ACS Final Report Form
Grant Cycle May 2021 – May 2022

> Name of project lead: Graham Bullock and Daniel Layman
> Campus: Davidson College
> Project title: The Deliberative Pedagogy (DeeP) Collaborative: Integrating
> Democratic Deliberation into the Classroom
> Today's date: 12/15/22

I. **Project summary:** Briefly describe the purpose, intended goals, and major activities of your project.

This project was designed to foster a community of faculty members from across ACS institutions dedicated to learning about and utilizing innovative strategies that foster productive deliberation in their courses. The purpose of the DeeP Collaborative is to help faculty create opportunities in their courses for students to productively engage with one another on difficult and contentious issues facing our society. This means enabling them to go deeper than ordinary discussions and allow for the examination of the arguments that underlie the strong differences we often have on these issues. It also aims to enable faculty to foster deliberations that lead to new ideas and innovative policies that transcend our original thinking and positions.

In order to accomplish these goals, members of the **Deliberative Pedagogy (DeeP) Collaborative** engaged with the deliberative pedagogy literature to understand frameworks and tools for improving the quality of student deliberations and integrate deliberation into one of their courses. They did so by reading relevant materials, attending a one-day orientation workshop, and meeting regularly as a cohort and in small groups to discuss materials and discuss successes and challenges they encountered in designing and teaching their deliberation-involved courses. They also completed a Deliberative Course Plan and submitted a syllabus with deliberation elements embedded in it. At the conclusion of their course, Collaborative members published blog posts or video blogs describing their experience embedding deliberation into their courses. Several members opted to develop a second deliberation-involved course in the fall of 2022 as part of our no-cost extension, and they participated in the discussions of a new DeeP Collaborative cohort over the course of the semester.

II. **Attainment of goals:** Explain the steps you took to achieve and evaluate the success of each project goal. Provide details regarding the tools and methods used to measure each goal and the extent to which, based on those measurements, each goal was met.

GOAL #1: Embed deliberation in a new interdisciplinary course, Ethics and Policymaking

In order to create a tangible example of a deliberation-involved course, Graham Bullock and Dan Layman designed and co-taught a new interdisciplinary course, Ethics and Policymaking. They developed and shared with the DeeP cohort a Deliberative Course Plan that modelled how to systematically embed deliberation into a course. The course plan template they developed included

1

sections on deliberation-related expected outcomes, graded deliberation-elements of the course, significant time for deliberation, engagement with the deliberation literature, cultivation of deliberation-related skills, and deliberation-related reflection opportunities.

Dr. Bullock and Dr. Layman assessed whether deliberation has been adequately embedded in the course by reviewing the syllabus for the key deliberative components outlined in the Appendix and found that it did indeed incorporate each of the required elements.

For their specific course, Dr. Bullock and Dr. Layman included a specific learning outcome in the course syllabus directly related to deliberation: "Students will be able to deliberate respectfully with others about moral problems in policymaking." The graded deliberation element of the course was a Deliberation Design Project, which required students to work in groups to 1) decide on a deliberation topic relevant to policy ethics; 2) draft a deliberation guide on that topic; and 3) facilitate a deliberation among their classmates about the topic during two "Deliberation Days" at the end of the course. All students also were required to participate in the deliberations they were not facilitating. Students' performance as both facilitators and deliberators were graded by Dr. Bullock, Dr. Layman, and two other faculty colleagues who have been trained as deliberation facilitators.

To prepare for these deliberations, students were asked to submit weekly reflections about the topics covered in class, and they were encouraged to respond to each other's points in a deliberative fashion. Dr. Bullock and Dr. Layman also assigned readings about deliberation by Amy Gutmann, Dennis Thompson, Scott Aiken, and Robert Talisse in the syllabus, and the students were encouraged to reflect on these materials in their weekly reflections, in class discussions, and in the final graded deliberation activity. Dr. Bullock and Dr. Layman also lectured about the key aims and elements of successful deliberations and facilitated "micro-deliberations" on the topics covered in the course throughout the semester. In these discussions, the skills of offering reasons and practicing active and charitable listening were emphasized, as was the importance of intellectual humility, courage, and cooperation.

To assess whether these components contribute to student learning, Dr. Bullock and Dr. Layman assessed their effects on learning in two ways. They first directly assessed their performance on the deliberation-related assignments, including both their facilitation and deliberation skills. While they incorporated the level of their students' deliberative skills in their general evaluations of class participation and mini-essays, they focused our assessment on the students' performance on the deliberation projects that culminated in the Deliberation Days at the end of the semester. Dr. Bullock and Dr. Layman developed and shared with the students both a "Rubric for Deliberators" and a "Rubric for Facilitators" that outlined the criteria (included in the appendix) that they used to evaluate the students' performance.

Overall, Dr. Bullock and Dr. Layman were very impressed by the students' performance as both facilitators and deliberators. The average grade for both was an A-, with scores ranging from an 80 to 100. Facilitators struggled the most with the referee role and excelled the most with the interviewer role. Deliberators did best with being deliberatively responsive and had more trouble with offering plausible reasons to one another, but the differences in these scores were marginal.

Dr. Bullock and Dr. Layman had originally planned to ask students to report through an anonymous survey their awareness of the value of deliberation. After further consideration and in order to avoid the problem of students providing responses that they thought the professors wanted to hear (even anonymously), they instead reviewed student responses to the general course feedback survey for references to the deliberation components. Among the 15 students (out of 23) who completed the survey, nine expressed uniformly positive views about the deliberative components of the course, 1 expressed uniformly negative views, 3 expressed mixed views, and two did not express any views on these components. Examples of these comments are provided in the Appendix.

At a high level, the fact that all but two students mentioned deliberation in their feedback suggests that it was a highly salient component of the class. The majority of students were positive about its inclusion in the class and highlighted it as one of its most helpful elements (without prompting). Those who expressed some negative views mostly focused on the amount of time the course dedicated to deliberation rather than on its inherent value. Lessons learned from this feedback will be discussed in the relevant section below.

GOAL #2: Enable faculty at ACS institutions to develop deliberation-involved courses or deliberation modules for their courses

Along with the development of this course, Professors Bullock and Layman organized a year-long cross-campus Deliberative Pedagogy Collaborative for 15 faculty from ACS institutions. Nine faculty from Davidson (funded by a different grant), two faculty from Furman and one each from Morehouse, Rollins, Spelman, and Southwestern participated in the Collaborative. Spanning the states of Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas and disciplines including communication studies, world languages and cultures, communication, classical art and archaeology, philosophy, and political science, these faculty brought a diverse set of insights and expertise to our learning community.

In the summer of 2021, each member of the Collaborative was provided with books and chapters relating to deliberative pedagogy for them to read before the day-long workshop held in August 2021 at Davidson College. Hard copies of two books (*The Political Classroom: Evidence and Ethics in Democratic Education* by Diana Hess and Paula McAvoy and *Why We Argue and How We Should* by Scott Aiken and Robert Talisse) were sent to all participants. Most faculty participated in the workshop in person, but several joined via Zoom due to pandemic concerns.

The workshop introduced participants to each other and to the concepts and practices of deliberative pedagogy using our course as a case study. It was divided into five distinct sessions that culminated in the participants discussing their specific plans for integrating deliberation into one of their courses. Then monthly check-in meetings were held throughout the academic year (three per semester), as were small group discussions of 2-3 faculty members that allowed for more in-depth and intimate conversations about their progress, ideas, and questions.

