

Student Learning Committee (SLC)
Minutes from Meeting on November 22, 2011

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

Absent: Adrienne Christiansen, Jim Hoppe, Lisa Landreman

I. Review feedback and suggestions for the initial draft

SLC continued to discuss revisions to the document, returning to Learning Goal C: Communicate Effectively. Highlights are included here, but for specific edits, see the revised draft.

- LO # 1 and 3 are interactive, while #2 is something that students produce.
- Communication is an interactive process, and the document should reflect that.
 - SLC added the word “others” in the stem to highlight both parts of the equation—students communicate with an audience.
 - When the student expresses something, what effect does this have on the audience? A few ideas: resonate, connect, move, evoke, stimulate, convey, inspire.
- LO #1-3 may occur simultaneously—is the order of the outcomes correct? The consensus is to keep the order as is for these outcomes.

Action Item: SLC should revisit the order of outcomes in other sections.

Discussion moved to Goal D: Demonstrate Intercultural Knowledge and Competency.

- In the second paragraph, there were suggestions to omit “nationality and geographic location.”

Action Item: Check for consistency with the language used in the Internationalism requirement.

- Beth Severy-Hoven suggested that the second language requirement “deserve a much richer articulation in this document.”
 - The comment is well-taken, and raises the question of the purpose and suggested outcomes for the second language requirement. According to the requirement:

“All students must demonstrate proficiency in a second language – other than the student’s native tongue-- equivalent to four (4) semester of college-level study in a single language. This proficiency extends to all skill areas: reading; writing; speaking; listening.”

The specific purpose for acquiring proficiency in a second language has not yet been articulated by faculty. For example, is the purpose aligned with a desire to communicate or interact effectively with others, or perhaps to better understand cultural contexts?

Should this document be a specific articulation of all graduation requirements? Some of the requirements are more detailed than others—for example, Internationalism, Multiculturalism and Writing are all major components of the Statement of Purpose and Belief and are represented in this document, while connections to Quantitative Thinking, for example, are less clear.

The committee's consensus is that the graduation requirements should be inferred but not addressed in detail. The document should be broad enough to encompass curricular and co-curricular initiatives. It may be used as a guide for how the College thinks about the requirements, and may provide a framework in which requirements connect to the larger whole. But that the purpose of the document is not to detail learning outcomes for every requirement.

Action Item: Kendrick will contact Beth to discuss SLC's position.

Action Item: SLC will articulate this stance at the beginning of the document.

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

II. Review of calendars for next semester

SLC members reviewed calendars for next semester. It appears that Monday afternoon at 3:00 is the best option for now, pending the schedules of those who were unable to attend the meeting. Less desirable options are Monday mornings at 9:00 and Wednesday afternoons after 2:00.

Action Item: Kendrick will discuss schedules with Jim and Lisa, and will communicate the proposed date and time to EPAG.