

FHSU General Education Committee

Minutes

Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

Date: Thursday February 11, 2021

Time: 3:30-4:43

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)

Lanee Young (STM)

Robyn Hartman (Lib)

Helen Miles (Senate)

Isaiah Schindler (SGA)

Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)

Tanya Smith (Grad Sch)

3:35 (1 minute) All members were present with the exception of Orth and Young. Determined that a quorum was met.

3:36 (1 minute) The minutes from last week's meeting were approved.

3:37 (3 minutes) The committee considered a proposal from the Department of English for ENG 126: Introduction to Literature to satisfy the outcomes for objective 2.1A, the aesthetic mode of inquiry. The proposal was **approved**. The committee appreciated that the CORE outcomes appeared to be well-integrated into the course design with the particular learning outcomes of the course clearly linked to the CORE outcomes.

3:40 (17 minutes) The committee considered a proposal from the Department of English for ENG 327: Literature Matters to satisfy the outcomes sets for both objective 2.1A: the aesthetic mode of inquiry and objective 3.3: engaged global citizens. The committee noted that, even though this is a variable content course, we still need a sample syllabus to see how the course design and assignments would be able to achieve all six CORE outcomes. In addition to a syllabus, the committee noted that the CORE outcomes need to be separated out from the other course outcomes and given their own one-page rubric. The consensus of the committee seemed to be that the course is pretty clearly a good fit for 2.1A, but less clearly a good fit for 3.3. The proposal was **tabled** until we hear back from the department.

3:57 (8 minutes) Conversation turned to recurring problems in the CORE proposals -- failure to match assignments and assessments to outcomes, failure to distinguish institution-facing outcome-monitoring rubrics from student-facing developmental rubrics, failure to provide meaningful descriptions of what it means for a student to do something well enough ("proficiency"), and so on -- and whether there is something we can do to get the word out about what we have come to learn about these things. It was decided that a subcommittee will form (McNeil, Hartman, Duffy, and Drabkin) to select rubrics that do certain things well and to explain in writing exactly what is good about them. The subcommittee will report back to the committee-at-large, and if we can agree on this, the information will be shared with the Faculty Development Committee, of which Hartman is a member.

4:05 (29 minutes) The committee considered four proposals from the Department of History, all to satisfy the outcomes for objective 2.1B, the historical mode of inquiry -- HIST 110: World Civilization to 1500, HIST 111: Modern World Civilization, HIST 130: United States History to 1877, and HIST 131: United States History since 1877. We considered these courses as a set because they all are clearly good fits for 2.1B, and they are all being put forward with the same general assignment-rubric structure. Most of the discussion focused on their handling of outcome 2.1B.1, "the student will identify distinguishing characteristics of historical questions." They define proficiency for this outcome as "the student will make at least 3 connections between secondary sources and primary texts." Making these three connections sets the student up nicely for interpreting the connections (outcome 2.1B.2), and building an historical argument on the basis of these interpretations (outcome 2.1B.3), so it is not hard to see why the department would want to set things up this way. But the pedagogical good sense of this sequence aside, making connections between secondary sources and primary texts (doing history, in part) and identifying the distinguishing characteristics of historical questions (identifying what it is that historians do, as opposed to what social scientists do or novelists) are two different things; or so it seemed to enough members of the committee that we decided to **table** the four proposals and invite members of the Department of History to join us and share their thoughts.

4:34 Meeting ended. The next meeting will be Thursday February 18.

Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary

