

Questions, Comments Concerns sent to administration team about The WOU Way prior to 4.25.17 FS meeting

First set of questions April 14th.

Questions coming from faculty are these:

1. How was the Gen Ed Committee involved with the 30 60 90 plan - considering the 60 is a driving force? or the Curriculum Committee? (I believe they are wondering how did this get presented at Faculty Senate with no other faculty input prior to this?)
2. What is the evidence that requiring minors, the way it is now, stops or is a roadblock to students from graduating on time, at 180 credits?
3. Why are some majors or programs going to be allowed to not conform to 30 60 90? Who gets to make the decision for that? If we allow that for a bunch of majors then won't that water down the 30 60 90?
4. Are there other universities that are using the 30 60 90 model and, if so, which ones and what has been the outcome?
5. Not a question but a concern- Workload issues: Assessment, Program Review, and Gen ED - 30 60 90.
6. Is there a targeted completion date for the entire 30 60 90 plan to be implemented? or a timeline of sorts?

I hear that it is "the administration" wants... I believe faculty need to hear more about the other influences of this going beyond the strategic plan. In the FS presentation the strategic plan connections were shown and emphasized. How does this model set us up to be ahead?

Second set of questions 4.19.17

Evidence, process and data:

1. We would like to see some very specific proof that the gen ed requirements are inadequate before we attempt to change them.
2. What is the correlation between the size of the gen ed requirements and the time to graduation across institutions? Did administration do this analysis before settling on 60 Gen Ed credits? If not, why not? Isn't that step 1 for evidence-based decision-making?
3. What evidence do we have that our current Gen Ed model is successful?

Possible metrics might include:

- A. in producing students who demonstrate that they have met all of our undergraduate learning outcomes at the level 3 or 4 in the VALUE rubrics,
- B. in producing students who have the skills they need to be competitive in post-graduate education or career readiness
- C. in not significantly negatively affecting time to degree and/or number of credits needed for degree completion when compared to other general education frameworks at comparator institutions

- D. in administration not significantly differentially affecting any of the above metrics for women, underrepresented minorities, first-generation students, or students of lower socio-economic levels
- E. in defining and demonstrating the mission and vision of WOU to our faculty, students, and the broader community

4. One of the problems raised about WOU during the accreditation process is our lack of assessment and too many ad hoc curricular decisions that are not based on sound evidence or process. The seemingly ad hoc adoption of this plan - with NO assessment, evidence, or process - seems indicative of exactly why we are in this mess with accreditation. I cannot imagine, were the accreditation team to evaluate this situation, that feedback would be positive

Unintended impacts?

We have 62 required upper division credits. The minor generally requires about 12 upper division credits. Two concerns to address:

1) Concern that there might be an unintended consequence that students end up taking more credits because they want to get those upper division credits in multiple disciplines and therefore have to go through multiple sequences of prerequisites classes. Managing these upper division electives will likely also be a new difficulty in advising. What are their thoughts on this?

2) Concern that the administration will ask us to remove prerequisites to upper division classes to address this problem and thus reduce the rigor and depth of these classes.

What ifs?

1) What if the Gen Ed Task Force decides the Gen Ed should be less than 60 credits?
More than 60 credits?