**FHSU Liberal Education Committee**

**Minutes**

Meeting Called by

Shala Mills, Chair

Date: Thursday April 27, 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)

3:06 (5 minutes) All were present except for Garcia, Heronemus, McNeil, Russell, Scheck, Smith, and Splichal. Drabkin served as proxy for Russell, Hartman served as proxy for Heronemus, and Miles served as proxy for McNeil. Established that a quorum was met. Rackaway was congratulated on his having accepted an academic position at the University of West Georgia. There was some talk about scheduling an end of year social gathering at Gella’s which would involve, among other important things, a good-bye toast to Chap.

3:11 (21 minutes) Chair complemented the committee on its hard work this semester, and drew attention to the simplified version of the compromise model for the new general education program that came out of last week’s meeting. With this version before the committee’s attention, Miles moved as follows:

*That the committee approve the simplified model (see attached) as the general direction we would like to see for the new program, recognizing that some elements (such as the reasoning and communication sequence and the modes of inquiry section) are more fully developed than others (such as the Gateway and Civic Perspectives sections), and acknowledging that some necessary changes may be revealed and details will emerge as the committee seeks input from the university community, and as assessable learning outcomes are developed.*

In the discussion, Woods expressed concerns that tagging the various objectives of the program to particular sections of the proposal may be too restrictive. Will noted, however, the desirability of connecting the objectives (last semester’s work) to the proposal (this semester’s work). Chair noted the value of having all twelve of our program objectives incorporated into the new proposal. The committee decided to keep references to the objectives in the proposal, but with the following wording added: “Objectives listed are minimum objectives for each area. Additional objectives could be included.” The motion was approved unanimously. Rackaway opined that the blending of specificity and vagueness in the compromise proposal is reminiscent of the Virginia Plan at the Constitutional Convention of 1787 in its providing a framework that enables future progress.

3:33 (23 minutes) The remainder of the meeting was spent polishing some of the wording on the program proposal handout, making sections consistent, remembering to identify overlooked objectives, and so on. The resulting document is ***appended below***. Some time was spent by the committee in self-congratulatory reflection.

3:56 Meeting ended. The final meeting of the semester will be Monday May 1 at 3:00 in Rarick 329. The focus will be on what needs to happen this summer to set up a productive 2017-2018.

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

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



**PROGRAM PROPOSAL**

**\*36-51 credit hour program**

*(\*depending upon number of hours student uses to simultaneously complete both major and General Education requirements)*

**NOTE:** Objectives listed are minimum objectives for each area. Additional objectives could be included.

|  |
| --- |
| **GATEWAY COURSES (approximately 6 hours)** |
| *Note: Although the exact details of number of courses and credit hours per course remain undecided, the committee is generally supportive of the idea that students need some gateway courses that prepare them for success. The general idea is a set of courses that would address learning outcomes associated with:***Objective 1.5: Critical thinking**Students will explore issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.  Students will recognize, analyze, criticize, evaluate, and formulate arguments in ways characterized by intellectual courage.**Objective 3.1: Personal and professional efficacy**Students will understand the consequences of choices in their personal and professional lives and possess knowledge necessary for the management of health, time, money, natural resources, and human relationships. |
| **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 (all 5 levels)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)**1.2: Quantitative Literacy (for Mathematical)1.3: Technology Literacy (for Technological)2.1: Knowledge of the Liberal Arts (as appropriate for 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 not social or subjective data. Human Biology, for example, would be about non-human data.*  | **Social Scientific***empirical approach to human data* | **Historical***narrative approach to human data* | **Technological***instrumental approach to practical problems* |
| **CIVIC PERSPECTIVES: LOCAL, NATIONAL, AND GLOBAL (approximately 6 hours)**Objective 3.1: Personal and Professional EfficacyObjective 3.2: Intercultural competence (for Global)Objective 3.4: Engaged global citizen leaders |
| **To meet FHSU’s mission to educate engaged global citizen leaders***.* |
| **Local and National** | **Global** |
| **INTEGRATION and CREATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING (3 hours)**Objective 1.5: Critical thinkingObjective 2.2: Integrative and cross-disciplinary thinkingObjective 2.3: Synthesis with the majorObjective 3.3: Ethical judgmentObjective 3.4: Engaged global citizen leaders |
| **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.**  |