

General Education Self-Study

February 15, 2016

If we teach today's students as we taught yesterday's we rob them of tomorrow.
John Dewey

Irrespective of college major or institutional selectivity, what matters to career success is students' development of a broad set of cross-cutting capabilities.
Anthony Carnavale,
Georgetown Center on Education and the Workforce

Compiled by the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on General Education



COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Bruce Ferrin, (co-chair) – faculty member, Department of Marketing

Dan Jacobson, (co-chair) – faculty member, School of Music

Elizabeth Blasko – undergraduate student, WSA senator

Matthew Bracey – undergraduate student, WSA senator

Eli Collins-Brown – Director of the Office of Faculty Development

James Cousins, Interim Associate Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences

Jim Butterfield – faculty member, Department of Political Science

Linda Dove – advisor and faculty member, Family and Consumer Sciences

James Dunnigan – (past Graduate Research Assistant) – Department of Anthropology

Marcia Feters – Interim Associate Dean of the College of Education and Human

Development, and Director of Teacher Education

Leigh Ford – Director of the School of Communication

Luca Funk – undergraduate student, WSA senator

Deveta Gardner – Career and Student Employment

Harold Glasser – faculty member and Executive Director, Office for Sustainability

John Geiser – faculty member, Department of Biological Sciences, and Chair of COGE

Decker Hains, (past chair) – Chair of the Dept. of Military Science and Leadership

Duane Hampton – faculty member, Department of Geosciences

Sarah Hill, (past co-chair) – faculty member, Environmental and Sustainable Studies

Kevin Knutson – Director of Advising, College of Arts and Sciences

Molly Lynde-Recchia – Chair of the Department of World Languages and Literatures

David Paul – faculty specialist, Department of Philosophy, and also representing part-

time instructor and graduate teaching assistant perspective

Staci Perryman-Clark – faculty member and Director of First Year Writing, Department of English

Deanne Puca – Office of University Relations

David Reinhold – Associate Provost for Assessment and Undergraduate Studies

Dianna Sachs – faculty member, University Libraries

Kevin Wanner – faculty member, Department of Comparative Religion

Carol Weideman – faculty member, Human Performance and Health Education

Brian Wilson – faculty member, Department of Comparative Religion

Toni Woolfork-Barnes – Director of First-Year Experience Programs

CONTENTS

	<u>Pages</u>
Executive Summary	1
I. Introduction.....	3
II. Information-Gathering Strategies	3
III. Findings	
A. <i>Finding #1</i> : Qualitative Findings from Campus Feedback	
1. Survey of Faculty, Advisors, and Administrators.....	4
2. Brown Bag Discussions	7
3. Student Voice.....	8
B. <i>Finding #2</i> : Best Practices—	
1. The Association of American Colleges and Universities	8
2. AAC&U's L.E.A.P. Initiative	8
C. <i>Finding #3</i> : Innovative L.E.A.P.-based Revisions at Other Institutions	
1. Portland State University	10
2. University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh	11
3. University of North Dakota, Grand Forks	12
4. Michigan State University	12
5. Grand Valley State University	13
6. Summary Conclusions from other institutions	13
D. <i>Finding #4</i> : WMU's General Education Program	
1. The History of General Education at WMU	13
a. Background	13
b. Recent Initiatives	14
c. The Current Review	15
2. A Closer Look at Our Current Distribution Area/Proficiencies Model	
a. Number of Approved Courses	15
b. Current Investment by College	16
c. Offerings by Day and Time	19
d. Enrollment Data	19
e. Instructor Designation.....	20
IV. Recommendations.....	20
V. References.....	23

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Student Comments on WMU General Education Program.....	24
Appendix 2: Detailed Descriptions of Other Institutions' General Education Reforms and New Programs	26
Appendix 3: Data on WMU's Current General Education Program	36
Appendix 4: Opportunities and Challenges	46
Appendix 5: WMU General Education Requirements 2015/2016.....	53

Executive Summary

Western Michigan University's Faculty Senate empanelled the Ad Hoc Committee on General Education in March 2013. The committee included representatives from across the university community: board-appointed and part time faculty, students, advisors, administrators (chairs and associate deans), and representatives from the Office for Sustainability, Student Affairs, University Relations, the Office of Faculty Development, and First-Year Experience.

The committee's charges were as follows:

- Examine Western Michigan University's current general education program in light of recent innovations in such programs around the country in order to determine if changes should be recommended. The committee may want to consider findings from the Association of American Colleges and Universities and programs at similar institutions that have been described as innovative and effective.
- Examine the learning outcomes that should be addressed by the general education program. This includes an examination of WMU's current outcomes and those of other innovative programs.
- Recommend ways in which to better integrate the general education learning outcomes across disciplines and curricula.
- Recommend ways in which to help students appreciate the goals of the general education program.
- Recommend a system by which the general education program can be assessed with the purpose of continual improvement.

This report delineates the data and information that informs the recommendations of the committee. Specifically, the report provides a discussion of each of the following:

- a. *Information-gathering strategies:* The committee used a variety of strategies to gather information, feedback and input from members of the university community including a campus wide survey of stakeholders, student focus groups, and brown bag discussion sessions for faculty and staff. Research into best practices, including the L.E.A.P. Initiative of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) was conducted. In March 2015, the committee and the campus community participated in a two-day on-campus residency by Dr. Paul Gaston, nationally known expert on general education reform.
- b. *Findings:* This section describes an analysis of the information collected from each method and source cited above. Key themes identified across the campus survey and the student focus groups suggest some dissatisfaction with the current general education program. That dissatisfaction appears to arise from a lack of clarity of purpose, a lack of communication about and understanding of the connections between general education and a student's major, and a lack of perceived value that general education brings to a student's future goals. The L.E.A.P. Initiative finding serves as a framework for general education reform and provides a context for the examination of models of reform at (Portland State

University, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, University of North Dakota/Grand Forks, Michigan State University, and Grand Valley State University). Finally, the committee examined in depth our current general education program. The history of the general education program at WMU and its several permutations were examined. Through this examination the committee gained as appreciation for the relationship between the programs structures and goals and the students' needs in a particular time and place. Finally, an analysis of the current course offerings in our general education program was conducted. This analysis addressed the committee's need to understand basic but important variables such as the number of course offerings, the time and day of course offerings, and the enrollment in various distribution areas. This data is presented within the report and also in table format in Appendix 3.

The committee's consideration and analysis of these findings and its deliberations over the likely options and opportunities for general education at WMU have led to the following recommendations.

Recommendations for the Reform of General Education at WMU

1. Endorse a learner-centered approach to general education that balances learning of essential skills and content, prepares our students to succeed in an ever-changing 21st-century world, and aligns as closely as possible with WMU's vision, mission and Strategic Plan.
2. Adopt a university-wide set of essential learning outcomes that can be traced across the curriculum.
3. Adopt a curriculum structure that supports essential learning outcomes and simplifies and refines the menu-driven structure of the existing general education curriculum (see Appendix 5). The new structure should merge proficiencies with content knowledge by scaffolding intellectual and practical skills across disciplines and curricula:
 - Build foundations;
 - Integrate and apply them through additional content courses — some of which will address "big questions" and real-world problems;
 - Use these learning outcomes as a means to enhance and support students' successful work in their chosen major(s) and/or minor(s), culminating with a capstone.
 - Make appropriate connections with relevant programs such as the First-Year Experience, Broncos First, and the WMU Signature initiative;
4. Ensure the ongoing assessment of essential learning outcomes across the undergraduate curriculum for the benefit of our students, and to remedy concerns raised by the Higher Learning Commission;
5. Appoint a "Design Team" with a minimum of two charges: a) to create alternative models of a revised general education curriculum based on the recommendations outlined in the related MOA; and b) engage the university community in the naming of the new general education curriculum.

I. Introduction

Western Michigan University's current general education model has been in place for nearly 30 years, and features over 400 courses, arrayed across eight distribution areas, four proficiencies and seven sub-proficiencies. General Education is the university's singular shared undergraduate curricular experience, and for most of our students it is also the primary focus of their first two years of college.

The students in our classrooms today face a world characterized by instability and rapid change. They must be equipped with the skills and knowledge to adapt to that change in their personal lives and employment, and as participants in their communities, our democracy and the world beyond. We must be poised to address these fundamental questions: What abilities and skills should 21st century graduates of Western Michigan University have? What experiences at WMU will allow them to achieve their full potential? Our general education curriculum should reflect our university's answers to these fundamental questions. With the university community's commitment to reform, we have the potential to meet the needs of the 21st century student and to distinguish our university from our peers as leaders in outcomes-based, assessable undergraduate education.

To achieve that distinction, a clear and meaningful purpose for this critical aspect of our baccalaureate education is required. The purpose of general education should align with the university's mission, vision and Strategic Plan, and should embrace best practices for student learning as current research and innovative General Education models demonstrate. Through a "Learner Centered" approach, WMU's revised general education curriculum should achieve for our students the essential student learning outcomes of a 21st century liberal education, outcomes that provide them with the knowledge, skills, and perspectives that will enable them to succeed, adapt, and continue learning throughout their lives.

II. Information-Gathering Strategies

In Spring 2013, the Ad Hoc Committee on General Education began to address its first charge from the Faculty Senate: to examine Western Michigan University's current general education program in light of recent innovations in such programs around the country in order to determine if changes should be recommended. To address this charge, the committee focused on these guiding questions: What is the current status of general education at WMU and how is our general education curriculum perceived by our university community? What have institutions that have already initiated a process of general education reform done? What are the evidence-based practices advocated by the American Association of Colleges & Universities (AAC&U)?

The committee employed a variety of strategies to address these questions. We reviewed the current literature on liberal education reform, reading key texts and updates provided

by AAC&U's *Weekly Liberal Education News Watch*. A four-member team attended the 2014 AAC&U's Summer Institute on General Education. In March 2015, Dr. Paul Gaston, a nationally recognized expert on general education reforms, came to campus for a two-day consultation that included meetings with President Dunn and Provost Greene, three faculty and staff workshops, and a keynote address to the university community. Dr. Gaston also consulted with the Ad Hoc Committee on both the content and processes for achieving successful general education reform.

To gather feedback and perspective from the university community the committee conducted a campus-wide survey of faculty, advisors and administrators and hosted 11 university-wide "brown bag" discussions. It also held a focus group with Student Orientation Team members, attended new student orientation sessions, and observed advising sessions. Finally to provide updates and information and to seek feedback, committee members also gave presentations to various campus constituencies and departments including the Senior Leadership Team, Provost's Council, Student Affairs, Academic Forum, and the Faculty Senate.

To complete the committee's understanding of the general education program at WMU, Mr. David Paul conducted an analysis focused on providing answers to the following questions:

- a) How many different general education courses are there?
- b) What is the current investment of individual colleges in general education?
- c) What days and times are these class sections offered?
- d) What are the enrollments?
- e) Who is teaching general education courses?
- f) How does the general education program affect retention?

III. Findings

A. Finding #1: Qualitative Findings - Campus Feedback

1. Campus Survey

The Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on General Education surveyed the campus community in April of 2014. A total of 330 individuals responded to the survey: Board-appointed faculty (54%), advisors (18%), graduate teaching assistants (11%), part-time instructors (14%) and other (16%). "Other" included graduate students who were not currently teaching, administrators (chairs, directors, associate deans, etc.), emeritii and staff. Note: Respondents could mark more than one category if applicable.

Survey responses by academic college affiliation were as follows: the College of Arts and Sciences (45%), the College of Education and Human Development (18%), and each of the other five academic colleges represented between 2% to 7% of the total respondents. Twelve percent of the respondents marked "Other."

The majority of the respondents (70%) came from departments or programs that offer general education courses. Slightly less than half of all respondents were teaching a general education course in the Spring 2014 semester (27%) or had taught a general education course in the past (18%).

Survey highlights included the following:

- Respondents either had no familiarity with the general education policy and requirements (12%), were somewhat familiar with them (22%), or were familiar with only some area requirements (30%), for a total of nearly two-thirds of survey participants.
- Over half of the respondents were either not aware of the goals and purpose of the general education program (22%) or only somewhat aware (37%),
- In response to a question focused on how well WMU assesses the student learning outcomes of the general education program, 55% stated that they had no basis to judge this. On a scale from 1 ("not at all") to 5 ("very well,"), 28% rated a 1 or 2.
- Respondents were asked to judge the value students place on WMU's general education program. While 26% of respondents had "no basis to judge," 67% marked 1, 2 or 3 on a scale from 1 ("not at all") to 5 ("very well")
- Another survey question asked respondents to assess how effective the program was in providing students with the knowledge and skills they would need to be engaged citizens and creative problem solvers. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents rated the program with a 1, 2 or 3 (see scale above) and 26% stated that they had no basis to judge.
- Slightly over half of the respondents (51%) were aware that the Faculty Senate had established the Ad Hoc Committee on General Education that was administering the survey.
- The survey included a question about preferred methods to facilitate participation in the redesign of general education. Respondents indicated the following preferences: small group meetings (66%) and surveys (52%). Other less preferred participation strategies included town hall meetings, committee service, and symposiums.

At the end of the survey respondents were invited to provide written comments regarding the current general education program. A majority of respondents (234) offered comments. The committee examined these comments and identified seven themes, each illustrated below by a representative comment:

- ***"Our students don't appreciate the purpose of general education. We do not do a good job of conveying the goals or learning outcomes of general education and how that will impact their lives in the future."*** This observation was present in many comments. For example, a current graduate student, who recently finished a BA at WMU, noted, "I do not recall any of the courses I was required to take nor how I use the knowledge now in life." Another respondent commented that "students (and their families) view general education as something to 'get through' and do not see value in the course offerings."

- ***“The current program needs revision.”*** Such comments were more common than those that suggested satisfaction with the current program and its goal achievement. Example comments included phrases such as “grossly outdated,” “antiquated,” “poorly constructed,” “too complicated,” “unnecessarily obtuse,” “not integrated,” “disjointed,” “haphazard,” “not perceived as a program,” “very ‘old school’ and not focused,” “a cobbled-up mess that students and faculty alike don’t value or like,” and “could use updating.” Other comments were that the program has “little intellectual coherence and no assessment,” “needs structure,” and is “not based on student learning outcomes,” “needs to be revitalized,” is based upon outdated “perceptions of higher education,” and that we have a “tremendous opportunity for meaningful improvement.”
- ***“Students need to build skills.”*** Survey respondents asked specifically for a more vigorous focus on skills building. The most frequently identified skills were writing, critical thinking, problem solving and global and cultural awareness (through study abroad). Other skills like information literacy, health appreciation and basic knowledge of sustainability were also mentioned, but less frequently. Calls for specific disciplinary knowledge were not included in the comments, but the idea of a well-rounded individual was expressed repeatedly. Such comments may imply that content knowledge in multiple areas is desirable. As one respondent summed up: “The goal is to develop well-rounded students capable of analyzing evidence, synthesizing information, and communicating ideas; however, we attempt to achieve these goals through content-based courses.”
- ***“Those who teach Gen Ed do not have a good grasp of the goals and learning outcomes of our current general education program and the administration does not provide adequate support.”*** It was noted that about 50% of courses in general education are taught by part-time instructors and graduate students. In the comments administrative support was only occasionally linked to financial issues. More often, administrators’ advocacy for the importance of general education to student success was deemed lacking and the communication with students about the benefits of general education for their future was less than satisfactory.
- ***“The program lacks effective assessment.”*** This observation appeared in several comments. One respondent summarized a number of issues by stating that the current “program lacks the characteristics that would qualify it as a true ‘Program.’ These characteristics would include clearly stated learning objectives, some mechanism in place to ensure the objectives are integrated into the curriculum, and some form of program wide assessment.”
- ***“General Education is a political football.”*** Many respondents recognized that revising general education will involve campus politics. Some expressed the concern that there were too many areas with unnecessary courses that prevented students from getting additional courses in their major. Other comments mentioned that our current program was driven at the departmental level by the need to generate student credit hours making the program necessarily a

challenging “political football.” Still others cited the concern that some courses seemed to be designed only for students in specific programs and “that individual academic programs keep inserting program requirements into the Gen Ed requirements, thus co-opting general education for their own agenda.” Finally there was the concern that for some departments the recruitment of majors, i.e. discovery majors, would be affected by potential changes in general education.

“The program’s name needs to be changed.” The need to rename general education as part of the reform/revisioning was expressed in some written comments.

