**FHSU Liberal Education Committee**

**Minutes**

Meeting Called by

Shala Mills, Chair

Date: Thursday 4/13/2017

Time: 3:00-4:00

Location: Rarick 312

Members

Douglas Drabkin (AHSS)

Bradley Will (AHSS)

Dmitry Gimon (BE)

Jessica Heronemus (BE)

Kevin Splichal (Ed)

Teresa Woods (Ed)

Glen McNeil (HBS)

Tanya Smith (HBS)

William Weber (STM)

Tom Schafer (STM)

Robyn Hartman (Lib)

Helen Miles (Senate)

Megan Garcia (SGA)

Cody Scheck (SGA)

Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)

Kenton Russell (FYE)

Chapman Rackaway (Grad Sch)

3:01 (1 minute) All were present except for Garcia, Gimon, Heronemus, Schafer, Scheck, Smith, and Splichal. Established that a quorum was met.

3:02 (5 minutes) Chair began with a review and overview of the terms “general education” and “liberal education.” Please see [www.fhsu.edu/liberaleducation](http://www.fhsu.edu/liberaleducation) for the AAC&U definitions. Chair noted some ongoing confusion and clarified that the program models we have been discussing this semester have all been “general education” proposals.

3:07 (13 minutes) As prelude to setting out the elements of a “compromise proposal” – the focus of this week’s meeting – Chair read through the three goals and twelve objectives decided upon last semester. She then indicated that the compromise proposal aims to account for them all, while borrowing elements from McNeil’s proposal and Drabkin’s proposal, and taking into consideration Miles’ concerns regarding highly prescriptive major programs. In addition, she indicated that the compromise proposal is sensitive to the concerns expressed in the 2015-2016 surveys of faculty and administrators, that it is more flexible than our current program, that it’s smaller, that it allows for a wider range of courses to count towards general education, that it emphasizes making our students better writers, that it emphasizes making our students better thinkers, that it’s sensitive to the desirability of making use of Kansas Core Outcomes to facilitate transferring credits between institutions, that it incorporates technology into the program as a mode of inquiry, that it involves reimagining and improving the Freshman Seminar, that it’s sensitive to the fact that abrupt changes in student credit hour production would have repercussions for academic departments, that significant losses along these lines should be balanced if possible with compensatory gains in other respects, and that it suggests where many of our current courses might fit in the new program. She also noted that this is still only a sketch. If we were to agree on something like this, the hard work of identifying learning outcomes would follow.

3:20 (6 minutes) Chair distributed a four-page overview of the proposed compromise program. (See below.) Regarding the program being “39 to 51” hours, Chair explained that, ideally, two of the writing intensive courses would be part of student’s major program, and that some of the modes of inquiry courses as well as other elements of the program would likely be required courses in the student’s major program. In other words, if by the “size” of a general education program one were to mean requirements outside of the requirements of the major program itself, the program should be thought of as considerably smaller than 51 hours. McNeil suggested that these outside-of-the-major requirements could be around 33 hours. But all told, the proposal comes to 17 three-hour courses, or 51 hours.

3:26 (2 minutes) Regarding the “single-category condition,” that no one general education course can serve two purposes – that a mode of inquiry course, for instance, cannot also serve as a writing intensive course, or as a civic perspectives course that aims to broaden the student’s understanding of the world – Chair suggested that the learning objectives of the various categories of the proposal would rule out any one course being able to satisfy two sets of learning outcomes. She admitted, however, that this limitation might be controversial, and would turn, in the end, on just what those learning outcomes are.

3:28 (3 minutes) Chair emphasized the importance of good, assessable learning outcomes for every element of the new program. Ideally, committees of faculty members closest to the disciplines related to a particular part of the program would advise the liberal education committee regarding these outcomes.

3:31 (4 minutes) The “Orientation and Wellness” gateway course would combine elements of our current First Year Seminar with elements of Personal Wellness so as to include “helpful facts and advice about time management, financial management, diet, exercise, sleep, stress, sexuality, drug use and abuse, advisors and counsellors, selecting college majors, changing college majors, and planning for careers.”

3:35 (4 minutes) The “Reasoning and Inquiry” gateway course would combine training in analyzing, understanding, and evaluating arguments with an introduction to the seven modes of inquiry.

3:39 (7 minutes) The “Reasoning and Communication Sequence” would add public speaking to previous proposals, and would include two writing-intensive courses in the major. The university’s writing advisory group would be asked to devise learning outcomes for these elements of the sequence in consultation with the various departments.

3:46 (2 minutes) A seventh mode of inquiry category would be added: “Technological – an instrumental approach to practical problems.”

3:48 (2 minutes) A new category of courses, “Civic Perspectives,” would be added. Students would select from a list of options: one “National” course, and one “Global” course.

3:50 (5 minutes) Finally, the upper-division integrative course would cease to be a reasoning-and-writing course (as in Drabkin’s proposal), but would become instead a “Junior/Senior Interdisciplinary Seminar.”

