

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Spring 2-23-1994

Senate Meeting, February 23, 1994

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, February 23, 1994" (1994). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1219.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1219>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

✓

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

February 23, 1994

Volume XXV, No. 10

Call to Order

Seating of New Senators

Approval of Minutes of February 9, 1994

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

INFORMATION ITEM: 1. July-December, 1994 Academic
Senate Meeting Calendar

ACTION ITEMS: 1. Faculty Affairs Committee
Presentation of University
Review Committee Proposed
Changes in the ASPT Document

 2. Academic Affairs Committee
Presentation of University
Studies Review Comm. Revised
Proposal for General Education

Communications

Committee Reports

Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University Community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussions with the consent of the Senate. Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(Not Approved by the Academic Senate)

February 23, 1994

Volume XXV, No. 10

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:05 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

SEATING OF NEW SENATORS

Chairperson Schmaltz introduced two new student senators: Amy Snyder, a Public Relations major; and Uchendu Ude, a Finance major.

ROLL CALL

Secretary Jan Cook called the roll and declared a quorum present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 9, 1994

CORRECTIONS TO MINUTES:

Senator Amster: On Page 21, paragraph five, the first sentence of my remarks should read: "It is possible that departments do not have to go the maximum speed limits to award ratings."

Senator David Strand: Page 6, paragraph five, next to last line, delete "for."

Senator Nelsen: Page 15, second paragraph, third line: word "revise," should read "receive."

Senator Winchip: Page 20, after the fourth paragraph, I had an additional question: "Has the committee considered looking at an average for three to five years?"

The committee's answer was "no."

Senator Williams: Page 11, ninth paragraph at the bottom of the page, delete words: "whereas criteria come from,:" and substitute the word "by."

Senator Williams: Page 32, Strike paragraphs seven and nine, because they do not represent my comments.

Page 35, paragraph ten, delete last sentence and replace with: "You might not be able to assess the entire program at the end of the time period for the pilot study."

Page 36, paragraph eleven, at the bottom of the page, first sentence, strike "relating on paper" and replace with: "writing a paper related to the content of the course. Second sentence should read: "There is no special expertise being imparted to students if they are just writing a lot of papers." -- delete last three words.

Senator Schroer: Page 16, paragraph five, delete entire paragraph, it is not what I said.

Senator Zeidenstein: Page 10, fourth paragraph, first sentence should read: "Since both examples to answer my question about these previous faculty accomplishments, and faculty input cite ASPT evaluations, might be the dominant rather than the minority situation, you might consider changing the wording to "previous ASPT accomplishments."

Page 34, sixth paragraph, first sentence should read: "Does one speak Spanish or French in these context language courses?"

Senator Ken Strand: Page eight, paragraph nine, second sentence, should read: "My hunch is it will be close to 80/20 all the time."

Page eight, paragraph eleven, last sentence, strike words: "sort of."

Page eight, paragraph thirteen, last sentence: strike "when maybe the 80/20 would be a good idea."

Page nineteen, paragraph four, should read: "If there were five departments in a college, wouldn't there be heterogeneity across the departments regarding performance? If there were six departments in a college, it is possible that if evaluations were performed at the college level, the per cent exceptional merit ratings could be as extreme as 10/10/10/10/10 and 50%, respectively? Wouldn't this constitute a problem with a cap of 20% for each department?"

Page nineteen, paragraph six, first sentence should read: "Those faculty with higher salaries will receive higher raises."

XXV-53

Motion to approve Minutes of February 9, 1994, as amended, by Walker (Second, Wilner) carried on a voice vote.

CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Chairperson Len Schmaltz had no remarks.

VICE CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Vice Chairperson, Renee Mousavi: I would like to bring up as a point of information to the Senate the Proposed Revision of the Course Withdrawal Policy that you each received in your packet. To give you a little background information on this, the student senators felt that this was an issue that needed to be addressed. This is a policy that they would like to see changed. The proposed revision has been sent to Academic Affairs and Academic Standards Committees, and will be coming up as an Information Item.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

Senator Diane Shaya had no remarks.

ADMINISTRATORS' REMARKS

PRESIDENT WALLACE had no remarks.

PROVOST STRAND had no remarks.

VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS, WILLIAM GUROWITZ had an excused absence.

INFORMATION ITEM

1. July-December 1994 Academic Senate Meeting Calendar

Chairperson Schmaltz: I would like to point out that an Executive Committee Meeting is scheduled for September 5th, which is the Labor Day Holiday. Please correct your calendars to read: September 6th.

Senator Johnson: Shouldn't the July 13th meeting be listed as Subject to Call?

Chairperson Schmaltz: Yes.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Faculty Affairs Committee Presentation of University Review Committee Proposed Changes in the ASPT Document

Senator Wilner: I would like to request that the order of the two action items be reversed on the Agenda, so that the University Studies item would be first.

Chairperson Schmaltz: The Chair rules that request out of order given that the Executive Committee of the Senate put the items on the Agenda as they came in, and the Faculty Affairs item was received first.

XXV-54

Senator Wilner: I challenge the chair.

Parliamentarian Cohen: This is non-debatable, because it is a procedural matter. A no vote means you support the Chair's ruling, a yes vote would reverse the order of the items on the Agenda.

Senator Razaki: What percentage of the vote do we need to pass?

Parliamentarian Cohen: A simple majority.

Roll Call Vote on challenge to the chair: 20 yes; 23 no; one abstention. Motion failed.

Senator Razaki, Chair of Faculty Affairs Committee, introduced James Reid of Foreign Languages, and Paul Holsinger of History, members of the University Review Committee.

Senator Razaki: Senators received a revised document in their packets. The changes are noted at the bottom of the respective pages. I would like to request the chair to deal with these changes on an item by item basis. Do I make one motion, or a separate motion for each item?

Parliamentarian Cohen: No. He can make a general motion, and a part of the motion is understood that the vote should take place on each item. The Minutes should reflect this. The motion could be worded, I move to approve A-N respectively. If there were amendments, they could be considered as each item is voted upon separately.

Senator Ken Strand: I am worried about this suggestion, since these items are related to one another. I am worried about doing a step-by-step process.

XXV-55

Senator Razaki: I move that all of the Proposed ASPT Changes be accepted and voted upon on an item by item basis. (Second, Zeidenstein)

Senator Insel: Is page ten one item, or four separate items?

Senator Razaki: We will consider each Roman Numeral separately, which is basically each page.

Senator Ken Strand: Once we approve one page, then everything that follows it is conditional and relates to it.

Senator Zeidenstein: This is not Mathematics, and most of these provisions are not related to each other. A couple of them may be, but that is stretching it. Most of them are separate. In fact, two are so separate that they have been removed from tonight's agenda.

Senator Walker: I would agree with Senator Zeidenstein. They are not that specifically related to one another. When the Faculty Affairs Committee brought these forward a few years ago, we did the same procedure. As Senator Razaki and his committee have done, they have ordered them so that those that are the most important come last, so as you go forward, you don't expect those until the end. It would be more expeditious to go one at a time and we would be better off that way.

Senator Razaki: The Faculty Affairs Committee and members of the University Review Committee will respond to questions and debate.

Senator Ken Strand: Senator Walker was correct relative to the incremental support of the item. But, based on the amount of conversation that took place at our last meeting, I would disagree that the items are in the order of the respective importance. It may be close to it, but not an exact order. I am willing to go on with this page by page, but I think there is a danger that if you approve one page, then all subsequent decisions are based on the first decision.

Chairperson Schmaltz: The motion is to vote on these item by item. The Parliamentarian tells me that the only option is to vote against each item.

Parliamentarian Cohen: There is a second possibility which is a reconsideration at the end of the vote. You would have to be on the prevailing side.

Senator Ken Strand: I like the idea of toward the end having the freedom to go back and change an earlier decision, but I don't know how to do that.

Parliamentarian Cohen: I think before you vote on the last item, since it is the main motion, you might want to then amend it if you see a problem. After you vote on the last page, you have closed it. Until you vote on the last page an amendment would be possible. It is up to anyone who sees a lot of linkage on this to say they see a problem and they want to amend it because of the language or something. If you don't consider them in order, the discussion becomes too disparate.

Senator Razaki: There are pros and cons to both sides.

Senator Ken Strand: Given the information that the Parliamentarian has provided, I feel comfortable with going along with the original motion.

XXV-56

Vote on Page One, additions to opening paragraph of the ISU ASPT Policies and Procedures document carried.

"General guidelines are set forth in the Governing Policy for the Regency Universities System of Illinois. The present Policies and Procedures document follows those guidelines, and is approved by the Illinois State University Academic Senate. In addition to a description of the Committees involved in the ASPT process and their activities, as well as Appointment Policies, this document describes the minimum level of achievement necessary for continued progress in the areas of Promotion, Tenure, Performance, Evaluation and Salary. Colleges and Departments are not only allowed but expected to design standards of achievement which may exceed but not violate the intent of these criteria. The ASPT documents for each Department and College are annually reviewed by other bodies; standards which are below the minimums delineated herein, or which violate in principle the guidelines of the Board of Regents, will not be allowed."

XXV-57

Vote on Page Two -- V. F. 1 (ASPT - Page Nine) carried.

"If the DFSC chooses to conduct a salary equity review, it may designate that up to 10 percent of the Department's annual salary increase funds be used for equity adjustments if other sources of funding become available. The DFSC shall notify its faculty that a salary equity review is taking place, and provide

department faculty with the criteria (policies and procedures) used for determining equity adjustments."

XXV-58

Vote on Page Three -- IV. F. (ASPT - Page Seven) carried.

"Following appropriate faculty input, each CFSC shall develop college criteria or Milner Library criteria for performance evaluation, promotion and tenure and provide these criteria to faculty members in the college or in Milner Library. Criteria for administrative salary adjustments outside the ASPT process shall be developed by the CFSC and provided to faculty by May 1."

XXV-59

Page Four -- VI. G. (ASPT - Page Ten)

"In case an applicant shall have duties in more than one Department or area, the recommendation or appointment shall originate in the major Department, only after consultation among the supervisors of all Departments or areas to which a person is to be assigned. Cooperative interviews are encouraged. The written appointment form shall include the signature of the administrative officer of the minor Department or area and shall be accompanied by a written agreement stating the terms of employment signed by both the administrative officers of the major and minor Departments or areas. These written agreements shall be in the College Dean's office and in the Department office."

Deleted by Stearns/Jerich Amendment: "Copies shall be available only to the CFSC's and DFSC's, if requested."

XXV-60

Senator Stearns: I move that we amend Page Four by striking the last sentence: "Copies shall be available only to the CFSC's and DFSC's, if requested." (Second, Jerich)

Senator Stearns: Agreements of this type should be a matter of public record. Every other faculty member's salary document is a matter of public record.

Senator Johnson: I would like to ask the committee why that was in there in the first place?

Senator Razaki: We have no objection to the friendly amendment.

Senator Zeidenstein: Accepted.

Senator Walker: I would like clarification from Provost Strand. Is it true that every faculty member's agreement is available for anyone to see.

Provost Strand: I did not sit with the committee when they made this change. You could interpret the current statement to be exclusive at the present time. I would refer back to the committee to see if they are clarifying that the current policy is exclusive and they are just clarifying that ambiguity. A nod of heads indicates that they are just clarifying the current policy, not recommending a change in the policy.

Senator Walker: And are contracts of any faculty member available for anyone to see?

Provost Strand: If that was your question, the answer is no. Under the freedom of information act, you may request access to your own file.

Senator Walker: Then Senator Stearn's comment was not true?

Senator Stearns: I would take exception. Our contracts come on standard contract forms. The salary amounts appear in the Board of Regents Minutes and are therefore a matter of public record.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Both the mover and seconder of the original motion have accepted the amendment as friendly to strike the last sentence: "Copies shall be available only to the CFSC's and DFSC's, if requested."

Senator Walker: I was asking a question.

Provost Strand: Dr. Stearn's response is not entirely correct. While the salary figure may be the most common denominator, there are other conditions placed in contracts of some people. For example, if you come here and start on tenure track line and don't have your doctorate completed, maybe you are at the ABD stage, it could be a stipulation of your contract that appointment beyond year X, Y, or Z is contingent upon completion of the doctorate. There may be other conditions. That information at this point in time would never be made public unless the freedom of information act requested that we contact the faculty member and indicate that this request had been forthcoming, and get the reaction of that faculty member.

Senator Stearns: It should be public information beyond the public information act.

Senator Wallace: I have a point of information about the wording. Are we dropping the last sentence? And does this not return it to its original form?

Senator Razaki: By removing that sentence, we leave the status quo as it is. There is nothing added or deleted by striking that sentence.

Senator Zeidenstein: Most of that last sentence already appears in the 1994 version of the ASPT Document. If the entire last sentence is deleted, it is altering the ASPT policy.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Our choices are to vote in favor of this motion or against it.

Senator Newgren: At what point in the document does this come into play? The CFSC's and DFSC's need to know information before they can make decisions. If no one needs to know, the federal government prohibits access to these records.

Provost Strand: That is correct.

Senator Walker: If we vote against this, can it be brought back up later.

Senator Shaya: Can't we just vote against it?

Chairperson Schmaltz: No, because there is nothing to vote on. It is a friendly amendment and the mover and seconder have already accepted it.

Senator Parr: As it stands now, it could be amended.

XXV-61

Senator Walker: I move to amend this by reinserting the last sentence. (Second, Shaya)

Parliamentarian Cohen: The main motion now is everything without that sentence. Therefore an amendment inserting that sentence back into the document would be in order.

Senator Johnson: I would like to point out to everyone that the only difference between this and the original document is the word "only." Do we want the word only in there or not?

Roll call vote on Walker Amendment: 22 yes; 22 no. Motion failed.

XXV-62

Senator Hesse: I call the question on the original motion. Motion carried on a voice vote.

(XXV-59 -- Vote on Page Four - VI. G. (ASPT - Page Ten)
Original motion with amendment to delete last sentence.

XXV-63

Page Five - VII. C. (ASPT - Page Ten)

"Department, College, and University criteria for promotion shall be provided to faculty. Under no circumstances should a candidate be promised or in any way assured of promotion."

Senator Insel: Point of information. Pages 5, 6, and 7 all refer to roman numeral VII.

Chairperson Schmaltz: We are going page by page. We are only voting on page five.

Vote on page five carried on a voice vote.

XXV-64

Page Six - VII. D. (ASPT - Page Ten)

Motion carried on a voice vote.

"It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to provide appropriate certification of the completion of degree requirements or credit hours necessary for consideration for promotion before February 1, if they are to be considered in the recommendation of promotion for the following academic year. The Provost, however, may use discretion in interpreting 'appropriate certification' and authorize promotion and salary increases contingent upon the completion of degree requirements or credit hours."

XXV-65

Page Seven - VII. E. 1. b (ASPT - Page Eleven)

Senator Schroer: There is disagreement between the note at the bottom of the page and the actual change in the document. Do you mean sufficient or significant.

Senator Walker: I would hope that the one at the bottom is a typo. It should read sufficient rather than significant.

Senator Zeidenstein: The original document said significant enough -- the word quality was added which was not there before.

Senator Razaki: The word should be "sufficient." The final sentence would read: "The candidate's continuing professional growth and professional activities should be of sufficient quality to warrant promotion to Assistant Professor."

Senator Parr: I wonder if they really meant to concentrate on quality and not quantity.

Senator Razaki: ".....sufficient quality....."

Voice vote on page seven carried.

"The candidate's continuing professional growth and professional activities should be of sufficient quality to warrant promotion to Assistant Professor."

XXV-66

Page Eight - VIII. B. 4. (ASPT - Page 13)

Voice vote on page eight carried.

"Department, College, and University criteria for tenure shall be provided to faculty. Under no circumstances should a candidate be promised or in any way assured of tenure."

