

**2018 UNI General Education Re-Envisioning  
Mission and Learning Outcomes Survey**

<b>Survey Procedure .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Respondents By Area .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Mission Statement Preferences.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Mission Statement Comments: .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Learning Area Descriptive Statistics .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Communication: Comments .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Creative Thinking: Comments.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Critical Thinking: Comments .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Diversity: Comments .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Ethics: Comments.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Information Literacy: Comments.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Mathematical Reasoning: Comments .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Problem Solving: Comments.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Human World: Comments .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Natural World: Comments.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Engaged Learning: Comments .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Teamwork and Leadership: Comments.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Personal and Civic Responsibility: Comments .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Learning Outcome Groupings: Comments .....</b>	<b>41</b>

## Survey Procedure

An email containing a link to the survey hosted on Qualtrics was emailed to faculty and select units in student affairs. The survey was available from October 15 – 22, 2018.

A conceptual definition of each learning area was presented followed by a listing of suggested student learning outcomes. The areas were rated on the scale: (1) *Not a Priority*; (2) *Low Priority*; (3) *Medium Priority*; (4) *High Priority*; (5) *Essential*. Respondents were instructed to make their ratings “with an eye toward keeping the number of learning areas manageable...”

## Respondents By Area

AREA	N
College of Business	8
College of Education	33
College of Humanities, Arts, and Sciences	96
Library	10
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences	45
Student Affairs	21
Other	20
Blank	5
Total	238

## Mission Statement Preferences

Respondents were instructed to click on the mission statement they preferred:

MISSION STATEMENT	N
<i>Students in UNI’s General Education Program will participate in remarkable experiences that foster engaged and meaningful lives.</i>	33
<i>UNI’s General Education Program is our foundational curriculum that informs all of our majors. In their encounters with diverse disciplines, our students develop fundamental skills, cultivate an appreciation for multiple perspectives, and integrate them all in thoughtful dialogue and action. We take pride in preparing students for fulfilling personal, professional, and civic lives.</i>	175

## Mission Statement Comments:

"General education" is so bland and anodyne as to be off-putting in its meaningless. I understand that the provost is tired of defending "liberal" in the liberal arts core, but part of our mission as an institution of higher education should be defending (and explaining) the meaning of "liberal arts" to our constituencies. We should ALL be equipped to do this. If we must change the name, then at the

<p>very least, we should be calling it "core curriculum" as at least it connotes something fundamental to the classes that we make our students take. As a comprehensive, public university, one of the things that makes us unique is our emphasis on liberal arts in a public setting. We can compete with private liberal arts institutions in this regard (both quality and lower cost). As a public institution we are never going to be an R1 (nor should we strive to be). Moving to "general education" makes us more like ISU and Uofl - so why wouldn't a student choose to go there (we aren't appreciably cheaper)?</p>
<p>"remarkable experiences" has a hollow ring ... I'd simplify the first sentence to: UNI's General Education Program is our foundational curriculum for all our majors.</p>
<p>"Remarkable" experiences? What is a "remarkable" experience? Teachers are taught to avoid writing "good" on a paper as it is too general.</p>
<p>Add: remarkable "learning" experiences. Add: foster "informed, enriched, engaged and meaningful lives."</p>
<p>Being short is fine (the first one), but what is a "remarkable experience"? Being attacked would be remarkable, but not in a good way. Maybe you could combine them and use "foster engaged and meaningful lives" into the last part of the 2nd option.</p>
<p>Can we call it a "Core Curriculum" instead of a "General Education Program"? Then the second statement could start "UNI's Core Curriculum is the foundation for all our majors...."</p>
<p>Even though the first is easier to digest, it does not seem rigorous enough--or even, necessarily, related to coursework. I find "experiences" too vague.</p>
<p>First one is high school terminology.</p>
<p>I do like both statements, however, the second one stands out a little more because gives a more detailed mission. The one suggestion I would make would be to get rid of the first sentence in option #2 and replace it with option #1. I think the first sentence should make a statement (like #1 does), but then the rest of #2 provides more details on the goals of the Gen Ed program.</p>
<p>I don't like "remarkable" in the first statement. It feels insincere. The second statement is too long. I know this work is extremely difficult so thanks for your efforts. Here's another idea... Dedication to General Education experiences that foster engaged and meaningful lives for all students.</p>
<p>I feel that the second option is a better choice. However, it feels more like a catalog description than a mission statement. It seems like it could be a little more specific without being too much more lengthy.</p>
<p>I feel that the use of 'remarkable' makes the statement very unprofessional as it lacks tangible meaning. I liked the second mission as it uses more tangible terms.</p>
<p>I like #2 a lot.</p>
<p>I like #2 better but it is very wordy. Proposed rewrite: The General Education Program is the foundational curriculum for all majors. Through their encounters with diverse disciplines, students develop fundamental skills and an appreciation for multiple perspectives that fosters thoughtful dialogue and action.(Etc.)</p>
<p>I like more detail, I'm not sure it should be called "General Education" as that is confusing with us having "Education" majors.</p>
<p>I like the content and theme of the bottom statement much more, but the top statement is more concise, and could be a truly live-able mission. The bottom statement would not be something that people could memorize, implement, or live-by.</p>
<p>I like the first (shorter) one although I think the last line "We take pride..." might be incorporated as the goal is to prepare students and encourage life-long learning and realization of full potential.</p>
<p>I LIKE the first one better. But it does not answer the question, "Why am I here?" as well as the second one. This is the question students want answered.</p>

I like the length of the first statement, but it leaves me wondering why and what. The second statement gives me answers to those questions!
I like the longer mission statement but I would like it to be a little shorter. I would like to see something which is detailed enough for people to understand the general education program but short enough where people will actually read it.
I like the second one better--- but would prefer a SHORTER Version. Something like: UNI's General Education Program is our foundational curriculum for all majors. Students develop fundamental skills, cultivate appreciation for multiple perspectives, and integrate them all in thoughtful dialogue and action.
I like the short, concise nature of the first mission statement but I don't like the use of "remarkable."
I prefer the first, but it is a little too vague. I like the idea of changes lives, contributing to society... Maybe a combination of both, but a little more concrete would help.
I prefer the latter, but without the last sentence that reads "We take pride in preparing students for fulfilling personal, professional, and civic lives." Feels tacked on and unnecessary.
I prefer the second mission statement. I'm not sure, however, that our students, by the time they graduate, can "integrate them all in thoughtful dialogue and action." I'm pretty sure that many (most) of our graduates are not prepared to do that at age 22. How about "In their encounters with diverse disciplines, our students develop fundamental skills and cultivate an appreciation for multiple perspectives so that they can live fulfilling personal, professional, and civic lives."
I prefer the second statement however it is wordy and could be condensed,
I think it depends on our audience. The second is better for us (as academic folk), but the first is MUCH more student/family friendly.
I think the second option is much better than the first. However, it can and should still be improved. As stated, the outcomes include only skills, appreciations and integrations; I think it is also key to general education that it provides broad knowledge and intellectual concepts. Other changes to this proposed mission statement have been discussed among my colleagues. Accordingly, I do hope there will be an opportunity for revision to this proposal before implementation.
I would like to know how you'll assess "appreciation", and the criteria for how thoughtful the dialogues and actions are.
instead of diverse disciplines, it would be better to focus on a wide variety of disciplines - stress that they can't do this with courses in 3 or 4 different disciplines.
Is there any evidence that mission statements have ever affected actual behavior at a university or any other institution?
Mission statement #1 doesn't say anything. What is a remarkable experience and how do we know the students think those experiences are remarkable? Mission statement #2 is good, but the last statement starting with "we take pride..." really doesn't belong as it describe the direction of the university as well as the earlier statements.
Neither of these is actually very good
Of the two statements, the second is more specific; the first could mean a number of adventures unrelated to higher education. The second statement seems to address what is taught in the general education program more directly, although I am not that fond of the last sentence which seems somewhat paternalistic (or maternalistic).
Option 1: The first option has brevity going for it, but it has almost no semantic content, and could be applied to virtually any element of the college experience. If I were a prospective student (or the parent of a prospective student), I would gain no understanding about the purpose or substance of the General Education Program from this sentence. It reads more like an advertising slogan than a mission statement. The word "remarkable" is particularly jarring. Option 2: This option is considerably

better, and its emphasis on skills and multiple perspectives is welcome. But the HLC criteria also emphasize that such a program should impart "broad knowledge and intellectual concepts" to students; something that reflects the program's role in facilitating this should be included. The new emphasis on skills should supplement, not eliminate, the program's purpose of providing a "well-rounded" education. As for the specific wording, the assertion that "we take pride" here is to me as jarring as "remarkable" in the first option: why is how "we feel" germane to a mission statement? Why not simply state this sentence as a goal of the program? (E.g., "The General Education Program helps to prepare students for fulfilling personal, professional, and civic lives" or something along those lines.) Finally, and I know this is nitpicking (and I apologize), but I'd eliminate the word "all" in the phrase "integrate them all": is it really the case that everything will be integrated (and what is this "all," in any event)? I think that "integrate them" makes essentially the same point without the difficulties introduced by "all." I very much appreciate the use of "integrate," though.

Overall the concepts included in this mission statement are great! Very forward thinking and inspiring. I would suggest you rephrase the first sentence and combine it with the second. Also, you should always describe "their" as "students." Lastly, you are making a lot of lists; I would suggest writing another sentence instead of having 3 sentences in a row that have a list OR I would adjust the last sentence as a good send off and take out the list all together. It would flow better if you write: "We take pride in preparing students at UNI so that in all settings students post graduation will thrive and build for themselves a fulfilling life built on an esteemed foundation."

Overall, the statement is fine. However, the word "remarkable" sounds odd and stands out.

Please consider the following modification of this mission statement: By exposing students to a broad range of disciplines, UNI's General Education Program provides students with the fundamental knowledge, key skills, and ability to assess issues from diverse perspectives needed to flourish in our increasingly changing world. By integrating them all in thoughtful dialogue and action, students will be prepared to lead successful personal, professional, and civic lives. I think that this proposed version of the mission statement improves on the current one in a few ways: 1. The current language of Option B crucially fails to take account of the fact that among the Higher Learning Commission's criteria for accreditation (3.B.2) are, in addition to skills, etc., are "broad knowledge and intellectual concepts": "The program of general education [...] imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students [...]" . (This quotation is from <https://www.hlcommission.org/Policies/criteria-and-core-components.html>.) The omission of any reference to broad knowledge and intellectual concepts from the current version of Option B fails to live up to some things that the HLC is explicitly looking for as it considers the general education program in the accreditation process, 2. The term "foundational" in the current version of Option B might misleadingly suggest that what's learned in the General Education Program is something in some way "lower than" what's taught in the various majors: something to be "gotten out of the way" in the first couple of years in order to focus on what's "really" important. 3. The phrase "ability to assess issues from diverse perspectives" in the proposed modification below better expresses the rigor with which our classes introduce diverse perspectives than which might be suggested by the current language of "appreciation for multiple perspectives." (The proposed language also has the advantage that it includes the term "diverse.")

Proposed modification of Option B: By exposing students to a broad range of disciplines, UNI's General Education Program provides students with the fundamental knowledge, key skills, and ability to assess issues from diverse perspectives needed to flourish in our increasingly changing world. By integrating them all in thoughtful dialogue and action, students will be prepared to lead fulfilling personal, professional, and civic lives. Rationale: Most importantly, like current Option A, the current language of Option B crucially fails to take account of the fact that among the Higher Learning Commission's criteria for accreditation (3.B.2), in addition to skills, etc., are "broad knowledge and

<p>intellectual concepts”: “The program of general education [...] imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students [...]” . (from <a href="https://www.hlcommission.org/Policies/criteria-and-core-components.html">https://www.hlcommission.org/Policies/criteria-and-core-components.html</a>.) Secondly, Option B uses the term “foundational” in the current version, which might misleadingly suggest that what’s learned in the General Education Program is something in some way “lower than” what’s taught in the various majors: something to be “gotten out of the way” in the first couple of years in order to focus on what’s “really” important. Thirdly, the phrase “ability to assess issues from diverse perspectives” in the proposed modification of option B better expresses the rigor with which our classes introduce diverse perspectives than might be suggested by the current language of “appreciation for multiple perspectives.” The proposed language also has the advantage that it includes the term “diverse.”</p>
<p>Remove foundational from the second statement. I do not agree that all course that would provide "encounters with diverse discipline" should be at "foundational" level.</p>
<p>Statement 1 is very vague. Statement 2 is too long. Neither statement makes any reference to knowledge, however, I appreciate the notion of "engaged, meaningful, fulfilling lives" as a desirable outcome.</p>
<p>Students in UNI's General Education Program will participate in experiences that foster engaged and meaningful lives. No need to use hyperbole or to be too verbose.</p>
<p>The 2nd mission statement is much better than the other option, but I have a few comments: - "Appreciation" is a feeling. This isn't something we can assess, and university is about knowledge not feelings. -"Thoughtful" is a little vague. The thing students really need to do is to analyze complex information and support their ideas with sound arguments and data. -The last sentence is not needed. It is impossible to assess.</p>
<p>The comprehensive experiences in UNI's General Education Program develop fundamental skills in diverse disciplines to provide a foundation for success, preparing UNI undergraduate students for fulfilling personal, professional, and civic lives. Vision - Students prepared for life - personal, professional, civic.</p>
<p>The first is too short to be useful. I like parts of the second, but the second claims students will learn integration, but according to good research from Bloom's perspective integration is not something that most undergraduate students are able to do. See research by Wolcott and Lynch.</p>
<p>the first is too vague, and will only generate snickers (really? remarkable experiences?) the second is so jumbled and wordy. a suggestion: UNI's General Education Program allows for students to develop fundamental skills in diverse disciplines with multiple perspective that will ready them for dialogue and action in their professional, civic, and personal lives.</p>
<p>The first line should be "UNI's General Education Program is THE foundational curriculum WHICH informs..... I think we could eliminate the last sentence "We take pride...."</p>
<p>the first one is awful. given that i picked the longer one. :)</p>
<p>The first one is so short and general as to be meaningless; the long one is a bit too verbose but at least gives an idea of what distinguishes General Education from, say, going on a mission trip, having a bad date, or joining a Greek organization.</p>
<p>The first one is vague, says absolutely nothing about what general education is. Literally anything could fit in there. It provides no meaningful description or guiding principles to prospective students, current students, faculty or staff.</p>
<p>The first one seems built for the future UNI student. The second one, while more specific, puts my millennial self to sleep. The first one seems aspirational; the second reflects what we already do, but is jargon-heavy and tl;dr. Who's the audience for the second mission statement? Faculty? But we already took our GenEds, often so long ago that what we needed then bears no resemblance to what</p>

students need now. And if the audience is future students and their families, there's only one real choice here.
The first option doesn't focus on education; it sounds like a mission statement for a summer camp.
The first option is too generic, and could refer to a number of things that aren't formal education.
The first statement has no substance. It's more an advertising slogan than a mission statement. The second has more substance but still says nothing about imparting content knowledge in addition to skills. Content and skills are not exclusive; they complement one another. It's important for students to master content from diverse disciplines as well as skills from those disciplines.
The first statement is not enough; the second statement is really too much. I like how the second statement connects General Education and majors. I suggest removing the last sentence from the second statement.
The first version is too vague to take seriously at all. What is "remarkable?"
The longer one does a much better job of clearly explaining to students and their parents what the purpose of general education courses is. In my opinion, the shorter one fails to explain much of anything.
The one I selected is better than the first. However, it's still a little lengthy and should be shortened.
The only thing I like about #1 is the length. #2 is too long, but closer. Maybe something about how the gen ed program is the foundation that provides students with the knowledge and skills to prepare them for fulfilling lives by integrating diverse perspectives in a variety of disciplines....
The second one, but delete the aspect that it "informs all of our majors" -- It doesn't and it shouldn't. The General Education curriculum is part of being a thinking, well rounded citizen that provides skills that can enhance performance in one's major area, in the workplace and everyday life. But it does not inform all majors, and it would be limiting the major areas if it did so. It is an enhancement agent.
The shorter mission statement is ridiculously vague, not quantifiable, and open to extreme interpretations. What exactly is a remarkable experience?!?!
These are both pretty bad. The first is too short and meaningless ("remarkable?"); the second, while at least providing something a little less fluffy, is too long. Do we really need "to take pride in"? SHORTEN.
To me the two options are two endpoints, very hard to select one over the other.
UNI's General Education Program lays a foundation of information and experience, foundational skills, diversity and inclusion that our students can carry with them throughout their lives.
UNI's General Education Program is our foundational curriculum that informs all our majors. In their encounters with diverse ways of knowing and appreciating the world, our students develop fundamental skills to cultivate their appreciation for multiple perspectives and to integrate those perspectives in thoughtful dialogue and action. In this way, UNI's General Education Program fosters remarkable experiences that foster engaged and meaningful lives.
We need to have the term "knowledge" in any mission statement. The phrase "broad knowledge and intellectual concepts" is in the HLC criteria.
We really need the multiple perspectives. Remarkable? Not sure what that means, in practical terms.
What about a blend of the two ... UNI's General Education Program is our foundational curriculum where students participate in remarkable experiences that foster engaged and meaningful lives and serves as the infrastructure for all majors. In their encounters with diverse disciplines, our students develop fundamental skills, cultivate an appreciation for multiple perspectives, and integrate them all in thoughtful dialogue and action. We take pride in preparing students for fulfilling personal, professional, and civic lives.

When I think of General Education, I do not think of remarkable experiences. By its very name, it is general. I also don't know how you would assess remarkable experiences or how much they foster engaged and meaningful lives.

Would like to see something about a global perspective in the mission statement.

### Learning Area Descriptive Statistics

LEARNING AREA	Total		Means By College or Unit							
	M	SD	BUS	COE	CHAS	LIB	SBS	SA	OTH	BLK
Communication	4.55	0.69	4.50	4.56	4.50	4.33	4.40	5.00	4.70	5.00
Critical Thinking	4.43	0.70	4.50	3.78	4.55	4.33	4.70	4.33	4.60	4.00
Problem Solving	3.84	1.10	3.50	3.67	4.05	4.00	3.30	4.33	4.00	4.00
Ethics	3.84	1.03	4.00	4.00	3.85	3.67	3.60	3.00	4.10	5.00
Information Literacy	3.83	1.01	3.50	3.44	4.05	4.67	4.00	3.00	3.70	3.00
Diversity	3.81	1.08	4.00	3.56	4.00	3.67	3.40	3.67	4.30	2.00
Natural World	3.72	0.97	3.50	3.78	3.95	4.00	3.60	3.67	3.50	2.00
Creative Thinking	3.66	1.00	4.00	3.22	4.05	3.00	3.20	4.00	3.80	3.00
Human World	3.61	1.03	3.00	3.78	3.53	3.67	3.80	4.00	3.60	2.00
Mathematical Reasoning	3.59	0.98	4.00	3.56	3.55	3.67	3.70	4.00	3.40	3.00
Personal & Civic Responsib	3.55	1.03	3.00	3.56	3.80	3.00	3.20	3.33	3.60	5.00
Engaged Learning	3.47	1.18	3.00	4.22	3.50	3.67	2.60	3.67	3.50	4.00
Teamwork & Leadership	3.34	1.21	3.00	3.11	3.40	3.00	2.90	3.67	3.80	5.00

Note. M=mean, SD=standard deviation; BUS=College of Business; COE=College of Education; CHAS=College of Humanities, Arts, & Science; LIB=Library; SBS=College of Social and Behavioral Science; SA=Student Affairs; OTH=Other; BLK=Blank.

### Communication: Comments

#2 and #3 are communications skills perhaps best tasked to a student's major, not the Gen Ed curriculum, since the skills may vary from major to major. #1 may fall into that category too. "Students will be able to" could be taken to mean that a student's success or failure rests more with the instructors than the students. Instructors can teach skills, but only students can learn them, and the ultimate responsibility rests with them. They're not children anymore.

#5 uses "deliver" and "well-delivered" in the same outcome. Could one use of the word be changed to a synonym? i.e. "execute" rather than "deliver"

A thousand times yes.

Across the last two decades, oral speaking abilities have improved given the integration in early schooling. However, writing and grammar has decreased due to writing becoming less formal (e.g., texting) on a regular basis. If given the choice, students need a writing class over a speech class.

<p>Although we might not be able to "control" it as many students take this content at other universities.</p>
<p>Communication classes can be a springboard for so many other degrees! This is a necessary area to study. It combines creative and critical thinking and fosters conversations about diversity and ethics.</p>
<p>Communication skills are essential, thru along with a few other essential skills are the foundational components to being contributing citizens.</p>
<p>Communication skills can be a crosscutting concept or core practice integrated into every GE course.</p>
<p>I am bothered by the term 'active listening'. What does that mean outside of the field of Communication? It has a bit of a therapeutic ring to it. Are you intending something more general about paying close attention? Close reading? Thoughtful comprehension and processing of information?</p>
<p>I do not support the explicit naming of one discipline or department in the learning areas. Because the kind of effective communication named in this option can be found in other disciplines, I see this more as a learning goal. If resources are going to be attached to these learning areas, then this would unfairly give preference to one discipline over others.</p>
<p>I have worked as an adjunct instructor for over fifteen years. On top of that, I've had a long career outside of academia and have worked in a managerial role for the last several years. In both capacities I have observed the decline in students' abilities in this particular area, particularly as it relates to points #3 and #4. What I've also observed is that students do not place the same importance on these skills as they previously did. Whether they choose to believe it or not (and most of them don't), employers want students who can think critically, express well-informed opinions, and write in complete sentences. As the job market grows more competitive it will remain critical that students possess the ability to take information, question it, verify it, synthesize it, communicate it effectively, and use it ethically. This is where general education/liberal arts comes in to play.</p>
<p>I hope students get courses in both writing and speaking.</p>
<p>I often don't see that these are in place by the time I work with many students. Many of the basic skills of sharing ideas in a clear way with conventional mechanics are not shown in their writing. I continue to develop these skills.</p>
<p>I would like to see more about writing beyond conveying meaning using correct grammar and syntax.</p>
<p>I would love to see this emphasize communicating with others to achieve a shared goal, not just communicating one's individual work/ideas/claims, etc. One outcome could involve teamwork, rather than teamwork having its own goal area.</p>
<p>I'd strongly suggest that few, if any, separate courses be devoted just to communication. Research has demonstrated that unless students are asked to communicate on some subject, or body of knowledge, they're less likely to take such classes as seriously as the would were they writing and speaking about a given subject, or body of knowledge, that they're (roughly) studying in common. It would be natural, for example, for effective written and oral communication skills to be developed in such categories as "The Human World."</p>

If you don't think this is essential, imagine sending UNI students and graduates out into the world with substandard speaking and writing skills. Our credibility (and theirs) would take a nosedive.
Leaders are speakers and action takers! Yes for communication skills!!
Leading or working in teams and being able to communicate with others is a key!
Literacy Information should be wrapped into this -- as this is often needed to accurately communicate. We should not even teach them to communicate without insisting that it is accurately informed when they do it.
NACE Competency - Oral/Written Communications: Articulate thoughts and ideas clearly and effectively in written and oral forms to persons inside and outside of the organization. The individual has public speaking skills; is able to express ideas to others; and can write/edit memos, letters, and complex technical reports clearly and effectively.
Need something about spatial communication...i.e. map reading and interpretation.
No need to state "UNI's" Be consistent in use of Oxford comma. 2. better: "Follow expectations appropriate to a communication task in organization, content, and presentation" 3. Redundant: appropriate, appropriate 5. Redundant: better: "Prepare and deliver an oral presentation in a purposeful, effective, and organized manner."
On area that is not mentioned is the importance of understanding the process of communication. For all forms of communication, process is just as important as product, and that should be recognized within the learning outcomes.
Outcome #1 should be something like "Formulate / craft messages appropriate to..." "Adapt" suggests something that already exists and students are just tinkering with it. "Formulate" or "craft" requires students to design and create the messages
Should/can quantitative literacy be included as well?
The area of composition and writing studies is conspicuously absent. Written Composition's emphasis on writing as an inventive process is slightly hinted at with outcome #1, but not actually followed through in ways that align with best practices drawn from research. I suggest revising outcome #1 to read "Adapt a message to the context, audience, genre, and purpose of a communication task" and adding - Form a message or idea through writing and research processes - Reflect on the development of composing practices and how those practices influence their work
The outcomes of this item seem to be aimed at oral communication. I would think that at a university we should give equal if not higher priority to written communication -- the writing of essays -- that have clear theses and arguments that utilize and explain evidence. So, I recommend you add this outcome: Prepare and submit well-organized written essays that are focussed around a thesis that is supported by structured arguments that utilize and explain evidence.
These are key foundational skills, and ones that should be developed further within majors. I would suggest that students take one course in which they are instructed in core writing skills, and it would be good if this was done in the freshman year. Students could then be required to take two additional courses that required a substantial amount of writing on the content of an academic discipline, at least one of which should be a junior or senior level course. These courses would incorporate the development of student's writing skills. These

could be courses students take as part of a major or minor. Students should take one course on the core skills of preparing and delivering an oral presentation. It is preferable that this course be taken as a freshman.
This area is relevant to all work outside of UNI. Even if they do not use their specific degree, any profession requires and expects these skills from graduates.
This outcome seems strangely all-encompassing ('listen and read with care and comprehension?'), as well as too specific (why is grammar such a focus of writing, and not the writing, revision, and editing processes. We can teach students to write, revise, and edit, by offering them opportunities to do so, as well as feedback; Word Doc editing software, on the other hand, can star their ungrammatical sentences--no need for higher ed.).
UNI graduates must learn early to communicate, both in writing and orally.
While the outcomes do refer to what we expect students to produce, I think we must also emphasize a unity of process, too, and while there is some variety in how one achieves the goal, the range of variety isn't as wide as is assumed.
why is "oral presentation" listed, but not writing? I am guessing #4 is supposed to cover this, but it does not - spoken language uses grammar as well. Also, why not something add something about well-organized writing with clearly expressed ideas - the "grammatical precision and syntactic clarity" should be cut - that is a pretty outmoded way to describe good writing.
why is there nothing about communicating visually? does #3 include citing those sources?
Wondering why oral presentation is specifically mentioned, while no written artifact is. Also, Item 5 needs punctuation for clarity: Prepare and deliver a purposeful, well-organized, and well-delivered oral presentation
you don't really have anything on writing effectively for various audiences, which is more important than a lot of these. Good writing matters--you should have something similar to #5 for writing. And I don't get why #6 is on there.

