

Learning Outcomes Post Town Meeting Meeting Notes
11-08-2004

In attendance: Maureen O'Herin, Angella VenJohn, Sophie Rheinheimer, Cheryl Warren, Amber Machamer, Peggy Riley, Jackie Fitzgerald, Rajeev Chopra, Terry Henson, Dale Boercker, Mike Ansell

Notes on Sub-groups

Maureen sent an e-mail to the English faculty about Communication. She did get some feedback but more is needed.

Timeline:

2 more meetings until we need to get a status report to Dr. Cota. Although the list does not have to be final we do want to have consensus on the top categories. Do we need Senate approval before December? It would be nice but the timeline will not allow that. We can give Dr. Cota a status report with the understanding that it does not have Senate approval yet. We can go to the Senate in January 2005.

Sub-groups need to have their work completed by December 1st and e-mail Maureen their lists ahead of time so that we can have them ready to go at the December 1st meeting. We will use the last two meetings to craft those sub-group lists into one composite list.

Sub-Group Reports/dialogue:

Critical Thinking: Someone from the sub-group was not at the meeting but there was some e-mail feedback. It was decided that this group would work with the Math and Science groups. This group will make Math and Science sub-categories of critical thinking. See below.

Ethics: A draft was presented. The draft has 4 sub-categories. Should not use "understand". Also, it was later decided that Ethics and Personal Development would work together because these two should be combined.

Mathematics: After much discussion and carefully examining the skills in the Math category the group decided that this might work as a sub-category in Critical Thinking and that some of the skills could go in the Communication category. The Math Department's careful articulation of the skills they wanted to see in the list helped us move the discussion along. Once we looked at the skills in the Math category, we were able to see where there was some overlap with critical thinking and Communication. Dale and Terry will work with Marilyn and Elena.

Personal Development: Angella and Jim had not had the chance to meet but a first thought is that it seems that there are just too many things in the example. There are many skills that we can't measure and don't necessarily teach. Angella will take the ethics category and put them into Personal Development. Concern that this one category is so much longer than all the other more academic categories.

There was some discussion and disagreement on what a higher education should contain. It was felt by some that higher education should not endeavor to have outcomes for students that are not academic in

nature. Others disagreed. American higher education has along tradition of contributing to both the academic and affective development of students.

Global/cultural Awareness and Citizenship Awareness: Jackie and Amber departed a bit from the assignment but think they have come up with something that might work and is an innovative way of thinking about all the “affective” outcomes. The top category would be “ Respect and Responsibility”. It seems that all the other affective areas are about the core competency of Respect and Responsibility. We envision the sub-categories to be something along the lines of Self, Others, Community, Global, Citizenship, Environment, and Ethics. The categories of Ethnics and Personal Development would be included in this one category. Jackie and Amber will continue to work on this while the Personal Development works their list. The group can see if Respect and Responsibility will work as a top category.

Science and Technology: There was lots of discussion and disagreement on this one. In short, the majority of those present (note that only one Science person was there) feel that Science and Technology should not be a separate category. There is broad support to separate Science and Technology, and place Science into the Critical Thinking category (just the same as with math). The committee agreed that this is the direction we will take unless the Science faculty can make a better case for having its own category. Science did not submit an articulation of ‘science’ skills to the committee so we don’t know, even in a general form, what the Core Competency of Science would contain and how that is different from any of the skills in critical thinking. Science subcommittee will come up with a list that shows skills that clearly cannot be contained in critical thinking or communication.

Information Management: Cheryl Warren presented a draft that was forwarded to her by the others on the sub committee although she did not meet with them. It looks to the committee that many of the skills in the Information Management section are already covered in Communication and Critical Thinking. The general feeling on the committee is that Information Management should not be its own category. Technology Competency is another story. The committee does not see where that is covered in the current draft. Maybe this will have to be its own category. However, it would be a very small category and would not be parallel with the other categories.