

November 2001

Minutes November 26, 2001

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/senate_minutes

Recommended Citation

"Minutes November 26, 2001" (2001). *Minutes*. 15.
http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/senate_minutes/15

MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

1. The special meeting of the University Senate of November 26, 2001 was called to order by the moderator, Mr. Palmer, at 4:07 p.m. in Room 7, Bishop Center.
2. The amendment submitted by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to the W and Q section, "CLAS W and Q Amendment" of Part One: Competencies of the "Proposal for General Education Requirements, University of Connecticut, 5.3.2001" was under discussion.
3. Mr. Zirakzadeh moved to amend the amendment and it was seconded.

"(1) that the current section "c" that deals with the topics of portfolios, capstone courses, etc., be dropped, and
(2) that a new section "c" be inserted, which states:

'Every undergraduate will be required to take at least one writing-intensive course during his or her final sixty units of study. This course does not have any credit-hour restriction, but it is to be in the student's major field of study. It will count as one of the two required writing-intensive courses that every undergraduate student must complete before graduation.'

In the discussion, Ms. Bramble expressed concern about the effect on Bachelor of General Studies students. Mr. Miller asked about the effect on dual majors. Mr. Kessel asked if 299 courses were included, to which, Mr. Zirakzadeh replied yes.

The motion to amend the amendment carried.

4. Mr. Zirakzadeh moved to amend the amendment, and it was seconded, that

"the writing-intensive course mentioned under 'c' shall be taught by an in-residence, tenure, or tenure-track faculty, and it cannot be taught by any person currently enrolled as either a graduate or undergraduate student at the University of Connecticut."

Mr. G. Anderson asked about adjunct faculty. Mr. Zirakzadeh replied that he wanted fully committed people. Mr. DeWolf asked if Lecturers were included. Mr. Maryanski said that, as written, Lecturers were excluded. Mr. Knox suggested that the motion be withdrawn, perhaps to be resubmitted without a list of possible teachers. Ms. Bridges said adjunct faculty are needed.

The motion to amend the amendment was defeated.

5. Mr. Zirakzadeh moved to amend the amendment, and it was seconded, that

"the writing-intensive course mentioned under 'c' shall not be taught by any person currently enrolled as either a graduate or undergraduate student at the University of Connecticut."

Mr. Sidney asked about people who are students at other schools.

The motion to amend the amendment carried.

6. Mr. Zirakzadeh moved, and it was seconded, that

"the writing-intensive course related to the student's major field of study under 'c' shall not have a class size greater than 25."

Mr. G. Anderson asked about large lectures with smaller writing sections. Ms. Roberts said that the General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC) will handle the details. Mr. Zirakzadeh replied that the Committee is not qualified to handle class size pressure from the administration. Mr. Knox suggested that the amendment be changed to a faculty-student ratio not greater than 1 in 25. Mr. G. Anderson advised the defeat of the amendment and then its resubmission in modified form.

The motion to amend the amendment failed.

7. Mr. Zirakzadeh moved to amend the amendment, and it was seconded, that

"the writing-intensive course related to the student's major field of study under 'c' shall not have a faculty-to-student ratio less than 1/25."

The motion to amend the amendment passed.

8. Mr. Zirakzadeh moved to amend the amendment, and it was seconded, that

"the writing intensive upper-division requirement shall be applied to only one major for a dual major or one degree for a dual degree candidate."

There was some discussion supporting the idea that two degrees should require the work of two degrees. Ms. Croteau asked who will decide in which department the course will be taken. Mr. Brown said that two courses would cause serious scheduling problems for students in Education.

The motion to amend the amendment failed 25 to 29.

9. Discussion returned to the CLAS amendment concerning Q and W courses as amended.

The "CLAS W and Q Amendment" to the "Proposal for General Education Requirements, University of Connecticut, 5.3.2001" passed, as amended.

10. Discussion now returned to the "Proposal for General Education Requirements, University of Connecticut, 5.3.2001," as amended.