### Creative Thinking: Comments

"within a domain" doesn't sound like this belongs in a GE program. Save it for majors. Sorry.
#1 doesn't seem to fit
A 21st century skill
Although important, I believe this develops more from experiences outside the classroom.
Are we expecting students to know what this means? I don't know what it means.
Can this be restated so the audience understands "domain"? And what about extra-domain application or revision? Is that what #3 is supposed to be? If so, why only "well-reasoned"? Why not "imaginative" or "imagined with an eye to practical limitations"?
could best be taught by courses in a student's major
Creative thinking can be a crosscutting concept or core practice integrated into every course. Creativity is aided by different skills in different disciplines and is not in any way the sole domain of the arts. Careful - A Comprehensive education should demonstrate this while protecting arts for arts sake. That is, we creativity is not singing the periodic table of elements in chemistry class. Creativity is both expressing an idea in a new way through drawing or painting or dance AND it is developing a novel hypothesis through deep study of a

specific field. The concert pianist is a better physicist and the physicist may be a better concert pianist. Integration should not go to the point of replacing art with craft or experiment with demonstration.
Creative thinking is a VERY important skill, but can it be taught?
Creative thinking is not a foundational skill, it is a skill that is best developed once students have a substantial body of knowledge and skills that they can be synthesize and connect. Thus it should not be included in the general education requirements, instead it is something that is best developed within majors and minors. Creative thinking as a generic skill is also difficult to assess consistently, since what is creative is highly dependent on the nature of the academic discipline. This will make it very difficult to have a uniform way of assessing student outcomes in this category in a general education program, which will be a problem.
Definition is far too wordy and results in it being almost meaningless. The first outcome is far too vague. Also, what the heck is a domain? I have no idea what that means. If you mean as appropriate to the subject at hand, then say that. Everyone knows what that means.
Done well, creative thinking can foster engaged learning. I'd do away with engaged learning and emphasize this.
I can see the need to differentiate creative from critical thinking, I am still uneasy about it. Creative thinking is marked by 'original ways,' and yet I don't believe that critical thinking lacks this aspect of being original, since each of us is different (though all submit to the same disciplines of LAC, or what I think is adult education.
I see this as a learning goal, not learning area.
I think that creative and critical thinking can be combined.
I think this is best handled within major classes, not the General Ed requirements. There is creativity in all fields but it looks very different in each field. In some fields, this may be something that is cultivated from the beginning and in the other fields it may be something you attempt after you have mastered many of the other skills.
I view this skill as essential. The outcomes could be characterized differently though. The first outcome is very generic.
I'm selecting "High Priority" because this important learning goal might be best accomplished in individual majors. On the other hand, perhaps a revised liberal arts core might integrate creative thinking into a kind of capstone course pertaining to a relevant set of majors.
Not sure what this means
Principles are sound, but this sentence is confusing!— Creative thinking is the capacity to synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways and the experience of thinking, reacting, and working in an imaginative way characterized by a high degree of innovation, divergent thinking, and risk taking.
Really important but so close to critical thinking and problem solving.
Students need to be able to think outside the box - which now means "googling" or watching a youtube video. This is an important area.
Students these days are different than 20 years ago. They grew up with technology and they are also creating many companies that are booming. The number of entrepreneurs is increasing because these students have so many ideas. We need to teach them how to be creative with those ideas so they can find there passion and have huge success.

Synthesis and integration, absolutely. I'm not sure people really need innovation, divergent thinking and risk taking. I'm also not sure those latter qualities really lend themselves to being taught. I believe (perhaps wrongly) that they are more intrinsic.
The area is essential, but these learning outcomes are vague and too general. Yes, creativity occurs in every field...but is that what we are really aiming for here? This really needs to be more specifically about the arts.
The first sentence is very cumbersome, and I confess that I don't really follow some of the categorical divisions. Why is "images" grouped with "ideas" and "expertise"? What does "reacting" and "working" in an imaginative way add to "thinking" "in an imaginative way? Imagination seems to me to be a cognitive act, and "reacting" and "working" imaginatively are really just manifestations of imaginative thinking, are they not? Doesn't "innovation" capture the essence of "divergent thinking" and "risk taking" (or at least the kind of "risk taking" that is surely intended here)? Regarding the numbered points, I don't see how the first is connected to the category of "Creative Thinking." The third seems to me to be the most relevant.
The first two learning objectives don't seem specific to creativity.
The Future of Human Work Is Imagination, Creativity, and Strategy: <a href="https://hbr.org/2018/01/the-future-of-human-work-is-imagination-creativity-and-strategy">https://hbr.org/2018/01/the-future-of-human-work-is-imagination-creativity-and-strategy</a>
The language here is unrealistically ambitious: "thinking, reacting, and working in an imaginative way characterized by a HIGH degree of innovation, divergent thinking, and risk taking" and expecting all students to perform to this level ("students WILL be able") is fantastical. The people who wrote this need to get out of their upper-division seminar rooms and Honors sections and deal with ordinary UNI freshmen and sophomores in large-enrollment sections.
The outcomes don't match what "creative thinking" means to me. Maybe this should be renamed "critical thinking"--that I could get behind, and would put as "essential." Oh, wait, you have that below. So in that case, I don't know what this section is even getting at.
This competence is extremely important however the above conceptualization of this competence needs further consideration.
This is better suited to the content areas and not to general education.
This is important, but we also work on this in their lesson planning design.
This is part of critical thinking and should not be separated. that is why I am indicating "not a priority"
This is unclear. "demonstrate basic strategies and skills within a domain" could literally apply to ANYTHING. How is that uniquely "Creative Thinking"? If there is a separate category for something, it should be clear as to why it is separate.
This learning goal is most likely measured by the students program of study and is likely already being measured by a departmental SOA programmatic goal.
This looks like a discipline specific area? While it should certainly be party of the General Education program, will it be a discrete course or woven into several (all?) GE courses?
This should be done through the major.
To me, creative thinking is part of critical thinking

wordy. better: "Creative thinking involves the synthesis of ideas, images, and expertise which requires imaginative, innovative, and sometimes divergent thinking and the willingness to take risks." etc. No need to state UNI's 1. Word choice--"domain." Field? Area? Context? 3. Get rid of and/ors

### Critical Thinking: Comments

21st century skill. Can be combined with creativity.
Absolutely essential. I wonder if Information Literacy and Problem Solving might be incorporated into this, rather than standing as their own categories. For the specific components, I think a mention of "rational argumentation" (or "reasoned argumentation") should be included somewhere, perhaps in conjunction with "draw[ing] logical conclusions" in #5.
Again, this is better for the content disciplines and not for the general education program.
Although I believe our students need to think critically, this should not necessarily be a "class" in itself, but rather integrated into everything we teach. I believe a specific class in just "critical thinking" would not be well received by the 18 year olds that walk through our doors. Let's do a great job of teaching this through everything else we do.
AS I mentioned in the above comment box, there is something artificial about dividing thinking into creative and critical. perhaps we need a 3rd term - adult thinking? human thinking? critical thinking goes on in the artist and there is an art to scientific inquiry....But I'm not sure if at this stage of our re-envisioning I need both our heads about it
Building on my comments regarding communication, the ability to think critically is not lacking just among the student population. Unfortunately, the masses have lost this ability. Look at the ways in which social media is being used to spread half-truths and total falsehoods. Look at how quick people are to react to stereotypes and myths about cultures and populations different from their own. We don't question information the way we should. Heck, even Abraham Lincoln said you can't believe everything you read on the Internet &lt;jk>.
Combine critical thinking with problem solving
Critical thinking along with communication skills, diversity education, problem solving and other areas I marked essential set the foundation for the other areas of learning. Without the "essential" tasks the others either wouldn't be developed or wouldn't be effective in their teachings.
Critical thinking is an essential outcome for UNI graduates. I think this skill is best developed within the students' majors and minors rather than in the core curriculum.
Critical thinking is another crosscutting concept or core practice. Every course should engage students in critical thinking of that field and how that fields relates to personal, professional, and civic life.
Definition is far too wordy. Should just be "Critical thinking involves the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, and theories and the rigorous analysis of evidence before reaching conclusions or forming opinions." Lose the word "domain" throughout this entire document. "Subject at hand" or something comparable.

Do the authors of this particular mission statement regard it as necessary that students have something to think critically about (e.g., content), or is critical thinking a pure abstraction and a skill divorced from content knowledge?
Every UNI student MUST know how to think critically before they can graduate. Hence, this is an essential part of the GE program.
I like the re-working of this goal a lot!
I see this as a learning goal not learning area
I would suggest that students take two courses in which they are required to do extensive analysis of information and/or data and use it to make well supported arguments for the conclusions they draw from the information/data. The information/data analyzed could be of a wide varieties of types, from experimental data collected in a laboratory or field work, to primary sources on a historical topic. As long as students took two courses of this type, it should not matter what type of information they were doing in depth analysis of. At least one of these courses should be at the junior or senior level. Some of these courses could be ones that students are taking for a major or minor. Students should be given freedom to choose which topic or academic field the courses that meet the critical thinking requirement are on.
If they can't do this, we and they are both wasting our time.
NACE Competency - Critical Thinking/Problem Solving: Exercise sound reasoning to analyze issues, make decisions, and overcome problems. The individual is able to obtain, interpret, and use knowledge, facts, and data in this process, and may demonstrate originality and inventiveness.
Needed more and more in our society!!
not sure if the breaking apart is measurable, or essential-- number 5 only could work?
Run on. "which includes," not "and includes." Better yet, break it into two sentences. "domain?" 5. "conclusions" is fine--get rid of parentheses
See above - plus society needs good thinkers!!
Should be combined with Problem solving -- critically think about something and then develop a solution. So many people develop solutions that were not well (critically) thought out. The combination of these I would rate as ESSENTIAL.
Should be part of every GE course!
Something essential is missing from this category: disposition to asking questions. This could be incorporated as follows: 3. Analyze, question, and interpret relevant theories, concepts, evidence and data.
Teaching critical thinking must also include making students aware of the dangers of confirmation bias.
The wording "collection and analysis of evidence before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion" is paralyzing. Perhaps the wording could be tweaked to acknowledge we must make judgments and act while uncertain. Thinking should remain an open, on-going process. NOT now I know what is right, true...
There are many models of critical thinking out there. I am a fan of the Perry model, which conceptualizes critical thinking as intellectual development. This is the model my college uses to gauge critical thinking, as a lack of intellectual development is often the underlying

problem when students have a difficult time reaching the higher learning levels of other models of critical thinking.
There doesn't seem to be any explicit language here that identifies actual "thinking." The outcomes are the preparatory stages and the conclusion of "thinking." So what is thinking? Thinking is the development of logically constructed arguments that support a position, a thesis. So I suggest you add the following criterion or outcome: Establish a cumulative set of logically constructed arguments that contain and explain evidence and reasons that support a position, a thesis.
THIS IS #1. This is my desert island goal (if I could only have one.)
This learning goal is absolutely key to a revised general education program, and I imagine that most of my colleagues will agree. I'd suggest adding "and the use of logical reasoning" to the description of the learning goal, such that it would read as follows: Critical Thinking: Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, theories, and events and includes the collection and analysis of evidence and the use of logical reasoning before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.
This learning goal is most likely measured by the students program of study and is likely already being measured by a departmental SOA programmatic goal. This goal would be tough to measure for the General education.
This seems to be a very narrow definition of critical thinking, that strips any original thinking/creativity from it. Probably this is at least in part because critical thinking is divorced from disciplines here - in reality it is different within different disciplines. The attempt to make it generic takes much away from the concept. Any definition should acknowledge that there are various types of critical thinking and that learning one type is not sufficient. I would also suggest that much of what is listed in the learning outcome "Creative thinking" is a part of critical thinking. Those two things should not be separated. I would say that this version of critical thinking is not a priority for me, although critical thinking itself is essential.
This should be modified to include the language of "reasoned argumentation"
What about speculation? So much we are asked to do in civil and other affairs calls on us to speculate reasonably. Or power? Shouldn't power relations be part of the equation here and not just in "Diversity"? Maybe "Consider the power relations at work when analyzing and preparing a range of perspectives to formulate a position"?

### Diversity: Comments

#1 outcome should be deleted. I would use something instead like "Describe how culture influences people's thoughts and actions." Just knowing groups differ doesn't help reduce prejudice--lots of research on that. It can even increase prejudice.
A global perspective must be emphasized in one and two above.
Are we ready to plant the flag for Social Construction theory as a key concept? Although that is where my thinking lies, I am also aware that there are a growing number of writers who are promoting the revival of Essentialism as it relates to trans identities. Maybe state Outcome 2 in a more general way?
As written, this and the Human World overlap a lot.

Could we add more specifics here, so as to include Humanities, Religion, Social Sciences...etc.
Diversity along with communication skills, critical thinking, problem solving and other areas I marked essential set the foundation for the other areas of learning. Without the "essential" tasks the others either wouldn't be developed or wouldn't be effective in their teachings.
Diversity is larger than cultural differences. Political, economic, educational differences as well..more. What about equality, equity, and justice? Diversity is an area that should have it's own courses (world religion, cultures, etc.) and should also be integrated into specific MAJOR and GE coursework. While critical thinking, creativity, and communication skills can be built in all GE and all major courses. Our student's background content in diversity issues begins limited and siloed, which each student bringing in only a certain level of expertise of their own background (and maybe not a historic understanding of that). This is one of the things that should differentiate a Comprehensive education from a career and technical or highly specialized education. Learning how to think critically, be creative, and communicate ideas beyond your own area of expertise because you have studied diversely and diversity.
Diversity is not a gen ed issue. Gen ed is for "tools" that have yet to be applied. There is potential for abuse of this issue by those with a political agenda -- from either side.
Good grief, this item #1 under diversity is absolutely awful. For example, take a look at the 3rd Grade Iowa Social Studies Standards. By the end of third grade, on the topic of immigration and migration, we expect 3rd grade students to "infer", "explain", and "develop" in relation to this topic. "Describe" is such a weak learning objective and is an affront to what college students can achieve in the area of diversity. Please, please set high expectations for our students, especially in the area of diversity.
Here is the thing: understanding diversity and having diverse cultural experiences is the way out of bigotry, sexism, and racism. We know that these are still HUGE social problems. We would be very mistaken to not make this an essential element. I think you can get to some of this in history, sociology, anthropology, literature, communication, art, theatre, philosophy, etc.
Human Experiences and Diversity seem to be related and could fold onto each other. I like the description of Human Experiences better.
I marked this as "medium" not because I don't think it's essential--I do--but I wonder if it too might be included in a broader category such as "The Human World," or alternatively have #5 of that category included here.
I think diversity is essential - BUT....if we are doing our job in critical and creative thinking, this should naturally flow from the work.
I think this is often missing in courses and we need to do a better job in this area of study
I'm selecting "Not a Priority" *not* because this isn't a very important aspect of general education, but rather because I think it should be included in classes in "The Human World" category. Although the learning goals aren't designed to fit specific courses, humanities, history, religion, philosophy, sociology, anthropology courses could, and probably all should, include a discussion of issues of diversity. I also think that another reason it might be a mistake to include "Diversity" as a separate category - again, not because studying diversity isn't essential - but because students required to take courses explicitly falling under the

category of "Diversity" might feel that they're being instructed to think and behave in certain ways. (Enter the "culture wars.")