2. Brown Bag Discussions:

During the Fall 2014 semester, the Ad Hoc Committee on General Education in collaboration with the University Center for the Humanities held five brown bag discussions about general education revision. A total of 67 faculty, staff and administrators attended at least one of the sessions, with several faculty attending multiple sessions.

Multiple members of the committee attended each brown bag discussion. Members in attendance took notes during the brown bag discussions. The notes were transcribed and major themes were identified. Many topics arose during these discussions; however, three central ideas emerged as especially important:

- a. Learning Outcomes for General Education:** This was a major topic of discussion largely due to the committee’s desire for input and feedback on the issue of learning outcomes. The three outcomes that were discussed most frequently (in alpha order) were communication skills, critical thinking, and global competency. Other skills mentioned included analytical literacy, civic responsibility, competency in a language other than English and problem solving. Broader ideas of the type of learning that general education should foster included the development of life skills and the ability to apply learning to real life situations. Some discussants suggested that the general education program should support the three pillars of the university strategic plan. The belief that general education should help produce a well-rounded individual was also expressed in the brown bag discussions.
- b. Integration of General Education with the Major:** One discussion topic focused on changing the conversation from general education to a liberal education as advocated by the AAC&U. Some participants spoke about the need to make general education relevant to all majors and that there should be interconnections between the major and general education. Multiple participants suggested that we should consider more use of interdisciplinary courses within the general education curriculum. The idea that general education should be something that spans the entire baccalaureate experience, i.e., the program should mature as students matriculate through their program of study.

- c. **Communication with Students:** The need to explain the value of general education to our students was identified as a theme of the 2014 campus survey. Participants in the brown bag discussions expressed a similar point. Participants advocated opening new lines of communication with our undergraduate students and other constituencies about the importance of general education (liberal education). This communication effort should begin prior to students attending the university and should continue throughout their undergraduate experience. Discussants stated that a good general education experience prepares a student for life beyond their university experience and that value is not being communicated effectively.

3. Student Voices: Understanding students' perceptions of and experiences with general education at WMU is critical to the success of any general education revision. To that end, David Reinhold (Associate Provost for Assessment and Undergraduate Studies) conducted a student focus group with self-selected honors students, met with the Western Student Association, and with the assistance of the student representative on the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on General Education met with 38 student orientation leaders. These groups do not represent a random cross-section of the student body; they do represent some of the most engaged students on campus. (See Appendix 1 for specific student comments)

B. Finding #2: Best Practices

1. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U)

The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) has over 1,000 member institutions across the nation, and describes itself "as the only major higher education association whose sole focus is the quality of student learning in the college years."

2. AAC&U's *Liberal Education for America's Promise Initiative (L.E.A.P.)*

In 2005, the AAC&U launched its *Liberal Education and America's Promise: Excellence for Everyone as a Nation Goes to College* (L.E.A.P.). The L.E.A.P. initiative seeks to help all colleges and universities develop meaningful curricular pathways with clear and transparent learning outcomes and make use of authentic forms of assessment. In this reimagining, general education becomes a more deliberate and intentional part of a student's development and students can demonstrate they are learning the full spectrum of liberal learning outcomes so important in today's world.

In 2007, the AAC&U published its report entitled *College Learning for the New Global Century*, which acknowledges that **access**, **affordability**, and **accountability** in higher education are important priorities for national action. The report also provides compelling evidence that an increase in access to higher education has not led to a significant increase in graduation rates. The gap between "aspiration and actual achievement" remains wide and "stubbornly stratified by income and race"(AAC&U, 2007). The

report's authors also contend that the commitment to expanded college access needs to be anchored in an equally strong commitment to **educational excellence**, since student success in college cannot be measured only in terms of enrollment, persistence, and degree completion:

These metrics, while important, miss entirely the question of whether students who have placed their hopes for the future in higher education are actually achieving the kind of learning they need.

Further, the authors state that the 21st-century student faces a future that is characterized by dislocation and interdependence rather than certainty and insularity:

The world is being dramatically reshaped by scientific and technological innovations, global interdependence, cross-cultural encounters, and changes in the balance of economic and political power.

This report argues for a "liberating education" that equips students with the skills, abilities, and understandings necessary to meet the challenges of the 21st century:

Liberal Education is an approach to learning that empowers individuals and prepares them to deal with complexity, diversity, and change. It provides students with broad knowledge of the wider world (e.g. science, culture, and society) as well as in-depth study in a specific area of interest. A liberal education helps students develop a sense of social responsibility, as well as strong and transferable intellectual and practical skills such as communication, analytical and problem-solving skills, and a demonstrated ability to apply knowledge and skills in real-world settings.

The report's authors note that liberal education has always been this nation's signature educational tradition, and the AAC&U recommendations build on those core values: (1) expanding horizons, (2) building understanding of the wider world, (3) honing analytical and communication skills, and (4) fostering responsibilities beyond one's self.

Many colleges and universities have recognized the need for reforming, revitalizing, and reimagining liberal education and general education has been the focal site of most of these reimagining efforts. As Carol Geary Schneider (2015), president of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, states:

General education is the nation's largest education program—the part of the curriculum deliberately designed to prepare all students for life, work, and citizenship by fostering their knowledge of the wider world (science, cultures, histories, societies, values) and by preparing them to think analytically and learn collaboratively. General education is viewed, in the United States and abroad, as an American hallmark—a key to creativity in the economy as well as to participatory citizenship. When done well, it both expresses and guides the US commitment to broad and multidisciplinary education—liberal education—that other countries are seeking to import. (p. v)

In practice, however, general education programs often underperform. Paul Gaston (2015) summarized the issue very succinctly: “At present, most students in most institutions of higher learning experience general education programs ill-designed to accomplish their stated purposes and ill-suited to ensure the wide range of learning outcomes that define degrees” (p. 1) In *General Education Maps and Markers*, the authors agree that “The program and experience that touches almost all students, general education, has failed to contribute as it should to a students’ achievement of a sound liberal education.” (AAC&U, 2015, p. 6)

To achieve the 21st century liberal education the L.E.A.P. National Leadership Council recommends that a university develops a comprehensive set of aims and outcomes that will be emphasized across every field of college study, whether one of the arts and sciences disciplines or one of the professional and technical fields (business, engineering, education, health, the performing arts, etc.). Further, the council recommends that general education and the majors must address these essential learning outcomes **systematically**.

Our committee's recommendations for general education reform at WMU rely on the L.E.A.P. Initiative recommendations and the L.E.A.P. Essential Learning Outcomes. These recommendations attempt to strike a balance between skills and content, while prioritizing outcomes that prepare our students to be life long learners as they face a 21st century workplace and civic and global environment characterized by instability and change.

C. Finding #3: Innovative L.E.A.P.-based Revisions at Other Institutions

Summary Observations (for further information, see Appendix 2)

Chairs and Directors present at the May 20, 2015 Academic Forum and at the Chairs’ Council of the College of Arts and Sciences on June 1, 2015 recommended that the Ad Hoc Committee on General Education provide the campus community with examples of innovative ways that other institutions have revised their general education programs. The committee investigated several models. Four different approaches to general education reform at five institutions are summarized below. These programs have been recognized as being particularly innovative — including models recently adopted at two universities considered to be in direct competition with WMU.

1. Portland State University

Portland State University initiated the nation-wide movement to reform general education; thus, it became the landmark institution for effective, top-to-bottom renovation of its common undergraduate curriculum. Indeed, its transformation has reached every aspect of its academic affairs, including extensive training, mentoring and instructional support of all teaching personnel. Its investments have paid off; PSU was named one of country’s most innovative campuses in a nation-wide survey of top-level university administrators. Among its outstanding features are two innovations that could only be possible in the context of a general education program that works as a cohesive whole:

ReTHINK PSU, a push to help students stay on course and graduate sooner using innovative curriculum, community engagement and effective technology. Projects include creating a better math lab, new online mentoring, targeted academic advising, flexible degrees for returning adults and redesigned student services.

The Four-Year Degree Guarantee, a pledge that students who follow a degree path will graduate in four years — or they can finish for free.

As part of its curricular changes, PSU Senate established the university's Office of Academic Innovation, (<http://www.pdx.edu/oai/>), a center of holistic approach to instructional technology, tactics, strategies, training and community.

The goals of its program are:

- Produce students who are effective communicators
- Provide students with the skills for inquiry and critical thinking
- Produce students who appreciate the diversity of the human experience
- Provide students with the skills to be ethical and socially responsible

It begins with a team-taught Freshman Inquiry seminar that not only engages students in critical questions, but also establishes the relationship – in practice – of knowledge partnered with skill-development. The second year features a sophomore version of the class, and a capstone concludes the sequence.

2. University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh

The University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh provided the most extensive insight on not only the composition of a new general education program, but the process of reform and the role in that reform played by senior leadership and financial resources.

The description below comes from a small group conversation, conducted by Skype, in March of 2015:

Oshkosh undertook its reform at the behest of its senior leadership, who confessed in 2006 that no one on campus could explain the university's then 40-year old program, with over 700 courses at the 100-300 level. The process launched with conversation, began in earnest with the summer of 2011 dedicated to “dreaming” and went live in 2013, after unanimous faculty senate approval. All phases of the reform received modest but important financial incentives and support from the Oshkosh provost. This included summer stipends and release time for the active research undertaken in the summer of 2011, stipends for faculty to develop the first round of new courses, and smaller stipends for developing the second round of courses students would take. In total, Oshkosh spent close to \$450,000 in the overhaul, approving 257 new courses (with either a \$1,000 or \$500 stipend per course).

The program consists of:

- One freshman English composition course
- One freshman oral communications course

- One mathematics course (Quest or Explore course)
- Two laboratory science courses (Quest or Explore courses)
- Three culture courses from at least two different departments (Quest or Explore courses)
- Three society courses from at least two different departments (Quest or Explore courses)
- One ethnic studies or non-western culture course (Quest or Explore course)
- One advanced writing course (Connect course)

The innovation of this program is not the list of courses students must take, but the manner in which the requirements are met. The program is divided into Quests and Explore courses. Each student must take three Quests, taken over two years. The Quests also serve a second role in the University Studies Program. There are three Signature Questions that Quest courses address, each course concentrating on only one of the questions. These Signature Questions are:

- Sustainability
- Civic Learning
- Intercultural Knowledge and Competence

3. University of North Dakota, Grand Forks

The University of North Dakota's award-winning general education program is called Essential Studies and was implemented beginning in the Fall of 2008. The program consists of 39 credit hours and is built on three levels: Special Emphasis, Breadth of Knowledge and a Capstone course. The University of North Dakota web site (<http://www.und.edu/academics/essential-studies>) lists four goals for the Essential Studies program. These include:

- Thinking and Reasoning
- Communication
- Information Literacy
- Diversity

The program facilitates progress toward learning outcomes by creating courses that have both a Special Emphasis and Breadth of Knowledge. For example, Anth 100 – Introduction to Anthropology is approved for the Global Diversity Special Emphasis and as a Social Science course in the Breadth of Knowledge level.

4. Michigan State University:

Michigan State University currently has an interdisciplinary distribution model of general education that is similar to the general education program here at WMU. The innovation comes in the fact that they have established Undergraduate Learning Goals (ULGs) that all academic and student affairs units are expected to align with in their programming. No single unit at Michigan State is expected to align with all five areas, but most do. It is the expectation that all graduating MSU undergraduates will reach an established level of proficiency in each area due to their educational experience. The identified areas are: Analytical Thinking, Cultural Understanding, Effective Citizenship, Effective Communication and Integrated Reasoning

5. Grand Valley State University

Grand Valley State University implemented a new general education program in Fall 2014 that requires 13 courses. The program integrates three knowledge goals with nine skills goals by requiring that all general education courses address both knowledge and skills learning outcomes. The knowledge goals are called Foundations (arts and sciences), Cultures (one's own and others) and Issues (how study connects to the world). Outcomes for each course in each area assessed. Skills goals are incorporated into Foundations, Cultures and Issues courses. They are: collaboration, critical and creative thinking, ethical reasoning, information literacy, integration of knowledge, oral communication, problem solving, quantitative literacy, and written communication. GVSU assesses the skill using the VALUE Rubrics of the AAC&U.

6. Summary of findings from other institutions:

The four general education programs described above (plus MSU's university program) have at least one common characteristic that WMU's current general education program lacks. Our program purposefully separates skills (proficiencies) from knowledge (distribution areas). Our program does not intend, and therefore does not accomplish, a student's integration of the two. All four of the programs described here strongly integrate knowledge and skills, although they attempt to accomplish that in very different ways. It should be noted that two of these four general education revisions took considerable investment in the construction and delivery of new courses, and the integration of skills and content involved focused professional development for faculty.

D. Finding #4: Western Michigan University's General Education Program

1. The History of General Education at WMU

a. Background

With our founding as a teacher's college, Western Michigan University has had some sort of core university requirements since its birth in 1903.

In the 1930s, the Sangren administration established a Committee on General Education, charged with developing "a plan whereby the students would obtain a broad general background of knowledge which would make them conscious of the relationships of various fields and of the social implications of all knowledge" (Knauss, 1953, p. 77). New interdisciplinary courses out of this initiative included "Foundations of Western Civilization," "Introduction to Contemporary Society," "Introduction to Physical Science," and "Aesthetics." In a pattern typical of higher education at the time, these electives were offered to freshmen and sophomores.

In 1952, the administration made the general education program a requirement of all students studying for a bachelor's degree. The program, then called "Basic Studies," consisted of 38 credit hours and covered four areas: Communication and College Writing, Science, Social Science, and Electives. In 1954 the Division of Basic Studies was formed and a director was appointed.

A little over a decade later, the Basic Studies curriculum was restructured into three components: Freshman-Sophomore Level, Junior-Senior Level, and Electives. The number of credit hours increased to 40 and Basic Studies was renamed General Studies. The Division of Basic Studies became the School of General Studies in 1966, complete with its own instructional staff. In 1970, the School of General Studies became the College of General Studies.

In 1973, students had the option of fulfilling requirements either by taking the “Integrated Studies Program” offered by the College of General Studies or taking them in a “Distribution Program,” offered through various departments. The “Distribution Program” developed from the Basic Studies curriculum with the structure of five areas: Humanities and Fine Arts, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Natural Science and Mathematics, Non-Western World, and Electives. Credit hours required in the program decreased from 40 to 35. In 1987, the departmentally-based Distribution Program became the primary General Education Program. The gradual redundancy of The College of General Studies prompted its reduction to a department in 1992, and its closure in 1993.

In 1988, the provost asked for a review of the Distribution Program. Chaired by Faith Gabelnick, the Undergraduate Studies Council began its work in 1990, proposing a model called the University Education Program. This divided proficiencies from areas, and within the areas proposed a “modified distribution program” with courses moving “from broad freshman level introductory courses to junior-senior interdisciplinary, problem-oriented, capstone courses” (GERT Committee, 2006, p. 2). The Senate rejected the proposed University Education Program the next year.

A new committee was convened, chaired by Arthur Falk. This committee recommended against a core emphasis in favor of the distribution model, arguing that it better served students in a “pluralistic, individualistic, and democratic society” (Falk, 1993, p. 2). The committee also recommended greater student choice within the distribution model since it “requires each student to seek *breadth* in knowledge and *versatility* in intellectual skills” (Falk, 1993, p. 4) as opposed to the specialization appropriate to the major.

The structure of our current 37 credit-hour minimum general education program resulted from this committee’s deliberations. As first implemented in 1996, this model was based on criteria for approving and evaluating the individual Distribution Areas and Proficiencies that was approved by the Faculty Senate in 1993. Since 1996, this program has been overseen by the Committee to Oversee General Education (COGE), a sub-committee of the Undergraduate Studies Council.

b. Recent Initiatives

In 2003 Provost Elise Jorgens convened the General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC) with a mandate to develop, implement, and monitor the assessment of general education at Western Michigan University. Comprised of members from most of the colleges, the committee’s first charge was to create a plan for assessing the effectiveness of the University’s general education program. The committee’s second charge was to begin evaluating the program, by using – in part – assessment data.

The committee first formulated student-learning outcomes for each of the eight distribution areas, based on the goals established in the 1993 document that was implemented in 1996. With input from faculty in each of the distribution areas, the committee established the first learning outcomes for General Education. These distribution area outcomes remain in place today.

