# Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 1, 2012

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, November 1, 2012 in room 201 of Buckingham. Senate Chair William D. Rich called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m.

Of the current roster of 62 Senators, 34 were present for this meeting, Senators Beneke, S. Clark, Swinn, Hamed, Huff, Koskey, Lillie, McKnight, Opoku-Agyeman, Patnaik, Ramcharran, Vinnedge, Wesdemiotis and Youngs were absent with notice. Senators Apple, Chronister, Clemons, Cushing, Ducharme, Elliott, Gatzia, LiVecchi, Lyndall, Newton, Queener, Rostedt and Zhe were absent without notice.

## I. Approval of the Agenda

Senator Sterns moved to adopt the proposed agenda. The motion was seconded by Senator Buldum.

**The motion was adopted without dissent**.

## II. Approval of the Minutes

Adoption of the proposed minutes of the October 4, 2012 meeting will be considered at the December meeting.

## III. Chairman's Remarks

Chair Rich began his remarks by commenting on the General Education Revision Proposal. The ad hoc committee is not proposing this for adoption at this time, but rather is distributing it so that faculty around the University can review it and comment on it to the committee. The committee intends to revise the proposal in light of those comments.

Included in today's Executive Committee report is a proposal for a resolution in which the Senate states its intent not to consider and ultimately approve or disapprove the proposal until each of the faculties of the affected colleges has had a chance to deliberate on and vote on the eventual proposal that comes out of the committee.

The process of changing the general education requirement is a two-stage process. The first stage will result in a proposal from the committee. If it passes, it will establish the *architecture* of the General Education Revision. Once adopted stage two will focus on *constructing* the curriculum changes that will be channeled through the normal curriculum review process, including the Curriculum Review Committee.

## IV. Special Announcements

Chair Rich reported the deaths of five members of the university community:

*Dr. Robert William Roberts,* one of the founders of The University of Akron's Department of Chemical Engineering, died October 8. He was 89.

*Dr. Gerard "Gerry" M. Sweeney* died May 15th in Readfield, Maine. He was 69.

*Charlotte M. Hanten* died October 7th. She was 90.

*Dr. Coleman Joseph* died August 21st. He was 96.

*Dr. Giannina Pianalto* died October 30th.

The Senate stood for a moment of silence in memory of our deceased colleagues.

## V. Reports

**Executive Committee**
Senator Bove reported as follows on behalf of the Executive Committee:

Thank you Chair Rich. Good Afternoon Guests and Senators.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met on October 11th to appoint unassigned Senators to standing committees of the Faculty Senate. The EC discussed how the Akron Experience and Culture Quest may intersect with academic matters under the purview of the Faculty Senate. The EC also discussed how to disseminate and gather feedback on the preliminary findings of the ad hoc General Education Revision Committee.

The Executive Committee next met on October 18th to review the agenda and to prepare for the meeting with the President and Provost later that afternoon. At this meeting the Executive Committee discussed how to target faculty-users of clicker technology to call for nominations in order to appoint members to the ad hoc Clicker Technology Review Committee. Instructional Design shared its contact list and the call for nominations was sent to the group by email. Seven voting faculty and two ex-officio, non-voting members were appointed to the committee. The EC also certified the Buchtel College run-off election.

Later that afternoon, with the President and Provost, updates to initiatives were presented by Assoc. Dean Subich regarding the General Education Revisions, by Vice-President Sage regarding UA Online, and by Vice-President Tressel on the Akron Experience.

The EC met on October 25th to set the agenda for today's meeting and appointed a faculty member at large to the University Council IT committee to fill a vacancy. Assoc. Dean Subich also met with the EC and it was agreed that Dr. Subich will present an interim report on the general education revisions to the Faculty Senate today. We look forward to the presentation.

It also came to light that some faculty members are having problems with the Curriculum Proposal System. If you have trouble logging on to the system, please contact the support desk at phone extension 6888 or by email at supportdesk@uakron.edu. Other faculty have noticed they are not receiving notification of proposals in the system at the point of university review. Receiving these notices is an opt-in process. If you would like to receive these alerts, please navigate to the curriculum proposal system website and select the OPT-IN link.

Before I conclude the report of the Executive Committee, the EC has one resolution to bring forward:

> *RESOLVED*, that the Faculty Senate will not consider the adoption of a proposal to reform the general education requirements until after the faculties of the affected colleges have had the opportunity to deliberate and vote on it.

Chair Rich called for debate on the resolution. There was no debate.

**The motion was adopted without dissent.**

Senators, thank you very much for your service to the senate and the university. This concludes my report.

**Remarks of the President**

The President began his remarks by stating that he and the Provost have initiated a series of meetings with all of the colleges of the university. This is an opportunity to share details of what is happening within the state, the nation, the university, and to hear from faculty and staff about their ideas and concerns.

The President reminded the Senate of the committee of university presidents, commissioned by the Governor and Chaired by OSU's Gordon Gee, charged to make recommendations regarding the restructuring of the state share of instruction (SSI) funding formula. To date the proposals provide an almost neutral aspect to our appropriations. But be forewarned, many states are increasingly interested in funds allocated according to performance criteria. In Ohio those criteria are seen as *course completion*, *retention* of students, and progress towards *graduation* and graduation itself.

The President turned his attention to online learning initiatives. The addition of respectable institutions, like Stanford, Harvard, and MIT, joining the Coursera group legitimizes the trend toward massively open online courses (MOOC). The President believes we need to follow this trend, especially in light of the unsustainable rising costs of higher education. The President is promoting this concept further by initiating a discussion in the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities about how public higher education institutions can best participate and advance the relevance of MOOC.

The President also remarked that because of the pressures of the rising costs of higher education and technological advancements, the public is questioning the value of higher education. To overcome this perspective, we need to demonstrate our value and create new ways to demonstrate that value, articulated through the Akron model.

The President also mentioned the dedication of the Timken Engineered Surfaces Laboratory, the MOU with the Northeast Ohio Manufacturing Extension Program to enable small and medium sized companies to engage with the university for technology and faculty expertise, and Dean Stephen Cheng's award of the 2013 Polymer Physics Prize. The President concluded his remarks with an invitation to the annual State of the University Address.

**Remarks of the Provost**
The Provost began his remarks by inviting CFO Cummins to present an update on the SSI reformulation. CFO Cummins stated that the current formula sets a priority on stability and to the degree a given institution may be performing well in some of the priority areas, they wouldn't see that in their funding allocation. High performing institutions would not necessarily see significant increases in funding.

CFO Cummins also noted that one of the proposals is to eliminate the stop loss component of SSI which prevented an institution's funding from falling below a certain level. Another proposal is that each institution's subsidy earnings would be based on either their two or five year enrollments, whichever is greater. In the past, eighty percent of the funding was based on the fifteenth day enrollment figure. The new SSI formula will likely provide eighty percent of funding based on successful course completions. The new formula will also likely provide a degree completion component for the regional campuses.

The Provost announced that the draft of the self-study for the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) was available on the website for review and comment. Comments are due by November 16th.

The Provost also stressed that planning, budget, and governance were critical components of the self-study and the HLC visit in March 2013. To that end the University Council Steering Committee is on track to deliberate the proposed UC bylaws at the December meeting.

Many are asking about the allocation of funds for faculty searches. In total the university is allocating nine million dollars to faculty this coming year. The distribution will be determined after the deans have constructed templates in order to help analyze the needs within their college and programs.

## VI. Committee Reports

**Academic Policies Committee**
Senator Buldum reported a resolution from the committee to change the name of the Department of Geology and Environmental Science to the Department of Geosciences (Appendix A). Chair Rich called for debate on the resolution. There was no debate.

**The motion was adopted without dissent.**

**Athletics Committee**
Athletics Committee submitted a written report (Appendix B).

**Computing & Communications Technologies Committee**
Computing & Communications Technologies Committee submitted a written report (Appendix C).

**Faculty Research Committee**
Faculty Research Committee submitted a written report (Appendix D).

**Ad hoc Committee on Part-time Faculty Issues**
Senator Osorio reported a resolution from the ad hoc committee to amend Rule 3359-20-35 to include

part-time faculty in the orientation and to correct a drafting error (Appendix E). Chair Rich called for debate on the resolution. There was no debate.

