**FHSU Liberal Education Committee**

**Minutes**

Meeting Called by

Shala Mills, Chair

Date: 9/15/2016

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)

Chapman Rackaway (Grad Sch)

3:00 Meeting began. All members present except Heronemus, Rackaway, Scheck and Smith. Will announced that he was to serve as proxy for Rackaway. Established that a quorum was met. Helen Miles, representative from the academic affairs committee of faculty senate, was welcomed to the committee. Miles announced that she will be sharing her seat with Kenny Rigler, co-chair of academic affairs. Chair thanked the committee for its hard work, and reminded members to keep using the committee’s BlackBoard wiki to conduct discussion before committee meetings each week. This outside-of-meeting work is essential for efficient use of our face-to-face time.

3:10 Chair reminded members of the importance of keeping clear the difference between what we mean by “goals,” “objectives,” and “outcomes,” noting that some of our disciplines may use these terms in different ways. For purposes of our liberal education work, goals are big, broad aims. Objectives are more specific, and explain in a concise way what we mean by the goals. Outcomes are results that can be observed and assessed. We should bear these distinctions in mind as we move ahead.

3:15 Chair asked that committee members representing the college of education as well as those who attended last summer’s AAC&U workshop be especially forthcoming with assessment ideas and insights as we start bringing assessable outcomes into focus.

3:17 First question (25 minute discussion): How should the technology literacy objective, now understood as falling under the core skills goal, be worded? The original wording was this: “Students will understand the relationship between technology and society, and responsibly use appropriate technology for communication, scholarship, and problem-solving.” The committee voted to remove the phrase “understand the relationship between technology and society” from the objective and temporarily move it somewhere under goal 2, the details to be determined at a later meeting. The motion passed 14 in favor, none opposed. This left the objective as this: “Students will responsibly use appropriate technology for communication, scholarship, and problem-solving.” Drabkin suggested amending the objective to read: “Students will effectively and responsibly use . . .” etc. Will questioned whether the committee has any technology in mind other than computer/information technology. Woods suggested that these specifics could be decided later, when learning outcomes for this objective come to be developed. It was put to a vote to keep the title “technology literacy” and to word the objective as follows: “Students will effectively and responsibly use appropriate technology for communication, scholarship, and problem-solving.” The motion passed 12 in favor, 2 opposed.

3:42 Second question (9 minute discussion): How should the information literacy objective, now understood as falling under the core skills goal, be worded? The original wording was as follows: “Students will responsibly discover, evaluate, and use information when creating new knowledge, synthesizing ideas, and participating in communities of learning.” The committee voted to change it to read as follows: “Students will effectively and responsibly gather, evaluate, and use information for scholarship and problem-solving.” The motion passed: 14 in favor, none opposed.

3:50 Third question (3 minute discussion): Duffy moved that all instances of “will be able to” language in the objectives be changed to “will.” So, for example, objective 1.1, which had read “Students *will be able to* effectively develop, express, and exchange ideas in the English language, both in writing and speaking, with clarity and coherence,” would be changed to “Students *will* effectively develop, express, and exchange . . . etc.” The motion passed: 14 in favor, none opposed.

3:53 Fourth question (6 minute discussion): Should the title of the second goal be kept as “Broad and Integrative Knowledge”? This was put to a vote, which passed: 12 in favor, 2 abstaining.

3:59 Fifth question (11 minute discussion): Should the title of objective 2.1 change from “knowledge of arts, humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences” to “multi-disciplinary knowledge”? This proved to be a complex question, and the committee chose to table it until next week. What is at stake is how the committee is going to understand the breadth of knowledge required under the liberal education program. The question of the objective’s title is related to the wording, and meaning, of the objective itself. The original objective is this: “Knowledge of arts, humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences: Students will possess a broad understanding of the world, including knowledge in the range of disciplines that provide the foundation of knowledge and inquiry necessary for understanding the cultural, social, natural, and designed world.” The proposed objective is this: “Multi-disciplinary knowledge: Students will possess a broad understanding of the world’s complexity by studying the achievements of diverse academic disciplines and the ways of knowing characteristic of these disciplines.” Chair charged the committee to really think hard about the Goal 2 objectives and to share thoughts on the BlackBoard wiki before the next meeting on Thursday September 22.

4:10 Meeting ended.

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