While one faculty member had to step back from the Collaborative due to personal reasons (not included in the total above), all the rest were able to achieve the goal of developing and teaching deliberation-involved courses in the 2021-22 academic year. As part of this process, they all submitted deliberation course plans and syllabi with the deliberation elements outlined in our template for these courses. Dr. Layman and Dr. Bullock provided feedback on these materials to assist faculty members with clarifying their goals and plans for their courses. These faculty members also submitted either blog posts or video posts about their experience designing and teaching their deliberation-involved courses, which were published on the DCI Blog (one faculty member requested that their reflection not be made publicly available, which we honored). These posts along with their links to the website are listed in the Appendix.

To assess whether deliberation was adequately embedded into these courses, Dr. Bullock and Layman reviewed the syllabi of the deliberation-involved courses for the key deliberative components listed above. To assess whether these components contribute to student learning in these courses, we asked DeeP participants to assess their effects on learning in the same ways described above, through evaluating student performance on deliberation-related assignments and measuring self-reported awareness of the value of deliberation. Because the content and orientation of deliberation in each course is likely to be very context and discipline dependent, faculty members were responsible for developing and implementing their own assessment plans that Dr. Layman and Dr. Bullock reviewed with them. Faculty employed a range of different assessment methods. One Collaborative member, for example, asked her students to write reflective papers discussing their experience with the deliberation component of the course. Perhaps surprisingly, they were very candid about both the

3

value and limitations of the deliberative model used in the course. The Appendix provides excerpts from three students' papers.

As the complexity and nuance of these responses reveal, it is difficult to productively quantify whether our general goals related to student learning have been achieved. Certainly they have been exposed to deliberation and are aware of its strengths and limitations, but whether they have been exposed to the best forms of it and have reached a particular skill level is harder to say. Related lessons learned will be discussed below.

GOAL #3: Develop a deliberative pedagogy framework and set of related tools that faculty at ACS and other institutions can use to incorporate deliberation into their courses

Building on the materials we read and the conversations we had among ourselves, Dr. Layman and Dr. Bullock developed a framework to assist faculty in introducing deliberation into their pedagogy. This framework was embedded in the design of the orientation workshop organized for the DeeP participants, and had the following five components:

1. DeeP 101: Definitions, Histories, Motivations
2. DeeP 201: Approaches, Frameworks, Concepts
3. DeeP 301: Methods, Tools, Techniques
4. DeeP 401: Case Study
5. DeeP 501: Personal Reflections and Planning

To make this framework and insights from this literature and our project more easily accessible, we have developed a simplified online "mini-course" in the form of a series of short powerpoint presentations that we have posted to the DCI website, available at https://deliberativecitizenship.org/deliberative-pedagogy-mini-course/. A key component of this mini-course is the Deliberative Pedagogy Course Plan template that is also provided on the website and faculty members can download and use to design their own deliberation-involved courses. This template is a specific tool we developed as part of this project that provides a robust and accessible framework for carefully thinking through how to do this work. While there is no substitute for participating in an intensive collaborative effort like the DeeP Collaborative, faculty members who read the assigned materials, review the mini-course slides, and complete this template can begin the process of embedding deliberation into their course.

We plan to share this mini-course more widely via social media and our email distribution lists in the summer of 2023, a time when many faculty will be planning their fall courses and may be more open to incorporating some deliberative elements into their classroom discussions. We will also share deliberator and facilitator assessment rubrics on the website.

This framework and set of tools are a tangible output of the project that we have shared publicly. Collaborative members also have written or recorded blog post describing their experience developing and teaching deliberation-involved course that we have similarly shared online. To assess uptake of these resources, we have tracked and will continue to track visits to the webpages where they are available (so far over we have had over 500 views of at least one of the 14 blog posts posted by our Collaborative members). We will also track how many deliberative pedagogy sessions DeeP Collaborative members hold at their home institutions and how many faculty members at ACS schools contact us for more information about deliberative pedagogy methods and the materials we have provided.

GOAL #4: Create a community of faculty across ACS institutions that will continue to collaborate on introducing more deliberation into their courses, curricula and disciplines.

Faculty who participated in the Deliberative Pedagogy Collaborative had multiple opportunities to interact and get to know each other, first at the initial workshop and then our regular cohort check-ins.

The small group check-ins also contributed to forming long-lasting bonds between participants. While it is too early to tell, our hope is that the Collaborative will spur additional collaborations among both its participants and new collaborations among faculty at each home institution. We have developed an email distribution list that will enable faculty to remain in touch and continue to share the work they have been doing on developing their deliberative pedagogy.

Measurement of this goal necessarily must take place after the completion of the project. We distributed a survey after our final session together assessing participants' satisfaction with their experience as a member of the Collaborative and their interest in working together on future related projects, which give some indication of our progress on this goal. Over time, we will track how many deliberation modules and deliberation-involved courses are developed at ACS institutions, and we will list these modules on our website along with avenues for following up on them. We will also list future opportunities to engage with ACS and other faculty on incorporating deliberation into our curricula.

Throughout the year, we encouraged members to discuss possible projects that we could collaborate on that would build on the work of the Collaborative. We considered applying for an additional ACS grant last summer, but time limitations precluded us from doing so. While no specific plans have been made, participants offered a variety of ideas for follow-up collaborations in our end of the year survey. These included reaching out to colleagues at their own colleges and nearby ones and hosting a conference or writing a joint publication on deliberative pedagogy. One suggestion we have implemented in our no-cost extension phase was to develop sessions where people who have experience with deliberative pedagogy are paired with new Collaborative participants. As we expected, this has allowed the more experienced people can share their experiences with the new people and the new people can inspire the more experienced people with their new ideas. Another possible follow-up action continues to be creating a Deliberative Citizenship Network across ACS schools that shares information, provides a liaison to faculty on each campus, and co-hosts events, such as the Deliberation Day idea mentioned above. We will follow-up more on these possibilities in the spring of 2023.

III. **Impact of project:** Explain the impact your project had on relevant constituencies (e.g., students), structures, (e.g., a major program), processes (e.g., community engagement), and/or relationships (e.g., consortial partnerships).

Our primary constituency for this project was our faculty participants. In the feedback survey we asked all Collaborative members to complete, 13 out of 14 respondents reported that they were either somewhat or extremely satisfied with their DeeP Collaborative experience and that it allowed them to achieve the Collaborative's four primary goals (outlined in the Appendix). In response to a question about how they plan to build on the work they have done this year integrating deliberation into one of your courses, the responses were thoughtful, ambitious, and creative. The Appendix includes a sample of these responses. These comments suggest that the participating faculty members deeply valued what they learned as part of the Collaborative and are committed to building on it in the future.

Another critical constituency is our students, and the assessment results discussed above suggest that the vast majority of students appreciated the incorporation of deliberation into their courses. Measuring the effects on deliberative skills and dispositions is more difficult, but the data from Dr. Layman and Dr. Bullock's course reveals that students can productively engage with one another on difficult topics, particularly when they are encouraged and trained to do so.

In terms of affecting structures and processes, it is evident from the participants' survey comments that the Collaborative did have an effect on how faculty think about structuring their courses and organizing discussion opportunities in the classroom. Teaching students about deliberation also may help raise their own expectations about – and encourage them to improve – the quality of discussion in their courses and among their peer groups. With regard to institutional structures, the success of the Collaborative has cemented the perceived value of the curricular component of the Deliberative

5

Citizenship Initiative at Davidson College among administrators, and it contributed to their financial support of a second year DeeP Collaborative cohort of Davidson faculty. This support comes from the Center for Teaching and Learning, which did not previously support this work, and has the potential to continue in the future.

IV. **Consortial (ACS-wide) value of the project:** Describe how your project results can or will strengthen ACS, e.g., via the dissemination of a final report, the future training of campus leaders, or the building of an inclusive community of practice.

New bonds were certainly created among the ACS faculty participants, and as noted above, the value placed on ACS connections and the potential for future collaborations is very real. The Collaborative supported and forged interdisciplinary and inter-campus linkages that revealed important insights about the differences and similarities among the represented fields and colleges. Two participants eloquently summarized a sentiment that I think everyone shared about the value and impact of the Collaborative experience:

- "One of the best things about this collaborative was how I got to work with colleagues at Davidson and ACS in an in-depth manner for an entire year on pedagogy. The opportunity to exchange ideas and support each other over an entire academic year as we learned to implement the deliberations was unparalleled. I learned so much from my colleagues, and was able to improve the quality of discussion in my classes as a result."
- "One thing that was appealing about the collaborative was the opportunity it afforded to meet faculty at other ACS institutions. I valued feeling the sense of solidarity across institutions - the sense that we are all engaged in similar activities and face similar challenges at our different universities. I'm not sure how to carry this forward but I would say that Zoom meetings can only take us so far. As long as in-person meetings are possible, we should try to hold them annually or semi-annually at different ACS colleges."

We will return to the last point about in-person interactions in the lessons learned below.

More generally, the project revealed a whole new world of possible connections to the participants, many of whom did not know about or have much experience with ACS as an organization or with other colleges that are a part of it. These faculty will likely pay more attention to communications from ACS in the future and be more open to possible collaborations with ACS colleagues.

The dissemination of our "mini-course" through our email distribution lists, blog posts, and other avenues will also demonstrate the value of ACS collaborations and projects. Through that communication, we plan to share not only the min-course but also links to member blog posts, background about ACS, DCI, and the DeeP Collaborative, and more. This will also help raise awareness not only about deliberative pedagogy but also about ACS's contributions to supporting more productive public discourse and classroom deliberation across its member institutions.

V. **Lessons Learned:** Describe the surprises, challenges, and lessons learned during the project, e.g., is there something you are very glad you did or would do differently? Did you face obstacles that called for creative problem-solving? What would have made the project even more successful?

Overall, we were surprised by how successful the project was. First, we did not expect to attract as much interest from as many different disciplines and backgrounds (e.g., junior and senior faculty) as we did. We were also amazed by how creative and thoughtful the Collaborative members were in adapting the general concepts and techniques of deliberation to their particular areas of teaching and expertise – from a classics course on the Roman Republic to an environmental studies course on political ecology. The added value of the blog posts was also a surprise – we have seen rather lackluster blog posts produced by other projects, but the seriousness and attention our colleagues gave to this work with was inspiring. These posts help make deliberative pedagogy more tangible and

accessible to other faculty who might be interested in adopting it, and they make recruitment for future cohorts that much easier.

Of course, there were challenges as well. Finding times that 15 faculty members can all meet proved difficult and ultimately impossible (in the spring semester we ended up splitting the group into two separate meetings to accommodate everyone's schedules). While we did provide feedback on their plans, having such a large group also precluded Dr. Layman and Dr. Bullock from working with individual faculty as extensively as might have been helpful.

A key challenge for all faculty participants was figuring out how to assess the process and outcomes of their deliberation projects. We read materials on this topic, discussed the pros and cons of different approaches, and shared rubrics and ideas with one another, but a general lesson learned is that assessment is difficult and both requires more attention and may ultimately not as feasible as assessing other types of skills and knowledge. Given this complexity, assessment of deliberation outcomes could be a rich area for further collaboration. Identifying which deliberative pedagogy practices and deliberation skills are most likely to work well could be part of that project.

One specific lesson learned from Dr. Layman and Dr. Bullock's Ethics and Policymaking course relates to the importance of framing the role of deliberation in the course. The few students who were more critical of the course's deliberation components did not fully connect these components to the course's focus on policymaking, for example. It is important to help students see the direct relevance of deliberation to the other learning outcomes of the course. As one of our readings discussed, deliberation is both a pedagogical end in itself and a means to achieving other pedagogical ends. Not overemphasizing deliberation but framing it within a range of other pedagogical and discursive approaches being used in the course can be helpful as well.