**The motion was adopted without dissent.**

**Ad hoc General Education Revision Committee**

Dr. Linda Subich reported the draft proposal on general education revision from the ad hoc committee. Three documents were distributed to the senators before the meeting: the draft proposal (Appendix F), executive summary (Appendix G), and a comparison chart of the current and proposed models (Appendix H). The details of the discussion may be found in the verbatim transcript.

## VII. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

## VIII. New Business

There was no new business.

## IX. Adjournment

Senator Hajjafar moved to adjourn the meeting. Senator Lazar seconded the motion.

**The motion was adopted without dissent.**

The meeting adjourned at 4:48 p.m.

---

Any comments concerning the contents in *The University of Akron Chronicle*
may be directed to the Secretary, Frank J. Bove (x5104).
facultysenate@uakron.edu

## APPENDIX A

## THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

## RESOLUTION 11-1-2012

BE IT RESOLVED, the Academic Policies Committee unanimously recommends that the Faculty Senate give final approval to change the name of the Department of Geology and Environmental Science to the Department of Geosciences.

## APPENDIX B

### Faculty Senate Athletic Committee Report 11/1/12

The Faculty Senate Athletic Committee met on October 5, 2012 at 3:00 PM. The meeting was called by temporary chair John Nicholas as last year's chair resigned unexpectedly, leaving the committee in an undetermined state.

At the meeting, the first order of business was to elect a chairperson for this academic year. Joann Johns nominated Dr. Nicholas and Tim Lille seconded that motion. There were no other nominations and Dr. Nicholas won unanimously. It should be noted that there was not a quorum present and an official vote will be held once a quorum is present. Until that time Dr. Nicholas will serve as chair.

The committee then discussed setting the agenda for this academic year. The agenda will be officially set when a quorum is present. Some of the possible ideas are continuing the creation of a "safe zone" for athletes and graduate assistants to report any abuse that may be experienced or witnessed, a review of the role of the Faculty Senate Athletic Committee and clarification of the Roles of the University Council Athletic committee and that of the Faculty Senate Athletic Committee to avoid any overlap.

The committee will hold its second meeting on October 31, 2012. Dr. Nicholas will be present at the 11/1/12 meeting provide any updates to this report if needed.

# APPENDIX C

## Computing & Computing Technologies Committee

### Particulars

- Subject: Computing & Computing Technologies Committee meeting report
- Date: 2012-10-26 Fri

### Report

The CCTC met on Thursday, October 25, 2012. Scott Randby was affirmed as chair of the committee. The charge of the committee was reviewed and discussed. After examining a number of possible directions to pursue, the committee decided to focus its efforts on the next refresh of faculty laptops. The committee plans to develop a recommended course of action for this refresh. The next meeting of the CCTC will be on Thursday, November 29, 2012.

Scott Randby
CCTC Chair

## APPENDIX D

### Faculty Research Committee
### Report for Faculty Senate
### October, 2012

The Faculty Research Committee met on Friday, October 12 in the Student Union. After an introduction of committee members, Dr. Bouchard nominated Dr. Robert M. Schwartz as Chair. By acclimation, Dr. Schwartz will remain as Chair for the 2012-2013 academic year.

Other agenda items included approval of previous minutes, National Endowment for Humanities applicants, University Council Research Committee, budget, and timeline. In addition, the criteria and scoring rubric were fine tuned for this year's competition.

There will be one summer competition for up to $10,000 per fellowship. Proposals will be due at 4:00 on January 25, 2013. Reviewers will be due by February 22, 2013, and the FRC will meet on March 8, 2013 to make decisions on the awards.

Submitted by Robert M. Schwartz, FRC Chair

## APPENDIX E

### Report of the ad hoc Committee on Part-time Issues
### October 23, 2012

The ad hoc Committee on Part-time Issues recommends that the Faculty Senate adopt the following resolution.

RESOLVED, that University regulation 3359-20-35 (Orientation of new faculty members) amended as follows:

*"Before the opening of the fall semester of the university, a seminar is conducted for new, regular, ~~and~~ full-time, auxiliary and part-time faculty members to acquaint them with the objectives and the various activities of the university."*

The purposes of these amendments are (1) to require that new, part-time faculty members be included in orientations; and (2) to correct an apparent typographical error that makes "full-time" modify "auxiliary."

**APPENDIX F**

# DRAFT General Education Learning Outcomes & Implementation Plan

General Education Revision Steering Committee
Report to the Faculty Senate





November 1, 2012

**Draft General Education Learning Outcomes and Implementation Plan**

*Context:*

The proposed general education requirements for undergraduates are defined in terms of learning outcomes. These outcomes are set at the foundational level and their achievement is documented after specific general education courses or specified experiences are completed. Institutional documentation of the achievement of these learning outcomes is accomplished via the proposed Assessment Plan.

It is intended that the specified outcomes will be expanded and built upon during the remainder of the student's baccalaureate degree work, including the student's major. A capstone experience of some type for all bachelor's degrees is recommended as a culmination of the educational process.

This proposal is a shift in approach for the university's undergraduate curriculum. It proposes to ensure students have achieved foundational learning outcomes so that instruction in the major can focus on development of subject-specific and higher-order learning outcomes that are extensions of the foundational competencies.

*Criteria for Learning Outcomes*:

The learning outcomes

1. Must reflect the foundational skills and knowledge that the faculty actually want students to achieve.
2. Must be sufficiently broad to be achievable by a variety of means and disciplines.
3. Must be defined in terms that allow observation, evidence collection and eventually measurement.
4. Must reflect a high standard of expectation.

*Implementation of Learning Outcomes*

The proposed learning outcomes and the suggested credit hour implementation requirements will be operationalized via a campus-level course approval process. In this process, teams of faculty who are disciplinary experts will evaluate proposed General Education courses in terms of whether they meet the stated learning outcomes for the General Education requirement to which each proposed course is intended to apply. Also evaluated will be whether there is a stated commitment and plan for assessment of those learning outcomes.

*Learning Outcome 1:* Communication Skills and Information Literacy - Students will demonstrate foundational competency in written communication, oral communication and information literacy.

a) As writer or speaker, students:
   i) Demonstrate an understanding of context, purpose, and audience.
   ii) Develop content using credible sources, as appropriate to the communication task.
   iii) Organize a presentation coherently and logically.
   iv) Use appropriate conventions.
      (1) Writing: Use style appropriate to genre and discipline.
      (2) Speaking: Use verbal and nonverbal conventions appropriate to audience and purpose of speech.
   v) Use appropriate syntax, grammar, and
      (1) Writing: punctuation and spelling.
      (2) Speaking: pauses, intonation, and pronunciation.
b) As writer, students:
   i) Collaborate with others to improve writing through feedback and revision.
   ii) Use writing for multiple purposes, such as improving learning, critical thinking, and reflection.
c) As speaker, students:
   i) Demonstrate behavioral flexibility in response to unexpected variations in audience or context.
   ii) Employ appropriate nonverbal behavior
d) As reader or listener, students:
   i) Identify a writer's or a speaker's purpose(s) and rhetorical technique(s).
   ii) Critically analyze claims, appeals, and evidence in arguments.
e) Students demonstrate information literacy by effectively, ethically, and responsibly using appropriate sources and technologies to accomplish an intended purpose.
   i) Use appropriate tools and technologies to identify, access, analyze, evaluate, and document information.
   ii) Use information effectively and appropriately to accomplish an intended purpose.
   iii) Access and use information responsibly, ethically, and legally in accordance with disciplinary standards.



| *Implementation of Learning Outcome 1*: | |
|---|---|
| Writing Skills and Information Literacy I & II | 6 credits |
| Speaking Skills and Information Literacy | 3 credits |

*Learning Outcome 2:* Critical Thinking and Complex Reasoning Skills - Students will demonstrate foundational competency in creating and evaluating reasoned arguments, and employing quantitative, qualitative, and normative information in such arguments.