Mr. Faustman asked how the "Second Language" requirement applied to students with two years of a high school language. Mr. English said that a shift from "seat time" to proficiency is being proposed. Mr. Faustman suggested that all students should take the examination.

Mr. Sidney said that the Q proficiency as stated is meaningless.

Ms. Rodin said that the students in the College of Continuing Studies would have problems with the language requirement. Options are needed for these students. Also, there are no foreign-language faculty at the regional campuses. Mr. Maryanski confirmed that there are no full-time language faculty at the regional campuses.

Mr. Frank said that the on-line based Q-test was not proctored and information from his students indicated that cheating was taking place.

At this point, Mr. Brown assumed the Chair as Moderator.

11. Mr. Frank moved and it was seconded that the word, proctored, be added to the section, Quantitative Skills, a. Entry Expectation., so that it reads:

"All entering students who have not demonstrated entry-level proficiency in mathematics with a math SAT score of 650 or higher, or who have not earned university credits in mathematics through a UCONN COOP course, or an appropriate score on the mathematics AP exam, will be required to take a **proctored** quantitative placement test."
[Proposed addition in boldface]

Mr. Frank suggested the use of passwords and having the tests taken at the high schools or the regional campuses. He said that the issue of the sufficiency of the entry level requirement needs to be discussed later.

The motion to amend passed.

12. Mr. Mannheim moved and it was seconded that the section labeled Second Language, b. Exit Proficiency be changed by adding a fourth method of demonstrating proficiency at the level of 3 years of second language study. The new section shall read

"having taken three years of a second language in high school."

Ms. von Hammerstein said that 3 years of language study means different things at different high schools. Mr. Allinson pointed out that there will be an initial two years of collecting data. In response to Mr. Cutlip's question, he said that the estimated annual cost will be \$30,000. Ms. Croteau said that the requirement will have a disproportionate effect on poor students. Mr. Schlichting said that high schools are not doing their job and the stricter requirement will have a positive effect. Mr. Mannheim asked why the test was needed. Ms. von Hammerstein said many high schools do not meet standards. Mr. Pickering said we are asking too much, there are too many hurdles. Mr. Stave asked why do students in other nations speak foreign languages, but not in the U.S.

Ms. Adam moved to end debate. The motion was seconded.

The motion to end debate passed.

Mr. Mannheim's motion to amend was defeated.

13. The meeting was adjourned at 6:08 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Uwe Koehn
Secretary

The following members and alternates were absent from the November 26, 2001 meeting:

Alissi, Albert	Halvorson, Peter	Schwab, Richard
Allenby, Edward	Hart, Ian	Schulster, Jerome
Anderson, Thomas	Hussein, Mohamed	Singha, Suman
Armstrong, Lawrence	Kendall, Debra	Spiggle, Susan
Aronson, Lorraine	Kobulnicky, Paul	Stwalley, William
Austin, Philip	Kurland, Michael	Terry, Thomas
Bowman, Larry	Miniutti, Peter	Thorson, Robert
Bravo-Ureta, Boris	Muirhead, Deborah	Triponey, Vicky
Cromley, Ellen	Paul, Jeremy	Usher, Kathleen
Currier, Danielle	Petersen, John	Wagner, David
Dauer, Steven	Pierce, C. Dennis	Wang, Tixiang
Faghri, Pouran	Reis, Sally	Wisensale, Steven
Goodwin, Paul	Saternow, Timothy	Woods, David
Gramling, Lawrence		

PROPOSAL FOR GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

5.3.2001

Introduction:

The Curricula and Courses Committee of the University Senate has reviewed the Task Force Report on General Education and numerous other documents and recommendations, most notably the alternative proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

The C and C Committee has debated the subject of General Education on a weekly basis since November, conducted two all university forums, invited and received feedback from each of the schools and colleges on campus, met with several Deans and their various staff, Vice-Provost Steele, and Chancellor Peterson.