In key ways, liberal education has always been about diversity but we had blinkers on as to how we were violating this goal. Now we are more aware of it. But I think one 'diversity' is still ignored, to our continual frustration. that is the cohort or universe of images that words conjure up in the adult mind. I know this 'diversity' refers to sociological areas, and yet adults in those areas use words, so at some point, the alternative viewpoint of ours images should be recognized. Then we discuss images in our minds from words we hear in discussions and I think that could lead to some very good communication moments.

In principle, learning about people unlike one's self is quite important. But I have two practical objections: 1. Do we have the resources to teach ALL our students about diversity? It seems we would have to hire a LOT of new faculty in this area, and I doubt that would be the best use of our limited funds, and 2. How can we be sure these classes will not turn into indoctrination sessions?

In the in-person GER meeting, I was really discouraged that most of my table didn't find this to be an essential area. They grumbled about it, and said that it was "politically correct". I find this unacceptable, and a true sign of why UNI doesn't attract students from diverse backgrounds.

Is an increasingly fraught term that is unlikely to age well. No longer means what the liberal university intends; viewed by many young people as a fig leaf for institutional racism. High priority in substance, but all our intentions mean nothing when the number of faculty of color at our institution remains (proportionally) so low.

Millennials are living diversely - far more so than prior generations, yet this is important

NACE Competency - Global/Intercultural Fluency: Value, respect, and learn from diverse cultures, races, ages, genders, sexual orientations, and religions. The individual demonstrates, openness, inclusiveness, sensitivity, and the ability to interact respectfully with all people and understand individuals' differences.

Need something stronger than "recognizing" to start this off. This is an important goal, but the outcomes are surprisingly vague. I look at this and essentially see outcomes aimed at people recognizing that there are others different than themselves. Seems like we should be able to do more than that. We should be able to bring that recognition to bear to analyze social problems in some way. I also fear that the current vogue of "privilege" will make this document dated in very short order. By that I don't mean to disparage the ideas behind recognizing privilege, but calling out privilege is very much in fashion right now in the same way that "sustainability" was in fashion ten years ago. If we did this ten years ago, there would almost certainly be a goal area of "sustainability." I don't see it here now. I think we should write this so that it uses language that can still be relevant a decade from now. Moreover, the term "privilege" has become a politically loaded term. If we're so politically sensitive that we're no longer going to call this the Liberal Arts Core (as it should be called), why are we going to beg trouble by using the word "privilege," which at this point is wholly identified with the political left and is like bait for the right? Again, I'm not saying we abandon this goal or outcome, which I've rated as a high priority. I'm suggesting, though, that we be smarter about how we phrase and present it.

Recognizing diversity is a high priority; I downgraded it to medium because whoever wrote this needs to leave out "power, privilege and access leading to". That's leftist rhetoric.
Should be integrated with another learning outcome.
Stress and anxiety are at an all time high in high school and college students because they are not being taught how to love themselves and how to accept everyone for who they are. We need to let students know they are unique and teach them the skills to respect one another. This will in turn increase student success in the classroom.
Student population in the USA generally needs to be more educated on different cultures and different parts of the world. I wish this would start in school.
The outcomes for diversity are well-written but are mainly focused on the definition of diversity and less on the act of inclusion. Suggestions: Don't use the word Diversity; we've passed that. Use the word "Inclusion" and let's focus on that. Also, #3, engaging multiple perspectives should be on anything, not just on questions of diversity. I would say something like: Demonstrate the ability to engage multiple perspectives in discussions.
The way this outcome is written makes responsible citizenship appear focused on 'virtues'-- not sure that is the best language for this outcome. ('tenet', 'principle?')
This definition lacks any sense that cultural differences and social construction of identity change over time. That is a significant drawback to it, as exposing students to evidence that these ideas are not "natural" and unchanging is a key way of teaching that identities are in fact constructed.
This is a priority, but could and should be integrated throughout; perhaps not a stand-alone area.
This is part of critical thinking. Get the first correct and the second follows.
This may be a priority for the students other than education students but the education program does a much better job at this and this is an area that ed students shouldn't have to take.
Tone down the "social construction of identity as related to power, privilege, and access" language. It is too close to the fashionable "identity politics" of today.
We continue to develop this in the students' field experiences in the schools.

#### Ethics: Comments

"Ethical Reasoning" would be a better title for the category. Also, it would be nice in this learning area to also focus on what persons cross-culturally have in common with each other.
"Uni's" is not needed--clear from context
Again, there is great potential for abuse from either side of political issues. Stick to liberal arts tools.
As you have observed, the learning areas and outcomes are interconnected. I think the link between ethics and information literacy is strong and can be strengthened among our students. Info literacy could be one area in which students explore ethics, such as the ethics of information authority, intellectual freedom, and intellectual property.
Ethical Societal Challenges Arising with Artificial Intelligence and Robots see: <a href="https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/frobt.2017.00075/full">https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/frobt.2017.00075/full</a>

Ethics is an important area of concern however I think it would better be integrated into the disciplines
Ethics is another crosscutting concept or core practice. Students should experience and practice ethics in their major and GE courses.
Ethics is important but the goal as written seem to lead students to narrow path of "and this is what you should think" Much of the ideas behind this learning outcome could be tied into diversity and communication.
I do not support the explicit naming of one discipline or department in the learning areas. Because the kind of effective communication named in this option can be found in other disciplines, I see this more as a learning goal. If resources are going to be attached to these learning areas, then this would unfairly give preference to one discipline over others.
I do think this is essential. It might be best addressed across the curriculum, or with diversity elements, rather than be a standalone "ethics" course.
I strongly urge the committee to change the title to "Ethical Reasoning," in order to identify that ethics has to do with thinking about, discovering, evaluating, judging, and justifying the better course of action when we face conflict among our personal, social and professional standards. It is not observations of right and wrong conduct -- that's an "ethical or personal code" which as little to do with thinking. Here is my suggestion for a more appropriate statement of this broad goal: Ethical Reasoning: Ethical reasoning involves understanding reasons that justify what we should do, utilizing a conceptual framework within which to thoughtfully negotiate actual and potential conflicts that arise within one's personal, professional, and civic life. So, I would also ask you to consider modifying outcome 3 in this way: Apply different ethical frameworks to address, negotiate and resolve ethical dilemmas. This is what students in courses on ethics, in any department, should be working toward -- namely, the ability to reason about ethical problems (conflicts in established moral norms) in order to resolve them in responsible ways. So, please consider adding this modified statement to outcome 3.
I suspect that people are going to rate this category as a low priority or not a priority because they'll think it means something like personal ethical codes that people will get from their religious upbringing, or professional codes of conduct that they'll learn in their majors. The crucial importance of including ethical reasoning in general education is that students should develop an understanding of concepts and theories in the philosophical field of ethics that provide the foundation for thinking about what it means to act ethically. Once they learn this foundation, students will employ these concepts and theories to ethical challenges that arise in their personal, professional, and civic lives.
I'm ranking this one a little lower because if they're high on diversity and critical thinking I think ethical reasoning is implied
In order to clarify the nature of this learning goal, I propose something like the following as an alternative: Ethical Reasoning [altered title]: Ethical reasoning involves understanding and providing principled arguments that justify what we ought to do in a particular situation, and also provides a conceptual framework within which to thoughtfully negotiate potential conflicts and dilemmas that arise within one's personal, professional, and civic life. I feel strongly that "Ethical Reasoning" would be a much better title for this learning goal than

<p>"Ethics." The latter term might be misunderstood as meaning "codes of professional ethics" (accounting, legal or clinical work, etc.) or "acting according to one's personal moral code." I'm also concerned that the current title of this learning goal might lead to misunderstandings about what the goal actually is that would detract many respondents to this survey to fail to accord it a sufficiently high priority. I'd also strong suggest adding the following learning objective: Apply concepts and theories in the field of ethics to reason in a principled way about potential ethical dilemmas. I suggest eliminating talk of "right and wrong human conduct" from the description of this learning goal, on the grounds that it might sound too "preachy," as if this learning goal involved students being didactically instructed on what's right and wrong to do. Please see my proposed revision of the language for an alternative.</p>
<p>It'll be interesting to see what courses are used to fulfill this one.</p>
<p>Learning about ethics and behaving ethically are not the same thing. By the time students reach us, their characters are mostly already formed.</p>
<p>Should permeate entire general education program</p>
<p>This goal would be one that is in all departments of content since there is an illicit way of understanding the content and methodology and a valid way. We do have students remain adamant in a viewpoint due to ideological commitments and their behavior or intellectual stance really must be challenged, though the real valid perspectives just compel assent (though usually from a position of adhering to a contrasting perspective, so cognitive dissonances is often involved).</p>
<p>This learning area would better be titled "Ethical Reasoning," and its description should be updated through consideration of faculty concerns.</p>
<p>This outcome seems to be here in place of other areas that may be more important. Of course, ethics are important, but perhaps this would be better as part of the purview of major fieldwork, rather than at the university level (standard-bearing in the disciplines).</p>
<p>We have become a "selfie" society - it is important for young people to conduct themselves ethically in the workplace and in personal relations and actions</p>
<p>What is meant by "the social context of problems" in #1? It would be helpful, in my opinion, to place more emphasis on the process of ethical reasoning and reflection; e.g., "awareness of their roles and responsibilities" is good, but how these roles and responsibilities are developed is also crucial.</p>
<p>While ethics are important, is this really a topic for our GE program? It seems it should be a part of many majors on campus, but I question its role in a GE program, especially one that is more lean.</p>

#### Information Literacy: Comments

<p>I'm selecting "Not a Priority" *not* because this isn't a very important kind of learning, but rather because information literacy should be a component of every specific major. Rather than take a general education course devoted to evaluation of the reliability of sources, documentation of sources, etc., students would benefit more from focusing on information literacy within their own disciplines.</p>
<p>Absolutely essential. The heart of a GE program!</p>

Again I think this one is implied by some of the ones above
Again, it'll be interesting to see what courses get used to fulfill this one.
As with "Diversity" above, I believe this is essential but perhaps better included in a different category (in this case, the "Critical Thinking" category).
Could this be combined with either critical thinking or literacy and communication?
Essential for the Future of Work: <a href="http://information-literacy.blogspot.com/2017/09/information-literacy-and-future-of-work.html">http://information-literacy.blogspot.com/2017/09/information-literacy-and-future-of-work.html</a>
First sentence is awkward and wordy. Make parallel phrases parallel constructions. Better: "Information literacy is the ability to recognize when information is needed and to identify, evaluate, and apply that information effectively and responsibly." Cut "UNI's"--clear from context.
Given the world in which we live, where information is available at our fingertips, our students really need IL so that they can learn how to find good info on the internet.
High priority also about reputable sources!
I don't agree with #1. It is not as if we research by looking at a known, limited data set and coming up with an answer. A big part of information literacy is being able to say "I am not sure what is needed, but I can form a plan to start looking." So, it is the plan that matters, not the information itself. As stated, I am afraid this part conflicts with other outcomes related to diversity and creative thinking.
I rated this as a low priority because quite honestly this is the very minimum that K12 should accomplish. University Students should learn to better employ their already build understanding of information literacy to their specific majors, interests, and lives. At the University our information literacy work should focus on the specific skills of an academic.
I routinely assign research projects to my students. I know they are going to consult Google first; as much as I hate it, I've realized I need to accept it. However, I also work hard to encourage them to use Google as one of MANY tools available to them for finding information. It's a hard sell, because Google is fast, cheap, and easy. What students fail to understand is that not all information is created equal, and just because it's on Google (in the first ten hits, of course) doesn't mean it's "good" information, even if it is true. I think most people struggle with how to determine whether a source is credible, relevant, timely, objective, verifiable, and so forth.
I see that you have used the National Forum on Information Literacy as the foundation of your information literacy statement. I know the NFIL coalition was created as a response to the American Library Association's recommendations. I encourage you to also review guidelines written for college and university students, faculty, and library faculty, namely, the Association for College & Research Libraries' "Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education" at <a href="http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/issues/infolit/Framework_ILHE.pdf">http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/issues/infolit/Framework_ILHE.pdf</a> and see whether meaningful aspects of information literacy could enhance your statements or be added as additional statements. For example, that faculty would foster the understandings among students that "Authority Is Constructed and Contextual. Information resources reflect their creators' expertise and credibility, and are evaluated based on the information need and the context in which the information will be used. Authority is

constructed in that various communities may recognize different types of authority. It is contextual in that the information need may help to determine the level of authority required."
I see this as a learning goal, not necessarily a learning area.
I think I students can find information, however evaluation (#3) needs bolstering.
I think this is part of critical thinking, should be combined.
I would consider consulting the Association of College & Research Libraries Information Literacy Framework at <a href="http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework">http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework</a> too as a resource. There is a lot of good information on how librarians, faculty and administratorss can embrace the framework in higher education.
Important but doesn't require a huge amount of time/effort to develop, unlike say communication and critical thinking.
Important, but specific outcomes might be able to be subsumed under critical thinking First outcome seems incomplete... "what information is needed to solve/address a given problem"?
In the current political, social, and information climate, information literacy is a critical skill.
Increasingly important in an era of constant change and multiple forms of disinformation. Applicable to all majors and disciplines as well as to personal lives of our students. There is so much wonderful potential for incorporating these learning outcomes for all students, which would set apart a UNI education. Library faculty are eager to collaborate to help focus on this outcome in the General Education program as well as in the majors. Do not combine with other outcomes. This is a distinct skill set with a rich body of literature, best practices, national guiding documents, etc.
Instead of Information Literacy, this section could focus on "Research Reading." Students need to be required to access information on a topic and read complex texts on a topic. One of learning outcomes within this section could be "access and evaluate information and use it ethically and legally." Yes, you can get information through other forms than reading. But reading is the hardest way and therefore it is our duty to make sure students are proficient in reading and analyzing complex texts.
IT SEEMS that this outcome would be part of critical thinking. We not only examine the information but realize when there is insufficient information for a decision or conclusion or the production of a claim.
Learning goal to be rolled into communication and in departmental program SOA.
Literacy Information should be wrapped into Communication -- as this is often needed to accurately communicate. We should not even teach them to communicate without insisting that it is accurately informed when they do it. Combined together, these would be ESSENTIAL.
Need to stress non-digital information
Students come to college having some information on this. Schools prepare them well for this.
These are important skills, but part of this is also covered in the current version of critical thinking, so its a bit redundant. It could also be covered by having learning outcomes linked to reasoning/methods in different disciplinary areas. A generic concept of information

literacy does not seem very useful - i.e. there is a large difference in what info is appropriate and how to access it for different types of questions.
This is so broad -- anything is "information," and we could be talking about math, science, media analysis, literary criticism, etc. (And we do a lot of this already in these areas.)
This learning area description is weak and should be enhanced. The elementary--if not even remedial sounding--wording does not do justice to what a college educated person should be able to do upon graduate.
This should be a priority in every academic class. This is our duty as professors. This should already be happening.
This should be the core of social and natural science requirements in the GE program.
This should not be a separate category. The fundamental skills in this area can be introduced in the foundational course on written and oral communication, and other aspects of it would be parts of courses taken for the Critical Thinking category.
You'd think this would be essential in the Age of Trump, except that I'm pretty sure if many of the other categories are executed well (critical thinking/creative thinking/ethics/communication), this imperative vanishes. Keep the above four categories, and this one is high priority at best.

