

# FHSU General Education Committee

---

## Minutes

### Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

**Date:** Thursday October 18, 2018

**Time:** 3:30-5:00

**Location:** Rarick 114

### Members

Douglas Drabkin (AHSS)

Marcella Marez (AHSS)

Jessica Heronemus (BE)

David Schmidt (BE)

Sarah Broman (Ed)

Kevin Splichal (Ed)

Trey Hill (HBS)

Glen McNeil (HBS)

Joe Chretien (STM)

Tom Schafer (STM)

Robyn Hartman (Lib)

Helen Miles (Senate)

Adam Schibi (SGA)

Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)

Tanya Smith (Grad Sch)

---

3:31 (1 minute) All members were present with the exception of Duffy, Hill, and Marez. Drabkin was proxy for Duffy. Miles was proxy for Hill. And Heronemus was proxy for Marez. Determined that a quorum was met.

3:32 (81 minutes) A six-member subgroup of the committee (Drabkin, Hartman, Heronemus, McNeil, Miles, and Schafer) met twice earlier this week to discuss ways to operationalize the FHSU CORE program and make it work in considerably fewer than 55 hours. So this week's meeting began with summaries of the recommendations that came out of this sub-group's conversations: that some objectives be handled by unique courses, that other objectives be shared by multiple courses, that some objectives be allowed to be handled by courses satisfying degree program requirements, that other courses be kept from being handled by courses satisfying degree program requirements, that some objectives be combinable with other objectives in the same course, that other objectives not be combinable in this way. These sorts of recommendations were really just a refining of things the committee-at-large had talked about, and largely agreed to, last week. But then, some *far more controversial questions* arose. Should objective 1.2 (mathematical literacy) be merged in with objective 2.1-C (the mathematical mode of inquiry)? Should objective 1.3 (computing literacy) be moved elsewhere in the program, perhaps into the technological mode of inquiry, or be handled in the major, or dropped altogether? Should objective 2.1-E (the philosophical mode of inquiry) be kept at all? And so on. The significance of these questions is that the committee began seriously considering a significant pruning of the list of objectives and outcomes that we've worked so hard this past year to formulate. And it's not clear what is and what is not on the table for elimination or combination. This of course is nothing to be entered into recklessly. And so, the committee chose, first of all, to invite Keith Dreiling, chair of the department of mathematics, and Bill Weber, also of the

department of mathematics and a past member of this committee, to speak with us at our meeting next Thursday. The committee wonders, with respect to 1.2 and 2.1-C, whether we really do want to require every student at FHSU to take two math courses, and if not, how best to capture what we do want in our objectives and outcomes. Also, another subgroup of the committee (Chretien, Drabkin, Schmidt, and perhaps others) will try to meet with Kim Stewart of the department of applied technology before next week's meeting to try to get in clearer focus how the outcomes for 2.1-G (the technological mode of inquiry) should be interpreted. The upshot is this: exciting times are upon us. Now that we have a big, beautiful list of eminently desirable measurable learning outcomes, we are asking: What should the *emphasis* of the FHSU CORE program be? What are we going to *prioritize*? And *why*?

4:53 Meeting ended. The committee will next meet on Thursday October 25 at 3:30 in the Pioneer Room of the Union.

---

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

