Minutes

Board Members Present: Swati Adarkar, Erica Bestpitch, Sho Dozono, Maude Hines, Margaret Kirkpatrick, Thomas Imeson, Rick Miller, Stephanie Shao, Lindsay Stewart, Peter Stott, Christine Vernier, Chair Nickerson and President Wiewel (ex-officio)

Board Member(s) Not Present: Gale Castillo, Irving Levin

1. Call to Order/Roll/Declaration of Quorum

Chair Nickerson called the meeting to order at 2:07 pm. Roll was taken, a quorum was present, and the meeting proceeded.

2. Open Comment

The following individuals signed up for open comment and were invited to speak to the Board. Hayley for Emma Whetsell made comments about the Board, the Foundation, and Tuition Board votes. Kaden Burdick made statements about PSU as a sanctuary campus and campus police. Shannon Neal made comments regarding student wages. Donald Thompson III made statements about campus police. Kaitlyn Dey made comments about PSUSU not being heard by the Board. Quinn Calkins provided comments about PSU as a sanctuary campus.

Faculty members Cornel Pewewardy, Winston Grady-Wills, Sally McWilliams, Staci Martin, Roberta Hunte, and Pedro Ferbel-Azcarate presented comments supporting the declaration of PSU as a sanctuary campus and asking the University to take certain actions for the well-being and safety of all PSU students, faculty, and PSU community members. For additional details about the request for certain actions, please see the attached handout.

Trustee Hines would like the Board to consider the structure for Open Comment and other methods for feedback and response in order to enhance communication.

Trustee Kirkpatrick commended President Wiewel for his announcement that PSU is a sanctuary campus.

3. Opening Comments and Reports

   a. Comments from Presiding Officer of the Portland State University Faculty Senate
Professor Brad Hansen discussed the role of liberal education at PSU. He provided an historical background and current context for liberal education. He discussed the learning outcomes associated with liberal education and PSU’s general education goals. For additional details and information about this presentation, please see the attached handout.

b. Comments from the Associated Students of Portland State University

ASPSU Vice-President Kaitlyn Verret deferred the allotted time to Donald Thompson III and Katlyn Coback. ASPSU representatives shared that they had passed a ‘Resolution to recommend divestment from companies involved in Israeli military occupation’ and asked the Board to support the resolution. ASPSU is also working on developing a Resolution in Support of the Water Protectors at Standing Rock and an Injustice Boycott Resolution. Board members were invited to attend Student Senate meetings.

Comments were made that Board members don’t care about student experiences and that comments made by the Board members are disingenuous.

The Board took a 10 minute break at 3:20 pm.

4. Consent Agenda

a. Approval of Minutes from the September 15, 2016 Meeting

ACTION: Stott made a Motion to approve the consent agenda. Hines seconded. The Motion was adopted unanimously.

5. Reports of Standing Committees of the Board

a. Executive & Audit Committee

Pete Nickerson, Chair of the Executive and Audit Committee, reported that the committee met on November 2, 2016. All committee members and three additional trustees were present. PSU’s external auditors CliftonLarsonAllen LLP presented to the committee the audited 2016 annual financial report. The final report is included in the docket today. The auditor’s report was an unmodified opinion. Chair Nickerson reviewed the management report and found nothing material nor anything that is not being addressed by management. The report was unanimously accepted by the committee. The committee also heard the internal auditor’s report, which included a status updates on the annual audit plan, hotline usage and current projects.

b. Academic and Student Affairs Committee

Margaret Kirkpatrick, Chair of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee reported that the committee met on November 19, 2016. The committee is working to understand and explore barriers to student success. Vice President John Fraire and his team have identified five priorities to address. The committee is focused on understanding and identifying student success and strategies and tools to help students achieve success at PSU.
c. Finance and Administration Committee

Rick Miller, Chair of the Finance and Administration Committee, reported that the committee met on November 17, 2016. The committee discussed enrollment and a Five-Year FTE enrollment forecast, student population, the fiscal 2016-2017 year budget and Quarter 1 budget to actuals. Please see the Power Point Presentation for additional details. (https://www.pdx.edu/board/sites/www.pdx.edu.board/files/December%201%2C%202016_PowerPoint%20Presentation.pdf)

6. Reports of Other Committees

a. President Search Advisory Committee

Steve Percy, Dean of the College of Urban and Public Affairs and Vice Chair of the Presidential Search Advisory Committee, reported that the committee had completed the Opportunities and Challenges Profile that will be used to guide the presidential search process. It is anticipated that the candidate pool will be established and vetted before the end of the winter term. January and February will be focused on reviewing and narrowing the pool, with the intent to then bring finalists to campus.

