**GOAL:** Build knowledge and awareness of diverse peoples and cultures and of the natural and physical world through the study of mathematics, sciences and technologies, histories, humanities, arts, and social sciences. *Recommendation from the floor to add “languages” — PASSED in CONCEPT.*

**Format options discussed:**

- **Split goal into 2 sentences:**
  - Build knowledge and awareness of diverse peoples and cultures and of the natural and physical world. *This can be gained* through the study of mathematics, sciences and technologies, histories, humanities, arts, and social sciences, and languages.

- **Maintain 1 sentence added the words “which can be gained”:**
  - Build knowledge and awareness of diverse peoples and cultures and of the natural and physical world *which can be gained* through the study of mathematics, sciences and technologies, histories, humanities, arts, and social sciences, and languages.

- **Maintain 1 sentence with just “and languages” added:**
  - Build knowledge and awareness of diverse peoples and cultures and of the natural and physical world through the study of mathematics, sciences and technologies, histories, humanities, arts, and social sciences, and languages.

- Do all courses that meet the social science and humanities outcomes have to use historical perspective to be approved for that outcome?
  - Maintain 1 sentence with just “and languages” added.
  - I prefer this formulation, but think we should consider alphabetizing the list as it currently follows no discernible order.

  - Build knowledge and awareness of diverse peoples and cultures and of the natural and physical world through the study of arts, histories, humanities, languages, mathematics, sciences and technologies.

- (3) Agreements
- Humanities, arts, social sciences and languages in one sentence
- (6) agreements
- Alphabetize arts, languages, humanities...
  - (1) agreement
  - Sounds good, I like “awareness of diverse peoples”
- I think we need to add languages to every goal and outcomes regardless of topic
- Last option, just add languages
  - (1) agreement
  - Appreciate knowledge and develop awareness
- #3
- #3 — must include language
  - (1) agreement
- One sentence – the last one
  - (9) agreements
**Outcome within the Knowledge Goal:** Describe models for understanding the structure and functionality of natural entities, systems, and processes; use scientific, mathematical, or computational methods to challenge models; and draw inferences from data.

- **Challenge is the wrong word** – Liberty University and Oral Roberts University would challenge a scientific model. We 1) construct models based on understanding, 2) scrutinize/evaluate those models, 3) modify these models or discard them as appropriate after examining the scientific evidence.
  - **Comment of:** Not limited to math and science, cool and this is better
  - **What does “challenge models” mean? How can it be assessed?**
  - **Models can be challenged using more than scientific, mathematical, & computational methods. There are other additional forms of critical thinking/analysis that do this well. Limiting this outcome to math/science creates artificial silos of the type we are trying to avoid**
  - **Comments:** I feel like this is a bit wordy. Can it be simplified?
    - (2) agreements

- **Describe models that represent the structure & functionality of natural entities, systems and processes**
  - Use empirical evidence along with scientific, mathematical & computational methods to create and evaluate models.
  - **Comments:** Nice and (1) agreement and nice that it is simplified
    - Will this outcome be accomplished in the Liberal Ed. Core? It seems more like a STEM major. Will 1-2 courses do all this?

**[Recommendation from the floor – to revise or split current outcome to emphasize the different ways data are used and models challenged in mathematics and in the sciences.]**

**Formats presented by others:**

- **Maintain 1 sentence with MODIFIED language:**
  Critically evaluate models of systems and processes using mathematical or computational methods; and critically evaluate scientific models through collection, analysis, and interpretation of data in order to understand the structure and functionality of natural entities, systems, and processes.

- **OR Split into 2 OUTCOMES with MODIFIED language:**
  **Outcome:** Critically challenge models of systems and processes using mathematical or computational methods.
  **Outcome:** Critically challenge scientific models through collection, analysis, and interpretation of data in order to understand the structure and functionality of natural entities, systems, and processes.

- **I endorse the proposed changes in language to Outcome 4 spearheaded by Drs. Phil Ihinger and Alex Smith. I think having the outcome split into two different outcomes would make sense because the outcome 4 currently addresses two different things. However, I could live with a single outcome.**

- **Critically evaluate scientific models through collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and through mathematical or computational methods to understand the structure and functionality of natural entities, systems, and processes**
  - **Comment:** Perfect

- **We critically evaluate scientific or mathematical models. We do not challenge them (even Einstein did not do that). Have we forgotten to differentiate between models and hypothesis?**
  - (3) agreements

- **Second part of outcomes sounds a little redundant of outcome for Goal 1 (Skills goal)**

- **Please split into 2 outcomes. Highly preferred by STEM Chairs. However, the 2nd outcome here is very similar to the 2nd outcome under the Skills goal**
  - **Comment:** Unless revised to show that new knowledge is created by the activity
Didn’t like the word “entity” – inclusive, yet also weirdly vague. (1) agreement to this section of the comment. Maintain 1 sentence using modified version

Describe models for understanding the structure and functionality of natural entities, systems, and processes; use scientific, mathematical, or computational methods to challenge hypotheses; and draw inferences from data.

(2) agreements
Add “empirical evidence and omit” to draw inferences from data

I would strongly prefer to use the 2 outcomes version

Does the second part address the Skill vs. Knowledge?
The two “new STEM” outcomes represent two very different ways of solving problems: they should both be experienced by our undergraduates.

Challenging models/drawing inferences should not be limited to scientific and computational methods – there are other ways to gain understanding/evaluate data that are excluded by this language

---

**Outcome within the Knowledge Goal:** Use knowledge, personal awareness, historical perspectives, analysis, interpretation, critical evaluation, and the standards of evidence appropriate to the humanities to address problems and explore questions.

I do not endorse the addition of “personal awareness” to the outcomes 5, 6, and 7. While I agree with senators last week who said that personal awareness can be assessed through different writing instruments, I think assessing personal awareness is inappropriate. This gets into the mind and conscience of a student, and I do not want to go there. What will we do if we decide a student is not sufficiently “personally aware”? If we are teaching our classes properly, students should become more personally aware. However, I do not think the university should assess “personal awareness.” I think this information could be used improperly. (**Also listed below)**

Use knowledge, personal awareness, historical perspectives, analysis, interpretation, and the standards of evidence appropriate to the arts, humanities or practice discipline to address problems and explore questions.

Why limit this to what is “appropriate to the humanities?” Why create unnecessary silos?

How will personal awareness be measured?

Overall, good question for all

What if we leave “awareness” in the goal, but not in the outcomes?

Agree to outcome as currently written

Agree as is

Personal knowledge is knowledge too. There are many parts of “knowledge”

Questioning of......? or is this referring to the broad sense of answering questions?

What problems? How do we apply appropriate critical thinking skills to society?

Right, humanities is not limited to addressing problems
Outcome within the Knowledge Goal: Use knowledge, personal awareness, theories, methods, and historical perspectives appropriate to the social sciences to explain and evaluate human behavior and social institutions.

- I do not endorse the addition of “personal awareness” to the outcomes 5, 6, and 7. While I agree with senators last week who said that personal awareness can be assessed through different writing instruments, I think assessing personal awareness is inappropriate. This gets into the mind and conscience of a student, and I do not want to go there. What will we do if we decide a student is not sufficiently “personally aware”? If we are teaching our classes properly, students should become more personally aware. However, I do not think the university should assess “personal awareness.” I think this information could be used improperly. (**Also listed above and below**)
- Use knowledge, personal awareness, theories, methods, and historical perspectives to help explain and understand human behavior and social institutions.
- Take out “appropriate to social sciences.” Leaving this in creates artificial silos/turf issues
- How will personal awareness be measured
  - (1) agreement
  - (1) good question
  - (1) not assessable
    - Could be pre/post assessment
  - (1) agreement
- I think it is assessable, moreover, there is interest in documenting change over time
- Agree with current outcome as is
- Personal awareness is totally not assessable
- Excellent for teaching and research
- Sounds good
- Social sciences are not the only discipline that evaluates behavior/institutions/people. In fact they are not the primary evaluators of these things—ethics as discipline is in humanities
Outcome within the Knowledge Goal: Use knowledge, personal awareness, historical perspectives, theories, or methods appropriate to the arts to describe their context, function and impact.

- I do not endorse the addition of “personal awareness” to the outcomes 5, 6, and 7. While I agree with senators last week who said that personal awareness can be assessed through different writing instruments, I think assessing personal awareness is inappropriate. This gets into the mind and conscience of a student, and I do not want to go there. What will we do if we decide a student is not sufficiently “personally aware”? If we are teaching our classes properly, students should become more personally aware. However, I do not think the university should assess “personal awareness.” I think this information could be used improperly. (**Also listed above**)

- Use knowledge, personal awareness, historical perspectives, theories, or methods appropriate and humanities or practice disciplines to the arts to describe their context, function and impact.

- Limiting methods to those “appropriate to arts” is unnecessary and arbitrary distinction
  - (1) agreement

- Measuring does not fit with all culture. I know “essential” in the western world but......

- Agree with current outcomes as it

- Agree that it is assessable and critically important
  - (1) agree: incredibly important

- Sounds good

- How will personal awareness be measured?
  - (2) agreements
  - Comment: this is not assessable
GOAL: Develop intellectual and practical **skills**, including, for example, inquiry and analysis, critical and creative thinking, written and oral communication, quantitative literacy, information literacy, and teamwork and problem solving.

- Addition of qualitative literacy
  - Great wording
  - Is this different from information literacy

**GOAL 1:** Develop intellectual and practical **skills**, including, for example, inquiry and analysis, critical and creative thinking, written and oral communication, quantitative literacy, information literacy, and teamwork and problem solving.

This goal includes teamwork and problem solving but there is no parallel outcome. Ability to work in groups and teams is increasingly important in the modern world and should be one of the skills we measure.

- (1) agreement
- Definitely need teamwork. We don’t really have “creative thinking” as implied by AAC&U rubrics
- Leave as is
- The goal includes things that are omitted from outcomes ➔ inquiry, analysis and critical thinking are not listed in any outcomes associated with this goal with exception for mathematical, cal., formal reasoning, computational and statistical, etc.. Analysis/critical thinking/inquiry are much more than this
  - (1) agreement
  - (1) agreement with: goal does not have parallel outcomes
- Definitely keep teamwork – it is essential today
- Information literacy ties into lifelong learning (or lifelong inquiry, part of UWEC mission)
- I like this but you’ve sure packed into this a lot of skills... is that good to do?
- There are of course many forms of how one can be literate, therefore, instead of just having 2 listed, what about just say “various forms of literacy”?
  - Too vague
    - Agree, people might thing we just want students to be able to read
  - Would this be able to be measured?
Outcome within the Skills Goal: Write, read, speak, and listen effectively in various contexts using a variety of means including appropriate technologies.

- Does a course have to assess “write, read speak, listen” and use appropriate technologies? Are there going to be rubrics for each of these?
- Change “including” to “and”
- (2) agreements
- Prefer change of Option 1 – including “information sources and technology”
  - I agree: without including “information sources,” none of the goals address information literacy (which is not the same as information technology literacy – it is in fact independent of technology
  - (4) agreements and (1) information literacy cannot be assessed through use of technology
- Add words “and sources” after the word “technologies”
- Outcome 1: Write, read, speak, and listen effectively in various contexts using a variety of means including appropriate technologies.

- Information Literacy is related to the information itself, sometimes we call it the content, and it’s evaluation for reliability as much as the form in which it is delivered.
- Also, in order to accurately reflect the goal itself, this outcome should be changed to say:
  - Outcome 1: Write, read, speak, listen and evaluate information effectively in various contexts using a variety of means including appropriate technologies.