XXV-67

Page Nine - X. A. 1. (ASPT - Page 15)

Each year, following consultation with the Staff of the Board of Regents and the President, the Provost shall make known to the URC the amount of funds available for salary increases to faculty subject to the ASPT system. The funds so designated shall consist, at a minimum, of the continuing contract faculty's proportionate share of the percentage increase which shall be never less than 80% of the personal services funds appropriated by the State legislature for that year nor less than 80% of any funds from other sources for purpose of salary increase. The Provost may distribute any remaining funds outside the ASPT system. These funds must be designated for specific categories of faculty rather than for individuals. These categories must be determined through a process which includes appropriate faculty input. Faculty will be provided with a description of the categories by the Provost or appropriate Dean. The categories should be announced no later than April 1. Nothing in this article shall preclude the addressing of salary inequities in a manner directed by the Board of Regents or Board of Higher Education."

Senator Razaki: The Faculty Affairs Committee would like to announce that they will not accept any amendments to this change as "friendly." So, if you wish to amend it, just make a motion.

Senator Hesse: I would like to speak in favor of this ASPT change. I think it is very important that we have some kind of equity process on this campus. I think 80% is a good

number. I think we could argue about the percentage number, but equity is something we need.

Senator Nelsen: At the last meeting the comment was made that setting caps become targets. Is it possible to set a target instead of a cap on the numbers to be allocated? I would much prefer some small amount with flexibility in order to accommodate those natural things that happen like retirements, etc. I would rather have the provision read that criteria can be brought to the Senate along with a number. I speak against the change.

President Wallace: I have a point of clarification. The example cited by this senator about retirements is not correct. This money does not come out of salary increment funds.

Senator Zeidenstein: There are two eighty percent numbers here. I am referring right now to the top one about the sixth line down. It is underlined because it is an intrusion. It is an intrusion which changes what used to be (in effect 100% of the appropriation from the legislature) and decreases it to 80%. I don't know what kind of compromise some people consider that. If I sold land in Florida, I would love clients like that. I am going to suggest that I see no reason why the original wording should be changed that the faculty should give up what the legislature appropriated. This is quite separate from the issue of the second 80% that came from other sources.

Interruption: Senator Shaya: The faculty would not be giving up what the legislature appropriated.....

Chairperson Schmaltz: The Chair is not going to allow any senator to take over the floor of the Senate. If you have a question, you will ask the Chair for a turn to speak, you will not debate with another senator.

Senator Zeidenstein: Perhaps I misspoke, I should have said given up 100% of the appropriated money used through the ASPT process.

XXV-68

Senator Zeidenstein: I would like to move an amendment to change the first underlined change from "which shall be never less than 80%" to "which shall be never less than 100%." (Second, Walker)

President Wallace: With all due respect to Senator Zeidenstein, I think he is incorrect. The faculty has gained money in ASPT in recent years. We might argue that in certain years you would be losing and in certain years you would be gaining. The extent to which this is

confusing is what we have to debate every year, to say that it is a fixed percent every year, regardless of where the money comes from. If we go back to the previous year, if we had put only the money from the General Assembly into the ASPT process, we would not have gotten anywhere near the raises that we did.

Senator Zeidenstein: That is correct. You are quite right, there were funds put into the ASPT process -- some funds from the internal reallocations or whatever magic was purveyed, and most of the faculty gained. I recognize that and I applaud it. But, that is a separate issue. One can still generate more funds through the ASPT process by what we did in the past or what we will do in the future. You still have the 80% from other sources for the purposes of salary increases. It is the other sources which you are referring to, I presume, so I don't see where the two are connected.

President Wallace: I think it is connected. Because this past year for example about 50% went through the ASPT process. The Executive Committee every year for the past few years has not been recommending the appropriated funds and has gone through a lively debate as to how much should go into ASPT. If we followed policy which legally we should have done, there would have been less than 50%. Regardless of where the funds come from in the future, it should be an 80/20 split.

Chairperson Schmaltz: As a member of the Executive Committee, I would like to say that Senator Wallace's statement in no way reflects my own opinion of that debate.

Senator Jerich: Could the committee explain their rationale behind the wording for this change?

Chairperson Schmaltz: We are debating Senator Zeidenstein's motion to change the percentage from 80% to 100%. Are you speaking against the motion? Please keep to the motion.

Senator Walker: I agree with a lot of what President Wallace has said, however, I feel he is incorrect in his statement. The first 80% is what would normally come through the ASPT process as appropriated funds. In the past that has been 100%. The discussion has been about whether those funds were generated outside of the ASPT process. The second part of the sentence deals with those funds. It is a "win" situation by having an 80/20 split on the second and putting it back to 100% on the first, and clarifying what has been debated over the years. I think the amendment is more correct in terms of what we had and what we hope to gain.

Senator Shaya: I think that the 80/20 split provides a good balance, and I agree with Senator Hesse that we need more equity.

Senator Liedtke: I would like to ask President Wallace about his statement regarding personnel dollars, that only 50% of the appropriated funds went through the ASPT process last year.

President Wallace: Because we received very few dollars from the General Assembly last year for faculty salaries, we had to use reallocated monies.

Senator Liedtke: Why didn't you use all of the money designated for faculty salaries for faculty salaries? The amendment says that all the money that comes for salaries (4%) should all be used for salaries.

Senator Ken Strand: The 100% figure still strikes me as being extreme. Would you consider say 90%?

Senator Zeidenstein: What my amendment does is return the policy to where it was before. The present document states that appropriated funds from the state legislature shall go through the ASPT process. What my amendment does, in effect, is clarify that. It does not change the existing policy. This would go back and emphasize that all the funds appropriated for personal service funds should be used for personal services. This amendment would go back and support what the original document says.

Senator White: If I understand this debate, a large part seems to be about the fact that faculty somehow will gain from 100% of the money being used for the ASPT process. I would like to suggest that the sense in which the "faculty gains" by keeping everything in the ASPT system needs to be reconsidered. On the contrast, many faculty have gained from the presence of money in administrative equity. I would like to see us keep a steady pool of money for administrative equity.

Provost Strand: I would like to review for the members of the Senate the scenario that led to this proposal. You may recall that last fall the President and I distributed a memo which said in part that no more than 1/3 of the faculty salary increase money should be used for administrative equity. That document was circulated among colleges and departments across the campus. The responses to that document were given to the University Review Committee for analysis and recommendation. The recommendation that you have before you is the one which reflected a combination of the input from departments and colleges and the best judgment of the University Review Committee. When you begin to amend a portion of it, as Senator Zeidenstein has

done, you then disrupt the other factoring. My point is that when you begin upsetting the balance of the ratios, then you may destroy the comprehensive intent of this change.

Senator Insel: There is another provision for salary equity as stated on page two of these changes: V. F. 1: "If the DFSC chooses to conduct a salary equity review, it may designate that up to ten percent of the Department's annual salary increase funds be used for equity adjustments within the Department. Additional monies may be used for these adjustments if other sources of funding become available." In the past I have heard the rumors that sometimes people end up being over equity adjusted between the departments and the URC. If a faculty member receives exceptional merit, perhaps he should be rewarded for this within the system.

Senator Ritch: In years when we get no salary funds from other sources, there is nothing to get 20% of, and we don't get any equity money at all. And that is hurting. We cut ourselves off from equity money in the years when we get no outside funds. We need to keep that 80/20 balance. There are all kinds of faculty who are not adequately rewarded through the ASPT system.

Senator Parr: Since there is a provision for equity within the departments, why can't it be done within the ASPT system?

Provost Strand: The current arrangement in most departments who devote a portion of their raise money for equity adjustments does not respond to circumstances where a given department may have a problem that cannot be addressed solely with its own funds. For example, a group of faculty members within a department who have been hired at very low entry salaries find that the market in comparable institutions with which we are competing for faculty changes dramatically, even if they utilize their reallocation resources, they will never catch up and be competitive with their peer institutions. The equity process that we have before us will enable the Deans, working with department chairs to address such departmental problems.

Senator Parr: Just as departments can do it through their DFSC, can't colleges do it also?

Provost Strand: Through what is being proposed here with X. A. 1, they could.

Senator Zeidenstein: There are other provisions in the current document, which say that each department can take up to ten percent of their annual salary increase funds to be used for equity adjustments within the department. That is

not the same shifting as from one college to another where one department has market problems. It is not the same shifting within the same college, if a particular department has market problems. That, it seems to me, would be the under the realm of funds coming from other sources, which may be distributed outside the ASPT system. Within a department there can be equity adjustments with the department's ASPT funds. The 100% amendment does not change that. If anything, it gives a larger piece of the pie to a department so that 10% of that within the department would be more. If you are talking about equity adjustments across departmental lines, or across college lines, that is when you get into the 80% of the other sources of funds, such as reallocations. Most of the arguments that I have heard against my amendment simply do not hold water.

James Reid, URC Committee: Twenty-two of the units that responded wanted 20% of all the funds to go to departments.

Chairperson Schmaltz: Senator Zeidenstein's amendment refers to appropriated funds, and that poll was for all sources of revenue.

James Reid: In our opinion it covered both sources of funds. We concluded that they wanted both appropriated and non appropriated funds.

President Wallace: Some years the appropriated funds are all that come to the University. It seems like every year there has been, will be, should be extra funds that come. I would like to remind you that one year ago we had to eliminate sixty some positions in order to get part of the money for raises. I wish the money was available from some other source. If people want equity money, regardless of where it come from, to my judgment, we have to designate a portion of the appropriated money so that it will be guaranteed every year. The 80% figure will guarantee this. If we do not do this, the money will not be there every year.

Senator Zeidenstein: There could still be at the will of the department, ten percent equity within the department for members of the department. That has been in the ASPT provisions since day one and will be there tonight and in the future.

Senator Stearns: I would like to speak against the amendment. I also have a question for the Provost. My understanding of the 20% funds for equity is that it goes beyond equity and could be used for supplementing personnel budgets, for early retirements, etc.

Provost Strand: The 20% is to be used just for raises for continuing faculty. It is not to be used for end of the year payouts for retirements.

Senator Stearns: In the past, it seems like this money was available for retirements, etc.

Provost Strand: We have not had such situations occur. This year we asked the department to estimate the impact of retirements upon the department, and provided some resources from another fund source.

Chairperson Schmaltz: I don't see how this is germane to the debate.

Senator Stearns: I was wondering if part of the funds were used to offset early retirements.

Provost Strand: That is another source of funds.

Senator Ken Strand: So far we have heard points of view supporting all kinds of percentages: 100%/0%; 80%/20%; I am struggling with what we should do. I have a feeling that the Faculty Affairs Committee and the University Review Committee have been living and sleeping with this more than some of the senators. I would like a representative of the FAC or URC to give an up-to-date version of the 80/20.

Chairperson Schmaltz: That is inappropriate. We are discussing Senator Zeidenstein's amendment. You can speak for or against the amendment, but you can't ask for an update.

Senator Ken Strand: I would like to have enough information to vote on the amendment.

Senator Ritch: I am from an area of campus where for those years when we get no outside funds, and no money available from any source other than the department, faculty who have not been treated fairly by the department for years, there is no reason for the department to turn around and give that person equity. I am arguing for a balance so that someone outside the department has some dollars to reward people who might teach in interdisciplinary programs, etc. I think this amendment cuts the flexibility of departments and faculty, so I will vote against it.

Senator Liedtke: Pass.

Senator Nelsen: I would speak against the amendment, because I believe departments need some flexibility. I would like to see an amendment to provide for the amounts and criteria to be brought to the Senate for approval prior to being given out.

Senator Ken Strand: There is another way of looking at this. It looks like there is a lot of support for 100/0; and for 80/20. I am leaning toward going against the Zeidenstein amendment with the possibility of a new amendment for 90/10.

Senator Johnson: It is my understanding that this figure was a compromise. Eighty percent was a total guarantee of non-appropriated funds. I think the consensus was that we gave up a little, but we gained some. There are years when there are appropriated funds when there are no reallocated funds.

XXV-69

Senator White: I move the question. (Second, Hesse)

Motion carried on a voice vote.

(XXV-68)

Roll call vote on Zeidenstein (Walker) amendment failed:
36 no; 9 yes; one abstention.

XXV-70

Senator Nelsen: I would like to move the following amendment to change the percentages to 95/5%

"The funds so designated shall consist, at a minimum, of the continuing contract faculty's proportionate share of the percentage increase which shall be never less than 95% of the personal service funds appropriated by the State legislature for that year nor less than 95% of any funds from other sources for purpose of salary increase.

95% be distributed through ASPT and 5% outside with the provision that in such rare circumstances the Provost may exceed the percentage cap by presenting a formal request and justification to the Academic Senate for approval prior to the implementation of any such plan and that no distributions will be made unless the plan is approved by the Academic Senate. (Second, McCune.)

Senator Nelsen: Rationale: There are events, such as retirements, unfilled positions, etc. which require a degree of flexibility in order to be addressed by the administration. When more routine areas such as salary compression or University wide equity need to be addressed there is sufficient time to consult the Academic Senate for approval of a plan. Additionally there should be a provision requiring that the results of such a plan be made public in general statistical terms.

Senator Hesse: I would like to speak against this amendment. I think that the Faculty Affairs Committee created sufficient equity sources to address equity purposes. I think 5% is likely to be insufficient, and certainly is not in line with the feedback that the committee solicited for this program. Having the Senate consider it each year would result each year in the same kind of go around that we are having here tonight.

Senator Ken Strand: I would oppose this amendment. I opposed the 90% figure, and felt that 80% was more of a compromise.

Senator Newgren: I oppose this amendment. The committee said that the majority of feedback from departments wanted 80%. I think we should go with that percentage.

Senator Jerich: I would also oppose the amendment. I would support a 90/10 split.

Senator Johnson: I appreciate what Senator Nelsen is trying to do, but I think the mechanical process of trying to justify it each year would be impossible. We might find ourselves having to meet three times in July. It is a good idea, but not feasible.

Senator Amster: I am confused as to why you think we need a compromise. Why can't we use the money like it is initially proposed?

Senator Thomas: You mentioned a poll of faculty. I would remind senators that you have in your packet this evening a copy of the resolution passed at a general faculty meeting in November that represents faculty members:

"It is therefore moved that: Presently proposed changes that would allow the ISU President and Provost to use 20% of appropriated and reallocated salary funds at their own discretion and apart from the procedures and specific criteria established in ASPT Guidelines, that this be rejected and that the Academic Senate be advised similarly to reject this proposal."

Senator David Strand: The vote on the item which you referred was fifty in favor of the motion, 38 against. Fifty faculty members who voted in favor of the motion at the faculty meeting constitute 6.5% of the faculty who receive raises under the ASPT system during a year.

Voice vote on Nelsen (McCune) amendment failed.

XXV-71

Senator White: I move the previous question. (Second, Barker)

Roll call vote on motion to move the previous question passed 35 yes; 9 no; one abstention.

(XXV-67)

Vote on Changes on Page Nine carried.

Senate recessed for ten minutes.

Page Ten - X. B. 4 (ASPT - Page 16)

Each DFSC will conduct annual performance evaluations of each faculty member subject to the ASPT system assigned to that department, exclusive of members of the DFSC.

- a. During the annual performance review the DFSC shall normally consider the activities performed (or those reaching culmination) during the calendar year being evaluated. Under no circumstances shall the DFSC reward activities performed more than three years prior to the current evaluation year.
- b. Each faculty member will be given a rating of either "exceptional merit," "high merit," "merit," or "insufficient merit." Except in rare circumstances, no more than 20% of a department's faculty should be ranked in the "exceptional merit" category nor should more than 20% be recognized as worthy of "high merit." In such rare circumstances, a DFSC may exceed the percentage caps for exceptional and high merit by presenting a formal request and justification to the CFSC. Requests must be approved by both the CFSC and the Provost.
- c. On a yearly basis and as part of the decisions made regarding the conduct of DFSC matters, each department will determine, by secret ballot, how DFSC matters, each department will determine, by secret ballot, how DFSC members are to be evaluated on their performance and, where relevant, promotion and tenure: (1) by the Department Chairperson only, or (2) by the peer members of the DFSC, including the Department Chairperson as a committee member; each member shall be absent during his/her evaluation.
- d. Concurrently, the DFSC shall conduct evaluations of faculty members who are eligible for promotions and tenure.

