

Defining Universal Goals for the Undergraduate Curriculum
Summary of Feedback from
November 21, 2008 CCTL event

Could you please identify at least one part of today's program that you found important, useful or informative? Explain briefly.

- Activities were good – the ideas, conversation and engagement was productive.
- I am new, so learning where UNLV is at in terms of curriculum development was helpful.
- Feedback on proposed learning outcomes.
- Effort to define outcomes v. useful: wasn't (a) common 'broad' goals BUT (b) not a lot of comfort w/specific content discussions.
- Ok program.
- Opportunity to interact w/faculty from other departments/colleges. My working familiarity w/the learning outcomes.
- The presentation from Portland State was very helpful in demonstrating one possible model.
- I think creating a unified general core requirement is a great idea to get students focused on these core skills that will be necessary to be successful in careers and life.
- Judy Patton's presentation was great! An applied instance of how to do this.
- The dialogue was excellent. I hope that we really look at the models presented to utilize at UNLV.
- The guest presenter and brainstorming of how, which will lead into Dec 1. Having students!; Intentional seating w/diverse perspectives; Keeping tables focused on one goal; Dave's presentation on the Gen Ed was very helpful. The Portland State Example was useful.
- The whole thing. We focused on details of outcomes and objectives as well as some elements of the broader learning structures and environments.
- The mismatch between what UNLV is actually about and what the well-intentioned group here today feels it is about and what it should become.
- The discussion of learning goals caused a lot of deep thinking. This was good. What is critical is whether the information gets back to the faculty in the context it was presented. We need to visibly see how the workshop "impacted" the learning goals.
- There were differences related to details but no one disagreed with the 5 broad outcomes.
- It was a good way to discuss priorities and interesting to hear how different disciplines feel about learning outcomes.
- I was surprised to see so many perspectives that hadn't occurred to me. I was also heartened to see so many concerns for students.
- Guest Speaker. Totally different approach and different way of thinking about the subject.
- Discussion in groups brought out diverse ideas. I enjoyed learning from colleagues.
- I was interested to hear about the Portland model. It was also useful to spend time reading and discussing the proposed outcomes.
- Discussion by Judy Patton was useful and informative. It provides concrete examples of an implementation strategy for Gen Ed reform that has been successful.
- Judy Patton's presentation. Portland State curriculum process and outcomes. This was truly innovative for student learning for assessment. This makes sense!!
- Conversation. Judy Patton.
- Judy Patton's presentation.

- Group discussions allowed different perspectives on outcomes.
- It was a really good experience to bring colleagues together from so many different fields/disciplines at one table.
- Neil's view of the benefits and opportunities presented by economic cycles and the role of education in maximizing the utilization of our strengths as a nation.
- Thanks Patty!! The speaker. Lots of examples. Tell people to turn off Blackberries unless you have a sick kid in surgery. You are not sooo important that you can't devote 3 hours to something this important....
- Hearing different challenges faced by different disciplines. For example, stats has different needs and challenges than humanities. How do these 5 outcomes mesh with the school of education and the NCATE standards?
- Being invited to listen/observe the discussion around UNLV's expectation of general education helps me understand mission and direction CSN needs to move.
- I found the struggles (opportunities/challenges) of PSU very informative. Would UNLV be able to reconstruct Gen Ed in a more integrated, less menu-driven Gen Ed program? I would like to think so, but I fear it isn't politically, economically, financially possible.
- The process of discussing these issues w/colleagues from various departments was very rich. In particular, I think it was really valuable for me to think about these learning outcomes in the context of enrollment management and how we can contribute to student learning.
- Judy Patton's portion of the program was EXCELLENT and reinforces that change is possible. Noting the emotional (psychological) aspects of program change was important and could be easily missed or minimized. Also, emphasis on profession development was a great point of focus
- (1) Portland state presentation. (2) Examination of undergrad core learning outcomes and specific details therein.
- The hard work and energy invested by the organizers.
- Specific format/questions for topic assignments. Student participation. EXCELLENT speaker and use of her presentation.
- Portland State presentation emphasis on student group sessions led by a student mentor(?).
- Group discussion of competencies in citizenship and ethics. Clarified concepts – especially ethics. It is such an expansive topic. How can it be measured? Very good conversations.
- Group activity 1 and 2, especially re: revelation of horrifically vague language of UNLV proposed outcomes and lack of specificity re: content.
- Judy Patton's discussion and examples from Portland State. Great ideas for faculty and students working together rather than staying in their own disciplines and in isolation. In order to develop well rounded students, you need well rounded faculty and staff. Have to catch students in the classroom rather than by phoning and emailing them.
- Importance of giving faculty some sort of bonus and reasons for getting involved. More \$, emphasis on teaching and not only research. Tenure offered for such activities.
- I thought the entire program was worthwhile. I particularly enjoyed the presentation on Portland State.

Was there any aspect of today's program that you didn't understand completely or would like to learn more about? If so, explain briefly.

- The presentation was interesting but long. I would like to review the power point before the next mtg.
- This program today seems to have no clear connection w/anything that comes after.
- How Portland State gets faculty buy-in. Does each department have a required Gen Ed commitment? In other words, are as many faculty hours set aside each semester for Gen Ed?
- The resource implications of adopting appropriate models: the "???" successful models are also the cheaper ones...!
- No.
- The overall program was very informative, but I think some of the objectives were not clearly written and leave a lot of room for confusion. I would like to learn more about how this process can be implemented.
- How the differences between Portland State (or other urban schools) and Las Vegas would impact the pragmatic institution of these wonderful ideas.
- More time for group discussion (of course!). Activity 3 was asking for so much information with little room and time to analyze. Not enough time to talk about how we compare. What institutions w/similar characteristics to UNLV are participating in similar way?
- Nope.
- Because of time constraints, the discussion time was too short. We understand why, but the larger discussion may be important.
- Methods for organizing freshman experience. Good distribution models from excellent universities.
- We need to know about student motivations for being in higher ed and what their expectations are for a higher ed experience.
- Needed more time to work in teams.
- How can faculty do research and teach more effectively? UNLV needs to focus on main goal and develop hierarchy of mission goals – Research or teaching?
- It was a well done program in general. Would have liked to have the individual assignments in advance of this meeting.
- A very informative and thought provoking program.
- Why are we always starting from ground zero? I'd have people read and somehow respond to what we already "know" prior to meeting. It's frustrating to sit at a table with people who have no concept of assessment or who arrive wanting to change everything they see because they're not aware of what's going on? We need better communication and then assessment of the effectiveness of the communication. Let's take this seriously or dump it. By serious I mean 'require' people to stay alert.
- How could PSU do a major change in 18 months while UNLV is taking 8 years plus? I would like to have known who or what was represented here? Is Nevada State here? How is this coming? Bottom up or top down?
- Maybe more introductory information to help facilitate a deeper shift in thinking could have better prepared the participants for stepping outside of current mode of thinking.
- Concerned about the years of talking, retreats, workshops, etc., and not enough practical application.
- Timeline for implementation.

- Most of the learning outcome language still seems vague. My hope is that we'll soon be discussing more content language, and specific plans for actions.
- Will our comments and suggestions lead possibly to changed learning outcomes statements?
- I do not understand why in the world we would use Portland State as an aspirational model, especially, re: lack of specificity re: content of core and commonality of core experience and huge over-emphasis in pedagogy as & opposed to content expertise!!
- First exercise was vague.
- No.