7. Discussion Items

a. Overview of the Office of Global Diversity and Inclusion

Vice President Carmen Suarez explained the priorities of the Office of Global Diversity and Inclusion (OGDI) and how the office is working on the implementation of various aspects of the University’s Strategic Plan. OGDI focuses on recruitment and retention; its work is framed by culture and climate; and it focuses on representational diversity, systemic diversity and structural diversity. OGDI is responsible for overseeing institutional compliance related to Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity (AA/EEO), the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title IX, Title VI, and Title VII, and for conducting investigations when concerns or allegations are raised. This work is important for organizational self-reflection and for continuous improvement in culture and climate. OGDI promotes and supports diversity education and learning at PSU and community outreach and engagement with non-profits, social service entities, business organizations and schools. Priorities for the coming year include the Diversity Action Plan, improvements to diversity hiring practices and diversity education, professional development and training. Please see the Power Point Presentation for additional details. (https://www.pdx.edu/board/sites/www.pdx.edu.board/files/December%201%2C%202016_PowerPoint%20Presentation.pdf)

8. Report from the President

President Wiewel highlighted certain aspects of his written report, including the semi-annual report to the Board regarding campus public safety, which was attached to the report. It was reported that the Governor’s budget was released earlier today (December 1).
9. Adjourn

Chair Nickerson adjourned the meeting at 4:56 pm.
Words that Wound: A white paper for creating a safe and respectful campus at Portland State University

Submitted to President Wim Wiewel and Board of Trustees at Portland State University

December 1, 2016

By Cornel Pewewardy in behalf of the Critically Consciousness Study Group, United Indigenous Students in Higher Education, Native/Indigenous Alliance, and SGRN Anti-Racist Task Force
Introduction and Context

Consistent with the University’s stated mission, *Let Knowledge Serve the City*, and in response to broad calls for administration and institutional changes prompted by the *Students of Color Speak Out* on December 1, 2015, the Critically Consciousness Study Group (CCSG) refocused their study on a White Paper titled *Why We Need to Take the “Chief” Out of Chief Diversity Officer*. Issues of diversity are critical issues that this nation, state, and University will continue to face, and as a leader of academic excellence in higher education, PSU is poised to be a national model for preparing culturally responsive leaders.

The white paper was submitted to President Wim Wiewel’s office on July 24, 2015, and the President never officially acknowledged receiving of the white paper to this date. It took a *Students of Color Speak Out* (12/1/15) to demand of President Wim Wiewel to not only acknowledge receipt of the white paper but take action upon to eliminate the word “Chief” from its original title, Chief Diversity Officer. That action was officially change by the President’s campus email announcement on December 9, 2015 with a new title of Vice President for Global Diversity and Inclusion. Note that this is the original title recommended by the Critically Consciousness Study Group for changing the title.

The *Students of Color Speak Out* and other troubling events at PSU in 2015-2016 raised serious concerns about the safety and respect of Native/Indigenous culture on the campus community. In response, the Critical Consciousness Study Group responded to President Wiewel’s invitation to discuss the issues of politically/linguistically-charged language used on campus. The CCSG responded by engaging in two separate meetings with the President with a mandate to provide recommendations on how to foster a campus culture that practices culturally responsive language usage, encourages respectful behavior, and ensures that members of the community can learn in an environment that is free of ethnic labeling, one that truly honors affirming diversity.

This introduction and the pages that follow will reveal that ethnic slurs—the racist thoughts, images, and assumptions in the minds of those that express unkind words on campus, including those that by most accounts are perceived as “not racist”—is dangerous precisely because it is perceived as harmless. No social entity as complex as higher education can function without considerable trust. Trust is most effective when it is taken for granted. But when students of color with legitimate social and cultural differences from White students and faculty are brought into a campus under a colorblind perspective that will not acknowledge such differences,
trouble is bound to arise and many times explode. Negative stereotypes held by many White educators and simple unfamiliarity with the sociocultural patterns of students of color and their communities compound these difficulties. One important kind of trouble on the part of White adults is a fear of raising racial issues, a fear that silences what could become a healthy and sometimes painful, racial dialogue. Accordingly, this paper explicates much of the issues of politically/linguistically-charged language used on this campus as White fragility. DiAngelo (2011) refers to White fragility as a “state in which even a minimum amount of racial stress becomes intolerable, triggering a range of defensive moves. These moves include the outward display of emotions such as anger, fear, and guilt, and behaviors such as argumentation, silence, and leaving the stress-inducing situation” (p. 54). Tuck and Gaztabmbide (2013) contend that “it is strategically and politically important to mark and understand how the settler colonial curricular project of replacement is relentless in its recuperation and absorption of such critiques” (p. 81).

