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Abstract

The purpose of education is to prepare students to address imperative concerns that face our communities and planet. Many ways exist to address these pressing issues we are confronted with. Regardless of what subjects students are studying, how they are educated is of critical importance. This is because the “how” of education will directly influence the way in which the important issues they are being trained for are addressed. Around the turn of the twentieth century experiential education (EE) came into use among scholars to address problems they saw in “traditional” or “mainstream” education. Between then and now much has changed in the educational landscape, and yet this dichotomy between “mainstream” and “alternative” pedagogies persists. This study explores the present-day realities of EE, place-based education, and significant learning (Fink 2013) within the context of the University of Missouri (MU). Grounded theory methodology was applied for this exploratory case study. The theory that emerged seems to have implications beyond the realms of education and the MU community.
Introduction

The aim of education is to prepare students to address crucial issues that face our communities and planet. Many ideas exist as to what the important, pressing issues of the day are. Regardless of what subjects students are focusing on, how they are educated is of critical importance. This is because the “how” of education will directly influence the way in which the important issues they are being trained for are addressed. Around the turn of the twentieth century experiential education (EE) came into use among scholars (Dewey 1986; James 1980; Mendenhall, Macomber, and Cutright 2000; Kolb and Kolb 2017) to address problems they saw in “traditional” or “mainstream” education. Between then and now much has changed in the educational landscape, and yet there still exists a “mainstream” pedagogy juxtaposed against “alternative” ones (Wilson 2018; Speck 2018b; Elder 2018; Sebastian 2018; Peters 2018; Malkin 2018; Schulte 2018; Minnick 2018; Larsen 2018b; Palmer 2018; Spain 2018; Kim 2018; Allyon 2018; Hemmelgarn 2018; Mendleson 2018; Fellabaum-Totson 2018; Fink 2013; Mayer and Alexander 2017). As an outdoor educator who has been trained in EE, I became interested in what the EE landscape was like at the University of Missouri (MU or Mizzou) where I pursued a master’s degree in geography.
Prior to starting my studies at MU, I had become interested in a newer “how” of education, place-based education (PBE). With instructing responsibilities as part of my assistantship I naturally taught them with a combination of PBE and EE strategies. My experiences as an instructor and student at MU were combined with interviews of local instructors to generate data on what the EE landscape was like at Mizzou. The results of this study link EE and PBE with significant learning (Fink 2013) outcomes. The purpose of this study evolved from looking at the use of EE in the MU context, to generating a grounded theory (Birks and Mills 2015) on how to best provide students with SL outcomes. The theory that emerged seems to have larger implications for not just how we educate and learn, but how we live our everyday lives.
Two: Expeditionary Review of Literature

Expeditions Informed Through Place

Steve, my co-instructor on this Outward Bound (OB) expedition, and I are in the La Sal Mountains of Eastern Utah, watching a leadership theory (Appendix A) come to life before our eyes. For about two weeks we have been instructing students on leadership, character development, and service through exploring canyons, rivers, and mountains. Each day we move camp and navigate to a new one. The students are on their first day of true self travel. This means we instructors will not step in unless a critical safety issue is imminent. We will allow them to get lost. It has been nothing but blue skies and sunshine today. Morning saw the students crushing miles and nailing the route, but things have started going sideways. While the day remains sunny and bright without a cloud in the sky, clouds of discontent are moving in among our group members. What was once a single pod of eight intrepid backpackers is now three distinct groups sorted according to previously self-identified tendencies. Four students who identified closely with driver and spontaneous motivator traits (Creech 2018) are in the “lead” and marching purposefully towards their goal. They occasionally take a cursory glance at the map to assure themselves they are headed in the right direction. Internally, Steve and I shake our heads as they did not stop at the last high point, about two hundred feet from where they are now, nor do they stop to orient the map when they look at it, and they look at the map first and then at the landmarks around them; displaying three fundamental mistakes of
navigation. Two group members have refused to move any farther. They are up on the high point with their map oriented. Intentionally, they look out across the montane surroundings they are a part of. With this information, they go back to the map for further guidance. Their minds click with thoughts, doubtful thoughts (Malkin 2018). Their uncertainty that the group is where it needs to be is palpable. The other two group members are halfway between the analyzers and the driver/motivator sects (Creech 2018). These self-identified relationship masters (Creech 2018) are clearly concerned about the visible difference of opinion among the group. One seeks to console the frustrated drivers/motivators and the other has engaged one of the analyzers to gain clarity on what they are seeing. This is something we OB (“Our Story | Colorado Outward Bound School” n.d.) instructors have encountered countless times on courses and is something we humans have been dealing with throughout our brief time on Earth. The MU community is no different.

When I began my OB career, immersed in the lakes and loons of the Northern Plains of what has become known as the Midwest, I would have been in that group of four drivers and motivators. I would be exasperated with the “loafers” and impatient to be moving full steam ahead. The Places and experiences of my life have shown me the need for all of the feelings, thoughts, and actions displayed by each of the expedition members in the story above. The trick is knowing when which skillset is needed in the moment and how to successfully blend them together on the individual and group scales. I currently find myself reflecting on another expedition with a different co-instructor, my advisor and mentor Soren Larsen. Instead of it taking Place in the La Sal Mountains, it has taken Place on the tops of the rolling hills with a
manicured landscape dominated by hardwood trees and roadways. This Place is bordered by the limestone bluffs that overlook Hinkson and Flatbranch watersheds. Soren and I found ourselves being the analyzers filled with solution-oriented doubt. We slowed down and found a high point. We oriented our maps, first observing the visceral landmarks around us and integrating these observations not just with our maps, but with our experiences down there in the everyday reality of instructing at Mizzou. At Mizzou instructors have the same goal in navigation: providing students with the best education. From our perspective, collectively we are not where many of us think we are, and it is time to re-calibrate our location and our trajectory.

“Grounded” Navigation – Landscape and Maps

It needs to be stated that the grounded theory methodology used in this research (explained in detail in Chapter Three) does not test theories or findings of academic literature. Instead exploration starts with observations of everyday realities, and through these observations makes inductive and abductive connections to form a theory that explains those connections. This study has a unique relationship within the existing literature. It views peer reviewed academic articles equal to other information sources, such as informal chats, formalized interviews, newspaper articles, or inferences made from the wording of a document (Birks and Mills 2015). Imagine the example from the OB expedition above. The drivers and motivators were first checking their maps, and then looking around the landscape they were in. Doing this makes it very easy to convince yourself you are somewhere when, in fact, you are not.
Conversely, we start with our observations (the landscape) and then look at the existing literature (the maps). In order to present this study, it makes sense to provide readers with a literature review first so we can get on the same page with some terms and concepts important to this research, even though this is not the order in which the research operated.

The Experiential Learning Landscape and some of its Maps

The idea of giving experience a pivotal, central role in education and human development has been circulating in intellectual circles since at least the end of the nineteenth century (Kolb and Kolb 2017). The major contributing scholars to this theory include John Dewey, Mary Parker Follet, William James, Jean Piaget, Kurt Lewin, Lev Vygotsky, Carl Jung, Carl Rogers, and Paulo Freire (Kolb and Kolb 2017). Pertinent for this study are John Dewey’s “Experience and Education,” Alice and David Kolb’s “Experiential Learning Theory as a guide for Experiential Educators in Higher Education,” and the contributions of Kurt Hahn, co-founder of OB (Hahn 1936; Stetson Unpublished document; James 1980; Hanford 2015).

From the outset, John Dewey described EE as needed to address major problems that he deemed habitual and rampant in mainstream (“traditional”) education. Paramount among these problems were imposing education on students, lack of ethical and moral guidance, the organization of the classroom, and abstract knowledge divorced from personal experiences (Dewey 1986). Dewey argued that mainstream education imposed itself on students in unhealthy ways. It started with abstract concepts that the students must learn from instructors
who were deemed unquestioned experts. Such a starting point, Dewey argued, led to a lack of student buy-in and an inability to use the knowledge later on.

Instead, any learning should start with each student’s individual impulses (Dewey 1986). Such impulses are usually thought of as distractions in mainstream education. Dewey argued that instructors must aid students in channeling and reconstructing their impulses into purpose. Once a student has a purpose, and their education is predicated on it; then education stops being a requirement. The purposes of education, furthermore, must be morally and ethically guided. Otherwise the responsibility, power, and effects of using knowledge are more likely to be abused or not taken into consideration (Dewey 1986). With a morally infused purpose, students should learn abstract knowledge through experience. In order to teach through experience, the classroom will be organized around socially familiar arrangements such as family and other “organic social constructions” (Dewey 1986). This means that to practice EE calls on curriculums and classrooms to be organized in ways that organically provide experiences that are familiar to students as social animals.

Dewey emphasized that it would not be easy to take on such an endeavor. This is because experience does not directly equate with, or translate into, education (Dewey 1986). The task for EE instructors is to plan and connect student experiences so that they are educational. This is where their expert knowledge is needed. Not to simply present it to students, but to glean it from planned and unplanned experiences the students are having while being guided by their evolving morals and ethics. Disconnected experiences are not educational and do not address
the larger issues Dewey saw needing to be changed in mainstream education. An education that is based in lively, entertaining, but disconnected experiences is not better than the flawed mainstream educational habits (Dewey 1986). This is why Dewey repeatedly reminds readers not to get caught up in adjectives placed in front of education. Dewey concluded his thoughts on EE this way:

I do not wish to close, however, without recording my firm belief that the fundamental issue is not … of progressive against traditional education but a question of what anything whatever must be to be worthy of the name education … The basic question concerns the nature of education with no qualifying adjectives prefixed … we devote ourselves to finding out just what education is and what conditions have to be satisfied in order that education may be a reality and not a name or a slogan. It is for this reason alone that I have emphasized the need for a sound philosophy of experience.

Kurt Hahn’s life work would put this “sound philosophy of experience” into practice. Known more for the educational institutions that bear his fingerprints (Gordonstoun School, Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme, the United World Colleges, and Outward Bound) than any published scholarly work, Hahn’s life was devoted to EE (Hanford 2015; James 1980; Hahn 1936; James 1990; Stetson Unpublished document). Hahn was born into a Jewish family in Germany close to the turn of the 20th century. He was critical of his German and English mainstream educational experiences. This prompted him to begin forming his own educational ideas while still a teenager. He was especially contemptuous towards the didactic, single-minded preparation for tests. Despite his loathing of mainstream education, Hahn experienced success within it. He did not receive a college degree because his studies were interrupted by the outbreak of WWI.
During the war, Hahn worked for Germany’s foreign office. He was emotionally torn to be caught up in the widespread hatred and nationalistic fervor of this wartime era, especially with Germany fighting against England where he had attended Oxford University.

After the war was over, Hahn’s ever evolving theories on education (Hahn 1936; Hanford 2015; James 1980, 1990) were put into practice when he helped start the Salem School in southern Germany. The Salem School was started, largely, to address the lack of moral strength that Hahn and his benefactor, Prince Max von Baden, saw as major problems in German society and the world at large. It was as Salem School’s headmaster that we first see Hahn put his educational theories into practice. Despite a lack of explicit connection to Dewey’s theory on EE, we see its main principles put into practice at Salem. Two artifacts from Salem demonstrate this link: the “Seven Laws of Salem” and the “Salem School Final Student Report.” We will look at each of these in turn.

The Seven Laws of Salem:(Hanford 2015)

1. Give the children opportunity for self-discovery
2. Make the children meet with triumph and defeat.
3. Give the children the opportunity of self-effacement in the common cause.
4. Provide periods of silence.
5. Train the imagination
6. Make games important but not predominant.
7. Free the sons of the wealthy and powerful from the enervating sense of privilege.

It is telling that Dewey calls for EE to start out with a student’s impulses and the first priority of Salem is providing students with the opportunity for self-discovery. The wording of these laws invokes student self-efficacy and seems to break with mainstream education’s penchant for imposing a particular educational agenda or program upon students. “Opportunity,” “meet with,” and “provide” particularly give you the sense that students are not being required to do things, but instead are presented with opportunities that they choose to engage. Numbers three and seven overtly suggest that the organization of Salem is not based on a contrived hierarchy, but embrace what Dewey called “organic social constructions.” The morality and ethical considerations that Hahn and Prince von Boden were so keen on are another component with connections to Dewey. In particular, the idea of community stands out. Again, in numbers three and seven invoke a unified community with a moral conscious. While number three seems to address service to the wider community in general terms, number seven seeks to address a specific social ill.

While the seven laws are the starting point and guiding principles for Salem’s EE approaches, Salem’s final student report represents the end result. This feedback on student performance is the Salem version of the report card, and it was sent out to parents at the end of each school year. It is noteworthy that during the year the students themselves were responsible for grading their work and marking their attendance. This approach was a planned, facilitated, experiential opportunity for students to build up self-discipline and integrity (Hanford 2015).
The Salem School Final Student Report (Hanford 2015)

- Esprit de corps (group spirit)
- Sense of justice
- Ability to state facts precisely
- Ability to follow out what he believes to be the right course in the face of discomforts, hardships, dangers, mockery, boredom, skepticism, and impulses of the moment
- Ability to plan
- Imagination
- Ability to organize shown in the disposition of work and in the direction of young boys
- Ability to deal with the unexpected
- Degree of mental concentration where the task in question interests him, where it does not
- Conscientiousness
  - in everyday affairs
  - in tasks with which he is specially entrusted
- Manners
- Manual dexterity
- Standard reached in school subjects:
- German (author’s note: Students were assessed in German at Salem. Presumably boys were graded in English at Gorsdonstoun)
- Ancient Languages
- Modern Languages
- Natural Science
- Mathematics
- History
- Practical Work (Handicraft, etc.)
- Art work
- Physical exercises
  - Fighting spirit
  - Endurance
  - Reaction time

This extensive report card has sixteen main categories, of which I imagine only two to five are assigned a grade in most mainstream school’s today. With such myriad life skills being actively learned, we have a window into the experiences students were having at Hahn’s schools. The first law of Salem (above) is further explained with “Every girl and boy has a ‘grand passion,’ often hidden and unrealized to the end of life... It can and will be revealed by the child coming into close touch with a number of different activities.” This explanation shows us that activities are the method through which self-discovery will occur. The extent and diversity of feedback on
the final report eludes to just how many diverse activities were happening and being discussed at Hahn’s schools.

This final report was also used at Gordonstoun School which Hahn started in England after being exiled there for speaking out against Hitler and the Nazis (Hanford 2015; Stetson Unpublished document). Joshua Miner was an American who taught at Gordonstoun in the 1950s. Miner described Hahn as being an educator, who practiced better than any other, an educational philosophy that had the twin objectives of enabling students to make intelligent judgements while building their character (Hanford 2015). Miner would be one of the founding (U.S.) members of one of Hahn’s most well-known exports, Outward Bound.

OB schools have their roots in Hahn’s emphasis on ethics, morality, and purpose (“Outdoor Education Adventures & Wilderness Programs | Outward Bound” n.d.; Stetson Unpublished document; Hanford 2015; Freeman 2010; James 1980). I have worked for two, U.S.-based, OB schools and I can personally attest that the purpose of OB courses is not for you to learn whitewater rafting, mountaineering, rock climbing, canyoneering, or any other mode of outdoor recreation, despite the fact that you will be immersed in daily lessons on them. The goal is self-discovery through adventure (“Educational Approach | Colorado Outward Bound School” n.d.). To facilitate the achievement of self-discovery three outcomes are assessed with a detailed student evaluation given to graduates: strength of character, leadership abilities, and desire to serve (“Educational Approach | Colorado Outward Bound School” n.d.). This student
evaluation echoes Salem’s final report, and experienced instructors interweave specific incidents from course, student self-assessments, and instructor perspectives in them.

While the pedagogical emphasis on morality and ethics is important, it seems to be a specialized niche of the OB community. Other EE schools do not highlight and focus on this aspect of education as stringently. This speaks to specializations within the EE community. I have also worked for Boulder Outdoor Survival School (BOSS), American Conservation Experience (ACE), Outdoor Adventure Recreation Specialists (OARS), Canyonlands Field Institute (CFI), and Bear Valley Cross Country. These educational communities do not focus on personal growth as explicitly as OB, but all would colloquially fall under the EE umbrella. A question that begins to bubble to the surface is, what is our modern conception of EE, and is it living up to Dewey’s audacious goal of “education pure and simple?”

Figure 1: Experiential Learning Cycle (Kolb and Kolb 2017)
Alice and David Kolb lay out arguments that educators in institutions of higher education already use core principles of EE, but often fail to incorporate the entire cycle effectively (Kolb and Kolb 2017). They describe EE through their iteration of the “experiential learning cycle” (Figure 1). Using a combination of EE principles and other educational theories, they create a “nine (learning) style experiential cycle” that integrates instructional roles (Figure 2). What these cycles show us is the modern push to reshape mainstream pedagogical practices centered on experience. This suggests that despite the changes to both “mainstream” education and EE, a divide is still persisting.

![Figure 2: Nine Style Experiential Learning Cycle (Kolb and Kolb 2017)](image)

What the Kolbs reveal is that experience does not need to be narrowly defined as a low-ropes course, a plumber’s apprenticeship, or a cross-country ski lesson. The underlying concepts of successful instruction are not unique to a particular field or type of instructor, they are universally applicable. I have seen an OB instructor give sermonizing lectures (not EE) while on a river trip and I have seen a college professor carry out an interactive learning experience in a lecture hall (Larsen 2019).
It is important to draw connections between what Dewey laid out as EE, how it has been practiced, is being practiced, and how it could be practiced. EE remains critical of mainstream pedagogy, but not in an antithetical, either-or way. It does not reject organization, planning, or even use of a classroom. Rather, it is an attempt to get at the deeper meaning and purpose of education: to prepare students to use knowledge in the present, with an understanding of the past, so that we can have people able to build a better future (Dewey 1986). This requires a well-thought-out pedagogy that links together everyday experiences, including experiential coursework, in a way that facilitates learning, creates usable knowledge, and cultivates ethical purposes with moral expectations. Students’ impulses are the guide throughout this educational journey. To understand how this integration might be better achieved, I turn to educator and geographer L. Dee Fink’s conceptualization of “significant learning,” which is centered at the intersections of mainstream education and EE.

**The Significant Learning (SL) Landscape and some of its Maps**

If learning is regarded not as the acquisition of information, but as a search for meaning and coherence in one’s life and, if an emphasis is placed on what is learned and its personal significance to the learner, rather than how much is learned, researchers would gain valuable new insights into both the mechanisms of learning and the relative advantages of teacher-controlled and learner-controlled modes of learning.

- Phillip Candy (Candy 1991)
The quote above did not come from a Venture Out high ropes leadership training, nor did it come from an Outward Bound staff training. L. Dee Fink opened the second chapter of his book (Fink 2013) with it. The focus of Fink’s book is on how instructors in higher education can create SL experiences for their students. Fink is a retired geography professor who taught for over twenty years at the University of Oklahoma and was known for making his courses interactive for students (Palmer 2018). Like Dewey, Fink is emphasizing the need for a student-centered approach that seems to tap into student impulses. This approach goes beyond content into deep, life-changing realms. In order to explain how instructors can achieve this, Fink defines SL through the six categories in Figure 3 below.

![Figure 3: Fink's major categories in the taxonomy of SL (Fink 2013)](image-url)
This framework was inspired from Fink’s desire to fundamentally change the education offered at institutions of higher education. In order for improvement to happen Fink encouraged instructors to recognize that there are significantly different ways of teaching than what they do now. These different ways will improve both the students’ and the instructors’ experiences and learning outcomes. Instructors will need guidance to accomplish these changes, and the institutions of higher education will need to provide support to accomplish them (Fink 2013).

Fink’s focus is initially on course design. He assumes that most, if not all, of higher education would like courses that yield outcomes in all six categories above. His “integrated course design” involves crafting learning outcomes in those categories that not only convey subject matter (e.g. foundational knowledge), but connect subject matter to other areas of learning (e.g. caring). This is a meticulous and time-consuming affair. I know this first-hand because I designed a PBE/EE geography course using it. However, as I discuss below, it yields results.

As important as course design is, it will not alone ensure SL. In chapter five, Fink discusses changing how instructors teach. Fink emphasizes that it is not a matter of changing everything you do, but rather looking deeply and honestly at your instruction and seeing where you merely need to tweak it, and where a more comprehensive overhaul might be needed.

Fink lays out three ways that instructors of higher education can revamp their courses with SL in mind: make better use of class time, provide content in different forms, and link content to other learning activities. All three are very reminiscent of EE principles. There is an emphasis on
activities other than lecture and reading that bring content to life. Not that lecture and reading do not have a part to play, but they do not have to be the only or primary parts. The linking content is a mirror image of Dewey’s explanation that experience does not equate with learning but must be intentionally planned, and that the instructor’s role is to provide students with the connections between experiences that are building towards the course’s outcomes. A not so hidden message seems to be to trust that students want to learn (their impulses) and that you want to teach (your impulses), and vice versa.

Fink closes his book by showing the relationship education has to the quality of human life. A significant education improves the student’s, and therefore society’s, quality of life. The role an instructor has in this endeavor is tied to the credibility, leadership, and spirituality of their teaching (Fink 2013). Such sentiments exist at, and have been written into the guiding principles of MU.

One of the first things I search for in any organization and/or community I might find myself is what they strive for. Mission statements are a useful way to communicate this and Mizzou’s mission statement has some connections to what Fink, Kolb, Hahn, Dewey, and other educators have expressed. Here it is in its entirety:

The mission of the University of Missouri System, as a land-grant university and Missouri’s only public research and doctoral-level institution, is to discover, disseminate, preserve, and apply knowledge. The university promotes learning by its students and lifelong learning by Missouri’s
citizens, fosters innovation to support economic development, and advances the health, cultural, and social interests of the people of Missouri, the nation, and the world (“Mission Statement | About the University | University of Missouri System” 2019).

An equally important set of principles for the MU community is our statement of values. It clarifies specifically how we strive to accomplish our shared mission. If our mission statement is the pitch, our statement of values can be thought of as the rhythm. Together they are the institutional melody we seek to dance to. Here are MU’s values in their entirety:

Statement of Values

The University of Missouri, as the state's major land-grant university, honors the public trust placed in it and accepts the associated accountability to the people of Missouri for its stewardship of that trust. Our duty is to acquire, create, transmit and preserve knowledge and to promote understanding.

We the students, faculty and staff of MU hold the following values to be the foundation of our identity as a community. We pledge ourselves to act, in the totality of our life together, in accord with these values.

Respect
Respect for one's self and for others is the foundation of honor and the basis of integrity. A hallmark of our community is respect — for the process by which we seek truths and for those who engage in that process. Such respect is essential for nurturing the free and open discourse, exploration and creative expression that characterize a university. Respect results in dedication to individual as well as collective expressions of truth and honesty. Respect is demonstrated by a commitment to act ethically, to welcome difference, and to engage in open exchange about both ideas and decisions.

Responsibility

A sense of responsibility requires careful reflection on one's moral obligations. Being responsible imposes the duty on us and our university to make decisions by acknowledging the context and considering consequences, both intended and unintended, of any course of action. Being responsible requires us to be thoughtful stewards of resources — accountable to ourselves, each other and the publics we serve.

Discovery

Learning requires trust in the process of discovery. Discovery often fractures existing world views and requires acceptance of uncertainty and ambiguity. Therefore, the university must support all its members in this lifelong process that is both challenging and rewarding. As we
seek greater understanding and wisdom, we also recognize that knowledge itself has boundaries. What we know is not all that is.

Excellence

We aspire to an excellence that is approached through diligent effort, both individual and collective. Pursuing excellence means being satisfied with no less than the highest goals we can envision. Pursuing excellence involves being informed by regional, national and global standards, as well as our personal expectations. We recognize and accept the sacrifices, risks and responsibilities involved in pursuing excellence, and so we celebrate each other's successes. We commit ourselves to this process in an ethical and moral manner.

These statements are mere words until we integrate them as values in our individual lives and reflect them in our institutional policies and practices. We pledge ourselves to make them effective in the very fabric of our lives, our community, and all our relationships with others, thereby enhancing the development of individuals and the well-being of society.

At this point I hope that the connections between EE and SL are discernible. Both strive for an education that starts with a student’s impulses (EE) or a student’s personal connection (SL) to the material. Both use a variety of approaches with the intent of transferring knowledge to students’ everyday lives. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, both are involved in the moral, ethical, emotional, and spiritual well-being of the learning community. Perhaps now is the point
where we can recognize that EE and SL are one and the same. Dewey said that EE would only succeed if its practitioners were able to drop any adjective from in front of education. I think both EE and SL have helped define “education pure and simple.”

An education grounded in EE and SL is not something that should be relegated to the climbing tower or STEM lab. It must be embraced university-wide as chancellor Cartwright has suggested (“MU Chancellor Alexander Cartwright Announces Scholarships to Increase Access and Affordability during ‘100 Days’ Address” 2017). Most importantly, it must not be misrepresented or misunderstood. We have to be on guard against unintentional misleading claims. They are just as harmful as intentionally making false statements. We strive for EE and SL today because the foundational changes to mainstream education that Dewey, Follet, Hahn, and other early practitioners of EE sought remain elusive (Fink 2013; Mayer and Alexander 2017). Habits, especially entrenched habits, do not fundamentally change easily. They have an uncanny ability to resurface, having changed in name only (Dewey 1986). To avoid the pitfalls of faux approaches to EE/SL, we turn our attentions to Place and a P/place-based education.

The Place-based Landscape and Some of its Maps

From the outset it must be stated that P/place does not have one interpretation. It is an elusive term that is not easily defined. Everyone defines P/place differently, and this is a key connection to EE. It is exactly because P/place is unique for each individual that it is important. Both EE and SL seek to ground their educational approaches in the learner’s personal
experiences. It flows organically from a focus on students’ personal experiences with P/place to achieve significant learning. Within the EE landscape (Dewey 1986; Hanford 2015; “Educational Approach | Colorado Outward Bound School” 2019; Kolb and Kolb 2017) and SL landscape (Fink 2013; “Mission Statement | About the University | University of Missouri System” 2019; “Statement of Values” 2019) the concept of P/place is recognized as a meaningful piece of the educational process. It is often referred to with other terms such as setting, context, region, community, and society. It is important to recognize that P/place is already playing a role within the combined EE/SL paradigm (Fink 2013; Dewey, n.d.; “Outdoor Education Adventures & Wilderness Programs | Outward Bound” n.d.; Hickman Dunne 2018; Kolb and Kolb 2017). While this relationship will not be fully flushed out in this section, I want the reader to understand two markedly different conceptions of P/place and provide some examples of how P/place-based education has been implemented.

This paper embraces and is informed by the author’s budding non-Western conception of Place as opposed to common Western conceptions of place. The bias is clear by how I express the distinction: capital “P” Place refers to non-Western conceptions of Place through Indigenous traditions of North America and lowercase “p” place refers to more commonly accepted Western perceptions. In the next section more details are provided for how this positionality plays out in this study.

Tim Cresswell and John Agnew, Western academics, explain place in conjunction with location and locale (Agnew 1987; Cresswell 2015). Location is an objective point in space usually thought
of in relation to an Earthbound coordinate system. This concept can be extended to our own planet’s location in the solar system, galaxy, universe, etc. Location can be thought of as both absolute, as in latitude and longitude, and relative, as in its relation in space to other observable phenomena (Hobbs 2017). When we at Mizzou look at a map of our campus we might say something like MU’s campus is south of downtown Columbia and North of Hinkson Creek (between where Grindstone and Flatbranch creeks join). Within our campus, Stewart Hall is “here”, and Jesse Hall is “there” (Cresswell 2015). Such a description is locating, but are bodies, brains, and spirits our probably registering with details beyond the dry utility of location. Locale refers to “the material setting for social relations” (Cresswell 2015; Agnew 1987). The locale of MU’s campus can be thought of as a collection of buildings, rooms, walkways, roads, plants, and memorials. This material setting is what we as individuals interact with when going about our campus business. So far Mizzou has a location and material form but is missing one component before it becomes a place. Emotional meaning, or “sense of place,” is the final ingredient in place-making (Cresswell 2015). When someone points to a campus map, and says Strickland Hall is “here.” My sense of place immediately transforms that location and locale into a place. The memories of Lily, a Dog friend who has passed away, meeting me with a wagging tail and stretch many a late afternoon during my first semester stirs my emotions and creates a personally unique attachment to that Northwest corner of Strickland Hall where she would wait for me (okay I snuck her inside sometimes). I was usually mentally fatigued having just finished working on my GIS coursework, but the sight of Lily’s welcome, the feeling of the soon to be setting sun on my skin, the sound of students loitering about as they waited for their bus ride home, the smell of car fumes and fall blooms
intertwining in my nostrils, the taste of Strickland’s second floor water fountain still in my mouth, and the emotional relief of going home all roil together to transform Strickland Hall into a unique place to me (Figure 4).

Figure 4: Basic description of place from Western academic perspective (Cresswell 2015; Agnew 1987).

Deep, emotional ties to a P/place do not automatically mean that it is a Place to the person experiencing the emotional connection. The potential for this constructed reality exists, but emotional connection alone is not enough (Malkin 2018; Wilson 2018; Deloria 1992; Kimmerer 2013). I am not convinced that I have a deep enough or holistic enough connection to Place (yet...) because I did not grow up in a culture or society that taught me how to construct this relationship (Mendleson 2018; Hemmelgarn 2018; Collins and Coleman 2008). Modern day Western culture and society, despite much of its secular embrace of science, does not teach how to form a relationship with Place, but with place (Mendleson 2018; Hemmelgarn 2018; Deloria 1992a; Kimmerer 2013). To explain the difference between Place and place I will turn to Indigenous knowledge and traditions of North America, but do not limit your understanding of Indigeneity to Native Americans or First Nations People of this continent. No human is excluded
from their own unique heritage of Indigeneity (Kimmerer 2013; Murphy 2013). I have chosen to explain Place through Indigenous traditions from North America because Mizzou currently resides here, most of my lived experiences in Place come from moments of inhabiting North America, and there is ample writing from these Indigenous cultures to draw from. There is also the time component to consider. Some North American Indigenous traditions have been able to preserve their substantively different views and relationship with Place because of the geographic isolation they had from fundamentally different Western conceptions until the year 1492. This is when sustained contact between Western conceptions of place and North American Indigenous views began.

A basic requirement for place to be Place is that there needs to be a holistically spiritual connection to it. Emotions are often related to spirituality, but they do not guarantee a spiritual connection. This is similar to how Dewey explained experience’s relationship to education. Just because you have an experience does not mean that you have learned anything. Similarly, just because you have an emotional connection does not mean you have a spiritual connection. A spiritual connection is also different from a “holistically” spiritual connection. Many Westerners experience spiritual connection in their lives and their land, but it is usually siloed off from their physical and mental experiences and most importantly for us, disconnected from the places they reside in (Deloria 1992a; Gruenewald 2003).

This spiritual isolation from Place is visible when we consider spiritual revelation (Deloria 1992). For many Indigenous peoples in North America thousands of years of occupancy on the land and
(emphasis and capitalization mine) they were holistically connected to, gave birth to their specific structure of ceremonial reality (Deloria 1992). It was (and is) not what people believed to be true that was important but what they experienced as true. This led to revelation being a continuous process of adjustment to Place, in contrast to a specific message valid for all times and places (Deloria 1992). I offer up the multitude of disputes between Indigenous tribes and the U.S. government involving sacred burial grounds as a prime example of the differences between attachment and meaning of P/place. The holistically spiritual connection to Place is so strong with many Indigenous peoples, and so fundamentally divergent from Western understandings, that the concept seems impossible to translate. The laws and government, as extensions of Western perception of place, have a history of negating the sacred reality of Places for Indigenous groups (Sack 2016; Dawes 1887; “Fort Laramie Treaty” 2017; Jackson 1830; Howard, Wheeler, and Collier 1934; Reece 2016; The Verge n.d.; Brown, Parrish, and Speri 2017; Lennard 2017; Aisch and Lai 2016; Emperor 2016; Plumer 2017). (Sack 2016; Wong 2016; Dawes 1887; “Fort Laramie Treaty” 2017; Jackson 1830; Howard, Wheeler, and Collier 1934; Reece 2016; Hersher n.d.; The Verge n.d.; Brown, Parrish, and Speri 2017; O’Neil 2018; Medina Daniel n.d.; Lennard 2017; Aisch and Lai 2016; Emperor 2016; PBS NewsHour n.d.; Hardy 2018; Plumer 2017).

I do not pretend to fully understand this deeply held, intergenerational connection to Place. However, I own that it intuitively makes sense and feels like truth. I implore those reading this to take a moment and recognize what reading this description of spiritual connection to Place brings up for them. It may be easy to respectfully consider, or it may meet with strong internal
resistance. Regardless of your internal reaction I ask all readers to go back to Mizzou’s statement of values and reread the “respect” and “discovery” sections (“Statement of Values” 2019). It is important for all us life-long students to stay flexible as the dynamic nature of academia continues to march into brave territory. There is growing interest and use of Indigenous knowledge within academic communities (Watson and Huntington 2008; Gruenewald 2003). One article in particular from David Gruenewald (Gruenewald 2003) is of particular interest to this study’s focus on P/place-based education.

Gruenewald argues that place-based education is inherently a critical pedagogy, not just of ecological issues, but simultaneously of social issues. The acts of re-inhabitation and decolonization relate to these two critical aims of place-based education. The methods of this “critical pedagogy of place” are meant to change the world for the better through intentional educational practices. Gruenewald was critiquing a socially constructed divide between the classic conception of place-based education and the classic conception of critical pedagogy. While this divide was not absolute, he saw it as impeding the true meaning and potential behind place-based education.

David Sobel is seen as one of the founders of place-based education. Sobel’s perception of it can be summed up succinctly as “connecting classroom and community” (Sobel 2004). The local community should be actively engaged to teach any subject. Local engagement is key and “field trips” are not the rare occurrence that they are in mainstream education, but a staple, as students actively go out into their local communities to learn. Doing so will address “the not-
thinking about the Earth” that Sobel saw as so prevalent in most educational institutions. In his own words Sobel describes place-based education thusly:

Place-based education is the process of using the local community and environment as a starting point to teach concepts in language arts, mathematics, social studies, science and other subjects across the curriculum. Emphasizing hands-on, real-world learning experiences, this approach to education increases academic achievement, helps students develop stronger ties to their community, enhances students’ appreciation for the natural world, and creates a heightened commitment to serving as active, contributing citizens. Community vitality and environmental quality are improved through the active engagement of local citizens, community organizations, and environmental resources in the life of the school (Sobel 2004).

Gruenewald’s critique sought to address how place-based education was often pigeonholed. P/p-based education became somewhat synonymous with rich, rural, white communities who were more concerned about the environment. This contrasted with critical pedagogy being stereotyped as poor, urban, people of color who were more concerned about social issues (Gruenewald 2003). Between Sobel and Gruenewald we get a window into what this relatively new pedagogy is becoming.

Local communities are seen as the classroom in which all members can be involved in teaching and learning. The question remains as to whether or not individuals and the communities they are a part of reside in place or inhabit Place (Kimmerer 2013; Deloria 1992; Gruenewald 2003). From combining perceptions of P/place with the concept of learning through community we are left with whether or not a community will nurture Place-based education or place-based
education. Many years prior to Gruenewald or Sobel I believe Aldo Leopold was touching on a similar theme:

Perhaps the most serious obstacle impeding the evolution of land ethic is the fact that our educational and economic system is headed away from, rather than toward, an intense consciousness of land. Your true modern is separated from the land by many middlemen, and by innumerable physical gadgets. They have no vital relation to it … Synthetic substitutes for wood, leather, wool, and other natural land products suit them better than the originals. In short, land is something they have ‘outgrown’ (Leopold 1972).

We now have an idea, however murky, of the difference between \textit{Place} and \textit{place}. We have established that modern, Western culture is connected to lowercase “p” place but is not inherently excluded from connecting into capital “P” Place. Indigenous knowledge in North America provided us with a great way to conceptualize what Place is compared to place. The importance of P/place in the educational process has inspired educational methods tied to engaging the local community. The views and beliefs communities have regarding their relationship to P/place will influence and inform what type of P/place-based education is possible. It is informative to compare examples of P/place-based education (Mamaril, Cox, and Vaughan 2018; Azano 2011; Hostetter 2016; Smith 2002; Semken et al. 2017) through the lenses of Place and place.

We also drew connections between EE and P/place. The “context” and/or “setting” that educational experiences occur in have importance in the quality and manner of EE opportunities. I know that there are probably still questions lurking in our minds about the
relationships between PBE, EE, and SL. It is important to understand there are connections linking all three. For now, it suffices to understand that both PBE and EE seek the same holistic outcomes Fink describes as SL. One aim of this study is to elucidate the links between EE, SL, and PBE, but first I need to tell you details about this study’s other purposes and its design.
Three: Climbing to the High Point

Methodology

The starting point for this study is an exploration of how EE is being defined and used by instructors at Mizzou. Since EE is not unified and aligned across departments (“Why Experiential Learning Matters” 2019; “Tips and Best Practices” 2019; “Honors College Student Experiential Learning Award (HC-SELA)” 2019; “The Missouri Method” 2019; “Experiential Learning Opportunities” 2018), schools, and colleges, despite its longstanding use on our campus (“The Missouri Method” 2019) I adopted an exploratory case study design (Shields and Rangarajan 2013). Exploratory case studies are appropriate for investigating a distinct phenomenon or problem that has not been extensively studied before. This provides information to inform the creation of a needs assessment that MU might choose to use for any initiative or plan. As I began to explore EE at Mizzou it quickly encompassed PBE too. My advisor and I knew that PBE was increasingly becoming a part of the lexicon of higher education, and more importantly, that it was intimately associated with EE. Establishing the relationship between EE and PBE, and understanding how instructors saw this connection, seemed necessary.

I used grounded theory methodology to aid in this study’s design, data collection, analysis, and explanation of its findings. I chose grounded theory because I did not have a clearly defined hypothesis to test, but rather curiosity about how Mizzou instructors define and practice
PBE/EE. Grounded theory arose for precisely these kinds of situations in which the researcher(s) is interested in observable phenomena and seeks to create data from the observations (Birks and Mills 2015). From these data, the theory that emerges is grounded in the pragmatic, everyday experiences that relate to the phenomena.

This initial phase of the exploration coincided with an intentionally curbed literature review. In *Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide*, Birks and Mills strongly encourage grounded theory practitioners to initially read literature only to gain some basic ideas of what they will be investigating, and then to disengage with reading literature during the data generation. They further advise grounded theorists not to re-engage with literature until the theory has emerged from the data and can cofunction with it. This guideline ensures any theory that emerges is not overly influenced by pre-existing theories, the fear being that a researcher unwittingly exposed to abstract theories will unintentionally super-impose them onto their own study.

As I explored the initial question (how are EE and PBE educational practices being defined and practiced at Mizzou?), I conducted an initial literature review on PBE and EE. During this phase other important and related questions surfaced:

1) What is the relationship, if there is one, between EE and PBE?

2) Is there a link between using these educational practices and achieving SL?

3) What is it like to run a PBE/EE course at MU?

4) What obstacles, if any, exist for Mizzou instructors to implement PBE/EE?
5) What solutions, if any are needed, can MU instructors use to overcome any identified obstacles?

A foundational piece of any grounded theory research is concurrent data collection and analysis. In any research there will be moments where you are both collecting and analyzing data. While this is not a unique concept that is exclusive to grounded theory, it is imperative that grounded theorists have a high level of ability to carry it out (Birks and Mills 2015). In grounded theory you usually do not start out with a clean, well defined hypothesis to test. Instead you jump into the everyday, messy world and make observations of something that is of particular interest to you. This leads to a need to continually refine and make well-reasoned judgements as your study evolves over time. The formulation of the five questions above happened while I was observing, generating, and analyzing the data coming from my everyday experiences as a MU instructor and student.

Another key element of this, and any, study is researcher positionality. In this grounded theory exploratory case study both of us researchers are active, subjective participants in it and not inactive, objective data collecting machines. To help explain why we take this positionality we offer individualized statements on our personal philosophical positions:

I (Brad) assume that there is no truly meaningful separation between self and the larger whole. Just like a cell is a part of a larger system, so too am I part of a larger system. Everyone perceives reality through their subjective lens, and this cannot be transcended. When I write or
say everyone, I am not limiting its definition to humans (Kimmerer 2013). Everyone to me is all encompassing and goes beyond what Western science classifies as “life.” Everyone to me includes Water, Tree, Squirrel, Fish, Bird, Fungus, Bacteria, Fire, Earth, etc. All of us can only be more and more aware of our inherent subjectivity and its effects. This makes reality a riddle to contemplate, not a problem to solve. If self and objectivity are delusions, then it is important for there to be no lines separating “researcher” and “participant” in a study. It is important for there to be strong lines of communication, transparency, and trust between the interconnected parts of the larger whole. This allows them to work together towards unravelling a piece of the larger mystery. We receive knowledge, and hopefully wisdom, from the world by slowing down and listening. To truly listen means engaging all six senses. We must listen with our eyes, noses, skin, taste buds, ears, and spirit. When opening up to this deep listening, we are not gaining knowledge, but remembering wisdom. Such beliefs and assumptions can be classified as simultaneously critical relativist (Birks and Mills 2015; Peet 1998) and post humanist (Cresswell 2013).

And Soren:

I (Soren) developed an interest in place as a child and teenager, moving from place to place, following my Dad’s career as an academic journeyman. Then, to be honest, I got interested in remote, out-of-the-way places, those spots on the map where the roads end and the white space begins, places that seemed different, somehow, from the humdrum urban and suburban existence I knew. That wanderlust eventually brought me to the Cheslatta Carrier Nation in
northern British Columbia. There, I learned an entirely different way of thinking about place as the relationship of things to each other, a web of interdependence that also supports the singularity of our own existence. The notion of place as a way of being and experiencing the world in this way changed all my relationships, and ultimately, my research and teaching. Now, working with the agency of place, I am trying to understand how we can pluralize higher education while grounding it in the lived, earthly realities of the Anthropocene.

Although I (Brad) am the principal researcher and writer of this study, I thankfully had Soren overseeing its completion as my academic advisor and mentor. Unless otherwise noted the reader should assume I (Brad) am the author of the writing and the pronouns “I” and “my” refer to me. There may seem to be conspicuous grammatical errors, especially in regard to capitalization. However, they are connected to my critical relativist and post-humanist assumptions. I encourage those interested to read Robin Wall Kimmerer’s explanation of her grammar use along these lines in Braiding Sweetgrass. I was inspired and educated by Ms. Kimmerer’s critical use of English grammar. Finally, the pronoun “us” is used not to pass responsibility of any errors or mistakes made in this study. Those are mine to bear. “Us” is used because of my philosophical assumptions on the relationship between self and whole. Minimally it refers to Soren and I and maximally it refers to “everyone” as defined in my personal philosophical statement. I empathize with readers who find this usage burdensome, but I intend and hope what is initially burdensome ultimately supports the intellectual, ethical, and spiritual framework of this research.
Soren and I had different paths to EE and PBE. Soren’s experiences and work with the Cheslatta Carrier Nation in what is today known as British Columbia introduced him not only to other ways of educating and learning, but to other ways of being in relationship with Place. My experiences as a field instructor for two OB schools and with Boulder Outdoor Survival School (BOSS) highlight my introduction and work with EE and PBE. Over the span of nine, going on ten, years working as an outdoor instructor, I have been able to finely tune my understanding and use of PBE/EE skill sets. Soren and I began forming our partnership over the winter of 2017. Soren gave me a campus tour and shared his budding work of implementing PBE/EE in a geography course. Shortly after I committed to studying with Soren and Mizzou’s geography department, Soren emailed me an article by David Gruenewald on PBE (Gruenewald 2003) and this marked this study’s initial engagement in literature.

This was the first literature I had extensively read that used the term PBE. It got me thinking about how what I had been doing in my life up to that point had been and/or related to PBE. The term that I identified my instruction and learning with more was EE. During my first semester I took a creative non-fiction writing course Soren instructed called Placewriting (GEOG 7904). This class emphasized emotional connection to Place and its effects on storytelling. Placewriting’s literature (Momaday and Momaday 2007; Didion 2011; Doig 1992; Williams 2001; Nabhan 1994) and content helped expand my understanding of how Place has been and can be conceptualized. Through my Geographic Thought (GEOG 8760) coursework, that same semester, I was exposed to the vast array of philosophic traditions within the discipline of geography (Cresswell 2013; Peet 1998). I created a document full of potential questions
regarding PBE during Geographic Thought and it served as a spring board for this exploratory case study. I also began my service working as a teaching assistant for introductory regional geography courses (GEOG 1100 and GEOG 1200). Once a week, I was responsible for leading a discussion section, and I began experimenting with ways to implement the educational strategies I used for OB, BOSS, and other EE-based organizations. From these first semester activities, even though the exploratory case study idea had not been fully conceptualized, the concurrent data generation and analysis had begun.

In my second semester and in pursuit of my minor in college teaching, I took a course with the same name: College Teaching (ED_LPA 9448). One of the foundational texts for the course was L. Dee Fink’s _Creating Significant Learning Experiences: An Integrated Approach to Designing College Courses_. It struck a chord in me because it described why I love instructing and why I was trying to implement PBE/EE in my new place of learning, MU. This was a watershed moment in this study because Fink’s work seemed like a Rosetta Stone. It was a way to explain to instructors who had never had experiences with PBE why P/place was so important. With this new tool, the exploratory study really began to take form. We now had a description of instructors’ aims from two socially constructed educational communities: the “alternative” one I had come from, and the “mainstream” one I now found myself. With this tool in hand I formed an interview protocol to fully flush out our accumulated questions:

1) How are EE and PBE practices defined and implemented at Mizzou?

2) What is the relationship, if there is one, between EE and PBE?
3) Is there a link between using these educational practices and achieving SL?

4) What is it like to run a PBE/EE course at MU?

5) What obstacles, if any, exist for Mizzou instructors to implement PBE/EE?

6) What solutions, if any are needed, can MU instructors use to overcome any identified obstacles?

Two methodological elements were key and provided the structure for this study. One was my reading of *Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide*, and the other was setting up semi-structured interviews. The Birks and Mills book (Birks and Mills 2015) would supply me with the nuts and bolts of working with grounded theory, and the interviews would be an important way to ground our research in the everyday requirements of instructing at Mizzou. In addition to the interviews there would be my participant observation, both my everyday lived experiences as a student at Mizzou, and my instructional responsibilities. It is important to emphasize that my participant observation and direct experience are data sources in this study (Figure 5). I also used a number of secondary data sources (Figure 6). These figures break down the primary and ancillary methods that this study used.
The planning and framing for both the interviews and a head instructing role for Exploration of Place (PBE/EE geography course, GEOG 4390) for me took place prior to the summer break.

Exploration of Place (EoP) was a way to experience first-hand what it is like to implement a PBE/EE course at MU. It also bolstered my instructing experiences as a participant observer.

The interviews provided other instructor views on PBE/EE.
I conducted fourteen interviews within a purposive sample of sixteen instructors in the community of Columbia, MO, including instructors both at MU and elsewhere in the community. A purposive sample is intentionally choosing participants to interview because of the relevance they bring to your study. I constructed this purposive sample using the following criteria: (1) balance between MU and non-MU instructors, (2) diversity in gender, areas of expertise, race, years instructing, and age, (3) diversity among instructors who embraced the title of PBE instructor, instructors who dabbled in PBE, and instructors who were unaware of any use they had of PBE.

For criteria (1), my thought process was even though the study was focused on PBE/EE at MU, it needed to have both inside and outside perspectives. The educational cultures and experiences with PBE/EE would inform each other and provide knowledge and insights that the other group might not possess yet. It is important to note that there is interaction between these groups. For example, Tony Minnick, the farm manager from Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture (CCUA), has regular interaction with MU students who volunteer at the urban farm. This provides him insight into student reactions and opinions of their MU education. Eleven Mizzou instructors were interviewed with a diversity in their roles and titles. They ranged from doctoral candidates to vice provost. Five non-MU instructors were interviewed with a diversity in their organization’s structure and purpose, but a common theme of being Place-based educators.

Within the Mizzou community there is a conspicuous absence of an interviewee from the School of Journalism (J-School). This absence stands out because the J-School is what people
colloquially identify as MU’s best example of EE. After failing to secure an interview after multiple email attempts I determined that I would utilize the readily available online and written sources (“The Missouri Method” 2019; warrenmayer 2016; Trott 2018; pTp 2011).

While this was far from ideal, I was further informed through informal conversations with Mizzou students and faculty. In particular I got to talk with a current student in the J-School and a fellow graduate student who took undergraduate coursework through the J-School.

Diversity was important because it would provide information and theories that would be representative of the experience of instructing in Columbia. This study failed to meet this criterion in an important way by not having any African-American instructors’ voices. African-Americans are the largest minority at Mizzou and in Columbia, but I did not secure an interview with an instructor with this background and perspective. This stems from my lack of African-American instructors throughout my graduate education, but does not excuse it, and it does represent a limitation to this study. The racial diversity of this study is as follows: twelve identify as Caucasian (white, European decent), one as South Korean, one as Kiowa Nation - Native American, one as Indian, and one as Peruvian - Latin.

Criteria (3) was determined based on my personal knowledge and understanding of instructors. The nine years between my undergraduate degree and graduate studies were spent immersed in PBE/EE. While not always cognitively aware of it during these nine years, my seven years as an Outward Bound instructor introduced me to PBE/EE educational philosophies, theories, and
strategies on a more cognitive level. These experiences provided me with the necessary insight to categorize instructors based on their level of PBE/EE familiarity.

Interviews were semi-structured with initially seven questions that were expanded to nine. A semi-structured approach was taken because I wanted participants to feel at ease and comfortable. A rigid, structured design where the exact questions were asked in exactly the same order would take away from the natural flow of ideas. The nine questions covered in the interviews are listed below. The italicized questions are the two that were added in after some interviews had been completed. Number nine was added in after three interviews had been completed. Two of these participants emailed responses and I was able to chat face to face with the third. Number six was added in after four interviews had been completed. It was not deemed important enough to gather the four interviewees responses to number six.

1. Describe your teaching philosophy.
2. How have you tried to achieve SL?
3. Define experiential education and describe your use, if any, with it.
4. Do you engage local landscapes, places, environments, and community in your teaching? How?
5. What, in your opinion, are the differences, if any, between experiential education and place-based education?
6. What area of SL is most important for students?
7. What role do you think a student’s sense of self-worth plays in SL?
8. What role, if any, can place-based education play in achieving SL?

9. What obstacles do you see in (Mizzou) instructors achieving SL?

Number six was added because I felt I was allowing my personal experiences and beliefs to influence the conversations with question number seven. From my experience, a student’s sense of self-worth is foundational to their ability to achieve SL. This intentional reordering allowed the interviewees to share their own personal opinions before being specifically asked about sense of self-worth. Number nine was added in because it helps make the study to be solution oriented. Soren and I had discussed adding in such a question prior to summer break, but I left for my summer work before making this addition. When I returned, I jumped right into the interviews without thoroughly checking to see if I had included in this provision. I promptly recognized this oversight and corrected it.

After interviews were concluded, I transcribed them (Appendices B and C). In an ideal world, this would have happened shortly afterwards, but my school schedule and especially my responsibilities lead instructing EoP often prevented the transcription happening in a timely manner. Some interviews were not transcribed until months afterwards. While this was not ideal, it was a necessary trade-off because of the insight my other responsibilities were providing through participant observation data. After initially trying to hand type out the interviews, I was told and read about voice to text options that might improve the speed and accuracy of the process (Schulte 2018; Birks and Mills 2015). I developed a process using a voice to text app in Google Documents. This ended up being a fantastic medium to transcribe with.
because it sped up the transcription process while still requiring me to contemplate what the interviewee was saying and meaning. The voice to text would not accurately transcribe straight from the recorded interviews, this forced me to pause the voice to text, play a portion of an interview, pause the interview, turn on the voice to text, and then restate what the interviewee had said. While this process might seem, and was in some respects, cumbersome and tedious, it forced me to soak in the interviewees’ ideas (data). Many memos (Appendix D) that I wrote during the coding process have portions where I describe moments of contemplating what the interviewee meant or was trying to say. The way in which I used voice to text really helped build my sensitivity to accurately record the spirit of what the interviewee was saying and not what I misheard or wanted them to say. This resulted in high quality transcriptions.

We should now revisit the essential grounded theory method of concurrent data generation and analysis (Birks and Mills 2015). Before I even knew I would be doing a grounded theory study I was practicing concurrent data generation and analysis through my first two semesters. Take my TA instructing as an example. While I was not generating data in the visceral sense of interview transcriptions, I was receiving feedback from students on my PBE/EE methods of instruction and contemplating how to improve it in a way that accomplished SL. This was happening concurrently with me providing my instructors feedback, building my academic skill sets that would be necessary for me to complete a master’s degree, and providing manual labor at CCUA’s urban farm. These lived experiences in the reality of MU and Columbia culture meant I was constantly taking in and analyzing my personal experiences. This was how every semester and every day at Mizzou generated data for this study.
Within the method of concurrent data generation and analysis is a specific sub-method called “constant comparative analysis.” Think of this as zooming into a specific aspect of the study and how at this different scale that idea of concurrent data generation and analysis occurs. For example, each interview generated data that informed the next interview. Even if I did not transcribe them right away, I was influenced by prior interviews and they informed how I approached and conducted the next one. In this way, from the very first exchange with Angela Speck, the theory began to emerge. Constant comparative analysis requires the researcher to be able to integrate and synthesize all the steps of the interview process (Figure 7). You do not finish a step and then move on, but rather bleed each step into the other. Transcriptions happened while I was interviewing. Before I finished transcribing, I began the initial coding phase (Appendices C, E, and F). As I analyzed each transcription the first time for codes, I began making notes of how the codes were relating to each other. The building of relationships between codes is a function of the intermediate coding phase (Appendix G). These decisions relied on inductive and abductive principles to make judgements (Birks and Mills 2015). First a large number of concepts, coming from the interviews, were collapsed and integrated in the process of research (induction) (Birks and Mills 2015), then abduction examines the data and
hypotheses are formed and proven or disproven (Birks and Mills 2015). For example, during the intermediate coding phase, one hundred and twenty-four codes were collapsed into six main categories (induction). These categories had been codes prior to being reorganized as categories based on their importance in explaining and encompassing other codes. In order to justify this reorganization, abductive logic was used to draw on what interviewees said, as well as my own experience as an instructor. This process involved the codes in hypothetical and/or real experiences. Thinking through the codes this way either changed or kept existing relationships between codes. This iterative process repeated itself until the organization felt right. In every aspect (interviews, my coursework, my instructing, and my campus research), I was using concurrent data generation and analysis (small-scale) and constant comparative analysis (large-scale). With such a dynamic method as one of the foundations of grounded theory, it is no wonder that memoing is another indispensable element.

Memos (Appendix D) provided a way to deal with the demands of concurrent data generation and analysis. Birks and Mills define memoing as the records of thoughts, feelings, insights, and ideas (Birks and Mills 2015). In this study, memos served three main functions that were intimately connected to the concurrent data generation and analysis processes. I would first simultaneously experience and generate data, then record it, and next analyze it. This process (Figure 7) endlessly looped back on itself throughout the entire study. This looping is happening at multiple scales, as described above. Many times, I struggled over how and what to code. Anytime such an intellectual struggle occurred I would begin to write a memo. Through the memo writing process, I was able to analyze the data and explain the decision that was made.
The copious amounts of memos end up being a data generation tool as well. Birks and Mills emphasize the importance of memos and explain that they will eventually transform into your study’s findings (Birks and Mills 2015).

I wrote forty-five memos in total. When I first read the description of how important memoing was to a grounded theory study, I was not convinced. Once I got into the coding process, however, and I was juggling all of these different data, it quickly became obvious how crucial the memos were. Not only did they help organize, build, and inform my thoughts, they provide a record for others to look back on my work and opportunity to critique it. The memoing process can feel onerous, but it yields and unlocks the true power behind what the interviewees said and participant observation data. I wish I had devoted more time to writing.
memos from my instructing and other MU experiences. Unfortunately, I was constrained by the timeline of my thesis (two years) and the workload it required. I do not think the quality of this grounded theory study was critically hurt by this, but I recognize that this feeling exists.

The last sentence of the paragraph above is a demonstration of my reflexivity. Being metacognitively aware (thinking about my thinking) is important for the quality of grounded theory research. Such analysis of my thought process, as recorded through memoing, ensures I maintain methodological congruence in the present and that my future actions align. Another ingredient in a grounded theory study that is positively affected by memoing is theoretical sensitivity. My theoretical sensitivity is my ability to perceive and glean the salient points for the emerging theory from the data (Birks and Mills 2015). My background as an outdoor PBE/EE instructor with varied experiences across two cultures, different educational outcomes, and no less than five official instructing positions provided me with a strong foundation to decipher what other instructors were saying about PBE/EE. What I lacked in theoretical understanding of PBE/EE, I made up for in my time spent working with it.

The timing of the emergence of theory will vary from study to study based on their unique sets of circumstances. The quality of the study, and therefore the theory, is dependent on three overarching elements: researcher expertise, methodological congruence, and procedural precision (Birks and Mills 2015). As stated earlier, the theory is growing from the outset of the study even if it is not readily apparent. In this study, the theory became apparent somewhere around when the coding of the interviews was transitioning between intermediate and
advanced stages. Five major categories (holistic, critical, always learning, community, and relationship) emerged (Figure 9), and seemed to take precedence because of their ability to explain the other codes.

![Figure 9: Intermediate arrangement of categories and codes.](image)

The emergence of these five codes represented “code saturation” (no new codes were emerging from the interviews) and a transition between analysis (breaking apart) and synthesis (re-constructing). This transition also represents a shift from the grounded data of interviewees experiences and towards an explanatory theory. At this point, I felt I could start to re-engage with literature, but wanted to make sure I did not jump right into it. I had already begun to write the thesis, and so I avoided the literature review for fear that writing it might skew the budding theory. Instead of jumping back into the literature, I went back and listened to the interviews. I also reread portions of Birks and Mills for guidance, while continuing to memo.
From these three activities came the idea to place them all under the category “holistic.” It made both logical sense and felt right that if the education the interviewees were describing was holistic, then this category would incorporate all the codes. When this reworking of the categories and codes happened, it felt that the emerging theory had strong roots, and I was not nearly as worried about engaging with the literature. Still I refrained. One morning I had a “eureka moment” as I was in that wonderful state of half asleep: the interviewees were not describing one kind of education that we all strive for, but rather, two educational communities; one that readily achieves SL and another one that struggles to (Figure 10).

![Diagram of Educational Communities](image)

*Figure 10: A preliminary schematic of the theory.*

This moment in the study represented the final push towards “theoretical saturation,” or the moment when no new codes are identified as pertaining to a particular category. I was not quite there yet, however, because I initially thought some codes only pertained to the “holistic”
educational community and that the “siloed” educational community was largely devoid of codes. However, through memoing and going back to the interviews, it became apparent that both communities had their own interpretation of all of the codes. This would be the final major reorganization of the categories and codes. I renamed some of them for explanatory purposes, but with two versions of each code, I had reached theoretical saturation.

Often this is where many grounded theory studies stop and do not reach full abstraction. These studies are said to not truly be grounded theory, because a theory that can be applied to other contexts has not been explained (abstracted) (Birks and Mills 2015). Initially I told Soren I thought this is where we would get to (given the time constraints), but I was pleasantly surprised that further abstraction happened. It is in this theoretical integration phase, that outside concepts and ideas can be most useful for grounded theory (Birks and Mills 2015). All of the data had been squeezed out of the interviews, and at this point the literature provided great assistance. In particular, I faced the problem of labelling the two main categories. Each rendition seemed to lack full explanatory power. The literature, however, provided these labels and further explanations on how the main subcategories related to each other. It is with these advanced abstractions that theoretical integration was achieved.

Now we should have a strong idea of this study’s design and how it was implemented. The basics of grounded theory explain the backdrop to and what is going on behind the scenes in this study. In the next chapter, I present the results, starting with participant observation data, and then moving to the interview data.
“What do the students need guys?” uttered Lance, the course director on this OB course. He had spent the day rowing our eighteen-foot supply boat, loaded high with gear, down Colorado River while we instructors were with the students in sixteen-foot paddle boats. We had spent the day teaching lessons on boat captaining and facilitating discussions on students’ views on leadership. In turn, we instructors shared with Lance what had been the day’s experiences for the students. From this conversation we made the plan for the evening’s activities. It was imperative that these activities were based on what the students needed.

This recurring instructor conversation is built into every day of every course offered by Colorado Outward Bound School’s Southwest Program (COBS and SWP, respectively). It is a demonstration of our commitment to basing learning experiences on what students need in the moment. We draw on instructor capabilities and the vast institutional knowledge of COBS to create flexible plans based on students’ needs. It is in the context of moving students towards our three (content) outcomes, but that content is not a starting point. The student’s desires and personal goals (impulses) are the starting point that get expressed through leadership, character, and service. Moving from this educational community to MU’s gave me some culture shock.
At Mizzou, I hear a lot of conversations bemoaning undergraduate students. Instructor expectations for students, especially undergraduates, seem to be very low. The low expectations seem to be defined by a concentration and focus on the negative interactions MU instructors have had with students. Conversations with fellow graduate instructors puts primacy on “our” research over discussions on “our” instructing experiences. Professors can also have an equally low bar for both undergraduate and graduate students, based on that same habit of fixating on the unfavorable past experiences. Most telling of all, I have never once been explicitly asked, “what do the students need Brad?”

These experiences make me question not just the quality of EE happening at Mizzou, but if it should even be called EE. As we have established, if the education is not starting with students’ impulses in mind, then it is not EE. Even parts of our Mizzou educational community who tout EE as their approach seem to not always have a clear understanding that EE is centered around inherent student inclinations. I experienced this most viscerally when a seasoned instructor from the Career Center was a guest instructor in my Professional Development class. The instructor seemed desperate to prove their personal expertise on the subject and dominated the discussion that we were supposed to be learning from. It reminded me of watching a novice OB instructor give one of their first lessons to students. We did not move, had no change in instructional approach, and we rarely spoke within the hour and a half that they “taught.” It was a good old fashioned “sit and get” dominated by the “expert” who had the answers for us.
If EE is your approach, a lesson (especially from a seasoned instructor) would never have so many non-EE components.

Of the seventeen classes I have been involved with during my graduate degree studies, four stand out as engaging in students’ impulses. In order for a course to engage student impulses, it must assume that students are trustworthy and genuinely want to learn. Even when students are not putting forth the effort, an EE instructor’s response will be to reach out to them and gain clarification. This communication assumes that the student is lacking a personal connection to the course which is negatively affecting their motivation and performance. An EE instructor seeks to listen to a student so they can then assist the student in making a personal connection to the course. An example of this not happening in my coursework was when an instructor assumed, I was lying to them about missing a class, and started out a communication with this accusation. This is a prime example of a Mizzou instructor not trusting a student’s personal motivation and intentions. If I had not been an experienced EE instructor with a high level of self-confidence in my intentions as a student I would have easily been cowed by this accusation and the instructors (incorrect) perspective on me would have become a self-fulfilling prophecy. Such negative experiences do not define all MU courses, but it is troubling that these happened at all. Most upsetting is I do not have a feeling that I can provide feedback that will address such issues. To accomplish our mission according to our stated values teaching must come from a place of trust in a student’s desire to learn. The course content was the starting point and emphasis of most of my MU courses. This was not carried out in the same fashion as the mainstream education that early EE instructors sought to change, but the underlying spirit
seems to remain. It is complicated because instructors having the best of intentions, but often carry out their “student-centered” approaches without a trust in student impulses. I cannot think of a course that was solely content-driven, but I cannot think of a course that explicitly had me reflect on how it fit into my impulses, purpose, or personal life mission. MU seems to assume that your education is meant to connect you to a career and not a life mission (Headlee 2015). My MU education would have been more significant if I had explicitly been asked to reflect on connections between my life mission and each course I took.

Now I am not saying that OB instructors do not commiserate about students. We certainly do. I am not saying that I have not had incredible conversations with fellow Mizzou instructors that center around what is best for students. I have had them. I am not saying that EE instructors do not ever discount student impulses. We are all humans in training. What I am saying is that anytime we instructors assume the worst in our students, we are not practicing EE or being student-centered. Fink’s SL dimensions need to be framed not in the context of a career, but a mission.

Zooming out and taking all of my interactions during my two-years at MU into account, all my instructors had my best interest at heart and are by far more concerned about my personal interests than mainstream pedagogies at the turn of the twentieth century. However, we need to be in the present moment and continue to improve. Mainstream education, as experienced at MU, seems to struggle to trust student impulse. This is taking Mizzou as a whole. My own experiences as a graduate student in the geography department, while not perfect, seem to be
vastly superior to other graduate students from other departments. I am not suggesting that it is geography alone that is doing well in this regard either. It varies department to department and instructor to instructor. This suggests that EE is ill-defined and not well understood by the MU community overall.

The Instructor Participant Grove

My Mizzou instructing responsibilities were two-fold: leading discussion sections for introductory regional geography courses (GEOG 1100 and GEOG 1200) as a teaching assistant (TA) and head instructing a new PBE/EE geography course, EoP (Appendices H and I). Both of these responsibilities were inevitably affected by my past experiences as an educator, my outdoor instructing at COBS and BOSS chief among them. These experiences provided me with insight into all six questions this exploratory case study strove to answer. Student feedback and the assigned classroom settings would provide evidence of the existing PBE/EE landscape at Mizzou. Any relationship between PBE and EE would be experienced via participant observation, as I intentionally instructed to discover any connections. Using PBE, EE, and SL, I would gain perspective on any of the role(s) PBE/EE could play in achieving SL. Additionally, obstacles and solutions to PBE/EE implementation would be experienced as I learned first-hand what it is like to create, plan, advertise, and instruct a PBE/EE course at MU.

As a TA, I worked with two professors and five fellow TAs with different personalities and approaches to teaching. The professors set the course outcomes and chose the organization of
the course while guiding us TAs in our instruction of discussion sections. Being part of an instructional team for a course that was not necessarily organized with PBE/EE or SL in mind presented a great learning opportunity for me. Each semester I improved my ability to connect SL through some PBE/EE principles when it was appropriate given the course context.

To improve, I had to be flexible and resilient, but most importantly serendipitous (Mendleson 2018). I needed to focus on what was in my zone of influence as a TA and not focus on the things I did not have control over. Doing this revealed all of the ways open to me to implement PBE/EE. Each semester saw me improve my ability to fit in PBE/EE/SL. As the students from my first semester informed me, I struggled to find balance between the foundational geographic knowledge and other SL outcomes. I interpreted this to mean that I did not connect the experiences that focused on other SL areas well enough to the geographic content. I took this feedback into account and improved upon it with each semester. Anytime you receive feedback it is a balancing act of interpreting what it is the students want, need, and expect and what you as the instructor see that they want, need, and expect. This is one of the reasons why it can be difficult to engage in student impulses, especially with students who are not regularly asked to do so. Some students never got comfortable with my interest in their personal connections to course content.

One student in particular was very frustrated with my structuring of a geography assignment that connected geographic content to life plans and dreams. Their frustration was compounded by their mistrust that I was not forcing them to do this. Previous experiences seemed to make
them assume I was not genuine in the “challenge by choice” philosophy that I communicated. If an assignment pushed a student into an unhealthy place, I did my best to create a culture of open dialogue. A student’s concerns would be trusted and together a solution for a better way for them to learn could be worked out. Such reactions reflect not just their other experiences at Mizzou, but also the educational upbringing they had at home and the formal education they received prior to attending MU. This is evidence of a need to expose students to education that is not imposed and forced but entered into freely.

In its inaugural offering, EoP was a 4 credit-hour place-based course that engaged the local Places and landscapes of the greater Columbia, MO (CoMO) area. Five fundamental themes and techniques in geography were integrated with the personal and interpersonal dimensions of learning. To achieve this goal, the course synthesized SL, EE, PBE, and service learning. The course met on Tuesdays from 9:00am-noon at the Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture (CCUA) and Thursdays from 9:00am-noon at various outdoor locations, from campus to Rock Bridge State Park to Cooper’s Landing beside Missouri River. A series of instructor- and student-guided explorations of course themes through the experience of Place occurred wherever we went. EoP was born out of an assignment I had for my College Teaching (ED_LPA 9448) course. The assignment asked us to envision the beginning of planning a course based off of L Dee Fink’s “integrated design” (Fink 2013). I grew this assignment into fully planning EoP. During the fall semester of 2018, Soren and I ran the course and gained more valuable information on what it is like to run a PBE/EE course at Mizzou. This experience fit in nicely with my TA instructing responsibilities. While EoP served a role, showing us what it is like to plan a course
with only PBE/EE approaches, my TA instructing showed me what it is like to integrate PBE/EE into courses not necessarily planned for its use.

I came away from my instructing experiences with several conclusions. Whether or not you embrace Place-based methods, the Place of an educational experience has an effect on learning outcomes (Allyon 2018; Elder 2018; Fellabaum-Totson 2018; Hemmelgarn 2018; Kim 2018; Malkin 2018; Mendleson 2018; Minnick 2018; Palmer 2018; Schulte 2018; Sebastian 2018; Spain 2018; Speck 2018; Wilson 2018; Dewey, 1986; Louv 2010; Mayer and Alexander 2017).

The worst setting I was given as a TA was a small room, with no windows, and seating fixed in a manner where all seats faced a podium. The best setting was a room with easily movable chairs and desks where we could readily circle up. During this semester, I was originally assigned a room that would have made it very difficult to break up our class into small groups for discussion because of its small size, difficulty to re-arrange seating, and assumption that the chairs should be aligned in a fixed manner towards a podium. There is evidence that MU is actively moving away from “fixed” seating classrooms, but it is not ubiquitous yet. Generally, the newer modifications on campus seem to facilitate different arrangements from “the teacher is the expert” model, but they are not campus wide or intentionally utilized. It still perplexes me that any class labelled a discussion section would be assigned to a room that cannot not readily move people into small group circles for discussion. This suggests that MU lacks an understanding of or is not prioritizing implementation of EE’s principle of “organic, social organization” (Dewey 1986).
I also came away from my TAing experiences with a feeling that many students have never been asked to reflect on how a course’s content is going to fit into their everyday life, or how they plan to use course content after the course is over. While MU cannot be held accountable for how and what learners have been taught prior to joining our community, we are responsible for how and what we teach them. Too many juniors and seniors in my discussion sections struggled with these and other SL outcomes. This suggests that as an educational community, we need to improve how and what we are teaching to achieve SL. There are initiatives being pushed to address this, like the implementation of individual development plans (IDPs) (Page 2018). The push for IDPs seems to suggest that I am not the only MU community member seeing this aspect of students’ personal impulses not being prioritized. IDPs, like anything else, must be intentionally implemented otherwise we are just creating more busy work. How educational tools, like IDPs, are engaged in will determine whether they hurt or help MU be better about engaging student impulses to achieve SL.

As to whether there is a link between PBE/EE approaches and SL at MU, I cannot say for certain based on my instructing experiences alone. It is important to note that I am biased in regard to this question. For seven years of my life, I operated in an outdoor educational context that explicitly teaches within the paradigms of PBE/EE. I have had the experience of students achieving SL through PBE/EE approaches both within and outside of the MU context. After working as a student and instructor in the Mizzou community, using PBE/EE approaches intuitively seems to achieve SL. My OB instructing has a significantly different focus than Mizzou, and it is possible that OB’s outcomes of leadership, character development, and desire
to serve make comparing the two difficult, if not impossible; like comparing apples and oranges.

My time instructing at BOSS was different. BOSS uses the foundational knowledge of survival skills as learning outcomes for students, yet students consistently report other elements of SL at the course’s end. Even with the human dimension, learning to learn, and caring as ancillary outcomes, most BOSS students report deep, life changing experiences in these areas. This suggests that SL comes from the direct connection to Place that inevitably happens on a BOSS course. Clear linkages between our most basic needs as humans (air, water, food, and shelter) are made with the Places we find ourselves. It would follow, that the role of our Place in CoMO is something to tap into for SL.

The experiences of head instructing a place-based course and TAing under the auspices of more traditionally organized courses were invaluable. Both gave me windows into the obstacles and challenges that currently exist at Mizzou. From these experiences, I discern three, interrelated challenges: time, enrollment, and assessment. Time was a challenge because Place-based learning operates at a slower pace and a different cadence. It is exceedingly difficult to allow students and instructors the time and rhythm needed to sink into Place if they are worried about inflexible time constraints. Assessing students on subjective, metacognitive outcomes does not easily fit into how most Mizzou courses are assessed, but it is needed for SL. Both time issues and assessment issues played a part in two students dropping EoP. It is not unusual for a new course to struggle with enrollment. EoP’s enrollment struggles, though, also stemmed
from its focus on metacognitive outcomes and the time needed for farm work and hikes. Even though this participation in two, three-hour time blocks was taken into consideration in regard to credit hour protocol, it still proved restrictive for students to fit other required coursework in. Time and assessment issues will need to be addressed if EoP, and courses like it, are going to grow here at Mizzou. Solutions can be found.

The Grove of Interview Data

It was not until a geography professor, Clayton Blodgett, explicitly asked me to explain the difference between EE and PBE (“Achieving Significant Learning through Place” 2018) that this difference became an important part of the study. I spent my summer contemplating this relationship as I worked for both BOSS and OB, but I did not get any farther than the fact that we are always in a P/place, and we are always experiencing something. From this, my thoughts circulated on ways in which instructors could be more intentional about both Place and experience, since the two phenomena are always present. It was not to be until I conducted the interviews for this project that I got the insight I needed to build a more sophisticated understanding that contextualizes the participant observation data.

Here are the individuals who took the time to share their knowledge, wisdom, and perspectives:

- Angela Speck, Physics Professor at MU
- Anna Wilson, Head Instructor at Wild Folk
• Becca Elder, Garden Instructor at The Green Thumb Project
• Bini Sebastian, Counseling Psychology Doctoral Student at MU
• Clark Peters, Social Work and Law Professor at MU
• Hannah Hemmelgarn, Agro-forestry Professor at MU
• Jennifer Fellabaum-Totson, Education Professor at MU
• Jim Spain, Animal Science Professor & Administrator at MU
• Kristen Schulte, Education Director at Missouri River Relief (MRR)
• Mark Palmer, Geography Professor at MU
• Miguel Allyn, Director of Study Abroad at MU
• Polina Malikin, Director of Wild Folk
• Sang Kim, Director of Asian Affairs at MU
• Sophie Mendleson, Agro-forestry Doctoral Student at MU
• Soren Larsen, Geography Professor at MU
• Tony Minnick, Farm Manager at Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture (CCUA)

Not all of the interview questions (please refer back to Chapter 3) will be explicitly discussed here. There is too much data to unpack to make it tenable. Instead we will focus on the quotes and paraphrases from participants that were transformed into codes, categories, and theory.

To start, I will share the codes that emerged from the interviews, how I expressed them, and how interrelationships led to theory (Appendices B-F). Initial codes emerged while I listened to and transcribed the interviews. I would make note of words or topics that grabbed my
attention. Most often, I used words directly from the participants, like “community” (Minnick 2018; Schulte 2018; Speck 2018; Wilson 2018; Malkin 2018) to label the codes. Less often, a code would be formed to generalize a topic, like “time-pace” (Elder 2018; Minnick 2018; Hemmelgarn 2018; Mendleson 2018; Fellabaum-Totson 2018; Schulte 2018; Speck 2018)

Usually, these topic-based codes contained spoken words from interviewees, but something about them necessitated clarification, and so, I revised them. “Time-pace” for example, started out as “slow time.” However, when I went back through the initial codes, it was clear that interviewees were not always discussing time in the context of “slow time.” Kristen Schulte talked about the “gobs of time” she spent on transference activities while teaching at Teton Science School (TSS). This was categorically different from Angela Speck discussing how she adjusted the pace in her physics and astronomy courses. She explained that if you rushed through content than you are not teaching anything. A healthy balance must be struck between the quality of conceptual understanding and the quantity of content covered by adjusting your pace as the instructor. (Speck 2018) This caused “slow time” to be split into the codes “time-pace” and “time-length.”

This iterative process reminded me of brushing tangled hair. No matter how many times I “brushed” through the transcripts, I untangled some hair. However, there does come a point when you know the hair is as untangled as it is going to get. When I reached this point with the data, I needed to “braid it.” The braiding process should be thought of as the late-intermediate to early-advanced coding stage, and the brushing process should be thought of as the initial to beginning-intermediate coding stage. While brushing through the transcripts and interviews, I
was mostly analyzing and disentangling data from the interviews. While braiding, I was synthesizing and putting that data into an organized, coherent form. The later parts of advanced coding through theoretical integration were akin to securing the braid with hair ties and double-checking that it is sound.

The transition from brushing to braiding saw one hundred twenty-four codes (Appendix F) become intertwined around one main category, “holistic,” with the main sub-categories being “community,” “time-pace,” “always learning,” “critical,” and “relationship,” because of their significant explanatory power over the rest of the codes (Figure 11).

![Figure 11: Intermediate arrangement of categories and codes.](image)

At this point it seemed that the interviewees were describing a unified educational strategy based around holistic approaches. I could not put my finger on it, but something inside me
knew that this was not the exact message the participants were communicating. There was something deeper within the data. After memo writing and re-listening to interviews with an express interest in how “holistic” was being described, this feeling of unease cleared up. The term holistic meant something different to each instructor. While there was overlap, there were also some clear differences. A contingent of interviewees were explicitly expressing “holistic” in terms of how “spirit” was needed in education (Hemmelgarn 2018; Mendleson 2018; Malkin 2018; Wilson 2018). Spirit denotes a concern for developing one’s character and purpose, as evidenced in phrases like “… in a battle for that person’s soul” (Mendleson 2018), “It is not about solar power, it is about soul power” (Hemmelgarn 2018), and reading a Thanksgiving Address as an intentional tone set before meals (Malkin 2018; Wilson 2018).

This initial distinction was binary: there was a group who was embracing “spirit” and a group who was not. Upon further contemplation, memoing, and consultation with the interviews, it became clear that each instructor had different comfort levels with incorporating their definition of spirit into their instruction. The line between spirit and spirituality seemed like a way to help explain this personal definition of spirit. I used spirituality to distinguish between the group of four mentioned above and the rest of the interviewees. Spirit served as a more subdued expression of what the four above were describing. Some participants made little to no mention of spirit (Allyon 2018; Kim 2018; Speck 2018). Most, however, seemed to be open to spirit on some level, especially when describing their teaching philosophy and its relationship to SL. The fact that participants’ definitions of “holistic” and “spirit” were entangled suggested the need for a better, more grounded way to explain what was going on. Despite the trouble of
understanding what this new configuration might be, the theory had already begun to emerge through the data.

I could look at each individual code and make the same messy conclusions as I did with “holistic.” This was a sobering thought given the fact that there were still around one hundred and twenty codes (some had been collapsed into each other, while others had been split apart). Existing literature helped explain what had emerged through the concepts of Place versus place. The one hundred and twentyish codes were aspects of P/place-making (Fettes and Judson 2011). When the interviewees described their work as instructors and directors of educational communities, they were describing the P/places they worked. This meant that the sixteen interviewees had communicated the complicated web of P/place as it existed inside and outside of their lived realities as instructors. This stems from the give and take (affect and effect) that communities/individuals have on Place and vice versa (Course Plant Person 2018; “Bhutan, the Mountain Kingdom” 2016).
At this point the theory had emerged (Figure 12) but it needed further abstraction, requiring the use from outside sources. I had already begun this process when I used the concept of P/place to interpret the advanced coding reorganization. As I began to define the new relationships between main sub-categories, I ran into a perplexing situation. I was (wrongfully) assuming a binary, an either/or distinction that would exist across all the major sub-categories. Initially, this was making some sense as “holistic” was opposed to “siloed” and “time-pace” was expressed by the opposites of “hurried” and “unhurried.” This overly simplified model quickly fell apart when I got to “critical” and “always learning.” Both types of communities (place and Place) would embrace the concepts of feedback and always learning. This unentangled educational theory had no use. I went back to the time-tested combination of memoing and reviewing the interviews and their transcripts to lead the way in sorting this out.
Interviewees shed light on just how entangled the conceptions of place and Place were, and their roles in an educational community. Jim Spain, an administrator at MU, had similar responses to “always learning” as Polina Malkin, the director of Wild Folk (a Place-based school in Columbia). I had personally seen both of these individuals create incredibly welcoming environments for students, and their interviews reflected a high level of student-centered approach. Yet, there was something different in their conceptions of P/place. They lived in very different P/places within the shared Columbia community. Chief among these was their relationship with time. The interview with Polina was at her home and with a relaxed timetable. Jim’s interview was in his office with a rigid timetable. Both interviews were incredibly positive, but upon reflection, they had very different feels. I spent about the same amount of time talking with each of them, and both are incredibly busy people. Yet the difference of feeling lingered in my memory. It was not the people, but the different P/places that played a role in this feeling, which is an expression of divergent educational communities.

Through additional observation it became clear that just because you were a “mainstream” (MU) instructor did not mean that you exclusively in the place-based world. Equally true was that if you were an “alternative” (non-MU) instructor did not mean you fit exclusively in the Place-based world. The major difference between the two conceptions of community is the understanding of time. Conspicuously, some interviews referenced a rigid, chronological time, and others referenced a more relaxed, fluid kind of time. This observation gains explanatory power when we consider how Vine Deloria Jr. explains worldviews based on time or space.
(Deloria 1992). Depending on which element you use as a focal point (time or Place) leads not just to different relationships to time, but to a cascade of effects that were being expressed in the codes. Capital “P” Place emphasizes Place as the focal point, which leads to a more relaxed relationship with time. In this reality time is more like an ongoing, ever-changing rhythm than an orderly march from past to present to future. This position is that of an “inhabitant” (Gruenewald 2003). Lowercase “p” place emphasizes chronological time as the focal point, which leads to rigidity in the conceptualization and delivery of educational activities. This position is that of a “resident” (Gruenewald 2003). Combining this typology with the idea that no interviewee, and therefore no educational community, in this study is completely Place-based or place-based, we reach a new theory: an entangled educational community theory of inhabitants and residents (Figure 13).

Figure 13: Entangled Educational Community Theory: This is a simplified, hierarchical depiction of the grounded theory that emerged from the study. It is important to use this visual only as a starting point because, as the name suggests, the relationship is not
For further explanatory power, especially in the educational context of this study, we brought in Gruenewald’s concept of critical pedagogy of place. Gruenewald argues that truly place-based pedagogies are inherently critical pedagogies. This does not, and cannot, limit critical pedagogies of place to siloed off ecological issues. The sociological and ecological issues are inseparable from place, and therefore are dependent on each other. Gruenewald uses the term “re-inhabitation” to explain the need to reconnect with the Places we live in. Doing so will reveal the inseparable relationship between the social and ecological. Re-inhabiting is described as a decolonial action. This “inhabitant” reality, is contrasted with the “resident” reality.

Residents of place are disconnected from Place and caught up in the reproduction of colonizing attitudes and actions.

The differences between a resident view and an inhabitant view is not about whether you believe in holistic teaching approaches. It is about how you define “holistic.” A resident view can champion holistic approaches as much as an inhabitant view can. This leads to confusion, because on the surface there is agreement, but deep down disagreement exists. Residents silo off, and over simplify leading to mismanagement. The concept of holistic approaches to education is no different. This leads to an initially confusing, residential definition of siloed holism. The resident recognizes that mind, body, and spirit are needed in education; however, they hesitate and resist that all three can, or should happen at once (Wilson 2018). On the contrary, an inhabitant defines holistic by recognizing mind, body, and spirit are happening simultaneously and need to be taught and experienced in integrated reality (Wilson 2018).
inhabitant view seeks to connect, and to understand complexity through service and other forms of personal interaction with Place. Worship, exercise, and learning are all connected and need to be experienced at once (Wilson 2018). This leads to the seemingly redundant definition of connected holism. Each code is more accurately explained through these clearer definitions of residents of place and inhabitants of Place.

We must not forget that these two conceptions of educational community remain entangled within the interviewees. No one only expressed “inhabitant” views, and no one only expressed “resident” perspectives. This means it comes down to ratio. How often do we as instructors and students take on the inhabitant viewpoint, and how often do we take on the resident outlook? This is how the entangled educational community theory must be interpreted. Not only was this theory explaining the entangled nature of the inhabitant/resident paradigm (Gruenewald 2003) on the individual scale, but at other scales.

Zooming out from the individual scale, the most striking difference was between MU and non-MU instructors. The Mizzou instructor interviews came with the ever-present pressure to not use up more time than was necessary. This was in contrast to the lack of time pressure that surrounded the non-Mizzou instructor interviews. At this scale we see how the instructor community of Columbia is colored by both resident (time-focused nature of MU) instructors and inhabitant (Place-focused nature of Wild Folk, CCUA, Green Thumb Project, and MRR) instructors. Zooming into the MU community we also see differences. The interview with Hannah Hemmelgarn and Sophie Mendleson was the least time-crunched while several others
had the feel of more stringent time constraints pressing in on the conversations (Kim 2018; Spain 2018; Fellabaum-Totson 2018). All interviewees were extremely busy, but distinct attitudes towards time were conspicuous. For example, Hannah had to leave our interview prior to it being organically wrapped up and Sophie and I kept discussing as she left. Even as she left, Hannah did so without radiating concern and apprehension. In contrast, the interview with Jennifer was equally relaxed throughout, but had subtle cues that it needed to end at the appointed time. Body posture, tone of voice, pace of speech, and other similar cues are what built into the different feelings each MU interview had in regards to time concerns. This one detail does not determine whether someone is resident or inhabitant, again it is an entangled identity in everyone. The MU community overall seems to have more resident, time-focused culture than inhabitant, Place-focused culture. It would be informative to compare colleges, departments, and schools in greater detail than this study was able to conduct. The entangled educational community theory can be applied to illuminate what PBE is and that there is likely a resident and inhabitant definition of it.

The interviews suggest that there is a unique relationship between Place and experience. Most instructors saw PBE as inherently requiring EE, but not the inverse. EE was usually seen as being able to happen detached from Place, in a classroom. Put another way: you can take an experience out of context, but you cannot take the context out of an experience. Becca Elder stated that PBE’s goal is to connect and root into the physical places we are in. The methods that require such a connection are going to be experiential in nature (Elder 2018). Thus, PBE is inherently going to require experiential methods. EE is seen as “hands-on” learning that focuses
on an experience. An experience is mobile and can be adapted to different locations (Speck 2018b; Hemmelgarn 2018; Mendleson 2018; Sebastian 2018; Palmer 2018; Kim 2018; Wilson 2018; Minnick 2018; Schulte 2018; Malkin 2018). This is why Soren made the distinction that there appears to be two different types of EE. One that is based on pre-existing curriculum and relegated to a specific time, while the other embraces the idea that you are always learning and that unpredictable instances of learning are important (Larsen 2018). A highly mobile EE should be viewed with some degree of wariness. Kristen Schulte explicitly designed Missouri River Relief’s curriculum to “be unrepeatable in the classroom setting” explicitly because of this concern. There also seems to be a categorically different relationship with P/place in the two types of EE that Soren explained. A content and time focused EE can be readily taken out of context but an EE that embraces unpredictability inherently puts that experience in the context of the Place in which it occurred. I encourage readers to think of examples of this in their own life (Figure 14). Think of moments when you learned a skill “experientially” but not in context. What was it like to perform that skill later with contextual requirements? Would you consider an education that continually lacks context to be able to provide all six elements of SL?
Initially, I was worried about providing interviewees with the precise definition of SL from Fink. However, the all-encompassing nature of Fink’s SL negated my concerns that it would overly influence their responses. It was not important that interviewees understood precisely the six dimensions Fink identified, but that they shared what they thought was significant and how they went about achieving it. This “what” and “how” was the valuable information. An important concept that came from this element of the interviews was how each instructor emphasized different aspects of SL. Some thought learning to learn was the most important aspect, while others expressed caring or application. In each answer it was clear how all six aspects of SL were intertwined and dependent on each other. A key takeaway from this is that SL does not have a start or end. It is simply important to have all six present. Any absence or unbalance in a student’s education decreases its significance. Revisiting the importance of context suggests that being Place-focused is a useful strategy to ensure all six components are incorporated.
Extrapolating from the interviews and my experiences at MU, there does not appear to be a consistent balance of SL components in educational programs. It seems likely that divides exist between colleges, departments, and schools. For example, the humanities are vernacularly considered “soft” (human dimension and caring) while the STEM fields are considered “hard” (content application). Instead of trying to impose one on the other, it seems important to recognize that each does not necessarily fall into such a binary paradigm. The reality this study’s theory would predict is that both “soft” and “hard” are already present in both. However, the identities (soft or hard) associated with each likely serve to inhibit SL outcomes for students. This is a constructed reality that we can demolish and rebuild.

In this study, we assume that everyone is constructing their realities. This does not happen in isolation. We interact among each other and our constructed P/places get added into our shared community. Those who take on the title of instructor become agents who pass along their constructed realities. Kristen Schulte mentioned that instructors teach from their experiences. If instructors’ life experiences have been constructed around a resident, time-focused paradigm than that is what they will teach. In such a reality it seems like all aspects of SL would be hard to come by. It also creates a cyclical feedback loop that makes changing the educational community difficult. Especially if the change needed is a fundamental shift in outlook and personal relationship to P/place. What this theory is communicating is that these two communities are entangled within each individual, community, county, state, nation, and our shared world. We cannot disentangle ourselves from neighbors who are residents of place.
We can only strive to be inhabitants of Place and work to share with others ways we have been successful and unsuccessful in acting out this reality inside and outside of ourselves. Both parts are alive and well inside us and in our communities. MU serves as an example of this.

I expected there would be strong evidence that instructors at Mizzou are lacking conceptual understanding of EE and how to implement it. The results are more nuanced than this, but if we are to take MU as a whole, they seem to back up this expectation. Mizzou instructors seem to be fighting an uphill battle by being overly wary of student impulses and unpredictability. The spirit of EE can be misconstrued as a mobile learning tool that can be disassociated with Place (Elder 2018; Malkin 2018; Hemmelgarn 2018; Sebastian 2018) without losing its power to achieve SL. This seems unlikely given the power that connection to Place has (Hemmelgarn 2018; Mendleson 2018; Larsen 2018a; Palmer 2018; Peters 2018; Wilson 2018; Malkin 2018; Schulte 2018; Sobel 2004; Mamaril, Cox, and Vaughan 2018; Louv 2010; Azano 2011; Hostetter 2016; Semken et al. 2017). Each element of SL seems to be enhanced if it is learned based on what students need and their needs are met through the Place they are residing/inhabiting. Growing Mizzou’s trust of student impulses, while engaging in Place seems like a surefire way to achieve SL.

Many potential obstacles and solutions to implementing PBE/EE were identified by the interview participants. Three main obstacles faced by MU instructors revolve around time, enrollment, and assessment (Allyon 2018; Elder 2018; Fellabaum-Totson 2018; Hemmelgarn 2018; Kim 2018; Larsen 2018; Malkin 2018; Mendleson 2018; Minnick 2018; Palmer 2018;
Peters 2018; Schulte 2018; Sebastian 2018; Spain 2018; Speck 2018; Wilson 2018; Martens 2018a, 2018b). A key quality to address obstacles is being serendipitous (Mendleson 2018). If someone is going to be serendipitous, then they will act out the idiom: “the problem is the solution.” Solutions is where we turn our attentions to next.
Five: Views from High Points

Discussion from the top of Memorial Union Tower

Thank you for slowing down and listening to what I have seen from my perspective on this high point. We are on the same expedition together: to provide students with life changing educational experiences. I invite you to climb up to this and other high points to help clarify, corroborate, and constructively critique conclusions that this study purports. We cannot forget that Mizzou’s ethically guided mission is a shared mission. Embedded within every instructor interviewed is a piece of place and Place, obstacle and solution. Know that this paper is written from a Place of compassion and that I am as guilty as anyone of not always living up to the potential we deserve. It is not perfect. It is not personal. And perhaps most importantly, it is not permanent. (Bach 2019).

Our study indicates we are not doing as well as we could be because of the place we inherited and its incongruities with the Place we want to build. As a whole Mizzou is currently too content focused, and transactional. Students want to pay as little as possible in both money, and more importantly, time. This duel focus on money and time is also embraced by too many MU leaders (graduate students, professors, staff, and administration), reinforcing the problem that we need to unite against. The fight for quality education, is the fight for a better present moment. Each present moment leads to the future. Solutions exist and are eloquently
expressed through our responsibilities as a land grant institution ("Mission Statement | About the University | University of Missouri System” 2019) and our values (“Statement of Values” 2019). We must remember them through the lens of the new trajectory this paper is strongly suggesting. Below are some thoughts on how to solve the three identified problems of time, enrollment, and assessment.

Our relationship with time and how we are always in a hurry to be more efficient with it is hurting our quality of education (Deloria 1992; Wilson 2018; Malkin 2018). There is a current push to use new technologies in ways that would only worsen this obstacle (Quinn 2019). The call for EE and its popularity is not because it is less academically rigorous. It came about because mainstream pedagogies were not adequately preparing students to face the salient issues of the day (Dewey 1986; Hanford 2015). Fink, the Kolbs, and PBE educators continue to push for many of the same fundamental changes that the original EE instructors envisioned (Fink 2013; Kolb and Kolb 2017; Sobel 2004; Gruenewald 2003; Malkin 2018; Wilson 2018; Hemmelgarn 2018; Mendleson 2018; Elder 2018; Minnick 2018; Schulte 2018; Speck 2018b; Fellabaum-Totson 2018; Larsen 2018b; Palmer 2018) because of their continued relevance.

Mainstream education has changed in many positive ways since the turn of the twentieth century (Fink 2013; Mayer and Alexander 2017; Kolb and Kolb 2017), but it still remains chained to poor educational practices that do not start with student impulses (Fink 2013; Mayer and Alexander 2017).
The terms “student-centered” and “student impulses” need better clarity. It seems that instructors at MU envision different things when they say and hear “student centered.” It appears that some instructors connect this with tapping into student impulses, but others do not because they feel the student’s impulses are often not in the student’s best interest. How and when an instructor deals with their role as a mentor is important. Education is not the sole responsibility of an instructor. They must work together with students to achieve the audacious goals of SL. No one needs to always be the driver on the road trip that is education. Ultimately, the student will drive away from MU and they will need to know how to drive without Mizzou instructors. Time must be spent on each student growing their life’s mission (practice driving). This driving practice makes them better able to articulate to instructors what they want and need from courses. At times instructors will need to be mentors and demonstrate to students ways they need to grow in all six areas of SL. This might mean taking the wheel and having the students learn by example, but students will need time behind the wheel to achieve SL.

The push for SL/EE, and its intimately related cousin PBE, are evidence of how mainstream education is not consistently producing empowered graduates ready to hit the ground running after graduation. True PBE/EE is not about cool, entertaining activities. It is about coherently linking deeply (cool and entertaining) educational experiences that prepare students to graduate with the necessary holistic skill sets (SL) today’s problems require of them. A continued myopic obsession with time will not produce quality. To implement a meaningful education that makes time for all parts of the experiential learning cycle (Kolb and Kolb 2017), SL (Fink 2013), and Place (Kimmerer 2013; Deloria 1992; Gruenewald 2003; Basso 1996) will
require a different attitude towards time. I know some instructors already push back against this obsession with time to balance content with conceptual understanding (application and integration) (Speck 2018), diversity and inclusion (human dimensions and caring) (Palmer 2018), mindfulness (human dimensions and caring) (Sebastian 2018), and being able to reflect (integration) (Peters 2018).
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*Figure 15: Place-based actions needed from administration* (Fink 2013; Deloria 1992; Kimmerer 2013; Basso 1996; Malkin 2018; Wilson 2018; Hemmelgarn 2018; Mendleson 2018; Larsen 2018; Palmer 2018)

We need to build on our current practices that are based off of more than time, and push for changes that incentivize MU instructors to do this in Place-based ways. This means administrators removing obstacles and re-examining the responsibilities they place on instructors. Subtraction can be addition. Removing ineffective tasks can free instructors to re-
design their courses with the PBE/EE/SL trifecta as guiding lights. Instructors are more likely to trust student impulses if administrators trust instructor impulses. Fink identifies five categories for administrators to focus on (Figure 15). I suggest informing these revamped administrational concerns with Indigenous conceptions of Place (Fink 2013; Deloria 1992; Kimmerer 2013; Basso 1996; Malkin 2018; Wilson 2018; Hemmelgarn 2018; Mendleson 2018; Larsen 2018; Palmer 2018), because doing so will fundamentally shift our relationship to time. A new focus on Place by MU will truly set instructors and students free to unleash high levels of SL.

Right now, the MU community seems to be constructed more from resident actions than inhabitant ones (Figures 16 and 17). Our campus is still dealing with the consequences of not creating a nurturing and welcoming Place for all our students. The relationships between people of color and the other segments of our community must continue to improve for us to
not repeat the incident of 2015 that was long in the making. A direct correlation exists between the initial “cleaning of the wound” events of 2015 and lower enrollment (Basi 2015; Garrett 2017). If we had all six of Fink’s significant learning categories happening in every course offered, with equal significance given to human dimensions and caring, it seems like such an event would have been less destructive. The 2015 events that saw a president along with a chancellor fired, and enrollment drop precipitously were akin to a crown fire (Egan 2009) that destroys everything in its path. Built up social ills fueled it to highly destructive levels of heat. PBE/EE/SL curriculum would usher in a regular cycle of less hot, less destructive, social fires that would regularly cleanse our community of our built-up social ills. This new curriculum would increase the focus on the human dimensions and caring aspects of SL, to achieve this healthier social fire regime. To truly embrace PBE/EE is to prioritize the caring and human dimensions of SL. Mizzou would repair and grow its relationship with students. This ever-improving relationship would build and maintain a safe and nurturing, yet challenging and brave Place (Speck 2018) for us all to live and learn in. Healthier relations between overrepresented and underrepresented segments of our community would be evidence of MU helping grow inhabitants of Place.
If we are to radically change the focus of MU overall, we will need to make adjustments to our assessment system. The current interpretation of grades (A, B, C, D, F) does not suffice. It must be greatly altered because our familiarity with assigning As, Bs, Cs, Ds, and Fs would impede the fundamental shift to plugging into student impulses. To grade a course that hits all six elements of SL requires a totally new grading system. The discipline specific knowledge of our departments, schools, and colleges should be viewed as conduits to achieve a student impulse-centered education with much greater feedback to students on their caring and human dimension performances. I believe elements of Kurt Hahn’s Salem School Final Report (Hanford 2015) and OB’s student evaluation (Appendix J) could be key contributors for guidance.

No one on an expedition likes the person who only complains about what others are doing or not doing. Feedback is needed, but it is not the starting point. The starting point is self-feedback. Everyone regardless of which type of student you are (undergraduate, graduate,
staff, faculty, and/or administrator), can start implementing the solutions to these three obstacles. No formal inquiry or study is necessary, although those would be welcome. More importantly, we must immediately act on our logic and intuition to start achieving Place-based SL outcomes. Only by focusing on our zones of influence will we change the course of MU’s expedition. There are serious problems to Mizzou’s current overall trajectory. It does not align with our values or our mission (“Mission Statement | About the University | University of Missouri System” 2019; “Statement of Values” 2019) and it is not up to someone else to change course. It is up to us, no matter our level of influence. When enough people stop moving (in the wrong direction), climb up to the high point, and enterprisingly march out onto a new, Place-based course, others will follow. We need enterprising leaders, not apathetic followers. Look at your current course activities. Start substituting readings and lectures with active connections to the larger Mizzou and CoMO communities. We deserve to be free to partner with all the other instructors in this amazing Place. There will be growing pains. When in doubt, an intentional and facilitated walk outside will do wonders.

**Discussion from a High Branch of Yggdrasil**

It seems that the entangled educational community theory that arose from this research could be taken into the context of other institutions of higher education. I think the theory can be further abstracted and find use at multiple scales and multiple contexts. I believe the entangled educational community theory needs no change in title, but a re-conception of how we envision it. Deeply embracing the concept of always learning (Minnick 2018; Fellabaum-Totson
2018; Peters 2018; Schulte 2018; Malkin 2018) leads us to a realization that we are always “in school.” However, you can be in school and not learning. Our abilities of learning to learn (Fink 2013) free us to maximize the learning opportunities that Place is constantly providing. If most communities in Missouri saw this potential in their own local contexts the benefits would be that much grander.

At the global scale, we can apply this study’s theory to explain how an issue like climate change is prioritized and acted upon. It makes sense that more residential countries are more concerned with jockeying for position in resource access than jointly tackling it through shared goals. The U.S. government is more concerned with “winning” now than it is with denying itself power and wealth for a longer-term win-win as a member of the global community. This is especially evident when the “resource” use per person (carbon emissions, wood removal, and total water usage) of the U.S. is outpacing everyone else in the world (“Gapminder Tools” 2019). This does not mean that other governments do not also have residential views, but it suggests that the U.S. has the highest percentage of residential actions. This creates a feedback loop as our Places are supplanted by places. An increase in places filled with residents reduces the ability for connection and service as social and government laws (Jackson 1830; Dawes 1887; Howard, Wheeler, and Collier 1934; Plumer 2017) help create and maintain siloed areas to manage. Zooming in we can see this at play at different scales. Extrapolating from the entangled heterogeneity that MU displayed, it is likely that each time you zoom into a smaller part of society you could end up with communities of various blends of inhabitant and resident, Place and place. Each context and scale interplaying with other contexts and scales. Taking it to
the individual scale provides insight into our own personal manifestation of the internal resident-inhabitant continuum. I believe the following story, adopted from a reading titled “Cherokee Grandfather” (Creech 2018), explains what this entangled reality inside each of us is.

An enlightened community elder is teaching their grandchild about life. “A fight is going on inside me” they said to the child. “It is a terrible fight and it is between two wolves. One is evil – they are anger, envy, sorrow, regret, greed, arrogance, self-pity, guilt, resentment, inferiority, lies, false pride, superiority, and ego. The other is good – they are joy, peace, love, hope, serenity, humility, kindness, benevolence, empathy, generosity, truth, compassion, and faith. This same fight is going on inside you – and inside every other person, too.”

The grandchild thought about it for a minute and then asked their grandparent, “Which wolf will win?”

The wise elder simply replied, “The one you feed.”

- Anonymous

An interesting connection seems to exist between a warning from Dewey and this entangled theory on communities. Dewey warned of the peril of trying to change mainstream education but failing to do so because we just give the spirit of mainstream education a different name. He conceived possible scenarios where educators fell in love with the adjective “experiential” and became so myopic and obsessive about it that a new, equally ineffective “experiential”
pedagogy was established falsely claiming to have fixed the problem. I believe we as a society have fallen into this trap in some way. The push to educate students through experience, place, and significant learning is really about trusting their and our own natural impulses. We need space to discover just how strong, dedicated, and smart each of us is. To make sure we understand that our communities desperately need us. That without each of us the world does not spin the way it needs to (Wilson 2018).

An elephant in the room is the spiritual embrace of Place. This is such a foundational shift that it might meet with a lot of (internal) resistance, especially from community members whose spirituality embraces a Place in the sky rather than a Place in the ground. One such spiritual tradition is Christianity. We must remember that Western science tradition sprung from Christian faith and while it often views itself as separate and even in opposition to it, they remain connected in their foundational belief of the superiority of human people over the other people of Earth (Kimmerer 2013). Can someone keep their faith that Jesus is God and embrace the Place-based education this paper espouses? This is a critical question because I believe it will determine how much buy-in many community members will have. I cannot definitively answer this question. It is a personal one that I encourage all of us to explore, especially if we feel internal resistance to the concept of Place-based education. To explore it, I recommend you start spending more time outside. Weave it into your job, your courses, your daily commute, and any other frequent activity you can think of. In the spirit of Mizzou’s shared values of respect, responsibility, discovery, and excellence I implore you to reach out to the P/place of CoMO. What can it teach you? What is it teaching you? What do you want to learn
from it? Can it teach you that in its current state? What is needed to give CoMO back this
power? I do not believe such questions are antithetical to any spiritual tradition. I think the
foundational, philosophical struggle goes deeper than religion. Capital “P” Place is open to
anyone who is willing to earnestly search for it.

Each day we are presented with choices that add to our personal ratio of inhabitant and/or
resident. We cannot assume we are inhabitants because we recycle or because we enjoy
canoeing. We need to be fueled by constructive doubt (Malkin 2018) so that we can be of
better and better service to the larger whole. This means every moment is an opportunity to
serve and learn.

The concept of “always learning” is inherently taught with PBE. By connecting students to the
communities (P/places) they live in students engage daily in Fink’s learning to learn aspect of
SL. It is not the “expert” instructor that is relied on, it is the Place and the student’s ability to
learn from it. Their ability to learn from their P/place (community) is dependent upon the care
its residents/inhabitants have shown it. Residents display siloed actions that lead to
disconnected places (communities) and a feedback loop is established. Why would you go out
into the community to learn with it if it has little to teach? The converse is also true. Inhabitants
display actions that connect members of Places (communities) and a feedback loop is
established. We must visualize which wolf each of our actions feed. I believe we will feed the
wolf that will build the type of community (inhabitant/resident) we think we deserve. Each day
we need to build the free community we deserve. That is, one free of siloed management and
free to embrace connected service. This will combine EE, with PBE, with SL and the need for their adjectives will cease to exist. We will be part of a “community, plain and simple” (Dewey 1986; Sobel 2004; Elder 2018; Minnick 2018; Wilson 2018; Malkin 2018; Schulte 2018)
Six: Emancipating Education through Place

**Our/Your Expedition through Place**

Whether in the La Sal Mountains, the rolling hills above Hinkson Creek, or anywhere else you find yourself I hope your expedition is connected to Place. Do not let others hurry you into directions you know in your heart to be unethical. It is always your choice to stop at high points and scan the landscape around you. Pick out the aspects you want to support and those you do not want to support. Do not be in a hurry. Take your time and be sure of your direction of travel. Do not be cocksure. Embrace healthy doubt (Malkin 2018) on where you are currently located and be more intentional (Fellabaum-Totson 2018) of where you need to go. Focus on the Place around you and inside of you. They will guide you to both answers. When appropriate use maps that others have created but know that they were invalid from the moment they were printed. Place is dynamic and changing from moment to moment. Maps are snapshots of Places as they existed in the past according to someone else. You are needed to be in the present moment. Do not forget that your expedition is part of our shared expedition. Your actions influence me and mine you. When our expeditions cross paths please teach me what you have learned from Place and how it guides you. Please listen when I share what Place has taught me. When we inevitably part ways I hope we are serendipitous (Mendleson 2018) enough to use our newly acquired Place wisdom (Basso 1996) in our journeys. Most importantly know that you are needed (Wilson 2018). Walk good.
Conclusion

A community’s strength, diversity, resiliency, and health depend upon its ability to not only learn and adjust to the salient issues of the day, but to identify what issues need to be prioritized. Educational communities are complex networks of interwoven individuals who live in relationship with each other, interact with each other, and learn from each other. The quality of these relationships and interactions will determine the quality of learning happening and vice versa. An important way to visualize quality learning is through an educational community’s ability to learn to learn, care, role model what it means to be human, integrate wisdom, and ethically apply community members areas of expertise (Fink 2013; Sobel 2004; Mamaril, Cox, and Vaughan 2018; James 1980; Minnick 2018). Mainstream education has been critiqued for its overuse of lecture, indoor educational activities, lack of diversity and inclusion, and lack of quality interdisciplinary opportunities (Fink 2013; Gruenewald 2003; Sobel 2004; “Outdoor Education Adventures & Wilderness Programs | Outward Bound” 2019). These are symptoms of deeper philosophical and spiritual flaws stemming from educational communities being made up more of residents than inhabitants (Gruenewald 2003). To fix this problem, this paper calls for a melding of Place-based experiences, taught out in communities, to achieve significant learning (PBE/EE/SL). It is crucial to point out that the level of PBE/EE/SL varies college to college, department to department, school to school, course to course, and instructor to instructor. We should take heart that in each of us is a longing to be an inhabitant seeking
connection and opportunities to serve. We simply need to embrace this side of us and free them from self-created shackles.

When MU's classrooms are expanded to the local Place any hierarchy will become fluid. The role of instructor is taken on by many different members of Place, determined by whose gifts are needed in the moment. This means the “teacher” or “instructor” must be able to facilitate a learning experience based in Place. They must be able to perceive what the “students” need right now, based on student impulses and life purposes. Such an instructor will be able to help students identify who in this Place is best to teach them in the present moment. This leads to moments when a “student” might become the “teacher” or Tree or Stream or Grass or Building or Mural or Business Owner or Memorial ... the list of possible teachers is seemingly endless. This type of educational community requires instructors who have a great understanding of their discipline’s knowledge in the context of the local Place and how to teach students to listen to all these potential instructors. To openly and actively embrace this type of education (PBE/EE/SL) takes a willingness to be vulnerable and allow others to be vulnerable. It takes vulnerability to step outside the classroom and into Place.

If Mizzou were to work towards implementing this trifecta education (PBE/EE/SL) across all departments and disciplines, more of its graduates would have the ability to learn from their everyday lives' interactions and relationships. This would truly be a lasting change in terms of the learner's life. They would be able to formulate and act on self-created projects that have
the community’s best interests at heart. Moral and ethical concerns would not take a backseat but be paramount.

Creating such an educational community throughout Mizzou’s campus (not just in isolated pockets) would take some drastic change of habits from everyone, regardless of title. I have heard hopeful rumors that these habits are changing at Mizzou. New opportunities for students to earn credit through their engagement in interdisciplinary projects seem to be happening. Programs like the Deaton Scholars Program (DSP) (“The Deaton Scholars Program (DSP)” 2019) want to move in this direction. Further evidence of change is the Teaching for Learning Center (TLC) (“About the Teaching For Learning Center // Teaching For Learning Center” 2019) recently being christened. While such moves are promising, we need to remain vigilant as to whether or not they are place-based or Place-based (Kimmerer 2013; Deloria 1992a; Sobel 2004; Agnew 1987; Cresswell 2015). Our mission and values must come alive through intentionally using overarching design principles (Schulte 2018; Fink 2013) that simultaneously build and connect us to CoMO the sacred Place, not CoMO the place.

The resident elements of Mizzou’s current reality, while not universal, seem to hold the most sway. This imprisons us as a community. It leads to us having more disconnected, transactional relationships than connected, deep relationships. This self-imposed prison prevents us from reaching our sacred destinations. All of us, not just “the students,” need inhabitant experiences grounded in the local Place to achieve the highest potential of SL. We must realize each of us holds the keys to our constructed prisons of mainstream pedagogical practices. Loosening the
shackles, improving the meal rations, and painting PBE/EE on the outside does not mean we have freed ourselves from our entrenched habits. We must be unified and live up to our mission and values (“Mission Statement | About the University | University of Missouri System” 2019; “Statement of Values” 2019) and not have them be platitudes for image. We must fully emancipate ourselves through Place. I close with a slight variant on words we Missourians idealize in our state’s nickname. May we live up to them:

... frothy eloquence neither convinces nor satisfies us. We are from Missouri. We have got to show ourselves (Ashcroft 1979)
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LEADERSHIP QUADRANTS

This exercise is designed to look at how you relate to others and how you define your position within a group setting. It also allows those who have been in a group with you to show how they perceived your position within that group. The middle is out of bounds.

Jell-O and cookies refer to how you are in situations with others and how others perceive you.

On the left: Jell-O! Jell-O agrees with statements such as:

- I’m very flexible.
- I don’t often voice strong opinions, particularly if I think it will cause hurt or be a waste of time.
- I put others before myself pretty consistently.
- Others probably don’t know where I stand on issues, or what I think about them unless they ask me directly.
- It’s hard for me to state my own needs.
- I find myself responding to the actions of others rather than initiating action.
- I need someone to lean on / a bowl to give me form.

On the right: cookies! Cookies agree with statements such as:

- I am solid.
- I like things my way.
- I make my own shape (drop dough on a cookie sheet and see what comes out!)
- I state my opinions and take stands easily.
- What you see is what you get – no surprises - people know exactly what I think, feel, and want.
- I’m an open book. You don’t even have to read the words because I tell them to you especially if you try to cross one of my lines.
- I do what I think is right for me without second-guessing.

