History of the BA Curriculum Review Process

In November 2011, Arts Faculty Council approved a five-year Academic Plan that included a systematic review of the BA general requirements.1

After determining the reasons why such a review was necessary, five working groups were formed in September 2012 to develop visions for the future of the BA degree. A series of open meetings and focus group sessions were held with the members of the five working groups and others in the Faculty of Arts. These lengthy discussions centered on the question of whether or not to define the BA degree in terms of “attributes.”

“Attributes” were defined as the qualities, values, and dispositions that students develop during the process of obtaining an Arts degree. Broader than — but including — skills, attributes are not discipline-specific and are developed by all students as they progress through their degrees. The working group discussions were informed by specialists in curriculum development, including Dr. Jennifer Summit from Stanford University and Dr. John Galaty from McGill University, who presented lectures in January 2013 (see Appendix H).

The five working groups were merged into a single Task Force in February 2013. The Task Force members investigated the ways in which other universities, primarily in the United States and Australia, had organized their BA basic requirements around the concept of attributes. Comprehensive surveys of University of Alberta undergraduates were conducted in 2011-2012, using some of the various guiding principles used by other institutions across the world (see Appendix I).

A set of key attributes were put forward at the end of 2013, along with a proposed table of BA requirements, which clearly outlined the number of course credits and expected learning outcomes for each set of attributes (see Appendix J). Five core attributes were identified:

- Analysis and Interpretation
- Research, Creation, and Inquiry
- Communication and Culture
- Global Citizenship
- Lifelong, Adaptive, and Engaged Learning

This working proposal was then sent out to all stakeholders in the Faculty of Arts for feedback.

In September 2014, an ad hoc committee was constituted at the request of Dean Lesley Cormack and Associate Dean Mickey Adolphson, then-Chair of the BA Curriculum Review. This committee was asked to bring the work of earlier iterations of the BA Review Committee to fruition by drafting a proposal based on the attributes for presentation to Arts Faculty Council. In Spring 2015, a draft entitled “The BA Core Review – The Proposed Attributes BA” (see Appendix J) was presented to various Arts stakeholder groups, including Undergraduate Student Services, Dean’s Executive Council, and Chairs Council.

---

There were concerns expressed that the attribute model was too complex and would make advising individual students nearly impossible. It also became clear that there was a perception that a full conversation about the attributes themselves had not yet happened, including whether the identified attributes were the appropriate ones on which to form the foundation for our BA requirements. Further, it was obvious that many, if not most, of the degree programs offered by the Faculty incorporated many of these attributes, so it was not clear why the required core would need to duplicate the efforts of these offerings by requiring specific types of core courses. The draft proposal was brought to Arts Executive Committee and the Committee voted against forwarding the proposal to Arts Faculty Council.

Although the Faculty did not move forward with the recommendations as presented, it was agreed, in principle, by the Dean’s Executive Council that the identified attributes were a valuable means of understanding undergraduate programs, shifting attention away from thinking about content and towards the diverse skills and competencies our students gain throughout their degrees. Disciplinary requirements are the primary mechanism that shape students’ paths throughout their degrees. These discipline-specific program requirements develop many of the core attributes that become the transferable skills with which students enter the workforce upon graduation. Exactly how these attributes are embedded in the trajectories of specific majors and minors is best determined by each individual department or program.
Ongoing BA Curriculum Renewal Consultation Process

In July 2015, Associate Dean (Student Programs: Teaching and Learning) Allen Ball took on the leadership of the BA Curriculum Review process. The review process was renamed the BA Curriculum Renewal, and direction was given to draft a new BA Curriculum Renewal proposal for consideration by all members of the Faculty of Arts by the end of the 2015-2016 academic year.

Associate Dean Ball has undertaken a consultative process with input from the 2015-2016 Dean’s Executive Councils, which included the following members of faculty:

- Acting Dean Lise Gotell (Women’s and Gender Studies)
- Acting Vice-Dean Stuart Landon (Economics)
- Associate Dean (Graduate) Tom Spalding (Psychology)
- Associate Dean (Research) Michael O’Driscoll (English and Film Studies)
- Associate Dean (Student Programs) Rebecca Nagel (History and Classics)
- Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning) Allen Ball (Art and Design)

Additional input has also been received from the following faculty members of the 2016-2017 Dean’s Executive Council:

- Dean Lesley Cormack (History and Classics)
- Vice-Dean Lise Gotell (Women’s and Gender Studies)
- Associate Dean (Graduate) Tom Spalding (Psychology)
- Associate Dean (Research) Steve Patten (Political Science)
- Associate Dean (Student Programs) Rebecca Nagel (History and Classics)
- Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning) Allen Ball (Art and Design)

During the 2015-2016 academic year, Associate Dean Ball held individual meetings with all 15 Faculty of Arts Department Chairs, as well as the Executive Director of Community Service-Learning and the Director of the Office of Interdisciplinary Studies:

- Dr. Pamela Willoughby, Chair (Anthropology)
- Professor Cezary Gajewski, Chair (Art and Design)
- Dr. David Peacock, Executive Director (Community Service-Learning)
- Professor Betty Moulton, Chair (Drama)
- Dr. Constance Smith, Chair (Economics)
- Dr. Walter Davis, Interim Chair (East Asian Studies)
- Dr. Peter Sinnema, Chair (English and Film Studies)
- Dr. David Marples (History and Classics)
- Dr. Sean Gouglas, Director (Office of Interdisciplinary Studies)
- Dr. Herbert Colston, Chair (Linguistics)
- Dr. Laura Beard, Chair (Modern Languages and Cultural Studies)
- Professor William Street, Chair (Music)
- Dr. Jack Zupko, Chair (Philosophy)
- Dr. Lois Harder, Chair (Political Science)
- Dr. Jeff Bisanz, Chair (Psychology)
- Dr. Gillian Stevens, Acting Chair (Sociology)
Ongoing updates on the BA Curriculum Renewal process have been provided by Associate Dean Ball to members of the central administration, including:

- Meg Brolley, General Faculty Council Secretary
- Dr. Sarah Forgie, Vice Provost (Learning Initiatives)
- Dr. Nat Kav, Vice Provost (Academic Programs and Instruction)
- Kate Peters, Portfolio Initiatives Manager, Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic).

Further, discussions are underway with Dr. Christine Brown, Head Librarian, to identify and address any resource implications that the proposed BA Curriculum Renewal may generate for library services.

The potential changes to our BA have also been discussed with Faculties across campus. To date, the following Associate Deans and Deans have been consulted on this initiative by Associate Dean Ball:

- Dr. Jason Carey, Associate Dean (Programs & Planning), Faculty of Engineering
- Dr. Janice Causgrove Dunn, Associate Dean (Undergraduate Programs), Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation
- Dr. Robin Everall, Interim Vice-Provost and Dean of Students
- Dr. Elaine Geddes, Associate Dean (Undergraduate), Alberta School of Business
- Dr. Clive Hickson, Associate Dean (Undergraduate Programs and Services), Faculty of Education
- Dr. Tim Joseph, Associate Dean (Student & Co-op Services), Faculty of Engineering
- Dr. Brenda Leskiw, Senior Associate Dean (Undergraduate), Faculty of Science
- Dr. Karsten Mundel, Director & Associate Dean (Academic), Augustana Campus
- Dr. Frank Tough, Associate Dean (Academic), Faculty of Native Studies

An update on the BA Curriculum Renewal consultation process was presented by Associate Dean Ball at Arts Faculty Council on October 5, 2015. The process has also been discussed extensively in each 2015-2016 Arts Teaching and Learning Enhancement Committee meeting and at the Associate Chairs (Undergraduate) 2015-2016 meetings.

Roundtable sessions have taken place with the Undergraduate Student Services staff to address the possible administrative impacts of different changes to the BA basic requirements. In addition, the Recruitment and Engagement team have articulated the needs and interests of prospective students.

The Faculty of Arts: BA Curriculum Renewal Discussion Paper was distributed across the Faculty on January 8, 2016. The proposal was initially discussed at Faculty of Arts Chairs Council on January 20, 2016, and again at Faculty of Arts Chairs Council on February 3, 2016. Associate Dean Ball also presented and discussed the proposal at Arts Executive Council on February 25, 2016.
A town hall meeting was held on February 5, 2016. More than 100 students, staff, and faculty attended this open forum. An online form was also circulated prior to the event, inviting feedback about the BA Curriculum Renewal Discussion Paper from those who would not be able to attend the town hall.\(^1\)

During Winter 2016, Associate Dean Ball presented the BA Curriculum Renewal Discussion Paper at the following Departmental Councils: Anthropology; Art and Design; English and Film Studies; History and Classics; Linguistics; Modern Languages and Cultural Studies; and Philosophy.

We have developed an open and robust dialogue with students about the renewal process through numerous discussions with our Faculty of Arts Students’ Association, OASIS (Organization for Arts Students and Interdisciplinary Studies). Associate Dean Ball was invited to participate in a student town hall organized by OASIS on March 8, 2016. All BA students were invited to attend to ask questions and give feedback. The event was well attended and the students’ thoughtful observations, along with the complete record of students’ contributions, were added to the Faculty’s consideration of the BA Curriculum Renewal.\(^2\)

A survey was distributed on March 10, 2016 (closing March 20, 2016), to gauge students’ and faculty members’ initial response to the BA Renewal Discussion Paper. The survey garnered nearly 1000 responses, with 831 students and 167 faculty members submitting their opinions. The aggregated results were made available on April 7, 2016.\(^3\)

On April 27, 2016 Associate Dean Ball met with the executive members of OASIS to discuss the results of the surveys. Associate Dean Ball met with representatives from the Graduate Student Association (GSA) on May 19, 2016 to explore the impacts the proposed changes to the BA may have on graduate student recruitment and retention. A meeting to discuss the BA Renewal Proposal with OASIS was held on September 22, 2016.

Dean Lesley Cormack moderated a second town hall meeting on September 30, 2016. Once again, more than 100 students, staff, and faculty attended this open forum. A video recording of the town hall can be viewed online.\(^4\) Also, an online form was circulated prior to the event, inviting feedback about the BA Curriculum Renewal Discussion Paper from those who would

not be able to attend the town hall.\textsuperscript{5} Lastly, an update on the BA Renewal Proposal process was presented by Associate Dean Ball at Arts Faculty Council on October 3, 2016.

Throughout the BA Curriculum Review and the BA Curriculum Renewal processes, the Faculty of Arts Dean’s Office has engaged and consulted widely, hearing from key campus partners and stakeholders, including students, faculty, contract instructors, staff, and alumni. The revised recommendations laid out in the next section of this document are the direct result of this comprehensive consultation process.

\textsuperscript{5} University of Alberta Faculty of Arts, https://d1pbog36rur0t.cloudfront.net/~/media/arts/about/BA-renewal-fall-2016-responses-online.pdf. Accessed 18 Oct. 2016.
Edmonton Population by Census Metropolitan Area

Source: Statistics Canada, Table 051-0056
Table 051-0056 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8
Estimates of population by census metropolitan area, sex and age group for July 1, based on the Standard Geographical Classification (SGC) 2011 annual (persons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>962,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>984,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,000,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,017,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,041,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,074,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,104,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,131,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,161,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,183,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,206,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,241,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,286,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,331,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,363,277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Footnotes:

2. A census metropolitan area (CMA) is formed by one or more adjacent municipalities centred on a population centre (known as the core). A CMA must have a total population of at least 100,000 of which 50,000 or more must live in the core. To be included in the CMA, other adjacent municipalities must have a high degree of integration with the core, as measured by commuting flows derived from previous census place of work data. Once an area becomes a CMA, it is retained as a CMA even if its total population declines below 100,000 or the population of its core falls below 50,000. Small population centres with a population count of less than 10,000 are called fringe. All areas inside the CMA that are not population centres are rural areas. All CMAs are subdivided into census tracts.
3. Postcensal estimates are based on the latest census counts adjusted for census net undercoverage (including adjustment for incompletely enumerated Indian reserves) and for the estimated population growth that occurred since that census. Intercensal estimates are based on postcensal estimates and census counts adjusted of the censuses preceding and following the considered year.
4. Preliminary postcensal population estimates for census metropolitan areas (CMAs) in Quebec and British Columbia were prepared by "l'Institut de la statistique du Québec" (ISQ) and BC Stats, Ministry of Labour and Citizens’ Services, respectively. Estimates for Quebec were based on statistics derived from the registration file for insured people of the "Régie de l’assurance-maladie". Estimates for British Columbia were produced using a regression model based upon changes in residential electrical (hydro) connections and Ministry of Health Client Registry counts. These estimates were controlled to Statistics Canada provincial estimates. Please note that for these two specific cases, the component method is not applicable.
6. Age at July 1.
7. The population growth, which is used to calculate population estimates of Census metropolitan areas (CANSIM 051-0056), is comprised of the components of population growth (CANSIM 051-0057).
8. This table replaces CANSIM table 051-0046.

Source: Statistics Canada. Table 051-0056 - Estimates of population by census metropolitan area, sex and age group for July 1, based on the Standard Geographical Classification (SGC) 2011, annual (persons), CANSIM (database). (accessed: )
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### Arts Undergraduate Headcount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-6</td>
<td>6,210</td>
<td>5,823</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-7</td>
<td>6,127</td>
<td>5,730</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-8</td>
<td>6,018</td>
<td>5,455</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-9</td>
<td>5,870</td>
<td>5,276</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>5,954</td>
<td>5,330</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>6,045</td>
<td>5,252</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>6,023</td>
<td>5,023</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>6,048</td>
<td>4,917</td>
<td>1,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>6,002</td>
<td>4,777</td>
<td>1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>5,776</td>
<td>4,506</td>
<td>1,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>5,712</td>
<td>4,461</td>
<td>1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>5,786</td>
<td>4,537</td>
<td>1,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Relative to 2005-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-7</td>
<td>-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-8</td>
<td>-192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-9</td>
<td>-340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>-256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>-165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>-187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>-162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>-208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>-498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>-424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                       | *30-*48 at 200+ | *12-*42 at 200+ | *36  | *6 Junior English  
|                       |                   |                   |      | *6 LOE         
|                       |                   |                   |      | *6 Science      
|                       |                   |                   |      | *6 Social Sciences  
|                       |                   |                   |      | *6 Humanities    
|                       |                   |                   |      | *6 Fine Arts     |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of British Columbia</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                                 | *42 with *30 at 300+ | No minor necessary/ *30 with *18 at 300+ | *30 or *24 with grade 12 language | *3 Writing  
|                                 |                   |                   |      | *3 Research (from long approved list including in major)  
|                                 |                   |                   |      | *3 Language (can be satisfied by grade 12)         
|                                 |                   |                   |      | *6 Science (includes Arts courses)      
|                                 |                   |                   |      | *6 Literature (long list includes courses from many fields |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Calgary</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet requirements of major field.</td>
<td>May declare a minor/minor *30</td>
<td>*6 from Faculty of Science (maximum *48 at 100 or 200-level)</td>
<td>Major plus Other Requirements¹ (may be specified for major)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*6 from Faculty of Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dalhousie University</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Major *36-*54        | May declare minor *18-*27 | *24  | *6 Writing (double dipped with breadth requirements)  
|                      |                   |      | *6 Social Sciences         
|                      |                   |      | *6 Humanities              
|                      |                   |      | *6 Life and Physical Sciences (includes Arts courses)  
|                      |                   |      | *6 Language                |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Manitoba</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| minimum *48            | Minimum *18 | *24  | *3 English  
|                       |                   |      | *3 Math         
|                       |                   |      | *6 Humanities    
|                       |                   |      | *6 Social Sciences  
|                       |                   |      | *6 Science      |

