What is an Educated Person? The Value of a Campus-wide Conversation in Finding an Answer

Susan Verducci Sandford, Annette Nellen, and Gail Evans

"Broad, meaningful reform in higher education is long overdue. The near-universal demand for higher learning in the United States creates new urgency, opportunity, and responsibility to revitalize the practice of undergraduate education" (Association of American Colleges and Universities 2002, vii).

Abstract

This article explains the value to our campus community of a vibrant conversation addressing the question: What does it mean to be an educated person? Our ongoing, campus-wide dialogue began in 2003 and brings San José State employees and students together to explore the question of what skills, knowledge, dispositions and habits an educated person should possess. In the article, we explain how and why we started the conversation, the results and benefits derived, and the challenges encountered. We also provide some words of advice for those interested in beginning their own campus dialogue.

Universities seem to be in constant conversation about how to achieve greater success in all of their work. How do general education courses fit with the major to help students become liberally educated? What roles do co-curricular activities play in helping students become intentional, lifelong learners? What do today's college students need in order to succeed in the twenty-first century global workforce? These and other questions were posed when faculty, staff, administrators and students at San José State University (SJSU) began, in May 2003, a dialogue to answer the questions: What does it mean to be an educated person, and how is this concept relevant to the university's curriculum and programs?

The purpose of this article is to relay the value to our campus community of the resulting, vibrant, campus-wide conversation on the skills, knowledge, dispositions and habits an educated person should possess and to share our lessons learned. In the article, we explain how and why we started the conversation, the tangible results and benefits derived, and the challenges encountered. We also provide some words of advice for those interested in beginning their own campus dialogue.

Why Make the Effort?

Most SJSU employees keep just slightly ahead of the avalanche of work. Why then did we bother adding more snow to our load? Why did people get engaged in this dialogue? Why did they ask that it be continued beyond its planned one-year run? One obvious reason was because we care about what we do in our professional lives. Those who participated in the dialogue did so because addressing the knotty question at the heart of our explorations—What does it mean to be an educated person?—is fundamental to our ability to do our work well.

Additionally, the question itself responds, in part, to what we see as a recent change in higher education. No longer do effective educators consider their work uncoupled from the learning that occurs in their institutions. Emphasis on *learning* shifts the conversation away from topics such as *teaching* and how the university should *assess* teaching, to what students should be learning and whether we know if that learning is occurring. A primary aim of the dialogue has been to articulate exactly what our learning goals are for our students. A secondary aim has been to act in ways that allow these goals to permeate the structures, processes, and classrooms of the university. Inherent in these goals is the search for ways to help students understand what a university education is all about and to explore how curricular and co-curricular activities work together to meet the learning and developmental needs of our students.

There has also been a recent change in the social discourse about the purposes of undergraduate education. The traditional aims of a liberal education are enjoying a renaissance. With professional scandals such as Enron fresh in our memories, bioethical issues in the air, and the effects of the commercialization on the university coming into focus, the glow surrounding specialization and narrow professional training as primary aims for the university has begun to fade. Discussion of more traditional goals, effectively merged with professional goals, has gained ground both in our conversation and in the focus of various accrediting bodies and higher education organizations.

Another catalyst for dialogue was the issuance of a report by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) entitled *Greater Expectations—A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College*. This report not only catalyzed the conversation, it shaped its direction.

Greater Expectations reported that most jobs today require a college education, change is rapid, and people need to be able to make informed decisions and employ creative and intellectual skills. In response, it recommends that universities help students become "intentional learners." Such learners are integrative thinkers who can see connections in seemingly disparate information and draw on a wide range of knowledge to make decisions. They adapt the skills learned in one situation to problems encountered in another: in a classroom, the workplace, their communities, or their personal lives. As a result, intentional learners succeed even when instability is the only constant (2002, 21-22).

Greater Expectations also identifies challenges universities face in helping students to gain the skills and knowledge they need to become "intentional learners." Learning tends to be fragmented around discipline-focused departments while the world has taken on a more interdisciplinary focus. Also, faculty members tend to focus on the goals of courses rather than the broader university goals. In addition, too much emphasis has been placed on the major when many of the skills and much of the knowledge students need today derives from general education courses. The AAC&U report also emphasizes the need to "reinvigorate" liberal education to be sure it is high quality, meaningful and practical. It should integrate general education with the major and co-curricular activities. *Greater Expectations* is a report we found hard to ignore.

Finally, through *Greater Expectations*, we came to understand the need to articulate what higher education is about to our local community and our students. Despite changes in the world and in the needs of the workforce, students, for the most part, view college as a pathway to a job with the major courses as the focus. They tend to not understand or appreciate the value of general education courses and co-curricular activities. The same can be said of the local community. This lack of communication, combined with greater scrutiny by the public, politicians, government agencies, and "consumer" students can become problematic. We began to question how we might help our communities understand the role of higher education.

One of the first steps toward this and other ends mentioned above was to understand and, to a certain extent, agree upon the purposes of the institution regarding its students. Articulating our expectations for our students *and* for ourselves, and finding effective ways to communicate with students about these expectations was a second step. Aligning the structures, processes, policies and curriculum of the university with the goals of cultivating educated persons is a third, followed by engaging parents, employees and the community in the conversation. All these steps are required to achieve the healthy alignment necessary to do good work. Our conversation recognized what needed to be done and began to do it.

The campus dialogue, as explained below, proved to be a mechanism that allowed for exploration of *Greater Expectations* and other reports, that allowed employees from academic affairs and student affairs to share ideas and experiences, and that allowed us to seriously consider what college students need to be doing and achieving and how university programs and services need to be designed and coordinated to help them do both.

What We Did at SJSU

Beginnings. The campus dialogue began in May 2003 with the start of the term of one of the authors of this article, Annette Nellen, as chair of the Academic Senate. This, in combination with the impending policy review of the general education program by the end of 2005, sparked the conversation, as noted in the flyer announcing the creation of the dialogue:

> Universities continually discuss what it means to be an educated person, what a "liberal education" means or looks like and why it is or is not important and how general education courses help or hinder. Given several upcoming areas where the Senate will be discussing initiatives and involved with activities surrounding these topics, it seems like a good time to get people from all parts of the SJSU campus community involved in discussing and sharing ideas on this important and timely topic.

Structure. The dialogue was designed for both online and face-to-face discussions. A Web page was created with information about the dialogue, the questions to be posed and links to relevant campus and lifelong learning Web sites and documents. Input and buy-in was obtained from the Undergraduate Studies Office which deals with general education, assessment and degree programs. Information was distributed via flyers and an announcement on the campus weekly news update distributed via email.

The online discussion was through a campus-based listserv that people could either join on their own (the signup instructions were on the dialogue Web page) or ask the dialogue facilitator to add them. Members of the SJSU community (employees, students, alums, community members) were invited to join. While there was an "owner" of the listserv, there was no "guard" and any post went to everyone subscribed to the listserv. Participants were mostly respectful in keeping the comments pertinent to the purpose of the dialogue. When posts occasionally got off topic, as can happen on any listserv, the "owner" politely stepped in and asked those participants to move their discussion off the listserv. We had occasional posts that seemed off point, but often someone was able to restate or broaden the topic of the post so that discussion would ensue.

The online dialogue started out robustly with people offering their ideas on what it means to be an educated citizen and commenting on suggestions of others. While nine questions were initially posed for the listserv (to be spread out over the academic year), the conversation took on a life of its own. Based on comments submitted, people came up with new questions for further exploration. Participants were engaged in the subject matter and interested in directing the dialogue towards their needs and interests.

The initial question—What does it mean to be an educated citizen/person?—led to the creation of two documents to answer the question. One document lists traits of an educated person and the other lists things that an educated person should be able to do (both are available on the dialogue Web site: www.sjsu.edu/educatedpersondialogue/.

