
The second element of the charge asked the committee to identify best and worst practices for Gen Ed transitions. Despite initial uncertainty about the availability of information about these processes (particularly the “worst”, a number of instructive case studies were identified (these documents will be appended to the report).

1. : [Reflection on a Successful Process for General Education Reform](#). This mostly focuses on the steps that we have already done at SU. However, Stage 4: Implementation (pp. 97–98) as well as the references might also prove useful.
2. : [Guiding Principles: A Template for General Education Reform](#). Again, this mostly focuses on the steps we have already done at SU. However, the discussion of (pp. 104–107) and the Appendix A: Guiding Principles (p. 109) detailing the Process and Design Principles are worth reviewing.
3. : [Revising General Education—And Avoiding the Potholes](#). This is a very thorough document referenced by many others. The “Program Implementation” section would probably be most useful to the GEOC (pp. 26–29; Potholes 43–50) as well as Appendix A: Pothole Patches for the corresponding Potholes.
4. : “Advice from the Trenches” [presentations](#).
5. : [The Process of General Education Reform from a Faculty Perspective: A Grounded Theory Approach](#). The “Theoretical Propositions” section starting on p. 28 seems to both align with our experiences and also can potentially inform about their model for implementation, including how that worked/didn’t work (from a faculty perspective).

There are also several universities whose websites provide good examples of “reformed” General Education programs, including resources and documentation, that can be considered as models.

1. : <https://www.radford.edu/content/real/home/faculty.html>
2. : <https://gened.umd.edu/faculty>
3. : <https://www.buffalo.edu/ubcurriculum.html>

Finally, the charge asked the committee to identify existing requirements at other institutions for categories similar to First Year Seminar, Experiential Learning, Civic Engagement, Diversity and Inclusion, and Environmental Sustainability. There are a wealth of resources available in these areas. Many of these have been compiled on our committee's MyClasses site, which can be made available to the GEOC. Here in the report, we will share an executive summary for each of the specified categories.

First Year Seminar

Under the new Gen Ed model, a first-year seminar course will focus on "academic preparation, skills and expectations for educational and professional success through exploration of a topic or issue". ECs include: Critical Thinking and Reasoning, Effective Reading, Information Literacy, Oral Communication, Written Communication; PSCRs include Intellectual Curiosity. Currently 4 "performance-peer" institutions offer the type of 3-4 credit hour FYS course outlined by the new Gen Ed model. Shared components include limited enrollment (~20-25 students) and emphasizing engagement in special topic as means of developing critical thinking and writing skills. Some campuses use department HEGIS codes for the FYS, but how they implement FYS curriculum varies. For instance, the [Rowan University requires the Rowan Seminar](#) is a special section of a regular class that caters to first-year students, taught by faculty who receive training in first-year curriculum. Others (see [Framingham](#)) use special HEGIS codes

The [AAC&U Value Rubric on Lifelong Learning](#) seems a good fit; it captures curiosity as well as transfer, independence, initiative, and reflection, all of which seem to fit the purpose of the course (*and* the rubric directly supports part of SU's Mission).

Civic and Community Engagement

Salisbury University has a process in place for tagging CE courses. This process pre-dates but was instrumental to our designation

