

## **Gen Ed Advisory Committee Meeting Summary**

Chair: Dave James                      Friday, Dec. 5, 2008      9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

### **Student Union Room 213**

*Please send any changes, additions, deletions to Janet Gustafson at [janet.gustafson@unlv.edu](mailto:janet.gustafson@unlv.edu)*

#### **1) 9:00 a.m. - Open Meeting and Introduction of Committee members and Guest**

a) Dr. Thomas Piechota, Director, Sustainability Programs, Office of Research and Graduate Studies

#### **2) 9:10 a.m. - Dr. Piechota - Brief Presentation and Q&A on Sustainability and the Upcoming Sustainability and Climate Change Education Conference - March 6, 2009**

a) Status of interactions between sustainability and education at UNLV

a. Many faculty do research relating to sustainability, and students look for green campuses.

b) Proposed ideas for sustainability as a curricular goal

a. Emphasis on multidisciplinary research, scholarship and creative activity, as well as community outreach.

Carl: Conserving isn't a gen ed issue in some ways. We need to be very careful that we engage in the intellectual arguments for sustainability. Our program at UNLV moved towards policy, which I think was a good move.

Jeff: Sustainability is a broader context. About economic and social balance as well, needs to be complete picture. There is room for education there. Some people don't understand the connection to sustainability.

**Handouts:** "Call for Abstracts" "Undergraduate Sustainability Programs" "Colleges Get Greener"

#### **3) 9:45 a.m. - The Next Steps - Moving to Implementation of Gen Ed Reform**

Chris: I think that is a dangerous assumption that everyone is on board. The people at the meeting were more receptive, and not all of them agreed.

Jeff: Need for communication, learned that from Gen Ed retreat. Next step is to go to the departments. Our goal is to design it to be interactive.

Steve: Faculty aren't doing it wrong, but they aren't intentional at it. Maybe there is a better way to do it, and to do it intentionally.

Jeff: Need to talk with departments and get them involved. Need for more information and persuasion. We need to rephrase the question, not what are we doing wrong.

Chris : I agree. If we don't have a compelling answer to Andrew Bell's question, we are in a rough spot. Why are we doing this?

Jeff: We need a following. Maybe put this on the web and sending an email to participants. Positive, people reacted to high impact activities and presentation.

Breadth and Global multiculturalism elicited most feedback. Breadth was positive, integration and transference brought up a lot. Lot of comments

for 2004 outcomes, people found them old fashioned. Need to define breadth better. Global multiculturalism drew accusations of indoctrination. Civic imagination was shot down.

Vicki: Several people at my table had issues with infusion. What does it mean to be a global citizen? How do you infuse this across the curriculum?

Jeff: This is the kind of education and conversation that needs to occur on the department level.

Steve: We need more specific examples before we go back to the departments.

Jeff: Most of these objectives are too broad. We need to define what these skills are, and develop them at the classroom level. People had issues with language that was too full of jargon.

Martha: If the college is the next level after university, will the colleges have any say? Many in the college of education don't know what we are doing.

Tim: Global university goals must be integrated, not dumped into Gen Ed.

Martha: Need for more at the department level. . The goal is to determine and communicate shared outcomes in the context of the major, and how they can use these skills.

J: Faculty need to engage this at a broader level. I think we should call these proposed outcomes as we go to the departments, and still elicit feedback about them.

Chris: We don't want to roll this out before it is ready.

Dave: What is the best approach to go to your college?

When we think about going to the departments in the spring, are we going to bring up content revision and practice revisions?

Chris: It seems to me what we are trying to accomplish in this spring. It seemed as though some wanted curriculum proposals to be rolled out.

Jeff: We are trying to move to outcomes based. Right now we are in distribution model, course, not outcomes based. First step is determining outcomes, then saying, how are we going to get there?

Dave: Faculty in many departments are not invested in or engaged in general education. First issue is to get them engaged. Gen ed is something that gets in the way of them taking major courses, and students see it as getting in the way, taught in a way hostile to students. Creates a schism in the academic world in what Gen Ed is supposed to do, and what it does. We must end that schism; we need faculty engagement in the programs, as well as students. Issue is engagement and attainment of outcomes.

Martha: You must get buy in from the departments. Many believe that Gen Ed is not their problem, there needs to be a conception shift in how Gen Ed is viewed. I was thinking about what we talked about, and how I could get participation from my colleagues.

Jack: We need to firm up our outcomes and objectives, need more meeting with the subcommittees. We need to be more specific in how we are going to do this. Where is it being done, and how can we do it better? How can we do it better in our department, and how can Gen Ed help you?

Jeff: We are moving to the forefront of Gen Ed. We need to explain this shift from traditional to a more coherent education better. We need faculty ownership, maybe workshops at the departmental level.

Chris: At outset, we need an agreement on what we are trying to accomplish. Why are we trying to do this? What are the overarching implications of our actions? We are trying to improve undergrad education. Diffuse learning outcomes across the departments.

1. Core set of outcomes
2. Align educational efforts of everyone.
3. Increase use of high impact educational outcomes.

Jeff: We had a retreat where we elicited feedback, got feedback on the language. We have to say that this is more or less the framework; how can we revise the language? We can't open up everything, as that would go on forever, and not everyone would agree. We can still call them proposed outcomes.

Dave: How do these proposed outcomes help you create that great grad student?

**Handouts:** "Attaining Universal Goals," "Summary of Feedback on Outcomes," "Defining Universal Goals for the Undergrad Curriculum," "Next steps in Implementation"

#### **4) 10:25 a.m. - Proposed Planning Activities and Meetings for Spring 2009**

Jan. 23, 2009 - Review of Draft Framework - Student Union Room 205

Feb. 20, 2009 - Adam Sikula, Joe Valenzano - Urban Affairs Learning Communities - Student Union (SU) Room 205

Mar. 13, 2009 - Joint Meeting with Academic Assessment Committee - SU 208C

Apr. 17, 2009 - Open - SU 205

May 1, 2009 - Finalization of Curricular Recommendations - SU 205

#### **5) 10:30 a.m. - Adjourn**