

FHSU General Education Committee

Minutes

Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

Date: Thursday, April 5, 2018

Time: 2:30-3:30

Location: Rarick 308

Members

Douglas Drabkin (AHSS)
Marcella Marez (AHSS)
Jessica Heronemus (BE)
David Schmidt (BE)
Kevin Splichal (Ed)
Teresa Woods (Ed)
Trey Hill (HBS)
Glen McNeil (HBS)
William Weber (STM)
Tom Schafer (STM)
Robyn Hartman (Lib)
Helen Miles (Senate)
Adam Schibi (SGA)
Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)
Kenton Russell (FYE)
Karmen Porter (Grad Sch)
Paul Lucas (nonvoting member)

2:33 (1 minute) All members were present with the exception of Hartman, Heronemus, Hill, Lucas, Marez, McNeil, and Russell. Miles was serving as proxy for McNeil. Determined that a quorum was met.

2:34 (12 minutes) Stepping back from details, the committee set a timetable of deadlines for bringing to fruition the revised General Education Program:

- F '18 Faculty Senate approves objectives and outcomes
- S '19 Assessment tools (rubrics) for the outcomes completed
- F '19 Courses for producing the outcomes identified
- S '20 Everything scheduled and put up online for pre-enrollment in April
- F '20 Full roll-out of the new program for entering freshmen

2:46 (8 minutes) The committee reviewed what is still left to do re. measurable learning outcomes. We still need to draft or revise outcomes for 1.3 technology literacy, 2.1 aesthetic mode of inquiry, 2.3 synthesis with the major, 3.1 personal and professional efficacy, 3.2 intercultural competence, and 3.4 engaged global citizen leaders. And we need to process survey feedback as well for 1.1 oral communication, 1.2 quantitative literacy, 2.1 mathematical mode of inquiry, and 2.1 technological mode of inquiry.

2:54 (36 minutes) Woods presented stakeholder survey feedback on the proposed measurable learning outcomes for objective 3.3, **ethical judgment** (“students will recognize where reasonable, well-informed people disagree about what the right thing to do is”). The outcomes were modified slightly in response to feedback from the surveys, and the following wording was put to a vote:

The student will

1. *describe a situation in an area such as private life, business, health care, politics, applied science, or the arts where reasonable, well-informed people disagree about what the right thing to do is;*
2. *explain in detail the underlying values that are in apparent tension in this situation, bringing to bear relevant ethical principles;*
3. *provide well-reasoned arguments that resolve tensions in the situation by either reconciling the underlying tensions, finding one of the competing considerations decisive, or explaining why it remains unclear what ought to be done.*

This passed, 8 in favor, 1 opposed.

3:30 (10 minutes?) Woods presented stakeholder survey feedback on the proposed measurable learning outcomes for objective 1.5, **critical thinking** (“students will explore issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion; students will recognize, analyze, criticize, evaluate, and formulate arguments in ways characterized by intellectual courage”). The outcomes were modified slightly in response to feedback from the surveys, and the following wording was approved by unanimous vote:

The student will

1. *sort claims according to the kinds of evidence that could be used to establish their truth, and the kinds of expertise that would be relevant to evaluating this evidence;*
2. *evaluate arguments of various kinds (identify when an argument is being made, what its conclusion is, what the logical relation between premises and conclusion is purported to be, whether the premises are plausible, and whether the conclusion is established);*
3. *compose an essay on a difficult question that subjects the student’s own reasoning to sustained, intelligent criticism.*

3:40? Meeting ended. As the meeting broke up, Drabkin distributed a handout proposing new wording for objective 1.5, critical thinking to consider at a future meeting (“students will develop skill at judging the relevance of evidence, at identifying and evaluating arguments, and at engaging in thoughtful self-criticism”). The chair suggested that this might be taken up at the committee’s next meeting, which will be held on Thursday, April 12 at 2:30 PM in the Pioneer Room of the Union.

