

# FHSU General Education Committee

---

## Minutes

### Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

**Date:** Thursday October 7, 2021

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

**Location:** Pioneer Room, and  
<https://fhsu.zoom.us/j/94468542828>

### Members

Douglas Drabkin (AHSS)  
Marcella Marez (AHSS)  
Christina Glenn (BE)  
David Schmidt (BE)  
Sarah Broman Miller (Ed)  
Phillip Olt (Ed)  
Denise Orth (HBS)  
Tanya Smith (HBS)  
C.D. Clark (STM)  
Lane Young (STM)  
Robyn Hartman (Lib)  
Jeni McRay (Senate)  
Ryan Stanley (SGA)  
Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)

---

3:31 (1 minute) All members were present with the exception of Miller, Olt, and Stanley. Schmidt served as proxy for Miller. Brett Whitaker, Chair of the Department of Leadership Studies, was also in attendance.

3:32 (0.5 minutes) The minutes from September 23 were approved.

3:32 (1 minute) Chair announced that Young has been appointed to serve as vice-chair of the committee.

3:33 (8 minutes) Chair will be attending the Faculty Senate meeting on Tuesday November 2 to answer questions that have arisen related to the College of Science, Technology, and Mathematics' decision to develop an multiple choice exam template to serve as an optional assessment tool for proposals handling the outcomes 2.1D.1 and 2.1D.2 (the natural scientific mode of inquiry). There also appears to be confusion among some senators as to why 2.1D.3, the science lab outcome, is being handled in a separate lab course.

3:41 (51 minutes) Brett Whitaker made a presentation to the committee regarding the Department of Leadership Studies' proposal for **LDRS 460: Global Leadership** to satisfy two outcome sets: 2.1F (the social scientific mode of inquiry) and 3.2 (intercultural competence). The committee reviewed this proposal last semester, on March 18, 2021 ([see 4:30? in the minutes](#)), and decided to table it. Whitaker explained to the committee that it would be a pretty straightforward matter to handle our concerns regarding outcomes 2.1F.1 and 2.1F.2, but that our concern regarding 3.2.1 is more problematic. 3.2.1 reads, that the student will "produce an exploratory or investigative work based upon a personal interaction such as a conversation, an interview, or a service-learning experience that compares and contrasts the culture of an individual or group outside of the student's own identity community with the student's own culture."

It is this outcome itself, Whitaker argued, that is problematic, for two reasons, one logistical and one theoretical: (1) logistically, it will be difficult to find a different-enough person for each student to interact with, and (2) theoretically, the tendency of students to over-generalize on the basis of a single interaction is likely to have results that are contrary to objective 3.2, which is to get students to "understand their own and others' cultures and possess skills necessary to engage constructively with all kinds of people." Whitaker also shared a handout with the committee sketching out what seems to him how we ought to go about teaching towards intercultural competence. ("Do's" include "design assignments with experiential rigor," "provide feedback," "promote self-reflection," "use cultural dimensions," "connect intercultural competence learning to other objectives," and "remind students to stay humble." "Don'ts" include "allow unchecked stereotyping," "condone superficial interaction," and "generalize.") Whitaker concluded with a request that our committee waive outcome 3.2.1 for LDRS 460, or more specifically, that the requirement for "a personal interaction such as a conversation, an interview, or a service-learning experience" be waived for this course proposal. McRay moved to grant this request, because the course seems to be the sort of thing that would do justice to the overall objective. In discussion, Duffy noted that the personal interaction in 3.2.1 was intentional, and is in keeping with the "practical applications" emphasis of CORE Goal 3. Drabkin suggested that 3.2.1 may be poorly thought through, or impractical, but that it would be a bad precedent to simply waive it if it seems problematic; it would be better to rework the outcome. The committee voted to reject the motion: 4 were in favor, 8 against. So the proposal remains tabled until we see a revision. Whitaker said we can expect a revised proposal for 2.1F, but not for 3.2, not until the outcome itself is revised. To look into the advisability of revising 3.2.1 -- which would be the first change to the CORE objectives and outcomes since the program was approved nearly three years ago -- a subcommittee of Clark, McRay, and Orth was appointed.

4:32 (3 minutes) The committee considered a proposal for **PSY 340: Social Psychology** to satisfy the outcomes for objective 3.2 (intercultural competence). The proposal was unanimously approved.

4:35 (2 minutes) The committee considered a proposal for **BCOM 695: Corporate Communication Strategy** to satisfy outcomes 1.1A.1, 1.1A.2, and 1.5.3 (upper-level writing and critical thinking). The proposal was unanimously approved.

4:37 (5 minutes) The committee considered a proposal for **THTR 120: Introduction to Theater** to satisfy the outcomes for objective 2.1A (the aesthetic mode of inquiry). The proposal was unanimously approved.

4:42 Meeting ended. Our next meeting will be in two weeks, on Thursday October 21.

---

Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary

