

Program Prioritization Recommendations to the Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee

Submitted by the General Education Council

**Prepared by Amy Craddock,
Interim Coordinator, General Education Program**

April 14, 2006

The program prioritization task force charged the General Education Council (GEC) to provide the Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee (CAAC) with a General Education (GE) course inventory that increases focus and efficiency while maintaining or enhancing quality. The recommendations should include suggested courses for Web delivery and should take into account the Indiana Commission for Higher Education's implementation of Indiana law regarding the transfer of courses among Indiana public colleges and universities.

This document describes the issues we considered in responding to the charge, our approach and procedures to carrying it out, and our recommendations to CAAC regarding the inventory.

Issues Pertinent to the Charge

Throughout the process of creating a recommended course inventory, we discussed the meaning of the charge and its implications for our work. These discussions can be organized around three components of the charge. Some discussions reached consensus while others did not, but all were sources of concern in our deliberations and activities.

Focus

Many courses on the inventory were "grandfathered" in from the GE89 program and did not undergo review concomitant with that required for courses created for GE 2000. To increase the focus of the GE program, we need to examine all such courses carefully to assure that they meet the GE 2000 program goals to a similar degree as those that were created after the implementation of GE 2000.

Efficiency

To increase efficiency, we must reduce the number of courses on the inventory, but doing so does not address important aspects of efficiency. As a practical matter, efficiency requires that GE courses be offered consistently and with consistently high enrollments. The meaning of offering a course consistently varies by type of department. For example, in a smaller, or perhaps leaner, department that has two GE courses, consistent offering may be effected by

using a rotation system in which each GE course is offered once per year; a GE course is offered every semester, but the same course is not offered every semester. In such a scenario, a sabbatical or a retirement may significantly upset this schedule if only one faculty member can teach a specific course. On the other hand, departments with more faculty (or adjuncts or graduate assistants) can offer multiple sections of the same GE course every term. Both departments may be offering their GE courses efficiently, but the two methods will yield vastly different enrollments. Likewise, the meaning of "high" enrollment must be understood in terms of pedagogy (e.g, studio art classes should have relatively few students compared perhaps to a survey course in one of the social sciences).

According to some, an attractive feature of ISU's GE program is that it offers students a smorgasbord of courses. Balancing efficiency with a wide range of course choices is challenging. If we think of efficiency primarily in terms of frequency of offering and having sections enrolled to near capacity, then we must be mindful of its implications. Using this definition of efficiency, we may create an inventory that consists primarily of the most popular and populous courses. Courses become popular for many reasons, some academically appropriate and others not. For example, the fact that a course is predictably offered and has the capacity to serve many students in a section can make a course popular, apart from almost any other characteristics of the course.

For our present purposes, probably the most important outcome that efficiency implies is an inventory that articulates a coherent and identifiable GE program containing courses that undergo periodic assessment to assure that they continue to meet the goals of the GE program. The GEC recognizes that the GE program and departments have much work to do in this area and that we can only begin this task within the parameters established by the program prioritization process.

Quality

The requirement in the charge to recommend an inventory that maintains or enhances quality assumes that information exists regarding the quality of the courses currently on the inventory. Such information exists in rudimentary form, where it exists at all. In particular, the General Education program has no information on student learning outcomes assessment. Evaluation of some areas of the GE program has provided information on a few aspects of quality, primarily assessment of the degree to which courses address the goals of the GE program and some course evaluation data from students (primarily from the SIR). Such information does not exist for the majority of GE courses, however.

Summary

As educators, we all have the common goal of providing a meaningful liberal education experience for our students. The program prioritization process requires balancing this overarching goal with a variety of needs and, sometimes harsh, realities. One reality is that the GE inventory must be reduced. Another reality is that we did not possess the requisite assessment information at the beginning of this process to make well-informed recommendations, nor was it possible to obtain such information in the timeframe available. Therefore, GEC cannot address the charge fully because we do not have reliable and/or valid measures of quality. In addition, the concept of efficiency is fraught with implications that require examination well beyond the time and other parameters allowed for this task.

Approach and Procedures

In light of the issues discussed above, the GEC decided upon an approach and developed procedures for addressing the charge in the manner in which we believed was most appropriate and feasible within the resource constraints. An essential feature of our approach was to seek input from the departments.

We obtained data from OSPIRE for all GE courses taught from Fall 2002 through Fall 2005. Data elements for each course included GE core area, number of sections offered per term, cross-listing status, enrollment, and enrollment by first major.

The GEC examined Liberal Studies GE courses only. Basic studies courses are limited and pre-determined and do not need to be considered for elimination from the GE program. The official total number of courses in the current inventory is **233**.

We conducted the following steps in developing our recommendations:

1. *Compile a list of courses offered in four terms or fewer since Fall 2002.* This compilation included fall and spring terms only. This list carried the presumptive recommendation that such courses may not be offered frequently enough to justify retention on the inventory.
2. *Send each department chairperson the list described in Step 1, for courses in their department only.* We asked department chairpersons to indicate whether they concurred with the GEC's recommendation to eliminate these courses, and if not, to provide a rationale for retaining the course on the inventory. (In this and all other communications with chairpersons, we were careful to state that our recommendations addressed only whether a course should remain on the GE inventory, not whether it should remain in the department's inventory.)
3. *Develop criteria for recommending the elimination of courses that have been offered in more than four terms since Fall 2002.* These criteria are as follows:
 - a. *Syllabus shows that the course does not meet the goals of the General Education (GE) Area for which it is approved.* Appendix A contains information regarding goals of the GE program and the goals of each Liberal Studies core area. Normally, when the GEC determined that a course did not meet the goals of the liberal studies area, our rationale was that the course was too specific and not a course in the fundamental knowledge of a discipline.
 - b. *Enrollment pattern indicates that the course does not appear to function as general education.* If a substantial majority of enrollments in a course are students in the major, then it is questionable whether this course is functioning as a General Education course. (We have data on enrollments by first major. We do not know how many students enrolled in a particular course may have that subject as a minor or second major.)
 - c. *Course has prerequisites outside of GE (i.e., if a GE course has a prerequisite that is NOT another GE course).* This is not a requirement of the GE program, but the GEC felt that no course on the inventory should be so advanced or specific to a discipline that it requires prerequisites that students cannot satisfy with another GE course.
 - d. *Other situations that would require or strongly recommend retention or elimination.* We eliminated 400/500 level courses and courses taught solely or primarily by a faculty member who is no longer at ISU and for whom no replacement is likely in the foreseeable future. We retained courses that otherwise might be eliminated if they are

directed GE courses in another major. We also retained all courses currently taught via distance education.

4. *Provide list of courses to chairpersons with recommendations based on criteria set out in Step 3.* We requested chairpersons to indicate whether they concurred with the GEC recommendation. If not, we asked them to provide a rationale and supporting information/documentation (see Appendix A).

After several meetings of the GEC and upon receiving initial feedback from department chairpersons in the College of Arts and Sciences, (often noting that they were concerns that the GEC had discussed as well), the GEC held additional discussions regarding our approach to the task. As a result, we decided to alter our approach somewhat in making the recommendations that appear here.

We decided to offer three recommended inventories based on the following two sets of criteria.

Option 1

- a. Retain all foundational courses (SBS:F, SMS:F) and LAPS:LL courses.
- b. Perform "administrative" clean-up: **Eliminate** all inactive courses (e.g., banked courses, duplications on the list due to courses that have changed department designation/names).
- c. **Eliminate** General Honors (GH) courses. GH courses receive GE credit as a requirement of the program and are not typically available to students outside the Honors program.
- d. **Eliminate** International Studies (IS) courses. IS courses are created and approved for GE credit on an ad hoc basis. They are created and taught exclusively for students in this program.
- e. **Eliminate** courses with which department chairpersons indicated concurrence with the GEC's recommendations from Step 2 or 3.

Option 2

Items a – e below are identical to Option 1.

- a. Retain all foundational courses (SBS:F, SMS:F) and LAPS:LL courses.
- b. Perform "administrative" clean-up: **Eliminate** all inactive courses (e.g., banked courses, duplications on the list due to courses that have changed department designation/names).
- c. **Eliminate** General Honors (GH) courses. GH courses receive GE credit as a requirement of the program and are not typically available to students outside the Honors program.
- d. **Eliminate** International Studies (IS) courses. IS courses are created and approved for GE credit on an ad hoc basis. They are created and taught exclusively for students in this program.
- e. **Eliminate** courses with which department chairpersons indicated concurrence with the GEC's recommendations from Step 2 or 3.
- f. **Retain** no more than two courses per discipline per core area in which the department already offers at least one GE course. Note that departments with more than one

discipline may end up with more courses on the GE inventory than departments in a single discipline. The departments with more than one discipline are: Art (ART, ARTH), Communication (COMM, JOUR), Geography, Geology, and Anthropology (ANTH, GEOG, GEOL), Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics (LING, FL), and MCS (CS, MATH). Also note that course numbers with suffixes (e.g., A, B, C...) designating 'topics' (or similar) courses will be treated as a single course. For example, ART 200 includes ART 200A, 200D, 200E, 200F, 200G; for this recommendation, ART 200 will be 'counted' as one course rather than 5. We took into account the comments and recommendations of the chairpersons when creating this inventory. In some cases, the inventory will not show a specific course to be eliminated, but will instead indicate that the department should make a selection regarding elimination.

Option 3

Option 3 is not an inventory of courses, per se. Rather, it is a framework by which to establish an inventory; it reflects item f under Option 2, above. Most members of the GEC agreed that it is reasonable for a department to offer no more than two courses per core area per discipline. (Appendix C contains a memo dissenting from this general conclusion.)

This guideline allows for better distribution of courses across core areas, so that one area does not have far more capacity than needed and another have far less. Deviation from such a guideline is expected in certain circumstances (e.g., directed GE courses for a major or courses required for teacher education). Typically, these deviations would be allowed and encouraged to better serve students in majors with a very large number of required hours.

The GEC did not make recommendations regarding the number of sections that should be offered, the time of day, or the modality (distance education, large versus small sections). The departments and colleges must address these issues. Our discussions did note, though, that coordination of scheduling is required to be able to provide the GE program in an efficient manner (just as coordination is necessary to achieve efficiency of courses offerings overall), but it is outside the purview of the council.

A key feature of Option 3 is that departments should choose the courses to retain in each area. It would also allow for rotation of courses on and off of the inventory as department resources allow or demand.

