Two Outcomes, Two Goals requirement for a Liberal Education Experience

Motion: (proposed by Jim Boulter)
The University Liberal Education Committee is instructed to define each approved Liberal Education experience as meeting exactly two outcomes, with one outcome in each of two distinct goals; ULEC would be authorized to grant justified exceptions as necessary.

(For instance, a class might meet goals K1 and R3, or S3 and IL1.)

Motion: (proposed by Jim Boulter)
The Liberal Education experiences that meet these outcomes should be assessed with no two goals assessed in the same year.

(For example, this could be accomplished on a 5-year rolling basis, with half the Knowledge goal outcomes assessed in year one and the remainder in year two, because there’s more of these required in many of the proposed frameworks. In year three, the Skills outcomes are assessed and in year four the Responsibility outcomes are assessed. In year five, the single Integration outcome is assessed; it is assessed alone because this goal is the newest to our structure and may be the most challenging to assess.)

Justification:
This would finally resolve the ongoing and problematic uncertainty about how many outcomes can/should be addressed by a LE course, enabling faculty to immediately begin to design courses that satisfy LE outcomes, and increasing the probability of a successful outcome to the transition. The absence of a clear guideline for this crucial issue is a concern to many. One positive practical outcome of this would be that no single course would ever be assessing more than one outcome in any one year, reducing the annual assessment workload for many courses. It would have the effect of spreading out the required effort of assessment and also make it more continuous, with every LE course undergoing at least some assessment in 2 out of every 5 years. Although this may be perceived as overly rigid and proscriptive, I don’t feel that many of our current GE courses would actually require substantial revision to accomplish this requirement. And I’m not sure that any course that can’t meet this should really be a part of the integrative LE core we aspire to: it would make intentional the value of integration throughout the LE core, not just in some courses. Additionally, this would eliminate the concerns about “gaming” the LE system by artificially inflating the number of goals addressed by any one course. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it reduces the overall credit load for students, minimizing “credit creep” and time-to-graduation. And this would allow students more choice in selecting the remainder of their credits. This is particularly important for transfer students, who especially require that freedom, and all students will benefit from a wide array of “two-fer” classes, rather than a confusing matrix of variably counted courses – potentially anywhere from 1 to 7 LE outcomes fulfilled.