OR the wording proposed in the Faculty Senate

  Outcome 1: Write, read, speak, and listen effectively in various contexts using a variety of means including information sources and appropriate technologies.

- (2) agreements with this last statement

[Recommendation from the floor – to insert after “appropriate” in the phrase “information sources and” – THEN amended to just say “information sources” and DROP “technologies”. POSTPONED to gather input at the Charrettes.]

OPTION 1 – include “information sources and”

Write, read, speak, and listen effectively in various contexts using a variety of means including appropriate information sources and technologies.

OPTION 2 – include only “information sources” and drop “technologies”

Write, read, speak, and listen effectively in various contexts using a variety of means including appropriate information sources technologies.

- For Outcome #1, I endorse the de-emphasis on technology and the greater stress on “appropriate sources.”
- (12) agreements for Option 1
- Either Option 1 or 2 would be preferable to the original
- (1) agreement for Option 2
**Outcome within the Skills Goal:** Use mathematical, computational, statistical, or formal reasoning to solve problems, draw inferences, and determine the validity of stated claims.

- (5) agreements
- Generally ok, but what, exactly, if found reasoning? What about the empirical interpretation of experimented results?
- Where does “scientific reasoning” fit in?
- If formal reasoning includes scientific/logic – this is good
- What about “logic” or is that the same as formal reasoning?
- This outcomes needs to be expanded to include other types of analysis/critical thinking or another outcome that includes analysis/critical thinking needs to be drafted
- Why do we list math, comp., statistics and then only “formal” – these are either too many of one or not enough of the other or limited in scope

---

**Outcome within the Skills Goal:** Create original work, perform original work, or interpret the work of others.

- Outcome 3: I have heard several interpretations of this outcome. If it means a creative work (art, drama, etc) then it should say so. But then we need to understand that we have two outcomes related to the arts and extremely few courses available to non-majors. (I would make that point even about outcome 7). If outcome 3 is really about any original work (a history paper, a lab experiment), then it is really meaningless--- everything we do either is original or evaluates something original. I have no idea how that would be assessed.
- Outcome 3: This outcome is so simplistic here and meaningless. If each and every assignment or activity isn't an “original work,” then we call the work “plagiarism.” I believe this outcome is important, but would be better placed under integrate where a much greater depth of work would be expected. (see comments under Integrate goal)
- (8) agreements
- I am wondering if “interpret: should be unpacked so that it includes practices in art such as paying homage to a work or artist
- I like it as is – the lack of specificity allows for individual instructors’ courses
- Create original work, preform original work and interpret the work of others
  - (2) agreements
- Read the goal: critical and creative thinking. This outcome is a far cry from the values being promoted by AAC&U. Creative thinking is independent of discipline and can be developed and demonstrated in many other contexts than those captured by the stated outcome. We have taken a cross-discipline construct and defined it very narrowly as the activities contained in a very narrow range of disciplines.
**GOAL:** Apply personal and social responsibility for active citizenship and develop skills needed to thrive in a pluralistic and globally interdependent world.

- (6) agreements
- I prefer apply – exercise and active seems to have a physical activity bias
- (1) OK
  - *Exercise* personal and social responsibility citizenship...
    - (4) agreements
      - More active
        - Why is exercise more active than apply?

**Outcome within the Responsibility Goal:** Use critical and analytical skills to evaluate assumptions and challenge existing structures in ways that respect diversity and foster equity and inclusivity.

- (7) agreements
- Need to evaluate assumptions and existing values
  - (2) agreements
    - Is really important and very challenging
- Important
- Challenge assumptions related to “measuring” for instance

**Outcome within the Responsibility Goal:** Evaluate the impact of systems, institutions and issues in local and global contexts and across cultures.

- Outcomes 9 is particularly problematic — to include systems, institutions and issues in one goal is bad enough, but then to say local and global contexts and across cultures makes it extremely complex and almost impossible to achieve
- I think we have minimized global awareness — is one small part of outcome 9. I didn’t think that was the direction the university was going. Based on these goals and outcomes we would dramatically increase our faculty in the arts (however defined) and decrease courses related to foreign cultures.
- (7) agreements
- Change to; global contexts across various cultures

**Outcome within the Responsibility Goal:** Use critical and creative thinking to address civic, social, and environmental challenges.

