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1. Proposal Summary

(Summary is generally less than one page. Briefly: state what is proposed with a summary of rationale and highlights. Additional rationale may be attached.)

The Humanities Area in the Department of Humanities is seeking to create a new course, PHIL 316: Applied Ethics and to delete HUMN 331: Ethics and Professionalism in Engineering. The field of ethics has evolved to address the increasing complexity of our personal and professional lives, and the Humanities Area is responding to those changes with the development of this new course.

Many key agencies are advocating for a refreshed ethics curriculum. According to the findings of the 2008 Harvard Business School’s summit on “Ethics in Globalization,” the recent global financial meltdown was created, in part, by “ethical lapses, failures of understanding, herd behavior, self-deception . . . .” The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) requires that its programs focus on ethics within organizations and in society. The need for an updated and expanded ethics curriculum also has been recognized by the National Academy of Engineering. According to their On-line Ethics Center, “a fruitful curriculum model would aim at simultaneously addressing . . . an understanding of professional and ethical responsibility and . . . the broad education necessary to understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global and societal context.” Best practices in applied ethics now stress the importance of intellectual diversity when formulating and solving ethical dilemmas. The Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) requires that students demonstrate an “ability to function on multi-disciplinary teams,” and many well-established applied ethics programs ground coursework in interdisciplinary group projects.

Thus, based upon current guidelines, we are incorporating the above best practices into PHIL 316:

- Students should develop an understanding of established ethical frameworks and demonstrate the ability to apply those frameworks to a variety of moral issues in personal and professional contexts.
- Students should be able to articulate the relative strengths and limitations of a variety of ethical frameworks.
- Courses should stress interdisciplinary teamwork and recognize the value of applying multiple disciplinary and ethical perspectives for responsible decision making and leadership.
- Courses should address both the “micro-ethical” issues facing an individual as well as the “macro-ethical” issues arising from a profession’s relation to larger considerations.
- Courses should provide ample time for reflection, revision of thought, and clarification of the interplay between values and facts.

As the new class will clearly meet the recommendations/requirements of ABET and AACSB, the Humanities Area believes that there will be many programs on campus with a direct interest in the course. Also as a result of creating the new class, we will be terminating our portion of HUMN/SURE 331: Ethics and Professionalism in Engineering. We are of the opinion that the new course will provide students a more robust interdisciplinary experience when engaging the complex ethical challenges of a global and complex nature.

Some programs in the COET recently have added HUMN/SURE 331 as a requirement, and we would invite these programs to consider exchanging PHIL 316 for HUMN 331. The Humanities Area welcomes continued collaboration with the COET and COB. This new course allows us to work together across all three colleges using current best practices in applied ethics—which emphasize the necessity of broad intellectual and disciplinary perspectives when addressing our increasing complicated world. This new course provides the pedagogical recipe outlined by Harvard Business Professor, Thomas Piper: “extended time is necessary to develop sufficient strength and sophistication to acknowledge the presence of ethical dilemmas, to imagine what could be, to recognize explicitly avoidable and unavoidable harms. It takes time to develop tough-minded individuals with the courage to act.” The new course will provide that focused and extended time.

The Philosophy faculty responsible for the course will create an advisory committee from across campus (especially from but not limited to COB and COET) to offer suggestions/assessments of the course. Members of the committee would be invited to work with students, to be present during student presentations or to respond to student work, and to suggest cases and issues for inclusion. Additionally, the advisory committee may play a role in the creation of research resources related to the course. Ideally at some point in the future, the Humanities Area would like to build upon the success of this collaboration to create a FSU Center for Applied Ethics. Among many potential activities, the Center would invite speakers or workshops to campus, connecting them to the course and making sure they were relevant to a broad range of disciplines. Wide collaboration across campus and from the professions would be a hallmark of such a center.
2. Summary of All Course Action Required*

a. Newly Created Courses to FSU:
   Prefix     Number     Title
   PHIL       316        Applied Ethics

b. Courses to be Deleted From FSU Catalog:
   Prefix     Number     Title
   HUMN       331        Ethics and Professionalism in Engineering

c. Existing Course(s) to be Modified:
   Prefix     Number     Title


d. Addition of existing FSU courses to program
   Prefix     Number     Title


e. Removal of existing FSU courses from program
   Prefix     Number     Title
3. Summary of All Consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form Sent (B or C)</th>
<th>Date Sent</th>
<th>Responding Dept.</th>
<th>Date Received &amp; by Whom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form B</td>
<td>11/10/10</td>
<td>Survey Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form B</td>
<td>11/10/10</td>
<td>Automotive and Heavy Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form C</td>
<td>11/10/10</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Will External Accreditation be Sought? (For new programs or certificates only)

[ ] Yes [X] No

If yes, name the organization involved with accreditation for this program.

5. Program Checksheets affected by this proposal.

Survey Engineering
Automotive and Heavy Equipment
CURRICULUM CONSULTATION FORM

To be completed by each department affected by the proposed change, new degree, new program, new minor, or new course. Potential duplication of coursework is reason for consultation.

1. This completed form must be forwarded with the proposal to the chair/head of the department to be consulted.

2. The department must respond within 20 calendar days of receipt of this form to insure inclusion in the final proposal. The completed form is returned to the initiator and inserted into the proposal.

   Failure to respond is interpreted as support for the proposal.

3. The Proposing Department must address any concerns raised by the department. This response will be in writing and be included in the proposal following the consultation form.

RE: Proposal Title (new course to replace old) PHIL 316: Applied Ethics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiator(s): Grant Snider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Contact: Grant Snider Date Sent: 9/10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department: Humanities    Campus Address: 117 Johnson Hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This date is NOT accurate. The document in its final form was sent on Nov. 30, 2010.

J. Hashimi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responding Department: Survey Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair/Head/Coordinator: Saved Hashimi Date Returned: 11/11/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon department faculty review on ________ (date), we

- [ ] Support the above proposal.
- [ ] Support the above proposal with the modifications and concerns listed below.
- [x] Do not support the proposal for the reasons listed below.

Comment regarding the impact this proposal has on scheduling, room assignments, faculty load, and prerequisites for your department. Use additional pages, if necessary.
The Surveying Engineering Faculty reject the proposal for the following reasons:

- If this course is designed to address the needs of the Engineering and Technology programs at the College of Engineering and Technology (CET), then it is a duplicate effort as the current SURE 331 is designed specifically for this purpose. The SURE 331 has been widely accepted as an approved course by all ABETS accredited programs within CET. For example, during fall semester, 2010, there are 33 students enrolled in the course and during the upcoming spring 2011 there are two sections of the course offered.

- This new course stifles any joint collaborative efforts that currently exist in SURE 331. Collaboration is cited in the University's Strategic Planning as one of the six "Values".

- Teaching Engineering Ethics, as identified by the National Council of Engineering Examiners for Engineering and Surveying (NCEES), requires knowledge of engineering.

- If this proposal is approved, it should have no affect on the current acceptance of SURE 331 and its status an approved cultural enrichment when taught by SURE faculty only. The course has been taught exclusively by SURE faculty in the past with the consent of HUMN Department.
FORM B
Rev.7/23/07

CURRICULUM CONSULTATION FORM

To be completed by each department affected by the proposed change, new degree, new program, new minor, or new course. Potential duplication of coursework is reason for consultation.

1. This completed form must be forwarded with the proposal to the chair/head of the department to be consulted.

2. The department must respond within 20 calendar days of receipt of this form to insure inclusion in the final proposal. The completed form is returned to the initiator and inserted into the proposal.

   Failure to respond is interpreted as support for the proposal.

3. The Proposing Department must address any concerns raised by the department. This response will be in writing and be included in the proposal following the consultation form.

RE: Proposal Title (new course to replace old) PHIL 316: Applied Ethics

Initiator(s): Grant Snider
Proposal Contact: Grant Snider Date Sent: 9/10/10
Department: Humanities Campus Address: 117 Johnson Hall
(Please print)

Responding Department: Automotive and Heavy Equipment Technology
Chair/Head/Coordinator: Greg Key Date Returned: ___

Based upon department faculty review on ____ (date), we

☐ Support the above proposal.
☐ Support the above proposal with the modifications and concerns listed below.
☒ Do not support the proposal for the reasons listed below.

Comment regarding the impact this proposal has on scheduling, room assignments, faculty load, and prerequisites for your department. Use additional pages, if necessary.
Attachment to Form B: Curriculum Consultation Form
Re: Proposal Title (new course to replace old) PHIL 316: Applied Ethics

The Auto and Heavy Equipment Faculty reject the proposal for the following reasons:

SURE 331 is in two programs in the School of Automotive and Heavy Equipment. One program doesn’t require a course in Ethics for accreditation (HSET). Therefore, there would be no reason to change their curriculum to take a different ethics course that may or may not be better. Thus, there is no reason to create a new course because there would be no student load for the new course.

In the AET program one of the program educational objectives is to demonstrate a high standard of ethical and social values, along with continual education through varied means including advance degrees. The key here is demonstration throughout the program including internship. Not that someone has taken a course. We have to demonstrate to the accrediting board that the students can do all of the objectives, not that they have had a course.

In the proposal there was no documentations (proof) provided that the present ethics course did not meet the ABET requirements or that it was not a good course. No shortcomings were given nor were any of the programs dissatisfied with the SURE 331 course. “Humanities Area believes that there will be many programs on campus with a direct interest in the course”. All of the Automotive and Heavy Equipment programs plan on continuing to use SURE 331.

Why was there no meeting between all parties in order to fix what week or two needed to be improved in the SURE 331 course? There is no reason to duplicate a course that has been working well for many different programs. Creating a duplicate course doesn’t prove that it will be any better. However, what will happen is you will subdivide the number of students between the two courses which will lower the productivity of both courses and whatever courses the programs decide to take. This will add cost to the University. We should be reducing the number of duplicate courses at the University not creating (duplicating) when we are in the worst financial times since 1930.

If this course is approved none of the schools program will be making program changes to use this course. By not taking the course or by integrating the topic through other courses such as internship you will be decreasing the productivity of the university.

Since there is no support from any of the programs listed in the proposal my recommendation would be to disapprove the proposal.
FLITE SERVICES CONSULTATION FORM

To be completed by the liaison librarian and approved by the Dean of FLITE. All returned forms should be included in the proposal. FLITE must respond within 20 calendar days of receipt of this form to insure that the form is included in the final proposal.

FAILURE TO RESPOND IS CONSIDERED AS SUPPORT OF THE CHANGE.

RE: Proposal Title: (new course) PHIL 316: Applied Ethics

Projected number of students per year affected by proposed change: 50

Initiator(s): Grant Snider
Proposal Contact: Grant Snider Date Sent: August 31, 2010
Department: Humanities Campus Address: Johnson Hall 117
(Please print)

Liaison Librarian Signature: [Signature] Date: 12-2-10
Dean of FLITE Signature: [Signature] Date Returned: 12-2-10

Based upon our review on ___________ (date), FLITE concludes that:

☑ Library resources to support the proposed curriculum change are currently available.

☐ Additional Library resources are needed but can be obtained from current funds.

☐ Support, but significant additional Library funds/resources are required in the amount of $__________.

☐ Does not support the proposal for reasons listed below.

Comment regarding the impact this proposal will have on library resources, collection development, programs, etc. Use additional pages if necessary.
NEW COURSE INFORMATION FORM
See Sample – Limit to Two Pages Please

Course Identification:
Prefix:  Number  Title
PHIL  316  Applied Ethics

Course Description: Students will summarize key arguments in the tradition of ethics; students will test those arguments against real world dilemmas in personal and professional contexts; students will formulate solutions and recommendations to ethical issues facing people in leadership/management positions; and, integrate knowledge from multiple disciplines while working in teams to craft an ethical response that forestalls crises.

Course Outcomes and Assessment Plan:

Course Outcomes:
Upon completion of the course, students should be able to:

- Summarize and appraise established ethical frameworks from the tradition of ethics, including but not limited to utilitarianism, deontological ethics, virtue ethics, moral relativism, and moral truth
- Test those frameworks against a variety of moral issues in personal and professional contexts
- Formulate solutions or guidance to ethical dilemmas facing people in leadership positions
- Value the need for reflection regarding the interplay between facts and values
- Integrate knowledge from multiple disciplines while working in teams to recommend ethical responses to real-world issues

Assessment Plan:
Assessment of students:

- Reading quizzes and essay exam questions will assess the student’s ability to summarize, appraise and test established ethical frameworks
- Individual student presentations (with written supplement) will measure an individual’s ability to formulate solutions and guidance regarding ethical dilemmas
- Group presentations at the end of the semester will measure how well students are able to collaborate within a group and able to integrate knowledge from multiple disciplines in recommending ethical responses to a real-world issue

Course Assessment:

- The Philosophy faculty will lead an advisory board that will be formed from interested faculty/staff from across the university. Board members and other relevant professionals will be invited to observe end-of-semester group presentations. Feedback from the board will be used to help construct complex, interdisciplinary cases for study in the class.
Course Outline including Time Allocation:

Unit One (one week): Introduction to ethics and applied ethics
               (facts versus values)
               (survey our own initial personal ethics)
               (relativism and objectivism)

Unit Two (two weeks): What are the consequences of my actions?
               (utilitarianism)

Unit Three (two weeks): What duties am I obligated to perform?
               (deontological ethics)

Unit Four (two weeks): Virtue ethics and leadership
               (example: Stoicism and courage)

Unit Five (two weeks): Caring for and responding to stakeholders
               (moving beyond rights and duties in complex situations)

Unit Six (one week): Refining and applying a personal ethics
               (finding our own way among the ethical frameworks?)

Unit Seven (five weeks):

Interdisciplinary Group Projects: Applying Ethical Visions to Ethical Dilemmas
CREATE NEW COURSE
Course Data Entry Form

FORM F
Create New Course
Rev. 07/23/07

I. ACTION TO BE TAKEN: CREATE A NEW COURSE

Notes
1. Complete each item in Section I and Section II.
2. If this course is to be used as a prerequisite for other university courses, Form Fs that reflect the prerequisite change must be submitted for those courses as well.

Term Effective (6 digit code only): 201108 Examples: 200801(Spring), 200805(Summer), 200808(Fall)
Note: The first four digits indicate year, the next two digits indicate month in which term begins.

II. PROPOSED FOR NEW COURSE: Complete all sections a through r. See manual for clarification.

a. Course Prefix:
   PHIL

b. Number:
   316


c. Enter Contact Hours per week in boxes.
   LECTure 3
   LAB
   INDependent Study – Check (x)
   Practicum:
   Seminar:

d. Course Title: Applied Ethics (Limit to 30 characters/spaces.)

e. College Code: AS
f. Department Code: HUMN
Credit Hours: Check (x) type and enter maximum and minimum hours in boxes.

   g. Type: □ Variable  X□ Fixed  h. Minimum Credit Hours 3
   i. Maximum Credit Hours 3

j. May Be Repeated for Added Credit: Check (x) □ Yes  X□ No

k. Levels: Check (x) □ Undergraduate □ Graduate □ Professional

l. Grade Method: Check (x) X□ Normal Grading  □ Credit/No Credit only (Pass/Fail)

m. Does proposed new course replace an equivalent course? Check (x) X Yes  □ No

n. Equivalent course: Prefix HUMN  Number 331 See instructions on Replacement courses.

o. CATALOG DESCRIPTION – Limit to 75 words – PLEASE BE CONCISE.
Students will summarize key arguments in the tradition of ethics; students will test those arguments against real world dilemmas in personal and professional contexts; students will formulate solutions and recommendations to ethical issues facing people in leadership/management positions; and, integrate knowledge from multiple disciplines while working in teams to craft an ethical response that forestalls crises.

p. Term(s) Offered: (See instructions for listing.)  q. Max. Section Enrollment: 25
   Typically offered on demand.

r. Prerequisites/Co-requisites/Restrictions: (If none, leave blank.) Limited to 100 spaces. ENGL 150.

UCC Chair Signature/Date: 2/1/11  Academic Affairs Approval Signature/Date: 

To be completed by Academic Affairs Office: - Standard & Measures Coding and General Education Code
□ Basic Skill (BS) □ General Education (GE) □ Occupational Education (OC) □ G.E. Codes

Office of the Registrar use ONLY
Date Rec’d: Date Completed: Entered: SCACRSE _ SCADTL _ SCARRES _ SCAPREQ _
I. ACTION TO BE TAKEN: DELETE COURSE FROM CATALOG.

Note: Complete each section.

The course described below will be moved to inactive status.

HUMN 331: Ethics and Professionalism in Engineering and Technology

a. Term Effective: Term Fall Year 201108 See instructions.

II. CURRENT COURSE TO BE DELETED FROM THE ACTIVE STATUS:

Include the information that is in the current course database.

a. Course Prefix  

b. Number

c. Enter Contact Hours per week in boxes.

LECTure  LAB  INDependent Study – Check (x)  
Practicum:  Seminar:  

d. Full Course Title:

UCP Chair Signature/Date:  Academic Affairs Approval Signature/Date:

2/7/11  2/11/11

Office of the Registrar use ONLY

Date Rec’d: ___ Date Completed: ___ Entered: SCACRSE __ SCADETL __ SCARRES __ SCAPREQ ___
GENERAL EDUCATION APPROVAL FORM

Form G plus justification of the General Education designation being sought must be sent to the General Education Coordinator (preferably electronically). The criteria for each designation can be found FSU General Education website: http://www.ferris.edu/HTMLS/academics/gened/gened.html

Upon review, the form below will be completed by the University General Education Committee for the courses that will meet General Education requirements. The form must be included in the proposal packet.

Course Prefix: PHIL  Course Number: 316

Course Title: Applied Ethics  G. E. Codes Requested: C

| G.E. Codes: G=Global Consciousness; R=Race/Ethnicity/Gender Issues; S=Social Awareness; C=Cultural Enrichment; W=Writing Intensive; Z=Scientific Understanding |

Initiator: Grant Snider  Date Sent: November, 2010

Proposal Contact: Grant Snider  Email: snider@ferris.edu

Department: Humanities  Campus Address: JOH 117

Please Print

University General Education Committee: ______

Chair: ______  Date Returned: ______

Based upon University General Education Committee review on ______(date), we

☐ Support the request to designate the course listed above as a ______(insert Gen. Ed. Designation(s)).

☐ Do not support the request to designate the course listed above as a ______(insert Gen. Ed. Designation(s)) for reasons listed below.

Comments:

______
General Education Course Criteria Form

All courses seeking General Education status are required to meet specific criteria approved by the Academic Senate. These criteria differ for each of the General Education designators. Course proposers must provide a justification for why their course should be given General Education status by speaking to each of the course criteria that apply to the requested designator.

Course proposers can request a General Education designator for any of the following learning outcome areas: Cultural Enrichment (C); Global Consciousness (G); Race, Ethnicity, Gender (R); Scientific Understanding (Z); Social Awareness (S), or Writing Intensive Courses (WIC).

The criteria that a course must meet for a given designator are listed on the pages that follow. Each page has the course criteria for one of the designators. Below each criterion is a space for the proposer to explain how her/his course meets that particular criterion. Course proposers must complete the appropriate page for the requested General Education designator by speaking to each one of the criteria for that designator.

Some of the outcome areas state that a course “should meet” rather than “must meet” the given criteria. In these cases it is not expected that each criterion will be met with equal strength, but each criterion must be addressed, even if only to acknowledge that the course will not meet that criterion.

The completed page(s) must be included with curriculum proposal forms A, E, F and G and then sent electronically to the General Education Coordinator who will forward the proposal to the appropriate General Education learning outcome committee for evaluation.

Please contact the General Education Coordinator for any questions about this process.

Form approved by University General Education Committee, December 2008
Cultural Enrichment Course Criteria

Courses designated as Cultural Enrichment courses should meet the following criteria:

1. provide interpretive approaches to the events, arts, languages, or ideas of cultures;

   PHIL 316: Applied Ethics will survey a variety of established ethical frameworks and apply those frameworks to specific events or issues. Thus, the course will provide students a number of “interpretive approaches” to ethical dilemmas and complex situations that face people personally and professionally. For example, how does one take a dissenting position on ethical grounds regarding a project or decision made by their employer? Frameworks will include ethical schools such as utilitarianism, deontological ethics, virtue ethics, moral relativism, and moral absolutism.

2. offer established methodologies for understanding components of cultures;

   This course will rely heavily upon established methodologies, in that each of the schools of ethical thought implies a recognized set of variables and methods for understanding and navigating an ethical situation. For example, the basic methodology of utilitarianism is to anticipate the variety and types of consequences that might follow from one response versus another to an ethical dilemma. On the other hand, deontological ethics tends to focus on the principles of our responses rather than, in fact often despite, the consequences. Going beyond the standard introductory treatment of ethics, the benefits and limitations of such methodologies are explicitly a part of this course’s content.

3. offer an appreciation and understanding of the "techniques" of the arts or disciplines;

   It is often incorrectly assumed that the study of philosophy is removed from practical application to life or to professions. While philosophy can be approached in that narrow way, the discipline’s origins tell a different story. Philosophy was (and still can be) meaningful in people’s lives because it provides clarity of thought regarding how one might live life, about how one might respond to ethical and professional dilemmas, or clarity about what is most essential to a person or society. Two main faces in philosophy include episteme (knowledge) and technē (craft, art, or practice) This course will combine the best of each face of philosophy: knowledge of ethical schools and the practice of applying those methods. To quote one writer discussing the ancient philosophy of Stoicism: “It is a set of practices by which one can acquire, assimilate, and transform truth into a permanent principle of action.”

4. possibly provide participation in the various arts;

   Philosophy 316 will not meet this learning outcome because the course will not provide students a chance to participate in the arts like a Music Activity class might do so.

5. help students see the connection between the elements of cultures and themselves;

   Given that one of the course outcomes will require students to test ethical frameworks “against a variety of personal and professional contexts,” students routinely will be able to make connections and draw distinctions between their own values and those of past cases and future hypothetical cases. The traditional ethical frameworks represent active and influential forces in culture, in business, in politics, and in religion. In other words, the past intellectual traditions inform and often drive emerging challenges.

6. help students explore new ways to perceive, think, experience, and value;

   This course will help students explore values in ways that go beyond common sense, to un-common sense if you will, through the methodologies of philosophy and ethics. While students bring their own values, experiences, and perceptions to class, they rarely have been provided opportunities to analyze and evaluate them; to appreciate the historical, intellectual and social origins of their values; to test the limits of those values and experiences. In a sense, students will audit their own ethical assumptions and “try on” assumptions that are sure to be new to them.
7. help students gain a better understanding of a culture from an analysis of specific events or works;

To the extent that much of western culture draws heavily upon the philosophical and ethical traditions explored in this course, students should come away from the course with a keener appreciation for the intellectual traditions that inform western culture.

8. be compatible with the designation of other universities;

Courses in ethics routinely contribute to the core or general requirements of universities. For example, St. Petersburg College goes so far as to create an entire “Ethics” component to their general education requirements even at the level of the two-year degree. Their students may choose from among Studies in Applied Ethics, Studies in Professional Ethics, Health Care Ethics Applied, or Applied Ethics in Public Safety Professions. Santa Clara University requires all students take an ethics class, and Ashland University offers a variety of Applied Ethics courses in its general education menu.

9. provide knowledge and appreciation of the components of a culture;

To the extent that the traditional ethical schools of thought are at work in western culture, politics, and society, students will have a greater understanding and appreciation of western culture. They should leave the class better able to identify these traditions, better able to discuss their contributions and limitations, and better prepared to appreciate why personal and professional conflicts can be challenging to navigate. Again, this is a focus on “culture” broadly understood rather than on the culture of a single country.

10. offer an understanding of the processes of thought or creativity that produces a cultural artifact;

This course will not produce a cultural artifact in the sense of creating an object of art or a new piece of music.

11. be taught by faculty with the appropriate credentials.

The Humanities Area faculty members who are likely to be responsible for the course have teaching experience in ethics and philosophy. They have held either administrative leadership positions or have served as ethics consultants. Thus, they have the disciplinary expertise required to explore the traditions of ethics with an appreciation to the nuances of those traditions, and they have sufficient “applied” experience either as managers or consultants.
Dear Sayed Hashimi:

Thank you for your program’s candid response on Form B of our curriculum proposal. Below you will find our rebuttal to your concerns. Per the instructions of the University Curriculum Committee, I am copying Leonard Johnson on this email. Additionally, given that your department has raised an issue related to General Education, I have copied Fred Heck.

1. “If this course is designed to address the needs of the Engineering and Technology programs at the College of Engineering and Technology (CET), then it is a duplicate effort as the current SURE 331 is designed specifically for this purpose. The SURE 331 has been widely accepted as an approved course by all ABETS accredited programs within CET. For example, during fall semester, 2010, there are 33 students enrolled in the course and during the upcoming spring 2011 there are two sections of the course offered.”

   HUMN Response: The new course, PHIL 316, is not designed to address only the needs of CET programs. Therefore, it is not a “duplicate effort” in the sense suggested above. The material and design of the new course are compatible with but not identical to those of HUMN/SURE 331. The new course will expand the amount of attention devoted to ethics, widen the potential for interdisciplinary collaboration, and broaden the scope of the ethical dilemmas explored.

2. “This new course stifles any joint collaborative efforts that currently exist in SURE 331. Collaboration is cited in the University’s Strategic Planning as one of the six ‘Values’.”

   HUMN Response: Just the opposite is true. Currently, collaboration is stifled because enrollment has been focused only on CET students. The new course embraces collaboration across several colleges. Students from all majors would be welcome to enroll in the new course, and the advisory committee (already formed) has representation from Allied Health, Criminal Justice, Business, CET (Welding and Construction Management), and Arts and Sciences (Biology and Philosophy). The new course is built upon the premise that ethical dilemmas often benefit from cross disciplinary perspectives and solutions.

3. “Teaching Engineering Ethics, as identified by the National Council of Engineering Examiners for Engineering and Surveying (NCEES), requires knowledge of engineering.”

   HUMN Response: We are not sure what precise concern is being raised in this passage, but we would note that from its inception the course has been team taught with a faculty member from the Department of Humanities (with the exception of one section in one
A better description of the arrangement would be "tag-team taught," as the first half of the semester has been taught by an independent HUMN faculty member and the second half has been taught by an independent SURE faculty member.

4. “If this proposal is approved, it should have no affect on the current acceptance of SURE 331 and its status an approved cultural enrichment when taught by SURE faculty only. The course has been taught exclusively by SURE faculty in the past with the consent of HUMN Department.”

HUMN Response: To be clear, our proposal makes no mention of eliminating SURE 331. Our proposal is to create a new course (PHIL 316) and to delete an existing course (HUMN 331). The SURE Department obviously has the prerogative to create, modify, or eliminate its own courses within the curriculum policies of the university. Neither the Department of Humanities nor the Department of Surveying is in a position to determine for themselves which courses receive General Education status. Since the SURE Department itself has raised the issue of General Education, and since (as documented in their own comments on this form) they seem keen on limiting the focus of SURE 331 to the needs of very specific programs within the CET, perhaps they should consult with the University General Education Committee, who is the deciding authority regarding General Education.

For the record, due to the departure of a HUMN faculty member in 2007, we were unable to arrange for team teaching of the course for one section in one semester (spring 2008). On September 7, 2007, the Department Head of Humanities sent the email below to Ron McKean. It was certainly Grant’s intention that our “consent” be narrowly construed, given the situation at the time.

Ron,

I have spoken with Ted Walker, the Area Coordinator for Humanities, and he has agreed with your assessment. We agree that allowing Professor Thapa to teach the course solo during the spring 2008 schedule is the best way to cover our short-term faculty shortage issue. It is likely that Professor John Gray will be available to team-teach the course again after this semester.

We also think, though, that it might be a good time for us to review the exact requirements set out by ABET. It might be helpful for us to understand fully what outcomes or expectations they have for your students in courses like this.

I look forward to discussing the possibilities.

Thanks,

Grant
PHIL 316 Proposal
Leonard Johnson  to: Grant Snider  01/24/2011 02:39 PM
Sandra L Alspach, Leonard Johnson, Paula L Hadley-Kennedy, Donald Flickinger, Terrence J Doyle, Ronald A Mehringer, Kristen L
Cc: Motz, Fritz J Erickson, Tracey Boncher, Steve Karnes, Mitzi A Day, Anita Fegeman, Helen Woodman, Olukemi Fadayomi, Maureen Mitarski

Hi Grant,

The UCC met today and discussed your proposal to add PHIL 316 to the curriculum. Before we can act on the proposal, there are a few concerns raised at the meeting today to which we'd like you to attend:

1) Please include a response to concerns raised on each of the Form B's (an email to the responding parties with a copy to me will suffice),
2) Expand the rationale provided on the Form A to include a description of the population for whom this course is targeted along with the justification for the course (as described on page C-9 of the Curriculum Manual. (Which raised the question in the meeting today: "Wouldn't it make more sense to run this course first as a 390?)

Please contact either Sandy Alspach or me should you have any questions.

Thanks,

Leonard

Leonard R. Johnson, Ph.D
Professor of Education and Chair,
Strategic Planning and Resources Council
University Curriculum Committee
Ferris State University
1349 Cramer Circle
Big Rapids, Michigan 49307
(231) 591-2134
http://www.ferris.edu/education/education
Re: PHIL-316 UCC No Vote
Leonard R Johnson Jr
to:
Ronald Mehringer
02/07/2011 04:10 PM
Cc:
hadley
Show Details

Thanks, Ron
Paula

Please add this to the proposal packet.

Leonard

---

Ronald Mehringer@ferris.edu wrote:

Leonard,

It is obvious that the Humanities department should be able to create a new philosophy course, PHIL-316, since they know their needs and curriculum. My objection was not to the creation of this new course but to the statement in their Form A that part of the process of creating the new course was the abandonment of the existing course HUMN-331/SURE-331. The existing course provides a specific solution to a specific need in the College of Engineering Technology and should be continued. It seems to me that all parties would be better served by not requiring the termination of HUMN-331/SURE-331 as a necessity for creating PHIL-316. I would also argue that, contrary to statements made by the Humanities department that they are not advocating for termination of HUMN-331/SURE-331, by removing their support from this course, that is exactly what they are doing. I also believe that the University benefits from the cross-department cooperation of the course HUMN-331/SURE-331 in a manner that would not be realized in the replacement course, PHIL-316. I would propose that the Humanities department include a statement committing to maintaining HUMN-331/SURE-331 as part of the proposal to create PHIL-316. In my opinion this would better serve all parties concerned and provide better choices for all students at the University.

Sincerely,

Ron Mehringer
Associate Professor
EET & CNS Department
306 Johnson Hall
Ferris State University
email: mehrinr@ferris.edu
Office: 231-591-3064