The ideas presented in this paper emerged from within a critical race theory paradigm that regards racism in the United States as a societal phenomenon that is rooted in slavery and genocide. Exploring how well-meaning people make sense of ethnic labeling entailed taking an in-depth look at the participants’ thoughts about unkind words used on campus. Therefore, the purpose of this white paper is to examine what are politically/linguistically-charged words and especially how the terms of abuse themselves can yield a special insight into the social workings of American society and culture, both past and present.

Engaged Pedagogy

As the result of this internal administrative decision made by President Wiewel on January 19, 2016, he invited members of the Critically Consciousness Study Group along with some allies/advocates to his Presidential executive board room to discuss the concept of “politically/linguistically-charged words.” The President facilitated the meeting seated at the front of the executive conference table. The only other PSU administrator in this meeting was Dr. Carmen Suarez, the new Vice President for Global Diversity and Inclusion.

Basically, this was a very contentious meeting filled with multiple clarifications and examples of word meanings and conversation exchanges. Study group members and students offered examples of politically/linguistically-charged words through examples of unkind words/terms for which they heard on the PSU campus such as:
Low man on the totem pole
Hold down the fort
Circle the wagons
Let’s powwow
Sit down Indian style
Chief
“Hut-oh” (this was a non-verbal expression toward a person while crossing paths walking towards each other on campus—meaning a scornful gaze, not a positive greetings or one-way non-verbal expression). It is important to note that students invited had many more examples of unkind words/terms, but because of time we were only limited to these mentioned terms.

As time elapsed from this first meeting, President Wiewel was called out by his secretary to attend another scheduled meeting. On his way out of the conference room, he suggested that there should be another follow-up meeting.

After this first meeting, the President invited the study group to continue this discussion at a later date. Accordingly, a second meeting was held on July 25, 2016 in the Native American Student and Community Center hosted by the United Indigenous Students in Higher Education, Critically Consciousness Study Group and the Native/Indigenous Alliance. President Wiewel was present along with his administrative team consisting of Provost Sona Andrews, Vice President of Enrollment Management John Fraire, and Vice President of Global Diversity and Inclusion Carmen Suarez. This follow-up gathering consisted of twenty-four people participating in a traditional Native American talking circle (4 PSU administrators; 20 students/staff/faculty/community representatives).²

**Framing Holistic Teaching and Learning**

The second meeting between the President and Critically Consciousness Study Group was a paradigm shift toward holistic teaching and learning. Hosted by most Native/Indigenous groups on campus, holistic teaching practices guided the second conversation about politically/linguistically-charged terms used on campus.

This second gathering consisted of an inclusive gathering of educators and students from many realms of holistic practice, primarily Native/Indigenous teaching pedagogy. The traditional talking circle highlighted a diverse and inspiring range of approaches for creative planning and interconnected teaching and learning. Student leaders gave out gifts of prayer ties to each participant in the talking circle.
The meeting began with a cultural welcoming by Jon George, Council Member of the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde. Together with tribal member, Greg Archuleta, they sang an honor song. The talking circle was led by Lea Ann Holder (Chickasaw) who used her personal “talking stick” as a symbolic guide for creating global interconnectedness. By using the talking circle concept, less emphasis was placed on executive hierarchical control such as facts or figures and more emphasis was centered on learner empowerment and conceptual framing the issues of the gathering.

