

March 9, 2016 – Revised Gen Educ Curriculum – Draft Proposal

President Soltis started with giving background noting of the current Drake Curriculum revision conversation started in 2013-2014. He outlined, in general, the process which brought the Senate to today's proposal. The intent for today is to move a committee discussion to a Senate level discussion and acknowledges blind spots as well as gets those blind spots informed.

Senator Owen offered that he helped author the document, yet it is not ironclad. It is written based on a number of documents and research (both external and internal). Senator DeLaet agreed the proposal is a starting point. She read a portion of the Wabash Report to highlight a cited need for change of the Drake Curriculum.

Senator Clapham challenged the language around the Nov 15 Senate outcomes. Senator Schneider compared the six points and the Cornerstone Section which does not include the Arts. It was stated this was not an intentional omission.

Senator Heaston offered that he circulated the proposal in CBPA and they hoped the colleges would be included in any change and not just the Senate. He continued that it is easy to say "we set it up and you fund it". He thinks a collaborative model needs to consider the funding, resources and the courses. Senator Heaston asked: "is the Administration willing to fund this? And how willing are we (co/sch) to fund and take care of providing courses." There are so many credits which come into Drake and are applied to general education & students expect to get out quickly with a degree AND they are looking for ways to accelerate their education. He offered one point which would be difficult for the CBPA: the 12 hours of upper level. Internships are so important and with our high placement rate, we'd have a problem with the upper division courses.

Senator Saylor would like to keep the Fine Arts included as a 'checkbox list' general education is avoided. The creative arts and efforts fit well with the move to more experiential and hands-on activities. He noted only limited history is included within the contemporary content. Senator Owens agreed the contemporary cannot be well understood without including enough history.

Senator Saylor echoed comments made by Senator Heaston and offered his own concerns about the Keystone area of the proposal. Senator Vandegrift agreed that accreditation requirements are extremely important and fitting general education requirements into majors with few credit hour options. When thinking about revenue and student recruiting, the present AOI system does not tell the students or families what the student will receive in their time at Drake. There is a potential for us to articulate what is special about Drake. Senator Simpson echoed the CBPA concern as their students are interested in the professional areas and may not be interested in what a liberal arts general education offers.

Senator Wrenn appreciated the time and effort which has been put into the document. We needed something to review. He indicated he liked some portions and some gave him a pause. The Keystone section was something which gave him pause. He stated the proposal has 36% of the general education is political/social justice and he did not want to cross the line away from education.

Senator Phillips agreed the proposal nicely pulls out some themes in the mission statement and misses some. Also, 60% of the current students do multi-curricula which is a good way to set them apart and make them competitive once they leave Drake. Senator Clapham agreed that many students are interested in

multi-degrees and would this limit that path or enhance the opportunities. Senator Gilbert did a review and sent it out to Senate. The current Honors track is similar to this proposal in his opinion. Also, know the discussion needs to include the 120 credit hour requirement. He liked the first year full course.

Senator Courard-Hauri wondered about how broadly social justice is defined and which resources or departments would teach those courses. He asked: “how important is it to us to have a Drake Curriculum which has the student taking courses outside their major?” Senator Owens agreed that students should achieve both depth and breadth. Ms. Karen Leroux appreciated the proposal included pedagogy as the current system does not do this well. Senator Vandegrift wondered how many credits a student can take outside their program. Senator Dunham-LaGree indicated some of this information is in the appendix. President Soltis remarked how the general education is always in the process of changing like the Continuous Improvement Process. He urged people to see how their majors and curriculum could be improved. Provost Lenz offered his thanks to the proposal developers for bringing this forward. He stated there is value in the faculty actively involved in their general education curriculum and keeping student learning at the forefront.

There was a short discussion of the value of having the FYS change to two semesters or not. It was confirmed that multiple adjunct professors are hired to teach FYS courses.