



2021-2022 Assessment: Social Sciences OLE Core and the Learning Goals Questionnaire September 2022

Executive Summary

OLE Core Assessment Pilot: Social Sciences

The Assessment Committee is developing effective and meaningful assessment processes for each of the OLE Core attributes, to inform faculty (especially those teaching OLE Core courses) about student achievement of intended learning outcomes, and to provide valuable information for improving the curriculum formatively and when it is next under review. We began this process by focusing on the Social Sciences OLE Core attribute.

During a June 2022 workshop, faculty and staff piloted an assessment process for the three intended learning outcomes (ILOs) of the Social Sciences (SCS) OLE Core Requirement (see [Appendix A](#) for a list of the SCS ILOs). The primary goal of the workshop was to test and refine the new model of using a common rubric to score student work. Over three days, nine faculty and staff scored a subsample of 192 artifacts (i.e., pieces of student work) submitted by faculty teaching SCS courses during the 2021-22 academic year. Faculty scorers came from 7 different departments, including some outside of the Social Sciences Faculty.

This process represented a marked improvement over our prior methods for assessing general education by ensuring consistent, direct assessment of all SCS ILOs and utilizing common criteria for assessing student learning across a variety of courses. Through this pilot year, we learned several important lessons that will inform the Assessment Committee's work with future OLE Core assessment endeavors, as well as provide opportunities to guide faculty in designing their courses and assignments to best elicit demonstrations of student learning within the learning outcomes identified for each OLE Core attribute:

- 1. This is a viable process for assessing OLE Core ILOs.** It is possible for faculty from different disciplines to read and assess artifacts from outside of their disciplinary expertise with a high degree of consensus.
- 2. Assignment prompts matter.** Many of the artifact prompts submitted for SCS assessment did not explicitly address the ILO being assessed, leading the SCS assessment team to rate the corresponding student work as insufficiently meeting the learning outcome. However, this is likely an underestimate of student learning given the mismatch between the artifact assignment and the ILO and resulting lack of opportunity

for students to demonstrate their learning. The Assessment Committee will need to guide faculty in redesigning or choosing assignments to more directly align with the OLE Core ILOs associated with their course.

- 3. We will need to consider revisions to the SCS Intended Learning Outcomes.** At least one of the SCS ILOs uses verbs that suggest higher-order thinking that is unrealistic for Level I and II courses, especially when these may represent a student's first exposure to a particular field or subject area. The Assessment Committee will consult with the Curriculum Committee about revising the SCS ILOs. We will also work to identify potential problem areas for the learning outcomes associated with the remaining OLE Core attributes to ensure that they are realistic and reflective of appropriate expectations for student learning.

Learning Goals Questionnaire (LGQ)

The LGQ was developed at St. Olaf to gather indirect evidence about student achievement of the eight college-wide learning outcomes ("STOGoals"): Broad Knowledge, Communication and Collaboration, Critical Thinking, Integration and Application, Responsible Engagement, Self-Development, Specialized Knowledge, and Vocational Discernment. In the Fall of 2021, 63% of incoming first-years responded to the survey; in the Spring, 38% of first-years and 31% of seniors responded.

Compared to their high-school years, first-year respondents engaged more in self-development, acquisition of broad knowledge, and vocational discernment, and slightly more in integration and application of learning and developing skills in communication and collaboration. Overall, first-year and senior respondents self-reported the most growth in Self-Development, and the least growth in Responsible Engagement. While classroom-based experiences emerged as the top contributors to respondents' learning and growth, a variety of other kinds of experiences were also important, including co-curricular engagement; self-reflection; interactions with peers, faculty, and staff; and for senior respondents, high-impact learning experiences.

Full Report

2021-22 Social Sciences OLE Core Assessment Pilot

In 2021-22, the Assessment Committee piloted a process for assessing OLE Core intended learning outcomes (in this case for Social Sciences, as listed in [Appendix A](#)) using a common rubric (see [Appendix B](#)). We intend for this process to become the model for assessment of future OLE Core intended learning outcomes (ILOs) that lend themselves to assessment of student artifacts, which allows us to directly observe student learning through their coursework and determine the extent to which students are meeting the ILOs.

Methods

Previously, our general education assessment process allowed faculty to determine 1) which learning outcome they would assess, 2) how they would measure student learning within that outcome (e.g., which assignment, exam, etc. they would use), and 3) the criteria for determining exemplary, satisfactory, or emerging student demonstrations of learning. We found that these methods resulted in unbalanced assessment across general education ILOs (e.g., certain ILOs would be assessed in many courses, while others were assessed in only one or two courses). It was also difficult, if not impossible, to meaningfully summarize the extent to which students were fulfilling the GE learning outcomes when faculty were not using common criteria to score their students' work.

To address these concerns, the Assessment Committee designed a new assessment process for the OLE Core. During the 2021-22 academic year, the Committee randomly assigned one Social Sciences (SCS) ILO to all faculty teaching the SCS Core requirement to ensure a more balanced distribution of ILO assessment. These faculty received instructions to submit direct evidence reflecting student learning of that ILO (i.e., student artifacts). Faculty were told that artifacts could include exam questions, papers, reflections, portfolios and more. Many faculty also submitted their assignment prompt for the artifact, but the Assessment Committee did not officially ask for the prompt this year. Faculty submitted an artifact from the same assignment for every student in their course. Beyond those instructions, faculty were allowed to submit artifacts for any assignment they chose, thus maintaining key elements of autonomy from the prior assessment model. Faculty teaching multiple SCS courses during the year were only asked to submit artifacts from one course, though some chose to submit for additional courses.

The rubric used to score submitted artifacts was designed by one subject-matter expert from the Assessment Committee, in consultation with three other faculty members who regularly teach Social Sciences courses. The Assessment Committee also solicited feedback from all Social Sciences faculty on an early draft of the rubric. The use of a common rubric addressed concerns about consistency in our prior GE assessment process by using a single set of criteria to assess student learning across courses fulfilling the Social Sciences requirement.

The Assessment Committee requested artifacts from 43 faculty and of those, 27 faculty (63%) submitted artifacts. This process generated 717 artifacts from 29 courses (representing 9 different departments or programs). A variety of student artifact types were submitted including papers, annotated bibliographies, short-answer exam questions, and multiple-choice exam questions. Submitted artifacts included team products as well as individual student work, although the summer scoring workshop team excluded team-based artifacts (submitted for 2 courses) from the official scoring. We also excluded multiple-choice artifacts (submitted for 2 courses) from this round of scoring and discussed how to utilize these types of artifacts in the future. The Assessment Committee randomly sampled student artifacts from each class¹ with artifacts meeting the inclusion criteria. The Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment (IE&A) office removed any identifying information from the artifacts before the summer workshop, including student names, instructor names, and/or course numbers. In total, 192 artifacts from 20 courses² were scored during the workshop.

The SCS ILO assessment workshop team consisted of nine faculty and staff representing the departments of economics, psychology, political science, sociology/anthropology, mathematics, chemistry, and English, as well as IE&A. The workshop's first half-day was spent discussing the SCS ILOs, gaining familiarity with and modifying the scoring rubric, and calibrating to the rubric by scoring an initial set of artifacts previously identified as good training artifacts. Workshop participants then divided into three teams, each scoring for one ILO. The scoring of artifacts took about a day and a half (~ 8 hours) per ILO. Each person scored artifacts individually and then each team came together at regular intervals to determine a consensus score for each artifact, and to compare salient factors in determining scores. These consensus scores appear in the results summarized below.

Results

The rubric used by the SCS ILO assessment team ([Appendix B](#)) identified three levels of student learning: exemplary, sufficiently demonstrated, and insufficiently demonstrated. Below we provide the percentage of artifacts scored in each category for each of the three ILOs (Table 1). While at first glance, these numbers do not appear to demonstrate student success in some ILOs, the assessment team found that the scores were skewed in part by the fact that many of the artifact prompts did not explicitly address the ILO being assessed. We view this primarily as

¹ The number of artifacts selected from each course was guided by the goals of having roughly similar numbers of courses and total artifacts scored for each ILO, and balancing the workload (i.e., page count) for each ILO scoring group. Typically, this meant that 9 artifacts were randomly selected from each course. In some cases, fewer than 9 artifacts were submitted for a particular course; in others, additional artifacts were selected to bring the total artifact pool more in line with the other ILOs. In the end, 60 artifacts from 7 courses were scored for ILO #1, 69 artifacts from 6 courses for ILO #2, and 63 artifacts from 7 courses for ILO #3.

² In addition to excluding the team projects and multiple choice artifacts from 4 courses, 2 courses were excluded in consideration of scorer time, due to having very long artifacts (20+ pages); there were technical difficulties in accessing artifacts from 2 courses; and 1 course was excluded due to an excess of artifacts submitted for that ILO already, in an effort to roughly balance the workload for scorers across ILOs.

a by-product of piloting this OLE Core assessment process for the first time. It is also likely due to the gradual process by which faculty are coming to understand the need to redesign syllabi to match OLE Core ILOs, particularly for pre-existing courses previously carrying the Human Behavior and Society GE that must now address a different set of ILOs under the new Social Sciences OLE Core attribute. As a result, some artifacts were rated as insufficient largely because of a mismatch between the artifact assignment and the ILO. In short, some assignments did not give students appropriate opportunities to demonstrate their learning.

For example, the group assessing ILO #2 first assessed all of the artifacts provided using the SCS rubric and counted the number of exemplary, sufficient, and insufficient responses as reported in Table 1 (0% exemplary, 32% sufficient, 68% insufficient). Then the group revisited the prompts for each artifact and counted only those artifacts from courses where the prompt was likely to elicit evidence of students' ability to "examine research methods and modes of gathering evidence." The results of this exercise dramatically changed the estimates of student performance (0% exemplary, 64% sufficient, 36% insufficient), as shown in Table 1. The teams who reviewed the other two ILOs believe a similar impact on the estimates of student learning would be likely had they engaged in a similar reanalysis.

Table 1: Understanding the Importance of Assignment Prompt and ILO Alignment.			
ILO	Exemplary	Sufficient	Insufficient
1 - "Analyze social systems and human behavior within those systems."	17%	37%	47%
2 - "Examine research methods and modes of gathering evidence."	0%	32%	68%
*Rescoring of ILO #2 using only well-aligned assignment prompts³	0%	64%	36%
3 - "Evaluate social science theories."	2%	51%	48%

Lessons Learned

Most importantly, we learned that this is a viable process for assessing OLE Core ILOs. The Assessment Committee was able to completely overhaul our process for general education assessment, creating a model for annual OLE Core assessment that will provide valuable information about student learning once it is further refined to address some of the inevitable glitches that arose as we embarked on this new process for the first time.

³ This rescoring method was only completed for the ILO #2 artifacts

We also learned that it is possible for faculty from different disciplines to read and assess artifacts from outside of their disciplinary expertise with a high degree of consensus. Following brief discussion to calibrate scores, the three teams generally came up with consistent assessments of student work. Because of this, the Assessment Committee will consider reducing the size of ILO scoring groups and the number of artifacts assessed for each ILO to increase the efficiency of the assessment process when scaling it up for this year and beyond.

In addition, the Assessment Committee learned that we will need to be more explicit with faculty and faculty leaders about the importance of creating assignments that are aligned with specific OLE Core ILOs. Assignment prompts are crucial for providing students with the structure and opportunity to demonstrate their learning. The summer assessment team found that the prompt's connection to the ILO was more critical to scoring than the format or type of assignment. The prompts most amenable to assessment included language explicitly instructing students to do the work associated with the target ILO. These more targeted prompts worked best when specifically referencing both the verb (e.g., analyze) and the noun (e.g., theory) identified in the ILO. Reflection-based artifacts in particular need careful direction to the ILO in order to elicit student responses that align with the skill(s) targeted in the outcome.

Finally, we learned that this assessment process is a good one for testing and evaluating our ILOs. First, it reveals places where ILOs need to be tweaked so the language fits the appropriate level of learning, as described in Bloom's Taxonomy⁴. Second, it reveals the need to reconsider if some ILOs are appropriate for Level I or II courses that carry OLE Core credit. Third, it points to the need to communicate regularly with faculty about how to design courses that attend to the ILOs, with assignments where students can demonstrate learning that corresponds to the ILO.

Conclusions and Next Steps

The SCS OLE Core requirement is primarily taught in courses at the 100 or 200 level. Most of these courses are either explicitly introductory or are implicitly so (i.e., have very limited expectations of prior content knowledge). We believe these courses represent many students' first foray into a scholarly domain and only a small number of students will have any collegiate-level experience within that domain. As such, we believe that expectations for student learning are, most appropriately, modest. Realistically, emerging competency with any given ILO seems appropriate for most students engaging with a general education curriculum. Thus, the fact that few or no students demonstrated exemplary performance within each SCS ILO is not surprising. The Assessment Committee and faculty involved in the scoring process this coming year will consider simplified rubrics that target emerging competence rather than sophisticated demonstration of the ILOs.

⁴ Bloom's Taxonomy is a framework, commonly used in assessment and the development of learning outcomes, that describes different levels of learning, from lower-order to higher-order thinking skills. The six levels include, in order of progression: Knowledge, Comprehension, Application, Analysis, Synthesis, and Evaluation.

Regarding the assessment process itself, we learned that it is vital for professors to provide a sense of how the artifacts they submit are designed to satisfy the intended learning outcome. Providing the artifact's context in a course helps those scoring the artifact to read and better assess it. This contextualization could be as short as just a few sentences, and also allows professors to have more agency in the assessment process by providing their rationale for choosing a particular assignment. Going forward, the Assessment Committee will ask faculty members to provide such a rationale along with their assignment prompt when submitting artifacts for scoring. Additionally, we will guide faculty to consider how their course design connects class work to the ILOs in a more direct way.

To begin this process, members of the Assessment Committee presented to Academic Leadership on September 22nd, leading discussions on the lessons learned from the summer workshop, particularly the importance of designing assignment or exam prompts that are well-aligned with the learning outcomes for the OLE Core so that we can gain a more accurate understanding of student learning in the Core. Chairs and directors were also alerted to the Committee's plan to solicit the assignment prompt rationales described above so they can pass this information along to faculty who will be submitting artifacts this year. The Assessment Committee offered its support to faculty who will be submitting artifacts for 2022-23, suggesting that faculty contact Committee members with any questions or requests for assistance in selecting or designing assignments for assessment.

Finally, the Assessment Committee has begun conversations with the Curriculum Committee about revising the Social Sciences ILOs. Some of the SCS ILOs may be too complex for introductory courses. Asking students to "examine" research methods is a good aim, but perhaps helping students to simply "identify" the different social science methodologies is more appropriate for Level I or Level II courses. A related question is that of "evaluating" social science theories, a skill at the highest level of Bloom's Taxonomy. In introductory courses, students are encountering such theories for the first time. Simply grasping them is a significant task, while trying to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of a given theory likely exceeds what our students are able to demonstrate in a first course within the field.

The Assessment Committee will also discuss the learning outcomes associated with the remaining OLE Core attributes, identifying potential problem areas related to the discoveries shared above. We intend for this to lead to broader discussions with faculty about how to best reflect their expectations for student learning in the OLE Core ILOs, potentially leading to a reduction in the total number of ILOs and/or revisions of existing ILOs before they are assessed to ensure that they are realistic and reflective of appropriate expectations for students.

Overall, this process was a valuable first step in identifying meaningful ways to assess the new OLE Core. Many important lessons learned about this approach will inform the Assessment Committee's work with future OLE Core assessment endeavors, as well as provide opportunities to guide faculty in designing their courses and assignments to best elicit demonstrations of student learning within the learning outcomes identified for each OLE Core

attribute. As stated above, we plan to continue utilizing and improving this workshop model of assessment for the remaining OLE Core attributes, focusing in 2022-23 on The Active Body; Ethical Reasoning in Context; and Religion, Faith, and Values (see [Appendix C](#) for the full, 9-year OLE Core assessment schedule). However, some ILOs in these and future attributes may not require direct assessment of student artifacts to understand whether students are meeting the outcomes; the Assessment Committee will also continue to consider the best and most efficient methods for assessing each type of outcome.

The Learning Goals Questionnaire (LGQ)

The Learning Goals Questionnaire (LGQ) is administered every three years to incoming first-years, these same first-years in the spring, and seniors in the spring to gather indirect evidence about student achievement of the eight college-wide learning outcomes (“STOGGoals”): Self-Development, Broad Knowledge, Specialized Knowledge, Critical Thinking, Communication and Collaboration, Integration and Application, Responsible Engagement, and Vocational Discernment⁵. The survey lists 3-5 skill or behavior statements associated with each goal and students are asked to indicate how often they engaged in developing in these areas during high school (incoming first-years), their first year of college (spring first-years) or their undergraduate experience (spring seniors).

At the end of the survey, incoming first-years are asked to indicate which STOGGoal they find most intriguing and what experiences they have had in high school and anticipate having in college that will help them develop in this goal. Spring first-years and seniors are asked to indicate the STOGGoal outcome where they believe they grew the most during the past year (first-years) or their time at the college (seniors) and describe experiences at St. Olaf that contributed to this growth. Select results from the 2021-22 LGQ are summarized below; the full summary of closed-ended responses to the Spring survey can be found in [Appendix D](#).⁶

Longitudinal First-Year Results

Of the 487 first-years who completed the LGQ in the Fall of 2021, 207 completed it again during the Spring 2022 semester, representing 27% of the incoming class.

- Compared to their high-school years, first-year respondents engaged more in self-development, acquisition of broad knowledge, and vocational discernment during their first year of college, and slightly more in integration and application of learning and developing skills in communication and collaboration.

⁵ For brevity, the shortened names of the STOGGoals are used throughout this report. However, the LGQ used more descriptive language for each goal (e.g., “Broad knowledge of human cultures and the natural world” for Broad Knowledge, “Discerning and pursuing your life’s purpose” for Vocational Discernment, “Connecting and applying your learning” for Integration and Application).

⁶ Fall incoming first-year results are discussed only briefly in this report and are not included in full as an appendix, but can be found on the IE&A website: <https://wp.stolaf.edu/iea/learning-goals-questionnaire/>

- Table 2 below summarizes their responses to the statements associated with each STOGGoal from the Fall and Spring surveys, displaying the average percentage who responded that they “often” or “very often” worked on developing the particular types of behaviors or skills associated with each goal.

Table 2. 2021-22 Fall to Spring First-Year STOGGoal Development		
STOGGoal⁷	Fall 2021 (avg % responding Often/Very Often)	Spring 2022 (avg % responding Often/Very Often)
Integration and Application	85%	89%
Critical Thinking	84%	86%
Communication and Collaboration	75%	81%
Responsible Engagement	67%	68%
Self-Development	66%	79%
Broad Knowledge	65%	74%
Vocational Discernment	64%	79%

- First-year respondents were more likely to find Vocational Discernment and Specialized Knowledge compelling areas for future development (Table 3) than self-report actually developing these outcomes the most over their first year.
- By contrast, first-year respondents were more likely to self-report development in Critical Thinking and Self-Development knowledge and skills over their first year than report being compelled by these areas in the Fall.

⁷ Specialized Knowledge has different statements for first-years in the fall versus the spring instruments, and is excluded from this table.

Table 3. 2021-22 STOGGoal Interest v. Development		
STOGGoal	Goal Students Most Compelled By – Fall 2021	Goal Students Developed Most – Spring 2022
Self-Development	24%	35%
Vocational Discernment	22%	11%
Specialized Knowledge	14%	7%
Integration and Application	12%	13%
Communication and Collaboration	9%	10%
Broad Knowledge	8%	9%
Critical Thinking	6%	14%
Responsible Engagement	5%	1%

Spring First-Year and Senior Results

For the Spring 2022 LGQ surveys, 38% of first-years⁸ and 31% of seniors responded.

- First-years' responses showed a deeper focus on Integration and Application, while seniors' indicated development across a broader array of skills.
- The skills students developed the least were similar for first-year and senior respondents.
- The following table shows the five specific skills that first-year and senior respondents worked on the most (i.e., greatest proportion responding "often" or "very often") and least (i.e., smallest proportion responding "often" or "very often").

⁸ This section focuses on the full sample of Spring first-year respondents, rather than the subsample who responded to both the Fall and Spring surveys referenced in the previous section.

Table 4. Spring 2022 LGQ Top and Bottom 5 Skills⁹			
First-Years – Top 5	Seniors – Top 5	First-Years – Bottom 5	Seniors – Bottom 5
95%: Thinking critically (Critical Thinking)	96%: Thinking critically (Critical Thinking)	42%: Working to make a difference in the local community (Responsible Engagement)	49%: Working to make a difference in the local community (Responsible Engagement)
93%: Applying your knowledge to new situations or problems (Integration and Application)	95%: Stating and supporting an argument with evidence (Critical Thinking)	50%: Using scientific methods to investigate the natural world (Broad Knowledge)	52%: Understanding and expressing ideas in more than one language (Communication and Collaboration)
92%: Listening thoughtfully (Communication and Collaboration)	94%: Drawing on knowledge from different subjects or fields to understand a topic (Broad Knowledge)	57%: Understanding and responding to global systems and challenges (Responsible Engagement)	62%: Understanding and responding to global systems and challenges (Responsible Engagement)
91%: Solving problems (Integration and Application)	93%: Writing clearly and expressively (Communication and Collaboration)	64%: Creating, understanding, or performing artistic works (Broad Knowledge)	64%: Reflecting on faith, ethics, or values (Self-Development)
91%: Connecting information and ideas from different sources or experiences (Integration and Application)	92%: Understanding the subject matter of a field – terms and concepts, controversies, scholarly findings, current issues (Specialized Knowledge)	66%: Developing a sense of vocation (Vocational Discernment)	66%: Developing a sense of vocation (Vocational Discernment)
	92%: Connecting information and ideas from different sources or experiences (Integration and Application)		

⁹ Associated STOGal shown in parentheses for each statement

Looking at the STOGGoal students believed they developed the most (Table 5):

- Both groups of respondents were most likely to choose Self-Development and least likely to choose Responsible Engagement.
- Senior respondents were more likely than first-year respondents to choose Critical Thinking, Specialized Knowledge, and Communication and Collaboration, while first-year respondents were more likely to choose Self-Development and Vocational Discernment.

First-Years	Seniors
Self-Development (33%)	Self-Development (20%)
Critical Thinking (14%)	Critical Thinking (19%)
Integration and Application (14%)	Communication and Collaboration (17%)
Vocational Discernment (11%)	Integration and Application (14%)
Communication and Collaboration (10%)	Specialized Knowledge (14%)
Broad Knowledge (9%)	Broad Knowledge (6%)
Specialized Knowledge (8%)	Vocational Discernment (6%)
Responsible Engagement (3%)	Responsible Engagement (4%)

Compared to the previous LGQ administration in Spring 2019:

- Senior respondents were less likely to choose Vocational Discernment as the area where they grew the most (2022: 6%, 2019: 13%), and slightly more likely to choose Critical Thinking (2022: 19%, 2019: 15%) and Communication and Collaboration (2022: 17%, 2019: 12%).
- First-year respondents were less likely to choose Broad Knowledge (2022: 9%, 2019: 16%), and slightly more likely to choose Integration and Application in 2022 (14%) compared to 2019 (10%).

After respondents were asked to choose the STOGGoal outcome where they'd grown the most, they were prompted to describe the experiences that had led to this development. These responses can be categorized as follows, with examples of the most commonly cited experiences for each category listed below:

- **Co-curricular experiences:** student organizations, athletics, music, student work

¹⁰ Columns show the ranked order of STOGGoals based on the percentage of respondents who selected that outcome as the area where they believed they grew the most.

- **College environment:** living independently, managing time and the increased rigor of classes
- **Coursework:** readings, assignments, group work, discussions
- **Faculty/staff interactions:** office hours; meeting with advisors; academic support, counseling, and Piper Center services
- **High-impact educational experiences¹¹:** field/clinical experiences, practicums, study abroad, internships, undergraduate research (e.g., CURI)
- **Personal reflection:** reflection on identity, values, skills, and interests; setting goals for the future; learning from mistakes; overcoming hardships
- **Social interactions:** building friendships, interacting with others from diverse backgrounds
- **Other:** managing mental health, seeking out other skill-building opportunities, non-St. Olaf experiences

Table 6 shows the overall breakdown of responses across the categories listed above, for all eight STOGGoals combined (detailed breakdowns for each STOGGoal and some sample student quotes can be found in [Appendix E](#)).

Table 6. Experiences that led to STOGGoal development¹²	
First-Years (239 Responses)	Seniors (177 Responses)
Coursework (59%)	Coursework (67%)
Co-curricular experiences (18%)	Co-curricular experiences (26%)
Personal reflection (18%)	Faculty/staff interactions (16%)
Social interactions (18%)	High-impact experiences (16%)
College environment (13%)	Personal reflection (16%)
Faculty/staff interactions (13%)	Social interactions (16%)
Other (8%)	College environment (3%)
	Other (5%)

- Classroom-based experiences were the most frequently mentioned across most of the STOGGoals, though a variety of experiences inside and outside of the classroom led to student development in all eight areas.

¹¹ For first-years, this category was included under “Other” as few respondents mentioned these types of experiences, likely because they had not had the opportunity to complete them at this stage of their college experience.

¹² Many respondents listed experiences that fell into multiple categories

- Overall, first-year respondents were more likely than senior respondents to benefit from learning to navigate the general college environment, while senior respondents were more likely to cite co-curricular and high-impact learning experiences as important contributors to their learning and development.

Appendix A: Social Sciences Intended Learning Outcomes and Course Guidelines

Description:

Students use social science approaches to better understand the complexity of human systems. The examination of these systems through theories and empirical evidence helps students understand their intersection with specific communities and/or the wider environment, while developing their ability to evaluate social science research.

Intended Learning Outcomes:

Students will:

1. Analyze social systems and human behavior within those systems.
2. Examine research methods and modes of gathering evidence.
3. Evaluate social science theories.

Course Guidelines:

1. **Analyze social systems and human behavior within those systems.**
This analytical work may focus on individual or group-level behavior, and may explore intersections between groups, systems, and structures. It may also focus on analyzing how social systems and human behavior influence one another.
2. **Examine research methods and modes of gathering evidence.**
This examination might include a wide range of approaches, either qualitative or quantitative, that help students learn to critically assess empirical evidence.
3. **Evaluate social science theories.**
Students will learn to evaluate and critique the strengths and limitations of discipline specific theories. Students will use theories to provide an analytical framework for evidence. Students will identify how systematic observations are used to evaluate and modify theories in an ongoing process of refinement.

Appendix B: Social Sciences Assessment Rubric

ILO	Exemplary	Sufficiently Demonstrated	Insufficiently Demonstrated
<p>1. Analyze social systems and human behavior within those systems. <i>This analytical work may focus on individual or group-level behavior, and may explore intersections between groups, systems, and structures. It may also focus on analyzing how social systems and human behavior influence one another.</i></p>	<p><i>Artifact provides evidence that the student can:</i></p> <p>Effectively analyze relevant research to the FRQ (free response question);</p> <p>Identify and apply key concepts and terms related to the FRQ;</p>	<p><i>Artifact provides evidence that the student can:</i></p> <p>Satisfactorily analyze research for the FRQ, though some information may be marginally relevant (but does not detract from the focus);</p> <p>Identify and apply most key concepts and terms to the FRQ, though some may be vaguely explained;</p>	<p><i>Artifact provides evidence that the student:</i></p> <p>Does not address relevant research;</p> <p>Identifies few key concepts, and with inconsistent clarity;</p>
<p>2. Examine research methods and modes of gathering evidence. <i>This examination might include a wide range of approaches, either qualitative or quantitative, that help students learn to critically assess empirical evidence.</i></p>	<p><i>Artifact provides evidence that the student:</i></p> <p>Can effectively examine research methodology, including modes of gathering evidence</p>	<p><i>Artifact provides evidence that the student:</i></p> <p>Can passably examine research methodology, including modes of gathering evidence</p>	<p><i>Artifact provides evidence that the student:</i></p> <p>Can minimally examine research methodology, including modes of gathering evidence</p>
<p>3. Evaluate social science theories. <i>Students will learn to evaluate and critique the strengths and limitations of discipline specific theories. Students will use theories to provide an analytical framework for evidence. Students will identify how systematic observations are used to evaluate and modify theories in an ongoing process of refinement.</i></p>	<p><i>Artifact provides evidence that the student:</i></p> <p>Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the strengths and limitations of theories relevant to the discipline;</p> <p>Demonstrates analytical expertise when assessing evidence discovered in their inquiry;</p>	<p><i>Artifact provides evidence that the student:</i></p> <p>Demonstrates marginal understanding of the strengths and limitations of theories relevant to the discipline;</p> <p>Demonstrates marginal analytical expertise when assessing evidence discovered in their inquiry;</p>	<p><i>Artifact provides evidence that the student:</i></p> <p>Demonstrates limited to no understanding of the strengths and limitations of theories relevant to the discipline;</p> <p>Demonstrates limited to no expertise when assessing evidence discovered in their inquiry;</p>

Appendix C: OLE Core Assessment 9-Year Timeline

Note: Asterisks indicate the year each attribute will be assessed

	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30
ACB: The Active Body: Moving Toward Health & Wellbeing		*					*		
CRE: Creativity				*			*		
CTD: Christian Theology in Dialogue				*			*		
ERC: Ethical Reasoning in Context		*				*			
FYS: First-year Experience: First-year Seminar			*					*	
GHS: Global Histories and Societies					*				*
NTS: Natural Science				*					*
OEP: Ole Experience in Practice			*			*			
PAR: Power and Race			*			*			
QCR: Quantitative and Computational Reasoning					*			*	
RFV: Religion Faith and Values		*					*		
SCS: Social Sciences	*								*
WAC: Writing Across the Curriculum				*					*
WLC: World Languages and Cultures					*			*	
WRR: First-year Experience: Writing and Rhetoric			*					*	

Appendix D: Spring 2022 First-Year and Senior LGQ Responses

First-Years: 281 respondents (38% response rate)

1. How often during your first year at St. Olaf have you worked on developing the following skills for *purposeful self-development*?

		#	%
1a. Recognizing your personal strengths, limitations, and interests	Very often	110	39%
	Often	127	45%
	Sometimes	42	15%
	Never	2	1%
	Total	281	100%¹³
	Very often + Often	237	84%
<hr/>			
		#	%
1b. Managing your resources of time, talent, or money	Very often	138	49%
	Often	98	35%
	Sometimes	39	14%
	Never	6	2%
	Total	281	100%
	Very often + Often	236	84%
<hr/>			
		#	%
1c. Reflecting on faith, ethics, or values	Very often	82	29%
	Often	110	39%
	Sometimes	78	28%
	Never	11	4%
	Total	281	100%
	Very often + Often	192	68%
<hr/>			
		#	%
1d. Responding constructively to a challenge, disappointment, or failure	Very often	92	33%
	Often	140	50%
	Sometimes	46	16%
	Never	3	1%
	Total	281	100%
	Very often + Often	232	83%

¹³ May not sum to exactly 100% due to rounding

2. How often during your first year at St. Olaf have you worked on developing ***broad knowledge of human cultures and the natural world***, including:

		#	%
2a. Creating, understanding, or performing artistic works	Very often	88	31%
	Often	90	32%
	Sometimes	85	30%
	Never	17	6%
	Total	280	100%
	Very often + Often	178	64%
		#	%
2b. Using scientific methods to investigate the natural world	Very often	73	26%
	Often	67	24%
	Sometimes	108	39%
	Never	31	11%
	Total	279	100%
	Very often + Often	140	50%
		#	%
2c. Exploring literature, languages, philosophy, religion, or history	Very often	124	44%
	Often	106	38%
	Sometimes	47	17%
	Never	3	1%
	Total	280	100%
	Very often + Often	230	82%
		#	%
2d. Understanding human behaviors, relationships, politics, or social patterns	Very often	111	40%
	Often	129	46%
	Sometimes	36	13%
	Never	3	1%
	Total	279	100%
	Very often + Often	240	86%
		#	%
2e. Drawing on knowledge from different subjects or fields to understand a topic	Very often	140	50%
	Often	108	39%
	Sometimes	30	11%
	Never	2	1%
	Total	280	100%
	Very often + Often	248	89%

3. How often during your first year at St. Olaf have you worked on developing *specialized knowledge of a particular subject, field, or topic*, through activities such as:

		#	%
3a. Understanding the subject matter of a field – terms and concepts, controversies, scholarly findings, current issues	Very often	109	39%
	Often	123	44%
	Sometimes	46	16%
	Never	2	1%
	Total	280	100%
	Very often + Often	232	83%
		#	%
3b. Using methods of inquiry in a field to investigate a question or solve a problem	Very often	87	31%
	Often	120	43%
	Sometimes	65	23%
	Never	6	2%
	Total	278	100%
	Very often + Often	207	74%
		#	%
3c. Using tools or techniques in a field to demonstrate, create, or perform	Very often	89	32%
	Often	108	39%
	Sometimes	72	26%
	Never	10	4%
	Total	279	100%
	Very often + Often	197	71%
		#	%
3d. Recognizing connections between different fields of study	Very often	133	48%
	Often	103	37%
	Sometimes	42	15%
	Never	1	0%
	Total	279	100%
	Very often + Often	236	85%

4. How often during your first year at St. Olaf have you worked on developing the following skills for *critical thinking and inquiry*?

		#	%
4a. Reading carefully	Very often	154	55%
	Often	94	34%
	Sometimes	30	11%
	Never	1	0%
	Total	279	100%
	Very often + Often	248	89%
		#	%
4b. Thinking critically	Very often	194	69%
	Often	73	26%
	Sometimes	13	5%
	Never	0	0%
	Total	280	100%
	Very often + Often	267	95%
		#	%
4c. Understanding and using quantitative information	Very often	109	39%
	Often	105	38%
	Sometimes	58	21%
	Never	8	3%
	Total	280	100%
	Very often + Often	214	76%
		#	%
4d. Finding and evaluating academic research resources	Very often	114	41%
	Often	113	41%
	Sometimes	51	18%
	Never	1	0%
	Total	279	100%
	Very often + Often	227	82%
		#	%
4e. Stating and supporting an argument with evidence	Very often	156	56%
	Often	97	35%
	Sometimes	27	10%
	Never	0	0%
	Total	280	100%
	Very often + Often	253	90%

5. How often during your first year at St. Olaf have you worked on developing the following skills for *effective communication and collaboration*?

		#	%
5a. Writing clearly and expressively	Very often	157	56%
	Often	94	34%
	Sometimes	26	9%
	Never	2	1%
	Total	279	100%
	Very often + Often	251	90%
		#	%
5b. Speaking persuasively and confidently	Very often	97	35%
	Often	103	37%
	Sometimes	74	27%
	Never	5	2%
	Total	279	100%
	Very often + Often	200	72%
		#	%
5c. Listening thoughtfully	Very often	182	65%
	Often	76	27%
	Sometimes	21	8%
	Never	0	0%
	Total	279	100%
	Very often + Often	258	92%
		#	%
5d. Understanding and expressing ideas in more than one language	Very often	112	40%
	Often	95	34%
	Sometimes	49	18%
	Never	23	8%
	Total	279	100%
	Very often + Often	207	74%
		#	%
5e. Working effectively with others to accomplish a goal or complete a project	Very often	113	41%
	Often	108	39%
	Sometimes	55	20%
	Never	2	1%
	Total	278	100%
	Very often + Often	221	79%

6. How often during your first year at St. Olaf have you worked on developing the following skills for *connecting and applying your learning*?

		#	%
6a. Thinking creatively	Very often	141	51%
	Often	101	36%
	Sometimes	35	13%
	Never	1	0%
	Total	278	100%
	Very often + Often	242	87%
		#	%
6b. Solving problems	Very often	156	56%
	Often	96	35%
	Sometimes	25	9%
	Never	0	0%
	Total	277	100%
	Very often + Often	252	91%
		#	%
6c. Connecting information and ideas from different sources or experiences	Very often	148	54%
	Often	103	37%
	Sometimes	25	9%
	Never	0	0%
	Total	276	100%
	Very often + Often	251	91%
		#	%
6d. Applying your knowledge to new situations or problems	Very often	159	57%
	Often	99	36%
	Sometimes	19	7%
	Never	0	0%
	Total	277	100%
	Very often + Often	258	93%

7. How often during your first year at St. Olaf have you worked on developing the following skills for *responsible interpersonal, civic, and global engagement*?

		#	%
7a. Being a good family member, friend, or neighbor	Very often	126	45%
	Often	113	41%
	Sometimes	34	12%
	Never	5	2%
	Total	278	100%
	Very often + Often	239	86%
		#	%
7b. Working to make a difference in the local community	Very often	50	18%
	Often	66	24%
	Sometimes	128	46%
	Never	33	12%
	Total	277	100%
	Very often + Often	116	42%
		#	%
7c. Understanding and responding to global systems and challenges	Very often	70	25%
	Often	90	32%
	Sometimes	104	37%
	Never	14	5%
	Total	278	100%
	Very often + Often	160	57%
		#	%
7d. Interacting effectively with people from cultural backgrounds other than your own	Very often	121	43%
	Often	107	38%
	Sometimes	47	17%
	Never	4	1%
	Total	279	100%
	Very often + Often	228	82%
		#	%
7e. Analyzing and applying ethical principles in making decisions	Very often	111	40%
	Often	112	40%
	Sometimes	50	18%
	Never	4	1%
	Total	277	100%
	Very often + Often	223	80%

8. How often during your first year at St. Olaf have you worked on developing the following skills for *discerning and pursuing your life's purpose*?

		#	%
8a. Reflecting on your learning experiences and outcomes	Very often	137	49%
	Often	103	37%
	Sometimes	37	13%
	Never	3	1%
	Total	280	100%
	Very often + Often	240	86%

		#	%
8b. Using many resources to establish goals and make plans	Very often	122	44%
	Often	94	34%
	Sometimes	57	20%
	Never	7	3%
	Total	280	100%
	Very often + Often	216	77%

		#	%
8c. Developing a sense of vocation	Very often	89	32%
	Often	95	34%
	Sometimes	85	30%
	Never	11	4%
	Total	280	100%
	Very often + Often	184	66%

		#	%
8d. Preparing for continued learning throughout your life	Very often	150	54%
	Often	96	34%
	Sometimes	29	10%
	Never	5	2%
	Total	280	100%
	Very often + Often	246	88%

9. While St. Olaf aims to engage you in developing all eight of these goals and the skills and abilities associated with each, **where do you think you have grown the most this year?**

	#	%
Purposeful self-development	91	33%
Connecting and applying your learning	38	14%
Critical thinking and inquiry	38	14%
Discerning and pursuing your life's purpose	32	11%
Effective communication and collaboration	27	10%
Broad knowledge of human cultures and the natural world	26	9%
Specialized knowledge of a particular subject, field, or topic	21	8%
Responsible interpersonal, civic, and global engagement	7	3%
Total	280	100%

Seniors: 209 respondents (31% response rate)

1. Thinking back on all your years at St. Olaf, to what extent have your experiences at the college helped you develop the following skills for **purposeful self-development?**

		#	%
1a. Recognizing your personal strengths, limitations, and interests	Very often	91	44%
	Often	92	44%
	Sometimes	25	12%
	Never	0	0%
	Total	208	100%
	Very often + Often	183	88%

		#	%
1b. Managing your resources of time, talent, or money	Very often	67	32%
	Often	94	45%
	Sometimes	44	21%
	Never	3	1%
	Total	208	100%
	Very often + Often	161	77%

		#	%
1c. Reflecting on faith, ethics, or values	Very often	59	29%
	Often	72	35%
	Sometimes	66	32%
	Never	10	5%
	Total	207	100%
	Very often + Often	131	64%

		#	%
1d. Responding constructively to a challenge, disappointment, or failure	Very often	68	33%
	Often	99	48%
	Sometimes	39	19%
	Never	2	1%
	Total	208	100%
	Very often + Often	167	80%

2. To what extent have your St. Olaf experiences helped you develop *broad knowledge of human cultures and the natural world*, including:

		#	%
2a. Creating, understanding, or performing artistic works	Very often	75	36%
	Often	64	31%
	Sometimes	67	32%
	Never	1	0%
	Total	207	100%
	Very often + Often	139	67%

		#	%
2b. Using scientific methods to investigate the natural world	Very often	74	36%
	Often	67	32%
	Sometimes	62	30%
	Never	5	2%
	Total	208	100%
	Very often + Often	141	68%

		#	%
2c. Exploring literature, languages, philosophy, religion, or history	Very often	88	43%
	Often	86	42%
	Sometimes	32	15%
	Never	1	0%
	Total	207	100%
	Very often + Often	174	84%

		#	%
2d. Understanding human behaviors, relationships, politics, or social patterns	Very often	104	50%
	Often	78	38%
	Sometimes	25	12%
	Never	1	0%
	Total	208	100%
	Very often + Often	182	88%

		#	%
2e. Drawing on knowledge from different subjects or fields to understand a topic	Very often	114	55%
	Often	81	39%
	Sometimes	13	6%
	Never	0	0%
	Total	208	100%
	Very often + Often	195	94%

3. To what extent have your St. Olaf experiences helped you develop *specialized knowledge of a particular subject, field, or topic*, through activities such as:

		#	%
3a. Understanding the subject matter of a field – terms and concepts, controversies, scholarly findings, current issues	Very often	116	56%
	Often	75	36%
	Sometimes	16	8%
	Never	0	0%
	Total	207	100%
	Very often + Often	191	92%

		#	%
3b. Using methods of inquiry in a field to investigate a question or solve a problem	Very often	104	50%
	Often	76	37%
	Sometimes	27	13%
	Never	0	0%
	Total	207	100%
	Very often + Often	180	87%

		#	%
3c. Using tools or techniques in a field to demonstrate, create, or perform	Very often	108	52%
	Often	75	36%
	Sometimes	23	11%
	Never	1	0%
	Total	207	100%
	Very often + Often	183	88%

		#	%
3d. Recognizing connections between different fields of study	Very often	110	53%
	Often	76	37%
	Sometimes	22	11%
	Never	0	0%
	Total	208	100%
	Very often + Often	186	89%

4. To what extent have your St. Olaf experiences helped you develop the following skills for *critical thinking and inquiry*?

		#	%
4a. Reading carefully	Very often	104	50%
	Often	80	38%
	Sometimes	24	11%
	Never	1	0%
	Total	209	100%
	Very often + Often	184	88%
		#	%
4b. Thinking critically	Very often	138	66%
	Often	63	30%
	Sometimes	8	4%
	Never	0	0%
	Total	209	100%
	Very often + Often	201	96%
		#	%
4c. Understanding and using quantitative information	Very often	98	48%
	Often	73	35%
	Sometimes	34	17%
	Never	1	0%
	Total	206	100%
	Very often + Often	171	83%
		#	%
4d. Finding and evaluating academic research resources	Very often	113	54%
	Often	74	36%
	Sometimes	20	10%
	Never	1	0%
	Total	208	100%
	Very often + Often	187	90%
		#	%
4e. Stating and supporting an argument with evidence	Very often	125	60%
	Often	72	35%
	Sometimes	11	5%
	Never	0	0%
	Total	208	100%
	Very often + Often	197	95%

5. To what extent have your St. Olaf experiences helped you develop the following skills for **effective communication and collaboration**?

		#	%
5a. Writing clearly and expressively	Very often	110	53%
	Often	85	41%
	Sometimes	14	7%
	Never	0	0%
	Total	209	100%
	Very often + Often	195	93%
		#	%
5b. Speaking persuasively and confidently	Very often	75	36%
	Often	87	42%
	Sometimes	47	22%
	Never	0	0%
	Total	209	100%
	Very often + Often	162	78%
		#	%
5c. Listening thoughtfully	Very often	115	55%
	Often	75	36%
	Sometimes	18	9%
	Never	1	0%
	Total	209	100%
	Very often + Often	190	91%
		#	%
5d. Understanding and expressing ideas in more than one language	Very often	53	25%
	Often	55	26%
	Sometimes	92	44%
	Never	9	4%
	Total	209	100%
	Very often + Often	108	52%
		#	%
5e. Working effectively with others to accomplish a goal or complete a project	Very often	91	44%
	Often	92	44%
	Sometimes	25	12%
	Never	0	0%
	Total	208	100%
	Very often + Often	183	88%

6. To what extent have your St. Olaf experiences helped you develop the following skills for **connecting and applying your learning**?

		#	%
6a. Thinking creatively	Very often	100	48%
	Often	78	37%
	Sometimes	31	15%
	Never	0	0%
	Total	209	100%
	Very often + Often	178	85%
		#	%
6b. Solving problems	Very often	121	58%
	Often	69	33%
	Sometimes	18	9%
	Never	1	0%
	Total	209	100%
	Very often + Often	190	91%
		#	%
6c. Connecting information and ideas from different sources or experiences	Very often	112	54%
	Often	81	39%
	Sometimes	16	8%
	Never	0	0%
	Total	209	100%
	Very often + Often	193	92%
		#	%
6d. Applying your knowledge to new situations or problems	Very often	111	53%
	Often	77	37%
	Sometimes	20	10%
	Never	1	0%
	Total	209	100%
	Very often + Often	188	90%

7. To what extent have your St. Olaf experiences helped you develop the following skills for *responsible interpersonal, civic, and global engagement*?

		#	%
7a. Being a good family member, friend, or neighbor	Very often	71	34%
	Often	74	36%
	Sometimes	56	27%
	Never	6	3%
	Total	207	100%
	Very often + Often	145	70%
		#	%
7b. Working to make a difference in the local community	Very often	48	23%
	Often	54	26%
	Sometimes	93	44%
	Never	14	7%
	Total	209	100%
	Very often + Often	102	49%
		#	%
7c. Understanding and responding to global systems and challenges	Very often	56	27%
	Often	74	35%
	Sometimes	74	35%
	Never	5	2%
	Total	209	100%
	Very often + Often	130	62%
		#	%
7d. Interacting effectively with people from cultural backgrounds other than your own	Very often	77	37%
	Often	73	35%
	Sometimes	57	27%
	Never	2	1%
	Total	209	100%
	Very often + Often	150	72%
		#	%
7e. Analyzing and applying ethical principles in making decisions	Very often	78	37%
	Often	85	41%
	Sometimes	41	20%
	Never	5	2%
	Total	209	100%
	Very often + Often	163	78%

8. To what extent have your St. Olaf experiences helped you develop the following skills for ***discerning and pursuing your life's purpose?***

		#	%
8a. Reflecting on your learning experiences and outcomes	Very often	83	40%
	Often	80	38%
	Sometimes	43	21%
	Never	3	1%
	Total	209	100%
	Very often + Often	163	78%
		#	%
8b. Using many resources to establish goals and make plans	Very often	74	35%
	Often	88	42%
	Sometimes	45	22%
	Never	2	1%
	Total	209	100%
	Very often + Often	162	78%
		#	%
8c. Developing a sense of vocation	Very often	67	32%
	Often	70	33%
	Sometimes	60	29%
	Never	12	6%
	Total	209	100%
	Very often + Often	137	66%
		#	%
8d. Preparing for continued learning throughout your life	Very often	98	47%
	Often	70	33%
	Sometimes	36	17%
	Never	5	2%
	Total	209	100%
	Very often + Often	168	80%

9. While St. Olaf has aimed to engage you in developing all eight of these goals and the skills and abilities associated with each, ***where do you think you have grown the most during your undergraduate experience?***

	#	%
Purposeful self-development	42	20%
Critical thinking and inquiry	40	19%
Effective communication and collaboration	35	17%
Connecting and applying your learning	29	14%
Specialized knowledge of a particular subject, field, or topic	29	14%
Discerning and pursuing your life's purpose	13	6%
Broad knowledge of human cultures and the natural world	12	6%
Responsible interpersonal, civic, and global engagement	9	4%
Total	209	100%

Appendix E: Experiences Tied to STOGGoal Development

Table E1. Experiences that led to STOGGoal development		
STOGGoal	First-Years	Seniors
Broad Knowledge	21 Total Responses Coursework (18) Social interactions (4) Co-curricular experiences (2) Faculty/staff interactions (1) Other (4)	8 Total Responses Coursework (7) High-impact experiences (2)
Communication and Collaboration	22 Total Responses Coursework (13) Social interactions (9) Co-curricular experiences (6) Faculty/staff interactions (5) College environment (4)	31 Total Responses Coursework (21) Co-curricular experiences (13) Social interactions (6) Faculty/staff interactions (2) High-impact experiences (2) Other (1)
Critical Thinking	34 Total Responses Coursework (30) Co-curricular experiences (4) Personal reflection (2) Faculty/staff interactions (2) Social interactions (1) College environment (1) Other (1)	32 Total Responses Coursework (27) High-impact experiences (6) Co-curricular experiences (4) Faculty/staff interactions (4) Personal reflection (3) Social interactions (3) Other (1)
Integration and Application	32 Total Responses Coursework (28) Co-curricular experiences (3) Faculty/staff interactions (3) Personal reflection (1) Social interactions (1) College environment (1)	23 Total Responses Coursework (21) Personal reflection (5) Co-curricular experiences (4) Social interactions (1) Faculty/staff interactions (1) High-impact experiences (1)
Responsible Engagement	4 Total Responses (not analyzed further)	9 Total Responses Co-curricular experiences (4) Social interactions (4) Coursework (3) High-impact experiences (3) Faculty/staff interactions (2) Personal reflection (1)

Table E1. Experiences that led to STOGGoal development		
Self-Development	81 Total Responses Personal reflection (27) Social interactions (24) Coursework (22) College environment (22) Co-curricular experiences (16) Faculty/staff interactions (10) Other (12)	38 Total Responses Personal reflection (16) Coursework (14) Social interactions (12) Faculty/staff interactions (12) Co-curricular experiences (11) College environment (6) High-impact experiences (3) Other (4)
Specialized Knowledge	17 Total Responses Coursework (15) Co-curricular experiences (4) Faculty/staff interactions (3)	24 Total Responses Coursework (18) High-impact experiences (8) Co-curricular experiences (6) Faculty/staff interactions (3) Personal reflection (1)
Vocational Discernment	28 Total Responses Coursework (16) Personal reflection (14) Faculty/staff interactions (6) Social interactions (5) Co-curricular experiences (3) College environment (2) Other (1)	12 Total Responses Coursework (8) Co-curricular experiences (4) Faculty/staff interactions (4) Personal reflection (3) Social interactions (3) High-impact experiences (3) Other (2)

Below is a sample of student responses¹⁴ to the question about experiences that helped them grow in their chosen STOGGoal area.

Broad Knowledge

First-Years:

- “I have taken classes where I learn more about people in different situations than me, whether that be people from the past or people from different areas of the world, or even people today who live in the United States but are living in different circumstances as me. I have also interacted with so many people from around the country and around the world here at Olaf and I have learned a lot from them as well. Additionally, I have learned about the natural world in my science courses, especially chemistry, from the molecular level of life.”

¹⁴ Quotes are copied verbatim, with no corrections to spelling or grammatical errors. Some potentially identifying information has been redacted.

- “The first thing would be that my social circle include mostly international students. Exchanging stories and learning about new cultures has been amazing. Another contributing factor would be some of my classes, which revolved around philosophy and religion in different parts of the world.”
- “My classes this year have been incredibly varied, as I've learned about everything from gender roles in Spain in the 1920s to sustainable farming to ancient Islamic poetry to Jewish mysticism to contemporary American politics. I have never been able to study so many aspects of humanity at one time, and as I've gone through this first year I've recognized more and more connection between the concepts taught in my classes. It's been very eye-opening and I believe that my knowledge of human cultures has expanded wonderfully because of this year.”

Seniors:

- “Many of my classes have taught me a great deal about the world and the way cultures intersect and connect each other. Not only that, but the history underlying many current affairs in the world today.”
- “I have taken classes in a bunch of different disciplines, and although my attempts to study abroad were canceled by the school/covid, the short time I was abroad allowed me to learn about different cultures.”

Communication and Collaboration

First-Years:

- “Just learning how to effectively navigate this new found freedom and responsibility took a lot of help from other people. There were often times when I knew that to be true, but I still had to work on reaching and getting support from friends, faculty, and classmates.”
- “I have been able to work on my communication and collaboration skills in all of my classes. I frequently have group projects and assignments that require me to work with my peers. In addition to in-class experiences, I have practiced emailing professors and more informal discussions with my classmates.”
- “Working in coordination together, my role as communications manager for [student org] along with my writing-based or literature-based classes really helped me improve my effective communication exponentially. My training as a Writing Tutor has taken this to the next level. You see, it wasn't just one thing. It wasn't just the teachers and mentors in my FYS seminar class on meaning-making (and meaning-making involves quite a bit of writing) or the senior tutors in my Writing Desk training. It wasn't just my personal writing and reflections for my classes, or the independent poetry written for projects. It wasn't just the emails I became more and more thoughtful in crafting for my team. It was the combination of all. That has contributed not just to my growth, but to

my relationship with communication and collaboration—what it means to serve the community, to be the community—overall.”

Seniors:

- “Group work has required the use of effective communication and collaboration, and I have been part of a lot of group work here at St. Olaf. I think this is an important thing for me to have gotten better at because I plan to go into the medical field, where I will be constantly working with others.”
- “Having roommates, podmates, and group work in classroom settings has allowed me to grow my communication and collaboration skills. I have lived with my same roommate since freshman year and the reason our relationship as roommates has been so successful is because of effective communication. Group projects in classroom settings taught me how it is necessary to balance a group with the strengths of its members. I've also learned that I work best within groups.”
- “My experiences outside the classroom within club leadership, as well as my experiences with creating relationships with professors, collaborating for group work, and developing friendships on campus.”
- “I used to struggle with writing papers, but the regular writing assignments and papers at St. Olaf have vastly improved my writing. Despite majoring in math, I've still had substantial written work in GEs and with this practice, I am now able to easily outline and write 5+ page papers.”

Critical Thinking

First-Years:

- “I took many classes specifically first semester that challenged the way I usually think about learning at school. I had to learn how to use way more critical thinking skills to solve the questions presented to me in my classes than I previously had in high school.”
- “My classes have been a source of having to think more critically about the world. Additionally, I think I have been thinking more critically about my own life, my values, and what I prioritize.”
- “Class discussions have helped me think more critically and expand my thinking. Hearing others share their perspectives has allowed me to reflect on my own perspectives and values.”
- “I think I grew the most in critical thinking inquiry because I was constantly challenged in my thinking inside and outside of class. I was always able to connect my course learnings with my day to day life.”

Seniors:

- “Almost all of my professors while I’ve been here effectively guide students through different ways of thinking and asking questions, rather than telling us what to think. We’re able to formulate and express our own thoughts in relation to what we’re being presented with in the classroom.”
- “Classwork that helped me develop the skill of reading a text and thinking critically about its author's intentions, argumentation style, and rhetorical goals. This has impacted how I view many aspects of life, as well as how I engage with everyday situations.”
- “I participated in CURI research which was an opportunity to apply critical thinking skills and knowledge that I have gained in other courses. I think that applying course material to research and facing problems that require a lot of thought have helped me learn to think critically.”
- “I think a lot has to do with intellectual range and diversity of other students (in majors primarily) and broad multi-faceted conversations in classes. I've learned from courses and peers that things are not nearly as one-dimensional or simple as they might seem. Talking about and being exposed to so many different ideologies and concepts has helped me make deeper connections, and recognize more in social dynamics/events than I'd realized.”

Integration and Application*First-Years:*

- “I have been really proud of the courses that I have been taking this academic year. I have learned a lot from my professors and classmates. I have grown much more as a person through this year at St. Olaf, and I am grateful for everything I have learned this year. Applying knowledge is really important, as everything we learn can be related to what is happening around us. Also, the connection with the professors in the class as well as through office hours helps a lot (it is always important to ask questions)!”
- “My classes so far have exposed me to a lot of new material and helped me develop various skills. In each class I have had the opportunity, whether in a project, paper, or exam, to apply my learning and test myself to see how much I have learned. I have especially liked the projects when the professor gave the class more freedom and creative liberty to use our imaginations or choose topics we were excited about or be able to make connections with information we learned in other classes.”
- “I took a religion class first semester and as a stem major, I never thought I’d be referencing the humanities as much as I am. That class, as well as other humanities classes have taught me to think in a way I’d never considered before.”
- “So often I will be in a class talking about a specific subject and the ideas in that class can be supported (or argued) based on information I’ve acquired from other classes. The constant cross over between the different field of study at St. Olaf is something I

never experienced before. It might help talking about the political power of music in a FYS or learning about social justice in choir, or any other subject or involvement on campus, it all seems to connect in some way.”

Seniors:

- “I think I have been able to strengthen my skills and use my knowledge to be a student leader. I have gained a lot of skills and have helped my [student org] members gain these skills too. I have actively been involved in organizations and my knowledge from social work has helped me develop goals for these student organizations.”
- “I think the nature of the liberal arts invites and requires the application of different fields of study in analyzing and solving a problem. This is definitely true in the ways that St Olaf has presented problems for analysis and in my own personal life”
- “The cross-disciplinary approach of liberal arts nurtures creative thinking. The ability to make connections between material learned in different fields and departments is something I have developed over my time at St. Olaf. I have learned to think deeply about things and to use a variety of approaches and angles when it comes to problem solving.”
- “I think being a double in two contrasting fields has allowed me a unique experience at St. Olaf, where I'm able to learn in very different ways and about very different subject matter but have moments of really meaningful intersection both through research projects done on my own and discussions in class.”

Responsible Engagement

First-Years:

- “Being conducted by Tesfa as a member of Viking Chorus has expanded my ethical understanding of the great conflicts that face our nation. Singing is only a part of what we do, and is influenced by what we find around us that transforms individuals into communities. My experiences from Viking alone are comparable to a significant amount of all the ethical teaching and training that I have received over my whole life prior to college, and I am grateful that I have been lucky enough to gain those experiences.”
- “I have connected with many cultural groups on campus like the community council in my dorm, attended and worked with different clubs (Celebrating South Asia and International Student Organization) to build a community.”

Seniors:

- “During my time at St. Olaf, I've learned a lot about what it means to be part of a community. Whether it was in the dorms or in a student organization, all of my interactions on the Hill have helped me grow in this area.”
- “I came to St. Olaf as a very self-focused individual. I wanted to succeed on my own, and I cared very little about how my community was doing. I believe that St. Olaf has

enlightened me to the importance of looking out for others, and using your skills and resources to help wherever you can. I believe one of the most influential experiences was traveling to China, as it gave me a perspective on how every person is part of the global human community. Additionally, the Ancient Warfare course showed me how fragile society is when people don't value others as much as themselves. Lastly, I would say that studying Behavioral Economics and Law and Economics taught me a lot about human behavior and values that I had not understood before, simply in that people develop their own implicit customs apart from government that create the foundation of society.”

Self-Development

First-Years:

- “I have improved most in personal development because college forces you to create better habits and take responsibility. Routines in high school might not work in college so I am working on better time management and taking initiative. I have also received support in this area from various teachers and CAAS which has been very beneficial.”
- “In my opinion, the first year of college is all about exploration. Finding yourself and discovering new things about you as a person are core examples of this principle. Developing self purpose has been a large part of my experience especially because it was the first time I have lived alone in my life and this forces you to rely on yourself.”
- “My work with SSSD and my weekly advising meetings have definitely aided in my purposeful self-development. I feel like SOAR was also helpful as well!”
- “My first year seminar and first year writing classes have given me the opportunity to learn more about myself and identity. I have had to reflect on how my identity affects others and I have learned a lot about myself through these classes including my interests and what is important to me.”
- “Going through personal and academic struggles my first semester lead me to plan ahead and build a support system before entering my second semester. Resultantly, I am more productive and happier than I have ever been on campus. I am disciplining myself more effectively.”
- “I have grown a lot as an individual since I came to school here. Part of this has to do with interactions between myself and others that come from different backgrounds, as I grew up rather sheltered.”

Seniors:

- “Almost everything I have experienced at St. Olaf has led me to grow and develop as a person. Whether it be group projects, experiences with professors and mentors, chapel services, discussion-based classes, or just experiencing the culture at St. Olaf in general, I have grown in more ways than I can explain. At St. Olaf, I've learned how to manage

my time, speak with confidence, advocate for myself, develop a moral compass, care for myself and others, and live a healthy balanced life.”

- “Classes that engage in different philosophies and ideas have helped my self-development because not only do I consider other perspectives but I've actively considered what ideas I want to add to my person and what ideas I want to leave behind. I've also found friends who have supported me and helped me learn to communicate better and trust myself and others and be more self-confident in who I am, and so in social contexts I've had lots of opportunities to grow personally.”
- “I have had many academic struggles related to my self and interpersonal relationships. My continued work to overcome these struggles aided by resources like the Boe House and Academic Support Center have been backdrop against which I have had to intentionally work on my on self-development.”
- “I think college has called me to learn about how I interact with the world. The opportunities I have been a part of thought the college have been intentional steps to grow either in professional skills, educational development, or emotional growth. I think the amount which I am able to take a reflective view of my experiences and choose going forward experiences that will intentionally help me grow is something I have gained from my time at Olaf.”
- “St. Olaf is a place that constantly challenged me. It challenged me intellectually, spiritually, and emotionally. My professors were able to bring the most out of me through my courses and sharpened my fine thinking abilities into real world skills that ended up getting me hired. My friends and my community pushed me to explore who I am, what I enjoy, and what I want my legacy to be. My 4 years have allowed me to push myself to my limits while letting me explore inside a sandbox to figure out who I will be after I graduate. For this, I am eternally grateful and know that I made the right decision with which college I decided to attend.”

Specialized Knowledge

First-Years:

- “I feel as if I have grown the most in specialized knowledge of music because I have invested so much time into it during my first year on campus... Between a number of different ensembles playing different instruments, trumpet and drum lessons, and all my music classes, I feel as if I have grown tremendously throughout the year.”
- “Through the art history and studio art course I have taken this year, I have learned that I definitely want to pursue a degree in these fields. I have gained a lot of specialized information specific to the field, and I am excited to continue the journey.”

Seniors:

- “In majoring in psychology and biology with a neuroscience concentration, I feel that I have learned a lot in this specific area, as my majors have a specific overlap and many of

my courses contribute to this and overlap together. I think that St. Olaf has helped my knowledge in this field grow the most, while other areas have undoubtedly grown as well.”

- “Since I am a music major, St. Olaf has provided me with multiple performance opportunities and rigorous training. I have seen my skills grow in this area especially throughout the 4 years I've been here, largely in part to the music faculty and their support.”
- “During my time at St. Olaf I completed my field practicum for my Social Work major. With this internship I was able to apply what I had learned in class and actually work with real people. I was able to have hands on experience and make connections with those in the Northfield community. I learned a lot through being able to work with a diverse set of people.”

Vocational Discernment

First-Years:

- “This year really gave me the opportunity to explore the fields of study that I have liked previously, but really aided me in deciding what I want to do with my future. It did not take me too long to find the subjects I am most passionate about to focus my academics on, while also giving me the opportunity to go beyond what is required from me and explore other options and fields just for fun.”
- “I feel like I learned a lot about myself and the way I learn and how I can apply that to what I want to do with my life. I have stuck to my gut when it comes to kicking classes and taking leaps and it’s all paid off because I feel like I have found a greater sense of what I want to do with my life to make a difference in the world. I am excited to expand on what I learned about myself this past year in hopes to become even more confident in my pursuits.”
- “the classes and discussions we have had in them, talking one on one with professors, meeting with the piper center”

Seniors:

- “I had the freedom to change my major my junior year and this helped me realize what type of humanitarian work I actually want to pursue. With my friendships, I have been able to realize how much the people around me influence me and contribute to my well-being. I do not know exactly what I will be doing in the future, but St. Olaf helped shape an idea/direction that I will take. Even without a solid plan, I now know what I want to do and how to get there.”
- “I was fortunate to have found my passion in my double major and the professors/advisors I have talked with throughout my four years at St. Olaf have made personal reflections and dreams into realistic goals that have shaped my current career path.”