Fourteen "brown bags" (face-to-face discussions) were held during the first year. While a few were open discussions, most involved a 20-minute presentation followed by a discussion. Topics included the role of civic engagement in helping develop educated persons, whether there was a definable knowledge base for an educated person, the role of student affairs, and what other universities do to help develop educated persons. In addition, a student panel explored what they viewed as the role of a university. The complete list of brown bag topics from September 2003 to the present

is also available at the dialogue Web site. Typical attendance at a brown bag was six to twenty people predominantly from colleges and student affairs. Each session was held during the noon hour in a discussion-friendly room supported by the Center for Faculty Development.

About one hundred people were involved in the listserv with about the same total number participating in the brown bags. While there was some overlap in these two groups, the number of participants was likely about 150. While this represents just 5 percent of the total SJSU workforce, it was a much larger and more diverse group of people than would have been involved if the discussion had been structured as a task force. Also, because several ideas and recommendations of the dialogue went to Senate committees and other units, the reach extended beyond the roughly 150 direct participants.

Facilitating factors. The dialogue was quite active at times and lasted beyond its originally planned one-year run. In fact, although we are writing this article in the past tense, the conversation continues today. Factors that contributed to the high level of interest and involvement include the following.

1. Support of Senate leadership: The chair of a strong senate does have a "pulpit" to help draw attention to activities. The relevance of the dialogue to activities of the senate and its committees also helped support the dialogue. Support of subsequent senate chairs has continued to help keep the dialogue strong.

2. Involvement of key people on campus: The dialogue was helped by the active participation of the President's Executive Assistant, Vice Provost, director of service learning, chair of the council on chairs, and leaders in the Undergraduate Studies Office.

3. Open to all: There were participants from all divisions on campus—President's office, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Advancement, Administration & Finance, Athletics, and Associated Students.

4. Support from the Center for Faculty Development: The Center was asked to serve as co-sponsor of the "brown bags" since the topic fit with their programming and they could help publicize the events. The Center's support was invaluable in raising the profile of the dialogue and helping to turn it into a regular campus activity. The Center also regularly invites the dialogue director and leaders from Undergraduate Studies to speak to new faculty about the dialogue, its findings and how to get involved.

5. Voluntary roles: Unlike a committee, the dialogue format allowed people to choose how to be involved, as well as when.

6. Output: While there is a lot of value in pure discussion, participants also saw many of the ideas actualized through senate referrals, content posted to the Web site, and changes made to general education. In addition, the participants created a list of

ideas that was shared with senate committees and various units on campus in the hopes that they might adopt some of them.

7. Timing: The reality of accreditation, general education review, strategic planning and joining the AAC&U's liberal education advocacy project all led to greater interest in the dialogue topic.

8. *Greater Expectations* and other reports: Various reports explain the need for universities to transform themselves and some offer suggestions on how universities might negotiate the current challenges delineated earlier. We found these reports strengthened our dialogue because they lay out many reasons why educators should be having a dialogue. The transformations facing higher education today call upon universities to focus on the items listed below, which are all excellent discussion topics:
   a. What students *learn*, not what faculty *teach*.
   b. Both *what* is learned and *how* it is learned.
   c. Connecting general education, major and minor courses and co-curricular experiences in a manner that provides high quality learning experiences and aids student development.
   d. Information and technological competencies.
   e. Integrative learning that is more than adding or reshuffling courses.
   f. Helping students understand the importance of liberal and integrative learning.
   g. The importance of diversity and inclusive excellence to learning and development.
   h. The skills and knowledge necessary for liberal learning.

The Value of the Conversation

Two key levels of value stem from our dialogue: value for the individual participants and value for the university and its role in educating students.

First, participants told us that the conversation provided an opportunity for collaboration with a variety of persons across campus. One faculty member wrote:

> Participation in the "educated person dialogue" has been very beneficial to me, professionally, in several ways. Foremost, it has served as a community builder for me, a relatively new faculty member. I have made genuine and valuable relations with colleagues from several departments.

Another professor stated that the dialogue "created a meaningful community," characterizing it as "an essential part of the 'new glue' that holds us together."

Participants also reported that the dialogue provided a welcome opportunity to reflect on their own work. One person described it as "one of the first non-committee opportunities for colleagues to engage in an ongoing thoughtful exchange of ideas." It helped that we were able to engage with each other without facing the hammer of

external demands: we had no "deadlines" and we were not tasked with producing something. No one (other than ourselves) had any expectations of us.

Donald Schön has written much on the value of reflecting on one's professional practice. He begins *Educating the Reflective Practitioner* with the following:

> In the varied topography of professional practice, there is the high, hard ground overlooking the swamp. On the high ground, manageable problems lend themselves to solution through the application of research-based theory and technique. In the swampy lowland, messy, confusing problems defy technical solution. The irony of this situation is that the problems of the high ground tend to be relatively unimportant to individuals or society at large, however great their technical interest may be, while in the swamp lie the problems of greatest human concern (1987, 1).

Schön follows this with a question: should the practitioner choose to "remain on the high ground where he can solve relatively unimportant problems according to prevailing standards or rigor, or shall he descend into the swamp of important problems and non-rigorous inquiry?" (1987, 1). In our campus dialogue, we descended straight into higher education's muck. Instead of feeling "swamped" by the descent (and the relative uselessness of the tools of our respective academic disciplines for addressing the tough and messy question at the center of our dialogue), the participants spoke of becoming invigorated. One told us, "The discussions, both over lunch and online, are enlightening but also affirming, as I strive in my own classes to teach to higher, holistic goals of human development."

Schön's work on reflection articulates the direct value of this mucking about to the practice of the professional. Through reflection, we brought to the surface, debated and honed ideas that in turn shaped our understanding of what it means to educate persons. We built our tacit and intuitive understanding of what is of value in what we do and what needs to be reworked. This, in turn, impacted our professional *practice*. On its exterior, this process seems somewhat obvious—engaging in a conversation on professional practice has the potential to impact that very practice. What Schön brings to the table is the unique importance of entering the swamp, of reflecting on fundamental questions that resist easy answers.

The second level of value is to the university and its role in educating students. Given that the dialogue was not a task force, did not report to anyone and had no obligation to the university governing structure, the impact to the university was surprising. The following are examples of actions that stemmed from the dialogue:

1. GE: Discussions in the dialogue on the role of civic learning, social responsibility, ethics and values, "intentional learning," renaming general education, and the need for a university mission statement to tie to the curriculum all led to specific changes in the general education guidelines.

2. First-Year Experience: Frequent conversations on how to help students to understand the meaning and importance of lifelong integrative learning helped to

shape a rubric used in the freshmen seminar program. This rubric helps students to see what is involved in becoming a university scholar and to gauge their progress.

3. E-portfolios: Discussion of the use of e-portfolios by some universities and the value to student learning, led to high interest and excitement in the dialogue. The outcome was a referral to the Senate which resulted in the creation of an e-portfolio task force and two-day conference on the topic.

4. Socrates Café: Discussion on active learning and getting all students engaged in classroom discussions led to conversations about Socrates Cafés. Socrates Cafés were introduced by Christopher Phillips in a book of that title with the subheading "A Fresh Taste of Philosophy." In these "cafés," small groups of people gather to discuss philosophical questions about life and its meaning. A small subset of dialogue participants pursued creation of a Socrates Café at SJSU which had its first meeting in March 2005 (http://www.philosopher.org/).

5. Pedagogy: The dialogue also surfaced the fact that many professors do not feel they have the best techniques for engaging students in high quality dialogue in the classroom. This led to a recommendation to the Center for Faculty Development and creation of a new workshop, *Enhancing Quality Participation in the Classroom*, which explained a variety of participation techniques including debate and online discussion boards.

6. Liberal education: Several topics discussed in the dialogue led to senate referrals or support for creation of new ventures. For example, discussions on the importance of co-curricular activities led to a senate referral to pursue having such a transcript for students. Discussions of ways to help students understand the importance of general education led to a senate referral for a letter to be sent to students when they complete their lower-division general education requirements to acknowledge that milestone and stress its importance. Other activities that benefited from recognition and discussion in the dialogue were the creation of the Campus Reading Program in 2005, having a team attend the AAC&U Greater Expectations Institute for the first time in 2005 and again in 2006, and having SJSU become a LEAP partner in the AAC&U's liberal education advocacy campaign. Finally, emphasis on the *Greater Expectations* report through the dialogue led more people to read it and for elements of it to be reflected in the vision statement and shared values created in the strategic planning process started in 2004.

