

FHSU General Education Committee

Minutes

Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

Date: Thursday April 8, 2021

Time: 3:30-5:00

Location: <https://fhsu.zoom.us/j/93003453531>

Members

Douglas Drabkin (AHSS)
Marcella Marez (AHSS)
Christina Glenn (BE)
David Schmidt (BE)
Sarah Broman Miller (Ed)
Phillip Olt (Ed)
Glen McNeil (HBS)
Denise Orth (HBS)
Joe Chretien (STM)
Lane Young (STM)
Robyn Hartman (Lib)
Helen Miles (Senate)
Isaiah Schindler (SGA)
Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)
Tanya Smith (Grad Sch)

3:31 (2 minutes) All members were present with the exception of Duffy, Marez, and Schindler. Hartman served as proxy for Duffy, and Young served as proxy for Marez. Kevin Splichal (Faculty Senate) was also in attendance. Determined that a quorum was met.

3:33 (2 minutes) The minutes from last week's meeting were amended and approved.

3:35 (16 minutes) The committee considered and approved an editing of the document "General Education Requirements for Students with Three-Year Baccalaureate Degrees," which will now be titled "International Partnership General Education Program."

3:51 (9 minutes) The committee considered and **approved** the revised proposal for **ECON 201: Principles of Microeconomics** to satisfy the 2.1F outcomes (social scientific mode of inquiry). The only question that came up for discussion concerned outcome 3 ("compare and contrast human behavior among various cultures using social science concepts") and whether the assignment is a comparison and contrast of actual human behavior, or more or less just an application of economic concepts to an idealized set of premises. We decided that it is more or less just an application of economic concepts to an idealized set of premises, but that this is the sort of things economics does in lower division courses, and so it should be accepted as an adequate handling of 2.1F.3.

4:00 (17 minutes) Next was **BIOL 102: Laboratory Experiences in Biology**, which is being proposed to satisfy 2.1D.3 ("apply scientific methodology to a natural science question to increase understanding, make an informed decision, and/or solve a problem"). This seemed to the committee a pretty solid proposal. Nevertheless, we decided to **table** it

and ask the department to resubmit with the descriptions in the student-facing rubric boiled down to their essential elements and transferred in condensed form over to the CORE rubric.

4:17 (3 minutes) Next was ***GSCI 102: Introduction to Geology Laboratory***, which is also being proposed for 2.1D.3. The committee decided to ***table*** it and ask the department to bring the assignment and assessment more in line with the recommendations of the faculty advisory panel. The faculty advisory panel had written: "We recommend an exercise or questions that involve data collection and analysis or investigation and interpretation, perhaps still relating to the same kind of project that is described in the current example." What they seem to be saying is that a science lab course should be rooted in first-person observations and the interpretation of first-person observations -- that applying scientific methodology to science questions requires working with raw empirical data, and not just second-hand, already interpreted empirical data. The student should be encouraged to think about where the data came from, how it was earned. The assessment of 2.1D.3 should be something more than an exercise in diagram reading.

4:20 (5 minutes) Chair recommended, with respect to our use of the TEAMS system, that posts be made, not under "Posts," but under "Files," as "Conversations" tagged to particular documents in the proposals we are considering. Each comment will then appear in two places, under "Files" as well as under "Posts," and will automatically be linked to a relevant document.

4:25 (18 minutes) The last proposal we considered this week was ***GSCI 100: Introduction to Geology*** for the first two 2.1D outcomes (scientific mode of inquiry). We decided to ***table*** the proposal and ask the department to submit two things: for outcome 1, an assignment that is more generally applicable to natural science as a methodology, rather than an assignment that requires students to recognize specific geological facts; and for outcome 2, an assignment that requires students to perform an evaluation of the merits or quality of research. Both of these requests have to do with bringing the assignments for CORE assessment better in line with the CORE outcomes.

4:43 Meeting ended. Our next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 15.

Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary

