Please read/review prior to the meeting (attached to the updated calendar invitation):
   • Nov. 5, 2018 Faculty Senate Minutes
   • Reports from standing committees

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Agenda

3. Approval of Minutes

4. Announcements and Information Items:
   Report of the FS President

5. Consent Agenda  (no action this month)

6. Reports from Committees (See committee minutes and/or reports. Each committee chair will be available to answer questions.)
   Academic Affairs: Stephen Donnelly and Helen Miles
   University Affairs: Amy Schmierbach
   Strategic Planning and Improvement: Kevin Splichal
   Partnerships and Technology: Jason Harper
   Student Affairs: Jeff Solheim

7. New Business
   a. Motion to adopt Resolution from Executive Committee (Consenting Relations Policy; see attachment)

      RESOLVED: The Faculty Senate supports the FHSU Consenting Relations policy as revised by the ad hoc committee (see attachment).

   b. Adopt motion from Academic Affairs Committee (General Education CORE Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes; see attachment)

      It is moved that the Faculty Senate approve the CORE Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes produced by the General Education Committee as written in the document titled “Final General Education Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes for Approval 11 13 2018.pdf”

8. Adjournment
Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate  
Monday, November 5, 2018  
Eagle Hall, Robbins Center, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm

Minutes

Senators were to have read before the meeting the following documents:
- 2 Oct. 2018 Faculty Senate Minutes/Attendance Log
- Courses/Programs approved by Academic Affairs at Tuesday, 16 Oct., meeting
- Reports from standing committee and ad hoc committee

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

2. Approval of Agenda
   - Gabel requests reordering of announcements/information to allow visitors Dennis King and Andrew Feldstein to speak first.
   - Motion to approve amended agenda from Denise Orth, seconded by Kevin Splichal.
   - Approved.

3. Approval of Minutes
   - 2 Oct. 2018 Meeting: One correction: Denise Orth made the motion to create the ad hoc committee.
   - Stephen Donnelly moves to approve the minutes as corrected, seconded by Brett Whitaker.
   - Approved.

4. Announcements and Information Items:
   - Dennis King: Update/Presentation—Name of Virtual College: The Virtual College was moving its name toward Virtual College—Online School, but the process was disrupted by administrative changes. Dr. Mason asked them to work on the change and created a task force last month. The committee is composed of FHSU faculty and Virtual College alumni and students. Internationally, the current name may not translate properly (“virtual” can be construed as “fake”). They are also looking at marketing concepts from Dartlet. Tony Gabel asked if they have ideas of where they might go, and King mentions that most students are searching the term “online” when looking for programs like ours.
   - Andrew Feldstein: Discussion of Proctoring: Students report cheating on tests in surveys (39%). This discussion initiated because of the change of library proctoring services, but this issue is larger than that.
     - There are two issues to be addressed by proctoring: 1) Authentication: Students prove they are the students who registered for the course (this addresses the biggest issue—someone paying someone else to take a test for them, and not properly authenticating students might result in pulling of Federal student aid from the university); 2) Academic integrity: students who failed in on campus classes then take and ace virtual classes.
     - Solutions should provide consistency—the same solution for all students, regardless of location; accessibility for all students; and scalability—the Virtual College is growing fast, so we must provide for a large and growing number of students.
     - Proctoring can be done online a few different ways: 1) With live proctoring, students sign in and use a camera to answer questions to the live proctor to ensure a “clean” environment. The session is then recorded and sent to the instructor with possible flags. 2) With partial live-proctoring, a
live proctor is only there for the initial authentication, the session is recorded and viewed later, and issues are flagged. This is less expensive. 3. A forthcoming proctoring type use AI with live intervention on demand—the AI alerts the proctor to look in real time and intervene. The final questions we have to consider are what is best and what the cost issues are.

- **Discussion:** Jason Harper asks about using a thumbprint or voiceprint for authentication. The answer is that Examity offers this through phones. Helen Miles asks how we will be reviewed for compliance with federal regulations. The answer is that we have to show we have a process of authentication. Rich Packauskas asks what the cost is. The answer is that Examity is $14 per hour for live proctoring; Emily Breit notes that this is about $50 a month for their students. The cost for pure AI proctoring is $7 using Respondus monitor—we pay for this service right now, but only works in Blackboard. Examity can accommodate all computerized testing and paper exams. Emily Breit notes that with Examity Level 2 (partial live) proctoring, she had students caught from a reflection in their glasses and the sound of other typing—she thought it caught a lot. Sunil Dhoubhadel asks about time availability. The answer is that the student can set up the time. Gary Brinker asks if catching cheaters will affect our enrollment; Andrew Feldstein says it depends on whether integrity is our priority, and he thinks it is. All schools getting federal aid will have to ensure integrity, so cheaters won’t have an alternative. We don’t want a “pay-to-play” reputation, and we’ll gain more students if we can prove the integrity of degrees.

c. **Report of FS President:** Dr. Mason say the Strategic Planning process has continued; they are working on one to two outcomes per goal. Position announcement of University Chief Communications Officer—this position will not focus on the marketing side as in the past, but be more focused on the broader message of the university and other key communication tasks (see position announcement). The Move-to-Market plan is proceeding. Faculty have been identified with CIP codes to see if salary matches 90% of market. Those below will be moved to 90% over the next four years each January. Merit will be in addition to that. We are closer to 90% for many people than expected. Search committee members are needed for the new Provost search. The Regents were very impressed on their visit with our meeting and campus; they said we are the star of the Regents system because of continued growth and lack of debt. The requested KU-JCCC reduced-credit hour plan was not approved. Hays airport use discussion in President’s Cabinet: Dr. Mason would like us to use. If we have 10 or more people coming in or out, United will give us a discount code (talk to Business Office). She is concerned about keeping the airport active/open. Next Faculty Senate meeting: Dec. 3: Black and Gold, with holiday refreshments courtesy of President Mason.

5. **Consent Agenda:**

- **Item 1. INT MIS BBA Degree program change application**
- **Item 2. INT MIS concentration change application**
- **Item 3. INF 656 Back-End Web Development II new course application**
- **Item 4. INF 657 Mobile Web Development II new course application**

Given the interrelated nature of these items, the committee considered them as a single block. The committee voted to approve all four applications on a unanimous vote (10-0-0). Note that all of these applications are from the Informatics Department (INF); however, the first two applications listed use that department’s old name of Information Networking and Technology (INT).

**Discussion:** Emily Breit moves to move Item 1 off the agenda. The INT MIS BBA Degree program issue has changed because we are no longer pursuing specialized accreditation. Shane Schartz notes that when we started pursuing it, the administration interpretation of the standards led to this program change, but program administration has changed and this program won’t prevent accreditation. Item 1 moves to Academic Affairs Committee Reports for consideration.
The consent agenda now contains only Items 2-4.

- Motion to approve Items 2-4 by Jeni McRay, seconded by Ginger Loggins.
- Approved.

6. Reports of Standing Committees:

- Academic Affairs:
  - Item 1 from Consent Agenda raised for approval (no motion needed because it is coming from a standing committee). Approved.
  - Report: Voted to reject KU-JCCC policy change request by vote of 10-0-0. Motion brought to FS (see below). Have just received final version of Gen Ed Outcomes document.
- University Affairs: Amy Schmierbach submitted a written report.
- Strategic Planning and Improvement: Kevin Splichal reports committee will continue to look at wording of bylaws. Motion for FS submitted as New Business.
- Partnerships and Technology: Jason Harper highlights issues with DuoSecurity in China and with using personal devices; he makes a request to ask departments for feedback.
- Student Affairs: Jeffery Solheim submitted a written report.
- Ad Hoc (Consenting Relations): Tony Gabel reports items under New Business for consideration.

7. New Business:

a. Motion from Strategic Planning and Improvement Committee to repeal Standing Rule #4.

MOTION: The members of the Strategic Planning & Improvement Committee move the Faculty Senate to repeal the Senate Standing Rule #4.
Discussion: Rob Scott asks what rules will be in place if repealed; Tony Gabel answers that it is a redundancy and covered by by-laws.
- Approved.

b. Motion from Executive Committee to approve the recommended motion from the ad hoc Committee on the Consenting Relations Policy:

MOTION: The FHSU Faculty Senate approve the following recommended changes to the FHSU Consenting Relations Policy and forward these changes to the FHSU Administration for their consideration:

1. Guideline number 3 be divided into two separate guidelines (new Guideline 3 and new Guideline 4), with current Guideline number 4 renumbered to Guideline 5;

2. New Guideline 3 (from current Guideline 3.a.) be revised to require removal of a dominant person from a “professional power differential” relationship;

3. New Guideline 4 be created from current Guideline 3.b., and maintain its recommendation to disclose the existence of a “professional power differential” relationship;

4. Renumber current Guideline 4 to new Guideline 5, and modify it accordingly to refer to new Guidelines 3 and 4; and

5. Add new paragraph “Reporting Policy Violations” to the policy to coordinate with the university’s current Harassment and Title IX policies.
• James Ward (sub for Michael Martin) moves to approve the motion, seconded by Janett Naylor-Tincknell.

Discussion: Laura Wilson asks about the requirement for the dominant person to remove themselves from their position, like professor in a small department with a student, or dean and faculty member. Gabel notes a substitute is habitually used for other conflict relationships. We can’t require disclosure because that violates the association clause of the Constitution. Emily Breit moves to change to add “when practicable”; Laura Wilson seconds. Discussion of proposed amendment: Stephen Donnelly notes that if we originally say “required” because it creates a potentially dangerous situation, we shouldn’t change it.

• Denise Orth moves to postpone; Candace Kultgen-Mehaffey seconds.
• Approved.
• Senators will take original recommendation to departments and send comments to Tony Gabel.

c. Motion from Academic Affairs Committee (KU/JCCC KBOR Policy Manual Change):

MOTION: The members of the Academic Affairs Committee move the Faculty Senate to not support the Johnson County Community College and KU-Edwards campus joint recommendation to change Chapter 111.A.9 Degrees B.2a-d the Kansas Board of Regents Policy Manual.

Discussion: Stephen Donnelly notes that motion language should be positive, so committee amends motion to say “reject” instead of “not support.” Parliamentary procedure does not allow the change of a motion from a committee, so Stephen Donnelly moves thus, seconded by Rob Scott:

• MOTION: The Faculty Senate of Fort Hays State University rejects the Johnson County Community College and KU-Edwards campus joint recommendation to change Chapter 111.A.9 Degrees B.2a-d the Kansas Board of Regents Policy Manual.
• Approved.
• Janett Naylor-Tincknell moves to substitute Stephen Donnelly’s motion for the committee’s motion, seconded by Emily Breit.
• Approved.

8. Adjournment
• Motion from Richard Packauskas, seconded by Stephen Donnelly. Approved.
• Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aflatoomi, Kayvan</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Jahan Aliari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Jalilah</td>
<td>Music and Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, Laura</td>
<td>Music and Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur, Charmion</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett, Lexy</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breit, Emily</td>
<td>Economics, Finance &amp; Accounting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castaneda, Rosa</td>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhoobhadel, Sunil</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnelly, Stephen</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du, Yuxiang</td>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis, Carol</td>
<td>Communication Sciences &amp; Disorders</td>
<td>Fragoon Chooz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillock, Eric / Stark, Bill</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove, Glenn</td>
<td>Economics, Finance &amp; Accounting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper, Jason</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartman, Robin</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeter, Whitney</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Elodie</td>
<td>Advanced Education Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandt, Greg</td>
<td>Health and Human Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Jung Hee</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loggins, Ginger</td>
<td>Informatics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Mike</td>
<td>Applied Business Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGonigal, Kate</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McRay, Jeni (Virgina)</td>
<td>Leadership Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehaffey-Kaltgen, Candace</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles, Helen</td>
<td>Health and Human Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Carl</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitra, Sarbari</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munsch, Kris</td>
<td>Applied Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naylor-Tricknell, Janett</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nienkamp, Paul</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orth, Denise</td>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packauskas, Richard</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schartz, Shane</td>
<td>Informatics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmierbach, Amy</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Robb</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Linda</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solheim, Jeff</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrchal, Kevin</td>
<td>Advanced Education Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun, Jian</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, April</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werth, Natasha</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitaker, Brett</td>
<td>Leadership Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Laura</td>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeller, Jana</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britten, Fred</td>
<td>Communication Sciences &amp; Disorders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabel, Tony</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (Please Print)</td>
<td>Department / Area Represented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Radner</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Feldstein</td>
<td>JST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Crowley</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proctoring

Dr. Andrew Feldstein, Assistant Provost for Teaching Innovation and Learning Technologies, addressed Faculty Senate on the subject of proctoring at its November 5, 2018, meeting.

New Business

No new business has been brought to the Student Affairs Committee, and hence the committee has not met since October 8, 2018.
University Affairs

Faculty Senate Update

November 27, 2018

University Affairs met three times this month.

1. Our first meeting was with Dr. Crowley to discuss course evaluation systems. Dr. Crowley created a task force whose members are a mixture of University Affair members and administration. We collaborated to create a list of needs in a course evaluation system and a Request for Proposals RFP was generated. This RFP will invite companies to submit proposals to FHSU for course evaluation systems. The Task force will attend these on-campus proposals and present the best two to Faculty Senate. We are hopefully that these presentations will be in the early Spring.

2. University Affairs is currently working on gathering data regarding the 2012 and 2018 Faculty Morale Survey. Initial findings seem that many of the main points of the 2018 survey are very similar to the 2012 survey. Committee members are breaking this data into Colleges. We hope to bring this to the February Senate meeting.
Faculty Senate Resolution  
December 3, 2018  
Topic: Consenting Relations Policy

**Report from Executive Committee:**  
**Modifications to FHSU’s Consenting Relations Policy**

The Executive Committee met Nov. 9, 2018, to consider comments made by senators during the Nov. 5, 2018, Faculty Senate meeting which concerned the FHSU Consenting Relations Policy as modified by the *ad hoc* committee. After due consideration, the Sen. Donnelly moved that the following resolution be brought to the Faculty Senate floor:

**RESOLVED:** The Faculty Senate supports the FHSU Consenting Relations policy as revised by the *ad hoc* committee (see attachment).

Sen. Miles seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

**FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION 2019 – ___**

(Upon motion from Executive Committee, Nov. 9, 2018)

**RESOLVED:** The Faculty Senate supports the FHSU Consenting Relations policy as revised by the *ad hoc* committee (see attachment).
Fort Hays State University

Faculty and Unclassified Staff Handbook
Chapter 4 -- Faculty: Benefits, Responsibilities, and Specific Requirements

Consenting Relations Policy
Policy Statement on Consenting Relations
Definitions
"Professional power differential" refers to any relationship or association that involves persons of unequal power (e.g., administrator and faculty, faculty and student, supervisor and employee). A "professional power differential" exists whenever one individual has authority over another individual. For example, a faculty member will always be treated as having a power differential in relation to a student if the student is in an educational experience where the faculty member has authority to assign grades, make recommendations for further study and future employment, or make other valutative judgments. These principles also apply to administrators and supervisors in their relationships with students, faculty, unclassified staff, and university support staff over whom they exercise any authority to make valutative judgments.

Rationale
Fort Hays State University recognizes that administrators, supervisors, and faculty are entrusted with considerable power in their relationships with subordinates and with students. Administrators, supervisors, and faculty are expected to exercise that power in such a manner as to inspire trust and respect. This trust and respect is inevitably jeopardized when a member of the University community engages in a romantic or sexual relationship that involves a professional power differential. A power differential, by its very existence, compromises the subordinate or student's ability to decide freely. Moreover, other employees or students may be affected by such unprofessional behavior as it may create favoritism or the appearance of favoritism at the expense of others.

Policy
This policy does not seek to prohibit all sexual or amorous relationships between consenting adults within the University community. Rather, this policy strongly discourages any sexual or amorous relationship which involves a professional power differential, even where the relationship appears to be a consensual one.