While we find much in the Task Force Report that represents a significant contribution to the subject of General Education, we find that many of the recommendations do not enjoy the support of the university community. Likewise, the CLAS alternative proposal makes a strong case on several key points, particularly in the organization of content areas, but its recommendations are also not universally acceptable. The conflict between liberal education and general education is no where more evident than in the different responses various schools and colleges have offered to the original Task Force Report, and in the differences between the Task Force Recommendations and the CLAS Response.

It is important to point out from the outset that we have taken the feedback we have received very seriously, and have made many substantial changes to the original Task Force Report. Many of these changes are consistent with the recommendations of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Our approach has been to identify what similarities exist that the substantial portion of the University can support, identify a method of implementation that is appropriate, and move ahead with a recommendation.

We live in a complex university setting that does not enjoy a single undergraduate vision. The result is a complex set of needs, sometimes defined by accreditation requirements that differs significantly across the undergraduate landscape. These needs require as simple and uniform solution as possible.

We therefore have opted for those portions of the Task Force Report that reduce the number of credits in General Education, while at the same time maintaining the discipline-based content divisions in group requirements as suggested by the CLAS alternative. We believe this will continue to guarantee a broad, rigorous intellectual experience for all university students.

Consistent with the Task Force Report and the original principles set forth by the Ad Hoc Committee on General Education in 1985, we agree with the following statement:

The purpose of general education requirements is to ensure that all University of Connecticut undergraduate students become articulate, and acquire intellectual breadth and versatility, critical judgement, moral sensitivity, awareness of their era and society, consciousness of the diversity of human culture and experience, and a working understanding of the processes by which they can continue to acquire and use knowledge. It is vital to the accomplishment of the University's mission that a balance between professional and general education be established and maintained in which each is complementary to and compatible with the other.

There are several principles consistent with portions of both the Task Force Report and the CLAS proposal that the C and C Committee believes should support any effort in General Education. These include:

Universality. All students at the University of Connecticut should have the same General Education Requirements irrespective of their major, school or college. Schools and colleges may not limit students' choices within general education or require certain choices.

Accessibility. All students at the University of Connecticut should have timely access to General Education courses and support services.

Transferability. Students must be able to transfer from one school or college to another without having to repeat general education requirements. A procedure should be established for the smooth transition of students who transfer into the University from other institutions.

Regular Faculty Participation. Where feasible, GER courses should be taught by regular Faculty; resources should be allocated to promote this practice.

Consistent with our approach to evaluating the Task Force Report we are submitting our recommendation to the Senate divided into three parts:

One – Competencies

Two – Content Areas

Three – Oversight and Implementation

Part One Competencies:

The University of Connecticut places a high value on the ability of its undergraduates to demonstrate competency in five fundamental areas -- computer technology, writing, quantitative skills, second language proficiency and information literacy. The development of these competencies rests on establishing clear expectations for students both at entrance and upon graduation, and on constructing a framework so that our students can reach these competencies.

With the exception of information literacy, the structure of each competency involves two parts -- one mandating the establishment of an entry-level expectation and the second mandating the establishment of a graduation expectation. The entry-level expectations apply to all incoming students. The writing and quantitative expectations are consistent with our current entrance requirements. The expectation concerning second language proficiency is consistent with the current recommendation that students complete three years of a single language in high school. The character of the baseline expectations in computer technology remains to be fully fleshed out, but it is clear that the majority of our students enter the university with skills in this area. Lacking a demonstration of the requisite entry-level competency, students will have the opportunity to bring their skills to the appropriate level. The exit-level expectations for all five competencies, on the other hand, will vary with each major.

It is unreasonable to place the institutional responsibility for developing these competencies solely on individual courses. Therefore, a plan has been developed to enrich the instructional environment through the development of a Learning Center, a place where students can come for asynchronous learning supported by tutors, advisors, teaching assistants, peer preceptors and faculty as well as through the use of technology. Faculty members should begin undergraduate classes with a summary of the competencies and proficiencies that a student will need to bring to the subject matter. Students can avail themselves of the services within the Learning Center to bring their skill levels up to faculty expectations.

Skill Codes

The C and C committee has adopted the view that skill designations are inappropriate drivers of enrollment with the result that most students take "W" or "Q" courses for no other reason than the skill designation. At the same time, however we find the Task Force recommendation for eliminating all skill codes and requiring all GER courses to require a major writing component to be unduly burdensome. In addition, we view quantitative reasoning skills to be as important as written communication skills. We are therefore propose that both writing and quantitative skills be imbedded into the various courses offered within the content areas of The GER.

Courses approved for the content areas of the GER will have a significant writing requirement OR a component that deals with quantitative reasoning. Each GER course will be designated as either a "W" or a "Q" course. Each student will be required to take at least two courses designated as "W" and two courses that are designated as "Q". The remaining two courses may be taken at the student's discretion. (Thus, a given student might take three "W's" and three "Q's", or four of one designation and two of the other.) This allows for flexibility relative to the individual interests of the students.

Computer Technology

a. Entry Expectations. Baseline expectations will be established for entering students in regard to the use of computers. While we would expect that many students will enter with skills at or above the baseline expectations, the university will have to be prepared to address the needs of those who do not. These needs may be met in a variety of ways (for example, during the First Year Experience). The General Education Oversight Committee, (GEOC) will establish a sub-committee to determine in more precise terms exactly what these expectations will be.

b. Exit Expectations. Each major will establish expectations about the information technology competencies of its graduates and will build the development of these into the major curriculum. These departmental requirements must be approved at the college or school level, in the same way that new upper-division courses are approved.

Writing

a. Entry Proficiency. Freshman English

1. Placement options for first year students at all University of Connecticut campuses:

AP Scores: Students who receive a 4 or 5 on the English Composition Advanced Placement Exam or the Literature Advanced Placement Exam receive 4 credits for Freshman English, thereby fulfilling the requirement.

Honors: Honors Students may choose English 250, a three-credit seminar taught by full-time faculty, to fulfill the Freshman English requirement.

SAT Placement Scores: Students with a Verbal SAT (VSAT) score of 430 and below are automatically placed in English 104. There is no pre-class appeal. Student writing is evaluated after the first week of the term. In rare cases it is possible, based on that writing and with the approval of the Director of Freshman English, for a student to be moved into an English 110 or 111 section.

Students with VSAT scores of 440-540 have the option to enroll in either English 104 or English 110 or 111. Student writing is evaluated after the first week of the semester and all inconsistencies brought to the attention of the Director of Freshman English. At this point a student may be placed in a course more appropriate to his or her writing. All

students who remain in English 104 must pass that course in order to move on to English 110 or 111.

Students with VSAT Scores above 540 may enroll in either English 110 or 111.

2. Connecticut Community College Transfer Students:

There is an articulation agreement with each community college that prescribes which two, three-credit community college courses fulfill UConn's Freshman English requirement. (Four of these six credits count toward the four credit Freshman English requirement; the other two credits come in as elective.)

3. Transfer students from other Connecticut colleges and from out-of-state:

These students will be assessed on a case-by-case basis by the Director of Freshman English.

b. Writing in General Education:

The C and C Committee has considered very carefully two fundamentally different approaches regarding writing: first, the proposal for a writing requirement to be imbedded in the general education curriculum as suggested by the Task Force Report; and second, the maintenance of separate "W" requirements as proposed by CLAS.

We agree with the Task Force Report that skill codes are inappropriate drivers for enrollments. It has been demonstrated many times that there have never been sufficient "W" seats available to UCONN students. In addition, the current "W" designation often drives students into courses in which they have no interest in the content. By most accounts it is a system that is broken and not likely to improve.

We are unconvinced, however, that a "Writing Across the Curriculum" model as proposed by the Task Force is workable, or even appropriate in all areas of study. Therefore, we propose an alternative approach to "Writing Across the Curriculum" which includes a "W" component.

