Proposed Amendment #1: Geoff Goddhu

Delete the sentence “A maximum of two courses in any one department or program can be taken to fulfill AOS requirements” on p. 12 of the proposal.

Rationale: 1. AOS areas are delimited by content. They are also deliberately arranged so that the content divisions cut across, for the most part, departments and programs. Hence, it is unsurprising that some departments will find different parts of their content falling into different AOS areas. But if the distribution of content is the desired outcome of the AOS divisions and some departments naturally reside at the intersection of three or more of these content areas why the restriction? If the department’s courses really satisfy the content requirements of three or more Areas, the student is getting the desired content distribution.

2. Given the current restriction, two students can take the exact same three courses and the three will all count for one student, but not the other. Suppose two students take two courses in department X and both legitimately receive credit in AOS 1 for one course and AOS 2 for the other. Now both students take a third course in department X, but one takes it via the cross-listing with department Y. The cross-lister gets credit for AOS 3, but the one who takes it under the auspices of department X does not, despite the fact that they have taken the exact same three courses with the exact same content.

3. I suspect the motivation behind the restriction is some notion that there is the potential for too much overlap in satisfying both the AOS requirements and the requirements of a particular major. If the goal of the AOS requirements is breadth of content on the part of our students and they are in fact getting much of this content within the bounds of a single department, then why is there a problem—they are getting the desired content. Also, if the worry is about the overlap of satisfying AOS and major requirements simultaneously, the current restriction only eliminates this worry for department specific majors—interdisciplinary majors such as American Studies, Cognitive Science, Criminal Justice, Interdisciplinary Studies, PPEL, etc. will still permit three or more courses to count for both the major and distinct Areas of Study.

Proposed Amendment #2: Doug Hicks, Leadership Studies; seconded by Jennifer Erkulwater, Political Science; and supported by April Hill, Biology; Andy Litteral, Management; Rick Mayes, Political Science; KimMarie McGoldrick, Economics; and Del McWhorter, Philosophy and WGSS

Add a Community-Based Learning Competency to Models 2 and 3

Model 2: To be added to “Core Competency Requirements,” p. 9

Community-Based Learning Competency (1 Unit) –Fulfilled by completing one unit of designated community-based learning (CBL) course work. A course could fulfill the CBL competency if it integrates text- and discussion-based coursework with experiential, community-
focused course components. Connecting theory and practice, students cultivate the ability to contextualize and respond to community-identified needs and to enact the principles of democracy and citizenship in their own lives and communities. Community-based learning can take a variety of forms that help students and faculty meet a course’s learning objectives, including: Service learning (mentoring, tutoring, interpreting, etc.); performing data analysis, research, or organizational studies for partner agencies; bringing community leaders into the classroom; participant observation & “shadowing”; teaching course material in schools; producing documentaries and performances about or for the community; study or service trips; and clinical education. CBL courses could be first-year seminars, field of study courses, and/or courses offered in any department, program, or school.

This change will also be reflected on p. 6, “Summary of Requirements,” by adding “Community-based learning competency -1 unit,” on the appropriate list.

Model 3: To be added to “Core Competency Requirements,” pp. 16-17

Community-Based Learning Competency (1 Unit) –Fulfilled by completing one unit of designated community-based learning (CBL) course work. A course could fulfill the CBL competency if it integrates text- and discussion-based coursework with experiential, community-focused course components. Connecting theory and practice, students cultivate the ability to contextualize and respond to community-identified needs and to enact the principles of democracy and citizenship in their own lives and communities. Community-based learning can take a variety of forms that help students and faculty meet a course’s learning objectives, including: Service learning (mentoring, tutoring, interpreting, etc.); performing data analysis, research, or organizational studies for partner agencies; bringing community leaders into the classroom; participant observation & “shadowing”; teaching course material in schools; producing documentaries and performances about or for the community; study or service trips; and clinical education. Such courses could be first-year seminars, area of study courses, and/or courses offered in any department, program, or school.

This change will also be reflected on p. 10, “Summary of Requirements,” by adding “Community-based learning competency -1 unit,” on the appropriate list.

Finally, as part of this amendment, the description of the “Civic issues” area of study, on p. 9, will be abbreviated by deleting the following sentence: “Coursework may incorporate a civic engagement component, which can be satisfied in a variety of ways, including service learning; bringing community partners into the classroom; participant observation & “shadowing”; producing documentaries and performances about or for the community; study trips; service trips; organizational studies for change, etc.” Civic issues will still remain an area of study, and some, but not all, courses that satisfy this area of study will also integrate a CBL component and thus also fulfill that competency.

Proposed Amendment #3*: Carol Summers

Proposal 1 draws its field of study descriptions from a recent assessment document. These differ from the more methodology-based descriptions used in the course catalogue. For purposes of moving forward, I move that the "Field of Study Mission Statements" of the proposal revert to those listed on the catalogue website at

Rationale: The catalogue field of study descriptions offer more philosophically and intellectually grounded descriptions of current practice than the assessment oriented descriptions included in the current plan. As such, they allow faculty to more accurately consider the rationale and structure of the current plan against that of the new models. While it may make sense to amend and modify current language, it is appropriate first to ensure that we are clear on what is current practice, the intellectual justification for the categories, and what is a change.

*Revised January 20, 2010

**Proposed Amendment #4:** Carol Summers

In Model II, the new plan calls for 5 "competencies". If, however, we consider general education only as a part of (rather than the whole of) students' education, this seems unnecessarily complex. I would move that this proposal delete the designated "Oral Communication Competency"; "Information Literacy Competency" and "Ethical Reasoning Competency".

Rationale: First, the plan for 5 competencies in addition to 6 fields of study almost seems to ask for administrative chaos. Second and more substantively, though, the competencies I point to are more appropriately and effectively dealt with in other parts of students' education. All of these will be integrated to some degree into first year seminars in any case, and in disciplinary and applied form are aspects of current capstone seminars in students' majors. These are more appropriate and powerful locations for these important competencies.

**Proposed Amendment #5:** Carol Summers

I move that after a model is selected by the faculty, a new committee of tenured and/or tenure track faculty who regularly teach undergraduate general education courses should be elected to draft descriptions of the appropriate fields of study, competencies, or areas of study for submission to the undergraduate faculty.

Rationale: The descriptions of areas and fields in the current plan seem to be changing without careful intellectual consideration of either epistemological issues, or those of discipline and content exploration. It may be time for the descriptions to change, but the process needs to be open, transparent, and owned by the undergraduate faculty. Thinking and drafting catalogue copy is unlikely to occur on the schedule of the major structural and institutional changes put forward through any of the General Education modifications.