

## **Agenda - GE Path – July 22, 2004**

### **Salazar 2014**

11:00AM –2:30 PM: Working Lunch provided

#### **Attendance**

Paul Draper (PD), Chair, A & H/ Theater Arts

Scott Miller (SM) A&H/ Writing Center and English

Tim Wandling (TW) A&H/ English

Suzanne Toczyski (ST) A&H/ Modern Languages

Anne Greenblatt (AG) Student Services Professional (SSP)

Debora Hammond (DH), A&H/ Hutchins

Wanda Boda (WB)

Carlos Benito (CB), Econ

Art Warmoth (AW), Psychology

#### **11:00 AM**

Group convenes at 11:00. Several documents brought from the Asheville Summer Institute of First-Year Experience are provided for folks to peruse.

After 20 minutes, PD begins discussion of WASC report. Report was somewhat favorable; but the follow-up letter was harsher. The group reads the letter. CB volunteers to provide a written summary of the letter, and offers an oral summary.

Discussion of diversity issue: WASC is concerned about retention of nontraditional students. CB: WASC has a different angle from the visit. WASC wants to be convinced that we really are committed to student learning.

DH: are the standards laid out in the previous report? CB: it's not easy to digest what they mean. AW: I've looked over the minutes and am delighted at the group's work this summer. It's not that difficult to figure out what WASC wants; it's just difficult to reconcile this with faculty interests. This committee with others is in a good position. If we deal with assessment & learning philosophy issues in this committee, we'll give impetus to others. It's not necessary for everyone to operate on the same theory; just that we articulate it and can assess it. Also: getting planning for new GE "PATH" aligned with fiscal planning and separating GE from Departmental funding--if we could restructure the incentive structure in this way, GE would be a model for doing what WASC wants us to do. Then the different schools could do separate work. If we can outline some ways that GE can align with what faculty think GE should do, if we can lay out a program that achieves these objectives, that'd be great--but doing it without hitting the majors is the big issue.

WB: Where are we in terms of progress on these things compared with other CSUs? PD: My impression from The Fullerton GE Assessment Conference last year was that we're 3-5 years behind the curve. SJSU has completely revamped; Dominguez Hills has a \$5,000,000 grant for WAC; campuses are doing lots of things. Other institutions have a lot of understanding of what assessment is. AW: I second that. SJSU looks like a model.

Not one we'd be too happy with, b/c the process was top-down; ours will be more satisfying and generate results that are more satisfying. PD: Admin will push hard for us to. Moving ahead within one year (when WASC will visit again). Getting faculty on board, being collaborative and inclusive, faculty staying in charge of the process may be a challenge—but the alternative maybe a more top down solution. AW: Fear of assessment--assessment driven by some sort of bureaucratic mindset--that's the fear. We need to convene a committee of people really who are expert on assessment and have them help us move forward. If we set up such a committee, we could make a lot of progress relatively quickly. And we might be able to get some data.

CB: The task-force model could be an intermediate solution b/w top-down and bottom-up; identify faculty and staff who are really concerned and know some things about the subject.

PD: Moving to our practice--designing FYE with assessment tools built in. WASC has endorsed the notion of revamping GE. Passes around John Gardner doc--guru of FYE stuff. What makes a program assessable? One: it's not about individual courses; not about RTP; not about evaluation; not anecdotal. Almost all our past surveys are anecdote based, not evidence based. Assessment is about whole programs and learning skills, building a body of evidence, including a feedback loop. Rather than asking, "Did you get adequate feedback on your writing?" Send some answers out to a qualified group to do a detailed analysis of writing samples to see if critical thinking and writing skills are changing. Give the evidence back to instructors and program leaders, and they will find their own ways to do improvement. AW: that's an excellent example, and you could use statistical principles to get the right sample.

PD: So Gardner: build in assessment from beginning; turn over assessment duties to people who know how to do it; build a rubric, turn it over to people who can do the assessment, and have them give you the results. Obtain input from relevant players. It makes less difference what your design is; what matters is that we find out that what we designed is working. Qualitative and quantitative measures; don't hide anything; do a data audit; use both homegrown and nationally developed measures. Share findings with all stakeholders. Take care to explain how assessment has helped you change your teaching. Confess how assessment has had impact. Ten-year cycles, not one-year cycles. Check each year, and build a body of evidence. Maintain continuity in terms of personnel if possible. Have assessors tell you what's working. We develop goals; then we turn our results and goals over to assessors to tell us how we're doing. WB: This makes it easier politically.

PD: So as we think about what we want FYE to be like, we need to be thinking about the kinds of tools that will help us know if it's working.

PD: The National Survey of Educational Effectiveness (NCEE). We get a snapshot of a variety of things. Useful but not evidence-based. There's also a faculty survey of educational effectiveness to see what faculty think about ed. effectiveness. We should compare these attitudes. CB: There's another, similar survey. Both of these are based on

anecdote. If 30% of students report that GE courses are not worthwhile, what do we do with that? We can compare with other schools; or we can do a statistical study to determine who are the students who are saying this--may be associated with who the people are, social class background, etc. Gives an example of a study done with Francisco Vasquez to determine civic engagement among Latino students. So to look at who are reporting what and then learn how to tailor curriculum. Currently we don't do anything like this with surveyed students. Who fills these out? A self-selected sample? We need to be careful about collecting this kind of data. PD: NESE sends a big binder that's much more complete than the short report.

AW: We should look for grant support. And I'd add another principle" we should look at assessment in info mgmt technology that will enable us to look at the data in a cost-effective way. WB: It'd be nice to have a list of things that we're already doing. PD: I'm going to put as much data as we already know onto the website. WB: We have to build in the data-collection techniques from the beginning, not just 30-minutes at the end of a class.

AW: You can get good data from a random sample; it is possible to get such a sample and learn from them. But the point is getting faculty to see that assessment is not an add-on, it's a built-in. An integral part of the learning process. PD: And there's a very valuable point of validating what we do well.

PD: Triangulation. Like navigation: finding three different points, do a plot, and find out where you are. A national rubric, a local rubric (embedded assessment), and student surveys. If you have these triangulated assessments, over time, the triangle gets smaller (more accurate). Evidence supports what we're doing more and more.

DH: Student-learning outcomes can be pretty broad. David Richart gave me a binder that contains their student learning outcomes. Are we aiming toward such a list? PD: We could have a list of 25 goals that we're interested in, but we might only assess four of those. Then we trust that the other 21 are working too, or are getting better.

WB: I would err on the side of more information rather than less. Will we have different goals for different schools? PD: Each dept. needs to determine its own assessments. For FYE, we want to build in what we want. If we want to build Eng 101 into FYE, we need to have an assessment tool geared to that. AW: If we do the FYE assessment right, we could come up with a model that's useful for all other sectors. How would we distinguish expectations for different populations, e.g. people with identified deficiencies in math or whatever? AG: one thing to assess cognitive issues (WB (or development) as opposed to retention).

PD: We need now to look at lots of models. Hands around Deming study of the quantitative results of GE survey. There's good info. It's a proxy for evidence, anecdotal, not evidentiary. It isn't pretty.

PD: Also: one exciting thing from Asheville. Ball State program. MAP. An in-house program. A very detailed survey offered to every freshman, everything from how they're getting along with roommates to what's going on with faculty. They combine this data with other data (remediation issues, SAT scores, etc) and make sure that everybody fills it out. People get rewards. And they know if you don't complete your survey. If you didn't respond, that's a test for at risk. Then an end-of-year survey, more academic. This tells folks specific things about specific students--problems with individual students. People have a way of accessing students to help them and find out what they're doing well. Then every student gets an 8-page report on himself or herself. Shows their expectations vs. something about reality. Very intensive and fully fed back. This is by week five. And they follow up with students who haven't responded. PD shares the actual MAP survey. Likes something like this for our FYE. WB: Is there intervention for students who get bad results? PD: Yes, a whole advising system is set up. CB: Who does this work? PD: one woman with a lot of student help administers it. All student assistants on campus come to help. ST: Looking at MAP: likes parts of it-- foregrounding of "you're here to get an education." Having them think about this as an education--a nice push in that direction. CB: Other more generic surveys allow us to design 14 questions of our own making. AW: Perhaps something we could get grant for. And see how resources for this are allocated there as opposed to here. PD: I talked with another theatre person who's been named to do FYE stuff. Her initial budget is half a mill. She got a salary increase.

How do we know if what we're trying to give our students is actually coming across? And this can give us ammunition to show students that what we're doing works.

Discussion of GE survey. Advising: EMT students felt they got worse advising (!). The gap in hiring (with few hires for a long time) has created difficulties in training faculty.

AW: What are differing expectations of students on advising?

CB: It would be interesting to find out who are the people who feel they're getting good advising vs. those who don't. PD: The MAP get a tailored report; by providing feedback, they get something tangible back. Ball State has an 80% retention rate.

Review of national models for FYE—one per person (see list below)

1) Dominant structure

- a) Academic content
- b) Critical thinking components
- c) Reading, Writing, and Research requirements
- d) Learning skills components
- e) Co-curricular components (what we do in

EMT/ Freshman Seminar)

- f) Assessment tools

2) Pros for SSU consideration

3) Negatives for SSU consideration

#### 4) Other useful findings

ST presents on Pacific Lutheran University--see attachment. Lots of cool stuff.

ST argues that training is key. WB wonders if we should have a particular person (ST: a chair of GE, a dean of GE); WB: there's so much to it. I think it should be a real, full-time person.

TW: I like the emphasis on values. I really like the notion of changing from "G" to "core curriculum." How well can faculty demonstrate how well their teaching is contributing to our core mission, liberal arts ed?

CB: in writing the first WASC report, we found that lots of faculty were not even aware they were teaching GE--but they were glad to learn that they were.

AW: PLU puts a lot of stuff into themes; in social sciences, there are faculty who think that GE should be initiation into specific classes vs. people who get excited about cross-curric collaboration. PD: I've heard lots of faculty say GE is how I build my major. People sustain themselves through that. AW: History is most vociferous about introducing people to a discipline. But there are lots of other more applied disciplines that recognize the need to be open to applied pedagogies (e.g., service learning).

ST: international core is team-taught. AW: a majority of faculty would enjoy this. And if we could deal with recruiting for the majors, then people will be interested.

TW: This PLU model looks a bit like our PATH, with flexibility. Discussion ensues about the challenge of flexibility vs. a set curriculum or canon and how to assess in either model. TW: I used to be much more interested in distribution; now I'm seeing the value of a set curriculum, as long as we overtly discuss these courses as GE courses.

AG reports on Stanford: 600 students, lots of grad students; 50% are students of color. Largest major is human bio. International Relations is also big--both are interdisciplinary. Residential Life is called Residential Education. RE students are not alcohol police. Academic advising group--6-8 students you as advisor follow until people declare a major. We got good training. Core curriculum has evolved over the years.

AG then described James Madison U. (See attachment.) PD likes their "Go for the Gold" info lit component that requires students to develop skills for sophomore year.

TW: a report from Asheville--someone who argued that "testing out of" should not happen. E.g., passing out of E101 with an AP score of 3. (Is this an SSU or CSU thing?) There appears to be general agreement that, especially for integrated portions of FYE, you shouldn't get out of it. TW argues in favor of advertising what's going to be in a given course.

ST: What about for E99 or E30 students? PD: This may be removed from consideration; the CSU is trying to work it out whereby remedial issues would be taken care of in HS. TW: I've not heard that non-compliant students would actually be barred from CSU. PD: Second-language students are a bigger issue for us. AW: There is a need for us to work with HSs in terms of offering a clearer sense of what linkages should be, also with community colleges. Diversity issue is important here. PD: I think it's possible to build an integrated structure and also create remedial sections that travel alongside. So, by the end of the first semester they've actually taken the equivalent of two English courses.

Discussion of writing skills development ensues. SM argues that all writing instruction should be integrative. AW mentions research on development of voice in various cultural sites--it's difficult. PD: cites research from Asheville--building a culture of writing and skill development involves multiple opportunities to write, read, etc. It's a building-on process. TW cites further research that argues for WAC. San Bernardino assessed writing ability and determined that students wrote worse after their major programs. AG: do we need to read for grammar? TW: argues strongly for high expectations. SM seconds. ST testifies from her experience at PLU; teaching writing in the FYE made her sensitive to writing for all her classes. AW agrees we need to have high expectations but not that we have to have the same expectation across the board. Argues for small classes and large classes, where in small classes writing could really be looked at. Other kinds of assessment measures would be appropriate for other classes. WB: what about a language requirement? Helps you learn grammar. PD: I can't believe that Spanish, Chinese, or Japanese is not required. ST: this is a controversial hot potato across the CSU. AG reports on SJSU. (See attachment.)

AW: We should build on the EMT peer mentor program. PD: faculty need training and part of GE training is making sure they know how to deal well with GE classes--how to build syllabi, how to advise, how to assess. Even if we change nothing, just helping people advise better will help. WB: we have to sell this to faculty. A class about how to advise.... how do we sell this? PD: "service" the first semester must be training. AW: I like Res education rather than res life--the whole residential experience becomes educational. TW: if we shift from 3 to 4 units, maybe we could keep GE at three units, but people would be required to use extra units for training and faculty development. Argues for this group to get its work done so that when we hire to replace Julie Allen we know what to say: "We want a person who can do this." PD: suggests putting something in the PA about this. Ability to teach GE should be part of criteria for hire.

ST: What if we had classes marked as project Muse ones--where there's a peer who does EMT stuff? With SSP. Any of the GE classes that are taught in this section would have this unity. AW: students earning units generates revenue. WB: in a perfect world, you'd have GE czar with that as their only job. We should push for that.

PD: next week, can we have some more presentations? Then can we look at what the big blob of possibility looks like. Then on the last day, we can have more of that general discussion.

Meeting ended at 2:10.

## PACIFIC LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY FIRST-YEAR EXPERIENCE PROGRAM

Suzanne Toczyski

July 19, 2004

Note: Most of this report is based on the website, though some I'm getting from my memory of teaching Writing 101 in the program in 1996-1998.

- I. Dominant Structure: all students entering with < 20 units as freshmen do.
  - a. Academic Content: two core courses + one January (J-term) course
    - i. First-Year Writing Seminar (Writing 101) –
      1. **themed classes** (law & justice; four by Shakespeare; healing, medicine, body and soul; addressing the New World; slavery in American life. turning points in history; re-writing violence; animal rights etc.).
      2. 21 sections total, **15 students each**
      3. classes are taught by **faculty from across the disciplines**
      4. includes a strong research component (1-10 page paper in addition 4 or 5 other writing assignments, I think)
      5. emphasis on “thinking like a writer” in various disciplines and in variety of styles
    - ii. First-Year Inquiry Seminar: focus on methods and topics of study **within a particular academic discipline or field**
      1. **themed classes** (ANTH 190, Marriage & Kinship; BUS190, Vocation; CSCE 190, Privacy (computer science); ECON 190, Microeconomics; MUS 190, Intro to Music; HEED 190, Issues in Body Weight; PHIL 190, Moral Philosophy; SOC 190, Intro to Social Work)
      2. number of sections not specified
      3. classes are taught by **faculty from across the disciplines**
      4. fulfills a **GE** or departmental or school **requirement**
    - iii. J-term Course: wide variety of options, including options abroad
  - b. Critical Thinking Components: see “Inquiry Seminar,” above
  - c. Reading, Writing & Research Requirements
    - i. Not obvious on the webpages
    - ii. If memory serves, students read 6-10 books over course of semester, write at least 25 pages of solid prose in a variety of styles (narrative; compare/contrast; research paper).
    - iii. No information literacy component evident on webpage, though research is part of the program.

- d. Learning Skills Components: FYE focuses on skills of:
  - i. thinking: inquiring more deeply into issues
  - ii. literacy: communication as writers, readers, speakers, listeners
  - iii. community: working with community of learners
  - iv. note: *one of the Writing 101* courses is called “College for Beginners” which covers very explicitly the curriculum of EMT
- e. Co-Curricular (EMT-like) components
  - i. Emphasis on “nurturing and supportive learning environment” within academic classes
  - ii. small classes
  - iii. maximum interaction between teacher and student
  - iv. courses with only freshmen peers in cohort
- f. Assessment Tools : none listed on website

## II. Pros for SSU Consideration

- a. Very small seminars for first-year students
- b. Builds FYE directly into GE, what we call Area A, through a coherent format and challenging themes for both writing and critical thinking courses
- c. Extensive (remunerated, I think) workshops prepare faculty to teach in the FYE program, including segments on how to teach writing and how to create a course around critical thinking and a particular theme – a model we might inquire about when we decide to organize such training here for teaching GE in general.

## III. Maybe yes, maybe no:

- a. Gets students involved in a discipline, and in thinking explicitly about writing and inquiry within a discipline from their second semester
- b. Learning about learning/how to learn & transitioning to college is an explicit part of the program, without, however, addressing EMT goals directly; perhaps having small cohort classes facilitates transition?

## IV. Negatives for SSU Consideration

- a. Not sure if this is a negative? – Includes faculty from across the disciplines teaching our ENG101 and PHIL101 courses; maybe this would be good for the English Department but not as good for Philosophy at SSU (in terms of number of FT TT faculty in each department available to teach those classes here?)
- b. We can’t require students to take a course in January
- c. Definite lack of explicitly addressing the essential issues of EMT
- d. Little emphasis, except for very small group, on important freshman issues (time management, drinking, etc.), though some of these may be covered indirectly in the two classes

- V. Other Useful Findings
  - a. GE includes “Core Requirements” in two other categories:
    - i. Distributive & Disciplinary
      - 1. 4 units of Art/Music/Theatre;
      - 2. 4 units of Literature;
      - 3. 4 units of Philosophy;
      - 4. 4 units of Religious Studies;
      - 5. 4 units of Anthropology, History or Political Science;
      - 6. 4 units of Economics, Psychology, Sociology or Social Work
      - 7. 2-4 units of Natural Sciences, Computer Science or Math
    - ii. International Core: Integrated Studies of the Contemporary World
      - 1. 8 units of Development of Western Thought (incl. non-Western world)
      - 2. 16 units of 200-level theme courses
      - 3. 4 units of thematic, values-based 300-level courses
  - b. Their general GE package de-emphasizes science and math and promotes Arts & Humanities and Social Sciences

# **JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY FIRST-YEAR EXPERIENCE PROGRAM**

Anne Greenblatt

GE Task Force

July 20, 2004

## **I. Dominant Structure:**

The General Education Program “*The Human Community*” is the core academic program of James Madison University. It is required of all students regardless of their major or professional program.

In a rapidly changing world, it is increasingly important that students learn how to create knowledge out of the vast amounts of available information and place that knowledge in its appropriate contexts. The role of general education is to introduce these concepts, so students understand that knowledge seldom develops in isolation, but rather within larger interactive, often competing contexts.

## **The Goals of General Education**

Students acquire knowledge of past and present achievements of our own and other cultures in the arts, letters, and sciences; of the impact of people, institutions and communities involved in the creation, preservation and transmission of culture; of the distinctions and interconnections among disciplines. This includes Knowledge of:

- the world’s great literary, philosophical, and religious traditions;
- the historical and social context of major political, intellectual, religious, economic, scientific and cultural developments;
- the evidence, ideas, and models needed to understand how people relate to each other, to institutions and to communities;
- the evidence, ideas, and models to make informed and responsible judgments about the physical world;
- major achievements in the fine arts of our own and other civilizations and the cultural, social, and historical context in which they were created;
- values, ethics, and legal issues in a free society;
- the wellness issues involved in encouraging life-style choices necessary for sustaining health and well-being;
- Students learn the skills of perception, research, investigation and the critical analyses needed to cope with problems and find solutions, and the written, oral, and electronic communication skills requisite to shaping ideas and transmitting them persuasively. These skills include being able:
- To communicate purposefully through reading, writing, speaking and listening effectively and through use of appropriate technology;
- to use the investigative, analytical, quantitative, and critical thinking skills needed to examine alternatives and make decisions;
- to perceive and make informed aesthetic choices and analyses about artistic use of sound, movement, and images;
- to identify, locate, and evaluate information sources in both traditional and electronic forms;
- to interact effectively in interpersonal and inter-cultural group situations.
- Students will actively engage in reflection about aesthetic and ethical concerns and the diversity of human values through experiences that transcend the limits of specialization. This is evident when students:

- become independent, creative, and self-directed learners;
  - gain an understanding of the academic community and its application to broader communities;
- cooperate and collaborate when working with other people;
- examine the influence of culture on one's own perceptions and treat others with dignity, respect, and civility.