¹ No Other Requirement for BA major in Political Science, English or Sociology, for example.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Total Credits</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Mathematics and Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td>*36</td>
<td>*18</td>
<td>*24</td>
<td>*6 Humanities</td>
<td>*6 Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*6 Social Sciences</td>
<td>*6 Mathematics and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Ottawa</td>
<td>*42</td>
<td>*30</td>
<td>*12</td>
<td>*3 to *12 in English (or French)</td>
<td>or Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Saskatchewan</td>
<td>*54 senior credit units</td>
<td></td>
<td>*18</td>
<td>* Arts Distribution Requirement (18 credit units from the Social Sciences, Humanities and Fine Arts; at most 6 credit units in one subject; at minimum at least 6 credit units from two of Social Sciences, Humanities and Fine Arts; and a minimum of 3 credit units of Languages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>Students must complete: One Specialist *54 - *84 or Two Majors *72 or One Major and Two Minors *72</td>
<td></td>
<td>*24 Breadth (*6 from 4/5) 1. Creative and Cultural Representations 2. Thought, Belief, and Behaviour 3. Society and Its Institutions 4. Living Things and Their Environment 5. The Physical and Mathematical Universes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
<td>Program degree requirements set by program</td>
<td></td>
<td>*30</td>
<td>*3 Fine, Performing and Communicative Arts *6 Humanities *6 Languages and Cultures *12 Social Sciences *3 Transdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **University of Western Ontario** | Honors: Specialization *54 or Double Major *72  
Bachelor: Specialization *54 or Major *36 | *12 | *12 Breadth: *6 from 2/3  
1. Social Science, Interdisciplinary, and Various  
2. Arts, Humanities and Languages  
3. Engineering, Medical Sciences, Science, and Various  
*12 (double-dipping) two full courses must be designated essay courses |
**Draft Table for New BA Attributes and Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Attributes</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Junior Courses</th>
<th>Senior Courses</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Analysis and Interpretation (“Ways of Thinking and Knowing”) | - Numeric Literacy  
- Quantitative and qualitative analysis  
- Critical thinking and interpretation  
- Theory of knowledge  
- Information literacy | *3 quantitativ e analysis and reasoning course chosen from “Science and Arts” or Science  
*3 qualitative analysis course in Arts | Information literacy will be satisfied by online module, required of all students.  
Will require new courses on quantitative analyses in Arts |         |
|                                    |                                                                                   | *3 Capstone project attached to 400-level course, as designated by student with faculty supervision | 400-level course can also be directed reading to allow students to satisfy requirement as part of URI, AWE or CSL courses |         |
| 2. Research, Creation and Inquiry   | - Creative solutions  
- Innovative thinking  
- Problem-oriented | *6 of which *3 in writing (“W-“) and *3 in visual |                                                                                 |         |
| 3. Communication and Culture       | - Seeing, reading and hearing critically  
- Communication across disciplines | *3 “Writing in the Discipline” course | Current “W” courses might include WRS, junior |         |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Attributes</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Junior Courses</th>
<th>Senior Courses</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English, but also new writing-intensive courses offered by departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of various media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual courses might include cultural, film and fine arts courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Global Citizenship
- Understanding language study
- Global and cultural awareness in historical context
- Engagement with diverse communities
- *6 of junior or senior language courses or content courses in LOE

*3 of senior language course or approved content “GC” courses (Poli. Sci., MLCS, EAS, EFS, Music, H&C etc.)

Numerous courses already exist on each level.

Students will be encouraged to take study abroad courses.

5. Lifelong, Adaptive and Engaged Learning
- Experiential learning
- Social engagement
- Ethical awareness
- Citizenship
- *3 from CSL, AWE or study abroad

Engagement outside classroom essential

Total Credits 18 12 =30
Other notes and suggestions:

• BA-wide requirements in this scenario is down from *36 to *30, from 12 to 10 courses.
• One of the advantages with this mix of junior and senior courses is that they are linked and that they build capacity for success in the major as well as post-graduation.
• Note that since some of the requirements can be fulfilled by taking courses within the major, students should have more optional courses.
• Students will have the option of taking up to two courses as Fail/Pass options after having taken *60. This might encourage students to take courses outside their comfort zone. F/P courses cannot be counted towards any requirements for the BA or the major.
• Some new courses will have to be created for the core attributes and there needs to be a body that approves those courses. More specific criteria need to be established for what constitutes a course in each category.
• To articulate the attributes, all students will maintain an e-portfolio, where various essays, reflective pieces, creative works, and research papers may be included. (Will need staff to monitor students’ portfolios)
Summary of Lecture Notes: Dr. Jennifer Summit, February 1, 2013

1. The public excitement about big-scale online learning (at least where I live: view from Silicon Valley), and concern over the possibility that it will displace and eventually replace entirely humans teaching on physical campuses, challenge us to articulate and strengthen the particular benefits of human/campus higher ed.

2. I believe that online learning won’t replace human/campus teaching, but it will redefine it—just like print didn’t replace manuscript and photography didn’t replace painting, but they did change them, forcing them to differentiate themselves from the new medium—manuscript became a personalized textual form, just as painting became less representational: both, in other words, responded to the introduction of a mechanized form of reproduction by embracing the characteristics that distinguished them from machine reproduction, becoming more high-touch and personal.

3. Personally, I don’t buy the apocalyptic belief that we’ll all be replaced by online talking heads, but we should anticipate that in the not too distant future, any aspect of higher ed that can be done online will be; and I’m also won over by Cathy Davidson’s observation that if we as teachers can be replaced by a computer, then we should be. (get the proper quote)

4. So what are the things that distinguish human/campus higher ed from online? What are the things that students can only (or best) receive from a campus and human, classroom interaction?

5. In order to make the case that human teaching in physical classrooms represents a special value that can’t be captured in or replaced by online media, our teaching needs to be about something other than course delivery/content delivery. (Many people make the point that content is now freely available, no longer the special province of professors and universities, so we need to be about something other than guarding and transmitting content)

6. This is or should be good news for the humanities and social sciences, which have never been about the rote memorization of facts but about cultivating special forms of attention and ways of perceiving and being in the world; the classroom has a special place in our disciplines, and increasingly the same is true of the outside-the-classroom experiences we introduce to our students through civic engagement, field work, and internships. (John Dewey: education isn’t preparation for living: it is living.)

7. So this is what I propose: the special work that we do—which can’t and won’t be replaced by computers or the for-profits that are poised to harvest their promise—isn’t the course but the curriculum, which is rightly recognized as the highest responsibility of the faculty on campus. While course delivery can happen anywhere (even via iphone), faculty decide how the courses fit together into a coherent and integrated whole, how they are sequenced together, and what we expect of students who come through that sequence. While any individual can design and offer a course (now), only a faculty can create a curriculum—to say what it all adds up to.

8. [Some lessons I learned when we did our curriculum revision at Stanford: about the importance of coming together as a faculty to have the conversations that lead to curriculum revision]
9. Given the atomization of our fields, curricular revision is one of the only times we come together collaboratively, to look at the big questions of our disciplines and the larger mission of the university (for which everything else is support: cite guy who talks about ideal college as student on one end of the log and the professor on the other: the administration, broadly defined, is the log, and its job is to facilitate that conversation) (?)

10. It's difficult for us to come together and hold conversations across the borderlands of our disciplines: yet we expect our students to do it by passing through our degrees (the ideal of the "university"—achieving a universality of perspective and knowledge)-- how can we ask it of our students if we can't do it ourselves? (or if we don't believe in it—if we cling to our atomization?)