a) Students create reasoned arguments and evaluate the reasonableness of arguments. They
   i) State the nature of controversies as propositions, including fact (i.e., what is), value (i.e., what should be), and policy (i.e., what steps can be taken) propositions;
   ii) Recognize and choose the premises, purposes, audiences, and contexts of propositions;
   iii) Recognize and choose the appropriate logic to support propositions, including symbolic, deductive, and inductive logic;
   iv) Recognize and choose the appropriate information to support propositions, including the sources, authority, and biases of information;
   v) Recognize and be able to argue both sides of a proposition, and employ logic and information to challenge opposing propositions.

b) Students employ the appropriate analysis and application of
   i) Quantitative information, such that they:
      (1) Identify the value and limitations of magnitude (i.e., how large) and multitude (i.e., how many) measures;
      (2) Manipulate and express such measures with arithmetic, algebraic, geometric, and statistical methods;
      (3) Manipulate and express such measures with graphs, charts, and tables;
      (4) Manipulate and express such measures to solve practical and multistage problems;
   ii) Qualitative information, such that they:
      (1) Identify the value and limitations of character (i.e., the nature of a thing) and capacity (i.e., what a thing can do) assessments;
      (2) Interpret and express assessments with a contrary structure, such as truth versus falsehood or good versus evil;
      (3) Interpret and express assessments with a relational structure, such as the degree of beauty or the level of success;
      (4) Interpret and express assessments with a unique structure, such as cultural ethos or historical eras;
   iii) Normative information, such that they:
      (1) Identify the value and limitations of prescriptive (i.e., how things should be) and proscriptive (i.e., how things shouldn't be) claims;
      (2) Acknowledge and express claims concerning personal behavior, such as honesty and virtue;
      (3) Acknowledge and express claims concerning social life, such as pluralism and justice;
      (4) Acknowledge and express claims concerning mental life, such as respect for evidence and open-mindedness;
      (5) Describe how such claims are used to make ethical decisions

| *Implementation of Learning Outcome 2*: | |
|---|---|
| Quantitative Reasoning: Math | 3 credits |
| Reasoning Process | 3 credits |
| And Embedded in Learning Outcome 4 Attributes (credits variable) | |

*Learning Outcome 3*: The Arts, Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences - Students will demonstrate foundational competency in knowledge of representative content and methods of inquiry of the arts, humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences.

a) Knowledge/Content competency
   i) Demonstrate knowledge of major concepts, findings, and historical perspectives in each disciplinary area
   ii) Find information resources in each disciplinary area and evaluate their reliability.
   iii) Articulate the role of ethics in each disciplinary area.
   iv) Demonstrate an understanding of scientific and technical issues at a functional level and articulate how they impact our society and economy.
   v) Demonstrate a basic knowledge of major cultures/societies of the world including their art, history, and geography
b) Methods of Inquiry competency
   i) Articulate the nature of the scientific method (in the natural and social sciences and humanities), apply it through hands-on laboratory experiments, and critically evaluate applications of the scientific method.
   ii) Solve quantitative and qualitative problems in the natural and social sciences
   iii) Use rhetorical skills in the analysis of creative works (arts and humanities) including their social, political, emotional and psychological components.
   iv) Demonstrate effective written and oral communication appropriate to each disciplinary area.

*Implementation of Learning Outcome 3:*

| | |
|---|---|
| Disciplinary Knowledge: | |
| Fine Arts | 3 credits |
| Humanities | 3 credits |
| Natural Sciences | 4 credits (includes lab) |
| Social Sciences | 3 credits |

*Learning Outcome 4*: Responsible Citizenship in an Interconnected World - Students will demonstrate foundational competency in knowledge and skills that promote personal, social and environmental responsibility. This foundational competency shall include an understanding of systemic relationships, and the collateral effects and consequences within and across systems. Students will demonstrate learning in all four outcomes listed here (i.e., a., b., c., and d.), but we expect variation in the specific learning objectives (e.g., b.i., b.ii., b.iii., b.iv.) for each outcome as it is covered across varied disciplines.

a) Awareness of Multiple Dimensions of Diversity (broadly defined to include age, disability, gender, education, ethnicity, nationality, race, sexuality, social class, religion), such that students:
   i) Recognize multiple perspectives on cross-cultural difference, both within the United States and across countries.
   ii) Articulate the ways that diversity impacts the understanding and application of knowledge.
   iii) Work successfully in teams, composed of diverse people, to complete desired projects or to reach desired goals.
   iv) Recognize interrelationships of dimensions of diversity.
b) Recognize the importance of, and understand the elements of, financial literacy, so as to appreciate short and long-term consequences of financial decisions:
   i) Understand the fundamentals of savings, investments, debt, credit, and money management.
   ii) Understand the fundamentals of financial markets and financial institutions.
   iii) Understand the elements of financial statements and the basic meaning of reported financial data.
   iv) Recognize and appreciate the personal and societal implications of financial scams and fraud.
c) Understand the connections between personal and societal health, and appreciate short and long term health consequences.
   i) Understand the technical and scientific foundations for personal health outcomes (e.g., the relationship between nutrition, exercise, health and well-being, the role of social relationships).
   ii) Recognize the importance of societal and physical infrastructure and environmental context on health.
   iii) Understand the social and economic challenges of providing health care.
d) Recognize the complex interconnectedness of individual, organizational and governmental choices for environmental sustainability.
   i) Understand the technical and scientific foundations of environmental sustainability (e.g., the environmental impact of particular agricultural policies).
   ii) Understand the connectedness of local decision to global sustainability.
   iii) Understand the importance of transparent processes to achieving environmental sustainability.
   iv) Recognize the costs and benefits of environmental sustainability.

*Implementation of Learning Outcome 4*:

This learning outcome is met by a distribution requirement that involves collecting "attributes" in courses, workshops, etc.; these courses/experiences should contribute from 6-15 additional credits to the General Education curriculum. These courses may cover more than one attribute, and must be outside of the General Education "Core" but may be embedded in the student's major or minor or elective courses, may vary in credit hours, and are expected to involve critical reasoning or writing intensive work.

| *Attributes:* | *Courses with these Attributes are expected to include at least one of the following skills:* |
|---|---|
| Diversity-Domestic (4a) | Be Writing Intensive |
| Diversity-Global (4a) | Include Qualitative Reasoning |
| Financial Literacy (4b) | Include Normative Reasoning |
| Personal and Societal Health (4c) | |
| Environmental Sustainability (4d) | |

**Assessment Plan**

Assessment refers to the process of using students' work to verify that learning outcomes desired by the faculty and institution are being achieved and that appropriate action is being taken to assure continuous improvement. All students who have completed their general education requirements will be deemed to have the skills described in the learning outcomes and able to apply those skills to coursework within the major.

Each of the four learning outcomes is demonstrated by means of formal student expression; this may be written, oral, artistic, ASL, or Braille as appropriate. These student products will be kept in a centralized university repository. They may be used by the instructor as part of a grading scheme and will be sampled by the institution for institutional level assessment. Such assessment will be shared with the campus as a whole to inform subsequent practice.

*Implementation of Assessment Plan*:

All approved General Education courses will collect predetermined, course embedded learning artifacts.

Samples of artifacts will be evaluated by faculty experts who will use agreed upon rubrics. The General Education Revision Steering Committee has identified potential types of artifacts and created/adapted rubrics for most Learning Outcomes

After evaluation of sampled artifacts, a summary of findings will be shared with campus for consideration and action.

There will be a regular schedule of assessment and feedback for each Learning Outcome. The General Education Revision Steering Committee suggests a four year cycle whereby each Learning Outcome is evaluated every four years.

# APPENDIX G

**Summary of DRAFT General Education Program**
**Learning Outcomes Implementation Proposal**

The proposed general education requirements for undergraduates are defined in terms of learning outcomes. The current delineation of these outcomes, the draft implementation plan, and the assumptions that guided the implementation plan (including the assumption that baccalaureate requirements drop from 128 to 120 credits) are specified in our Committee report. We recommend that the proposed learning outcomes and the suggested credit hour implementation requirements be operationalized via a campus-level course approval process. In this process, teams of faculty who are disciplinary experts will evaluate proposed General Education courses in terms of whether they meet the stated learning outcomes for the General Education requirement to which each proposed course is intended to apply. Also evaluated should be whether there is a stated commitment and plan for assessment of those learning outcomes.

1. Communication Skills and Information Literacy
   - Oral Communication—3 credits (e.g., oral communication, public speaking)
   - 2 English Composition/Writing courses—6 credits (e.g., English composition I and II)

2. Critical Thinking
   - Quantitative: Math—3 credits (e.g., a college level mathematics or statistics course)
   - Reasoning Processes—3 credits (e.g., logic, ethics, argumentation, humanities in the western tradition)

3. Disciplinary Knowledge
   - Fine Arts—3 credits (any fine arts course taught in the discipline)
   - Humanities—3 credits (any humanities course taught in the discipline)
   - Natural Science—4 credits (any natural science course taught in the discipline with a lab)
   - Social Science—3 credits (any social science course taught in the discipline)

*Core Requirements = 28 credits*

4. Responsible Citizenship in an Interconnected World
   - Diversity: Domestic (e.g., Black experience, women's studies, Latino literature)
   - Diversity: International (e.g., African politics, study abroad experience, geography of cultural diversity)
   - Financial Literacy (e.g., personal finance, family financial management, accounting principles)
   - Personal and Societal Health (e.g., sociology of health and illness, nutrition fundamentals)
   - Environmental Sustainability (e.g., economics of natural resources, introduction to environmental science)

*RC Attribute Requirements = 6-15 additional credits outside the student's major*

*Note*: Courses (and experiences such as study abroad) that meet this learning outcome will be designated with a "Responsible Citizenship" attribute. Students must complete a distribution requirement that includes each of the five categories (these may be combined in some cases). These courses must be outside of the General Education "Core" but may be embedded in the student's major or minor or elective courses, may vary in credit hours, and are expected to involve critical reasoning or writing intensive work. These attributes, however, must comprise a minimum of 6 credits outside the student's major, but could involve up to 15 credits if a department elects to fulfill the RC attributes with five 3 credit courses outside of the student's major.

# APPENDIX H

## Comparison of Current and Proposed General Education Implementation Models

**(Assumes Baccalaureate requirements drop from 128 to 120)**

| CURRENT SYSTEM | | PROPOSED SYSTEM | |
|---|---|---|---|
| General Education Requirements | Total Credits | "Core" Requirements | Total Credits |
| English | 7 | Communication—Writing/Information Literacy | 6 |
| Speech | 3 | Communication—Speaking/Information Literacy | 3 |
| Math | 3 | Critical Thinking—Math | 3 |
| | | Disciplinary Knowledge—Humanities | 3 |
| Humanities | 10 | Disciplinary Knowledge—Fine Arts | 3 |
| Natural Science Requirement | 8 | Disciplinary Knowledge—Natural Science | 4 |
| Social Science Requirement | 6 | Disciplinary Knowledge—Social Science | 3 |
| | | | |
| Area Studies & Cultural Diversity | 4 | | |
| | | Critical Thinking—Reasoning Process | 3 |
| Physical Education | 1 | | |
| | | **Total General Education Core Requirements** | **28 cr.** |
| | | | |
| | | **Responsible Citizenship (RC) Attributes*** | |
| | | Diversity—Domestic | |
| | | Diversity--International | |
| | | Financial Literacy | |
| | | Personal and Societal Health | |
| | | Environmental Sustainability | |
| | | | |
| | | **Total RC Attribute credits (not in major)** | **6-15 cr.** |
| | | | |
| **Total General Education Credits** | **42 cr.** | **Total General Education Credits** | **34-43 cr.** |

* Courses (and experiences such as study abroad) that meet the RC Learning Outcome will be designated with a "Responsible Citizenship" attribute. Students must complete a distribution requirement that includes each of the five categories (these may be combined in some cases). These courses must be outside of the General Education "Core" but may be embedded in the student's major or minor or elective courses, may vary in credit hours, and are expected to involve critical reasoning or writing intensive work.