These broad goals are achieved through coursework in five cluster areas, each of which is defined by a set of learning objectives. Students work to meet these learning objectives while enrolled in integrated or sequenced courses in each cluster area. All students complete Cluster One their freshman year, and all students at least start Cluster Three their freshman year.

### **a. Academic content**

*One Package in each of Five Clusters:* The Human Community provides fundamental knowledge and skills across the breadth of traditional disciplines so that students learn how to

- think and communicate effectively (Cluster One);
- appreciate the arts and humanities as an essential component of the human experience (Cluster Two);
- recognize the relevance of science and mathematics in the world they inhabit (Cluster Three);
- identify ways in which political, social and economic forces shape American and global experiences (Cluster Four); and
- understand themselves both as individuals and members of various groups in society (Cluster Five).

In each of these five clusters, students choose and complete a cross-disciplinary or sequenced set of courses called a "package." These courses together challenge students to make connections among disciplines while satisfying all of the learning objectives of each cluster. Since every package forms a coherent and integrated body of knowledge, students must take and complete a single package of courses and may not pick and choose courses from different packages.

Because Cluster One provides the necessary college-level skills of critical thinking, writing, and speech, all students are expected to complete this cluster by the end of their first year. All students should complete Cluster Three: The Natural World by the end of their second year.

**Critical Thinking Components:** covered in Cluster 1.

Cluster One brings together the basic skills in reasoning, writing, and oral communication.

### **Reading, writing, & research requirements**

Cluster One also responds to the contemporary need for effective information literacy within diverse contexts of human communication and decision making.

### **Requirements:**

**Learning Skills Components:** mentioned in Goals, but I'm not clear on his this is implemented

**Co-curricular (EMT-like) components:** Values clarification, wellness/lifestyle issues, communication in culturally diverse situations, and group dynamics are addressed in the Gen Ed cluster courses – but it's not clear how.

#### **Pro's for SSU Consideration**

- Students must work with faculty to design coherent packages within each Cluster – can't just pick and choose eclectically.
- Looks like evaluation has been built in, and a public version is included on the website at [www.jmu.edu/gened/executive\\_summary.html](http://www.jmu.edu/gened/executive_summary.html)
- Students take two tests on-a drop-in basis in the computer lab during their first year:
  - A Tech/Computer Literacy test on word processing, Excel spreadsheet, and presentation skills (by Nov. of first year)
  - An Information Seeking Skills Test to evaluate their ability to locate and evaluate information sources as part of academic research (by April of first year). This is taught on-line in self-instruction modules: "Go for the Gold."

#### **Negatives for SSU Consideration**

- The Program does not seem to address several of SSU EMT topics, such as choice of major and career direction, or study skills and time management.
- In their self-evaluation of the Program, they identified areas mentioned below that need future focus.

#### **Other**

James Madison recently re-designed their General Education curriculum: Evaluation Summary at: [www.jmu.edu/gened/executive\\_summary.html](http://www.jmu.edu/gened/executive_summary.html)

*The General Education program was implemented as a change from the Liberal Studies program to another core curriculum. The transition was a frequently debated one, and a summary of important events during the development of the General Education program is included.*

*The mission and goals of the General Education embrace the mission and defining characteristics of the university. Review and assessment are an integral part of the program to continue the advancement of these goals. As a result of this continual assessment and the on-going deliberations of the university community, the Program Self-Study Team identified several areas as future priorities for the program. They included:*

- *Addressing resource issues regarding to staffing needs*
- *Integrating student advisement*
- *Improving communication with the university community*
- *Increasing collaboration with other programs*
- *Focusing on excellence in teaching*
- *Establishing continuous assessment of the General Education program goals*
- *Addressing growing technological needs*

# SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY FIRST-YEAR EXPERIENCE PROGRAM

Anne Greenblatt

GE Task Force

July 20, 2004

## I. Dominant Structure: All students required to take 50 units GE coursework

### Purpose of GE:

A university brings together many separate areas of learning, yet it is more than just a collection of specialized disciplines. General Education involves both the development of skills and the acquisition of knowledge through the study of facts, issues, and ideas. Regardless of major, all who earn undergraduate degrees should share a common universe of discourse.

The objectives of the San José State University General Education program are:

- To develop analytical skills and reasoning powers;
- To increase the ability to communicate ideas effectively both in speaking and in writing;
- To enhance the ability to live and work intelligently, responsibly, and cooperatively in a multicultural society and an increasingly interdependent world;
- To provide a fundamental understanding of science and the natural world;
- To further knowledge and appreciation of the arts and letters;
- To promote citizenship through knowledge of the forces that shape the individual and modern society; and
- To develop abilities to address complex issues and problems using disciplined analytic skills and creative techniques.

The advancement of academic discourse requires civility and a respectful attitude toward all members of the academic community in the expression and consideration of a variety of viewpoints. All courses shall reinforce the ethical responsibility of students and instructors to acknowledge respectfully the learning styles and forms of expression of individuals and members of all groups.

### a. Academic content

- 39 units of Core GE courses in areas A – E (similar to SSU)

- 12 units of Advanced GE:

R. Earth & Environment	3
S. Self, Society & Equality in the U.S.	3
V. Culture, Civilization & Global Understanding	3
Z. Written Communication II	3

- 6 units of American Institutions

F1. American History	3
F2 & 3. US Constitution & Calif. Govt.	3

**Critical Thinking Components:** covered in Area A

“Critical thinking courses should help students learn to recognize, analyze, evaluate, and produce reasoning.

### **Reading, writing, & research requirements**

In written communication II courses, Area Z, students develop advanced proficiency in college-level writing and appropriate contemporary research strategies and methodologies to communicate effectively to both specialized and general audiences

**Learning Skills Components:** I don't see them specifically. Only mentioned in MUSE Program?

### **Co-curricular (EMT-like) components**

#### ***Frosh First Year Experience***

##### ***Metropolitan University Scholar's Experience (MUSE)***

***SJSU offers the Metropolitan University Scholars Program (MUSE Program), which features small classes taught by faculty with a special interest in helping new freshmen make a successful transition to SJSU. Only one MUSE course may be taken for GE credit.***

*It's your first class. MUSE seminars are small classes of no more than fifteen students who are teamed with great professors who enjoy working with frosh.*

*Not only will you earn general education credit, you'll also learn the skills you need to be a successful student scholar at SJSU. Check out the offerings at [www.sjsu.edu/muse](http://www.sjsu.edu/muse).*

##### ***Mentors***

*If you'd like to be mentored by someone from your major, sign up for the Faculty Mentor Program. The Peer Mentor Program matches upper division SJSU students with new students. Learn to be successful from the experts.*

##### ***Finding your place***

*You'll also want to explore the dozens of clubs, organizations and intramural sports that will be the hook-up to your new friends at SJSU. Hang out in the Student Union, lounge in the residence halls, work out at the Sport Club and connect with your club in the Art Quad.*

### **Pro's for SSU Consideration**

- a. MUSE Program has small seminars
- b. Seminars features high faculty involvement by faculty with a strong interest in freshmen.
- c. Builds FYE directly into GE
- d. Optional – students decide if they want this program
- e. The Peer Mentor Program for freshmen seems like an excellent and cost-effective idea worth researching in more depth! Does not seem to be tied to the MUSE Program (on the website).

### **Negatives for SSU Consideration**

- a. Must only involve a small percentage of first year students

- b. Not clear whether it addresses all the EMT topics we cover.
- c. Optional for first year students

**Other**

Who trains and supervises the Peer Mentors for freshmen?

Their GE program includes an Intensive Science track which is not described on the website, but might offer flexibility for science majors and faculty to design “vertical tracks” to support their majors