XXV-72

Senator Parr: I would like to move an amendment to Paragraph b: "Change exceptional to highest and delete the end of the paragraph beginning with the word, except."
(Second, Ken Strand)

Senator Schroeer: I certainly have no strong feelings about whether we call it exceptional or highest merit. My preference would probably be to leave it the way it is. I would argue against dropping the rest of the paragraph. I think that exceptional merit should be limited, otherwise it loses its meaning.

Senator Insel: I would like to speak in favor of the amendment. I do think the percentage caps should be determined by the department. The departments should also set up policies about criteria.

Senator Ritch: I would ask the Chair that we consider these item, by item. We seem to be focusing on Item B. I will vote against the amendment for two reasons. I am against four categories, but for caps.

Senator Cook: My department looked at section B. and noted that this is proposing a change in philosophy for merit ratings, that it is proposing that departments operate on a competitive basis inside the department, with the individuals competing against each other for a limited number of openings in the two higher categories. Whereas, the current policy says that a department and its college will set criteria to be met, and those people who meet the criteria will be assigned a particular rating. My department would be willing to compromise by having a cap on the top category, but is strongly opposed to having a cap on the middle category. They would much prefer, however, that we retain a criterion based system where people know what they should aspire to, but are not encouraged to fight against each other for a limited number of bonuses.

Senator Liedtke: Could we vote just on section B?

Senator Razaki: Yes.

Senator Liedtke: I would like to speak in favor of the Parr amendment. Departments and colleges should establish criteria to be appropriate, so that faculty are competing against the criteria, and not against each other.

Senator White: I would like to speak against the amendment. We had data provided for us by the committee. If we are to evaluate the faculty at this university, I think the ratings should mean something and there should be some more rigor involved. It seems to me that it is insufficient for a department to do this. Especially, in a situation where

from department to department there is no commonality in criteria about what is exceptional, etc

Senator Nelsen: I think the data shows that a majority of the departments are doing their jobs. The failure is on the part of the CFSC in establishing criteria and guidelines which enables this problem. Also, I would vote against the amendment because I would no more like to see caps placed here than I would like to see caps on any other evaluative process, such as grading the students. It would be like saying, regardless of the criteria, I will only allow so many of the students to receive A's. The idea of externally putting rigor on is not good.

Senator Liedtke: I am aware of a case of one department which has very high exceptional merit, but I also happen to know that they have a very high level of scholarly productivity required of their faculty members -- at least three journal articles per year -- to which all faculty members must be aspiring and achieving. So, if there is a problem, it is with the CFSC document which is not high enough. Or, faculty members within a department must not be rating their own faculty members correctly, if everyone is receiving exceptional merit. I think the criteria within the college and department are the places to do this.

Senator Walker: The Department of Agriculture has discussed this change at length. For the same reason that Senators Insel, Liedtke, and Cook expressed very well, I would also support this amendment. One thing that I can add that they have not touched on is if a small department, say with ten faculty or less, now have a very small number that are eligible for the highest category. What the younger faculty members have expressed to us is very true. If you have a department with three or four senior faculty members that are indeed celebrated in their productivity, it is very discouraging to young faculty members to try to do that and succeed. They will not make the highest category for a long time. It is discouraging to them. Making it purely competitive, against faculty, rather than against criteria, is a mistake. On behalf of the Agriculture faculty, I will argue for the amendment.

Senator Williams: I have different concern, as to whether there is some cap on the number of people in high merit and exceptional merit categories. The rigidity of this 20% cap places unnecessary burdens on DFSC's and CFSC's.

Senator Razaki: One of the reasons for the caps was that there should be a significant monetary value on the ratings. If you have 70% to 80% of the faculty in a department in one rating, how will you give anyone a fair share of the dollars? The URC divided their number in half so that

exceptional merit would get half and high merit would get half.

Senator Stearns: I would like to speak on behalf of the faculty in my college. No faculty member in the college of education supports the idea of caps. They felt that this would be destructive. There was less expression on the four categories, much less than the opposition to the caps.

Senator Insel: Another point about the differences between departments and exceptional merit ratings is that now the university has a committee through the PQP process trying to identify highly meritorious departments. Since the university admits that there are departments that are of higher merit than others, it should not be unusual that a greater proportion of faculty members are exceptional and deserve an exceptional merit rating.

Senator Winchip: I would like to speak in support of the amendment. Of the twenty-seven units that responded to the exceptional merit cap question, there were 8 yes's; 12 no's, and 7 yes's with conditions. Very few conditions have been met. Three of the departments objected to percentages. One department said limit exceptional if the number of faculty in this category reached 50%. Another department said caps should apply on a five year average. 32% cap was preferred over a 25%. One department said the percent should range over 20% to 30%, rather than a fixed 20%. In addition to that four departments who opposed the cap said that the cap on exceptional merit changes the criteria reference to merit.

Provost David Strand: As you debate this amendment from the floor, I would indicate that the reason the University Review Committee amendment is before you tonight is that the ideal would be to monitor this at the department and college level. History says it has not been monitored at the department and college level. Therefore, we question whether or not there would be problems with the reaffirmation of the importance of departments and colleges to do this again. I would also like to reference later on page twelve, Item 3, of our amendments, the part that is being dropped reads: "For each 1% of the faculty placed in the exceptional merit category, a minimum of 0.25% of the salary increase monies must be allocated to exceptional merit awards." The Senate voted several years ago to make sure that exceptional merit had some monetary value. If you pass the amendment from the floor, my perspective would be to examine carefully what is on page 12, because it is possible that a higher percentage of people in the exceptional merit and high merit categories would very well become meaningless financially.

Senator Hesse: Pass.

Senator White: Earlier we were told that faculty are capable of making the kinds of decisions that result in exceptional faculty being rewarded. But, now you cite a situation in which exceptional faculty turns out to be 80% of the total number in the department. So, in that situation \$5 is taken out of one pocket to award exceptional merit. The same five dollars is put back into the same pocket. That is not the way to reward exceptional faculty. That is the way of making sure that everyone gets some. If we want a way to reward exceptional merit, then this document has to have some teeth.

Senator Ritch: I agree with Senator White. I think if this amendment passes and we have four categories, and no caps and no criteria, that a whole lot of faculty members are going to feel good, but it isn't going to mean very much.

Senator Hesse: The reward of faculty seems to be important to the Board of Regents and the Illinois Board of Higher Education. It is important to have a frequent evaluation of our faculty and a good reward system. When we regularly have departments that have everyone significantly above average or exceptional, it seems spurious to anyone who is evaluating faculty. For that reason, I am against the amendment.

Senator Nelsen: I am in favor of the amendment. This is not a real set of circumstances. Our department is lower than any of the others on this chart in exceptional merit. The rating system does not encourage people to apply for tenure. We also look at these numbers and see that we have done a good job of eliminating people who are at the low end of the scale. We have not rewarded a great number of people.

Senator Liedtke: It is part of the hiring process to hire the best and most outstanding members of our profession throughout the academic community. If we then try to target and hire the best possible people, how can we not accept the fact that some departments have the best people in the country, and therefore be exceptional.

(XXV-72)

Parr amendment to section b., strike exceptional and substitutes "highest," and eliminates the rest of the paragraph beginning "Except in rare circumstances....."

Roll call vote carried: 22 yes; 21 no; one abstention.

XXV-73

Senator Zeidenstein: I move that we delete the entire paragraph a. (Second, Insel)

Senator Zeidenstein: Generally, this is just another way of micromanaging what departments are able to do. More specifically, you preclude the ability for departments to use cumulative point totals over the years if they choose to. One department that I know very well does this, and does not have a very high percentage of high merit. Some departments may not be willing to change the way they do things. I say strike a.

Senator Nelsen: I am in favor of striking that paragraph. I think it is important to eliminate the three year limitation because it puts junior faculty and others who are coming into the system at a disadvantage. There is no need to carry over activities from one year to the next, the accomplishment should be rewarded the year that it takes place. Multi-year rewards negate the accomplishments.

Senator Zeidenstein: It is authorized under the existing document. Removing this will revert back to the existing ASPT document. It is not precluded.

Senator Liedtke: I will speak against Senator Zeidenstein's amendment, but will suggest another one later.

James Reid, URC: Another call was for people who are now in the system to have an annual performance evaluation. The other was to take care of ambiguity in the present document. It says: during the calendar year being evaluated. Some departments interpret this as meaning "every year," other departments interpret it an "only during that year." Some departments say it can only cover one year; while others say it can never cover more than one year. We are trying to make it clear that it just covers one year.

Senator Zeidenstein: As long as ambiguity does now allow bad things to happen, a little ambiguity is a healthy thing. Interpretation of different departments does not sound like it is necessarily harmful. This clearly compels one point of view, whereas without it, there would be freedom or flexibility. As far as removing the carryover because it deters new faculty members, it seems to me that new faculty members are being hired at quite high prevailing market prices. If it weren't indeed the fact that after four or five years, old faculty have to be given equity adjustments to catch up with recent faculty, there would be less of a need for more equity. I don't think we are putting too much on new faculty members. They come in at a pretty high market price.

Senator Amster: A cumulative average is used in the Art Department. Sometimes they need that extra year. They might be borderline, but need the recognition until their work comes to culmination.

Senator Ritch: The College of Fine Arts has long used cumulative rewards to help offset salary compression of old faculty to bring them up to the level of new hires.

Senator Nelsen: I appreciate the fact that new faculty are hired at higher salaries. That is why the equity provisions are here. We are now dealing with the merit evaluation performance. I think that the "annual performance review" is the key word here.

Senator Razaki: In departments where there are a great number of people in the highest merit category, ISU must be a pretty exceptional campus.

Roll call vote on Zeidenstein/Insel amendment to strike paragraph a, page 10. 9 yes; 32 no; one abstention. failed.

XXV-74

Senator Liedtke: Under Item a., strike the word "normally," in the first sentence; and strike the last sentence: "Under no circumstances shall the DFSC reward activities performed more than three years prior to the current evaluation year." (Second, Nelsen)

Senator Liedtke: This is an annual evaluation, and therefore, those things that culminate within that year could be part of the evaluation. Carry-over systems put new faculty under a disadvantage. To elevate the number of people who qualify for exceptional merit might be allowed here.

Senator Insel: I would like to speak against this amendment. Different department faculty view scholarly productivity in different ways. For instance, the Philosophy Department is different than life sciences. Opportunities and the level of research required differ. Some departments need cumulative years. I think it should be left up to the departments.

Senator Stearns: I would like to speak against the motion. Faculty from other departments and colleges work at different levels. Many faculty work under circumstances where cumulative evaluations are important. This would be a disadvantage to new faculty. Our department chair recently announced that departmental resources would go to develop new faculty. This would give the new faculty members an advantage over the old ones.

Senator Razaki: I would support the motion. A faculty member could have received insufficient merit for ten years and in fifteen years could have enough points to get

exceptional merit. In some departments the finished product takes a number of years.

Senator Borg: I would like to speak against the amendment for this reason. We are talking about the possibility of an accumulative evaluation. I do not equate that with production related points, because there are departments that do not use points. Different kinds of activities can be evaluated on a cumulative, evaluative basis.

Senator Liedtke: Isn't that the purpose of the evaluation that they receive as part of their tenure track evaluation in the department?

Senator Borg: That is correct.

Senator Johnson: I object to the amendment. I think we should allow three or four years for accumulation of recognition. A lot of work takes more than one year to create. A lot of DFSC's are very reluctant to accept and reward "it is in progress -- it's in the editor's hands." On the other hand, once that major article appears in print in a major journal, it is very comfortable to give a second or third year credit, recognizing the accomplishment.

Senator Liedtke: The reason why I want it to be annual is so that you reward the person when the work comes to fruition. So, if you submitted your article, and it takes three years to be published, the year it is published is the year that you receive credit for it. That makes it fair for everyone. It would be counted in your annual evaluation.

Senator Insel: In my department, if you publish an article or a significant paper in a year, you get credit for it. If you have articles two or three years in a row, you get cumulative credit for them.

Senator Williams: I would like to speak against the amendment. I find it hard to believe that a department has criteria of three publications per year. If a faculty member published three articles one year, but did not publish anything for the consecutive two years, It makes no sense whatsoever.

Senator Nelsen: I would support the amendment. The criteria made up by departments about how articles are to be published and how it will be evaluated during the year is negated a bit because the departments can adjust their criteria to allow for departments that have clear publishing capabilities like a department that requires three journal articles. So the question of carryover points to adjust for differentials between departments is not necessarily valid.

Senator Hesse: I like the wording: "the DFSC shall normally consider the activities performed or those reaching culmination." I like the fact that there is given some flexibility. I think this allows for both flexibility to departments and also normalcy.

Senator Manns: What about departments that do both qualitative and quantitative studies? Will they be compensated for that?

Senator Nelsen: Yes. Because departments would establish their own criteria.

Senator Walker: The Department of Agriculture faculty have discussed this issue at some length. Their feeling is that the word "normally" gives the spirit of a single year evaluation. They feel that the second sentence which you are proposing to strike, puts some limits on what the current guidelines allow to be any number of years. This is better than what the current guidelines say, but it does allow for what Senator Williams suggested. A faculty member who gets two publications one year is not necessarily better than someone who gets one a year for consistency over time. For those reasons, they felt the current wording was very appropriate.

Senator Schroer: Senator Hesse reflected my feelings very well.

XXV-75

Senator White: I move the previous question. (Second, Barker) Motion carried on voice vote.

(XXV-74)

Liedtke Amendment failed on a voice vote.

XXV-76

Senator White moved to restore B. in its entirety.

Ruled out of order.

Vote on Page Ten, as amended carried on a voice vote.

XXV-77

Senator White: I move to reconsider item b. to be restored in its entirety. (Second,

Parliamentarian Cohen: A vote to reconsider would be considered dilatory at this point. It would have to take place at another meeting, and the person moving to reconsider would have had to have voted on the prevailing side on the amendment. The history of this body for more

than twenty years has been that you cannot reconsider an amendment at the same meeting that you voted upon it.

Page Eleven, X. B. 8. (ASPT - Page 17)

"Each DFSC shall advise faculty members annually of the results of any appraisal, as called for in V. C. of this document. Written results shall be sent to the College Dean."

XXV-78

Senator Walker: I call the question.

Motion carried on a voice vote.

Page Twelve and Thirteen, X. B. 10 - (ASPT - Page 17)

- "a. Salary increases will be allocated on the basis of insufficient merit, merit, high merit, and highest merit.
- b. Each year, after the DFSC makes its performance evaluations, the individual salary increase of each faculty member shall be based on the following four considerations:
 1. Ninety percent (90%) of all available monies (after consideration of V. F. 1.) will be divided among members of departmental faculty who receive an evaluation of "merit" or above. No salary increment shall be provided to individuals who receive insufficient performance ratings.
 2. The "merit" increment must be distributed as a percentage of the individual's base salary. The same percentage must be applied to all these individuals, regardless of rank or contract (tenure or probationary tenure).
 3. The remaining ten per cent (10%) of the available departmental ASPT funds will be divided among those faculty ranked either "highest merit" or "high merit." Faculty rated "highest merit" shall receive 7/3 of the amount awarded faculty receiving "high merit". If a department places no one in the highest merit category and/or in the high merit category, the dollars allocated to that category (categories) will revert to the merit category.

4. Those monies reserved for either "highest" or "high" merit must be distributed on an absolute dollar basis and must be added to the "merit" increase received by the faculty member. All those in either the "highest merit" or "high merit" categories must receive the same dollar amounts for those respective ratings regardless of rank or base salary."

Senator Walker: I have a question for Provost Strand. Since we have amended the document, if we leave the old wording and allow it to occur in each of the top four categories is that going to be a different approach from what is there? Can you explain the relationship between those two.

Provost Strand: The wording in B. 3. is currently stricken or deleted, then you would have to revisit other parts of this section because B. was 90% of the monies available, and could be affected.

Senator Insel: One of the things that concerns me about taking a percentage of the faculty pay raises and distributing it to the two top categories, is that in years when there is a small amount of money available for faculty pay raises, members of these two top categories will receive very little of the compensation. For example, if my paper was to be published, I might delay until next year, so that I could receive credit in a more favorable year. This is in contrast to what we currently have.

Senator Stearns: Just in terms of Professor Insel's calculations that 50% of the faculty in a department would be in the two highest merit categories; using 12% of the salary money for the two highest categories, I think only 10% of the department funds can go for this.

Senator Schroeer: There has been a problem in the past with very little money being available for salary increases and thus for Exceptional Merit increments. In our Department (Physics) that was handled by Departmental equity adjustments in a later year when funds were available.

Senator Zeidenstein: I have a question for the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, Dr. Razaki: "Why did you change the 70%/30% in the version we received two weeks ago to 7/3's of the amount awarded? It seems less clear than the original.

Senator Razaki: With the 20% caps, on highest and high merit, there was a possibility that 20% would be distributed between four faculty members who received highest merit. In

that case, one person with high merit would end up with more money than the four people in highest merit. We used that ratio so that the number of people would be more fair.

Senator Parr: I think what is not clear here, is that those faculty rated highest merit -- do you mean those faculty as a whole or each one of them?

XXV-79

Senator Williams: Under b. 3, change the wording to "each faculty member."

Amendment accepted as friendly.

Senator Johnson: One department chair raised a question about only having 10% for highest merit and high merit. He felt that wasted the DFSC's time to calculate the distribution of the money.

Vote on pages twelve and thirteen carried on a voice vote.

Page fourteen - X. B. 11 (ASPT - Page 18)

"Each year, after the salary increase process is complete, the departmental chairperson shall provide to each faculty member:

- a. the criteria used for all components of the salary incrementation process; highest merit, high merit, merit, promotion, administrative adjustment, equity adjustment.
- b. the amount of salary incrementation dollars awarded to each component.

Vote on Page Fourteen carried on a voice vote.

Page Fifteen - X. C (ASPT - Page 15)

"Personal service funds, other than the salary increase funds defined in X. A. 1., maybe utilized as supplemental salary increases for individual faculty members covered by the ASPT system. The Dean with prior approval of the affected department's DFSC, shall recommend such salary increases to the Provost."

Motion on page fifteen carried on a voice vote.

2. **Academic Affairs Committee Presentation of University Studies Review Committee Revised Proposal for General Education**

XXV-80

Senator Paul Walker for the Academic Affairs Committee moved:

"Per my letter of February 1, 1994, to Academic Senators and Other Members of the University Community regarding a Recommendation to Endorse a Change in the University Studies Program and to Approve Implementation of the Piloting of a New General Education Program,

Attached to this narrative is the revised University studies proposal and recommendation for implementation. In accordance with the charge received from the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, the Academic Affairs Comm. unanimously recommends that the Academic Senate:

1. Endorse the need to change the existing University Studies Program,
2. Approve the implementation process which includes a pilot of the proposed General Education Program, and
3. Upon conclusion of the piloting period, approve, modify or reject the proposed General Education program."

Second, Senator Borg.

XXV-81

Senator Barker: I move to postpone consideration of this item until the next Senate meeting. (Second, Insel)

Parliamentarian Cohen: That motion is debatable, and requires a simple majority.

Senator Shaya: Will we vote without any amendments or anything?

Parliamentarian Cohen: If the item was postponed, it would be on the Agenda for the next Senate Meeting as the first action item.

Senator Hesse: I object to the motion to postpone. Several students have stuck it out through two very lengthy meetings, and they deserve to get it out of the way.

Senator Ritch: I would like to ask Senator Walker what the consequences of postponement might be?

Senator Walker: This Senate has only one meeting left. If there are items that arise tonight that need further consideration, by doing our discussion tonight, we would have time to do that. If we run into those types of problems at the next meeting, we have no more meetings left without calling a special meeting of the Academic Senate. We need to begin our debate this evening. In case there are questions that do arise that we could answer by the next meeting.

Senator Rosenthal: I would like to speak in favor of the motion for postponement. I think we would be voting fatigued. This evening we received at our places some revisions. We have not had time to consider these. I think a vote would be premature.

Senator Zeidenstein: The next scheduled meeting is not until March 23rd. Another possibility would be to schedule a meeting on March 1st or March 9th. That would give the committee two and one half weeks to work before the last meeting.

Chairperson Schmaltz: The Board of Regents is meeting at ISU on March 9th.

Senator Manns: I think it important to stay and vote on this tonight.

Senator Barker withdrew his motion. Secunder, Insel, did not agree to withdrawal.

Senator Walker: We revised the proposal somewhat after the Information discussion.

I. General Education Program Document:

Page 3

(Added to the diagram as a footnote\
for Category 7)

Page 8

(Added after prerequisites for Language
in Context)

"For courses in which the desirability is simultaneous rather than subsequent presentation with 1, 2, and 3 (Foundations, Language and Composition; Language and Communication) can be demonstrated, Co-requisite status may be granted."

II. Pilot Document:

Spring 1995

"Implementation Committee begins determining where and how Advanced Placement credit may appropriately fit the course categories."

Senator Stearns: Could we have a special meeting of the Senate on March 2?

Parliamentarian Cohen: Yes. The Executive Committee can call a special meeting.

Senator Schroeer: Can we set a specific date for the next meeting?

Parliamentarian Cohen: Academic Senate Meetings are set up on a calendar. Special meetings are called by the Executive Committee or by request of ten faculty senators. Postponing consideration means the item will be considered at the next regular Academic Senate Meeting.

XXV-82

Senator Shaya: I call the question.
Motion carried on a voice vote.

Roll call vote on Barker/Insel Motion to Postpone Action on this Item failed: 15 yes; 28 no; and 1 abstention.

Senator Walker: I would direct your attention to the changes that the Academic Affairs Committee furnished at your places this evening.

On Page 3, added to the diagram as a footnote, that allows Language and Context to be co-requisites.

That has also been added to Page 8.

In the Pilot Document, Spring 1995, there is a change regarding the Advanced Placement credit.

Regarding the Constitution Exam, it is currently required as a requirement for Graduation. The Academic Affairs Committee has already charged the University Curriculum Committee and has requested the Academic Standards Committee consider this issue, Requirement #8 for Graduation, the Constitution Exam, regardless of whether this program goes forward or not, in light of the fact that the Constitution Exam is no longer mandated by the State of Illinois for college graduation. That was signed this last summer by

Governor Edgar. We have consulted with the College of Education regarding this requirement to teacher education. the Council for Teacher Education suggests that teacher education majors have a course in Political Science or U.S. History to meet their obligations. We are asking the Univ. Curriculum Committee how those things can be worked out. If they were passing a new program, those issues would be addressed accordingly in implementation. They need to be addressed anyway, regarding the current university studies program.

Debate on the University Studies Program:

Senator Zeidenstein: Are we voting on items 1, 2, and 3, of your letter of February 1, 1994?

Senator Walker: Items 1, 2, and 3, yes.

Senator Zeidenstein: On Item #1, we are endorsing the need to change the existing University Studies Program. There has not been one iota of data brought before this Senate or even one judgment, one value, one conclusion, one specific criticism of the existing University Studies Program. We are being asked to endorse the need to change the existing University Studies Program -- why?

Senator Walker: Senator Zeidenstein is not correct. When the first proposal came forward from the committee, there was a justification for a new program in there. That information has been presented, and all the senators received that information. It was distributed to all the faculty on campus. There was ample justification as to why a new program was necessary.

Senator Hesse: The charge to the USRC was to develop a philosophy and goals for a University Studies Program. The new philosophy was adopted by the Academic Senate, as were the objectives. The USRC was fulfilling these goals that the Senate approved. The current University Studies Program does not meet this need.

Senator Schroeer: I would like to applaud the committee for trying so hard to consider everyone's needs. I am willing to endorse a pilot program. The Physics Department looked at this and have no particular problems. Under the present program Physics majors have to take 30 hours of physics. The students will come out ahead. I still have questions whether the faculty can reasonably teach these courses; and whether our students get as well-rounded an education as they should. Is there enough basic material? I am concerned about the outer core course distribution. I would rather see differences in a particular discipline. We need to have more teaching of history, literature, fine arts, and foreign languages and have less discussion until the end

when you have something to discuss. I have doubts that the students will be able to do this. Can the faculty members teach this? If we have 5,000 freshmen, we will need 200 sections, and approximately 65 faculty members just to teach the first semester. I need some indication that this number of faculty could be made available.

Senator Walker: The purpose of the pilot program is to test this. We are not voting on the entire University Studies program tonight, we are voting on a pilot program. The pilot program would give us that information. The number of freshmen is much lower than the figure you quoted. Interdisciplinary classes can occur. It cuts across disciplines. We do have substantial content in the outer core and will be able to teach meaty courses. You probably need to read the philosophy statement again.

Senator Williams: The questions some people are asking refer to their own experience in a general education program. This is not just the College of Arts and Sciences. If they wish, their college can have their own set of graduation requirements which include a wide range of disciplines. As for Foreign Language requirements, this is a College of Arts and Sciences issue not a university issue.

Senator Shaya: I would like to remind Senators that we are voting on a pilot program which will lead us to more data.

Senator Liedtke: Can the courses proposed actually be developed? What are the criteria on which the pilot program will be evaluated? It needs to include both quantitative and qualitative questions. We have consistently asked for dollar amounts for this program, and all we have gotten is a pilot study instead of answers. We need something beyond this proposal.

Senator Hesse: That would be counter productive.

Senator Liedtke: We should not go into a pilot study without having data.

Senator Walker: Hard data will be generated as the program is developed.

Senator Liedtke: So we are going to get data that we have been asking for all along -- three years from now.

Senator Ken Strand: This is a dynamic process. I see a number of very important questions. We have faculty in this room who are qualified to do this type of study. What will be done in the pilot study?

Senator Insel: The whole underlying viewpoint of this program is wrong. It is inherent in the language of the program that there is a reversal of method over content. For example, on page ten, Knowing in the Disciplines, it is proposed that first the students become wise, and then they use their wisdom to learn -- going from the general to the specific.

The two mathematically oriented course objectives or outlines, Math Literacy and Quantitative Reasoning, were written without consulting the mathematics faculty in any meaningful way. There have never been any quantitative oriented members of the committee to develop the proposed program.

As experts in mathematics, we view the course descriptions as convoluted, obscure, and in some places, just plain meaningless. The Mathematical Association of America has done a great deal of study on this. The lack of validity and construction of this document would be embarrassing to our Math Department if this document got out to other faculty at other Universities.

Senator Walker: People from the Math Department were consulted. We invited a member of the faculty in Math to attend meetings and met with the acting chair of the Math Department, Mike Plantholt. Our understanding was that he met with faculty and made recommendations to the committee regarding Math Literacy and Quantitative Reasoning.

Senator Insel: Dr. Mike Plantholt had some communication between Math and the committee. However, no one in Math ever proof-read the actual writing of the material. A lot of it doesn't make any sense. No one from any of the hard sciences was on the committee, like Physics and Chemistry.

Senator Walker: Two or three of the committee members do have a quantitative background.

Senator Williams: In reference to Senator Insel's suggestions that students have to begin with content knowledge and move on, from the general to the specific. Students come to us at age 18-20 or 25-30. They are not empty vessels. There is the notion that you can go into a class and accept assertions, but it is not necessarily the way to approach this. There is no sure method. This is a process. This is the introduction, not the final production.

Senator Nelsen: I am in favor of the proposal. I have had my doubts about the objectives, and I think the implementation committee will have its job cut out for it. However, I am in favor of the pilot study.

President Wallace: A number of people have talked about not enough basic material. Some faculty members view general education as mini-courses. We are in the business of training minds to use content, not requiring a large amount of content. We are teaching people how to think. We are told by specialists that having a class size of 25 has better learning than a class of fifty, a hundred, or even a thousand. Comments about assessment are appropriate. We need to be charging the implementation committee with the role of assessment. Does this model make General Education a little better? We need to stick to that kind of concern.

Senator Ritch: My colleagues in theatre have reviewed this proposal. It was our consensus that it is workable for a B. S. candidate, but what about a program for the B. A. candidate? It should be a good enrollment management factor for the department of theatre, because with the Math and Science program, a number of fine arts students in theatre would go elsewhere. We don't want all the answers, but would feel more comfortable with more language and literature. I think we should go ahead with the pilot study and charge the Senate with looking into a program that a B. A. Student will benefit from.

Senator Manns: I would question your enrollment management comments. I thought the program was designed to challenge our students.

Senator Ritch: It is a matter of the overwhelming number of hours a student would have to take.

Senator Manns: (unintelligible) Methodology -- triangulate this -- quantitative/qualitative -- plus test on this study.

Senator Williams: There could be any number of methods of assessment: multi-method; multi-test; comparison and dynamics process, etc. I don't see any serious problems. It would be a small hypothesis.

Senator Liedtke: The purpose doesn't address student's concerns.

Senator Walker: The purpose is not to measure outcomes. We will not have piloted the entire program in the two year study. We will see the outcomes of student's abilities only after the entire program has had an opportunity to be offered in full for a period of years.

Senator Liedtke: In the proposal, you very carefully listed the goals for each course. How will we as senators know that students have achieved these goals?

Senator Hesse: As faculty teach courses and students pass them. What can we compare it with now? The emphasis is shifted to faculty.

Dr. Alan Dillingham: Value added assessments of general education programs have not been done. Further, the pilot program is not the complete proposed general education program. We can review syllabi, exams and student reaction and compare that to patterns observed in the current program.

Senator Liedtke: I suggest that we say we are going to do that.

Senator Wallace: I am not sure that you are talking about outcomes that can be measured to assess new goals or better.

Senator Walker: Regarding program assessment, it is detailed on the bottom of page 17. In the fall of 1995, the results will be compiled and brought back to the Senate.

Senator Liedtke: Then you are promising that we will get this information three years from now?

Senator Zeidenstein: In the Spring of 1997, the Senate will make a decision. In the meantime, stipends, course development, supervisory personnel, an entirely separate general education coordinating committee, etc. the momentum of all this reflects many vested interests. I would be willing to predict that in 1997 we will have such a juggernaut, there will be no way of stopping it even if we want to. On page 15, under the proposed administrative structure and responsibilities, you list a General Education Coordinating Committee. I can foresee potential problems of academic freedom living within this program. Live or not live within the same University.

Senator Wallace: Courses teach people how to think. Emphases tell people what they are supposed to think about. I would vote no.

Senator Walker: The integrity of the program and philosophy and objectives will be tested in the pilot study. The Senate will see if the program meets its own criteria.

Senator Shaya: All we are voting on this evening is whether to give the pilot program a chance. Academia should encourage everyone to give the program a chance.

Provost Strand: As an external view of the program, Ernest Boyer, stated it was bold and exciting.

Senator Jerich: I am in favor of this proposal. There are many ways in which we can assess this pilot study. Ernest Boyer is a leading faculty mentor.

Senator Ken Strand: I support this motion. We encourage the responsible parties to consider the talent at ISU in evaluating the pilot study. I can think of at least fifty people who are qualified to assess the study.

XXV-83

Senator Barker: I call the question.

(XXV-80)

Roll call vote on main motion by Walker (Second, Borg) :
31 yes; 7 no; 3 abstentions. (Endorsement of General
Education Pilot Program) *(Copy of final General Education Program
is available in the Academic Senate Office.)*

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: Senator Walker announced a short meeting following Senate.

ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: Senator White reported that his committee had passed the Academic Calendars and was forwarding them to the Executive Committee for the March 23 Academic Senate Agenda.

BUDGET COMMITTEE: Senator Nelsen had no report.

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: No report.