Selected Highlights of the Discussion

One of the "hottest" topics in the early discussions was whether we should be talking about an educated "person" or "citizen." In its inception, the dialogue was entitled, "What is an educated citizen?" However, the issue was raised that many of our students are not citizens in the political sense. One participant pointed out that the term citizen has been used to designate those with privileges as distinct from those without. Some voiced that if we are careful in developing good, educated people, the citizen

part will take care of itself. Still others argued that the question assumes a false dichotomy since to be a person in the twenty-first century is to be a citizen as well, and therefore, we must prepare our students as citizens as well as persons, for their sake and for society's. Perhaps the statement that finally swayed the decision to the "person" side came from a student: "To be a citizen is a privilege," and not all feel or have that sense of privilege. And at the end of the 2004 spring semester, the discussion was renamed the "Educated Person Dialogue" since the term "citizen" distracted from the key point of becoming "educated."

Another terminology point dealt with "educated person" which connotes finality when in reality we were talking about a continual process—about *lifelong* learning. Participants acknowledged this while continuing to refer to the discussions as the "Educated Person Dialogue" since the name seems to have stuck. Additional terms used to describe what we hope our students will become are university scholars and lifelong learners.

The student panel held in the first year of the dialogue was also a highlight. Most of the students were peer mentors for the first-year experience program and so were able to share both their experiences and what they had learned from working with freshmen. The following are some highlights of the questions and answers from the student panel.

1. *Why did you choose San José State to pursue your education?*
   - "I came to SJSU as a default, but now I love it...I forced myself to get to know some of my professors and to go to their office hours. That's when I learned what it meant to go to school, when I found my connection with the actual university."
   - "I came as a transfer student. I didn't like it at first, then I started seeking clubs to join."
   - "I didn't have a choice—it was all I could afford."
   - "This was one of my top choices...I want to embrace everything SJSU has to offer me. I'm enjoying my classes and teachers so much."

2. *What makes an educated person?*
   - "That you can make a change. It can be a small one, but still make a difference."
   - "To be more open-minded, more accepting. It helps to know your professors and find your place in the university."
   - "To broaden my view. Diversity, to have a variety of interests."
   - "It means how active you are in your own learning."
   - "The degree doesn't get interviewed for the job, the person does."
   - "Learning to interact with different kinds of people helps me in other situations."
   - "As long as I'm learning new things, I think differently. I never want to be static."

Many of these comments were considered in the 2005 revision of the General Education Guidelines, as well as in strategic planning efforts around assessment, first-year experience for freshmen and transfers, and integrative learning. Because the

campus has been engaged in these conversations it has helped to pave the way for initiatives that may have otherwise been delayed for lack of understanding.

Challenges We Encountered

Not all was rosy in our dialogue. Two of the challenges we encountered were having a good mix of voices including students, and process issues.

Like many institutions, we experience a disconnect between our students' goals for themselves and those that university personnel have for them. Understanding and bridging this gap is a challenge. Student participation in the dialogue was minimal. It is unclear why students did not participate more. Was there a lack of incentives to do what might be necessary to attract students to the conversation? Were they reluctant to participate with faculty? Did they feel they did not have the necessary foundation for participating in the conversation? Was it uninteresting? Were they just too busy? One participant from Student Affairs noted that contradictory impulses might be at play. "I've wondered what would be different if the group included students. Would it change the freedom to be open and honest about some of our shortcomings? Or would it make us more thoughtful?"

We also encountered a different problem of inclusion. In the typical shared-governance structure of higher education, each college has a seat at the table. With the dialogue, while all were invited to participate, there was no guarantee that all colleges had a voice in all discussions as it depended on the interest and time of faculty and staff to contribute. However, all colleges had at least one active participant and these participants were strong voices in their colleges. They included department chairs, associate deans and one dean. Yet, there was never a guarantee during any discussion that we would hear from across the campus.