11. I spent the last two years involved in a major general education redesign at Stanford—approved by our faculty senate last spring!—and I'm now spending this year with an ACE Fellowship (explain), where I've had the wonderful opportunity to visit a number of other campuses that are undertaking curricular revisions of their own, and to reinforce the point that curriculum, not course delivery, is special to faculty and campuses, it's been interesting to see that every curriculum is unique to its campus, however many elements it might hold in common with others. Particularly in public institutions, each is rooted to the community, people, and place it serves, and each is uniquely attuned to their specific educational needs. (branding vs close reading) And each bears a special relation to the visions of its founders (cite examples? University of Laverne and the Brethren; Georgetown; landgrants) (*I was struck by the fact of how many of your students enter careers of service: in the US how many humanities majors become educators, though our curricula haven't all caught up to this reality)

12. With that understanding—that every curriculum should be unique in its own ways—I want to extract some lessons both from Stanford and from the field (such as I've had a chance to observe so far this year):

13. Lesson #1: curriculum is not autobiography
   - my Stanford colleagues and I learned this from general education workshop in Vermont: noticed how every discussion of curriculum would invariably come down to someone saying "well, when I was in college I took X, and it changed my life—therefore surely no one should graduate without taking X too!"
   - It's hard, but we have to recognize that our students aren't miniature, larval versions of ourselves. They have different needs, and the state of knowledge has changed.

14. Lesson #2: trust the committee process
   What I learned from two curricular reviews: committees will always come up with better solutions than any one person can, but only if we trust our colleagues and enter the process in good faith

15. Lesson #2a: beware turf guarding!
   This is only natural, but remember that curriculum isn't about filling seats in our classes
Summary of Lecture Notes: Dr. Jennifer Summit, February 1, 2013

There's even a danger when we mistake disciplines for knowledge structures (don't conflate the two)
Cite Andrew Abbot: disciplines are professional and administrative structures: they came into being in order to manage the appointment and advancement of professors, and they continue a very useful professional function in that they provide transferable credentials and apprenticeship models. Abbot says that they also serve to delimit knowledge: to define what we don't need to know.

16. But we mustn't be fooled by their importance in our professional lives into thinking that they should be equally important to our students, or to the professional lives they're preparing for.

17. In my own discipline, English literature, since we've exfoliated the elements that at various historical moments were considered to be the core of the discipline—from freshman English to the canon—it's harder to escape from the fact that the discipline doesn't exist as a platonic form of knowledge, but it's something we make, every day, through our work and practice. It doesn't precede that practice but is produced out of it. If we accept this (Abbot's) point that the disciplines largely exist for the professional advancement of the faculty, it becomes harder to defend a curriculum structured along strictly disciplinary (or even divisional) lines.

18. Lesson #3: most fundamental question of any curriculum reform has to be: what do our students need to learn? It's becoming clearer that this has to be the first question of a truly innovative curriculum.

19. Example from Alverno College: when you ask what students need to learn (skills, knowledge, capacities), you reach understandings that cross disciplines: ie, to communicate clearly and effectively, to think critically, to approach the natural world with critical analysis and reverence, to be able to communicate with and listen and hear others whose cultural, racial, and national backgrounds differ from your own. [summarize Alverno competencies?]

20. Our aim: for our students to become active, competent, and self-directed learners (from Stanford SUES report): not just seeing the curriculum as a sequence of hoops they had to jump through or something that we had and would give them, in the hope that they would give it back in exams

21. Self-directed doesn't mean undirected: research on first-generation college students and unconfident learners: they need greater scaffolding; all students appreciate clear guidance about the rationale

22. The goal of fostering metacognition [give example of UW Bothell curriculum?]

23. In other words, when we start by asking what our students need, we're likely to come up with answers that bring us together, rather than activating our instinctive turf-bound defenses

24. One last thing: agreeing to meet our students' needs means not running away from what they're asking us for: preparation for work. The humanities has a long history of putting itself against "vocationalism" [maybe summarize John Dewey on this point?]—we want them to enjoy the life of the mind, as we do
Summary of Lecture Notes: Dr. Jennifer Summit, February 1, 2013

25. But we’re the last people who should be arguing against education for career, since for us (and research shows this of faculty), our careers are places of passionate engagement: isn’t this what we wish for our students as well, that they leave college with as profound a sense of calling, and as deep a wish for fulfillment in meaningful work, as we did?

26. Then we need to accept first that learning and work can’t be separated in the stark oppositions that we habitually place them; we also need to accept that there are other forms of meaningful work beyond academia, and that our very best and deepest wish for our students is that they will find them. And we need to invite them to bring their own questions, fears, and hopes about their professional future into the work they do with us on our campuses.

27. [example of the internship program for English majors at Stanford?]

28. Rousing and inspiring conclusion.
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To: Members of BA Curriculum Review Group

From: Lianne McTavish

Re: Summary of the Lecture Given by Dr. John Galaty, 01 February 2013, 4-5:30 pm

“Friction, Creativity, and Core Values: Curriculum for the Future”

Dr. Galaty is the former Associate Dean and Interim Dean of Arts at McGill University. He projected bullet points as part of his PowerPoint presentation and I have copied them below. He elaborated slightly on most of them, and spoke in more depth about McGill University’s Legacy Program, an innovative interdisciplinary and trans-global historical first-year course that worked well but was discontinued because of its high cost.

**Creating Tomorrow’s University**

- The University, a very good idea, in continuous reinvention

- training vs education, with education as the goal of universities, understood as the cultivation of capacities, and preparation for global citizenship

- only the Arts reinvigorate the past for the sake of the future

- need to reconcile depth and breadth
Friction on Planning for the Curriculum for the Future

- friction refers to divergence, contradiction, tensions, but also traction and creativity when changing curriculum

- these kinds of changes involve threatening people’s interests

- finding points of friction that may provide leverage
  - joining the past to the future, a unique vantage point in the Arts
  - balancing disciplinary foundations and interdisciplinary strategies to address problems
  - connecting the University to the public
  - situating the nation in global context

Innovations in Heritage Themes in the Core Curriculum: McGill’s Legacy Program

- the Academic politics of “foundation” programs

- innovations in the core curriculum at the University of Chicago; it is no longer just about great books

- McGill’s Legacy Program, which examined civilizational contrasts and encounters over time

- McGill’s Legacy Program aimed to:
  - honour the diversity of excellence, so it moved from a focus on western civilization to one of global perspectives
  - co-create knowledge through participation and performance (this involved team teaching for professors, and a performance element (such as staging a play), for the incoming students
  - in terms of skills, it was aimed to focus on writing, creative reading, and analysis, group learning, and learning technologies
  - it involved four interdisciplinary courses taken for 6 weeks, namely the Classical Worlds (Greece/China), Medieval Worlds (Europe/Islam), Early Modern Atlantic Worlds (South America/Europe), and Making Modernities (Vienna/ Ottoman).
2012 Students’ Union Undergraduate
Student Survey Summary for
Bachelor of Arts Curriculum Review
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INTRODUCTION

This survey was distributed by the Students’ Union in the Fall of 2012 to all University of Alberta undergraduate students. The survey was sent by email and offered participants the chance to win a series of prizes for participating. All told the survey saw 5290 participants, 936 of which were from the Faculty of Arts. This report has extracted questions from the survey that may be of relevant for the Faculty of Arts’ Bachelor of Arts Curriculum Review. In the below graphs, the orange bars represent the labeled response as a proportion of all responses to that question from all survey respondents. The green bars represent the same proportions, only they are limited to responses from students in the Faculty of Arts. Some of the questions allowed respondents to provide more than one answer (these questions are noted with “check all that apply”) and so will add up to more than 100%.

QUESTIONS

Are you involved in a student group/organization on campus?

![Graph showing involvement in student groups/organizations on campus](image)
How did you get involved with these campus organizations/activities? (Check all that apply)

- Through a family member
- Website
- Through a class/professor
- Attended a group event
- Advertisements
- Clubs Fair
- Self motivated
- Through a friend

What is stopping you from getting involved with campus organizations/activities? (Check all that apply)

- Other (please specify)
- Not interested
- Costs associated with involvement
- Employment
- Unaware of what opportunities are available
- Don't know others who are involved
- Academics
Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: With the implementation of a new Assessment and Grading Policy in 2012, I have a better understand of how my grades are determined.
2011 National Survey of Student Engagement
Comparators Summary for the
Bachelor of Arts Curriculum Review
INTRODUCTION

The below results are from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) administered at the University of Alberta in 2011. In total there were 1846 participants, 829 of which were from the Faculty of Arts. The results below show comparisons between respondents from the Faculty of Arts, all University of Alberta respondents, and the G13 average.

