

10-2-2018

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, October 2, 2018

FHSU Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all

Recommended Citation

FHSU Faculty Senate, "Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, October 2, 2018" (2018). *Faculty Senate*. 987.

https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/987

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Archives Online at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository. For more information, please contact ScholarsRepository@fhsu.edu.

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate

Tuesday, October 2, 2018

Eagle Hall, Robbins Center, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm

Minutes

Senators were to have read before the meeting the following documents:

- 04 Sept. 2018 Faculty Senate Minutes/Attendance Log
- 18 Sept. 2018 Minutes of Special Meeting/Attendance Log
- Consensual Relationship Policy
- Current Faculty Recognitions and Awards
- Johnson County CC / KU Proposal
- Kansas Core Outcomes Group (KCOG) Courses for 2018

1. **Call to Order:** Meeting called to order at 3:33 p.m.

2. **Approval of Agenda**

- Motion from Helen Miles, seconded by Jeni McRay
- Approved unanimously

3. **Approval of Minutes**

- September Regular Meeting (9/4): Motion from Denise Orth, seconded by Janett Naylor-Tincknell. Minutes were approved without discussion as submitted.
- September Special Meeting (9/18): Motion from Natasha Werth, seconded by Brett Whitaker. Minutes were approved without discussion as submitted.

4. **Announcements and Information Items:**

a. Report of FS President Tony Gabel on Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) and Council of Faculty Senate Presidents (CoFSP) Meeting and other items:

- Regents' Directive: Consensual Relations Policy: requested to have review of policies by each institution; looks pretty good to Gabel although it is old; cannot be a blanket prohibition because of freedom of association; but we must review: can be new policy, revision of old policy, or simply review of old policy and reapproval. Gabel asks us to review. McRay asks for clarification that institutions will still have their own policies, and that is correct. Wilson asks about distinct policies for consensual policies as well as familial relationship (nepotism) policies, but Gabel suggests it would be clearer to keep them separate as they currently are.
- Regents' Theme/Directive: Faculty rewards: Gabel worked with Briggs to create document outlining all current processes at FHSU aligning with Faculty Recognition/Reward. May be due to issues at other institutions. Asked to take these back to our departments to see if anything is not listed and forward them to Gabel. Miller asks what KBOR is looking for. Gabel responds that best guess is that this is directed toward research institutions, where, for example, teaching excellence may not be recognized, or other faculty roles depending also on different kinds of faculty appointments. May also be related to base cuts at KU and K-State in order to improve faculty morale in the face of personnel cuts.
- Johnson County CC / KU Proposal: Proposal would eliminate the requirement for

students to take 60 credit hours at the degree-granting institution. This would potentially reduce the number of hours students need to take at the four-year institutions.

- Kansas Core Outcomes Group (KCOG) Courses for 2018: First meeting in October. 7 new courses under consideration; 21 under review. Craig Karlin is campus contact person for this review.
- KBOR visit (Oct. 17): Two events: 1. Breakfast with FS, SGA, and USS Executive Committees: 8 a.m.-9 a.m. 2. Open meeting with FS at 11:50 AM – 12:35 PM (Black & Gold Room): We may ask questions. We have been asked by Dr. Mason to forward questions to Gabel so that the Regents may be prepared with answers. Questions will also be shared to FS in advance. KBOR are looking to FS for leadership, but they are also looking at the bargaining units on campuses.
- From President's Cabinet: Graduation dates: both graduations will be at 9 a.m., on Friday and Saturday. First December commencement will be in 2019.
- Dr. Mason also has now seen Faculty Morale Poll, and in answer to Miller's question from 9/4, she wants to know what we want to do with the information. University Affairs are working on this task.

b. Dr. Brad Will: General Education Program Update: Dr. Will presents document with the measurable learning outcomes for the Objectives created by earlier processes. These will apply to students who begin as freshmen or transfer fewer than 45 hours. We were accredited by HLC, but they discontinued AQIP in favor of "the Open Pathway," which means we will be reviewed in 5 years. Part of this review is how well our students attain common learning outcomes, but we do not have these kinds of learning outcomes. For example, students must take 9 hours from Social and Behavioral Sciences, but this allows many paths to meet the current Gen Ed requirements, which may not have students attaining same learning outcomes. The new proposal focuses on 7 modes of inquiry, so the focus is on making sure that students take courses that all meet the same learning outcomes, even though the courses are different.

- **Considerations:**

- Economy of transfer: students transfer both in and out, so we want to continue to participate in a way that is compatible with other institutions, which means we can't get too far out of line with other institutions. So much will be comparable to our previous system, but the focus is different. And we also must keep key courses compatible for system-wide transfer. So, for example, the current History courses that count for Gen Ed credit will still likely be options.
- DQP: Degree Qualification Program: Outcomes should be compatible with level of degree, so things like writing outcomes need to be evaluated at the bachelor degree level, and not just the associate degree level. So Outcomes 1.1-A.2. and Outcome 1.5.3 would be examples of outcomes at this level, and might be related to something like a capstone project or course.
- Double-dipping is allowed: General education outcomes can be met through courses in the major. Faculty who teach courses that connect to these outcomes will have to report the outcomes for each student completing the course.

- **Discussion:** Stephen Donnelly asks for the document electronically and asks if there is a limit to the amount of double-dipping that will be allowed. Dr. Will says that has not been determined yet; they are still working on that. Jeni McRay asks for rollout date; Fall 2020 is the answer. Tony Gabel asks what they want from FS, and the answer is approval of these outcomes so the committee can proceed with implementation plans. The approval is desired soon, end of Oct./beginning of Nov. Dr. Will notes that the committee's weekly meeting minutes are detailed and available on website, so that anyone can read them in order to be as transparent as possible. Denise Orth asks what the plan is on how many hours students will need, and Dr. Will says that has not yet been determined because of the decision to focus on outcomes first. They will come back for further approval on the question of credit hours. Tony Gabel notes the committee has worked very hard on this and asks for only substantively significant defects. Carl Miller notes that the committee has already been compromising and considering different needs, so outsiders may

not have that perspective and should be aware that many questions have already been raised and addressed. Kevin Splichal notes that the process has been transparent and the body should remember that the process has been shared.

5. Reports of Standing Committees:

In future, written reports will be submitted in advance as they were last year.

- Strategic Planning and Improvements: Kevin Splichal reports that in two meetings they have reviewed three standing rules, #4 for repeal, and #6 and 7. Archival of approved minutes: all standing committee minutes and faculty senate minutes that have been approved should be sent to Splichal for archiving in the library. They also have requested to take control of FS website; Partnerships and Technology will take that.
- Academic Affairs: Helen Miles defers to Will's presentation on Gen Ed issues; Stephen Donnelly notes no new programs or courses to bring to FS, but Gen Ed is a focus.
- University Affairs: Amy Schmierbach reports that in two meetings they have discussed the Faculty Morale Survey, esp. comparison with 2012 survey, and have made requests for more info from Docking, which are outstanding. They have also met to discuss course evaluations, specifically a request to find course evaluations that have research behind them; they are working with Sangki Min on that.
- Partnerships and Technology: Jason Harper reports the collection of issues from China on both partnerships and technology.
- Student Affairs: Jeffery Sollheim has contacted SA and SGA, but no new business yet. Miller asks about "dead week" policy, but it has not been raised by SGA.

6. **Unfinished Business:** See above in #4a, last bullet, re: question about use of Faculty Morale Poll.

7. New Business

- Action on Consensual Relations Policy (move to/create committee): Questions regarding appropriate standing committees. It could be brought to departments and then returned to FS for consideration. Carl Miller suggests an ad hoc committee be created only if there are concerns. Stephen Donnelly asks if this has to go through Administrative Council, but Tony Gabel notes it will not be taken up by them until next year on review cycle. Lexey Bartlett asks if Student Affairs and University Affairs could work together on it since it involves students, faculty, and other employees, but Fred Britten notes it belongs to University Affairs because it requires liaison with USS. Question about whether it is an AAUP issue, and Janett Naylor-Tincknell says that she will look in the AAUP guide. Linda Smith and Tony Gabel mention their willingness to serve on an ad hoc committee, if one is formed. Kevin Splichal asks for clarification if the first step is to take the policy to departments to review and gather any questions, which will be brought to an ad hoc committee composed of Denise Orth, Carl Miller, Linda Smith, and Tony Gabel. **Motion made to create the ad hoc committee by _____ . Motion seconded by Laura Andrews. Passed unanimously.**
- Action on Johnson County CC / KU Proposal: Motion to move review to Academic Affairs by Janett Naylor-Tincknell, seconded by Jana Zeller. Passed unanimously.
- Academic Affairs will review Gen Ed Outcomes framework for approval in committee. A finalized version of the framework will be given to AA in time for them to review it, preferably by Nov. meeting. April Terry moves to send GE framework to AA for review; Rob Scott seconds. Stephen Donnelly asks for clarification of which draft; the answer is the next one. Passed unanimously.
- Kayvan Aflatooni asks about the reduction or possible elimination of proctoring at the library. Robyn Hartman mentions that library has 12.5 hours of proctoring sessions open per week and 4

students can be proctored at a time. Previously, they proctored about 500 students per year, for 3-4 hours each. This service costs the library about \$17,000 per year in terms of personnel hours. Helen Miles asks about using cameras and a security guard. Tony Gabel asks who is using the service; the answer is mostly virtual students in Math and Statistics. Tony Gabel asks if anyone know about Examity, which has a cost for students but is useful. Jana Zeller and Natasha Werth note that Nursing uses the camera-recording option in Respondus Lockdown Browser. Stephen Donnelly asks if offering proctoring is an administrative request or library-initiated; Robyn Hartman replies that usage has just ballooned and she is not sure where it started. Mary Radnor notes that proctoring doesn't have to be completed in the library, and it is not sustainable by library. Kayvan Aflatooni thinks that the library is supposed to be the main proctoring service, but Robyn Hartman replies that at other libraries, there is a testing center, rather than relying on library faculty to perform this work for other faculty. Rob Scott notes that this is a nationwide problem, and it may not naturally be part of the mission of a library. Mary Radnor suggests inviting Dean Ludwig to give more information on the strain on library resources. Stephen Donnelly notes that it needs to be paid for by administrative resources, whoever is using the services. Kayvan Aflatooni responds that with a Virtual College, a secure proctoring center must be provided. Thom Dunn (sub. for Sarbari Mitra) notes that the hours are often outside of regular hours and the number of students that need proctoring would be creating a lot of work. Robyn Hartman notes that space is also an issue, aside from the issue of library faculty time. Motion from Jana Zeller to move this issue to Student Affairs, seconded by Thom Dunn (sub. for Sarbari Mitra). Passed unanimously.

8. Adjournment

- Motion from Jason Harper, seconded by Denise Orth.
- Meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

Note: A handout of the General Education Goals, Objectives, and Draft Outcomes was made available to the Faculty Senate by Dr. Brad Will (attached).

Senator Sign-In Sheet: Oct 2, 2018

Alternates

Senator Sign-In Sheet: Oct 2, 2018		Alternates	
Aflatooni, Kayvan	Kayvan Aflatooni	Physics	
Allen, Ivalah		Music and Theatre	
Andrews, Laura	Laura Andrews	Music and Theatre	
Arthur, Charmion		Art & Design	
Bartlett, Lexey	Lexey Bartlett	English	
Breit, Emily		Economics, Finance & Accounting	
Castaneda, Rosa	Chita Espino	Modern Languages	CEB
Dhoubhadel, Sunil	Sunil Dhoubhadel	Agriculture	
Donnelly, Stephen	Stephen Donnelly	Chemistry	Dr. Lorita Doran
Du, Yuxiang	Yuxiang Du	Communication Studies	
Ellis, Carol	Carol Ellis	Communication Sciences & Disorders	CE Jacqie Jacobs
Gillock, Eric / Stark, Bill	Eric Gillock	Biology	
Grove, Glenn	Glenn Grove	Economics, Finance & Accounting	
Harper, Jason	Jason Harper	English	
Hartman, Robyn	Robyn Hartman	Librarian	
Jeter, Whitney	Whitney Jeter	Psychology	
Jones, Elodie	Elodie Jones	Advanced Education Programs	
Kandt, Greg	Greg Kandt	Health and Human Performance	
Lee, Jung Hee	Jung Hee Lee	Social Work	
Loggins, Ginger	Ginger Loggins	Informatics	
Martin, Mike	Mike Martin	Applied Business Studies	Dr. Skip Ward
McGonigal, Kate	Kate McGonigal	Sociology	KM
McRay, Jeni (Virginia)	Jeni McRay	Leadership Studies	
Mehaffey-Kultgen, Candace	Candace Mehaffey-Kultgen	Management	
Miles, Helen	Helen Miles	Health and Human Performance	
Miller, Carl	Carl Miller	Philosophy	
Mitra, Sarbari	Sarbari Mitra	Mathematics	Tom Dunne
Munsch, Kris	Kris Munsch	Applied Technology	
Naylor-Tincknell, Janett	Janett Naylor-Tincknell	Psychology	
Nienkamp, Paul	Paul Nienkamp	History	Jud. Winchester
Orth, Denise	Denise Orth	Allied Health	Susan Demules
Packauskas, Richard	Richard Packauskas	Biology	
Schartz, Shane	Shane Schartz	Informatics	
Schmierbach, Amy	Amy Schmierbach	Art & Design	
Scott, Robb	Robb Scott	Teacher Education	
Smith, Linda	Linda Smith	English	
Solheim, Jeff	Jeff Solheim	Mathematics	
Splichal, Kevin	Kevin Splichal	Advanced Education Programs	
Sun, Jian	Jian Sun	Political Science	
Terry, April	April Terry	Criminal Justice	Morgan Steele
Werth, Natasha	Natasha Werth	Nursing	
Whitaker, Brett	Brett Whitaker	Leadership Studies	
Wilson, Laura	Laura Wilson	Geosciences	
Zeller, Jana	Jana Zeller	Nursing	
Britten, Fred	Fred Britten	Communication Sciences & Disorders	
Gabel, Tony	Tony Gabel	Management	

Guest Sign-In Oct. 2, 2018

Name (Please Print)	Department / Area Represented
Trey Hill	Psychology
Mary Radnor	Library
Jeff Briggs	Provost Office
Tom Crowley	" "
Glen McNeill	CHBS
Jennifer Sauer	Forsyth
Alternates Nursing Patricia Drees & Rebecca Sanders	

FHSU CORE: Common Outcomes for Relevant Education

Draft Version, Informational Faculty Senate Presentation

2 October 2018

PREAMBLE

The current Fort Hays State University General Education Program was adopted by the FHSU Faculty Senate in 1992. The program has been reviewed and revised since then—most notably by a General Education Review Task force in 1998. Nevertheless, the General Education Program in place today is largely the same as when it was adopted more than a quarter century ago. The Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes below are the product of an ongoing, multiyear effort and represent the next step toward revising the FHSU General Education program.

History and Process

In 2015, then President Mirta Martin reconstituted the General Education Committee as the Liberal Education Committee, charged with developing a new Liberal Education Program to replace the current General Education Program. The committee was chaired by Dr. Chapman Rackaway and began with a needs assessment that included numerous town-hall meetings and listening sessions, as well as an extensive survey of faculty needs and expectations.

In the fall of 2016, Dr. Shala Mills was appointed Director of Liberal Education and Chair of the Liberal Education Committee. The committee's work focused on using the information gathered from meetings and the survey to develop an appropriate set of Goals and Objectives for the new program.

In spring of 2017, under the direction of Dr. Cheryl Duffy, the Writing Across the Curriculum Subgroup developed measurable learning outcomes for the Written Communication segment of Objective 1.1 Written and Oral Communication. Notably, these outcomes specify a level of achievement appropriate for students earning Bachelor's Degrees and particularly indicating that upon graduation, the students' writing ability should be judged in terms of their disciplines and major programs. The WAC subgroup would go on to develop and pilot a writing assessment rubric suitable for use in upper-division courses across the University.

In the fall of 2017, Dr. Bradley Will was appointed Director of Liberal Education and Chair of the Liberal Education Committee. At this point, the committee shifted its focus to developing measurable learning outcomes for each of the Objectives identified for the program. A subgroup was identified for each Objective. A Liberal Education Committee member was appointed to meet with a small segment of each subgroup in order to draft measurable learning outcomes for the respective Objectives. Each draft set of measurable learning outcomes was approved by the Liberal Education Committee (with revisions as deemed necessary), and those draft outcomes were submitted to the subgroup and their response to the outcomes was solicited through an anonymous survey. The Liberal Education Committee carefully considered the survey responses, further revised the measurable learning outcomes where indicated, and finalized the measurable learning outcomes for each Objective. This process was concluded in September of 2018.

Additionally, in the fall of 2018, the committee voted to discard the "Liberal Education" designation and readopt the name and title General-Education Committee and Director of General Education.

Scope

This revision of the General Education Program does not apply to the General Education Requirements specified by the Kansas Board of Regents Transfer Agreement and Articulation Guide, the General Education Requirements specified for students earning a Bachelor of General Studies degree, or the General Education Requirements established for students earning Bachelor's degrees through International Partnership Programs.

Common Learning Outcomes

FHSU's regionally accrediting body is the Higher Learning Commission. With HLC's recent dissolution of the AQIP accreditation pathway, FHSU has moved to the Five-Year Open Pathway. A key element of this accreditation (and the previous AQIP accreditation) requires that the University assess and document how well Common Learning Outcomes are achieved by students earning Bachelor's degrees.

The current General Education Program does not specify Common Learning Outcomes, and in fact, the current structure negates the possibility of establishing Common Learning Outcomes. For example, the current program requires that all students complete 9 credit hours of coursework from among a list of approved courses in Social and Behavioral Sciences. A student might fulfill this requirement by completing HIS 110 World Civilization to 1500, POLS 230 Introduction to International Relations, and ECON 202 Principles of Macroeconomics. Another student might fulfill this same requirement by completing IDS 350 Diversity in the US, SOC 388 Sociology of the Family in America, and POLS 101 American Government. A third student might fulfill the requirement with PSY 300 Abnormal Psychology, PSY 340 Social Psychology, and POLS 105 Current Political Issues. Though all three students have successfully fulfilled the Social and Behavioral Sciences distribution requirement, they have achieved no Common Learning Outcomes. At best the University can assure the Higher Learning Commission that all three have spent a considerable amount of time studying Social and Behavioral Sciences, but the University cannot identify a Common Learning Outcome that they have all achieved, making assessment of achievement of a Common Learning Outcome impossible. With this structure, the University cannot fulfill a key requirement set by its accrediting body.

To solve this problem, the FHSU CORE replaces the distribution requirements with 7 Modes of Inquiry (see Objective 2.1 Knowledge of the Liberal Arts, below). Two Modes of Inquiry are relevant to our example above: Social Scientific Mode of Inquiry and Historical Mode of Inquiry. The FHSU CORE will require every student to take a course that meets the 3 outcomes specified for the Social Scientific Mode of Inquiry and a course that meets the 3 outcomes specified for the Historical Mode of Inquiry. Assuming that the courses are slightly revised to specifically meet the required outcomes, a student might complete HIS 110 World Civilization to 1500 and POLS 230 Introduction to International Relations. Another Student might complete HIS 130 United States History to 1877 and SOC 388 Sociology of the Family in America. A third student might complete HIS 131 United States History since 1877 and PSY 300 Abnormal Psychology. Though all three of these students are still selecting from a broad array of possible courses, if each course meets the 3 measurable learning outcomes for its respective Mode of Inquiry, then the students will have all achieved Common Learning Outcomes as required by HLC. Further, because each of those learning outcomes is measurable, the professors teaching the courses will be able to report the level at which each student achieves each outcome, and the University will be able to assess and report levels of achievement to HLC, fulfilling a key requirement of accreditation.

Limitations of Kansas System-Wide Transfer and Transferability in General

The structure of the FHSU CORE program has been limited by the necessity of providing students efficient means to transfer both into and out of FHSU. A significant number of our students begin work at other institutions, such as community colleges, before transferring that work to FHSU in order to complete their Bachelor's Degree. Additionally, many students begin work at FHSU and later transfer to other four-year institutions to complete their degrees. In order for FHSU to viably continue to benefit from the robust economy of transferring credits, the FHSU CORE must remain similar enough to other General Education Programs to allow students to efficiently transfer both to and from our institution. The measurable learning outcomes below are, where appropriate, compatible with the learning outcomes specified by the Kansas Core Outcomes Project.

Senior-Level Achievement

Common Learning Outcomes indicate what students should be able to achieve upon graduation with a Bachelor's degree. Where outcomes such as those for writing and critical-thinking skills might be introduced in first-year classes such as English Composition I and II and possibly a Critical-Thinking course, students will fulfill the outcome at the appropriate level during their final year of study. The final outcome for Objective 1.1-A states that by graduation a student will "produce a discipline-specific document judged proficient according to a department-approved rubric in the student's major." Similarly, the final outcome for Objective 1.5 states that by graduation a student will "produce a written document on a difficult question involving the disciplinary content of the student's major that subjects the student's reasoning to sustained, intelligent criticism according

to the standards of that discipline.” Therefore, the current working plan for attaining the writing and critical-thinking outcomes imagines fulfillment in a senior-level capstone class as part of the student’s major. The major-program capstone class will fulfill a general-education requirement. If programs elect to opt out of offering a capstone class to fulfill this requirement, the University will offer a general, non-major, senior-level class to ensure that students have the opportunity to fulfill the outcomes at the appropriate level.

Flexibility with Major Programs

The possibility—as indicated above—of a major-program course fulfilling a general-education requirement will extend beyond the capstone course. The current General Education Program stipulates that a course cannot fulfill both a requirement in the major program and a requirement for general education. The FHSU CORE will have no such stipulation. Courses required for major programs will also be able to fulfill CORE requirements. For example, a course such as ENG 307 Introduction to Literary Analysis and Theory, which is required of English majors, might also address the measurable learning outcomes for the Aesthetic Mode of Inquiry (Objective 2.1-A below), fulfilling the requirement for that Objective. The degree to which a program integrates major courses with general-education outcomes will be entirely at the discretion of the academic department.

Outcomes Assessment Required

Faculty teaching courses that fulfill CORE requirements will be required to report the level at which each student achieves each of the outcomes. The outcomes for each Objective will be delineated on a simple four-column rubric, similar in structure to the rubric piloted by the Writing Across the Curriculum Subgroup. Faculty will not be required to use this rubric for grading. The CORE program does not have the authority to stipulate how faculty grade students. However, a student will be required to pass the associated course before they will be considered to have successfully achieved the measurable learning outcomes and fulfilled the CORE requirement.

GOAL 1: CORE SKILLS

Objective 1.1: Written and Oral Communication

Students will effectively develop, express, and exchange ideas in the English language, both in writing and speaking, with clarity and coherence.

Outcomes 1.1-A: Written Communication

By graduation, students will ...

1. Write a persuasive essay that includes the following:
 - a. a clear and debatable thesis,
 - b. fully developed and supported ideas,
 - c. clear organizational structure,
 - d. effective consideration of opposing arguments,
 - e. use of credible sources,
 - f. appropriate documentation of sources,
 - g. consideration of a target audience,
 - h. conventional grammar and mechanics.
2. Produce a discipline-specific document judged proficient according to a department-approved rubric in the student's major.

Outcomes 1.1-B: Oral Communication

By graduation, students will ...

1. Present orally an original message that effectively addresses an assigned purpose;
2. Present orally an original message that effectively addresses a specified audience;
3. Demonstrate effective critical listening.

Objective 1.2: Quantitative Literacy

Students will recognize quantitative relationships, use multiple approaches to analyze these relationships, and apply knowledge of these relationships to solve practical problems.

Outcomes 1.2: Quantitative Literacy

By graduation, students will ...

1. Communicate mathematical concepts using appropriate notation and terminology;
2. Solve problems graphically, numerically, and algebraically;
3. Apply linear and non-linear models to real-world situations.

Objective 1.3: Computing Literacy

Students will effectively and responsibly use appropriate computer applications for communication, scholarship, and problem solving.

Outcomes 1.3: Computing Literacy

By graduation, students will ...

1. Effectively perform data analysis using appropriate technology such as spreadsheets or database applications;
2. Effectively format documents such as reports, essays, or resumes using appropriate technology;
3. Design effective presentations using appropriate technology;
4. Successfully perform a task with others using collaborative technology;
5. Identify the ethical and legal standards of conduct regarding the use of data and technology.

Objective 1.4: Information Literacy

Students will effectively and responsibly gather, evaluate, and use information for scholarship and problem solving.

Outcomes 1.4: Information Literacy

By graduation, students will ...

1. Design a research plan that:
 - a. Incorporates a clear research question;
 - b. Identifies appropriate information resources;
2. Produce a research log that clearly demonstrates the application of appropriate keyword search criteria, such as Boolean operators, source types, and filters;
3. Write an annotated bibliography that:
 - a. Critically analyzes the context, relevance, and authority of an information source, particularly in light of new perspectives, additional voices, and changes in schools of thought;
 - b. Applies appropriate disciplinary conventions of citation.

Objective 1.5: Critical Thinking

Students will recognize, analyze, criticize, evaluate, and formulate arguments in ways characterized by intellectual courage and reflective self criticism.

Outcomes 1.5: Critical Thinking

By graduation, students 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 when an argument is being made, what its conclusion is, what the logical relation between premises and conclusion is purported to be, whether the premises are plausible, and whether the conclusion is established);
3. Produce a written document on a difficult question involving the disciplinary content of the student's major that subjects the student's reasoning to sustained, intelligent criticism according to the standards of that discipline.

GOAL 2: BROAD AND INTEGRATIVE KNOWLEDGE

Objective 2.1: Knowledge of the Liberal Arts

Students will possess a broad understanding of how to think about the world, having studied the modes of inquiry characteristic of humanities, mathematics, natural sciences, social and behavioral sciences, and technological design.

Outcomes 2.1-A: Aesthetic Mode of Inquiry

By graduation, students will:

1. Identify concepts and characteristics that illustrate their appreciation and interpretation of an artistic work;
2. Compose a written work that explores artistic expression by use of critical thinking, analysis, and interpretation of an artistic work;
3. Explain how reflection on an artistic work can clarify personal and cultural values, beliefs, and attitudes.

Outcomes 2.1-B: Historical Mode of Inquiry

By graduation, students will:

1. Identify distinguishing characteristics of historical questions;
2. Interpret historical events by contextualizing primary and secondary sources;
3. Advance a historical argument grounded in the scholarly application of evidence, reasoning, and organization.

Outcomes 2.1-C: Mathematical Mode of Inquiry

By graduation, students will:

1. Express real-world situations using mathematical language (numerals and symbols);
2. Apply appropriate methods to solve mathematical problems;
3. Correctly interpret the solutions of mathematical problems.

Outcomes 2.1-D: Natural Scientific Mode of Inquiry

By graduation, students will ...

1. Identify essential characteristics of natural science questions (questions of empirical study and applications of scientific methodologies);
2. Evaluate the merits of examples of natural scientific research at the level of an informed citizen;
3. Apply scientific methodology to a natural science question to increase understanding, make an informed decision, and/or solve a problem.

Outcomes 2.1-E: Philosophical Mode of Inquiry

By graduation, students will ...

1. Identify the distinguishing characteristics of philosophical questions (non-empirical questions suitable for being approached dialectically);
2. Compose an essay that accurately captures someone else's reasoning in support of their answer to a philosophical question;
3. Compose an essay that accurately captures a significant objection to a clearly formulated philosophical argument and explains why the objection is significant.

Outcomes 2.1-F: Social Scientific Mode of Inquiry

By graduation, students will ...

1. Identify, within a given scenario, applicable frameworks for explaining social phenomena;
2. Evaluate the merits of social science research, with respect to factors such as sample size, study design, and validity, at the level of an informed citizen;
3. Compare and contrast human behavior among various cultures using social science concepts.

Outcomes 2.1-G: Technological Mode of Inquiry

By graduation, students will ...

1. Identify characteristics of a problem that is solvable by the Technological Design Process;
2. Design a reliable and efficient solution to the problem;
3. Build a workable model of the designed solution;
4. Evaluate the solution to identify measurable improvements.

Objective 2.2: Integrative and Cross-Disciplinary Thinking

Students will make connections among ideas and experiences, synthesizing and transferring learning from different disciplines.

Outcome 2.2: Integrative and Cross-Disciplinary Thinking

By graduation, students will ...

1. Students will produce an investigative, creative, or practical work that integrates two or more modes of inquiry or disciplines.

GOAL 3: PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

Objective 3.1: Health and Wealth

Students will understand the likely consequences of personal choices with respect to the dimensions of wellness, including financial health.

Outcomes 3.1-A: Dimensions of Wellness

By graduation, students will ...

1. Evaluate their current wellness status through a variety of self-assessments;
2. Analyze how personal choices are likely to affect wellness in its various dimensions;
3. Formulate a healthy-living plan based on the dimensions of wellness.

Outcomes 3.1-B: Financial Health

By graduation, students will ...

1. Compare their current financial position to recognized standards of financial health;
2. Analyze how personal choices are likely to affect their financial health;
3. Formulate a plan for the management of their financial health.

Objective 3.2: Intercultural Competence

Students will understand their own and others' cultures and possess skills necessary to engage constructively with all kinds of people.

Outcomes 3.2: Intercultural Competence

By graduation, students will ...

1. Produce an exploratory or investigative work based upon a personal interaction such as a conversation, an interview, or a service-learning experience that compares and contrasts the culture of an individual or group outside of the student's own identity community with the student's own culture;
2. Produce an exploratory or investigative work that elucidates multiple aspects of a culture outside of the student's own identity community.
3. Accomplish an interpersonal task using phrasebook-level communication outside the student's own language.

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.

Outcomes 3.3: Ethical Judgment

By graduation, students will ...

1. Describe a situation in an area such as private life, business, health care, politics, applied science, or 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 principles;
3. Provide well-reasoned arguments that resolve tensions in the situation by either reconciling the underlying tensions, finding one of the competing considerations decisive, or explaining why it remains unclear what ought to be done.

Objective 3.4: Engaged Global Citizens

Students will appreciate the world's complexity; the interdependence of natural, social, economic, and political factors; and the deep challenges that can arise both on a local and global scale. Students will possess the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to engage civically and work in cooperation with others toward creative responses to these challenges.

Outcomes 3.4: Engaged Global Citizens

By graduation, students will ...

1. Describe complex, boundary-spanning issues that involve diverse interests;
2. Analyze a complex boundary-spanning issue, taking into account the various perspectives of those involved;
3. Design a project in cooperation with others that addresses a complex, boundary-spanning issue.

Appendix A
General-Education Committee Membership

2018–19

Brad Will (General Education Director), Chair
Helen Miles (FS Academic Affairs Chair)
Cheryl Duffy (Goss Distinguished Prof.)
Tanya Smith (Grad Council)
Doug Drabkin (AHSS)
Marcella Marez (AHSS)
Jessica Heronemus (BE)
David Schmidt (BE)
Kevin Splichal (Ed)
Sarah Broman (Ed)
Trey Hill (HBS)
Glen McNeil (HBS)
Tom Schafer (STM)
Joe Chretien (STM)
Robyn Hartman (Library)
Adam Schibi (Student)

2017–18

Brad Will (Liberal Ed Director), Chair
Kenny Rigler (FS Academic Affairs Chair)
Helen Miles (FS Academic Affairs Chair)
Kenton Russell (Coordinator First Year Seminar)
Karmen Porter (Graduate Council)
Cheryl Duffy (Goss Distinguished Prof.)
Doug Drabkin (AHSS)
Dmitry Gimon (BE)
Jessica Heronemus (BE)
Kevin Splichal (Ed)
Teresa Woods (Ed)
Trey Hill (HBS)
Glen McNeil (HBS)
Tom Schafer (STM)
Bill Weber (STM)
Robyn Hartman (Forsyth Library)
Adam Schibi (Student)

2016–17

Shala Mills (Liberal Ed Director), Chair
Kenton Russell (Coordinator First Year Seminar)
Kenny Rigler (FS Academic Affairs Chair)
Helen Miles (FS Academic Affairs Chair)
Cheryl Duffy (Goss Distinguished Prof.)
Doug Drabkin (AHSS)
Dr. Brad Will (AHSS)
Dmitry Gimon (BE)
Jessica Heronemus (BE)
Kevin Splichal (Ed)
Teresa Woods (Ed)
Glen McNeil (HBS)
Tanya Smith (HBS)
Tom Schafer (STM)
Bill Weber (STM)
Robyn Hartman (Forsyth Library)
Cody Scheck (Student)
Megan Garcia (Student)

2016–17

Chapman Rackaway (Liberal Ed Director), Chair
Kenton Russell (Coordinator First Year Seminar)
Jeff Burnett (FS Academic Affairs Chair)
Cheryl Duffy (Goss Distinguished Prof.)
Ben Cline
April Terry
Jessica Heronemus
Shala Mills
Kenny Rigler
Teresa Woods
Carol Patrick
Tom Schafer
Bill Weber
Dmitry Gimon
Robyn Hartman
Cody Scheck
Brad Will
Tanya Smith

Appendix B
Subgroups Receiving Surveys Regarding Outcomes

Subgroup 1.1-A: Writing Across the Curriculum

Cheryl Duffy, Lead, Goss Professor and Director of Composition, English
Lexey Bartlett, Writing Center Director, English
Sarah Broman, Teacher Education
Loretta Dorn, Chemistry
Doug Drabkin, Philosophy
Nathan Ellwood, Forsyth Library
Rose Helens-Hart, Applied Business Studies
Carol Patrick, Psychology

Subgroup 1.1-B: Oral Communication

Marcella Marez, Lead, Communication Studies
Arvin Cruz, Chemistry
Linda Feldstein, Teacher Education
Wally Guyot, Applied Business Studies
Rose Helens-Hart, Applied Business Studies
Chris Jochum, Teacher Education
Seth Kastle, Leadership Studies
Ginger Loggins, Informatics
Carl Miller, Philosophy
Denise Orth, Allied Health
Scott Robson, Communication Studies
Ron Rohlf, Informatics
Tomme Williams, Music & Theatre
Hsin-Yen Yang, Communication Studies

Subgroup 1.2: Quantitative Literacy

Bill Weber, Lead, Mathematics
Amanda Buday, Sociology
Eric Deneault, Applied technology
Loretta Dorn, Chemistry
Yuxiang Du, Communication Studies
Susan Dumler, Allied Health
Tom Johansen, Economics, Finance, and Accounting
Theresa Madden, Nursing
Steven Sedbrook, Health and Human Performance
Craig Smith, Agriculture
Brett Whitaker, Leadership Studies

Subgroup 1.3: Computing Literacy

David Schmidt, Lead, Informatics
Suzanne Becking, Advanced Education Programs
Nicholas Caporusso, Informatics
Gordon Carlson, Communication Studies
Eric Denault, Applied Technology
Nathan Elwood, Library
Thomas Goebel, Applied Business Studies

David Gray, Informatics
Jessica Heronemus College of Business and Entrepreneurship
Elodie Jones, Advanced Education Programs
Greg Kandt, Health and Human Performance
Rich Lisichenko, Geosciences
Kweilin Lucas, Criminal Justice
Kris Munsch, Applied Technology
Kenny Rigler, Applied Technology
Tanya Smith, Nursing
Andy Tinknell, Library
Angela Walters, Informatics
Hongbiao Zeng, Computer Science

Subgroup 1.4: Information Literacy

Robyn Hartman, Lead, Forsyth Library
Erica Bittel, Art
Fred Britten, Communication Sciences and Disorders
Kathleen Cook, Virtual College
Lagretia Copp, History
Eric Deyo, Physics
Nathan Elwood, Forsyth Library
Elmer Finck, Biological Sciences
David Fitzhugh, Health and Human Performance
Lynn Haggard, Forsyth Library
Jason Harper, English
Rose Helens-Hart, Applied Business Studies
Seth Kastle, Leadership Studies
Mary Meckenstock, Teacher Education
Candace Mehaffey-Kultgen, Management
Claire Nickerson, Forsyth Library
Kim Perez, History
David Schmidt, Informatics
Breanna Taylor, Communication Sciences and Disorders
Mary Alice Wade, Forsyth Library
Teresa Woods, Teacher Education
Hsin-Yen Yang, Communication Studies

Subgroup 1.5: Critical Thinking

Doug Drabkin, Lead, Philosophy
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, Forsyth Library
Rose Helens-Hart, Applied Business Studies
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
Ken Windholtz, Psychology

Subgroup 2.1-A: Aesthetic Mode of Inquiry

Marcella Marez, Lead, Communication Studies
Laura Andrews, Music and Theatre
Erica Bittel, Art and Design
Sungwon Chung, Communication Studies
Ben Cline, Music and Theatre
Allen Craven, Art and Design
Ron Rohlf, Informatics
Jennifer Sauer, Library
Amy Schmierbach, Art and Design
Chaiwat Thumsujarit, Art and Design
Angela Walters, Informatics
Brett Weaver, English
Tomme Williams, Music and Theatre

Subgroup 2.1-B: Historical Mode of Inquiry

Kevin Splichal, Lead, Advanced Education programs
Erica Bittel, Art and Design
Sue Boldra, Teacher Education
Ben Cline, Music and Theatre
Brian Gribben, Forsyth Library
Anna Obermayer, Forsyth Library
Kim Perez, History
Carl Singleton, English
Juti Winchester, History

