

# FHSU General Education Committee

---

## Minutes

### Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

**Date:** Thursday February 7, 2019

**Time:** 3:30-5:00

**Location:** Smoky Hill 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)

Adam Schibi (SGA)

Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)

Tanya Smith (Grad Sch)

---

3:51 (1 minute) All members were present with the exception of Hartman, Hill, McNeil, and Schibi. Duffy served as proxy for Hill, and Heronemus served as proxy for Hartman (who showed up later in the meeting). Determined that a quorum was met.

3:32 (95 minutes) The meeting focused on following up the idea from last week that we won't have a single rubric for each set of outcomes in the CORE program, but instead will invite departments interested in offering a course to meet the outcomes for a given objective to come up with a rubric of their own, still with the four-column "not proficient," "developing proficiency," "proficient," "exceeding proficiency" organization, but tailored to their own specific interpretation of the outcomes and their own course assignments, and to submit this course-and-assignment-and-rubric package for consideration. The first item having to do with this to come to a vote was the following:

*Courses seeking inclusion in the FHSU CORE program must submit assignments whereby the students fulfill program outcomes, along with the rubric by which these assignments will be assessed.*

This passed 12 in favor, none opposed, 1 abstaining. What proved most controversial in the committee's deliberations was whether these course-and-assignment-and-rubric packages should be evaluated for approval by the general education committee alone, or whether it would be wise for the committee to consult content experts as well from outside the membership of the committee. Some argued that consulting natural science faculty outside the committee, for instance, would "gum up" the process, getting in the way of quick approval of proposals. Others argued that it is

important for the integrity of the program that it get "buy in" from the university at large, and that taking into account the opinions of content experts outside the committee would help with this; also that we would do well not to assume that the current members of the General Education committee are qualified to judge what should count as "proficient" for every learning outcome in the program. This much, however, was largely agreed upon, and put to a vote:

*The Chair will ask the deans [see 1/31/19 minutes at 4:11 for details] to appoint faculty members to serve on faculty rubric groups with the task of advising colleagues in developing rubrics for course approval submissions.*

The idea was to draw together and train content experts deeply familiar with the CORE outcomes for a given objective and having a good idea of what we're looking for in an assessment rubric to help colleagues produce the sort of course proposals we need to get the CORE program off the ground. This motion passed 11 in favor, 2 against, no abstentions. The only other item the committee agreed upon was that the course approval process will use the "significant course change" path in the current course approval system. This means, in part, that all CORE course approvals will go through the academic affairs committee of faculty senate.

5:05 The meeting ended. The committee will next meet on Thursday February 14 in the Smoky Hill Room of Memorial Union.

---

**Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary**