The experience of traditional teaching pedagogy for the faculty, staff and students of the Indigenous Nations Studies is customary whereas all participants in the talking circle are sitting together (side-by-side) in one large circle, without hierarchical, linear sitting orders. The taking circle also empowers learners to respect and value others, to work together, communicate and solve problems as members of a larger group. This traditional teaching method served well for the overall synergy of the group and a non-threatening way to introduce students to the more participatory learning approach exemplified by the talking circle concept speaking more from the heart (emotions) rather than the head (cognition). It is a method of teaching and learning and healing that was developed through a re-envisioning of Indigenous ways of knowing, to address countless microagressions¹ (as well as blatant microaggressions) experienced on the PSU campus by students, staff, faculty and community members. Everyday multicultural teaching moments take many forms on our campus, most of which engages in culturally responsive practice outside one’s own home and community.

The second gathering of this group, the use of a traditional talking circle expressed a deeper understanding of the issues as well as engaged a holistic learning/teaching interactions as it was enacted within the model-in-use.

**Talking Circle Model-In-Use**

In Native/Indigenous teaching practice, healing and learning begins with efforts to develop internal self-consciousness, collective consciousness. Indigenous teaching practices includes the development of the self-consciousness as many of us are influenced in part by our Indigenous mimetic consciousness and how this cognitive development interacts with Western colonial consciousness. While the pedagogical tools articulated in the talking circle model arise (for me, Cornel Pewewardy), out of my Indigenous teaching traditions, several educators too have supports in anti-racist theory as well as other critical race theory knowledge bases.
The description and analysis of the talking circle as the model-in-use relied on the insights of students, faculty, staff and community members, who contributed their voices through testimony and the talking circle. In the talking circle, participants were encouraged to present their insights and offer recommendations using index cards. Some students selected to tell their stories of current and past cross-cultural encounters microaggressions they experienced in PSU classrooms. Sometimes they shared the deep-rooted feelings that have been harbored for years at PSU.

Along with the index cards compiled, many observations of the model-in-use by participants of the talking circle were provided. Several categories of data were constructed and deconstructed reflected by the following themes: reflection of the critical issues and themes, review of the talking circle, community building as seen by community participants, specific lessons for classroom teachers, recommendations to administrators to create a safe, Native/Indigenous friendly campus. Most of participant feedback from the talking circle was very positive.

**Reframing the Language of Savagism**

Well over a thousand derogatory nicknames aimed at more than one hundred different American ethnic groups have been recorded in dictionaries and other studies of our popular speech. The profusion of these unkind words speaks to one of the most troublesome aspects of our national social history and identity. Yet the terms of abuse themselves can yield a special insight into the social workings of American society and culture, both past and present. Ethnic labeling and slurs can cause major conflict, even wars. Many arguments have occurred on our campus because we misunderstand the words used by someone else. Weiner (2015) asserts that “most European scholarship fails to analyze cultures of whiteness in educational settings” (p. 359). More often than not, arguments begin because works formed specifically to hurt, abuse, antagonize, marginalize, or incite certain diverse groups of people, particularly Indigenous peoples.

Even today with the national discussion of the language of savagism like that of the U.S. military forces continues to personify Native/Indigenous peoples as enemies and savages by using the name of Geronimo as a code name for Osama Bin Laden is reprehensible. Returning and referring to the grounds of “Indian Country” and “Geronimo” reveal how certain parts of the globe are envisioned at the frontier of the U.S. homeland, a “us” versus “them” temporal close of the Indian wars. As Williams (2012) asserts, “even in the twenty-first century, the Western world’s most advanced nation-states continue to perpetuate the stereotypes and cliché images of human savagery that were first invented by the
ancient Greeks to justify their ongoing violations of the most basic human rights of cultural survival belonging to indigenous tribal peoples” (p. 9).

According to Delgado (2000), “the racial insult remains one of the most pervasive channels through which discrimination attitudes are imparted. Such language injures the dignity and self-regard of the person to whom it is addressed, communicating the message that distinctions of race are distinctions of merit, dignity, status, and personhood. Not only does the listener learn and internalize the messages contained in racial insults, these messages color our society’s institutions and are transmitted to succeeding generations” (p. 131). This is the language of racism, the language of savagism. Working to decolonize and transform the contemporary stereotypical images of the Noble Savage and the language of savagism is promoting critical liberation praxis.

Starting Points

The general feedback from the talking circle fall into three overlapping but nonetheless distinct groups: The first cluster group titled “Starting Points” focuses on places to begin creating a safe, Native/Indigenous friendly campus, “Reading and Teaching” centers on classroom and resources, and “Connections” discusses building community across the racial and ethnic divides on the PSU campus.

