GENERAL EDUCATION 2.0 IMPLEMENTATION TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS
August 15, 2017

INTRODUCTION

This proposal outlines recommendations of plans for implementation of General Education 2.0 (GE2.0). Finite details of each recommendation will be developed over the course of the 2017 and 2018 AY, as indicated in the timeline at the end of this report.

As directed by the General Education 2.0 Task Force Charge (Appendix A), GE2.0 will “be driven by clearly stated and measurable student learning outcomes that articulate the essential competencies which faculty strive to instill in all UMKC’s undergraduate students” (Bichelmeyer, July 2016). GE2.0 is not a curriculum, but a program that will provide a common intellectual experience for all UMKC undergraduate students.

GE2.0 is guided by the Student Learning Outcomes that were developed by the General Education 2.0 Task Force with feedback by the faculty and endorsed by the Faculty Senate during AY 2016-2017. These SLOs (Appendix B) were approved by the Provost as the guide for GE2.0 in March 2017.

SLOs will be met through a 30-credit hour curricular model that was developed by the General Education 2.0 Task Force with feedback by the faculty and endorsed by the Faculty Senate during AY 2016-2017. The model (Appendix C) was approved by the Provost as the guide for GE2.0 in March 2017. As approved, the model contains two types of courses, foundational courses and Essential Question courses. Foundational courses include two courses in Written Communication, one course in Oral Communication and one Math Pathways course. The Foundational courses are guided by and will be assessed on the Written and Oral Communication and Quantitative Reasoning SLOs, respectively.

The remaining six courses (18 credit hours) are satisfied through Essential Questions (EQ) courses. EQ courses are guided by and will be assessed by the Critical Thinking, Culture & Diversity and Civic and Urban Engagement SLOs. The first EQ course is the First Year Experience (FYE). As directed by the GE2.0 Charge, FYE provides “a baseline common denominator experience for undergraduate students in all degree programs” (Bichelmeyer, July 2016). FYE is described in detail in the “Student Experience” section of this report. The five other EQ courses contain three courses in Critical Thinking, one course in Culture & Diversity and one course in Civic & Urban Engagement. As stated, these courses are guided by and will be assessed on the respective SLOs. Furthermore, the Critical Thinking courses expose students to critical thinking in three separate disciplinary areas (one course each): humanities, social science and natural science. Course experiences are further detailed in subsequent sections of this report.

Finally, GE2.0 will “ensure students are highly engaged in valued co-curricular experiences such as research, internships, civic engagement, service learning, and cultural enrichment” (Bichelmeyer, July 2016). These co-curricular experiences are further detailed in the “Student Experience” section of this report.

GE2.0 will be a stand-alone organizational and program structure (non-degree granting unit) that reports directly to the Provost. The Provost has final oversight and decision-making authority over the
General Education Program. However, daily operations will be the responsibility of the GE2.0 Director, who will be advised by the GE2.0 Executive Committee.

GE2.0 will be staffed by a Director and a First Year Experience (FYE) Coordinator, supported by an Executive Assistant. GE2.0 will also hire and be the academic home to 11 (eleven) Non Tenure Track Ranked Faculty Members on 9 month appointments. The GE2.0 NTTs will be full-time faculty whose primary teaching assignment will be the FYE. While the GE2.0 program will rely on faculty from all units across campus to teach the majority of the essential questions courses, these faculty will also teach Essential Questions (EQ) courses (see descriptions above), as appropriate to their respective areas. All GE2.0 NTTs will be certified online upon hire and all expectations need to be clear in the job description (willing to teach online, weekend, evening, summer session, and completion of orientation to GE program).

Information regarding the governance structure, job responsibilities and additional recommendations for staffing are detailed in subsequent sections of this report.

Implementation of General Education 2.0 Program will begin in Fall 2017. An Acting General Education 2.0 Executive Committee (including identification of a committee chair) will be identified in September 2017. The Acting GE2.0 Executive Committee will serve in lieu of any vacant appointments or committees, until the respective committees or positions are filled.

This report is organized in three sections and addresses each component of the General Education 2.0 Implementation Team Charge (Appendix D). The charge expectations are addressed in the order they appear in the charge. However, different from the charge, this report begins with the “Infrastructure” components of the charge, followed by components of the “Student Experience” and then components of the “Faculty Experience” as charged.

I. Infrastructure
The following statements are recommendations forwarded to the Provost for consideration and final approval.

1. Develop specifications regarding governance structure, implementation responsibility, and administrative oversight for the general education program:
   a. ensure the General Education 2.0 Program is logistically as easy and expeditious as possible to implement, given external constraints (HLC, MDHE, etc.).
      • The General Education 2.0 Academic Program (GE2.0) is a Student Learning Outcome-driven 30-hour General Education Program as recommended by the GE2.0 Task Force, endorsed by the Faculty Senate and approved by the Provost. Beginning Fall 2019, all First Time College (Native) students will be required to complete the GE2.0 Program. Courses in the GE2.0 program do not count for major degree requirements, with the exception of the Math Pathways course. The GE2.0 program is guided by the GE2.0 core SLOs (Appendix B). A draft crosswalk of the MDHE Outcomes and GE2.0 core SLOs can be found in Appendix E. The GE2.0 program curriculum consists of two types of courses, Foundational Courses and Essential Question courses. Foundational courses include Math Pathways, Written Communication I, Written Communication II and Oral Communication. Essential Question (EQ) courses include First Year Experience (FYE) and courses in Critical Thinking (3), Culture and Diversity (1) and Civic Engagement (1). FTCs can receive credit for dual credit and transfer coursework meeting equivalency of any
Foundational Course. The Director of the General Education Program will evaluate requests for equivalencies for EQ courses on a course-by-course basis. FTCs with more than 45 transferable credit hours default to the UMKC Program, but can petition to complete the MDHE 42-hour block (however, FYE is required for all FTCs). More information about student experiences are detailed in subsequent sections of this report.

- Course sequencing guidelines for GE2.0 program courses can be found in the "Course Approval" section of this report.
- Information regarding transfer students can be found in the "Transfer Student" section of this report.

b. determine processes for working within existing university operating procedures to oversee and support the General Education 2.0 Program (University Assessment Committee, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, University Budget Committee, Faculty Senate).

- As indicated, GE2.0 will be a stand-alone organizational and program structure (non-degree granting unit) that reports directly to the Provost. However, interface with the University Assessment Committee, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, University Budget Committee and Faculty Senate will follow similar processes as other academic units. Interface with each of these committees specific to GE2.0 are detailed in subsequent sections of this report.

c. describe the General Education Executive Committee whose members will include the General Education Program Coordinator, University Assessment Director, First Year Experience Coordinator, Director of Composition from the English Department, Coordinator or Chairperson of Communication Studies, Math Pathways Coordinator or Chairperson of Math Department, Section Chair for Curriculum Panels (Critical Thinking, Culture & Diversity, Civic Engagement).

- The Provost has final oversight and decision-making authority over the General Education Program. However, daily operations will be the responsibility of the Director, who will be advised by the General Education Executive Committee (GE2.0 Exec). The GE2.0 Exec will make recommendations for implementation of the GE2.0 program. The GE2.0 Exec will also be responsible for the initial approval of the Foundational Courses. These courses will be reviewed and approved based on alignment with the respective SLOs and in accordance with the Course Approval Process outlined in subsequent sections of this report. The GE2.0 Exec serves as an advisory group to the Director. However, the executive committee has oversight authority for program quality and continuous improvement. If a conflict of interest exists regarding any discussion or action item (e.g., the discontinuation of a service contract with a department servicing a Foundational Course), it is expected that respective members will recuse themselves from the discussion. The GE2.0 Exec will meet monthly for the first year of the program. Meeting schedules for concurrent years will be determined at the close of year one.

- GE2.0 Exec members include:
  - General Education Program Director
  - Director of Assessment
  - First Year Experience Coordinator
  - Director of Composition or Chairperson of English Department
  - Coordinator or Chairperson of Communication Studies
d. determine the charge and qualifications of members who serve on the Section Curriculum Review Panels.

- GE2.0 EQ Course Approvals will be vetted by a Curriculum Review Panel that will make recommendations to the Director. Courses will then move to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for review and approval before final review by the Provost. The GE2.0 Curriculum Review Panel is responsible for making recommendations regarding course approvals and continuous improvement of curriculum and instruction within GE2.0.

- Review Panel Members:
  - Director
  - First Year Experience Coordinator
  - Culture & Diversity Specialist (3)*
  - Civic Engagement Specialist (3)*
  - Critical Thinking Specialist (9 total: 3 in Humanities, 3 in Natural Sciences, 3 in Social Sciences)*
  - Director of Assessment
  - UMKC Online Representative

*Review Panel Specialists will be appointed by the Provost, in consultation with GE2.0 Exec.

- Appointment of Review Panel Specialists will occur during the Fall 2017 semester
  - Review Panel Specialists will meet HLC faculty qualifications (credentials) requirements of a terminal degree or tested experience in the course SLO area. Tested experience will be defined as scholarship and/or extensive service in the SLO area. Faculty members will apply to be a Review Panel Specialist by submitting a current vita and one-page letter of application. The letter of application should address the faculty member’s interest in the position, experience and knowledge of General Education, and experience and knowledge with the SLO area. Experience with curriculum development is preferred.

- Based on the course type that has been proposed, a subgroup will complete the initial course review and make a recommendation to the panel. At minimum, subgroups will be comprised of 3 people from the course area (e.g., Critical Thinking in the Arts & Humanities) and 3 additional members. Feedback to the course submitters will be communicated by the Director and will come from the panel as a whole. The process for course approval is detailed in the next section of this report.

- Curriculum Review Panel Specialists will serve 3-year appointments, on a rotating basis.
  - Curriculum Review Panelists will be expected to participate in the Course Development Process during the Spring 2018 semester (under the guidance of the Acting GE2.0 Executive Committee)
During AY 2018-2019 the Curriculum Review Panel will meet biweekly, until all initial courses are approved or denied.

During subsequent academic years, the Curriculum Review Panel will meet monthly.

Curriculum Review Panel Meetings will be facilitated by the Director.

Curriculum Review Panels will conduct course reviews to include general considerations for all GE2.0 Courses (see below).

In the event that a Curriculum Review Panel member submits a course for consideration, the Panel member will recuse themselves from discussion.

e. develop process for course approval for new courses as well as existing courses proposed to be recertified in the new program and the ongoing review process to ensure compliance with quality student outcomes contributing to the overall general education program effectiveness.

- All GE2.0 program courses will follow the GE2.0 Course Approval Process
- For the initial slate of courses, faculty interested in proposing courses for GE2.0 will be expected to participate in an orientation session to learn about the GE2.0 Course Approval Process and Expectations for specific course types. These orientation sessions will begin in January 2018. Orientations will be led by the Director. Information regarding faculty orientations and onboarding can be found in the “Faculty Experience” section of this report in section 4a.
- For subsequent years, course designers are required to attend General Education Course Development Sessions, again led by the Director.
- All courses must follow the process of approvals:
  - Course Designer(s) attend initial GE2.0 Course Development Orientations or General Education Course Development Sessions
    - In orientations, it will be made clear that all GE2.0 courses are property of the GE2.0 program. Course developers waive their copyright to approved GE2.0 courses.
  - Course submission must include Departmental consent of faculty availability to teach the course as recurring faculty to GE2.0- see “Faculty Experience” section 4d2b.
    - With the approval of the Department Chair, course designers have right of first refusal to teach the respective course as scheduled by the Director
    - Courses are approved as GE2.0 courses, as such, the Director may schedule multiple sections of courses and assign or hire faculty to teach the course in accordance with HLC faculty guidelines
  - Course submitted to General Education Curriculum Review Panel (as the program level review)
  - Course submitted to Assessment for Review of any additional SLOs
  - Course submitted to Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
    - The Director will represent GE2.0 courses on the UCC. It is the Director's discretion to invite Curriculum Review Section Panel Chairs and/or course designers to also represent the course at UCC meetings.
- Courses proposed for the first year of GE2.0 must be submitted to GE2.0 Curriculum Panel no later than August 15, 2018 for consideration for AY 2019-2020. In subsequent years, new course proposals must be submitted to GE2.0 Curriculum Panel by October 1
to be taught the following fall semester (subject to change based on UCC recommended timelines for course approval).

- The initial checklist for Course Development can be found in Appendix E.
  - Specific Proposal Evaluation Rubrics for each course type will be developed Fall 2017 and will be updated annually by the GE2.0 Curriculum Review Panel.

- General Considerations for all GE2.0 Courses
  - Course has broad appeal to students
  - Course can be taught by a variety of faculty throughout academic units
  - Department’s ability and commitment to allocate faculty as GE2.0 recurring faculty to teaching the course
  - The signature assignment elicits the general education course type student learning outcomes (e.g., the signature assignment for a Culture & Diversity course must elicit all Culture & Diversity SLOs)
  - The course includes sufficient educational experiences to support student achievement of the student learning outcomes
  - Course has been submitted as both F2F/Blended and Online
  - Course proposers will be expected to work with Instructional Designers to create the online course offering.
  - Feasibility of F2F course to be delivered weekend, evening, summer and/or intersession delivery formats
  - The recommended cap for the course is within GE2.0 recommended cap range
    - Critical Thinking Courses (30-150)
    - Culture & Diversity (30-120)
    - Civic Engagement (30-120)
    - Oral Communication (25-30)
    - Written Communication (25-30)
    - Math Pathways (30-80)

- Recommendations for course sequencing is as follows (FTC unless otherwise specified)
  - FYE and Foundational Courses:
    - FYE (including initial RooWriter) and Written Communication I will be completed first semester (or 15 hours if not full time)
    - Math Pathway and Oral Communications will be completed within first 30 hours
    - Written Communication I is a pre-requisite for Written Communication II
    - Written Communication II will be completed within the first 60 credit hours
      - Written Communication II must incorporate the final administration of the RooWriter
    - For students transferring Written Communication II, the RooWriter will be completed as a pre-requisite to any WI courses or within the first 75 credit hours.
  - Students will have a minimum of 30 credit hours or sophomore standing prior to enrolling in Culture and Diversity course
  - Students will have a minimum of 30 credit hours or sophomore standing prior to enrolling in Civic Engagement course
f. design metrics and processes by which success of the General Education Program will be measured, including student learning outcome assessments, end-of-course evaluations by faculty, students and administrators, and program review and monitoring.

- develop an assessment plan that holds faculty accountable to meet targeted student learning outcomes through appropriate assessments and evaluations, while at the same time allowing for academic freedom and independent action in the design and delivery of courses.
- The GE2.0 Academic Program will be measured through a comprehensive Assessment Plan. Assessment of GE2.0 is the responsibility of the Director, with the assistance of the GE2.0 Exec and GE2.0 Core Faculty and Staff. The Assessment Plan consists of 4 components: Authentic Assessment, Faculty Reflections, Faculty Peer Review, and Student Evaluations. The ETS proficiency profile will be used as part of the direct assessment of GE2.0. Indirect assessments of GE2.0 may include NSSE, FSSE, Exit Survey, and Graduation Survey. The review of the Undergraduate Reflective e-portfolios created for the proposed Roo Badges may provide additional data reflecting progress on GE2.0 student learning outcomes.

   — Authentic Assessment - Signature Assignment (student artifacts)
   - As part of the Course Approval Process, faculty identify the course signature assignment.
     - GE Signature Assignment is defined as an authentic assessment designed to elicit all of the General Education Student Learning Outcomes for the particular course. The assignment is a regular part of the course and included in the final course grade.
     - Each faculty member teaching in the GE2.0 program will submit required student learning outcome signature assessment assignments as requested.
     - Assessment of signature assessments will occur on a three-year cycle. The assessment will be conducted via a double-blind review of a representative sample of student artifacts (signature assignments).
     - During each annual cycle, approximately one third of GE2.0 courses will be assessed. The following triads are recommended:
       - Phase I: Written Communication I, FYE, Math Pathway;
       - Phase II: Oral Communication I, Critical Thinking I, II and II; and
       - Phase III: Written Communication II, Culture & Diversity, Civic Engagement.
     - During each annual cycle, a random sample of students enrolled in each category of courses will be assessed. Faculty will submit ungraded copies of signature assignments - students’ work created as part of the normal course requirements, along with copies of the assignment guidelines designed to elicit the specified general education student learning outcomes. The student artifacts and assignment guidelines will be stripped of identifying information prior to review by two members of the assessment panels. General Education Core Faculty, Recurring Faculty, members of the GE Curriculum Panels and the UAC will participate in assessment of the student artifacts. The review panels will be convened in late May. After engaging in rubric norming sessions, evaluators will use rubrics, adapted from the AAC&U VALUE rubrics, to evaluate the student artifacts. Each artifact will be assessed by two evaluators. In the event that the reviewers’ results for an
artifact differ by more than one point on any criteria, a third reviewer drawn from one of the facilitators will assesses the artifact.

- AAC&U VALUE rubrics will be provided to faculty during the GE2.0 Course Development Orientations
- Assignment guidelines will also be evaluated and feedback provided to the course instructors, developers and associated administrators. If any assignment is rated unsatisfactory, course instructors will be required to revise the assignment guidelines prior to the course being offered again. The course will then undergo a triggered review during the subsequent assessment cycle (when the course is next offered).

--- Faculty Reflection
- Annually, faculty teaching in the General Education program will submit reflections that will serve as self-assessments and course reviews. These reflections will be submitted using a common form. The submissions will be reviewed by the General Education Director, Director of Assessment, and First-Year Experience Coordinator and feedback will be provided to faculty. If a faculty reflection is inconsistent with other data, the reflection will be submitted to the GE2.0 Executive Committee for additional review. If the GE2.0 Exec review is in agreement with the initial review, a faculty development plan will be created in conjunction with the faculty member and his/her respective supervisor. Oversight of this process is the responsibility of the Director.

--- Faculty Peer Review
- Annually, faculty teaching in the General Education program will participate in a faculty peer review process focused on instructional delivery and instructional best practice. More information about the Faculty Peer Review Process can be found in the “Faculty Experience” section of this report in section b2.

--- Student Evaluations/Student Voice
- It is recommended that Student/Course Evaluations be developed and specifically aligned with the expectations of GE2.0 courses.
  - Drafts of these evaluations will be developed by GE2.0 Exec during the Spring 2018 semester
  - Student Evaluations will be provided to faculty during the GE2.0 Course Developer Orientations
- Annually, student evaluations of General Education courses will be reviewed by the General Education Program Director and GE Executive Committee. Student Evaluations will be standard among all General Education 2.0 course types.

- Annually, assessment data will be aggregated and analyzed by the Director of Assessment and GE2.0 Director. The assessment data will be reported for review by the GE2.0 Exec. The GE2.0 Exec will provide feedback to faculty and administration involved with General Education at UMKC. Summary findings and plans for programmatic improvements will be reported to appropriate faculty teaching in GE2.0, the Faculty Senate, and the faculty-at-large, as well as to the Provost.
- In the event that data indicate a course or set of courses is not meeting the core SLOs, a triggered review will occur that may include any or all of the assessment strategies within a calendar year. An improvement plan will then be created by the GE2.0 Exec in
collaboration with the faculty member and his/her supervisor (e.g., director, chair, or dean) and the course monitored during the following academic year.

— In the event that a course repeatedly does not meet student learning outcomes, the GE2.0 Exec has the right and responsibility to de-certify, discontinue or modify a GE2.0 course and/or reassign the teaching of any such course.

2. Develop specifications for implementation of the General Education 2.0 Program, including any technical requirements, committee structures, policies, procedures, information systems, communications, marketing, and personnel support.
   a. develop a plan for scheduling co-curricular experiences.
   b. develop a plan for scheduling General Education 2.0 courses that allows for:
      ➢ priority and flexible delivery of courses, such that the program may be delivered on-campus, online, in competency-based formats, and in a variety of timeframes which include regular semesters, intensive sessions, and summer and weekend programs;
      ➢ ensures the availability of classes, sections and seats to meet the needs of our students.
   • Each faculty member teaching in the GE2.0 program will submit required student learning outcome signature assessment assignments as requested.
   • As indicated in the “Course Approval” section, in order for a course to be considered for approval as a GE2.0 course, it must be proposed to be delivered in multiple formats (f2f, blended and online). Course approvals will also be based on the feasibility of courses being delivered in a variety of timeframes, including regular semesters, summer session, intersessions, evening and weekend options.
   • All courses will be owned by the GE2.0 program, not by individual instructors, units or departments. This will allow the Director to add or remove courses and/or sections of courses from the schedule as enrollment demands.
   • As indicated previously, GE2.0 will house 11 (eleven) NTT faculty whose primary teaching responsibility will be FYE. These core faculty will also teach EQ courses, as needed and aligned with their expertise areas. More information about GE2.0 core faculty expertise and responsibilities is detailed in the "faculty experience" section of this report.
   • Most GE2.0 courses will be staffed by recurring FT faculty from academic units. These recurring GE2.0 faculty will make 2-3 year commitments to teaching in the GE2.0 program with a minimum teaching expectation of one (1) GE2.0 course per academic year.
   • The Director will also work with academic units to solicit faculty on 9-month appointments for summer teaching and faculty will be compensated at a flat rate TBD by the GE2.0 Exec. In determining the rate for summer teaching, GE2.0 Exec will consider the rates of existing academic units. However, the rate must be justifiable within the GE2.0 budget.
   • To ensure quality of instruction and availability of courses, the Director may also hire qualified adjunct faculty who meet HLC and university requirements for qualified faculty to teach EQ courses. Requirements are aligned to that of Curriculum Panel Specialists (terminal degree or 18 graduate credit hours in the SLO area or scholarship and extensive service in the SLO area).
   • Course scheduling will be the responsibility of the Director, in consultation with the FYE Coordinator and Associate Vice Provost for University College and Undergraduate Advising. An academic schedule planning tool will be utilized to predict enrollment and scheduling needs.
   • CourseLeaf CLSS (new class scheduling application beginning Spring 2018) will be utilized to ensure priority scheduling of GE courses.
• Initial scheduling for Fall 2019 GE2.0 courses will be drafted in early Spring 2018.

c. develop a smooth and workable transition plan for moving from the current curriculum to the General Education 2.0 Program, including the process for general education program review and reporting on general education to the Higher Learning Commission. Propose a plan for transitioning from the current to the new General Education program, attending to the fact that there are also students who are completing their degree under the pre-2013 general education requirements. Work with Transfer Coordinator and Registrars’ Office to develop articulation agreements and transfer agreements for students within the current and General Education 2.0 Program.

• Transition and Transfer Guidelines for GE2.0 will be finalized during the Fall 2017 semester (or consistent with the MDHE timeline)
• Transition from current or pre-2013 General Education requirements to GE2.0:
  — The implementation calendar for GE2.0 will guide the transition plans for FTC (native) students who started their academic career under the 2013 or pre-2013 general education requirements
    a) FTC (native) students entering UMKC from Fall 2017-Summer 2019 will be expected to complete their degree under the 2013 general education requirements
    • Academic units and advisors will be expected to advise students according to the following plan for discontinuing 2013 General Education Courses:
      — Anchor and Discourse I: Final semester Spring 2020
      — Anchor and Discourse II: Final semester Spring 2021
      — Anchor and Discourse III: Final semester Spring 2022
      — While many Focus courses are major courses, the Focus designation will be removed from courses after Spring 2021
• In the event that a student needs to complete a 2013 General Education Program course after it has been discontinued, the Director will review petitions for GE2.0 courses to meet the 2013 course requirement
  — In general, it is recommended that GE2.0 courses be considered to meet requirements of the 2013 general education courses as follows:
    ▪ FYE: proposed to meet requirement for Anchor I
    ▪ Oral Communication, Written Communication I and Written Communication II: proposed to meet requirement for Discourse I, II and III, respectively
    ▪ Math Pathway: proposed to meet the requirement for Focus B
    ▪ EQ Culture & Diversity: proposed to meet the requirement for Anchor II
    ▪ EQ Civic Engagement: proposed to meet the requirement for Anchor III
• Critical Thinking and/or existing disciplinary-based courses can be reviewed for SLO alignment and to meet the requirements for Focus A and C
  — While the above lays out a proposal for GE2.0 courses meeting requirements for 2013 general education requirements, the reverse is not recommended or feasible (i.e., 2013 general education courses do not meet the requirements for GE2.0)
• Students who begin their academic career under the 2013 or pre-2013 general education requirements can petition to complete their degree under the GE2.0 program.
• Courses reviewed for equivalency or to meet requirements will be reviewed based on Student Learning Outcomes and Student Experiences
  b) FYE is required for all FTCs entering fall 2019 or later.
  c) FTC students entering UMKC Fall 2019 or later will be expected to complete their degree under the GE2.0 general education requirements

• Transfer Students
  — UMKC considers students who have taken college courses after graduating from high school as transfer students.
  a) Students transferring from Missouri or Kansas institutions, default to the MDHE block, but can opt-in to the GE2.0 Program
  b) Students transferring from any institution with 24 or more transferable credit hours default to the MDHE block, but can opt-in to the GE2.0 Program
  c) Students transferring less than 24 transferable credit hours from any institution outside of Missouri or Kansas will be required to complete the GE2.0 Program

d. work with MCOM to develop a marketing and communications plan to effectively and expeditiously communicate program and implementations plan.
  • Upon the Provost’s approval of the GE2.0 Implementation plan, the Acting GE2.0 Executive Committee will work with MCOM to develop a marketing and communications plan to effectively communicate the GE2.0 program and implementation plan
  • The plan should include a timeline, advertising/marketing approved by early fall 2018 for public advertising by spring 2019.

e. work with UMKC Online, IT, IR and Registrar’s Office to develop processes for technology support within course delivery, scheduling, degree audit additions and modifications and Undergraduate Reflection ePortfolios (see student experience, section 2).
  • UMKC Online, IT, IR and the Registrar’s Office have been involved in the development of this Implementation Plan. Representatives will serve on GE2.0 Exec to ensure smooth implementation of all components of GE2.0. The Implementation Timeline specifies duties related to this Infrastructure component

f. encourage all academic and administrative units to work together to provide students with a broad, deep, and interdisciplinary experience reflecting the entire university.
- Over the summer 2017 session, the GE2.0 Implementation Team has communicated regularly with academic units. The Implementation Timeline, “faculty experience” section and “student experience” sections of this report specify duties related to this Infrastructure component.

3. Develop recommendations regarding budgetary considerations for implementation and maintenance of the General Education 2.0 Program.

Summary:
The purpose of the Gen Ed 2.0 Budget Model is two-fold:

1) To attempt to capture as many of the costs of the Program as feasible with conservative budget assumptions, and

2) To determine if the GE2.0 Program has the potential to generate enough revenue to be self-sufficient.

UMKC is currently in the process of developing a new Asset Allocation Formula that would allocate all funding to the Academic, Administrative and Support functions of the University. This expansive project is not scheduled to be complete until mid-calendar 2018. We assert that this Budget Model for General Education will need to be included as part of the new, broader asset allocation model.

In order for the Implementation Team (Budget Model sub-team) to develop some sense of the ability of GE2.0 to support itself as a stand-alone entity within the University, it was necessary to apply current methods of tuition earnings and allocation, as well as recent enrollment statistics, to the identified variable (costs of instruction) and fixed (annual costs of the Program not tied directly to student enrollment), as well as certain non-regular costs for start-up. Spreadsheet included as Appendix G.

a. Revenue Computations:
The sub-team extracted statistics from the UMKC data warehouse enrollment data for the past three full academic years. These data included all courses taught under the current definition of General Education, i.e. student headcount and credit hours earned for all Anchor I, II and III courses, Discourse I, II and III courses, and Focus A, B, and C courses. Student enrollment was further delineated by In-state, Metro, Midwest Student Exchange, Military, Medical school, Out-of-state and International. Each of these categories carries a different tuition rate (we used only the “retail” rates for credit hours, and not supplemental fees). The average per credit hour “retail” tuition rate for the FS16/SP17/SS17 used was $327.

This $327 rate was discounted by 45%, to account for the net tuition rate after scholarships, etc. (25%) and an assumed split of 20% with the academic units in which a student originates (NB: this formula may change in the upcoming budget model, but the team felt this was a good starting point). This amounts, under current assumptions, to $2.3 million going back to the units from the General Education program.

The changes made to the GE2.0 courses from the current Gen Ed i.e. Anchor, Discourse, and Focus, which are not only applicable to Gen Ed but also may be degree courses, made it necessary to make some “educated” assumptions about how many students would actually be enrolled in the GE2.0 courses. It was decided that FYE, Critical Thinking 1, 2 & 3, Civic Engagement and Cultural Diversity courses would resemble the Anchor I headcount for the 2016 academic year, or 1,550 students. The new Math Pathways for GE2.0 would include Statistics
but not Calculus. So, instead of using 1,550, it was decided to use 900 as a base. Written Communications I was considered equivalent to Discourse I, or 830, and Written Communication II and Oral Communication I equivalent to Discourse II, or 985 students. These numbers include all students, not just new students; therefore, we made no specific adjustment for transfer students. However, in order to account for a variation between GE2.0 and the current Gen Ed headcounts, and to be conservative, each class HC total was reduced by 10%.

Class sizes are recommended by the Task Force to be much smaller than the norm, and the low end of the averages were used to calculate the number of sections to be taught.

b. Cost of Instruction (Variable Costs):
The budget model was calculated using the following assumptions:

- A core instructor team of 11 NTT faculty (calculated at the rank of NTT Assoc Prof salary level) be included in the GE2.0 Program, in order to maximize stability in scheduling, and student outcomes and direct student contact with regular UMKC faculty, for the designated “Inside” courses. The only exceptions would be Tenured Faculty to teach the Cultural Diversity classes, and be guest speakers in FYE.
- The remaining GE2.0 instructors were calculated with 75% of the instructors at the NTT Associate Professor salary rate and 25% of the instructors at the TT Associate Professor salary rate.

The Math, Written Communication I & II and Speech (Oral Communications) I classes would be taught by “contracted” NTT Assistant Profs from the academic units.

Actual 9 month salaries, derived from the data warehouse, for each academic unit were averaged by instructor category, and grossed up for benefits at a 35% rate. The Core instructor salaries/benefits were divided by 8 to cover a 4+4 load. The “contracted” instructor pay was divided by 10 to cover a 4+4 plus summer (2) workload. Note that this model does not assume adjuncts teaching in any of the courses, although using adjuncts would reduce the per section costs of instruction, and quite possibly would be used to overcome scheduling issues. Hopefully, this would be rare.

Supplementing the class instructors would be GTA, SI, graders, and peer leader costs, which have been estimated for each class and every section, although we doubt all classes/sections would require all of them with such small classroom sizes.

Understanding that FYE costs would be higher than other courses, we included $220 per student to cover transportation, supplies, lab supplies, and any other unforeseen costs, plus the Common Book, and first RooWriter. This amounts to $280 per student in the FYE class- again, this is likely a very conservative estimate.

c. Fixed Costs:
Fixed costs have been divided into three sections: Personnel Costs, non-personnel annual costs, and startup costs (with some costs that may repeat every 3-5 years).

- Personnel Costs
  We included full time salary/benefits for the
    — 1.0 FTE Director of Gen Ed,
    — 1.0 FTE Coordinator of FYE,
    — 1.0 FTE Executive Admin to assist the Director,
1.0 FTE UMKC Impact Experience Coordinator,
1.0 FTE IS technician,
0.5 FTE for Coordinator of Competency Based Learning,
0.5 FTE Coordinator for ePortfolio/badging,
summer pay for the Core NTT’s (if not actually teaching a summer section).

Total Fixed Personnel costs are estimated at $1.0M.

• Other non-Personnel Annual Costs
Included are the annual licensing costs $80,000 for the ePortfolio software (for 10,000 licenses, as ePortfolio will be rolled out campus-wide). There should be some offset for the units that already have ePortfolio software that can be dropped in lieu of this new software. (Going forward, individual units should assume some of these costs for their students not in Gen Ed.)

FaCET will be certifying and providing training to all instructors, as well as associate deans and department chairs that supervise instructors teaching Gen Ed classes. Included is a $25,000 annual supplement (estimate) to the FaCET budget to help cover the expenses of this additional responsibility. (This estimate could be light.)

Service Learning Software licenses will be used to organize and monitor FYE activities off campus, as well as any activities in the Civic Engagement classes that may occur. This software is estimated at $10,000 annually.

RooWriter has been increased to two assessments for GE2.0 students (including once during the FYE course) and one time for transfer students. Student charges of $15 for the assessment are assumed to be dropped, and the cost per assessment estimated at $30 each for 3,000 assessments, or $90,000. This is in addition to one assessment included in FYE per student costs.

Annual Marketing costs are estimated at $100,000, which will likely be routed through MCOM and events.

Library support of $40,000 has been added to help defray some of the routine Gen Ed support provided by the Library staff.

Finally, $80,000 has been included for all other costs, which includes internal space costs, telecom, supplies, travel, consulting, etc.

Total Annual Non-personnel costs are estimated at $0.4M.

• Start-up Costs (5-year amortization)
These are costs that provide a multi-year benefit but will be incurred at the initiation of Gen Ed 2.0:

— Update RooWriter logic $20,000 (internal software programming costs)
— Video/audio recording/storage equipment upgrades to 6 ILE rooms at an average cost of $25,000, or $150,000
— Offices for 11 NTT’s, Director of Gen Ed, Coordinator of FYE, Admins, and two 0.5 FTE coordinators, $100,000
— New computer workstations for 15 employees @ $2,000, $30,000
— Costs of recruitment $150,000
— Moving costs for new out-of-town hires @ 10% of salary $60,000
— Total of Start-up Costs $0.5M. One-fifth $0.1M (5-year life) is included in Fixed Costs on the Model.

d. Conclusion: Net Gain/(Loss)
It should be understood that this Budget Model was built using as conservative as possible assumptions and estimates. The thought process was such that if GE2.0 could at least break-even, after the tuition sharing of 20% with the academic units, then GE2.0 would at least be viable in today’s UMKC world. The Model shows a positive gain of $11,454. This should be interpreted as breaking even or better.

The current model for GE2.0 assumes that NO STATE FUNDS are used for General Education on a year-to-year basis- the model looks only at tuition generated by General Education courses. The budget task force felt that this was the only fair way to assess whether General Education could “break-even” under the newly proposed program model. Regardless of how the future Asset Allocation Model distributes tuition and State funds, the Implementation Team believes that the costs of operating the Program are as accurate in the Budget Model as can be determined at this time.

II. Student Experience: First contact Through Graduation

The recommendations below provide additional detail beyond the approved GE2.0 Approved Curricular Model and Learning Outcomes regarding the Student Experience. This recommended Student Experience design was informed by best practices and research by the National Resource Center, First Year Experience and Students in Transition and the American Association of Colleges and Universities High Impact Educational Experiences. The design provides UMKC students the unique opportunity to connect curricular and co-curricular experiences in a meaningful way.

The Gen Ed 2.0 Implementation Team - Student Experience group makes the following recommendations according to the Provost’s charge:

a. Provide details of the student experience beginning with admission, summer orientation, summer bridge program (if applicable), to convocation, prior to the start of the academic year.

Recommendation for GE2.0 first contact through alumni communication strategy:

Clear and consistent language guiding students through the GE2.0 curriculum is a critical component to student success. Consistent GE2.0 talking points (program rationale and benefit) will be developed and shared with parents and students from first contact through graduation. These talking points will be supported/shared through multiple modes including interactions with recruiters, faculty, staff, and advisors; and both UMKC web sites and other media publications.

Responsible for Action: The GE2.0 Exec, Strategic Marketing and Communications, and Student Focus Groups will be responsible for developing and vetting program language and implementation. Staff and faculty development/training materials and programs will be developed by the GE2.0 Oversight Task Force and administrative units for all participants (See Implementation plan).
Recommendations for contact prior to first term:

First contact: Early communications with prospective students will highlight the GE2.0 program as a differentiator as students are making their decision regarding the university that they will attend. GE2.0 program talking points will be reflected in all recruitment information. All recruiters will participate in GE2.0 training during the Spring 2018 term.

In addition, ongoing recruitment interactions will optimally gain additional, more robust interest information from each potential student indicating the students’ broader interest areas along with their current major selection. The more robust interest information would guide students’ optimal meta-major selection. Subsequent messaging could then be targeted to students’ expressed interests/meta-major, highlighting the UMKC Impact Experiences that promote personalized opportunities in which a student may participate in their very first term.

A committee representing those responsible for action (below) should investigate options made possible through the current Admissions CRM system. The UMKC Journey online career assessment tool may be a viable strategy to learn/capture more information about students’ interests as related to both their career and academic goals. A mechanism for sharing additional student interest information captured during the admissions process with advising records would optimize UMKC’s ability to offer personalized guidance.

Responsible for Action: GE2.0 Exec, Strategic Marketing and Communications, Admissions, and Admissions and Recruitment Council

Summer Orientation: Orientation should include a large-group session (for both students and parents) which highlights the GE2.0 program, followed by academic unit advising sessions which reinforce GE2.0’s relevance to specific academic programs. Again, developed GE2.0 program talking points will be utilized to improve communications. Key components of the program that students will experience in their initial UMKC term will be highlighted. Students will enroll in the FYE Seminar and other course work determined by the academic program major map. Students will select a specific FYE Seminar section (offered by meta-major) for enrollment based on their identified interest areas (major selected, career interest inventory, etc.)

Responsible for Action: GE2.0 Exec, GE2.0 faculty, Admissions, and Academic Unit Advising Teams

Bridge Programs: Consider the development of a variety of potential programs that address specific needs and goals of targeted groups. A Bridge Program Planning Team should be convened to determine where joint programs, potentially organized by meta-majors, extend current opportunities for potential UMKC students to confirm choice of institution and optimize transition. Current bridging programs are sponsored by Academic Support and Mentoring and a variety of academic units.

---

1 Utilization of block enrollment practices should be explored to leverage the proven benefit of cohorting/learning communities as recommended by Tinto (2003). Should UMKC adopt the practice of learning communities, we should further explore the role of residential life in our long-term planning for the program.
Responsible for Action: Academic Unit Faculty and Academic Advising Teams, Career Services & Career Development Specialist, University College, and Academic Support and Mentoring

Convocation: GE2.0 Program highlights should be included in the formal remarks by the Provost. Student presentations regarding the impact of their FYE experiences should become a part of the Convocation program after the initial year.

Responsible for Action: GE2.0 Director and Provost

b. Provide a baseline common denominator experience for undergraduate students in all degree programs.

The baseline experience should serve as a foundation to the rest of the General Education program. The common experience should occur during the students’ first semester at UMKC and should instill the UMKC’s mission, beliefs, and objectives in addition to clearly explaining the role of general education in the college experience.

All components will prioritize the use of “engaging pedagogies that are active and collaborative in nature, including group work, interactive lectures, experiential learning, and problem based learning. [These pedagogies] help students see that the skills they need to succeed in the seminar are skills they will use throughout college and after graduation” (Brownell & Swaner, 2009).

Recommendation to implement a First Year Experience (FYE) Seminar:

The First Year Experience (FYE) Seminar is an intensive and high impact three-hour, graded course that serves as the foundation or baseline experience in the UMKC General Education Program. The FYE Seminar design attempts to both provide a common learning experience for all incoming students and the opportunity for individual students to personalize their first term by identifying with UMKC contributions of particular relevance to their own goals and aspirations. This seminar is required of all freshmen during their first semester.

The FYE Seminar weekly schedule will include one large group (multi-section) lecture and one small group, meta-major discussion facilitated by a GE2.0 faculty member and peer mentor. FYE small group sections will be designated by meta-majors, a collection of academic programs that have common or related courses, facilitating connections between students, faculty and peer mentors with similar broad interests. This organizational approach was selected to create Learning Communities identified by AAC&U as a High Impact Practice (http://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/HIP_tables.pdf).

In addition to scheduled classroom times, students will select from a variety of UMKC Impact Experiences taking place outside the classroom that allow students to identify UMKC contributions (including potential faculty, fellow students & staff mentors) that most closely align with their own academic and career interests.

General aims:
1. Students will understand the value added by the UMKC General Education 2.0 Program to their own goals and the needs of future employers (nationally and locally). Curriculum
components are outlined in the infrastructure section of this report for each of the following:
— Foundational Skills
— Critical Questions Approach
— Inclusion and Diversity
— Civic and Community Engagement

2. Students will understand their role as a full participant and valued member of our academic community – particularly related to an improved sense of belonging (Stryhorn, 2009), the Experiential Learning Process (Kolb, 2014), a Growth Mindset approach (Dweck, 2006), the importance of academic integrity, and the responsibilities for planning and managing their academic careers.

3. Students will explore alternative perspectives & begin to reflect on their own role in a multicultural society.

4. Students will discover first-hand about UMKC’s mission & goals (lead in life and health sciences, advance urban engagement, excel in the visual and performing arts, embrace diversity, and promote research and economic development) and identify/pursue ways in which UMKC’s mission and goals link with their own interests, skills, and values/goals.

Student Experience:
For general aims 1 and 2 students will participate in large group presentations at the beginning of each week. The large group activities will include discussion of case studies, readings, and reflection of assigned activities as led by GE2.0 faculty. Small group discussions will follow the large group presentations for more individual and personalized contact led by GE2.0 faculty, academic advisors, and peer mentors. The small group discussions will allow reflections on concepts and activities as they relate to the appropriate meta-major and facilitate the logistics for aims 3 and 4.

Aim 3 represents an important aspect of the First Year Experience, which is common across all sections and crucial to helping the students understand UMKC’s role and their roles within Kansas City and society. Partnering with the UMKC Social Justice Lecture program, students will have the opportunity to engage with the text’s author(s) and participate in a variety of discussions with campus and community members on key topics. FYE faculty will guide deeper exploration of relevant subjects based on student and small group interest. Social Justice Book selections have included:

2016 Reyna Grande, The Distance Between Us: A Memoir (2013)
2015 Steve Perry, Push Has Come to Shove: Getting Our Kids the Education They Deserve Even If It Means Picking A Fight (2011)
2013 Wes Moore, The Other Wes Moore: One Name, Two Fates (2010)
In order to Optimize FYE planning, the selected book should be selected two years prior to the campus discussion/event. Further discussions with the Office of Inclusion and Diversity and the FYE teams should occur to confirm.

Aim 4 will provide students the opportunity to learn about UMKC’s unique contributions to the Kansas City and larger community regarding research, service, and arts from key UMKC contributors (faculty scholar/researchers, staff and students). Students will select from a variety of UMKC Impact Experiences further exploring UMKC goals of particular relevance to their own academic goals. Throughout aim 4 activities, the students will be encouraged to “be the city.” Examples of UMKC Impact Experiences include collaborating with the Kansas City Public Works to evaluate differences in infrastructure needs across various parts of the city, conceptual planning of urban redevelopment needs, or attending select public meetings on infrastructure initiatives. Participating in Kansas City Cultural Communities may include attending or contributing to performances at key cultural locations throughout the city, creating educational materials or programs to accompany cultural exhibits, or volunteering at fundraising events for non-profit cultural institutions. In the development of FYE, alternative experiences will be designed for distance students, refer to section 2e.

Students, working with their peer mentors and FYE GE2.0 faculty, will select hours of UMKC Impact Experiences from three or more areas (lead in life and health sciences, advance urban engagement, excel in the visual and performing arts, embrace diversity, and promote research and economic development). These experiences will be completed throughout the term, at least five hours completed by the close of week five, and an additional 5 hours completed by the close of week ten. Experiences will provide opportunities through research, civic engagement, and service learning. Students will begin a process of documenting and reflecting on their experiences (both in and outside the classroom), personal performance, and growth in their Undergraduate Reflective e-portfolio.

The UMKC Impact Experience Coordinator, FYE NTT faculty, and peer mentors will develop a menu of options. FYE NTT faculty may develop up to nine contact hours of impactful experiences for their students that relate to their reflection/discussion course curriculum. Options will be made available to minimize cost for participants, maximize variability in scheduling (time and location), and student-initiated options. Student Undergraduate Reflective e-portfolio submissions will be reviewed and evaluated by FYE NTT faculty and peer mentors.

**Responsible for Action:** FYE faculty, working with the Director of Assessment, will develop specific and measurable learning outcomes, signature assignment guidelines, and scoring rubrics for all components of the FYE Seminar.

GE2.0 Exec, GE2.0 Director, and FYE faculty will further define contact hours for FYE classroom (small and large group) and UMKC Impact Experiences.

GE2.0 Director, FYE Coordinator, UMKC Impact Experience Coordinator, Office of Student Engagement, Career Services, and FYE faculty will identify UMKC Impact Experiences available for Fall 2019 and forward.
Administrative Timeline Targets:

The Director in-place by July 1, 2018.
FYE Coordinator in-place by July 1, 2018.
Executive Administrative Assistant by September 1, 2018
UMKC Impact Experience Coordinator by May 1, 2019
Coordinator for ePortfolio and the Coordinator of CBE in-place by July 1, 2019
11 FYE GE 2.0 faculty identified/hired by Spring 2019.
40 peer mentors selected and trained (completed UNIV 300) by Summer 2019.
2019 Common Book selected by Fall 2018.
Classroom space and times designated by Spring 2018.
Detailed course syllabi, common readings (large group and small group sections) and
detailed schedule developed by Early Spring 2019.
Faculty Scholar/Researcher invited lecturers format, invitations, and schedule
completed by Spring 2018.

c. Ensure students are highly engaged in valued co-curricular experiences.

Recommendations bridging the classroom and co-curricular experiences:

Students will have multiple opportunities to expand their awareness of the impactful role UMKC
plays in the local and global community, apply theories and skills learned in the classroom to
community endeavors, and craft their own engagement with the world around them via co-
curricular experiences. These experiential opportunities will be delivered in two ways:

1. All students taking the Freshman Year Experience course will be **required** to complete contact
hours of high impact experiences outside of the classroom. These experiences will be designed
to engage students with Common Book issues, the arts, research, and community service, as
well as for them to experience first-hand how UMKC’s civic engagement and efforts in working
toward solutions to community challenges. Students will utilize the e-portfolio platform to
reflect on their experiences, which will in turn be evaluated by FYE NTT faculty and peer
mentors. (See First Year Experience above)

2. All UMKC Undergraduates will have the **option** of undergoing a sustained co-curricular program
by building a portfolio of experiences and reflection related to one or more elements of UMKC’s
stated Mission and Goals. The program offers students the opportunity to further link work both
inside and outside the classroom throughout their academic careers through a combination of
experiential learning and reflective writing, and to receive high-level recognition at graduation
for efforts

Badges awarded by colleges and universities signify accomplishments such as completion of a
project, mastery of a skill, or marks of experience. Badges provide a mechanism to recognize
with multiple knowledge streams, including new media, collaboration, interest-based learning,
and project-based learning in and out of the classrooms. As records of achievement, badges can
recognize the completion of projects within a traditional college program or acknowledge
experience gained through community efforts, online learning venues, or work-related projects.
(Educause)
Students participating in the badging program will be responsible for maintaining a current Undergraduate Reflective e-portfolio including entries for each term of participation. All FYE Seminar, UMKC Impact Experience options with e-portfolio entries may contribute to the requirements to earn one or more badges. Formative feedback on e-portfolio entries after the FYE Seminar will be provided by peers/peer mentors pursuing the same badge, providing key opportunities for collaborative feedback and increasing awareness of the ongoing experiences available.

Undergraduate Reflective e-portfolios evaluation guidelines will reflect the Council for Adult & Experiential Learning (CAEL, 2017) recommendations.

A current faculty sponsor/coordinator and/or a FYE NTT faculty facilitator will identify a faculty & staff advisory team to determine additional specific criteria for students to earn a badge in each of the following areas:

- Contributing in life and health sciences,
- Advancing urban engagement,
- Engaging the visual and performing arts,
- Embracing diversity,
- Promoting research
- Promoting economic development
- Leading as a student to contribute to the experience of other UMKC students

This criterion should outline the specific learning objectives and indicators for quality and quantity of effort.

Final Undergraduate Reflective e-portfolios must be submitted in the term prior to the student’s graduation to ensure an appropriate timeframe for review. Students will receive graduation recognition (graduation cord, transcript citation, etc.) upon approved submission.

Responsible for Action: The FYE Coordinator, High Impact Experience Coordinator, FYE NTT faculty, and peer mentors, faculty and staff advisory teams.

Recommendations for developing the GE2.0 Training & Supervision Program for Peer Mentors (and other student leaders):

A UMKC GE2.0 Peer Mentor Program will be developed and implemented. Peer mentors will be selected based on their understanding of the values and mission of UMKC and their commitment to our academic community. Peer mentors will receive training through enrollment in the UNIV 300 (1 credit course, repeatable), Peer Leadership. Selected GE2.0 peer mentors will receive a scholarship for UNIV 300 tuition costs. Once completed, peer mentors will become a part of the GE2.0 FYE course teaching team, provide support for all UMKC Impact Experience sponsored events, mentor incoming first-year students and participate in the awarding of UMKC Badges. Peer Mentor activities and resulting e-portfolio submissions will contribute the earning of the UMKC Student Leadership Badge.
d. Be as student-centered and easy for students and their advisors to navigate as possible.

Recommendations:

Advising Resources/Technology: Students’ understanding of GE2.0 requirements and their progress towards completing these requirements should be straightforward and consistently communicated in all advising resources: University Catalog, Major Maps, Degree Audit, and Degree Planner. Student enrollment through pathway for linked FYE Large group and small group sections should be clear and without need for manual exceptions.

Responsible for Action: GE2.0 Exec, GE2.0 Director, Registration & Records, Provost Office – Catalog, Undergraduate Advising.

ePortfolio: Available from first submission through the student’s resume and portfolio development as student moves into first employment or graduate school applications.

Responsible for Action: GE2.0 Exec, GE2.0 Director, Information Technology, Provost Office, GE2.0 Director, UMKC Impact Experience Coordinator

e. Describe how the program experience may differ for all student profiles that make up the undergraduate population at UMKC

Recommendations for student considerations:
Program experiences should be meaningful and designed to include native first-time full-time students, native part-time students, online students, transfer students, returning students, and international students.

The FYE Seminar will be available in both online and classroom options. UMKC Impact Experiences and opportunities for UMKC Badges will be made available to meet a wide variety of special interests as well as scheduling constraints. Alternative UMKC Impact Experience approval processes to meet student specialized needs and interests will be developed.

Responsible for Action: The GE2.0 Director, FYE Coordinator, High Impact Experience Coordinator, FYE NTT faculty, and peer mentors, faculty and staff advisory teams

III. Faculty Experience of the General Education 2.0 Program

The Gen Ed 2.0 Implementation Team - Faculty Experience group makes the following recommendations according to the Provost’s charge:
Describe the faculty experience of the General Education 2.0 Program, including faculty onboarding and faculty use of student learning outcome assessment data to make improvements in course and co-curricular experiences that enhance student learning.

a. engage faculty in an onboarding process that ensures effective delivery of the General Education 2.0 Program (involving New Faculty Orientation, ongoing faculty development opportunities, required faculty development experiences).

- **Onboarding of Faculty to the New General Education Program**
  - **Initial Implementation / Onboarding:**

    Over the last five years, faculty have invested considerable time and energy in the development of anchor and focus courses for the current general education program. The onboarding process needs to respect this work while also making sure that courses fulfill the student learning outcomes of the new program.

    For initial implementation, we recommend using Pathway, student learning assessment findings, and student evaluation data and academic unit input to identify faculty who have demonstrated an ongoing commitment to the general education program and inviting them to serve as core members of eight separate course development working groups; one working group will develop the *critical thinking in the humanities* courses, one will develop the *critical thinking in the social sciences courses*, one will develop the *critical thinking in the natural sciences courses*, one will develop the *critical thinking in culture and diversity courses*, and one will develop the *civic engagement courses*.

    These working groups should be charged with transitioning existing anchor and focus courses while also developing new courses to create a library of six to eight courses for each content area that should be submitted to the GE2.0 program by August of 2018 so that they can move through the course approval process for the AY 2019-2020 catalog.

    During the initial implementation period, no GE2.0 course proposals should be created outside the context of these working groups.

    These working groups should begin with an orientation that makes clear that courses need to address the SLOs for each content area first and not as an add-on to an existing content.

    The working groups should select a faculty leader and the Director and representatives from the Curriculum Review Panel Specialists should attend these meetings to help facilitate their work.

    - Faculty who have been engaged in teaching Anchor II courses should be suggested as possible candidates for the culture and diversity courses.
    - Faculty who have been engaged in teaching Anchor III courses should be suggested as possible candidates for the civic engagement courses.
    - The Director along with the general education committee implementation task force should look at the content areas of existing Anchor I courses and faculty should be asked to join the humanities, natural sciences, social sciences and FYE working groups as appropriate.
    - Focus courses that are not major specific could also be migrated to the new program. Faculty who have an ongoing commitment to teaching these focus courses should also be asked to join the committee relevant to their areas of expertise.
A more general invitation should be extended to all faculty to participate in these committees and it should be clear to all participants that proposals for completely new courses are also welcome.

Onboarding faculty after the initial implementation phase:

After the initial library of courses is in place for AY 2019-2020, faculty who would like to propose new courses will participate in the certification process described in section b and then submit courses through the course approval process as described in section 1e of the infrastructure section.

In addition to the certification process, the GE2.0 program should develop a robust and up-to-date online presence that provides current and accurate information about the GE2.0 program. (Park University: http://www.innovatepark.org/ has one possible model for this).

- Provide multiple formats for interaction, from in-depth workshops to 2-5 minute video blasts focused on specific topics.
- Provide easily accessible location to find learning outcomes
- Develop a Gen Ed Resource Guide, accessible online.
- Charge the Gen Ed Director to develop and maintain online resources.
- Responsibility: Oversight by the Director, with assistance from the FaCET Director.

New Faculty Orientation:

Beginning in academic year 2019-2020, the Director should develop an orientation session about the GE2.0 program that provides a high-level introduction to the general education program and encourages new faculty members’ subsequent participation in the general education program.

Required Faculty Development Experiences:

The GE2.0 program should strive to develop a sense of community among faculty who teach in the program. Faculty in both the foundational and essential questions program should be required to participate in at least two meetings of GE2.0 faculty during any semester during which they are teaching a GE2.0 course. Faculty with an ongoing commitment to the GE2.0 program who are not teaching in the current semester should be encouraged to attend. In addition to providing information about ongoing operations in the GE2.0 program, these meetings should also have a faculty development component that is modeled on the current advisors’ professional development reading group administered by Associate Vice Provost for University College and University Advising. For this component, the Director will ask faculty to read and discuss articles about the teaching and/or best practices in general education.

The Director should also work with the director of FaCET to develop sessions at the FaCET symposium related to the GE2.0 program and the GE2.0 faculty should be expected to attend these sessions.
b. engage faculty in an onboarding process that ensures work with FaCET to develop a plan for ongoing faculty and staff support and development that encourages: understanding of program curriculum and components, development and implementation of signature assignments, participation in assessment, learning to effectively implement high impact practices, development of instructional skills that support all student profiles in a highly engaging manner.

- Ongoing Faculty and Staff Support and Development
  - Gen Ed Faculty Development and Certification
    
    Recommendation:
    
    All instructors in the GE2.0 program, whether housed in the GE2.0 unit or other academic units, will be certified for teaching in the GE2.0 Program (understanding goals, objectives, and SLOs). The certification process should be available both online and in a face-to-face session at least once per semester for faculty who prefer that format. Faculty should be certified prior to the first time they teach a GE2.0 course. Recertification should occur every three years. Recertification can occur through repeating the certification course or participation in at least one GE2.0 faculty development event, such as FaCET GE2.0 programs, per year for three years.

    Note: faculty certification described here is distinct from the course approval process described in the infrastructure section.

- Responsibility: The GE2.0 Director will oversee and supervise the development and content of the certification program, while the FaCET Director will oversee the delivery of the certification process.

- Timeline: Certification processes need to be available at least one semester prior to the first student GE2.0 course offering, spring 2019. Ideally, they should be available in spring 2018.

- Objectives of the faculty development program are:
  
  o Describe the mission and objective of the UMKC Gen Ed Curriculum
  o Present the history of general education at UMKC and how it is related to the national conversation about general education.
  o Articulate the assessment compliance requirements for their Gen Ed courses and produce the artifacts necessary to assess the program.
  o Identify benefits of the GE2.0 program to the faculty, including mentorship, pedagogy training, and promotion.
  o Identify benefits of the GE2.0 program to the students, including learning objectives, program of study, etc.
  o Use UMKC Connect for group and individual student communication and engagement to include:
    - set up faculty office hours in Connect system
    - online scheduling of student-faculty appointments
    - Early Alert feedback for concerns (flags) or strong performance (kudos).
  o Produce a sample e-portfolio of their own work using the same system that students will use to generate their own e-portfolios.
  o Demonstrate understanding of the complete general education program that goes beyond the specific course that the instructor is teaching.

- Characteristics of the program for GE2.0 faculty development and certification:
  o The program should include both initial onboarding training and an ongoing
professional development component for returning faculty participants.

- The program should include an e-portfolio component that is similar to what students in the general education program will produce so that faculty will know the system that students are working with and so that these can be shared with other faculty and students as models.
- The program can be completed via an online module but ongoing professional development should take place in a face-to-face environment (perhaps under the auspices of FACET).

**Recommendation:**

Chairs, program directors, deans, and associate deans who directly supervise faculty or who make budget and scheduling decisions that impact the GE2.0 program should be required to complete the initial on-board training so that they understand the impact their decisions have on the GE2.0 program and how the GE2.0 program relates to their departments and units. Similar modules should be developed for University Assessment Committee, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, and the Faculty Senate to orient members to the GE2.0 Program.

**Recommendation:**

Faculty certification in GE2.0 should be included in MyVita.

- **Responsibility:** The Director should work with the Vice Provost (VP) of Faculty Affairs to ensure automatic entry of faculty certification into faculty MyVita data.
- **Timeline:** Prior to the first faculty certification class.

— Peer Review of Faculty in the GE2.0 Program

**Recommendation:**

Implement and require peer review of all faculty teaching in the GE2.0 program.

- **Promotion of faculty in the GE2.0 organizational unit should require peer review reports, ideally throughout the period of promotion review (not only the semester immediately preceding review).**
- **Faculty involved in providing peer review should receive teaching credit for this activity due to the preparation and execution time, and the number of faculty needing review.**
- **Responsibility:** The Director, FYE Coordinator, FaCET Director, and NTT faculty representatives in the GE2.0 organizational unit should constitute a Peer Review Development and Implementation Committee. Best practices of peer review (Chickering and Gamson 1987) and consideration of review programs at other institutions should be considered (for examples, Taylor 2016, Bandy (and references therein), Flaherty 2017, Penn State, University of Arizona).
- **Timeline:** Outline and develop peer review tools in year one of the GE2.0 (spring 2019), and begin implementation fall 2019.
c. recommend changes to annual faculty evaluation processes, tenure and promotion processes, and merit pay criteria that recognize faculty work and faculty excellence in teaching in the general education program.

- Faculty Evaluation
  - Faculty evaluation process, teaching evaluations

  **Recommendation:**

  The Director and faculty representatives from the GE2.0 program shall develop an online student evaluation of teaching. It is recommended that two to three core questions relating to student perceptions of faculty delivery of SLOs be identified and included in the teaching evaluation process of GE2.0 courses delivered by faculty in other academic units.

  - **Responsibility:** the Director shall oversee the development of the evaluation tool and should work with Information Services to develop the online teaching evaluation.
  - **Timeline:** the teaching evaluation tool and online delivery must be complete by fall 2019.

- Faculty evaluation process, annual faculty evaluations

  **Recommendation:**

  The Director will annually review all faculty whose home academic unit is in the GE2.0 program, including NTT faculty, instructors, and adjunct faculty.

  **Responsibility:** The Director will assure that the annual review process includes evaluation of the criteria used for promotion and merit review for raises. These criteria should be established by the faculty.

  **Timeline:** The criteria for annual review should be established within one year of hiring the first NTT faculty for the GE2.0 program.

- Promotion and tenure criteria

  **Recommendation:**

  For all tenured and tenure-track faculty at UMKC, the university criteria for promotion and tenure should include participation in the GE2.0 Program or participation in high impact practices with undergraduate or graduate students. The level of involvement may be tiered to their academic rank. For example, for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor, faculty should be expected to provide evidence of inclusion of high impact practices in their teaching component, and promotion from associate to full professor would additionally include teaching of general education courses.

  - **Responsibilities:** The Director, FYE Coordinator, the SEARCH Director, a representative from the Faculty Senate, and a representative from each academic unit should work closely with the VP of Faculty Affairs to constitute a committee to define high-impact educational practices for UMKC. This committee should be
further charged to develop the campus criteria for promotion and tenure that requires these teaching components. These may include practices identified by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (Kuh 2008) and reflect the mission and vision statements of UMKC. Final approval processes should be determined by the VP of Faculty Affairs and should include approval by the Faculty Senate.

- Timeline: As soon as the Director and FYE Coordinator are in place, they should begin this process. Recommendations should be made to the VP of Faculty Affairs and to the Faculty Senate by fall 2020.

--- GE2.0 Faculty Policies

Recommendation:

The GE2.0 organizational unit that is the academic home for GE2.0 faculty should establish: 1) guidelines for the evaluation of NTT for merit, 2) workload policy of NTT faculty, 3) governance structure of faculty in this unit, and 4) guidelines for promotion of NTT faculty within the unit.

- Responsibility: The Director will establish a committee led by them or their representative, the FYE Coordinator, and at least two GE2.0 faculty in this unit to address these issues and formulate the indicated policies. Final approval of these policies requires a vote by all faculty in the GE2.0 organizational unit.
- Timeline: completion by the end of the first year of implementation of GE2.0 program.

d. describe the faculty “life span” of participation in the general education program that provides for ongoing challenge and professional development.

- Faculty Life-Span in the General Education Program

- Recognition of Faculty Work and Excellence in GE2.0 Teaching

  Recommendation:

  Establish an annual campus award, such as the Provost’s Award for Excellence in General Education Teaching, with a $1500 stipend award.

  - Responsibilities: The Director and the VP of Faculty Affairs.
  - Timeline: to be awarded in year two of the delivery of the GE2.0 (2020).

- Faculty Participation in the GE2.0 Program

Instructors in the GE2.0 curriculum are expected to be full time faculty, either tenured, tenure-track, non-tenured faculty, or UMKC staff who meet HLC teaching credential requirements. Full-time instructors in the Gen Ed Program will have a teaching load of approximately four courses per semester (~90% FTE teaching). Utilization of part-time faculty should be minimized in GE2.0; to insure optimal student engagement with faculty outside the classroom and participation in ongoing professional development in the UMKC GE2.0 Program.
Recommendations:

a) Gen Ed Fellow: full-time NTT faculty hired by and housed in the General Education Program. They teach in the general education program for their entire teaching and service role for the University. These faculty will teach the first-year experience program, including the large sessions and smaller discussion groups. They will also be teaching courses in the critical thinking, culture and diversity, and/or civic engagement categories of the Gen Ed program. Additional responsibilities include general education assessment, e-portfolio supervision, peer mentoring of general education instructors, helping the general education program director build and run the certification and continuing education process for other faculty levels.

Initially, we expect a need for 11 NTT faculty as General Education Fellows (based on predicted first year enrollment). We anticipate there will be approximately two Gen Ed Fellows in each of the three Critical Thinking curriculum areas, the Culture and Diversity, and the Civic Engagement curriculum areas.

b) General Education Recurring Faculty: NTT and TT faculty with academic homes in units outside of the General Education Program. These faculty regularly teach at least one course in the General Education curriculum per year. The strength of the general education program depends on the level of engagement from full time faculty with a primary home in academic units from the entire campus.

Depending on the enrollment in individual Critical Thinking, Culture and Diversity, and Civic Engagement courses, 250 sections will be needed. NTT and TT faculty from academic units should provide a term commitment of 3 years of participation; terms may be repeated.

c) Emergency instructors: those who teach occasionally or those who teach on an emergency basis due to unanticipated demand or instructor shortage.

These faculty would be expected to be complete the online certification program within the first six weeks of the semester when they are assigned to teach a general education course. These faculty should be assigned to work with a mentor from the cohort of core Gen Ed Fellows.

— Required Faculty Development Experiences:

The GE2.0 program should strive to develop a sense of community among faculty who teach in the program. Faculty in both the foundational and essential questions program should be required to participate in at least two meetings of GE2.0 faculty during any semester during which they are teaching a GE2.0 course. Faculty with an ongoing commitment to the GE2.0 program who are not teaching in the current semester should be encouraged to attend. In addition to providing information about ongoing operations in the GE2.0 program, these meetings should also have a faculty development component that is modeled on the current
advisors’ professional development reading group administered by Associate Vice Provost for University College and University Advising. For this component, the Director will ask faculty to read and discuss articles about the teaching and/or best practices in general education.

The Director should also work with the director of FaCET to develop sessions at the FaCET symposium related to the GE2.0 program and the GE2.0 faculty should be expected to attend these sessions.

e. Recommendations of the Faculty Experience Group, beyond the Provost’s Charge:

• Budget Considerations
  The Implementation Team considered several options for budgeting and curriculum. We received feedback from the Administrative Council, Deans who teach general education courses, and individual meetings with Deans from Computer Science and Engineering and Nursing and Health Studies. A summary of these meetings is below.

  — In principle, most Deans accepted the concept of a continuation of the current split of 80/20 of tuition dollars between the academic unit of instruction and the student’s home academic unit. There is concern that the current system does not accurately distribute tuition dollars based on the stated budget model. If this type of split is maintained, the Deans want a more accurate distribution of tuition dollars.
  — Budgeting the GE2.0 using a tax if academic units do not meet expected teaching obligations was generally not viewed favorably. If a tax is implemented, they wanted assurance that the expected obligations and the tax was based on the proportion of students in the undergraduate population who needed to take general education courses.
  — The Deans did not express objections to GE2.0 courses counting for a student’s general education program, but not towards their degree program.
  — All Deans expressed that it was not possible to state preferences on budgeting of the GE2.0 program until a university budget model is known.

• Budgetary support for grders/TAs
  To enhance the effectiveness of instruction and to provide incentives for faculty participation in the GE2.0 program, the Director and GE Executive Committee should establish definitions and criteria for assignment of various instructor supports. They are encouraged to investigate funding levels and training programs at benchmarked institutions. Instructor support to be considered includes:

  — graders
  — TAs
  — Supplemental Instructors (SI) and/or Undergraduate Learning Assistants (ULAs)
  — Student Peer Mentors

  This committee should also develop standards and guidelines for TAs, ULAs, Peer Mentors, and graders.
• Space needs
  Space should be allocated for contiguous space for the Director, FYE Coordinator, admin, and NTT faculty. This includes:
    — four offices
    — additional open design space for 11 people (NTT faculty).
    — need adjacent small meeting space for breakout sessions with students.
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**UMKC General Education Program**

**Charge to the General Education Program 2.0 Task Force**

Version Date: July 15, 2016
Author: Barbara Bichelmeyer

**Charge**

The UMKC General Education Program 2.0 Task Force is charged with the review and re-design of the University’s General Education Program in order to meet existing requirements of the Higher Learning Commission and new requirements outlined in Missouri House Bill 2651: Higher Education Core Curriculum Transfer Act. It must achieve this while continuing to provide UMKC students with a high-quality, highly engaging educational experience that inspires their curiosity, and challenges their intellectual capacities with curricular breadth, depth, and interdisciplinary study that reflects the mission of the university. The core and emphasis of the program will be a clearly articulated focus on the skills, knowledge and values that UMKC students should demonstrate at the conclusion of their studies to demonstrate competence as individual citizens, professionals, and community leaders. At the end of the re-design process, all faculty will agree to support, to implement, and to continually refine the program which is developed, from a student-centric and data-driven perspective.

**Program Requirements**

The General Education Program should:
- be driven by clearly stated and measurable student learning outcomes that articulate the essential competencies which faculty strive to instill in all UMKC’s undergraduate students.
- retain those elements of the current curriculum that are demonstrated to be positive experiences for undergraduate students and that support student success (persistence and completion), and remove those elements of the current program that do not add value to students’ experience, or that are not implementable by faculty and staff.
- at minimum, meet all appropriate accreditor (HLC) and regulatory requirements (state).
- provide a baseline common denominator experience for undergraduate students in all degree programs, recognizing that requirements vary tremendously between programs.
- at best, provide experiences that will encourage students to demonstrate valued competencies guided by AAC&amp;U LEAP outcomes including critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, communications skills, global thinking, culture and diversity, interdisciplinary thinking, civic engagement, ethical reasoning, problem solving, creativity, while also considering the university’s commitment to developing within students the skills of innovation and entrepreneurialism, and the capacities to experience failure with resilience.
- ensure students are highly engaged in valued co-curricular experiences such as research, internships, civic engagement, service learning, and cultural enrichment.
- be as student-centered and easy for students and their advisors to navigate as possible.
- be navigable for all student profiles that make up the undergraduate population at UMKC, including native students, transfer students, online students, international students, first-time full-time, part-time, and returning students.
• engage students in multiple experiences in which they are highly involved and highly valued members of learning community.
• hold faculty accountable to meet targeted student learning outcomes through appropriate assessments and evaluations, while at the same time allowing for academic freedom and independent action in the design and delivery of courses.
• allow for flexible delivery of courses, such that the program may be delivered on-campus, online, in competency-based formats, and in a variety of timeframes which include regular semesters, intensive sessions, and summer and weekend programs.
• be logistically easy and as expeditious to implement as possible, given the constraints put upon us by the Missouri legislature and our accrediting bodies.
• encourage all academic and administrative units to work together to provide students with a broad, deep, and interdisciplinary experience reflecting the entire university.

Task Force Processes and Deliverables

The General Education Program 2.0 Task Force should begin with the end-in-mind; to re-envision and reverse-engineer the current program. The work should be completed in phases, with reports released at the completion of each phase. Phases and reports should address:

1. Articulation of General Education Task Force members’ responsibilities, such as:
   • Understanding the national work focused on general education (AAC&U, etc.), on the previous UMKC general education revision process and on UMKC student learning outcome achievements based on student learning outcome data.
   • Serve as a representative of an academic area or university function, communicating regularly with constituents and with the task force members.
   • Regular attendance and active participation in meetings/activities and to appropriate preparation for discussions and decision making.
   • To prioritize decision making on what is in the best interest of student learning and student academic achievement for all UMKC undergraduate students.

2. Consideration of expressed concerns from students, faculty, and staff regarding the existing program, to identify any immediate opportunities to eliminate or mitigate the most severe problems with the current program.

3. Development and codification of processes, timelines, and rules of engagement by which the task force will complete its work, including voting and record-keeping.

4. Review of the existing curriculum to affirm or revise the competencies and experiences students are to derive from the General Education Program, including learning outcomes, curriculum goals and structures, and co-curricular requirements.

5. Design of metrics and processes by which success of the General Education Program will be measured, including student learning outcome assessments, student end-of-course evaluations, and program review and monitoring.

6. Specifications for implementation of the General Education Program, including any technical requirements, committee structures, policies, procedures, information systems, communications, marketing, faculty/staff training, and personnel support. As well as specifications regarding governance structure, implementation responsibility, and administrative oversight for the general education program.

7. Development of recommendations regarding budgetary considerations for implementation and maintenance of the General Education Program.

8. Development of a smooth and workable transition plan for moving from the current curriculum to the new General Education Program, including development of the process for general education program review and reporting on general education to the Higher Learning Commission.
**Timeline**

1) Members should be solicited by various responsible parties as soon as possible during Summer 2016.
2) The Task Force should convene as soon as possible in August and complete work by May 1, 2017.
3) The Task Force should take into account any necessary timelines for all-Faculty votes and approvals from the Registrar and Provost.
4) The Task Force should be prepared to issue monthly reports to Faculty Senate by the first Tuesday in December, 2016.

*Membership*

**Sponsor:**
Deputy Provost / Cindy Pemberton

**Non-voting Co-chairs:**
General Education Coordinator / Jennifer Waddell
Arts and Sciences Faculty member elected by majority of College / TBD

**Voting members:**
University College Associate Vice Provost / Kim McNeley
Director of Assessment / Ruth Cain

**Academic unit representatives** – one faculty member per unit, with the exception of the College of Arts and Sciences, which should appoint three members, one from arts and humanities, one from social sciences, and one from natural sciences

Academic unit representatives – one advisor per unit, with the exception of the College of Arts and Sciences, which should appoint three members, one from arts and humanities, one from social sciences, and one from natural sciences

University Curriculum Committee representative
General Education Curriculum Committee representative
University Assessment Committee representative
Online Learning Advisory Committee representative
Honors College representative
Libraries representative
Non-tenure track faculty representative to be selected by faculty senate***
Adjunct faculty representative to be selected by faculty senate ***

**Ex-Officio (Non-voting) Members:**
Transfer Officer
Finance representative
Registrar representative
Institutional Research representative
Student Government Association representative
Trustee / Alumni / Community representative
Metropolitan Community College representative

*Two members of task force will be selected by the Provost to represent UMKC to the Missouri Department of Higher Education committee that is charged with implementation of Missouri House Bill 2651: Higher Education Core Curriculum Transfer Act

**Faculty members should have experience with curriculum maps for each academic program in academic unit

*** Elections for these positions will be run through Faculty Senate.
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General Education 2.0 Goals and SLOs

Communication:

Goal: UMKC students will communicate effectively orally and in writing.

Student Learning Outcomes for Oral Communication:
1. Communicate a clear central message
2. Develop a purposeful organizational pattern
3. Incorporate materials to support the central message
4. Use delivery techniques appropriate to the goal and the context
5. Choose language responsive to the goal and the context

Student Learning Outcomes for Written Communication:
1. Develop a clear focus
2. Construct a purposeful organizational scheme appropriate to the rhetorical situation
3. Identify, analyze, and synthesize credible and relevant sources to support focus
4. Compose appropriate and relevant content to illustrate mastery of subject
5. Employ format, style, syntax, and usage appropriate to the rhetorical situation
6. Utilize appropriate mechanics, grammar, punctuation, and spelling

Quantitative Analysis

Goal: UMKC students will produce, interpret, and present quantitative information.

1. Select and correctly apply foundational mathematical systems (e.g., arithmetic, algebra, geometry) and/or statistical methods to solve problems
2. Analyze information presented in mathematical and symbolic forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables)
3. Draw appropriate conclusions based on mathematical, statistical, or formal analyses, while recognizing the limits of these analyses
4. Apply mathematical, statistical, and logical methods in order to determine reasonableness of real-world claims

Critical Thinking and Analytic Reasoning

Goal: UMKC students will explore issues, ideas, artifacts, and events from multiple perspectives to formulate an evidence-based opinion or conclusion.

1. Identify a topic, problem, or issue to be addressed
2. Locate relevant information representing various points of view
3. Evaluate alternative points of view
4. Synthesize diverse points of view
5. Draw a conclusion that is a logical inference from the evidence
**Civic and Urban Engagement**

**Goal:** UMKC Students will explore the role of socially responsible citizens and leaders in a democratic society and contribute towards the betterment of the community.

1. Analyze general characteristics of relationships between individuals in personal, communal, cultural, political, or economic contexts
2. Analyze social problems, beliefs, values, attitudes, and behaviors among individuals, communities, cultures, or markets
3. Examine the balance between the rights and responsibilities of the individual and the rights and responsibilities of others in an interpersonal, social, cultural, political, or economic context
4. Evaluate how members of a community, culture, or society both affect and are affected by others, and how one's own civic participation can make a positive contribution to public life

**Culture and Diversity**

**Goal:** UMKC students will draw on a variety of disciplines to examine the factors defining cultural identities, to examine complexities of human cultures, past and present, and to come to an informed sense of self and others.

1. Analyze the factors that shape their own culture and worldview
2. Examine how cultural beliefs influence behaviors and practices at the individual, organizational, or societal levels
3. Assess how their own attitudes, behaviors, beliefs and biases impact their interactions with those different from themselves
4. Recognize the value of worldviews different from one's own
APPENDIX C: General Education 2.0 Model
(Faculty Senate recommended approval to
the Provost, Spring 2017)
General Education 2.0 Model

Guided by General Education 2.0 Student Learning Outcomes

First 15 Hours--Foundation

Writing (6 hrs)
Oral Communication (3 hrs)
Math Pathway (3 hrs)
1st Year Experience (3 hrs)

Second 15 Hours— Essential Questions

Critical Thinking in Natural & Physical Sciences (3 hrs)—100-/200-level classes
Critical Thinking in Arts & Humanities (3 hrs)--100-/200-level classes
Critical Thinking in Social & Behavioral Sciences (3 hrs)--100-/200-level classes
Culture & Diversity Class (3 hrs)--100-/200-level classes

Civic Engagement Class (3 hrs)-100- and 200-level classes
UMKC General Education Program  
Charge to the General Education Program 2.0 Implementation Team

Date: May 24, 2017  
Author: Barbara Bichelmeyer

Charge

The UMKC General Education Program 2.0 Implementation Team is charged with development of an implementation plan that ensures the General Education 2.0 Program has the infrastructure and resources necessary to be successful for students, faculty, advisors, staff and community members who are the constituents of the program.

Implementation Team Deliverables

1. Ensure the General Education 2.0 Program is driven by the UMKC mission, General Education 2.0 mission, student learning outcomes, and the adopted General Education Program model.

2. Ensure that, at minimum, the program meets all appropriate accredditor (HLC) and (State) regulatory requirements.

3. Describe the student experience of the General Education 2.0 Program from first contact (pre-orientation) through graduation:
   a. provide details of the student experience beginning with admission, summer orientation, summer bridge program (if applicable), to convocation, prior to the start of the academic year.
   b. provide a baseline common denominator experience for undergraduate students in all degree programs.
      ▪ The experience should be the foundation for the General Education program that is carried out through the rest of the program.
   c. ensure students are highly engaged in valued co-curricular experiences such as research, internships, civic engagement, service learning, writing intensive, eportfolios, first year seminars and experiences, common intellectual experiences, learning communities, capstone courses and projects, and diversity/global learning (Kuh, 2008).
      ▪ Co-curricular activities should be evaluated prior to graduation
      ▪ A mechanism for evaluation and transcripting of experiences should be developed
      ▪ Key individuals, to ensure successful implementation of the student experience, should be identified.
   d. be as student-centered and easy for students and their advisors to navigate as possible.
   e. engage students in multiple experiences in which they are highly involved and highly valued members of learning community.
   f. describe how the program experience may differ for all student profiles that make up the undergraduate population at UMKC, including:
      ▪ native first-time full-time students,
• native part-time students,
• online students,
• transfer students,
• returning students,
• international students.

4. Describe the **faculty experience** of the General Education 2.0 Program, including faculty onboarding and faculty use of student learning outcome assessment data to make improvements in course and co-curricular experiences that enhance student learning.
   a. engage faculty in an onboarding process that ensures effective delivery of the General Education 2.0 Program (involving New Faculty Orientation, ongoing faculty development opportunities, required faculty development experiences).
   b. work with FaCET to develop a plan for ongoing faculty and staff support and development that encourages:
      ▪ understanding of program curriculum and components,
      ▪ development and implementation of signature assignments,
      ▪ participation in assessment,
      ▪ learning to effectively implement high impact practices,
      ▪ development of instructional skills that support all student profiles in a highly engaging manner.
   c. recommend changes to annual faculty evaluation processes, tenure and promotion processes, and merit pay criteria that recognize faculty work and faculty excellence in teaching in the general education program.
   d. describe the faculty “life span” of participation in the general education program that provides for ongoing challenge and professional development.

5. Develop specifications regarding governance structure, implementation responsibility, and administrative oversight for the general education program:
   a. ensure the General Education 2.0 Program is logistically as easy and expeditious as possible to implement, given external constraints (HLC, MDHE, etc.).
   b. determine processes for working within existing university operating procedures to oversee and support the General Education 2.0 Program (University Assessment Committee, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, University Budget Committee, Faculty Senate).
   c. describe the General Education Executive Committee whose members will include the General Education Program Coordinator, University Assessment Director, First Year Experience Coordinator, Director of Composition from the English Department, Coordinator or Chairperson of Communication Studies, Math Pathways Coordinator or Chairperson of Math Department, Section Chair for Curriculum Panels (Critical Thinking, Culture & Diversity, Civic Engagement).
   d. determine the charge and qualifications of members who serve on the Section Curriculum Review Panels.
   e. develop process for course approval for new courses as well as existing courses proposed to be recertified in the new program and the ongoing review process to ensure compliance with quality student outcomes contributing to the overall general education program effectiveness.
   f. design metrics and processes by which success of the General Education Program will be measured, including student learning outcome assessments, student end-of-course evaluations by faculty, students and administrators, and program review and monitoring.
- develop an assessment plan that holds faculty accountable to meet targeted student learning outcomes through appropriate assessments and evaluations, while at the same time allowing for academic freedom and independent action in the design and delivery of courses.

6. Develop specifications for implementation of the General Education 2.0 Program, including any technical requirements, committee structures, policies, procedures, information systems, communications, marketing, and personnel support.
   a. develop a plan for transcripting co-curricular experiences.
   b. develop a plan for scheduling General Education 2.0 courses that allows for:
      - priority and flexible delivery of courses, such that the program may be delivered on-campus, online, in competency-based formats, and in a variety of timeframes which include regular semesters, intensive sessions, and summer and weekend programs;
      - ensures the availability of classes, sections and seats to meet the needs of our students.
   c. develop a smooth and workable transition plan for moving from the current curriculum to the General Education 2.0 Program, including the process for general education program review and reporting on general education to the Higher Learning Commission.
      - propose a plan for transitioning from the current to the new General Education program, attending to the fact that there are also students who are completing their degree under the pre-2013 general education requirements.
      - work with Transfer Coordinator and Registrars’ Office to develop articulation agreements and transfer agreements for students within the current and General Education 2.0 Program.
   d. work with MCOM to develop a marketing and communications plan to effectively and expeditiously communicate program and implementations plan.
   e. work with UMKC Online, IT, IR and Registrar’s Office to develop processes for technology support within course delivery, scheduling and ePortfolios.
   f. encourage all academic and administrative units to work together to provide students with a broad, deep, and interdisciplinary experience reflecting the entire university.

6. Develop recommendations regarding budgetary considerations for implementation and maintenance of the General Education 2.0 Program.

Implementation Team Processes

The General Education Program 2.0 Implementation Team work should be completed by August 10, 2017 with a summary report due to the Provost. General 2.0 Implementation Team members’ responsibilities include:
- Regular attendance and active participation in meetings/activities and appropriate preparation for discussions and decision making.
- Decision making should be prioritized based on what is in the best interest of student learning and academic achievement for all UMKC undergraduate students.

Timeline

1) The Implementation Team should convene by May 31, 2017 and complete work by August 9, 2017.
2) The Implementation Team will meet with the General Education 2.0 Task Force
   Wednesday 23, August 2017 and September 6, 2017.
   a. General Education 2.0 Task Force Members should begin immediately to
      schedule meetings with their constituencies (academic units, etc.) for the
      week of August 28 to gain feedback on the Draft Implementation Plan.
   b. At the September 6 General Education 2.0 Task Force Meeting, Task Force
      members will report feedback from their academic unit constituencies.
3) The Implementation Plan will be presented to the Provost by September 15, 2017.

**General Education 2.0 Implementation Team Membership**

**Sponsor:**
Deputy Provost / Cindy Pemberton

**Co-chairs:**
Infrastructure: General Education Coordinator / Jennifer Waddell
Student Experience: University College Associate Vice Provost / Kim McNeley
Faculty Experience: Jeffrey Rydberg-Cox and Marilyn Yoder

**Members (drawn from General Education 2.0 Task Force):**
Director of Assessment / Ruth Cain
University Curriculum Committee representative / Aaron Reed
University Assessment Committee representative / Brenda Bethman
Online Learning Advisory Committee representative / Molly Mead
General Education Curriculum Committee representative / Jerry Wyckoff
Libraries representative / Mardi Mahaffey
Transfer Officer / Benjamin Howard
Finance representative / Dales Unglesbee
Registrar representative / Doug Swink
FaCET Representative / Peggy Ward-Smith
Institutional Research Representative / Ali Korkmaz
Faculty Representative / Sabrina Madison-Cannon
Faculty Representative / John Kevern
Advisor Representative / Rebecca Bergman
Advisor Representative / Wayne Nagy
Information Technology / Representative: Andrew Goodenow
APPENDIX E: MDHE Crosswalk
UMKC’s General Education Core 2.0
In developing a general education model which reflects the unique mission and character of the University of Missouri-Kansas City, university faculty, staff, and administration have looked for inspiration and guidance to general education best practices as outlined by the Association of American Colleges & Universities as well as innovative models at peer-institutions around the country. At the same time the General Education 2.0 Taskforce, in developing a new program for all UMKC undergraduate students, has also been thoughtful of the needs of our transfer students and how we can ensure compliance with the requirements and spirit of Missouri’s Higher Education Core Curriculum Transfer Act (hereafter referred to as “the Act”).

Pursuant to guidance from the Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) regarding section 178.788 of the Act, UMKC has developed a two-path general education model which creates a unique experience for UMKC’s native student population while also ensuring ease of transfer for students coming to UMKC from other public post-secondary institutions around the state. These two paths are both geared towards the same student learning outcomes (SLOs) and shall be treated as equivalent for the purposes of preparing students to pursue any undergraduate credential or plan of study at the university.

Transfer Students – Core Curriculum Transfer Path (Effective Fall, 2018)
Students who transfer to UMKC having begun the 42hr core curriculum at another Missouri institution without completing it will have the option to complete the MDHE core curriculum at UMKC via a selection of courses approved to fulfil the categories below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social and Behavioral Sciences</th>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Natural Sciences and Mathematical Sciences</th>
<th>Humanities and Fine Arts</th>
<th>Additional Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 credit hours total</td>
<td>9 credit hours total</td>
<td>9 credit hours total</td>
<td>9 credit hours total</td>
<td>6 credit hours total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From at least two disciplines.</td>
<td>History/ constitution requirement</td>
<td>Written communication</td>
<td>Oral communication</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Native Students – UMKC General Education Core 2.0 Path (Effective Fall, 2019)
Pursuant to section 178.788 of the Act, UMKC has developed a unique General Education program for native students. This program focuses on the university’s unique character and identity as an urban-serving, public research institution with a particular emphasis in supporting the visual and performing arts.

General Education 2.0 Mission, Vision, & Objective Statements - Approved by UMKC Faculty Senate December 5, 2016
- Mission: As you engage in UMKC’s General Education Program, you will build your communication and critical thinking skills, hone your creative abilities, and tackle challenging problems by exploring varied disciplines.
- Vision: The General Education Program will prepare you for the dynamic, diverse world that needs your contributions as both an informed citizen and in complex workplaces.
- Objective: Through the General Education Program, you will discover that learning stretches from your classroom to the labs, archives, and studios located on our campus, into the Kansas City community, across the nation, and around the globe.

General Education 2.0 Knowledge Areas & Student Learning Outcomes – Approved by the UMKC Faculty Senate
1. Communication:
   a. Goal: UMKC students will communicate effectively orally and in writing.
   b. Student Learning Outcomes for Oral Communication:
      i. Communicate a clear central message
      ii. Develop a purposeful organizational pattern
      iii. Incorporate materials to support the central message
      iv. Use delivery techniques appropriate to the goal and the context
      v. Choose language responsive to the goal and the context
   c. Student Learning Outcomes for Written Communication:
      i. Develop a clear focus
      ii. Construct a purposeful organizational scheme appropriate to the rhetorical situation
      iii. Identify, analyze, and synthesize credible and relevant sources to support focus
      iv. Compose appropriate and relevant content to illustrate mastery of subject
      v. Employ format, style, syntax, and usage appropriate to the rhetorical situation
      vi. Utilize appropriate mechanics, grammar, punctuation, and spelling

2. Quantitative Analysis
   a. Goal: UMKC students will produce, interpret, and present quantitative information.
   b. Student Learning Outcomes for Quantitative Analysis:
      i. Select and correctly apply foundational mathematical systems (e.g., arithmetic, algebra, geometry) and/or statistical methods to solve problems
      ii. Analyze information presented in mathematical and symbolic forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables)
      iii. Draw appropriate conclusions based on mathematical, statistical, or formal analyses, while recognizing the limits of these analyses
      iv. Apply mathematical, statistical, and logical methods in order to determine reasonableness of real-world claims
3. Critical Thinking & Analytic Reasoning
   a. Goal: UMKC students will explore issues, ideas, artifacts, and events from multiple perspectives to formulate an evidence-based opinion or conclusion.
   b. Student Learning Outcomes for Critical Thinking & Analytic Reasoning:
      i. Identify a topic, problem, or issue to be addressed
      ii. Locate relevant information representing various points of view
      iii. Evaluate alternative points of view
      iv. Synthesize diverse points of view
      v. Draw a conclusion that is a logical inference from the evidence

4. Civic & Urban Engagement
   a. Goal: UMKC Students will explore the role of socially responsible citizens and leaders in a democratic society and contribute towards the betterment of the community.
   b. Student Learning Outcomes for Civic & Urban Engagement:
      i. Analyze general characteristics of relationships between individuals in personal, communal, cultural, political, or economic contexts
      ii. Analyze social problems, beliefs, values, attitudes, and behaviors among individuals, communities, cultures, or markets
      iii. Examine the balance between the rights and responsibilities of the individual and the rights and responsibilities of others in an interpersonal, social, cultural, political, or economic context
      iv. Evaluate how members of a community, culture, or society both affect and are affected by others, and how one’s own civic participation can make a positive contribution to public life

5. Culture and Diversity
   a. Goal: UMKC students will draw on a variety of disciplines to examine the factors defining cultural identities, to examine complexities of human cultures, past and present, and to come to an informed sense of self and others.
   b. Student Learning Outcomes for Civic & Urban Engagement:
      i. Analyze the factors that shape their own culture and worldview
      ii. Examine how cultural beliefs influence behaviors and practices at the individual, organizational, or societal levels
      iii. Assess how their own attitudes, behaviors, beliefs and biases impact their interactions with those different from themselves
      iv. Recognize the value of worldviews different from one’s own

