

## **General Education Committee's Feedback on the External Review Team Recommendations**

The External Review Team offered 10 recommendations for improving the University's General Education curriculum/program. The General Education Core Curriculum Review Committee met on March 17, 2003 to discuss the recommendations of the External Review Team. The Committee notes that the External Review Team did not mention the General Education Core Curriculum Review Committee Report in its final report. The Committee also notes that the External Review Team's recommendations do not preclude the need for a detailed program review (involving the entire University faculty body) of the existing General Education Core Curriculum/Program. We view the Core Curriculum Review Committee's Report (June, 2002) and the External Review Team's report (October, 2002) as only the *initial stage* of a multi-year core curriculum review, revision, implementation, and assessment process.

In the following, we provide the Committee's response to each recommendation of the External Review Team:

### Recommendation #1 (Program planning and administration)

The Committee agrees with the need to charge an office/person with primary responsibility/accountability for General Education. (This was also mentioned on page 5 item #2 of the Committee's report) The Committee deems this to be critical to the future success of the core curriculum review, revision, implementation, and assessment process.

### Recommendation #2 (Purpose, structure, governance, competencies and assessment) & #3 (Funding model)

The Committee agrees with both recommendations. Meaningful reform and continued improvement in core curriculum instruction and student learning will require adequate funding.

### Recommendation #4 (Faculty Consensus)

The Committee agrees that the core curriculum program review process must assure faculty consensus around a broad set of guidelines. However, these guidelines have not yet been defined and agreed upon by the faculty. The Committee emphasizes that this recommendation broadens the process beyond the Committee's original charge (See page 6 of our report).

### Recommendation #5 (Timeline & Cost structure)

The Committee believes that this recommendation represents a reasonable decision to be made. However this issue was not addressed in our report.

### Recommendation #6 (Faculty Development)

The Committee agrees with this recommendation. However, the budget for the ATL needs to be adequate if this recommendation is to be realized. The Committee notes that the part of recommendation #6 focusing on the role of enhanced faculty expertise in

tenure promotion portfolios should be considered as a separate recommendation due to its importance.

Recommendation #7 (Retention Plan)

The Committee agrees with this recommendation. The Committee notes that some programs are already in place that deal with retention and assessment in the first two years of the undergraduate experience.

Recommendation #8 (Advising)

The Committee agrees with this recommendation and notes that student advising would be more effective if the University moved to centrally located advising centers of School/College-based advising centers.

Recommendation #9 (FUTURES)

The Committee agrees that the connection between the FUTURES goals and those of General Education need to be publicized and clarified. (See FUTURES: Goal 2). There has been little or no coordination of efforts between the Core Curriculum Review Committee and the FUTURES Planning Committee to date.

Recommendation #10 (Academic Performance)

The Committee agrees with the need to strengthen student academic performance with regard to the core curriculum.