The GEC views the program prioritization process as the beginning of what needs to be a well-reasoned approach to creating a coherent GE inventory. While this framework is not perfect, it provides a paradigm for starting to provide coherence to the GE program by recognizing that balance across areas is crucial.

Explanation of Course Recommendation Data

Appendix B lists the courses on the inventories under Options 1 and 2. Courses are listed by Liberal Studies Core Area. (Option 3 is not an inventory per se, and therefore does not appear on the spreadsheet.)

The columns of the spreadsheet contain the following information:

Core Area: This column uses the Banner designations for core areas. They are different from the abbreviations by the GE Program, but are self-explanatory.

Cross Listed: This column contains the 'companion' course for a cross listed course.

#Terms Offered: This column contains the number of all fall, spring, and summer terms beginning with Fall 2002. If multiple sections were offered per term, the course is counted only once.

Total Enrollment: This column contains total enrollment across all sections for all fall, spring, and summer terms beginning with Fall 2002.

Total Fall/Spring Enrollment: This column contains total enrollment across all sections for all fall and spring terms only, beginning with Fall 2002.

Number of Fall/Spring Sections Offered: This column includes the number of sections offered all fall and spring terms beginning with Fall 2002.

Average Enrollment per Section: This column gives the average enrollment per section for fall and spring terms only.

We calculated the mean enrollment using fall and spring terms only because not all courses are offered in the summer and the summer terms have different enrollment expectations.

Enrollment data from the file in Appendix B is misleading for courses that have undergone a prefix/name change (e.g., LIFS to BIOL or ECOL), and for cross-listed courses. In these cases, it is necessary to add the enrollment figures for both courses to obtain the correct enrollment information.

Option 1: A red "X" indicates a course that the GEC recommends for elimination from the GE inventory.

Option 2: A blue "E" indicates a course that the GEC recommends for elimination under Option 2. The Option 2 column includes all courses recommended for elimination under Option 1 as well.

Comments: The information in this column explains the rationale for deletion of a course from the inventory or other explanatory information, if applicable.

The table below presents the breakdown by core area under each option. It also shows the number of courses in the inventory in each core area using the guideline under Option 3. This guideline does not specify which courses are retained, but only shows how many courses would be in each area were this guideline to be established.

	Current Inventory	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
HSR *	19	10	10	10
LAPS:E	55	32	26	19
LAPS:LL **	16	14	14	14
MCS:IC	39	34	22	19
MCS:USD	14	11	11	10
SBS:E	51	34	27	28
SBS:F	6	6	6	6
SMS:E	27	16	14	18
SMS:F ***	6	6	6	6
Total in Inventory	233	163	136	130

* The History Department teaches all HSR courses, so it must necessarily be exempt from the "two course" guideline unless GE policy changes regarding this core area.

** All LAPS:LL courses were retained because course designations allowing various departments to teach in this area were created, with the knowledge that the courses might not be offered routinely or for a while after creation of the course designation.

*** Lab courses are not counted as separate courses in this calculation.

Recommendations

The charge to the GEC calls for recommendations in the following three areas:

Web Delivery of General Education Courses

The GEC did not suggest specific courses for web delivery; almost all GE courses are appropriate for web delivery. The departments are in the best position to address this issue, both in terms of feasibility and appropriateness.

Transfer of General Education Courses

Procedures already exist for providing GE credit to courses transferred from other universities when ISU does not have a specific course equivalent.

General Education Course Inventory

The GEC recommends that CAAC approve Option 1 as a starting point for refinement of the GE course inventory.

Refinement will move us toward the approximate number of courses presented under the other options. Option 2 is presented as only one possible inventory that can be created using the guideline expressed under Option 3. It is premature to adopt Option 2 or 3 at this point, however, because we have not had the opportunity to fully consider the rationale behind these options.

The GEC and the GE office plan to implement student outcomes assessment in the coming academic year. We will work to assess all GE courses offered and obtain any assessment information that exists within the departments. Given that sound assessment is essential to producing a coherent GE inventory, we urge CAAC to be conservative at this point when determining a GE inventory.

Appendix A

Note:

This appendix contains information from several department chairpersons. It includes their concerns and rationales for retaining specific courses. It does not include syllabi.

I attempted to include feedback on all of the issues they discussed regarding the program prioritization process. Other information is in my office (e.g, less formal comments, syllabi). If CAAC wishes to see any of this additional information, please let me know.

Also, be aware that a number of the issues raised by the chairs have been resolved, and courses that were originally considered for elimination have been reconsidered and are no longer recommended for elimination from the inventory.

Amy Craddock
X3941

The following chairpersons provided comments. Each response is in a separate file.

- A-1: Sue Berta – GGA
- A-2: John Conant – ECON
- A-3: Ron Dunbar – LLL
- A-4: Art Feinsod – THTR
- A-5: Eric Hampton – EPSY
- A-6: Diana Hews – EOB
- A-7: Bhaskara Kopparty – MCS
- A-8: Charles Mayer – ART
- A-9: Chris Olsen – HIST
- A-10: Rob Perrin – ENG
- A-11: David Worley – COMM

Appendix A-1: Sue Berta, Chairperson, GGA

April 11, 2006

Response to General Education Council Recommendations

ANTH 409 – Medical Anthropology

The department strongly opposes the elimination of Anth 409 from the SBS:E General Education Program. This is the only course taught at ISU that examines elements of health, disease, medicine, and public health as part of the evolution of social institutions and systems. This course is vital for anthropology majors but also is significant to pre-med, nursing, health & human performance, and other students since it includes the study of methods and class projects that introduce health and disease issues that are critical contemporary problems.

Geography General Education Courses

GEOG 115 – Earth Sp: Remote Sensing

See attached memo from Dr. Qihao Weng on how this course meets the goals of the GE 2000 status SMS:E general education program.

GEOG 210 – Cultural Geography

GEOG 210 should remain in the General Education Program. While general education courses GEOG 130 (World Geography) and GEOG 423 (Geography of the Middle East) have a more regional focus, GEOG 210 has a more thematic focus. The low enrollment may be partly due to irregular and poor scheduling, and we are working to address those problems.

GEOG 423 – Geography of the Middle East

GEOG 423 is still a new course and should remain in the General Education Program. From the beginning, the course was strongly opposed by some ISU faculty (especially from CAAC, but also from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee as well as the Faculty Senate as a whole) and it took about one year to have it accepted by the General Education Council. It is needed for diversity and is the only geography course on the Middle East in the General Education Program. The enrollment could be a temporary problem, and we are working to address it.

GEOG 431 – Urban Geography

The proposed elimination of GE2000 status (SBS:E) for GEOG431 Urban Geography should not be approved as Urban Geography's content is consistent with the requirements of the general education program's SBS intent to enable students to reflect "on the operation and evolution of social institutions and systems." (Office of General Education,

GenEd 2000 Website). In particular, Urban Geography examines the historical and contemporary development of urban systems and the socio-spatial processes that continue to shape cities and change the everyday lives of citizens. Insofar as geography is recognized as a social science, urban geography resides at the center of a systematic approach to understanding, classifying, and explaining economic, political, and cultural systems from the geographic perspective. Additionally, urban geography explores themes of race, ethnicity, and gender insofar as these categories alter the social, economic, and culture landscapes of cities. Indeed, sequences on neighborhood change, the material landscape, diversity, and urban policy challenges serve to synthesize core themes within the General Education program's curriculum. In addition to course content, Urban Geography, as a 400-level course, increases the overall deliverability of all ISU programs--particularly in the case of transfer students--with respect to 300/400-level degree requirements. Likewise, Urban Geography has been transformed into an on-line course (taught at-least once on-line per year) and aids in the overall deliverability of programs at distance.

For all of the above substantive and practical reasons, GEOG431 Urban Geography should continue to be a recognized course within the general education Program. Moreover, Urban Geography makes a unique contribution to the current suite of SBS:E courses and complements coursework in a range of majors and minors including Social Studies Education, Political Science, Criminology, Women's Studies, African & African American Studies, Economics, and Sociology.

Geology General Education Courses

GEOL 270 – Historical Geology

The department strongly opposes the elimination of GEOL 270 Historical Geology GE2000 status (SMS:E) from the general education program. This course was approved just last year by the general education committee as fulfilling the six SMS objectives and the objectives of Liberal Studies. At that time, we identified how the course content, assignments, and pedagogy were successful in: assisting students in developing broad disciplinary understanding, understanding the scientific method and ways of knowing, and development of content knowledge. This course offers high quality hands-on learning experiences in the form of in-class activities and field trips. These include exercises to develop critical thinking and communication skills. Students are required to complete a project that promotes the development of computer use, oral presentations, and writing skills. Based on student assessments, 77% of the students surveyed anticipated that they would use this information in future courses and during their professional careers. Ninety-five percent believed that the hand-on activities enhanced their learning experiences relative to other general education classes. This 200-level course is designed for students with an interest in applied activities and field-based experiences. There are no other courses of this kind that offer field and in-class activities at the 200-level in the physical sciences.

For the above reasons, GEOL 270 should continue to be recognized in the general education program as making a unique contribution to the current suite of SMS:E courses and complements coursework in several majors and minors including the Geophysics emphasis in Physics, the Environmental Geology emphasis in Chemistry, the Earth Space Teaching Major, and the Climatology minor.

GEOL 361 – Oceanography

The department is adamantly opposed to the elimination of GEOL 361 Oceanography GE 2000 status (SMS:E) from the general education program. This course was also approved last year as fulfilling the six SMS objectives and the objectives of Liberal Studies. As with GEOL 270, our course content, assignments, and pedagogy successfully assist students in: developing broad disciplinary understanding of scientific processes and their impact on society, understanding of the scientific method and ways of knowing, and development of content knowledge. In addition, this is one of the very few science general education courses that is offered in the evening. Many non-traditional students and continuing education students take this course because of its accessibility. This course is also one of the few, if not the only, upper level *interdisciplinary* courses offered in the sciences. It includes principles from geology, chemistry, biology, physics, and geography, as well as management and policy. This course prepares students to think about global issues, such as global warming, tsunamis, hurricanes, biodiversity, pollution, etc. Based on student outcome assessments, 79% of the students responding to the assessment stated that they anticipated using information from the course in future courses, in teaching, and their future careers. In addition, 87% of students indicated that course material and in-class problem solving improved their ability to assess information about current issues. This course is designed to facilitate the development of critical thinking skills through the discussion of timely topics.

Based on these reasons, GEOL 361 should continue to be recognized in the general education program as making an important and unique contribution to the current suite of SMS:E courses. This course also compliments coursework in several other majors including Earth Space Teaching Major, Physical Science Licensure, and the Climatology minor.