3:55 (1 minute) Drabkin asked if the plan would be to try to have a full draft of the new general education program, complete with learning outcomes, before Faculty Senate by the end of the Fall 2017 semester. The answer was yes. Would the program then launch (after a call for courses, the development of courses, and the scheduling of courses) in Fall 2019? The answer was hopefully.

3:56 (2 minutes) Committee members murmured nice things about various aspects of the proposal. Duffy mentioned something about “turning cartwheels.”

3:58 Meeting ended. The next meeting will be on Monday April 17 at 3:00 PM in Rarick 329. The idea is to begin a critical assessment of the new proposal. This is likely to continue beyond Monday’s meeting through a revival of the committee’s wiki site.

**----------------------------------------------------------------------**

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



**PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

**\*39-51 credit hour program**

**(but what we expect and hope for is really 39-45 credit hour program)**

**Double Dipping with Major is not only allowed, it is expected.**

* Two of the writing courses in this program would ideally be offered in the major, preferably as part of existing major requirements.
* Every major should connect, if not in the major then at least as a cognate for the major, with at least one if not more of the Modes of Inquiry. It is, therefore, expected that students will be able to use at least 3 hrs and up to as many as 9 hrs in the Modes of Inquiry as part of their major program requirements.
* Moreoever, double dipping is allowed in the Civics component of the program for another possible 6 hrs of double dipped requirements.
* *As a result, the non-major determined courses in the program could range from 39-51 credit hours.*

**SINGLE-CATEGORY CONDITION:**

Due to the specific Program Goals/Objectives/Outcomes associated with each area of the program, no single course may apply for inclusion in more than one area of the Program. (For example: American History could not apply for inclusion in both the Historical Mode of Inquiry and in the Civic Perspectives: National component.)

