

# FHSU General Education Committee

---

## Minutes

### Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

**Date:** Thursday, February 8, 2018

**Time:** 2:30-3:30

**Location:** Pioneer Room, Union

### 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)

---

2:30 (5 minutes) All members were present with the exception of Hill, Marez, McNeil, Schibi, and Weber. Miles was serving proxy for McNeil. Brooke Mann, from the psychology department, was substituting for Hill.

2:35 (2 minutes) Chair drew attention to a tally of things-already-done and things-yet-to-do to complete our goal of getting a full slate of measurable learning outcomes formulated, evaluated, revised, and approved by the end of this semester. So far we have approved first-formulations for 1.1 written communication, 1.5 critical thinking, 2.1 natural scientific mode of inquiry, 2.1 social scientific mode of inquiry, and 3.3 ethical judgment. None of these have left the first-formulation stage and been sent out for survey feedback.

2:37 (28 minutes) As for why the outcomes have yet to be sent out for survey feedback, our instrument (see [minutes for 11/13/17](#)) has yet to be approved by the university's Institutional Review Board. The IRB committee, in an expedited review, decided that our survey project warrants maintaining confidentiality of names associated with specific survey comments. So the committee was offered a choice: either (1) to drop questioning our colleagues altogether, (2) to set up face-to-face focus groups to get our colleagues' opinions about the outcomes, (3) to send emails to our colleagues that pretty much ask the same questions that are on the survey but not to call what we are doing a "survey," (4) to send out the survey but in a way that "de-identifies" the respondents (in practice, Teresa Woods and Paul Lucas would know who said what, but the respondents would be anonymous to the rest of the committee), or (5) to meet with the full IRB committee later this month and attempt to convince them that what we are proposing should not be considered "research" warranting confidential handling of survey responses. The committee voted 12 in favor, 1 against, and 1 abstaining in support of option (4), going with a de-identified survey.

3:05 (1 minute) The committee approved the three measurable learning outcomes for the philosophical mode of inquiry as modified in committee last week:

The student will

1. *identify the distinguishing characteristics of philosophical questions (non-empirical questions suitable for being approached dialectically);*
2. *compose an essay that accurately captures someone else's reasoning in support of their answer to a philosophical question;*
3. *compose an essay that accurately captures a significant objection to a clearly formulated philosophical argument and explains why the objection is significant.*

3:06 (15 minutes) Hartman presented eight measurable learning outcomes for objective 1.3 technological literacy ("Students will effectively and responsibly use appropriate technology for communication, scholarship, and problem-solving."):

The student will

[Gather]

1. *prioritize areas of interest within a discipline in order to articulate a research topic;*
2. *articulate key elements in their research questions in order to develop and execute a search strategy;*
3. *think critically in order to adapt search strategies;*

[Evaluate]

4. *refine search results in order to choose appropriate types of information resources;*
5. *consider sources from diverse worldviews in order to expand their personal knowledge and frame of reference;*
6. *critically analyze the context of information sources in order to find relevant, authoritative sources;*

[Use]

7. *share ideas thoughtfully in order to uphold their responsibility as knowledge creators;*
8. *follow copyright and citation conventions in order to use information legally and with academic integrity.*

The committee thought this list was pretty good, but that the language should be modified to bring it in keeping with other measurable outcomes we are formulating. In particular, it would help if the actual measurable product were identified (e.g., a research log). Hartman and Chair will meet in the coming days to try to work out an appropriate revision.

3:21 (5 minutes) Chair brought a suggestion from Associate Provost Crowley to the committee: that in the interest of simplifying our task and speeding along the general education reform process, we consider dropping objective 3.4 engaged global citizen leaders ("Students will appreciate the world's complexity; the interdependence of natural, social, economic, and political factors; and the deep challenges that can arise both on a local and global scale. Students will

*possess the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to engage civically and work in cooperation with others toward creative responses to these challenges.”) The committee judged it premature to drop objective 3.4 at this time.*

3:26 (2 minutes) Chair announced that at our next meeting we will have at least three things on our agenda: (1) to consider the revised outcomes for information literacy, (2) to consider the revised outcomes for the historical mode of inquiry, and (3) to formulate an outcomes subgroup for objective 1.3 technology literacy. If time remains, we will set subgroups for the remaining objectives.

3:38 Meeting ended. The committee’s next meeting will be Thursday, February 15 at 2:30 PM in Rarick 308.

---

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