#### Mathematical Reasoning: Comments

A basic mathematical ability is necessary.
A little discipline specific.
And what happens if after the command that students WILL be able to do these things, some can't or don't or just don't do it as well as some others? How much failure are you comfortable with?
Can mathematical reasoning and problem solving be combined?
Could be strengthened by incorporating additional concepts related to "data literacy" or "data information literacy". See ebook: Johnston, Carlson, Johnston, Lisa, & Carlson, Jake. (2015). Data Information Literacy: Librarians, Data and the Education of a New Generation of Researchers (Purdue information literacy handbooks). West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press. <a href="https://northern-iowau-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=01NRTHIOW_ALMA51137446310002841&amp;context=L&amp;vid=NewUI&amp;search_scope=Books/Media&amp;tab=01nrthiow_alma&amp;lang=en_US">https://northern-iowau-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=01NRTHIOW_ALMA51137446310002841&amp;context=L&amp;vid=NewUI&amp;search_scope=Books/Media&amp;tab=01nrthiow_alma&amp;lang=en_US</a>
Everyone needs math
I do not support the explicit naming of one discipline in the learning areas. I consider this to fall under "problem solving," which would allow other disciplines to fall under such an umbrella. If resources are going to be attached to these learning areas, then this would unfairly give preference to one discipline over others.
I personally think this is a vital part of education, but I understand why many students may not feel like this is a necessary part of their education. Many students feel that if they will not use an idea or concept in their career, why learn it. This is especially true in the mathematics.
I strongly suggest that this learning goal be re-titled "Formal Reasoning." This is a fairly standard category in higher education, and involves the use not necessarily just of

<p>mathematics, but of some basic formal logic as well. In many universities, a course in formal logic satisfies a broad general education requirement. Although courses providing a basic understanding of formal reasoning might not be need to be required of every student, surely this field of study is of similar benefit to that of mathematics. Note that the current language in the specific learning objectives includes "logical conclusions," "valid arguments." All we need to do is broaden this category beyond mathematics in a narrow sense.</p>
<p>I think math reasoning should be rephrased to "scientific" or "logical" reasoning or scientific methodology.</p>
<p>I think this goal is written to specifically. I would prefer Quantitative Reasoning.</p>
<p>I think this is part of critical thinking or problem solving, shouldn't be pulled out as a discipline.</p>
<p>If people want to go into educational leadership or politics, they will be overseeing million dollar or even billion dollar budgets. If they choose these fields I hope they have mathematical reasoning skills.</p>
<p>If you keep mathematical reasoning in gen ed, which you should, please, please, please encourage a basic mathematical course focused on the kinds of math skills that students will need in their lives: balancing a checkbook, understanding compound interest, reading statistics in news articles...</p>
<p>Important but can it be treated as an aspect of or tool for critical thinking?</p>
<p>Math and Decision Making or anything like it, should be replaced with a statistics and big data based course that helps build mathematical literacy. They should focus on using mathematical reasoning to understand real world topics - such as health (does it make sense to get a flu shot?) and access publicly available data. Graduates should be able to ask reasonable questions about public datasets and media reports. Questions like - does this representation of the data seem reasonable? Is the sample representative? What is missing? Are there outliers? Does the analysis fit the purpose?</p>
<p>Mathematical Reasoning is essential to problem solving skills.</p>
<p>Mathematical reasoning is part of our lives. As such, it is a must! But, I know you are trying to trim the program.</p>
<p>Mathematics should not have been utilized as a separate learning outcome, nor any another discipline. Notice how you can substitute the words Humanities or Arts and take away the word mathematics or Mathematical. Including this as a learning outcome will not allow the overall GE program to be accepted by the entire campus. This one should be deleted.</p>
<p>People need Math...many don't even know how to calculate a percent on their own. They struggle to carry over their math skills into novel situations -- e.g. can determine how to calculate exam percent grade, but not the percent of European countries involved with WWI (when told how many countries there were in Europe at the time and how many were involved.)</p>
<p>Should be in-line with discipline expectations too (for example continued having STATS meet the needs of programs that rely on stats in their field).</p>
<p>Should be integrated into a larger competence umbrella</p>
<p>Students should take one mathematics course. The range of mathematics courses that count should be wider than they are in the current LAC where there is the ridiculous situation</p>

where Precalculus does not count but Calculus I and Mathematics in Decision Making do. In addition to one mathematics course students should be required to take one additional course in which there is extensive use of mathematics. This could be a second mathematics course, a physical sciences course that uses mathematical models and calculations, or a business or social sciences course that uses statistics.
The logic piece is critical. I think of this as mathematical literacy is preferred.
the others aren't discipline specific
This is better done in the content areas.
Too little attention is paid to applied mathematics. This area is important-especially appreciating drawing logical conclusions from quantitative information.
Why is "mathematical reasoning" used instead of "quantitative reasoning"?
Why is mathematical reasoning privileged on this list? Why is it so important that it gets its own category while many other ways of thinking/reasoning do not. Perhaps the answer is not to cut mathematical reasoning, but to think about what the other types of reasoning are and create areas for them.

#### Problem Solving: Comments

"to achieve" See above on UNI's and "domain" "Solutions" is fine--parentheses look weak.
21st century skill!
As with several of the categories above, I think the specifics are essential but might better be incorporated into other categories (such as "Critical Thinking" and "Creative Thinking").
Can mathematical reasoning and problem solving be combined?
Could be part of critical thinking.
Essential, essential, essential!
I could see this as a key outcome, but only if we also understand that we apply this activity to our own intellectual resources. I think these words in the explanation likely conjure up images in the reader of doing things in the external world, in society, and that is all fine and good, but a key challenge in educating students via the LAC is to get them to see how they can find their own way to what I call adult level understanding of adult ideas taught to them in childhood.
I like critical thinking more as a way to get at problem solving (also in conjunction with communication because we need to work with other to solve most problems and we need to communicate with others to share our solutions)
I think this is challenging in a general education course. The students look bored and offended when the scientific method is reviewed, and I believe this is better pursued in their major courses.
I think this is too broad to be meaningful
I'd just like to add that in addition to developing problem-solving skills, students need encouragement and opportunities to learn about personal and professional accountability, responsibility, and initiative.

I'm selecting "Not a Priority" *not* because this isn't a very important kind of learning, but rather because this kind of problem solving should be a component of every specific major. Rather than take a general education course devoted to solving problems, students would benefit more from solving problems that arise within their own disciplines.
Important but part of critical thinking?
Important, but specific outcomes might be able to be subsumed under critical thinking Get rid of "domains" throughout document. Subject areas
NACE Competency - Critical Thinking/Problem Solving: Exercise sound reasoning to analyze issues, make decisions, and overcome problems. The individual is able to obtain, interpret, and use knowledge, facts, and data in this process, and may demonstrate originality and inventiveness.
Once again, it'll be interesting to see what courses get used to fulfill this one.
Problem solving and critical thinking could be combined....see comment in critical thinking.
Problem solving can and should be embedded into most of the other areas.
Problem solving is a good outcome. This could be addressed within the students' majors and minors.
Problem solving is another crosscutting concept or core practice.
Problem solving is done in every discipline in some way or another. It's essential, but isn't an area unto itself.
problem solving is important, but the learning outcomes all seem to be included with other sections above--I don't see what's distinct here.
Same as mathematical reasoning or should be combined.
This is another skill employers expect in the "real world."
This is more a method than a learning area.
This is so generic it seems meaningless. Also it is ideological in that it assumes that problems can be solved. Many of the biggest problems we currently face clearly are not being solved and will not be solved - we should move beyond this sort of simplistic thinking.
This is something best handled in major classes (where students have compiled enough knowledge to help them think critically about an issue) and therefore it doesn't need to be assessed as part of the General Ed.
This is the responsibility of the majors.
This is very similar to critical thinking, and since that is a broader category, that is the one that should be used in the General Education program.
This one could be combined with Critical Thinking. Need more science courses in the GE program.
This seems duplicative of creative thinking, diversity, and communication. I suggest deleting. Even if kept, what would *not* fall under this category or could not be considered?
This seems to be duplicative of the Creative Thinking and Critical Thinking
this to me is the same as critical and creative thinking. Note the outcomes too, seem much less measurable.

## Human World: Comments

Perhaps could be folded together with diversity and ethics
"Power and Privilege" are already part of the Diversity category. We should avoid evacuating the words of their power by making them either empty buzzwords or cudgels for silencing diverse student views.
"The Human World" holds an extremely large amount of stuff. This one might need to be broken down or shared with other categories. Humanities, Social sciences, history, political science, art, theater, music, .... so many things fall in this one simplified category that should/might need to be split up a bit so as to include those different areas.
ANTHROPOCENTRIC! What about nature, animals, the ants that will over take all the earth after the climate apocalypse? There are real disciplines now called pre-humanism and posthumanities....worth looking into. What is the historical role of the humanities? to build empathy for all phenomena....while the outcomes here are important--I think-- it need not be tied to "HUMAN" experience or humanities. Thinly veiled....
Can be combined with problem solving
Can the phrase "processes and products of making meaning" refer to the ways that human beings explore "big" questions about human nature and purpose and the like which are often (not exclusively of course) explored in the disciplines of philosophy and the study of religion? The language of this one is a bit confusing, I'm trying to see where an exploration of philosophical and religious ideas would fit, this is more than a defense of discipline, because these ideas are a significant dimension of "the Human World" and a failure to gain exposure to the ways that humans past and present have wrestled with them would really weaken the general education experience. It is unclear why outcome number three is limited to "creative work" - what is meant by that term in this case?
Combine this area with diversity.
Could be combined with Diversity
could this be a part of diversity?
Could we call this category the social world and have a separate category for what are the humanities? Math and the natural sciences are effectively getting their own category, but the humanities and social sciences are slotted together in one category that is somewhat meaningless. I get that there is a knee jerk reaction against disciplinarity in the conceptualization of "general education" - but the liberal arts ought to mean something and be identifiable - this also maintains support for the liberal arts, because students know what it is and value the components of it. It is extremely difficult to react to these potential outcomes. It seems to me we should first be identifying goals (which are different from outcomes)
Focus should be on the global community. While individuals are important, they should not be the end-all of the objectives for "The Human World." Trade wars, coups... just to name two. These must be understood in a global setting.
From the learning outcomes, I am not completely certain I understand what this is saying.
Human Experiences and Diversity seem to be related and could fold onto each other. I like the description of Human Experiences better.

I am glad that one bullet point mentions "produce creative work." I think that a really visionary LAC program would have students practice the arts as much as the practice things in science labs. I think that there are aspects or areas of the human mind which can only be accessed (or accessed more easily) through the practice of an art. This can just be something as easy as a semester of taking painting or watercolor, even dance. This would be the practice of a non-verbal art, but I would hope that the course on verbal communication would give them ways to access parts of their mind by seeing the images that words conjure up in their minds. This kind of engagement with what seems to be one half of their brain - art - would really make our curriculum visionary and in the end, the students would have terrific intellectual resources for their job and for their civic duties

I do not support the radical distinction between the Human and the Natural World.

I do not think that students should all be required to take a course about the Human World and the aspects of it described here as part of the General Education program. Instead I think that students should be required to take two courses in which they are required to read and analyze a large amount of complex written material. These courses should be at the sophomore level or higher. The clear requirement that students interact with complex pieces of writing seems to me a serious omission from the draft proposals for the General Education program. The courses in which students read and analyze substantive written works are mostly going to be in the humanities disciplines. They could be courses on literature (poetry or prose), ethics or history, for example. Students should be given freedom to choose courses in a variety of fields for this requirement. The advantage of this is that this allows students to do substantive reading on topics they are already interested in or are curious about, so they will be more motivated and engaged to grapple with complex texts, something many of them struggle with. It also avoids the problem of the General Education courses all being shallow in content and skills as the current LAC is because they are almost all at the freshman level (Capstone is the only exception). Rather than requiring students to do multiple courses in different categories such as an ethics course, a human world course, a diversity course, a civic responsibility course, etc. students should do a smaller number (2 maximum) of courses and be given freedom to choose which topics and ideas they will explore as they read and analyze complex written material. Some courses that meet the requirement for engaging with a substantial amount of complex written material could also meet the requirement for students to take courses that develop their critical thinking skills.

I like diversity better

I would love to see social studies play a big role in the General Ed requirements, but I can't see how any of the outcomes listed here would work. They are very vague, based on ideology, and would be very hard to assess. The outcomes should focus on things like analyzing cause and effect, problem solving, how belief and culture impact behavior, etc.

I would mark #s 1, 2, and 5 as high priority, and #s 2 and 3 medium priority.

I'd suggest changing the title of this learning goal to "Understanding the Human World," since this would be an actual goal, whereas "The Human World" would seem to denote a broad subject. Also, I find the current wording of the learning goal both a bit nebulous (for example, students might not know what's meant by "systems," "making meaning," etc.). Here's a suggestion for a revision of the formulation of the learning goal: By exploring a

broad range of human experiences, identities, cultures, institutions, histories, practices, conceptual frameworks, and value-systems students will come to better understand themselves and others in these contexts. I think that the inclusion of "histories, practices, conceptual frameworks, and value-systems" provides a useful broadening of what we mean when we speak of "the human world." Roughly speaking, these are categories used by the humanistic disciplines (including history, religion, philosophy, art history, music appreciation, etc.), as opposed to primarily the social sciences, as the current language seems to highlight. Learning objective (4) appears to place the production of fine art (painting, sculpture, photography, performing or composing music, etc.) in a single learning goal that also involves the understanding of human phenomena. This leads to a major incongruity or at least a category stretched so broadly as not to constitute a single recognizable goal. Surely what students get out of studying history, sociology, religion, or philosophy is very different from what they get out of producing fine art. Lumping the two together thus presents a conceptual problem. Thus I'd suggest reverting to treating the production of fine art as a separate learning goal; this is roughly what was done in the original version of the learning goals under the title "Expressing Humanity."

In my opinion, some of the specifics in this category are--along with Critical Thinking, Ethics, and Communication above--at the heart of what a good Gen Ed program should be. Having said that, this category as it stands presents difficulties. The most apparent of these is that it illustrates a problem with the very way these groups are being described: as "Gen Ed Learning Areas and Outcomes." "Understanding the Human World" might move it closer to the other categories as an "Outcome," but it nevertheless is extraordinarily broad. It also is formulated in very social-science style language; this is not in and of itself a problem, but it would be helpful to have an equal emphasis on humanities (perhaps as two "tracks" within this category). With respect to the enumerated portion, #4 and #5 are, at least to me, a poor fit with the rest of the category. As a comparison, "Studio Art" and "Art History" are traditionally viewed as separate disciplines, but this conflates them (i.e. production with analysis/study). The production of creative work would seem to belong more naturally in the "Creative Thinking" category above. #5 similarly would be a better fit with the "Engaged Learning" category below, or perhaps the "Diversity" category (unless elements of that are instead incorporated into this category).

It seems that some outcomes from diversity and creative thinking are in here.

It seems that there is some overlap between Diversity and the Human World. Could they be combined somehow?

Many important threads but what a jumble. Rethink this

Need more emphasis on cross-cultural and global perspective. Especially, human-environmental interactions.

Need to understand our places and roles

Not sure that it is realistic to think that all students will be able to "produce" creative work. Will all students be taking a creativity class?

Objective number 5 is fabulous!!!! Society is always changing and so are our students. Students need to adapt to the way of the world (Ex. Technology and business trends- The 9am-5pm schedule is not as common).

Perhaps this would better be called "Understanding the Human World." The description is in need of revision. I hope there will be opportunity for consideration of faculty feedback.

Some of these outcomes seem too intermingled with diversity. Outcomes should be more content-based. We're expecting students to know specific mathematical concepts and expecting them to know specific scientific content. What do we want them to know about human history, creativity, society, etc.? This should be broken up into two outcomes (though perhaps personal and civic responsibility could be adapted to do this). You're trying to lump humanities and social sciences together here, and that is not fair to the breadth and importance of those key elements of understanding and explanation. If these are being abandoned because of concern about assessing content, this mindset needs to change on the committee ASAP. We can assess outcomes. Other schools obviously do it. I just took five minutes to look at some of our peer institutions. Marshall requires a course each in specific subject areas. Truman State requires courses in particular subject areas and the outcomes are linked to specific content. College of Charleston still has a distributional core not unlike ours. The notion that we can't assess content is nonsense and shouldn't be driving decisions. Educated people know certain things. Understanding basic elements of human history, human creative achievements, and human behavior, are among these things. That's a HUGE area, though, and probably can't be captured in one goal area.

Students often lack context, no matter the subject area. For example, a student may have been raised an atheist, or simply without any religious influence at all, and never exposed to the Bible. However, if one doesn't understand the basic precepts of the Judeo-Christian tradition and the role it has played in nation and empire building, one is going to have a very hard time understanding Western European and North American history, art, music, politics, education, and socio-economic strata. If one does not understand those things, one will also have a hard time understanding the tensions present in being exposed to, recognizing, understanding, and working with other cultures and traditions that are very different from their own.

The 'Human World' has to include global in the description. As the learning area reads now, global is not a priority of this institution; it telegraphs to current and prospective students that "if you want a global perspective go to Drake, Grinnell, or one of the other Regents universities, not to UNI." I know global is in one of the numbered objectives, but that is the only place it appears in this whole plan.

The Future of Work: <https://www.weforum.org/about/the-fourth-industrial-revolution-by-klaus-schwab>

There is a shift here from skills to topic area here, and this seems to be a catch-all category for humanities and social sciences. Frankly one category for all of this is not giving the various possible learning areas within them their due. Ans why not keep the focus on skills What about literary thinking/reasoning/methods, historical thinking, artistic, social science thinking? Also why are we assuming that the "human" and the "natural" world are 2 separate subjects of study - as if humans are not a part of nature. The theme of the natural world category seems to be more accurately represented by scientific thinking/reasoning methods - are science classes that focus on humans going to be excluded? I have to pick "essential" even though the category is problematic so that won't be taken as a vote against more disciplinary specificity - many skills are discipline specific.

There is the need to emphasize the role and importance of both human and natural processes, and the need to think in terms of systems. This is critical because institutions, artifacts, and products are by-products of systems and the associated processes.

This feels duplicative of the Diversity and Ethics priorities

This is the only outcome that has to do with humanity. The parallel one has to do with nature. But there is no recognition that we understand the natural world as humans in and with and through culture. We do everything else as humans in and with and through culture as well. So it is surprising that there is no use of the word, "culture," anywhere in the goal or outcomes of "The Human World." Don't students have to know something about what culture is, or how it is we are cultural beings? I don't mind any of the ideas offered here -- just that they are not inclusive enough. Moreover, what are we going to do with the human world. It would seem that what we want students to be able to do is to understand it, and it is our job to figure out what is most important for them to understand. So here is my suggestion for modifying this broad goal: Understanding the Human World: Students will gain insight into a range of historical and contemporary human experiences, through the study of human dynamics, histories, cultures, conceptual frameworks, and value systems, which includes the creation of systems, institutions, and artifacts, as well as the processes and products of making meaning. Upon completion of UNI's general education curriculum, students will be able to: My major quibble with this category is that it is so broad that we could really put anything in the university in it. It all has to do with human culture. Of the 5 outcomes in this category, I'd suggest moving number 5 to teamwork, and number 4 to the performing arts. In their place, I'd suggest we modify outcome 1 in the following way: Analyze diverse historical and contemporary identities, cultures, institutions, histories, values, and conceptual frameworks. This captures a much broader understanding of what is involved in the study of human world. No one course can possibly do all of this -- to be sure, but every course that is on the human world should do some of these things. It is likely that interdisciplinary courses will be able to do more of these things than simple introductory courses in any one discipline.

This learning area is essential, but it is far too broad. It would encompass all of the social sciences, humanities, and most of the arts. Also, tone down the "institutions of power, privilege, and influence" language. It is too close to the fashionable "identity politics" of today.

This learning outcomes are not clear or not inclusive. The way they are described seem to focus more on the "individual/group/institutional" level and not much on the "global" level which is definitely a key analytical level for any topic in the human world as we are facing globalization on a daily basis. The way it reads now suggests "global" is not a priority at UNI, which I don't think it's right. Besides, while "institutions, artifacts, and products" are mentioned, they should be considered as secondary to "processes and systems" which are way more fundamental in the human world but are not emphasized much in the description.

This one is pretty much the same as the diversity one.

What do #4 and #5 mean, in practice (as opposed to as rhetoric), and how, exactly, do the authors of this propose to accomplish the now-obligatory mandate ("students WILL")? I'm

shocked to find it hinted in #1 and #2 that content knowledge might have some relevance to a college education. Whoever wrote that should be fired immediately.

Yes. This is broad, though, and could be combined with things above.

### Natural World: Comments

'The Natural World' needs to have 'processes' and 'systems' drive this learning area with specific mention of sustainability. As the learning area reads now, Gen Ed is not faithful to the university strategic plan with sustainability being a core value in the strategic plan, but weakly implicit (at best) in this general education draft. Theories, principles, and practices are important, but both scientific inquiry and the key issues of our time require understanding processes and systems.

again too discipline specific

Another duplicative characteristic

As mentioned above, this area seems an inaccurate depiction of what the learning outcomes are. The theme of the natural world category seems to be more accurately represented by scientific thinking/reasoning methods - are science classes that focus on humans going to be excluded? Or are humans in the natural world in this category, but separated from it in the previous one? I have to pick "essential" even though the category is problematic so that won't be taken as a vote against more disciplinary specificity - many skills are discipline specific.

At least two courses should be required. We cannot even begin to address global climate changes without a firm basic understanding of the science of global climate changes.

Combine human world and natural world

could this be a part of diversity?

Do they have to actually LEARN any scientific knowledge? You know, content?

Everyone needs some science

get rid of and/or. Why not just say "and?"

I do not support the radical distinction between the Human and the Natural World.

I do not think that all students should be required to take a course where they study the natural world (even though I am an academic in that area). I think that it is more important to develop students mathematical reasoning and critical thinking skills. If they have solid skills in these two areas, then they will be capable of investigating and understanding the natural world when they have need or interest in doing so. Natural sciences courses would be good options for students to develop their skills in using mathematical reasoning and critical thinking, so they could be used to meet General Education requirements in those categories under the model I have suggested for requirements in those areas.

I would point out here that scientific method is not limited to the "natural world." Social sciences are also sciences!!!

Integrate into critical thinking

Looks great, concise and well-articulated.

No one is going to become an expert taking one or two general ed classes in science. It might be better to focus on math - which is applicable across fields --and classes that require higher-level reading, thinking and writing.
Not a fan of how this is stated or even the category. Why not Scientific Literacy? What does number 1 even mean? What is the "other" world that science does not apply to? The "Human" world? Kinda goofy, inconsistent and inaccurate-right?
Rename: Natural Sciences. We live in a world where we depend on science. Call it natural sciences. Where is "sustainability"? I think this doesn't reflect the University Mission statement. There are many Geography programs across the country with "Sustainability" in their names. One above should be "scientific inquiry" - not a list of scientific concepts. "Scientific inquiry" is only partly addressed in number three. Four is important, if handled well.
So important, particularly the immediate crisis of global warming. This is the generation that has to deal with it, after the current generation ignored it. Students need to know how to proceed in our natural world.
The Future of Work: <a href="https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/10/can-we-balance-conservation-and-development-science-says-yes/">https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/10/can-we-balance-conservation-and-development-science-says-yes/</a>
There is the need to emphasize the importance of sustainability in this area, as well as the importance of systems and the associated processes.
These learning outcomes don't just apply to "the natural world"--which, btw would also include people. I think the idea here is so get at bio, chem, etc., but these outcomes are taught just as well in psychology and sociology classes. I'd broaden it.
This is very important, but I'll note that it's the only outcome that references being able to apply scientific principles. We have a lot of places on campus that apply scientific principles to explain human behavior, too, and most of those scientific problems that natural scientists want to solve can't be solved without getting human beings to do it. This requires social science. We should have an outcome somewhere that explicitly recognizes the importance of being able to apply scientific thinking to explain human behavior and societal outcomes.
This learning outcomes also share the similar issue as those for "human world" described above. That is they fail to emphasize "processes and systems" - the core areas in the "natural world". Another key point that is lacking is the topic of "sustainability". As the human and natural world' conflict is getting more and more acute on a daily scale, it's essential that UNI deliver the knowledge of sustainability to our students through Gen Ed. Besides, UNI's strategic plan has indicated sustainability being a core value. Yet based on the current description, the Gen Ed does not seem to be faithful to the school's strategic plan on this area.
This may be a good venue to teach problem solving and critical thinking.
Would natural world include both bio and physical science classes?

#### Engaged Learning: Comments

An important category, but could include elements of several of the other categories.
---

are you providing this atmosphere or that you expect them to always engage academically in all settings, because that's unrealistic. Or are you meaning that you expect students to be able to pull from their prior knowledge? If so, that falls into critical thinking which I classified as essential.
As long as engaged learning can be embedded into major requirements such as a capstone experience, research or independent study and not have to be a service learning component outside it should be part of a general education program
As long as this includes undergraduate research in the sciences, I am for it. If instead it means only community engagement, then I am not as enthusiastic.
Could and should be done within major.
definition and time need to be appropriate for the subject
Duplicative again
Either this is a kind of critical thinking, or it belongs in the majors.
Engaged learning is not a learning area, it's a teaching method. In addition, though I have no objection to faculty including service learning (which is what I think you really mean here) in gen ed courses, I think it's more suited to majors, where classes are smaller, and the intense labor of developing community engagement projects is more possible.
Engaged learning should be a part of every major course especially and hopefully GE courses as well. Engaged learning isn't a subject that (non-teaching) majors study. Faculty should study or form learning communities around it so that they can integrate it into their work. Annette Lynch and Josh Sebree are two professors who have deeply integrated engaged learning into major courses.
Experiential learning seems more a process of learning than a student outcome
get rid of and/or
How many faculty will be hired to cover these experiences?
I do not feel this belongs with Gen Ed - instead it belongs with each program's curriculum
I don't quite see how the definition fits the concept. Engagement seems to be internal to the person (I'm not sure if we could assess how engaged a person is). Fink spends a lot of his work articulating what engaged learning is and how to cultivate it. By contrast the activities described in the definition seem to be about application of learning (which can be assessed) rather than an internal state. I do strive to build engagement, but I'm not certain engagement is a prerequisite (or corequisite) of good learning.
I doubt UNI and the community can support having every student be an intern. While important, save internships for majors. You can't possibly find hours for this in a reduced-size GE program! Doesn't belong in a GE program.
I have no idea how this will be taught, much less assessed and measured. It sounds more like higher-ed administrator rhetoric than anything else.
I have no idea what you mean by "Engaged Learning" and your list of skills does not help.
I like the idea of engaged experiences, but the outcomes are kind of weird.
I like the idea, but compared to other things it's low priority. If this is a university-wide goal, it might be better pursued within major programs.
I see this as a pedagogical technique or course designation not a learning area