**ASSESSMENT CONDITIONS:**

* Learning Outcomes would be developed collaboratively with units best able to advise the committee (ex: Science departments would be consulted in developing Science learning outcomes…)
* Application to and inclusion in the program will be liberally construed in favor of courses that propose to meet the Learning Outcomes associated with the applicable portion of the program.
* Any course accepted for inclusion in the program will be subject to assessment based upon the learning outcomes of the relevant portion of the program.
* The Liberal Education Committee will review the assessment results and if a course fails to meet the expected learning outcomes, the committee will intervene in an effort to assist the course in meeting the outcomes. If the department refuses remediation or if after 2 consecutive semesters remediation has not been successful, then the committee will consider whether the course should be removed from the program.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **GATEWAY COURSES (6 hours)** | |
| **UNIV 101 (3 hrs)**  **Orientation and Wellness for the First Year Student**  This is a re-imagining of the First Year Seminar.  Course would include helpful facts and advice about time management, financial management, diet, exercise, sleep, stress, sexuality, drug use and abuse, advisor and counselors, selecting college majors, changing college majors, and planning for careers.  Objective 3.1:  Personal and Professional Efficacy  *(Notes: This envisions combining elements of FR seminar and Personal Wellness. This could be approached in different ways and a committee would need to study and make a recommendation:*   * *This course could be team taught in rotation so that, for example, a single HHP faculty member would teach 2/3 of 3 sections for every 6-credit hour teaching load. And the other 1/3 could be taught as 1-course overloads or 3 sections could be combined for a 3-credit hour teaching load by current or new FS faculty. OR* * *This could be separately credited with 1-hour for FS and 2-hours for Wellness. (which might better accommodate transfers). OR* * *We might completely revise the two into a single 3-hour course.* * *We might all Learning Communities to create their own versions.*   *This new course could also make use of blended learning formats.* | **(3 hrs)**  **Freshman-level Reasoning and Inquiry**  *This could be done in one of two ways (to be studied and recommended):*   * *We might create a new course called: Freshman-level Reasoning and Inquiry. OR* * *We might have a category where students choose one course from a range of options. All courses among the options MUST be approved courses subject to the Program’s reasoning and inquiry learning outcomes.*   Emphasis on analyzing, understanding, and evaluating arguments (giving reasons in support of claims); students introduced to the six modes of inquiry; students analyze representative arguments from all seven modes.  Must be completed prior to or concurrent with the Intermediate Reasoning-and-Writing Course  Objective 1.5: Critical Thinking  *(Note: After careful development of the learning outcomes for this component of the program, an RFP would go out inviting departments to submit course proposals. It is unlikely that any existing FHSU courses would meet the specific learning outcomes without significant revision in concert with those guidelines.)* |
| **REASONING and COMMUNICATION SEQUENCE (15 hours)**  Objective 1.1 Written and Oral Communitation (written for all 5 levels, written and oral for levels #3, 4 and 5)  Objective 1.4: Information Literacy (scaffolded up in concert with modules developed by Forsyth Library)  Objective 1.5: Critical Thinking (all 5 levels)  Objective 2.3: Synthesis with the major (at least for levels #4 and #5) | |
|  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MODES OF INQUIRY (21 hours)**  Seven 3+ credit-hour courses.   * Students must take at least one course from each of the 7 modes of inquiry. * Students may apply courses toward requirements for a degree, major, minor, or certificate (i.e.: double dipping is allowed).   + *HOWEVER, no more than 3 Modes of Inquiry could be used to satisfy 1st major and cognate requirements. (In other words, at least 4 Modes of Inquiry must be outside the student’s 1st major and its cognates.)* * All courses must meet applicable Program Goals and will be subject to assessment and review regarding applicable goals.   + All existing courses in the 55-hour Gen Ed program are eligible for inclusion in a Mode of Inquiry provided they are willing to be assessed re: the Program Goals.   + Any other UG course willing to meet and be assessed re: the Program Goals for one of the Modes of Inquiry may be included in the list of approved courses.   + No single course can be included in more than one Mode of Inquiry, nor may any Mode of Inquiry course also be included in another area of the Program.   **Required Liberal Education Goals**  Mode of Inquiry goals (to be drafted in consultation with Advisory group drawn from related disciplines for that Mode.)  2.1: Knowledge of the Liberal Arts (as appropriate fore each Mode of Inquiry) | | | | | | |
| **Aesthetic (Artistic)**  *imaginative approach to subjective experience* | **Philosophical**  *dialectical approach to non-empirical questions* | **Mathematical**  *logical approach to necessary truths* | **Natural Scientific**  *empirical approach to non-human data*  *Note: “Non-human data” means it is it not social or subjective data. Human Biology, while about humans, would still be non-human data.* | **Historical**  *narrative approach to human data* | **Social Scientific**  *empirical approach to human data* | **Technological**  *instrumental approach to practical problems* |
| Courses would meet learning outcomes aimed at teaching students to engage in Aesthetic or Artistic modes of inquiry,  for example:   * art * music * literature * theater | Courses would meet learning outcomes aimed at teaching students to engage in Philosophical modes of inquiry  for example:   * ethics * moral philosophy * political philosophy * religion | Courses would meet learning outcomes aimed at teaching students to engage in Mathematical modes of inquriy  for example:   * algebra * geometry * calculus * statistics * symbolic logic | Courses would meet learning outcomes aimed at teaching students to engage in Scientific modes of inquiry  for example:   * biology * chemistry * geology * health sciences * pscyhology * physics   *Note: some course may have required labs. (Indeed, we might add that requirement and an additional 1-hr here.)* | Courses would meet learning outcomes aimed at teaching students to engage in Historical modes of inquiry  for example:   * art history * eastern or western civilization * American history * history of science * history of education * economic history | Courses would meet learning outcomes aimed at teaching students to engage in Social Scientific modes of inquiry  for example:   * crimonology * economics * international relations * organizational communica-tion * organizational leadership * political science * sociology * social psychology | Courses would meet learning outcomes aimed at teaching students to engage in Technological modes of inquiry  For example:   * computer information systems * web development * instructional technology * technology and society * usin technology in HHP |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CIVIC PERSPECTIVES: NATIONAL AND GLOBAL (6 hours)** | |
| **To meet FHSU’s mission to educate engaged global citizen leaders,**  **students will choose from among a list of courses aimed at civic learning both national and global.**  *Students may double dip requirements in this category with their major, minor, certificates, or cognates.*  Objective 3.1: Personal and Professional Efficacy  Objective 3.2: Intercultural competence (for Global)  Objective 3.4: Engaged global citizen leaders | |
| **National (3 hours)**  Students choose one course from a list of courses. Courses in this section would ground students in American civics, providing students with a foundational understanding of American history, culture, geography, and/or government.  Courses *might* include, for example:   * American History * American Government * American Literature * U.S. Geography * State and Local Government * American Political Thought * Diversity in the US * American Jazz | **Global (3 hours)**  Courses in this section would broaden students’ understanding of the world, providing students with a foundational understanding of world geography, international relations, comparative politics, world history, language and/or world cultures.  Courses *might* include, for example:   * World History (ancient or modern) * World Religions * World Geography * Cutural Geography * Anthropology * International Relations * Comparative Politics * Comparative Justice Systems * International Political Economy * Global Public Health * Modern Languages * World Art * World Literature * World Music * Study Abroad |
| **INTEGRATION and CREATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING (3 hours)** | |
| **Junior/Senior Interdisciplinary Seminars**  **Students choose one course from a range of options: topics of the “wicked problems” type (involving difficult choices and conflicting values); classes draw students of different majors.**  *This is a re-imagining of FHSU’s current Upper-division Integrative requirement. Courses currently in that component of th Gen Ed might wish to be considered, however, any course in this section would be required to meet ambitious program goals regarding critical thinking, integrative and cross-disciplinary thinking, systhesis with the major, and careful exercise of ethical judgement. Each course would have a goal of preparing students to exercise leadership in addressing the “wicked-problems” that face the world.*  Objective 1.5: Critical thinking  Objective 2.2: Integrative and cross-disciplinary thinking  Objective 2.3: Synthesis with the major  Objective 3.3: Ethical judgment  Objective 3.4: Engaged global citizen leaders  *Courses might be considered for permanent or temporary inclusion in this section. For example, courses, including appropriate existing upper division integrative courses, might seek a permanent spot. But faculty/departments need not make a permanent commitment to staff a course, especially if a course relates to a time-senstive topic or in cases where a faculty member might only be available to teach the course for a couple of years due to other departmental staffing needs.* | |