The General Education Review Task Force replaced the General Education Assessment Committee in June 2005, with a charge to review the program and offer recommendations. Although it concluded that “WMU has been well served by the current model, and it accords well with those in use at most of our peer institutions, both in terms of the number of required credit hours and its structure of Proficiencies and Areas” (GERT Committee, 2006, p. 10), it also concluded that “our program can improve with a greater integration of General Education, both within the program and with other aspects of student majors/minors” (GERT Committee, 2006, p. 13). In its major finding, however, GERT recommended continuation of the current system.

The program may have been "functioning" for the instructional units, but not for our students. This was made clear in 2010, when the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) found that our general education program was largely, if not in places completely, unassessed. Moreover, at precisely the moment GERT recommended maintaining the silo-approach that divided skills courses from knowledge courses, experts in higher education were well at work on what would become by 2005 the new model for general education, articulated in the L.E.A.P. initiative — as detailed in section II. B. above, and represented in our recommendations in section IV below.

c. The Current Review

As a first step in addressing the HLC concerns about assessment at the undergraduate level, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies and Assessment David Reinhold surveyed WMU instructors in general education distribution courses about their assessment tools and practices. This effort quickly revealed a critical issue: instructors (including board-appointed, part-time, and graduate assistants) were often unaware of the published learning outcomes that have been in place since 2006.

Reinhold took his concerns to the Faculty Senate Executive Board, which decided, in late 2012, to convene the current Ad Hoc Committee. The committee was given the charges previously noted and members began the review and recommendation process outlined in this document.

2. A Closer Look at Our Current Distribution Area/Proficiencies Model (see Appendix 3 for more specific data)

a. Number of Approved Courses:

There are a total of 447 total courses currently approved for general education at WMU. Of these, 299 are in the eight Distribution Areas, and 148 are designated to fulfill a proficiency:

Distribution Areas (ranked by number of different courses offered):

- Area II (Humanities): 56 courses [19%]
- Area IV (Other Cultures and Civilizations): 55 courses [18%]
- Area III (United States—Culture and Issues): 50 courses [17%]
- Area V (Social and Behavioral Sciences): 46 courses [15%]
- Area VII (Natural Science and Technology): 38 courses [13%]
- Area I (Fine Arts): 25 courses [8%]
- Area VI (Natural Science with Lab): 18 courses [6%]
- Area VIII (Health and Well-Being) 17 courses [6%]

Proficiencies (ranked by number of different courses that fulfill each proficiency):

- Proficiency 2 (Baccalaureate-level Writing): 109 courses [74%]
- Proficiency 3 (College-level Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning): 9 courses
- Proficiency 4c (Critical Thinking): 8 courses
- Proficiency 4b (Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning): 7 courses
- Proficiency 4d (Oral Communication): 4 courses
- Proficiency 4e (American Sign Language): 4 courses
- Proficiency 4f (Computer Science): 3 courses
- Proficiency 1 (College-Level Writing): 3 courses
- Proficiency 4a (Advanced Writing): 2 courses
- Proficiency 4g (Foreign Languages): All foreign language courses count

Eighty-two per cent of these different general education courses come from just five Distribution Areas (II, III, IV, V, VII). Courses designed to fulfill Proficiency 2 (Baccalaureate-level Writing) comprise nearly three-fourths of all approved proficiency offerings at WMU, but this is because each of the over 250 undergraduate degree programs at Western must have a means to fulfill this proficiency, which is not part of the 37-credit minimum general education requirement.

b. Current Investment in General Education by College:

As one might expect, certain colleges dominate the offerings and enrollments of particular Distribution Areas and Proficiencies, but there is a wide variance in whether students in these courses are being taught by tenure-track/tenured professors, part-time instructors, or Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTA):

Distribution Area I: Fine Arts

Two-thirds of the courses and 75% of enrollment in Area I courses are in the College of Fine Arts. Of these in the CFA, 80% of the general education courses and

enrollment is covered by tenured or tenure-track faculty, with the remaining 20% taught by part-time instructors. None of these courses are taught by GTAs.

Distribution Area II: Humanities

Over 96% of the courses and student enrollment in Area II are in the College of Arts and Sciences. Of these, 33-40% of the courses and enrollment are taught by part-time instructors, roughly the same proportion by tenured or tenure-track professors, with the remaining 20-33% taught by GTAs.

Distribution Area III: The United States: Cultures and Issues

Approximately 90% of the courses and student enrollment in Area III are in the College of Arts and Sciences. Of these in the CAS, 33-40% of the courses and enrollment are taught by part-time instructors, roughly the same proportion by tenured or tenure-track professors, with the remaining 20-33% taught by GTAs.

Distribution Area IV: Other Cultures and Civilizations

Approximately 70% of the courses and student enrollment in Area IV are in the College of Arts and Sciences. Of these, nearly 60% of the course sections and students in these classes are taught by tenured or tenure-track professors, with about 33% of course sections and enrollment overseen by full-time/non-tenure track and part-time instructors, while the rest are taught GTAs.

Distribution Area V: Social and Behavioral Sciences

Courses in Area V are distributed among several colleges, but the College of Arts and Sciences and the Haworth College of Business together have approximately 97% of the course sections and student enrollment. (CAS: 70% of the course sections and 83% of the enrollment; HCoB: 27% of the sections but only 15% of the enrolled students). Overall, slightly over 40% of the course sections and 45% of students enrolled in Area V are taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty; 40% of sections/enrollment taught by part-time instructors; 17% of sections/15% of enrollment taught by GTAs. CAS has tenured or tenure-track professors teaching about one-third of its Area V sections and nearly 40% of enrolled students.

Distribution Area VI: Natural Science with Lab

CAS offers 100% of the Natural Science course sections with separate lab sections, and 71% of the course sections with integrated lab activities. In the CAS Area VI offerings, approximately half the lecture sections and enrolled students are taught by tenured or tenure-track professors; part-time instructors teach 1/3 of the lecture sections and 40% of the enrolled students. About 60% of the lab sections and are taught by GTAs.

Distribution Area VII: Natural Science and Technology

Approximately 70% of the course sections and three-fourths of the students enrolled in Area VII are in CAS. Of these, part-time instructors teach about 40% of the sections (45% of enrolled students), while GTAs teach 20% of the sections (but just

10% of the students). About a third of all sections and enrolled students are taught by tenured or tenure-track professors.

Distribution Area VIII: Health and Well-being

Virtually all Area VIII courses are taught in either the CEHD or the CHHS. The CEHD offers 62% of the total sections but enrolls only 25% of the students. Almost 90% of the sections and 80% of enrolled students are taught by tenured or tenure-track professors (almost all the rest are taught by part-time instructors). In the CHHS, where the vast majority of students are enrolled, more than 70% of sections and about 80% of enrolled students are in courses taught by part-time instructors, with almost all the rest of the CHHS sections/students taught by GTAs.

Proficiency 1: College-level Writing

CAS offers 80% of these course sections, which are almost exclusively taught by GTAs and part-time instructors. In the CEAS, the majority of sections and students are taught by non-tenure track and tenured or tenure-track instructors.

Proficiency 2: Baccalaureate-level Writing

This proficiency is split among all the colleges. Overall, nearly three-fourths of these sections and enrollment are taught by tenured or tenure-track professors. About 40% of these courses and enrolled students are taught in CAS, where nearly 80% of these courses are taught by tenured or tenure-track professors.

Proficiency 3: College-level Mathematics or Quantitative Reasoning

100% of these sections and enrollment are in CAS, where the instructor type in these courses varies:

	<i>% of Sections</i>	<i>% of Enrollment</i>
Non-tenure track	30%	60%
Tenure-track	26%	18%
GTA	26%	14%
Part-time instructors	15%	7%

Proficiency 4a: Advanced Writing

This proficiency is taught in one or two sections each semester with about 15 students per section—all taught in CAS. Since 2006, it has been taught by a variety non-GTA, non-staff instructors.

Proficiency 4b: Mathematics or Quantitative Reasoning

100% of these courses are provided through CAS. GTAs teach 40-45% of the sections and enrollment, while non-tenure track and tenured or tenure-track professors teach about 20% of these sections.

Proficiency 4c: Critical Thinking

96% of these sections are in CAS, where approximately 33-45% of the course sections are taught by part-time instructors and another 33-45% are taught by GTAs. Tenured or tenure-track professors typically teach the remainder of the course

sections. The enrollment percentages do not correspond to the sections, however, because roughly half of the students enrolled in P4c are taught by a tenured or tenure-track professor or a non-tenure track instructor.

Proficiency 4d: Oral Communication

All of these courses are in CAS. Part-time instructors teach half to two-thirds of the course sections; however, 40-65% of all enrolled students are in a course section taught by a tenured or tenure-track professor.

Proficiency 4f: Computer Science

95% of these courses are offered by the College of Engineering & Applied Science. About 75% of these sections and 80% of these students are in courses taught by tenured or tenure-track professors, with most of the remaining sections taught by part-time instructors.

Proficiency 4g: Foreign Language [College of Arts and Sciences 100%]

All of these courses are provided by CAS. In a typical semester, both the number of sections and the number of students have been divided nearly equally among part-time instructors, tenured or tenure-track professors and graduate assistants; however in the past two years, a decrease in enrollment has considerably lowered the number of students taught by tenured or tenure-track professors and part-time instructors.

c. General Education Offerings by Day and Time:

What follows are a few very broad comments about the favored and avoided times and days for WMU general education classes:

- Courses that start at noon and 2:00 PM are by far the most popular during the academic year. This is true regardless of appointment type. Of those, 53% are T/R courses and 42% are M/W courses (the rest include Friday courses).
- Except for 2:00 PM, afternoon classes are strongly avoided.
- A small proportion of courses start at 8:00 AM (4% in fall, 5% in spring).
- There are more evening courses than early morning courses, but these are less popular than courses offered in the middle of the day (10% in fall, 9% in spring).

The course scheduling matrices probably have a significant influence on the choices made by instructors and departments about the times and days chosen for courses. For more details in the day/time offerings, see Appendix 3, Section III.

d. Current Enrollment Data in General Education:

In order to have some understanding of the class sizes within our general education program, data for six semesters were examined (see Appendix 3, Section IV). Based on an initial review of the data, it appears that WMU students have the potential for small class experiences within the current program. For example, the median class size for Area II – Humanities ranges between 23 and 28 students for this six-semester period.

Many of the other areas have a median in the range of 40 students per class. The exception is the lecture portion of the Area VI – Natural Science with Lab courses where the median class size can be over 100. These courses, however, have a laboratory component where the median class size ranges from 19 to 23 students; thus, these large classes have the opportunity for more individual student attention within the lab experience. According to data from Institutional Research and COGNOS, over the past 10 years the total enrollment of WMU undergraduates has decreased by 13.4%, and the number of general education courses and sections has increased by 7.6%, which would lead to somewhat smaller class sizes overall.

Very broadly speaking, there are more sections covering Proficiency 2 – Baccalaureate-Level Writing than any other Proficiency or Area (the average number of sections for Proficiency 2 in the past six semesters is 119.5; again, an expected result). Proficiency 4g – Foreign Languages follows with an average of 95 sections per semester. Other Areas or Proficiencies with a large number of sections include: Area V – Social and Behavioral Sciences (82), Area II – Humanities (72), Proficiency 1 – College-Level Writing (71), and Area VI (Lab Sections) – Natural Science with Lab (60). Areas or Proficiencies with few sections include: Proficiency 4f – Computer Science (8) and Area VI (Lecture Sections) – Natural Science with Lab (15), and Proficiency 4a – Advanced Writing (1.5).

e. Current Data on Instructor Designation within General Education:

Data from fall 2011 – spring 2014 are presented in the chart below in order of enrollment. Tenure Track/Tenured professors as a group teach more enrolled students than any other group. Part-time instructors, GTAs, non tenure-track professors, and staff follow in order.

	Summer I		Fall		Spring		Summer II	
	<i>Enroll</i>	<i>Sections</i>	<i>Enroll</i>	<i>Sections</i>	<i>Enroll</i>	<i>Sections</i>	<i>Enroll</i>	<i>Sections</i>
<i>Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors</i>	51%	57%	46%	82%	45%	82%	61%	56%
<i>Part-time Instructors</i>	31%	26%	24%	8%	23%	7%	19%	17%
<i>Graduate Assistants</i>	12%	13%	20%	8%	22%	8%	13%	20%
<i>Non-Tenure Track Professors</i>	5%	3%	5%	1%	7%	1%	6%	6%
<i>Staff</i>	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
Totals	100%	100%	97%	100%	99%	99%	100%	100%

Note that part-time instructors, graduate assistants, and non-tenure track professors have disproportionately higher ratios of enrollment to sections in the fall and spring, and that tenured and tenure-track professors have disproportionately lower ratios of enrollment to sections in the fall and spring.

The comparisons here are by group and not by instructor. Therefore, this aggregated data misses many of the finer-resolution points: many part-time instructors and graduate students teach courses with 20 students; and many tenure track/tenured professors teach courses with 200 students. Also, there are areas and proficiencies that deviate from the averages, and there are departments and colleges that deviate from the averages.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

To serve the needs of the 21st-century WMU student population, to maximize the strengths of the WMU faculty and to unify the structure and outcomes of a WMU undergraduate education, the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on General Education recommends that the university community undertake a substantial revision and refocusing of the WMU General Education Program in the light of the best 21st-century practices and in full consideration of the knowledge, skills, and perspectives WMU students will need throughout their lives. The Ad Hoc Committee on General Education makes the following recommendations:

In order to give the general education curriculum a clear and meaningful purpose that aligns with WMU's vision, mission and Strategic Plan, the Faculty Senate should

1. Endorse a learner-centered approach to general education that balances learning of essential skills and content while prioritizing student learning outcomes that prepare our students to succeed in an ever-changing 21st-century world.
2. Adopt the following university-wide set of essential learning outcomes that can be traced across the curriculum:

WMU Essential Student Learning Outcomes

Through learner-centered approaches, the WMU General Education program will enable students to:

- a. Expand their understanding of human cultures and the physical/natural world
 - Increase their foundational knowledge of the sciences, social sciences, humanities and the arts
 - Apply different methods of intellectual inquiry, investigation and discovery
 - Develop awareness of how everyday actions affect quality of life for all
- b. Enhance intellectual and practical skills
 - Demonstrate effective and appropriate oral, written and digital communication abilities
 - Develop creative and critical thinking
 - Demonstrate and apply information literacy
 - Analyze and interpret quantitative data
- c. Exercise personal and social responsibility

- Practice sensitivity to diversity and inclusion
 - Develop global awareness
 - Gain familiarity with a language other than English
 - Exercise civic responsibility and become engaged in their communities at the local level and beyond
 - Develop practices for personal wellness and planetary sustainability
- d. Exhibit integrative and applied learning
- Apply ethical, critical, and informed thought within and across disciplines
 - Work both independently and in collaboration with others to achieve goals
 - Become lifelong learners
3. Adopt a curriculum structure that supports essential learning outcomes and simplifies and refines the menu-driven structure of the existing general education curriculum (see Appendix 5). The new structure should merge proficiencies with content knowledge by scaffolding intellectual and practical skills across disciplines and curricula:
- Build foundations;
 - Integrate and apply them through additional content courses — some of which will address "big questions" and real-world problems;
 - Use these learning outcomes as a means to enhance and support students' successful work in their chosen major(s) and/or minor(s), culminating with a capstone;
 - Make appropriate connections with relevant programs such as the First-Year Experience, Broncos First, and the WMU Signature initiative.
4. Ensure the ongoing assessment of essential learning outcomes across the undergraduate curriculum for the benefit of our students, and to remedy concerns raised by the Higher Learning Commission.
5. Appoint a "Design Team" with a minimum of two charges: a) to create (an) alternative model(s) of a revised general education curriculum based on the recommendations outlined in MOA 16/06; and b) to engage the university community in the naming of the new general education curriculum.

V. REFERENCES

Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2015). *General Education Maps and Markers: Designing Meaningful Pathways to Student Achievement*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Bauerlein, M. (2009). The State of General Education. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from September 2. <http://chronicle.com/blogs/brainstorm/the-state-of-general-education/7899>.

Couturier, L. K. (2012). *Cornerstones of Completion: State Policy Support for Accelerated, Structured Pathways of College Credentials and Transfer*. Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future. http://www.jff.org/sites/default/files/publicaitons/CBD_CornerstonesOfCompletion_111612.pdf.

Falk, A. (1993, March 22). *Comments to the Senate on the General Education Policy*. Kalamazoo, MI: Western Michigan University.

Gaston, P. (2015). *General Education Transformed: How We Can, Why We Must*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

GERT Committee. (2006), *General Education Review Task Force Report*, <https://www.wmich.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/u405/2016/GenEdReviewTFReport.pdf>.