Finally, although some significant ideas were generated throughout the dialogue, translating the conversation into meaningful action was sometimes a challenge. Unlike a formal committee, this group was not formed to produce any specific product, to regulate any particular processes, to reform any defined structures or to develop any curriculum. Also, it had no formal reporting structure—which was both an advantage and a disadvantage. The grassroots nature of our discourse eventually became a double-edged sword; without mechanisms for translating our ideas into actions, we were occasionally left exploring the "So what?" question. Without obvious and powerful outlets for our work, we relied upon the members to take our ideas with them into their formal committees. As indicated earlier, our conversation did end up influencing many decisions made on campus, but this impact was scattershot. Had we been able to mount a more focused, organized and directed reform effort, we could have had a greater impact. Of course, on the flip side, in being part of a structure—whether a senate committee, provost's task force or advisory board—there would not have been the opportunity for so many people to have actively participated.

None of these challenges proved to be significant, however, as indicated by participant involvement that has kept the dialogue active and interesting for over three years.

What is an Educated Person?

Many university mission statements describe learning goals in very broad terms. When efforts are made to drill down to get a better sense of what broad terms really mean, such as develop professional skills or multi-cultural perspectives, the opportunity for rich dialogue is created. That discussion most likely entails several dimensions including: (1) what is the knowledge and what are the list of skills, dispositions, and habits needed to be an educated person, and what does each item on that list mean; (2) what level of achievement is desired for the skills, knowledge, dispositions, and habits; and (3) what should a university do to help its students attain those skills, dispositions, and habits and have the requisite foundation knowledge to be an educated person and qualified graduate of the university.

As noted earlier, the dialogue group created two lists to answer this question (traits of an educated person and things that an educated person should be able to do, found on the dialogue Web site). In addition, we compiled a list of skills, knowledge, dispositions, and habits that might possibly be used to describe an educated person from various reports of higher education organizations and documents from campuses that had addressed the question. This list is included in the appendix. The latter may be useful in helping to review or reformulate learning objectives for students at your university or to answer, for yourselves, the question as to what it means to be an educated person.

Be prepared that the discussion will probably provide more questions than answers. And the "answers" you do find will evolve with the times. Don't let the existence of lists fool you.

Conclusion: Lessons Learned and Advice for Others

The Educated Person Dialogue at SJSU has been, and continues to be, a wonderful experience. It has provided a unique opportunity for people from across campus to discuss changes in higher education, what it means to be an educated person, and how to help students become educated persons. It has provided a collegial venue for the sharing of ideas and practices and the influencing of policy. The topic is so broad that it is unlikely we will run out of things to discuss. The dialogue has led to more people reading various reports of higher education organizations that otherwise would likely have been overlooked. Having the opportunity to discuss some of these reports with colleagues has made them more meaningful to the readers.

Our experiences lead us to recommend that other universities try their own campus dialogue. If there is an upcoming project, such as general education revision or new assessment requirements, starting an informal conversation beforehand can be extremely helpful. It allows an opportunity for anyone interested to contribute ideas in

a pressure-free environment and a collegial opportunity to delve deeply into some of higher education's burning issues. This can lead to greater interest in any upcoming project, as well as better informed participants.

Supplementing the dialogue with reading and discussion of appropriate reports from higher education organizations (see references for a partial list) and articles from higher education journals will provide greater significance and interest in your dialogue. Extra effort will likely be needed to get students involved. Encourage faculty to find ways to get their students involved in attending at least one face-to-face discussion as a class assignment or serving on a panel to share their ideas about a particular matter. Also, ask faculty to share ideas from the dialogue with their students to get their reaction and ideas.

We recommend that an employee well-known across campus and somehow associated with the upcoming project or topic facilitate the dialogue. This should help elevate the attention given by others to the activity and increase the chances that the ideas will move to the group that is formally working on the project. The facilitator must be willing and able to help sustain the conversation such as by sending an occasional question to the listserv if it becomes inactive, keeping the discussion on topic, and finding ways to get enough voices involved for it to be a "campus dialogue." In addition, affiliation with appropriate units on campus, such as the undergraduate studies office, will help sustain and support the dialogue. We look forward to the continuation of our own dialogue in the upcoming academic year.

For further information on the SJSU Educated Person Campus Dialogue, including a list of "brown bag" topics, reports referenced, and the dialogue history, please visit http://www.sjsu.edu/educatedpersondialogue/.

References

ACT. 2005. *Crisis at the core*, http://www.act.org/path/policy/alert/crisis.html.

ACT. 2006. *Reading between the lines*, http://www.act.org/path/policy/reports/reading.html.

Association of American Colleges and Universities. 2002. *Greater Expectations—A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to Colleg*e, http://www.greaterexpectations.org.

Association of American Colleges and Universities. *Liberal education materials*, http://www.aacu.org/issues/liberaleducation/.

Humphreys, D., and A. Davenport. 2005. What really matters in college. *Liberal Education* 36 (Summer/Fall), http://www.aacu.org/liberaleducation/le-sufa05/LEAP_SUFA05.pdf.

NASPA, and ACPA. 2004. *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student Experience*, http://www.naspa.org/membership/leader_ex_pdf/lr_long.pdf.

San Jose State University. 2003. Educated Person Dialogue. *On Campus* (Fall). San Jose, CA. http://www.sjsu.edu/educatedpersondialogue/.

Schneider, C., and R. Shoenberg. Contemporary understandings of liberal education, http://www.aacu.org/publications/ContemporaryUnderstandings.cfm.

Schön, D. 1987. *Educating the reflective practitioner.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schön, D. 1983. *The reflective practitioner: how professionals think in action.* New York: Basic Books.

Author Information

Susan Verducci Sandford is an assistant professor in the College of Humanities & The Arts and Coordinator of the Liberal Studies program.

Annette Nellen is a professor in the College of Business and the founder/facilitator of the SJSU Educated Person Campus Dialogue.

Gail Evans is Associate Dean and Director of General Education in the Office of Undergraduate Studies.

Susan Verducci Sandford
Humanities Department
San José State University
1 Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95192-0092
E-mail: Susan.Verducci@sjsu.edu
Telephone: 408-924-4459

Annette Nellen
Accounting and Finance
San José State University
1 Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95192-0066
E-mail: Annette.Nellen@sjsu.edu
Telephone: 408-924-3508

Gail Evans
Undergraduate Studies
San José State University
1 Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95192-0030
E-mail: Gail.Evans@sjsu.edu
Telephone: 408-924-2447

Appendix

Possible Skills, Knowledge, Dispositions, and Habits of an Educated Person/University Scholar

Communication skills

Listening skills

Critical-thinking skills

Creative-thinking skills

Information literacy

Quantitative literacy

Reading competency at the college level

Appreciation of reading and writing as key to the learning process

Technology skills

Problem-solving skills

Teamwork skills

Ability to deal with ambiguity

Ethical decision-making skills

Understanding one's values

Ability to form reasoned, independent judgment

Ability to engage in civil discourse

Broad understanding of the sciences

Broad understanding of the social sciences

Broad understanding of the arts and humanities

Knowledge and skills in a specific discipline

Civic engagement

Social responsibility

Participation in civic, professional, cultural, and other communities

Understand societal problems and strategies for change

Cultural competency—multicultural perspectives

Understanding religions and their relevance in society

Global perspective

Understanding of self and limitations/confidence

Responsibility for actions

Ability to adapt to local and world changes

Ability to question self and society

Ability to accept and use criticism

Ability to develop and implement appropriate assessments

Decision-making skills

Leadership skills

Open-minded

Aesthetic awareness

Understand human experiences and current relevance

Ability to apply knowledge in daily life

Integrative learning abilities

Motivation, habits of mind, and ability for lifelong learning

Ability to manage university experience and to graduate

Daily living competencies (could include health maintenance, financial literacy, economic self-sufficiency, ability to balance work and leisure, personal goal-setting, engaging in meaningful relationships, ability to manage one's own affairs.)

Spiritual awareness/search for meaning and purpose in one's life

Second language