**FHSU Liberal Education Committee**

**Minutes**

Meeting Called by

Shala Mills, Chair

Date: Thursday May 1, 2017

Time: 3:00-4:00

Location: Rarick 329

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)

3:00 (5 minutes) All were present except for Garcia, Gimon, Heronemus, Rackaway, Scheck, and Smith. Drabkin served as proxy for Smith, and Hartman served as proxy for Heronemus. Established that a quorum was met. Chair announced that she will be making an informational presentation on the committee’s recent work to Faculty Senate on Tuesday May 2. The end-of-year social was set for 4:30 PM at Gutch’s on Tuesday May 9.

3:05 (39 minutes) Duffy brought recommendations for two learning outcomes that would fall under Objective 1.1, “Written and Oral Communication.” These were developed by the writing advisory group. Chair suggested that it would be helpful to approve something like these at present so that Sangki Min could develop a model for operationalizing them over the summer. The idea would be for Mills, Duffy and Min to work up a demo for a single rubric accessible through BlackBoard that could be used throughout the university; assessment data could, in this way, be stored automatically. The committee would consider this demo early in the fall semester and decide how it might inform the development of learning outcomes for other parts of the program. There was discussion of the proposed learning outcomes, the first one was slightly amended, and the following wording was put to a vote:

*By graduation, students will be able to . . .*

1. *Write a persuasive essay that includes the following:*
   1. *a clear and debatable thesis*
   2. *fully developed and supported ideas*
   3. *clear organizational structure*
   4. *effective consideration of opposing arguments*
   5. *use of credible sources*
   6. *appropriate documentation of sources*
   7. *consideration of a target audience*
   8. *conventional grammar and mechanics.*
2. *Produce a discipline-specific document judged competent according to a department-developed rubric.*

The motion passed unanimously.

3:44 (9 minutes) Attention turned to polishing the document that will represent the program proposal until the committee gathers again at the start of the fall semester. A couple of minor changes were made to the “Civic Perspectives” section. The resulting document is ***appended below***.

3:53 (9 minutes) Chair indicated four committee-related tasks she plans to be involved in over the summer: (1) meeting with Min and Duffy about the approved learning outcomes for writing, (2) meeting with college deans and department chairs for feedback on the program proposal, (3) meeting with the chairs of departments likely to be involved in developing one or another of the as-of-yet-not-thought-through gateway courses, and (4) meeting with deans and chairs about lining up faculty members to be involved in coming up with learning outcomes for the seven modes-of-inquiry categories. Regarding (4), Woods hoped faculty from departments such as nursing and teacher education will be invited to participate in developing these learning outcomes. And Hartman indicated that, for her part, she will be working over the summer to develop learning outcomes for Objective 1.4, “Information literacy.”

4:02 Meeting ended.

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

**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 Efficacy  Objective 3.2: Intercultural Competence  Objective 3.4: Engaged Global Citizen Leaders | | | | | | |
| **To meet FHSU’s mission to educate engaged global citizen leaders***.* | | | | | | |
| **INTEGRATION and CREATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING (3 hours)**  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 | | | | | | |
| **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.** | | | | | | |