

DATE: February 28, 2007

TO: Eric Ruckh, Ph.D., Chair, BRIDGE Committee

FROM: Janice R.W. Joplin, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
School of Business

RE: Review of BRIDGE Proposals

The Curriculum and CCIT committees of the School of Business were asked to review the three proposals under consideration for General Education requirements. The following comments on each proposal reflect committee input and my review.

Learning Communities

Strengths: The proposal has some overlap with a proposed business core curriculum that is being developed in the School of Business (e.g., gateway course).

Weaknesses: This proposal may be the most demanding in terms of required resources for implementation. The “Other Requirements” (i.e., Intergroup Relations, Service Learning, Information Literacy) are worthy of consideration, however, the service learning component may be extremely cumbersome to implement.

Integrated Core

Strengths: This proposal stretches the boundaries of the current general education requirements. The thinking is creative and unique.

Weakness: The ability to gain and maintain momentum on a long-term basis may be difficult. This is particularly true for the Integrated LAS courses where long-term coordination and personnel hours will be required to maintain the original intent.

Integrated and Universal Essential Education (Distributed Model)

Strengths: The proposal tackles both skills and breadth of knowledge. The implementation of this proposal is likely to be achievable with fewer new resource demands. The capability of spreading out resource needs across colleges/schools seems more likely with this proposal.

Weakness: The “distribution” may also be a weakness in that it may be difficult to gain momentum throughout the sequencing of the courses.