Knauss, J. O. (1953). *The First Fifty Years: A History of Western Michigan College of Education*. Kalamazoo, MI: Western Michigan University.

Zakaria, F. (2015). *In Defense of a Liberal Education*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc.

Other General Education Programs Cited

Grand Valley State University: <http://www.gvsu.edu/gened/>.

Michigan State University: <http://undergrad.msu.edu/programs/learninggoals>.

Portland State University: <http://www.pdx.edu/unst/>.

Univ. of North Dakota/Grand Forks: <http://www.und.edu/academics/essential-studies>.

Univ. of Wisconsin/Oshkosh: <http://www.uwosh.edu/usp/about-the-usp>.

Appendix 1: Student Comments on General Education Program

The comments below come from the June 2015 meeting with the student orientation leaders. This meeting was the longest of the three with students (approximately an hour and a half) and also had the largest representation from the committee present. In the opinion of the Associate Provost, the thoughts and ideas mentioned in this June 2015 meeting represent some of the comments of both the self-selected honors students and the members of the Western Student Association.

The comments below are a summary of the meeting as noted by the Associate Provost and student committee member.

- When asked if they had any idea what the purpose of general education was when they started here at WMU, many students said “no.” The number of students who responded “no” to this question (less than half) appeared to be a smaller percentage than in the previous meetings with students where it was a decisive majority.
- All students stated that they felt their general education experience could have been better.
- The students expressed several positive aspects of the general education program. Among these were the notions that it developed well-rounded individuals (similar to some faculty comments), it allowed students to experience disciplines they hadn’t in high school and helped undecided students pick a major. One student noted that the capstone course in his major that had brought together the concepts of general education and the discipline specific knowledge of his major was a terrific learning experience.
- Several students expressed the idea that they learned more about skills such as leadership and critical thinking in experiences outside of their formal classes than they did in their classes. This led to the suggestion that there should be a mechanism where by experiential learning outside of class and in co-curricular activities could receive credit for general education. This currently can occur in study abroad, but the students were suggesting a much broader opportunity to do this that would include experiences here on campus and in the local area.
- When asked if they could describe at least one learning outcome of the general education program, not one student stated that they could. This may be related to comments expressed by some of the students in the Fall 2013 meetings that general education was simply a way for WMU to collect more money from them. If students can’t see the value in what they are doing, they are probably more likely to think it is a waste of time and money. One student suggested that all general education courses should provide, in the course description in the undergraduate catalog, a statement of what general education learning outcome(s) would be addressed in the course.
- Students stated that they appreciated and liked general education courses where the instructor purposefully asked them to reflect on how the information in that particular course related to their major, whatever that might be.

- All students admitted that during their time at WMU, they had heard at least one representative of the campus community say “get your gen eds out of the way.” They felt that this, along with the lack of understanding of the goals of the program, devalued their early college career.
- There was considerable interest in how the “Signature Project” for the Higher Learning Commission Quality Initiative fit into the general education discussion. They seemed to think this could be aligned with their desire to have experiences outside the classroom count for general education credit (see above).
- The students would like to see more experiential learning in the general education classes.
- Several students made the comment that general education courses were seen as a way to increase your GPA. When asked if this was a commonly held concept across all the colleges, the students indicated that it was. Students choose general education courses based upon which ones provide an easy A, and not on any consideration of the learning that occurs in those courses. This lead to an interesting suggestion that general education courses be graded upon a pass/fail basis so they would not artificially raise a student’s GPA.
- The students appeared to be interested in the idea that general education could be more outcomes-oriented than in the current system. They agreed that it would take a campus culture change to accomplish that goal and wondered what the general education committee was doing to affect that change.
- Students struggled with an issue that they said is also a point of disagreement with some faculty: Is it better to have more general education courses in their discipline, or better to take courses outside their major to be more well-rounded?

Appendix 2: Detailed descriptions of other institutions' general education reforms and programs

1. Portland State University

Portland State University initiated the nation-wide movement to reform general education. It has thus become the landmark institution for effective, top-to-bottom renovation of its common undergraduate curriculum. Indeed, its transformation has reached every aspect of its academic affairs, including extensive training, mentoring and instructional support of all teaching personnel. Its investments have paid off; PSU was named one of country's most innovative campuses, in a nation-wide survey of top-level university administrators. Among its outstanding features are two key innovations:

ReTHINK PSU, a push to help students stay on course and graduate sooner using innovative curriculum, community engagement and effective technology. Projects include creating a better math lab, new online mentoring, targeted academic advising, flexible degrees for returning adults and redesigned student services.

The Four-Year Degree Guarantee, a pledge that students who follow a degree path will graduate in four years — or they can finish for free.

As part of its curricular changes, PSU Senate established the university's Office of Academic Innovation, (<http://www.pdx.edu/oai/>), a center of holistic approaches to instructional technology, tactics, strategies, training and community.

The goals of its program are:

- Produce students who are effective communicators
- Provide students with the skills for inquiry and critical thinking
- Produce students who appreciate the diversity of the human experience
- Provide students with the skills to be ethical and socially responsible

It begins with a team-taught Freshman Inquiry seminar that not only engages students in critical questions, but also establishes the relationship – in practice – of knowledge partnered with skill-development. The second year features a sophomore version of the class, and a capstone concludes the sequence.

The Freshman Inquiry is a yearlong, theme-based course taken in the first year. This course is team-taught, and students are introduced to the goals of the program and the resources available to them at the university. In addition, students develop skills in writing, research, communication and computer technology as they learning how a topic can be covered by multiple disciplines in different ways. They are taught how to apply writing, quantitative literacy, speech, visual/graphic skills and technology skills to complex problems. The themes for the Freshman Inquiry include (<http://www.pdx.edu/unst/>):

- Design and Society
- Globalization
- Human/Nature

- Life Unlimited
- Portland
- Power and Imagination
- Race and Social Justice
- Sustainability
- Ways of Knowing
- The Work of Art

The course is taught by a team of faculty and student mentors. The faculty members typically teach the large class sessions and the mentors continue the discussions in smaller breakout groups. The courses concentrate on lifelong learning skills that help students think across disciplinary boundaries. Assessment is achieved through a portfolio system.

Students take the Sophomore Inquiry in their second year at PSU. These courses are thematic in nature and help students acquire research skills and key concepts that will help them in upper level courses. The themes are different from those covered in the first year and include:

- American Identities
- Community Studies
- Design Thinking/Innovation/Entrepreneurship
- Environmental Sustainability
- Families and Society
- Freedom, Privacy and Technology
- Gender and Sexuality Studies
- Global Environmental Change
- Global Perspectives
- Healthy People/Healthy Places
- Interpreting the Past
- Knowledge, Values and Rationality
- Leading Social Change
- Popular Culture
- Science in the Liberal Arts

A student must take one of these courses in each of the three trimesters of the sophomore year, hitting on three different themes. These courses, along with the Freshman Inquiry experience, are what ensure students meet the writing requirements of the university. It is expected that after the sophomore year, the University Studies program has prepared students for the critical thinking, research methods, communication skills and other basic skills that are necessary for the upper level courses both in the major and in the general education program. The enrollment caps for both the Freshman and Sophomore Inquiry courses are 37 students with breakout sessions of 12 – 14 students.

Students select one of the themes they investigated in the sophomore year to concentrate on in the junior year by choosing three courses in that theme from departments outside their major. The courses available for what is called the Upper Division Cluster are

different from the thematic courses provided for the Sophomore Inquiry. These Upper Division Cluster courses seem to be similar to what we currently have in our general education program Distribution Areas and could easily serve as courses in the various majors. Each course must be approved for a specific theme, with many approved for multiple themes.

The Capstone is completed in the senior year. This is meant to be the culminating experience and build cooperative learning communities. Instead of the capstone being part of the major, each capstone course at Portland State University is composed of students from different majors. Students are expected to work in groups on a community project and use the knowledge and skills they have developed in their academic career to solve real problems. The Senior Capstone courses are capped at 16 students.

It would take considerable resources to establish a program such as the one described above for Portland State University. The Freshman and Sophomore Inquiry courses would need to be developed and faculty trained to teach those courses. Junior and senior student mentors also would need to be trained and paid. This considerable expense would be partially offset by the fact that there would be no need for either our current First-Year Seminar course or the many sections of ENGL 1050 since the Freshman and Sophomore Inquiry classes are designed to provide students with this knowledge.

Even if the cost of a University Studies curriculum like that at Portland State may seem daunting, we can still gain some insight from this program. The University Studies programs at Wisconsin-Oshkosh and Portland State, along with the general education program at Grand Valley State University, have at least one major similarity. In all three cases, students are asked to use what they learn in the general education program to address or solve real problems/issues within society. We must ask ourselves if this is something we would desire in a revised general education program.

2. University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh

The University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh has the third highest undergraduate population of all the institutions in the Wisconsin system with slightly fewer than 13,000. Thus, even though it is not as complex or large as WMU, the general education program still must accommodate a relatively large number of students. This is the smallest of the institutions examined in this self-study, but has an innovative program that might prove useful for discussions here at WMU.

The University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh gave our committee its most extensive insight on not only the composition of a new general education program, but on the process of reform and the role in that reform played by senior leadership and financial resources. The description below comes from a small group conversation, conducted by Skype, in March of 2015.

Oshkosh undertook its reform at the behest of its senior leadership, who confessed in 2006 that no one on campus could explain the university's then 40-year old program, with over 700 courses at the 100-300 level. The process launched with conversation,

began in earnest with the summer of 2011 dedicated to “dreaming” and went live in 2013, after unanimous faculty senate approval. All phases of the reform received modest but important financial incentives and support from the Oshkosh provost. This included summer stipends and release time for the active research, undertaken in the summer of 2011. To develop the first round of new courses, faculty received stipends as well, and smaller stipends were offered for the second round of courses students would take. In total, Oshkosh spent close to \$450,000 in the overhaul, approving 257 new courses (with either a \$1,000 or \$500 stipend per course).

UW-Oshkosh implemented the new program in the fall of 2013. The institution does not call the program general education, but uses the term University Studies Program (USP) instead. The program consists of 41 credit hours.

The UW-Oshkosh has adopted the Association of American Colleges and Universities Essential Learning Outcomes (ELOs) with one major modification, the addition of a sustainability element. The ELOs as published on the UW-Oshkosh web site (<http://www.uwosh.edu/usp/about-the-usp>) are:

Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World

Through study in fine and performing arts, humanities, mathematics and science, and social science focused by engagement with big questions, both contemporary and enduring

Skills, Both Intellectual and Practical

- Identification and objective evaluation of theories and assumptions
- Critical and creative thinking
- Written and oral communication
- Quantitative literacy
- Technology and information literacy
- Teamwork, leadership and problem solving practiced extensively, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects and standards for performance

Responsibility, as Individuals and Communities

- Knowledge of Sustainability and Its Applications
- Civic Learning—local and global
- Intercultural Knowledge and Competence
- Ethical reasoning and action
- Foundations and skills for lifelong learning developed through real-world challenges and active involvement with diverse communities

Learning: Integrated, Synthesized and Advanced

Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems.

The program consists of:

- One freshman English composition course
- One freshman oral communications course
- One mathematics course (Quest or Explore course)
- Two laboratory science courses (Quest or Explore courses)
- Three culture courses from at least two different departments (Quest or Explore courses)
- Three society courses from at least two different departments (Quest or Explore courses)
- One ethnic studies or non-western culture course (Quest or Explore course)
- One advanced writing course (Connect course)

The innovation of this program is not the list of courses students must take, but the manner in which the requirements are met. The program is divided into Quests and Explore courses. Each student must take three Quests. Quest I is taken in the first semester of the freshman year and contains both discipline specific content and elements of a First-Year Experience course. The course begins by explaining to students the benefits of a liberal education and why it is important for them to take the USP courses, as well as introducing them to the campus and the resources that are available for their success. The remainder of the course then contains discipline specific content.

Quest II is taken in the second semester of the freshman year. The purpose of the courses in this Quest is to introduce students to ethical reasoning through a discipline specific course.

Quest III is taken in the sophomore year. This Quest course requires the students to have a community experience.

The Quests also serve a second role in the USP. There are three Signature Questions that Quest courses address, each course concentrating on only one of the questions. These Signature Questions are:

- Sustainability
- Civic Learning
- Intercultural Knowledge and Competence

Each Quest course the student takes must deal with a different signature question to ensure that the student has a classroom experience in each one. An example of how a student might progress through the Quest sequence is provided below.

First Semester of Freshman Year (Quest I):

The student takes Communication 275 – Arguing Sustainability. This specially crafted course has the initial elements of a First-Year Experience course and then covers the majority of discipline specific content that a non-Quest I course would cover. This course counts as one of the three culture courses the student is required to take and satisfies the Sustainability Signature Question

Second Semester of the Freshman Year (Quest II):

The student takes English 210 – Classical and Medieval Literature. Since this is Quest II, the course must focus to some degree on ethical reasoning. This course also satisfies the second of the three Signature Questions (Civic Learning) as well as counting for the students second of three culture courses.

First or Second Semester Sophomore Year (Quest III):

The student takes Women and Gender Studies 204 – Global Perspectives on Women. Since this is a Quest III course, it must contain a community experience. This course also satisfies the final Signature Question (Intercultural Knowledge and Competence) and completes one of the three society courses.

In the example above, the student has credit for two of the three culture courses and one of the three society courses by virtue of the courses they took to satisfy the three Quests. To satisfy most of the remaining USP requirements, the student will take Explore courses. In general, these are courses that address one of the requirements of the program, but do not qualify as a Quest course. The list of Explore courses and Quest courses are almost totally exclusive of each other.

The final course of the USP is the Connect or advanced writing course. This course is taken after the Quest sequence is complete. It is designed as a type of capstone course that is intended to bring the students Quest and Explore experience together in an integrated fashion.

The WMU ad hoc general education committee has had conversations with the USP director at the UW-Oshkosh. Implementation of this particular program required a great deal of faculty development resources (time and money). The largest time commitment was taken in developing the Quest I courses. Faculty teaching these courses had to be advised on how to integrate the needed elements of a First-Year Experience course into the course that they had taught in the past. Every faculty member who developed a course for this Quest was provided a stipend to revise their course to fit the requirement of Quest I courses.

3. University of North Dakota, Grand Forks

The University of North Dakota, Grand Forks has been designated as one of our peer institutions, and as such, we may be able to learn something about how we can revise our general education program by looking at theirs. The University of North Dakota's award-winning general education program is called Essential Studies and was implemented beginning in the Fall of 2008. The program consists of 39 credit hours and is built on three levels: Special Emphasis, Breadth of Knowledge and a Capstone course. The University of North Dakota web site (<http://www.und.edu/academics/essential-studies>) lists four goals for the Essential Studies program. These include:

- Thinking and Reasoning
- Communication
- Information Literacy
- Diversity

The Special Emphasis level of the Essential Studies (ES) program requires students to take three credit hours of course work in four different areas. The areas include Advanced Communication, Quantitative Reasoning, Global Diversity and United States Diversity.

The Breadth of Knowledge level is divided into four areas also. A student must take 9 credit hours in each of the areas.

- *Communication*: Students are required to take Engl. 110 and Engl. 130 and then a third course designated as an oral communication course. The Advanced Communication course described above in Special Emphasis is in addition to these three courses.
- *Social Sciences*: The three courses taken in this area must be from at least 2 different departments.
- *Fine Arts and Humanities*: The three courses in this area must also be from at least two different departments, and there must be at least one course from Fine Arts and one course from the Humanities. Students cannot satisfy this requirement by taking three Fine Arts courses or three Humanities courses.
- *Mathematics, Science and Technology*: The courses taken in this area must also be from a minimum of two different departments and must include one 4 credit hour course with a lab.

The entire program is based upon the fact that many courses can count for both the Special Emphasis and the Breadth of Knowledge levels. For example, Anth 100 – Introduction to Anthropology is approved for the Global Diversity Special Emphasis and as a Social Science course in the Breadth of Knowledge level. Thus, a student who successfully completes this course will satisfy the 3 credit hours required in Global Diversity (Special Emphasis level) and get credit for 3 hours towards the social science requirement of the Breadth of Knowledge level. Many courses that satisfy one area of the Breadth of Knowledge level do not count for any credit towards the Special Emphasis level (can't be double counted). Thus, the student, along with the academic advisor, must be strategic when selecting courses. Courses that can be double counted in both the Special Emphasis and Breadth of Knowledge levels are clearly marked in the catalog and the Essential Studies web pages.

The third level is the three credit-hour Capstone course. This course must be taken within the last three semesters prior to graduation. Many of these courses are found within the major, but there are also interdisciplinary capstone courses that can be taken by any student.

4. Michigan State University

Michigan State University currently has an interdisciplinary distribution model of general education that is similar to the general education program here at WMU. The innovation comes in the fact that they have established Undergraduate Learning Goals (ULGs) that all academic and student affairs units are expected to align with in their programming. No single unit at Michigan State is expected to align with all five areas, but most do. It is the expectation that all graduating MSU undergraduates will reach an established level of proficiency in each area due to their educational experience. The concept of university-

wide learning objectives is consistent with the starting point Paul Gaston suggested during his March 2015 visit.

The ULGs at Michigan State for all graduating students are (<http://undergrad.msu.edu/programs/learninggoals>):

- Analytical Thinking – The MSU graduate uses ways of knowing from mathematics, natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, and arts to access information and critically analyzes complex material in order to evaluate evidence, construct reasoned arguments, and communicate inferences and conclusions.
- Cultural Understanding – The MSU graduate comprehends global and cultural diversity with historical, artistic, and societal contexts.
- Effective Citizenship – The MSU graduate participates as a member of local, national, and global communities and has the capacity to lead in an increasingly interdependent world.
- Effective Communication – The MSU graduate uses a variety of media to communicate effectively with diverse audiences.
- Integrated Reasoning – The MSU graduate integrates discipline-based knowledge to make informed decisions that reflect humane, social, ethical and aesthetic values.

Rubrics have been developed for each of the five areas. These rubrics measure 2 – 4 dimensions of each of these five learning outcomes on a scale of emerging, developing, proficient and exemplary. The goal is to get most students into the proficient or exemplary designation by the time they graduate. The rubrics also help units map curriculum and programs to the ULGs and establish a system for assessing student progress. The administration works with departments and faculty to align their departmental and course outcomes to the established university outcomes.

The university has begun to embed these ULGs into the processes and functions of the university. For example, all changes to curriculum or development of study abroad programs must show how they link to the ULGs. Some of the colleges have gone so far as to link funding and faculty requests to the ULGs. These types of intentional actions help the university build a common goal with respect to learning outcomes for all undergraduate students.

Finally, development and use of the ULGs has spurred the conversation of general education reform at MSU. One can easily see how the established goals could evolve into a program that would assure that all students would have the opportunity to reach proficiency in all five areas.

5. Grand Valley State University

Grand Valley State University implemented a new general education program in the fall of 2014 that requires 13 courses. The program integrates three knowledge goals with nine skills goals by requiring that all general education courses address both knowledge and skills learning outcomes (see handbook at <http://www.gvsu.edu/gened/>).

The knowledge goals include:

- The major areas of human investigation and accomplishment – the arts, the humanities, the mathematical sciences, the natural sciences and the social sciences (Foundations).
- An understanding of one's own culture and the culture of others (Cultures).
- An understanding of how academic study connects to world issues (Issues).

The first knowledge goal is accomplished by a series of courses in the Foundations category. Students are required to take one course in the physical sciences, one in the natural sciences, one basic writing course, one course in the arts, one course in philosophy and literature, one course in mathematical sciences, two courses from two different disciplines in the social and behavioral sciences and one course with historical perspectives. At least one of the courses in either the physical sciences area or the natural sciences area must have a laboratory section associated with it.

The second knowledge goal is achieved through a group of courses in the Cultures category. Students are required to take one course in world perspectives and one course in U.S. diversity.

Finally, the third knowledge goal is achieved by courses in the Issues category. There are eight areas within the issues category that include: globalization, health, human rights, identity, sustainability, study abroad and information, innovation and technology. A student must take two courses in this category and the courses must be from 2 different disciplines. The student can choose to take both courses in the same Issue, or two courses in different Issues. Students can only take these upper level courses once they have attained junior status or beyond.

Each of the areas within the Foundations, Cultures and Issues categories has specific learning outcomes that are assessed. For example, the learning outcomes for philosophy and literature are:

- Philosophy or literature as a “way of knowing,” including an examination of principles and questions that define the field and its contributions to human knowledge and civilization
- The relationship between the works discussed, the cultures in which they were created, and the human concerns they illuminate
- Critical analysis and interpretation of one or more primary texts as a major portion of course content

The second part of the general education program involves skills goals. The nine skills goals include:

- Collaboration
- Critical and Creative Thinking
- Ethical Reasoning
- Information Literacy
- Integration of Knowledge

- Oral Communication
- Problem Solving
- Quantitative Literacy
- Written Communication

These skills are included in the courses listed in the Foundations, Cultures and Issues categories mentioned previously. For example, courses in philosophy and literature must contain learning outcomes in either written communication or information literacy and in either oral communication or ethical reasoning. These learning outcomes are in addition to the three knowledge outcomes listed above. Thus, a course in the philosophy and literature area would have three general education knowledge-learning outcomes and two general education skills learning outcomes. The skills learning outcomes are assessed using modifications of the VALUE rubrics from the Association of American Colleges and Universities.

The only category in which courses do not have any options with regard to the skills goals are those courses in Issues. All courses in this category must address the Collaboration, Problem Solving and Integration of Knowledge skills goals. Courses in the Issues category are the only courses that deal with the Integration of Knowledge goal. The other eight skills goals are fairly equally divided among the Foundation category courses and the Culture category courses.

Appendix 3: Data on WMU's Current General Education Program

I. Number of Approved Courses:

The number of courses approved for general education for the 2015 – 2016 academic year by proficiency and distribution area:

Proficiency Courses:

- Proficiency 1: College-level Writing – 3 courses
- Proficiency 2: Baccalaureate-level Writing – 109 courses
- Proficiency 3: College-level Mathematics or Quantitative Reasoning – 9 courses
- Proficiency 4a: Advanced Writing – 2 courses
- Proficiency 4b: Mathematics or Quantitative Reasoning – 7 courses
- Proficiency 4c: Critical Thinking – 8 courses
- Proficiency 4d: Oral Communications – 4 courses
- Proficiency 4e: American Sign Language - 4 courses
- Proficiency 4f: Computer Science – 3 courses
- Proficiency 4g: Foreign Languages – All foreign language courses count

Total Number of Proficiency Courses = 148

(This "Total Number of Proficiency Courses" takes into account that MATH 2000 is listed in both Proficiency 3 and 4b and does not include all the foreign language courses.)

Distribution Area Courses:

- Distribution Area I: Fine Arts – 25 courses
- Distribution Area II: Humanities – 56 courses
- Distribution Area III: The United States: Cultures and Issues – 50 courses
- Distribution Area IV: Other Cultures and Civilizations – 55 courses
- Distribution Area V: Social and Behavioral Sciences – 46 courses
- Distribution Area VI: Natural Science with a Lab – 18 courses (lecture and associated lab counted as one course)
- Distribution Area VII: Natural Science and Technology: Applications and Implications – 38 courses
- Distribution Area VIII: Health and Well-being – 17 courses

Total Number of Distribution Area Courses = 299

(This "Total Number of Distribution Area Courses" takes into account that both INTL 3300 and INTL 3310 are both included in areas I, II, IV and V.)

Combined Total Number of Individual General Education Courses = 447
--

<i>(Does not count all the foreign language courses.)</i>

II. Current Investment in General Education by College:

The Distribution Areas:

Distribution Area I: Fine Arts

[The College of Fine Arts has 67% of the sections, 75% of enrollment]

In Area 1/Fine Arts, about two-thirds of all sections are taught in the College of Fine Arts (CFA) and the remaining third taught in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). However, roughly 75% of all enrolled students are enrolled in courses taught in Fine Arts. In Fine Arts, part-time instructors cover about 20% of the sections and enrollment, about 25% of the sections (but only 20% of enrollment) are covered by tenure-track professors, and tenured professors teach the remaining sections and enrollment.

Distribution Area II: Humanities

[College of Arts and Sciences has 97% of the sections, 98% of enrollment]

In Area 2/Humanities, all but 2 courses are taught in the CAS (remainder are taught in the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS)). Between one-third and two-fifths of the CAS sections and enrollment are shouldered by part-time instructors, with roughly the same proportion of sections and enrollment by tenured professors. In a typical semester, part-time instructors teach more sections but fewer total students than tenured professors do. The remainder (about 1/5 of sections with 1/6 of enrolled students) are taught by GTAs.

Distribution Area III: The United States: Cultures and Issues

[College of Arts and Sciences has 88% of the sections, 91% of enrollment]

Almost all the courses in Area 3/U.S. Cultures, are taught in the CAS. In a typical semester, of the 60 or so sections offered, approximately three are offered in the CFA and approximately four are offered in the CHHS. In the CAS, graduate assistants teach about a sixth of all sections and teach about a sixth of all enrolled students. Part-time instructors typically teach just more than a quarter of the sections and just less than a quarter of the enrolled students. Almost all of the remaining sections (just less than half) and all the remaining enrolled students (a bit more than half) are taught by tenured professors.

Distribution Area IV: Other Cultures and Civilizations

[College of Arts and Sciences has 70% of the sections, 82% of enrollment]

Most of the sections taught in Area 4/Other Cultures and Civilizations, that are not taught in the CAS, are taught in the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD) (about 23% of sections and 13% of enrollment), the remaining few are taught in the CFA. In the CAS, graduate assistants, and non-tenure track and tenure track professors each teach about 7% of sections and 6% of enrolled students (the three groups together teach about 22% of sections and 16% of enrolled students). Part-time instructors teach about 31% of sections and 29% of enrolled students. Tenured professors teach about 47% of sections and 55% of enrolled students.

Distribution Area V: Social and Behavioral Sciences

[College of Arts and Sciences has 70% of the sections, 83% of enrollment]

Courses in Area 5, Social and Behavioral Sciences, are distributed among many colleges. About 27% of sections are taught in the Haworth College of Business (HCoB), though these cover only about 15% of enrolled students. In the HCoB, just over 50% of sections and enrollment are taught by part-time instructors. Almost all the rest are evenly divided between non-tenure track and tenured professors. Both the CEHD and the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences (CEAS) offer one course every term, and the total number of enrolled students is around 50 in the CEHD and 20 in the CEAS. In the CAS, about a quarter of sections and a fifth of enrolled students are taught by part-time instructors. Graduate assistants teach a bit more than a quarter of sections and a bit more than a quarter of enrolled students. Tenured professors teach about a third of the sections and nearly 40% of enrolled students. The rest of the sections and enrolled students are taught by a variety of other instructor types.

Distribution Area VI: Natural Science with Lab

[College of Arts and Sciences has 100% of "Lecture & Separate Lab" format]

[College of Arts and Sciences has 71% of "Lecture & Integrated Lab" format]

Perhaps the most difficult area to summarize is Area 6, Natural Sciences. This area has a variety of lecture and lab courses. The lecture courses with associated but separate lab courses are all taught in CAS. Courses in which the labs are not separated out as distinct courses are taught mostly in the CAS, but some are taught in the CEAS and the CHHS. In the CAS, a bit more than half the lecture sections and half the enrolled students are in courses taught by tenured professors. More than a third of the lecture sections, and about 40% of the enrolled students, are in courses taught by part-time instructors. The remainder is split among many other instructor types. About 60% of the labs (both sections and enrolled students) are taught by graduate assistants. In Biology, the instructor of record is a staff member for most of the sections. This accounts for the vast majority of the lab sections not taught by graduate assistants.

Distribution Area VII: Natural Science/Technology: Applications-Implications

[College of Arts and Sciences 69% of sections, 75% of enrollment]

Of the nearly 30% of sections taught in Area 7, Natural Science and Technology, that are not taught in the CAS, half are taught in the CHHS and half in the CEAS (recently, the College of Aviation (CoA) has added one-to-three sections). Those sections in the CHHS and the CEAS cover about 22% of the enrolled students. Of those taught in the CAS, part-time instructors teach about 40% of the sections and 45% of enrolled students. The number of sections taught by graduate students is on the rise, and in 2013-2014 this amounted to about 20% of sections. The percentage of enrolled students taught by graduate students remains low at about 10%. About a third of all sections and enrolled students are taught by tenured professors, though tenured professors have tended to teach fewer sections in Spring terms than Fall terms.

Distribution Area VIII: Health and Well-being

[College of Education and Human Development has 62% of the sections, 25% of enrollment; College of Health and Human Services has 38% of the sections, 75% of enrollment]

Except for the rare course taught in the Honors College, all Area 8, Health and Well-Being, courses are taught in either the CEHD or the CHHS. The CEHD offers nearly two-thirds of the total sections but enrolls only a quarter of the students. In the CEHD, almost 90% of sections and 80% of enrolled students are in courses taught by tenured professors (almost all the rest are taught by part-time instructors). In the CHHS, where the vast majority of students are enrolled, more than 70% of sections and about 80% of enrolled students are in courses taught by part-time instructors. Graduate assistants teach almost all the rest of the courses in the CHHS.

The Proficiencies:

Proficiency 1: College-level Writing

[College of Arts and Sciences 80%]

In the CAS, P1 is handled almost exclusively by GTAs and part-time instructors. Their respective shares have varied between about 35% and 65% in any given year, but between the two groups, they almost always account for more than 99% of the courses taught (both in terms of sections and enrollment). In the CEAS, part-time instructors carry between a third and half the load, and graduate students do not teach in P1. In the HCoB, part-timers carried about 10% of the load until 2011. After that year, students in the HCoB began enrolling in ENGL 1050 to satisfy P1. In the CEAS, the majority of sections and students taught fall to some combination of non-tenure track and tenure track instructors.

Proficiency 2: Baccalaureate-level Writing

[College of Arts and Sciences 43%]

Since every department with an academic program is required to have at least one baccalaureate-level writing course, this proficiency is split among all the colleges. About 40% of P2 courses are taught in the CAS. In the last few years, the CAS has handled 43% of sections and 42% of enrollment for P2. In that college, two-thirds of the courses have been taught by tenured professors, tenure-track professors have shouldered about 12%, part-timers about 10%, with most of the rest going to staff (until the most recent year when most went to GTAs, and some went to non-tenure-track instructors). The CEHD, the CEAS and the HCoB each handle about 13% of the sections of P2, with the HCoB having the highest enrollment of the three and the CEAS having the lowest. The CoA and the CFA each account for about 5% of both sections and enrollment in P2. Over all the colleges, 58% of P2 sections and enrollment are taught by tenured professors, 22% by part-timers, and 13% by tenure-track professors.

Proficiency 3: College-level Mathematics or Quantitative Reasoning**[College of Arts and Sciences 100%]**

P3 is tremendously varied with regard to instructor type. Non-tenure track professors shoulder the greatest burden with almost a third of all sections and significantly more than half of all students.

Proficiency 4a: Advance Writing**[College of Arts and Sciences 100%]**

This proficiency category is an outlier with one or two sections each semester with about 15 students per section. Since 2006, it has been taught by non-GTA, non-staff instructors of a variety of types.

Proficiency 4b: Mathematics or Quantitative Reasoning**[College of Arts and Sciences 100%]**

Historically, graduate assistants handle more than 40% (very often roughly 45%) of the sections and about the same percentage of enrollment in P4B. Usually, non-tenure track and tenured professors handle about 20% each of sections and enrollment. There is enough variation that part-timers usually have about 10% each of sections and enrollment as well. The most recent year saw a dramatic drop in sections and enrollment for graduate instructors and a corresponding increase for tenured professors.

Proficiency 4c: Critical Thinking**[College of Arts and Sciences 96%, College of Health and Human Services 4%]**

There are about two dozen sections a semester offered in the CAS, and between a third and a half of those are usually taught by part-timers and another third-to-half are taught by graduate assistants. A tenured professor almost always teaches the remainder. The enrollment percentages do not correspond to the sections. Usually, fewer than a quarter of all the enrolled students are in a course taught by a part-time instructor or a graduate assistant, and roughly half are in a course taught by a tenured professor or a non-tenure track professor (in the previous four years, two of the 24 courses every term have been taught by a non-tenure track professor who usually taught very large sections).

Proficiency 4d: Oral Communication**[College of Arts and Sciences 99%, College of Health and Human Services 1%]**

The total number of sections taught is usually around 15 and the total number enrolled is usually around 600. Part-time instructors usually teach somewhere between 7 and 10 of the courses, with the remainder divided among tenured professors and graduate assistants. Usually a third to a half of all the enrolled students are in a course taught by a part-time instructor and between 40% and 65% of all enrolled students are in a course taught by a tenured professor.