Overall, the talking circle turned out to be a very successful model-in-use to unfold and understand at least three important points:

1. Whether the current programs designed to foster diversity and tolerance on our campus can be made more robust. If we do not recognize and analyze the permeation of microaggressions caused by unkind words throughout our campus, then our efforts for affirming diversity will fail. Reading articles like DiAngelo’s White Fragility could be guide for instructors who want to promote more honest and informed conversations about race and racism.

2. Whether there are other ways we might continue to advance the causes of diversity and tolerance on our campus. President Wim Wiewel’s campus email about the rise in anti-Islamic and rhetoric throughout the country including PSU should also include all ethnic groups on campus being stereotyped like Native/Indigenous populations: “We are doing all we can to make our campus a safe and welcoming place, and we do not tolerate racial, ethnic, religious or any form of discrimination at PSU.” (President’s email 2/23/16)
3. Whether the current dispute resolution procedures are sufficient to handle any future outbreaks of hateful or violent speech in a coordinated and campus-side manner. We cannot ignore, avoid, or otherwise diminish the important role of unkind words (personal or institutional) used on campus in defeating our attempts to provide an inclusive, safe culturally responsive campus environment. Trying to understand unkind words does not increase the differences, but rather illuminates the similarities, the commonalities. Even President Wiewel's email (11/10/16 “responding to the presidential election”) to the PSU community expresses concerns to create a safe space on campus like the student cultural centers.

From what we learned from the talking circle in the Native American Student and Community Center was we had to begin to hear our multiple stories and grapple with the content in our stories, even when that content made us most uncomfortable.

**Recommendations**

Term after term at PSU Native/Indigenous students have worked with their trusted faculty and staff explaining how unkind words, racist ideas and assumptions from our nation’s past continue to be perpetuated, often unconsciously, by both Whites and Peoples of Color on the PSU campus. Microaggressions caused by these entanglements ignite student experiences moderating inflammatory—or painfully silent—classroom discussions, speaking from their own experiences and family histories and encouraging student allies and accomplices to do the same. Race talk has become intensely exhausting for many of the students that testified in these two discussions because it takes a great deal of energy to question the way a student has been taught to make sense of the world and begin to see that other interpretations are possible. As faculty and staff supporting these student voices, the diversity work on campus has also been debilitating. Many supportive faculty patiently try to help students face their own doubts and fears, listen to their internalized hatreds, and assist them with daily encounters of racism.

After a thorough examination of past campus climate incidents like the 2015 *Students of Color Speak Out*, relevant diversity action council plans, current PSU strategic planning reviews, and best practices from the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education of comparable institutions, the following recommendations for creating a more coordinated campus-wide response emerged from discussions among CCSG, Native/Indigenous Alliance, and the School of Gender, Race and Nations’ Anti-racism Task Force:
1. Request for the administration to take an authentic, passionate stand on diversity and inclusiveness across all aspects of the campus community.
2. Establish a Task Force on Safety and Racial Respect on the PSU campus, with a focus on ethnic labeling/slurs.
3. Institutionalize a periodic campus climate survey of the entire PSU community, to be conducted by an outside vendor.
4. Commission a report from an independent social justice advocate and educator on university responses to ethnic labeling and unkind words on campus.
5. Development and implementation of a public affairs and media relations strategy for portraying the inclusiveness of the campus and commitment to diversity by examining the effectiveness with which PSU conveys the diversity (the “face”) of our student population on campus and to the outside world.
6. Create a Native/Indigenous Friendly Campus Resolution.
7. Hold annual Town Hall Meetings with the President of the University in a proactive stance to debunk and demystify relational environment and multicultural efforts. This addresses the recommendation to increase opportunities for authentic dialogue.
8. Adopt an explicit statement of values to clearly articulate and transmit the University’s position regarding respect, safe campus, and equality and integrate this statement of values into the new PSU Strategic Plan.
9. Appoint an Implementation Team to pursue the recommendations in this paper.

Conclusion

This document will be of interest to many different people and organizations at PSU, especially the Native/Indigenous Alliance and local Native American community, sovereign tribes in Oregon, higher education commissions, K-12 community leaders, funders, Native American organizations, and students and parents. We hope it will inspire all of us to push harder for Native American student success and to learn from the inspiring examples and powerful student testimonies and practices at PSU.

Most of the local Native/Indigenous community here in Multnomah County know and live with the reality that Native American enrollment and retention in institutions of higher education like PSU remain the lowest compared to other ethnic populations. Understanding Native American student success, development,
and learning, particularly with regards to culturally responsive models is at the core of student affairs profession (Shotton, Lowe & Waterman, 2013). Unfortunately, the current literature is almost silent regarding these issues of ethnic labeling/unkind words in higher education. This document clearly indicates that there is a dire need for improvements in postsecondary efforts for Native American students and that there are many creative and effective efforts underway that can be profitably emulated and expanded at PSU.

Subsequently, PSU’s stated commitment to diversity on the Office of Diversity and Inclusion website reads: “As a public university, PSU has a special responsibility to work for equity and social justice and to make PSU programs truly in conjunction with our diverse constituents.” Their commitment to diversity is reflected in the following mission and vision statements:

**Our Mission:** GDI’s mission is to create a positive campus climate that celebrates diversity, builds partnerships, promotes equity, and supports the entire campus community.

**Our Vision:** GDI’s vision is to promote the value diversity brings to the campus by helping to create an inclusive and culturally respectful university environment.

Using engaged pedagogy as an analytic framework to enhance understanding about how racial inequality is reproduced on our campus through educational policies is the purpose of this white paper. Testimonies by students suggest that well-intentioned attempts to create a more inclusive campus may unwittingly reinforce practices that support exclusion and policies. Consequently, CCSG members are deeply concerned about the lack of broader action or referral of their recommendations and the lack of communication to the public regarding any follow up action taken.

CCSG members acknowledge that there have been some initiatives taken, including the establishment of the Provost’s Blog on Race and Equity at PSU, a hierarchical response to the 2015 *Students of Color Speak Out* and Discriminatory Harassment, Title IX and Reporting Obligations Training by the Office of Global Diversity and Inclusion. In those student voices of protest, there has been public denouncements of institutional racism at PSU, still it persists as testified by Native/Indigenous students during the two meetings with President Wim Wiewel.

The focus of this white paper is to highlight the two meetings with the PSU president; respond to his meeting request for examining politically/linguistically-charged in a culturally responsive method (talking circle); and provide recommendations.
Notes

1 Gerald Wing Sue (2010) provides a solid conceptual and theoretical understanding of microaggressions, how they operate, the prejudicial thinking that powers them, and the spoken words and subtle behaviors that operationalize the aggressions.

2 See the attendance from the seating arrangement of the talking circle diagram for the second meeting with President Wim Wiewel and his administrative team.
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CCSG 2nd meeting with FSU President Wim Wiewel
Monday, July 25, 2016 11:30 AM - 3:00 PM
NASCC Room 170 Talking Circle Seating Arrangement:

Adam  Melissa  Sana  Valderrama  Snell  Belgr  George /groups/  Tawana  LeAnn  Holder  Cornell  Suarez  Carmen  Kevin  Su  Kevin  S  John  Sue

Adam, Melissa, Sana, Valderrama, Snell, Belgr, George, Tawana, LeAnn, Holder, Cornell, Suarez, Carmen, Kevin, Su, Kevin, S, John, Sue
LIBERAL EDUCATION

PSU Academic Affairs Site, April 2016

“The mission of Portland State University is to enhance the intellectual, social, cultural and economic qualities of urban life by providing access throughout the life span to a quality liberal education for undergraduates and an appropriate array of professional and graduate programs...

The institution is committed to providing access to programs defined by the traditions of liberal education...”

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

6th Century: Quadrivium—the numerical arts: arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy

9th Century: Trivium—the verbal arts: grammar, logic, rhetoric

16th Century: Humanities—add history, Greek, ethics, poetry

These subjects were the core of a Liberal Education in Europe until the middle of the 20th Century, along with analysis and interpretation of information.

Current Context

Society has changed. Centuries ago, only privileged aristocrats, politicians, clergy, and a few professionals had the benefit of an education. The modern democracy in which we live places more importance on an educated populace. Being liberally educated has taken on new meaning in the 21st century. The following slides contribute to a current definition in 2016.
WHAT IS LIBERAL EDUCATION?

• **Liberal Education**: An approach to college learning that empowers individuals and prepares them to deal with complexity, diversity and change. It emphasizes broad knowledge of the wider world (e.g., science, culture and society) as well as in-depth achievement in a specific field of interest. It helps students develop a sense of social responsibility as well as strong intellectual and practical skills that span all areas of study, such as communication, analytical and problem-solving skills, and includes a demonstrated ability to apply knowledge and skills in real-world settings.