Another take-away was the value of in-person interaction, as noted above. The ability of most participants to gather together at the initial workshop was critical to forming relationships and reinforcing everyone's commitment to the process and each other. We experimented with a variety of hybrid formats throughout the year, but ultimately reverted to all Zoom discussions so that everyone was literally on the same screen. Having some people meeting in person (at Davidson) and some online created a sense of divide between the two groups that we wanted to avoid. There may be ways to leverage the benefits of in-person and online interactions using different technologies or formats better in the future, but this was definitely a challenge. While it worked out well overall, having a second in-person workshop might have helped bridge this gap more effectively.

VI. **Next Steps:** Explain what you intend to do with/how to you intend to use or build on the results of your project

As noted above, we have continued the work of the DeeP Collaborative, with the support of both ACS's no-cost extension and Davidson College's Center for Teaching and Learning. The current cohort has a more manageable nine faculty members this fall semester, and the Davidson faculty will continue their work into the spring semester. Assuming faculty interest and funding support, we plan to recruit Davidson faculty to join future cohorts as well. We will also disseminate the DeeP "mini-course" and related information as discussed above in early 2023 as faculty are preparing for their spring courses. This may spark new connections and new interests in further ACS and non-ACS collaborations. If there is enthusiasm for embarking on a follow-up ACS project related to deliberation, we will be in touch!

VII.   **Feedback/suggestions for the ACS grant program (optional)**

None at this time. Thank you for your support for this project!

APPENDIX

<u>Expected Elements of Deliberation-Involved Courses</u>

- **Learning Outcome and Graded Aspect of the Course:** Include improved deliberative skills as a learning outcome and graded component of the course, either directly or as a component of participation or other assignments.
- **Significant Time for Deliberation:** A significant portion of class time (at least 25%) should be devoted to facilitated deliberations regarding significant political, social, aesthetic, ethical, scientific, historical, or other scholarly and public controversies made available through common texts, artifacts, or other materials. In a MWF course, for example, one class a week might be dedicated to deliberation, in a T Th course, one class every two weeks, or in a weekly seminar, a third of each class, or every third class.
- **Engagement with the Deliberation Literature:** Through at least one reading and classroom discussion and/or lecture, attention should be given to the theory and practice of deliberation (as opposed to debate and ordinary conversation), and its role in scholarly inquiry and democratic life should be made clear.
- **Cultivation of Deliberation-Related Skills:** Cultivate the practical skills of deliberation, including self-reflection, empathetic listening, critical thinking, intellectual collaboration across differences, discipline-sensitive analysis and argument, and communication in both spoken and written forms – and possibly other material forms as well.
- **Deliberation-Related Reflection Opportunities:** Provide robust opportunities for reflection on the process and outcomes of class deliberations.

Deliberation and Facilitation Rubric Elements

Assess the student's deliberation skills on the following four elements:

Deliberative Talking: Does the student speak respectfully and at the right times but not excessively?
Deliberative Listening: Does the student listen actively and carefully to others?
Deliberative Quality: Does the student offer reasons that are plausible and convincing?
Deliberative Responsiveness: Does the student offer relevant contributions that track the flow of discussion and respond to the contributions offered by others?

Assess the students' facilitation skills on the following four elements:

The Referee Role: Does the student enforce rules, follow time constraints, and ensure participants stay on topic?
The Interviewer Role: Does the student ask questions developed beforehand and follow-up questions that enable participants to "dig deeper?"
The Challenger Role: Does the student raise perspectives that have not been expressed while maintaining their "passionate impartiality?"
The Weaver Role: Does the student make connections between participants' statements, identify common ground, and support stronger inter-personal relationships?