Subgroup 2.1-C: Mathematical Mode of Inquiry

Bill Weber, Lead, Mathematics
Joe Chretien, Applied Technology
Janett Naylor-Tinknell, Psychology
Mohammad Riazi-Kermani, Mathematics
Scott Robson, Communication Studies
Tanya Smith, Nursing
Janet Stramel, Teacher Education
David Tostenson, Philosophy
Lanee Young, Mathematics
Hongbiao Zeng, Computer Science

Subgroup 2.1-D: Natural Scientific Mode of Inquiry

Tom Schafer, Lead, Geosciences
James Balthazor, Chemistry

Gavin Buffington, Physics
Clyde Cranwell, Agriculture
Grady Dixon, Geosciences
Loretta Dorn, Chemistry
Eric Gillock, Biological Sciences
David Fitzhugh, Health and Human Performance
Brittany Howell, Agriculture
Brian Maricle, Biological Sciences
Helen Miles, Health and Human Performance
Teresa Woods, Teacher Education
Valerie Yu, Nursing

Subgroup 2.1-E: Philosophical Mode of Inquiry

Doug Drabkin, Lead, Philosophy
Gary Andersen, Advanced Education Programs
Lexey Bartlett, English
Amanda Fields, English
Elmer Finck, Biological Sciences
Paul Lucas, Criminal Justice
Carl Miller, Philosophy
Gene Rice, Philosophy
Michelle Robinson, Advanced Education Programs

Subgroupup 2.1-F: Social Scientific Mode of Inquiry

Trey Hill, Lead, Psychology
Gary Andersen, Advanced Education Programs
Sue Boldra, Teacher Education
Keith Bremer, Geosciences
Gordon Carlson, Communication Studies
Tim Davis, Social Work
Reade Dowda, Advanced Education Programs
Larry Gould, Political Science
Chris Jochum, Teacher Education
Paul Lucas, Criminal Justice
Jenny McRay, Leadership Studies
Brooke Moore, Advanced Education Programs
Paul Niencamp, History
Kenton Olliff, Student Support Services
Dosse Toulaboe, Economics, Finance, and Accounting
Valerie Yu, Nursing
Valerie Zelenka, Teacher Education
Brett Zollinger, Sociology

Subgroup 2.1-G: Technological Mode of Inquiry

David Schmidt, Lead, Informatics
Suzanne Becking, Advanced Education Programs
Gordon Carlson, Communication Studies
Clyde Cranwell, Agriculture
Eric Denault, Applied Technology
Glenn Growe, Economics, Finance, and Accounting

Rich Lisichenko, Geosciences
Kris Munsch, Applied Technology
Ken Neuhauser, Geosciences
Kenny Rigler, Applied Technology
Kenal Sevak, Management
Andy Tinknell, Library
Hsin-Yen Yang, Communication Studies
Hongbao Zeng, Mathematics

Subgroup 2.2: Integrative and Cross-Disciplinary Thinking

Brad Will, Lead, English
Robyn Hartman, Library
Jessica Heronemus, College of Business and Entrepreneurship
Glen McNeil, College of Health and Behavioral Sciences
All other members of the General Education Committee

Subgroup 3.1: Health and Wealth

Jessica Heronemus, Co-Lead, College of Business and Entrepreneurship
Glen McNeil, Co-Lead, College of Health and Behavioral Sciences
Lexey Bartlett, English
Amanda Buday, Sociology
Grady Dixon, Geosciences
Elmer Finck, Biology
Tony Gabel, Management
Justin Greenleaf, Leadership
Patti Griffin, Academic Advising
Ron Haag, Health and Human Performance
Leo Herrman, Psychology
Tom Johansen, Economics, Finance, and Accounting
Kenton Russell, Freshman Seminar
Steve Sedbrook, Health and Human Performance
Tanya Smith, Nursing
April Terry, Criminal Justice
Anita Walters, Health and Human Performance

Subgroup 3.2: Intercultural Competence

Karmen Porter, Lead, Communication Sciences and Disorders
Keith Bremer, Geosciences
Tim Davis, Social Work
Carol Ellis, Communication Sciences and Disorders
Babu George, College of Business and Entrepreneurship
Amanda Fields, English
Jason Harper, English
Chris Jochum, Teacher Education
Jennifer Kitson, Psychology
Kate McGonigal, Sociology
Candace Mehaffey-Kultgen, Management
Chris Mohn, Modern languages
Gene Rice, Philosophy
Scott Robson, Communication Studies

Brett Whitaker, Leadership Studies

Subgroup 3.3: Ethical Judgment

Doug Drabkin, Lead, Philosophy
Sungwon Chung, Communication Studies
Matthew Clarke, Informatics
Tim Davis, Social Work
Nathan Elwood, Forsyth 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, Forsyth Library
Karmen Porter, Communication Disorders
Scott Robson, Communication Studies
Bill Stark, Biology
Josh Tanguay, Psychology
David Tostenson, Philosophy
Christa Weigel, Nursing
Laura Wilson, Sternberg Museum

Subgroup 3.4: Engaged Global Citizens

Jessica Heronemus, College of Business and Entrepreneurship
Gary Andersen, Advanced Education Programs
Hendratta Ali, Geosciences
Lexey Bartlett, English
Soumya Bhoumik, Mathematics
Curt Brungardt, Leadership Studies
Rosa Castaneda, Modern Languages
Hillary Gillock, Biology
Larry Gould, Political Science
Brian Gribben, Library
Patricia Levy, Social Work
Brooke Mann, Psychology
Tom Schafer, Geosciences
April Terry, Criminal Justice
Dose Toulaboe, Economics
Peter Tramel, Philosophy
Yaprak Dalat Ward, Advanced Education Programs
Laura Wilson, Sternberg Museum