UMKC General Education 2.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundations</th>
<th>Essential Questions</th>
<th>Additional Requirements for 42 Hour Block</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 credit hours total</td>
<td>15 credit hours total</td>
<td>12 credit hours total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Experience</td>
<td>Critical Thinking: Natural &amp; Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Constitution Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>Critical Thinking: Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>Distribution Courses*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hours</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>9 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>Critical Thinking: Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>*Pursuant to section 178.788 of the Act, only non-professional students shall be required to complete the additional 9 hours of distribution coursework (i.e. UMKC students working towards a Bachelor of Arts credential).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Pathways</td>
<td>Culture &amp; Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Pathways</td>
<td>Civic &amp; Urban Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State-Level Goal & Knowledge Area Mapping: The following links UMKC’s general education program with the Statewide General Education Policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDHE Skill / Knowledge Area - Communicating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State-Level Goal:</strong> To develop students’ effective use of the English language and quantitative and other symbolic systems essential to their success in school and in the world. Students should be able to read and listen critically and to write and speak with thoughtfulness, clarity, coherence, and persuasiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDHE Skill / Knowledge Area - Higher Order Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State-Level Goal:</strong> To develop students’ ability to distinguish among opinions, facts, and inferences; to identify underlying or implicit assumptions; to make informed judgments; and to solve problems by applying evaluative standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDHE Skill / Knowledge Area - Managing Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State-Level Goal(s):</strong> To develop students' abilities to locate, organize, store, retrieve, evaluate, synthesize, and annotate information from print, electronic, and other sources in preparation for solving problems and making informed decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDHE Skill / Knowledge Area - Valuing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State-Level Goal:</strong> To develop students' abilities to understand the moral and ethical values of a diverse society and to understand that many courses of action are guided by value judgments about the way things ought to be. Students should be able to make informed decisions through identifying personal values and the values of others and through understanding how such values develop. They should be able to analyze the ethical implications of choices made on the basis of these values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDHE Skill / Knowledge Area - Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State-Level Goal:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop students' understanding of themselves and the world around them through study of content and the processes used by historians and social and behavioral scientists to discover, describe, explain, and predict human behavior and social systems. Students must understand the diversities and complexities of the cultural and social world, past and present, and come to an informed sense of self and others. (Students must fulfill the state statute requirements for the United States and Missouri constitutions.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDHE Skill / Knowledge Area - Humanities &amp; Fine Arts</th>
<th></th>
<th>MDHE Core Curriculum Element</th>
<th>UMKC GE Curriculum Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State-Level Goal:</strong></td>
<td><strong>UMKC Goal</strong></td>
<td>Culture and Diversity: UMKC students will draw on a variety of disciplines to examine the factors defining cultural identities, to examine complexities of human cultures, past and present, and to come to an informed sense of self and others.</td>
<td>3 hours Culture &amp; Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Level Goal: To develop students' understanding of the ways in which humans have addressed their condition through imaginative work in the humanities and fine arts; to deepen their understanding of how that imaginative process is informed and limited by social, cultural, linguistic, and historical circumstances; and to appreciate the world of the creative imagination as a form of knowledge.</td>
<td>Civic &amp; Urban Engagement: UMKC Students will explore the role of socially responsible citizens and leaders in a democratic society and contribute towards the betterment of the community.</td>
<td>9 hours from at least 2 disciplines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking &amp; Analytic Reasoning: UMKC students will explore issues, ideas, artifacts, and events from multiple perspectives to formulate an evidence-based opinion or conclusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 hours Critical Thinking: Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 hours Civic &amp; Urban engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MDHE Skill / Knowledge Area - Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State-Level Goal:</th>
<th>UMKC Goal</th>
<th>MDHE Core Curriculum Element</th>
<th>UMKC GE Curriculum Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State-Level Goal: To develop students' understanding of fundamental mathematical concepts and their applications. Students should develop a level of quantitative literacy that would enable them to make decisions and solve problems and which could serve as a basis for continued learning. (The mathematics requirement for general education should have the same prerequisite(s) and level of rigor as college algebra.)</td>
<td>Quantitative Analysis: UMKC students will produce, interpret, and present quantitative information.</td>
<td>3 hours Math Pathways</td>
<td>3 hours Math Pathways</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MDHE Skill / Knowledge Area - Life & Physical Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State-Level Goal:</th>
<th>UMKC Goal</th>
<th>MDHE Core Curriculum Element</th>
<th>UMKC GE Curriculum Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State-Level Goal: To develop students' understanding of the principles and laboratory procedures of life and physical sciences and to cultivate their abilities to apply the empirical methods of scientific inquiry. Students should understand how scientific discovery changes theoretical views of the world, informs our imaginations, and shapes human history. Students should also understand that science is shaped by historical and social contexts.</td>
<td>Quantitative Analysis: UMKC students will produce, interpret, and present quantitative information. Critical Thinking &amp; Analytic Reasoning: UMKC students will explore issues, ideas, artifacts, and events from multiple perspectives to formulate an evidence-based opinion or conclusion.</td>
<td>6 hours from at least 2 disciplines</td>
<td>3 hours Critical Thinking: Natural &amp; Physical Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F: Course Certification Checklist
UMKC Online Course Certification Checklist

(Version 8, March 2016)

Online courses must meet each of the standards listed below to achieve certification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Department:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Created:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Finalized:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Elements Needed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Course Overview and Introduction

Required elements:

☐ 1. This course includes approximately 45 clock hours of instructional materials/activities per credit hour.
☐ 2. Instructions make clear how to get started and where to find various course components.
☐ 3. The instructor explains the purpose and structure of the course.
☐ 4. Course specific and institutional policies that the learner is expected to follow are clearly stated.
☐ 5. Minimum technology requirements are clearly stated and links to resources for learning more are provided.
☐ 6. Prerequisites/co-requisites are located in the syllabus or course site.
☐ 7. Instructor and student introductions are made online. Ideally, these introductions are in video format or at least include an image of the person.

Feedback:

Learning Objectives (Competencies)

Required elements:

☐ 8. Course learning objectives (course/program competencies) are clearly stated in the course description, in the course site or in the syllabus.
☐ 9. Course learning objectives/competencies are measureable.
☐ 10. Module/unit learning objectives or competencies describe outcomes that are measureable and are consistent with course level objectives/competencies.
☐ 11. The relationship between the learning objectives and the course activities is clearly stated.

Feedback:
# Assessment and Measurement

Required elements:

- ☐ 12. **The assessments measure the stated learning objectives or competencies.**
- ☐ 13. **The course grading policy is stated clearly.**
- ☐ 14. **Due dates and points associated with each assignment are clearly delineated.**
- ☐ 15. **Specific and descriptive criteria for the evaluation of work are tied to the course grading policy.**
- ☐ 16. **The assessments are sequenced and varied.**
- ☐ 17. **The course provides learners with multiple opportunities to track their learning progress (formative and summative assessments).**

**Feedback:**

# Instructional Materials

Required elements:

- ☐ 18. **The instructional materials contribute to the achievement of the stated course and module/unit learning objectives.**
- ☐ 19. **Both the purpose of the instructional materials and how the materials are to be used for learning activities are clearly explained.**
- ☐ 20. **Appropriate copyright permissions have been obtained for all instructional materials in the course.**
- ☐ 21. **A variety of instructional materials are used in the course.**

**Feedback:**
### Course Activities and Interaction

Required elements:
- ☐ 22. The learning activities promote the achievement of the stated learning objectives or competencies.
- ☐ 23. The learning activities provide opportunities for interaction that support active learning.
- ☐ 24. The instructor’s plan for classroom response time and feedback on assignments is clearly stated.
- ☐ 25. The instructor uses a tool available to the entire class which allows for general question and answer about the course or syllabus.
- ☐ 26. The requirements for learner interactions are clearly stated.
- ☐ 27. The instructor's availability is clearly stated, including a schedule for online office hours.

### Feedback:

### Course Technology

Required elements:
- ☐ 28. The tools used in the course support the learning objectives and competencies.
- ☐ 29. Course tools promote learner engagement and active learning.
- ☐ 30. Technologies required in the course are representative of current standards for online instructional delivery.
- ☐ 31. Links are provided to privacy policies for all external tools required in the course.

### Feedback:
**Learner Support**

**Required elements:**
- ☐ 32. The course instructions articulate or link to a clear description of the technical support offered and how to obtain it.
- ☐ 33. Course instructions articulate or link to the institutions’ accessibility policies and services.
- ☐ 34. The course instructions articulate or link to an explanation of how the institution’s academic support services and resources can help learners succeed in the course and how learners can obtain them.

**Feedback:**

**Accessibility and Usability**

**Required elements:**
- ☐ 35. Course navigation is logical, consistent and efficient.
- ☐ 36. Information is provided about the accessibility of all technologies required in the course.
- ☐ 37. The course provides alternative means of access to course materials in formats that meet the needs of diverse learners.
- ☐ 38. The course design facilitates readability.

**Feedback:**
APPENDIX G: Budget Spreadsheet
### Class Size and Tuition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>HC Projection</th>
<th>Percentage HC</th>
<th>HC Taking (Actual)</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Class Size</th>
<th># Sections</th>
<th>Cost of instruction GTA/section</th>
<th>Revenue / class</th>
<th>Cost of instruction</th>
<th>Profit/Loss / class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FYE</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$18,402</td>
<td>$755,370</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td>(401,125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crit 1</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$10,492</td>
<td>$755,370</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$291,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crit 2</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$10,492</td>
<td>$755,370</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$291,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crit 3</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$10,492</td>
<td>$755,370</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$291,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engage</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$10,492</td>
<td>$755,370</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$291,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cult Div.</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$14,557</td>
<td>$755,370</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$129,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total inside</td>
<td>8370</td>
<td></td>
<td>9300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,532,220</td>
<td>$3,637,479</td>
<td>$894,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$6,317</td>
<td>$422,431</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$121,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp1</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$6,317</td>
<td>$410,058</td>
<td>$375</td>
<td>$155,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp2</td>
<td>886.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$6,317</td>
<td>$485,595</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$190,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>886.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$6,317</td>
<td>$485,595</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$190,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contra</td>
<td>3130</td>
<td></td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,823,679</td>
<td>$1,165,840</td>
<td>$657,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11700</td>
<td></td>
<td>13000</td>
<td></td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,355,899</td>
<td>$4,803,319</td>
<td>$1,552,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual fixed costs to cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,541,126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First Year Experience cost of instruction/other:

- Instructor- prof: $18,196 with 0.05 $910
- Instructors- assoc prof NTT: $10,492
- Other FYE costs: $220 cl size 25, $5,500
- Common read: social justice: $30 cl size 25, $750
- Roo writer testing: $30 cl size 25, $750

- $18,402

Classes taught by:

- Asst Prof NT INTERNAL: $7,896
- Assoc Prof N INTERNAL: $10,492
- Prof- NTT INTERNAL: $10,513
- Prof- T INTERNAL: $18,196
- Adjunct EXTERNAL: $3,883
- Asst Prof NTT EXTERNAL: $6,317
- Assoc Prof NT EXTERNAL: $8,394
- Prof-NTT EXTERNAL: $8,410
- Prof- T EXTERNAL: $14,557

Fixed Costs:

Personnel Costs

- VP of Gen Ed (1.0 FTE): $202,500
- FYE Coordinator (1.0 FTE): $140,805
- Exec Admin (1.0 FTE): $95,000

Net profit/loss: $11,454
UMKC Impact Experience Coordination position (1.0) $95,000
IS Support (transfer to IS for dedicated tech position) $65,000
Fixed Cost per NTT instructor $20,983.75 11 $230,821
Coor of competency based learning 0.5 FTE position $50,000
ePortfolio/badging coordinator 0.5 FTE position $50,000
Other transcripting costs including faculty stipends $50,000
Assessment panel stipends $35,000

Other non-personnel annual costs

ePortfolio licenses $80,000
FaCET supplement $25,000
Service Learning Software $10,000
Roowriter Costs 3000 30 $90,000
Marketing Costs $100,000
Library Costs $40,000
Miscellaneous $80,000

$1,439,126

Startup costs (first year, repeated every 3-5 years)

Update Roowriter software logic $20,000
Video/audio equipment for speech assessment $150,000
Offices for 11 NTT, Dir of Gen Ed, Coord FYE $100,000
New computers for 11 NTT, Dir of Gen Ed, Coord FYE, Admins $30,000
Costs of recruitment $150,000
Moving cost reimbursements $60,000

$510,000
$102,000
### Glossary of Terms Draft
*(terms pulled from AACU rubrics)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Civic engagement is &quot;working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political processes.&quot; <em>(Excerpted from Civic Responsibility and Higher Education, edited by Thomas Ehrlich, published by Oryx Press, 2000, Preface, page vi.)</em> In addition, civic engagement encompasses actions wherein individuals participate in activities of personal and public concern that are both individually life enriching and socially beneficial to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic identity</td>
<td>When one sees her or himself as an active participant in society with a strong commitment and responsibility to work with others towards public purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service-learning class</td>
<td>A course-based educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity and reflect on the experience in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>Listening, deliberation, negotiation, consensus building, and productive use of conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic life</td>
<td>The public life of the citizen concerned with the affairs of the community and nation as contrasted with private or personal life, which is devoted to the pursuit of private and personal interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>A process by which a group of people, whose opinions or interests might be divergent, reach collective decisions that are generally regarded as binding on the group and enforced as common policy. Political life enables people to accomplish goals they could not realize as individuals. Politics necessarily arises whenever groups of people live together, since they must always reach collective decisions of one kind or another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>&quot;The formal institutions of a society with the authority to make and implement binding decisions about such matters as the distribution of resources, allocation of benefits and burdens, and the management of conflicts.&quot; <em>(Retrieved from the Center for Civic Engagement Web site, May 5, 2009.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic/community contexts</td>
<td>Organizations, movements, campaigns, a place or locus where people and/or living creatures inhabit, which may be defined by a locality (school, national park, non-profit organization, town, state, nation) or defined by shared identity (i.e., African-Americans, North Carolinians, Americans, the Republican or Democratic Party, refugees, etc.). In addition, contexts for civic engagement may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be defined by a variety of approaches intended to benefit a person, group, or community, including community service or volunteer work, academic work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
<td>Information that may be interpreted in more than one way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td>Ideas, conditions, or beliefs (often implicit or unstated) that are &quot;taken for granted or accepted as true without proof.&quot; (quoted from <a href="http://www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/assumptions">www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/assumptions</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>The historical, ethical, political, cultural, environmental, or circumstantial settings or conditions that influence and complicate the consideration of any issues, ideas, artifacts, and events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literal meaning</td>
<td>Interpretation of information exactly as stated. For example, &quot;she was green with envy&quot; would be interpreted to mean that her skin was green.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Information that is (intended to be) interpreted in a non-literal way. For example, &quot;she was green with envy&quot; is intended to convey an intensity of emotion, not a skin color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Problem solving is the process of designing, evaluating and implementing a strategy to answer an open-ended question or achieve a desired goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Factors</td>
<td>Constraints (such as limits on cost), resources, attitudes (such as biases) and desired additional knowledge which affect how the problem can be best solved in the real world or simulated setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique</td>
<td>Involves analysis and synthesis of a full range of perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasible</td>
<td>Workable, in consideration of time-frame, functionality, available resources, necessary buy-in, and limits of the assignment or task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Off the shelf&quot;Solution</td>
<td>A simplistic option that is familiar from everyday experience but not tailored to the problem at hand (e.g. holding a bake sale to &quot;save&quot; an underfunded public library).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution</td>
<td>An appropriate response to a challenge or a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>A plan of action or an approach designed to arrive at a solution. (If the problem is a river that needs to be crossed, there could be a construction-oriented, cooperative (build a bridge with your community) approach and a personally oriented, physical (swim across alone) approach. An approach that partially applies would be a personal, physical approach for someone who doesn't know how to swim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Specific rationale, evidence, etc. for solution or selection of solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Literacy (QL)</td>
<td>Quantitative Literacy (QL) – also known as Numeracy or Quantitative Reasoning (QR) – is a &quot;habit of mind,&quot; competency, and comfort in working with numerical data. Individuals with strong QL skills possess the ability to reason and solve quantitative problems from a wide array of authentic contexts and everyday life situations. They understand and can create sophisticated arguments supported by quantitative evidence and they can clearly communicate those arguments in a variety of formats (using words, tables, graphs, mathematical equations, etc., as appropriate).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative thinking</td>
<td>Creative thinking is both the capacity to combine or synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways and the experience of thinking, reacting, and working in an imaginative way characterized by a high degree of innovation, divergent thinking, and risk taking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplar</td>
<td>A model or pattern to be copied or imitated (quoted from <a href="http://www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/exemplar">www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/exemplar</a>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Field of study or activity and a sphere of knowledge and influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>Inquiry is a systematic process of exploring issues, objects or works through the collection and analysis of evidence that results in informed conclusions or judgments. Analysis is the process of breaking complex topics or issues into parts to gain a better understanding of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>A synthesis of key findings drawn from research/evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>Critique of the process or evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>How inquiry results apply to a larger context or the real world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral communication</td>
<td>Oral communication is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central message</td>
<td>The main point/thesis/&quot;bottom line&quot;/&quot;take-away&quot; of a presentation. A clear central message is easy to identify; a compelling central message is also vivid and memorable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery techniques</td>
<td>Posture, gestures, eye contact, and use of the voice. Delivery techniques enhance the effectiveness of the presentation when the speaker stands and moves with authority, looks more often at the audience than at his/her speaking materials/notes, uses the voice expressively, and uses few vocal fillers (&quot;um,&quot; &quot;uh,&quot; &quot;like,&quot; &quot;you know,&quot; etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Vocabulary, terminology, and sentence structure. Language that supports the effectiveness of a presentation is appropriate to the topic and audience, grammatical, clear, and free from bias. Language that enhances the effectiveness of a presentation is also vivid, imaginative, and expressive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>The grouping and sequencing of ideas and supporting material in a presentation. An organizational pattern that supports the effectiveness of a presentation typically includes an introduction, one or more identifiable sections in the body of the speech, and a conclusion. An organizational pattern that enhances the effectiveness of the presentation reflects a purposeful choice among possible alternatives, such as a chronological pattern, a problem-solution pattern, an analysis-of-parts pattern, etc., that makes the content of the presentation easier to follow and more likely to accomplish its purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting material</td>
<td>Explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities, and other kinds of information or analysis that supports the principal ideas of the presentation. Supporting material is generally credible when it is relevant and derived from reliable and appropriate sources. Supporting material is highly credible when it is also vivid and varied across the types listed above (e.g., a mix of examples, statistics, and references to authorities). Supporting material may also serve the purpose of establishing the speaker’s credibility. For example, in presenting a creative work such as a dramatic reading of Shakespeare, supporting evidence may not advance the ideas of Shakespeare, but rather serve to establish the speaker as a credible Shakespearean actor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written communication</td>
<td>Written communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Development</td>
<td>The ways in which the text explores and represents its topic in relation to its audience and purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context of and purpose for writing</td>
<td>The context of writing is the situation surrounding a text: who is reading it? who is writing it? Under what circumstances will the text be shared or circulated? What social or political factors might affect how the text is composed or interpreted? The purpose for writing is the writer's intended effect on an audience. Writers might want to persuade or inform; they might want to report or summarize information; they might want to work through complexity or confusion; they might want to argue with other writers, or connect with other writers; they might want to convey urgency or amuse; they might write for themselves or for an assignment or to remember.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary conventions</td>
<td>Formal and informal rules that constitute what is seen generally as appropriate within different academic fields, e.g. introductory strategies, use of passive voice or first person point of view, expectations for thesis or hypothesis, expectations for kinds of...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Source material that is used to extend, in purposeful ways, writers' ideas in a text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre conventions</td>
<td>Formal and informal rules for particular kinds of texts and/or media that guide formatting, organization, and stylistic choices, e.g. lab reports, academic papers, poetry, webpages, or personal essays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>Texts (written, oral, behavioral, visual, or other) that writers draw on as they work for a variety of purposes -- to extend, argue with, develop, define, or shape their ideas, for example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Reasoning</td>
<td>Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Students’ ethical self identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Beliefs</td>
<td>Those fundamental principles that consciously or unconsciously influence one's ethical conduct and ethical thinking. Even when unacknowledged, core beliefs shape one's responses. Core beliefs can reflect one's environment, religion, culture or training. A person may or may not choose to act on their core beliefs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Perspectives/concepts</td>
<td>The different theoretical means through which ethical issues are analyzed, such as ethical theories (e.g., utilitarian, natural law, virtue) or ethical concepts (e.g., rights, justice, duty).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex, multi-layered (gray) context</td>
<td>The sub-parts or situational conditions of a scenario that bring two or more ethical dilemmas (issues) into the mix/problem/context/for student’s identification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-relationships among the issues</td>
<td>Obvious or subtle connections between/among the sub-parts or situational conditions of the issues present in a scenario (e.g., relationship of production of corn as part of climate change issue).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>The ability to know when there is a need for information, to be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and share that information for the problem at hand. - Adopted from the National Forum on Information Literacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence and support that are appropriate to the task at hand, use of primary and secondary sources to provide evidence and support arguments and to document critical perspectives on the topic. Writers will incorporate sources according to disciplinary and genre conventions, according to the writer’s purpose for the text. Through increasingly sophisticated use of sources, writers develop an ability to differentiate between their own ideas and the ideas of others, credit and build upon work already accomplished in the field or issue they are addressing, and provide meaningful examples to readers.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrative Learning</strong></td>
<td>Integrative learning is an understanding and a disposition that a student builds across the curriculum and co-curriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic knowledge</td>
<td>Disciplinary learning; learning from academic study, texts, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>The information conveyed in the work samples or collections of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contexts</td>
<td>Actual or simulated situations in which a student demonstrates learning outcomes. New and challenging contexts encourage students to stretch beyond their current frames of reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-curriculum</td>
<td>A parallel component of the academic curriculum that is in addition to formal classroom (student government, community service, residence hall activities, student organizations, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Learning that takes place in a setting outside of the formal classroom, such as workplace, service learning site, internship site or another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>The external frameworks in which information and evidence are presented, ranging from choices for particular work sample or collection of works (such as a research paper, PowerPoint, video recording, etc.) to choices in make-up of the eportfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>A dynamic and sustained act that brings together knowing and doing (creating a painting, solving an experimental design problem, developing a public relations strategy for a business, etc.); performance makes learning observable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>A meta-cognitive act of examining a performance in order to explore its significance and consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Assessment</td>
<td>Describing, interpreting, and judging a performance based on stated or implied expectations followed by planning for further learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I: Timeline
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in process</td>
<td>15-Sep</td>
<td>GE 2.0 Proposed Implementation Plan submitted to Provost</td>
<td>GE 2.0 Implementation Team Co-Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in process</td>
<td></td>
<td>Competency Crosswalk submitted to MDHE</td>
<td>Kim McNeley and Benjamin Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Sep</td>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>Job Description for GE 2.0 Director</td>
<td>GE Coordinator and Kim McNeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Sep</td>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>Job description for FYE Coordinator</td>
<td>GE Coordinator and Kim McNeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Sep</td>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>GE 2.0 Budget Request</td>
<td>GE Coordinator and Kim McNeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Sep</td>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>Proposal Feedback from Provost</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Sep</td>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>Establish Acting GE 2.0 Executive Committee</td>
<td>Provost, Provost Sponsor, GE Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>1-Nov</td>
<td>Schedule Spring Orientations</td>
<td>FaCET Director and Acting GE 2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>1-Nov</td>
<td>Hiring Authorizations for Director and FYE Coor</td>
<td>GE Coordinator and Kim McNeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>1-Dec</td>
<td>Submit for review to MDHE proposal to respect/accept Statewide 42-hour GE Block in transfer and how GE 1.0 meets SB 997 requirements for Fall 2018 go-live.</td>
<td>Kim McNeley, Benjamin Howard, GE Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>15-Nov</td>
<td>Meetings with Academic Units regarding Curricular Changes</td>
<td>GE Coordinator and Kim McNeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>1-Dec</td>
<td>Develop Parameters for GE 2.0 Courses</td>
<td>Acting GE 2.0 Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Nov</td>
<td>1-Dec</td>
<td>Job Announcement for Director</td>
<td>GE Coordinator and Kim McNeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>1-Dec</td>
<td>Complete course approval process and expectations</td>
<td>Acting GE 2.0 Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>1-Dec</td>
<td>Job Description and Hiring Authorization for Admin Assistant</td>
<td>Acting GE 2.0 Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>1-Dec</td>
<td>Register team for HLC’s Workshop on Assessing General Education (to be held in KC on Feb. 20-21, 2018)</td>
<td>Acting GE 2.0 Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>15-Dec</td>
<td>Initial Faculty Development Modules completed</td>
<td>Acting GE 2.0 Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Dec</td>
<td>15-Dec</td>
<td>Communication regarding course approval process and expectations</td>
<td>Acting GE 2.0 Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Nov</td>
<td>15-Dec</td>
<td>Establish Search Committee for GE Director</td>
<td>GE Coordinator and Kim McNeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>15-Dec</td>
<td>Transition Timeline (GE 1.0 --&gt; GE 2.0)</td>
<td>Acting GE 2.0 Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jan</td>
<td>19-Jan</td>
<td>FaCET Session on GE 2.0</td>
<td>FaCET Director and Acting GE 2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jan</td>
<td>1-Feb</td>
<td>Job Announcement for FYE Coord</td>
<td>GE Coordinator and Kim McNeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jan</td>
<td>1-Feb</td>
<td>Establish Search Committee for FYE Coordinator</td>
<td>GE Coordinator and Kim McNeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28-Feb</td>
<td>Send team to HLC’s Workshop on Assessing General Education (to be held in KC on Feb. 20-21, 2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Feb</td>
<td>1-Mar</td>
<td>Develop Initial Course Development Work Groups</td>
<td>Acting GE2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jan</td>
<td>1-Mar</td>
<td>Training for Admissions Staff</td>
<td>Acting GE2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Feb</td>
<td>1-Mar</td>
<td>Training for Advisors</td>
<td>Acting GE2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Feb</td>
<td>1-Mar</td>
<td>Training for Student Affairs Staff</td>
<td>Acting GE2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jan</td>
<td>1-Mar</td>
<td>Determine processes and policies for students (transfer, stop-out, returning)</td>
<td>Acting GE2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jan</td>
<td>1-Mar</td>
<td>Service Agreements with Discipline-Specific Departments for Foundations courses</td>
<td>Acting GE2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jan</td>
<td>15-Mar</td>
<td>Spring Orientations</td>
<td>FaCET Director and Acting GE 2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Feb</td>
<td>1-Apr</td>
<td>Training for Unit Specific Recruitment Staff</td>
<td>Acting GE2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Feb</td>
<td>1-Apr</td>
<td>Meetings with Community Colleges</td>
<td>Kim McNeley, Benjamin Howard, GE Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Feb</td>
<td>1-Apr</td>
<td>Interviews for Director</td>
<td>Search Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jan</td>
<td>15-Apr</td>
<td>Applications for Curriculum Review Panels due to Provost by April 15</td>
<td>Acting GE2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jan</td>
<td>15-Apr</td>
<td>Survey Academic Units to Determine their Needs</td>
<td>GE Coordinator and Kim McNeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Mar</td>
<td>1-May</td>
<td>Interviews for FYE Coordinator</td>
<td>Search Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb</td>
<td>15-May</td>
<td>Course Development</td>
<td>Course Development Work Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Apr</td>
<td>15-May</td>
<td>Provost appoints curriculum review panelists</td>
<td>Provost, Provost Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Mar</td>
<td>1-Jun</td>
<td>Search for Admin Assistant (or wait until summer so Director and FYE Coor can hire?)</td>
<td>Acting GE2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>Faculty Orientations</td>
<td>Acting GE2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Task Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Jul</td>
<td>1-Jul</td>
<td>Director Start</td>
<td>Acting GE2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jul</td>
<td>1-Jul</td>
<td>FYE Coordinator Start</td>
<td>Acting GE2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior semester</td>
<td>1-Jul</td>
<td>Submit for review to MDHE proposal for “Native” UMKC GE 2.0 Program</td>
<td>Kim McNeley, Benjamin Howard, GE Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior semester</td>
<td>31-Aug</td>
<td>Training for Curriculum Review Panelists</td>
<td>Director and Acting GE2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jul</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>Community Constituents (FYE planning)</td>
<td>FYE Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summer 2018**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prior semester</td>
<td>15-Aug</td>
<td>Course Proposals Due to GE Director</td>
<td>FaCET Director and Acting GE 2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Aug</td>
<td>15-Sep</td>
<td>FaCET Session on GE 2.0</td>
<td>FaCET Director, GE 2.0 Director and Acting GE 2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Sep</td>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>Job Descriptions and Hiring Authorization for GE2.0 NTTs</td>
<td>Director, FYE Coordinator and GE 2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Sep</td>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>Establish GE 2.0 Executive Committee</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Sep</td>
<td>1-Nov</td>
<td>Course Reviews</td>
<td>Curriculum Review Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>1-Nov</td>
<td>Establish Search Committee for GE2.0 NTTs</td>
<td>Director, FYE Coordinator and GE 2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>Training for GE 2.0 Exec</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Sep</td>
<td>1-Dec</td>
<td>Complete Community College Articulations</td>
<td>Kim McNeley, Benjamin Howard, GE Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>1-Dec</td>
<td>Develop Student Contract/Opt-In</td>
<td>Director, FYE Coordinator and Kim McNeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>1-Dec</td>
<td>Reproreact degree audits and major maps</td>
<td>Director, Kim McNeley, Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Sep</td>
<td>31-Dec</td>
<td>Schedule for Fall 2019</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>31-Dec</td>
<td>Training for Unit Specific Recruitment Staff</td>
<td>Director and FYE Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>31-Dec</td>
<td>Training for Advisors</td>
<td>Director, FYE Coordinator and Kim McNeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior semester</td>
<td>31-Dec</td>
<td>Training for Student Affairs Staff</td>
<td>Director and FYE Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior semester</td>
<td>31-Dec</td>
<td>Community Constituents (FYE planning)</td>
<td>FYE Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct</td>
<td>31-Dec</td>
<td>Determine Unit Faculty for Fall 2019 GE courses</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Nov</td>
<td>31-Dec</td>
<td>Develop Gen Ed website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jan</td>
<td>20-Jan</td>
<td>FaCET Session on GE 2.0</td>
<td>FaCET Director, GE 2.0 Director and GE 2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jan</td>
<td>31-Jan</td>
<td>Orientation Training</td>
<td>Director, FYE Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jan</td>
<td>1-Mar</td>
<td>Develop contracts/agreements with units for long-term faculty teaching GE courses</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jan</td>
<td>1-Mar</td>
<td>Course Development Trainings</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Feb</td>
<td>1-Apr</td>
<td>Interviews for GE 2.0 NTTs</td>
<td>Search Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Feb</td>
<td>1-Apr</td>
<td>Develop student surveys and faculty reflection format</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Feb</td>
<td>1-Apr</td>
<td>Finalize Assessment Plans</td>
<td>Director, Assessment Director, GE2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Feb</td>
<td>1-May</td>
<td>Faculty Orientations (Trainings)</td>
<td>Director, FYE Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Feb</td>
<td>31-May</td>
<td>Onboarding for FYE faculty</td>
<td>FYE Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior semester</td>
<td>15-Aug</td>
<td>Course Proposals Due to GE Director</td>
<td>FaCET Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Aug</td>
<td>31-Aug</td>
<td>Launch!</td>
<td>FaCET Director, GE 2.0 Director and GE 2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Aug</td>
<td>15-Sep</td>
<td>FaCET Session on GE 2.0</td>
<td>FaCET Director, GE 2.0 Director and GE 2.0 Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Sep</td>
<td>1-Nov</td>
<td>Course Reviews</td>
<td>Curriculum Review Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Sep</td>
<td>1-Dec</td>
<td>Implement Assessment Plan</td>
<td>Director, Assessment Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>