In each 3-credit general education course designated as a "W" course there will be a minimum of 12 pages of writing. While instruction in writing need not be an intrinsic element of such courses, instructors will make clear their expectations that student writing meet a standard of performance based on the type of writing done in that field. In an effort to improve the students' writing and critical thinking skills, students will be expected to make use of feedback from their instructors, either through the revising and resubmitting of papers or through the completion of a number of short writing assignments (such as lab reports). In most cases the writing will be in English; when appropriate, some percentage of this writing may be completed in another language.

Because there will in all probability continue to be General Education courses with large enrollments, such writing instruction will demand administrative backing in order to provide the necessary instructional support. In such cases, an appropriate number of teaching assistants or graders must be supplied on all University campuses for meaningful evaluation of student writing to take place. The faculty member in charge of each course will be expected to inform the assistants of the writing expectations for that course and to monitor the grading of student assignments.

The Curricula and Courses Committee has serious concerns regarding implementation of this portion of the proposal, particularly with respect to the financial considerations implied in the assignment of graduate assistants.

c. Upper-division Writing and Exit Expectations:

Each school, college, and major will mandate writing for its upper-division students. This requirement can be met in a number of ways --- for example, a discipline-based course with an intensive writing component, a senior research project or capstone experience, or the development of a writing portfolio based on writing assignments completed across the major courses. In all cases the expectation is that students will graduate with the writing and critical thinking skills appropriate to their field.

d. University Writing Center

Any comprehensive restructuring of UConn's undergraduate writing requirements must include the creation of a University Writing Center. A tenured faculty member whose specialty is writing instruction will be appointed by the English Department to run this Center, which will be included within The Learning Center. The Writing Center will provide tutorial support for undergraduate and graduate students in every school and college. The Director of the UWC will recruit and train graduate and undergraduate tutors from across the disciplines, and, working with the Linguistics Department, will develop an ESL Center to provide writing support for students and faculty members experiencing difficulties with writing English as a second language. All instructors will be able to refer undergraduate and graduate students with serious writing problems to the University Writing Center.

Quantitative Skills

a. Entry Expectations.

The present admission requirement for quantitative skills is the satisfactory completion of second-year high school algebra and first year geometry. Students are strongly encouraged, however, to take four years of mathematics in high school. This proposal does not modify current admission requirements. All entering students who have not demonstrated entry-level proficiency in mathematics with a math SAT score of 650 or higher, or who have not earned university credits in mathematics through a UCONN COOP course, or an appropriate score on the mathematics AP exam, will be required to take a quantitative placement test. Students who do not attain a passing grade on the quantitative placement test will be required to enroll in Mathematics 101 to satisfy entry level expectations in mathematics proficiency.

b. Quantitative skills in General Education.

In each 3-4 credit general education course designated as a "Q" course there will be an expectation of some major component of quantitative reasoning. This is not to be confused with a mathematics requirement, strictly speaking. In an effort to improve the students' quantitative thinking skills, the courses will incorporate issues such as problem solving strategies, externalization using pictures, graphs and charts, probability, statistical analysis, mathematical modeling, deductive reasoning, hypothesis testing, etc. A sub-committee of Faculty appointed by the GEOC will be asked to set specific criteria for courses with a "Q" designation.

c. Exit Proficiency.

All students graduating from the University of Connecticut are expected to demonstrate proficiency in quantitative reasoning. Majors in particular schools and colleges may require proficiency at a more advanced level.

d. University Learning Center.

The University will provide resources for the support of tutors, advisors and faculty well-versed in quantitative skills as part of a University Learning Center.

Second Language

a. Entry Expectations.

The present admission requirement for second language skills is two years of study in a second language in high school or the equivalent. Students are strongly encouraged, however, to take three or more years of the same second language by the time they complete high school. This proposal does not modify current admission requirements.

b. Exit Proficiency.

By graduation from the University, students must have achieved language proficiency in speaking, listening, reading and writing consistent with 3 years of second language study in high school. This may be demonstrated in one of the following ways:

1. an AP score of 3 or higher or a score of 4 or higher on the BYU Computer Adaptive Placement Examination -- no additional course work is required to meet the university requirement, although some degree programs may specify more advanced work;
2. completion of the second semester of elementary language study, which may be taken for credit.
3. a minimum of one semester study abroad in a language program approved by the appropriate language department as the equivalent of second-semester skill level.

American students who are native speakers of languages other than English (including American Sign Language) will be accommodated by the appropriate department. International students who are native speakers of languages other than English may fulfill the second language requirement through proficiency in English.

Many majors expect students to attain a higher level of second language proficiency than the minimum for graduation. Each school or college will determine the level of proficiency; the demonstration of proficiency should not be tied exclusively to seat-time.

All students are strongly encouraged to integrate their second language with their major or other studies, and departments are strongly encouraged to develop such opportunities for their students. Mechanisms for doing so will be developed and overseen by the student's major department in collaboration with Modern and Classical Languages. Students may link their second language to their major, to elective courses, or to co-curricular interests. Such mechanisms may include but are not limited to the following: Linkage Through Language courses, research involving use of the second language, internships and other work experience, travel, immersion courses, or study abroad.

All students who meet a level of language proficiency beyond the minimum needed for graduation will have that level noted on their transcript. In addition, students who have successfully integrated language with other elements of their education will have this noted on their transcript.

Because a demonstration of second language proficiency is a change from the current situation, a transition period is necessary. For the next two years, students will be required either to take the AP test before entrance or to take the BYU test at entrance, with the goal of gathering data on their proficiency. This data will measure the impact of the proposed change and will also allow the University to pass information about the results of language instruction to the high schools. Before the new requirements are permanently adopted, an assessment of their impact will be made and the units delivering language instruction will certify that they can handle the outcome of the change.

The University acknowledges that second semester proficiency in a language is not optimal. Our long-term goal is to produce graduates who can use a second language to accomplish career or personal goals. This will require, however, that there be more attention to second language study in elementary and secondary schools. Thus, we encourage the University to work with the appropriate organizations to improve K-12 second language instruction. When this collaboration improves the language abilities of incoming students, third or fourth semester proficiency should become the standard.

Information Literacy:

Information literacy implies a general understanding of and competence in three integrally related processes:

Information generation -- an understanding of how Information is created, disseminated and organized;

Information access -- an understanding of knowledge communication processes and a facility with the tools required to tap into these knowledge communication processes;

Information evaluation and integration -- an ability to evaluate, synthesize and incorporate information into written, oral and media presentations.

Exit Expectations.

Our graduates will be competent in information generation, information access, and information evaluation and integration. The University Libraries will create a series of interactive learning modules that will equip students with the information competencies that they need to succeed at the University of Connecticut. These modules will be integrated into the orientation program, the First Year Experience program and/or the first year composition courses. They will also be available for asynchronous learning at any time in the Library or The Learning Center, and at the regional campuses.

Each major program will consider the information literacy competencies required of its graduates and build those expectations into the upper level research and writing curricula of the major. The subject area specialist at the University Library will provide support.

PART TWO: Content Areas:

There will be three content Areas:

Group One – Arts and Humanities. Six credits.

Group Two – Social Sciences. Six credits.

Group Three – Science and Technology. Six to seven credits.

The C and C Committee agrees with the CLAS proposal that this organizing principle is advisable for the following reasons:

1. It is discipline based, and does necessarily depend on the invention of a substantial number of new courses.
2. It establishes a mechanism for monitoring general education instruction within presently available academic structures.
3. Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences, and Science and Technology are recognizable content areas similar to the current groupings.
4. It reduces the number of University GER Content courses from 10 to 6.

All courses offered for the General Education Requirements must be approved by the General Education Oversight Committee. (See section Three).

Content Area Principles:

The C and C Committee believes the General Education curriculum should entail a breadth of academic experience for all students, while at the same time providing an intellectually rigorous and challenging set of courses.

