

Student Learning Committee (SLC)
Minutes from Meeting on November 1, 2011

Committee members present: Kendrick Brown (Chair), Nancy Bostrom, Cheryl Browne , Adrienne Christiansen, Terri Fishel, Chad Higdon-Topaz , Jim Hoppe, Lisa Landreman, Peter Mathison, Kimerly Miller, Libby Shoop, Yang Yu.

Absent: none

I. Review feedback and suggestions for the initial draft

Kendrick shared additional feedback from Jim Dawes and Steph Schleuder; SLC members received copies of the suggestions for reference. In light of these comments and other feedback received to date, the committee continued to discuss revisions to the document, beginning with Learning Goal A. Highlights are included here, but for specific edits, see the revised draft.

- In our document, aesthetic sensibilities come across as separate from problem-solving. In an example like Steve Jobs, they're integrated. It may be difficult for us to bring them together for this document. It may be an ideal, but not expressed in the goal.
- It may be better to use the verb "express" rather than "apply" creativity and aesthetic sensibilities. That seems to fit better with the feedback we've received.
- LO#1: SLC removed the reference to achieve goals both "independently and collaboratively." We recognize that this is an important aspect of education, but it may be better suited to student responsibilities or other goal such as #5 under Communicate Effectively: "Navigate differences when collaborating with others" and #4 under Engage Community: "Participate in activities that benefit the community as a whole while respecting its beliefs, history, and expectations." Because it could involve almost every aspect of the learning outcomes expressed in Goal A, would it be better to insert it into the stem? This topic will be designated as a "major issue" to be discussed later.
- LO#2: One comment raised the question of whether students should be expected to address "unresolved questions." SLC confirmed that students should be able to do this, especially students going to graduate school.

Discussion moved into Goal B, "Think Critically and Analyze Effectively"

- One department raised the question of whether the goal is too focused on deconstructing and critiquing. The department asked whether it was possible to add a more proactive/productive focus as well. LO#4 appears to introduce a way for students to create an argument—but on the other hand, the argument could be used only to refute someone's point. If one looks across the learning outcomes, there are times when the outcomes are more focused on creation. Is this connection enough?

Please see the revised document for specific edits.

Action Item: Kendrick will revise the draft and circulate to SLC before our next meeting. He will incorporate additional suggestions. Track changes will be used to identify points for further discussion.