

# FHSU General Education Committee

---

## Minutes

### Meeting Called by

Brad Will, Chair

### Date:

Thursday December 7, 2023

### Time:

3:30-4:30

### Location:

Trails Room, Memorial Union

### Members

Douglas Drabkin (AHSS)  
Amber Nickell (AHSS)  
Emily Breit (BE)  
David Schmidt (BE)  
Sarah Broman Miller (Ed)  
Sohyun Yang (Ed)  
Arrica Braun (HBS)  
Tanya Smith (HBS)  
C.D. Clark (STM)  
Todd Moore (STM)  
Robyn Hartman (Lib)  
Ginger Loggins (Senate)  
Audrey Rymer (SGA)  
Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)

---

3:29 (3 minutes) All members were present with the exception of Miller and Yang. Schmidt served as proxy for Miller, and Hartman served as proxy for Yang. Determined that a quorum was met.

3:32 (1 minute) The minutes from the November 2 meeting were approved.

3:33 (1 minute) Chair announced that our Spring 2024 committee meeting will be held on the first and third Thursdays of each month.

3:34 (7 minutes) The committee considered a proposal for **HHP 310: A Critical Thinking Approach: Consumer Health** to satisfy the revised CORE 1.5 outcomes (critical thinking), and voted to ask the department to **revise and resubmit** the proposal. There needs to be a single assessment for each outcome, not an averaging of multiple assessments. They need to get the new outcome 1.5.1 in their sights, the outcome involving sorting claims having been replaced in last year's post-KBOR revisions to CORE program. The proficiency description for outcome 1 should focus on the systematic evaluation of various kinds of arguments. And the assignment for outcome 2 should require developing an argument in support of a controversial thesis, that uses a standard form of reasoning, that defends this reasoning from a significant objection, and that presents the whole thing as a formal paper.

3:51 (18 minutes) The committee considered a proposal for **COMM 306: Argumentation** to satisfy the revised CORE 1.5 outcomes (critical thinking), and voted to ask the department to **revise and resubmit** the proposal. The proposed assessment instrument for outcome 1 doesn't appear to be adequate for determining whether the student can systematically evaluate arguments of various kinds. In revising the proposal, the department may either provide a set of

representative questions that would adequately evaluate this outcome or show how they would develop such questions.

4:09 (28 minutes) Our meeting ended with a discussion of whether the General Education course proposal process is inappropriately opaque to our colleagues. The process may be clear enough to those of us who have been serving for years on the General Education committee, but it is perhaps less than adequately clear to faculty members who haven't been through the process before and are interested in proposing a new course. We agreed to revisit this at our January meeting and consider adjusting the guidelines for proposals.

4:37 The meeting ended. Our next meeting is scheduled for Thursday January 18, 3:30 PM, Trails Room.

---

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

