



**Report of the
General Education Review Task Force**



Submitted May 24, 2017

To the Reader:

In the Fall of 2016, Provost Steven Ralston commissioned the General Education Review Task Force at Morehead State University and charged it with reviewing the General Education program at MSU, investigating national best practice standards in General Education, and evaluating the extent to which the General Education program at MSU is consistent with those national best practice standards.

The Task Force submits this report detailing the results of our semester-long research to the Provost and the Steering Committee for their consideration. Our findings detail the strengths and weakness of the current general education program at MSU, and we also offer preliminary thoughts on how to improve the program going forward. In sum, we conclude that significant and substantive changes should be made to the current program for it to become a signature, coherent academic endeavor benefitting our students.

The Task Force would like to thank the Provost for forming this committee and supporting its important work as well as the General Education Review Steering Committee for its assistance throughout the process. We, the members of this task force, believe that this report is an important first step in developing an intellectually coherent, distinctive General Education program that more clearly aligns with the mission of MSU and enhances the educational experience for students at Morehead State University.

Table of Contents

I. Faculty and Student Responses to the General Education Program	4
Faculty Survey	4
Student Survey	11
Overall Survey Conclusions	16
II. General Education Program Structure and Courses	17
Overview of the Program	17
Program Compliance with State Requirements	19
Integrative Capstone Component	35
First Year Seminar (Freshman Experience)	46
General Education Management and Governance	54
III. Delivery of the General Education Program	58
Modes of Delivery and Proportion of Course Offerings	58
Course Scheduling	60
Friday Class Meeting	63
Conclusions	65
IV. Efficiency of the General Education Program	66
Efficiency of the General Education Core Courses	66
Efficiency of the General Education Distribution Courses	68
V. General Education and Institutional Priorities: Relevance to the MSU Mission Statement and Consistency with ASPIRE	72
Diversity and Global Awareness	72
Job Readiness	73
Student Needs	73
Scholarship and Community Service	73
Summation	74
VI. Cost of the General Education Program	75
Cost of the First Year Seminar	75
Cost of General Education Courses	76
VII. Impact of the General Education Program on Student Learning	77
Defining “Impact” on Student Learning	79
Outcomes as Experiential Measures of Quality and Impact	80

High-impact Practices and Employment as Measures of Quality and Impact	81
Conclusions	81
VIII. The General Education Program and Student Preparation for Post-Graduation Success	83
Conclusions	88
IX. Application of National Best Practice Standards to the General Education Program	89
X. General Education Programs at Kentucky's Four-Year Institutions and Highlighted Signature General Education Programs	93
General Education Programs at Kentucky's Four-Year Institutions	93
Review of Distinctive General Education Programs	97
Conclusions	99
XI. Meeting Student Needs Through the General Education Program	100
XII. The General Education Program as a Defining, Signature Program Unique to MSU	102
XIII. Conclusions and Future work	106
Acknowledgements	107
GERTF Members	107

I. Faculty and Student Responses to the General Education Program

The feedback and data given by the faculty and students on their respective General Education Survey are presented and summarized here as compiled by Institutional Research and received by the Task Force. Additional comments and conclusions drawn or inferred by the Task Force are also included. For completeness, the full results of the surveys are available upon request.

Faculty Survey

The survey was distributed electronically to a total of 448 respondents. Of those, 209 submitted a survey electronically. However, 19 of those were only partial submissions, leaving 190 completed surveys that were submitted. The survey consisted of five main sections:

- Section 1 consisted of six questions to measure the demographic nature of the respondents as well as gauge the overall level of knowledge of the respondents concerning General Education and specifically the General Education program at MSU.
- Section 2 asked the respondents to rate specific skills relative to their level of importance in a General Education program and then to rank those same skills by importance.
- Section 3 asked the respondents to rate specific content areas relative to their level of importance in a General Education program and then to rank those same areas by importance.
- Section 4 contained questions garnering opinions about the structure of a General Education program.
- Section 5 solicited open-response feedback about the General Education program at MSU specifically.

Section 1 (Questions 1-6). Of demographic note, roughly 63% of the respondents were tenured or tenure-track faculty members while an additional 26.32% classified themselves as instructors or non-tenure track faculty members.

Over two-thirds of the respondents were from the College of Science (32.54%) or the Caudill College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences (36.36%). Perhaps somewhat surprising is the fact that over 35% of the respondents reported having not taught any General Education courses in the last four years.

In Question 4, the respondents were asked to rate their knowledge of best practices in General Education. The plurality (42.79%) said that they had a working knowledge of these best practices. In Question 5, just under half (49.75%) of the respondents reported that they had a working knowledge about MSU's General Education program.

In Question 6, respondents were asked to rate their level of knowledge about various aspects of the General Education program at MSU. Roughly 75% said they have at least a working or thorough knowledge of the core courses. Roughly 65% claim to have a working or thorough knowledge of the distribution requirements. That percentage drops for the remaining areas: Student Learner Outcomes (60%), Assessment Process (54%), Assessment Results (37%) and Role of General Education Council (40%).

Section 1 Conclusions: The Task Force was surprised at the relatively high response rate by those who have not taught a General Education course in the last four years. Clearly, many faculty appear to lack knowledge regarding the assessment process and results, based upon their lack of involvement with General Education at MSU.

Section 2. First, respondents were asked to rate skills relative to their importance in a General Education experience at MSU. In Question 7, each of 9 skills could be rated as Not Important, Somewhat Important, Important, or Very Important, and any number of skills could be rated the same. Question 8 asked the respondents to rate each of the same skills on a scale of 1 through 9 requiring a different rating for each skill. In Table I-1, for the first question, a scale of 1 point for Not Important to 4 points for Very Important is used to quantify the average rating for each skill. Then, a scale of 9 points for a rank of 1 through 1 point for a rank of 9 is used to quantify the average ranking for each skill.

Skill	Average Rating	Rank	Average Ranking	Rank	Average of Both Ranks	Total Respondents (Rating/Rank)
Log. Reas./Crit. Thinking	3.68	1	7.97	1	1	195/195
Qual. Reasoning	3.36	4	5.76	4	4	195/195
Quant. Reasoning	3.23	6	4.90	6	6	195/195
Oral Communication	3.41	5	5.42	5	5	195/195
Written Communication	3.67	2	6.19	2	2	195/195
Reading Comprehension	3.66	3	6.11	3	3	195/195
Skill	Average Rating	Rank	Average Ranking	Rank	Average of Both Ranks	Total Respondents (Rating/Rank)

(cont'd from previous page)						
Comp. in Non-native language	2.38	9	2.08	9	9	195/195
Applied Tech. Skills	2.95	7	3.26	7	7	195/195
Life Skills	2.88	8	3.23	8	8	195/195

Table I-1. Average ratings and rankings by faculty for Gen. Ed. skills

Section 2 Conclusions: Clearly, respondents considered Logical Reasoning and Critical Thinking the most important skill that should be taught in the General Education program. Reading and Writing are also deemed to be of high importance. In general, the faculty do not support highly a foreign language as part of a general education program.

Section 3. In Question 9, respondents were asked to rate different content areas as to their importance in a General Education experience at MSU. Each of 9 content areas could be rated as Not Important, Somewhat Important, Important, or Very Important, and any number of content areas could be rated the same. Question 10 asked the respondents to rate each of the same content areas on a scale of 1 through 9 wherein each content area must receive a different ranking. For the first question, a scale of 1 point for Not Important to 4 points for Very Important is used to quantify the average rating for each content area. Then, a scale of 9 points for a rank of 1 through 1 point for a rank of 9 is used to quantify the average ranking for each content area. Table I-2 shows this data.

Content Area	Average Rating	Rank	Average Ranking	Rank	Average of both Ranks	Total Respondents (Rating/Rank)
Mathematics	3.37	2	6.53	1	1.5	195/181
Natural Sciences	3.18	4	5.91	2	3	195/181
Social Sciences	3.07	6	5.34	4	5	195/181

Content Area (cont'd from previous page)	Average Rating	Rank	Average Ranking	Rank	Average of both Ranks	Total Respondents (Rating/Rank)
Humanities	3.03	7	5.11	5	6.5	195/181
Arts	2.83	8	3.62	8	8	195/181
Local and Global Issues	3.16	5	5.56	3	4	195/181
Diversity and Cultural Differences	3.78	1	4.54	7	4	195/181
Values and Social Responsibility	3.18	3	5.07	6	4.5	195/181
Health and Wellness	2.81	9	3.31	9	9	195/181

Table I-2. Average ratings and rankings by faculty for Gen. Ed. content areas

Question 11 was an open-response question that brought together Sections 2 and 3. Respondents were asked what additional content areas and skills they would like to see in a General Education program. Among the 58 responses received, the faculty chose History and Reading and Literature, which were each mentioned four (4) times. Other multiple responses included Information Literacy (3), Technical Skills (3), Diversity and Multiculturalism (3), Information Literacy (3), Exercise and Activity (2), Critical Thinking (2), Foreign Language (2), Creative Thinking (2), Personal Finance (2), Etiquette and Social Norms (2), and Life Skills (2).

Section 3 Conclusions: Mathematics was deemed to be the most important content area while the Arts was deemed to be the least important. There was also significant support for the inclusion of non-traditional content areas in the General Education program, viz., Local and Global Issues, Diversity and Cultural Differences, and Values and Social Responsibility.

Section 4. In this section, respondents were asked how a General Education program should be structured. The section consisted of four questions (12-15). Over 76% of respondents said that the General Education program should consist of 36 hours or less with a plurality of respondents (43.23%) choosing 30 hours or less.

A plurality of respondents (39.58%) said that the General Education program should consist of the same number of core and elective courses.

Over 75% of the respondents said that each category of courses in General Education should contain 8 offerings or less with a plurality (45.03%) saying that the number of courses offered in each category should be 1 to 4.

Finally, faculty offered mixed responses to the General Education program existing independently from a student’s major or area of study. About 49% either agreed (29.51%) or strongly agreed (19.67%) with that statement while the rest either disagreed (33.33%) or strongly disagreed (17.49%).

Section 4 Conclusions: The faculty generally believe that the General Education program should be minimized (in terms of the number of hours in the program) and simplified (in terms of the courses offered in each category). No strong consensus emerged regarding the number of core versus. distribution courses or how significantly the General Education program should relate to a student’s major.

Section 5. In this section, the respondents were asked about specific aspects of the General Education program at MSU as well as what (if any) specific changes should be made to improve the program. This section consisted of nine questions (16 -24), several of which were open- ended.

In Question 16, respondents were asked about their level of agreement with various statements about the current General Education program at MSU. A point scale of 1 for Strongly Disagree through 4 for Strongly Agree was used to give a quantitative indication of the overall feelings of the faculty (with 2.5 being neutral). The following table summarizes these responses:

Statement	Score
<i>The General Education program is cohesive.</i>	2.44
<i>Faculty members help each student to make connections between General Education courses and his/her educational goals.</i>	2.43
<i>The skills and content that students acquire from their General Education courses are utilized in the major courses.</i>	2.87
<i>General Education faculty members utilize multiple pedagogical techniques.</i>	3.00

Statement (cont'd from previous page)	Score
<i>Each faculty member teaches his/her own General Education course without communication and/or consultation with other faculty members.</i>	2.66
<i>Our General Education program has an administrator who coordinates the program by establishing clear lines of responsibility and authority.</i>	2.21
<i>Students understand the purpose of General Education courses.</i>	2.06
<i>The General Education program has strong support from faculty members.</i>	2.35
<i>Students view General Education as a barrier to taking classes in their major.</i>	3.05
<i>General Education is focused exclusively on classroom activities.</i>	2.36
<i>Our General Education program is a high-quality program.</i>	2.37
<i>General Education assessment is a rigorous process.</i>	2.41
<i>General Education assessment is an important process.</i>	2.80
<i>Students acquire valuable skills and knowledge in FYS (First Year Seminar).</i>	2.10
<i>Using faculty members to teach FYS is a good utilization of resources.</i>	2.43

Table I-3. Faculty Levels of Agreement/Disagreement with Aspects of MSU General Education program

In Question 17, faculty were asked if the Capstone course should be included in the General Education program, the Major program, or both. Over three-fourths (75.79%) of respondents would place the Capstone in the Major program and not General Education.

In Question 18, only 3.68% of respondents said that the General Education program needed no revision. A plurality (50%) suggested some revision was needed while over one-fifth (20.53%) opted for an entirely different approach.

Question 19 was an open-response question asking faculty to identify the biggest problems with the General Education program at MSU. From among the 105 responses submitted, by

far faculty cited General Education Assessment and Student Learning Outcomes most often. One or both of these issues was mentioned 31 times. Other issues that were mentioned frequently included a “Lack of Vision or Coherence” (17), “First Year Seminar” (16), “More Options Needed” (11), “Fewer Options Needed” (9), “Exchange Courses and Double Dipping” (6), and “Lack of Administrative Support” (5).

In Question 20, respondents were asked how they would improve the General Education program at MSU. From among the 94 responses submitted, 19 faculty opted most frequently to “Eliminate or substantially change First Year Seminar (FYS).” Other frequent responses included simplification (17), reduce or reform Assessment (10), allow double dipping (9), establish clearer vision and goals (8), and offer more interdisciplinary classes (6).

Question 21 was a third consecutive open-ended response question asking how the General Education program might be made more relevant to students and unique to MSU. Here, two responses appeared most often, viz., “Define clearer goals, vision, and purpose,” and “Offer classes that involve Regional Engagement and Appalachian issues,” with each mentioned 13 times among 87 responses. Other frequent responses included changing or modifying FYS, offering more choices (7), offering fewer choices (5), eliminating uniqueness as a goal (5), and using a core text or a classical Liberal Arts approach (4).

In Question 22, only 14.74% (or 28 respondents) said that they were aware of an institution with a unique or exemplary General Education program. Of those, 24 named such an institution in Question 23, with Western Kentucky mentioned most frequently (4). Finally, in Question 24, the faculty were asked to rate how important it is to have a General Education program at MSU. Only 5.25% eschewed its importance while almost half (49.47%) said that it is very important.

Section 5 Conclusions: The strongest opinions garnered in Question 16 were a general agreement that students view the General Education program as a barrier to their major classes and a general disagreement that students understand the purpose of the General Education program. Faculty believe strongly that the FYS courses fail to provide useful information to the students. Similarly, there is clearly a strong sentiment among the faculty that the Capstone course should be removed from the General Education program and that the General Education program is in need of at least some, if not significant, revision. Frustration with both the assessment process for General Education and the First Year Seminar runs high among faculty. In addition, faculty are concerned about the lack of coherence and vision in the current General Education program, indicating that an increase in this sense of purpose would significantly benefit students in understanding and appreciating the importance of a strong General Education program. The faculty at MSU understand this importance.

Overall Faculty Survey Conclusions: By responding to this survey, faculty at MSU are to be commended for contributing to the creation of an outstanding General

Education program at MSU. The overall feeling as interpreted by the Task Force is that faculty desire a less intrusive, more simplified, and more effective General Education program. If survey data is any judge, it appears to the faculty are calling for substantial changes to the program's overall structure and content, with both assessment and FYS requiring the most significant changes or revision.

Student Survey

The student survey was sent to all degree-seeking undergraduates, which totaled 5,970 potential respondents. Of those, 784 students completed the survey for a 13.13% completion rate. The survey consisted of 11 questions, two of which were open-ended response questions. For substantive questions (Questions 4 through 11), the Task Force has assessed the responses and clearly identified conclusions drawn from the data.

Question 1. A plurality of student respondents reported that they had completed between 91 and 120 credit hours at MSU. The other responses were evenly distributed, with 21.17% reporting 0-30 hours, 26.28% reporting 31-60 hours, and 23.34% completing 61-90 hours. The respondents to the survey represented a solid cross-section of the student population in terms of progress toward graduation.

Question 2. In response to this question asking students how many General Education courses they have taken at MSU, only 21.81% reported having taken 3 or fewer of these courses while 34.95% have taken between 4 and 6. The respondents, then, have academic experiences adequate enough to provide informed opinions about the General Education program at MSU.

Question 3. When asked which college houses their major, over 45% responded with the College of Science, followed by the Caudill College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences at 26.02%. The remainder of the students represented majors in the College of Business and Technology (15.43%) and the College of Education (10.84%), with only 2.3% with no declared major yet or not knowing the location of their major. Although the College of Science is clearly represented, respondents hail from multiple majors across campus.