- In outcome 10, do environmental challenges have to be addressed in every course or assignment that meets this?
- (10) agreements
- Thanks goodness for one outcome that could lead to actions, all the rest are head games
GOAL: Integrate learning across courses, over time and between campus and community life.

- Suggest moving the creativity Outcome from SKILLS under the Integrate Goal.
  WAS: Create original work, perform original work, or interpret the work of others.

  CHANGE TO: Demonstrate the integration and application of learned skills, knowledge and responsibilities through the creation of original work, the performance of original work, or the interpretation of the work of others.

  The rubric used to “assess” this outcome should require a greater depth of integration and understanding of concepts to be shown in the created/performected/interpreted work – much like one would find in a senior research project, curriculum lesson plans, business plan, etc.

  - (2) agreements
  - Need more options for outcomes with this goal
    - (1) agreement
  - Integrate learning across disciplines
    - (4) agreements and support of wording clarification
  - Between curricular, co-curricular, and community
    - (2) agreements
  - Among life, curricular, co-curricular and community
    - (1) agreement
  - I feel like it’s a little broad. What does “between campus” mean?
    - Does it mean between campus and community?
      - I read it as between campus and community
        - (1) agreement
  - Goal: add disciplines….Integrate learning across courses “and disciplines”….and communities
  - We do not need four outcomes for this goal
  - Yes, delete between
  - GOAL 4: Integrate learning across courses, over time and between campus and community life.

  This goal reflects the many ways in which a residential campus, and physical presence of a learning community contributes to the liberal education process.  Yet there is no specific reference to the many ways we strive to enhance liberal education through non-course related opportunities such as lectures, workshops, co-curricular music, performance and organizational-related projects. The student organizations provided valuable leadership, organizational, process, and informational experiences.

  We should include a goal such as (they could be combined):
  Outcome 2: Develop and encourage participation in campus student governance, student organizations, campus lectures, performances and films.
  Outcome 3: Develop opportunities for student-to-student and faculty-and-staff formal and informal mentorships
  Outcome 4: Encourage and Facilitate student participation in local volunteer organizations

  - (1) agreement
  - Remove “volunteer” and could they also work with local for profit organizations?
Outcome within the Integrate Goal: Integrate and apply learned skills, knowledge and responsibilities to address new contexts and questions.

- (3) agreements
- Integrate outcomes are essential. Include community
- I like....what thinking about when state “new contexts”? 
- Add an outcomes: Meaningfully synthesizes connections among experiences outside of the formal classroom to deepen understanding of fields of study and to broaden own points of view (from AAC&U rubric)
  Examples: work experience, study abroad, service learning, internships, student orgs, campus films, resident advisors
  - I can’t imagine accessing assessing whether or not there has been “meaningful synthesis”
    - How about demonstrates understanding of connections
      - (1) agreement
  - Other examples: athletics, residence life
    - (1) agreement
- I agree that co-curricular experiences can be synthesized with course work to fulfill this goal. I don’t agree that it needs its own outcome--→so can we integrate this idea into the current outcome? And how is “synthesize among” substantially different from “integrate”?
Overall Formatting

[Recommendation from APC to remove numbering for Goals and Outcomes.]

Alternative formats discussed:
- Use letters A, B, C, D for goals and numbers for outcomes – renumbering within each Goal.
  (ex. A.1, A. 2; B.1, B. 2.)
- Use unique keyword labels or letters to identify each goal/outcome.

- That we should have a numbering system (with a caveat that the numbering is for administrative purposes only) for the Goals and outcomes. It will be an administrative nightmare if we don’t have any numbering. To have two versions of the goals and outcomes, one with and one without numbering would be very confusing and cumbersome and if there are numbers that is how it will get referred to, or people will create their own. Please help advocate for a universal, institution wide numbering system.
- Why not call each of the four goals G O L D? by themselves they mean nothing, it is only when taken together that they spell something import to our campus (Blugold, gold arrows, etc.)
- Format is confusing
- Letters are fine
- We need to ensure these do not become the “STEM” goals, “English” goals. They are all university goals
- We need letters or numbers – trying to avoid hierarchy is a waste of time – there will be an “order” on the page – does that imply hierarchy?
  - (1) agreement
- Please use letters/numbers (or just numbers)
  - (4) agreements
- An alternative is to name them: The knowledge Goal, the Skills Goal... Harder to do the outcomes this way though, and I think we need some kind of shorthand
- Consider that these goals should fit within the context of a larger framework; if the foundational framework begins with Knowledge, number it 1...etc., also I like the short naming – knowledge, skills, responsibility, and integration.
- Like alternative of naming them: Knowledge Goal, Skills Goal, Responsibility Goal, Integrate Goal
  - (1) agreement
- Could number outcomes for each goals such as K1, K2, K3, K4...S1, S2, S3...R1, R2, R3...I1
  - (2) agreements
- Use a unique key word for goal and letter for outcomes, numbers do suggest hierarchy thinking
- Regardless, a system of identification needs to meet multiple functions:
  1) Administrative: how will advisors, for example, ensure students have met the outcomes
  2) Assessment: during data collection, how will we organize an assessment plan that ID’s outcomes on a particular cycle, for example
  3) Define the program for students and they don’t refer to the “STEM” outcomes, etc. but see these as a collection of outcomes for a program
    - (1) comment of: Yes, we do
Other comments in general:

- I think whatever passes Senate will be an improvement over what we now have.

- We have eleven outcomes already, having been involved in developing rubrics and benchmarks for other curricular areas, I think that from a practical standpoint we should be careful not to add anymore if at all possible or limit ourselves by asking the question “Do we really need to add more outcomes or can this be folded into an existing outcome?

- I think there are far too many parts to most of the outcomes. This will make it very difficult to assess and in many cases, hard to explain.

- I don’t think you should have to read the outcomes several times to understand them. I think we need to think about how we would explain these outcomes to 19 year olds. They read like they were written by academicians for academicians. Again, outcome 9 is particularly problematic. And the more complicated they are, the more difficult they are to assess.

- Overall, I find this pretty thoughtful and attentive to the needs and realities of different disciplines, and to the spirit of our university mission, including the desire to integrate those disciplines. Still, I worry about the number of times the word “skills” pops up, because I think it reflects a kind of narrowing of what/how we teach, largely in order to fit the parameters of an assessment mechanism. This seems to me especially problematic when we imagine creative work as (simply) the product of a set of skills. It is that, certainly, but it’s also much more. Problem is, we don’t have an easy way to measure creativity or its close relative, intellectual courage, even though those may be the most important things “we foster in one another.” Having said that, I see that creating original work is only one of 11 outcomes anyway (when maybe it ought to be a goal), so my concerns probably won’t have much traction. Goals and outcomes depend on being able to generate data. We can show lots of evidence for that one outcome: number of paintings produced, number of poems, number of scientific experiments performed, all demonstrating skills learned in courses, etc. What we can’t measure is whether there was anything meaningful, anything courageous, anything creative about those projects. So, all mystery and uncertainty and personal transformation are set aside. Given that, “skills” are the obvious way to go. And product over process wins the day. Ah, well. Perhaps I’m oversimplifying. And, truly, taken as a whole, these goals and outcomes aren’t bad.

- (1) agreement

- Outcomes should be written in a consistent format
  Currently, we have: write, read, speak...using
  Use.....to...
  Use...to address civic...
  Critically evaluate models....using
- (1) agreement

- These are great but we need to approve them and experiment with their applicability. If we don’t get the chance to determine their efficiency, we, ourselves, will not learn and thus we will not be in a position to make suggested changes in the future, if needed, to improve them.