Guidelines
1. It is the responsibility of the administrator, supervisor or faculty member to recognize that a power differential exists.
2. It is the responsibility of the administrator, supervisor, or faculty member to recognize that a conflict of interest may arise from these relationships.
3. It is recommended that the administrator, supervisor, or faculty member who is involved in such a relationship should either:
   a. remove him/herself from the position of authority (e.g., a faculty member serving on the merit, tenure, or promotion committee of a faculty member with whom he/she has become involved in a consensual relationship should remove him/herself from the committee).
4. It is recommended that the administrator, supervisor, or faculty member who is involved in such a relationship should report the existence of the relationship to a superior (such as department chair, dean, vice president, or equal employment opportunity officer) so that fairness and equity can be monitored. It is further recommended that the administrator, supervisor, or faculty member who is in a relationship that involves a power differential should document the existence of the relationship and any actions taken under (a) guideline 3 and/or (b) 4 above.

Reporting Policy Violations
Violations of this policy may be reported through either the University's Harassment Policy or its Title IX Policy.

Consequences
Individuals who choose not to follow the guidelines presented in this policy should understand that if a charge of sexual harassment is filed, it will be exceedingly difficult for the administrator, supervisor, or faculty member to prove immunity on the grounds of "mutual consent." In such circumstances consent will be considered questionable. Based on the merits of a case, an individual may be subject to University sanctions or civil liabilities.

Approved by President Edward H. Hammond (05-25-95).
Suggested revisions by Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee (10-23-18)
Faculty Senate  
December 3, 2018  
Topic: General Education CORE

**Report from Academic Affairs**

The Academic Affairs Committee met Nov. 27, 2018, to consider the CORE Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes produced by the FHSU’s General Education Committee. The Academic Affairs Committee, on a vote of 10-0-1, approved the following motion to be brought to the Faculty Senate floor:

> It is moved that the Faculty Senate approve the CORE Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes produced by the General Education Committee as written in the document titled “Final General Education Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes for Approval 11 13 2018.pdf”.
### TENTATIVE CREDIT-HOUR OVERVIEW

#### Goal 1: Core Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1.1: Written and Oral Communication</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1-A: Written Communication</td>
<td>ENG 101 and ENG 102 and Senior-level course in major.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1-B: Oral Communication</td>
<td>COMM 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 CH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1.2: Quantitative Literacy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH 101 or MATH 110 or MATH 234 or MATH 331</td>
<td>3 CH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Objective 1.3: Computing Literacy            | INF 101 |
|----------------------------------------------| 3 CH |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1.4: Information Literacy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore- or Junior-level course in major.*</td>
<td>3 CH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1.5: Critical Thinking</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 10x and Senior-level course in major (likely same course as 1.1-A above).*</td>
<td>3 CH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 18 CH

#### Goal 2: Broad and Integrative Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2.1: Knowledge of the Liberal Arts</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1-A: Aesthetic Mode of Inquiry</td>
<td>One course of student’s choice from approved list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1-B: Historical Mode of Inquiry</td>
<td>One course of student’s choice from approved list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1-C: Mathematical Mode of Inquiry</td>
<td>Requirement fulfilled by the same course the student chooses for Objective 1.2: Quantitative Literacy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2.2: Natural Scientific Mode of Inquiry</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1-D: Natural Scientific Mode of Inquiry</td>
<td>One course of student’s choice from approved list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1-E: Philosophical Mode of Inquiry</td>
<td>One course of student’s choice from approved list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1-F: Social Scientific Mode of Inquiry</td>
<td>One course of student’s choice from approved list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 CH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two Outcome sets from Goal 2 can be fulfilled by courses that also fulfill a Major requirement from the student’s degree program, possibly reducing the total credit hours by 6.

**Total** 9–15 CH

#### Goal 3: Practical Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3.1: Health and Wealth</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1-A: Dimensions of Wellness</td>
<td>HHP 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1-B: Financial Health</td>
<td>FIN 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 CH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3.2 Intercultural Competence</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One course of student’s choice from approved list.</td>
<td>3 CH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3.3 Engaged Global Citizens</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One course of student’s choice from approved list.</td>
<td>3 CH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One Outcome set from Goal 3 can be fulfilled by a course that also fulfills Major requirements from the student’s degree program, possibly reducing the total credit hours by 3.

**Total** 9–12 CH

**Grand Total** 36–45 CH

*Written Communication and Critical Thinking each have an outcome to be fulfilled at the Senior level and in the context of the student’s major program. These outcomes would likely be fulfilled in one capstone course. If a major program lacks such a course, and the associated department prefers not to create such a course, the outcome will be fulfilled by a course from a different but associated discipline or by a non-discipline-specific writing and critical-thinking course offered under the UNIV designation.

Similarly, the Information Literacy outcomes are to be fulfilled at the Sophomore or Junior level, in the context of the specific Information Literacy needs of the student’s major program. If a major program lacks such a course, and the associated department prefers not to create such a course, the outcome will be fulfilled by a course from a different but associated discipline or by a non-discipline-specific information-literacy course offered under the UNIV designation.
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.

Timeline
December 2018  Faculty Senate approves outcomes
December 2018  General Education Committee identifies groups of faculty members to develop outcome-assessment rubrics
February 2019  Faculty Senate approves policies and procedures for CORE Program implementation
Spring 2019  Faculty teams develop outcome-assessment rubrics
Spring 2019  Departments propose courses to fulfill Outcomes and meet CORE requirements
October 2019  course schedule is set for Fall 2020
Spring 2020  Advising sheet for CORE Program distributed to advisors
August 2020  FHSU CORE program launches; students enroll in classes

History of 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 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 a ten-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 6 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.

**Discipline-Specific 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 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.

Similarly, outcomes associated with Objective 1.4: Information Literacy specify that the student will meet discipline-specific standards, so these outcomes should also be achieved in a course within the student’s major program of study. However, these outcomes are associated with skills and abilities useful to students prior to graduation. Therefore, the major-program course that satisfies this requirement should be taken earlier in the student’s course of study, most likely during the sophomore or junior year.

**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 and information literacy 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 (Outcome set 2.1-A below), fulfilling the requirement for that Objective. The degree to which a program integrates major courses with general-education outcomes is subject to specific limitations. Goal 1 assumes that major courses will fulfill outcomes for information literacy and senior-level writing and senior-level critical thinking. The number of FHSU CORE objectives from Goal 2 that can be fulfilled through courses that also satisfy requirements from the student’s degree program is limited to 2 (6 credit hours), and the number from Goal 3 is limited to 1 (3 credit hours).

**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.
Frequently Asked Questions

- **How will the transition period be handled? Will students be grandfathered?**
  Yes. Students admitted prior to the Fall 2020 semester will be permitted to use the old (current) program. Conceivably, a student using the current program might benefit by changing to the FHSU CORE Program. At this time, a student would be permitted to elect to change to the FHSU CORE. This and other such policies have yet to be codified, and are not part of the current proposal of Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes.

- **How will courses currently in the General Education Program fit in the new FHSU CORE program?**
  Some courses currently approved for fulfilling General Education Requirements will continue to do so with no change. Many courses will require only slight changes to add the new learning outcomes. The document below indicates where many courses from the current program will likely fulfill requirements of the FHSU CORE.

- **How will the FHSU CORE affect transfer to and from FHSU?**
  Transferability, both to and from FHSU, has been a key consideration in formulating these outcomes. FHSU CORE courses and requirements will remain compatible with the KBOR Statewide Transfer System. Students who transfer in to FHSU with an Associate’s degree or at least 45 credit hours will still use the Transfer Agreement General Education Program rather than the FHSU CORE.

- **Will the General Education Committee determine what classes will fulfill outcomes?**
  As with the current process, departments will propose courses to the General Education Committee, who will make recommendations to the Academic Affairs Committee.

- **Will the program allow “Double Dipping?”**
  Yes, with limitations. The number of FHSU CORE objectives that can be fulfilled through courses that also satisfy requirements from the student’s degree program is limited to 2 (6 credit hours) from Goal 2, and 1 (3 credit hours) from Goal 3.

