

FHSU General Education Committee

Minutes

Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

Date: Thursday, March 29, 2018

Time: 2:30-3:30

Location: Smoky Hill 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 (2 minutes) All members were present with the exception of Lucas, Marez (who did join us later in the meeting), McNeil, Russell, Splichal, and Woods. Hartman was serving as proxy for Woods. Miles was serving as proxy for McNeil. And Schafer was serving as proxy for Splichal. Determined that a quorum was met.

2:32 (1 minute) The minutes from March 1, 2018 were amended at 2:36 to note that the four proposed measurable learning outcomes for the technological mode of inquiry had not just been put to a vote that day, but had in fact been approved for distribution to the corresponding stakeholder group for comments.

2:33 (52 minutes) Porter brought to the table a proposal for three measurable learning outcomes for **objective 3.2: intercultural competence** (“students will understand their own and others’ cultures and possess skills necessary to engage constructively with people across a range of races, ethnicities, genders, identities, abilities, histories, religions, traditions, and languages”).

The student will

1. *through oral or written communication, explain their understanding of diverse cultural differences;*
2. *develop a plan for inclusion of traditionally disenfranchised categories of people in the U.S.;*

3. *express in oral or written communication how socioeconomic or linguistic stratification perpetuates inequalities in the U.S. or internationally.*

Drabkin suggested that, given the emphasis in the second and third outcomes on combatting large-scale injustice, the proper place for these outcomes should be, if anywhere, objective 3.4: engaged global citizen leaders, not 3.2. Schafer concurred, noting that geographers would not consider these a good measure of “intercultural competence” as they understand the term. Duffy affirmed the desirability that our graduates be able to achieve these things, but agreed that objective 3.4 would be a better place to locate them in the program. Chair turned the discussion to the term “intercultural,” and suggested that it may be beneficial to think of it as having two components, one domestic and one international. Is intercultural competence one thing for us as citizens living together in the United States, and something different for us as members of the world community? He suggested that it would be valuable for our students, as U.S. citizens, to be able to understand something of the extraordinary breadth of cultures just here in the United States. Heronemus emphasized the desirability of providing our students with “exposure” to people different from themselves, ideally with experiences outside the borders of our nation. Schafer suggested that we want students, not just to “understand” people different from themselves, but, at some level, to “appreciate” them as well. Drabkin suggested that the key to interpreting 3.2 is the phrase “engage constructively.” What does engaging constructively with people from different cultures entail? As our discussion of objective 3.2 continued, it became clear that the proposed outcomes need to go back to the working group for rethinking and reformulation. Chair asked Schafer and Drabkin join the 3.2 working group, and they accepted.

3:25 (3 minutes) The committee began discussing the stakeholder comments on the proposed measurable learning outcomes for **objective 3.3: ethical judgment** – when, suddenly . . .

3:28 (19 minutes) . . . Marez appeared! (She’s been unable to attend Thursday meetings this semester due to a conflict with a class she’s teaching, but has been working diligently on the committee’s behalf outside of our sessions.) Marez presented measurable learning outcomes for the **oral communication** component of **objective 1.1: written and oral communication** (“students will effectively develop, express, and exchange ideas in the English language, both in writing and speaking, with clarity and coherence”). These were modified slightly in the course of discussion and the following wording was put to a vote:

The student will

1. *present orally an original message that effectively addresses an assigned purpose;*
2. *present orally an original message that effectively addresses a specified audience;*
3. *demonstrate effective critical listening.*

This was approved unanimously. The committee decided that the initial stakeholder group for eliciting feedback on these outcomes will be: Arvin Cruz (chemistry), Linda Feldstein (teacher education), Wally Guyot (applied business), Rose Helens-Hart (applied business), Chris Jochum (teacher education), Seth Kastle (leadership), Ginger Loggins (informatics), Carl Miller (philosophy), Denise Orth (allied health), Scott Robson (communication), Ron Rohlf (informatics), Tomme Williams (music & theatre), and Hsin-Yen Yang (communication).

3:47 Meeting ended. The committee’s next meeting will be Thursday, April 5 at 2:30 PM in Rarick 308.

Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary

