

## **Feedback from November 8, 2018 Special Faculty Meeting**

Summary provided by Kelsey Thompson

Most faculty members liked the enduring questions framework and thought that they would engage students. There were, however, some noted aspects that faculty felt were missing:

- Some thought that the connections across the three broader questions were not clear and that integration should be more explicitly embedded.
  - Perhaps replace some of the “students will demonstrate” stems with “students will apply”, “students will integrate”, etc.
    - There should also be room for emerging/developing knowledge and skills and engagement with particular problems/topics over time. Some felt that “demonstrate” (and even “skills” in Q2) gives the impression of desiring a particular level of competency or mastery. “Gain” or “develop” may be alternatives.
  - Perhaps the ILOs should not be “forced” to fit within each of these questions, but should instead flow across multiple/all of them.
    - How do we enable any discipline to contribute to each of the 3 broader questions?
- Several suggested adding a reference to understanding one’s own identity/place in the world within Q1.
  - Some aspect of metacognition, reflection, and/or self-awareness should be included within this framework.
    - Students should be able to articulate what they have gained through their GE experience.
  - The idea of citizenship could also be made more explicit in Q3.
- Some thought that there was a notable absence of physical/mental health (i.e., the current SPM requirement).
  - This is also required to “live meaningfully” (Q2).
- Some felt that there could be more emphasis on the fine arts—creativity as an act, not just as a form of thinking.
  - Artistic expression could be added to the Q2.3 bullet point as another form of communication.
- Some also thought that religion did not clearly fit into or was not adequately covered by any of the three broad questions.
  - Perhaps religion (and even within that, Christianity/Lutheranism) should be specifically named in the list in Q1.1.
- Several tables noted that information literacy should be included as well, perhaps under Q2.1.
  - There should be an emphasis on finding and evaluating information, not just analyzing existing information.
- Vocational discernment and specific reference to the liberal arts were also identified by some faculty as missing elements.
  - Though care should be taken to find the right balance of emphasis between the two, these do not need to be mutually exclusive.

Faculty raised additional questions about the specific wording of the broader questions and the learning outcomes listed under each. The following were mentioned more than once:

- Perhaps Q1 should read something like “in what ways can I understand the world and my place in it?”
  - Through multiple lenses, disparate modes of thought/domains of inquiry, etc.
- To some, Q1.3 seems disconnected from the rest of Q1.
  - Perhaps it belongs in Q3?

- Some also worried that the language used in Q1.3 is too narrow or may soon seem dated.
- Perhaps Q2 could/should be plural, i.e., “live meaningfully in **communities**.”
- What does “communicate effectively” (Q2.3) mean?
  - Does “digitally” refer to digital literacy?
- Is the “global” level of understanding over-emphasized in Q1 and Q3?
- Q3.2 should be broader and include more examples of ways of knowing beyond “ethical considerations and religious beliefs.”

Many faculty still questioned how students would encounter and achieve each of these learning outcomes.

- What will this look like in practice?
  - The Q2.3 bullet point is fairly prescriptive about language, but the others are less specific.
- Moreover, how will students be enabled to make connections between the courses they take and these ILOs?
  - How will faculty help them do this?
  - Perhaps a list is not the right format for students (or even for faculty), as it still feels somewhat like a checklist. Could some other graphical illustration (e.g., a web or a circle) convey the structure of the new GE in a more meaningful way?

Several faculty questioned how the learning outcomes could be assessed, and whether they are specific enough to point to evidence that could be used for assessment. Some specific questions included:

- How will we know whether a student has acquired a “breadth of knowledge about the world”?
- What is the intended scope of Q2.3? How will students demonstrate “effective” communication?
- How will we assess “the ability to work together creatively” or “the ability to make informed choices”?