

Item	Description
Name/Title	General Education Review Committee
Date	March 4, 2015
Time	11:00-noon
Location	200 McKenny
Members Attending	Zenia Bahorski, Doug Baker, Chris Foreman (co-chair), Christopher Gardiner, John Koolage (co-chair), Konnie Kustron, Peggy Liggitt, Bob Winning
Absent	Lisa Klopfer, Gerald Newberry, Mary Rearick,

### Meeting Notes

#### Final Report:

- The format of the current Criterion Three draft will be the template for all criteria.
- Subcommittees should read all drafts for next meeting and be prepared to comment.
- Recommendations will have a dedicated section and a ranked order.
- Subcommittees should not limit the number of recommendations. Recommendations will be discussed as a group.

#### Criterion Three Recommendations

Recommendations as outlined in item seven of the attached Criterion Three draft were discussed.

- Educating part-time lectures with regard to General Education learning outcomes.
  - Workshops or online module for anyone teaching a General Education course.
  - Target departments. Need to stress that talking about General Education outcomes and not content knowledge.
  - Subdivide courses into those developed specifically for General Education and major courses.
- Infrastructure to support the development of interdisciplinary course offerings.
  - Not up to this group to figure out logistics of this, but it should be stated.
- Educate EMU community about benefits of the program.
  - There were a lot of misconceptions about General Education in the faculty survey.
  - This will be addressed in criterion five also and is also linked to criterion four.
  - Once it is know what General Education is and what it is supposed to do, we will know better how to assess it.
- Computer literacy course.
  - Possible to approach this in two ways:
    - Have technology intensive (TI) required course assigned to major programs in same way at writing intensive (WI) courses are currently. The disciplines will decided what technology requirements should apply to their students. These could evolve quickly as technologies that are discipline specific evolve.
    - Have a set of courses identified within the existing General Education program that satisfy the TI requirement. Such courses would have a sufficient technology component built into them already and/or classes to fit this role could be developed.
    - As with WI, this approach could be paired with a TI support center to provide basic remedial help. Funding model for UWC could be modeled here.
    - Using this approach, students would not get college credit for remedial work and they would understand how technology helps them in their major.
  - Computer literacy is not just about tools, but about being proficient in a living social environment where computers affect our daily lives.
    - If we're only talking about tools, then just have a remedial facility.

- Courses could be half tools and half theory. Students have greater problems with the latter.
- Should be STEM involved.
- Should be discipline specific.

#### **Criterion Four Recommendations**

See Criterion Four draft – Item 5

#### **Criterion Five Recommendations**

- Perceived threats not supported by data:
  - Range of courses is too great. Data shows a stable number of courses offered over time.
  - Poaching of credit hours, with some departments benefiting and others losing out. Within the current General Education program changes are minimal. While CMTA has grown by about 2% and H&P and G&G have dropped by about 2%, everything else has been stable over the five year period.
- Development of interdisciplinary courses.
- Coordination and oversight of course offerings. Currently staffing decisions are made solely at the department level.
- Technology requirement.
- Professional development/teacher training. Currently this is left up to the departments.
- Use comprehensive education as selling point for EMU.
- Staffing and engagement. What should optimal staffing look like?
- Staffing at macro level of program. Use an Honor's College model? Lack of staffing makes it difficult to plan and innovate.

#### **Attachments:**

Criterion Two: Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct draft

Criterion Three: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources and Support draft

Criterion Four: Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement draft