RULES COMMITTEE: Senator Johnson announced that the Rules Committee was working on faculty appointments to external committees. Representatives are needed from the College of Fine Arts for the Faculty Elections Committee; and from the College of Business for the University Curriculum Committee.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: Student Affairs will have a short meeting following Senate adjournment.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

XXV-84

Motion to adjourn by Zeidenstein (Second, Chernicky) carried on a voice vote. Academic Senate Meeting adjourned at 11:25 p.m.

FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE

JANET M. COOK, SECRETARY

a proposal for a new program of

**General Education
at
Illinois State University**

The Subcommittee on University Studies offers the following proposal for a new General Education Program at Illinois State University. The proposal consists of:

- | | |
|---|----|
| 1. a description and diagram of the program and its components; | 1 |
| 2. a series of course descriptions
suggesting content, goals,
specific criteria for course development, and topics; | 4 |
| 3. general criteria for program guidelines and course development; | 13 |
| 4. a chart specifying objectives and student outcomes
specific to each course category; and | 14 |
| 5. Statements of how the Committee suggests the
program be administered. | 15 |

A separate document describes a *Pilot Implementation of the Proposed General Education Program*.

The Academic Senate on Wednesday, February 23, 1994 approved:

1. an endorsement of the need to change the existing University Studies Program
2. an implementation process which includes a pilot of the proposed General Education Program, and
3. an agreement, upon conclusion of the piloting period, to approve, modify, or reject the proposed General Education Program.

Program Description

General Education at ISU is an integrated program that is designed to provide the undergraduate student with the kind of knowledge and understanding expected of one who earns a baccalaureate degree. The program is rooted in ISU's *Statement of Philosophy for University Studies* and is the means to allow the *Objectives for University Studies at ISU* to be fulfilled.

The 45 semester-hour program consists of:

- an inner core of six courses, three courses taken by all undergraduate students and three courses from two course categories in which the student selects courses from a limited number of choices;
- an outer core of seven course categories in which students select from a limited range of courses;
- and a capstone seminar.

Consistent with the idea that education is a progressive and cumulative process, it is expected that the student will take the program in a prescribed order; courses taken in the outer core are taken after those in the inner core and the capstone seminar is taken last. The program is also designed so that certain courses may be taken concurrently, allowing ideas and knowledge to be developed and reinforced from course to course. The program is constructed to encourage many perspectives on a subject or issue. It is designed to challenge student and teacher alike and to provide the best general academic support for a student's disciplinary focus.

Course Definitions

I. Inner Core

- A. The *Foundation* course initiates the student's systematic investigation of the nature of knowing, its methods and purposes, and its realizations in differing disciplinary and cultural contexts. It offers a basic orientation to intellectual inquiry, articulating a foundation of academic skills, knowledge, and attitudes to be built upon throughout the baccalaureate curriculum.
- B. *Literacy* courses focus on the acquisition and practice of specific academic skills: language, mathematics, and science. Intended to coordinate with the Foundation course, Literacy courses offer a structured context for developing and exercising abilities and understanding important to subsequent undergraduate course work.

II. Outer Core

- A. *Distribution* courses are of two varieties. Some (6. *Quantitative Reasoning* and 7. *Language in Context*) provide for the continued development of academic skills applied to a range of topics and involving a variety of disciplinary perspectives. Others (8. *United States Traditions* and 9. *Individuals and Civic Life*) foster the application of academic skills to traditional knowledge bases.
- B. *ABCD—Option Distribution* courses give insight into the varied nature of disciplinary knowledge, allowing both an introduction to disciplinary groups and a more specific investigation of issues raised in the foundation courses. Four options (Option A, Science, Mathematics & Technology; Option B, Fine Arts; Option C, Humanities; and Option D, Social Sciences) each contain a variety of course choices. [As students make choices among these course categories, they will take one Option A, one Option B, one Option C, and one Option D.] A student must take at least one course in the outer core which has a non-Western designation.

III. Capstone

Disciplines, Diversities, & Solutions: A Capstone Seminar provides a summative experience within General Education, allowing the development and exploration of ideas from a range of points of view and potentially resulting in a variety of reasoned solutions. Two versions of the course are:

1. trans-disciplinary (or university-wide) capstone courses, and
2. disciplinary capstone course.

Both versions of the course will fulfill the same goals and meet the same criteria. Version 1 will emphasize a set of disciplines and reference the major fields of the students enrolled, while version 2 will emphasize a particular discipline and reference others.

General Education Program

	Course Name and Designation	Required or Choice	Recommended Semester	Pre- or Corequisite	Sem Hours
<i>Inner Core</i>	<i>Foundation:</i> 1. Foundations of Inquiry (IDS---)	Required	Fr 1	none	3
	<i>Literacy:</i> 2. Language and Composition (ENG---)	Required	Fr 1 or 2	Co or Pre: 1	3
	3. Language and Communication (COM---)	Required	Fr 1 or 2	Co or Pre: 1	3
	4. Math Literacy (MAT---)*	Required	Fr 1 - So 2	Co or Pre: 1	3
	5. Science Literacy†	Required	Fr 1 - So 2	Co or Pre: 1	6 (2 x 3)
<i>Outer Core+</i>	<i>Distribution:</i> 6. Quantitative Reasoning (---)	Choice	So 1 - Jr 2	Pre: 1, 4	3
	7. Language in Context (---)±	Choice	So 1 - Jr 2	Pre: 1, 2, 3	3
	8. United States Traditions (---)	Choice	So 1 - Sr 1	Pre: 1, 2, 3	3
	9. Individuals and Civic Life (---)	Choice	So 1 - Sr 1	Pre: 1, 2, 3	3
	<i>ABCD Option Distribution</i> (Students must take one course from each of the disciplinary Options [for a total of four courses—12 s.h.] while fulfilling the requirements for the course categories 10, 11, and 12: Option A: Science, Mathematics, & Technology; Option B: Fine Arts; Option C: Humanities; Option D: Social Sciences.)				
	10. Knowing in the Disciplines (---)	Choice	So 1 - Sr 1	Pre: 1, 2, 3‡	3 or 6
	11. Disciplinary Knowledge and the Dynamics of Culture (---)	Choice	So 1 - Sr 1	Pre: 1, 2, 3‡	3 or 6
12. Disciplinary Knowledge and the Quality of Life (---)	Choice	So 1 - Sr 1	Pre: 1, 2, 3‡	3 or 6	
	<i>Capstone Seminar:</i> 13. Disciplines, Diversities, and Solutions	Choice	Sr 1 - Sr 2	Pre: 1-12	3
					Total
					45

*Students will select from three (or four) MAT courses, approved for the General Education Program.

†Students will select two courses created for the General Education Program from Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Geology, and Physics.

Major programs may designate two alternative science—laboratory courses chosen from two different sciences (Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Geology, and Physics). These courses must include specific general education content and be approved for the General Education Program.

+Students must take at least one course in the outer core which has a non-Western designation.

±For courses in which the desirability of simultaneous rather than subsequent presentation with 2 and 3 (Language and Composition; Language and Communication) can be demonstrated, Co-requisite status may be granted."

‡Additional prerequisites for Options A and D: 4, 5.

Course Descriptions

Foundations of Inquiry

Role of the course:

Foundations of Inquiry provides the intellectual cornerstone for the undergraduate educational experience at Illinois State University; it actively engages incoming students in the educational process and provides them with an understanding of how their education will be supported by the diverse resources and opportunities of the University.

It gives students an opportunity to investigate what it means to be educated and to develop a desire for learning, a sense of the value and importance of acquiring knowledge. It asks students to question the roles and responsibilities of both the individual and the University in the educational process, and to consider how the individual is empowered through education.

The course will allow students to develop an understanding of the ethics and values of scholarship, and to become aware of differing educational goals and strategies. Students will be exposed to the shared cultures and values of the academy and will examine the differing foundational assumptions of disciplinary knowledge.

It provides the starting point for the liberal, multidisciplinary, and global education that is the goal of the baccalaureate experience at ISU.

Content of the course:

Foundations of Inquiry involves a systematic exploration of knowledge which emphasizes both the purpose and process of learning. The course initiates an examination of how the University community fosters, structures, and understands inquiry. To accomplish this, students will be guided through a thorough, critical examination of a selected, major issue, period, or revolution. The selection of the topic will be the responsibility of the University Faculty; the specific topic may change from year to year. The topics should be comprehensive, allowing legitimate consideration from a number of points-of-view and disciplinary and intellectual approaches. The issue will allow the student to entertain critically the following concerns:

- I. Examine the intellectual and historical roots or turning points which gave rise to the selected issue.
- II. Look at the issue from a number of disciplinary perspectives. Ask and answer the question, "How do different disciplines understand this issue?" Identify and critique the broader, diverse, and often conflicting, disciplinary perspectives regarding the selected issue.
- III. Examine how various cultural perspectives (including those of race, class, gender, ethnicity, etc.) define or are defined by the issue.
- IV. Explore the current and future moral and ethical dimensions of this issue. Examine how various disciplinary contributions and perspectives affect one's own understanding of the issue.

In sum, the selected issue serves primarily as a vehicle to achieve the course goals, emphasizing how the University helps students achieve the following:

Goals of the course

1. Discover and evaluate the interests and assumptions that define and shape disciplines;
2. Explore what constitutes authority within and among disciplines, disciplinary claims to truth, the use of standards, and the ethical uses of disciplinary knowledge;
3. Apply selected disciplinary strategies, such as the scientific method, creative intuition, hermeneutics, and ethnography, to specific problems;
4. Explore the nature of and need for interdisciplinarity;
5. Examine the nature of personal knowledge and its necessary interrelationship with knowledge that develops from formal academic work within and across disciplines;
6. Explore the interactions among cultural perspectives and the creation and use of knowledge.

Language and Composition

Prerequisite or Corequisite: Foundations of Inquiry

Content: In *Language and Composition*, students develop their writing abilities, focusing on processes through which writers create effective texts for themselves and for others. Broadly stated, these processes include critical inquiry, the rhetorical deliberations influencing the choices writers must make in writing for particular audiences on particular subjects, the decision-making that determines the formal aspects of text

(structure, style, grammar), and the critical reflection central to effective revision. The course gives students experience writing for a range of audiences and purposes and writing in collaborative situations. The course also requires students to think consciously about the dynamics of written language and its relationship to learning. Readings for the course range across disciplines and develop students' abilities to analyze the writings of others. Students learn to appreciate critically different perspectives on various issues of importance to their growing understanding of themselves and of the world in which they live. The course stresses peer and instructor critiques of student writing and is computer-assisted.

Goals: In *Language and Composition*, students will:

1. develop strategies for critical inquiry;
2. apply effectively the rhetorical principles governing the effective presentation of ideas in writing to a range of audiences for a range of purposes;
3. follow the principles and employ the rules pertinent to the effective formal arrangement of ideas in writing;
4. read critically;
5. incorporate what they learn from their reading fluently into their own thinking and writing;
6. develop their abilities to write collaboratively; and
7. enable them to understand consciously the relationship between language and learning.

Criteria: In developing the course *Language and Composition*, faculty will attend to the following criteria:

1. the course should examine strategies for critical inquiry and teach students to apply them effectively in the students' writing processes;
2. the course should address explicitly and teach students to work with the rhetorical principles guiding the effective presentation of ideas in writing;
3. the course should treat the principles and standards required to help students to manage the formal aspects of their writing effectively;
4. the course should present and help students master the complex interplay between content and form;
5. the course should address the challenges inherent in working with others to develop a shared text;
6. the course should cultivate explicitly the connections among reading, writing, speaking, and listening, particularly as they bear on the substance and form students must manage in their writing and on the relationship between language and learning.

Suggested Topics:

1. Using, analyzing, and evaluating language for different audiences and purposes.
2. Writing collaboratively.
3. Language and learning.
4. Processes of critical inquiry.
5. Content and form.
6. Writing and rewriting.

Language and Communication

Prerequisite or Corequisite: Foundations of Inquiry

Content: In *Language and Communication*, students develop their oral communication abilities in different settings, ranging from large forums to small group situations. The course stresses various kinds of oral communication tasks. In some tasks, they work on presenting their ideas on an issue to others in a clear, coherent, and compelling manner. In other tasks, they work in small groups to resolve conflicts as the group works to negotiate a position on an issue. Students learn about effective means of formal and informal oral communication. The course emphasizes having students actively communicating in different settings and having instructor and peer critiques of their work.

Goals: In *Language and Communication*, students will learn to:

1. apply the rhetorical principles informing effective formal presentations;
2. accommodate rhetorical principles to different speech situations, both formal and informal;
3. complete background research necessary to develop well-informed presentations;
4. evaluate the oral presentations of others according to these rhetorical principles;
5. apply rhetorical principles critical to effective communication in small group discussions; and
6. demonstrate openness, intellectual tolerance, and civility in the exchange of ideas and the resolution of conflicts in small group settings.

Criteria: In developing the course *Language and Communication*, faculty will attend to the following criteria:

1. the course should survey the principles and strategies governing effective oral communication in diverse settings for diverse audiences;
2. the course should enable students to develop a command of these principles in practice as they move from one communicative situation to another;
3. the course should teach strategies of analysis and synthesis to help students incorporate background research fluently into their oral communication;
4. the course should require students to give oral presentations dealing with different issues for different audiences;
5. the course should address the differences and similarities between informal and formal oral communication and help students to adapt to the informal and formal communicative demands of different situations in which they find themselves;
6. the course should enable students to critique the oral presentation of others;
7. the course should develop in students a command of the relationship between goal and process in small group interaction;
8. the course should address the principles informing the resolution of conflict in small groups;
9. the course should provide students with practice in small group communication.

Suggested Topics:

1. The art of rhetoric.
 - a. Form and content
 - b. Forms of rhetorical appeal
 - c. Persuasion
2. Incorporating researched information into oral presentation.
3. Formal and informal communication.
4. Small group processes.
5. Conflict resolution in small group discussions.

Math Literacy

Prerequisites or Corequisites:

Foundations of Inquiry
Math 104 equivalency (Placement test required)

Content: In *Math Literacy* courses, students develop problem-solving capabilities that follow logical patterns and provide the essential mathematical background for work in other fields and courses. *Math Literacy* will be composed of three (or more) specifically designed courses (e.g., finite math, calculus, etc.), each designed to develop an appropriate degree of mathematical competency. The main topics in each course will depend on the level of competency required for enrollment in the course. Connections will be drawn to life and culture; also, there will be discussion of the historical development of mathematical topics.

Goals: In *Math Literacy* courses, students will learn to:

1. understand the logic of mathematics;
2. understand particular mathematical concepts;
3. develop the mathematical skills essential for problem solving; and
4. achieve a mathematical literacy consistent with the level of the course.

Criteria: In developing *Math Literacy* courses, faculty will attend to the following criteria:

1. students will be expected to develop and practice mathematical skills and reasoning appropriate to the competency being pursued (e.g., finite math, college algebra, or calculus);
2. the course will engage students in the use of a range of mathematical symbols and operations;
3. students will use the symbols and rules of mathematics as a tool in the formulation, solution, and communication of problems from a variety of application areas;
4. the topics and methods selected for the course will be placed within the perspective of the discipline of mathematics.

Suggested Topics:

1. Mathematical symbols
2. Development of skills
3. Mathematics as a discipline
4. Mathematical logic and reasoning
5. Mathematical applications

Science Literacy

Prerequisites or Corequisites: Foundations of Inquiry

[Students will select two courses created for the General Education Program from Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Geology, and Physics. Major programs may designate two alternative science—laboratory courses chosen from two different sciences (Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Geology, and Physics). These courses must include specific general education content and be approved for the General Education Program.]

Content: In *Science Literacy*, students learn about about the scientific view of the universe, the scientific laws governing its behavior, and the nature of scientific inquiry into these phenomena. The course emphasizes basic scientific principles and the way an understanding of these principles helps individuals understand the physical and natural worlds. Students will be expected to integrate information from the natural and physical sciences, and thus to begin the life-long process of arriving at an understanding of the nature of life, the earth, the universe, and interactions among them.

Goals: In the *Science Literacy* course, students will:

1. be introduced to the language and principles essential to the sciences;
2. be initiated to the diversity within and among scientific paradigms and yet aware of commonalities and consistencies with which the world is viewed through different disciplines;
3. be prepared to understand the role of science in our culture and the possible societal impacts of science and technology;
4. confront how scientists know what they know and examine the limits of scientific knowledge.
5. be encouraged to develop an abiding interest in and curiosity about the process of scientific discovery and the application of scientific knowledge in a broader context.

Criteria: In developing the *Science Literacy* course, faculty will attend to the following criteria:

1. develop course components that promote active learning (e.g., recitations, laboratory experiments, analytical tasks, take-home or library or team analytical projects, multimedia or computer simulations);
2. seek means of promoting integrative and shared experiences (e.g., common seminars, lectures, or projects) among students in all four *Science Literacy* courses;
3. follow guidelines for developing *topics for courses*:
 - a. Science faculty will seek ways to develop common topics or themes;
 - b. topics in all four courses will be modified in accordance with faculty expertise, changes in importance in a societal context, or student interests;
 - c. topics selected for each course will reflect scientific principles and the process of inquiry; and
 - d. topics selected for each course will reflect the relationship and interactions between the particular scientific disciplines and society in both an historical and contemporary context.

Quantitative Reasoning

Prerequisites: Foundations of Inquiry
Math Literacy

Content: In *Quantitative Reasoning*, students examine the principles, practices, instruments, and systems of mathematics and logic used to measure, quantify, analyze, and represent social, scientific, technological, and other phenomena as a basis for decision-making. Problems and examples in the course are drawn from a variety of disciplines to represent a rich diversity of applications. Mathematical tools will be combined with systems of logic to provide a basis for discourse in addressing the quantitative dimensions of problems confronting individuals, societies, and humanity.

Goals: In *Quantitative Reasoning*, students will learn:

1. approaches to understand quantitative concepts and related technologies and to apply them to problems confronting individuals, organizations, societies, and humanity;
2. to develop systematically their critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, and communication skills enabling them to collect, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information and argument from a range of sources appropriate to specific problems, and;
3. to reason quantitatively and use mathematical tools, logical tools, and related technologies suited to the problems they address.

Criteria: In developing a course in *Quantitative Reasoning*, faculty will attend to the following criteria:

1. the course must focus on the application of quantitative reasoning to disciplinary or interdisciplinary problems;
2. the course will build upon and encourage the practice of mathematical skills learned in *Math Literacy*;
3. problems will be selected to exemplify a variety of applications of mathematical and logical principles;
4. the course will use appropriate tools and technology for developing solutions and communicating them.

Suggested Topics:

1. The relationship between quantitative reasoning and disciplinary reasoning.
2. Methods of collecting, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating information and argument from a range of sources (e.g., statistical analysis, modeling, etc.)
3. Limitations of quantitative reasoning.
4. How quantitative tools and related technologies (such as quantitative applications software) can be used to address problems confronting individuals, organizations, societies, and humanity.
5. Communication of the results of quantitative reasoning, using appropriate means (such as a graphics software program).
6. Logical analysis of the structure of disciplinary argumentation.

Language In Context

Prerequisites:

Foundations of Inquiry
Language and Composition
Language and Communication

[For courses in which the desirability of simultaneous rather than subsequent presentation with Language and Composition and Language and Communication can be demonstrated, Co-requisite status may be granted.]

Content: In *Language in Context*, students who already possess basic skills in a language will build on their language experiences in earlier writing and speech courses to exercise their formal language abilities in an academic context. Courses in this category will focus on the discourse conventions of groups of similar disciplines or meta-disciplines. The courses will be designed to expand the student's ability to use language effectively within these broad disciplinary groups.

Goals: In *Language in Context* courses, students will learn to:

1. write and/or speak well according to the conventions governing language use within groups of academic disciplines;
2. understand the relationship between the context in which language is used and the development of conventions governing its use in the discipline;
3. build on their ability to use language flexibly for different audiences and different purposes.

Criteria: In developing a course in *Language in Context*, faculty will attend to the following criteria:

1. there must be an emphasis on the use of language in context;
2. the course must focus on developing a command of the language structure and discourse conventions of the disciplinary groups upon which the course is based;
3. the special conventions governing language use must build on rather than simply replicate students' earlier experiences with language;
4. the course must be directed toward language use, not to the content and substance of specific disciplines and disciplinary groups.

Suggested Topics:

1. The relationship between academic context and discourse conventions.
2. The relationship between academic context and the structure of language.
3. Historical factors influencing the current uses of language in an academic context.
4. Using, analyzing, and evaluating language in a specific academic context.
5. The relationship between language use in an academic context and language use in other social contexts.

United States Traditions

Prerequisites:

Foundations of Inquiry
Language and Composition
Language and Communication

Content: In *United States Traditions*, students study the historical and contemporary influences affecting changes in United States society. The course focuses on the diverse individuals, social values, beliefs, and institutions that have shaped and continue to shape United States culture. Special emphasis is placed on demographic (such as race, class and gender), political, legal, scientific, technological, and economic forces that have influenced and continue to influence the many varieties of United States culture.

Goals: In *United States Traditions*, students will learn to:

1. understand the development of United States culture through the examination of selected traditions using methods of analysis derived from the humanities, sciences, and social sciences;
2. explain the contributions of key individuals, events, issues, practices, ideas, and institutions to the development of and diversity within United States culture;
3. describe the mechanisms by which traditions and cultural values are shaped and applied to local, regional, and national affairs in the United States, and;
4. relate the involvement of the United States in global affairs to elements of United States culture.

Criteria: In developing a course in *United States Traditions*, faculty will attend to the following criteria:

1. the traditions and elements of culture selected must contribute to an understanding of the cultural-social complexity of the United States and how it differs from other cultures;
2. materials selected for the course must permit students to examine and reflect upon major contributions by individuals, groups, institutions, etc., to diversity in United States culture;
3. the content must allow methods of analysis, such as demographics, social structure, and economics, and other methods of disciplined inquiry developed in prerequisite courses;
4. the traditions and elements of cultures must be selected so that major historically significant themes are represented in the course.

Suggested Topics:

1. Ethnic diversity (Topics might include: indigenous peoples, immigration, cooperation and competition, integration and alienation—melting pot theory, impact of public policy and private actions).
2. Work and economic growth (Topics might include: evolving work ethics, labor economics, technology and work, social structure and work, evolving structure of the labor force, work and leisure, education and work, the internationalization of work).
3. Religion (Topics might include: Judeo-Christian roots, freedom, separation of church and state, rights, responsibilities, limits, fundamentalism, secularism).
4. Philosophies of democratic and civic/social life (Topics might include: rule by law—Constitution/Bill of Rights, one person—one vote, rights versus responsibilities, representative government, artistic expression, individualism, humanitarian consciousness/concern, sense of fair-play).

Individuals and Civic Life

Prerequisites: Foundations of Inquiry
Language and Composition
Language and Communication

Content: In *Individuals and Civic Life*, students learn about functioning responsibly in their civic environment. Students develop an understanding of the complex interrelationships among people, political structures, and other dimensions of society, including the natural, social, business, and legal. Special attention will be given to the civic traditions of diverse cultures in United States society. The course helps students understand how in the past and in the present individual freedoms and social and political environments interact. The course should actively stimulate students to ponder the socially responsible choices that educated citizens who participate in shared governance make.

Goals: In *Individuals and Civic Life*, students will learn to:

1. understand the general principles of governments and how they affect individuals;
2. explain the various kinds of institutions that are created in differing civilizations to effect governance;
3. explore individual responsibilities in the conduct of civic life;
4. analyze the dimensions in which interaction between the individual and groups occur, and
5. make judgments concerning personal ethics and responsibilities.

Criteria: In developing a course in *Individuals and Civic Life*, faculty will attend to the following criteria:

1. the course will focus on ethical judgments involving local, national and global communities;
2. problems and topics will encourage the student to explore the roles of the individual and of groups in assessing and acting on various civic options;
3. problems and topics will encourage the student to explore the roles of the individual and of groups in assessing the individual's human and civic responsibilities;
4. the course will focus on the political, business, economic, and social forces influencing local, national and world orders through which people conduct their lives;
5. the course will include a variety of cultural and national settings focusing on the social and ideological dimensions as affected by class, gender, and race which culminate in an increased understanding of the contemporary world;
6. the course will address effective decision-making with respect to current local and global social issues.

Suggested Topics:

1. The nature of democratic governance, including authority, systems of governance, rule by law, and the individual's role in governance.
2. United States governance including the fundamental principles of individual rights, equality under the law, the common good, and patriotism; the institutions of government; and the institutions of civic involvement such as elections, political parties, and special interest groups.
3. Perspectives on citizenship and civic participation as affected by historic, political, economic, geographic, ethnic, social, psychological, philosophic and technological aspects.

Knowing in the Disciplines—Options A) Science, Technology, & Mathematics; B) Fine Arts; C) Humanities; or D) Social Sciences

Prerequisites: Foundations of Inquiry
Language and Composition
Language and Communication
Math Literacy (for Options A and D)
Science Literacy (for Options A and D)

Content: In *Knowing in the Disciplines*, students encounter and apply various ways of knowing (such as those identified in *Foundations of Inquiry*) appropriate to disciplinary investigation and interpretation of problems in science and technology; the creations of artists, writers and other thinkers; or the nature of individuals and societies. Students learn to use appropriate methodology in dealing with problems and questions posed in disciplinary contexts. The topics, artistic creations, and problems will be selected and viewed with respect to disciplines reflecting A) Science, Technology, & Mathematics; B) Fine Arts; C) Humanities; or D) Social Sciences.

Goals: In *Knowing in the Disciplines*, students will:

1. develop an awareness of how general ways of knowing are adapted and applied in specific disciplinary areas;
2. identify and use specific disciplinary methodologies and tools to address issues of concern to disciplines;
3. develop a sense of how attitudes toward knowledge condition what problems and tools are appropriate to various disciplines.

Criteria: In developing a course in *Knowing in the Disciplines*, faculty will attend to the following criteria:

1. the course should address issues and topics appropriate to the disciplines addressed;
2. the course should address disciplinary perspectives from
 - A) Science, Technology, & Mathematics;
 - B) Fine Arts;
 - C) Humanities; or
 - D) Social Sciences.
3. the course should engage students in active application of critical disciplinary tools;
4. the course should assist students in distinguishing their personal assumptions and opinions from conclusions based on critical and analytical exploration of issues.

Disciplinary Knowledge and the Dynamics of Culture—Options A) Science, Technology, & Mathematics; B) Fine Arts; C) Humanities; or D) Social Sciences

Prerequisites: Foundations of Inquiry
Language and Composition
Language and Communication
Math Literacy (for Options A and D)
Science Literacy (for Options A and D)

Content: In *Disciplinary Knowledge and the Dynamics of Culture*, students investigate the reciprocal interaction between disciplinary knowledge and human cultures. Students begin developing an understanding of how different cultures affect what constitutes disciplines and their knowledge bases. The course provides insights into the dynamics of cultural change effected by various disciplinary assumptions and the resultant construction of knowledge. A selection of differing cultures will be viewed with respect to disciplines reflecting A) Science, Technology, & Mathematics; B) Fine Arts; C) Humanities; or D) Social Sciences.

Goals: In *Disciplinary Knowledge and the Dynamics of Culture*, students will:

1. develop an appreciation of differing cultural views about knowledge and its organization,
2. develop a familiarity with how concepts and ideas are culturally conditioned,
3. experience various artistic creations, use disciplinary tools, or evaluate human behaviors embedded within cultural contexts,
4. engage in critical thought about the ramifications of cultural diversity and disciplinary organization of knowledge.

Criteria: In developing a course in *Disciplinary Knowledge and the Dynamics of Culture*, faculty will attend to the following criteria:

1. the course should address differing cultures;
2. the course should address disciplinary perspectives from
A) Science, Technology, & Mathematics;
B) Fine Arts;
C) Humanities; or
D) Social Sciences.
3. the course should engage students in active application of critical disciplinary tools appropriate to the disciplines and cultures selected;
4. the course should encourage students to reflect on their cultural condition and personal knowledge base.

Disciplinary Knowledge and the Quality of Life—Options A) Science, Technology, & Mathematics; B) Fine Arts; C) Humanities; or D) Social Sciences

Prerequisites: Foundations of Inquiry
Language and Composition
Language and Communication
Math Literacy (for Options A and D)
Science Literacy (for Options A and D)

Content: In *Disciplinary Knowledge and the Quality of Life*, students confront how disciplines have contributed to the quality of individual and societal life and how they continue to affect it. In this course students will examine how different disciplinary tools, concepts, and critical apparatus may be used to address topics such as the human condition, moral and ethical dimensions to problems, the environment, or social contexts. A selection of problems will be viewed with respect to disciplines reflecting A) Science, Technology, & Mathematics; B) Fine Arts; C) Humanities; or D) Social Sciences.

Goals: In *Disciplinary Knowledge and the Quality of Life*, students will:

1. develop a reasoned understanding of issues bearing on individual and societal life;
2. identify and use specific disciplinary methodologies and tools to address problems and questions involving individuals and their surroundings;
3. identify attitudes and backgrounds contributing to differing perspectives on such questions; and,
4. engage in critical thought and expressions about potential answers to such questions.

Criteria: In developing a course in *Disciplinary Knowledge and the Quality of Life*, faculty will attend to the following criteria:

1. the course should address topics involving the quality of life such as work and leisure, consumption behavior, the environment, morals and ethics;
2. the course should address multi-faceted issues that allow a variety of reasoned positions;
3. the course should address disciplinary perspectives from
 - A) Science, Technology, & Mathematics;
 - B) Fine Arts;
 - C) Humanities; or
 - D) Social Sciences.
4. the course should engage students in active application of critical disciplinary tools appropriate to the issues discussed.

Disciplines, Diversities, and Solutions: A Capstone Seminar

Prerequisites: All other General Education Courses
Senior Standing

Content: In *Disciplines, Diversities, and Solutions: A Capstone Seminar*, students actively examine disciplines, including their own major, recognizing how they interact with social, cultural, business, political and environmental phenomena. They identify current local and global issues, disciplines that bear on them, obtain pertinent knowledge from the disciplines, and apply that knowledge to the development of reasoned solutions to problems raised by the issues. Students assess the consequence of their proposed solutions, recognize responsibility for them, and understand and respect the perspectives and values of others. Capstone activities incorporate fundamental concepts learned in General Education and encourage students to explore the interplay of ideas among the many knowledge areas as applied to various disciplines.

The two varieties of *Disciplines, Diversities, and Solutions: A Capstone Seminar* are:

1. trans-disciplinary (or university-wide) capstone courses, and
2. disciplinary capstone courses.

Both versions of the course will fulfill the same goals and meet the same criteria. Version 1 will emphasize a set of disciplines and reference the major fields of the students enrolled, while version 2 will emphasize a particular discipline and reference others.

Goals: In *Disciplines, Diversities, and Solutions: A Capstone Seminar*, students will:

1. learn about the historical, cultural, scientific, economic, and social aspects of substantive disciplinary issues;
2. understand the impact of society and culture on interpretations and values set by persons with opposing viewpoints on a subject of interest;
3. evaluate their own attitudes about life in relation to the values of others;
4. learn about the social and intellectual origins of positions and issues within and about their major discipline;
5. learn about the effects their discipline has and may have on the wider intellectual, social, economic, and political communities;
6. apply skills in critical thinking and reflective reading and writing to particular issues related to their major discipline and its applications, and;
7. develop goals, skills, and strategies for the transition to life beyond the baccalaureate degree.

Criteria: In developing a course in *Disciplines, Diversities, and Solutions: A Capstone Seminar*, faculty will attend to the following criteria:

1. the issues selected should have significance to society and should incorporate differing perspectives;
2. the issues selected must permit reasonable examination from multiple disciplines;
3. the course should be taught in a way to facilitate the ability to generalize to issues beyond those introduced in the course;
4. the course will reflect the essential relationship between disciplines and General Education goals and student outcomes.

General Education Program Guidelines

1. A student must take at least one course from the outer core which has a non-Western designation. Courses in any of the outer-core areas may qualify for the non-Western designation if:
 - a. the course focuses *primarily* upon facets of specific non-Western cultures or non-Western cultures in general. A minimum of 75% of the course content must deal directly with the non-Western culture(s).
 - b. exploration of the non-Western culture(s) be developed in a comparative perspective which helps the student understand and appreciate differences between the culture(s) under consideration and American culture.
 - c. the course includes exposure to primary writings and artifacts from the culture(s).
2. Students may count no more than three (3) semester hours of General Education Outer-Core course work (beyond the Capstone Seminar) from their major discipline.
3. General Education Faculty Development Seminars (GEFDS) will provide an opportunity for faculty to prepare to teach General Education courses. Faculty new to the program will have an opportunity not only to examine the content and methods used in the courses they are to teach, but will also develop an understanding of the interrelationship of their courses to the other courses in the General Education Program. Also, the seminars (GEFDS) provide a venue in which course content and methods will be systematically reviewed by faculty engaged in teaching the courses and by other interested faculty from throughout the University.
 - a. Faculty teaching in the General Education program are expected to participate in a GEFDS and an orientation to the program and to understand how any course they teach fits into the overall program.
 - b. College Deans and Department Chairs are expected to participate in a General Education Faculty Development Seminar (GEFDS) and an orientation to the program and to understand how courses fit into the overall program.

Course Development and Approval Criteria

General Criteria

1. Courses must address the Program Objectives and Student Outcomes enumerated for each course or course category.
2. Courses in General Education provide for interaction between faculty and students and allow for the student's active pursuit of knowledge.
3. Classroom experiences will range from small-enrollment seminars to larger lectures coupled with discussion groups and may include other active learning experiences such as field experiences and laboratory sessions.
4. Courses in General Education aim at broadening student horizons, rather than functioning as introductory courses for specific majors or as traditional survey courses in particular disciplines. Each course is designed to give perspective and a breadth of view while addressing knowledge, modes of inquiry, and applications.
5. The General Education Program fosters an interdisciplinary approach to learning. Interdisciplinary emphasis ranges among the courses in the program from those most completely involving different disciplines (e.g., *Foundations of Inquiry*) to those with less interdisciplinary focus (e.g., *Math Literacy*). The nature of interdisciplinarity includes both faculty members from different disciplines working together as well as a single faculty member dealing with interdisciplinary content.
6. Courses in the General Education Program will develop human communication skills. All courses in the program must require some writing, speaking, reading, and peer interaction. Communication skills will help students acquire and use knowledge. As a result, students will be able to explore solutions to questions and share the results with others.
7. Courses that require more than 3 semester hours may be a part of General Education, but only 3 semester hours credit will count toward fulfilling the General Education Program requirements.

A Summary of University Studies Objectives and Student Outcomes by Course Category

Course	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Obj 6	Obj 7	Obj 8	Obj 9	Obj 10	Obj 11	Obj 12
Foundations	b,e,f	b (e)	(a)		a,b (c)	(c)	b	a,b	a		c	a
Lang & Comp	(a)	a,b,d (e)				a			b			b,c
Lang & Comm	(f)	a,b,d (e)							b			b,c
Math Lit	c(f)	(c,e)										
Science Lit	c(d)	(c,e)							b			
Quant Reas	c	b,c							(c)	(c)		
Lang Context	f	a,b,d (e)										a,b,c
US Trad	b (e)				(b)		(a)			a,b (d,e)		
Ind Civic	(b)	(b)		(b)	b,c		c (a,b)		(c)	d (a)	a,c	b
Know/Disc A	c,d	c	a	(a)			(a,b,c)	d (a,b,d)	(c)		b	(b)
Know/Disc B	a	(d)	a			a,b,d		(a,b,c,d)	(c)			(a)
Know/Disc C	a,b	(d)	a			(c)		(a,b,c,d)	(c)			(a)
Know/Disc D			a	(a)			a (b,c)	(a,b,c,d)	(c)			(a)
Disc/Cult A	c,d (b)	(c)	a	(a)		(a)	(a,b,c)	(a,b,c)	(b,c)	(a,b,c,d,e)	b	(a)
Disc/Cult B	a	(d)	a	(a)		a,b,c		(a,b,c,d)	(b,c)	c (a,b,d,e)		(a)
Disc/Cult C	a,b	(d)	a	(a)	(a)	(c)		(a,b,c,d)	(b,c)	c (a,b,d,e)		(a)
Disc/Cult D	b		a	(a)			a (b,c)	(a,b,c,d)	(b,c)	a,b,d	(a)	(a)
Disc/Qual A	c,d (b)	c	a	(b,c)	(a,c)		a (b,c)	(a,b,c)	(b,c)		a,b	(a)
Disc/Qual B	a	(d)	a	(a,b)		a,b,c		(a,b,c,d)	(b,c)			(a)
Disc/Qual C	a,b	(d)	a	(a,b)	(a)	(c)		(a,b,c,d)	(b,c)			(a)
Disc/Qual D	b,d (c)		a	b (a)	(a)		a,b,c	(a,b,c,d)	(b,c)		a	(a)
Capstone	e (f)	a,b,c,d,e	a,b	a,b,c	a,b,c		(a,b,c)	c,d (a,b)	a,b,d	c,e (b,d)	a,b	c (b)

Letters refer to Student Outcomes as listed in *Objectives for University Studies at Illinois State University*. Letters in parenthesis receive secondary emphasis.

Proposed Administrative Structure and Responsibilities

Director of General Education (a position within the Provost's Office)

Functions:

1. Oversees program development, implementation, and maintenance.
2. Coordinates scheduling, staffing, and facility requirements.
3. Oversees course evaluations and program assessment (in cooperation with Council on University Studies and General Education Coordinating Committee).
4. Administers fiscal support for the Program.
5. Oversees faculty development seminars.
6. Oversees internal and external grant activity.

Council on University Studies (CUS)

Functions:

1. Ensures that the spirit of the *Philosophy of University Studies* is maintained by the Program.
2. Continually monitors the Program insuring that the objectives of the Program and student outcomes are met by the Program.
3. Makes recommendations regarding program modifications and consults with Program Director regarding implementation of program changes.
4. Approves course additions or deletions and program changes.

NOTE: To be eligible to serve on CUS it is suggested that a faculty member must have (1) participated in at least one General Education Faculty Development Seminar and (2) taught in the new General Education Program for at least one year. In addition, the USRC suggests that a minimum of two (2) of the seven (7) faculty members of CUS concurrently be members of the proposed General Education Coordinating Committee. This will require modifications to the *Academic Senate "Bluebook" Supplement to the Bylaws* for committee structure of the Academic Senate. See suggested changes in the Council on University Studies guidelines, pp. 16-17.

General Education Coordinating Committee

Description: A committee of the whole consists of the Director of General Education and a set of Coordinators who oversee and interact with the faculty (course instructors) specific to their area. Coordinators could be full-time faculty with a partial coordinator appointment. Coordinators are faculty members appointed by the Provost with recommendations originating from the Director of General Education in consultation with College Deans and Department Chairs. There should be one coordinator for each of the five inner-core course categories. There should be coordinators for outer-core categories as necessary.

Functions:

1. Coordinates pedagogy for the courses in a specific area.
2. Insures that the interactive, cohesive nature of the Program is maintained.
3. Works with the Director to develop and conduct General Education Faculty Development Seminars.
4. Interacts with the CUS to insure that the integrity of the Program is maintained.

Proposed General Education Course Approval Process

The course approval process for the new General Education Program differs for Inner-Core courses and for Outer-Core Courses. Inner-Core Courses will be developed (see Pilot Implementation Document) and approved, and then undergo annual review and revision. Outer-Core Courses will be developed (see below) and approved, and then require re-approval for the program at least every five years. The Council on University Studies (see below) will approve and monitor the Inner-Core Courses; it will also determine which courses may fulfill the Outer-Core and Capstone requirements for General Education.

Outer-Core Courses may be developed through individual departments or cooperatively by more than one department. The approval process for these courses will be the current process, i.e., a course is reviewed and approved by the Department, College, and University Curriculum Committees. Then, with the addition of a proposal outlining the contribution the course makes to the appropriate category in General Education, the Council on University Studies will review and approve or disapprove the course for the Program.

Outer-Core Interdisciplinary courses, normally developed by more than one individual or department, can follow the approval process for Interdisciplinary Studies, i.e., the Council on University Studies functions as the curriculum committee for the course proposal, which then is submitted to the University Curriculum Committee. Some Outer-Core courses may be cross-listed by department (and follow the first approval process outlined above) or may be listed as IDS (and follow the second approval process).

I. Inner Core Courses

- A. Inner Core courses are to be created during the piloting process (see Pilot Implementation Document)
- B. Courses in the Inner Core will be offered in a quantity that satisfies General Education demand. The number of sections for each course will be determined annually by the General Education Director in conjunction with the College Deans and Department Chairs.

II. Outer Core Courses

- A. Outer Core courses may be developed under departmental designations or as IDS (Interdisciplinary) courses.
- B. Course content and curricular proposals are developed by departmental faculty or by groups of faculty representing a variety of disciplines. Courses developed by individual departments or to be cross-listed between several departments, follow regular University curricular processes. Courses offered with an IDS listing are reviewed by the Council on University Studies, then sent to each of the colleges for comment by the College Curriculum Committee and subsequently submitted to the University Curriculum Committee for approval.
- C. Course proposals for the Outer Core should contain a letter from each appropriate Department Chair and College Dean stating their commitment to the course. Courses in the Outer Core will be offered in a quantity that satisfies General Education demand. The number of sections for each course will be determined annually by the General Education Director in conjunction with the College Deans and Department Chairs.
- D. Participation in the General Education Faculty Development Seminars is open to faculty teaching Outer-Core courses as well as to other faculty interested in the development of Outer-Core courses. The seminars will provide a venue for developing links between Outer-Core and Inner-Core courses and for exchanging ideas about achieving the objectives for the respective course categories.
- E. Outer-Core courses will be approved for a five-year period; they will continue in the Program only if re-approved by the Council on University Studies. Among the criteria for re-approval are demonstrated enrollment demand and course availability to the general student population.

III. Capstone Courses.

A. Trans-Disciplinary and University-wide capstone courses

1. Trans-Disciplinary capstone courses will be developed for students whose College or Department elects to develop and offer capstone courses for groups of majors or disciplines. Courses developed to be cross-listed between several departments follow regular University curricular processes.
2. University-wide capstone courses (IDS) are developed by faculty committees with representation from across the University. They are then reviewed by the Council on University Studies, sent to each of the colleges for comment by the College Curriculum Committees, and subsequently sent to the University Curriculum committee for approval.

B. Disciplinary capstone courses.

1. Capstone courses may be developed by Departments for each major they offer.
2. Course content and curricular proposals are developed by departmental faculty committees. Course approval is in accord with regular University curricular guidelines. The proposal is then sent to the Council on University Studies for review and approval for the General Education Program.

- C. Representative faculty who teach capstone courses are invited to participate in the GEFDS. The seminars will focus on how to achieve meaningful links between disciplines and general education.

IV. Council on University Studies

The Council on University Studies (CUS) is responsible for approving courses for the General Education Program and for setting and administering the policies needed for program operation, review, and modification. The structure of the revised Program requires some changes in the composition and authority of the current CUS. A Director of General Education is needed to coordinate the delivery of the Program. To ensure interaction and cooperation with CUS, this individual needs to be an ex-officio member of CUS. The Director of General Education serves as a liaison between CUS and the General Education Coordinating Committee (see, p. 15). The following specific changes in the operation of CUS are recommended to the Academic Senate for review and approval:

1. Membership: CUS guidelines should be changed to include the Director of General Education as an Ex-Officio member, representing the office of the Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Instruction. For faculty to be eligible to serve on CUS, they must have (1) participated in at least one General Education Faculty Development Seminar and (2) taught in the revised program for at least one year. It is also recommended that at least two of the seven faculty members appointed to CUS be members of the General Education Coordinating Committee. [Until a sufficient pool of eligible faculty can be developed, it is suggested that current members of CUS participate in the GEFDS or other course development processes. New members will be selected from faculty who participate in the GEFDS or other course development processes.]

2. Functions: The Academic Senate approved a *Statement of Philosophy for University Studies* on March 13, 1991. Therefore, function No. 1 (*Academic Senate "Bluebook" Supplement to the Bylaws*) charging CUS with developing a philosophy of General Education should be reworded as follows:

... insure that the spirit of the *Statement of Philosophy for University Studies* is maintained by the Program.

The remaining functions (2 through 6) should contain the phrase "with appropriate interaction with and input from the General Education Coordinating Committee," or some variation of it.

Function No. 2 should be reworded:

... continually monitors the Program, insuring that the objectives of the Program and the student outcomes are being met by the Program

Function No. 3 should be reworded:

... makes recommendations regarding program modifications and consults with the Program Director regarding implementation of program changes.

Changes in the Council on University Studies guidelines, such as those proposed above, are the exclusive purview of the Academic Senate and will require modification to the *Academic Senate "Bluebook" Supplement to the Bylaws* for committee structure of the Academic Senate. Where necessary, changes should be phased in during the first two years following the adoption of the Program.

Transfer Students

1. Students who transfer into Illinois State University and have completed an AA or AS degree at a Community College with which the University has an articulation agreement will have satisfied all General Education requirements except for Disciplines, Diversities, and Solutions: A Capstone Seminar.
2. Students who transfer into Illinois State University without a completed Associate's Degree will be responsible for completing all General Education courses and course categories for which no articulation is made on a course-by-course basis. Pre- and corequisite requirements for course categories may be adjusted to accommodate students transferring without a completed Associate's Degree. It is expected that these students will take, at least Disciplines, Diversities, and Solutions: A Capstone Seminar.
3. During the piloting and development of a new General Education Program, the University is to keep in close contact with Community Colleges, keeping them fully informed about the Program and its component parts.

Program Assessment

Assessment is an integral and on-going part of all curricular activities within the University. From the very beginning of the process of reviewing and revising the General Education Program, assessment has been a critical element in decision-making and planning. The result is a program structure and set of operating procedures that should provide a dynamic program that is open to change and improvement. The Director of General Education is responsible for General Education Program assessment in consultation with the Council on University Studies and the General Education Coordinating Committee.

Internal assessment will result from a number of activities, the most important of which will be General Education Faculty Development Seminars (see p. 13). Course content and methods will be systematically reviewed by faculty engaged in teaching the courses and by other interested faculty from throughout the University. The opportunity to make changes in program methods and contents will be present each year.

There will be formal annual assessment of the Program and its components. A cumulative assessment of the revised Program is to occur by the fifth year after full implementation. The fifth year is selected because the first class to complete the Program will have graduated. Additionally, the mechanisms designed to make the Program dynamic in method and content will have had an opportunity to work and be evaluated. In order to assess the content and operation of the Program, it is expected that no major structural changes be made in the Program during the time from its implementation to its fifth year of operation.

Pilot Implementation of the Proposed General Education Program

The Academic Affairs Committee recommends that the Senate endorse the need to change the existing University Studies Program and approve a pilot implementation of the proposed General Education program. At the conclusion of this piloting period, the Senate shall approve, modify, or reject the proposed General Education program.

Introduction: The Purpose of the Pilot Implementation

The proposed general education program has been developed through several iterations in order to accomplish the philosophy and goals of general education that were approved by the Senate. One of the central issues in most discussions of this program has been whether it would "work." Can these courses and this structure achieve the adopted philosophy? Can the courses that are proposed actually be developed and taught? What, specifically, will be their syllabi? What existing or new courses will be appropriate for the program? Will faculty be interested in and available to teach them? What are the ramifications for department, college, and university resources? How will the administrative structure of the program work?

