

FHSU General Education Committee

Minutes

Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

Date: Thursday, March 15, 2018

Time: 2:30-3:30

Location: Trails 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)

2:32 (1 minute) All members were present with the exception of Duffy, Marez, McNeil, Porter, Schibi, and Weber. Hartman was serving as proxy for Duffy. Miles was serving as proxy for McNeil and Porter. Splichal was serving as proxy for Weber. Determined that a quorum was met.

2:33 (36 minutes) Drabkin presented draft outcomes for objective 2.3, ***synthesis with the major*** (“students will make connections between the specialized knowledge and skills of their major and other fields of study”).

The student will

1. *produce a discipline-specific written document judged competent according to a department-developed rubric (i.e., objective 1.1, outcome 2);*
2. *produce an investigative, creative, or practical work that connects the student’s major program to two or more modes of inquiry (see outcome for objective 2.2).*

The discussion initially centered on proposed outcome 2, and to what extent it is appropriate for the new general education program to impose requirements on major programs. Chair expressed doubt that all programs would value this outcome. Heronemus expressed doubt that any program would not value this outcome. In this atmosphere of doubt, the committee began to wonder: just how far and in what ways should general education and the student’s

major be interwoven? Woods suggested that the integration should be not only through the modes of inquiry but also through the other elements of the new general education program (the various literacies, critical thinking, etc.). Drabkin suggested that, just as outcome 1 makes explicit reference to objective 1.1, explicit reference could be made to other objectives. Chair wondered if objective 2.3 needs measurable learning outcomes at all, besides those indicated elsewhere in the program. But if there are not outcomes dedicated to this objective, Miles asked, how will it be assessed? Drabkin recommended tabling discussion until outcomes for the rest of the program have been identified (technology literacy, intercultural competence, engaged global citizen leaders, etc.). Perhaps the major programs will be adequately integrated throughout the program as a whole. Discussion of objective 2.3 was tabled until a later date.

3:09 (1 minute) Woods presented stakeholder survey feedback on the proposed measurable learning outcomes for part of objective 2.1, knowledge of the liberal arts: ***the natural scientific mode of inquiry***. For this objective, we received only two responses, both supportive, but no comments. The three outcomes were accepted unchanged, without discussion, and by unanimous vote.

3:10 (22 minutes) Woods presented stakeholder survey feedback on the proposed measurable learning outcomes for part of objective 2.1, knowledge of the liberal arts: ***the philosophical mode of inquiry***. Discussion focused on the description of philosophical questions in outcome 1 (“non-empirical questions suitable for being approached dialectically”), and in particular on what it means for a question to be “non-empirical.” In the end, the committee decided by unanimous vote to keep the three outcomes unchanged.

3:32 (13 minutes) Woods presented stakeholder survey feedback on the proposed measurable learning outcomes for part of objective 2.1, knowledge of the liberal arts: ***the social scientific mode of inquiry***. Discussion this time focused on the term “frameworks” in outcome 1 (“students will identify, within a given scenario, applicable frameworks for explaining social phenomena”). One of the stakeholders had recommended changing “frameworks” to “theoretical frameworks,” and this proposal was eventually put up for a vote. 4 members of the committee voted in favor of the change, 6 voted against, and 4 abstained. In the end, the committee decided, again unanimously, to keep the three outcomes unchanged.

3:45 Meeting ended. The committee’s next meeting will be Thursday, March 29 at 2:30 PM in the Smoky Hill Room of the Memorial Union.

Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary

