

Note: Please get agenda items for the October 14 Senate meeting to Bege Bowers, English, by 5 p.m. Thursday, October 1. Thanks again to Joan Bevan, Philosophy & Religious Studies, for transcribing the tapes of the May 27 meeting.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
Special Meeting, May 27, 1998

OVERVIEW:

Major topics presented/discussed: GER: resources; the ASC's report on the whole package; whether the "intensive" courses must be upper-division; GER requirements for associate degrees; subsequent review of courses approved for GER; whether to impose a maximum number of courses in categories B, C, D, and E; the vote on the model

Actions:

1. A motion to change page 1 (the summary) of the model as follows carried (p. 7 of these minutes): Writing-intensive and oral communication-intensive components are to be integrated in other courses at the upper-division level. Critical thinking-intensive components may be integrated at the lower-division or upper-division level.
2. The following motion carried (p. 8 of these minutes): add mathematics and speech to the categories listed under section II (Associate Degrees) and add to section II the stipulation "No more than one course counted toward the requirement may be in mathematics."
3. The following motion carried (p. 9 of these minutes): delete the line "Subsequent reviews and recertification shall be made every 5 years" from item M but maintain the rest of part M on page 2 of the ASC's May 27 Report to the Senate.
4. A motion to impose a maximum on the number of GER courses in categories B, C, D, and E was defeated (p. 13 of these minutes).
5. A motion to vote on the GER model by secret ballot was defeated (p. 15 of these minutes).
6. **A motion to adopt the general education model outlined in the summary page and the document distributed by the ASC, including item III, A-N, carried (with the amendments noted in actions 1, 2, and 3 above) (p. 15 of these minutes).**

CALL TO ORDER:

Jim Morrison, chair of the Academic Senate, called the meeting to order at 4:09 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

Minutes of the 6 May 1998 meeting were approved as distributed. Motion to accept by Tom Shipka; seconded by Brendan Minogue.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE/REPORT FROM THE SENATE CHAIR: Jim Morrison made the following announcements:

1. The Executive Committee has met and is two people short of filling faculty appointments to 1998-99 Senate committees; a complete list should be available by the June 3 Senate meeting.

Morrison invited the administration and student government to follow through with their appointments.

2. Morrison will meet Friday, 29 May, in Columbus with the Ohio Faculty Council; he will provide a brief report at the June Senate meeting.

Morrison announced the business of the May 27 special meeting: the report from the Academic Standards Committee, which was asked at the May 6 meeting to come forward with a complete GER package. He asked speakers to identify themselves at the microphones and to restrict remarks to three minutes per session.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE:

Charles Singler: At the May 6 meeting, the GER model was referred back to committee until the ASC could come forward with as complete a document as possible. I distributed through the Senate procedure a copy of the updated document, which includes on the cover page a summary outlining the GER model as acted upon through the last meeting. Clarifications and the amendments that have passed are incorporated in brackets within the model itself. Please make one editorial change that was addressed on April 8: under the Critical Thinking portion on page 2, line 8, “development” should read “developing.” Also, I included, behind the model, the ASC report to the Senate dated May 27, 1998.

For organizational purposes, let me explain how I intend to proceed. I will start with a status report from the ASC and then present a motion to adopt the model you have previously seen, along with the outline and part III of the ASC’s Report to the Senate, which addresses the GER Committee and coordinator.

[At this point, Singler read part I, part II, and the introduction to part IV from the ASC Report to the Senate, dated May 27, which was distributed to those on the Senate mailing list along with the GER outline and model.]

Singler continued: The ASC has not addressed, not deliberated, not discussed items 1–14 of part IV. It makes no recommendation to approve or disapprove, but rather brings the items forward for informational purposes. So there is no recommendation from the ASC about the job description of the coordinator. After addressing the issue of resources, I will move to adopt the general education model and part III, items A–N, under the Report to the Senate. Item O is a request to the Senate Constitution & Bylaws Committee to write and present language if all of that is adopted.

I will start with a recurring question that the ASC thought was important: I will ask each of the deans, on behalf of their colleges, to address the question of resources available in their respective colleges if this model and implementation package pass. Will any of the deans step forward—or the provost?

George McCloud (Dean, Fine & Performing Arts): The Department of Speech and Communication is undergoing program review. Among the key issues is how they will reorient themselves to undertake the responsibility this body has given them. A consultant is coming in tomorrow for the program-review process. Three full-time faculty lines with a history of

association with that department are, or soon will be, vacant, and those will certainly have to be examined as among the resources to be deployed in support of this commitment. The department believed this was the *right* thing to do--not the *easy* thing to do--and we understand the constraints we must respect as we work to undertake the responsibility you have given that department.

Barbara Brothers (Dean, Arts & Sciences): I have partially addressed the issue of GER and resources in the College. A&S has traditionally had the mission for delivering general education. Some people may not appreciate the fact that general education is not a money-making business. In fact, it behooves us to list as few courses as possible under general studies since general-studies courses receive an abysmally low state subsidy. We see the present proposal as an opportunity to clean house--as a way of making sure the courses we list for general education are for the appropriate audience. If you offer a traditional course, but you mix in the audience for general studies, you lose considerable subsidy, so we have made certain kinds of choices.

We received a \$200,000 NSF grant to proceed with the investigatory science lab for non-majors. That is a much more efficient way to deliver a science lab than mixing non-majors into traditional lab courses that would carry a great deal more subsidy if they were not a part of, and not used for, general education. We also considered resources when we decided that it would be more efficient for students to get certain computer applications (not the whole of what Computer Science and Information Systems would consider "computer literacy" but applications needed by all students) in courses in which they would already be enrolled (e.g., Composition). Computer Science does not have the faculty to deliver general education courses. They get paid at a rate that is a little better than some other departments get, and they cannot deliver general education courses.

I want to emphasize that you need to become aware of what the subsidy levels are. We look forward to streamlining our operations so that those classes designed for general education reach general education students and there is less bifurcation of audiences.

Also, I think cross-listing courses to take advantage of faculty from two different departments--or even from different colleges--is another way to maximize the opportunities for students and for faculty members to participate in general education. But at the same time, for subsidy purposes, we must make sure that those courses are for general education and that we don't create a double audience between majors (baccalaureate study) and general education.

Charles Stevens (Dean, Engineering): We don't have a main course in general education, so we don't have a resource problem. We do intend to develop some courses for technology and society, but we will be able to staff those with our current staff.

Jim Scanlon (Provost): When I made a statement to the Senate on February 4, as you began your conversations about the proposal for general education, I said it was my assumption that the final proposal will not require a substantial reallocation of resources. I don't mean to rule out the possibility of some reallocation. However, I would assume that units that propose courses under the new general education model would implicitly be making the statement as they propose those courses that they will reallocate--internal to themselves, certainly at the college level if not at the department level--the resources necessary to mount the courses they propose.

Singler: On behalf of Academic Standards Committee [and referring to the document distributed by mail], I **move to adopt the general education model as outlined in the summary page and the document on the following pages, including, new to you, item III in the May 27 Report to the Senate, which speaks to several items A through N concerning the coordinator for general education and the General Education Committee.**

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed.

(Tom Shipka raised a point of clarification: I am looking at page 1 of the document circulated for today's special meeting, entitled "Summary of GER Model." Under the listing of the categories and the number of courses appropriate to each category, there is a statement that "writing-intensive, oral communication-intensive, and critical thinking-intensive components are to be integrated in other courses at the upper-division level." The point of clarification I seek is this: As I listen to the debate and read the language in the model, I understand that some intensive courses--courses qualifying as writing-intensive, oral communication-intensive, and certainly critical thinking-intensive--could be lower-division courses. Is that not the case?

Singler: Not if this language prevails. Thank you for your note to me a couple of days ago. Upon receiving that, I called several members of the ASC to ask what their reading of this was and what their intent was. Virtually unanimously, with one abstention of "no opinion," the response was that members of the ASC agree that there should be consistency across the three "intensive" components of the essential skills. The language under Writing, in section I.A.1 of the model, says "To be certified as a writing-intensive course . . . , a course must be at the 700 or 800 level." In section I.A.2, Speaking, there are several references to upper-division courses. And although it does not say that under section I.A.3, Critical Thinking, with the similarities concerning a 30% assignment of writing or oral communication or speaking, it was felt that there should be consistency across the three areas for intensive courses--and thus the members of the ASC agreed that all three should be at the upper-division level.

Shipka: May I reply? First, it seems to me that you bring back a document that differs from the document approved by the Senate, and I think as a courtesy you should have pointed out that change.

Second, those of us who were involved in proposing the critical thinking-intensive language very carefully structured the language so that a course could qualify as critical thinking-intensive whether it be lower-division or upper-division, or whether it be a GER-approved course or not. So it seems to me that--though you may see this as simply editorial license--you are going against the clear intent (the spirit *and* the letter) of the language in the critical thinking-intensive paragraph, which is on page 2, paragraph 3.

Singler: The ASC felt that the courtesy was rendered by putting together the outline, so that there would be a clear summary of what was in the document. The ASC tried, within the time frame available to it and the many meetings it had, to make clear that there should be a certain consistency and direction taken for the general education model. It seemed to me very straightforward, in a very simplified fashion, to say that the intensive courses should be at the upper-division level. That was the clear reading from the writing and speaking components or sections of the model, and it was felt that the upper-division stipulation should apply to the critical thinking section as well. If the Senate wishes otherwise, they can so move and have that stipulation deleted.

Shipka: I believe it was Emerson [in “Self-Reliance”] who said, “A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds.”

Singler: Other than the changes reflected in the summary, there are no changes in the document.)

Shipka: I wish to move an amendment. On page 1 of the summary of the GER model, the current language says, “Writing-intensive, oral communication–intensive, and critical thinking–intensive components are to be integrated in other courses at the upper-division level.” **I move to amend by saying, “Writing-intensive and oral communication–intensive components are to be integrated in other courses at the upper-division level. Critical thinking–intensive components may be integrated at the lower-division or upper-division level.”**

The motion to amend was seconded, and discussion followed.

Floyd Barger: I agree with the amendment as far as it goes. I just don’t believe it goes far enough. The intent of the general education model was to provide a great deal of diversity as well as depth in the various components of general education--so that many of the other courses in the general education model would be at the 600 level. This proposal as it now stands would eliminate the basic 600-level literature courses taught in the English Department from being writing-intensive. The people best prepared to teach these courses would not be able to do this.

I don’t think people have thought this through and written out specific programs for real people and actually tallied up the courses. I think what we have here is yet another instance in which the general education courses are just about their own subject with no additional responsibility. I would hope that the amendment would be expanded to allow appropriate lower-division courses for both the oral communication and the writing, and that the level would be decided by the appropriateness of the proposal, not by the course number.

Allen Hunter: I agree with Dr. Shipka very strongly. When the critical thinking–intensive component was proposed, it was my understanding that the core critical thinking–intensive courses would be 500- and 600-level philosophy courses, but the revised model distributed by the ASC would eliminate that as a possibility. I have a more general question: If we designate an 800-level capstone course as critical thinking–intensive, does that automatically mean that its state subsidy would go down to the GER level?

Morrison: My understanding is that the baccalaureate-level subsidy applies to those courses that are part of a baccalaureate degree program, usually identified as courses that have prerequisites.

Barger: So to make a course part of the GER does not automatically change the subsidy level.

Minogue: The only course in the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies that specifically focuses on critical thinking is not an upper-division course. Therefore, if the ASC report were accepted, the only course in the University that is currently entitled “Critical Thinking” would not satisfy the condition. I strongly recommend that this body support this amendment.

Singler: Point of clarification. The language specifically says *intensive* for all three areas. It does *not* say “critical thinking courses.” It says “critical thinking–intensive courses,” and if you have

writing-intensive and oral communication-intensive components with the clear understanding that these are upper-division, why would you not have the critical thinking-intensive component similarly designated?

McCloud: I was the ASC member that Professor Singler referred to who reserved opinion on this subject when he kindly polled us; I wanted to hear more of people's thoughts before I decided what I thought was best. As I hear these thoughts and think about them, I would point out that among the three areas (oral communication, writing, and critical thinking), critical thinking is the only one that doesn't have a required course that is a precursor to it. And as I think about that and the other arguments I have heard, my inclination is to urge us to pass this amendment.

Bill Wood: I would also like to speak in favor of it--and actually in favor of extending this to all intensive courses, because it seems to me that requiring an upper-level writing-, oral communication-, and critical thinking-intensive course will make it difficult to maintain the concept and the statement that no additional GER courses will be required. For my engineering program, the courses taken outside of the program are the GER courses. We don't have the luxury of a lot of free electives for students to take a critical thinking-intensive course or a writing-intensive course or an oral communications-intensive course that is not also meeting requirements. Otherwise, it is adding a course to the program, and our program does not have room for that. I would speak in favor of the amendment, or in favor of extending it to all three areas, so that the opportunity to take GER courses that satisfy GER requirements and also meet the writing-, critical thinking-, and oral communication-intensive requirements would be included.

Singler: The critical thinking language was not intended to focus toward the Philosophy Department and the fact that they offer a critical thinking course. Probably several areas across the University could offer a critical thinking-intensive course. It is not our intention to add a course under critical thinking.

It may be that the language related to a "critical thinking-intensive" course is misnamed or misdesignated. If the language was meant to specify a critical thinking course, then it should have clearly said so. But the language says that a substantial portion (30%) of any "intensive" course will be within the context of the applicable intensive component: writing, oral communication, or critical thinking. The language does not say that this will be a critical thinking course out of the Philosophy Department or some other department--it says it will be an intensive component that is presumed to be incorporated in other courses, notwithstanding that there is not a preceding course. The language may be wrong if your intent is to have a critical thinking course out of the Philosophy Department.

Minogue: If this amendment is *not* passed, you are de facto condemning all students to take two courses perhaps in English because all 700-level courses are now required to have departmental prereqs. For example, to take a 700-level course in English or philosophy, you have to take a course at the 600 level. So to satisfy this GER requirement, you are condemning students in engineering or in math or other departments to take more than what is apparent: as we move into the new era, all these upper-division courses are going to have prereqs at the 600 level.

Shipka: I certainly want to make it clear to Dr. Singler and to all of the senators present today that those of us involved in developing the critical thinking-intensive component in the GER proposal seek as a primary goal to draw lots of departments into developing critical thinking-intensive courses. Several of us are serving on an ad hoc faculty-development committee on

critical thinking. We are developing resources, media resources, of various kinds; we have run a workshop; and we intend to work extensively with faculty throughout the University to see that critical thinking–intensive courses are offered, hopefully in every college of the University. I do not speak from the self-interested viewpoint of the Philosophy and Religious Studies Department; I know what the intent of this language was. I crafted it with my colleagues, both in and out of the department, and there should be no misunderstanding of what the intent is.

Brothers: I have a question about what the word “intensive” means. I bring a certain understanding of that concept. As I understood “intensive,” the critical thinking–intensive course that the Philosophy Department has would not count as an intensive course, because it is a critical thinking course. Critical thinking “intensive,” as I know it at other universities, is when the College of Engineering or the Math Department or the Philosophy Department does a course that has been defined as applying critical thinking, and 30% of the course has to do so. My understanding of “writing-intensive” was that these courses are not to be courses offered by the English Department. The writing-intensive courses are to be offered by departments in students’ majors, but this discussion sounds to me as if that is not a shared understanding.

Perhaps we need to clarify. Bill [Jenkins], what is the understanding concerning an “intensive” course? I didn’t think intensive courses were supposed to be courses that on the upper-division level sent the history majors somewhere other than the History Department, the engineering majors somewhere other than the engineering departments, or the philosophy majors somewhere other than the Philosophy Department. Intensive courses were supposed to be within the discipline, aided by the other departments in developing them. It seems as if there is some confusion.

Paul Sracic: I have a question about the motion. As I look at page 2, section I.A. (Baccalaureate Degrees/Essential Skills), I don’t understand the first two sentences. Since the passage speaks to critical thinking, I would like a clarification. It says, “It is expected that GER courses will attempt to integrate goals 1, 2, and 3 wherever possible.” That is fine. Then it says, “Writing I, Writing II and Oral Communication course must incorporate all three.” As worded, that means that an oral communication course must include goal 3, which is critical thinking. I don’t think that was our intention, and if it was not our intention, don’t we need to reword this? It says “*must incorporate all three.*”

Singler: As a clarification to my colleague, Brendan Minogue, if I heard Dr. Minogue’s words correctly, he said that the prerequisite would have to be in the same department; that is incorrect. My understanding of Senate policy is that upper-division courses must have an appropriate prerequisite, but that prerequisite does not have to be in the same department.

Shipka: I would like to **move the previous question [which closes debate on the amendment].**

The motion to close debate on the amendment was seconded and carried.

The motion amending the summary/model to allow critical thinking–intensive courses to be at either the upper-division or the lower-division level carried.

Frank Krygowski, for Jim Zupanic, **moved passage of an amendment distributed to the Senate entitled “Associate Degree Amendment”** (see Appendix A). The amendment would add two categories and a stipulation about math to section II (Associate Degrees) in the revised model. Additions are bolded: “Students in associate degree programs must take a minimum of 6 general education courses, including Writing I and Writing II, and four additional courses selected from at least three of the following areas: natural science, artistic and literary perspectives, societies and institutions, personal and social responsibility, **mathematics, and speech. No more than one course counted toward the requirement may be in mathematics.**”

The motion was seconded.

Zupanic: About a year ago, Bill Jenkins from the GER Committee asked me if the requirements for the associate degree would cause any problems. At the time, I did not think they would, but I was really looking at my own program. Recently, my chair approached me and mentioned that the requirements would create a problem for a couple of our programs, so we have put together this amendment. We put together three different versions of it and have proposed the one that we thought would (1) have the least effect on any other associate degree program and (2) make sure that we accomplished our objective, which was to prevent us having to add an additional course.

We included “**No more than one course counted toward the requirement may be in mathematics**” to be sure that somebody would not assume that we want two courses in mathematics, one in speech, and one in natural science and no social studies electives. Our accreditation requirements will not allow us to do that anyway, but we just wanted to make clear that we were not attempting to do that.

Zupanic explained the figures and rationale on the sheet he had distributed: The current revised model shows 6 semester hours of English, plus four other courses equaling 12 semester hours, for a total of 18 semester hours. When you make the conversion, that is the equivalent of 27 quarter hours where we currently have 23 quarter hours. That would make a one-course increase, and that increase is fine with us as long as you make the amendment, as it is written, to could include mathematics and speech, and students would have to take four additional courses from at least three of those following areas.

Rochelle Ruffer: The people you are talking about currently take a math course? Essentially, you are asking that one of the math courses they take be taken as a GER course?

Zupanic: Yes.

The motion to add mathematics and speech to the categories listed under Associate Degrees, plus the stipulation that no more than one course counted toward the requirement may be in mathematics, carried.

Bill Jenkins: Overall, I endorse page 2 of the ASC’s May 27 Report to the Senate, which relates to the structure, but I object to part M and particularly the last sentence of M: “Subsequent reviews and recertification shall be made every 5 years.”

I believe it is appropriate for the Senate to call for assessment, and to some extent it is even appropriate to make sure that assessment occurs yearly, particularly in the beginning. However, I think it is the function of that GER committee, once established, and also of assessment procedures in general or of people involved in the assessment, to decide when, how often, etc. the review and recertification shall occur. To say it will occur only every five years after the first three years seems to be rather a long time. Most assessment today calls for ongoing consistent assessment, so with that in mind, I would like to **move that the line “Subsequent reviews and recertification shall be made every 5 years” be deleted but maintain the rest of part M.**

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed.

Singler: The ASC felt there should be recertification. (It was part of the original suggestion from the GER Task Force). It felt there should be some kind of a time target. The assessment speaker who was here in early April, who spoke as the Dean of Assessment at her university, noted that a recertification process should be incorporated and that it should be at a defined time, so that there would be an incentive to keep courses up to date and focused toward the goals. We provided that there would be a relatively short first-time assessment, but a longer second-, third-, and fourth-time assessment, which would seem to be reasonable on a five-year cycle.

Jenkins: I would distinguish between the function of setting policy and the function of administering a particular program. I think it is our prerogative to set the general policy; but adding the detail that recertification must occur every five years is putting a limit on the committee. The committee that discusses this, that looks at outside assessment and at what is going on, should be the one to decide and perhaps bring back to the Senate ideas about when assessment or recertification is going to occur. However, I do not disagree at all with the notion of calling for a review and recertification.

Someone called the question.

The motion to delete from category M the sentence “Subsequent reviews and recertification shall be made every 5 years” carried.

(Floyd Barger raised a point of clarification concerning the bracketed remarks following item C, Artistic and Literary Perspectives, on page 3 of the model: I recognize that this issue was raised, but I still have questions regarding the impact of this. Is this in reference to C, or is it in reference to D?

Singler: Over the last several months, the ASC has come forward with a variety of statements of clarification and explanation. The bracketed areas throughout the document are those explanations or clarifications as forwarded from Academic Standards. As explained at one of the previous meetings, these are included as understandings or interpretations of the specific sections in which they appear. [There is also one under D.] Our intent was that with the whole document before this body, if any of the parts or clarifications or interpretations were not in keeping with the wishes of the Senate, they could be deleted, but if the document as a whole passes, then all the brackets would be removed.

Barger: The bracketed material under C says “*With reference to satisfying goal 8.*” The only thing that speaks directly to goal 8 is category C. Whether one satisfies goal 8 in any other place is not germane to the appropriateness of the course. Since it was under category C, I assumed it refers to category C. If it does refer to C, am I correct in assuming that courses in European history or European culture would count under both C and D?

Singler: The language from ASC referred specifically to C, and the purpose of the language concerning “goal 8 in the context of goal 10” was that it was not to be narrowly interpreted but more broadly interpreted. Inclusion of goal 8 anyplace else is as a secondary issue. In this case, it has a direct reference to item C.

Barger: So the intent here is that this parenthetical remark would open the door and endorse counting European and non-European history, culture, and society courses under Artistic and Literary Perspectives?

Singler: Yes.)

Allen Hunter, for Tod Porter, **moved the amendment included in the memo to the ASC dated April 22 (see Appendix B):**

The GER committee will be responsible for establishing a maximum number of courses which can be used to meet the criteria of the groups B, C, D, and E. The maximum number of courses for each group will be not less than six and no more than fifteen, and can differ across the groups. The committee’s decision must be submitted to the Senate for approval. In determining the maximums, the committee should attempt to allow for a sufficient variety of material from relevant academic disciplines, provide sufficient variety in student choice, restrict the list of courses to those most relevant to the stated goals, and minimize duplication of topics across courses. Prior to making the decision, the committee will meet and consult with departments interested in offering GER courses in the different groups. The GER committee can seek Senate approval to change the maximum number at any time.

Porter offered the rationale printed in the memo and noted that if we leave the door open to an unlimited number of courses, the pressure on the GER Committee to allow courses will be overwhelming, and we will have a huge number of GER courses.

Shipka: I want to speak against the amendment. I am sure it is well intentioned. However, I believe it presents us with possibilities of lots of disputes and the feeling on the part of many departments they will be shut out by a smoke-filled room of political decision making. One of the promises this GER package should make to all departments is that if you have courses that meet the goals in the various clusters, and you can present such courses with the properly prepared syllabi and rationales, you have a crack at GER approval. The proposed amendment asks for simplicity, and it does so at the risk of jeopardizing fairness and openness and opportunity to departments to submit without coercion and without a feeling that they will be cut out simply because some quota has been met.

Tom Maraffa: I would like to speak against the proposed amendment also. I think coherence is a worthwhile goal; I think coherence can be better achieved by cooperation among departments. Departments can get together and submit a limited number of courses around a particular topic if they feel that that is a worthy thing to do. If you set the limit at 15, what about the 16th through 20th courses that you rank? What if those are fine courses? What goal is served by excluding those courses? If a department feels there are too many GER courses, probably the reasonable action to take is simply not to submit courses themselves; that will keep the program uncluttered.

Bill Jenkins: I also speak against the amendment. While the goal ultimately has some worth, I believe it is the function of the GER committee, which will hopefully be established today, to undertake deciding how many courses are appropriate to particular areas. We have not gone through that process. It is one in which people will make decisions that they have not thought about before, or perhaps they started thinking about them but have not concluded that thinking. As they do that, it should be the prerogative of the committee to make some sense out of all of that. As things are presented, the committee will look at the scope and sweep of the courses that are being proposed and then decide where the cut-off point might be or what an appropriate number of courses would be. I think the proposed amendment arbitrarily restricts that possibility.

Ruffer: I speak in favor of the amendment. The woman [from North Dakota] who spoke about assessment said one of the problems her university had with its GER model was that they had an inordinate number of courses (more than 100 courses) to fit GER. I think we need to establish some kind of limits.

As I noted at the last Senate meeting, I was a member of the GER Committee at a college with a very similar GER proposal, and we were given no direction. Although I think it is good to leave a lot of things in the hands of the committee, I believe the committee does need some direction.

We heard about resources, and I believe Dr. Porter's statement no. 3 (Appendix B), which talks about the low subsidy level of GER courses, is very important to think about. We cannot have 300 GER courses with 14 or 15 students in each. Does it serve our students to have 100 courses on the books and then have to cancel 40 courses every quarter because they have only 15 students? I speak in favor of this amendment; I think it will keep matters under wraps and, hopefully, minimize the whole problem of the fiscal realities.

Hunter: I am speaking for this amendment to prevent "course-creep." We all know that if we pass the model with no limit and start off with 7 courses in an area, and one or two courses are added each year, then 10 years down the road we could have 35 courses to meet each goal. It is very easy to add a course; it is very hard to take a course off. Guidelines help control the total number of courses. If you already have 15 good courses, and two great ones come up, you can always change the number, but you want to have some kind of guideline to help you focus your mind and keep the numbers relatively small.

Concerning the previous North Central accreditation, one of their biggest complaints about our GER model was that there were hundreds of courses, and that is the criticism at every school with an open model. If you don't have a fairly forceful mechanism to keep the number small, it will eventually creep up. There is nothing you can do to prevent the creep, because of the politics and the nature of how these committees have to work every year. So I think the proposed amendment is a good way of keeping that number focused. Again, the amendment leaves it open

for the committee to decide in each area after consultation what the number should be, and they can always change it. If 15 turns out not to be enough, we can change it, but there should be a target number. It will help us keep the GER much more focused than it would be otherwise.

Barger: Again, I understand the advantage of this proposal as an implementation proposal, but it would be disastrous. This is a zero sum game where for every course you add, you have to take one away. Tom Shipka mentioned palace politics. Palace politics would reign supreme in this setting, to say the least. There are a number of ways to prevent the wide dispersion of courses. One is to have sunset provisions in the adoption of these courses so that courses that are originally approved which turn out not to be of value are automatically dropped with the sunset provision. There are lots of other ways to do quality control here without predetermined numerics.

Genevra Kornbluth: I am speaking for neither the Art Department nor the ASC but only to my impression of this issue. It seems that the potential amendment raises two separate issues: (1) whether the specific numeric values are the appropriate ones, and (2) whether we in fact want to have numeric limits. This is a discussion that has not arisen before. I don't recall discussion of this specific standard in the ASC, and I certainly have not heard it on the floor of the Senate, and I think it is a basic one, so I am grateful to Economics for bringing this forward.

It seems to me that part of the initial rationale for the proposed model that came out of the General Education Task Force was to try to avoid the "smorgasbord" effect. People thought too many courses were being used potentially for general education and that there was no focus. They did not want to go as far as saying we need a specific core. They did not think a core would work on this campus, so they came up with what could be regarded as a middle ground: perhaps a modified core (or, as they thought of it, a modified smorgasbord). That has been the guiding principle, as I understand it, in the model we have been considering.

To address the second issue the proposed amendment raises, whether we want to impose a limit: If we now say that we *want* to set a specific limit on the number of courses that could be used to meet any particular goal or any particular group of goals, we are making a fairly major statement on how this whole model would work. I think that is something we need to think about very carefully. The question of whether the specific number is appropriate (should we decide to oppose a numeric limit or encourage the committee to come up with a numeric limit) is, as has been pointed out, much more flexible; one can always decide later that there are too many or not enough courses, but the principle of whether we want to have a numeric limit is I think a major issue and should be discussed as such.

Don Rudolph: I rise in favor of this amendment for reasons that expand on point 3 under the rationale for the amendment. Speaking from a student's perspective, there are certainly fiscal realities within the University; there are specific personnel realities with the University. It is all well and good if we end up 10 or 15 years down the road with 50 courses under each goal. However, does that mean that every quarter there will be sufficient personnel and funding to offer each and every course? Speaking from a student's perspective, it is quite frustrating to schedule classes only to find that the one class that will make or break your schedule for that particular quarter or semester is not being offered because there is no one to teach it. If we put some kind of structure onto the model before we get into picking courses, we have less of a possibility of a situation like that occurring, because we have specific structures, specific numbers that we will not exceed without amending the requirements, therefore making it much harder to pile things on and end up having an organism that is too large to control later on.

Minogue: I think the amendment presumes that this committee is going to act stupidly, and that we as a group have to stop them before they do it. I don't think they will. I have some basic trust in this committee; they are going to be colleagues, and we are going to elect them. If they approve 200 courses to satisfy GER credit, that would be dumb. Do I believe that they will do that? No! It is not reasonable to think they will act stupidly. Therefore, I think we should vote this amendment down simply as an expression of trust in the committee. There are a lot of issues left unanswered by this proposal, and we are going to need trust in our colleagues to act reasonably. A "no" vote on this one is an expression of trust in this committee.

Porter: This is not a matter of trust; I trust my colleagues very well. But if we look at every college in the country that has a fairly open structure for what courses can count for general education, and if that structure has been in place for more than five or 10 years, I think each would have more than 200 courses. Proliferation just happens; it happens at every school with an open number of courses. I am looking at the reality of what has happened at every other school in the country, as well as at our own history. There have always been good people on the committee in our last 20 years, but over the years the numbers have crept up to the several hundred courses we had before the new model. That is how these systems work.

Jenkins: I disagree that this happens all over the country in the various general education programs. As a matter of fact, the North Dakota program had about 100 courses, not several hundred courses. The woman from North Dakota was also dealing with a system in which they simply took the previous distribution requirements and tacked on the goals, and it was that type of system to which she was speaking. When someone makes a comment or someone comes in from the outside, I think it is very important to understand the circumstances and the kind of system about which the person is speaking. I do not think that those kinds of comments apply to our system.

Secondly, I don't disagree with the notion of some limitation; however, I am extremely concerned that the arbitrary designation of six to 15 will cause some irregularities and problems for the committee in terms of attempting to solicit and encourage the development of courses on the part of faculty throughout the University. Insofar as this amendment does that, I have concerns for how the committee will operate. I am not speaking against limits; I am speaking, however, against specific limits that at this point arbitrarily restrict the possibilities.

Shipka: I think we have heard plenty of debate pro and con. I would like to **move the previous question**.

The motion to close the debate on the proposed amendment was seconded and carried. The motion to limit the number of courses to be allowed in categories B, C, D, and E was defeated.

Morrison called for discussion on the main motion (the GER model).

Singler (speaking as a member of the Geology Department): I served on the original goal-writing committee that developed the 13 goals. I continued on the General Education Task Force for its

next three-plus years, and I have been, as you know, intimately involved in the Academic Standards review of that.

Many things can be said, and I know we are coming to a close on our overall debate, but I want to express a couple of concerns. We have an intention through the general education requirements to prepare our students as well as they can be prepared to meet the 21st century. That includes a lot of different areas, and we are supposed to do that initially through our general education requirements. I propose that you need to look at this proposal as meeting the 13 goals and the 8 purposes, which we often neglect to mention, that preface those goals that were written several years ago. Ask yourself if this model does the best for our students.

The model before you (and its implementation) promises to accomplish some of these goals and purposes, and it does so admirably in certain components. However, I think it falls short in a couple of areas. One is that it does not provide a system that will ensure that we can deliver what we promise. There are no criteria in the guidelines by which to judge whether course proposals will meet the specific goals. There are only some vague notions that the model will evolve and be adjusted in the future. I would remind you of some words I heard from Patricia Murphy--that invited assessment speaker and an NCA evaluator--who said at one of her sessions, "Establish the criteria by which courses are approved as meeting general education." It is politically expedient not to reject courses as not appropriate for general education. In other words, there is a difficulty in saying that a course is not appropriate, and this is especially difficult if you don't have criteria and guidelines by which to judge whether that course meets the goals. The proposed model poses those kinds of difficulties.

The second area has to do with resources, which is one of the reasons resources have been a recurring theme before us. The General Education Task Force was charged at the beginning--and the provost has reiterated--to be as resource-neutral as possible, and yet you have before you a proposal that has been tinkered with, amended, and changed. The proposal does somewhat resemble the original proposal from the Task Force, even with the amendments from Academic Standards, but it has seen considerable change on the floor of the Senate. (Not that those changes are not good in many ways, but we may judge that some of the changes are not necessarily as good.) What you see before you is a changed package. It is not resource-neutral, and it will have impact on every one of us--in every department in every college across the University--and I think you should consider that as well. Does the proposed model provide for the students what it is supposed to provide to move into the 21st century, to give the students what they need for fulfilling and productive lives? If yes, vote yes. If no, vote no.

Shipka: Mr. Chair, I am hoping that by the time we leave the room today, we can vote on the motion on the floor. I would like to offer a comment or two if I may. I have participated in the debate; I have listened to the debate. I think it has been a rich and substantive debate, at least most of the time. I certainly respect the views of all of the people in the room--those who agreed with me and those who disagreed with me. I think we need to understand that this document is a work in progress; GER is a work in progress. The decision we will make today is one of a number of decisions that will be reconsidered as time passes. All of the aspects, all of the facets of GER, are not settled today; many issues are left unsettled (for instance, the question of the specific responsibilities of the coordinator). However, I think there is plenty of substantive material on the floor. It has been adequately debated, and I hope that we will take this next step and approve it.

On this question of resources, I would like to say a word. When the debate on resources took place, it was not often mentioned that significant resources were committed to particular portions of the GER model. Writing I and II, for instance: Is there any more significant investment of resources than in that area? I don't know how we can get a resource-neutral or a revenue-neutral GER. If we are to go to the drawing board and bring forward a coherent, respectable, and responsible GER, it seems to me we have to be flexible enough to consider change and to vote on change--and wherever we are flexible enough to consider change and vote on change, there may be some shifting of resources. I think that is part of the implication of GER reform. Mr. Chair, I would like to know what procedures we can follow to have the body vote on the motion.

Morrison: The motion is in front of the group.

Shipka: I would like to **move the previous question.**

The motion to vote on closing debate on the main motion was seconded and passed.

Morrison: Motions of privilege may be made at this time.

Ruffer: I would like to **move that we take the vote by secret ballot as opposed to voice vote or hand vote.**

Morrison: This is a motion of privilege, which is not debatable.

The motion to vote by secret ballot was seconded; a voice vote and hand vote were taken; and the motion to vote by secret ballot failed by a count of 24 for, 27 opposed.

The motion to adopt the GER model and its implementation as presented by the ASC carried.

ADJOURNMENT: It was moved and seconded that we adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.