I strongly support, but there is insufficient resources available to support at a university wide level.
I think engaged learning is a high priority overall, but a low priority for the core curriculum. This is something that is being addressed in various ways within the students' majors and minors.
I think this could fit into each major though -- and each major has to offer an engaged learning upper level class. This could be a substitute for Capstone Courses.
I think this is critical, but am wondering if it makes more sense to embed as outcomes in certain classes.
I think this is important, but not necessarily in gen ed
I think this should be a lens all of the strands are taught through.
I understand that this is a tactic to ensure that every student has an engaged experience as part of gen ed, but it is a pedagogy, not a skill or body of content so seems out of place.
I'm selecting "Not a Priority" *not* because this isn't a very important kind of learning, but rather because engaged learning should be a component of every specific major. This could, for example, be accomplished in a senior seminar in which majors engage in a project that combines in-class study with outside-the-classroom engagement, say, with a community organization.
Internships are wonderful...and often for reasons unexpected. However, can we really require all of our students to have an internship opportunity?
Is this a separate component or a thread that should be woven throughout the other areas?
It seems to me that this is what happens when students work or volunteer. Should we give academic credit for that?
NACE Competency - Career Management: Identify and articulate one's skills, strengths, knowledge, and experiences relevant to the position desired and career goals, and identify areas necessary for professional growth. The individual is able to navigate and explore job options, understands and can take the steps necessary to pursue opportunities, and understands how to self-advocate for opportunities in the workplace.
perhaps if something from LAC would be placed in the last year of college, it would be this outer directed activity, since we are preparing students not just to be successful cogs in capitalism's economic system but to also be responsible and inspiring civic leaders. but with the reduction of the number of credit hours, and the diversity of human creativity (art and science) which is requires lots of inner directed work by students, I'd have to give this low priority
Should flow logically from other learning areas and outcomes
This can set UNI apart & is well-connected to the university strategic plan.
This does not belong in the General Education program, it is not a foundational skill but is better done as part of majors. Students can have more meaningful engagement once they are have acquired a core body of knowledge and skills that then can apply. Another reason not to include it in the General Education Program is that it will be difficult to assess this as a learning outcome for the whole Gen Ed program. Engaged learning opportunities are more a context in which students learn things such as communication skills or critical thinking skills,

rather than a learning outcome of themselves. They are valuable, but should not be a separate learning outcome that is assessed.
This is a method, not a learning area. We do this a lot right now. It's high priority, but not essential in every area of study.
This is extremely important, but we are doing this extensively in field experiences in our major.
This is not a learning outcome; it is a means of learning.
This is resource-intensive, as faculty who have research responsibilities cannot spend large portions of our time managing and coordinating out-of-classroom experiences. So if we have the resources to devote to it, then I could support. If not, there are other aspects of our mission that are more essential.
This seems like something every class should do, not unique to gen ed
This seems like something students will experience in their discipline; though I believe in the value of service learning at all levels, GenEd courses already have to do so much, this seems less crucial, since they'll definitely have these sorts of experiences later. That said, if we go with the first mission statement, this probably deserves to be high priority, since "remarkable experiences" is practically synonymous with "engaged learning."
This should be a University learning outcome; most of these are going to be done at the program level, not in the first two years. Indeed, students need to have a certain maturity and level of base knowledge before they can meaningfully engage with their community.
This should be done through the major.
Why assume that engaged learning always takes place out of the classroom? i.e. engaged learning also includes research projects that take place within the framework of classes.

#### Teamwork and Leadership: Comments

A method, not a learning area, for the most part (although Communication Studies teaches how to work in groups in some classes). You don't teach leadership, you become a leader.
Again - if we are doing the actual work in other categories, this seems a bit redundant.
Again, let's integrate these concepts into the teaching of other classes - not a special class on just this.
Again, this is very important but we are doing this in our major.
Although we use group work in our courses, I am not convinced that this is something we can effectively teach and assess.
Another skill needed post-graduation.
Could be embedded into other classes.
could best be taught in courses in students' majors
cut this goal. this is not very complex, and can be learned outside of coursework - focus on higher level goals for gen ed.
Do not use the word Teamwork. Replace with collaboration.
Flows logically from other outcomes
Get rid of this. too touchy feely.

I am suspicious of "leadership," since in practice it's so often code for ceding power to white men. And teamwork too often means picking up the slack for others because it's easier than fighting, given the aforementioned power imbalance. Other categories (ethics) frame these skills more effectively, IMO.
I don't discount the importance of the Teamwork and Leadership area, but I think other areas must come first.
I don't think this should be part of the GE program. It should be a part of some majors, instead. I worry that we are diluting our GE program with such objectives.
I like communication and diversity together better than specifically teamwork and leadership
I think that students probably learn a little about teamwork in their current LAC courses. I think this might be better done in the major, when students are a little older, and need to develop skills for their lives after college in the context of their major.
I think these outcomes will happen organically, even if not specifically articulated as outcomes.
I think this is critical, but am wondering if it makes more sense to embed as outcomes in certain classes.
I'm selecting "Not a Priority" *not* because this isn't a very important set of skills for students to acquire in college, but rather because I think it should be included in classes and outside-the-classroom experiences within their specific majors.
it depends on students individual traits to expect them to excel in this area. Not fair to some and extremely intuitive to others.
Leadership and teams are things students should be learning in classes, but these outcomes I don't see as important and/or I see as related to other topics. #2--you already have a section on ethics. #1--I'm not sure what you're getting at with this one, but it sounds kind of "soft sciencey". The other outcomes just don't seem important enough to have as overall outcomes--instructors should be encouraged to include group work within classes (and I think they already do that a lot).
NACE Competency - Leadership: Leverage the strengths of others to achieve common goals, and use interpersonal skills to coach and develop others. The individual is able to assess and manage his/her emotions and those of others; use empathetic skills to guide and motivate; and organize, prioritize, and delegate work.
Not everyone is a team player Not everyone is a leader
redundant - leadership is a major topic, not a GE topic. Different fields have different norms, paths, etc. Certain majors should study leadership more broadly, but not everyone needs to except where leadership is a part of ethics (above), diversity (above), problem solving (above).
see next note
Social interaction skills would be a preferred naming because as soon noted in the depiction following is as important as leading in group functioning.
Some people are leaders, some aren't, and most are leaders in some situations and not in others. You can't reach this stuff and you certainly can't mandate that all UNI students master and demonstrate it. How in the world do you plan to teach this, then assess and

measure it? What do you propose to do with students who don't turn out to fit your model or meet your standards?
Sounds like on the job 101 training. Save this for Business College students, and don't put it in the GE program. Does not belong in the GE program! We are an academic institution, not a business school (apologies to Business faculty).
Teamwork and leadership are good outcomes. Given the needs for other areas of focus within the core, this might best be addressed through experiences in students' majors and minor or co-curricular experiences.
Teamwork and leadership are not readily assessed in a consistent manner in a General Education program. Another difficulty for assessing this outcome is that there are important aspects of teamwork, such as what individuals do outside the group meetings that contributes to the group's tasks, that are practically impossible to assess.
The basic ideas are important, of course, but I am of the opinion that it need not be a separate category since its specifics could be included in the other categories (especially "Communication").
The members of the group have to know something before teamwork is productive. It should be done late in the student's careers.
This has to be about directly teaching, scaffolding, and giving feedback on the teamwork process, not just requiring lots of groupwork and expecting students to become a team.
This is not high priority as written.
This seems as though it could be incorporated in many experiences and should not be a separate Gen. Ed. category.
This sounds more like involvement in student government. Honestly, I don't know how we could fulfill this for every single student. Do all of them want or need?
Where does collaboration fit? I would see this is Collaboration and Leadership

#### Personal and Civic Responsibility: Comments

A course like capstone (especially the original Environment, Technology, and Society - I don't know enough about the other courses to know if they all fulfill the original intent) connect a student's growing expertise in their field with her broad ideas about personal, family, and community life in order to develop personal and civic responsibility. This is another key aspect of how comprehensive education should be different from career prep or specialized fields.
Again like diversity better
Again, essential concepts, but "Ethics" could effectively cover this.
Again, not to diminish the importance of this area, but it builds on other areas.
Again, there should be a statement about global responsibility, responsibility to the environment. This should not be added to the GE program if it reduces the Natural science component.
Combine with engaged learning?
Duplicative

I am not clear why the outcome of commitment to 'well-being' is separate from the earlier outcome of ethics. I like this better, really.
I am uncomfortable with the various outcomes that are designed to adjust students' thinking toward a set of values: Ethics, Personal and Civic Responsibility, Diversity, and to a certain extent, Teamwork and Leadership. Traditionally, a liberal arts education has been considered to accomplish many of these outcomes, without explicitly teaching them. However, the more career-focused the university has become, the less of a true liberal arts education students are getting. We are guilty of pandering to this career focus--we talk about gen ed or the LAC in terms of what employers value, as if we need to justify educating students broadly.
I appreciate that the expansion of this category emphasizes civic engagement and how personal "responsibility" is a function of socio-cultural influences. Perhaps reverse the order (civic and personal responsibility) or do away with personal responsibility altogether.
I see engaged learning courses falling into this category
I'm not crazy about the way this is currently described or defined, but I'm saying it's essential because it's the only goal area that I think emphasizes the very important skills of applying scientific understanding to human behavior. Let's get rid of the "demonstrate a commitment to..." language, and let's focus on skills and knowledge: will understand their role as citizens. Will be able to use scientific principles to explain human behavior, to explain how people cooperate and come into conflict with one another, to explain societal pressures on the individual. #3 and 4 here aren't too bad with a little work.
I'm selecting "Not a Priority" *not* because this isn't a very important set of skills for students to acquire in college, but rather because I think it should be included in classes and outside-the-classroom experiences within their specific majors. Students will presumably be more interested in being personally and civically responsible if they envision themselves as ethically accountable practitioners of their field. To be clear, however, I'm not suggesting that this learning goal, were it to be adopted, should focus on *professional* responsibility; but rather that thinking of oneself as practicing a profession could serve as a more concrete starting-point for this kind of thought and action.
Is there a level above essential? This describes the core function of a public university.
Is there a way to combine this with diversity?
It is not clear to me that we should be telling our students how to live their lives. The holier-than-thou professoriate is as messed up as the rest of society.
It's good to be cautious of the world around you but that goes beyond the immediate circle of where they live and could even apply on micro scales of how they impact their department or classroom... essentially critical thinking and applying knowledge.
Learning goal embedded into other areas, "the human world", "the natural world"
NACE Competency - Professionalism/Work Ethic: Demonstrate personal accountability and effective work habits, e.g., punctuality, working productively with others, and time workload management, and understand the impact of non-verbal communication on professional work image. The individual demonstrates integrity and ethical behavior, acts responsibly with the interests of the larger community in mind, and is able to learn from his/her mistakes.

See my previous comments: How in the world do you plan to teach this, then assess and measure it? What do you propose to do with students who don't turn out to fit your model or meet your standards?

these last two outcomes are very important but I wonder if an LAC program can leave these for a capstone or two (or one) course to be taken by all majors when they are about to graduate. ....It occurs to me that these areas seem to fit with ethics, but these two are more about our social situation beyond getting a job and so I think it is very important to focus on in the latter times of one's time in college.

This is an outcome, not a learning area. It should be a goal, though.

This is important but it's so similar to ethical reasoning. Why is it its own goal?

This seems as though it could be incorporated in many experiences and should not be a separate Gen. Ed. category.

While civic responsibility is important, the scale is too fine. Personal behaviors? Not all that important to the world we live in today. This is a revised GE program proposal. What about global responsibility? So much is going on in the world that demands our students understand it, and it isn't civic responsibility in a community that will ultimately affect their futures. Does not belong, as stated, in a GE program at UNI.

While we can all agree that having alumni who are responsible citizens is a good thing, teaching civic responsibility directly will distract from our core mission and could be used to promote ideology. For years, K-12 students have been encouraged to work on community projects and propose solutions to world problems (but they rarely have the knowledge to come up with good solutions). What university students need is training in how to think and analyze so that when they get out into the world, they don't propose solutions that are sloppy and ineffective. Smart thinkers is our best gift to the world.

Why are personal, civic and environmental lumped together? Civic education/responsibility is the higher level issue here (it encompasses personal responsibility, which encompasses environmental). So, civic education is essential, but as constructed here, I'm responding to a category of things I don't think go together. I hope when the results of this survey are tabulated that comments are paired with rankings (of individuals)

#### Learning Outcome Groupings: Comments

(couldn't remove an item once it had been placed in the greater "grouping" boxes, hence the grouping of one item)

1. Info literacy should be an outcome in Communication 2. Math and Problem solving should be combine 3. Critical Thinking could have 2 sections 1) Critical Thinking and the Human World and 2) Critical Thinking and the Natural World Group 4 does not include stand along learning outcome, instead they should be embedded throughout and the structure should make sure that students can do these alongside other learning outcomes in other areas

As stated above, learning objective (4) in the learning goal "The Human World" appears to place the production of fine art (painting, sculpture, photography, performing or composing music, etc.) in a single learning goal that also involves the understanding of human phenomena. This leads to a major incongruity or at least a category stretched so broadly as

not to constitute a single recognizable goal. Surely what students get out of studying history, sociology, religion, or philosophy is very different from what they get out of producing fine art. Lumping the two together thus presents a conceptual problem. Thus I'd suggest reverting to treating the production of fine art as a separate learning goal; this is roughly what was done in the original version of the learning goals under the title "Expressing Humanity."

Communication is a tough one to group because it is foundational to all of these areas. Coming up with the most creative solution of an essential problem won't be terribly useful if you can't communicate that solution effectively to others. Teamwork and leadership is founded on good communication. Communication needs to be woven throughout our university system at all levels and in all departments in addition to dedicated coursework that teaches the essentials.

Communications, ethics, teamwork, and engaged learning can and should be a part of nearly all courses. That is to say they are extremely important (NOT to say that we can say we teach this in every course but it's not really happening). Faculty need training in best practices to effectively integrate these skills and UNI needs to seek out and hire new faculty with these skills..

