

Problems with Current approach to GEC Limitations
Arts and Letters Division
1/7/09
Nancy Knowles

Points reviewed and agreed upon during the meeting:

- The prerequisites are needed. Programs encouraged to eliminate them to protect the number and variety of enrollments are adversely impacting curriculum.
- Because EOU is a small institution, General Education makes a difference to programs' ability to offer upper-division courses because it encourages enrollments at the upper-division. Restricting General Education to the lower-division will make EOU more like a community college, and fewer faculty members will be able to offer upper-division courses in their specialties.
- The attempt to limit General Education based on level adversely impacts EOU's particular student population with significant numbers of non-tradition, returning, and transfer students, particularly online. To be engaged and successful learners, students need to be challenged, and upper-division General Education allows these students to work successfully at their level.
- The "problems" EPCC is attempting to solve by limiting the number of GEC courses will not be solved as programs use the exceptions to maintain their current GEC offerings. This attempt represents just one more way in which EOU requires busywork from already overloaded faculty in defense of programs they have repeatedly defended.

Other points that came up during or after the meeting:

- We haven't had time to study the impact of these changes.
- The changes ignore different approaches to lower-level coursework occurring across disciplines. While they allow sequences (Biology and Chemistry), they don't allow prerequisites that ensure students moving from 100- to 200-level courses have the appropriate preparation (Art and English), thus eliminating courses included in General Education across the nation.
- Upper-division General Education encourages students to enroll in courses outside their majors, which enriches the pool of students in upper-division courses in each discipline.
- The limitations result from a reductive definition of General Education, that courses included in the GEC ought to be somehow "basic" ("general"). General Education can also be defined as having a liberal arts education grounded in discipline-specific work across a broad range of disciplines ("general"). Until the university resolves this definition, there is no point in making yet another arbitrary change to General Education that will result in accreditation problems and the need for paperwork yet again.