GEOL 360 – Astronomy

The department is strongly opposed to and somewhat surprised by the recommendation to eliminate GEOL 360 Astronomy GE 2000 status (SMS:E) from the general education program and allowing physics to retain it, especially since GGA has always supported strong enrollments in this course as opposed to physics (see attached enrollments for geology and physics). As with the geology courses listed above, the course content, assignments, and pedagogy for GEOL 360 are in-line with the goals of the general education program. We feel strongly that astronomy must be taught by geology faculty. Over 40% of the course content is based on geological processes, which geology faculty are qualified to teach. Physics faculty often do not have this background to successfully deliver the geologic content. The remainder of the course addresses physical scientific principles at an elementary level, which can be easily conveyed to students by any faculty

with a basic scientific background. Students have repeatedly conveyed to the geology faculty teaching the course that they relate better and are more interested in the planetary geology aspects of the course as opposed to astrophysics. This may explain why enrollments in the geology section are four times greater than the physics section. In addition, students may enroll in the geology section rather than the physics section because they perceive that physics is more difficult than geology, even though the course content is the same. GGA is particularly concerned that enrollments may plummet to levels where the course may not be offered due to low enrollments if the course is only offered in physics.

In addition to the course content being oriented toward geology, the department runs the John Hook Observatory, which is used in conjunction with the astronomy course. The observatory was founded by GGA. The newest telescopes were purchased from department subvention funds, and the observatory is run by geology students under the guidance of Dr. Sandra Brake, a geology faculty, who has operated an observatory before.

Thus, it seems that if the astronomy course is taught under the aegis of one department, the logical choice is that it should be taught by a geologist in the Department of Geography, Geology, and Anthropology.

Appendix A-2: John Conant, Chairperson, Economics

>>> John Conant 4/4/2006 1:47 PM >>>

Amy,

In regards to Econ 331 being on the cancellation list, all I can say is, that although we are unable to offer the course more than once every other year and that small numbers of students take it as GE,

it is a very good offering for those few students who are majoring in Political Science, SS Ed, or who have a non-vocational interest in government.

As such, despite small numbers, it serves a real GE purpose.

John

John Conant
Chair, Department of Economics
Director, Center for Economic Education

Appendix A-3: Ron Dunbar, Chairperson, LLL

Comments solicited from Ron Dunbar regarding FL 201-202 courses.

Ulla Belstra
Instructor in German

Comments on the cultural components of German 201 and 202

The study of German (history, culture, language) enables students in a unique way to learn about problems caused by prejudice, stereotyping and by uncritically accepting the opinions and policies of others.

Germans today are very well aware of the atrocities committed by German society, but also of the efforts of post-WWII Germany to make sure that all citizens have equal rights, are treated with respect and fairness. Germany's commitment to and major role in the Atlantic Alliance and the European Union emphasize its reliability, cooperation and willingness to make sacrifices for democratic values, free market economy and peace - not only at home but also in other parts of the world.

Germany's role during the Cold War and the peaceful end of the East-West confrontation can serve as a model for solving conflicts not only on the international, but also on a personal level.

1. As stated in the syllabi, students in the intermediate classes will

- Possess an understanding and appreciation of everyday life and culture in Germany.
- Demonstrate knowledge of the cultures of German-speaking countries.
- Reflect on and compare differences and similarities among German and American cultures.

2. Some of the topics are:

- Diversity and multi-cultural aspects of modern-day Germany, Austria and Switzerland (guest workers, asylum seekers, immigration policies, acceptance/ rejection issues; Germany as the second-largest immigration country, after the USA)
- Languages/ dialects and language policies in Germany, Austria and Switzerland
- Cultural differences between German-speaking countries and the USA (forms of address, manners, social behaviour in various settings, customs like keeping doors closed in Germany versus open-door policies in the US, personal space, youth culture)
- History and policies of equal rights (women's rights, family laws, naturalization process)
- Selected aspects of the history of German-speaking countries and their role in the European as well as in the global context.
- Ecological issues (recycling, urban planning, public transportation)
- The effects and influences immigrants from German-speaking countries had/ have on the USA (society: the concept of kindergarten, voices against slavery and for social justice; science; industry; arts)

3. These goals are achieved in several ways:

a. **Textbooks**

201: Reading sections in the textbook Deutsch Heute. There are about five pages of cultural information, written in **English**, in each chapter to provide students with more facts and give students a deeper understanding of issues than would be possible with a text only in the foreign language ("Land und Leute"). These cultural notes provide the framework for the main reading text **in German**. (Attachment 1: summary of chapters 6-10 of Deutsch Heute; attachment 2: sample pages for English-language culture texts). There are also several shorter pieces of authentic literature by German-speaking authors (mostly poems).

202: The textbook Kaleidoskop provides students with a great variety of authentic German-language texts by authors from Austria, Switzerland, and Germany (both the west and the eastern part, also by foreigners living in Germany and experiencing the country from their unique perspective). Every chapter has texts with cultural facts, informational texts and various genres of fiction. The content area of the book is entirely in German, whereas the grammar part in the back of the book has grammar explanations in English. (Attachment 3: summary of chapters 1-10 of Kaleidoskop)

Students can listen to the texts of both textbooks, read by German speakers from different regions, on the Virtual Lab.

b. **Classroom discussions/ students presentations**

The textbook materials are discussed in class, more information is provided by instructor presentations with visual and audio aids, and by student presentations in German (which are 10 % of the final grade for 201, 5 % of final grade for 202; 202 students also have 3 compositions on cultural topics which they present to the class; those are worth 9% of the final grade altogether). Students have to attend cultural events and write in German about their experiences (4 % of final grades)

c. **Intercultural activities and conversation with native speakers**

Students have several opportunities to interact with exchange students from various university programs (Study Abroad, Fullbright). When available, native speakers are invited to the classrooms to speak on cultural topics (example: growing up in the German Democratic Republic), and students can participate in e-mail exchanges with German-speaking students. German-language films with English subtitles are regularly offered during the semester. They meet German speakers from various areas at the German conversation table.

Connie Elmore
Instructor in Spanish
Comments on the Cultural Components of Spanish 201 and 202

Recent and current news events surrounding immigration policy reform and the presence of undocumented workers, most of whom are of Spanish-speaking origins, highlight the critical importance and high relevance of the study of Spanish (history, culture, and language).

Almost no field of study is disconnected from the potential, if not the inevitability, of present and future contact with persons of Spanish-speaking background. It is currently estimated that around 39 million persons living in the United States are of Spanish-speaking and/or Hispanic (history/culture) background.

No longer confined to "border states," Spanish speakers can be found in significant and growing numbers throughout the United States, including Midwestern States. Residents of Indiana increasingly meet with opportunities and responsibilities associated with Spanish-speakers and persons of Hispanic cultural, social, and economically-related histories.

The graduate of Indiana State University can expect to have and needs to be ready for positive and productive interactions with Spanish-speakers and persons of Hispanic backgrounds: in business and commerce; in government and private sectors; in fields related to health care and other services; and, as neighbors and friends.

The Spanish 201 and 202 course designers have anticipated these currently important social realities in their syllabi. In the syllabi for Spanish 201 and 202, words, terms, and phrases related to multicultural study goals appear 36 times. Course requirements include behaviorally-related, social-interaction activities design to further understanding between diverse cultures, social trait differences, and differing lifestyles. Cultural topics are developed for and by students, for research, writing, and oral presentation. Comparing and contrasting socio-cultural aspects of Spanish-speakers and Hispanics with other persons of differing backgrounds, promotes greater understanding and develops skills useful in areas of business, finance, government, services, agri-business, human relations, and the whole spectrum of human and family interactions in our pluralistic society.

Because, by the time a student of Spanish is ready for the 201 and 202 level, that student is capable of reading and learning more about those topics related to the university's multicultural goals, textbooks are chosen and used, and syllabi stipulations are designed to meet those goals. Cultural elements are examined in the context of our own country (including Indiana). This interface between language, histories, social contexts, and cultural aspects is the essence of multiculturalism. Students are guided in Spanish 201 and 202 towards exploring their personal perspectives on their own culture and society and, in turn, exploring their personal perspectives – be they well-informed or be they the product of unintended, but biased, misinformation on other cultures within and beyond the borders of the United States. Such an exploration falls clearly within the recognized goals of a university.

Students have commented through the medium of journaling and through direct verbal communication with professors and instructors that the further exposure to readings on cultural and social issues has contributed to changes in attitude and greater and deeper understanding of diversity and other multicultural issues.

Appendix A-4: Arthur Feinsod, Chairperson, Theater

>>> Arthur Feinsod 4/4/2006 9:02 AM >>>

Dear Amy,

I urge that the General Education Committee reconsider the decision to eliminate these three theater courses from the General Education offerings.

You say that Theater 396: Theater History II is infrequently offered but I think you are in error about the frequency. It has been offered every other spring in rotation with Theater 397: Theater History III since we redesigned the theater curriculum. I taught it in Spring 2002 and Chris Berchild taught it in Spring 2004. I am now teaching it in Spring 2006. Is that too infrequent?

To eliminate any of these three courses will be a huge detriment to our Department as well as the general theater education of those who take the classes you propose taking off the General Education list. On the issue of education quality, the nonmajors participating in all of these courses, though few in number, have been vital in giving the class multiple educational perspectives that have made the classes richer. The two art majors and one criminology major, for example, are only three among fifteen but they have added enormously to the quality and range of discussion in my Theater 396 class (Theater History II: Restoration to Shaw). When I think about the class without them, it seems like a far less interesting one. I show art slides to help my students better understand a theater style and the art history majors light up because now they are starting to see bridges between their discipline and this new one. I get excited because they add comments about the art works that shed interesting light on the culture of the times in which the plays we are reading were written. The criminology major has learned to look at a play as clues to decipher and has now begun to be a strong contributor to class discussion. Don't we want to encourage this kind of interdisciplinary thinking? All fifteen people in the class are benefiting from the presence of these three non-theater students (though only three) and even though they probably took the course at least in part to satisfy their General Education requirement.

Students in this class read classics such as Goethe's FAUST, Ibsen's A DOLL'S HOUSE, Chekhov's THE SEA GULL and Shaw's SAINT JOAN. The value of these plays extend far beyond the boundaries of theater and should be encouraged for those seeking a strong liberal arts general education. Please don't let numbers rule decisions here at ISU. A quality education must take precedence over efficiency.

There are a much larger percentage of nonmajors taking Theater History I, which offers the students access to plays by Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Shakespeare, Webster, and Moliere, all viewed from not only a literary but also a theatrical context. Even if the percentage of nonmajors is not large enough to satisfy your line-in-the-sand, however many non-theater students we have taking the course goes a long way to providing intellectual range and interdisciplinary inquiry that should be seen as vital to a classroom.

I will make sure that our 150 instructors send you copies of their syllabus. I am not sure why you didn't receive them already but I apologize if this was our oversight. Theater 150 has been a very successful course on many levels and adds a whole other dimension to the arts-side of general education. When you look at your criteria, remember, please, that studying an art has its own value and is very necessary for a well-rounded general education. Theater 174 Introduction to Theater can only touch on the art of acting; in Theater 150, the students have the opportunity to develop an artistic skill far beyond what can be accomplished in a very general 174 Introduction to Theater course.

We are having a difficult enough time accumulating the numbers necessary for courses to have permission to be offered under the new efficiency-mania that has taken over the campus. Without the three non-majors in the class, I would have twelve rather than fifteen in the course. With the draconian line-drawing mentality that seems to be fast taking over decisions about what courses are offered and what courses are not, I am afraid that suddenly this course wouldn't go and we couldn't offer a course that is vital to the theater curriculum and the high quality theater education that we have taken pains to design for our majors and minors, so the impact is not only on General Education but also on the integrity of our major.

Dr. Arthur Feinsod, Chairperson
Department of Theater

>>> Arthur Feinsod 4/6/2006 8:38 AM >>>

Dear Amy and Members of the General Education Council,

Based on the Chairs Council meeting and other issues that have come up in discussions with other Department Chairs, I strongly recommend that the following four factors be taken into account when considering whether or not a course should be cut from the General Education list -- in addition to the criteria of efficiency and productivity. If the factors below are not considered, I am concerned that the efficiency cuts could do irreparable damage to the Liberal Arts Mission of the University and the ability for departments (especially smaller majors) to deliver their majors.

Factor 1: We should consider the quality of the teaching that is going on in the course as deciphered by SIR's and/or interviews with high achieving general education students taking those classes and that criterion should override issues of efficiency;

Factor 2: The importance of the course in providing our students with a sound liberal arts foundation must also enter into the consideration. We need to make clear qualitative decisions as to what subjects we, as educators, think are a vital part of a strong liberal arts foundation on which a more specialized education can be built (e.g., courses that cover foundational thinkers, authors, books, events, experiments, methodologies, and subjects). Those courses need to be protected.

I am greatly in favor of cutting courses out of General Education and that many General Education courses, even some of the efficient ones, are NOT part of a sound liberal arts foundation and perhaps should be eliminated. And if that were done, large numbers of students would then go into the remaining courses, which would drive up their numbers. Efficiency, then, would stop being a problem if enough other courses were cut and selections of what remains on the General Education list were made primarily on mission and quality.

Factor 3: General Education courses that also satisfy core requirements of majors should not be cut if eliminating that course endangers the smaller department's abilities to maintain sufficient enrollments (otherwise, as Todd pointed out at Chairs Council, it can do irreparable damage to the departments' ability to deliver their majors (as cutting the two Theater History courses, for instance, would be for us). In addition, it should be remembered that the courses that do double-duty as General Education and as core department requirements afford the opportunity for interdisciplinary exchange and bridge-building between those in the major and students from other disciplines around campus. Arent we trying to encourage interdisciplinary thinking?

Factor 4: Because it is vital for being a well-rounded liberally educated student that he/she have a quality arts experience and a quality science experience, those kinds of courses need to be protected from being removed from the list, even if they do not meet other criteria.

I know you have a lot to deal with in carrying out your charge, but I do hope you will consider the factors I have delineated above. Thank you for giving this your attention.

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Feinsod, Chair
Department of Theater

>>> Arthur Feinsod 4/4/2006 9:25 PM >>>
Amy --

Thank you very much for your comments at the meeting.

Also, I hope CAAC and others up the food chain will consider the issue of the interdisciplinary value of a course. General Education courses that bring together a department's majors and members of the larger community, thereby encouraging interdisciplinary thinking and intellectual and artistic interconnections should be given priority. It also should be taken into account if eliminating a course from the general education list makes the course susceptible to be cut from the major, too, due to low enrollment. Our two theater history classes, as I tried to explain in my previous e-mail, have enough enrollment with both constituencies to pass the test, but if you eliminate the general education students, then the majors suffer the consequences of a course's total elimination. That will wreck havoc beyond what is now being anticipated on delivering the Department's major and enabling the majors to satisfy the major's requirements.

Thank you for considering all this and I do hope you pass both of these concerns along since they do not seem to have been addressed by the memo you sent out today after the Chairs Council Meeting.

If I have more time, I will try to gather quality data to support my earlier e-mail, if that is okay with you.

Bye for now,
Arthur Feinsod

Appendix A-5: Eric Hampton, Chairperson, Educational And School Psychology

I appreciate the opportunity to become involved in this dialogue at this point. I have not previously been contacted about provision of syllabi for departmental courses. I am attaching the NCATE syllabus for EPSY 342 to this email. I would hope that you would reconsider this course and continue its status as a general education requirement for the social and behavioral sciences area.

The excel document provided to me indicates that 64% of enrollment for this course is from the College of Education. From my point of view 36% of students taking the course from outside the COE represents a healthy general education student enrollment.

We fully embrace the ideals of general education in our developmental courses. Developmental writing is a focus in each developmental course approved for general education. Critical thinking is fostered in EPSY 342 through application of theory to analysis of observations and interpretation of observations. Communication skills are fostered through small group discussion of course content. Understanding personal values and beliefs are fostered through increased understanding of development, with its myriad issues, upon the young child. Grappling with these issues helps the student understand their own development during early years in addition to better understanding of present development of young children. Becoming a lifelong learner is furthered in this course through in-depth understanding of how learning takes place during early years and how their processes of adaption to change takes place.

A provided rationale for elimination is that there are too many developmental courses approved for general education. While developmental courses share things in common, they are each designed to address different aspects or time periods of growth. EPSY 202 focuses on childhood and adolescence; EPSY 221 covers development from conception to death; EPSY 342 focuses on the early years of development.

It is my understanding from the received email that EPSY 342 is the only EPSY course being considered for elimination from general education. I would urge reconsideration of this. If further information about this or any other course would help in your thinking on this issue, please feel free to contact me.

Eric Hampton

Appendix A-6: Diana Hews, Chairperson, EOB

>>> Diana Hews 4/12/2006 6:44 PM >>>

TO: Dr Amy Craddock

FROM: Diana Hews, Acting Chair, Ecology & Organismal Biology

RE: Program Prioritization and General Education Inventory

Date: 4/12/2006

We do not agree to the recommendation to drop ECOL 455 course from the Gen Ed Inventory for the following reasons:

- 1). After the retirement of Dr. Jackson, we have a newer faculty member who will now be teaching this course (Dr. Mitchell taught it in 2002 -we don't have assessment of it that year). The course is in our 6 year teaching plan to be taught on a rotation (every other year, Fall Semester.)
- 2) The course was not low enrollment when taught, typically having 15-25 people. Further, we will begin recruiting into the course more aggressively. The higher visibility of our new department (formed Jan 2005) should assist in this.
- 3) Most importantly the content matter of this course epitomizes what general education in Sciences should be. It centers on relevant and highly important topics related to how humans affect the world environment. Topics such as population growth, environmental degradation, resources, bioengineering and green solutions and agriculture, human disease; all are politically important issues and an upper-division offering in this course should be of fundamental importance for an informed electorate for citizens of our state and our nation.

Attached is the Syllabus.

Thank you for your consideration.

Appendix A-7. Bhaskara Kopparty, Chairperson, Math and Computer Science

Dr. Craddock,

Math 131 Calculus I is taken by students from other majors and they count this towards their gened requirements. The department of Math and CS feels that Math 131 Calculus I should not be dropped from the list of gened courses. It probably would be a good idea if the science departments chairs are asked for their input. I can ask them if you wish. I also imagine that you have data on the number of students that have taken Math 131 as a Gened course.

Also the reason for elimination from the Gened course inventory of this seems to be: Prerequisites are not Liberal Studies. Some of our faculty tell me that for a course to be a gened course it is not necessary that prerequisites are Liberal Studies. Did I understand your reason for elimination right?

If you can clarify this, I would appreciate it.

Kopparty

Bhaskara Rao Kopparty
Chair and Professor
Department of Mathematics and Computer Science
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, IN 47809
Office: 812-237-2130
Fax: 812-237-4296
e-mail: bkopparty@isugw.indstate.edu

This email, and any attachments, thereto, is intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this email, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited.

>>> Shirley Thomas 4/3/2006 1:18 PM >>>

This email is being sent to you because you chair a department offering one or more courses that the General Education Council (GEC) plans to recommend be eliminated from the General Education (GE) course inventory. See the attached files for an explanation and the course(s) recommended for elimination from the GE course inventory.

>>> Bhaskara Kopparty 4/10/2006 12:22 PM >>>

Amy,

We would like to retain the MATH 131 as a GEN ED course.

Do you have information on the number of students that took MATH 131 as a Gen Ed course for the last 3 to 5 years?

We would like to see the present status of MATH 131 as a Gen Ed maintained. Eliminating this from the GEN Ed course does not serve any purpose, since the course will be offered anyway and it would help the students get some GEN Ed requirements satisfied.

I was talking to Eric Glendening about Math 131 and he was suggesting that MATH 131 could still be a Gen Ed course on the lines of Chem 105(?) and Physics 105(?). Is this a possibility?

Kopparty



Indiana State University

Department of Art

TO : Amy Craddock
Interim Coordinator, General Education Program

FROM : Charles S. Mayer *CSMayer*
Interim Chair, Department of Art

DATE : April 10, 2006

RE : Elimination of General Education courses

Amy,

Thank you for so persuasively presenting the concerns of the CAS chairpersons to CAAC and convincing them to extend the deadline for responding to the proposed elimination of General Education Courses. Although I have already sent you a lengthy argument (copy attached) justifying why five of the Department of Art's courses (four sections of *ART 200* and *ARTH 373*) should not be eliminated, I would like to provide you with some additional information.