QUESTIONS

Q.1 In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following?

![Graphs showing comparisons for questions Q.1 to Q.4]

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often
Q.2 During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following mental activities?

- **MEMORIZING** facts, ideas, or methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same form:

  - Arts: 3.0, 2.6
  - UofA: 3.0, 2.9
  - GI3: 3.0, 2.8

  **Means:** Freshman Mean: 3.0, Senior Mean: 2.6

- **SYNTHESIZING** and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships:

  - Arts: 2.8, 3.0
  - UofA: 2.8, 2.9
  - GI3: 2.9, 3.0

  **Means:** Freshman Mean: 2.8, Senior Mean: 3.0

- **MAKING JUDGMENTS** about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and data and assessing the interpreted soundness of their conclusions:

  - Arts: 2.8, 3.0
  - UofA: 2.7, 2.9
  - GI3: 2.7, 2.9

  **Means:** Freshman Mean: 2.8, Senior Mean: 2.9

- **APPLYING** theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations:

  - Arts: 2.8, 2.9
  - UofA: 3.0, 3.1
  - GI3: 3.1, 3.1

  **Means:** Freshman Mean: 2.8, Senior Mean: 3.1
Q.3 During the current school year, about how much reading and writing have you done?
Q.4 In a typical week, how many homework problem sets do you complete?
Q.5 Mark the box that best represents the extent to which your examinations during the current school year have challenged you to do your best work.
Q.6 During the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following?

**Attend an art exhibit, play, dance, music, theater, or other performance**

- Arts: Freshman Mean 2.2, Senior Mean 2.3
- UofA: Freshman Mean 1.9, Senior Mean 1.9
- GI3: Freshman Mean 1.8, Senior Mean 1.9

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often

**Exercised or participated in physical fitness activities**

- Arts: Freshman Mean 2.5, Senior Mean 2.6
- UofA: Freshman Mean 2.6, Senior Mean 2.6
- GI3: Freshman Mean 2.8, Senior Mean 2.5

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often

**Participated in activities to enhance your spirituality (worship, meditation, prayer, etc.)**

- Arts: Freshman Mean 1.8, Senior Mean 1.7
- UofA: Freshman Mean 1.7, Senior Mean 1.7
- GI3: Freshman Mean 1.6, Senior Mean 1.6

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often

**Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue**

- Arts: Freshman Mean 2.6, Senior Mean 2.8
- UofA: Freshman Mean 2.4, Senior Mean 2.5
- GI3: Freshman Mean 2.4, Senior Mean 2.5

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often
Q.7 Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate from your institution?

**Incomparable Results**

Q.8 Mark the box that best represents the quality of your relationships with people at your institution.
Q.9 About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing each of the following?
Q. 10 To what extent does your institution emphasize each of the following?

- Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work
  
  ![Bar chart showing emphasis on time spent studying and academic work](chart1)

- Providing the support you need to help you succeed academically
  
  ![Bar chart showing support needed for academic success](chart2)

- Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds
  
  ![Bar chart showing encouragement of diverse contact](chart3)

- Helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)
  
  ![Bar chart showing support for non-academic responsibilities](chart4)
Q.11 To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?
Q. 12 Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?

Q. 13 How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?
Q. 14 If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution you are now attending?
2011 National Survey of Student Engagement
Summary for
Bachelor of Arts Curriculum Review
INTRODUCTION

The below results are from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) administered at the University of Alberta in 2011. In total there were 1846 participants, 829 of which were from the Faculty of Arts. These are the results for respondents from the Faculty of Arts.

DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS

Personal Traits

### Ethno–Cultural Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethno–Cultural Background</th>
<th>Freshman (1st year)</th>
<th>Senior (4th year)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American Indian</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metis</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inuit</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asian</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Respondent Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Age</th>
<th>Freshman (1st year)</th>
<th>Senior (4th year)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 or Younger</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–23</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24–29</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–55</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshman (1st year)</th>
<th>Senior (4th year)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Canadian Citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshman (1st year)</th>
<th>Senior (4th year)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Academic Status

#### Student Reported Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Institution Reported: Freshman (1st year)</th>
<th>Institution Reported: Senior (4th year)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman/first– Year</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore/2nd year</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior/3rd year</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/4th year</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Student Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshman (1st year)</th>
<th>Senior (4th year)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than full time</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulltime</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Primary Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshman (1st year)</th>
<th>Senior (4th year)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professions</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment of Father</td>
<td>Freshman (1st year)</td>
<td>Senior (4th year)</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not finish high school</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from high school</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or completed college or CEGEP</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended University without earning degree</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed a bachelor’s degree (B.A., B.Sc., etc.)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed a master’s degree (M.A., M.Sc., etc.)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed a doctoral degree (Ph.D., J.D., M.D., etc.)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment of Mother</th>
<th>Freshman (1st year)</th>
<th>Senior (4th year)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not finish high school</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from high school</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or completed college or CEGEP</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended University without earning degree</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed a bachelor’s degree (B.A., B.Sc., etc.)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed a master’s degree (M.A., M.Sc., etc.)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed a doctoral degree (Ph.D., J.D., M.D., etc.)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Academic Background

#### Other Educational Institutes Attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Started At</th>
<th>Freshman (1st year)</th>
<th>Senior (4th year)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community college (vocational or technical courses not at university level)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community college (university credit/transfer courses)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University other than this one</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEGEP (general or pre-university program)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEGEP (professional or technical program)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private training institution</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another School, not listed above</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Attend Other Schools than U of A</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Institution Started At

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman (1st year)</th>
<th>Senior (4th year)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Started Here</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started Elsewhere</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Grades Up Until Now

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman (1st year)</th>
<th>Senior (4th year)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C− or lower</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B−</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A−</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Extra-Curricular Information

#### Fraternity/Sorority Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman (1st year)</th>
<th>Senior (4th year)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Student Athlete

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman (1st year)</th>
<th>Senior (4th year)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Living Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living Arrangements</th>
<th>Freshman (1st year)</th>
<th>Senior (4th year)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dormitory or other campus housing (not fraternity/sorority house)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (house, apartment, etc.) within WALKING DISTANCE of the institution</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (house, apartment, etc.) within DRIVING DISTANCE of the institution</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity or sorority house</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### QUESTIONS

**Q.1** In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following?

#### Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions

- **Freshman Mean**: 2.4
- **Senior Mean**: 2.9
- **Total Mean**: 2.7

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often

#### Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in

- **Freshman Mean**: 2.5
- **Senior Mean**: 2.1
- **Total Mean**: 2.4

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often
**Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions**

- Freshman Mean: 2.6
- Senior Mean: 2.9
- Total Mean: 2.8

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often

**Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)**

- Freshman Mean: 1.6
- Senior Mean: 1.5
- Total Mean: 1.5

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often

**Participated in a community-based project (e.g., service learning) as part of a regular course**

- Freshman Mean: 1.4
- Senior Mean: 1.3
- Total Mean: 1.4

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often

**Used an electronic medium (listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment**

- Freshman Mean: 2.6
- Senior Mean: 2.5
- Total Mean: 2.6

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often

**Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor**

- Freshman Mean: 3
- Senior Mean: 3.3
- Total Mean: 3.1

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often

**Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor**

- Freshman Mean: 2.2
- Senior Mean: 2.5
- Total Mean: 2.3

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often
Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often

Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often

Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on your academic performance

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often

Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor’s standards or expectations

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often

Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.)

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often

Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co–workers, etc.)

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often
Q.2 During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following mental activities?

**Coursework emphasized: MEMORIZING facts, ideas, or methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same form**

- Freshman Mean: 3
- Senior Mean: 2.6
- Total Mean: 2.9

1 = very little, 2 = some, 3 = quite a bit, 4 = very much

**Coursework emphasized: ANALYZING the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and its components considering**

- Freshman Mean: 3
- Senior Mean: 3.3
- Total Mean: 3.1

1 = very little, 2 = some, 3 = quite a bit, 4 = very much

**Coursework emphasized: SYNTHESIZING and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships**

- Freshman Mean: 2.8
- Senior Mean: 3
- Total Mean: 2.9

1 = very little, 2 = some, 3 = quite a bit, 4 = very much

**Coursework emphasized: MAKING JUDGMENTS about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and data and assessing the interpreted soundness of their conclusions**

- Freshman Mean: 2.8
- Senior Mean: 3
- Total Mean: 2.9

1 = very little, 2 = some, 3 = quite a bit, 4 = very much
Q.3 During the current school year, about how much reading and writing have you done?
Q.4 In a typical week, how many homework problem sets do you complete?

Q.5 Mark the box that best represents the extent to which your examinations during the current school year have challenged you to do your best work.
Q.6 During the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following?

- **Attended an art exhibit, play, dance, music, theater, or other performance**
  - Freshman Mean: 2.2
  - Senior Mean: 2.3
  - Total Mean: 2.2

- **Exercised or participated in physical fitness activities**
  - Freshman Mean: 2.5
  - Senior Mean: 2.6
  - Total Mean: 2.6

- **Participated in activities to enhance your spirituality (worship, meditation, prayer, etc.)**
  - Freshman Mean: 1.8
  - Senior Mean: 1.7
  - Total Mean: 1.8

- **Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue**
  - Freshman Mean: 2.6
  - Senior Mean: 2.8
  - Total Mean: 2.7

- ** Tried to better understand someone else’s views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective**
  - Freshman Mean: 2.8
  - Senior Mean: 2.9
  - Total Mean: 2.9

- **Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept**
  - Freshman Mean: 3
  - Senior Mean: 3
  - Total Mean: 3

*1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, 4 = very often*
Q.7 Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate from your institution?

- Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment
  - Freshman Mean: 2.4
  - Senior Mean: 2.4
  - Total Mean: 2.4

- Community service or volunteer work
  - Freshman Mean: 3
  - Senior Mean: 3.2
  - Total Mean: 3.1

- Participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together
  - Freshman Mean: 2.1
  - Senior Mean: 2.2
  - Total Mean: 2.2

- Work on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements
  - Freshman Mean: 2
  - Senior Mean: 2.2
  - Total Mean: 2.1

- Foreign (or additional) language coursework
  - Freshman Mean: 2.8
  - Senior Mean: 3.1
  - Total Mean: 2.9

- Study abroad
  - Freshman Mean: 2.3
  - Senior Mean: 2.3
  - Total Mean: 2.3
Q.8 Mark the box that best represents the quality of your relationships with people at your institution.

**Relationships with OTHER STUDENTS**

- Freshman Mean: 5.1
- Senior Mean: 5.1
- Total Mean: 5.1

1 = Unfriendly, Unsupportive, Sense of alienation to 7 = Friendly, Supportive, Sense of belonging

**Relationships with ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL AND OFFICES**

- Freshman Mean: 4.4
- Senior Mean: 4
- Total Mean: 4.2

1 = Unhelpful, Inconsiderate, Rigid to 7 = Helpful, Considerate, Flexible

**Relationships with FACULTY MEMBERS**

- Freshman Mean: 4.8
- Senior Mean: 5
- Total Mean: 4.9

1 = Unfriendly, unhelpful, etc to 7 = friendly, helpful, supportive, etc
Q.9 About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing each of the following?

- **Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities)**
  - Freshman Mean: 5.1
  - Senior Mean: 5.1
  - Total Mean: 5.1

- **Working for pay ON CAMPUS**
  - Freshman Mean: 1.2
  - Senior Mean: 1.5
  - Total Mean: 1.4

- **Working for pay OFF CAMPUS**
  - Freshman Mean: 2.4
  - Senior Mean: 3
  - Total Mean: 2.7

- **Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)**
  - Freshman Mean: 1.8
  - Senior Mean: 2
  - Total Mean: 1.9

- **Relaxing and socializing (watching TV, partying, etc.)**
  - Freshman Mean: 3.7
  - Senior Mean: 3.7
  - Total Mean: 3.7

- **Providing care for dependents living with you (parents, children, spouse, etc.)**
  - Freshman Mean: 1.8
  - Senior Mean: 1.6
  - Total Mean: 1.7
Q. 10 To what extent does your institution emphasize each of the following?

**Commuting to class (driving, walking, etc.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshman Mean</th>
<th>Senior Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=0, 2=1–5, 3=6–10, 4=11–15, 5=16–20, 6=21–25, 7=26–30, 8=over 30

**Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshman Mean</th>
<th>Senior Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = very little, 2 = some, 3 = quite a bit, 4 = very much

**Providing the support you need to help you succeed academically**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshman Mean</th>
<th>Senior Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = very little, 2 = some, 3 = quite a bit, 4 = very much

**Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshman Mean</th>
<th>Senior Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = very little, 2 = some, 3 = quite a bit, 4 = very much

**Helping you cope with your non–academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshman Mean</th>
<th>Senior Mean</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = very little, 2 = some, 3 = quite a bit, 4 = very much
Q.11 To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?

- **Providing the support you need to thrive socially**
  - Freshman Mean: 2.2
  - Senior Mean: 2.1
  - Total Mean: 2.2

- **Attending campus events and activities**
  - Special speakers, cultural performances, athletic events, etc.
  - Freshman Mean: 2.5
  - Senior Mean: 2.4
  - Total Mean: 2.5

- **Using computers in academic work**
  - Freshman Mean: 3.2
  - Senior Mean: 3.3
  - Total Mean: 3.2

- **Acquiring a broad general education**
  - Freshman Mean: 3.2
  - Senior Mean: 3.3
  - Total Mean: 3.2

- **Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills**
  - Freshman Mean: 2.4
  - Senior Mean: 2.3
  - Total Mean: 2.3

1 = very little, 2 = some, 3 = quite a bit, 4 = very much
Q. 12 Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?

Q. 13 How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?
Q. 14 If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution you are now attending?

If you could start over again, would you go to the SAME INSTITUTION you are now attending?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Mean</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Mean</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = definitely no, 2 = probably no, 3 = probably yes, 4 = definitely yes
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INTRODUCTION

This survey was distributed by the Students’ Union in the Fall of 2011 to all University of Alberta undergraduate students. The survey was sent by email and offered participants the chance to win a series of prizes for participating. All told the survey saw 7540 participants, 1159 of which were from the Faculty of Arts. This report has extracted questions from the survey that may be of relevant for the Faculty of Arts’ Bachelor of Arts Curriculum Review. In the below graphs, the orange bars represent the labeled response as a proportion of all responses to that question from all survey respondents. The green bars represent the same proportions, only they are limited to responses from students in the Faculty of Arts. Some of the questions allowed respondents to provide more than one answer (these questions are noted with “check all that apply”) and so will add up to more than 100%.

QUESTIONS

What is the most effective way to inform you about on campus events, information and/or campaigns? (Check all that apply)
Which of the following do you do? (Check all that apply)

- None of the above
- Participate in health and wellness activities
- Attend/participate in events on campus
- Involvement with Student Groups
- Work off campus
- Work on campus
- Volunteer off campus
- Volunteer on campus

How did you get involved with campus organizations/activities? (Check all that apply)

- Started the group myself
- Attended a group event
- Self-motivated
- Advertisement
- Website
- Through a family member
- Through a class/professor
- Through a friend
- Clubs Fair
- Other

- All Students
- Arts
Please tell us why you are not involved in student groups: (Check all that apply)

- Other
- Not interested
- Don't know others who are involved
- Unaware of what opportunities are available
- Employment
- Costs associated with involvement
- Academics

How many of your current instructors would you rank as very good or excellent?