• **Liberal Arts**: Specific disciplines (e.g., the humanities, sciences, and social sciences)

• **General Education**: The part of a liberal education curriculum shared by all students. It provides broad exposure to multiple disciplines and forms the basis for developing important intellectual and civic capacities.

> As defined by The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U)

---

AAC&U Learning Outcomes

*Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World*
Focused on engagement with big questions, enduring and contemporary

*Intellectual and Practical Skills*
Practiced extensively across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance

*Personal and Social Responsibility*
Anchored through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges

*Integrative and Applied Learning*
Demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems

> Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP), an initiative begun in 2005 by the AAC&U
Hofstra College Learning Objectives

1. Critical and Analytical Thinking: Students will apply critical and analytical thinking across a broad array of liberal arts and science disciplines, designed to foster self-examination and inquiry into the outside world of nature and society. Liberal arts courses stress the development of clarity of expression, power of discovery, and creative imagination.

2. Written Communication: Demonstrate proficiency in written communication.


4. Cultural and Global Awareness: Develop cultural competencies and global awareness.

5. Information Literacy: Demonstrate information literacy.

6. Technological Competency: Demonstrate technological competency.

Duke University
General Education Outcomes

- Communicate compellingly
- Understand other languages, cultures and civilizations, past and present
- Understand different forms of scientific thought and evidence
- Understand creative products of the human imagination
- Evaluate, manage and interpret information

This language places the focus on *modes of inquiry*. 
PSU General Education Goals


1. Inquiry and Critical Thinking
Provide an integrated educational experience that will be supportive of and complement programs and majors and which will contribute to ongoing, lifelong inquiry and learning

2. Communication
Provide an integrated educational experience that will have as a primary focus enhancement of the ability to communicate what has been learned

3. Human Experience
Provide an integrated education that will increase understanding of the human experience. This includes emphasis upon scientific, social, multicultural, environmental, and artistic components to that experience and the full realization of human potential as individuals and communities

4. Ethical Issues and Social Responsibility
Provide an integrated educational experience that develops an appreciation for and understanding of the relationships among personal, societal, and global well-being and the personal implications of such issues as the basis of ethical judgment, societal diversity, and the expectations of social responsibility

PSU Campus-Wide Learning Outcomes

Disciplinary and/or Professional Expertise: Gain mastery at a baccalaureate level in a defined body of knowledge through attainment of their program’s objectives and completion of their major.

Creative and Critical Thinking: Develop the disposition and skills to strategize, gather, organize, create, refine, analyze, and evaluate the credibility of relevant information and ideas.

Communication: Communicate effectively in a range of social, academic, and professional contexts using a variety of means, including written, oral, numeric/quantitative, graphic, and visual modes of communication using appropriate technologies.

Diversity: Recognize and understand the rich and complex ways that group and individual inequalities and interactions impact self and society.

Ethics and Social Responsibility: Develop ethical and social responsibility to others, understand issues from a variety of cultural perspectives, collaborate with others to address ethical and social issues in a sustainable manner, and increase self-awareness.

Internationalization: Understand the richness and challenge of world cultures and the effects of globalization, and develop the skills and attitudes to function as “global citizens.”

Engagement: Engage in learning that is based on reciprocal and mutually beneficial relationships, and through this engagement apply theory and skills in diverse venues, linking the conceptual to the practical.

Sustainability: Identify, act on, and evaluate their professional and personal actions with the knowledge and appreciation of interconnections among economic, environmental, and social perspectives in order to create a more sustainable future.
Questions for the Board

- How do we effectively translate and transmit the importance of a Liberal Education to the public?
- What other descriptors would be more compelling and meaningful for both students and employers?
- How do we identify the unique and valuable features that PSU provides to the community?
- What steps can we take to increase awareness and investment in the full array of programs at PSU?
- How can professors and staff at PSU help in promoting this important message?

Resources on Liberal Education

The American Association of Colleges and Universities
www.aacu.org

It Takes More than a Major
http://www.slideshare.net/aacu_/2013survey-36575523

Falling Short? College Learning and Career Success
http://www.aacu.org/leap/public-opinion-research/2015-slides