**FHSU Liberal Education Committee**

**Minutes**

Meeting Called by

Shala Mills, Chair

Date: Tuesday 10/4/2016

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 (Provost)

Chapman Rackaway (Grad Sch)

3:02 Meeting began. All members present except Duffy, Rackaway, Scheck, and Weber. Will was serving as proxy for Rackaway, and Drabkin for Duffy. Established that a quorum was met. Chair set the background for the day’s discussion of the program’s third and final goal, summarizing points that had been made on the committee’s BlackBoard wikis: Drabkin had asked for clarification of the goal before getting into details. Will had warned against paternalistic indoctrination. Woods had argued for keeping a consideration of the natural world and resources in the objectives. McNeil had argued for keeping health and self-care in the objectives. Chair reminded the committee how the Goals and Objectives fit into the overall Liberal Education program.

3:10 First question (40 minute discussion): How should the first objective, the one having to do with living responsibly in one’s personal and professional life, read? Woods reviewed some of the thinking that went into last year’s resource management objective, in particular, the idea that students should consider in their practical decision-making what is sometimes called “the triple bottom line”: the financial, social, and environmental consequences of one’s choices. Will raised his concern that the university ought not to be prescribing how students ought to live, and that paternalism, however well-intended, has no place in a university education; moreover, he argued it is not easily assessable. A long and complicated discussion ensued. Splichal and Russell noted that several of the objectives listed already have associated, measurable outcomes in the UNIV 101 course. McNeil and Miles noted that many of the objectives already have associated, measurable outcomes in various HHP courses. Mills noted that there is a difference between educating someone about the consequences of choices (e.g., of choosing one insurance plan over another) and paternalistically telling someone what they should or must choose (demanding that someone choose Plan A, or ridiculing them for not choosing Plan B). So the argument was made that the objective under discussion would not be “paternalistic" (inappropriately prescriptive), and its learning outcomes could be measured. In the end the following language was put to a vote: *“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.”* It was understood, as this went to a vote, that concerns regarding inappropriately prescriptive language would be kept in mind when learning outcomes are set. The motion passed 10 in favor, 4 against, 1 abstention.

3:50 Second question (3 minute discussion): What should the title of goal 3 be? Candidates include “Living Responsibly,” “Personal and Social Responsibility,” “Personal, Social, and Professional Responsibility,” “Practical Wisdom,” and “Practical Wisdom and Social Responsibility.” It was decided to table this discussion until the objectives for the goal came into better focus.

3:53 Third question (5 minute discussion): How should the second objective read, the one having to do with interacting with people across boundaries of difference? The following language was put to a vote: *“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.”* This passed 14 in favor, none opposed.

3:58 Fourth question (12 minute discussion): How should the third objective, the one having to do with ethical thinking, read? There was some preliminary discussion of terminology and of what ethical reasoning is, but time ran out and the question was tabled. The committee will begin with this at the next meeting.

4:10 As the meeting drew to a close, the Chair charged the committee with the task of wrapping up discussion of goal 3 at the next meeting. In particular, the Chair asked that any new ideas be posted on the new BlackBoard wiki *before the end of the week*. This will allow a few days to work out clarification, reasoning, and compromise language before the next meeting. Instructions for accessing the wiki and posting are as follows:

1. Click on the “[GenEd: Liberal Education Committee](https://blackboard.fhsu.edu/webapps/blackboard/execute/launcher?type=Course&id=_3259_1&url=)” course in BlackBoard. All committee members should be listed as instructors.
2. On the left hand side of the screen, click on “Supporting Documents” under “Liberal Education Committee”.
3. Click on the “Learning Outcomes” folder.
4. Don’t try to post yet. Instead, click on the title “NEW Goal 3 Wiki” in the upper left.
5. A new page called “Glen” will appear. This is the editable page.
6. Don’t click on the “Comment” button at the lower right. Instead, click on “Edit Wiki Content” in the upper right, and scroll down to the bottom of the list under “**GOAL 3 Discussion: 10/4 to 10/11**”.
7. When you are finished contributing your thoughts, click “Submit”.

4:14 Meeting ended. The next meeting is scheduled for 3:00 PM on Tuesday October 11.

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