First of all, I am troubled by how the syllabus for a course such as *ART 200D* (Special Problems in Art-Painting), which received a glowing review last Spring when it was evaluated by the General Education Council, could now be thought of as providing no "evidence that the course meets LAPS goals." Among other things stated in a letter from Debra Worley, then Interim General Education Coordinator, to Nancy Nichols-Pethick, copy attached, was a recognition that the "course fulfills the five LAPS: E objectives identified in the Literary, Artistic, and Philosophical studies cores area." Dr. Worley went on to remark that :

You have identified how this course content, assignments, and pedagogy assist students in: analyzing, interpreting, and evaluating selected works, connecting the works to their cultural and historical context, and reflecting on how these works affect the lives of students. Your syllabus clearly identifies objects and assignments, and the pedagogy to accomplish those objectives.

How could a syllabus which clearly met the objectives and goals of LAPS:E several months ago, no longer meet those same objectives? This contradiction suggests to me that perhaps other criteria, beyond the quality of a course or the extent to which it meets the goals and objectives defined by the General Education program, are behind the recommendation for the elimination of four sections of *ART 200*.

In fact, in your e-mail of 4 April, you allude to these ephemeral "other criteria." The general tone of the first three paragraphs of that memo suggests that perhaps enrollment figures are one of the primary reasons these courses have been targeted for removal from the General Education

Fine Arts 108
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809
(812) 237-3697
Fax: (812) 237-4369
artdept@isugw.indstate.edu
www.indstate.edu/art-dept

offerings. There is no question that the enrollments of our studio classes might look low to anyone who is not completely aware of the nature of the discipline or does not understand why studio classes are purposely kept small. They are kept small for several reasons. First, the National Schools of Art and Design, our accrediting agency, mandates that the size of studio classes be kept small and suggests that while they should not exceed 25 students, they really should be limited to around 15. Moreover, in those classes like wood, sculpture and ceramics where the use of specialized equipment is required, safety issues dictate that the enrollments are kept even smaller. Secondly, studio art is based on individualized instruction, with the professor frequently working one-on-one with a student. If classes are larger than the recommended 15, studio art professors can not satisfactorily provide the appropriate quality instruction required of them. Thirdly, the small size of our general education *ART 200* classes is the consequence of how we are forced to schedule our studio classes to meet the needs of our majors, while providing non-art majors with the opportunity to explore the creative process. It is understandable, perhaps, that if one looks only at the enrollment figures for the various sections of *ART 200*, as indicated on the chart below, one might get the idea that these courses are under enrolled. However, what these figures do not show is that these studio classes for non-art majors are usually capped at 5 to 8

ART 200-A, ART 200-D, ART 200-F, & 200-G SPECIAL PROBLEMS IN ART: ENROLLMENT FIGURES 2001-2005															
	2001			2002			2003			2004			2005		
	SPG	S I	F	SPG	S I	F	SPG	S I	F	SPG	S I	F	SPG	S I	F
ART 200-A	5	8	6	5	6	8	8	3	5	6	4	3	6	5	7
ART 200-D	10		5	8		4	9		6	6		2	4	2	6
ART 200-F	5		3	6		10	4		5	4		8	9		10
ART 200-G	5	5	3	6	4	1	7		7	6		3	7	5	5

students because the courses are "stacked" with other studio courses taught for art majors. That is, because of limited studio faculty, in order to provide a full spectrum of studio offerings it is necessary to teach multiple studio courses simultaneously. For example, painting for non-majors (*ART 200*) might be combined with Painting I (*ARTS 230*), as happened during the Fall 2005 semester. That term, the total enrollment for the two combined painting classes was actually 16, which included the 6 students enrolled in *ART 200D* and ten students enrolled in *ARTS 230*. Comparable combinations occurred in *ART 200-G* which was taught simultaneously with *ARTS 255 (Sculpture Wood I)*, *ARTS 356 (Sculpture-Wood II)* and *ARTS 357 (Sculpture-Wood III)*. Only *ART 200-E (Photography)* is offered as a stand-alone course, which is reflected in its higher enrollments. While one might argue that this "little red school room" approach to combining multiple sections of different studio courses in the same media might be a disservice to the students, quite the opposite is true. There is a remarkable synergy in the studio with the students at different levels of expertise inspiring other students. So, in many ways this combination of different levels provides the students with the kind of stimulus to creativity they might not get were they in an isolated section.

In your e-mail dated 4 April 2006, explaining the time extension granted by CAAC, you suggested that information on assessment be included in our response to the request for input on the list of courses recommended for elimination. The Department of Art does monitor the success of its

courses and regularly evaluates the extent to which they are meeting their goals. One way in which this is done is by administering regular SIR's which, in the case of those sections of *ART 200* targeted for elimination, have consistently shown that the students have favorably evaluated all the instructors of the different sections of *ART 200*. The overall evaluation scores for each section of Art 200 being considered for elimination is indicated on the chart below and can be

ART 200-A, ART 200-D, ART 200-F, and 200-G SPECIAL PROBLEMS IN ART: STUDENT EVALUATIONS							
	FALL 2002	SPRING 2003	FALL 2003	SPRING 2004	FALL 2004	SPRING 2005	FALL 2005
ART 200 - A	3.00	3.85	3.19	N/A	3.50	N/A	N/A
ART 200 - F	4.79	3.96	4.59	N/A	4.50	4.1	4.21
ART 200 - D	4.60	4.69	4.32	4.65	4.81	4.83	4.91
ART 200 - G	SABBATICAL	3.71	4.60	4.87	4.78	3.79	4.14

found as well on the attached individual synopses for the *Art Evaluations of Teaching* of each instructor of record; the data for the *ART 200* sections has been highlighted in yellow. Additionally students' written observations, which accompanied the SIR's, have commented on how beneficial they found these courses and noted that they were a "great learning experience." Students also stated that they liked the personalized one-on-one instruction they received in the studio course, an attention to the individual which is too often not possible in larger lecture classes. Other students remarked on how these courses asked challenging questions and promoted critical thinking and conceptual skills not explored in other general education courses. Moreover, the professors were praised for making students use abilities they did not know they had. Some even noted that the class helped them to "think out of the box," an observation we in the Department of Art consider to be the utmost compliment.

For the reasons expressed in my previous e-mail memo to you dated 4 April 2006 (copy attached), and for those presented in this memo, the Department of Art believes that its *ART 200* sections and its *ARTH 373 (Women Artists)* continue to meet the requirements and satisfy the goals and objects for a General Education LAPS:E course. Therefore, they should not be eliminated.

From: Charles Mayer
To: acraddock@isugw.indstate.edu
Date: 4/4/2006 3:09:23 PM
Subject: Art response to Elimination of Gen ed approved Courses

Dear Dr. Craddock:

I would like to take this opportunity to respond to your recent e-mail concerning the elimination of six of the Department of Art's General Education approved courses from the inventory of offerings.

I will respond first to your proposal to remove four sections of ART 200. However, I will discuss them as a group, rather than as four separate courses. They are, after all, sections of essentially the same course. When the review and assessment of General Education courses took place during the Spring 2005 semester, syllabus and self-assessment materials were submitted to the General Education Council for the four Art 200 courses being targeted for elimination: ART 200-A (Special Problems in Art-Ceramics), 200-D (Special Problems in Art-Painting), 200-F (Special Problems in Art-Metals) and 200-G (Special Problems in Art-Wood). Had there been any concerns about the quality of these courses, their ability to meet the goals of the General Education program or the extent to which the course syllabi did not provide "evidence that the course meets LAPS goals," these concerns should have been presented to the department. They could have been addressed at that time and the appropriate changes made to rectify them. However, at no time during the review and assessment process was any feed-back received that indicated that these courses did not meet the criteria for LAPS courses. However, now, without any sufficient clarification other than a very general statement that the "syllabus gives no evidence that course meets LAPS goals" and with no provisions for redress, the General Education Council has been decided that courses that teach students to think creatively and to translate those thoughts into visual terms do not satisfy the requirements in the area of Literary, Artistic, and Philosophical Studies. Although each one of the different sections of ART 200 reflects different media, all of them address the same issues and concerns. All of them use a particular medium—whether ceramics, paint, sculptural materials, or wood—as means of developing problem-solving skills using visual elements in two or three dimensions. While all these classes introduce students to basic fundamental studio processes, they do so by engaging the student critically with the medium and its historical artistic tradition. Students are challenged to think analytically when they are forced to examine the formal elements which make up a given artwork. The configuration of these formal elements is one of the first things students must determine when they begin the actual creation of their work of art. Additionally, each one of the ART 200 sections includes a thorough investigation of the history of that medium—clay, painting, sculpture, and wood. By studying the historical traditions of any given medium, students come to understand the specific artistic and philosophical premises of their own work and the work of past artists. Students are also required to develop both a verbal and visual vocabulary to enable them to understand the meaning of their own work and the work of others. In each section of ART 200, a primary focus is the ongoing critical attention to works of art. A variety of critical strategies encourages students to approach critical analysis from a range of perspectives, which vary from medium to medium. Written and spoken critiques are methods through which students demonstrate their understanding of key concepts and terms. Assignments in all the different studio areas require students to exercise progressively more independent judgment. Because this cluster of Special Problems in Art courses are ones that promote creativity and visual exploration, foster the ability to think independently, and encourage the development of unique resolutions to visual problems, they do embody the principles and goals of the General Education program.

It is unfortunate that the General Education Council determined that the four Art 200 courses in question, on the basis of the syllabi alone, do not meet the criteria for LAPS courses. This is perhaps because the syllabi in question describe more intuitive creative processes rather than the kind of general objective analysis so often found in academic syllabi. Yet, each one of these courses, designed for students who have no "hands on" experience in the visual arts, has as its objectives goals that are commensurate with those defined by the General Education program:

- To develop problem solving skills using two or three-dimensional visual elements that will foster the students

abilities for independent thinking, critical analysis and reasoned inquiry.

- To develop in students a visual and verbal vocabulary through which they will be able to generate meaning verbally in their writing and speech and visually in the creation of works of art.
- To develop an understanding of the nature of aesthetic evaluation and analysis and an appreciation of how aesthetic evaluation differs from taste that, in turn, enables students to make better informed judgments about art.
- To develop a fuller understanding of the communicative possibilities inherent in artistic expression that will enable students to participate in the arts throughout their adult life.

The GEC needs to re-evaluate its recommendation to eliminate the four sections of ART 200 from the General Education offerings. To deprive students of the possibility to have a hand-on artistic experience to satisfy part of the Literary, Artistic and Philosophical Study requirements of their General education program is a mistake. The different sections of ART 200 are rigorous and challenging courses and require students to think in new and different ways. That this type of thinking is non-instrumentalist does not mean that the courses do not meet the goals of the General Education program, although it may explain why it is so difficult for people in the sciences, technology and business to grasp how these courses can make a valuable contribution to a student's general education. It would be criminal to deprive students of the opportunities these studio courses for non-art majors offer them to explore new modalities of thought, critical thinking, and creative expression. I thought that was an essential component of General Education.