- All of them
- Three quarters of them
- Half of them
- One quarter of them
- None of them
How satisfied are you with the quality of the following aspects of your university experience? - At the University of Alberta as a whole

How satisfied are you with the quality of the following aspects of your university experience? - Experience in the classroom
Q35. How satisfied are you with the quality of the following aspects of your university experience? - Life outside the classroom

How important are the following factors to a quality University experience? - Instructors who care about students' learning
How important are the following factors to a quality University experience? - Degree programs and courses that prepare you for a future career

How important are the following factors to a quality University experience? - Instructors who are good teachers
How important are the following factors to a quality University experience? - Thorough and helpful course material (books, course packs, etc.)

How important are the following factors to a quality University experience? - Small class sizes
How important is it to you to engage in research during your undergraduate learning experience?

![Bar chart showing the importance of research by students in different fields.](chart1)

Do you plan to pursue graduate studies?

![Bar chart showing the percentage of students planning to pursue graduate studies.](chart2)
Have you participated in a study abroad program?

What has stopped you from participating in a study abroad program? (Check all that apply)
How likely are you to make a financial donation to the University of Alberta after you graduate?

- Definitely will not
- Probably will not
- Probably will
- Definitely will

Categories: All Students, Arts
2011 Students’ Union Undergraduate
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INTRODUCTION

The following chart is a summary of responses from a question asked in the 2011 Students’ Union undergraduate student survey. This survey was distributed in the Fall of 2012 to all University of Alberta undergraduate students. It was sent by email and offered participants the chance to win a series of prizes for participating. All told the survey saw 7540 participants, and this particular question was answered by 5001 participants. This question allowed participants to offer multiple responses, meaning that when individually categorized, there were a total of 9,193 responses.

The question asked was:

“The university is interested in defining the university experience. What qualities do you feel a student should acquire as a result of their experience at the University of Alberta?”

As this is a very open question, respondents interpreted and answered it in unique ways. However, the majority of responses can be categorized as either: Skills, Characteristics, Experiences, or Miscellaneous.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Skill Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Knowledge or Skills</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking Skills</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management Skills</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Teamwork Skills</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Ethic</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study/Learning</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Specific Knowledge or Skills</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving Skills</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Skills</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Skill</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-working</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Skills</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skills</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Management Skills</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Speaking/Presentation Skills</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical Reasoning Skills</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuality</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3690</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Percent of Characteristic Responses</td>
<td>Percent of Total Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent (Learners and in life)</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-confident</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for others/Diversity</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity/ Personal Growth</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-minded</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-rounded</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-motivated</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm/ desire for (further) learning</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diligent</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourceful/Adaptable</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplined</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud (In self or the Institution)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionate</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determined</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curious</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modest</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuality</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courageous</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insightful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Experience Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work or practical experience</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A positive, broad experience</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding potential career paths</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Experience</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>507</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Miscellaneous Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>employment/life prep*</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Member of Society/ Community</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Belonging/Sense of Community at the</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Global/Social Issues</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Balance</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Good Education</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability**</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Accomplishment</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Citizen</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1684</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Responses were categorized here if respondents made mention of the knowledge or skills gained, or should be gained, from an education at the UofA

**Responses were categorized here if the notion of the response was students should get a job by the nature of them simply finishing a degree
Visual Depiction of Characteristics Responses

Visual Depiction of Skills Responses
Visual Depiction of All Responses
History of the Process
In November 2011 the Faculty of Arts began a systematic review of the BA general requirements, a process that is described in detail at uofa.ualberta.ca/arts/work-of-arts/ba-curriculum-review. After determining the reasons why such a review was necessary at this time—in part because of the growing need to articulate the value of a BA degree, communicating its benefits and outcomes clearly to students, parents, government bodies, and other stakeholders—a number of working groups submitted proposals outlining their visions of the future of the BA degree. In 2012 a series of open meetings and brainstorming sessions were held with the members of these groups along with others in the Faculty of Arts, eventually resulting in a lengthy discussion about whether or not to define the BA degree in terms of “attributes.” Attributes are the qualities, values, and dispositions that students develop during the process of obtaining a liberal arts degree. Attributes are broader than (but include) skills, and are encouraged in all students regardless of their field of study. More open meetings saw participants refining the notion of attributes and suggesting a range of attributes that would best represent the BA degree at the University of Alberta. These discussions were informed by specialists in curriculum development, including Dr. Jennifer Summit and Dr. John Galaty who gave lectures in January 2013 (for summaries of their talks please see uofa.ualberta.ca/arts/work-of-arts/ba-curriculum-review/progress-to-date/timeline-of-past-events). Once the working groups were merged into a single cohesive group, its members began researching the ways in which other universities, primarily in the United States and Australia, had organized their BA requirements around the concept of attributes. By the end of 2013, a key set of attributes was put forward, along with a proposed table of requirements that clearly outlined the number of course credits and expected learning outcomes for each set of attributes (uofa.ualberta.ca/arts/work-of-arts/ba-curriculum-review/working-proposals). This working proposal was then sent out to all stakeholders in the Faculty of Arts for feedback.

In September 2014 a committee was constituted at the request of Dean Lesley Cormack and Associate Dean Mickey Adolphson, Chair of the BA Curriculum Review. This committee was asked to bring the work of earlier iterations of the BA Review Committee to fruition by drafting a proposal of the attributes BA Review for presentation to Arts Faculty Council. This document is that draft. It is divided into four sections:

- History of the Process
- Principles of the Attributes BA
- Attributes: Learning Outcomes and Criteria
- Senior Courses and the Attributes
Principles of the Attributes BA

In a report prepared for Arts Faculty Council in November 2014 (the document was not distributed but was discussed), this committee articulated the principles and core ideas at the heart of its discussions of the attributes BA: that is,

- that the attributes should articulate clearly what we understand to be foundational principles and objectives in the Faculty of Arts: i.e. they should identify in a comprehensible way what we see students learning broadly when they undertake a BA
- that the attributes should not limit but expand students’ engagement with the courses and areas of study within the Faculty
- that the attributes, as core requirements for the BA, should not be difficult to identify by students, instructors, and administrators, particularly those in the Undergraduate Student Services Office, to whom much of the work of supporting students through their programs and the BA requirements falls now and will continue to fall
- that, concomitantly, the attributes should not be difficult to manage at any level
- that the identification of attributes should provide a logic for the choices students make in the BA (i.e. not “because this department needs to offer these courses” or “because it’s good for you” or “because we’ve always done it this way”)
- that the attributes should make it possible to affirm the work and the value of the BA and liberal arts education without instrumentalizing courses as training, or reducing knowledge, learning, pedagogies, and research in Arts to “skillsets” or “toolboxes”
- that the attributes indicate a recognition that we are responsible to our students and that it is important for students to know what our BA can do and to plan for their own futures with a degree that provides them with qualities that can be identified as the basis for continued learning, employment, and social, political, and cultural engagement; this is not the promise of work but the identification of the ways in which learning in Arts can be understood and valued
- that it is a good thing to think about and clarify what we do; that it is important to provide ways for students to think about the courses they take and to be involved in the process of building a BA that works for them
- that many existing BA courses embody one or more attribute; this process will reinforce as well as develop clarity about the BA and its courses

Attributes: Learning Outcomes and Criteria

There are five proposed attributes for the BA. These proposed attributes are intended to replace the current BA Core requirements. They are not intended to necessitate a review of all courses and curricula across the Faculty. They are intended to identify for students, instructors, parents, prospective employers, and, indeed, everyone else what the BA provides, uniquely and importantly, the capacities that graduates might see themselves as having achieved outside of the contexts of discipline and area. These attributes are not skills per se but, rather, represent qualities and ways of thinking and knowing that those
who have earned the BA will take with them into their work, their future study, and their engagement with the world. The committee has undertaken, then, not to redesign the BA but to identify and clarify with reference to these attributes what we and our students do.

Ways of thinking and knowing
We understand this concept to operate as an umbrella attribute for the BA core as a whole.

Analysis and Interpretation (*6)
Purpose:
Learning Outcomes
- introducing students to the tools, methods, material, ideas of a discipline as well as interdisciplinary methods; focused on processes and not necessarily content per se
- analysis, including quantitative, qualitative and critical analysis
- interpretation, including making meaning of: findings, texts, events, creations
- theories of knowledge
- critical thinking and interpretation
- information literacy; numeric literacy

Criteria
Courses in this category will teach and ask students to apply analytical and interpretive methods of a field or discipline. At least 60% of the course grade must be focused on the demonstration of the analytical or interpretive skills. Courses in this category are typically not content-driven.

Research, Creation, and Inquiry (*3)
Learning Outcomes
- creative processes and solutions
- innovative thinking
- problem-oriented practices
- the production of new knowledge
- creation as a process that brings something into existence
- inquiry as an act of asking or looking for information and meaning

Criteria
Courses in this category emphasize engaged learning by means of group and individual problem solving or investigations that encourage students to think in dynamic and original ways. At least 40% of the course grade will require the active production of new knowledge in a variety of formats (visual, dramatic, textual, performative, or social exchanges, among others, depending on the discipline). Courses in this category typically involve substantial project assignments, and can be capstone projects in the final year.

n.b. Courses that emphasize the comprehension of a body of knowledge, the synthesis of ideas, or the mastery of a particular skill, for example, might also include aspects of “Research, Creation, and Inquiry,” but not as the primary elements in terms of structure, assignments, and outcomes; this category is specifically focused on creation and content.
Communication and Culture (*9, including a required *3 from a writing-intensive course [CREDIT REQUIREMENT FOR DISCUSSION])

**Learning Outcomes**

- seeing, reading, writing, speaking and hearing critically
- communication across and within disciplines and communities and cultures
- use of various media
- visual, aural and performance courses
- developing understanding and knowledge of cultural formations and histories and how they are communicated

**Criteria**

**Writing Courses (min. *3)**

Courses in this category emphasize cultural and/or interdisciplinary means of communication. At least 50% of the grade will be based on assignments that ask students to incorporate cultural or interdisciplinary approaches. These courses are writing-intensive. There must be a substantial amount of writing in the course, with in-class time devoted to teaching the skill and art of writing. Revisions and editing may be a part of assignments. Courses in this category may be taught in an LOE.

**Non-writing Courses**

Communication can include any sensory modes of communication, such as visual, auditory, performances, taste, and assignments can be text-based and/or performance-based. Those courses designated as visual or aural, will be primarily devoted to developing skills of visual or aural analysis and/or, as with the writing category, developing speaking skills effective with varying audiences. Courses in this category emphasize cultural and/or interdisciplinary means of communication.

Global Citizenship (*9, including a required *6 from an LOE [CREDIT REQUIREMENT FOR DISCUSSION])

**Learning Outcomes**

- literacy in global and local languages
- understanding language study
- global and cultural awareness
- engagement with diverse communities

**Criteria**

**For LOE courses:**

For courses in this category, the language of classroom instruction/reading/graded work must be predominantly an LOE.

**For other courses:**

These courses are focused on developing students’ knowledge and understanding of diverse cultural contexts. The subject of the course engages one or more culture/nation/etc. and/or the course is taught abroad.

Engaged Learning, Responsible Citizenship, and Social Justice (*3)

**Learning Outcomes**

- experiential learning
Criteria
Courses in this category are focused on developing students’ understanding of the relationship of their studies to the community and of the ways in which post-secondary learning is dynamically engaged with the world in which we live. Courses will normally require students to participate in activities in the community or outside the classroom and have an interest in engaging the students actively with the practices of responsible environmental and community support. Course activities will normally have a practical, experiential component.

nb Students may fulfill up to *9 of the required *30 for the BA attributes from any other faculty, provided those courses meet the criteria for at least one of the attributes.

Senior Courses and the Attributes
The relationship of senior courses to the proposed attributes: 3 key points

An attribute is not something that is learned in one course, but that is developed through the whole of the BA. While the 30 credits that meet the attributes requirements may be completed in the first year, the development of attributes continues through the degree. This continuation highlights the fundamental nature of the requirements. More than boxes to be checked off, the requirements are key to the ongoing quest for understanding that characterizes a Liberal Arts degree. Such sustained emphasis on the attributes makes it clear that a BA encourages open-ended and potentially endless analysis in relation to specific subjects rather than a final mastery of skills or techniques.

a. Senior courses and the attributes
Although junior or 100- and in some instances 200-level courses have a foundational relationship to the proposed BA attributes, it is not the case that students are required to fulfill the attributes solely with junior courses. Students who are not required to take 100- and 200-level courses because of courses completed elsewhere that provide prerequisites for senior courses, advanced language skills, IB or in some instances AP grades, may choose to fulfill the attributes with senior courses. In order to make it possible for students to select such courses easily and for department and Faculty advisors to adequately and accurately direct and support students in that process of selection, any senior course that fulfills an attribute requirement will be identified in the calendar. While courses, especially at
the senior level, may be understood to saliently reinforce more than one attribute, and while that information will appear in the calendar, a single course may reinforce only one attribute in a student’s BA program.

It is important to note that identifying senior courses with reference to the attributes they reinforce does not in any way require departments to alter the content or objectives of their existing courses, but only to align each with a particular attribute or, in some instances, with more than one. The proposed BA does not necessitate or even suggest any change to existing Major and Honours programs. While there is some work involved in the initial alignment of senior courses with attributes, and while departments will need to review these alignments probably annually in order to ensure that courses are identified accurately for students, we do not see this identification of courses as something that could lead to restrictions on the content and objectives of any courses. When a department chooses to offer a course whose content and objectives are at variance with the attribute identified in the calendar description, that information must be made clearly available on the department website and in any materials it circulates to students well in advance of the beginning of the course. We propose that the calendar include clearly marked instructions to students to check with departments to ensure that courses meet particular attributes in any given year and that, when a course repeatedly falls outside of the attribute with which it was initially identified, its calendar description be reviewed.

b. Capstone projects
Capstone projects that complete the 3 credits of the Research, Creation, and Inquiry attribute or any other attribute will typically but not necessarily be undertaken in the final year of a student’s BA program. Capstone projects can be completed within existing upper-level courses, independent study courses, or with a “capstone” designation based on the specific requirements that have been determined by each Department.

c. The attributes BA: strengthening and clarifying a student’s accomplishments through an identification of the attributes emphasized through the degree program
In the committee’s view, one of the most important aspects of the proposed attributes BA inheres in the possibility of students choosing to emphasize an attribute through their program. Thus a student may complete any degree program in the Faculty, may choose courses that are identified in the calendar with reference to the specific attributes they reinforce, and will end up with a BA in a particular area that will also be identified on the transcript as a degree that emphasizes a particular attribute: for instance, Honours Anthropology with an emphasis in Global Literacy; or a Major in Psychology with an emphasis in Analysis and Interpretation. We feel strongly that such an emphasis, which will not alter or interfere with any existing degree programs and will not require any supplementary work at the department level beyond the calendar identification and annual
review of courses and the attributes they reinforce, will strengthen and clarify students’ accomplishments and will enable them to explain and demonstrate how the work they have done through their degree has developed skills, knowledge, and methods that are both fundamental to the discipline within which they have studied and relevant and applicable outside of it—in employment, in advanced studies, and in work in and for communities, societies, and their political and structural apparatuses. We already know this to be the case for our students who have completed the BA—but not everyone does, and it is important that the value of the BA be communicated through the shorthand of the degree designation and the transcript. In consultation with designers, the transcript can be developed to include a visual representation of the attributes taken, providing the Faculty of Arts with a distinctive document that communicates student strengths in multiple formats. We hope to see a system of identifying emphasis on the transcript implemented in Faculty software programs that can be used for reviewing students’ progress through their degrees, something that is currently done manually.

Respectfully,

Mickey Adolphson
Cecily Devereux
Pete Hurd
Lianne McTavish
Jan Selman
Micah True
Helen Vallianatos