Deliberative Pedagogy (DeeP) Collaborative Member Blog Posts

- Luis Gonzalez-Barrios (Spelman; World Languages and Cultures): "'Seeing Many More Angles than Usual:' Deliberative Pedagogy in a Spanish Course on Feminism, Democracy, and Utopia"
- Rachel Pang (Davidson; Religion): "Student-Driven, Curiosity-Focused Deliberation in a Chinese Religions Course"
- Melissa Gonzalez (Davidson; Gender and Sexuality Studies/Hispanic Studies/Latin American Studies): "Deliberation across Disciplines: Lessons from a Course in Gender and Sexuality Studies"
- Camille Lewis (Furman; Communication Studies): "From the Big Picture to Micro-Deliberations: Argumentation Meets Deliberative Pedagogy"
- Joshua Yesnowitz (Davidson; Writing Program/Political Science): "Writing Deliberatively"
- Kata Chillag (Davidson; Public Health): Conversations about Cases: Integrating Deliberation into a Public Health Ethics Seminar
- Nathan Nobis (Morehouse; Philosophy): A "Fair and Balanced" Approach to Deliberation in a Philosophical Ethics Course
- Kyra Kietrys (Davidson; Hispanic Studies/Global Literary Theory): Deliberating about Collective Memory in a Hispanic Studies Course on the Comics and Graphic Novels of Spain
- Robert Vander Poppen (Rollins; Art and Art History): Saving the Republic: Re-Enacting and Learning from a Key Deliberative Moment in Roman History
- Caleb Stroup (Davidson; Economics): Mapping Arguments and Weighing Values in an Economics Seminar
- Emily Sydnor (Southwestern; Political Science) Psyching Ourselves Out: Applying Political Psychology to Deliberative Discussion
- Greg Snyder (Davidson, Religion) "What does the Bible Say?" Deliberating Across Difference in a Course on the Bible and Modern Moral Issues
- Jessica Worl (Davidson, Environmental Studies): The Political Classroom in Practice: Roleplaying Deliberations in a Political Ecology Course

We will be publishing more posts this spring about the courses ACS faculty members developed this fall.

Deliberation-Related Feedback for Ethics and Policymaking Course

Examples of positive comments include the following:
- Group deliberation and in class group discussions were extremely helpful to the integration of course concepts.
- The most helpful element was the consistent deliberation practice in class.
- I found the mini-deliberations in-class to be the most helpful toward accomplishing the course's goals. I think practicing with the mini-deliberations was very helpful in learning how to deliberate and how to be more comfortable talking/deliberating and disagreeing with classmates in a respectful manner.
- I found the in-class deliberations the most helpful as they allowed students more easily and naturally to focus more on both the deliberation skills and the content.
- Toward the end of the semester, every class seemed to break up in deliberation and tackle the difficulties of the topic. This was extremely helpful and was a huge part of practicing true deliberation.
- I found the group discussions and deliberations to be helpful a lot of the time. It was good to hear other people's perspectives and thoughts about certain topics we had covered.
- The deliberations, while they did not really teach about policymaking, were helpful as they gave the opportunity to hear from other individuals in the class and hear their opinions.
- I think learning how to deliberate was important and learning how to develop and take apart arguments is also a skill that I am very thankful for and will use in the future.

Examples of negative comments include the following:
- I think that the days where we had an hour and fifteen minutes of background information provided on deliberation topics was not as engaging as it could have been.
- I found the deliberation project the least helpful as while they did allow us to utilize the facilitation skills learned in class, I found myself focusing more on the skills of deliberation rather than the content of the concepts at hand.
- I feel as though too much time was used on deliberations and it took away from learning about how to incorporate ethics into a policymaking context. Often times "deliberations" were used to reconstruct philosophical arguments and were devoid of any actual policy discussion. Focusing more on policy and how ethics fits into policymaking/policy communication would add more to the class.
- While deliberation is certainly a legitimate option for tackling policy issues, especially when doing so ethically, choosing to STRICTLY use deliberation in class activities was repetitive and impractical in the sense that many policymakers rarely use deliberation in their work. At the beginning of the course, we discussed Bardach's 8 steps for policy analysis. I think it would have been super exciting and educational to utltize policy analysis as a framework for the class and applying ethics to those steps— which would present a more in-depth and interesting discussion as opposed to simply discussing/ deliberating about a single author's reasoning. The policy world considers many voices, so relying on one author and reactions to one author for entire days of class seemed fairly removed from policy.
- I also felt as though deliberation was too heavily used. It takes a ton of time and took away from learning that could have been done. Policy work involving reading actual legislation and analyzing whether it is ethical, through the given ethical frameworks, would have been a better use of our class time.