As far as ARTH 373 (Women Artists) is concerned, there is no question that this course meets the conditions of a General Education course. Rather, it appears that the only reason for its being targeted for removal is that the majority of students enrolled are art majors. That seems a somewhat capricious reason to remove a valuable course from the General Education course offerings. Instead of justifying the removal of this course from the General Education offerings because 67% of its enrollments are art majors, consider how its removal will deprive 33 % of non-art majors from being able to expand their frames of reference. Moreover, because this course is an art history course, to say that 67% of the students enrolled are art majors is to overlook the fact that the majority of those students are studio art majors, which is an entirely different discipline. Were the majority of students enrolled in the course art history majors that would be a different matter. But, in point of fact, the majority of students enrolled for the course are really from another area of study, albeit a correlated one. Finally, this course is an important component of the Women Studies Program and draws the student's attention to a group of creative individuals who, because of their gender, have been marginalized in historical studies of the development of art. That these important artists should continue to be marginalized by being removed from the General Education program is a sad comment on how much further we have to go before women artists can achieve full equality.

Finally, it is regrettable yet understandable that ARTH 389 (Survey of African American Art) is also being targeted for removal from the roster of General Education offerings. Admittedly, currently there is no faculty member to teach this course but, like the history of Women Artists, it provides students with an insight into a group of artists and, by extension, an integral part of American culture that historically has been overlooked. Instead of simply eliminating the course from the General Education offerings, we propose that you allow the course to be "banked" so that when we are able to hire a competent art historian, with the appropriate expertise in African-American art, he or she could once again offer this course without having to resubmit a formal proposal to the GEC for approval.

If you need additional information from me in order to insure that the four sections of ART 200 and ARTH 373 can continue to be offered for General Education credit, please contact me accordingly.

Charles S. Mayer

Charles S. Mayer

Interim Chairperson, Department of Art

This email, and any attachments, thereto, is intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this email, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited.

CC: Alma Mary Anderson; Fran Lattanzio; Tom Sauer

Appendix A-9: Chris Olsen, Chairperson, History

April 11, 2006

To: Amy Craddock, Interim General Education Coordinator

From: Chris Olsen, History Dept. Chair

Re: Gen. Ed. Prioritization Review (HIST 355 and 372)

The Department of History opposes elimination of the GE credit for these two courses.

HIST 372 has been offered once per year (except when Prof. Muyumba was on sabbatical) and we intend to continue offering it on a regular basis. Also, it is unclear why HIST 372 is to be eliminated from the GE offering but HIST 371 is not.

HIST 355 is one of the most popular GE history courses and can be taught by several faculty members. It has virtually nothing in common with HIST 358, is taught by different faculty members, and is actually in a different GE category. These differences should be evident from the course descriptions:

355 Europe, 1500-1815-3 hours. National states, late Renaissance, Reformation, economic developments, cultural changes, international relations.
General Education Credits [GE89:D3; GE2000: Historical Studies]

358 The Atlantic World, 1500-1820-3 hours. This course introduces the concept of an Atlantic World. Key integrative and interpretive themes and trends will be considered, including European exploration and expansion into the Atlantic, imperialism and colonialism, the emergence of an Atlantic economy and trade, intercultural interaction and exchange, and the establishment of the African slave trade and the plantation economy. The Atlantic World, as it emerged during the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries was a complex community of communities, tied together by a web of relationships-personal, political, cultural, and commercial-and was, in a sense, a quintessential early modern multicultural community.
General Education Credits [GE2000: Multicultural Studies-International Cultures]

HIST 355 addresses the internal development of European nation-states, economies, and culture; HIST 358 examines the Atlantic World, focusing on the interchange of ideas, people, and culture among Europe, Africa, and the Americas. Other than the years covered, the two courses have virtually nothing in common.

ENG
 Courses Recommended for Elimination
 from General Education Course Inventory

GE Area	Course Title	Cross-Listed	# Terms Offered	COMMENTS	DEPARTMENT COMMENTS
SLAL	ENG 242 (Mod Black Amer Lit)	AFRI 283	2	Infrequently offered. (May be taught as Lit & Life topics course.)	In our previous response to the request from the Office of General Education regarding black literature courses correlated with AFRI, we explained that these three courses both were offered on a rotation and the supportive of elective requirements in the African and African American Studies program. We are now a bit confused as to why ENG 349/AFRI 383 has been singled out for elimination when it performs the same service and is offered on the same rotation as the other two ENG/AFRI black literature courses, which were accepted for retaining their independent course status. Here again is the rationale that we provided for all three ENG/AFRI courses: This course is offered on a rotation both to support elective credit in the African and African American Studies major and minor and to support Literature and Life requirement delivery. Our Lit topics are rotated according to faculty availability. Please retain GE credit for this course.
SSBE	ENG 310 (English Grammar, Text & Writers)		7	Does not meet SSBE goals	See attached documentation. The English Department would like to retain SSBE credit for this course.

A-10 Perrin
 English

Please feel free to make comments on this document and return to me by email.

Theoretical Overview of English 310:

The underlying theory of this class is that language is a social act. Determination of appropriate or inappropriate discourse is based on the rhetorical situation which does not exist in a social vacuum but is an interrelation of writer, reader, language, and community (community, both in its narrow definition of a discourse or professional community as well as the larger social and cultural communities in which an individual [and for that matter academic community] is embedded). The view that language both reflects and shapes reality (i.e., Bakhtin) is central to current rhetorical theory; in addition, contemporary rhetorical theory also notes the social construction of a writer's identity through the interrelationship of social and cultural roles adopted by or imposed upon individuals (i.e., Bizzell).

In addition, current sociolinguistic research has had significant influence on our view of grammar and language acquisition; for example, in order to meet NCATE standards for teacher licensure, teachers must demonstrate an understanding of the impact of language diversity (i.e., regional, ethnic, and social dialects) upon the language arts processes of learners. To that end, English 310 both begins and ends with a discussion of language diversity and its relationship to the rhetorical situation (see syllabus and textbook index). Students are presented with five different views of grammar as described from Hartwell (prescriptive [linguistic etiquette of Mainstream American English], descriptive [structural], rhetorical [see above], traditional [diagrams, parsing], and competence [Chomskian transformational-generative grammar]). The advantages and disadvantages of all five approaches are discussed and modeled over the course of the term. All editing issues (as listed on the syllabus) are presented in the context of this social constructivist view of writing.

1. Does the course identify the characteristics of different individuals and social systems (e.g. groups, families, or societies) and the factors that lead to these characteristics?

Yes, the social construction of identity is discussed as is the role of the individual within academic, social and cultural communities as the basis of language use.

2. Does the course describe the methods and the basic constructs within specific social/behavioral disciplines?

The course provides a brief overview of transformational-generative and structuralist grammar. In addition, nearly a century of empirical research in the educational and rhetorical perspectives on the subject of grammar exists, and we review some of the key empirical studies on grammar.

3. Does the course lead students to understand the basic structures and functions underlying the development of human behavior, institutions, systems or societies?

Yes, language is presented as a part of academic, social, and cultural communities; Standard American English is deconstructed as the dialect of social, political, and economic power in the United States.

4. Does the course lead students to understand the complex interaction between the personal needs and the competing demands of various social systems in shaping personal choices, values, and actions?

Yes, see Number 3 above.

5. Does the course critically evaluate the contributions and limitations of social and behavioral sciences in understanding individual behavior and/or determining social and public policy?

The tension between linguistic research and educational policy is discussed briefly, particularly in relation to standardized testing and standards based assessment in the wake of No Child Left Behind.

6. Does the course lead students to understand the nature of their participation in social institutions and systems?

Yes, students are made aware that language choice has social, political, and economic, as well as personal, impacts on their lives.

Appendix A-11: David Worley, Chairperson, Communication

>>> David Worley 4/5/2006 11:03 AM >>>

Amy,

I have reviewed the list of courses from Comm you sent earlier. I am particularly disappointed at the removal of COMM 416 from the Gen Ed list, given that we were encouraged to add the course by Gen Ed to meet the need for upper level internationally focused multicultural studies courses. We also stopped teaching this course as a 400/500 level course in order to meet the Gen Ed requirements, in view of this encouragement from Gen Ed. In other words, we altered our departmental offerings to accommodate Gen Ed needs and now we are told that the course is no longer necessary, after being urged to offer the course by Gen Ed.

I'm also disappointed by the fact that the removal of this course reduces the diversity of offerings in upper level multicultural studies; it is the only communication approach to the topic and one that is, in my view, an important perspective. While understanding cultural perspectives presented in literature, art, and history are valuable, focusing on the communication issues that attend cross-cultural interaction is vital to working toward human peaceful interaction and negotiation, as well as broadening one's appreciation for others' ways of being in the world. We teach this course in our department typically every spring, which provides those wishing to take the course for Gen Ed credit the opportunity to do so; there is, as I see it, no cost to us, the university or Gen Ed.

Moreover, this course was funded by a Liberal Learning in Action Grant, which worked with the ESL program at Vigo County Public Library to engage students in gathering the narratives of sojourners in Terre Haute. The course, then, has a history of serving students (both in and out of our major) and linking with the stated mission of the university. Additionally, as the instructor of this course, I participated in a Faculty Learning Community focused on migration in the Wabash, which linked this course with other courses being taught in history and LLL. This was a move toward interdisciplinarity.

This course is relatively new as a Gen Ed offering, although it has a rich history in our department. To remove it from Gen Ed appears, to me, to negate some of the very reasons the course was originally approved. However, in the end, knowing the dynamics that drive the decision to remove courses from the Gen Ed roster, I have little confidence that the course will remain a Gen Ed offering. Nevertheless, I think it important to offer some perspective, which may inform the ensuing conversation.

David

Appendix B: General Education Course Inventory Information and Recommendations to CAAC

Core Area	Course Name	Title	Cross-listed	# Terms Offered	Total Enrollment	Total Fall/Spring Enrollment	# of Fall/Spring Sections Offered	Average Enrollment per Section	Option 1 (Eliminations)	Option 2 (Eliminations)	Comments
\$HSR	HIST 101	World Civil To 1500		11	1571	1546	36	44			
\$HSR	HIST 102	World Civil Sin 1500		11	2228	2153	55	41			
\$HSR	HIST 110	History Of World War II		8	1172	1102	8	147			
\$HSR	HIST 201	U S To 1877		11	2220	2200	94	24			
\$HSR	HIST 202	U S Since 1865		12	3530	3429	107	33			
\$HSR	HIST 315	American Civil War		5	222	102	3	74			Distance Ed
\$HSR	HIST 336	1960'S:Counterdt&Profes		6	574	574	12	48			Distance Ed
\$HSR	HIST 341	Hist Western Religions I		1	3	3	1	3	X	X	Banked
\$HSR	HIST 342	Hist Western Religion II		1	18	18	1	18	X	X	Banked
\$HSR	HIST 343	History of Eastern Rel: India		0					X	X	Banked
\$HSR	HIST 344	History of Eastern Rel: Far East		0					X	X	Banked
\$HSR	HIST 351	Ancient World		6	601	601	14	43			
\$HSR	HIST 355	Europe 1500-1815		6	161	139	5	32			
\$HSR	HIST 356	Colonial&Natl SE Asia		1	2	2	1	2			New course rotation
\$HSR	HUM 351	Hist W Religions I		1	27	27	1	27	X	X	Course prefix change
\$HSR	HUM 352	Hist W Religions II		1	16	16	1	16	X	X	Course prefix change
\$HSR	IS 396D	Vienna-Cult&Soc Hist Med		1	3	3	1	3	X	X	Removed all IS courses
\$HSR	IS 397J	Italy-Hist Art&Architect		2	4	4	2	2	X	X	Removed all IS courses
\$HSR	IS 397M	Italy-Art History		1	1	1	1	1	X	X	Removed all IS courses
\$LAE	AFRI 325	Survey Jazz Blues & Rock	MUS 330	11	399	330	13	31			
\$LAE	AFRI 423M	Surv African Amer Music	MUS 425	3	87	87	3	29			
\$LAE	ANTH 400	Native Am Art & Cultures		1	59	59	1	59	X	X	
\$LAE	ART 100	Art Appreciation		5	482	479	14	34	X	X	No longer in catalog-Banked 02/05
\$LAE	ART 151	Vis Art In Civiliz		10	2075	2069	87	24			
\$LAE	ART 200A	Spec Prob Art(Ceramics)		10	56	43	7	8			ART 200 counts as 1 course
\$LAE	ART 200D	Spec Prob Art(Painting)		8	39	37	7	6			
\$LAE	ART 200E	Spec Prob Art(Photograph)		10	126	118	7	18			
\$LAE	ART 200F	Spec Prob(Sculpt-Metals)		7	50	50	7	7			
\$LAE	ART 200G	Spec Prob(Sculpt-Wood)		8	42	36	7	6			
\$LAE	ARTH 271	Surv Art Hist I		8	278	277	8	35			Delete 1-2 ARTH courses
\$LAE	ARTH 272	Surv Art Hist II		7	255	255	10	26			

General Education Course Inventory Information and Recommendations to CAAC

Core Area	Course Name	Title	Cross-listed	# Terms Offered	Total Enrollment	Total Fall/Spring Enrollment	# of Fall/Spring Sections Offered	Average Enrollment per Section	Option 1 (Eliminations)	Option 2 (Eliminations)	Comments
\$LAE	ARTH 371	Hist Art:Surv 20th Cent		4	143	143	4	36			
\$LAE	ARTH 373	Women Artists		4	125	125	4	31			Most enr are ART majors
\$LAE	ARTH 374	Hist Architect		3	185	185	3	62			Directed GE for MCT
\$LAE	COMM 110	Televiz Contemp Society		1	25	25	1	25			New GE course
\$LAE	COMM 240	Intro To Film		5	168	154	4	42			
\$LAE	COMM 265	Oral Interp Lit		4	105	105	4	26	X	X	Dept concurrence
\$LAE	COMM 266	Interp Child Lit		10	503	463	18	28			Directed GE: EESE
\$LAE	COMM 367	Oral Interp Poetry		0					X	X	Banked
\$LAE	FCS 354	Traditional Interiors		7	155	154	6	26			
\$LAE	GH 101F	Contemp Iss:Myth/Science		1	29	29	1	29	X	X	Removed all GH courses
\$LAE	GH 101H	Contemp Iss:Res&Presentation		1	13	13	1	13	X	X	Removed all GH courses
\$LAE	GH 121	Class Cult Greece Rome		7	198	198	13	15	X	X	Removed all GH courses
\$LAE	GH 201A	Hon:Ulysses/Homer&Joyce		1	9	9	1	9	X	X	Removed all GH courses
\$LAE	GH 221	Lit & Visual Arts		1	18	18	1	18	X	X	Removed all GH courses
\$LAE	GH 231	Utop Dreams&Radic Realit		3	48	48	3	16	X	X	Removed all GH courses
\$LAE	GH 271	Intro Performing Arts		2	27	27	2	14	X	X	Removed all GH courses
\$LAE	GH 301A	Sem:Dante's Divine Comedy		1	13	13	1	13	X	X	Removed all GH courses
\$LAE	GH 301C	Hon Sem:Perspect Envrmt		2	19	19	2	10	X	X	Removed all GH courses
\$LAE	GH 301E	Hon Sem:Stud Don Quixote		2	27	27	2	14	X	X	Removed all GH courses
\$LAE	GH 301O	Sem:Joyce/Modernism		2	13	13	2	7	X	X	Removed all GH courses
\$LAE	GH 401H	Hon Indep:Res&Presentation		1	3	3	1	3	X	X	Removed all GH courses
\$LAE	HUM 170	Hum & Mod World		8	361	353	10	36	X	X	Prefix Changed to LLL-170
\$LAE	HUM 190	Intro Religion		6	220	220	6	37	X	X	Prefix Changed to REL 190
\$LAE	IS 396N	Vienna - 1900		1	2	2	1	2	X	X	Removed all IS courses
\$LAE	IS 397K	Italy-Interm Painting		2	3	3	2	2	X	X	Removed all IS courses
\$LAE	LAT 215	Class Mythology		7	339	339	9	38			
\$LAE	LAT 316	Surv Lat Lit Transl		1	3	3	1	3		E	Infrequently Offered. Low Enrollment
\$LAE	LLL 170	Humanities Modern World		1	6	6	1	6			Was HUM 170
\$LAE	MUS 150	Intro Musical Tradit I		1	69	69	1	69			
\$LAE	MUS 233	Music Appreciation		11	1139	1134	58	20			

General Education Course Inventory Information and Recommendations to CAAC

Core Area	Course Name	Title	Cross-listed	# Terms Offered	Total Enrollment	Total Fall/Spring Enrollment	# of Fall/Spring Sections Offered	Average Enrollment per Section	Option 1 (Eliminations)	Option 2 (Eliminations)	Comments
\$LAE	MUS 330	Surv Jazz Blue Rock	AFRI 325	13	449	387	16	28			
\$LAE	MUS 333	Masterpieces Classic Mus		7	300	300	12	25			
\$LAE	MUS 341	History Of Jazz		9	267	241	7	38		E	Similar course in AFRI
\$LAE	MUS 425	Surv African Amer Music	AFRI 423M	3	24	24	3	8	X	X	Not in catalog
\$LAE	MUS 343	Surv Amer Folk, Cntry, Blgrs		0					X	X	Not in catalog
\$LAE	MUS 344	Surv Electronic Music		0							
\$LAE	PHIL 101	Intro Philosophy		4	247	245	7	35			High enr. Would be taught more freq but fac was on sabbatical
\$LAE	PHIL 190	Philosophy Star Trek		2	76	76	2	38			Changed to PHIL 101
\$LAE	PHIL 200	Intro To Phil		5	553	553	14	40	X	X	one?
\$LAE	PHIL 201	Intro to Aesthetics		0							Never taught. In planned Envir Studies program
\$LAE	PHIL 253	Environmental Ethics		0							
\$LAE	REL 190	Intro Religion		1	32	32	1	32			
\$LAE	THTR 150	Beginning Acting		7	156	156	9	17			THTR has 5 LAE courses. Recommend retain 2 courses
\$LAE	THTR 174	Intro To Theatre		10	1035	987	27	38			
\$LAE	THTR 191	Intro To Play Analysis		3	85	85	3	28			
\$LAE	THTR 395	His Thr I:Greeks Moliere		4	82	82	4	21		E	
\$LAE	THTR 396	Hist Thr II:Restorat Shaw		1	18	18	1	18		E	
\$LAL	AFRI 213	Intro Black Amer Writers	ENG 243	4	43	43	4	11			
\$LAL	AFRI 383	Mod Black Amer Lit	ENG 346	1	10	10	1	10			
\$LAL	COMM 308	Literature & Public Life		2	35	487	19	2			Offer fewer sections/semester
\$LAL	ENG 219	Intro Creative Writing		8	552	525	37	15			Offer fewer sections/semester
\$LAL	ENG 231	Intro To Fiction		9	475	439	34	14			
\$LAL	ENG 239	Literature and Life		13	3766	3491	86	44			
\$LAL	ENG 243	Black Amer Writ	AFRI 213	4	134	134	4	34			
\$LAL	ENG 335	Sci Fiction Social Criticism		2	89	89	2	45			
\$LAL	ENG 336	Pop Lit Mass Media		6	269	184	6	45			
\$LAL	ENG 338	Literature & Public Life		8	791	755	17	47			
\$LAL	ENG 341	Lit American West		1	1	1	1	1	X	X	Banked
\$LAL	ENG 346	Mod Black Amer Lit	AFRI 383	2	92	92	2	46			

General Education Course Inventory Information and Recommendations to CAAC

Core Area	Course Name	Title	Cross-listed	# Terms Offered	Total Enrollment	Total Fall/Spring Enrollment	# of Fall/Spring Sections Offered	Average Enrollment per Section	Option 1 (Eliminations)	Option 2 (Eliminations)	Comments
\$LAL	ENG 349	Women Writers of U S		4	169	169	4	42			
\$LAL	ENG 359	Women Writers Great Brit		4	100	100	4	25			
\$LAL	HUM 333	Literature & Public Life		1	13	13	1	13	X	X	Course prefix change
\$LAL	PHIL 321	Literature & Public Life		1	33	33	1	33			
\$MCI	AFRI 214	Lit of Black World	ENG 244	1	13	13	1	13			AFRI has 5 MCI, but most are cross listed w/other depts.
\$MCI	AFRI 329	Music in Africa	MUS 329	1	30	30	1	30			
\$MCI	AFRI 334	Intro African Art	ARTH 388	2	21	32	2	11			
\$MCI	AFRI 350	Hist&Cult Mod Africa I	HIST 371	3	95	95	3	32			
\$MCI	AFRI 351	Hist&Cult Mod Afr II: Nat	HIST 372	2	57	57	2	29	E	E	Low enrollments
\$MCI	ANTH 202	Multiple Lifeways		8	593	592	17	35			
\$MCI	ANTH 202I	Multiple Lifeways		3	17	17	3	6	X	X	IS section, no reason to keep
\$MCI	ARTH 388	Intro African Art	AFRI 334	2	28	185	3	9			
\$MCI	COMM 416	Cross Cultur Comm		3	79	79	3	26			73% COMM Majors. Only MCI in COMM
\$MCI	ENG 244	Lit Of Black World	AFRI 214	2	32	32	2	16			
\$MCI	ENG 370	Survey Folklore		8	1004	964	21	48			
\$MCI	FCS 214	Perspectives Dress I		7	213	213	7	30			
\$MCI	FREN 201	Interm French I		7	89	89	7	13		E	2nd year FL does not meet GE goals
\$MCI	FREN 202	Interm French II		7	71	71	7	10		E	
\$MCI	G H 141	Class Cult China India		1	1	1	1	1	X	X	Removed all GH courses
\$MCI	GEOG 130	World Geography		10	1795	1672	31	58			
\$MCI	GEOG 423	Geography Middle East		3	19	19	3	6		E	Very low enrollments
\$MCI	GERM 201	Intermed German I		7	56	56	7	8		E	2nd year FL does not meet GE goals
\$MCI	GERM 202	Intermed German II		7	42	42	8	5		E	2nd year FL does not meet GE goals
\$MCI	GERM 308	Weimar&Fascism Germ Cult		4	104	104	5	21			Can keep 1-2 MCI
\$MCI	HIST 320	Comparative Slavery		0							New course
\$MCI	HIST 358	Atlantic Wrld, 1500-1820		1	37	37	1	37			New hire will teach.
\$MCI	HIST 371	Hist&Cult Mod Africa I	AFRI 350	3	32	32	3	11			
\$MCI	HIST 372	Hist&Cult Mod Afr II: Nat	AFRI 351	2	17	17	2	9		E	
\$MCI	HUM 250	World Religions		7	298	298	8	37	X	X	Course prefix changed to REL 250

General Education Course Inventory Information and Recommendations to CAAC

Core Area	Course Name	Title	Cross-listed	# Terms Offered	Total Enrollment	Total Fall/Spring Enrollment	# of Fall/Spring Sections Offered	Average Enrollment per Section	Option 1 (Eliminations)	Option 2 (Eliminations)	Comments
\$MCI	IS 110	Invitation Asian Studies		3	28	28	3	9	X	X	Removed all IS courses
\$MCI	IS 396X	Vienna-Global Prob Solv		2	3	3	2	2	X	X	Removed all IS courses
\$MCI	ITAL 201	Intermed Ital I		2	9	9	3	3		E	2nd year FL does not meet GE goals
\$MCI	ITAL 202	Intermed Ital II		2	7	7	2	4		E	2nd year FL does not meet GE goals
\$MCI	ITE 335	Tech Internat Develop		10	817	693	22	37			
\$MCI	LAT 201	Intermed Latin I		4	40	40	4	10		E	2nd year FL does not meet GE goals
\$MCI	LAT 202	Intermed Latin II		3	21	21	3	7		E	2nd year FL does not meet GE goals
\$MCI	MUS 151	Intro Music Tradit II		1	51	51	1	51			
\$MCI	MUS 329	Music in Africa	AFRI 329	1	23	23	1	23			
\$MCI	PSCI 105	Issues Of Our Times		10	1169	1095	24	49			
\$MCI	PSCI 280	Intr Compar Pol		6	207	207	6	35			
\$MCI	REL 250	World Religions		1	28	28	1	28			
\$MCI	SPAN 201	Intermed Span I		7	348	348	18	19		E	2nd year FL does not meet GE goals
\$MCI	SPAN 202	Intermed Span II		8	244	241	14	17		E	2nd year FL does not meet GE goals
\$MCU	AFRI 113	Found Afr&Afri Am Stud		8	1309	1300	28	47			
\$MCU	AFRI 212	African Amer Cult Tradit		8	694	684	16	43			
\$MCU	AFRI 312	Socio-Polit Devel&Change		6	129	117	5	26			
\$MCU	AFRI 331	Survey African Amer Arts	ARTH 389	2	32	32	2	16	X	X	Dept concurrence
\$MCU	AFRI 340	Multicultural Amer Lit	ENG 340	9	97	87	8	12			
\$MCU	ANTH 315	Indians North America		2	119	119	4	30	X	X	Dept concurrence
\$MCU	ARTH 389	Surv African Amer Art	AFRI 331	2	23	23	2	12	X	X	Dept concurrence
\$MCU	ENG 340	Multicult Amer Lit	AFRI 340	10	428	355	10	43			
\$MCU	ENG 342	Native American Lit		3	135	135	3	45			High enrollments
\$MCU	ENG 373	American Folklore		8	1590	1545	35	45			
\$MCU	EPSY 341	Ed Multicult Society		10	1211	1119	27	45			Directed GE
\$MCU	PSCI 107	U.S. Diver:Contem Am Iss		8	1635	1624	53	31			
\$MCU	SOC 110	U S Diversity:Soc Perspect		12	813	664	31	26			

General Education Course Inventory Information and Recommendations to CAAC

Core Area	Course Name	Title	Cross-listed	# Terms Offered	Total Enrollment	Total Fall/Spring Enrollment	# of Fall/Spring Sections Offered	Average Enrollment per Section	Option 1 (Eliminations)	Option 2 (Eliminations)	Comments
\$MCU	W/S 200	Intro Women's Studies		9	1080	1042	24	45			
\$SBE	AFRI 423G	Urban Geography	GEOG 431	6	43	39	5	9		E	taught by GGA
\$SBE	ANTH 100	Intro Anthropol		8	572	559	15	38			
\$SBE	ANTH 200	Human Emergence		1	38	38	1	38			
\$SBE	ANTH 409	Medical Anth		2	18	18	2	9	X	X	400/500 course
\$SBE	COMM 105	Hist Free Sp Decis Mk		5	205	205	12	17	X	X	Banked
\$SBE	CRIM 150	Crim Just Sys		7	1640	1640	75	22			
\$SBE	CRIM 200	Criminology		11	2240	2189	41	55			
\$SBE	ECON 200	Princ Macroeconomics		13	2052	1949	63	33			Directed GE: Business
\$SBE	ECON 201	Princ Microeconomics		13	1453	1349	48	30			Directed GE: Business
\$SBE	ECON 331	Public Finance		2	27	27	2	14		E	Infrequently offered
\$SBE	ECON 351	Labor Econ. & Inst		10	350	342	11	32			
\$SBE	ELAF 200	Education & Community		7	778	778	32	24			
\$SBE	ENG 310	English Grammar Tchr&Writers		7	263	263	7	38		E	Does not meet SBS:E goals
\$SBE	EPSY 202	Psy Child Adole		7	1802	1802	31	58			Required for teacher Ed
\$SBE	EPSY 221	Develop Psy		7	228	228	12	19			
\$SBE	EPSY 342	Grow Dev Child		7	218	218	7	31			Required for teacher Ed
\$SBE	FCS 103	Human Dev Fam Context		6	301	301	6	50			
\$SBE	FCS 426	World Hunger Nutrition		1	6	6	1	6		E	Infrequently taught and low enr, but may retain max of 2
\$SBE	GH 101C	Contemp Iss:Student Politics		1	23	23	1	23	X	X	Removed all GH courses
\$SBE	GH 101E	Iss:Understand Mid East		1	15	15	1	15	X	X	Removed all GH courses
\$SBE	GH 101G	Contemp Iss:Social Ethics		4	69	69	4	17	X	X	Removed all GH courses
\$SBE	GH 201B	Hon:Technology&Society		3	48	48	6	8	X	X	Removed all GH courses
\$SBE	GH 301D	Hon Sem:Gender&Sexuality		1	22	22	1	22	X	X	Removed all GH courses
\$SBE	GEOG 210	Cultural Geography		4	50	50	4	13		E	Low enr. Recommend elim of 1 of 3 remaining SBE in GEOG
\$SBE	GEOG 213	Economic Geography		8	171	128	6	29			
\$SBE	GEOG 411	Conserv Natural Resource		4	67	60	3	22			
\$SBE	GEOG 431	Urban Geography	AFRI 423G	9	151	72	6	25			
\$SBE	HLTH 111	Person Hlth Behav&Well		10	1591	1559	38	42			

General Education Course Inventory Information and Recommendations to CAAC

Core Area	Course Name	Title	Cross-listed	# Terms Offered	Total Enrollment	Total Fall/Spring Enrollment	# of Fall/Spring Sections Offered	Average Enrollment per Section	Option 1 (Eliminations)	Option 2 (Eliminations)	Comments
\$SBE	IMT 461	Auto Indust:First 100 Years		1	27	27	1	27			New GE course
\$SBE	IS 301	World Probs Since 1945		1	4	4	1	4	X	X	Removed all IS courses
\$SBE	IS 396Z	Vienna-Polit Econ Europ Integr		2	2	2	2	1	X	X	Removed all IS courses
\$SBE	IS 397T	Italy-Modern Italy		2	2	2	2	1	X	X	Removed all IS courses

Appendix C

Statement of GEC Chairperson:

Here is a list of reasons why we should not propose the "two course per discipline" idea:

1. Does not take in to account course quality
2. Student outcomes assessment
3. Course assessment
4. Chair strategy such as course rotation, vision, long-range planning, faculty development...
5. Could/would cause/force Depts. to discard upper level courses, or choose to have one upper, one lower - is that what we want?
6. Further strip away upper level courses in general and likely "harder" classes (I call "real" courses).
7. Does not come with a plan or obvious strategy by the Gen Ed Council (or anyone else for that matter) as to the overall shape, makeup and balance of the GE program
8. Certain programs and Depts. would seem to have obvious needs and offerings for the campus well beyond a two-course limit (English, history, psychology, philosophy (ought to anyway), etc. However, if we do that, how to justify as "fair"?
9. Would likely cause departments to choose most popular, highly-higher enrolled courses in order to justify by SCH, etc. thus further taking away any sense of balance or control of the GE program.
10. Totally crush any sense or motivation for new course development, even for urgent and obvious new topics.