Proficiency 4f: Computer Science**[College of Engineering & Applied Science 94%, College of Fine Arts 6%]**

Until last year, the CEAS exclusively taught this. There is now one course taught in the CFA, and a tenured professor teaches it. In the CEAS, about 75% of the sections

and 80% of the students are in courses taught by tenured professors, part-time instructors teach most of the remainder. In some previous years, however, non-tenure track, tenure track and graduate students have taught a course (usually only one and usually with low enrollment). The courses taught by tenured professors tend to have an average of about 30 students and those with part-time instructors an average of about 22 students.

Proficiency 4g: Foreign Language

[College of Arts and Sciences 100%]

Typically, about 1800 students have been enrolled in about 100 courses. Lately, those numbers have dropped. In a typical semester, both the number of sections and the number of students were divided nearly equally among part-time instructors, tenured professors and graduate assistants. In the last two years, the number of students enrolled in the sections taught by tenured professors has dropped considerably. In the last year, the number of students enrolled in a section taught by part-timers has also dropped considerably. The number of sections and students per section in courses taught by graduate assistants has dropped slightly.

III. General Education Offerings by Day and Time:

What follows are a few very broad observations about the favored/avoided times and days:

- Courses that start at 2:00 PM and noon are by far the most popular during the academic year. *This is true regardless of appointment type.* Of those, 53% are T/R courses and 42% are M/W courses (the rest include Friday courses).
- Except for 2:00 PM, afternoon classes are strongly avoided.
- A small proportion of courses start at 8:00 AM (4% in fall, 5% in spring).
- There are more evening courses than early morning courses, but these are less popular than courses offered in the middle of the day (10% in fall, 9% in spring).

In both the fall and spring, more than 30% of all courses have a start time of either 2:00 PM or noon (about 31.5% in the fall and 32.5% in the spring). Just over a third of all courses start at 9:00 AM, 10:00 AM, or 11:00 AM. Of the remaining courses, more have evening (5:00 PM or later) start times than any specific other start time. Classes starting at 1:00, 3:00, and 4:00 in the afternoon, or 8:00 in the morning are tremendously unpopular (the most popular was 4:00 PM in the spring at 8.1%).

In the summer, by contrast, a quarter of courses start at 9:00 AM, more than 20% start at noon, and 13% start at 10:00 AM; those three start times comprise 60% of all summer courses. Half of the rest start at 1:00 PM or 2:00 PM, and most of those remaining are evening courses. Afternoon courses are even more unpopular in the summer than the rest of the year.

These time preferences suggest that meetings (both within and across departments, units and areas), grading, research and office hours are common activities from roughly noon

until the typical close of the business day at 5:00 PM, except for the twice-weekly 2:00 PM course.

The outlier, not including weekends, and only counting main campus, is Friday. Though 2:00 PM is consistently the favorite Monday through Thursday, it is exceedingly unpopular on Fridays. And, while evening courses tend to be popular on the other weekdays, there are virtually no courses taught on Friday evening (which is not surprising). The percentages that follow are the percentage of Friday courses compared to Monday-through-Thursday courses at that same time slot.

10:00 AM	14.1% (304/2158)
11:00 AM	10.7% (210/1966)
9:00 AM	9.6% (232/2429)
12:00 PM	6.6% (175/2650)
2:00 PM	3.9% (128/3278)
Evening	0.2% (3/1802)

The course scheduling matrices probably have a significant influence on the choices made by instructors and departments about the times and days chosen for courses.

IV. Enrollment Data for WMU's Current General Education Courses:

In order to have some understanding of the class sizes within our general education program, data for six semesters (fall 2011 – spring 2014) were examined (see table below). Both the mean enrollment and the median enrollment for each area (A) or proficiency (P) were determined. In addition, the standard deviation of the enrollment in the sections was calculated to provide some indication of the variation in class size within the area or proficiency. The column A6 w/lab refers to courses in Area VI – Natural Sciences with Lab where the lab is not broken out from the lecture (one CRN for both the lecture and lab). P3&4B refers to Math 2000 that is listed in both Proficiency 3 – College-Level Mathematics or Quantitative Reasoning and Proficiency 4b – Mathematics or Quantitative Reasoning.

Mean, Median and Standard Deviation of Enrollment, and Number of Sections Fall '11 - Spring '14

Area/Prof	Fall 11				Spring 12				Fall 12			
	Mean	Median	St. Dev.	Sections	Mean	Median	St. Dev.	Sections	Mean	Median	St. Dev.	Sections
A1	77.81	45.0	72.30	37	81.90	49.0	65.61	31	66.08	39.0	62.08	37
A2	37.93	27.0	23.41	72	36.12	26.0	24.39	76	33.93	26.0	25.56	70
A3	46.43	42.0	31.18	61	46.78	40.0	32.61	51	45.45	39.0	26.94	60
A4	57.42	44.0	53.41	54	57.79	39.0	52.07	47	49.95	35.0	43.78	60
A5	65.97	38.0	58.17	88	61.66	45.0	47.54	81	60.71	36.0	53.76	92
A6 - lab	19.09	19.0	2.07	76	22.38	23.0	5.81	52	18.84	19.0	2.04	69
A6 w/lab	20.22	18.0	5.77	37	21.69	19.0	23.44	42	19.00	18.0	5.79	37
A6 Lec	121.82	120.0	60.90	17	120.75	83.0	57.79	12	104.11	69.0	64.92	19
A7	66.30	52.5	50.96	44	65.83	53.0	56.25	41	57.63	49.0	50.12	48
A8	51.87	33.0	57.60	54	50.66	24.0	58.66	53	49.36	30.0	52.69	57
P1	20.84	22.0	3.42	88	23.56	25.0	2.95	54	25.10	20.0	51.23	91
P2	21.76	22.5	10.67	118	21.70	21.0	10.54	117	20.70	21.0	10.36	123
P3	84.35	53.5	67.04	26	89.72	48.0	70.73	18	85.45	59.0	63.95	22
P4A	18.00	18.0	NA	1	16.00	16.0	NA	1	20.00	20.0	NA	1
P4B	29.13	27.0	6.83	31	26.27	27.0	3.67	33	27.10	25.0	8.48	31
P4C	44.86	25.0	52.03	21	33.67	25.0	26.66	27	37.78	24.0	37.92	27
P4D	46.42	30.0	41.94	12	40.69	29.5	33.00	16	53.23	28.0	52.25	13
P4F	26.11	24.0	12.31	9	25.60	26.0	0.55	5	24.78	23.0	9.07	9
P4G	19.60	20.0	5.59	99	18.27	18.0	6.17	97	17.66	19.0	6.32	105
P3&4B	171.00	171.0	NA	1	125.00	125.0	NA	1	159.00	159.0	NA	1

Area/Prof	Spring 13				Fall 13				Spring 14			
	Mean	Median	St. Dev.	Sections	Mean	Median	St. Dev.	Sections	Mean	Median	St. Dev.	Sections
A1	64.67	48.0	52.57	33	60.33	24.0	59.77	35	55.92	30.0	52.01	37
A2	38.45	28.5	27.08	68	24.58	23.5	7.35	70	33.84	27.0	20.09	75
A3	46.87	44.0	26.67	52	38.50	25.5	25.86	68	43.56	41.5	19.83	52
A4	53.38	40.0	38.79	52	75.63	37.5	68.65	58	46.96	29.0	36.10	57
A5	64.94	43.0	52.06	77	53.36	36.0	53.31	79	59.36	41.0	46.44	76
A6 - lab	21.86	22.0	1.47	49	22.33	23.0	3.09	66	20.04	20.0	1.88	49
A6 w/lab	22.66	17.0	23.92	40	15.66	13.0	8.61	36	18.97	19.0	7.00	37
A6 Lec	116.91	92.0	53.86	11	114.94	100.0	63.69	17	109.91	96.0	42.05	11
A7	57.71	44.5	50.69	42	53.65	40.0	46.45	47	49.95	31.0	38.30	42
A8	49.42	22.0	59.19	52	34.35	23.0	43.85	57	45.34	20.0	52.42	53
P1	22.33	22.0	2.24	52	21.59	22.0	0.98	85	22.00	22.0	1.23	55
P2	20.50	20.0	11.37	112	21.54	21.0	9.59	124	21.49	23.0	10.28	123
P3	74.26	61.0	62.29	23	76.40	60.0	55.16	25	64.81	43.0	62.92	26
P4A	19.50	19.5	0.71	2	14.00	14.0	8.49	2	20.50	20.5	0.71	2
P4B	29.64	27.0	7.17	28	28.44	29.0	7.49	31	36.90	28.0	35.66	29
P4C	40.32	25.0	38.16	22	33.80	24.0	33.77	25	37.23	25.0	36.81	22
P4D	40.63	28.0	37.87	19	43.44	27.0	41.36	16	42.67	27.5	41.14	18
P4F	21.57	23.0	4.16	7	24.89	22.0	10.34	9	23.67	24.0	1.03	6
P4G	18.28	18.0	6.76	91	17.53	18.0	6.76	96	17.26	18.0	6.35	81
P3&4B	133.00	133.0	NA	1	170.00	170.0	NA	1	60.00	60.0	83.44	2

A quick review of the data appears to show that our students have the potential for small class experiences in our current program. For example, the median class size for Area II – Humanities ranges between 23.5 and 28.5 for this 6-semester period. Many of the other areas have a median in the range of 40 students per class. The significant outlier is the lecture portion of the Area VI – Natural Science with Lab courses where the median class size can be over 100. These courses, however, have a laboratory component associated with them where the median class size ranges from 19 – 23. Thus, these large classes have the opportunity for more individual student attention within the lab experience. It should also be noted that over the past 10 years, general education course enrollments have trended down as our total enrollment of undergraduates has decreased (down 13.4%) and the number of courses has increased slightly (up 7.6%).

In many cases, the mean and median of the number of enrolled students in an area are very different, meaning that within the area, there is a wide variety in class sizes experience by our students. In some cases, this might be because in one college the sections have low enrollments and in another college the sections have high enrollments; in some cases it might be because within one college, some departments have much higher or lower enrollments per section than in another department. The Areas and

Proficiencies with the greatest differences between mean and median enrollments are Area I (29), Proficiency 3 (25), Area VIII (22), Area V (21) and Area VI-Lecture (21). The Areas and Proficiencies with the least differences between mean and median (not including those rare cases where the mean and median are identical because the total number of sections is 1) are Proficiency 2 (0.22), Area VI-Lab (0.24), Proficiency 4g (0.40), and Proficiency 4f (0.77). In these cases of very low differences between mean and median, it appears the sections are almost exclusively within the same college.

Very broadly speaking, there are more sections covering Proficiency 2 – Baccalaureate-Level Writing, than any other Proficiency or Area (the average number of sections for Proficiency 2 in the past six semesters is 119.5). Not far behind is Proficiency 4g – Foreign Languages, with an average of 95 sections per semester. Other Areas or Proficiencies with many sections include: Area V – Social and Behavioral Sciences (82), Area II – Humanities (72), Proficiency 1 – College-Level Writing (71), and Area VI (Lab Sections) – Natural Science with Lab (60). The least number of sections is in Proficiency 4a – Advanced Writing (1.5). Other Areas or Proficiencies with few sections include: Proficiency 4f – Computer Science (8) and Area VI (Lecture Sections) – Natural Science with Lab (15).

The Areas and Proficiencies with extremely low (relatively speaking) standard deviations (when considering enrollment numbers) are Area VI (Lab Sections) – Natural Science with Lab (2.73), Proficiency 4a – Advanced Writing (3.3), Proficiency 4f – Computer Science (6.2) and Proficiency 4g – Foreign Languages (6.3). These relatively low standard deviations indicate that the number of students per semester has remained stable and that there is very little variation from section to section in number of students. There are many Areas or Proficiencies with standard deviations that are larger than the mean or larger than the median indicating tremendous variability in the number of students per section in any given class (for instance, there are courses with some sections of over 200 students and other sections of fewer than 10 students). The Areas and Proficiencies with the most extreme standard deviations are Proficiency 3 – College-Level Mathematics or Quantitative Reasoning (64), Area I – Fine Arts (61), Area VIII Health and Well-being (54) and Area V – Social and Behavioral Sciences (52).

V. Current Data on Instructor Designation within General Education:

All the data and summaries of that data below consider the average of the last three years. All percentages are rounded to the nearest percent and so some grouped data will round to a number not exactly 100%. Someone who does not meet any of these designations teaches a handful of courses, compared to the totals. As a percentage, this entire group amounts to significantly less than 1%. In the table, “Enroll” signifies percentage of total enrollment and “Sects” signifies percentage of total sections. The data is presented in order of enrollment, tenured professors as a group teach more enrolled students than any other group, part-time instructors as a group teach the second-most number of enrolled students, and so on.

	Summer I		Fall		Spring		Summer II	
	<i>Enroll</i>	<i>Sections</i>	<i>Enroll</i>	<i>Sections</i>	<i>Enroll</i>	<i>Sections</i>	<i>Enroll</i>	<i>Sections</i>
<i>Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors</i>	51%	57%	46%	82%	45%	82%	61%	56%
<i>Part-time Instructors</i>	31%	26%	24%	8%	23%	7%	19%	17%
<i>Graduate Assistants</i>	12%	13%	20%	8%	22%	8%	13%	20%
<i>Non-Tenure Track Professors</i>	5%	3%	5%	1%	7%	1%	6%	6%
<i>Staff</i>	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
Totals	100%	100%	97%	100%	99%	99%	100%	100%

Note that part-time instructors, graduate assistants, and non-tenure track professors have disproportionately higher ratios of enrollment to sections in the fall and spring, and that tenure-track professors have disproportionately lower ratios of enrollment to sections in the fall and spring. Only tenured professors and staff have an apparent balance between the percentage of enrolled courses and sections of courses compared to the entire group. This suggests that many (perhaps more than half) of the exceptionally large courses are being taught by contingent faculty and that many (probably the majority) of very small courses are being taught by tenured faculty.

This aggregated data misses many of the finer-resolution points: many part-time instructors and graduate students, for instance, teach courses with 20 students; and many full professors teach courses with 200 students. The comparisons here are by group and not by instructor. Also, there are areas and proficiencies that deviate from the averages, and there are departments and colleges that deviate from the averages.

Appendix 4: Opportunities and Challenges

I. Opportunities

A. LOCAL TALENT

A number of faculty and instructors have already retooled their general education courses to convey content (knowledge) through skills' development and practice. Such instructors can offer valuable guidance on their experience, and serve as the leading edge innovators on whom others can model their own efforts. The Design Team, in tandem with an invigorated Office of Faculty Development, could initiate a talent search to identify and develop ways to broadcast the strategies and techniques of faculty innovators.

B. SIGNATURE AND OTHER WMU INITIATIVES

Building on the work of existing student success initiatives will be a critical feature of the successful construction of a new general education program and a smooth transition into its operation. Collaborating with and drawing on the expertise of Broncos First and other programs should be a starting point for understanding what our students need and what currently hinders their success.

C. ALIGNING WITH THE UNIVERSITY MISSION, VISION, STRATEGIC PLAN

The Gold Standard 2020 will be in place when the Design Team begins its work. The Team will, thus, be able to leverage its efforts within that plan.

II. Challenges

A. ENROLLMENT TRENDS

*Many of our students are **transfer** students.* In the fall of 2015, slightly more than 37% of beginning undergraduates at WMU transferred from other institutions.¹ Over the past 11 years, the ratio of transfer students to First Time In Any College (FTIAC) students has oscillated, but with a somewhat steady trend toward more transfer students. The longer historical picture of WMU suggests that transfers have played a significant role in undergraduate enrollments for some time. The current trend suggests that they will do more so in the future.

*We face **declining ranks of high school graduates in Michigan.*** The state's production of high school graduates peaked in 2007-2008 (with 123,576 graduates), and current estimates do not pinpoint a bottom to the continued demographic slide. By 2020, high school graduates are expected to be nearly 20% fewer than they were in 2009.² They may well decline further still in subsequent years.

¹ <https://wmich.edu/ir/reports/enrollment/dose/201540dose.pdf>

² <http://www.wiche.edu/info/knocking-8th/profiles/mi.pdf>, pg. 2

Our state's struggling economy affects student success. According to a recent PBS report, the single most important factor in college graduation is family income.³ In Michigan, however, this has steadily declined over the last 30 years. Once one of the most prosperous states in the country, Michigan has fallen to number 24 in median income, and the rate of our children living in poverty, at 22.6%,^{4 5} is higher than the national average. That downward trend in prosperity, coupled with the state's reduced investment in pre-K – 12 education, affects the pipeline of future “traditional” FTIAC's. This has a double impact: middle-class families face greater economic insecurity – and thus challenges to paying for their children's higher education – and at the same time the state has consistently reduced funding, on a per-pupil basis, for education overall.

*Taken together, these factors may make **retention** both even more important, and possibly more challenging.* From 2003-2012, WMU averaged a 65% retention rate of incoming freshmen.⁶ Our rates are no worse than national trends. However, our struggling state economy, its structural economic problems, and the sustained pressure that K-12 education faces in securing stable, long-term funding may well affect the preparedness of future in-state students, their family fortunes, and thus their ability to complete a degree at WMU.

As one study noted, in 2010:

The higher education system in Michigan faces a declining source of potential college students. Prospective students will need additional academic and social supports, as well as increased financial assistance, in order to access and succeed in higher education. The challenge facing Michigan and other states is to find ways to provide the necessary supports to promote student success, which will in turn increase the pool of educated citizens necessary to enable Michigan to remain competitive in a global economy—in the midst of one of the most challenging fiscal climates in the nation's history.⁷

Finally, there is no longer one type of WMU undergraduate. Instead, when compared to past generations, *our current students differ more than ever from one another* in background, age, socioeconomic status, national origin, work history, and college preparedness. This ongoing shift in the composition of our student body must be addressed in meaningful ways by the university. It also means that any assumptions built into instruction about the “audience” of our course material, and our teaching methods, should adjust.

³ <http://www.americaspromise.org/news/pbs-newshour-biggest-predictor-college-success-family-income>; http://www.pellinstitute.org/downloads/publications-Indicators_of_Higher_Education_Equity_in_the_US_45_Year_Trend_Report.pdf, pp. 31-33

⁴ <http://www.mlpp.org/labor-day-report-michigans-paycheck-blues>

⁵ <http://www.mlpp.org/poverty-is-still-too-high-in-michigan>

⁶ <https://wmich.edu/ir/reports/retention/retention/201300CSRDEmain.pdf>

[Note: Our most recent freshman to sophomore retention rate was much better than this, but it is still an ongoing point of concern]

⁷ http://www.mhec.org/sites/mhec.org/files/1_michigan.pdf

B. TRANSFER COMMITMENTS

WMU will have obligations under the *2013 Michigan Transfer Agreement*. WMU is a signatory to MTA.⁸ This, and its predecessor – the MACRO guidelines – facilitate the transferability of students' course work between two- and four-year institutions. Care will need to be taken to ensure that transfer students are not unduly burdened by the new general education program.

C. COMMUNITY COLLEGE, BRANCH CAMPUS AND EUP OFFERINGS

Across the state, four and two-year institutions like ours have minted numerous new degree partnerships. This trend will likely continue, as will fully on-line BA programs, and offerings at existing and new branch campuses (e.g., Traverse City, Macomb County and Tampa, Florida). While still small in comparison to our overall undergraduate enrollments, students in these programs and receiving their instruction away from the main campus need consideration in both the structure and content of a new general education program.

D. THE GROWTH OF EXTENDED UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS (EUP)

With the growing number of fully online courses and degree programs, branch campus programs and 2-4 year partnerships, students increasingly do not meet face-to-face on the main campus. How will we ensure that any new learning outcomes can be consistently delivered in a variety of formats? We have cooperative agreements with 2-year schools (such as Northwest Michigan Community College). What will our expectations of students in those partner programs be?

E. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF TRENDS (THE CHANGING PROFESSORIATE)

In the coming years the ranks of *non-tenure stream instructors will continue to grow*, while the ranks of board-appointed faculty will continue to shrink. This is consistent with broader nation-wide trends, where non-tenure-track faculty comprise 70% of those teaching college courses.⁹ We must address this ongoing shift in the characteristics of instructional staff, their levels of expertise, and their time available for instructional development. Any move towards smaller class sizes will require more sections with an increased reliance on part-time faculty and GAs; however, funding for this is unpredictable and has been shrinking in some colleges, schools and departments.

F. VARYING PERCEPTIONS OF INSTRUCTION AND OUT-OF-CLASS ENGAGEMENT

A recent campus survey of student engagement has indicated a gap between faculty and student perceptions of faculty instruction and their out-of-class engagement with students. WMU faculty perceived that half of the freshmen would recognize that they “often discussed course topics, ideas or concepts with undergraduate students outside of class....” By contrast, only 27% of freshmen reported that to be the case. Faculty expected that most freshmen (65%) would report that faculty discuss academic progress with students, while only 35% of freshmen concurred. Finally, perhaps most

⁸ <https://wmich.edu/admissions/transfer-mta>

⁹ http://www.uscrossier.org/pullias/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/DelphiProject_AdaptingByDesign_EXEC-SUMMARY.pdf

relevant for our interests here, faculty almost universally expected freshmen to recognize their use of examples and illustrations as helpful (98%) while only 74% of freshmen agreed.¹⁰

G. INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT

Given the gap between faculty and student perceptions cited above, instructional support for a new general education program is critical. Changes will require time, support, and incentives. This implies additional resources for instructional development, including staff lines. At the same time, the increasing heterogeneity of our students suggests the need for more support services specifically tailored towards growing areas of student need.

H. INCENTIVES TO CHANGE

Beyond the building of a new general education structure based on new learning outcomes, we will face the challenge of making change appeal to those on the front line of the delivery of the new program: instructors (both board appointed and other). Models at other universities have included modest financial course development stipends. Such a reward might indeed, prompt some interest in change. But the broader, most meaningful change must come from a deep willingness on the part of every instructor – whether board appointed or otherwise – to examine current course content, its delivery and its effect on students. That willingness will stimulate the most effective change agent – a new culture of instruction organized around learning outcomes.

I. ASSESSMENT

The current general education program's weak assessment was flagged by the Higher Learning Commission. Thus, assessment will be a major consideration of the Design Team and will have to be built into the new program from the start with rubrics that are transparent and sensible.

J. CRITICAL COURSES

Such courses are critical to a department's budget, personnel or graduate programs: They range from multiple sections of the same course, taught by fleets of instructors (including board-appointed, PIO, TAU and other personnel) to a few sections of the same course taught lecture-style to large volumes of students – with or without break-out sections/labs or single courses offered within specific majors – which serve almost exclusively only those majors.

K. DOUBLE-DIPPING

Some current general education courses count toward a major. The design team may want to consider if this practice helps or hinders a student's achievement of the new program's learning outcomes.

¹⁰ 2013 NSSE Report: <http://www.wmich.edu/assessment/institutional>

L. GLOBAL LEARNING OUTCOMES

These have been approved by the Faculty Senate by a November 2015 MOA, and by the administration in January 2016. The Design Team will need to take these into consideration.

M. OUR CURRENT UNIVERSITY FUNDING MODEL

The heavy reliance of colleges on general education enrollments for revenue causes competing interests that sometimes impede what is in the best interests of our students.

N. WHO IS IN CHARGE OF GENERAL EDUCATION?

The 2006 General Education Review Task Force (GERT) Report¹¹ recommended the creation of a Director of General Education as a tenure-track, year-round, faculty line with full authority over all aspects of general education — as many of our peer institutions had at even at that time. That Task Force was very concerned that responsibility for WMU's general education is dispersed across a variety of levels and stakeholders, none of which has authority over the other:¹²

- Departments, which create and run courses;
- COGE, which approves and reapproves courses created by departments;
- General Education Assessment Committee (2003-2005), which no longer exists.

The task force's brief consideration of the problems associated with general education's lack of a coherent organizational structure concluded with the following:

The committee believes that the absence of consistent, centralized coordination of GE has led to many of the previously discussed issues relating to integration of GE courses across the program, accessibility for students, and assessment of GE learning outcomes.

The observations remain true, today: even though general education is the largest single curricular program at WMU, no single committee, individual, or set of individuals coordinates the various aspects of the program (including course development, instructional practices, or assessment, among other things). This not only causes issues for students, but also for the faculty.

1. *Everyone thinks COGE is in charge.*

The Committee to Oversee General Education (COGE) has a limited charge:

The Committee to Oversee General Education reviews and approves courses for general education credit received from college curriculum committees and deans and forwards its recommendations to the administration; reviews all general education courses at least once within a seven-year cycle as determined by the committee; and recommends revisions in the University's General Education Policy to the Undergraduate Studies Council.

¹¹ <https://www.wmich.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/u405/2016/GenEdReviewTFReport.pdf>

¹² As of 2009, the Associate Provost for Assessment and Undergraduate Studies is also involved.

Despite this limited charge, the university community tends to assume COGE is the ultimate gatekeeper on general education, with outsized authority. At present COGE's work is limited to approving and reapproving courses, or sending them back for further work within the existing forms and course approval requirements authorized by the Faculty Senate.

The evolving work of general education policy rests with the Undergraduate Studies Council (USC). Nonetheless, the broader focus of the USC may again reinforce the assumption that if something needs to be done with general education, COGE has the authority to address it. With this assumption, the USC may miss its own role in strengthening COGE's hand in improving general education courses, such as facilitating COGE's authority to require that new courses include the assessable learning outcomes published in the *Undergraduate Catalog*.

In sum, many perceive COGE to be the authority on general education, but in truth, COGE has limited oversight power, and currently lacks the specific authority to ensure that this very large program has a unified purpose and adheres to the best 21st century instructional models, with assessable outcomes.

2. There is no straightforward path of web-based information regarding general education course development and purpose, or instructional practice.

No information of this kind is found on the COGE website. The Faculty Senate website provides "Policies and Forms" — split under two separate subsections: "Curriculum Review" and "General Education." The latter includes a link to the "General Education Policy" of 1993: a 16-page pdf that looks more like something archived than a set of living guidelines. The General Education Policy includes a set of "goals," but does not mention learning outcomes, assessment, or the integration of skills and knowledge. The more recently developed general education learning outcomes (from 2003) can only be found on pp. 67-68 of the *WMU Undergraduate Catalog*.¹³ There is no web crosslink connecting these learning outcomes to the 1993 policy document. Nor do webpages anywhere exist that provide guidance on incorporation of learning outcomes into course design or instructional practice. Indeed, it's not clear whether these learning outcomes are required.

The Senate's role in curriculum is to establish policy. That leaves the development of general education practices — at present — to departments and instructors on their own. The university has no single clearing house of information that guides the process of creating, refining, executing, assessing, or improving a general education course. The Office for Faculty Development (OFD) offers instruction and programs for learning to use new technology for improving student interaction and facilitating course content evaluation; Extended University Programs (EUP) offers support for building online courses

¹³ <https://wmich.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/u580/2015/2015 - 2016 Undergraduate Catalog.pdf>

that maintain as closely as possible the integrity of an on-campus section — but neither OFD or EUP focus on the specific purposes, outcomes or practices of a general education course.

Appendix 5: WMU General Education Requirements 2015/2016

General Education Requirements
 2015/2016

University Graduation Requirements:

Minimum: 122 credits _____ Minimum: 2.0 cumulative GPA _____ Minimum: 30 credits from WMU _____ (No credit by exam) _____ Minimum: 10 of last 30 credits from WMU _____ (No credit by exam) _____ Minimum: One-half total required credits _____ from 4-year institution _____ Other: _____ _____	_____ Student Name _____ WIN# _____ Date _____ Intellectual Skills: Reading _____ Math _____ Basic Writing _____ Computer Literacy _____
--	---

General Education Graduation Requirements:

- Minimum 37 credits not including baccalaureate-level writing
- Minimum 6 credits of 3000/4000 level coursework within Distribution Areas
- No more than two courses from any one department may be used to satisfy distribution requirements.
 - Both the college-level writing and the college-level mathematics/quantitative reasoning proficiency requirements must be satisfied before a student may register for any upper-division level course.
 - Upper level courses are defined as those courses with a course number of 3000 or above.
- Additional requirements may exist for specific curricula, majors and minors. Please consult your curriculum, major and/or minor advisor for additional requirements.

Proficiencies:			
Proficiency 1:	College Level Writing	(3-4 credits)	Proficiency 3: College Level Math or Quantitative Reasoning (3-4 credits)
Proficiency 2:	Baccalaureate Level Writing (Does not count toward 37 credit requirement)	(3-4 credits)	Proficiency 4: Enhance or Develop a Proficiency (3-8 credits)
Distribution Areas:			
AREA I:	FINE ARTS	(3-4 credits)	AREA V: SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES (3-4 credits)
AREA II:	HUMANITIES	(3-4 credits)	AREA VI: NATURAL SCIENCES w/Lab (4-5 credits)
AREA III:	UNITED STATES: CULTURE & ISSUES	(3-4 credits)	AREA VII: NATURAL SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY APPLICATIONS & IMPLICATIONS (3-4 credits)
AREA IV:	OTHER CULTURES & CIVILIZATIONS	(3-4 credits)	AREA VIII: HEALTH & WELL BEING (2 credits)

Student Signature

Advisor Signature

Effective Fall 2015 semester

Subject to Change – Please reference www.wmich.edu/registrar or your academic advisor for subsequent additions/deletions to the list.

Proficiency 1: College-Level Writing

BCM 1420	Informational Writing	3
ENGL 1050	Thought & Writing	4
IME 1020	Technical Communication	3

Proficiency 2: Baccalaureate-Level Writing

Does not count toward 37 credit minimum

General Education hour requirement

See your curriculum or major program advisor

Proficiency 3: College-Level Mathematics or Quantitative Reasoning

MATH 1140	Excursions in Mathematics	3
MATH 1160	Finite Mathematics and Applications	3
MATH 1180	Precalculus Mathematics	4
MATH 1500	Number Concepts for Elem/Middle School Teachers	4
MATH 1900	Survey of Mathematical Ideas	4
MATH 2000	Calculus with Applications	4
STAT 1600	Statistics and Data Analysis	3
STAT 2830	Methods of Data Analysis	3
STAT 3660	Introduction to Statistics	4

Proficiency 4: Enhance or Develop a Proficiency

(NOTE: Please consult your college advisor)

A course or courses in one of the following categories:

Proficiency 4a Advanced Writing

ENGL 3060	Rhetoric, Writing, and Culture	3
REL 2000	Thinking about Religion	4

Proficiency 4b Mathematics or Quantitative Reasoning

MATH 1220	Calculus I	4
MATH 1510	Geometry for Elem/Middle School Teachers	4
MATH 1700	Calculus I, Science and Engineering	4
MATH 2000	Calculus with Applications	4
MATH 2650	Probability/Statistics for Elem/Middle School Teachers	4
STAT 2160	Business Statistics	3
STAT 2600	Elementary Statistics	4

Proficiency 4c Critical Thinking

COM 1000	Communication and Community Engagement	3
ENGL 3060	Rhetoric, Writing, and Culture	3
NUR 2200	Foundations of Nursing and Critical Thinking	3
PHIL 2200	Critical Thinking	3
PHIL 2250	Deductive Logic	3
PHIL 3200	Formal Logic	4
PHIL 3250	Inductive and Scientific Reasoning	3
PSCI 1050	Critical Thinking about Politics	3

Proficiency 4d Oral Communications

COM 1000	Communication and Community Engagement	3
COM 1040	Public Speaking	3
COM 1700	Interpersonal Communication	3
HSV 4860	Health Literacy Practices	3

Proficiency 4e American Sign Language

Proficiency 4f Computer Programming and Applications

CS 1110	Computer Science I	4
GPS 2510	Multimedia Publication and Design	3
MUS 2220	Computer Music Design	3

Proficiency 4g Foreign Languages

All Western Michigan University foreign language courses are granted general approval to satisfy Proficiency 4g.

Two semesters of college-level foreign language study will satisfy this requirement; students entering the University with college-level knowledge of a foreign language will be allowed to satisfy this requirement by taking two more advanced language courses or by taking two semesters of yet another foreign language.