- **Will FHSU CORE courses have to be available to all students, or can courses have prerequisites that might narrow the pool of students eligible to enroll?**
  Courses designed for students of a specific major will be able to satisfy requirements of the FHSU CORE. Such courses will be able to retain their prerequisites, corequisites, and required permissions. If, for example, enrollment in a course is restricted to majors, such as with Global Nursing, the course can fulfill FHSU CORE requirements and still be open only to Nursing majors.

- **How will departments submit courses to the General Education Committee for inclusion in the FSHU CORE?**
  As indicated above, policies and procedures have yet to be codified, and are not part of the current proposal of Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes. However, the current Course Approval Process will be retained. A large number of courses to be included in the FHSU CORE will require only slight additions to their outcomes, so the Course Approval Process might be revised to allow the Minor Course Change Process to include general-education approval. First-year courses will be prioritized for timeliness.
  Additionally, to be approved as a course fulfilling FHSU CORE requirements, Course
Approval submissions will be required to indicate which assignments will fulfill the required FHSU CORE Outcomes.

- **What about Freshman Seminar?**
  The Freshman Seminar is not a general-education course and is not part of the FHSU CORE.

- **How will outcomes be assessed?**
  The tentative plan for outcomes assessment (not part of this proposal regarding Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes) has student learning outcomes measured through faculty reporting each student’s achievement for each outcome met by their class. Each outcome set will have an associated rubric that faculty will use to report student achievement on a four-point scale, as is standard for assessment at FHSU. Faculty will be required to use the rubric for FHSU CORE assessment, but faculty will not be required to use the rubric for grading. Faculty will report student achievement through Tiger Central with a mechanism similar to the current system for reporting midterm and final grades.

- **Who will collect the assessment data?**
  Like Program Learning Outcome Assessment, assessment data for FHSU CORE classes will be collected by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Quality Improvement, headed by Dr. Sangki Min, Assistant Vice President.

- **What outcomes are departments responsible for meeting?**
  Please see the section headed “Discipline-Specific Achievement” above.

- **Will there be faculty development to help with the new FHSU CORE?**
  Yes. Faculty-development events will cover advising changes, assessment procedures, and methods for incorporating outcomes for writing, critical thinking, and information literacy into existing major courses.
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.

Courses Expected to Fulfill These Outcomes:
ENG 101, English Composition I (included here as a prerequisite for ENG 102)
AND
ENG 102, English Composition II (fulfills Outcome 1)
AND
A senior-level course in the student’s major certified as fulfilling Outcome 2. If a major program lacks such a course, and the associated department prefers not to create such a course, the outcome will be fulfilled by a course from a different, but associated discipline or by a non-discipline-specific writing and critical-thinking course offered under the UNIV designation.

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.

Courses Expected to Fulfill These Outcomes:
COMM 100, Fundamentals of Oral Communication.

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.
Courses Expected to Fulfill These Outcomes:
One of:
- MATH 101, Liberal Arts Mathematics, or
- MATH 110, College Algebra, or
- MATH 234, Analytic Geometry and Calculus I, or
- MATH 331, Calculus Methods.

[Note: The Department of Mathematics has established that these outcomes will be met by the course also used to satisfy Objective 2.1-C: Mathematical Mode of Inquiry]

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.

Courses Expected to Fulfill These Outcomes:
INF 101, Introduction to Computer Information Systems.

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.

Courses Expected to Fulfill These Outcomes:
A sophomore- or junior-level course in the student’s major certified as fulfilling these outcomes, possibly a “Methods” or “Research” course. If a major program lacks such a course, and the associated department prefers not to create such a course, the outcome will
be fulfilled by a course from a different, but associated discipline or by a non-discipline-specific general information-literacy course offered under the UNIV designation.

**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.

**Courses Expected to Fulfill These Outcomes:**
PHIL 10x, Critical Thinking (new course, serving as a corequisite of ENG 102.
AND
A senior-level course in the student’s major certified as fulfilling Outcome 3.
GOAL 2: BROAD AND INTEGRATIVE KNOWLEDGE

[Note: No more than 2 outcome sets (6 credit hours) from Goal 2 can be fulfilled through courses that also satisfy requirements from the student’s degree program.]

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, and social and behavioral sciences.

