**FHSU General Education Committee**

**Minutes**

Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

Date: Monday December 11, 2017

Time: 3:30-4:30

Location: Smoky Hill Room, Memorial Union

Members

Douglas Drabkin (AHSS)

Marcella Marez (AHSS)

Jessica Heronemus (BE)

David Schmidt (BE)

Kevin Splichal (Ed)

Teresa Woods (Ed)

Trey Hill (HBS)

Glen McNeil (HBS)

William Weber (STM)

Tom Schafer (STM)

Robyn Hartman (Lib)

Helen Miles (Senate)

Adam Schibi (SGA)

Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)

Kenton Russell (FYE)

Tanya Smith (Grad Sch)

Paul Lucas (nonvoting member)

3:37 (1 minute) All members were present with the exception of Duffy, Hartman, McNeil, Miles, Russell, Schibi, Smith, Weber, and Woods. Schafer served as proxy for Miles. It was established that a quorum was barely met.

3:38 (21 minutes) The committee considered the proposed measurable learning outcomes for 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.”). The following wording was put to a vote:

*The student will*

1. *sort claims according to the kinds of evidence that could be used to establish their truth, and the kinds of expertise that would be relevant to evaluating this evidence;*
2. *evaluate arguments of various kinds (identify, in a wide variety of contexts, when an argument is being made, what its conclusion is, what the logical relation between premises and conclusion is supposed to be, whether the premises are plausible, and whether the conclusion is established);*
3. *compose an essay on a difficult question that centers on subjecting the student’s own reasoning to sustained, intelligent criticism.*

This wording was approved by consensus. The next step for these outcomes will be to send them out for comments to the critical thinking stakeholder group: Gary Andersen (advanced educational programs), Rob Byer (philosophy), Nicholas Caporusso (informatics), Joe Chretien (applied technology), Grady Dixon (geosciences), Loretta Dorn (chemistry), Toby Flores (art), Robyn Hartman (library), Rose Helens-Hart (applied business), Ginger Loggins (informatics), Tamara Lynn (criminal justice), Denise Orth (allied health), Rebecca Sander (nursing), Rob Scott (teacher education), Peter Tramel (philosophy), Sky Westerlund (social work), Melissa Hunsicker Walburn (informatics), and Ken Windholtz (psychology).

3:59 (19 minutes) The committee next considered the proposed measurable learning outcomes for Objective 3.3: Ethical Judgment (“Students will recognize situations where reasonable, well-informed people disagree about what the right thing to do is; explain the underlying values that are in apparent tension, bringing to bear relevant ethical principles and approaches; and make intelligent decisions as a result.”). After two slight emendations, the following wording was put to a vote:

*The student will*

1. *describe a situation in an area such as private life, business, health care, politics, applied science, and the arts where reasonable, well-informed people disagree about what the right thing to do is;*
2. *explain in detail the underlying values that are in apparent tension in this situation, bringing to bear relevant ethical theories and principles;*
3. *respond intelligently to this situation in detail (providing well-reasoned arguments that either reconcile the underlying tensions, find one of the competing considerations decisive, or explain why it remains unclear what ought to be done).*

This wording was approved by consensus. The next step for these outcomes will be to send them out for comments to the ethical judgment stakeholder group: Sungwon Chung (communication), Matthew Clarke (informatics), Tim Davis (social work), Nathan Elwood (library), Linda Feldstein (teacher education), Charlie Gnizak (accounting), Jason Graham (health and human performance), Brittany Howell (agriculture), Carolyn Insley (nursing), Whitney Jeter (psychology), Jackie Lubin (advanced education programs), Kweilin Lucas (criminal justice), Carl Miller (philosophy), Claire Nickerson (library), Karmen Porter (communication disorders), Scott Robson (communication studies), Bill Stark (biology), Josh Tanguay (psychology), David Tostenson (philosophy), Christa Weigel (nursing), and Laura Wilson (museum).

4:18 (5 minutes) Chair previewed some business having to do with a tweak to the current general education program that the committee will consider when it reconvenes in January. Briefly, the English department requests a change of focus for ENG 327: Introduction to Fiction. The idea is to allow Introduction to Fiction to be offered as a topical course (e.g., literary works concerned with political struggles, genetic technology, or the family) rather than as a course with a genre focus (the novel and the short story).

4:23 Meeting ended. Chair will email members about meeting times for Spring 2018. *Festina lente.*

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

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