Find yourself a place on the x-axis. (No more than 5 minutes.) One at a time, you may step out of your position and move one person if you see anyone you think should be further left or right – more like Jell-O or cookies. No explanation necessary, just quickly show the person to a new spot on the axis and go back to your position. If moved, you stay in your new spot (unless moved again).
If you were moved, find the rough average between the ends of the range in which you were placed. Stay there.

**Cool cucumber** and **red hot chili pepper** refer to how you feel you are internally, yourself in the context of Just You. In that sense, define cool cucumber and red hot chili pepper for yourself.

No need for me to impose definitions on you ;) Without changing your position on the x-axis, shift along the y-axis: forward toward **cool cucumber** and backward toward **red hot chili pepper**. Everyone is now someplace in a quadrant.

Each group has different responses to similar situations. Not everyone in your group would react the same even though they have the same style.

This activity is about seeing yourself in context of the others and also in the context of Just you, all regarding one’s leadership style. This is not leadership night, but how you interact with others plays a big part in how you lead – your interactions are highly visible when you are in a position of leadership.

- How differently do you act in different situations? Could you fit into two different quadrants? Three? All four?
- Why do you act the way you act?
- Have you changed over time? Did you previously fit into one quadrant more so than you do now? Any specific thing initiate that change?
- What quadrant would you like most to fit into? What would you have to do to mold yourself into what you want to become?
- Relating to others: Which quadrant type do you relate to best? Worst? Anyone you just couldn’t work with?
- Forget traditional “leadership” for a second: what category would your friends be in? Are they the same as you or different? How do they / have they change(d) your quadrant-style? How do you / have you changed theirs?
- You meet your dream boy/girl/loaf-of-bread. As you get to know this person/loaf, you realize that they are of the quadrant you find most difficult to be with. What do you do?

ARCHITECTS AND ANALYSTS Emphasizes meaning and conceptual function

+ Information and opinion seekers
+ Good at analysis and process observation
+ Prefer to make decisions based on facts
+ Prefer as much information as possible before deciding
+ Can come out with totally off the wall solutions that work
+ Translate feelings and experiences into ideas

△ Can be slow in making decisions or dogged in the facts
△ or can happily leave most decisions to others and focus on one
△ Have to watch out for non-involvement or unrealistic ideas if they get into their world

- If a leader has this style, honor their need for information while also requesting them to tell you how they will decide or delegate and when.

Effects on Group
Architects and analysts are often in the minority but the function is essential. If a group doesn’t pay attention to this area, it will miss out on significant learning that comes from observation and analysis. The group may also be missing important process steps of other ways to view a situation. Too much of this style in a group and the group may not move on much because the discussion, laissez-faire attitude and analysis allows opportunity to pass.

**DRIVERS** Emphasizes action and directing functions

+ Information and opinion givers
+ Decision making is easy for them
+ Often the keeper of the vision of the group
+ Great at taking a stand, being direct and making things happen
+ Usually not too shaken by critical feedback

△ Often will urge “let’s decide“ as indecision can drive them crazy
△ Will sometimes decide without input from others and step on toes
△ Make mistakes when moving too quickly without adequate info
△ Can come across as too impersonal and lose connection with their group
△ Have to be careful not toe “overload” if strongly in this quadrant

- If a leader has this style, be as direct as possible. Bring problems and opinions to them as they expect this.

**Effects on Group**

If a group does not have drivers, they must pick up driver functions or they can fail to meet far-reaching goals. Mature drivers are non-reactionary individuals with much ability in the other
quads and help ground a group. When this style is not mature, there may be too much individuality or structure. Turf battles or a lack of member autonomy an collaboration ensue.

**RELATIONSHIP MASTERS** Emphasizes caring function

+ Excellent at building and sustaining community
+ Work well on a team
+ Great at building rapport, consensus, commitment, seeking feedback
+ Support, praise, are concerned
+ Display high regard for others’ wishes, viewpoints and actions
△ May not take an unpopular stance if it puts a relationship at risk
△ Can put so much emphasis on relationship that task and decision-making fall behind
△ Can forget or downplay their own needs – to their detriment.

• If a leader has this style, you may need to ask them to be more specific in outlining their expectations. Encourage critical feedback from them and tell them when you want to know what they think.

**Effects on Group**

You cannot have too much caring and respect as part of your capacity – it is the connective glue and essential for a functional group. As a leader, it is powerful when combined with other quadrant functions. If it is the only style a group has, the group may not take enough risks or make enough decisions to move forward significantly. The group may also avoid conflict to the extent that there is lack of depth in genuine connection and innovation.

**SPONTANEOUS MOTIVATORS** Emphasizes emotional stimulation function
Often voice their ideas and supply passion to follow those ideas; energizers

Great at motivating people as they possess a sense of mission or vision

Often both inter-personal problem solvers as well as task problem solvers

Good at energetic dialogues with other group members

Δ Can be emotionally bound to their ideas; objectivity can be their biggest challenge

Δ Can create a highly emotionally charged climate if they put too much emphasis on challenging others and confronting assumptions

• If a leader has this style, know your own stance / position and don’t be afraid to voice it.

   Ask them to give concrete examples to back up their viewpoints.

Effects on Group

Spontaneous motivators are often light bulbs. Groups need this function to sparkle, create, prod, stir the pot and impassion. A group without this style may be functional, but somewhat lackluster. Mature people with this style can choose to be detached or attached and monitor their emotional involvement, which is highly effective. If too much of this style is present in a leader, or when not mature, a group can be overly reactive, or so impassioned around their ideals, that they lose touch with other realities. Interestingly, many charismatic leaders and cult leaders come from this quadrant.
Appendix B

Achieving Significant Learning through Place – The Interviews

Kristen Schulte, Education Director at Missouri River Relief (MRR)

“The Fellow Trail Dog Interview”

Context: We chatted in MRR’s shared front room on a mild, sunny fall day in November. The room consisted of a long conference table where it seems MRR has team meetings. Indigo, dog partner of Kristen, was whiny and wanted attention as the interview started. Indigo did not distract either of us from the great conversation. Kristen was a NPS intern, trail crew leader, and attended grad school at the Teton Science School prior to becoming the education director at MRR.

Kristen: She chatted about other PBE practitioners including Kevin Biele John Muer Laws (in reference to her master’s studies). Good to balance rabbit hole exploration and focusing on main topics.

Me: I explain my study. I give a brief description of Fink’s sig learn.
Kristen: Talks about a woman she met at a conference that might have had a connection to Fink. She was interested in Fink as an individual

Me: I give an explanation of why I was drawn to Fink’s sig learn (OB instructing). Could you briefly, or not so briefly, explain your teaching philosophy?

Kristen: it is more of a story that statement. I struggled in school and in fourth grade was diagnosed with dyslexia and ADD. So, I was pulled out of class is constantly and was always behind. At the same time my parents made a really good parenting decision. Instead of enrolling us kids in sports they bought a camper and we went camping most weekends. From this I got obsessed in part because it was one of the first times one of the first places I felt smart. It wasn’t just about regurgitating information but about making connections among many different things; ecosystem to ecosystem, going on cave tours, being on the river, or out in the forest, etc. This was not the case in formal education. I spent a lot of time memorizing field guides because I wanted to become a naturalist. I was the kid behind the naturalist shouting out answers and telling people what plant they were looking at before they could look it up in their field guide. I knew by middle school that I wanted to be a naturalist. In addition to Missouri state parks we started going to national parks. Just led me to want to be an interpretive park ranger. This led to me wanting to become a professional storyteller. From here I got interested in environmental education.

Me: seems like a natural evolution.
Transcript continues...
Appendix C

This is the first page from an interview. It is the same interview as that in Appendix A, but two things have been added. Beneath the context for the interview I have included how I see the instructor’s relationship to PBE and EE. This version also includes highlighted passages. Each highlight corresponds to the following:

- **Orange** corresponds to a relationship with one code
- **Yellow** corresponds to a relationship with multiple codes
- **Pink** corresponds to a salient point often relating directly to the interview questions

Achieving Significant Learning through Place – The Interviews

Kristen Schulte, Education Director at Missouri River Relief (MRR)

“The Fellow Trail Dog Interview”

Context: We chatted in MRR’s shared front room on a mild, sunny fall day in November. The room consisted of a long conference table where it seems MRR has team meetings. Indigo, dog partner of Kristen, was whiny and wanted attention as the interview started. Indigo did not distract either of us from the great conversation. Kristen was a NPS intern, trail crew leader,
and attended grad school at the Teton Science School prior to becoming the education director at MRR.

Relationship w/ PBE & EE: Actively gone camping since elementary school (classic sense of PBE). Extensively read on both during work/school. Framed MRR’s curriculum around PBE & EE. Would consider herself a PBE/EE instructor. Has taught in these and related ways for years with intention and awareness.

Kristen: She chatted about other PBE practitioners including Kevin Biele John Muer Laws (in reference to her Master’s studies). Good to balance rabbit hole exploration and focusing on main topics.

Me: I explain my study. I give a brief description of Fink’s sig learn.

Kristen: Talks about a woman she met at a conference that might have had a connection to Fink. She was interested in Fink as an individual

Me: I give an explanation of why I was drawn to Fink’s sig learn (OB instructing). Could you briefly, or not so briefly, explain your teaching philosophy?

Kristen: it is more of a story that statement (narrative). I struggled in school and in fourth grade was diagnosed with dyslexia and ADD. So, I was pulled out of class is constantly and was always
behind. At the same time my parents made a really good parenting decision. Instead of enrolling us kids in sports they bought a camper and we went camping most weekends. From this I got obsessed in part because it was one of the first times one of the first places I felt smart (human dimension & relationship). It wasn't just about regurgitating information but about making connections among many different things (relationship & interaction); ecosystem to ecosystem, going on cave tours, being on the river, or out in the forest, etc. (options) This was not the case in formal education. I spent a lot of time memorizing field guides because I wanted to become a naturalist. (not paddling upstream & enjoyable) I was the kid behind the naturalist shouting out answers and telling people what plant they were looking at before they could look it up in their field guide. I knew by middle school that I wanted to be a naturalist. In addition to Missouri state parks we started going to national parks. Just led me to want to be an interpretive park ranger. This led to me wanting to become a professional storyteller (narrative, enjoyable, & not paddling upstream). From here I got interested in environmental education.

Me: seems like a natural evolution.

Transcript continues...
Appendix D

Memo: February 15, 2019

I am finishing the initial coding today! Miguel’s interview is the only one I have not gone through yet and I just started. I changed the title of the code “Slow - time” to “Time - pace” b/c I created a new category for a statement Miguel made that was referring to the length of time and the debates being had over the importance of how long a study abroad trip is. This is not focusing on the pace of time, but the length of it so it helped me refine my codes.

I have also noticed that I am much more prone to give more details in what I record down for codes, other big/important ideas, and obstacles. This is why there is an initial, intermediate, and final coding phases in GT. It is especially helpful with this being my first research study using GT. I have learned so much from when I first started coding Becca’s interview to now coding Miguel’s. I look forward to the other phases of coding, so I can go back over and refine everything; really dig into it and observe the theory emerge.

During my coding of Miguel’s interview I recorded the following and it seemed more appropriate to include in a memo than to just leave it in the transcript: “(I let out an audible laugh; I am not sure how Miguel took this but I remember it coming from a place of goodwill as Miguel massaged his conception of experiential and place based learning) - [re-reading this
statement on Fri, Feb. 15, 2019 I think it sounds like I laughed in Miguel’s face. This is not what I remember happening. It was more of a laugh directed at the trickiness of trying to pull place and experience apart for analysis. I contemplated this a lot over the summer during my hiking and whitewater rafting. It was good-naturedly humorous to witness others grapple with this same question.”

Just had a red flag moment in coding Miguel’s interview. He makes confusing statement that seems to contradict itself in regard to growth vs. closed mindsets to learning. He also brings up god determining personal talents and skills. See notes on Miguel in the “Other big important ideas” document under the sense of self-worth heading. It is a red flag moment for me b/c it seems to bring in Christianity which I broke away from when I was 16 and I believe very strongly in growth mindset. It will be interesting coming back to this in other phases of coding.

Miguel makes a statement regarding the need for students to be adaptable towards one another. I put this under the code flexibility. It seems analogous in how I am defining it and how Miguel used adaptability.

After finishing Miguel’s, I realized I had not coded Jim’s “transcript” yet. I put transcript in quotes b/c as I stated in an earlier memo, the recorder malfunctioned during Jim’s interview and did not record. When I went play Jim’s interview it was only 1 second long with no audio. Since I did not recognize this right away (it was at least a month before I went back to transcribe) my notes on Jim’s interview lack the depth and precision of the other interviews.
This was a learning experience for me. It is important to go back over the interviews while they are fresh in your mind. Even if you have a recorder. The same malfunction happened for Clark’s interview, but b/c I checked it right after the interview I was able to write down notes while the interview was fresh in my mind.

I am electing to not include Jim’s personal relationship building skills in the code “relationship.” This is b/c I feel there is an air of admin utility in his relationship building rapport. I recognize this is very subjective and might be connected to other things in my conscious and subconscious. This is very tricky to address since on one hand I am embracing my subjectivity, even relying on it, for the GT study; but I wonder if this is hindering me with coding Jim’s interview. I am going to contemplate this some more and come back to it...
Appendix E

Below is an excerpt from the detailed initial code list. The detailed initial code list has the highlighted passages from interviews (like the example from Appendix D directly above) organized according to codes. Originally, I did not alphabetize the code list. The next time I do this I will alphabetize from the beginning as it was an arduous process to alphabetize the multi-layered bulleted relationships. You may note that there is a section highlighted in pink within the detailed initial code list. It means the same thing as pink highlights within the interview transcripts (see above in Appendix D).

- Mixed Ages
  - Tony
    - Silence, created by older volunteers, leading to reflection & observation
  - Anna
    - Older mentors and younger friends
- Money
  - Tony
    - Negative effects of focusing on money (connected to balance)
    - Takes away from efforts to focus on sig learn
  - Polina & Ann
    - Many critiques about capitalism and a focus on making money
• Mutually Beneficial
  o Polina
    ▪ “share their music and being gifted a violin” (Syrian refugee)

• Naively
  o Polina
    ▪ [Always expecting the best from students, themselves, and everyone together in Place] (ref use of achieving sig learn)

• Narrative/Story
  o Kristen
    ▪ Uses her life story to explain her teaching philosophy
      • Includes the Places she grew up/lived
      • ... cogs that fit together ... (explaining how her life story formed and is forming her philosophy)
    ▪ References her story to explain what role PBE can play
  o Mark
    ▪ Combining story and sci w/ geologist
    ▪ “once we got them talking about Maori stories it became clear how much we could learn from them” (ref EE)
    ▪ Story and creativity being a better way to engage public and policy makers for sci
  o Jim
• “He told a great story about Vandiver in Congress and how his response to another representative grew into Missouri being called the “Show Me” state.”

• New Environments
  o Jennifer
    ▪ PBE enriched by multiple environments & travel
  o Kristen
    ▪ See diminishing returns
  o Mark
    ▪ Trips to the mounds

• No hierarchy
  o Hannah & Sophie
    ▪ Mutual learner
    ▪ Peer to peer learning
    ▪ Teachers as co-learners w/ students
  o Tony
    ▪ Discussions (while completing farm tasks)
    ▪ Them asking me questions that challenge me
  o Kristen
    ▪ … you have this tight-knit peer teaching group … side-by-side mentorship (connected to context)
  o Anna
- Allowing students to be themselves and not “mixing up” the instructor in that process (connected to instructors as learners)
- Being in relationship w/ the students where everyone learns from each other (connected to relationship & instructor as a learner)
- Being a part of discussion groups [Anna phrases her answer in a way that implies she is a participant and not necessarily the “leader.” This distinction is important b/c it shows her beginner’s mindset and connection to learning to learn. The emerging theory here is that you must have a certain level of mastery with a sig learn, before you can teach/role model it.
  - Polina
    - “They are burnt out on working with adults and do not ask questions about our experiences that could benefit them (no hierarchy).” Evidence of hierarchy impeding edu?
  - Mark
    - Letting Julia lead.
      - Students as teachers and [leaders?]
      - “I want to “flatten” my classrooms out, that is, I don’t want to be the sage on the stage”
  - Me: “The point of these interviews is for me to be learning from you not vice versa.” (ref Bini’s interview
Appendix F

All 124 Initial Codes

- Absolute
- Alone time outside
- Always learning
- Adjusting
- Balance
- Beauty
- Belonging
- Bodily Knowledge
- Breaking Point
- Capacity
- Challenge
- Change
- Collaborative
- Comfort
- Community
- Complicated
- Conflict
- Connections
- Context
- Control
- Creation
- Creativity
- Critical
- Detail
- Different
- Different Experience
- Diminishing returns
- Discomfort
- Disconnect
- Diversity & Inclusion
- Dynamic
- Elder veneration
- Empowered
- Emotion
- Enjoyable
- Entangle
- Experimentation
- Explore
- Feedback
- Feedback loop
- Flexibility
- Forced learning
- Foundational Understanding
- Frequency
- Health
- Holistic
- Humility
- Indigenous Knowledge
- Inhabitant vs. Resident
- Imagination
- Immersive
- Impact
- Instructors as students
- Intentionality (not important)
- Intentionality (important)
- Interaction
- Interactive
- Internal/External
- Interdisciplinary
- Introspection
- Learning from failure
- Learning from success
- Learning motivation
- Less can be more
- Listen
- Long Term
- Mindfulness
- Mixed Ages
- Money
- Mutually Beneficial
- Naively
- Narrative/Story
- New Environments
- No Hierarchy
- No middle men
- Nonhuman people
- Nonhuman teachers
- Not paddling upstream
- Nurturing
- Observations
- Obstacles
- Options
- Outdoors
- Ownership
- Physically do
- Physical exertion
- Place as entity
- Place as tool
- Place to learner
- Practicality
- Redundancy
- Reflection
- Relationship
- Responsibility
- Reveal
- Role Modeling
- Self-directed
- Serendipity
- Senses
- Service
- Silence
- Simple
- Spatial
- Spirit
- Success & Failure
- Tangible
- Teachable moments
- Teamwork
- Timing
- Time - length
- Time - pace
- Transformation
- Transparency
- Travel
- Trauma
- Unaware
- Unexpected (learning)
- Unique
- Unstructured
- Visualizing
- Visceral
- Vulnerability
- Work Experience
- Younger veneration
Appendix G

Excerpt from the intermediate coding process:

- Community
  - Tony
    - Drawing in volunteers from community
    - Defining communities
  - Kristen
    - Tight-knit group(s): trail crews & TSS
    - Her experience trail crew leading a trip where she was not backed up by her organization
      - Hurt feelings
      - very little mainstream or similar levels of skill and group culture
    - Talking about her personal experience as a child moving through Sobel’s expanding circles
  - Angela
    - Community planetarium tours
  - Anna
    - Involving herself in community building of group (connected to human dimensions)
- Creating things together (connected to tangible and creation)
- Engaging in diverse activities w/in community to achieve sig learn (connected to options)
- Society has abundant resources but some lack access (connected to critical)
- “Is (what I do) worthy of my community?” (ref sense of self worth)
  - Polina
    - Doubt being good for the community
    - “removed from experience in society” (ref EE)
    - Going out and connecting to other organizations, businesses, and people (ref how she has engaged Place)
    - Move students to become members of the Earth Community (connections to inhabitant vs. resident)
  - Soren
    - “As you learn from a place with other people and what you assumed to be true begins to be shown to be false it is very powerful. It ties back to vulnerability.”
  - Dr. HB
    - Building her own TAM community and networking
      - Role modeling this skill for students and plugging them into her existing network(s)
  - Kristen
▪ Communication skills being taught through trail crew leading as well as work skills (connections to relationship, bodily skills, & interaction)

○ Health

▪ Anna

▪ (ref her teach phil) … concerned about individual and collective health (connected to critical)

▪ Society would be healthier (if EE was embraced)

▪ “And we can have well-being among it all.”

