

FHSU General Education Committee

Minutes

Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

Date: Thursday April 14, 2022

Time: 4:00-5:00

Location: Pioneer Room, and
<https://fhsu.zoom.us/j/94468542828>

Members

Douglas Drabkin (AHSS)
Marcella Marez (AHSS)
Christina Glenn (BE)
David Schmidt (BE)
Sarah Broman Miller (Ed)
Phillip Olt (Ed)
Denise Orth (HBS)
Tanya Smith (HBS)
C.D. Clark (STM)
Lane Young (STM)
Robyn Hartman (Lib)
Rob Byer (Senate)
Mark Faber (SGA)
Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)

3:29 (1 minute) All members were present with the exception of Hartman, Miller, and Faber. Marez served as proxy for Hartman, and Schmidt served as proxy for Miller. Chris Jochum from the Department of Teacher Education was also in attendance. Determined that a quorum was met.

3:30 (1 minute) The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

3:31 (4 minutes) Chair shared a draft document (one page, one side) setting out the full set of CORE outcomes as a list without goal-and-objective numbering. This would be for sending out to president, deans, the advisor corps, admissions, etc. to help bring what we've been working on for several years into focus as an integrated whole, so that, moving forward, we will be able to articulate what lies at the heart of a Fort Hays State University education.

3:35 (47 minutes) The committee met with Jochum about **TEEL 341: Educational Psychology** which is being proposed to satisfy two outcome sets: the **social scientific mode of inquiry (2.1F)** and **upper-division writing and critical thinking (1.1A and 1.5.3)**. (See [minutes](#) from April 7 for our concerns from last week.) Jochum explained that this would be the third social science content course students preparing to be teachers would be required to take, and so, it would be an appropriate place to assess 2.1F. The committee recommended three changes to the proposal: (1) that the CORE rubric for 1.1A.2 (the discipline-specific document) be

condensed down to one row of descriptions; (2) that the assignment and rubric for 1.5.3 (subjecting the student's reasoning to sustained and intelligent criticism) be made explicit, involving something like, as Jochum put it, a self-reflective "devil's advocate" section in the student's paper; and (3) that the assessment for the three 2.1F outcomes be separated out from the assessment for 1.1A and 1.5.3 and perhaps broken up into two or three separate assignments. Jochum agreed to take these suggestions to the developers of the proposal with the idea of working up a revision. The proposal was **tabled** until we hear back from the department.

4:22 (3 minutes) The committee considered and **approved** a revision to the proposal for **CHEM 100: The Chemist's View of the World** to satisfy **outcomes 2.1D.1-2 (natural scientific mode of inquiry, first two outcomes)**. Our rationale is as follows:

This course is clearly appropriate for 2.1D. The CORE outcomes are listed in the syllabus. The assessment tool, "Informed Citizen's Look at Chemical Research," requires students to read a news article about scientific research, obtain the original paper on which the article is based, and write a summary of the paper. It requires students to identify elements in the paper that would be considered "essential characteristics of natural science questions," including the hypothesis and methods used. And it requires the students to consider the paper's merit. The committee believes this a good-faith effort to be true to the language of the outcomes.

4:25 Meeting ended. Our next meeting will be on Thursday April 22 at 3:30 PM.

Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary

