

FHSU General Education Committee

Minutes

Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

Date: Thursday, August 23, 2018

Time: 3:30-5:00

Location: Pioneer Room, Union

Members

Douglas Drabkin (AHSS)

Marcella Marez (AHSS)

Jessica Heronemus (BE)

David Schmidt (BE)

Sarah Broman (Ed)

Kevin Splichal (Ed)

Trey Hill (HBS)

Glen McNeil (HBS)

Joe Chretien (STM)

Tom Schafer (STM)

Robyn Hartman (Lib)

Helen Miles (Senate)

not yet appointed (SGA)

Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)

Tanya Smith (Grad Sch)

3:30 (3 minutes) All members were present with the exception of Marez, McNeil, and the not-yet-appointed representative of the Student Government Association. Heronemus was serving as proxy for Marez. Tim Crowley, Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs, was in attendance as an observer. Determined that a quorum was met. New committee members Broman and Chretien were welcomed. Brief introductions were made.

3:34 (1 minute) Woods and Lucas having left the committee, Hill agreed to serve in their place as IRB “primary investigator” for the purpose of receiving and collating data from our remaining learning outcomes stakeholder feedback surveys.

3:35 (2 minutes) Chair reminded the committee that if we can’t come to a meeting, we are to try to get a proxy; but that we should make sure to let the intended proxy know about it, and get their permission. Also, the committee’s procedure for approving the minutes by email was reviewed.

3:37 (2 minutes) The committee began considering the stakeholder survey data for the three measurable learning outcomes corresponding to **objective 3.2: intercultural competence** (“Students will understand their own and others’ cultures and possess skills necessary to engage constructively with all kinds of people”). We began with outcome 1 (“The student will produce an exploratory or investigative work based upon a personal interaction such as a conversation, an interview, or a service-learning experience that compares and contrasts the culture of an individual or group outside of the student’s own identity community with the student’s own culture”). As the feedback had been

generally supportive, the only opposition suggesting that a more ambitious outcome would be preferable, the committee voted to keep the outcome unchanged. The motion passed: 12 in favor, 1 abstaining.

3:39 (1 minute) The committee briefly reviewed, for the sake of the new members, that what we're doing here is trying to build a general education program around a set of *measurable learning outcomes*, things we expect every Fort Hays State University graduate to be able to do, and that we are going to be testing for.

3:40 (13 minutes) We turned next to outcome 2 ("The student will produce an exploratory or investigative work that elucidates multiple aspects of a culture outside of the student's own identity community"). In the end, the committee voted unanimously to keep the outcome unchanged. But several minutes were spent considering the stakeholder comment that "It would probably help to define what it means for something to be outside of one's culture. . . . For example, is a traditional aged student working with someone that's older (but in other ways similar to the student) considered being outside of their identity community?" In the end, the committee decided not to get into defining what it means to be inside or outside one's culture, but to leave this to the faculty members who would be overseeing designing and administering the assessment rubric for the outcome.

3:53 (35 minutes) Outcome 3 proved the most controversial of the set ("The student will accomplish a task by engaging in an interpersonal experience involving a language other than the student's native language(s). American Sign Language counts as a language"). One of the things that struck the committee on reflection was that perhaps our wording "engaging in an interpersonal experience involving a language" cannot be expected to mean that the student is actually to communicate with someone in the foreign language. Our intention had been that the student is indeed to use the language in this way. But then, how well? As one of the stakeholder comments in opposition to the outcome suggests ("a meaningful engagement with another individual in another language implies greater competency in another language than I believe the current ten hours of foreign language [courses] provide the typical student"), outcome 3 fails to clearly indicate just how low a level of proficiency we have in mind, what we've been calling a "phrasebook" level of proficiency. We do not expect this outcome to require ten credit hours of language study, or even necessarily a three hour course. So a motion was put to a vote calling for a subgroup led by the Chair to reformulate outcome 3, perhaps running it by some of those surveyed who had found the original language objectionable, and to bring the revision to our third meeting of the semester, on Thursday, September 6. This motion passed, 11 in favor, 2 opposed.

4:28 (9 minutes) Chair brought to the attention of the committee a problem that has arisen with the university's new textbook supplier Akedemos. In several courses, including heavily enrolled general education courses such as INF 101: Introduction to Computer Information Systems, books simply are not available for the students, and it's not clear when the students will be getting their books. This is potentially a very big problem. Assistant Provost Crowley is preparing a letter of complaint to send to Akedemos.

4:37 Meeting ended. The committee will meet next in just four days, on Monday, August 27 at 3:30 PM in Rarick 114. On the agenda is discussing the proposed outcomes for objective 3.1, personal and professional efficacy.

Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary

