

Curriculum Review Best Practices:
Toward a Synthesis of the Gen Ed Review Process at
The University of Denver
Prepared by the Academic Planning Committee of Faculty Senate

This document provides a review of the General Education Review process leading to DU's current Common Curriculum and suggested best practices gleaned from the process. A short survey of department chairs, interviews of General Education Review Committee members, various academic department chairs, and dissenters from approval for the new Common Curriculum were conducted for this review. The following notes were created to provide guidance for future endeavors of this nature. The Academic Planning Committee would like to thank all who gave time in reflection on this process.

Summary of General Education Review

- I. Summary of how discussions and feedback was solicited from faculty in the 2007-2009 review process:
 - a) A Gen. Ed. review committee was set up by the Provost that included faculty representatives of all academic divisions, two representatives from the APC of faculty senate and several administrative personnel. Luc Beaudoin was appointed chair of the committee and convener of meetings.
 - b) Email questions were sent out to all faculty soliciting a larger set of input around 4 questions regarding the then current General Education format
 - (1) What role should DU's general education curriculum play in achieving the aims of DU's Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes? (The Outcomes are available at <http://www.du.edu/assessment/UGoutcomesfinal.pdf>.)
 - (2) How well does the current general education structure achieve these aims?
 - (3) What could be changed to the current general education structure to make it better achieve those goals?
 - (4) What is the relationship of the major to the general education curriculum?
 - c) Emails continued to flow in first months and were filtered according to need and who might best consider the feedback.
 - d) Portfolio Site established (still open): All faculty had access to the work being done and posted on Portfolio
 - e) Feedback forwarded along to entire committee when requested by sender
 - f) Some emails were not of content nature so were not forwarded
 - g) Most feedback was received "in the first few months," and seemed to come to a halt 6 months in, until Dean Saitta offered his counter proposal in winter 2009
 - h) All conversations and ideas reportedly were discussed openly with the entire committee; no side sub-groups