Reflection Paper Excerpts from DeeP Collaborative Member's Deliberation-Involved Course

- "I feel like this class deliberation setting was helpful for giving students a time and space to discuss the topics of free speech and inclusion. I think the deliberation process becomes more effective when students are familiar with it and willing to see others' perspectives empathetically."

- "Overall, I feel that deliberation is an effective way to promote discussion in politics and engage citizens ideas with one another in an attempt to find a common ground and if not, an attempt to further educate one another about a specific issue or topic. While I felt that our deliberation was a little lackluster due to the majority of the time spent on everyone agreeing with one another, deliberations are a great space to discuss politics in an engaging, educational setting. It prompts those that typically don't feel that they have a voice to speak up about policies and feel heard about what they are feeling, solutions they have to offer or information they are able to provide."

- "While there were times when students seemed to genuinely try and understand what the others were saying, there were also times when students were interrupting one another and not putting in effort to address different perspectives. It also seemed like, at times, people were struggling to come up with things to say, and thus they would talk either to fill the silence or for the sake of participating. All of this to say, I think there is room for improvement when it comes to showing empathy and reciprocity during deliberations."

<u>Deliberative Pedagogy (DeeP) Collaborative Goals</u>

- Examine our own pedagogical practices, to learn new techniques for bringing constructive disagreement into the classroom, and to imagine how deliberation may enliven the learning outcomes of my courses.
- Design a new course or redesign an existing course so as to sequence reading assignments, writing assignments, and research activities in ways that feature interpretive, analytic, or other epistemic disagreements as objects of study.
- Improve the quality of classroom conversations about public and/or intellectual issues by teaching students' deliberative techniques, including how to stage a deliberation as an event that enhances the learning outcomes of a course, how to use deliberation as a way to research a history of claims and evidence about a contestable subject, and how to enact empathetic listening, social reasoning, and ethical argument.
- Bring issues of wide public interest into the classroom so that students may glimpse the vicissitudes of civic debate and identify for themselves the challenges of good argument in the face of ideologic, cultural, and identity-based difference.

<u>Sample of Survey Responses from Deliberative Pedagogy (DeeP) Collaborative Members</u>

How do you plan to build on the work you have done this year integrating deliberation into one of your courses?

- I'm going to continue using the readings and class activities in the class I taught this year. I will also use the DeeP materials in a new course next Spring.
- Introducing more "mini deliberations" practices and "model videos" in the classroom, and less theoretical readings at the beginning
  At this point I am considering re-implementing the plan in a future iteration of the same course, to see whether challenges encountered were specific to the Spring 2022 group of students.
- I want to see if I can scale this exercise up to a 30 person class. I also want to see if it can adapt to a survey course instead of a specialized upper year course.
- I think I am going to better situate it (compare and contrast it) in different forms of public engagement that exist in my field, and make more room in the course to do so. While my plan was upended by COVID delay in start of semester, I think generally I packed things too tightly in my "target course" to fully engage and have students do so with that delay just exacerbating it.
- I will continue to hold in class deliberations and assign the literature when most relevant.
- I hope to take these techniques to other courses to apply them there.
- I would like deliberation to become a standard feature of all of my courses. Although I already teach the kinds of issues encouraged by the DeeP Collaborative, I intend to be more intentional about structuring class deliberations and more explicit about the aims and importance of democratic deliberation.