Questions 4 and 5. In Question 4, students were asked to rate the same nine skills as faculty as Not Important, Somewhat Important, Important, or Very Important. Students could rate any number of skills at the same level of importance. In Question 5, the students were asked to rank the same skills on a scale of 1 through 9, but each skill must receive a different ranking. For the first question, a scale of 1 point for Not Important to 4 points for Very Important is used to quantify the average rating for each skill. Then, a scale of 9 points for a rank of 1 through 1 point for a rank of 9 is used to quantify the average ranking for each skill. Table I-4 shows this data:

Skill	Average Rating	Rate	Average Ranking	Rank	Average of both Ranks	Total Respondents (Rating/Rank)
Log. Reas./Crit. Thinking	3.307	5	7.24	1	3	784/784
Qual. Reasoning	3.020	6	4.83	6	6	784/784
Quant. Reasoning	2.957	8	4.07	7	7.5	784/784
Oral Communication	3.389	3	6.36	2	2.5	784/784
Written Communication	3.349	4	5.41	4	4	784/784
Reading Comprehension	3.469	1	5.34	5	3	784/784
Comp. in Non-native language	2.219	9	1.79	9	9	784/784
Applied Tech. Skills	2.976	7	3.79	8	7.5	784/784
Life Skills	3.426	2	6.18	3	2.5	784/784

Table I-4. Students’ Average Ratings and Rankings of General Education Skills

Questions 4 and 5 Conclusions: Not surprisingly, faculty and students disagreed about which skills are the most important in a General Education program. While both groups ranked Logical Reasoning and Critical Thinking high, Life Skills was given an average ranking of 2.5 by the students while the faculty gave it an average ranking of 8. In addition, the students feel strongly that Oral Communication stay a part of the General Education program, giving it an average ranking of 2.5, tied with Life Skills for the highest average ranking.

Questions 6 and 7. In Question 6, students were asked to rate different content areas as to their importance in a General Education experience at MSU. Each of 9 content areas could be rated as Not Important, Somewhat Important, Important, or Very Important, and any

number of content areas could be rated the same. Question 10 asked the students to rate each of the same content areas on a scale of 1 through 9, but each content area must receive a different ranking. For the first question, a scale of 1 point for Not Important to 4 points for Very Important is used to quantify the average rating for each content area. Then, a scale of 9 points for a rank of 1 through 1 point for a rank of 9 is used to quantify the average ranking for each content area. See Table I-5 below for the outcomes:

Content Area	Average Rating	Rank	Average Ranking	Rank	Average of both Ranks	Total Respondents (Rating/Rank)
Mathematics	3.07	4	6.22	1	2.5	784/784
Natural Sciences	2.79	7	5.52	4	5.5	784/784
Social Sciences	2.83	6	5.23	5	5.5	784/784
Humanities	2.68	8	4.19	8	8	784/784
Arts	2.36	9	2.99	9	9	784/784
Local and Global Issues	3.12	2	5.85	2	2	784/784
Diversity and Cultural Differences	3.01	5	4.80	6	5.5	784/784
Values and Social Responsibility	3.13	1	5.58	3	2.5	784/784
Health and Wellness	3.11	3	4.64	7	5	784/784

Table I-5. Students' Average Ratings and Rankings of General Education Content Areas

Questions 6 and 7 Conclusions: While the students agreed with the faculty that Mathematics is an important content area, their highest average ranking went to Local and Global Issues. The students also indicated that Values and Social Responsibility should be given high priority as a content area in the General Education program.

Question 8. This question asked the students to register a level of agreement or disagreement with a series of statements about their General Education experience at Morehead State University. A point scale of 1 for Strongly Disagree through 4 for Strongly Agree was used to give a quantitative indication of the overall feelings of the faculty (with 2.5 being neutral). The following table summarizes these responses:

Statement	Score
<i>I understand the purpose of General Education courses.</i>	3.19
<i>General Education courses should be required.</i>	2.93
<i>There are too many required General Education courses.</i>	2.90
<i>The skills/content taught in the General Education program are relevant to today's students.</i>	2.67
<i>General Education courses provide important information.</i>	2.79
<i>My instructors helped me connect the information from my General Education courses to my educational goals.</i>	2.47
<i>My General Education courses included many different methods of instruction (i.e., group-work, lecture, presentations, hands-on learning, etc.).</i>	2.94
<i>I utilize the skills/content from General Education courses in my major courses.</i>	2.61
<i>I received high quality instruction in my General Education courses.</i>	2.80
<i>The quality of instruction in my General Education courses matched the quality of instruction in my major courses.</i>	2.52
<i>General Education courses are a barrier to taking classes in my major.</i>	2.71

Statement	Score
<i>In my General Education courses, I participated in learning activities outside of the classroom.</i>	2.52
<i>First Year Seminar is a vital component of my educational experience.</i>	1.91
<i>I learned important information in FYS.</i>	2.04

Table I-6. Student Levels of Agreement/Disagreement with Aspects of MSU General Education Program

Question 8 Conclusions: The students admit that General Education courses have a purpose, which they understand, but feel too many are required. In addition, they would like more relevant material, but are generally satisfied with the level of instruction. However, their responses suggest that the General Education courses are a hindrance to taking courses in the major and that the FYS course is not a crucial part of their learning.

Question 9. In this open-ended response question, students were asked what one skill they learned (or one course they took) in the General Education program that was most useful to them. The question produced over 25 distinct responses. However, the number one response was oral communications and the Introduction to Speech course, which was mentioned 146 times in the 548 responses. The second most mentioned response was English or Writing (113). Other courses and skill that were mentioned multiple times were Mathematics (44), Time Management and Study Skills (35), Life Skills (34), Critical and Logical Thinking (31), and Logic and Philosophy (20). Numerous other courses and skills were also referenced.

Question 9. Conclusions: The Task Force is somewhat surprised at the overwhelming number of students that counted oral communication among the most useful skill obtained in the General Education program. Students also seemed to appreciate acquiring practical knowledge such as study and life skills.

Questions 10 and 11. Question 10 asked the students if they would change any components of Morehead State University’s General Education program. Of the 515 (65.69%) that directly responded, 464 offered suggestions in Question 11 using open-ended response.

By far the most popular response was to either eliminate the General Education program or reduce the number of classes required for General Education. A total of 160 comments indicated something along these lines. Another 91 students suggested that the First Year Seminar courses be eliminated. Another 59 students want the General Education program

to relate more to their major. In addition, 49 suggested significant changes to FYS, with most of those requesting that the course focus more on life skills or skills to help them succeed in college. Interestingly, a number of students (19) asked that the General Education program be more rigorous and another 10 students registered their disappointment with the quality of instruction in their General Education classes.

Questions 10 and 11 Conclusions: The students clearly assert that General Education program requirements are burdensome and unnecessary for achieving their academic goals. A significant number of students want either to eliminate or reduce the number of classes in the General Education program and request that FYS relate more to their major. If student responses to these questions are valid, then students do not value FYS.

Overall Student Survey Conclusions: The students are to be commended for their willingness to participate in the survey and to offer specific, thoughtful suggestions on how to improve the General Education program at MSU. They have registered a general dissatisfaction with the number of required courses in the General Education program and the quality of content and instruction in those courses. The First Year Seminar is a course or experience that they don't deem worth their time and money. *The Task Force notes, however, that the FYS was singled out for specific scrutiny and comment on both the faculty and student surveys, which may bias the results reported here.* The Task Force fully intends to consider carefully the data and comments supplied by students as we formulate any recommendations for change to the current General Education program.

II. General Education Program Structure and Courses

Overview of the Program

According to Morehead State University's *2016-2017 Undergraduate Catalog*, the purpose of Morehead State University's general education program is to "provide students with the attributes needed to participate intelligently and responsibly in the discourses that shape the communities in which they live" and to "equip all students with the knowledge and skills to live fulfilling and productive lives as educated citizens of the world" (25). To that end, the general education program defines 21 student learner outcomes (SLOs) distributed across three skill areas and three knowledge areas (see Table II-1).

The general education program is a 36-hour program. Students take one course (3 hours) in each of 12 categories (see Table II-2). The number of courses in a category from which students can choose ranges from 1 to 14 across the 12 categories. Each category addresses three of the 21 SLOs (see Table II-3). For example, all courses in the Humanities II category require students to read college-level texts for comprehension (SLO 1b), to investigate the worldview of societies outside the United States (SLO 4b), and to analyze historical processes that influence individuals or groups (SLO 4c). Also, the number of categories that address an SLO ranges from 1 to 5 across the 21 SLOs. For example, only the category Math Reasoning addresses SLO 3a whereas the three categories Writing Core I, Writing Core II, and Oral Communications address SLO 2a. *Thus some of the 21 SLOs are addressed more extensively than others.*

Each course in a category must assess the three SLOs that are addressed by the category. The measure used to assess an SLO can vary across courses in a category, but must remain constant across sections of a course. For example, [IST 250](#) (International Culture and Diversity) and [PHIL 106](#) (Beginning Logic) are courses in the Humanities II category and both must assess SLO 1b. The measure used in IST 250 to assess SLO 1b can differ from that used in PHIL 106. However, all sections of IST 250 must use the same measure. A student is said to have attained an SLO if the student scores 70% or higher on the SLO measure. A yearly report is produced that summarizes the measures and results for each SLO. *The use of different measures to assess the same SLO is problematic because it is unlikely that the different measures are equally rigorous and valid.*

For courses in Categories 1 to 5 (the core categories), the number of students that can enroll in a course section is generally limited to no more than 30 students (see Table II-2). However, for courses in Categories 6 to 11 (the distribution categories), enrollment caps vary widely across sections. For example, PHIL 100 (Beginning Philosophy) and MUSH 261 (Global Musical Experience) are both Humanities I courses with maximum enrollment caps of 30 and 100, respectively. Similarly, GEO 100 (The Human World) and PSY 154 (Introduction to Psychology) are both Social and Behavioral Sciences II courses with maximum enrollment caps of 30 and 120, respectively. *If the ability to effectively address an SLO diminishes with increased class size, then not all classes in the distribution categories are addressing the SLOs with equal effectiveness.*

With the exception of the integrative component, the general education courses in Table II-2 cannot be used to satisfy both a general education requirement and an academic program requirement (i.e., double-dipping is prohibited). For example, SOC 101 (Introduction to Sociology) is a course in the Social and Behavioral Sciences II category and it is also a requirement for the sociology major. Thus, a student who is a sociology major cannot use SOC 101 to satisfy the Social and Behavioral Sciences II category requirement. However, the general education courses in Table II-2 can be used to satisfy both a general education requirement and a prerequisite for an academic program requirement. For example, PSY 154 (Introduction to Psychology) is a course in the Social and Behavioral Sciences II category and, although it is not a requirement for the psychology major, it is a prerequisite for courses that are requirements. Thus a student who is a psychology major can use PSY 154 to satisfy the Social and Behavioral Sciences II category requirement. Officially, PSY 154 is not a requirement for the psychology major, but unofficially, PSY 154 is a requirement for the psychology major because PSY 154 is a prerequisite for courses that are requirements. *Thus, an academic program can circumvent the prohibition against double-dipping by taking a general education course in Table II-2 off the program's official list of requirements and then making the course a prerequisite for courses that are on the official list of requirements. The prohibition against double-dipping often times produces the unreasonable situation in which two students take the same general education course in Table II-2 (e.g., SOC 101) and the course satisfies a general education requirement for one student (e.g., a mathematics major) but not the other student (e.g., a sociology major).*

An academic program can propose exchange courses. An exchange course (a) is not a general education course (i.e., it does not appear in Table II-2), (b) is a requirement of the academic program, and (c) satisfies a general education distribution category requirement only for students in the academic program. An exchange course must address and assess the three SLOs that are associated with the distribution category to which the course is assigned. For example, CHEM 111 (Principles of Chemistry I) is an exchange course for the physics major. CHEM 111 does not appear in Table II-2 and it is a requirement for the physics major. CHEM 111 addresses and assesses the three SLOs that are associated with the Natural Sciences II category, and so the course satisfies the Natural Sciences II requirement for students who are physics majors. A student who is not a physics major cannot take CHEM 111 to satisfy the Natural Sciences II requirement. However, a student who is a physics major, takes CHEM 111, and then changes his or her major, can use CHEM 111 to satisfy the Natural Sciences II requirement. An academic program can have no more than two exchange courses. *Exchange courses can produce the unreasonable situation in which two students take the same course (e.g., CHEM 111) and the course satisfies a general education requirement for one student (e.g., a physics major) but not the other student (e.g., a psychology major).*

Program Compliance with State Requirements

To facilitate the transfer of general education credits between public colleges and universities in the state of Kentucky, the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education has put in place a set of lower-division general education requirements that students at any public college or university could complete in their first two years. The state requirements consist of five categories of courses and a set of SLOs for each category. Table II-4 describes the state requirements and the extent to which Morehead State University's general education program complies with the requirements. *Table II-4 describes a number of instances in which Morehead State University's general education program fails to comply with state requirements.*

Table II-1. Morehead State University's Student Learner Outcomes

1. Communication Skills

- 1a. Speak effectively in conversational, small group, public, or intercultural contexts.
- 1b. Read college-level texts for comprehension.
- 1c. Write effectively for a variety of target audiences using conventions associated with standard English.
- 1d. Convey relationships using two or more of the following: equations, graphs, tables, maps, and diagrams.

2. Intellectual Skills

- 2a. Employ current research technologies in the process of locating, analyzing, evaluating, and using information.
- 2b. Effectively utilize deductive or inductive reasoning.
- 2c. Analyze or evaluate diverse points of view.
- 2d. Articulate ethical consequences of decisions or actions.
- 2e. Apply knowledge and skills to new settings.

3. Quantitative Skills

- 3a. Analyze problems using arithmetic, geometric, algebraic, or statistical methods.
- 3b. Use deductive reasoning in a formal, symbolic, axiomatic system.
- 3c. Verify answers to mathematical or scientific problems.

4. Knowledge of Human Cultures

- 4a. Investigate the history of the basic principles or operations of the United States government with a view to being a responsible citizen.
- 4b. Investigate the worldview of societies outside the United States.
- 4c. Analyze historical processes that influence individuals or groups.
- 4d. Demonstrate the knowledge necessary to make choices that promote sustained health and well-being.

5. Knowledge of the Natural World

- 5a. Classify statements as scientific or nonscientific.
- 5b. Apply scientific or technological concepts to solving problems of natural systems.
- 5c. Employ a scientific approach to analyze scientific questions.

6. Knowledge of Aesthetics

- 6a. Discuss how ideas are communicated through the expressive arts; e.g., literature, theatre, dance, music, or visual arts.
- 6b. Analyze the aesthetic value of creative productions in a cultural or historical context.

Table II-2. Morehead State University's General Education Requirements (below)

* The parentheses next to a course indicate the minimum/maximum enrollment capacities across sections of the course for Fall 2017.

‡ The notation “n-o” signifies courses not offered.

Students take one course (3 hours) in each of the following 12 categories:

Core Categories

1. First Year Seminar

FYS 101 First Year Seminar (27/27)*

2. Writing Core I

ENG 100 Writing I (22/22)

3. Writing Core II

ENG 200 Writing II (22/22)

HON 200 The Ancient World
(Honors students only) (15/15)

4. Oral Communications

COMS 108 Fundamentals of
Speech Communication (28/28)

5. Math Reasoning

[MATH 131](#) General Mathematics (30/30)
Problem Solving

[MATH 135](#) Mathematics for (30/30)
Technical Students

[MATH 152](#) College Algebra (25/40)

[MATH 174](#) Pre-Calculus (30/30)
Mathematics

[MATH 175](#) Calculus I (30/30)

Distribution Categories

6. Humanities I

ART 160 Understanding the Visual Arts	(30/90)
ART 263 World Arts	(35/35)
CVM 210 Media Literacy	(28/28)
ENG 120 Approaches to Literature	(n-o)‡
ENG 211 Introduction to World Literature I	(22/22)
IST 211 Introduction to World Literature I	(24/24)
FLM 170 Introduction to Film	(24/24)
HON 205 Interdisciplinary Honors Core II: The Medieval World	(15/15)
HUM 203 Medieval Culture	(n-o)
MUSH 261 Global Musical Experience	(35/100)
MUSH 270 Multicultural Arts	(n-o)
PHIL 100 Beginning Philosophy	(30/30)
PHIL 103 Beginning Ethics	(30/30)
THEA 110 Introduction to Theatre	(20/35)

7. Humanities II

COMS 290 Conflict and Communication	(30/30)
ENG 205 Language: Culture and Mind	(n-o)
FRN 101 Beginning French I	(20/20)
GER 101 Beginning German I	(30/30)
GOVT 180 Introduction to Political Theory	(20/50)
HST 110 World History Since 1945	(40/40)
HST 111 World History through Film	(40/40)
IST 250 International Culture and Diversity	(25/25)
PHIL 106 Beginning Logic	(30/30)
SPA 101 Spanish Language and Culture I	(30/30)

8. Social and Behavioral Sciences I

COMS 250 Introduction to Intercultural Communication	(30/30)
ETM 101 Social Dimensions of Technology	(50/50)
FIN 264 Personal Finance	(75/75)
GOVT 141 United States Government	(20/50)
GOVT 147 Public Service through Science	(n-o)

GOVT 262 U.S. Foreign Policy	(50/50)
HST 105 U.S. History Since 1945	(40/40)
HUM 250 American and Global Citizenship	(n-o)
MKT 200 The ABC's of Marketing	(n-o)
MNGT 101 Reel Business	(n-o)
PLS 200 Law and Individual Rights	(40/40)
RAPP 101 Introduction to Public Policy	(n-o)
SOC 203 American Social Problems	(35/90)

9. Social and Behavioral Sciences II

AGR 185 Current Food and Energy Issues	(n-o)
APS 201 Introduction to Appalachia	(35/35)
ECON 101 Introduction to Economics	(35, 35)
ETM 200 Technology and Society	(25, 25)
FIN 160 Money: A Cultural Exchange	(n-o)
GEO 100 The Human World	(30, 30)
GOVT 102 Introduction to Politics	(n-o)
GST 273 Introduction to Women's Studies	(25, 25)
HLTH 151 Wellness: Theory to Action	(30, 30)
HON 210 Interdisciplinary Honors Core III: The Renaissance and Enlightenment World	(n-o)
IST 101 Introduction to International Studies	(25/30)
PSY 154 Introduction to Psychology	(50/120)
RAPP 203 Society, Nature and Development	(n-o)
SOC 101 Introduction to Sociology	(20/70)

10. Natural Sciences I

BIOL 105 Biology for Your Life	(35/40)
BIOL 155 Environmental Biology	(30/30)
ETM 104 Human Factors At Work	(50/50)
ETM 201 Technology and Life Sciences	(50/50)
MATH 125 Introduction to Biostatistics	(30/30)
NUTR 101 Nutrition and Well Being	(50/50)
NEUR 121 Introduction to Brain and Behavior	(15/15)
PSY 121 Introduction to Brain and Behavior	(15/15)
RAPP 289 Regional Natural History	(n-o)

11. Natural Sciences II

ASTR 105 Your Cosmic Context	(50/50)
ASTR 112 Introductory Astronomy	(50/50)
CHEM 104 The Chemistry of Ordinary Things	(n-o)
ESS 102 Dangerous Planet	(35/50)
GEO 103 Physical Geography	(30/30)
GEO 245 Natural Landscapes of Appalachia	(n-o)
HON 215 Interdisciplinary Honors Core IV: The Modern World	(15/15)
PHYS 109 History of the Universe	(n-o)
RAPP 202 Basic Computer Techniques in Regional Analysis	(n-o)
SCI 104 Modern Issues and Problems in the Physical Sciences	(30/30)
ETM 123 Concepts and Experiences in Energy	(30/30)
PHYS 123 Concepts and Experiences in Energy	(n-o)
SCI 123 Concepts and Experiences in Energy	(48/48)
SSE 123 Concepts and Experiences in Energy	(n-o)

Integrative Category

12. Integrative Component

Students must take the course that is for their major of study.

AGR 499C Senior Seminar in Agriculture	
ART 499C Visual Art Capstone	
ASTR 499C Senior Thesis I	
ASTR 499D Senior Thesis II	
BBA 499C Strategic Management	
BIOL 499C Contemporary Environmental Issues*	
BIOL 499D Principles of Evolution	
BIOL 499E Current Issues in Biomedical Sciences	
BIS 499C Methods of Teaching Business and Information Technology Education	
CHEM 499C Chemistry Senior Project I	
CHEM 499D Chemistry Senior Project II	
CHEM 499E Issues in Chemistry	
COMS 499C Senior Seminar in Communication	
CRIM 499C Senior Criminology Capstone	
CRW 499C Senior Thesis	
CS 499C Capstone and Senior Thesis I	

[CS 499D](#) Capstone and Senior Thesis II
[CTMR 499C](#) Seminar in Magnetic Resonance
[DMS 499C](#) Seminar in Sonography
[EDEC 499C](#) Senior Seminar
[EDEM 499C](#) Seminar in Effective Teaching
[ENG 499C](#) Senior Seminar in English
[ESS 499C](#) Earth System Science Senior Thesis
[ESS 499D](#) C & I Action Research in ESS
[FRN 499C](#) Senior Colloquium in French
[GOVT 499C](#) Senior Seminar
[HLTH 499C](#) Senior Seminar in Health Promotion
[HPE 499C](#) Senior Seminar in HPE*
[HST 499C](#) Senior Seminar in History
[EDSE 499D](#) Teaching Social Studies*
[ETM 499C](#) Senior Project
[IMS 499C](#) Senior Seminar in Imaging Sciences
[IST 499C](#) Senior Seminar
[MATH 499C](#) Capstone and Senior Thesis I
[MATH 499D](#) Capstone and Senior Thesis II
[MSU 499C](#) Senior Seminar
[MUSP 499C](#) Senior Recital
[MUSW 499C](#) Senior Project
[NURB 499C](#) Advanced Nursing Practicum
[NURB 499D](#) Nursing Synthesis
[PHED 499D](#) Senior Capstone in Exercise Science
[PHIL 499C](#) Senior Seminar in Philosophy
[PHYS 499C](#) Capstone and Senior Thesis I
[PHYS 499D](#) Capstone and Senior Thesis II
[PLS 499C](#) Senior Paralegal Practice Seminar
[PPOL 499C](#) Senior Seminar in Public Policy
[PSY 499C](#) Systems and Theories of Psychology
[SOC 499C](#) Senior Seminar
[SPA 499C](#) Senior Seminar
[SPMT 499C](#) Senior Capstone
[SSE 499C](#) Senior Design Project II
[SWK 499C](#) Senior Seminar
[THEA 499C](#) Senior Seminar Theatre
[VET 499C](#) Veterinary Technician Seminar

Courses with an * require admission into the Teacher Education Program.

Table II-3. Student Learner Outcomes Addressed by each of the 12 Categories

	F Y S	W C I	W C II	O C	M R	H I	H II	S B S I	S B S II	N S I	N S II	I C
1. Communication Skills												
1a. Speak effectively in conversational, small group, public, or intercultural contexts.				X								X
1b. Read college-level texts for comprehension.	X	X		X			X		X			
1c. Write effectively for a variety of target audiences using conventions associated with standard English.		X	X									X
1d. Convey relationships using two or more of the following: equations, graphs, tables, maps and diagrams.								X	X			
2. Intellectual Skills												
2a. Employ current research technologies in the process of locating, analyzing, evaluating and using information.		X	X	X								

	F Y S	W C I	W C II	O C	M R	H I	H II	S B S I	S B S II	N S I	N S II	I C
2b. Effectively utilize deductive or inductive reasoning.											X	
2c. Analyze or evaluate diverse points of view.			X					X				
2d. Articulate ethical consequences of decisions or actions.	X											
2e. Apply knowledge and skills to new settings.	X											X
3. Quantitative Skills												
3a. Analyze problems using arithmetic, geometric, algebraic or statistical methods.					X							
3b. Use deductive reasoning in a formal, symbolic, axiomatic system.					X							
3c. Verify answers to mathematical or scientific problems.					X							

(cont'd on next page)

	F Y S	W C I	W C II	O C	M R	H I	H II	S B S I	S B S II	N S I	N S II	I C
4. Knowledge of Human Cultures												
4a. Investigate the history of the basic principles or operations of the United States government with a view to being a responsible citizen.								X				
4b. Investigate the worldview of societies outside the United States.						X	X					
4c. Analyze historical processes that influence individuals or groups.							X					
4d. Demonstrate the knowledge necessary to make choices that promote sustained health and well-being.									X	X		
5. Knowledge of the Natural World												
5a. Classify statements as scientific or nonscientific.										X		

	F Y S	W C I	W C II	O C	M R	H I	H II	S B S I	S B S II	N S I	N S II	I C
5b. Apply scientific or technological concepts to solving problems of natural systems.										X	X	
5c. Employ a scientific approach to analyze scientific questions.											X	
6. Knowledge of Aesthetics												
6a. Discuss how ideas are communicated through the expressive arts; e.g., literature, theatre, dance, music, or visual arts.						X						
6b. Analyze the aesthetic value of creative productions in a cultural or historical context.						X						
Student Learner Outcome Count	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Note: FYS = First Year Seminar; WCI = Writing Core I; WCII = Writing Core II; OC = Oral Communications; MR = Math Reasoning; HI = Humanities I; HII = Humanities II; SBS I = Social and Behavioral Sciences I; SBS II = Social and Behavioral Sciences II; NS I = Natural Sciences I; NS II = Natural Sciences II; IC = Integrative Component

Table II-4. Kentucky Statewide General Education Core and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), and Morehead State University (MSU) Equivalencies

Source: Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education's *General Education Transfer Policy and Implementation Guidelines [effective Fall 2012]*

A. Written (WC) and Oral (OC) Communication (6 to 9 hours)

SLOs

A1. Write clear and effective prose in several forms, using conventions appropriate to audience (including academic audiences), purpose, and genre.

MSU Equivalent: SLO 1c (see Table II-1)

A2. Listen and speak competently in a variety of communication contexts, which may include public, interpersonal, and/or small-group settings.

MSU Equivalent: SLO 1a

A3. Find, analyze, evaluate, and cite pertinent primary and secondary sources, including academic databases, to prepare speeches and written texts.

MSU Equivalent: SLO 2a

A4. Identify, analyze, and evaluate statements, assumptions, and conclusions representing diverse points of view; and construct informed, sustained, and ethical arguments in response.

MSU Equivalent: SLO 2c

A5. Plan, organize, revise, practice, edit, and proofread to improve the development and clarity of ideas.

MSU Equivalent: None

Each WC course must address SLO A1 and at least two of the following SLOs: A3, A4, A5.

Each OC course must address SLO A2 and at least two of the following SLOs: A3, A4, A5.

Across the WC and OC courses taken by a student, each of the five SLOs must be addressed at least once.

MSU Compliance

MSU's general education program requires 6 hours of WC (i.e., Writing Core I and Writing Core II, see Table 2) and 3 hours of OC (i.e., Oral Communications).

Writing Core I addresses SLOs 1b, 1c (A1), and 2a (A3) (see Table II-3).

Writing Core II addresses SLOs 1c (A1), 2a (A3), and 2c (A4).

Oral Communications addresses SLOs 1a (A2), 1b, and 2a (A3).

MSU's general education program appears to have the following compliance failures:

1. Writing Core I does not address at least two of A3, A4, A5.
2. Oral Communications does not address at least two of A3, A4, A5.
3. Across Writing Core I, Writing Core II, and Oral Communications, SLO A5 is not addressed at least once.

B. Quantitative Reasoning (QR) (3 to 6 hours)

SLOs

B1. Interpret information presented in mathematical and/or statistical forms.

MSU Equivalent: SLO 3c

B2. Illustrate and communicate mathematical and/or statistical information symbolically, visually, and/or numerically.

MSU Equivalent: SLOs 3a and 3c

B3. Determine when computations are needed and to execute the appropriate computations.

MSU Equivalent: SLO 3a

B4. Apply an appropriate model to the problem to be solved.

MSU Equivalent: SLO 3a

B5. Make inferences, evaluate assumptions, and assess limitations in estimation modeling and/or statistical analysis.

MSU Equivalent: None

Each QR course must address all five SLOs.

MSU Compliance

MSU's general education program requires 3 hours of QR (i.e., Math Reasoning).

Math Reasoning addresses SLOs 3a (B2, B3, B4), 3b, and 3c (B1, B2).

MSU's general education program appears to have the following compliance failure:

1. Math Reasoning does not address SLO B5.

C. Arts and Humanities (AH) (6 to 9 hours)

SLOs

C1. Utilize basic formal elements, techniques, concepts and vocabulary of specific disciplines within the Arts and Humanities.

MSU Equivalent: This SLO is addressed by taking AH courses

C2. Distinguish between various kinds of evidence by identifying reliable sources and valid arguments.

MSU Equivalent: SLOs 2a and 2b

C3. Demonstrate how social, cultural, and historical contexts influence creative expression in the arts and humanities.

MSU Equivalent: SLOs 4c and 6b

C4. Evaluate the significance of human expression and experience in shaping larger social, cultural, and historical contexts.

MSU Equivalent: SLO 6a

C5. Evaluate enduring and contemporary issues of human experience.

MSU Equivalent: None

Foreign Language: Demonstrate competency in a foreign language. Foreign language study develops essential skills and cultural awareness critical for success in a multilingual world.

Each AH course must address at least three of the five SLOs.

Across the AH courses taken by a student, each of the five SLOs must be addressed at least once.

MSU Compliance

MSU's general education program requires 6 hours of AH (i.e., Humanities I and Humanities II).

Humanities I addresses SLOs 4b, 6a (C4), 6b (C3), and (C1).

Humanities II addresses SLOs 1b, 4b, 4c (C3), and (C1).

MSU's general education program appears to have the following compliance failures:

1. Humanities II does not address at least three of the five SLOs.

2. Across Humanities I and Humanities II, SLOs C2 and C5 are not addressed at least once.

D. Natural Sciences (NS) (3 to 7 hours)

SLOs

D1. Demonstrate an understanding of the methods of science inquiry.

MSU Equivalent: SLOs 5a and 5c

D2. Explain basic concepts and principles in one or more of the sciences.

MSU Equivalent: This SLO is addressed by taking NS courses.

D3. Apply scientific principles to interpret and make predictions in one or more of the sciences.

MSU Equivalent: SLOs 2b and 5c

D4. Explain how scientific principles relate to issues of personal and/or public importance.

MSU Equivalent: SLOs 4d and 5b

Each NS course must address all four SLOs.

Across the NS courses taken by a student, at least one course must include a hands-on project using scientific principles (category experience).

MSU Compliance

MSU's general education program requires 6 hours of NS (i.e., Natural Sciences I and Natural Sciences II).

Natural Sciences I addresses SLOs 4d (D4), 5a (D1), 5b (D4), and (D2).

Natural Sciences II addresses SLOs 2b (D3), 5b (D4), 5c (D1, D3), and (D2).

MSU's general education program appears to have the following compliance failures:

1. Natural Sciences I does not address all four SLOs.

2. Neither Natural Sciences I nor Natural Sciences II includes a hands-on project using scientific principles.

E. Social and Behavioral Sciences (SB) (6 to 9 hours)

SLOs

E1. Demonstrate knowledge of at least one area of the social and behavioral sciences.

MSU Equivalent: This SLO is addressed by taking SB courses.

E2. Apply knowledge, theories, and research methods, including ethical conduct, to analyze problems pertinent to at least one area of the social and behavioral sciences.

MSU Equivalent: SLO 2e

E3. Understand and demonstrate how at least one area of the social and behavioral sciences conceptualizes diversity and the ways it shapes human experience.

MSU Equivalent: SLO 4b

E4. Integrate knowledge of at least one area of the social and behavioral sciences into issues of personal or public importance.

MSU Equivalent: SLO 4d

E5. Communicate effectively using the language and terminology germane to at least one area of the social and behavioral sciences.

MSU Equivalent: SLOs 1a, 1c, and 1d

A student must take at least two SB courses from different disciplines.

Across the SB courses taken by a student, each of the five SLOs must be addressed at least once.

MSU Compliance

MSU's general education program requires 6 hours of SB (i.e., Social and Behavioral Sciences I and Social and Behavioral Sciences II).

Social and Behavioral Sciences I addresses SLOs 1d (E5), 2c, 4a, and (E1).

Social and Behavioral Sciences II addresses SLOs 1b, 1d (E5), 4d (E4), and (E1).

MSU's general education program appears to have the following compliance failures:

1. Across Social and Behavioral Sciences I and II, SLOs E2 and E3 are not addressed at least once.
2. Given that a particular discipline may be represented in both the Social and Behavioral Sciences I category and the Social and Behavioral Sciences II category, it is possible that the SB courses taken by a student are not from different disciplines.

Integrative Capstone Component

Requiring a senior capstone course in MSU's general education curriculum was intended to offer students a culminating experience. This integrative component of general education requires students to demonstrate proficiency in specific student learner outcomes. In 2009, the General Education Curriculum and Course Distribution Proposal (GECCDP) approved by the Faculty Senate on May 7th, 2009, stated, "[C]apstone courses are designed as cumulative and integrative measures of students' attainment of general education and discipline-specific goals. Courses should require students to demonstrate the ability to integrate certain knowledge, skills, and dispositions with their chosen discipline." Various teaching methodologies and modes of capstone delivery ensure academic freedom for faculty when guiding students to the attainment of these goals.

The original capstone GECCDP approved by the Faculty Senate stated that programs could choose to create a three (3) or more credit hour course to fulfill the requirement, and currently, senior capstone course credits range from one (1) to three (3) credit hours. Most courses with the suffix C are identified as 3 credit-hour courses, but some with a C designation offer only two (2) hours of credit. In addition to courses taken for two (2) to three (3) hours of credit to the student, additional courses identified with the suffix D and E, allow only one (1) to two (2) hours of credit. The flexibility of variable credit hours allows faculty to offer the capstone over 2 semesters.

Thirty-eight (38) senior capstone courses were offered in Spring 2017, broken down into thirty-five (35) from face-to-face sections (offered on Main Campus or a satellite facility) and three (3) online sections. Currently, thirty-one (31) capstone courses are scheduled for Fall 2017 (27 face-to-face on the Main or a satellite campus) and four (4) online. Two (2) capstone courses will be offered Summer Session 2017 (8 weeks) and two (2) Summer Session II (See Table II-5).

Table II-5. Capstone Course Delivery Calendar Year 2017

Integrative Component (Senior Capstone Courses)							
Course	Hrs.	Spring 2017	Summer Session	Fall 2017	SSI	SSII	Delivery
AGR 499C	3	X		X			Main Campus
ART 499C	3	X		X			Main Campus
ASTR 499C	3	X					Main Campus
ASTR 499D	1	X					Main Campus
BBA 499C	3	X		X		X	Main Campus/ Internet
Biol 499D	3	X		X			Main Campus
Biol 499E	3	X		X			Main Campus
CHEM 499C	3	X		X			Main Campus
CHEM 499D	1	X					Main Campus
CHEM 499E	3	X					Main Campus
COMS 499C	3	X		X			Main Campus

CRIM 499C	3	X		X			Main Campus
CRW 499C	3	X		X			Internet
CS 499C	2	X		X			Main Campus
CS 499D	1	X		X			Main Campus
CTMR 499C	3	X					Main Campus
DMS 499C	3					X	Main Campus
EDEC 499C	3	X		X			Main Campus/ Off Campus
EDEM 499C	3	X	X	X			Internet/ Off Campus
ENG 499C	3			X			Main Campus
ESS 499C	3	X					Main Campus
ETM 499C	3	X		X			Main Campus/ Internet
GOVT 499C	3	X					Main Campus
HLTH 499C	3			X			Internet

HPE 499C	3	X		X			Main Campus
HST 499C	3	X					Main Campus
IMS 499C	3	X					Internet
IST 499C	3	X					Main Campus
MATH 499C	2	X		X			Main Campus
MATH 499D	1	X		X			Main Campus
MSU 499C	3	X	X	X			Internet
MUSP 499C	3	X		X			Main Campus
MUS W 499C	3	X		X			Main Campus
NURB 499C	3	X					Main Campus
NURB 499D	1			X			Main Campus/ Internet
PHED 499D	3	X					Main Campus
PHIL 499C	3			X			Main Campus

PHYS 499C	2	X		X			Main Campus
PHYS 499D	1			X			Main Campus
PLS 499C	3			X			Main Campus
PSY 499C	3	X		X			Main Campus
SOC 499C	3	X					Main Campus
SPA 499C	3	X					Main Campus
SPMT 499C	3			X			Main Campus
SSE 499C	3	X					Main Campus
SWK 499C	3			X			Off Campus
THEA 499C	3	X					Main Campus
VET 499C	3			X			Main Campus

Some capstone courses listed in the University catalog are not scheduled during the semesters identified above.

Course Embedded Assessment

Although the senior capstone remains the responsibility of the discipline, the course must assess specific University general education student learner outcomes (SLOs) as follows (Communication Skills, 1a and 1c; Intellectual Skills, 2e)

- 1a. Speak effectively in conversational, small group, public or intercultural context.
- 1c. Write effectively for a variety of target audiences using conventions associated with standard English.
- 2e. Apply knowledge skills to a new setting.

Faculty may choose how they assess the above SLOs, but all capstone instructors must use common rubrics for assessing the capstone project and presentation. In the past, many faculty considered the common project rubric onerous and not always applicable to their disciplines (See Figure II-1). Taking comments of faculty into consideration, the General Education Council (GEC) appointed a committee to review and revise the senior capstone project rubric. A newly developed rubric was adopted and offered to faculty for use in Spring 2017 (See Figure II-2). Faculty are still required to use the common presentation rubric (See Figure II-3) to assess SLO 1a, speak effectively in conversational, small, group, public or intercultural context.

Figure II-1. Original Capstone Project Rubric¹

SLO	Chapter Performance Indicators	Lacking	Insufficient	Adequate	Ample	Substantial
	Statement of the Purpose					
1c	Clearly articulates a purpose					
2e	Supports the purpose through relevant, current resources					
1c	Summarizes rationale for the project based on the review of resources					
2e	Specifies key objectives to accomplish					
2e	Defines the scope and limitations to focus the project					
2e	Defines unique terminology					

Review of Resources						
2e	Chooses sources (literature, records, interviews, scores, focus groups, presentations) relevant to support the purpose					
1c	Organizes the review around a <u>logical progression</u> of key ideas, themes, styles, etc.					
2e	Summarizes significant ideas derived from the reviewed references/resources					
2e	Synthesizes concepts to demonstrate relationships and patterns of knowledge					
Methods						
1c	Restates the purpose of the project in the introductory paragraph(s) summarizing key elements					
1c	Provides rationale for project design					
2e	Identifies objectives to accomplish the project's purpose					
2e	Develops an implementation plan as a guide to project completion					
2e	Presents an evaluation plan to determine level of project accomplishment					
2e	Describes the methods for collecting the data used for evaluation					
2e	Describes the methods for analyzing the data					

Results/Conclusions & Recommendations						
1c	Summarizes the project					
1c	Describe the sources of data					
2e	Presents findings that address fulfilling the purpose of the project					
2e	Draws conclusions about the effectiveness of the project to accomplish the purpose					
2e	Recommends at least one application of the results					
Style and Format						
1c	Used conventions associated with standard English; noted difficulties with					
	o Grammar					
	o Punctuation					
	o Spelling					
	o Wording					
1c	Engages the target audience					
1c	Uses scholarly writing techniques to create a seamless flow of ideas within and between sections					
1c	Creates clear transitions between related ideas and paragraphs					
1c	Uses discipline specific writing style & formatting throughout					

1c	Incorporates appropriate in-text citations					
1c	Lists references applying appropriate techniques and formats					
Overall Project (components assessed on adequacy scale)						
1c	Complete					
1c	Coherent					
1c	Organized					
32 PIs - 160 possible points						

¹ Adapted from Dr. Paula D. Serra, Ph.D., Morehead State University and Dr. Jennifer Cochran, Ph.D., Central Michigan University

	Adequacy Scale:
1	Lacking (missing, absent)
2	Insufficient (incomplete, not enough , inadequate, underprovided)
3	Adequate (enough , acceptable, passable)
4	Ample (abundant, more than enough , sufficient)
5	Substantial (considerable, extensive, great, huge)

Figure II-2. Revised Capstone Project Rubric (adopted by GEC 10 April 2017 by GEC)

The following Performance Indicators are evaluated with the following scale:

0	1	2	3
Fails criterion	Meets criterion minimally	Meets criterion with minor exceptions	Fully meets criterion

The following Performance Indicators are associated with SLO 1c:

SCORE

- ___ 1. The project uses a coherent organizational structure.
- ___ 2. The project relies on appropriate source material to support relevant ideas.
- ___ 3. Sentences conform to standards of formal edited American English.

- ___ 4. Each paragraph functions well.
- ___ 5. The project conforms to style conventions appropriate to the discipline.
(MLA, APA, Chicago, etc.)

The following Performance Indicators are associated with SLO 2e:

SCORE

- ___ 1. The student frames the task.
- ___ 2. The student identifies relevant information from relevant sources.
- ___ 3. The student designs a course of action to produce the capstone project or as part of the capstone project, or proposes a new perspective on the issue.
- ___ 4. The student reflects on the rationale for the chosen course of action or the advantages of the new perspective.

SLO 1c: Write effectively for a variety of target audiences using conventions associated with standard English.

SLO 2e: Apply knowledge and skills to new settings.

NOTE:

For SLO 1c a student must score at least an 11 total AND must get at least a score of 1 on each performance indicator in order to say they have attained the SLO.

For SLO 2d a student must score at least a 9 total AND must get at least a score of 1 on each performance indicator in order to say they have attained the SLO.

Figure II-3. Capstone Presentation Rubric

<p>Directions: 1) Mark assessed level for each Performance Indicator</p> <p>2) Sum the total for each section (I, II..) in the Score column</p> <p>3) Add all scores to get Total Score.</p>					
SLO	1a) Listen and speak effectively in conversational, small group, public and intercultural contexts	Fails to Meet Criterion	Meets Criterion	Exceeds Criterion	Score
1a	I. Speaking				
	A. Speaks clearly and distinctly throughout	1	2	3	
	B. Uses appropriate language for the discipline	1	2	3	
	C. Vocalized pauses (um, uh, er, etc.) are not distracting	1	2	3	
	D. Speaks with confidence; neither too quickly, nor too slowly	1	2	3	
1a	II. Organization/Preparation				
	A. Introduction effectively communicated presentation goals	1	2	3	
	B. Topic was well focused & appropriate	1	2	3	
	C. Clear evidence of planning, obviously rehearsed	1	2	3	
	D. Conclusion summarized ideas well	1	2	3	
1a	III. Delivery				
	A. Maintains eye contact with the audience	1	2	3	
	B. Facial expression and body language convey strong enthusiasm & interest	1	2	3	

	C. Delivery medium was appropriate	1	2	3	
	D. Listens effectively to adequately address questions	1	2	3	
Content					
2e	2e) Applied knowledge and skills to new settings and/or complex problems				
	A. Summarized most meaningful ideas or findings	1	2	3	
	B. Drew Conclusions	1	2	3	
	C. Discussed possible applications	1	2	3	
Total Score (45 possible)					

First Year Seminar (Freshman Experience)

The First Year Seminar is required for all first-time first year students and transfer students who have earned fewer than 24 credit hours. The course also fulfills the postsecondary education requirement of nine hours in the Social and Behavioral Sciences.

The purpose of MSU’s First Year Seminar (FYS) course and its role in general education may be best explained in terms of its development and implementation into general education. During the last revision of general education by the General Education Council Advisory Committee (FGEAC), faculty questioned the benefit to students of the existing freshman orientation class (MSU 101). In response, a subcommittee was assembled consisting of many instructors who had taught MSU 101 to evaluate the freshman orientation course and freshman experience, using national “best practices” as their guide for inspiration. The subcommittee review and evaluation revealed the following:

- Many institutions had courses ranging from 1 to 3 credit hours;
- Most institutions had a common reading;
- Some institutions had learning communities that incorporated activities for all students, hence the term freshman experience;
- Most institutions required academic rigor in the course, rather than merely orientation activities;
- Courses were developed by faculty based on their area of expertise and students were allowed to select a freshman experience course based on interest and not their major;
- Professional speakers were a component of the freshman experience;

- Faculty taught most of the courses offered, but staff meeting certain criteria were allowed to teach;
- Some institutions required service learning as a component; and
- Most institutions had a regional theme.

Based upon the findings of the subcommittee, the FGEAC began the process of developing a first year seminar to meet the following expectations:

1. All course would be 3 credit hours to promote academic rigor;
2. All courses would focus on a common theme, initially “Fact or fiction”;
3. All sections would use a required common textbook selected by the FYS subcommittee to promote the common theme, with a pre-test and post-test to be given across all sections to assess reading comprehension;
4. All courses would require students to write a 10-page paper (currently eliminated as a course requirement);
5. Attendance should be a valued component of each student’s grade (at a suggested weight of 10%); and
6. The First Year Subcommittee would select three speakers per semester and student attendance would be mandatory.

At a later date, the First Year seminar subcommittee agreed that certain components of MSU 101 would be incorporated by providing modules for the students to review, including study skills, time and money management, test taking skills, career planning activities, and, campus safety guidelines and academic policies. Development of these modules never came to fruition as instructors believed that their forced incorporation into courses impinged on academic freedom. Instructors previously teaching MSU 101 continue to present all or some of these topics in their FYS course. Other instructors believe the required incorporation of QEP critical thinking assessment into all FYS courses prevents the coverage of additional content.

Course Proposals

Historically, all course proposals were initially and continue to be vetted by the First Year Seminar Subcommittee, with final acceptance approved by the GEC. Following the original intent of the FGEAC and FYS Subcommittee, faculty are encouraged to develop intellectually challenging courses which also provide students with a unique and interesting experience.

Listed next are a few descriptions of FYS courses offered in the fall of 2016, demonstrating the diverse interests first-year students may explore.

Millionaire Mindset and the Road to Financial Freedom: Knowledge Pay\$ Off

Many college students today are faced with daunting student loans, high credit card debt, and other financial burdens when they graduate and before they find good paying jobs. This course is intended to introduce students to personal finance and financial literacy education resources aimed at supporting students as they develop their personal finance life skills. Students will use financial literacy resources to explore well-proven methods aimed at ensuring lifelong financial stability.

Medical Dramas: Fact or Fiction – Is There a Doctor in the “House”?

Medical dramas are not new to television, as they have been a staple for TV viewers since the 1960's. Shows such as Dr. Kildare and Marcus Welby, MD, brought medicine into the homes of thousands of Americans. Medical dramas have evolved over the years. The excitement sparked by the show ER in the early 1990's helped to shape the future of many medical series, setting the standard for shows which viewers watch today. In this course, students will view real examples from medical TV shows such as, “ER”, “House”, and Grey's Anatomy”. The students will examine the impact of these shows and their coloring of the public's perception of medicine and the individuals who deliver healthcare. In addition, they will evaluate the accuracy of medical situations and examine the relationships between physicians and patients, and other members of the healthcare team.

The Holocaust in Literature and Film

This seminar will examine many different types of Holocaust film (genres ranging from comedy to psychodrama, docudrama, and filmed testimony) and literature (memoir, fiction, the graphic novel, and poetry). We will conduct close analyses of film excerpts and writings, focusing on perspectives, aims, and topical focus such as resistance, complicity, or moral ambivalence, as well as the treatment of Jewish victim groups, non-Jewish victim groups, perpetrators, and bystanders.

Big Bang Theory and More: Higher Education on TV

Do you believe that colleges and universities are accurately portrayed in TV programming? By viewing excerpts from Friends, Undeclared, The Big Bang Theory, Saved by the Bell The College Years and other programs, we will explore the structure of universities and common misconceptions of university life. Students will learn about Morehead State University and how to be a successful college student.

Ensuring Quality Instruction through Faculty Training and Resources

Historically, both the FGEAC and First Year Seminar Subcommittee believe only the best teachers should teach the course to ensure its success. Initially, all faculty were required to attend FYS Faculty Training Workshops to develop skills essential to the success of the program, and numerous sessions were offered to accommodate faculty. In the last several years, a First Year Seminar Resource Manual has been compiled and disseminated to all faculty teaching the course. Listed below is the table of contents of the manual.

Table of Contents

Thank You!	2
FYS Course Checklist	3
Disciplinary Content	3
QEP Inclusion	4
Student Learning Outcomes.....	4
Pre-Test & Post-Test	4
FYS Required Reading	5
Library Session	5
Speakers	5
Financial Literacy	6
MSU Student Success Content	6
FYS Course Evaluation Information	6
SLO Assessment Reporting.....	6
Professional Development Account Information	7
FYS Sub-Committee	11
FYS Course Evaluation	13
PDA Forms	14

Resources and faculty expectations are outlined in the manual. In addition, a “toolbox” can be located online through the Library as described on the next page.

Library/Research Critical Thinking Activities

Below is a list of approved research-related MSU Critical Thinking activities that can be conducted for your students by library instructors. These activities can help your course meet the QEP requirements AND receive the mandatory library instruction simultaneously! In addition to conducting these activities, librarians can also provide you with the student answer sheets so that you can evaluate student performance using the applicable Gen Ed rubric if you so desire.

- Ancient Aliens Video Analysis -- Using a clip from the TV Show "Ancient Aliens," takes students through an exploration of the dangers of misinformation. Provides education about the distinction between reliable and unreliable "experts" and sources of information. The activity can be evaluated using rubric 2e.
- Avoiding Plagiarism -- Analyzing an example of possible plagiarism from a Beyonce video, educates students about plagiarism and how to avoid committing it. The activity can be evaluated using rubric 2d.
- Evaluating Sources of Information -- Requires students to think critically in order to rank various information sources according to their reliability. Students then evaluate a website based on seven specific criteria. The activity can be evaluated using rubric 2e.
- Finding and Analyzing Library Sources -- Using a possible "Bigfoot" sighting as a topic of research and discussion, this activity teaches students how to locate books and peer-reviewed articles in library collections, and how to analyze what they have read. The activity is designed to be completed in one class period. No rubric is used.

Figure II-4. Faculty Resources as Part of FYS Toolbox.

Ensuring Quality Instruction through FYS Instructor Evaluation

All faculty teaching FYS are evaluated by the FYS Subcommittee to ensure students are receiving quality instruction. Lack of resources has prevented evaluation by in-class observations, but an overall performance level of less than 3.0 on items 1-18 on the Faculty/ Course Evaluation administered in class triggers further assessment:

1. The FYS Coordinator will meet with the instructor to evaluate classroom instruction and course management to identify any potential problems.
2. The FYS subcommittee will arrange classroom observations to provide feedback to the instructor and FYS coordinator.
3. The FYS Coordinator and instructor will develop and implement a strategy for addressing any instructional weaknesses identified, which might include, but is not limited to, a) taking advantage of professional development activities, b) team teaching FYS sections, c) discontinuing FYS instruction over one's required teaching loads, and d) discontinuing FYS instruction entirely.

Should an FYS instructor's overall level of performance remain below 3.0 on items 1-18 for two consecutive semesters of FYS instruction, the next level of assessment will occur:

1. The FYS Coordinator will meet with the instructor to evaluate classroom instruction and course management to identify potential problems.
2. The FYS Coordinator will meet with the instructor's department chair to discuss any deficiencies (the instructor may participate in the discussion).
3. The FYS Coordinator and instructor's department chair will arrange classroom observations by FYS Subcommittee members and departmental faculty.
4. The FYS Coordinator, instructor, and the instructor's department chair will develop and implement a strategy for addressing any instructional weaknesses identified.

Should an instructor's overall level of performance remain below 3.0 on items 1-18 for three consecutive semesters of FYS instruction, further intervention will occur:

1. The instructor will be limited to teaching only one course the next semester and not above one's expected teaching load.
2. The FYS Coordinator will meet once again with the instructor to evaluate classroom instruction and course management to identify any potential problems.
3. An additional meeting between the FYS Coordinator and the instructor's department chair will take place, with the instructor invited to participate if desired.
4. The FYS Coordinator and instructor's department chair will schedule further classroom observations by FYS Subcommittee members and departmental faculty.
5. The FYS Coordinator, instructor, and the instructor's department chair will develop and implement a strategy for addressing any instructional weaknesses identified.

Finally, should an instructor's overall level of performance remain below 3.0 on items 1-18 for four consecutive semesters of FYS instruction, the instructor will be denied the opportunity to teach an FYS section for a period of three semesters.

Instructing First Year Seminar is an incentivized opportunity. Because timely general education assessment of assigned student learner outcomes is important to the overall evaluation of the FYS program, should an instructor fail to submit general education assessment data by the designated timeline, professional development funds will not be awarded. Should an instructor fail to submit assessment data for a second semester, funds will not be awarded and opportunities to teach FYS will be denied.

First Year Seminar General Education Assessment

Upon its creation, the FYS course was required to assess six (6) SLOs, more than any other general education course, proving onerous and appearing to deter faculty from teaching the course. A later redistribution of SLOs across all courses to remove disproportionately strenuous assessment burdens on some courses resulted in the assignment to FYS of the SLOs below assessed according to the rubrics that follow:

Communication Skills	Intellectual Skills
1b. Read college level texts for comprehension	2d. Articulate ethical consequences of decisions or actions
	2e. Apply knowledge and skills to new settings*

* SLO 2e is assessed in both the FYS and Senior Capstone courses.

SLO 2d - Articulate ethical consequences of decisions or actions.						
SLO	Performance Indicators	No Evidence	Insufficient Evidence	Sufficient Evidence	Overwhelming Evidence	Score
2d	Self-awareness					
	Identifies the issues	1	2	3	4	
	States their belief	1	2	3	4	

States the origin of the belief	1	2	3	4	
Articulates Assumptions	1	2	3	4	
Analyzes alternatives and consequences					
Explains alternative courses of action to take	1	2	3	4	
Identifies potential effects on people, places, and things	1	2	3	4	
Evaluates alternative courses of action based on consequences to those affected	1	2	3	4	
Decision making					
Explains a specific course of action	1	2	3	4	
Outlines concepts used in reaching the decision	1	2	3	4	
Total Score (36 points possible)					
Comment:					

Evidence (E) Scale	Descriptors
Overwhelming Evidence	Embellished, vast, great, tremendous, massive

Sufficient Evidence	Stated, detailed, listed, itemized, quantified
Insufficient Evidence	Barely articulated, not enough, disorganized, scarce, unclear, incomplete
No evidence	Not articulated, nothing, zilch

General Education Management and Governance

The general education program at Morehead State University is managed by the General Education Council. The council approves general education and exchange courses, assesses the general education program, and implements improvements to the program.

History and Evolution

The General Education Council is the most recent in a series of organized bodies devoted to the advancement of general education at Morehead State University. Beginning in February 2007, a small group of faculty and administrators gathered as the General Education Task Force (GETF; estimated dates of service. February 2007 – December 2007), charged with the task of initiating and organizing a new general education program. The GETF produced the document *Pathways to Success* later distributed to faculty, with its goal to frame and chart the course of general education reform at the University. With the creation of the Faculty General Education Advisory Council (FGEAC), the GETF changed its name to the General Education Steering Committee (GESC) for the remainder of its life (est. January 2007 – June 2009), adding to its membership the Chair of the FGEAC.

Consisting of an initial 22 members representing broad faculty constituencies across campus (with the expectation of increasing membership to serve on subcommittees as needed), the FGEAC began its work in December 2009 (est.). Representatives were elected by each department with an expectation of a two-year commitment (until Spring 2010 est.) and an agreement to work according to the general education reform timeline established by the University. The position of FGEAC chair was appointed by the GESC from among the elected FGEAC representatives.

The GESC disbanded in June 2009 (est.), passing on responsibilities for governing general education to the newly created general education academic unit (University College) and the General Education Council (GEC). Having completed its charge by submitting a general education framework and assessment plan to the Faculty Senate, the FGEAC was also disbanded at the same time. Currently responsible for the direction of general education,

the GEC was formed in April 2009 (and approved by Faculty Senate vote in May 2009) and revised in June 2010, September 2011, and November 2011.

GEC Charge and Responsibilities

The GEC is responsible for directing, managing, and reviewing the General Education program at Morehead State University including, but not limited to, the following areas:

- General Education assessment, including the direction, implementation, and supervision of program assessment;
- General Education course management, including the selection, evaluation, approval, and processing of courses within the general education curriculum; and
- General Education program structure, including the review and supplying of suggestions and recommendations for program improvements.

Meeting Schedule and General Education Documentation

The full membership of the GEC must meet at least once per academic year. Over the past several years, the GEC has typically met at least once or twice per month during the academic year and more frequently as necessary.

Clerical support is supplied the GEC by the Office of Academic Affairs/Academic Programs. Minutes for each meeting are posted through the MyMoreheadstate portal (Academics → General Education → Gen Ed. Council (GEC) → Gen. Ed. Council Minutes). Reports, general education assessment data, and all documentation involving assessment originates from the Office of Assessment and Testing.

Membership and Procedures

The GEC functions as a University Standing Committee whose membership is made up of non-voting members sitting on the committee by virtue of their roles and expertise throughout the University and/or as representatives of other entities whose charges and responsibilities may be impacted by the actions of the General Education Council. Faculty positions (divided into college representatives and members at-large) come with voting privileges, and they are filled as a result of Faculty Senate vote. Each year, the Faculty Senate's Governance Committee nominates a spate of eligible candidates to fill open positions on the GEC, and candidates are approved by a simple majority of votes in the Faculty Senate as a whole. Should a nominee not be approved, the Faculty Senate Chair may nominate another individual to serve. Department chair representatives or their equivalents are chosen by members of the University's Chair Council. Appointment for all positions is made in the spring for service beginning in the following fall semester.

As originally established, the GEC consists of the following positions, all voting unless otherwise noted:

1. Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs/Academic Programs
(Chair—non-voting)
2. Registrar or his/her representative (non-voting)
3. Director of Testing and Assessment (or Accreditation Officer appointed by the Provost—non-voting)
4. Dean of Library Services or his/her representative (non-voting)
5. First-Year Seminar Coordinator or his/her representative (*ex officio*—voting)
6. Department chair or equivalent
7. Department chair or equivalent
8. Chair-Elect of the Faculty Senate
9. Faculty member—College of Business and Public Affairs
10. Faculty member—College of Education
11. Faculty member—Caudill College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences
12. Faculty member—College of Science and Technology
13. Faculty member at-large
14. Faculty member at-large
15. Faculty member at-large
16. Faculty member at-large
17. Faculty member at-large
18. Faculty member at-large

Note. In the original description of the GEC, a General Education Director is designated as chair. With the dissolving of University College, this position is presently not filled or has been eliminated.

Membership Rules

1. Faculty members representing their respective colleges must be tenured. With the exception of the Faculty Senate chair-elect, whose position is filled yearly, they will serve three-year terms offset to ensure revolving membership each year.
2. At-large members must routinely teach general education courses. They will serve offset three-year terms.
3. No two voting members may represent the same department (Note: Exceptions have been made when department chair representation has been difficult to secure.)
4. No faculty member or department chair can serve more than two consecutive terms. After two consecutive terms, a member can only serve again after a one-year interruption in membership.
5. The Chair-Elect of the Faculty Senate will serve a one-year term and act as a communication liaison between the GEC and the Faculty Senate. In cases when the chair-elect is already serving on the GEC or is unable to serve, the current Chair of the Faculty Senate will appoint another faculty senator from the Executive Council.

6. Department membership restrictions (see point 3 above) do not apply to the First Year Seminar Coordinator and the Chair-Elect of the Faculty Senate.
7. Department chairs must hail from different colleges and will serve offset three-year terms.
8. Any GEC member may invite non-voting visitors to meetings to provide input as appropriate.
9. Any member wishing to remove him- or herself from the GEC must follow the procedures for resigning from a University Standing Committee. Written notification must be provided to the Chair of the GEC, the Faculty Senate secretary, and the faculty member's department chair.

Standing Subcommittees

The First Year Seminar Subcommittee is responsible for directing the First Year Seminar program, including recruiting faculty, supervising enrollment, and recommending improvements to the program. The subcommittee consists of the following membership, all holding positions on the GEC unless otherwise noted:

First Year Seminar Coordinator
Director of First-Year Programs (non-GEC)
Six GEC members

III. Delivery of the General Education Program

An investigation of patterns in general education course delivery involves three main considerations: 1) the various modes of delivering general education courses (Face-to-face, ITV, or on-line); 2) how many courses are delivered via various modes as a percentage of the total of all general education courses offered; and 3) the scheduling of courses during a school day and school week.

Modes of Delivery and Proportion of Course Offerings

Figure III-1. illustrates the total number of general education courses offered over a recent two-semester, and projected third semester, period from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017. During this period, the total number of general education sections offered has fluctuated mildly as a result of demand, or lack thereof, and/or the resulting need for more efficient use of resources (See “Cost of General Education Program” for additional information), peaking in Fall 2016 for all courses. This pattern in the number of sections prevails regardless of the type of course (Core or Distribution) or the mode of delivery (online or face-to-face). The representative proportion of sections, type and mode of delivery, sometimes varies, however.

For example, Table III-1 also reveals that the representative proportion of Core sections as a percentage of all sections has remained relatively stable, with a slight increase as projected for Spring 2017. The percentage of Distribution sections as a percentage of all sections has also remained relatively stable, with a slight decrease as projected for Spring 2017.

Table III-1. General Education Courses Offered by Type of Course

Metric	SP 2016	FA 2016	SP 2017 (projected)
Total number of sections offered	328	361	279
Number of Core sections offered/representing % of total sections offered	189/ 57.6%	218/ 60.4%	171/ 61.3%
Number of Distribution sections offered/representing % of total sections offered	139/ 42.4%	143/ 39.6%	108/ 38.7%

In terms of online and face-to-face courses (See Table III-2), the proportion of the total number of general education sections offered across all three semesters has remained relatively constant even when the number of sections peaked in Fall 2016 and then decreased in Spring 2017.

Looking specifically at Core courses, despite the dramatic decline in the number of sections by Spring 2017, the proportion of Core general education courses offered online and face-to-face remained relatively consistent. With a sharp decline in the number of face-to-face Distribution sections, the proportion of face-to-face sections declined. Online distribution sections as a proportion of all distribution courses offered actually slightly increased by Spring 2017, however. One variable to consider here is whether or not enrollment in online classes has increased.

Table III-2. General Education Core and Distribution Courses by Modes of Delivery
 OL = Online F2F = Face-to-face

Metric	SP 2016	FA 2016	SP 2017 (projected)
Total number of general education sections offered	328	361	279
Number of OL sections offered/representing % of total sections offered	60/ 18.3%	70/ 19.4%	53/ 19%
Number of F2F sections offered/representing % of total sections offered on main campus	268/ 81.7%	291/ 80.6%	226/ 81%
Core sections offered/representing % of total general education sections offered	189/ 57.6%	218/ 60.4%	171/ 61.3%
OL Core sections/representing % of total core sections offered	28/ 14.8%	31/ 14.2%	22/ 12.9%
F2F Core sections /representing % of total core sections offered on main campus	161/ 85.1%	187/ 85.8%	149/ 87.1%

Metric	SP 2016	FA 2016	SP 2017 (projected)
Distribution sections offered/representing % of total general education sections offered	139/ 42.4%	143/ 39.6%	108/ 38.7%
OL Distribution sections/representing % of total distribution sections offered	32/ 23.2%	39/ 27.2%	31/ 28.7%
F2F Distribution sections/representing % of total distribution sections offered on main campus	107/ 76.9%	104/ 72.7%	77/ 71.2%

Course Scheduling

UAR 136.01, Section 10.1.1, establishes two mandates for course scheduling during the academic day and week:

- 1) No more than 70% of classes should be scheduled between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. and at least 30% of classes should be scheduled before 9:00 a.m. or after 3:00 p.m.;
- 2) At least 50% of classes scheduled should include a Friday class meeting.

General Education Courses Overall

As Figure III-3 below indicates, only core courses scheduled during Spring 2016 met the 30% target for early morning/late afternoon offerings. The number of core and distribution courses offered between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. exceeded the 70% target, significantly so during Fall 2016.





Figure III-1. Scheduling of General Education Courses

Core Courses

A breakdown (Figure III-2) of course scheduling by type of general education courses reveals significant violations of the UAR in scheduling sections for four of the five courses in the general education core (FYS, ENG 100 and 200, and Communications) and partial variation by capstone scheduling. On average the targets failed to be met most consistently during Fall 2016 and Spring 2017. The number of distribution courses scheduled over the three semester period consistently exceeded the 70% target. The exceptions included math offerings during Spring 2016 and 2017 and the capstone during Spring and Fall 2016.







Figure III-2. Scheduling of Core Courses

Distribution Courses

As Figure III-3 reveals, with only two exceptions (HUM I for Fall 2016 and NSC 1 for Spring 2017), distribution course scheduling failed to meet the 30% target (before 9 a.m./after 3 p.m.) and in most cases all distribution course scheduling exceeded the 70% limit (between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m.). HUM 2 and NSC 1 seem to be the categories in strongest violation of the UAR over the three-semester period.






Figure III-3. Scheduling of Distribution Courses

Friday Class Meeting

According to UAR 136.01, Section 10.1., 50% of general education classes must include a Friday class period within their scheduling time frame. As Figure III-4 illustrates, University scheduling has only been fully compliant (both core and distributions courses) as of Spring 2017. In the core, the scheduling of the first-year seminar and the capstone have been the least compliant with the UAR (Figure III-5).




Figure III- 4. Scheduling of Courses with Friday Class Meeting




Figure III-5. Scheduling of Core Courses with Friday Class Meetings

As Figure III-6 indicates, of the distribution courses, the HUM 2 and SB 2 categories have been the least consistently compliant with Friday course scheduling; HUM 1 and NSC 2, the most.




Figure III-6. Scheduling of Distribution Courses with a Friday Class Meeting

Conclusions

General education courses—both core and distribution—have been offered in two forms, online and face-to-face, and in varying number of sections over the representative three-semester examination period. On a whole, the most general education sections were offered during Fall 2016, with a sometimes sharp downturn in number of sections offered from Fall 2016 to Spring 2017 (as projected for 2017). The number of core and distribution general education sections as a proportion of the entire number of sections offered has remained relatively consistent, with a few exceptions. Compliance with UAR 136.01, mandating a certain percentage of face-to-face classes be offered at varying times of the day and week, has also been inconsistent, with the seemingly most radical deviation from the policy occurring with the First Year Seminar and the capstone.

IV. Efficiency of the General Education Program

This component of the report includes data and information related to the efficiency of the offerings and enrollment of the courses associated with the General Education Program at Morehead State University.

Efficiency of the General Education Core Courses

The General Education Core consists of the following courses:

- First Year Seminar (3 hours)
- Writing I (3 hours)
- Writing II (3 hours)
- Fundamentals of Speech Communication (3 hours)
- Quantitative Reasoning (3-4 hours) from:
 - General Mathematics and Problem Solving (3 hours)
 - Mathematics for Technical Students (3 hours)
 - College Algebra (3 hours)
 - Pre-Calculus Mathematics (3 hours)
 - Calculus I (4 hours)

The Task Force had access to a limited amount of data for the core courses. The next table shows the enrollment versus capacity for the core courses for the 2016-2017 academic year. As the data reveals, core General Education courses suffer from significant under enrollment. Taken as a group, there was an 8.4% under enrollment of capacity for the fall 2016 semester and 16.1% for the spring 2017 semester.

General Education Course Category	Course	Fall 2016			Spring 2017 (preliminary)		
		Enrollment	Capacity	Percentage of Capacity Unenrolled	Enrollment	Capacity	Percentage of Capacity Unenrolled
Oral Communication	COMS 108	684	728	6.0%	507	588	13.8%
Written Communication	ENG 100	732	792	7.6%	241	352	31.5%
	ENG 200	368	396	7.1%	613	682	10.1%
<i>Written Communication Totals</i>		<i>1100</i>	<i>1188</i>	<i>7.4%</i>	<i>854</i>	<i>1034</i>	<i>17.4%</i>
Quantitative Reasoning	MATH 131	262	265	1.1%	183	210	12.9%
	MATH 135	127	152	16.4%	59	105	43.8%
	MATH 152	290	330	12.1%	183	215	14.9%
	MATH 174	158	194	18.6%	67	90	25.6%
	MATH 175	98	140	30.0%	106	90	-17.8%
<i>Quantitative Reasoning Totals</i>		<i>935</i>	<i>1081</i>	<i>13.5%</i>	<i>598</i>	<i>710</i>	<i>15.8%</i>
First Year Seminar	FYS 101	1273	1361	6.5%	299	360	16.9%
Totals		3992	4358	8.4%	2258	2692	16.1%

Table IV-1: Enrollment versus Capacity, 2016-17 Academic Year


Efficiency of the General Education Distribution Courses

The distribution courses are divided into the three main categories, Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Natural Sciences. Students must take two courses from each category, choosing from several different options.

The following figures show the enrollment versus capacity for the spring semesters from 2013 through 2017 (although spring 2017 enrollment numbers were not included) and the fall semesters from 2013 through 2016.

Spring Semester Enrollment/Capacity Data – General Education Distribution Courses











In light of the underenrollment issues presented in the above figures, Table IV-2 outlines the potential inefficiency for the Spring 2017 semester.

Distribution Category	Colleges (or Programs) offering courses in the category	Spring 2016 Enrollment	Spring 2017 Seats Scheduled	If S17 Enrollment numbers are similar to S16....
HUM1	CCAHSS/HON	695	828	133 surplus seats
HUM2	CCAHSS	681	630	51-seat deficit
SBS1	CCAHSS/CoBT	818	873	55 surplus seats
SBS2	CCAHSS/CoBT/ CoS/HON	750	800	50 surplus seats
NSC1	CoS/CoBT	589	693	104 surplus seats
NSC2	CoS/HON	558	544	14-seat deficit

Table IV-2. Potential inefficiency for the Spring 2017 General Education Distribution Courses.

Fall Semester Enrollment/Capacity Data – General Education Distribution Courses



To alleviate the projected inefficiency in enrollment vs. capacity for the Fall 2017 semester, the following changes have been proposed by the administration as outlined in Table IV-3.

Distribution Category	Colleges (or Programs) offering courses in the category	Fall 2016 Enrollment	Average Cap in Fall 2016	Average cap needed to meet minimum APNA Tier Target	Max number of sections needed in F17 to match F16 enrollment at Targeted Avg. Cap
HUM1	CCAHS/HON	719	36	40	18
HUM2	CCAHS	681	34	40	17
SBS1	CCAHS/CoBT	819	42	50	17
SBS2	CCAHS/CoBT/CoS/HON	750	47	50	15
NSC1	CoS/CoBT	589	38	50	12
NSC2	CoS/HON	558	41	50	12

Table IV-3. Proposed changes to Fall 2017 General Education Distribution courses

As the figures show, there is considerable and consistent inefficiency in the distribution courses for the last several years. As the tables show, the solution to this inefficiency has been to raise capacities for these sections in the coming semesters, straining professors already struggling to provide effective instruction and timely, thoughtful feedback to their students. Students struggling to learn in a class with far more students than originally intended suffer as well.

While the Task Force appreciates the immediate efforts of the administration to prioritize efficiency in General Education course enrollment, we believe other solutions to this problem may exist beyond increasing capacity in classes not designed to serve such a high volume of students. Ultimately, The Task Force will consider enrollment data when recommending revisions to the General Education program.

V. General Education and Institutional Priorities: Relevance to the MSU Mission Statement and Consistency with ASPIRE

The MSU mission statement calls for the University to educate students for success in a global environment; to engage in scholarship; promote diversity of people and ideas; foster innovation, collaboration and creative thinking; and serve our communities to improve the quality of life. The ASPIRE plan is relevant to General Education in terms of three ASPIRE goals including Goal 1: Academic Excellence; Goal 2: Student Success; and Goal 6: Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation. The goals established in the mission statement and ASPIRE that could relate to general education can be categorized into four main areas: 1) **diversity and global awareness**; 2) **job readiness**; 3) **student needs**; and 4) **scholarship and community service**. This section of the report assesses the current General Education program as it relates to the mission statement and ASPIRE in these four areas.

Diversity and Global Awareness

The mission statement and ASPIRE establish the need to promote global awareness and inclusion (see ASPIRE Goal 2 Objective 2), promote awareness of diversity of people and ideas (see MSU Mission Statement) and provide opportunities for freshmen and sophomore students to participate in international and national experiences (see ASPIRE Goal 6 Objective 4). Only one general education SLO (4b) out of 21 SLOs pertains directly to diversity and global awareness. Required in both the Humanities I and II, SLO 4b requires that students “investigate the worldview of societies outside of the United States.” Courses that may fill these areas cover topics such as world art, global music, world history, foreign language, international culture and diversity, and others. Thus, in the current program, students take at least two courses that explore some issue related to societies outside of the United States. However, the promotion of global awareness and diversity is not necessarily diffused throughout the curriculum and the global awareness may not include contemporary issues. For example, a student may choose to take Medieval Culture (HUM 203) and Beginning Logic (Phil 106) to fill these requirements. Whether this combination of courses would truly fill the ASPIRE goals and University mission to promote global awareness and inclusion and to promote awareness of diversity of people and ideas is unclear. If the general education curriculum is to be in line with the mission statement and ASPIRE goals, the curriculum may need to be revised such that a focus on global awareness is diffused throughout the curriculum.

Additionally, ASPIRE seeks to provide opportunities for freshmen and sophomore students to participate in international experiences. While opportunities in the university for these experiences may be available, they are not established within the general education curriculum. Students may choose to participate in KIIS (Kentucky Institute for International Study) and take courses that will meet a humanities requirement such as

French 101, but no General Education options in any of the areas specific to international study seemingly exist currently.

Job Readiness

The focus on job readiness is present in both the mission statement and ASPIRE. The mission statement calls on the university to “educate students for success in a global environment.” ASPIRE prioritizes the need to prepare students for the regional and global labor markets (see ASPIRE Goal 1 Objective 3 and Goal 2 Objectives 7 and 8), to include career planning in the curriculum (Goal 1 Objective 3) and to enhance experiential learning to promote job readiness (Goal 1 Objective 3). ASPIRE also establishes the goal of assisting students as they transition into workforce or graduate education (Goal 3 Objective 8). While one may argue that all of the general education courses are preparing students for careers, no specific SLOs or courses geared toward job readiness or experiential learning exist. The senior capstone courses may offer job readiness skills and career planning such as resumé creation, but not as a required component of the capstone course. While job readiness, career building, experiential learning, and assisting students as they transition to the workforce are important components of ASPIRE, they are not specifically present in the General Education curriculum. The curriculum as a whole may be preparing students for the workforce, but no specific courses are devoted to this goal.

Student Needs

ASPIRE provides attention to the goal of offering online courses and delivery methods to meet the needs of diverse students (Goal 1 Objective 2) including residential and non-residential students (Goal 6 Objective 4). Its principles also argue that general education should have a positive influence on student adjustment and retention (Goal 6 Objective 5). Except for UAR mandates that General Education course be scheduled throughout the academic day and week (for example, 30% of courses must be scheduled before 9 a.m. and after 3 pm.; see “General Education Course Delivery”), no specific guidelines on delivery methods within the General Education program address the needs of diverse students.

Scholarship and Community Service

MSU promotes a curriculum that supports community service (MSU Mission Statement) and provides opportunities for students to participate early in research, learning communities, and service learning (ASPIRE Goal 6 Objective 4). While students may take advantage of opportunities to engage in community service, early research, or service learning, these opportunities are NOT built into the current general education curriculum.

Summation

The current general education program is not closely linked to the mission statement and ASPIRE goals. Two SLOs and two areas in the distribution of General Education courses relate to promoting global awareness. However, in terms of ensuring job readiness, meeting the needs of diverse students, and promoting scholarship and community service, the current General Education program does not address or deliver on these goals.

VI. Cost of the General Education Program

This component of the report includes data and information related to the cost of the offerings and enrollment of General Education courses at Morehead State University. Because of the inherently different nature of First Year Seminar, the costs associated with this course are addressed separately.

Cost of First Year Seminar

The cost estimates for operating First Year Seminar (FYS) for one year are shown in Table VI-1.

FYS 101 Estimated Budget	
Student Fall and Spring FYS 101 Fee - \$60	\$90,000
Professional Development Fund Earnings	(\$55,000)
Speaker - Fall Semester	(\$25,000)
Training/Workshop Expenses	(\$3500)
Classroom Supplies	(\$1000)
Instructor Common Reading Books	(\$750)

Table VI-1. FYS 101 Estimated Annual Budget

The First Year Seminar (FYS) courses are self-funding through a \$60.00 fee charged to enrolled students. Those fees fund the totality of the program including compensation for instructors and invited speakers and various other costs. While sheltering the University from additional costs, this funding model is not without its problems. For example, instructor compensation funds an individual professional development account that can be used to purchase job-related equipment or travel. However, this form of compensation has been cited as one of the major reasons faculty have resisted teaching the course. In addition, current estimates of the shortfall in the number of seats offered for FYS in the fall 2017 semester range from 500 to 600. The major problem is department chairs cannot both staff their own major/minor program requirements and assign instructors an FYS course. And professional development compensation is not sufficiently adequate to encourage instructors to teach above their designated workload

To overcome this instructor deficit in FYS, Director of First Year Operations Lora Pace suggests that traditional adjunct instructor pay should replace the professional development compensation model. She estimates an investment by the administration of between \$130,000 and \$150,000 would fund this new payment method.

Cost of General Education Courses

The Net Tuition Revenue, Instructional Cost, and Profit/(Loss) totals for the General Education courses, academic year 2015-2016, are shown in Table VI-2.

Academic Year	Total Credit Hours	Total Students	Net Tuition Revenue	Instructional Cost	Profit/Loss
2015-2016	53,236	17,719	\$11,401,814	\$5,306,141	+ \$6,095,673

Table VI-2. Net Profit/(Loss) for General Education Courses in 2015-2016 Academic Year

As the table indicates, General Education courses turned a profit of just over \$6 million during the 2015-2016 academic year across 722 sections of General Education courses taught during this year, amounting to a net profit of \$8443 per section. While the data have not been analyzed by each type of General Education course, some courses appear more cost effective than others. For example, of the 722 sections of General Education courses taught, 136 were a Capstone course (499C, 499D, or 499E). Of those courses, the overall profit was \$84,079 which amounts to a profit of only \$623 per section.

Net tuition revenue above reflects gross tuition charged to students at the applicable resident, non-resident, and international tuition rates minus institutional student financial aid applied to the tuition charges. The instructional cost indicates the personnel expense for salary and fringe benefits of the instructor teaching the course, proportionate to the individual's annual workload. This financial analysis does not reflect other indirect costs such as expenses for facilities, technology, student services, or administration. The above analysis can be made available on a per section basis as well as a per department basis.

While comparisons to other courses taught at MSU are not readily available, that the General Education courses provide a net profit to the University is encouraging. The Task Force believes that this profitability could be improved with an increase in efficiency in terms of the number of classes and sections offered. When making our recommendations, the Task Force will make every effort to maintain or increase the net profitability of the General Education program at MSU.

VII. Impact of the General Education Program on Student Learning

The aggregate data from Morehead State University's General Education reports for 2014–15 and 2015–16 show that our students are largely meeting the present twenty-one student learning outcomes (SLOs) at the prescribed 70% rate or higher. The data presented in Table VII-1 shows the percentage of students assessed out of the total number of enrolled students and the percentage of students assessed who attained the SLO:

- In 2015–16 (SLO 1c), at least 70% of assessed students achieved competency in all the learning outcomes except for 1c, measured by the assessment instrument chosen by the instructor.
- During 2015–16, 75–90% of students assessed attained competency in 19 out of the 21 SLOs.

To contextualize the previous results, the number of students assessed sometimes represents only a fraction of the total students registered for the course in any given semester. For example, in 2015–16, data for only six of the 21 SLOs was reported at a rate of 70% enrollment or above.

Table VII-1. Percentage of students assessed and attaining each SLO (2014–15 and 2015–16 data).

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	2014–15		2015–16	
	% of students assessed	% of students attaining the SLO	% of students assessed	% of student attaining the SLO
1. Communication Skills				
1a. Speak effectively in conversational, small group, public, or intercultural contexts.	56%	95%	75%	90%
1b. Read college-level texts for comprehension.	61%	65%	62%	72%
1c. Write effectively for a variety of target audiences using conventions associated with standard English.	15%	36%	22%	55%

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) (cont'd from previous page)	2014-15		2015-16	
	% of students assessed	% of students attaining the SLO	% of students assessed	% of student attaining the SLO
2. Intellectual Skills				
2a. Employ current research technologies in the process of locating, analyzing, evaluating and using information.	88%	80%	87%	79%
2b. Effectively utilize deductive or inductive reasoning.	28%	85%	48%	82%
2c. Analyze or evaluate diverse points of view.	27%	66%	36%	75%
2d. Articulate ethical consequences of decisions or actions.	36%	81%	36%	82%
2e. Apply knowledge and skills to new settings.	20%	81%	38%	77%
3. Quantitative Skills				
3a. Analyze problems using arithmetic, geometric, algebraic or statistical methods.	91%	76%	95%	87%
3b. Use deductive reasoning in a formal, symbolic, axiomatic system.	91%	79%	94%	88%
3c. Verify answers to mathematical or scientific problems.	91%	82%	95%	89%
4. Knowledge of Human Cultures				
4a. Investigate the history of the basic principles or operations of the United States government with a view to being a responsible citizen.	24%	83%	40%	79%

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) (cont'd from previous page)	2014-15		2015-16	
	% of students assessed	% of students attaining the SLO	% of students assessed	% of student attaining the SLO
4c. Analyze historical processes that influence individuals or groups.	31%	78%	31%	77%
4d. Demonstrate the knowledge necessary to make choices that promote sustained health and well- being.	53%	85%	58%	85%
5. Knowledge of the Natural World				
5a. Classify statements as scientific or nonscientific.	79%	82%	81%	82%
5b. Apply scientific or technological concepts to solving problems of natural systems.	55%	79%	64%	79%
5c. Employ a scientific approach to analyze scientific questions.	34%	80%	48%	84%
6. Knowledge of Aesthetics				
6a. Discuss how ideas are communicated through the expressive arts; e.g., literature, theatre, dance, music, or visual arts.	45%	84%	52%	85%
6b. Analyze the aesthetic value of creative productions in a cultural or historical context.	40%	79%	55%	84%

In summary, although data indicate that the General Education program positively impacts student learning at Morehead State University, the Task Force believes the true measure of student success cannot be calculated because of insufficient reporting by instructors. Furthermore, the data we are collecting may not satisfactorily address the question of “impact”; additional measures of student success should be considered.

Defining “Impact” on Student Learning

General Education assessment reports for 2014–15 and 2015–16 provide narrative descriptions of the types of assessments and student artifacts determining SLO competency. However, the Task Force questions both what “impact” really means in the context of student learning and success and the accuracy of the data used to determine it. We need an accurate and useful definition of *impact* for tracking and assessment purposes, perhaps reassessing the kinds of learning we wish to see in our students. For example, should a general education program feature deep learning from high-impact practices; traditional academic learning models assessed by tests, assignments, and overall grade point averages; or, more generally, markers of career readiness in student performance or success in post-university performance?

Outcomes as Experiential Measures of Quality and Impact

Educational outcomes, broadly speaking, result from clearly defined objectives and outputs. One way to define the quality and impact of MSU’s General Education program would be to reevaluate and standardize our program’s objectives, outputs, and outcomes, as outlined below:

- Objectives can include mission and vision, student and instructor expectations, quality standards, and performance goals.
- Outputs could include the programs, activities and services offered; the number of enrollments and graduates; reputation and rank; and accreditations, partnerships, and alliances.
- Outcomes could include overall satisfaction with a course or program; transformative experiences gained; notable achievements; and tangible indicators of career readiness and improved performance. Outcomes are about what happens to students as a result of objectives and outputs. *They convey students’ overall satisfaction with a course or program.*
- Outcomes also convey intellectual and emotional connections with one’s brand and program offerings. They provide a roadmap helping learners make sense of not only who you are and what you do, but also whom one serves, with what success, and to what end.

(Source: Fleming, “Defining Educational Outcomes, Assessing Impact,” Eduventures, 21 April 2015)

High-Impact Practices and Employment as Measures of Quality and Impact

Hart Research polled employers to assess the power of high-impact practices. The results below list high-impact practices, accompanied by the percentage of employers saying each practice *would help a lot/fair amount* to prepare students for success after college:

- 84%: students complete a significant project before graduation that demonstrates their depth of knowledge in their major AND their acquisition of analytical, problem-solving, and communication skills (62% believe it contributes significantly);
- 81%: students complete an internship/community-based field project to connect classroom learning with real-world experiences (66% believe it contributes significantly);
- 81%: students develop research skills appropriate to their field and develop evidence-based analyses (57% believe it contributes significantly);
- 73%: students wrestle with/debate ethical issues to form their own judgments (48% believe it contributes significantly).

(Source: *Raising the Bar*, Hart Research for AAC&U, October/November 2009)

Conclusions

We currently have no explicit, usable data gathered from direct student surveys at various points during their General Education program to determine the impact of General Education on overall student learning. The Capstone survey administered in Spring 2016 yielded little generalizable information due to the design of the instrument. A redesigned survey instrument was administered during Fall 2016 and Spring 2017. Results will be analyzed and shared with the General Education Council and included in the 2016–17 General Education report.

In order to more effectively measure the “impact” of General Education on student learning in the future, the purpose of General Education at MSU must also be defined. To that end, the Task Force has generated a series of questions to guide a response:

- SLOs and Program Parameters
 - Are MSU’s current SLOs sufficiently addressing “ impact” in the expansive area of “student learning”?
 - What does the marketplace tell us about the impact of general education on future employees?
 - What else do employers desire from their employees, and how can the General Education program at Morehead State University support these skills to produce a

desirable workforce? Should workforce readiness be a goal of General Education at MSU?

- o Should we consider implementing more high-impact practices?
- o Should we consider the reduction or streamlining of SLOs?
- Tracking Student Responses with Regard to “Impact”
 - o Should we be polling students on specific measures of “impact” frequently during their General Education path, perhaps in specific courses or at specific times during the year?
 - o Can we create learning communities or cohorts that report to a central collection point like a General Education office, but also create peer accountability?
 - o Can we track students in General Education like we do in individual courses? Then, students accruing multiple absences or failing grades at midterm could be contacted by a central General Education director’s office as well as the individual professor.
 - o What kinds of data might we collect or present that correlates early success in General Education courses with retention as a measurable criterion for “impact”?

VIII. The General Education Program and Student Preparation for Post-Graduation Success

Measuring how the General Education program has prepared Morehead State University students for success after graduation is a difficult task. A number of factors contribute to a student’s preparation for post-graduation success, and their General Education experiences are just some of those factors. Nevertheless, the Task Force determined that one such measure would be self-assessment results drawn from the senior survey administered in Capstone courses. “Success” itself can be difficult to accurately define, undoubtedly differing from student to student. Yet if success can be partially defined as living productively as a contributing member of society, and if such a life results, at least in part, from skills learned in a university setting, then this survey data provides a good measure of the General Education program’s effectiveness in producing “successful” graduates.

As Table VIII-1 reflects skills that have a presumed direct result on post-graduation success.

Skill	Fall 2016 Mean	Spring 2017 Mean	2016-17 Total Mean
<i>Communication Skills</i>			
I can speak effectively in a variety of situations.	4.30	4.28	4.29
I can use standard English to write effectively for different target audiences.	4.51	4.48	4.50
I can read and comprehend college level texts.	4.49	4.49	4.49
I can communicate how two or more things are related using equations.	3.88	3.81	3.84
I can communicate how two or more things are related using graphs.	4.29	4.22	4.25

Skill	Fall 2016 Mean	Spring 2017 Mean	2016-17 Total Mean
I can communicate how two or more things are related using tables.	4.33	4.28	4.31
I can communicate how two or more things are related using maps.	4.12	4.03	4.07
I can communicate how two or more things are related using diagrams.	4.29	4.20	4.24
I can communicate how two or more things are related using (other)	3.39	3.34	3.37
<i>Intellectual Skills</i>			
I can employ current research technologies to locate information.	4.35	4.43	4.39
I can analyze and evaluation the quality of the information being used.	4.37	4.38	4.37
I can reason effectively from evidence.	4.45	4.41	4.43
I can consider diverse points of view, including those that do not agree with mine.	4.51	4.46	4.48

Skill	Fall 2016 Mean	Spring 2017 Mean	2016-17 Total Mean
I understand the ethical consequences of decisions or actions.	4.52	4.48	4.50
I can articulate the ethical consequences of decisions or actions.	4.47	4.44	4.46
I can apply knowledge and skills to new settings.	4.48	4.50	4.49
<i>Quantitative Skills</i>			
I can use mathematical or statistical methods to solve problems.	3.87	3.82	3.85
I can build a logical chain of reasoning to solve problems.	4.17	4.19	4.18
I can verify the validity of scientific or mathematical results.	3.95	3.87	3.90
<i>Knowledge of Human Culture</i>			
I understand the foundations of the United States government.	4.00	3.96	3.98
I understand the functions of the United States government.	3.97	3.97	3.97

Skill	Fall 2016 Mean	Spring 2017 Mean	2016-17 Total Mean
I understand how to be a responsible citizen.	4.43	4.38	4.40
I can investigate the world view of societies outside of the United States.	4.18	4.10	4.14
I can analyze historical processes that influence individuals or groups.	4.15	4.06	4.40
<i>Knowledge of the Natural World</i>			
I can classify statements as scientific or non-scientific.	4.23	4.12	4.17
I can apply scientific theories or technological concepts to solve problems in the natural world.	4.09	3.97	4.02
I can use a scientific approach to analyze questions.	4.13	4.07	4.10
<i>Knowledge of Aesthetics</i>			
I can discuss how ideas are communicated through the arts.	3.93	3.85	3.89
I can analyze the aesthetic value of creative productions in a cultural or historical context.	3.84	3.71	3.77

Skill	Fall 2016 Mean	Spring 2017 Mean	2016-17 Total Mean
<i>Social Development</i>			
I have developed leadership skills.	4.39	4.37	4.38
I am able to collaborate successfully with others.	4.55	4.48	4.51
I have the skills to contribute to my community.	4.50	4.49	4.49
I am motivated to contribute to my community.	4.46	4.37	4.41
I developed self-awareness.	4.56	4.45	4.50
I take responsibility of my own choices and behavior.	4.62	4.61	4.61
I have the knowledge to make choices that promote health and well-being.	4.54	4.51	4.52
I value lifelong learning.	4.64	4.57	4.60
I am more aware of diversity.	4.50	4.40	4.45

(cont'd on next page)

Skill	Fall 2016 Mean	Spring 2017 Mean	2016-17 Total Mean
<i>General Education Program Overall</i>			
The General Education program provided me with a foundation of knowledge and skills for my life/career.	4.10	3.96	4.03
The General Education program created a questioning spirit in me that will continue throughout my life.	4.05	3.79	3.91

Table VIII-1. Student Self-evaluation of General Education Skills Learned
 (Source: Capstone survey, Fall 2016 and Spring 2017)

Conclusions

While the above data conveys an overall sense that the General Education program at MSU has effectively taught students the skills needed for post-graduation success, the Task Force recognizes that this assessment may not be an accurate measure of that desired outcome. As with any self-evaluation data, the information reported may not be an objective assessment. The Task Force acknowledges that the General Education program has equipped many of the students with the skills listed above. However, the extent to which those skills have been fully attained, and the connection that those skills have to post-graduation success, has not been firmly established by the above data. If a true measurement of this outcome is desired, the Task Force suggests that other metrics be developed and employed to more accurately determine how the General Education program at MSU has prepared students for post-graduation success.

IX. Application of National Best Practice Standards to the General Education Program

This component of the report reviews best practices in general education nationwide as identified in salient reports.

“College Learning for the New Global Century”

In 2008, a report entitled “College Learning for the New Global Century” was released under the auspices of the LEAP initiative. The key question asked was “What specific knowledge and skills should college graduates know or possess?” In response, a diverse work group of various business executives, teachers, foundation presidents, politicians, college faculty, and policy advocates came together from across the country to formulate four “essential outcomes” that every college and university graduate would hopefully achieve (See Table IX-1 below).

LEAP Four Essential Learning Outcome Framework (as numbered)
<p>(1). Knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world [gained] [t]hrough study in the sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages and the arts.</p> <p><i>FOCUSED by engagement with big questions, both contemporary and enduring.</i></p>
<p>(2) Intellectual and practical skills including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Inquiry and analysis● Critical and creative thinking● Written and oral communication● Quantitative literacy● Information literacy● Teamwork and problem solving <p><i>PRACTICED EXTENSIVELY, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects and standards for performance.</i></p> <p>(cont'd on next page)</p>

(3) Personal and social responsibility, including:

- Civic knowledge and engagement—local and global
- Intercultural knowledge and competence
- Ethical reasoning and action Foundations and skills for lifelong learning

ANCHORED through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges.

(4) Integrative learning, including

- Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies

DEMONSTRATED through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems.”

Table IX-1. LEAP Four Essential Learning Outcomes

(Directly quoted from the following source: LEAP, “College Learning for the New Global Century,” Association of American Colleges and Universities, www.aacu.org/leap/essential-learning-outcomes, 2008. Accessed 8 April 2017.)

To facilitate students attainment of these four broad outcomes, seven principles (“Principles of Excellence”) are then enumerated to guide colleges and universities in their work, summarized below.

LEAP Principles of Excellence

1. Aim high—and make excellence inclusive.
2. Give students a compass.
3. Teach the arts of inquiry and innovation.
4. Engage the big questions.
5. Connect knowledge with choices and action.
6. Foster civic, intercultural and ethical learning.
7. Assess students’ ability to apply learning to complex problems.

(Source: <https://aacu.org/leap/principles-of-excellence>)

The LEAP Learning Outcomes Framework concludes with five necessary steps to bring this vision to fruition.

1. Make the principles of excellence a priority on campus.
2. Form coalitions across sectors for all students' long term interests.
3. Build principled and determined leadership [consisting of]
 - High profile advocacy from presidents, trustees, school leaders, and employers needed;
 - Curricular leadership from scholars and teachers needed;
 - Policy leadership at the state, national and agency level.
4. Put employers in direct dialogue with students.
5. Reclaim the connections between liberal education and democratic freedom.

(Source: www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/leap_vision_summary.pdf , pp. 11-13).

“General Education Transformed: How We Can, Why We Must”--Paul I. Gaston

“General Education Maps and Markers: Designing Meaningful Pathways to Student Achievement” and “The Art and Science of Assessing General Education Outcomes: A Practical Guide”--Andrea Leskes and Barbara D. Wright.

These documents, published by AACU, elaborate on and endorse the LEAP document's four essential outcomes. They provide scenarios illustrating how colleges and universities implement the LEAP essential outcomes recommendations in more concrete ways than the LEAP report itself. Of special interest is the importance of designing a general education program that can deliver the LEAP four essential outcomes to a diverse student population with widely divergent post-graduation goals and ambitions.

These publications argue that students tend not to understand *how* and *why* general education matters, which contributes to their failure to achieve significant progress. The authors explain that greater clarity of purpose and implementation of general education is an essential step if a general education program is to be successful. Because clarity of purpose is often lacking at the institutional level, students seldom grasp why general education matters or is required. As a result, to students, general education then becomes a bewildering maze of classes that serve no purpose for the selection of a major and are of no real importance to a career. The Leskes and Wright guide, in particular, maintains that if essential outcomes are first identified, implemented and then consistently explained, students benefit. Further, if these identified essential outcomes are adequately and effectively measured, the *why* of general education becomes less and less confusing for students. These reports maintain that increased student completion and success follow in

the wake of clear purpose, clear communication, clear planning and effective implementation.

Paul Gaston asserts, “Throughout higher education, students should approach their college experience with an informed understanding of the outcomes they should expect to achieve and of the ways in which the undergraduate curriculum—general education in concert with study in one or more major fields—will enable them to achieve those outcomes.”

(Sources: Gaston, <https://www.aacu.org/publications/general-education-transformed>, 21 April 2015. Accessed 8 April 2017

Leskes and Wright, *The Art and Science of Assessing General Education Outcomes: A Practical Guide*, 2005, <http://secure.aacu.org/store/detail.aspx?id=ARTSCI>. Accessed 8 April 2017

Leskes and Wright, “General Education Maps and Markers: Designing Meaningful Pathways to Student Achievement,” AACU, 2015, <http://icsps.illinoisstate.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/General-Education-Design-Principles-2.pdf>, Accessed 8 April 2017.)

Conclusions

1. These reports suggest that one best practice in general education is identifying clear “essential outcomes” for students, prompting questions for future reflection:
 - What are the essential outcomes MSU wishes for students to achieve?
 - Do current MSU general education SLOs need significant revision?
 - How do current SLOs relate to the four essential outcomes identified by LEAP?
 - Do all faculty, staff, and students know the essential outcomes that we currently identify in our general education program? If not, how can we better communicate them?

2. In addition, these authorities insist that systematic and thorough communication of these essential outcomes to the students must occur. These outcomes must be woven through the general education program, but they must also be outcomes that connect with the major fields of study. This mandate, too, prompts questions for future reflection:
 - Do we adequately communicate to students from their first day of classes through their graduation what their essential outcomes should be?
 - Is there appropriate continuity built into the MSU course sequence, regardless of major, that communicates these essential outcomes?
 - Do the assessments we lead them through match these essential outcomes? If the assessments do not mesh with the essential outcomes that we have identified, then students will be further confused by them.

X. General Education Programs at Kentucky's Four-Year Institutions and Highlighted Signature General Education Programs

This section begins with a summary of the general education programs from the seven four-year public institutions in Kentucky, excluding MSU, followed by the highlights and descriptions of selected signature general education programs of note.

(Note: Taxonomic labels (e.g. "A" versus "1") are idiosyncratic to each institution.)

General Education Programs at Kentucky's Four-Year Institutions

Eastern Kentucky University (EKU)

Requirements are divided into six categories (elements) for a total of 36 hours:

Element 1: Communication (9 hours)

A: Written Communication (3)

B: Written Communication (3)

C: Oral Communication (3)

Element 2: Mathematics (3)

Element 3: Arts and Humanities (6)

A: Arts (3)

B: Humanities (3)

Element 4: Natural Sciences (6)

Element 5: Social Behavioral Sciences (6)

A: Historical Science (3)

B: Social & Behavioral Science (3)

Element 6: Diversity of Perspectives & Experiences (6)

Kentucky State University (KSU)

General education program is named “Liberal Studies” and has a total of 43-45 hours designed to meet the following learning outcomes:

1. Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical World
2. Intellectual and Practical Skills
3. Personal and Social Responsibility
4. Integrative and Applied Learning

Requirements of the Liberal Studies program:

- I. First Year Experience (1-2 hours)
- II. Languages and Reasoning (19)
- III. Fine Arts and Letters (3)
- IV. Sciences (12)
- V. Integrative Studies (9)

University of Louisville (UofL)

The general education program requires 34 total hours, including 6 hours of Cultural Diversity content that may simultaneously fulfill other content area requirements:

1. Arts and Humanities (6 hours; 3 each in arts and humanities, respectively)
2. Mathematics (3)
3. Natural Sciences (7; 4 must be in a class that contains a laboratory component)
4. Oral Communication (3)
5. Social and Behavioral Sciences (9; one course must be in the Department of History)
6. Written Communication (6; 3 must be in a writing course in the Department of English)

Murray State University (MuSU)

The University Studies program is not universal to all undergraduates at MuSU but ranges from 32-49 required hours depending on the choice of major. Within these variable guidelines are the following common categories:

1. Oral and Written Communication
2. Global Awareness, Cultural Diversity, and the World’s Artistic Traditions
3. Scientific Inquiry, Methodologies, and Quantitative Skills
4. Social and Self-Awareness and Responsible Citizenship
5. World’s Historical, Literary, and Philosophical Traditions

Northern Kentucky University (NKU)

The General Education program requires a total of 37 hours with the intent to further the “Foundation of Knowledge Core Competencies” that includes critical thinking, perspectives, communication, science and technology, and personal responsibility and community. The categories of coursework and the required hours for each are shown below:

1. Communication (9)
 - A. Oral (3)
 - B. Written (6)
2. Scientific and Quantitative Inquiry (10)
 - A. Natural Sciences (including one lab course) (7)
 - B. Mathematics and Statistics (3)
3. Culture and Creativity (6)
4. Self and Society (9)
 - A. Cultural Pluralism (3)
 - B. Individual and Society (6)
5. Global Viewpoints (3)

University of Kentucky (UK)

The “UK Core” general education requirements are grouped into the four learning outcomes for a total of 30 hours:

1. Learning Outcome I: Intellectual Inquiry
 - A. The Nature of Inquiry in Arts and Creativity (3)
 - B. The Nature of Inquiry in the Humanities (3)
 - C. The Nature of Inquiry in the Social Sciences (3)
 - D. The Nature of Inquiry in the Natural, Physical and Mathematical Sciences (3)
2. Learning Outcome II: Written, Oral and Visual Communication
 - A. Composition and Communication I (3)
 - B. Composition and Communication II (3)

(UK cont'd)

3. Learning Outcome III: Quantitative Reasoning

- A. Quantitative Foundations (3)
- B. Statistical Inferential Reasoning (3)

4. Learning Outcome IV: Citizenship

- A. Community, Culture and Citizenship in the USA (3)
- B. Global Dynamics (3)

Western Kentucky University (WKU)

The WKU general education program is called the “Colonnade” and is based on the following goals and outcomes: (1) Knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world; (2) Intellectual and practical skills; (3) Personal and social responsibility; and (4) Integrative learning. The total requirement is 39 hours divided among the categories as shown below:

1. Foundations: Intellectual and Practical Skills (18)

- A. College Composition (3)
- B. Writing in the disciplines (3)
- C. Human Communication (3)
- D. Quantitative Reasoning (3)
- E. Literary Studies (3)
- F. World History (3)

2. Explorations: Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World (12)

- A. Arts and Humanities (3)
- B. Social and Behavioral Sciences (3)
- C. Natural and Physical Sciences (6; one course must have a laboratory component)

3. Connections: Understanding Individual and Social Responsibility (9)

- A. Social and Cultural (3)
- B. Local to Global (3)
- C. Systems (3)

Review of Distinctive General Education Programs

Below is a brief summary of two distinctive general education programs: James Madison University and Miami University (Ohio). JMU was chosen because MSU frequently regards it as a reach school, and Miami was chosen because its general education program has been lauded at various times by others, including the faculty and administrators at Western Kentucky University. Both programs generally provide much to admire and much the Task Force could apply as we evaluate our own general education program.

James Madison University (JMU)

The general education program at JMU carries a distinctive name, the Human Community, with a common core and the goal to inculcate global citizenship in its students through the Liberal Arts. The program consists of 41 hours, plus an unspecified number of the integrated courses.

The goals are divided into these three groups:

1. Students understand the historical and contemporary distinctions and interconnections among people, institutions, and communities that create, preserve, and transmit culture and knowledge in the arts, sciences, mathematics, social sciences, and humanities.
2. Students become skilled in questioning, investigating, analyzing, evaluating, and communicating.
3. Students participate in a variety of aesthetic and civic experiences reflecting human concerns and values that transcend the limits of specialization.

There are five “clusters” as well as 300-level integrated (across multiple clusters) classes:

1. 21st C. skills (9 credits)
2. Arts and Humanities (9)
3. The Natural World (10)
4. Social and Cultural Processes (7)
5. Individuals in the Human Community (6), such as individual health and wellness.

The program appears to address **60** different student learner outcomes.

Miami University (MU--Ohio)

Miami University calls its general education program “The Miami Plan for Liberal Education,” sometimes shortened to simply “The Miami Plan,” with four basic goals (and longer descriptions available):

1. Thinking Critically.
2. Understanding Contexts.
3. Engaging with Other Learners.
4. Reflecting and Acting.

The Miami Plan consists of three parts: Foundation Courses, a Thematic Sequence, and a Capstone Course.*** The program is distinctive because courses span the entirety of students’ undergraduate education.

Foundation

- I. English Composition (6 hours)
- II. Fine Arts, Humanities, Social Science (12 hours)
- III. Cultures (6 hours)
 - A. United States Cultures (3 hours)
 - B. World Cultures (3 hours)
- IV. Natural Science (9 hours, must include 1 laboratory course)
 - A. Biological Science (3 hours minimum)
 - B. Physical Science (3 hours minimum)
- V. Mathematics, Formal Reasoning, Technology (3 hours)

*** A first year seminar and a history class are also required, but are not listed in any of the parts.

Thematic Sequence:

9 hours in an approved sequence not a part of the student’s major.

The Capstone Course (*MPC*)

Students meet this requirement by completing three hours in an approved Capstone course during their senior year.

Students may also earn extra 1 hour credits for extended studies and service learning.

Conclusions

Both distinctive programs are undergirded by a mission statement and a set of goals, and the programs span all four years of curriculum. We could draw much from these outstanding undergraduate experiences, but we do so judiciously. For example, JMU seems to have entirely too many SLOs for their general education, but our student population could benefit from some of the health and wellness courses required. In addition, the service requirement could be beneficial to the students, the University, the community, and the region. We could adopt many of the principles of these signature experiences easily with an overarching general education goal that fits with institutional goals, ASPIRE, and with our Mission.

XI. Meeting Student Needs Through the General Education Program

In this section of the report, data from the student General Education survey conducted is used to determine how students believe the General Education program is meeting their academic needs. In addition, the Task Force assesses the extent to which the General Education program is meeting the needs of our students.

One of the open-ended response items on the student survey requested, "Based on your experience, please identify the most useful skills or courses you acquired through Morehead State University's General Education program." Of the 548 submitted responses, by far the most popular answer--mentioned on 146 occasions--was oral communication. The improvement of speaking abilities as a result of courses taken in the General Education program at MSU is clearly a need that is being met. The skill mentioned second most frequently was writing. This is another skill that students feel like they need to learn, or improve on, in college, and based on the 113 students who responded this way, MSU generally appears to be meeting this need through the General Education program.

In contrast, students believe several needs are not being met, based upon responses to another open-ended item in the survey, "Please describe what you would change about MSU's General Education program." Here, the students expressed that General Education requirements or substantial parts of the program wasted their time and failed to meet their needs. Over one-third, a total of 160 responses out of the 464 total, mentioned eliminating or reducing the requirements of the General Education program. Similarly, a total of 59 responses indicated in some way or another that they would like the General Education program to relate more to their major. It can be inferred that these students also believe General Education classes are hindering them from getting the additional time they believe they need in their major. Many students support more practical learning than what they are getting from the current General Education program: 38 students mentioned wanting more classes in "Life Skills" and another 16 requested more instruction on how to succeed in college.

The students' opinions on these matters will be taken seriously by the Task Force because we believe we have a responsibility to provide the students the best education to serve them as free citizens in our society. With more experience to draw upon, we understand that students benefit from learning subjects and skills even if the positive outcome is not immediately seen or understood by the student. Fulfilling the stated purpose of MSU's General Education program--namely "to provide students with the attributes needed to participate intelligently and responsibly in the discourses that shape the communities in which they live" and to "equip all students with the knowledge and skills to live fulfilling and productive lives as educated citizens of the world"--contributes significantly to meeting the academic and intellectual needs of our students. While students may be looking to have only their immediate needs met by the General Education program, we are looking to make sure that *all* of their needs are met, especially those most important in making them into informed, liberated, educated, productive citizens.

With both of these perspectives in mind, the General Education program at MSU has attempted to meet these needs, but could use improvement from both points of view. For example, the FYS class was intended help students learn important college-success skills, including how to be productive and self-sufficient outside of the classroom. However, many FYS sections appear to miss the mark in offering the students what was advertised at the outset of the program, viz., at least some aspect of college orientation and preparation. As for General Education classes relating more to students' majors, perhaps some components could be geared more specifically to a certain field of study. Moreover, the General Education program could be streamlined to the minimum CPE requirement of 30 hours. The Task Force will be considering such options and more.

From our perspective, the current General Education program has met many of the needs of these students. Requiring classes in writing, composition, quantitative reasoning, and oral communication have benefited students beyond their General Education experiences at MSU and in their post-graduate lives as well. In addition, exposing students (albeit limited exposure) to the humanities and the natural and social sciences as important facets of a liberal arts education advantages students in becoming well-rounded, responsible citizens. Unfortunately, MSU's General Education program currently lacks demonstrable coherence and purpose. Students need to understand why these classes are important and why they are required to take them. The Task Force intends to revise and/or devise a general education program with students' best needs in mind crafted so that they recognize the merits of these courses for every college-educated citizen.

XII. The General Education Program as a Defining, Signature Program Unique to MSU

Currently, the General Education Program falls short as a defining, signature program unique to MSU, as the surveys of students and staff acknowledge. We also believe that the administrative impetus for the GERTF committee reflects the same position. In addition MSU's General Education does not stand out in comparison to other clearly signature programs. We believe we could certainly implement a signature program at MSU, we believe it would facilitate recruitment and retention, and, most important, we believe we could craft an excellent program better equipping our students for success in an increasingly changing, competitive, and globalized world. In addition to preparing them for further academic study and encouraging intellectual curiosity outside of their chosen major, their successful completion of a defining signature program could prepare students to pursue free and independent lives and educate them to be better citizens of Eastern Kentucky, the United States, and the world.

MSU's General Education program could be made distinctive by adopting some or all of the strategies offered below:

- **Academically Superior and Substantive Requirements**

The first priority of the Task Force and the entire MSU community will always be to craft an academically coherent, diverse, and rigorous 30-hour (minimally) program meeting the needs of our students in a 21st Century world and comparable to, if not superior to, other general education programs of note.

- **Marketing**

Most signature programs are often easily recognizable by a distinct name and an identifiable logo, helpful in marketing the program to prospective students and parents and program sponsors (See Section X for descriptions of Western Kentucky's and Miami of Ohio's programs.). Some representative possibilities include:

- o The LUX Program (*Lux* was MSU's original motto). LUX (Light) could also be a kind of slant acronym for "Leading (our) Undergraduates to Excellence". (See draft logo in Figure XII-1.)

- o The Eagle Program/Eagle Experience. SOAR. FLIGHT.

o Beacon (referring to the phrase, “A Light to the Mountains”) or integrating MSU’s mascot with an alternative spelling, Bea-*k*-on. The “k” in the term could be made into a stylized eagle beak if slanted or turned downward 45 degrees. “Beacon” might be signified by a stylized coal miner’s lantern as a logo.

o The Bell Tower could also be incorporated, with the four principles on the tower playing a part somehow: Love, Service, Justice, Wisdom.

- Four-Year Program Span

A newly revised MSU General Education program should span all 4 years of a student’s education, not simply something to “get out of the way” during the freshman and sophomore year. Western Kentucky’s program discourages this notion by tiering their program into three different levels, with “Connections” classes on top. We could create four categories, perhaps aligned with the four principles on the Bell Tower. Service is one of the concepts on the bell tower: see next suggestion.

- Service

Embodying one the principles on the Bell Tower, students could be required to perform some form of reasonable, yet minimal, service. This expectation would accord with the mission of the university and make us distinct.

- Tiers

As alluded to earlier, as part of general education delivery over four years, MSU could adopt a graduated or “tiered” general education system, identified by the three school colors (Blue, White, Gold). For the lowest level (say, white) students would achieve a minimum set of expectations (and we could grant this automatically to transfers who have completed their general education elsewhere), but students could benefit more from general education if desired. We could also establish ways to recognize completion of higher tiers on diplomas and/or transcripts. For any High Impact Practice (HIP) the student achieves, for example, students could soar to higher levels (Blue, then Gold). Examples of HIP’s include:

- o Studying abroad

- o Studying a foreign language (perhaps the lowest tier would have no foreign language requirement, but 1-2 semesters for Blue and 3-4 for Gold).

- o Completing service hours (set benchmarks for different levels)

- o Taking more than one class per general education category outside of major/minor.

- o Completing writing intensive classes
 - o Completing Co-ops/Internships
 - o Engaging in undergraduate research through undergraduate research fellowships
 - o Presenting at conferences
 - o Mentoring or serving as a student assistant or tutor for a Gen Ed. (We could establish student assistantships, i.e. Juniors and Seniors who help with Freshman level gen ed classes.)
 - o Successfully completing General Education courses designated white, blue, or gold depending upon their degree of rigor. The most difficult classes could be gold, and students could be recognized for each higher level General Education course they took.
- Recognition

For every HIP the student completes, the student could receive a sticker (or patch) to put on a sash at graduation. A suggested “patch” could be a flame (See Figure XII-2).



Figure XII-1. Two possible logos for LUX



Figure XII-2. The flame from the University seal as the LUX logo.

XIII. Conclusions and Future Work

The General Education Review Task Force is pleased to submit this report detailing the current state of the General Education program at MSU as of the conclusion of the Spring 2017 semester. As the report reveals, the General Education program and all of the instructors, staff, and administrators who make up the program have much to applaud. However, based on the findings in this report, the Task Force believes that significant and substantial changes should be made to the General Education program. While no plans for revision have been reached at this time, the Task Force recommends that we reconvene during fall semester 2017 to put forth a set of formal recommendations for change to the General Education program. The primary aim of these recommendations will be to craft a General Education program excellent in purpose, content, scope, and delivery. We believe strongly that such changes are possible and that they would maximize Morehead State University's efforts to continue to serve as "A Light to the Mountains."

In particular, we advocate for a General Education program at Morehead State with a unified vision that students can clearly articulate and recognize the purpose of. Simultaneously, we should strive to create a distinctive program with appeal for not only current students, but also prospective students and their parents, employers, alumni, staff, and faculty.

As a result, the General Education Review Task Force does hereby formally request the approval and support of the Provost and the office of Academic Affairs in continuing the work we have begun in making the General Education program at MSU a model of academic excellence and a source of admiration.

Acknowledgements

The General Education Review Task Force thanks the following individuals and departments for their invaluable time, effort, and assistance in making this report possible.

- Dr. Steve Ralston
- Dr. Laurie Couch
- Dr. Jill Ratliff
- Dr. Wayne Miller
- Dr. Scott McBride
- Dr. John Ernst
- Mrs. Teresa Lindgren
- Mr. Ryan Hill
- Mrs. Lora Pace
- The Office of the Provost
- The Office of Academic Affairs
- Dr. Lawrence Snyder et al., Western Kentucky University

General Education Review Task Force Members

- Dr. Chris Beckham, Assistant Professor of Education
- Dr. Julia Finch, Assistant Professor of Art History
- Ms. Cyndi Gibbs, Associate Professor of Imaging Sciences
- Dr. Mark Graves, Associate Professor of English
- Dr. Constance Hardesty, Associate Professor of Sociology
- Dr. Kenneth Henderson, Associate Professor of Marketing
- Dr. Nilesh Joshi, Associate Professor of Engineering and Technology Management
- Dr. Gregory McBrayer, Assistant Professor of Government
- Dr. David Peyton, Professor of Biology
- Dr. Gilbert Remillard, Associate Professor of Psychology
- Dr. Melinda Willis, Associate Professor of Education
- Dr. Shannon Harr, *ex officio*, Director University Assessment and Testing
- Dr. Christopher Schroeder, chair, Professor of Mathematics

