

## **General Education Open Meeting (Listening Meeting)**

**December 13, 2007**

**2:00 pm**

**Union 213**

**Notes prepared by: Sara Kearns**

**Task Force:** Vicki Clegg, Kerri Day-Keller, Greg Eiselein, Judy Hughey, Sara K. Kearns, Brian Kovar, Melody Lehew, Karen Myers-Bowman

**Guests:** Lenn Brazeal, Les Hannah (Salina), Phillip Marzluf, Brian Niehoff, Frank Spikes, Barbara Steward . . . .[~ 25 participants]

### Points of Discussion

- Concern that this is being driven without regard for what the colleges have already accomplished (ie being driven by accrediting body) and already having orientation classes that fulfill needs. Cannot have one-size fits all. For instance, College of Engineering would prefer that their students take their orientation rather than another first year seminar. Architecture seconds that. They are going to a five year/master's program.
  - We are trying to work with college first year seminars and to remain flexible with Gen Ed programs. Maybe it's a problem with the name.
  - Not adding hours to current system; would grant students flexibility as they change majors
- What about accreditation? Accrediting agencies already assess many outcomes. Do we need to add more to that?
  - Higher Learning Commission dinged us on assessment and what we still need to work on assessing is Gen Ed
  - Voluntary System of Accountability
- Why 24 credits? Why not less?
  - We feel that represents the breadth of knowledge. The number of credits did not come first. We first considered content areas that would lead to a generally educated graduate of K-State and then looked at how many credit hours would be practicable to get that breadth of knowledge yet no overburden the student.
- Concerns about implementation
  - Has to be brought to the program level for buy-in: not sure how any program could see how they would incorporate this into their programs
    - Not talking about having a committee tag the courses, but departments
    - Look at courses and look at the content of courses to see how they would fit into the content areas
- General Education at K-State started in 1986; 1990 task force put forward an ambitious proposal—many of the ideas in the 2007 proposal were in the 1990 proposal. [Handed Karen the proposal and suggested that we read it.]
- Does taking current courses and making them general education really change anything? Conversely does a change need to be made?

- A lot of courses have migrated to the pedagogy of UGE, without ever being UGE courses—have accomplished a lot with the existing UGE program.
- Tagged courses—current system there is oversight and evaluation/assessment. If all departments tag their courses will that be a free for all. Can departments adequately critically evaluate their courses?
- What will change other than making colleges tag courses, adding administrative positions, and more standardized tests?
  - Trying to address breadth of knowledge, not specific content
  - Assessing student learning—not necessarily the course and delivery mechanism
  - Not saying that we should stop saying attention to pedagogy and quality issues; just not going to be part of the requirement for labeling it UGE
  - What will change will be the breadth-while many of our students currently leave with this breadth; but this will hopefully ensure that
- Some current UGE courses are 1 credit hour; are we specifying only three credit courses would be Gen Ed?
  - No, it's more of a tallying system.
  - All students should leave K-State with exposure to all of these areas
  - Is it going to be more challenging for professional programs?
- Remember that we have to advise students
  - Colleges may chose to have a list of courses that will work best with their programs
- Why was communication pulled out?
  - Because isn't something to take in one class, but should be across the curriculum and cuts across all of the categories, not necessarily a category of it's own
  - We aren't messing with the Regent's requirements—they aren't part of general education technically, but stand-alone and we don't have control over that set of requirements
  - Elevating communication skills is a way to encourage more communication
  - Communication and critical thinking needs to be targeted in every course on campus
- Four themes that overlap in the social systems: condense them down into one topic. Diversity could be tagged four times?
  - So that one person would take one course to fulfill all of those areas?
- Would like to see five content areas and 18 credit hours.
- Is the only way to take the 8 content areas to take courses?
  - No, can do things like study abroad or done an internship, etc . . .