There must be a significant commitment to several principles:

1. Multiculturalism and Diversity

First, in this increasingly interconnected world, our students must be able to understand, appreciate, and function in cultures other than their own, whether "their own" is defined on a local, regional, national, or continental basis. The Curricula and Courses Committee seriously considered the proposal for creating a "D" skill designation for so-called "D" courses to be required as part of the GER. However, we concluded a "D" designation would separate, indeed isolate, rather than integrate the broad array of multicultural and diversity-related topics. Our conclusion is that diversity related issues are of sufficient importance to the entire university community that they must be imbedded across the General Education Curriculum.

However, Understanding the different emphases among the courses in the three content areas, the C and C Committee recognized that issues related to diversity, multiculturalism, ethics and social bias can be addressed in different ways in different courses. (For example, in some Group Three courses the focus may be on the social ethics of scientific inquiry and the relationship of public policy to scientific and technological practice.)

As a guideline toward the development of an awareness of and appreciation for diversity, the committee identified the following four themes: (a) recognizing that there are varieties of human experiences and perceptions, (b) developing an awareness of social power; (c) understanding that interpretive systems and social structure are cultural creations; and (d) appreciating the commonalities that cut across differences.

2. Introductory Courses.

All courses approved for the GER should generally be at an introductory level. They can include both discipline-based and introductory and interdisciplinary courses.

3. Universality.

Each department or school may propose courses for any of the three content areas. All courses approved for the GER must be valid for all schools and colleges of the University of Connecticut. This in no way inhibits the various schools and colleges, departments or programs from setting up additional internal requirements.

4. Other operating regulations and procedures would include:

- a. All students would be required to take a minimum of two courses from each Group for a minimum of six credits. Normally the six credits required as a minimum for each group will be met by two three-credit courses. However, in Group One, one-credit performance courses may be constructed. Students may use no more than three credits of such courses to meet the requirement. In addition, each one-credit performance course must have a four page writing requirement, so that a three credit performance sequence would maintain the 12 page writing requirement of a three credit "W" course.

- b. As a part of General Education, all students will be required to take six unencumbered elective credits. These credits cannot be used to fulfill a student's major, programic, or General Education content area requirements.
- c. No more than one course (with the exception of one-credit performance classes) may be taken in the same department or program.
- d. Content area courses may be counted toward the major. However, no more than one course from any department may be counted toward the GER.
- e. In Group Three, one of the courses must be a laboratory course of 4 or more credits. However, this laboratory requirement is waived for students who have completed a laboratory science course in the biological, physical chemical, or behavioral sciences.
- f. Any AA graduate of a GEOC-agreed community college degree program would have satisfied all general education requirements.
- g. General education courses should be delivered by faculty members. Whenever possible, class sizes should be limited to permit direct interactions between students and faculty.
- h. All courses offered for GER credit must be approved by the GEOC. There will be no rollover of existing course offerings. Procedures for course approval are listed under Section Three.
- i. INTD courses may be offered for inclusion in General Education. Each INTD course must be approved by the GEOC, and must be placed in only one of the three content areas. No more than six credits with the INTD prefix may be elected by any student to meet the General Education Requirements.
- j. No school of college may set enrollment bars or priorities for their own students for any GER course.
- k. Undergraduate students with Bachelor's degrees from accredited institutions are exempt from the GER.
- l. Courses approved for the GER may have no prerequisites (with the possible exception of other general education courses).

While many courses may require both quantitative reasoning and writing, and indeed the C and C Curriculum applauds the efforts of those faculty who do so, for the purposes of order and clarity there will be no multiple designations. This in no way should inhibit departments from requiring writing in their "Q" offerings or quantitative analysis in their "W" courses.

PART THREE: Oversight and Implementation

The curriculum in degree programs remains vibrant and alive because faculty members constantly attend to it. They debate what is essential and what is optional to a degree program; they assess how the character of individual courses contributes to the whole; and they consider whether courses are properly sequenced relative to one another. If a general education curriculum is to avoid almost instantaneous ossification, it requires a similar level of faculty involvement and on-going attention. Given the responsibilities of the Senate Courses & Curriculum Committee, it is unreasonable to expect this body to add such oversight to their charge.

Therefore, the Committee proposes the creation of a General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC), a faculty group appointed by the Senate and representative of the schools and colleges. This committee will monitor the general education curriculum. This will require a change in the University By-Laws. The creation of a Senate-appointed committee recognizes the policy control of the Senate in matters relating to undergraduate education. This committee will work in association with the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction because this office has university-wide responsibility for the health of undergraduate education and the fiscal resources to address emerging issues. A member of the Vice-Provost's office will be a non-voting member of the committee. Financial support for the activity of the GEOC will come from the Office of the Chancellor.

The GEOC will be charged with:

- reviewing of the university-wide general education program to ensure that its goals are being met;
- development of policy regarding the delivery of the university-wide general education program;
- determining the resources necessary to deliver the new GER. (Number of seats per content area per year, etc.);
- setting the criteria for entrance and exit requirements for all five of the skill areas;
- setting the criteria for approving all course proposals for the Three Content areas;
- approving and monitoring the courses offered in the GER;

New courses, once they have been approved by the GEOC will be submitted to the Senate C and C Committee for formal approval and submission to the Senate. Existing courses, once they have been approved by the GEOC, will be submitted directly to the Senate for final approval.

The membership of the GEOC should be broadly representative across all of the schools and colleges consistent with current nominating committee practice; faculty who are central to the delivery of GER courses should be appropriately represented. There should also be undergraduate student representation. While its members will be appointed by the Senate, the process of consultation should include the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction. Terms of appointment to the GEOC would be two years, except in the case of student members where one-year terms may be more appropriate. In addition, one half of the first group of GEOC members shall be appointed for one year to ensure some overlap in membership from year to year. Normally no member shall serve more than two terms of two years each without taking off from the committee for at least two years.

Although general education courses serve a university-wide audience, at the moment no university-level administrative structure is in place to attend to them. The faculty members on the GEOC will attend to broad policy issues, but they do not have the time to ensure the implementation of their decisions. We propose the creation of a director for general education to be chosen by the Chancellor from a list of candidates approved by the Senate Nominating Committee. The Director of General Education will provide leadership to the GEOC, will work with the GEOC on identifying issues and concerns, and will take care of the administrative details surrounding the general education curriculum. It is desirable to give the faculty chair of the GEOC a 50%-time directorship as well as administrative support. The Director will serve a three-year term, not to be renewed.

Faculty members involved in general education have different pedagogical challenges than those facing instructors in major or graduate courses. These faculty members should be brought

together on a regular basis to collaborate on issues concerning the delivery of these courses. This can be accomplished by the director of GEOC, who will organize their regular meetings. These meetings will provide the kind of on-going discussion necessary to keep this part of the curriculum vibrant and vital.

IMPLEMENTATION:

Beginning in the fall of 2001, pending approval by the University Senate, the GEOC will be formed to begin the process of implementation. The following steps should take place in order to facilitate a smooth transition to the new GER.

1. The GEOC shall establish a set of faculty sub-committees to determine and continue to review entrance and exit expectations for each of the five skill areas.
2. The GEOC shall establish three faculty sub-committees to establish the criteria for all courses to be approved for each of the Content Areas. Each of these sub-committees must be representative of all the Schools and Colleges, and should be limited to a workable number.
3. Once the criteria for each of the Content Areas is developed and accepted by the GEOC, they must be submitted to the Senate for final approval.
4. Once criteria are approved by the Senate, courses may be submitted to the GEOC for approval and listing in one of the three Content Areas. After no more than one year of course submissions and approvals have taken place, the GEOC will submit the entire menu to the University Senate for final approval.
5. At this time there shall be an evaluation made by the Budget Committee of the Senate to determine:
 - a. if sufficient seats and resources exist to handle the undergraduate enrollment;
 - b. if academic resources, particularly T.A's to assist in "W" courses are available to meet enrollment demands;
 - c. if the Learning Center has been adequately funded to support the GER.

Once these conditions are met, the new GER will be introduced to incoming freshman the following Fall Semester, or as soon as deemed possible for the purposes of publication and scheduling.