Distribution Area I: Fine Arts

ART 1200	Introduction to Art	3
ART 1300	Studio Experience (3-D)	3
ART 1400	Studio Experience (2-D)	3
ART 1480	Direct Encounter with the Arts	4
ART 2200	History of Art	3
ART 2210	History of Art	3
CHIN 2800	Chinese Calligraphy	3
DANC 1450	Experiencing Dance	3
DANC 1480	Direct Encounter with the Arts	4
ED 2300	The Nature of Creativity	3
ENGL 1100	Literary Interpretation	4
ENGL 2100	Film Interpretation	4
HIST 3015	History and Cinema	3
HIST 3150	Popular Art and Architecture in America	3
HNRS 4101	Introduction to World Cinema	3
HNRS 4102	Studies in Film	3
INTL 3300**	Study Abroad-WMU Programs	1-16
INTL 3310**	Study Abroad-Non-WMU Programs	1-16
MUS 1480	Direct Encounter with the Arts	4
MUS 1500	Music Appreciation: Live Music	4
MUS 1520	Rock Music: Genesis and Development	3
MUS 4500	Music Appreciation: The Symphony	3
PHIL 3120	Philosophy of Art	3
THEA 1000	Playing with Fire: Love, Politics & Entertainment	3
THEA 1480	Direct Encounter with the Arts	4

****Must be approved by College General Education advisor.**

(Note: Not major/minor advisor)

Distribution Area II: Humanities

AFS 2800	Topics and Themes in Africana Studies	3
ENGL 1120	Literary Classics	4
ENGL 2110	Folklore and Mythology	4
ENGL 2520	Shakespeare	4
ENGL 3070	Literature in Our Lives	3
ENGL 3080	Quest for the Self	3
ENGL 3110	Our Place in Nature	3
ENGL 3120	Western World Literature	3
ENGL 3150	The English Bible as Literature	3
ENGL 3830	Literature for the Intermediate Reader	4
ENGL 4160	Women in Literature	4
ES 2800	Human Flourishing and the Pursuit of Happiness	3
GWS 1000	Media and the Sexes	3
HIST 1000	Early Western World	3
HIST 1010	Modern Western World	3
HIST 1450	Heroes and Villains in the Middle Ages	3
HIST 3000	Arts and Ideas: Ancient/Medieval	3
HIST 3010	Modern Arts and Ideas	3
HIST 3300	Canadian History and Culture	3
HIST 3360	Women in European History	3
HIST 3790	WWII in American and Japanese History	3
HNRS 3201	Art of the Book	3
HNRS 3202	Modernism in Art and Literature	3
INTL 3300**	Study Abroad-WMU Programs	1-16
INTL 3310**	Study Abroad-Non-WMU Programs	1-16
INTL 4050	Foreign Studies Seminar – Humanities	1-6
LANG 3500	Classical Greek and Roman Mythology	3
LANG 3510	The City of Gods: Power and Morality in the Roman World	3
LANG 3530	Russian Myths and Tales	3
LANG 3750	Foreign Lit. in English Translation: Views of Humanity	3
LANG 4040	East and West Literary Relations	3
MDVL 1450	Heroes and Villains of the Middle Ages	3
MUS 3120	Explorations in World Music	3
NUR 3220	Health Care Ethics	3
PHIL 2000	Introduction to Philosophy	4
PHIL 2010	Introduction to Ethics	4
PHIL 3000	Ancient and Medieval Philosophy	4
PHIL 3010	History of Modern Philosophy	4
PHIL 3030	Existentialist Philosophies	3

****Must be approved by College General Education advisor.**

(Note: Not major/minor advisor)

PHIL	3110	Political Philosophy	3
PHIL	3140	Philosophy and Public Affairs	3
PHIL	3160	Ethics in Engineering and Technology	3
PSCI	3600	Intro to History of Political Theory I: Political Theory to Thomas Hobbes	3
PSCI	3610	Intro to History of Political Theory II: Political Theory from Thomas Hobbes to Karl Marx	3
PSCI	3620	Contemporary Political Ideologies	3
REL	1000	Religions of the World	4
REL	2050	Christianity	4
REL	2070	Judaism	4
REL	3111	Superhero Comic Book Religion	4
REL	3115	Myth and Its Study	4
REL	3125	Ritual and Its Study	4
REL	3135	Religious Texts and Their Uses	4
REL	3180	Death, Dying, and Beyond	4
REL	3240	Psychological Elements in Religion	4
REL	3320	Religion and Social Ethics	4
RUSS	3100	Russian Civilization	3

Distribution Area III: The United States: Cultures and Issues

AFS	2000	Introduction and Foundations to Africana Studies	3
AFS	3000	Black Experience: From the African Beginnings to 1865	3
AFS	3010	Black Experience: From 1866 to the Present	3
AFS	3100	The Black Woman: Historical Perspective and Contemporary Status	3
AFS	3140	The Black Community	3
AFS	3600	Black Woman- Black Man Relationships	3
AFS	3950	Women of Color in the U.S.	3
ANTH	2600	Sex, Gender, and Culture	3
ANTH	3470	Ethnicity/Multiculturalism	3
ANTH	3480	Gender and Plastic Bodies	3
BLS	3050	Introduction to Adults with Disabilities	3
COM	3070	Freedom of Expression	3
CORP	2560	Introduction to Community and Regional Planning	3
ECON	3090	Women and the Economy	3
ENGL	2220	Literatures and Cultures of the U.S.	4
ENGL	2230	African American Literature	4
ENGL	4840	Multi-Cultural American Literature for Children	4
GRN	1000	Introduction to Aging Studies	3
GWS	2000	Introduction to Gender and Women's Studies	4
GWS	2010	LGBT Studies	3
GWS	3500	Psychological Perspectives on Gender	3
HIST	2100	American History to 1877	3
HIST	2110	American History Since 1877	3
HIST	2120	American Culture	3
HIST	2125	Sport in American Culture	3
HIST	3160	Women in United States History	3
HIST	3200	American Military History	3
HIST	3230	History of Healthcare in the United States	3
HIST	3260	Native American History and Culture	3
HIST	3280	African-American History and Culture	3
HNRS	3301	Jazz, Blues and the Harlem Renaissance	4
HNRS	3302	Civil Rights and Jazz: 1950-1975	4
HNRS	3303	Vietnam and Rock	4
HSV	3550	Perspectives in Women's Health	3
HSV	4400	Diversity and Inclusion in Health and Human Services	3
LWIR	3000	Immigration, Race and Ethnicity in the U.S.	3
MUS	1510	Jazz in American Culture	4
MUS	3500	American Music	4
NUR	3550	Perspectives in Women's Health	3
PHIL	3070	Philosophy in the American Context	3
PHIL	3150	Race and Gender Issues	3
PSCI	2000	National Government	3
PSCI	3000	Urban Politics in the U.S.	3
PSCI	3200	The American Judicial Process	4
PSCI	3630	American Political Theory	3
REL	2065	Islam in America	4
REL	3015	Christianity in the United States	4
SPAN	2650	Hispanic Culture in the U.S.	3
SPAN	2750	Latino Writing/Latino Culture	3
THEA	1050	Introduction to African-American Theatre	3

Distribution Area IV: Other Cultures and Civilizations

AFS	3580	The African Diaspora: Peoples and Culture	3
AFS	3900	Women Writers in Contemporary Black Literature From the 19 th Century to the Present	3
ANTH	1100	Lost Worlds and Archeology	3
ANTH	1200	Peoples of the World	3
ANTH	3390	Cultures of Latin America	3
ANTH	3400	Cultures of Asia	3
ANTH	3410	Cultures of Africa	3
ANTH	3440	The First Americans	3
ANTH	3580	The African Diaspora: Peoples and Culture	3
ARAB	2750	Life and Culture of the Arabs	3
ART	2220	Art of Africa, Oceania and the Americas	3
ART	2230	Introduction to Asian Art History	3
CHIN	2750	Chinese Life and Culture	3
ECON	3870	Studies in Asian Economies	3
ECON	3880	African Economies	3
ECON	3890	Latin American Economies	3
ENGL	3130	Asian Literature	3
ENGL	3140	African Literature	3
ENGL	3160	Storytellers	3
ENGR	3400	Engineering Global Practices in Non-Western Countries	3
FCS	3150	Global Ecology of the Family	3
FREN	2750	Francophone Culture	3
GEOG	3200	Culinary Tourism	3
GEOG	3810	South America	3
GEOG	3820	Mexico and the Caribbean	3
GEOG	3860	Geography of Africa	3
GEOG	3890	Monsoon Asia	3
GEOG	3900	China, Japan, and Korea: Lands and Cultures	3
GEOS	2020	Egypt – Civilization and Geology	3
GWS	3200	Woman, Globalization and Social Change	3
HIST	3020	World History to 1500	3
HIST	3030	World History since 1500	3
HIST	3760	Modern East Asia	3
HIST	3850	Modern Middle East	3
HIST	3880	Introduction to African Civilization	3
HNRS	3401	Vues d' Afrique	3
INTL	2000	Introduction to Global and International Studies	3
INTL	3300**	Study Abroad-WMU Programs	1-16
INTL	3310**	Study Abroad-Non-WMU Programs	1-16
IPE	3050	Study Abroad and Global Learning in Health and Human Services	1-6
JPNS	2750	Japanese Language and Culture	3
MUS	3520	World Music in Theory and Practice	4
PSCI	3410	The Politics of Sub-Saharan Africa	4
PSCI	3440	Russian and Central Asian Politics	4
PSCI	3450	Latin American Politics	4
PSCI	3460	Women in Developing Countries	4
REL	2010	Buddhism	4
REL	2020	Religion in China	4
REL	2030	Religion in Japan	4
REL	2040	Religion in India	4
REL	2060	Islam	4
REL	3025	The Qur'an	4
SOC	3040	Nonwestern World	4
SOC	3340	East Asia and the World	3
SOC	3350	Modern Latin American Societies	3

****Must be approved by College General Education advisor.
(Note: Not major/minor advisor)**

Distribution Area V: Social and Behavioral Sciences

AFS	2100	Comparative Approaches to Forms of Black Consciousness	3
ANTH	2100	Introduction to Archeology	3
ANTH	2400	Principles of Cultural Anthropology	3
ANTH	2800	Language in a Global World	4
BUS	1750	Business Enterprise	3
COM	2000	Human Communication Theory	3
ECON	1070	Economic Issues in the U.S. Today	3
ECON	1080	Contemporary International Economic Issues	3
ECON	2010	Principles of Microeconomics	3

ECON	2020	Principles of Macroeconomics	3
EDMM	3020	Engineering Teams: Theory and Practice	3
ENVS	1000	Climate Challenged Society	3
GEOG	1020	World Geography Through Maps and Media	3
GEOG	2050	Human Geography	3
GEOG	2440	Economic Geography	3
GEOG	3830	Geography of Europe	3
HIST	3060	Technology and Culture	3
HIST	3130	The U.S. and the World	3
HIST	3325	History of Healthcare in the World	3
HIST	3330	The World Since 1945	3
HIST	3600	The Medieval World: Society and Culture	3
HIST	3630	History of Modern Britain	3
HIST	3640	Modern Europe: Culture and Society	3
HIST	3660	Russia Yesterday and Tomorrow	3
HIST	3700	History of Latin America	3
HPHE	1700	Introduction to Recreation/Sport Management	3
HSV	2250	Growth, Development, and Aging	3
INTL	3300**	Study Abroad-WMU Programs	1-16
INTL	3310**	Study Abroad-Non-WMU Programs	1-16
INTL	4040	Foreign Studies Seminar-Social Sciences	1-6
LANG	2500	The Nature of Languages	4
MUS	3811	Your Brain on Music	3
PADM	2000	Introduction to Nonprofit Leadership	3
PHIL	3130	Philosophy of Law	3
PSCI	2400	Comparative Politics	3
PSCI	2500	International Relations	4
PSCI	3110	American Politics and the Media	3
PSCI	3400	European Politics	4
PSCI	3500	American Foreign Policy	4
PSY	1000	General Psychology	3
REL	2080	Religion in Europe	4
REL	3145	New Religious Movements	4
REL	3155	Religion and Conflict	4
REL	3165	Religion and Globalization	4
REL	3230	Religion and Revolution	4
SOC	2000	Principles of Sociology	3
**Must be approved by College General Education advisor.			
(Note: Not major/minor advisor)			
Distribution Area VI: Natural Science with Lab			
ANTH	2500	Intro to Biological Anthropology	4
BIOS	1050	Environmental Biology	3
and			
BIOS	1100	Biology Laboratory	1
BIOS	1120	Principles of Biology	3
and			
BIOS	1100	Biology Laboratory	1
BIOS	1980	Human Form and Function	4
CHEM	1100	General Chemistry I	3
and			
CHEM	1110	General Chemistry Laboratory	1
GEOG	1050	Physical Geography	4
GEOS	1000	Dynamic Earth	4
GEOS	1020	Planetary Geology	4
GEOS	1300	Physical Geology	4
GEOS	2000	Evolution of Life-A Geological Perspective	4
GPS	1500	Introduction to Imaging	4
OT	2000	Human Functional Anatomy	3
and			
OT	2010	Human Functional Anatomy Laboratory	1
PHYS	1000	How Things Work	4
PHYS	1040	Introduction to the Sky and Solar System	3
and			
PHYS	1030	Sky and Solar System Laboratory	1
PHYS	1060	Introduction to Stars and Galaxies	3
and			
PHYS	1050	Stars and Galaxies Laboratory	1
PHYS	1070	Elementary Physics	4
and			
PHYS	1080	Elementary Physics Laboratory	1
PHYS	1130	General Physics I	4
and			
PHYS	1140	General Physics I Laboratory	1

PHYS	2050	University Physics I	4
and			
PHYS	2060	University Physics I Laboratory	1

**Distribution Area VII: Natural Science and Technology:
Applications and Implications**

ANTH	1500	Race, Biology and Culture	3
ANTH	2510	Forensic Anthropology	3
AVS	1200	Introduction to Aviation	3
AVS	2800	Transportation Technology: Policy, Perils and Promise	3
BIOS	2700	Everyday Biology: Cells	3
CHEG	2610	Environmental Engineering	3
CHEM	1900	Chemistry of Climate Change	3
CHEM	2800	Active Chemistry	3
COM	2400	Introduction to Media and Telecommunications	3
CS	1000	Fluency with Information Technology	3
EDMM	1220	Automobile in Society	3
EDMM	1500	Introduction to Manufacturing	3
ENGR	3700	Engineering Global Practices in Western Countries	3
ENVS	3000	Introduction to Sustainability	3
GEOG	1000	World Ecological Problems and Man	4
GEOG	2650	Introduction to Geospatial Technologies	3
GEOG	3060	Climate Change: Atmospheric Perspectives	3
GEOG	3500	Conservation and Environmental Management	3
GEOS	1200	Climate Change: Geological Perspectives	3
GEOS	1440	Environmental Earth Science	3
GEOS	1500	Earth Hazards and Disasters	3
GEOS	2900	Earth Systems: Issues and Applications	3
GEOS	3120	Geology of National Parks and Monuments	3
GEOS	3220	Ocean Systems	3
GWS	3400	Race, Gender and Science	3
HIST	3180	American Environmental History	3
ME	2200	Processes and Materials in Manufacturing	4
NUR	3330	Informatics for Health Care Professionals	3
PAPR	1600	Introduction to Environmental Technology	3
PHIL	2550	Science, Technology, and Values	3
PHIL	3340	Biomedical Ethics	4
PHIL	3350	Medical Humanities	3
PHIL	3500	Foundations of the Modern Worldview	4
PHIL	3550	Philosophy of Science	3
PHIL	3710	History and Philosophy of Science I	3
PHIL	3720	History and Philosophy of Science II	3
PHYS	1020	Energy and the Environment	3
SPPA	2000	Communication Disorders and Sciences	3

Distribution Area VIII: Health and Well-being

ADA	2250	Drug Use: Personal and Social Impact	3
HOL	1000	Choices in Living	3
HOL	2701	Resiliency Training for Life	2
HOL	2801	Health and Well Being	3
HOL	2811	Resiliency Training for Leaders	2
HPHE	1110	Healthy Living	2
PEGN	1700	Health and Wellness – Aerobics	2
PEGN	1710	Health and Wellness - Water Aerobics	2
PEGN	1720	Health and Wellness - Circuit Fitness	2
PEGN	1730	Health and Wellness – Jogging	2
PEGN	1740	Health and Wellness – Walking	2
PEGN	1760	Health and Wellness - Racquet Sports	2
PEGN	1770	Health and Wellness - Climbing Techniques	2
PEGN	1800	Health and Wellness – Beginning Swimming	2
PEGN	1810	Health and Wellness - Intermediate Swimming	2
PEGN	1820	Health and Wellness - Swim Conditioning	2
REL	3190	Religion and Health	4