Disciplinary areas have meaning and should be given more attention.

Engaged learning should be a thread throughout all the other areas. Group 1 includes universal constructs that are the foundation for all other disciplines

Even though "communication" is primarily understood as verbal, words conjure up images in the adult mind and those images can be linked to what is described as creative thinking. What the student perceives when considering the images as a whole is an 'alternative viewpoint' that I don't think the emphasis on diversity in our days is aware off, but I think is the capstone to ethical communications and so community of charitable regard. Also, when it comes to communication, we need to be ethical with what Mark Van Doren calls the four verbal arts: not just speaking but reading, writing and listening. As for group 2, those are more content oriented and there the dynamics of critical thinking - as different from creative thinking - will now take center stage, but by then the students' intellects will have this richness of engagement due to 'creative thinking, due to seeing the role of images in human thinking and in their thinking. The 3rd group is more outer directed than inner directed, and I'd perhaps save those concerns for one's major or as a capstone. The first duty of liberal education is to lead students into the attainment of adult understanding of adult ideas that they were taught in childhood, and it seems to me that many of these learning areas are introduced to students in elementary school. I think LAC should really have the students first inner directed (which really is what has to occur when they see the word-image activity going on automatically in their minds) and then as they relate to the core silos of knowledge of an educated citizen of a polis and nation. Then of course, the values of leadership and civic responsibility when it comes to what students do once they leave the Academy, their new alma mater.

For the first grouping, I think there is some theme about being able to thoughtfully engage with/care about and work well with others that is repeated throughout. I would be open to this being two separate goals. The second grouping seems like ways of thinking, but generally critical thinking, and maybe more discipline-specific types of thinking. Paul and

Elder's critical thinking model consciously incorporates discipline-specific ways of identifying problems and working through them. This approach could be helpful.

Group 1 above are crosscutting concepts that should be involved in all courses - major and GE. Group 2 are GE topics that should be covered in depth for the non-major building up to the capstone course which reconciles GE and major skills, knowledge and experience - As a developing professional (leader/expert) in my chosen field who, through GE experiences, has studies issues of structure, culture, power, justice, etc. - how do I find my place in this world and serve best myself, my family, my communities, and the world? Group 3 are topics that should primarily be developed through the lens of one's major.

Group 1: Thinking, learning, and communicating in the information age Group 2: Solving today's problems Group 3: Preparing for engaged citizenship Group 4: Practicing engaged citizenship

Group one, all the categories are dependent on each other to do a good job in the others. Group 2, is essentially the geography department, there is a lot of overlap and you cant look at human or environmental dynamics without recognizing the relationship between them. That's not to say that one is more important than the other or that they can't be looked at in specializations (like ecology, biology, geology or education, anthropology, history) but there is a science of why and where and how there is a network of interconnected, interdisciplinary relationships and holistic practices that can't be ignored. This also encompasses the physical science of geography incorporating a lot of "hard science" math that is essential. Group 3 is about collaboration and understanding opposing viewpoints. I would also argue that these could be subsections of group one as they involve communication, critical thinking, problem solving, etc. Group 4 is about how to be respectful and ethical, opening ones mind to the impacts and how to do it in a way that is respectful, impactful, and accurate.

Grouping 4 contains the items I think are best dispensed with because of difficulties that I foresee with measuring and assessing student performance. Groupings 2 and 3 involve, to one degree or another, content learning as well as skills and therefore are measurable and assessable. Group 1 is pretty much all skills, but at least the skills involved are potentially measurable and assessable.

Having used writing in most of my courses that have intellectual subject matter, I am well aware of the need to combine writing and critical thinking. They go hand in hand. Writing is learned and developed best as exercises in critical thinking, the ability to identify a position and to argue for it in a persuasive way. I would imagine the same would be true of oral comm and critical thinking. Ethical reasoning, of course, should have to do with personal, civic and professional responsibility -- it should be applied to actual and genuine conflicts that arise in our lives. The study of ethics is useless apart from the ability to use the concepts and principles to guide reflection in the face of moral confusion and conflict. So they seem to go together fairly well. And engaged learning and teamwork/leadership seem to go hand in hand -- that have to do with active doing, the putting into practice the stuff we study at the university. And of course, one need to be able to work together with and for a diverse population, and so diversity can and ought to be studied at the same time.

I am comfortable with whatever grouping works out best, whichever combination will help our student learn to live within the limits imposed by the physical world of actuality imposed by the planet; a combination that helps them rehab our failing democracy.

I am not sure what the implications of grouping these things are, so I didn't do it. If you mean the categories could be merged, I would group critical thinking, creative thinking and information literacy. But also I would suggest deleting these categories entirely and replacing them with methodology/reasoning categories from different areas - not one for every single discipline, but ones for ways of thinking - i.e. literary analysis, scientific thinking, historical thinking, etc

I do not think "Engaged Learning" should be within the Gen Ed. I feel this should reside within each program's curriculum.

I doubt that this is the kind of grouping you might have imagined. Here is what is challenging about this task. You have combined content--math, science, especially--with other kinds of outcomes that are less content-oriented and possible to teach from many different disciplinary perspectives, like personal and civic responsibility, problem solving, teamwork and leadership. Why couldn't someone develop a gen ed math course that focused primarily on problem solving or developing teamwork and leadership skills? It's confusing to mix these different kinds of areas up all as content areas, when some are skill-based, and some are not. My grouping #1 puts together the six areas that could be aligned most closely with what I imagine to be content. One might argue with including communication and/or diversity in this category, but I don't think diversity is a skill, per se, and I want our students to think about writing and speaking as crucial areas of content in their learning. If you want gen ed to be skill-based, choose the skills you think students need to have and then have people develop courses in any of those skills from any disciplinary perspective. Faculty from any number of disciplines could teach courses that would satisfy personal/civic responsibility requirements: political science, religion, science, ethics, etc. Grouping 2 contains all of the skills in these areas. One could probably develop content courses in some of these areas, but it seems to me that many of these skills could be taught in any number of courses; after all, many disciplines have specific frameworks for problem-solving or thinking about personal/civic responsibility. I know, for instance, that there are courses taught elsewhere on "Critical Thinking." We could do that here, too, I suppose. But, it seems to me that having a course that very specifically identifies critical thinking learning outcomes--and specifically teaches critical thinking skills--in the context of content would be a possible way of incorporating critical thinking into a number of different courses. If you want gen ed to be content based, you have a lot to work on. For example, why privilege math and science (the natural world)--the only disciplines actually mentioned by name? You've collapsed together all the courses currently offered in SBS and the Humanities/Arts into one big category: The Human World. Are you trying to get rid of every department on campus except for the old CNS departments? Because that's what this looks like. Maybe the Comm Studies department and the writing faculty in Lang and Lit will still be left to teach communication courses, but the rest of the departments will die a slow--or maybe not so slow--death, unless you divide The Human World out a little bit more. I know that you were trying to avoid keeping the disciplinary categories we currently have in the LAC so as to avoid territorial infighting, but this isn't sufficient. It seems to me that the benefit of getting rid of disciplinary

areas should be applicable to all disciplines (which isn't happening here), which means, then, that you'll have to go with a more skills-based curriculum, where many different disciplines could teach a particular skill.

I like the idea of learning groups, but General Education should expose students to areas they may not choose on their own (because it is a weak area for them, or too much work), so it is good to push people to diversify. Also, people may have very diverse interests and want to go beyond a cluster. A diverse Gen ed curriculum is a way for people to find a major when they didn't even know that area was of interest to them. We have so many people change majors... often due to Gen Ed classes.

I really think diversity and personal/civic responsibility need to be reworked, or eliminated. There is so much crossover between problem solving, critical thinking, creative thinking and information literacy that this could be a really powerful and interesting group. Communication, math and science seem to stand alone. Teamwork and leadership as well as engaged learning, ethics and information literacy could go anywhere

I think all of the learning areas are critical to student success in the Gen Ed program and I hope none of these learning areas get cut completely. The ones I think are critical for students to learn and take into the real world are critical thinking, problem solving and information literacy.

I think Diversity should not be it's own separate category...separate is not equal. Rather, I think it should be inserted into every area at every opportunity.

I think groupings, generally, are probably not the best route, as the point is INTEGRATION across courses and content areas....so more TRANS....how does ethics apply in creative problem-solving? How is creativity and innovation important in writing effectively about diverse populations in which a student might be engaged directly? How does logical reasoning need to be employed to determine the relevance and truth of an information source?

I think if they are taught problem solving in the context of critical thinking and ethical decision making, this is more likely to provide the context they need to better understand what they need to learn from disciplinary majors. Information literacy is an important part of the critical thinking process. This is the most important group for me, and I found myself wanting to add "personal and civic responsibility" here as well.

I think that you can potentially have creative thinking and critical thinking emersed within all of the learning outcomes

I would be careful of connections of the General Education Program to political agendas. There is already a perception, and rightfully noted, that universities are focused on a liberal agenda. If UNI engages and builds its General Education Program in the light of the current political environment, we will set ourselves up for problems in the future. If courses involved with "Personal and Civic Responsibility" are created, they have to offer and accept a wide belief of ideas and thought. If these courses only focus on a liberal perspective and students, if they are more conservative, feel their thoughts and beliefs are not valued, we will lose students, enrollment will continue to go down, and funding from the state will be impacted. This is a very important decision being developed by this committee. I would hate to have individual political beliefs drive what is best in terms of a General Education for our students.

I would put Communication into any and all groupings, because it is so central to our everyday existence.
I'm not totally happy with the groupings I've come up with. I do think Teamwork and Leadership pairs nicely with Personal and Civic Responsibility. Ethics could go with any of the other learning areas.
I've also proposed the transfer of specific elements from within some areas to others with which they are not necessarily combined in the larger groupings above; I have attempted to explain my rationale for these in the specific boxes above.
Info lit should not be combined in a grouping. It is applicable to across the board to all disciplines.
Of the remaining items NOT grouped, I see The Natural World, The Human World, and Diversity as ESSENTIAL learning goals but I see Communication as NOT essential.
The categories in grouping four should be ELIMINATED from a revised GE program. The Natural World should be Natural Sciences. See individual comments.
There are CORE content areas that every student needs. The old fashioned "3-r's" are still a part of everyone's every day living. These concepts as listed, can easily be integrated into the teaching of other content, by infusing them throughout the curriculum. Perhaps the real issue is NOT what classes we are offering, but rather HOW we are teaching our content (all content) classes. Gen. Eds (or LAC) courses need to be taught by educational experts -- as most of the teaching is to students who do NOT have any interest in that topic!
There are some items that need to be a part of all groupings, such as problem solving and critical thinking. There is no place where these two will not be in play. Communication, as well, must be ubiquitous in all areas of the curriculum.
These comments are more about my ideas for how the general education should be structured overall. Firstly, I think there should be a very limited number of learning outcomes, three or four, and that General Education should be designed so that these outcomes are developed beyond the freshman level. The learning outcomes in my proposed General Education model are: 1) Communication skills (written and oral) 2) Mathematical reasoning skills 3) Critical thinking skills The proposed structure for the course students would take is 1) Communication skills i) One foundational course in writing skills ii) One foundational course in oral communication skills iii) Two courses in which students do a substantial amount of writing and receive feedback that helps them develop their writing skills. 2) Mathematical reasoning skills i) One mathematics course ii) One course in which students use mathematical reasoning extensively 3) Critical thinking skills i) Two courses in which students do extensive analysis of information and/or data and use it to make well supported arguments for the conclusions they draw from the information/data. ii) Two courses in which students read and analyze a substantial amount of complex written material. This makes a total of 10 courses for the General Education program, which would be 30 credits. (Since some courses could meet more than one requirement, for some students the total number of credits would be fewer.)
These four seem to group the overall into areas that look broadly at area 1) how do we process information and make ideas matter? What does working with information get us and how do we work with information in complex ways? Area 2) the complex quantitative

procedures for understanding our world. Area 3) a systems approach to the human-environment globe as seen through different scales (from global to local, with place-based learning as a crucible for personal and civic care). Area 4) the consideration of those to whom we might care beyond ourselves. (Sorry to mix questions and statements here). One note, though, where in all this are feelings and affect? This seems so mental and centered on modernist reason. Even "creative reason" eschews passion and intensity. Ideally, the outcomes reflect the human spectrum, not just one side.

These groupings are an attempt to put related things together but are NOT listed by priority I assign to them.

This is the hardest, most fun game. I played around with many combos. In the end, I like the idea of grouping "content" areas (the human world, the natural world, mathematical reasoning, creative endeavor) with the epistemologies with which they are most closely associated: the social sciences with communicating the topos of self and world; the natural world with critical inquiry broadly conceived; creativity with encountering the other (people, ideologies) from a place of openness; and mathematics with problem-solving as an individual and/or collective. In all cases (except perhaps creative thinking), the "content" area seems less critical than the associated ways of thinking, hence the ordering.

Trying to untether General Education from a foundation in broad content areas in favor of one based on skills gained seems to be following a dangerous fad, particularly in an institution with a commitment to teacher training. As it stands, virtually all of the content courses required of elementary ed. majors are taken through the LAC and those courses also fulfill state certification requirements. Signs are that the Western/Nonwestern Humanities will be where the 9 hour reduction in the LAC/Gen Ed hours will come from, meaning we'll send out nearly all of our teaching graduates with a significantly reduced understanding of the world they live in.

We do not need three humanities requirements. I believe one would be plenty.

What seems to be missing is "Reading." Reading is a very complex skill, and since students are used to reading short snippets of information online, it is a skill they will probably need more and more instruction in as time goes on. We don't need specific classes in reading, but we should have an outcome of "complex reading" and some classes which require students to read and analyze a high volume of complex reading material. Some of this reading could be literature. Reading that is linked to research could also involve the skills listed under "Information Literacy."

Why not a goal called "Civic Competency"? The HLC wants to see this. It could include diversity, teamwork, engaged learning, social responsibility, and some knowledge of how institutions and structures work. Separate from The Human World (which should also include diversity).