▪ “You have to understand that human development is really complex and thus demands a dynamic approach if it is going to be healthy”

▪ “if we do not involve our kids in the way of doing life then they are not going to have a sense of self-worth. They are going to feel depression about themselves because depression comes from this place of disconnection from the things around you”

▪ Miguel

▪ “For some of our students maybe this can be an opportunity to heal because they come from such rough backgrounds. This (college edu) is an opportunity to make new friends and learn from good professors and staff that care for them beyond a grade beyond a test. The university as a place can be transformational and healing. It can set them up for success”
• Outdoors
  • Polina
    • “It is a universal need. Like the fresh air and the freshwater and healthy food.”
    • When was this ever in question?
    • Maybe it is enough to simply get people out there, but maybe that is me just grabbing on to something
      • [Doubt b/c of lack of deep level intentions; aka different definitions/conceptions of PBE/EE]
• Relationship
  • Becca
  • Hannah & Sophie
    • Facilitate and role model
    • Relating to one another (in the context of describing EE)
    • PBE is this tentacled thing
    • Connecting directly to the plants
    • Communicating with plants
    • Using our intuition and observations to communicate
    • Emerge into the connections
    • ... dialogue could be interesting for both of us (referencing comments on assignments between instructor & student(s))
  • Sophie
- Fundamental to have a caring relationship w/ whatever it is you are studying
  - Opens up so much (connections to options?)
  - Changes **how** you make your choices
  - Changes what you learn about
  - Do justice to the relationship w/ what you are learning about
- Hannah
  - Hiking helping build relationships w/ plants
- Tony
  - With crops
  - Intimacy (between co-workers/volunteers)
  - Give back to the community
- Kristen
  - w/ edu
    - Explaining her struggles in formal ed while explaining her teach phil
  - Making connections during family camping trips (connected to interaction)
  - ... there is something about building collaborative efforts in relationships [in PBE]
- Angela
  - w/ community during planetarium tours
Student-student, student-instructor, student-community, etc.

Anna

- “… relationship with the landscape …” (ref her teach phil)
- Focused on how she is affecting other people (connected to interactions & connections)
- “what does my community reflect back to me”

Soren

- [relationship between student and course material]
- Between student and teacher
  - “The challenge is for neither student nor instructor to take advantage of the relationship”
    - Impede learning
    - [seems to be coming from past experiences where he struggled to assess student constructively and the student used relationship to not be assessed accurately]
    - “I can be friendly but I’m not necessarily your friend.”
    - “It might even be learning relationship and how to navigate relationships.”
• “At the end of the day you cannot reciprocate everything you are given that's part of the gift.” (connection to spirit)

• “you get an undergraduate degree based off of your relationship(s) (with professors, grad students, and/or peers)” (quoting his dad, who is disillusioned with higher ed)

• Me

• “maintain the right kind of relationship with the people in my boat but also my relationship with the river.” (connections to interaction, Place as an Entity)

• “So what does the river have to teach me what is it telling me by being a river?” (connections to non-human teachers)

• Bini

• “by self-disclosing a my transparency it has helped students. It has helped us connect to one another but also help them achieve more academic success.”

• Dr. HB

• Community building among and across TAM cohorts

  • Supporting each others lives and careers

• Conflict

  • Bini

  • “Unfortunately it (student ideologies) clashes with the learning outcomes of the class.”
- Discomfort
  - Hannah & Sophie
    - Education as an uncomfortable process (Hannah)
    - (being in a caring relationship w/ that which you are learning of) will not always feel good
  - Polina
    - “Am I pushing myself too much?” [The need to balance comfort and affliction] (ref how she has achieved sig learn)
  - Sang
    - “They (international student) struggle to feel comfortable doing this (going out and talking w/ Columbia residents).”
    - “Expanding boundaries and pushing their comfort zones. We have them learn by doing.” (connections to challenge and responsibility)
- Physical exertion
  - Me
    - Breaking students down & teaching them how to build themselves back up
- Disconnection
  - Angela
    - Theoretical astrophysicists who do not understand that you cannot see the entire sky from a single point on Earth
Soren

“the people in victoria or the politicians are that are so removed from this place that they don't really understand it. They lack place-based understanding.”

“apathy is a disconnection. it is a failure to realize or be aware of the relationships you are a part of” (connections to relationship)

Sophie

... somewhat disconnected assignments (I am inferring this is in part b/c of a lack of context; something w/in the Place could be used for context and provide connection and continuity)

Unaware

Tony

Food is all around them

• Divorced from reality

Connections

Tony

All of these bits of information connect to each other (connections to holistic)

Anna
- Between humans and Place (connected to human dimensions)
- “Connect to all these other things in the brain” (ref unexpected moments out in “nature”)
- “Involve the world”
  - “The bullshit is in here to” (yoga studio)
- Polina
  - Tendrils out in the community (engagement w/ Place)
- Mark
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GEOG 4904/7904: Exploration of Place, Fall 2018

Instructors: Brad Hanson & Soren Larsen

Meeting times & locations:

**Tuesdays**, The Farm (1207 Smith St.; 1.5 miles north of campus), 9am-noon

**Thursdays**, Changing Weekly Explorations, 9am-noon

OFFICE: Stewart Hall 231

OFFICE HOURS: Mondays: 8:00-10:30 AM, Wednesdays: 10:00am-noon

E-MAIL: bhkdt@mail.missouri.edu

**Cell Phone:** (541) 231-3183

Course Description:

**You are needed** to aid in an expedition. This expedition will challenge your geographical assumptions about yourself, CoMO, and the world at large; by exploring our surroundings. The classroom and the head instructor will be the land presently occupied by the city of Columbia, Missouri. Emphasis will be placed on participation in activities, and there will be time required for our group explorations. In addition to group outings, once a week we will spend two-three hours working on an urban farm operated by Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture (CCUA). All this required participation time will be subtracted from more traditional modes of learning. Exploration of Place will **not be easy**, but challenge you in unexpected ways
and teach you more than the local geography. You will **discover** yourself and your place in the world.

**Course Outcomes**

Students will be able to:

- Use five central geographic themes in everyday life
- Increase their understanding of their own inner geography
- Evaluate their perspectives regarding place
- Integrate new perspectives on place into their daily lives
- Have an emotional connection to the land
- Share a meaningful story about place
- Identify an area in which they want to affect change

**Design Principles**

This course is both place based and experiential based. This means that the instructors will be setting up direct experiences for students to interact with the place of Columbia, Missouri.

Every Tuesday we will be working on an urban farm at Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture (CCUA), and every Thursday we will be actively exploring the Columbia area. These explorations will often be hikes but might also include meeting with certain community members to understand a particular element of the place in which we are living. While place takes precedence and is the lead instructor of the course, the human instructors will be utilizing the experiential learning cycle; moving through concrete experiences, reflections, abstract conceptualizations, and active experimentation. Through their active participation, including a daily journal, students will achieve their objectives through their relationship to place.
➢ Urban Farm
➢ Hikes
➢ High Ropes Course
➢ Storytelling
➢ Visual Project
➢ Journal Writing

**Undergraduate** Required Materials:

- Journal
- *Everyday Enlightenment: 12 Gateways to Personal Growth* by Dan Millman
- + one of the following:
  - ❖ *The Practice of the Wild* by Gary Synder
  - ❖ *Braiding Sweetgrass* by Robin Wall Kimmerer
  - ❖ *Wisdom Sits in Places* by Keith Basso

**Graduate** Required Materials:

- Same as undergraduate +
- *Presence: An Exploration of Profound Change* by Peter Senge, C. Otto Scharmer, Joseph Jaworski, & Betty Sue Flowers

Students with Disabilities

If you require disability-related accommodations, please establish an Accommodation Plan with the Disability Center:

disabilitycenter.missouri.edu

S5 Memorial Union
After you have registered, please notify me of your eligibility for reasonable accommodations. For other MU resources for students with disabilities, click on "Disability Resources" on the MU homepage.

** Academic integrity is fundamental to the activities and principles of a university. All members of the academic community must be confident that each person's work has been responsibly and honorably acquired, developed, and presented. Any effort to gain an advantage not given to all students is dishonest whether or not the effort is successful. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not confined to: plagiarizing; cheating on tests or examinations; turning in counterfeit reports, tests, and papers; stealing tests or other academic material; knowingly falsifying academic records or documents of the institution; accessing a student's confidential academic information without authorization; disclosing confidential academic information without authorization; and, turning in the same work to more than one class without informing the instructors involved. The academic community regards breaches of the academic integrity rules as extremely serious matters. Sanctions for such a breach may include academic sanctions from the instructor, including failing the course for any violation, to disciplinary sanctions ranging from probation to expulsion. When in doubt about plagiarism, paraphrasing, quoting, collaboration, or any other form of cheating, see me before you turn in an assignment.**

** Students with Disabilities: If you anticipate barriers related to the format or requirements of this course, if you have emergency medical information to share with me, or if you need to make arrangements in case the building must be evacuated, please let me know as soon as
possible. If disability related accommodations are necessary (for example, a note taker, extended time on exams, captioning), please register with the Office of Disability Services (http://disabilityservices.missouri.edu), SS Memorial Union, 882-4696, and then notify me of your eligibility for reasonable accommodations. For other MU resources for students with disabilities, click on "Disability Resources" on the MU homepage.**

**The University community welcomes intellectual diversity and respects student rights. Students who have questions or concerns regarding the atmosphere in this class (including respect for diverse opinions) may contact the Departmental Chair or Divisional Director; the Director of the Office of Students Rights and Responsibilities (http://osrr.missouri.edu/); or the MU Equity Office (http://equity.missouri.edu/), or by email at equity@missouri.edu. All students will have the opportunity to submit an anonymous evaluation of the instructor(s) at the end of the course.**

**University of Missouri System Executive Order No. 38 lays out principles regarding the sanctity of classroom discussions at the university. The policy is described fully in Section 200.015 of the Collected Rules and Regulations. In this class, students may make audio or video recordings of course activity unless specifically prohibited by the faculty member. However, the redistribution of audio or video recordings of statements or comments from the course to individuals who are not students in the course is prohibited without the express permission of the faculty member and of any students who are recorded. Students found to have violated this policy are subject to discipline in accordance with provisions of Section 200.020 of the Collected Rules and Regulations of the University of Missouri pertaining to student conduct matters.**
**The notes presented in conjunction with this class are the copyrighted intellectual property of the professor. Sale or distribution of these notes is not permitted without prior written consent from Douglas A. Hurt. This clause expressly forbids students from selling or being paid to take notes during this class.**

**Please read and keep this syllabus. This syllabus and schedule are subject to change in the event of extenuating circumstances. **

Policies

1.) Late assignments will receive a 5 point deduction for every day they are late. Assignments are considered late if they are not submitted online and/or turned in by the time decided.

2.) The use of cellphones or other electronic devices during explorations are not allowed. If a special circumstance arises, let’s discuss it as a group.

3.) The syllabus is our living document. I will communicate any changes promptly with you.

5.) We will not tolerate any disrespect amongst our team, directed at yourself or anyone else. Any student being disrespectful will need to brainstorm and discuss with Brad how to restore the harm done; it may result in permanently losing participation points.

6.) We are here to help each other succeed! If you are struggling reach out to your fellow learners (this includes myself and Soren).

Flexible (think of a blade of grass) Schedule of Topics:

Week 1: Get to know each other, Location, Self-Worth

Week 2: Place, Self-Worth, finalize book choice

Week 3: Movement, Basic Needs, Willpower

Week 4: Orienteering, Self-Worth & Mission Statements (finding your lens)
Week 5: Student Lead Explorations, Stories

Week 6: Student Lead Explorations, Stories

Week 7: Harvest Hootenanny

Week 8: Student Lead Explorations, Stories

Week 9: Grad Student Presentation on Presence

Week 10: Personal Interaction w/ Place, Visual Projects

Week 11: Personal Interaction w/ Place, Visual Projects

Week 12: Personal Interaction w/ Place, Visual Projects

Week 13: Personal Interaction w/ Place, On My Explorations

Week 14: Personal Interaction w/ Place, On My Explorations

Week 15: Culminating Thoughts/Family Meal

Week 16: Exit Interviews

The Feedback (Grades)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Group &amp; Individual Participation: Including, but not limited to: farm work, in-class activities, journal entries, time logs, group explorations, individual explorations</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 1-8: 20pts/week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 9-12: 10 pts/week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 13-16: Implied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culminating Individual Projects: 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story: 20pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Project: 20pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On My Exploration: 40pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culminating Group Projects: 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hootenany Tour Guiding: 40 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Meal: 20 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Scale (points):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = 313-340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B = 272-312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C = 238-271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participation & Assignments

*Important Note on “time and effort”: In the descriptions below it is stated that you need to be aware of how much time you are spending on the activities, and how much effort you are putting forth. Early on we will be maintaining time logs to understand how much time we are spending on course activities. This is a four hour credit course. This means that sixteen hours of work per week is expected. Being aware of how much time is being devoted to this course will help guide you from under or over achieving. Effort is not easily quantifiable and one on one discussions with instructors will monitor and adjust this component accordingly.

Much of our explorations of place will be built into our existing schedules. Do not think that you need to budget a sixteen hour block of time per week for this class. Also do not think that you do not need to devote significant time to this class. As our abilities to be aware of place grows, more and more of our daily lives will become part of this course; think of the Permaculture concept of “stacking functions.” We will be bringing awareness to the place we are living in and work on being inhabitants, not residents.

Participation
Think of this as a participation intensive course. Your **intentional, honest-effort** participation is what will make up the bulk of your grade. I will be in constant communication with you and give you constant feedback on what I am seeing from your participation level. I will be listening to how you are seeing your participation level. If something is not making sense, we will discuss it until it is resolved. This might not happen within one discussion.

Journal

Simply put, your journal is your daily/weekly reflections on the course material. The point of this course is for you to orient and understand yourself as a person, geographer, student, and a part of the land; reflecting on how this course is affecting you is imperative to your growth. Your journal is going to be foundational in your ability to complete the other course requirements with crafts(wo)manship and excellence.

Books & Readings

It will be expected that you read everything assigned. This course has been put together with the intention of not overloading you with quantity. We want to delve deep into the land and augment our experiences by delving just as deeply into our readings. If it seems that you are not reading the material, the instructors will communicate this with you and participation points will be unearned.

Your Story

This is a chance to share a story of you and the land. It will entail you sharing an event that has occurred **between you and this place**. The structure and subject matter of your story is up to you. We will have multiple demonstrations of storytelling and have a guest speaker teach us
about the power of storytelling. A successful story will entail consistently interacting with the land, grooming your oration skills, and being open to sharing who you are.

Visual Project

This project is an effort to provide you with a creative opportunity to show your learning. It is intentionally constructed with lots of room for your personal creativity and knowledge of your area of exploration to shine through. Please keep in mind that the spirit of this project is for you to share and teach your knowledge. It will include everything you have learned from the land, so far, in a visual format.

On My Exploration(s)

This is where you get to put it all together. It is a reflection piece. Take a step back, deep breath, and reflect on what you have explored. Where did you start out? Where are you now? Where are you headed? This will be a written piece and involve you organizing your major takeaways. Think of it as bringing some order to the chaos of your thoughts on this course.

CCUA Harvest Hootenanny; Saturday, October 6, 2018 @ CCUA farm from 3-8pm

This is an annual event put on by Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture (CCUA). We will be volunteering at this community celebration and partaking in the festivities. As a group or as individuals (whichever CCUA prefers), we will be giving farm tours and sharing our knowledge of the farm and the land.

For more details: https://columbiaurbanag.org/hoottenanny

Family Meal
This will be our last meeting together as an entire class. I am imagining us gathering up local food we have harvested and sharing a meal together. The venue can certainly change, but I want us to be able to share food and enjoy each other’s company one last time. This informal setting will also provide a venue for us to talk about our experiences throughout the semester and what the land has come to mean for us.
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Student Evaluation

Student Name: __________________________ Course #: __________________________

Course: ___________________________ to ___________________________

Dates: ___________________________ Type: ___________________________

Instructors: ___________________________ Course Director: ___________________________

This form is intended to provide feedback about your course to you and your parent or guardian by offering perspective on your strengths, accomplishments and challenges. Remember that the real measure of success at Colorado Outward Bound School is the transference of new skills and strengths to obstacles and opportunities in life after course.

Symbol Key: N/A = Not applicable ∆ = Needs Improvement √ = Demonstrated skill/trait √+ = Excelled in this skill/trait

COURSE SUMMARY

Enter text here

STRENGTH OF CHARACTER

ENTERPRISING CURIOSITY

_____ Critical Thinking _____ Creativity _____ Love of Learning

Openness to new experiences, information, ideas, and people

INDEFATIGABLE SPIRIT

_____ Resilience _____ Optimism _____ Enthusiasm

_____ Sense of Purpose _____ Playfulness

TENACITY IN PURSUIT

_____ Integrity _____ Resolve and grit _____ Inner-Strength _____ Excellence

Courage to continue seeking a goal, even if success is not guaranteed

_____ Not giving up despite hardship

READINESS FOR SENSIBLE SELF-DENIAL

_____ Giving up instant gratification for better, future accomplishments

_____ Challenging self to see a different point of view
Giving up, or doing, something for a greater good; either the good of him/herself or the good of a group

COMPASSION

Empathy    Forgiveness    Generosity    Kindness
Seeking to value differences in people, opinions, Humility
and cultures

Comments / Achievements / Development Opportunities on Strength of Character:
Enter text here

ABILITY TO LEAD

Setting & achieving goals    Problem-solving    Effective communication
Inspiring others to set & achieve goals    Teamwork    Conflict Resolution

Comments / Achievements / Development Opportunities on Ability to Lead:
Enter text here

DESIRE TO SERVE

Increased awareness of others    Increased social responsibility
Environmental awareness and responsibility    Initiated and engaged in service to others

Service Hours on Course:
Name of Service Group/Individual:
Service Project(s)
Summary:

Comments / Achievements / Development Opportunities on Desire to Serve:
Enter text here

Additional Comments
Enter text here