Faculty participated as a “committee of the whole” in each step of the process, from investigating possible directions to voting on the final curriculum model, and everything in between:

- established the skills, knowledge, and dispositions desired of our graduates
- drafted student learning outcomes
- determined appropriate size of core
- identified high-impact practices to incorporate
- designed all curricular elements
- approved final model

The Core Process Group promoted and facilitated an open, collaborative core development process, rather than craft a proposal in isolation.

- conducted research on curriculum design and development
- presented at campus faculty development workshops
- hosted meetings and workshops
- solicited input from individual faculty, academic departments, and other constituencies
- recruited faculty to lead workshops and participate in pilot programs
- synthesized feedback at each stage and reported results to full faculty

A variety of faculty development opportunities fostered an inclusive process.

- invited experts in curriculum design, pedagogy, and assessment to lead faculty workshops.
- Six different faculty groups attended national workshops and conferences to develop expertise in core curriculum design and assessment.
- Several faculty designed and led workshops on important curricular elements (e.g., first year seminars, undergraduate research, integrative course design).

**Inclusion**

- Faculty workshop to explore design elements and high-impact practices
- Core Process Group synthesizes feedback into curricula model options

**Persistence**

- Faculty workshop to discuss feedback from workshops
- Faculty workshop to develop new core curriculum model options
- Faculty workshop to discuss potential models

**Abstract**

Too often, campus leaders begin a general education reform process by assigning a committee to develop models to bring to the full faculty. All too often, and in some cases after years of effort, the proposal is ultimately voted down and the campus is back to square one. To avoid such a debacle, Wesley College chose a process in which a faculty group facilitated the process but did not direct the content of the new core. Instead, experts in general education reform were brought to campus for full faculty input and discussion. The result? A completely new core was developed and approved in a relatively short time period. This poster will describe this inclusive process for revising general education.

**Timeline**

**Planning**

- Spring, 2010: CAI and Faculty Governance attended AAC&U’s General Education & Assessment Conference, Seattle, WA
- Summer, 2010: Faculty Group attends Integrative Learning Workshop, Reading, VA

**Development**

- Fall, 2010: Full Faculty Workshop on core curriculum design
- Winter, 2011: Faculty Synthesis Group draft core outcomes based on faculty feedback from workshops
- March 28, 2011: Approval of Core Outcomes

**Implementation**

- Winter, 2012: Faculty attend AAC&U’s General Education & Assessment Conference
- Spring, 2012: Faculty elects Core Curriculum Committee; committee begins reviewing core course proposals
- Summer, 2012: Meetings to discuss revision of core on a degree program
- Fall, 2012: Core Process Group presents 3 potential models
- Winter, 2013: Faculty workshop to discuss revised model and other options
- February 27, 2014: Faculty Approves New Core Curriculum.