

More of what we've learned:

Our answer to the question: hypothesis is probably true, but it may make less sense than we thought to dis-integrate assignments and courses. In other words, many faculty construct (and could aspire to) projects and assignments that involve multiple skills and literacies (information, communication, civic engagement, numbers, visuality for instance). But there's still merit in thinking past the "I have to do it all" to "I can formulate an assignment that integrates a variety of skills and habits of mind by its very nature."

The Changing nature of curricular conversations at Carleton – initiatives, LTC events, workshops

Surveys and modifications:

A related point: many historians hate to be classified with social scientists, because their stock-in-trade is not constructing and testing models (which simplify nature and society), but reveling in complexity, even while recognizing the particular prisms through which individual historians interpret history.

1. The Carnegie question and our provisional answers
2. The literacies and cross-disciplinary initiatives that have energized the faculty and staff, and promoted cross-departmental activities, ranging from conversations, to projects, to courses, to curricula. And the connections among these initiatives, particularly the central role that writing and the writing portfolio has come to play in faculty development, assessment of college goals, etc.
3. The history of the QuIRK initiative from the informal discussions to something fully integrated with writing is a case in point of both the first 2 points (and the 4th one, for that matter).
4. The individual integrative learning projects, assignments and courses that are all over campus: e.g. Adriana Estill's Introduction to Latino Studies project on Latinos in Northfield; the remake of the computer science comps.
5. Things we've done; things we've learned (Scott is clearer than I am on which is which):
 - a. Need for more transparency in describing our overall, curricular, and course goals to ourselves and our students. The CSEQ shows that students are less confused about what it means to communicate in writing than many of the other competencies we looked at. We're making progress, and this is certain to be a theme of the curricular review.
 - b. The discourse has changed from (simply) teaching skills and techniques to teaching habits of mind. (One can, for instance, recast and understand the requirements for the writing portfolio as habits of mind in the guise of techniques). Curricular review

- focusing on habits of mind, both at the department level and at the college level, will be quite different from review focused on skills and methods. One of the distinctions is the increased focus on repetition and transferability, in contrast to the “inoculation” model.
- c. Another way the discourse has changed is that we’ve moved from asking “Should we do QR (or ethics, or ACE, or visuality) to “ How can we do QR with writing, ACE with visuality?”, etc.
 - d. On a department level, it’s possible and still a good thing, we think, to divide up the assignment types (allow for redundancy in non-hierarchical curricula. But it probably doesn’t make much sense to divide up the “habits of mind” – because that’s what all of us in a department do. (What about interdisciplinary programs where multiple habits of mind are at play? Judging from ENTS, at least, the discussions have hit on this issue much more explicitly).
 - e. We’ve learned that our first attempts at designing survey questions to measure student perception of integrative learning favor the skills and literacies outlined in the educational literature – which in turn, tend to de-value (as our culture does) the skills and habits of mind cultivated in the arts and literature. Visuality made our list because of the new initiative at Carleton, not because of anything in the literature, and, not surprisingly, it’s one of the skills that students self-report encountering the least. It will require a wider conversation outside the core ILP group to improve these instruments; thankfully, we have a large number of faculty and staff involved in the various initiatives.
 - f. The curriculum discussions that have taken place already in ECC, etc. are very different than they would have been without the ILP group. (Scott, elaborate?)

Where are we going from here?

6. Where do we go from here?

- a. Broadening the conversation on campus; using some of the graphs generated by our recent surveys to spark conversation.
- b. Figuring out a way to integrate the work of the “literacies and skills” groups with each other and into a broader curricular review.
- c. Settling on the most important questions to ask in the curriculum review and the ways in which to ask them.
- d. Figuring out how to highlight and what to highlight about individuals’ efforts so that their innovations can be intelligently transferred by other faculty.
- e. “Making teaching visible” – and continuing to make learning goals more transparent.

(A relevant side note: Carleton is involved in a longitudinal assessment study that includes administration of the Collegiate Learning Assessment, an

instrument that purports to measure gains in critical thinking. We will be interested in how the CLA results compare to the CSEQ data.)

Next step: Nexus of skills that go with one another? May be called "critical thinking" – cluster/factor analysis

>

> 4. I don't follow how a QR initiative impacts visual communication
> and communicating in a different language.

**QR includes visuals in many cases, and the nascent visuality initiative will expand the range of visual materials and pedagogical approaches. I'm not sure what to say about foreign language. We might want to add a sentence about how our students take a required language sequence, but they seldom achieve proficiency in just 4 or 5 terms of study. Other ideas?

ILP notes to include in snapshot

Could administer the ILP survey in two different ways – for introductory ("distro" classes) and for classes taken mainly by majors.

We may have turned out to look at the wrong things (another way to say it is that at a department level a finer level of granularity is needed – long papers, memos, short papers, etc.) Or a different take could be to look at "field work," "textual analysis," "observations," "experimentation" which is another way to cut across.