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.

Courses That Might Possibly Fulfill These Outcomes:
One of:
- ART 180, Fundamentals & Appreciation of Art,
- ART 201, Survey of Art History I,
- ART 202, Survey of Art History II,
- ART 280, Approaches to Creativity,
- COMM 125, Introduction to Motion Pictures,
- ENG 125, World Literature and the Human Experience,
- ENG 126, Introduction to Literature,
- ENG 327, Literature Matters,
- MUS 120, Introduction to Theatre,
- MUS 161, Listening to Music,
- MUS 391, Jazz,
or a new or existing course proposed by a department.

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.

Courses That Might Possibly Fulfill These Outcomes:
One of:
- HIST 110, World Civilization to 1500,
- HIST 111, Modern World Civilization,
- HIST 130, United States History to 1877,
- HIST 131, United States History since 1877,
or a new or existing course proposed by a department.
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.

[Note: The Department of Mathematics has established that these outcomes will be met by the course also used to satisfy Objective 1.2: Quantitative Literacy (Liberal Arts Mathematics, College Algebra, Analytic Geometry and Calculus I, or Calculus Methods)]

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.

Courses That Might Possibly Fulfill These Outcomes:
One of:
- BIOL 100, Human Biology,
- BIOL 200, Humans and the Environment,
- BIOL 300, Human Heredity,
- CHEM 100, Chemist’s View of the World,
- CHEM 112 General Chemistry I,
- CHEM 114 General Chemistry II,
- GSCI 100, Introduction to Geology,
- GSCI 101, Physical Geography
- GSCI 340, Environmental Geology,
- PHYS 102, Physical Science,
- PHYS 208 Elementary Meteorology,
- PHYS 309 Descriptive Astronomy,
- or a new or existing course proposed by a department.

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.

Courses That Might Possibly Fulfill These Outcomes:
One of:
- ACCT 409, Ethics for Accountants,
- COMM 349, Strategic Writing and Ethics,
- CRJ 245, Ethics in Criminal Justice,
IDS 400, Bioethics,
MGT 475, Business, Society, and Ethics
PHIL 120, Introduction to Philosophy,
PHIL 340, Introduction to Ethics,
or a new or existing course proposed by a department.

**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.

**Courses That Might Possibly Fulfill These Outcomes:**

One of:

- ECON 201, Principles of Microeconomics,
- ECON 202, Principles of Macroeconomics,
- GSCI 110, World Geography
- POLS 101, American Government,
- POLS 230, Introduction to International Relations,
- PSY 100, General Psychology,
- PSY 300, Abnormal Psychology,
- PSY 340, Social Psychology,
- SOC 140, Understanding Society,
- SOC 355, Sociology of Death and Dying,
- SOC 388, Sociology of the Family in America
or a new or existing course proposed by a department.
GOAL 3: PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS
[Note: No more than 1 outcome set (3 credit hours) from Goal 3 can be fulfilled through courses that also satisfy requirements from the student’s degree program.]

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.

Course Expected to Fulfill These Outcomes:
HHP 200, Personal 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.

Course Expected to Fulfill These Outcomes:
FIN 205, Theory and Practice of Personal Finance.

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.

Courses That Might Possibly Fulfill These Outcomes:
One of:
GSCI 11, World Geography
IDS 350, Diversity in the US
an approved, credit-bearing study-abroad course
a beginning 1 course in a non-native language,
or a new or existing course proposed by a department.
Objective 3.3: 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 3.3: 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.

Courses That Might Possibly Fulfill These Outcomes:
One of:
IDS 407, Global Challenges,
IDS 499, Global Environmental Issues,
or a new or existing course proposed by a department.
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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)
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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)
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Cheryl Duffy (Goss Distinguished Prof.)
Doug Drabkin (AHSS)
Dmitry Gimon (BE)
Jessica Heronemus (BE)
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Trey Hill (HBS)
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Tom Schafer (STM)
Bill Weber (STM)
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Adam Schibi (Student)
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)

Chapman Rackaway (Liberal Ed Director), Chair
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April Terry
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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

Subgroup 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 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: 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