College Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 7, 2012
2:04 p.m. – 3:35 p.m.
President's Conference Room

Item	Discussion
1. Minutes: January 17, 2012	M/S to approve minutes as written. (Lankford, Hartwell) Approved.
2. Announcements	Speaker: Holcroft
a. Reminder: ASCCC Accreditation Institute, 2/10 & 11	a. This conference will be at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Anahiem. Great opportunity to share insight about accreditation process with other faculty
b. Curr Sheet Due Date Reminder	b. Due date for Curriculum Sheets is March 1st.
c. New Course Form	c. Suggestion was made that perhaps there should be some short instructions e.g. "this form should be completed as soon as faculty are planning a new course outline." Reminder that it is not the purview of the CCC to decide whether a course should be written/taught and we should not require the faculty to defend the need for the course – this is the purview of the division curriculum committees. The objective of the CCC announcement process is to keep all faculty informed about curriculum development across campus, to provide transparency, and promote discussion among discipline faculty particularly with curriculum that might be interdisciplinary.
d. New Course Announcements	d. Huerta/Fong presented a new series course, ENGL 1S/T, that would give students an alternate path for completing their ENGL 1A requirement. Explained history of the course development at Foothill and that these have already received articulation with UC & CSU, and will be on consent calendar at next CCC meeting for Foothill GE Area II approval. Pending this approval, faculty will need to update all curriculum sheets to include ENGL 1T as an alternative to ENGL 1A to satisfy
e. Other	

meet individually on a more frequent basis, about once a month. The CCC reps meet on the off-weeks when there is no CCC meeting to work on curriculum, take care of the administrative requirements within the C3MS, etc. A lot of the work is done electronically.

PSME has developed a Transfer degree for Mathematics (currently w/Instruction office); Statway™ is continuing; the Algebra series has been revamped; there will be a retreat on Thursday where they are going to discuss integration of technology and curriculum. Computer ScietTJ ET Q q ( ) 2 (a) 4(c)31 ( ) 2 (d)31 (3 (e)14(c)31 lc)31 l

	all GE subcommittees have at least three members. Reps encouraged to solicit constituents to participate especially for Areas III, IV, V and VI.
8. Transfer Degrees	Speaker: Holcroft The Transfer degrees that are currently being developed are: Studio Art (Ciment), Art History (Pennington), Theatre Arts (MacLeod), and Kinesiology (Shewfelt). History is discussing now and the English department has decided to work on two, English and Creative Writing. Interest in Child Development AA-T but not initiating development yet.
9. Redlining Maximum	Deferred until the next meeting

Atendees: K. Armstrong, J. Baker, F. Cammin, B. Cashmore, B. Day, I. Escoto, V. Fong, M. Francisco, R. Hartwell, B. Hanning, C. Holcroft, K. Horowitz, S. Huerta, K. Jordahl, M. Knobel, S. Lankford, A. Lee, D. MacNeil, J. Nguyen, P. Murray, J. Ragey, P. Starer, B. Ziegenhorn
Minutes recorded by: C. Nuñez

President
Michelle Pilati
Rio Hondo College

Vice President
Beth Smith
Grossmont College

Secretary
David Morse
Long Beach City College

Treasurer
Wheeler North
San Diego Miramar College

Area A Representative
Julie Bruno
Sierra College

Area B Representative
Jon Drinnon
Merritt College

Area C Representative
Lesley Kawaguchi
Santa Monica College

Area D Representative
Stephanie Dumont
Golden West College

North Representative
Dan Crump
American River College

North Represent ative
Dolores Davison
Foothill College

South Representative

555 Capitol Mall¥ Suite 525¥ Sacramento¥ California¥ 95814
(916) 4454753¥ Fax (916) 3239867
info@asccc.org¥ www.asccc.org

Enclosure 1

DISCIPLINE LIST PROPOSAL PROCESS

How Changes Are Proposed?

There are two avenues for proposing changes: 1) through a local or district academic senate or 2) through a recognized organization*. Although the process for new proposals remains the same, a procedure for resubmissions has been added. For more detailed information about the process, we highly suggest you review the document ÒDisciplines List Review ProcessÓ, which can be accessed on our website at: http://asccc.org/sites/default/files/MinimumQualifications_2010.pdf

Month/Year	Process
	¥ Prepare 2Rureocm

Month/Year	Process
March 2013	¥ Summary document with Executive Committee positions will be included in mailings for the Area meetings ¥ Discussion at Area Meeting ¥ Rostrum Article (summary of additional proposals)
April 2013	¥ Spring Plenary Session Ñ Third Hearing on process and any proposals received. All testimony is collected.

Enclosure 3

REVISIONS TO DISCIPLINES LIST
PLEASE TYPE
(Note: Only typed forms will be accepted.)

DATE SUBMITTED: _____

DISCIPLINES LIST TITLE: _____

This proposal is for a
- ■ New discipline
- ■ Revision to existing discipline

Reason for the proposal
- ■ Create a new discipline
- ■ Update language in existing discipline to reflect new terminology
- ■ Make minimum qualific 0 0 41 0 0 4424.11024 0(l) 1000164452.1523 572.16 cm BI

Enclosure 3

REVISIONS TO DISCIPLINES LIST
PLEASE TYPE
(Note: Only typed forms will be accepted.)

DATE SUB (y) -2 ( ) 1 (t) 1 (y) 0.2 (U) -0.2 (B (y) -2 ( ) 1 (t) 1 (y) 0.2 (U) -0.2 (B (y) -2 ( ) 1(U) -0.2 T

FAQs on M inimum Qualifications (MQs)

The following list of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) has been compiled to assist individuals in better understanding and interpreting the rules and regulations governing the minimum qualifications (MQs) for faculty and administrators in the California Community College system. The FAQs were collaboratively developed with members of the Standards and Practices Committee of the State Academic Senate and staff from the ChancellorÕs Office of the California Community Colleges.

Q#1: Who has the responsibility for establishing and maintaining the Disciplines List and enforcing the regulations relating to the MQs?

A. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, in conjunction with the ChancellorÕs Office, shæs that responsibility. The Academic Senate is responsible for reviewing and revising the Disciplines List. A list of Academic Senate papers on minimum qualifications and the Disciplines List is included at the end of this document. An overview of the

determined by faculty representing their academic senate at the local level and approved by the local governing board

Q#5: Are the MQs for part-time faculty different than those for full-time faculty?

A. No. The MQs for all faculty members are the same, whether they are full-time or part-time. Note also that MQs are established for a discipline and not a single course. A part-time faculty member, when hired by the college, is hired to teach in the discipline under which a particular course has

- Equivalency processes for part-time faculty and Òemergency hireÓ should be no different from equivalency for full-time faculty.

-

No. Colleges need to be

These sections of the regulation can be found by accessing the Minimum Qualifications for

other constituent disciplines is also eligible to teach this course (exactly how much coursework in a second discipline is not specified in the Disciplines List). Agreement on qualifications to teach any such course should be made by the college curriculum committee and based on the course outline of record.

Q#22: [redacted] with a degree from a foreign country teach at a community college?

,+)"%4'?#"8')%456(%)B,/2,2"0990()6/%)4"9(0C('3&"'/2"&,(I%*,&"9(0I%2,2"96(&6'/")0";()%*+,">"E*033,/*%/C"
1%)$"5,*)%0/"?=?Y]F"0<"8$'9),("Q"0<"K'()"YQ\"*'396&"*$%+2"*'(,"&,(I%*,&"9(0I%2,2"96(&6'/")0";()%*+,"Y"
E*033,/*%/C"1%)$"5,*)%0/">QQ^F"0<"8$'9),("Q"0<"[illegible]C?'3&")$')"),'*$"G/C+%&$"'&""&,*0/2"+'/C6'C,\"'/2"

W

"

""'EWF";&&,&&3,/)"%/&)(63,/)&"&$'++"/0)"-,"6&,2")0",M*+62,"&)62,/)&"<(03'"23%&&%0/")0"*0336/%')4"*0++,C,&@

""'E*F"#$,"-0'(2"0<"C0I,(/0(&"&$'++",&)'-+%&$'"/'"2I%&0(4'")*,03'3%(,I%,1'"/2"3'.,"(,*033,/2')%0/&"
0/,(/%/C'"++'"&&,&&3,/)"%/&)(63,/)&"6&,2"-4"2%&)(%*)&'"/2"*0++,C,&"96(&6'/)")0")$'%&'"()%*+,@

0$2'*'")#(8'"6<%'78%&'"8%'1+94$'+,'=+5%4&+4)'9$+:")'9')?)"%<'+,'(+<<+&'9))%))<%&"B'$6)"46(")'9&$'(+;;%=%)'<
#)%')#::;%<%&"9;'9))%))<%&")'+4'+"8%4'<%9)#4%)',+4':;9(%<%&'":#4)#9&'"'"+'IJ-/N092>

GH@>"E'F";++"9'()%*%9')%/C"2%&)(%*)&"&$'++L"1%)$")$,'"&&%&)'/*,"0<")$,"*$'/*,++0(L",&)'-+%&$'"/2"3'%/)'%/"
%/&)%)6)%0/'+"(,&,'(*$")0",I'+6'),")$,",<<,*)%I,/,&&"0<")$"!"#$%&'"!#((%)'"9&$!#::+4'"34+=49<'&,(I%*,&"
2,&*(%-,2"-4")$%&'"()%*+,'"/2"0<"9(0C('3&'"/2"&,(I%*,&"2,&%~~C3,2"40"~~,9(6;6"9"%'&)62,/)&X~~&.%++&"2,<%*%~~%,/*%,&
(+<:;%"6+&'+,'"8%64'%$#(9;6=&9;)'9&$':4+=49<)'+,')"#$?@

""'E-F"#$,~~2")'"-'&,~~'9((+#&"916;6"?'<%"46()<0(")$%&"(,&,'(*$"&$'++"%/*+62,L"-6)"/0)"-,"+%3'%),2")0D

""'E!F"K(%0(",26*')%0/'+",M9,(%,/*,L"%/*+62%/C -3 ()%)Q) -3 (+)/-4 (&) -2 (+) -2 (+)%,("6,"&'"(-4 (() 0-4 ((-4 (() %:

%$#(9"6+&':;9&&6&=')%4'6(2(%)$%&"'()%*+9,&'$'0(2'4%H#646&='(+<<#&6"?'(+;;%=%'$6)"46(")"'+'9$+:"'9')"#$%&"'
9::%9;':4+(%))>
(

GH@>"EIF"#$,"B,C%&+')6(,"(,*0C/%J,&")$')"*0336/%)4"*0++,C,"2%&)(%*)&"'(,"*6((,/)"+(4%662%0390/,/)&"
0<"&)62,/)"3')(%*6+')%0/")$(06C$",M%&)%&"9"6+&':;9&&6&&,&&3,/)L"'/2"0)$,("
&)62,/)"&,(I%*,&L"-6)")$')"'2,H6'),"&)62,/)"3')(%*6+')%0/"'/2"%39+,3,/)')%0/"0<#$%&"'!#((%))9&&$!#::+4" '
34+=49<)"49"%=6%/)"%//0)"-,"(,'+%J,2"1%)$06)"&699+,3,/)'+"<6/2%/C"&6990()@

""E-F"#$,"-0'(2"0<"C0! [L0.86035 606.96 cm BT(&6

^"

"

""'EQF"#$,"*0++,C,"-62C,)"<0(")$,"%C#&$%$"#$%&"'!#((%)9&$!#::+4"'34+=49<)%456(%)6(&(9)36'5)*2471&4 [*(J
?"
"

""EQF"8'+%<0(/%'"5)'),"c/%I,(&%)4"0("c/%I,(&%)4"0<"8'+%<0(/%'"&)62,/)&",/(0++,2"%/"(,3,2%'+"*+'&&,&"9(0I%2,
*0336/%)4"*0++,C,"2%&)(%*)"0/"""*'396&"0<")$,"c/%I,(&%)4"0<"8'+%<0(/%'"0("""*'396&"0<")$,"8'+%<0(/%'"5)'),"
c/%I,(&%,(3c%,("

P'

"

```
""E$F"#$,"<,,"(,H6%(,3,/)&"0<")$%&"&,*)%0/"&$'++"-,"1'%I,2"<0("'/4"&)62,/)"1$0L"')")$,")%3,"0<",/(0++3,/)L"%&""""
2,9,/2,/)L"0("  &6(I%I%/C"&906&,"1$0"$'&"/0)"(,3'((%,2L"0<"'/4"3,3-,("0<")$,"8'+%<0(/%"'_')%0/'+"O6'(2"1$0L"%/"
)$,"+%/,"0<"26)4"'/2"1$%+,"%/")$,"'*)%I,"&,(I%*,"0<")$,"&)'),L"1'&".%++,2L"2%,2"0<""'2%&'-%+%)4"(,&6+)%/C"<(
)$')"0**6((,2"1$%+,"%/")$,"'*)%I,"&,(I%*,"0<")$,"&)'),L"0("%&"9,(3'/,/)+4"2%&'-+,2"'&"'"(,&6+)"0<"'/",I,/)")$')"
0**6((,2"1$%+,"%/")$,"'*)%I,"&,(I%*,"0<")$,"&)'),@"S;*)%I,"&,(I%*,"0<")$,"&)'),LS"<0(")$,"96(90&,&"0<")$%&"&6-2
(,<,(&")0"'"3,3-,("0<")$,"8'+%<0(/%"'_')%0/'+"O6'(2"'*)%I'),2"9&6(/')")0"5,*)%0/"!Y?"0<")$,":%+%)'(4"'/2"
e,),('/&"802,@"

""E%F"#$,"<,,"(,H6%(,3,/)&"0<")$%&"&,*)%0/"&$'++"-,"1'%I,2"<0("'/4"&)62,/)"1$0"%&")$,"&6(I%I%/C"&906&,"0(")$
/')6('+"0("'209),2L"0<"'"2,*,'&,2"9,(&0/"1$0"3,)"'++"0<")$,"(,H6%(,3,/)&"0<"5,*)%0>!Q]@

""EUF"#$,"<,,"(,H6%(,3,/)&"0<")$%&"&,*)%0/"&$'++"-,"1'%I,2"<0("'/4"&)62,/)"%/"'/"6/2,(C('26'),"9(0C('3L"%/*+62%/
&)62,/)"1$0"$'&"9(,I%06&+4"C('26'),2"<(03"'/0)$,("6/2,(C('26'),"0("C('26'),"9(0C('3L"1$0"%&")$,"2,9,/2,/)"
0<"'/4"%/2%I%26'+".%/"+)$,"5,9),3-,("!!L"Q]]!L"),((0(%&)"'))'*.&"0/")$,"f0(+2"#('2,"8,/),("'/2")$,"K,/)'C0/"
0(")$,"*('&$"0<"c/%),2";%(+%/,&"R+%C$)"=W"%/"&06)$1,&),(/"K,//&4+I'/%'L"%<")$')"2,9,/2,/)"3,,)&")$,"<%/'/*%'+"/
(,H6%(,3,/)&"&,)"<0()$"%/"5,*)%0/"?=YWQ@P"<0"(),/)"8"K(0C('3"'/2",%)$,("0<")$,"<0++01%/C"'"99'+%,&D

"""
```

>"

"

*0336/%)4"*0++,C,"2%&)(%*)&L"96(&6'/)")0")$%&"&6-2%I%&%0/L"'/"'306/)",H6'+*),0&"E/)]4@=!F"9,("*(,2%)"
6/%)"1'%I,2"96(&6'/)")0"&6-2%I%&%0/&"EC)F"60"ZU@"A)"%&")$,"%/),/)"0<")$,"B,C%&+')6(,")$')"<6/2&"9(0I%2,2"
96(&6'/)")0")$%&"&6-2%I%&%0/"-,"6&,2")0"&6990()")$,"2,),(3%/')%0/"0<"<%/'/*%'+"/,,2"'/2"2,+%I,(4"0<"&)62,/)"
<%/'/*%'+"'%2"&,(I%*,&L"0/")$,"-'&%&"0<")$,"/63-,("0<"&)62,/)&"<0("1$03"<%&I",2(@"1"A)"'+&0"%&")$,"%/),/)"0<")$,"
B,C%&+')6(,")$')")$,"<6/2&"9(0I%2,2"96(&6'/)")0")$%&"&6-2%I%&%0/"2%(,*)+4"0<<&,)"3'/2'),2"*0&)&"*+'%3,2"-4'
*0336/%)4"*0++,C,"2%&)(%*)&"96(&6'/)")0"8033%&&%0/"0/"5)'),":'/2'),&"*0/&0+%2'),2"#,&)"8#87W"==
EG/(0++3,/)"R,,"80++,*)%0/F"'/2"]#87!^"EG/(0++3,/)"R,,"f'%I,(&F@"R6/2&"'++0*'),2")0"'"*0336/%)4"*0++,C,"
2%&)(%*)"<0("2,),(3%/')%0/"0<"<%/'/*%'+"/,,2"'/2"2,+%I,(4"0<"&)62,/)"<%/'/*%'+"'%2"&,(I%*,&"&$'++"&699+,3,/)L"
&$'++"/0)"&699+'/)L")$,"+,I,+"0<"<6/2&"'+2"0")("),$,"'23%/%&)(')%0/"0<"&)62,/)"<%/'/*%'+"'%2"9(0C('3&"26(%/C")$,
!==Q7=W"<%&*'+"4,'(@

""E/F"#$,"-0'(2"0<"C0I,(/0(&"&$'++"209)"(,C6+')%0/&"%39+,3,/)%/C")$%&"&,*)%0/@

""E0F"#$%&"&,*)%0/"&$'++"-,"%/09,(')%I,"'/2"%&"(,9,'+,2"0/":'4"!L"Q]!QL"6/+%&&"2%&"E-F"0<"5,*)%0/"W@=Y"0<")

=

"

!"#$%&"'!#((%))'*('"+,'-./- '
'!#00123'+,' 4%3'56%0%&")'7&'82+9+)%$':766';1&<#1<%
=%>2#123'/?'-./-
'
'

!"#$%&'(#)*+,-*.#/,012345,026+#730#08*#9*:-6;1-<=*55#904>*+0#9433*..#730#6?#&('&

!"#$%&''#)*?634.*.#,+>#4<>,0*.#/,012345,026+#5,+@4,@*#06#,52@+#36-08#026#1*?16-#
08*#904>*+0#9433*..#B,.C#D613*##1*@,1>2+@#08*#<16@1,-#6?#.04>:#,+>#08*#4.*#6?#*'
E2>+3*>=,.*>#.04>*+0#.*1E23#*.G

!"#$%&''GH# I16E2>*.#.016+@#?1,-2+@#6?#<41<6.*F#2+#52+*#A2#8#99BD#,@*+>,J

- ¥ K-<610,+3*#6?#612*+0,026+F#,..*..-*+0#5,3*-*+0F#,+>#*>43,026+#<5,++2+@#2+#<16-602+@#.04>*+0.L#.433*..?45#36-<5*026+#6?#*>43,026+,5#@6,5.G
- ¥ D634.#6+#36-<5*026+#6?#>*@1**.F#3*102?23,0*.F#,+>#01,+.?*1G
- ¥)*2+?613*.#+**>#06#8,1+*..#+*A#0*38+656@2*.#06#,..2.0#2+#>*52E*12+@#08*.*#.4<<610#.*1E23#*.G

!"#$%&'&# 'M#N*52+*,0*.#08*#.04>*+0L.#,+>#08*#2+.0204026+L.#1?61608#2#24216.*#6?#,382*E2+@#08*#.04>*+0O.#*>43,026+,5#@6,5.#,+>#36-<5*02+@#08*#.04>*+0L.#<16@1,-#.04>:G###

&M#B,1@*0.#?4+>2+@#6+#361*#-,012345,026+#.*1E23*.#,+>#*#52#9202#P*+0#08*#4.9433*..#730#?4+>.#?61#08*#?65#56A2+@J##

- ¥ Q12*+0,026+#.*1E23*.#
- ¥ "6--6+#,..*..-*+0#,+>#*>43,026+,5#<5,++2+@#.*1E23*.#4<6+#*+16#5-*+0
- ¥ N*E*56<-*+0#6?#*>43,026+#<5,+.#5*,>2+@#06#,#<16@1,-#6?#.04>:#,+>#@42>,+3*3641.*#.*5*3026#+G

RM#9<*32?2*.#08#0#08*#SQT#,>6<0.#,#.:.0*-#6?#36--6+#,..*..-*+0F#>2.01230.#,+>#3655*@*.#-,:#4.*#.4<<5*-*+0,5#,..*..-*+0.#61#608*1#-*,.41*.#?61#<5,3*#+0G

!"#$%&'U# /,C*.#-2+61#,+>#35,12?:2+@#38,+@*.#06#-61*#*??*302E*5:#,52@+#2+.0204026+,5#1*.*,13*E,54,0*#08*#*??*302*..#6?#08*#904>*+0#9433*..#,+>#94<<610#I16@1,-G#

!"#$%&'H# N*?2+*.#165*#6?#SQT#2+#>*E*56<2+@#<65232*.#?61J#*V*-<02+@#.04>*+0.W#1*X4212+<,10232<,026+#2+#,302E202*.W#,+>#,<<*,5#<163*..*.G

!"#$%&'Y# "5,12?2*.#08*#4.*#6?#*V2.02+@#-,012345,026#904>*+0#9433*..#,+>#94<<610#I16@1,-#.*1E23*#G#

!"#$%&'YZ=MZ[R# #36+>2026+#6?#1*3*2<0#6?#?4+>.F#1*X421*.#>2.01230.#06#2-<5*-*+0#36--6+#,..*..-*+,+>#.04>*+0#.433*..#.361*3,1>F#6+3*#08*.*#,1*#*.0,=52.8*>#=:#08*#SQTG#

!"#$%&'YZ3MZ1MC.#3655*@*#90#9433*..#,+>##94<<610#I16@1,-#<5,+.#06#3655*@*#.04>*+0#*X420:#
<5,+.] 1*2+?613*.#99BD#*X420:#,@#*+>,G##

!

"#$!%&&!'()*&+!

!"#%HHZ@#MZ3M.#36+>2026+.#6+#*52@2=2520:#?61#SQT#D**#^,2E*1G###904>*+0.#-4.0J

Z7M2>*+02?##*@1**F#3*102?23,0*F#01,+.?*1#61E#3,1**10#@6,5W#
ZSM**0 #3,>*-23##,+>#<16@1*..#.0,+>,I#2+354>2+@#,#-,V2-4-#4+20#3*2I#>#
=:#08*#SQW
Z"MB8*.*#36+>2026+.#A255#=*#<8,.*>#2+#6E*1#,#1*,.6+,=5*#<*126>#6?#02-*#,.#>*0*1-2+*
=:#08*#SQ#G

General Education Review Request
AREA II - ENGLISH

Course Number & Title: !"#$ %&'()%*+,%'() -.%')!#01)!2%34564'/)/4"%1"2%0!12/"#

Breadth Criteria:

Depth Criteria for Area II – English:

must

General Education Review Request
AREA II - ENGLISH

Course Number & Title: 6789:;<%+,%'().%)!#01)!2%34564'/)/4"%1"2%0!12/"#

Course Outcome/Objective Course Outline of Record

Depth Map: Must

General Education Review Request
AREA II - ENGLISH

3. Recognize and employ critical thinking skills including comprehension, application, analysis, evaluation, and synthesis.
4. Articulate (verbally and in writing) own perspective based on critical evaluation of texts.

E8.

2. Expected Outcomes - The student will be able to:
- Understand and value of academic integrity and demonstrate ethical conduct.
  1. Integrate appropriate text citations and MLA documentation

Breadth Mapping: please indicate all that apply (if applicable)
B1.

A. **2. Expected Outcomes -** The student will be able to:
Identify oneself as a part of larger academic discourse communities
1. Demonstrate reading comprehension and construct meaning through summary
2. Identify and synthesize intertextual relationships among multiple works (published and student texts)
3. Collaborate with others during the reading and writing process, offering constructive criticism and accepting the criticism of others
4. Reco

General Education Review Request
AREA II - ENGLISH

Matching course objective(s):

B3.

A. **2. Expected Outcomes -** The student will be able to:

Identify oneself as a part of larger academic discourse communities

1. Demonstrate reading comprehension and construct meaning through summary
2. Identify and synthesize intertextual relationships among multiple works (published and student texts)
3. Collaborate with others during the reading and writing process, offering constructive criticism and accepting the criticism of others
4. Recognize differences and/or similarities in cultural value systems represented in various texts and within readers.

Understand reading and writing as a means to think critically and to develop and articulate own perspectives

1. Identify contexts, purposes, and rhetorical decisions that shape reading and writing in order to unde the nature of effective communication and discourse.
2. Read primarily non-fiction texts actively and effectively and think critically about information acquired from readings, research, and other sources.
3. Recognize and employ critical thinking skills including comprehension, application, analysis, evaluation and synthesis.
4. Articulate (verbally and in writing) own perspective based on critical evaluation of texts.

Understand reading and writing as an integrated processes for meaning-making and communication

1. Analyze college-level expository, narrative, and argumentative non-fiction prose for use as source information and/or model for writing
2. Read and write extended expository compositions, increasing in length and complexity, that articula perspective in relation to and informed by whole texts and class discussion.
3. Identify and formulate arguable theses.
4. Identify and formulate logical and systematic patterns of organization
5. Recognize and develop topics and main ideas at the paragraph level
6. Identify syntactical structures and apply to the editing of writing to achieve sentence variety and matu
7. Use vocabulary strategies to identify and produce diction (including connotative language) and tone appropriate to the content, audience, and purpose of the specific writing task.
8. Identify grammatical patterns and apply to the proofreading of writing to the degree that the nature a frequency of errors do not become distracting.

Reflect on their own reading and writing processes as an avenue to achieving greater control of these processes and increas effectiveness as a reader and writer

1. Use strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proofreading their own work
2. Evaluate own writing as an advanced critical reader at the essay, paragraph, and sentence levels.

Understand and value of academic integrity and demonstrate ethical conduct.

1. Integrate appropriate text citations and MLA documentation

B4.

2. Expected Outcomes - The student will be able to:

- Identify oneself as a part of larger academic discourse communities
  1. Demonstrate reading comprehension and construct meaning through summary
  2. Identify and synthesize intertextual relationships among multiple works (published and student texts)
  3. Collaborate with others during the reading and writing process, offering constructive criticism and accepting criticism of others

4. Recognize differences and/or similarities in cultural value systems represented in various texts and within re

B5.

4. Expanded Description of Course Content - Writing

•

Petition to Replace Substandard Grade for Foothill College GPA Calculation

April 2007

Center for Studies in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

http://cshe.berkeley.edu/research/gec/

This report was made possible by funding from
Carnegie Corporation of New York and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation.

Photo Credits:Courtesy of University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; University of California, Riverside; University of California, San Diego; Brenda Reheem/University of California, Santa Barbara; University of California, Irvine; Jim Mackenzie/University of California Santa Cruz; 2006©Christopher Viney, Ph.D./ University of California, Merced; Debbie Aldridge/University of California, Davis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON GENERAL EDUCATION IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Michael Schudson (co-chair)
Professor, Communication and Adjunct
Professor, Sociology, UC San Diego, and
Professor, Graduate School of Journalism,
Columbia University

Neil J. 3 1 Tf 10 0 0 1u2F/ActualText<FEFF00A0>>> BDC 17200030 0 18 35Neil J.)Neil J.)1_4 1 Tf 10.5 0 0 10.5 104.5 6

PREFACE

We also recommend extension of and improvements in freshman-sophomore seminars, capstone courses, problem-oriented courses offered by departments, and undergraduate involvement in research.

The Commission highlights especially the need for renewed attention to civic education as part of general education. We identify the new dimensions and problems of civic education in our rapidly changing world and the necessary components of good civic education in a democracy. In light of this, we advocate that campuses intensify the "civic experience" of students in their collegiate years, specifically in the form of student activities that combine civic engagement with research and reflective analysis.

The Commission considers next the difficulty for universities in governing general education requirements that students take outside the university from which they will graduate. This includes two large and increasingly important phenomena: the taking of "advanced placement" (AP) courses in high school and the transfer of AP credits, and the process of transferring to the university after some experience in community college or state-university settings. We recommend two strategies: first, that universities continue and extend working cooperatively with high schools and "feeder" colleges to coordinate general education expectations and offerings, and, second, that they extend and improve their general education offerings at the upper-division level.

The Commission sees implications for general education in the spread of new technologies in higher education. They can help improve educational quality, reduce costs, and widen access. At the same time, they are no panacea, and we identify a number of limits and excesses that uncritical application of new technologies can generate.

Improving general education requires not only initiating structural changes but sustaining a campus culture that supports general education. There is a need to publicize general education's value and, where possible, to reward the constituents and individuals involved in it. With this in mind, the Commission addresses methods for informing, supporting, and encouraging faculty, graduate students, and temporary faculty, as well as advising staff, undergraduates, parents, chancellors and presidents, and alumni.

Finally, while acknowledging the difficulties of effective educational evaluation, we recommend that campuses build in systematic machinery to evaluate general education courses and programs in their various phases of development and execution.

The following recommendations are directed to the University of California campuses in particular, but have implications for public and private universities nationwide:

1.

6. Administrators and faculty should pursue applications of new information and communication technologies to enhance teaching and learning, and potentially lower costs and increase access to their institutions. At the same time, administrators should assure that educational quality is not inadvertently sacrificed in the process. (See Section 8: New Technologies and General Education.

7. Campus administrators and faculty should actively and continuously strive to educate all of their constituencies on the value, rationale, and goals of general education, and make clear the opportunities for its pursuit on their campuses. Academic Affairs, as well as Student Affairs, should engage in efforts to integrate transfer students into the university, with specific course work designed for transfer students (including one-unit courses modeled on freshman seminars). (See Section 9: Encouraging a Culture that Supports General Education.

8. To assure the quality of general education, campuses should (a) establish machinery in their Academic Senate divisions dedicated to initiating, monitoring, and reviewing general education courses, programs, and experiments; and (b) require designers and teachers in general education to provide statements of the goals of their efforts,

organizations, notably in engineering, have grown insistent that professional schools require more, not less, general education. This is a rhetorical resource for advocates of general education that has not yet received the attention it deserves.

iv) A subtle but profound change in curricular emphasis, with an eroded consensus on (and discomfort with) setting priorities for what constitutes necessary general knowledge for undergraduates. One facet of this change is the continued dominance of the "cafeteria-ization" of course selection. Another facet of this change is reflected in the cultural controversies over curricula of the 1980s, which generated dissatisfaction with long-standing priorities for general education and disputes as to what should be regarded as the country's shared heritage.

2. Exceptional changes in the environment of higher education. Several significant social changes have altered the environment for curriculum in higher education. These include notably:

i) The continuing diversification of students along the lines of age, gender, social class, ethnicity, race, religion, and culture.

ii) The continuing interdependence of the world—including globalization—with an increased international flow of ideas, goods, capital, and people. This includes positive exchanges that lead to collaboration and innovation, as well as negative ones, such as the proliferation of disease.

iii) The uncertain future of the nation-state and political democracy around the world.

iv) Changing forms of warfare, with the threat of international terrorism extending indefinitely into the future.

v) Changing and increasing demands for accountability from legislatures and accrediting organizations, with a growing emphasis on measurable educational outcomes.

Taken together, these forces pose serious questions for colleges and universities. How should an educated person confront the radically altered circumstances of the 21st century? What are the obligations of these institutions of higher education to prepare

For better or for worse, California represents a dramatic case, one in which the forces affecting higher education—including general education programs—are likely to be extreme in the coming decades. We refer to the crisis occasioned by the explosive increase

of how aesthetic standards change or remain the same over time. Moreover, even an introductory acquaintance with the classics puts the student in touch with a culture shared broadly by educated members of society, thus bringing the student into that circle.

In a habits-of-mind general education model, however, there is limited value in knowing enough Shakespeare to recognize that Bugs Bunny is referring to Hamlet when he says, "To be or not to be, that is the question." In this model, it is much more important for a student to acquire in literary studies—whether studying Shakespeare or J.K. Rowling—an ability to read critically, to read between the lines, to recognize how rhetoric and argument are deployed, and to appreciate but also to resist the power of narrative or a tale well-told. What faculty hope to instill is the ability to generalize from one course or topic to the next, to write fluently and critically, to master a body of material, and to take a step beyond. They also hope to teach students to communicate logically about a common body of evidence and common rules of inference orally and in writing, and to link scientific or humanistic materials that seem remote from one another and from contemporary civic and social issues.[7]

Faced with such a variety of meanings, do we have to settle on one? A negative definition is not difficult: "general education" is the catch-all phrase that educators in higher education use to refer to those educational aspirations of their institutions that are not claimed by departments and disciplines. An encompassing positive definition may be more tentatively ventured: general education is the vehicle in higher education specifically focused on introducing students to ways of knowing, integrative knowledge, appreciation of historical context and common themes of human experience, social responsibility, civic (global and local) engagement, and the development of practical skills and reflective habits of mind.

The aspirations of higher education are by no means confined to education transmitted

Historian Sheldon Rothblatt has suggested that the greatest significance about the history of "the idea of a university" is that there has been such a long search for a single pure and enduring purpose for higher education. As Rothblatt observes, however, colleges and universities over time have served a multiplicity of purposes, "contradictory, confusing and ambiguous."[8] Robert Hutchins described the university as a set of schools and departments held together by a central heating system and Clark Kerr considered it "a series of individual faculty entrepreneurs held together by a common grievance over parking."[9] It should be clear that, like the idea of the university itself, the definitions and goals of general education are often ambiguous and difficult to pin down.

History

As indicated, many current educational scholars lament what they see as the collapse of collegiate general education for private and public institutions alike. The Commission subscribes neither to this extreme diagnosis nor to its opposite—that we have no cause for concern. Throughout this report we will attempt to identify both the strengths and vulnerabilities of general education as it exists in the 21st century.

Although contemporary images and ideals of what colleges should be are derived from practices going back hundreds of years, the specific concern with general education programs dates only to the late 19th century. Before that time, in the American tradition, colleges were designed to cultivate an elite class, both for those reared in wealthy families and for those from various ranks in society who would take on leadership roles in the clergy and other professions. Early colleges, going back to Harvard in 1636, were hierarchical, undemocratic, and faithful to a concept of the unity of knowledge under principles of Christian morality. This view of the character of knowledge did not change radically until the end of the 19th century. Vocational training, apart from preparation for the clergy, did not play an important role. Engineering, law, (cee.)-135(E)-13(1(1)10()23(ai()23(ai()23(3

and included government officials on their governing boards while early state universities,

moral discipline to master. As college educators saw students fall away from organized religion—refusing to attend daily chapel, for instance—the appeal of science as moral discipline, linked to democracy and to the absence of prejudice, grew stronger.[12]

The social sciences claimed not only to inform students of the social world around them, but also to equip them with tools to determine how society's problems might be solved. In this way, the social sciences also offered to reintegrate academic knowledge around a principle of morality, a loosely Christian principle of social reform on behalf of the people least advantaged in a society.

Finally, the humanities made claim by the 1910s and 1920s that—in a world where both science and social science insisted on the neutrality of fact and the detachment of the investigator's own values and preferences from the content of investigative work—only the humanities continued an education of character through a direct examination of and growing sophistication about the moral life of the human being. As historian Julie Reuben argues, the developing identity of the humanities was "closely related to the efforts to find a secular substitute for religiously-based moral education and to the adoption of the idea that science was morally neutral."[13]

Elements of all of these claims survive. They compete with a variety of other claims that urge a set of specific requirements on the contemporary student and—like the claims of the sciences, social sciences, and humanities—are justified implicitly or explicitly as moral obligations. There are requirements designed to prepare students for life in a globalizing world, or for life in a multi-ethnic, pluralistic American society, or for life in a world where scientific and technological developments are unusually influential.

Early 20th century curricular reform sought to curb the excesses of elective education. It did not seek to restore a standardized curriculum but, as Reuben explains, to modify the elective system "to reduce the arbitrariness of the average student's education." It identified 'the college' as "a distinct entity within the university" and brought back notions of character formation as a key goal of college education.[14] Rarely did this lead to a core curriculum or a strong notion of general education. Faculty by the 1920s were fully committed to specialization in their disciplines and did not want to teach general education courses. But, in the 1910s and 1920s, reformers settled on "concentration and distribution requirements" as a brake on the elective principle. This turned out to be an enduring reform that remains at the heart of the curriculum in most American colleges and universities to this day.[15] More dramatic efforts to create a core curriculum or a common body of study for all students achieved partial success at Columbia University,

3 STRUCTURE AND CULTURE OF THE ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES

We continue our diagnosis of the decisive features of the environment for general education by turning to the contemporary structure of higher education. We concentrate on major research institutions, where the forces we identify are in clearest evidence.

The Structure of Academic Departments

For more than a century, the discipline-based academic department has been the backbone of the American university and college system. It is the primary unit of Colleges of Letters and Sciences (or Arts and Sciences), which are, in turn, the largest and most pivotal units for undergraduate education. Typically, departments are named after academic disciplines such as physics, psychology, or history, and are inhabited by faculty members who identify themselves by those disciplines, calling themselves not "college professors" but "physicists," "psychologists," and "historians." The departmental structure has proved remarkably stable, though new departments (for example, biophysics) are added when new and viable areas of knowledge emerge, and sometimes wholesale realignments are made (as in the recent history of the biological sciences). Increasingly, interdisciplinary and group majors have come to supplement the academic disciplines, but these are often composites of departmental offerings and have not replaced discipline-based departments as the core structural units of the college and university system.

Academic departments are central to the intellectual, organizational, budgetary, and curricular structure of colleges and universities. Each department has an internal administration of its own, comprised of graduate and undergraduate curriculum committees, personnel committees, admissions committees, and others. These departments are the career homes for their constituent faculty members, in that the department is the point of initiation for recommendations to appoint, promote, and advance faculty. (These recommendations are reviewed and made final or reversed at higher administrative levels.) In major research institutions, the department divides its teaching between graduate and undergraduate instruction, and the department chair oversees each and arranges—mainly through persuasion—the teaching schedules of his or her colleagues. Through the graduate degree programs, the department trains future professionals of their own design.

Academic departments are also the key budgetary units of the college, with department chairs submitting annual requests that are reviewed, altered, and ultimately approved by higher administrators. The special feature of the multiple-year commitment to "regular" faculty in the form of the FTE or "full-time equivalent" (carried to its extreme in the principle of tenure) means that the largest portion of the departmental budget is fixed and carries over from year to year. The budget for service staff (administrative and clerical personnel) is likewise relatively invariant. The variable part of the budget—new positions, funds for temporary hires, etc.—is competed for on a year-by-year basis. Thus, department chairs are competitive fighters while higher administrators act as referees and arbiters.

The academic department also plays a major role in shaping curricula within the university, as it is responsible for designing and teaching courses that constitute a "major" for undergraduate students who choose it, and frequently for designing "service courses" offered mainly to non-majors.

The disciplinary base of departments also permeates the non-university world, and is thereby consolidated further. All disciplines have national and regional (and sometimes state and local) professional associations. Many of those who teach and conduct research in universities are members. These associations provide an identity base, an occasion for periodic reaffirmation of disciplinary membership in annual meetings, an intellectual forum, a publication outlet through journals, a job market, and sometimes a political lobby. They also endow their members with professional prestige through prizes, honors,

4 INTEGRATING GENERAL EDUCATION INTO THE FABRIC OF THE UNIVERSITY

One of the striking institutional innovations throughout the University of California over the past two decades has been the creation of an administrative position to oversee undergraduate education (with a title of Vice Provost, Associate Vice Provost, or Dean). These chief undergraduate education officers are responsible in different ways for general education programs (within the rubric of undergraduate education as a whole). Every UC campus, with the exception of the fledgling Merced campus, has developed such a position, and their incumbents meet periodically with one another to discuss their ideas, activities, and problems. We regard this development as a welcome response to the impulse to give greater salience to general education. That impulse arises within the University, but also emanates from the state legislature and other agencies (including the Board of Regents), which are ever cognizant of the University's obligation to provide quality undergraduate education to the young citizens of the state. States also appreciate the economic value and national prestige that accrues to them from graduate and professional programs. At the same time, however, states regard such programs—as well as the university and faculty cultures that drive them—as in tension with the undergraduate mission of universities.

As part of the Commission's work, its co-chairs conducted detailed and confidential interviews with every incumbent of these administrative positions—three of whom were Commission members—asking about the range of their responsibilities, their place in the campus administrative structure, the kinds of support they receive, and the quality of their experiences as administrators. (See appendix B.) The descriptions, conclusions, and recommendations that follow are based in significant part on the results of these interviews. We here record our appreciation for our interviewees' cooperation and candor.

The creation of these new administrative positions has been a positive development, and their incumbent administrators have been responsible for initiating and participating in much of the ferment and innovation of general education recorded in appendix A. Our interviews revealed an encouraging picture. All incumbents are admirably committed to their missions, and all reported pleasure in improving the educational lives of undergraduates. Each enumerated and took pride in specific innovations that promise to improve the quality of undergraduate life.

Within this generally positive context, we view the creation of these administrative positions as only the first in a series of steps necessary for reinvigorating general education in the University of California system. This judgment is based on what we perceive as a number of anomalies and weaknesses in the situations of these officers. At the risk of ignoring some variations and exceptions, we list these limitations as follows:

- These officers are endowed with the widest variety of titles. There is nothing inherently wrong with this dispersion of titles, as they reflect the distinctive cultures, structures, and historical initiatives of the different campuses. The dispersion, however, symbolizes a certain ambiguity of place in the established administrative structure of the University.

- The functions of these officers are as diverse as their titles. Some oversee undergraduate education in general; others focus primarily on general education programs and projects. The specific aspects of general education that each administrator oversees likewise vary significantly from campus to campus. Again, we do not notice this out of any fetish about uniformity of function. We believe, however, that this reflects the fact that such positions have been grafted onto other administrative structures traditionally responsible for the territory of undergraduate education—and general education. Much of this territory is already occupied by offices of undergraduate affairs, other central administrators, deans, and chairs.

- On a few campuses, these officers have been urged to place a high priority on innovation. At the same time, we notice a tendency for them to be assigned responsibility for routine administrative monitoring of a great diversity of ongoing or new activities. Among these are: academic advising, honors programs, writing courses, preparation for accreditation, education abroad, institutional research, summer enrichments programs, special tutoring programs, and, in one case, student discipline. All of these activities are worthy enterprises and are potential sites for innovation, but they tend to fill up the time of the officers, to crowd in on their time for other innovative activities, and to lead to the observation ventured by a few that their work is largely what others put on their desks.

- In some cases, these positions have been accorded parity with other administrators with respect to reporting arrangements, power and autonomy, and participation in the central administrative apparatus of the campus, but, in other cases, they have not. Individuals in these chief undergraduate education officer positions have been, with great variability and with some exceptions, left to work their way around the administrative system, using influence rather than delegated authority. Furthermore, their efforts are sometimes resisted by other administrators who have long regarded themselves as responsible for the educational and curricular life of the campus. While this does not always result in open conflict, our informants reported that a great deal of their time is spent on consulting, coordinating, persuading, and maintaining diplomatic relations with other interested parties.

- Academic Senate authorization for most new general educational efforts is required and exercised on the campuses but, with a couple of exceptions, the systematic tracking and overview of general educational work by the faculty does not measure up to that of academic programs of established schools, colleges, and departments.

The Commission endorses the decisions of various campuses to create and implement these chief undergraduate education officer positions (including those administrators whose focus is general education) and applauds the imaginative and difficult work carried out by many who have worked in this capacity. We are convinced, however, that these offices are still limited in their usefulness and that campuses would benefit by taking a next evolutionary step. We do not have a stock formula in mind. In fact, past experience suggests that campuses do best when they innovate within their own unique context. With this caveat in mind, we recommend the following:

- Each campus should make a major effort to assess and re-specify, definitively, the position, authority, and responsibility of its chief undergraduate education officer. This effort should emanate from the chancellor's office, and should involve other units, such as student affairs, colleges, and the Academic Senate, which are, in some ways, "in the same business" of general education, and with whom the designated chief undergraduate education officers overlap. What should emerge is a new balance of responsibility and authority for general education and educational innovation. All campuses would profit from clarification and authorization of what have been too often ill-defined and floating administrative responsibilities.

- On campuses where this has not already been done, incumbents of the redefined chief undergraduate education officer positions should be given parity in the chancellor's cabinet, thus involving them more centrally in the fabric of the campus

- The interest and participation of the Academic Senate in general education should be augmented on those campuses where general education is lacking. We have in mind machinery above and beyond routine review by an Academic Senate Committee responsible for approving all courses. We hesitate to suggest a specific locus for this function for every campus. We do suggest, however, ample senate provision for approving and reviewing new programs of general education, whether initiated by the chief undergraduate education officer or by colleges and departments. The relevant senate body might also be responsible for periodic reviews of general education as a whole on campus, thus moving toward regularizing interest and reform rather than relying on periodic, one-shot committees or commissions.

- The campus should redefine where and in what ways undergraduates are advised with respect to general education requirements and opportunities. The advising roles played by undergraduate affairs, colleges and schools, and departments should be more clearly delineated. We are aware that current advising arrangements are scattered and tend to focus on what students "have to take" in order to "meet" graduation requirements. These requirements reinforce student perceptions that general education is something mandatory, undesired, and to be gotten out of the way. Improvements in the understanding and execution of advising are one element of a broader effort to strengthen general education.

All of these recommendations are aimed at improving the structural conditions that define the capacity of campuses to innovate in the area of general education. We regard such changes as the sine qua non for improvement.

We turn now to content, first addressing general curricular issues and then discussing the very important topic of preparing the young for civic engagement in a radically changed and changing world.

5 CURRICULAR INNOVATION

Early in the work of the Commission, we contacted the administrations of approximately two-dozen mostly public universities around the country, each of which has certain characteristics comparable to the University of California. We asked about their general education provisions and about recent or ongoing efforts to improve them. We make no claim for the representativeness of this sample. From the information gathered, however, there emerged several patterns which have helped to inform this Commission's work. (See appendix C.)

First, almost all of the institutions contacted revealed the common formula of specifying a number of subject areas (natural and life sciences, social sciences, humanities, and arts) from which students are required to select a certain number or combination of courses. Within each of these subject areas is typically a wide range of specific classes from which students can choose. This formula of elective breadth is often designated as the "cafeteria" approach to general education.[16]

Second, most institutions had recently undertaken or were undertaking some kind of review of general education, but most had resulted in only incremental suggestions for change. This is what might be described as the formula of tinkering.

Third, curricular innovations in general education revealed a concentration on a discrete number of themes:

- An of rau1Tjm( )Tje9in BT/T1_3BT/T1_3-13/GS0 O2mrdEMC Ee( )Tjm( )TcEMC Ee( )T(n)-15lEM

number of themesN9sp6(of)-6ip(9)efmig-80(wip(9)12(r) 9)keep(r) 9 9elec 9suggestion-131(of rau1Tjm( )Tje/T1176 3 2 Tf11.5 5 0 0 slec 9)eas blemslec 9commofe etyon a discrete

of university life (administrative, faculty, budgetary) to which we give special attention in this report. Attention to such changes is a fundamental precondition for enduring reform of general education programs.

With respect to the third item—curricular innovation—the Commission concludes that, on the whole, the impulse to innovate is strong and that universities are doing a commendable job of responding to real and emerging changes in the larger society and world. All of these emphases seem consistent with the diverse goals of general education. We also conclude that if we were to try to generate a general list of timely topics to be given curricular emphasis, we would do no better than the cumulative efforts we observe. In fact, there may be some mischief in attempting to produce uniform general formulas, given the different institutional conditions and regional variations that characterize American institutions of higher education. (The partial exception to this conclusion is in the area of civic engagement, which we address in the next section.)

In place of such an exercise, we will address additional issues connected with curricular offerings in general education: (1) required courses and programs, and (2) the avenues through which general education is delivered. In this section, we address forms of and settings for instruction; subsequently we will raise two additional issues—transfer students and educational technologies.

Requirements vs. Alternatives

We begin by identifying a widespread tension in general education—between no choice on one side, and maximum choice on the other. The former is represented in the University of Chicago's mandatory core courses, all of them extra-departmental; the Contemporary Civilization (locally know as "CC") courses at Columbia; the former American History and Institutions equiredmnt an ahe aniversity o-18(af)-398(Calformnia)-398(which)]TJETI

specific requirements and rely on the cafeteria principle alone, specifying three or four major subject areas within which courses must be taken. In its famous "no requirements" approach, Brown University carried the cafeteria principle to its extreme.

Several forces appear to have contributed to this general tendency away from specific and universal requirements: (1) the sheer "massification" of university education, which makes offering the same course—much less the same sequence—to every student a logistical nightmare, unless it is broken into small sections, as in the case of required courses in writing. The freshman-junior core requirement of the new, small campus of UC Merced may prove sustainable, but it will certainly face pressures to evolve away from that pattern as the campus grows; (2) a long-term development of value emphasis on individual student choice; and (3) political and ideological disagreements on what, if any, curricular content should be imposed on everyone.

A cynic might describe this tension between requirements and alternatives (also structure vs. lack of structure and freedom vs. constraint) as a struggle between a principle of political impossibility on the one hand and a principle of institutional cowardice on the other. American higher education appears to have evolved into a mix of diverse—and politically conscious—cultural constituencies with the result that efforts to impose specific, binding requirements on all students typically end in bitter conflict, paralysis, or watery compromises. Under these circumstances, the "cafeteria" style is an easy path because it requires the minimum from students (and ennobles the principle of free choice), and it does not require faculty to do anything different from offering the kinds of discipline-based courses they prefer. It is perhaps not too much to say that the "institutional cowardice" end of the continuum has won out in the long run, favored as it is by students and faculties, and preferred by administrators weary of chronic conflict and institutional headaches.

The Commission cannot pretend to resolve this endemic tension, and acknowledges that it is impossible to turn the clock back to past visions of uniformity. We do envision, however, one creative way of working within the contemporary landscape to the benefit of undergraduates. What we have in mind is further developing and publicizing structured and interdisciplinary instructional collections or packages of courses around timely issues such as environmental sustainability, technology and society, bureaucracy and society, military and society, and political and ethical dimensions of biological knowledge. Course packages might consist of a specified number of courses and include special ingredients, such as a term of original themed research. These bundles of courses could be named, formally recognized as something like "thematic" minors, and listed on students' academic transcripts. As it is, many students seek official recognition for their classroom work and currently they receive that recognition mainly in their identification with a major. That they normally have no way to be recognized for their work in general education courses reinforces the subordinate place of general education

in their overall college program. If a general education bundle could be acknowledged as worthy of official recognition on a transcript, this could enhance the role of general education on campus.

These curricular bundles would organize general education more like a prix xe dinner menu rather than an a la carte or cafeteria array.[17] Students would be free to choose a specific collection of courses, but, once chosen, its curricular ingredients would become self-imposed requirements. Some campuses are already experimenting with variations of this principle. We encourage its development as a way of guiding interested students into in-depth and timely interdisciplinary experiences that are clearly consistent with the aC1 dine0cour1 ede0 S cue0cue0beco1 vid03(aC1)nts

- Induce departments—or better, clusters of departments—to shape existing courses and create new ones in the interest of applying knowledge to ethical, moral, and political issues. These courses would involve a stretch beyond existing "service" courses, which are designed primarily to make specialized fields of knowledge available to non-majors.

- Develop more possibilities for involving undergraduates in research activities in academic, laboratory, and "field" settings. Research involvement has proven to be a very potent educational device, and, as a side benefit, it involves faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates in a collective enterprise. In the following section, we indicate the special importance of these activities for civic engagement.

- Continue efforts to improve and evaluate instruction and teaching methods on the part of regular faculty, temporary faculty, and graduate teaching assistants. The benefits of this effort include, but are not limited to, general education.

The above-mentioned enterprises overlap with one another, but there is no reason why campuses should not pursue multiple paths to maximizing the availability and value of general education offerings. In fact, a multi-sided attack seems the most rational strategy if we acknowledge that richness—rather than requirements—will continue to be the dominant motif of universities' efforts to revitalize general education.

At the same time, data suggest that there has been a measurable decline in voter turnout since the 1960s, though this decline is more moderate than is normally recognized.[19] Most of this decline took place in the fateful period between 1964 and 1976. In the succeeding 30 years, overall voter turnout has slipped only slightly, and inconsistently. At the same time, young people—who are indeed voting less, reading newspapers less, and following current affairs less than young cohorts in the recent past—may be engaged in a more active politics of everyday life than was once true. That is, students are making consequential political and personal decisions daily—and the line between political and personal is difficult to define—to use drugs or not to use drugs, to acknowledge publicly one's sexual orientation or not, to recycle or not to recycle, to drive a gas guzzler or a hybrid, to be vegetarian or not, to reach out across ethnic groups for friendship or not. Today, every one of these decisions is a politicized choice which has become more individualized.

This shift is most visible in discussions of adapting the curriculum to a world growing both more diverse and changing in politically consequential ways for which students are not prepared. Some educators call for a revitalized emphasis on foreign language study and, when possible, education abroad. They may also argue that today's world requires a more sophisticated knowledge of digital media, and h12(wlesg5liIlm0hel)21(media,)215935 Towing

Four Goals of Civic Education

Civic Information. Faculty members would like to think that their students are sent off into the wider world knowing something about American history and politics and current affairs, enough to be able to read a newspaper or to vote with some appreciation for what might be at stake in an election. Simply "being informed" is a very important civic goal and the one that requirements in history, diversity, global issues, and non-Western cultures are designed to meet.

Civic "Search" SkillsIn the past, research literature in political science has suggested that it is costly for citizens to acquire the knowledge they need to discern their interests and make considered choices at the voting booth. In this view, casting a well-informed vote is "irrational" because the cost of seeking out relevant information is greater than the benefit to the individual that his or her single vote is likely to affect. Today, in contrast, searching for information is much less costly to individuals. In fact, the problem is not one of searching for scarce information but of information "overload." Even very conscientious voters adopt informational shortcuts, trusting in the advice of a friend or acquaintance, the counsel of an interest group, or simply the general information that a candidate's party affiliation signals. Mastering informational abundance sometimes points to the benefits of new technologies, but it is unlikely that technological innovation can substitute for strengthening citizens' own capacities and habits as users of information. Citizens need skills and inclination that include a taste for wide reading and exposure to information; a drive or hunger toward a search beyond the first, superficial answer; a penchant for trying to understand opponents and figuring out how to address them on their own grounds; and a capacity to defer closure until some attempt has been made to weigh or balance multiple views. These motivations and capacities distinguish consumers, citizens, and students who are better able to protect themselves against the manipulations of advertisers, the spin of political candidates, and, for that matter, the political bias of professors. Such capacities distinguish employees who are able to work well in teams and to represent a company to a wide range of outside audiences. They also prepare individuals for leadership as citizens or as managers—and, of course, they are just the capacities that liberal arts education has traditionally sought to foster.

Civic education, then, should be oriented not only to information acquisition but also to the acquisition of skills and dispositions to enable life-long searching, sorting, and evaluation of information, as well as skill at turning information into an articulate argument in speaking and writing.

Appreciation of Democratic Values. A third objective relies on information but cannot be satisfied by information alone. It is a matter of learning to appreciate widely shared

and inequality get equal time? There is room for debate on these matters, to be sure,

SECTION 6

N AP and IB courses have become important ingredients in the curricula of both

Differentiation of function has two corollaries: differential admissions and transfer. UC campuses are authorized to admit the top 12.5% of the state's high school graduates, CSU campuses the top 33%, and community colleges are designated as open-admission institutions for California residents with (and in some cases without) high school diplomas. The transfer function provides for community college students to transfer to the other two segments if, in all cases, their academic records justify it.

Taken together, the three principles of differential function, differential admissions, and transfer constitute an institutional compromise that urges the system as a whole to strive simultaneously for competitive excellence and open opportunity. The principles have shown a remarkable stability for almost a half-century, persisting through several state reviews and despite a number of episodes of intersegmental rivalry.

The Commission calls particular attention to the transfer function and its implications for general education. Transfer is an important counter-balance to the differentiation of functions, for it permits those who begin their college experiences in one of the non-University segments to move to the University (usually after two years) and to gain a full degree there. As such, it articulates productively with California's democratic and egalitarian traditions, and, in recent decades, has proved a meaningful ingredient in the state's efforts to provide all students an additional avenue to attain degrees in segments of California's system where they could not begin their higher education.

The rate of transfers has fluctuated over time, but has shown an overall pattern of growth. If we add these transfer data to a number of other significant numbers in higher education—numbers of dropouts and stop-outs, frequency of dropping cours5( )-1i-5(dm[wp)-5(i)-5ti-5

ueveraltimeina st5( )(n)-5(t)-5( )65(c)-5(a)-5(r)5(e)-5(e)-5rsiling135(f)-5()fse cel hae to revis5( )( )65(o)-5(u)-5(r

- There has been a steady climb in completion rates with respect to the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC)—a series of courses offered by the community colleges that satisfy the lower division breadth and general

courses specifically designed for transfer students. Thurgood Marshall College at UC San Diego, for instance, offers for transfers a one-quarter version of its three-quarter core course entitled “Diversity, Justice, and Imagination.”

The second issue concerns the nature and quality of general education offerings in the community colleges and state university systems. As more students come to meet their GE requirements in these segments, this problem becomes more salient. As a special commission on the status of general education, we ask that the University of California take a more cooperative interest in intersegmental discussions on the content, signi cance, and quality of general education courses offered in the other segments, and in how these articulate witf5wit eneral -ducation -duarsfegf5ulate1(on(transfef5ulate1(arioulate1()36(niv)6(ersity)-1iv)te1()36

8 NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND GENERAL EDUCATION

The applications of information and communication technologies (ICTs) in higher education are many. They increase efficiency in administrative processes such as admitting students, managing classroom space, and evaluating faculty. They also provide infrastructure (for example, universal e-mail systems and digital libraries) for the educational process. Finally, they promise to change the face of teaching and learning. We concentrate on the last set of potentialities because they link directly, but not exclusively, to issues of general education. In the teaching and learning realm specifically, ICTs are cited as potentially effective tools for (a) improving academic quality through collaborative and "student-centered" learning, (b) containing or reducing costs of undergraduate instruction, especially in high enrollment general education courses, and (c) providing access to an increasingly diverse college applicant pool. We will focus on these three aspects insofar as they have the potential to affect general education.

Quality

Two faulty assumptions often confuse discussions of technology in undergraduate education: 1) educational technology equals online and distance education, and 2) the technologies themselves are monolithic and static in their qualities and potential. Regarding the first, most public universities use ICTs in "hybrid" environments, where ICTs both complement and facilitate face-to-face and "one-to-many" interactions in large introductory lecture courses. The ratio of online components to face-to-face interactions can vary from course to course, as well as between types of institution, with only a few traditional four-year institutions currently offering large numbers of courses entirely online.

Regarding the second assumption, ICTs combine production and delivery technologies with interactive communication technologies. They also include rapidly evolving hardware and software systems that can be combined in an almost infinite number of ways. Each modality has particular characteristics that contribute to its relative strength or weakness as a tool for traditional teaching/learning methods. These tools may be paired with particular pedagogical goals such as literacy (including quantitative, information seeking, computational, and writing literacy), analytical and critical thinking, and internationalization. Their promise includes increased and easier interaction (e.g., synchronous and asynchronous collaborations between students and teachers, seamless

communication with dispersed peoples and places), visualization of complex structures and processes, and unprecedented access to primary source and secondary study materials, data sets, and media from around the world.

There are as many examples of creative use of ICTs in general education as there are faculty who have the time and inclination to experiment with their potential. General education courses urge upon students both a global perspective and a historical perspective on whatever is under study. The Internet makes this more and more available to every classroom and every student and teacher with access to adequate bandwidth. Students studying contemporary affairs can get perspectives on the topic at hand with ease from the BBC, The Guardian, or Al-Jazeera. Students of history can view original sources from their laptops and gain access to materials once available only at the largest research libraries or specialized archives. Students working on topics in the arts and languages can download myriad audio and visual materials and, of course, teachers can do the same for classroom presentation. In the sciences, simulations and animations can make difficult-to-visualize processes immediately comprehensible.

Assessing, not accessing, however, is at the heart of the critical intelligence that general education seeks to develop. Student facility with using new tools does not translate automatically to sophistication in navigating the online world for the substantive research needed in term papers and seminar discussions. The propensity of students to avoid the library and to cull most resources from the Web contributes to the perception that, although they are savvy about navigating online environments, they are less adept at discriminating quality. “Information lit-34(lit-34(lit-ing)-33 1 Tf11,c7)-111(ar)1011(r)1mTf1185(t.5 361185(

- Provide servers and other technologies that allow faculty to digitize and store their own teaching resources (e.g., digitized images, text, video, and audio). This may be particularly crucial in the humanities and "soft" social sciences where budgets are too small to permit conversion of analog materials to digital format.
- Develop mechanisms for assessing and ensuring the quality of online general education courses.

9 ENCOURAGING A CULTURE THAT SUPPORTS GENERAL EDUCATION

General education arose early in the 20th century as a protest against and remedy to the diversification and specialization of college curricula. Its proponents sought to revitalize the generalist perspective in light of this increasing trend toward specialization and elective choice for students and tried to instill in students values and skills beyond simply enhancing their earning potentials or career prospects. The idea quickly gained traction. Yet, despite all the efforts devoted to the liberal ideal of general education, and despite decades of eloquent testimony to its values, the ideal still faces an uphill battle.

Most students come to college with little comprehension of what a general education is, or why it might be valuable. Most expect college to advance them vocationally, but fewer anticipate that college can help them develop culturally, morally, or politically. In this context, it should come as no surprise that many students do not really "get the point" of general education requirements; these seem to be an extension of high school and students want to get them "out of the way." It is not clear that anything can change this outlook dramatically. What is certain is that nothing will change if there is no mobilization among relevant campus constituencies.

It is possible to build a campus culture that is more supportive of general education. In the text that follows, however, we offer no silver bullets. Our emphasis throughout has been on formidable structural obstacles to general education. We have in mind, rather, the imagery of clawing at a granite boulder in the hope of gaining a finger-hold here and there, in the hope that, cumulatively, multiple efforts will make a difference.

Faculty

Faculty do not generally reap material rewards for teaching general education courses, although this varies according to the cultures and economics of particular universities. S(M.8al)-to the cyp0 0 1xBT/T1inBT/T14 9ae cumthe /T15()-9(cl0(e -55(cumtheb1can)]TJb1ca 11rac)]TJb

typically have higher morale. This logic leads low-enrollment departments to find rewards in teaching general education courses. Yet, even in these departments, the collective benefit of general education enrollments does not necessarily translate into individual benefits for a particular faculty member who might prefer to teach upper-division courses for majors or lead a graduate seminar.

How can faculty be encouraged to teach general education?

- One option is to offer faculty members a financial bonus for teaching general education courses. At UC San Diego, faculty who teach college core courses (the heart of the freshman general education program in several of the undergraduate colleges) receive modest support for research-related expenses the first time they teach a core course, and a lesser sum for each additional time they teach. Faculty across the UC campuses who teach freshman seminars receive $1,500 in research funds. The amounts are modest and no doubt would be more effective if increased.

- A faculty member's total teaching obligation can be reduced as a reward for teaching general education courses. The Chemistry Department at UC San Diego, for instance, gives extra teaching credit to faculty who teach large lower-division or introductory courses that enroll both majors and non-majors.

- Faculty can be provided instructional resources when they teach general education courses. At some institutions, basic general education courses have their own office staffs who provide faculty with services such as ordering books, assembling photo-copied readers, posting a course web page, and hiring teaching assistants.

- Faculty can be provided moral support from prestigious sources. Are there campus-wide awards for teaching? Often such awards go to faculty who teach popular lower-division or general education courses. Is there an awards ceremony? Does the president, chancellor, or provost attend and speak at the awards ceremony? Does a leading administrator, a distinguished alumnus, or perhaps a leading donor, make remarks about the value of general education? Some high-powered cheerleading for general education can enhance the morale of those who devote time to general education.

This is not to suggest that external rewards alone matter. Many faculty members find intrinsic pleasure in teaching general education courses. Tackling materials beyond one's specialization can be challenging, enlightening, and gratifying. Many faculty appreciate the opportunity to work with colleagues outside of their own departments. Pleasing

Graduate Students

At most research universities, the first—and sometimes only—instructors that undergraduate students come to know, and become known to, are graduate students. This contact, however, is often governed by the rule that the more a graduate student focuses on his or her advancement in specialized research and on the distinctive language, culture, and presuppositions of the discipline, the more peers and instructors will admire that graduate student and the more successful the graduate student is likely to be in an academic career. Top graduate students are rarely directed to think about teaching and even less frequently urged to think about teaching undergraduate students who have no prospect or intention of becoming professionals in the discipline.

In this climate, what hope is there that undergraduates will learn to appreciate the value of a general education from the graduate students who teach them? There can be no strengthening of general education unless graduate students, as present and future instructors, are themselves welcomed into a culture that prizes general education. They, too, should reap additional rewards when they teach—as they frequently do—in general education courses. They, too, should be recognized with teaching awards. They could also be honored in an annual dinner or symposium on the meaning of general education, or with special invitations to receptions for distinguished visiting artists and lecturers on campus.

Some universities—UC campuses among them—have adopted programs for cultivating the teaching skills of graduate students and providing varying degrees of mentoring and support. Despite this, many graduate students find themselves in front of a classroom with little teacher training or support. In addition to exposing graduate students to the culture of general education, we endorse ongoing efforts to develop general teaching skills among graduate students.

Non-Ladder and Part-Time Faculty

In many institutions, a great deal of instruction in general education falls to non-ladder and part-time faculty. Colleges and universities, more and more dependent on these instructors and increasingly relating to them through standardized contracts negotiated with labor unions, do little to welcome these instructors into the wider culture of the institution. We urge campuses to develop policies and programs of ollegesT1_4 T1_felop poD19wependen?v pol

Advising Sta

At small colleges, academic advising may be done exclusively or primarily by the faculty. At larger institutions, academic advising is normally assigned to staff with specialized training. While advising typically takes place at both the college and departmental levels, at both there is a tendency to rely on non-academic staff personnel. They are typically delegated a great deal of advising responsibility, even though they are, in principle, supervised by academic deans and faculty members, respectively.

Academic advisors are routinely overburdened with student demands. It is likely that many of them have not had much in the way of general education themselves, and it is not practical to require it of them. It is practical, however, to have one or several of the most distinguished faculty on campus address advisors annually in a talk or workshop on topics such as the "Aims of Education" or "The Curriculum Past and Present" or "What Liberal Education Means." These workshops would honor the advisors' important role in undergraduate instruction and remind them, in ways their daily activities rarely allow, about its larger purposes. In addition to exposing advising staff to the aims and values of liberal education, they ought to be reminded often about the actual availability and value of current general education offerings on the campus. Such efforts promise to reinforce the presence and strength of information on general education in the advising culture.

Undergraduates

Students may value general education courses at the time they take them, or in retrospect. Prospectively, however, general education strikes many of them as a deviation from the upward path to marketable skills. National surveys show that students have grown increasingly conscious of economic reasons for attending college: in 1971, 37% of college freshman listed "being very well off financially" as an essential or very important reason to go to college—this rose to 74% in 2001. The goal of gaining "a general education and appreciation of ideas" has held steady as an essential or important reason for attending college—64% of freshman listed it in 1971 and 66% in 2001—though these percentages declined relative to career and economic goals. There is a constituency among students for general education, but the motivation for general education currently finds itself in greater conflict with the pressure of economic and vocational ambitions than in the past.[32]

The simplest way to teach undergraduates the value of general education is to speak to them about its value.[33] We should not allow the brute fact of requirements to substitute for a discussion about why those requirements exist, and we should inform students continuously of non-required opportunities for courses, programs, and activities with a general education component. Moreover, if universities adopt our proposal for clusters of general education courses (named "bundles"), then students who complete these bundles can be rewarded with recognition on their transcripts.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION

The following recommendations are directed to the UC campuses in particular, but have implications for public and private universities nationwide.

1. Campuses should systematize their commitment to general education by re-casting and extending the role of chief undergraduate education officers. In particular, these positions should (a) be assured a conspicuous place, voice, and role in the central administration of campuses; (b) be given ample discretionary, renewed annual budgets and other resources to promote courses and programs in general education; and (c) be protected, where appropriate, from routine administrative chores, in order to enhance opportunities for initiative and innovation. (See Section 4: Integrating General Education into the Fabric of the University.)

2. Campuses should give high priority to ensuring appropriate incentive structures to enable faculty to participate in general education enterprises, thus easing a principal impediment to faculty involvement in general education. (See Section 4: Integrating General Education into the Fabric of the University)

3. As one alternative to the "cafeteria approach" to general education, in which students choose a set of core courses from an unwieldy list of general education courses, campuses should develop a discrete number of thematic, interdisciplinary bundles or sequences of courses around substantive and timely topics. These packages could be considered a substitute for discipline-based minors and could receive full academic recognition, so indicated on students' transcripts. Students could select any given thematic package voluntarily, but once selected, all of its constituent parts would be required. (See Section 5: Curricular Innovation in General.)

4. Campuses should give the highest priority to advancing the civic education and engagement of their undergraduates. In particular, they should expand and consolidate courses and programs that combine (a) students' volunteer service or political work; (b) instruction in the academic significance and importance of that work; and (c) individual or group-based student research related to their community involvement. (See Section 6: Thinking Through the Civic Dimension.)

5. The University of California and its campuses should evaluate the implications of advanced placement credit and the academic work of transfer students for the general education of its students. They should cooperate fully and equally with high schools, community colleges, and state universities, in order to safeguard the integrity and maximize the quality and effectiveness of the general education of students who spend only part of their educational careers at the University. (See Section 7: Transfer of Credits and Transfer Students.)

ENDNOTES

[16] For a description of the near-universality of standard distribution requirements for statewide general education programs, see Robert Schoenberg (ed.) General Education and Student Transfer: Fostering Intentionality and Coherence in State Systems (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges

[27] See, for example, Carol A. Twigg, "Improving learning and reducing costs: New models for online learning." EDUCAUSE Review, 38(5): 28-38 (September/October 2003). Available at http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/erm0352.pdf; the Pew Grant Program in Course Redesign, at The National Center for Academic Transformation (NCAT). Available at http://www.thencat.org/PCR.htm; and the Mellon Cost-Effective Uses of Technology in Teaching (CEUTT) Initiative, Saul Fisher and Thomas I. Nygren, Experiments in the cost-effective uses of technology in teaching: Lessons from the Mellon program so far (New York: The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, 2000). Available at http://www.ceutt.org/

[28] Diane Harley, Jonathan Henke, and Michael W. Maher. "Rethinking Space and Time: The Role of Internet Technology in a Large Lecture Course," Innovate, Vol. 1, No. 1 (October/November 2004). Available at http://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/publications.php?id=34

[29] Providing undergraduate and high school curricula available free of cost to worldwide audiences (as embodied in the OpenCourseWare movement at MIT http://ocw.mit.edu/index.html) is an emerging phenomenon and may provide an avenue for public universities and colleges to demonstrate their relevance and openness to taxpayers and legislatures (which are usually more interested in an institution's quality of undergraduate education than they are in research preeminence). The movement has potentially large implications for public relations and social good.

[30] The University of California offers online AP courses through UC College Prep Online (UCCP) http://www.uccp.org/. The Michigan State Board of Education approved a new graduation requirement in December 2005 that would make every high-school student in the state take at least one online course before receiving a diploma. See Dan Carnevale, January 6, 2006. "Michigan Considers Requiring Online Course for High-School Students," Chronicle of Higher Education. Available at http://chronicle.com/weekly/v52/i18/18a04501.htm.

[31] Daniel Golden, May 9, 2006. "Degrees@StateU.edu Online University Enrollment Soars as Quality Improves." The Wall Street Journal. Available at http://online.wsj.com/article/SB114713782174047386.html?mod=googlenews_wsj

[32] Alexander W. Astin, Leticia Oseguera, Linda J. Sax, and William S. Korn, The American Freshman:

APPENDIX A

Summary of Undergraduate General Education at University of California Campuses

Table A-1: University of California general education requirements, by campus	
Campus	General Education Requirements
Riverside	UCR has cafeteria-style distribution requirements. Every student must take classes in World History, Ethnicity, Natural Sciences, and Social Science and Humanities. There is no campus-wide language requirement.
San Diego	UCSD is comprised of six semi-autonomous undergraduate colleges: Revelle, John Muir, Thurgood Marshall, Earl Warren, Eleanor Roosevelt, and Sixth. Each of the colleges has its own general education requirements, allowing undergraduates to choose from among six distinct general education curricula supplementing their major requirements. These curricula range from a very structured liberal arts type program to a program with a broad range of electives. The general education requirements of the colleges are met through a series of courses approved for these purposes. Some courses are the regular course o□erings of the instructional units (departments and programs) of the university, other courses have been developed specifically for the purposes of general education.
Santa Barbara	The General Education Program requirements include seven General Subject Areas and five Special Subject Areas. The degree that a student is pursuing (bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, bachelor of fine arts, or bachelor of music) determines the distribution of courses within General Subject

Table A-2: Recent campus-speci c general education initiatives	
Campus	Recent General Education Initiatives
Irvine	N In 2003, the campus established the joint Senate and Administrative UC Irvine Task Force on Undergraduate Education. The Task force was concerned that students were given few opportunities to take electives outside of their majors or to make informed decisions about which disciplines they wanted to pursue. The Task Force made three general recommendations: N Emphasize the benefits of not declaring a major to incoming freshman. The campus would instead o□er an "Integrated First-Year Experience" (UCLA's Cluster Program provides one model), to expose students to a wide range of disciplines without sacrificing their time to degree. N Provide students greater flexibility within the structure of existing majors and breadth requirements. This may involve requiring departments to allow students room for electives within the major, or incorporate a research or practical experience. N Create new majors that support interdisciplinary learning. One option might involve creating tran-disciplinary majors, in which students could customize their area of specialization. The Task Force also recommended that multiple departments sponsor a major so that students could study a discipline through a variety of lenses.
Los Angeles	N In 1994, a faculty-student workgroup was organized to examine the General Education (GE) curriculum at UCLA, and in 1997 issued a report entitled General Education at UCLA: A Proposal for Change. This document called for GE requirements that were "simpler, fewer, more coherent, and clearer in purpose;" a common campus-wide GE curriculum and course list; first year clusters; and a permanent GE oversight authority. N In 1996, Judith L. Smith was appointed Vice Provost (VP) for Undergraduate Education and given authority over general education at UCLA. Vice Provost Smith worked with university administrators, Deans, faculty, and Academic Senate committees throughout 1997-98 to draft and implement plans for GE reform, and in 1998-99, Smith launched a pilot GE Cluster Program with the aim of developing ten clusters over five years to enroll up to 45% of the incoming freshman class. During the same

Table A-2: Recent campus-speci c general education initiatives	
Campus	Recent General Education Initiatives
Santa Barbara	N In November 1999, UC Santa Barbara convened a General Education Task Force to review GE requirements, analyze them against GE programs at comparable universities, and recommend possible improvements to the general education program. The task force was also asked to look at the possibility of a community service component, and of additional ethnic studies courses, as part of the university's GE requirements. N In May 2002, the task force released its report, and recommended a GE plan with four components: skills courses; core courses; and one course each in ethnic studies and western civilization. There are three categories of skills courses: writing; quantitative reasoning; and foreign language. Core areas include: art studies; literary and textual studies; historical studies; social sciences; and science and mathematics. N The task force cited several goals in making its recommendations. Among these goals were: building GE around strong courses designed for non-majors; raising the academic standards in GE classes; providing freshmen with the opportunity to take small classes with regular faculty; increasing the number of GE courses taught by regular faculty; increasing the number of cross disciplinary and inter-disciplinary GE courses; and improving instruction in reading, writing, quantitative and research skills.
Santa Cruz	N In 1999, a taskforce of the Academic Senate proposed a revision that eliminated the distinction between "introductory" and "topical" courses, directed that the upper-division writing course be delivered in the major, and gave students the option of reducing the number of breadth courses required by satisfying an approved interdisciplinary topical cluster or by completing two years of a second language. The revision was narrowly defeated in the senate due to concerns about sustainability of the upper-division writing requirement and the reduction of required breadth. N Since the resolution's defeat, the Committee on Educational Policy has revisited one of the requirement areas each year to review the courses designated in the area to ensure that they remain aligned with the original intent of the requirements.

APPENDIX B

Chief Undergraduate Education O cers Interviewed		
Mark Appelbaum	Associate Vice Chancellor, Undergraduate Education	UC San Diego
Andrew Grosovsky	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education	UC Riverside
William Ladusaw	Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education	UC Santa Cruz
Christina Maslach	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instructional Technology	UC Berkeley
Gregg Herken	Professor, School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts	UC Merced
Sharon Salinger	Dean, Division of Undergraduate Education	UC Irvine
Judi Smith	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education	UC Los Angeles
Fred E. Wood	Interim Vice Provost, Undergraduate A□airs	UC Davis
Alan Wyner	Dean of Undergraduate Studies	UC Santa Barbara

Comparison of General Education Reforms Among Institutions				
Institution	Type of Initiative	General Education Program	Year	Link
Harvard University	Curricular Review			

Comparison of General Education Reforms Among Institutions				
Institution	Type of Initiative	General Education Program	Year	Link
Princeton University	Curricular Review	N Princeton's general education curriculum is designed to expose students to both specialized and broad areas of knowledge and to teach them critical thinking skills. N Princeton's new general education requirements include courses in writing, foreign language (though engineering students are exempt from this), epistemology and cognition, ethical thought and moral values, historical analysis, literature and the arts, quantitative reasoning, social analysis, and science and technology.	1995	http://www.princeton.edu/pr/pub/gen/
Stanford University	Curricular Review	N The Commission on Undergraduate Education issued a report that recommended improvements in academic advising, curricular changes, and creating a new vice provost post for undergraduate education. N The Commission focused their recommended curricular changes on creating a new core science requirement for non-science majors that teaches these students how to think scientifically. It also recommended requiring students to develop a thematic connection among their humanities and social science breadth requirements and to develop common sets of themes for the "Culture, Ideas, and Values" requirements. Finally, it recommended strengthening foreign language and writing requirements, and developing a course on oral communication. N The Commission's report led to the development of freshman and sophomore seminar courses and undergraduate research programs. N The report also led Stanford to launch its Campaign for Undergraduate Education (CUE). The money for this program was initially used to start up new curricular programs, but is now being used for a host of items that support undergraduate education, from scholarships to student organizations. N The CUE has raised over $1 billion thus far.	1994	http://news-service.stanford.edu/news/2005/january12/cue-011205.html http://www.stanford.edu/dept/news/pr/94/941012Arc4101.html

Comparison of General Education Reforms Among Institutions				
Institution	Type of Initiative	General Education Program	Year	Link
University of Florida	General Education Curriculum	N The University has a General Education Council that periodically reviews the curriculum. Currently, the goal of general education at the University of Florida is to provide students a "collective knowledge about the world [that] enables [them] to communicate, to make informed decisions about many aspects of [their] lives, and to understand and participate fully as informed citizens in matters local, national, and global." N Six of the students' general education credits must have an international/diversity focus.		
University of Georgia	Curricular Review	N The University's Council on General Education developed a set of general education learning outcomes that emphasized oral and written communication, quantitative reasoning, science, the arts, and cultural and social perspectives. N In 2000, the faculty senate held a symposium on the future of general education in the 21st century to make general observations on the current structure of higher education - whether or not it should be limited to the first two years of undergraduate education or should be integrated into the entire undergraduate experience. The task force report was published in 2006.	2000 2006	http://www.usg.edu/academics/comm/gen_ed/ http://www.curriculumsystems.uga.edu/ucc/ucctaskforce0306.pdf
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	No known major reforms	N Students are expected to develop fluency and literacy in English, literacy in at least one foreign language, exposure to di□erent disciplines, and intensive study in one discipline (or an interdisciplinary major).		

Comparison of General Education Reforms Among Institutions				
Institution	Type of Initiative			


SHE
Center

This course is also offered as RELS 324 .

PHIL 306

Theme C: Cross-Cultural Exploration

Theme Coordinator: Tony Waters, BUTE 629.

One of the most intriguing aspects of the human experience is how people from different cultures experience reality in often very different ways. Why is this? And how has it come about? You are invited to join in this intellectual adventure to explore across cultures for a greater understanding of the many perspectives and values which provide the

Theme Coordinator: Robert Stewart, TRNT 105.

In this theme you will study the relationship between moral values you, as a member of society, hold, and their embodiment in the social institutions which affect your daily life. In this theme, you will explore ethics as a philosophical theory, a social and cultural phenomenon, and as a matter of practical decision-making. The study of ethics cuts across disciplines and will allow you to select a capstone course close to your own interests.

1 course required:

GEOS 354	Science and Ethics	3.0	SP	GE

Prerequisites: Completion of the General Education Breadth Area B requirement, PHIL 3 21.

1 course selected from:

PHIL 321

This course is also offered as THEA 315 .

THEA 315	Gender and the Stage	3.0	FS	GE

This course is also offered as MCGS 315 .

1 course selected from:

CMST 334	Gender and Communication	3.0	FS	GE
HIST 335	Women and Gender in American History	3.0	INQ	GE

This course is also offered as WMST 335 .

JOUR 311	Women, Men, and the Media	3.0	SP	GE

This course is also offered as WMST 311 .

WMST 311	Women, Men, and the Media	3.0	SP	GE

This course is also offered as JOUR 311 .

WMST 335	Women and Gender in American History	3.0	INQ	GE

This course is also offered as HIST 335 .

Theme G: Global Issues

Theme Coordinator: Mitchell Johns, PLMS 219.

This theme focuses on the enduring global issues of food, environment, human rights, justice, and social conflict. Exploration of these issues can be done through careful selection of courses in the theme. Global food issues focuses on the area of worldwide food production, distribution, and consumption. It explores crop production systems, biotechnology/GMO, environment, politics, and economics of food production and distribution, hunger and poverty as a method of inquiry into the theme issues. Geopolitics investigates the nature of the world and its physical, cultural, economic, and political evolution and studies how the process of global interdependence, in its clash with local authorities and conditions, forces re- evaluation of the enduring theme issues.

Foundation Course - to be taken first:

1 course selected from:

PHIL 336	American Indian Environmental Philosophies	3.0	FS	USD GE
RELS 332	World Religions and Global Issues	3.0	FS	GC GE

1 course selected from:

GEOS 370	Energy in the Human Environment	3.0	SP	GE

Prerequisites: One course from Breadth Area B1.

PSSC 392	World Food and Fiber Systems	3.0	FS	GC GE

Capstone Course - to be taken last:

Prerequisites: Junior status at the end of semester in which course is taken and curr ent enrollment in the Honors Program.
This course is also offered as GEOG 316H .

GEOG 316H	Crossing Boundaries: Gender and Modernization	3.0	FS	USD

California, needs to understand and appreciate.

Students who select this theme have the option of spending the last six weeks of the semester on an "experiential-living" program in Mexico or Costa Rica. Please see the Latin American Studies Coordinator for more information.

1 course selected from:

LAST 351	Natural History and Ecology of Mexico and Central America	3.0	FS	GC GE

This course is also offered as LAST 321 .

Prerequisites: One biological sciences course.

BIOL 322	Science and Human Values	3.0	SP	GE

Prerequisites: One biological sciences course.
This course is also offered as PHIL 322 .

OR (the following course may be substituted for the above)

PHIL 322	Science and Human Values	3.0	SP	GE

Prerequisites: One biological sciences course.
This course is also offered as BIOL 322 .

PHIL 370	Philosophy of Science	3.0	FS	GE

Capstone - to be taken last:

1 course selected from:

CSCI 301	Computer's Impact on Society	3.0	FS	WP GE

Prerequisites: ENGL 130 (or its equivalent) with a grade of C- or higher; Junior stan ding.

MCGS 380	Gender, Science, and Society	3.0	SP	GE

Theme N: War and Peace in the Nuclear Age

Theme Coordinator: Thomas Imhoff, TRNT 107.

This theme examines an issue of universal concern in an age of apocalyptic weapons - the causes of war and prospects for peace. Integrating an array of courses in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities, this theme invites students to draw their own conclusions about the causes and ethics of war and the real possibilities for peace.

POLS 344	U.S. Foreign Policy	3.0	FS	GE
SOCI 356	Genocide	3.0	FA	GC GE

This course is also offered as MJIS 356 .

Theme O: Women's Issues

Theme Coordinator: Katherine McCarthy, TRNT 237.

This theme is designed to provide a variety of perspectives on women within the United States and globally, including psychological, social and cultural issues, artistic and religious expression, political and scientific involvement, and health concerns. These perspectives are explored and analyzed to help students, both male and female, appreciate the contributions of women and to understand the issues that affect women's lives.

1 course selected from:

HCSV 368	Women's Health	3.0	FS	GE

This course is also offered as NURS 368 , WMST 368 .

NURS 368	Women's Health	3.0	FS	GE

This course is also offered as HCSV 368 , WMST 368 .

WMST 368	Women's Health	3.0	FS	GE

This course is also offered as HCSV 368 , NURS 368 .

1 course selected from:

ENGL 360	Women Writers	3.0	FS	GE

This course is also offered as WMST 360 .

RELS 375	Women and Religion	3.0	FS	GE

This course is also offered as WMST 375 .

WMST 360	Women Writers	3.0	FS	GE

This course is also offered as ENGL 360GL 3 isse i iansas EWo41 -0.3 (d) 0.2 (( ) -0.7 (a) 0.4) -0.3 (me) -

WMST 333	Women Internationally	3.0	FS	GC GE

Theme Q: International Studies Abroad: London, Italy, France, Spain

Theme Coordinator: Frank Li, SSC 440.

Students who participate in the London Semester or in the CSU International Program in France (Aix-en- Provence or Paris), Spain (Madrid or Granada), or Italy (Florence) are eligible to complete two o

Theme U: Catastrophe and Humanity

Theme Coordinator: Karin Hoover, PHSC 226.

All human societies have pondered the meaning of catastrophe as they have experienced

Biodiversity and Cultural Diversity

Wildlife, Fish and Conservation Biology 10	SciEng, Div, Wrt
Plant Biology 11	SciEng, Wrt
Textiles and Clothing 7	SocSci, Div, Wrt
Community and Regional Development 2	SocSci, Div, Wrt
Landscape Architecture 2	SocSci, Wrt

Food and Fiber

This option focuses on food and fiber systems, from their plant, animal, or synthetic sources to their ultimate use by humans for health, safety, communication, and pleasure. Underst anding these systems enables students to see the connections between the food and clothes th at are part of our everyday lives and the scientific, social, and cultural issues that make them so significant to society as a whole.

Topics might include food and clothing safety, quality, and availability; media and c onsumer perceptions; and cultural histories, values, and meanings.

Food and Fiber

Animal Science 1	SciEng, Wrt
[or Plant Biology 12	

Plant Biology 12	SciEng, Div, Wrt
Agricultural and Resource Economics 15	SocSci, Div, Wrt
Environmental & Resource Sciences 121*	SciEng, Wrt
Science and Society 2	SciEng or SocSci, Wrt

Page content manager can be reached at Catalog-Comment@ucdavis.edu .

Updated: November 17, 2010 2:46 PM