

BUCCS 2 Conversation notes

Question #1

- *One common theme that emerged from the first round of BUCCS conversation was our desire as educators to produce graduates who are critical and creative thinkers, life-long learners, and mature, productive, socially responsible citizens. Where would you assess that we currently stand on achieving this ideal? What needs to be done to the current curricular and support structures (if anything) to achieve this ideal?*

(Missing)

Lifelong learning with critical thinking and life skills

Lack of cohesiveness in curriculum – drawing connections along areas – remedy by collaboration?

+Survey students (exit interview)

Structured multidisciplinary experience

Over-reliance on computers?

Evaluate faculty climate

- Time, workload

- Resources

Revising gen ed requirements “_____across the curriculum” (reading, writing, ethics. . .)

Service learning component in every major

Exocultural experiences

Teaching leadership

Student workload?

Develop coherent body of knowledge base

More interdisciplinary networking

Report undergrad research

Website on faculty interests

Action

Invite a philanthropist to campus

Reassess gen eds

Tie gen eds to majors

Vanity courses

Look at gen ed smorgasbord

General acquisitions of knowledge in discipline going well

How do you assess curiosity

Discrimination between good and poor sources of information is problematic for students

Sharpening intellect and curiosity through study abroad

Exit interview would be helpful

Opportunities exist – are they sufficient?

Student-Body fluctuation limits personal contact

Discussion/ What skills do students need?

Students understand the way they learn now may not be the best way in the future

Themes –

1. Assessment

2. Responsibility

3. Engagement

Difficult to assess issues across disciplines

Over departmentalized

Need to be more specific on goals

How to assess since we don't measure now

More writing in depth/over years

Student research apply to tenure

AEP students commit sooner

Connect international students

Link education to arts

Develop better cultural identity

Link students to civil government leaders

Better mentoring

Connectedness

Get gen eds out of way – bad idea

Themes across curriculum

Connect students to community

Leadership

People

Time need

Money 2

Change

Desire for change

Proactive vs. reactive

Culture of change

Thoughtful and reasonable change

Lack of info across disciplines

Size enables change

Technology supports change

Size advantage

Survey of students and faculty

Need to continue conversations

Assessment of social responsibility difficult, esp. with transfer students

Faculty must exemplify lifelong learning

Permanent study abroad locations?

Walmart mentality – purchase (of knowledge) is made

VS.

Health club mentality – purchase of membership is made, after which customer does the work

Addressing different kinds of intelligence

_____ across the curriculum:

- Ethics

- Writing

Course linkage (disparate subjects)

Global studies – mandating vs. inclusion in current courses

Creating “uncomfortability” in campus experiences

Scholarship expo for credit

Interdisciplinary faculty teams

Gen eds may not emphasize critical thinking skills

AEP students need to commit sooner

Student/support staff communication

Gen ed requirements should be reexamined

Assignments find balance between creative/critical thinking

Grade of C+

Common learning goals

Consequences for irresponsibility

Specific courses ethics/writing etc across curriculum

Link courses toward goals

Global studies expand study abroad

Question #2

- *Which aspects of the current environment (student and faculty composition, institutional culture, community partnerships, etc.) can help us achieve our goals for the Bradley graduate of 2010? Which serve as barriers?*

Helps –

Not using new technologies to bring experts to campus\

Study abroad programs good but need

Have good community connections

Admit higher potential students

Helps 2 –

Dynamic faculty

Size of university, size of class, know students

Potential for cultural change

Learning in retirement (potential help)

Have some writing intensive courses

Helps 3 –

Have resources in retirement community

Emphasis on excellence “push students”

Diversity learning

Strong graduate program

Strong alumni program and support

Strengths –

Good internships and practicums

Rethink how to use time with students

Unique resources

Good faculty invested in university and community

Good students

Faculty model behaviors

Service learning centered needed

Dedicated faculty support IUE administration

Small size allows good student faculty collaboration

Use spring break as a structured service/learning

Improve students ability to critically think

Intuitive interest and curiosity

Need to encourage discussion and writing

Get students to synthesize

Students develop real computer skills

Critical thinking

Study abroad take students out of comfort zone

Reassess gen eds C+ on all

Faculty/student cooperation

Faculty staff, administration model critical thinking

Professional curriculum require critical thinking

5-10 year out evaluation

Faculty model life long learning

Strong relationships, strong diverse experience

Rethink what professorate looks like
Easy to work with other departments
Diverse student body
Helpful technology

Question #2B

Look at grads over time – evaluate student vs. graduate
Communication lacking especially writing
Not achieving goals – evaluate faculty climate
Faculty willingness to change?
Social responsibility other culture experience
Engagement in community, local & global leadership
Ethics – missing honors board, student review board
Maturity of incoming students down – Silo problem-students specialized rather than exposed to broader area
Barriers –
Gen ed in current form with limitations and restrictions imposed by major
Lack of effective evaluation, post-graduation
Students’ perception of entitlement
Accrediting associations may work within narrowly defined parameters
Study abroad needs to be more fully developed along B.U. lines
Opportunities for association with local entities not fully exploited
Top-heavy faculty in terms of service, experience with students’ generation
Institutional inertia; “buy-in” on large scale difficult
Institutional motivation of faculty
Geographical/cultural diversity
Funding
Lack of integration of technology into curriculum
Interdepartmental communication
Time to integration of plan
Student preparation for internships and practicums
Faculty modeling appropriate (ideal) behavior
Assessment of cross-disciplinary activities
Institutional inertia
Resources for faculty
Gaps between units/departments
Ongoing training for new faculty
Overly homogeneous undergrads, insular grads
No common set of experiences
Devaluing of general education
“Silo mentality” discourages cross-disciplinary work
Incoherent gen ed program
Student culture:

- Narcissism
- Focus on grades
- New technology overvalued

“Discipline silos” among faculty (modeled by students)
Inadequate diversity

“Efficient management”

Not addressing diversity

Assessment of attributes is problematic

Issues student-based, not faculty-directed

“Critique of pure buccs”

Assessment facilitated by small group or individual instruction

Attention span, motivation of students called into question

Writing and other communication skills also called into question

Business model of efficiency

Adjunct professors not integrated into faculty

Internet 2

Bring world in

Cell phones

Why stop them

Embrace technology

Lack of time and monetary resources

Poor attitudes – resistance among faculty to develop

Space limitations

Failure to put discussion into practice

More cooperation needed

“Cultural literacy”

Credit for faculty in new curricular initiatives

“Get those gen eds out of the way”

Homogeneous course structures

Roadblocks to collaboration exist within existing structure

More is asked of faculty etc. with less time

(Thoughtful and reasonable risk-taking creates climate for change)

Inaccurate perspectives of students of education experience is barrier

Technology can also be confining

“We live in our own Silos”

Future employers give different lists to students than faculty