The purpose of the Pilot Study will be to 1) provide structures and support for faculty to develop course syllabi; 2) develop instructional methods and media in support of the courses; 3) identify potential faculty for the pilot course offerings; 4) provide faculty development for individuals electing to teach courses; 5) establish administrative structures; and 6) offer the program on a limited basis as an alternative to the current University Studies Program. The Implementation Committee will assess the program by addressing the questions outlined in the previous paragraph. It will provide periodic reports to the university community and solicit responses. The ultimate purpose of the pilot implementation is to judge whether or not the program can be delivered as proposed.

The Pilot Implementation Committee will be appointed by the Provost and chaired by a representative of the Provost's office. Its membership will consist of 2 representatives from the Council on University Studies, 2 representatives from the University Studies Review Committee, 1 representative from the Academic Senate, and at least 1 representative from each of the five colleges and Milner Library. Since the Implementation Committee has the vital twin roles of providing intellectual leadership in course and program development and providing administrative oversight and guidance, these responsibilities will be an important selection criteria in the committee's formation. At least one member of the Implementation Committee shall serve on each Inner Core Course Development Committee and participate in each faculty development seminar during the piloting period. The responsibilities of this committee will end no later than one year after the program is approved (or upon the Senate's disapproval at the end of the pilot study). At that time the Council on University Studies (CUS) will assume oversight responsibilities, as suggested in the proposal.

Inner Core Course Development Committees will be structured as follows:

1. **Foundations of Inquiry:** A development committee consists of eight (8) faculty members with content expertise (3 from CAS, 1 each from the other four colleges, and 1 from Milner Library). Faculty members with content expertise apply for appointment to the committees. Applications are screened by the respective college deans and are submitted to the Director of General Education for selection. The development committee works with other university faculty to determine course content and identify and develop the methods used in the course.
2. **Language and Composition, Language and Communication, Math Literacy, Science Literacy:** A development committee for each course consists of eight (8) or fewer faculty members with content expertise (1 from each college, the rest reflecting discipline-specific interests and/or skills). Faculty members with content expertise apply for appointment to the committees. Applications are screened by the respective colleges and are submitted to the Director of General Education for selection. The development committees review the content of Foundations of Inquiry and work with other faculty to determine course content (identifying and including ways that link these courses with the pre- and corequisite courses), and identify and develop the methods used in the respective courses.

The Pilot Implementation: Two Views

For purposes of clarity, the Pilot Implementation is explained in two different fashions. The first is a strictly chronological timeline. The second is a table organized to show how each facet of the proposed General Education program is to be developed during the piloting period. The information in these two views is identical.

Pilot Implementation Timeline

April 1994

1. The Provost is charged with responsibility for directing the General Education Program
2. Provost appoints the Implementation Committee.
3. Provost appoints Course Development Committees for all Inner Core courses. Committees will consist of 8 faculty with content expertise and 1 member of the Implementation Committee. Each college will have at least 1 member on the committee, with the remaining members reflecting discipline-specific interests and skills. "Foundations" only will have 3 CAS faculty and 1 from each other college and Milner. Faculty with content expertise apply for appointment and are screened by their respect deans, who submit nominations to the Provost.
4. Inner Core Course Development Committees hold open forums to gather input from the University Community about these courses.

Summer 1994

1. Inner Core Course Development Committees receive stipends to meet, write sample syllabi, and become oriented to the course and General Education program. Science Literacy Committee, additionally, begins to develop general education guidelines for the laboratory course options. Science departments are involved in this process throughout.
2. Implementation Committee receives stipends to meet and develop working procedures and guidelines.

Fall 1994

1. Course Development Committees present course syllabi and descriptions to the university community, teach demonstration lessons, and hold open forums for input from faculty.
2. Decisions are made about how pilot offerings of these courses will satisfy existing university studies requirements so as not to "penalize" students who enroll in them.
3. A limited number of pilot sections of "Foundations" and "Language and Composition" courses are advertised as 89 courses for the spring of 1995.
4. Implementation Committee solicits applications for course development of sample offerings of Quantitative Reasoning and Language in Context (in the Outer Core).

Spring 1995

1. A limited number of sections of "Foundations" and "Language and Composition" are offered as 89 courses taught by members of the Course Development Committees.
2. Implementation Committee solicits applications for course development of sample offerings of United States Traditions and Individuals in Civic Life (in the Outer Core).
3. Implementation Committee solicits applications from additional faculty who wish to take part in summer orientation workshops for Inner Core courses.
4. Implementation Committee begins determining where and how Advanced Placement credit may appropriately fit the course categories.

Summer 1995

1. Development workshops are held for continuing "Foundations" and "Language and Composition" committee members and faculty. Stipends awarded. Workshop includes a review of the course as it has been taught.
2. Orientation workshops for faculty who will teach Inner Core courses for the first time during 1995-96. Stipends awarded.
3. Selected faculty receive stipends to develop Outer Core courses. These faculty take part in an orientation to the General Education program.
4. Implementation Committee receives stipends to draft a report and assessment of the program to date.

Fall 1995

1. Limited number of sections of all Inner Core courses are offered. Some sections of "Foundations"

and "Language and Composition" are taught by faculty different from those who have taught the courses previously. (These faculty have participated in summer workshops.)

2. Faculty who have developed Outer Core courses share information about those courses with the university community.
3. Implementation Committee solicits applications for course development of sample offerings of Knowing in the Disciplines, Disciplinary Knowledge and Dynamics of Culture, and Disciplinary Knowledge and the Quality of Life (in the Outer Core).
4. Implementation Committee approves selected Outer Core courses for pilot testing in the spring. If these are new courses, they are advertised as 89 courses.
5. Decisions are made about how pilot offerings of all approved courses will satisfy existing university studies requirements so as not to "penalize" students who enroll in them.

Spring 1996

1. Limited numbers of sections of all Inner Core courses are offered. Some sections are taught by faculty different from those who have taught the courses previously. (These faculty have participated in summer workshops.)
2. Selected Outer Core courses are offered.
3. "Foundations" Course Development Committee determines 1996-97 theme.
4. Implementation Committee solicits proposals 1) to develop interdisciplinary capstone seminars or 2) to develop or modify majors capstone courses that will satisfy general education requirements.
5. Implementation Committee solicits applications for summer Faculty Development Workshops and Orientations.

Summer 1996

1. Development workshops are held for continuing Inner Core committee members and faculty. Stipends awarded. Workshop includes a review of the course as it has been taught.
2. Orientation workshops for faculty who will teach Inner Core courses for the first time during 1995-96. Stipends awarded.
3. Selected faculty receive stipends to develop Outer Core courses. These faculty take part in an orientation to the General Education program.
4. Selected faculty or groups of faculty receive stipends to develop interdisciplinary capstone seminars or develop/modify departmental general education capstones. These faculty take part in an orientation to the General Education program.
5. Provost prepares an impact statement of the "costs" of the general education program, should it be adopted on a full scale.
6. Implementation Committee receives stipend to begin drafting a final report and recommendations. Report shall address questions raised in the "Introduction," above.

Fall 1996

1. Limited offerings of Inner Core courses continue. Some sections are taught by faculty different from those who have taught the courses previously. (These faculty have participated in summer workshops.)
2. Selected Outer Core courses are offered.
3. Faculty who have developed capstone seminars share syllabi and course descriptions with the university community and solicit input.
4. Implementation committee approves capstone seminars for pilot testing during the spring of 1997. New courses to be offered as 89 courses.
5. Provost solicits recommendations of faculty to serve on the General Education Coordinating Committee (see page 15 of the proposal), should the program receive final approval.
6. Implementation Committee issues final report on the piloting process and a recommendation to the Academic Senate.

Spring 1997

1. Academic Senate votes on final approval of the General Education Program.
2. New capstone seminars are offered.
3. Sample offerings of Inner and Outer Core Courses continue.

Time Period	Implementation Committee	<i>Inner Core</i> Foundations Language and Composition	<i>Inner Core</i> Language and Communication Math Literacy Science Literacy	<i>Outer Core</i> Quantitative Reasoning Language in Context	<i>Outer Core</i> United States Traditions Individuals and Civic Life	<i>Outer Core</i> Know/Disciplines Kiscip Know/ Culture Discip/Qual of life	Capstone
APRIL 1994	<p>*Provost charged with responsibility for directing General Education Program.</p> <p>*Provost appoints Implementation Committee.</p> <p>*Provost appoints Course Development Committees for all Inner Core courses. See guidelines at right. At least one member of Implementation Committee shall serve on each Course Development Committee.</p>	<p>*Provost appoints Course Development Committees for all Inner Core courses. Committees will consist of 8 faculty with content expertise and 1 member of Implementation Committee. Each college will have at least 1 member on the committee, with the remaining members reflecting discipline-specific interests and skills. "Foundations" only will have 3 CAS faculty and 1 from each other college and Milner. Faculty with content expertise apply for appointment and are screened by their respective deans, who submit nominations to the Provost.</p> <p>*Inner Core Course Development Committees hold open forums to gather input from University Community about these courses.</p>	<p>*Provost appoints Course Development Committees for all Inner Core courses. Committees will consist of 8 faculty with content expertise and 1 member of Implementation Committee. Each college will have at least 1 member on the committee, with the remaining members reflecting discipline-specific interests and skills. Faculty with content expertise apply for appointment and are screened by their respective deans, who submit nominations to the Provost.</p> <p>*Inner Core Course Development Committees hold open forums to gather input from University Community about these courses.</p>				

Time Period	Implementation Committee	<i>Inner Core</i> Foundations Language and Composition	<i>Inner Core</i> Language and Communication Math Literacy Science Literacy	<i>Outer Core</i> Quantative Reasoning Language in Context	<i>Outer Core</i> United States Traditions Individuals and Civic Life	<i>Outer Core</i> Know/Disciplines Kiscip Know/ Culture Discip/Qual of life	Capstone
S U M M E R 1 9 9 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Implementation Committee receives stipends to meet and develop working procedures and guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Inner Core Course Development Committees receive stipends to meet, write sample syllabi, and become oriented to course and General Education program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Inner Core Course Development Committees receive stipends to meet, write sample syllabi, and become oriented to course and General Education program •Science Literacy committee, additionally, begins to develop general education guidelines for the laboratory course options. Science departments are involved in this process throughout. 				
F A L L 1 9 9 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Decisions made about how pilot offerings of these courses will satisfy existing university studies requirements so as not to "penalize" students who enroll in them. •A limited number of pilot sections of "Foundations" and "Language and Composition" courses are advertised as 89 courses for spring of 1995. •Implementation Committee solicits applications for course development of sample offerings of Quantitative Reasoning and Language in Context (in Outer Core). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Course Development Committees present course syllabi and descriptions to university community, teach demonstration lessons, and hold open forums for input from faculty. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Implementation Committee solicits applications for course development of sample offerings of Quantitative Reasoning and Language in Context (in Outer Core). 			

Time Period	Implementation Committee	<i>Inner Core</i> Foundations Language and Composition	<i>Inner Core</i> Language and Communication Math Literacy Science Literacy	<i>Outer Core</i> Quantative Reasoning Language in Context	<i>Outer Core</i> United States Traditions Individuals and Civic Life	<i>Outer Core</i> Know/Disciplines Kiscip Know/ Culture Discip/Qual of life	Capstone
S P R I N G 1 9 9 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Implementation Committee solicits applications for course development of sample offerings of United States Traditions and Individuals in Civic Life (in Outer Core). •Implementation Committee solicits applications from additional faculty who wish to take part in summer orientation workshops for Inner Core courses. •Implementation Committee begins determining where and how Advanced Placement credit may appropriately fit the course categories 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A limited number of sections of "Foundations" and "Language and Composition" are offered as 89 courses taught by members of Course Development Committees. •Implementation Committee solicits applications from additional faculty who wish to take part in summer orientation workshops for Inner Core courses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Course Development Committees present syllabi and descriptions to university, teach demonstration lessons, hold faculty forums for input. •Implementation Committee solicits applications from additional faculty who wish to take part in summer orientation workshops for Inner Core courses. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Implementation Committee solicits applications for course development of sample offerings of United States Traditions and Individuals in Civic Life (in Outer Core) 		
S U M M E R 1 9 9 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Implementation Committee receives stipends to draft a report and assessment of program to date. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Development workshops are held for continuing "Foundations" and "Language and Composition" committee members and faculty. Stipends awarded. Workshop includes a review of course as it has been taught. •Orientation workshops for faculty who will teach Inner Core courses for first time during 1995-96. Stipends awarded. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Orientation workshops for faculty who will teach Inner Core courses for first time during 1995-96. Stipends awarded. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Selected faculty receive stipends to develop Outer Core courses. These faculty take part in an orientation to General Education program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Selected faculty receive stipends to develop Outer Core courses. These faculty take part in an orientation to General Education program. 		

Time Period	Implementation Committee	<i>Inner Core</i> Foundations Language and Composition	<i>Inner Core</i> Language and Communication Math Literacy Science Literacy	<i>Outer Core</i> Quantative Reasoning Language in Context	<i>Outer Core</i> United States Traditions Individuals and Civic Life	<i>Outer Core</i> Know/Disciplines Kiscip Know/ Culture Discip/Qual of life	Capstone
F A L L 1 9 9 5	<p>Implementation Committee solicits applications for course development of sample offerings of Knowing in Disciplines, Disciplinary Knowledge and Dynamics of Culture, and Disciplinary Knowledge and Quality of Life (in Outer Core).</p> <p>•Implementation Committee approves selected Outer Core courses for pilot testing in spring. If these are new courses, they are advertised as 89 courses.</p> <p>•Decisions are made about how pilot offerings of all approved courses will satisfy existing university studies requirements so as not to "penalize" students who enroll in them.</p>	<p>•Limited number of sections of all Inner Core courses are offered. Some sections of "Foundations" and "Language and Composition" are taught by faculty different from those who have taught courses previously. (These faculty have participated in summer workshops.)</p>	<p>•Limited number of sections of all Inner Core courses are offered. Some sections of "Foundations" and "Language and Composition" are taught by faculty different from those who have taught courses previously. (These faculty have participated in summer workshops.)</p>	<p>•Faculty who have developed Outer Core courses share information about those courses with university community.</p>	<p>•Faculty who have developed Outer Core courses share information about those courses with university community.</p>	<p>•Implementation Committee solicits applications for course development of sample offerings of Knowing in Disciplines, Disciplinary Knowledge and Dynamics of Culture, and Disciplinary Knowledge and Quality of Life (in Outer Core).</p>	

Time Period	Implementation Committee	<i>Inner Core</i> Foundations Language and Composition	<i>Inner Core</i> Language and Communication Math Literacy Science Literacy	<i>Outer Core</i> Quantative Reasoning Language in Context	<i>Outer Core</i> United States Traditions Individuals and Civic Life	<i>Outer Core</i> Know/Disciplines Kiscip Know/ Culture Discipi/Qual of life	Capstone
S P R I N G 1 9 9 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Implementation Committee solicits proposals 1) to develop interdisciplinary capstone seminars or 2) to develop or modify majors capstone courses that will satisfy general education requirements. •Implementation Committee solicits applications for summer Faculty Development Workshops and Orientations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Limited numbers of sections of all Inner Core courses are offered. Some sections are taught by faculty different from those who have taught courses previously. (These faculty have participated in summer workshops.) •"Foundations" Course Development Committee determines 1996-97 theme. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Limited numbers of sections of all Inner Core courses are offered. Some sections are taught by faculty different from those who have taught courses previously. (These faculty have participated in summer workshops.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Selected Outer Core courses are offered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Selected Outer Core courses are offered. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Implementation Committee solicits proposals 1) to develop interdisciplinary capstone seminars or 2) to develop or modify majors capstone courses that will satisfy general education requirements.
S U M M E R 1 9 9 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Provost prepares an impact statement of "costs" of general education program, should it be adopted on a full scale. •Implementation Committee receives stipend to begin final report and recommendations. Report shall address questions raised in "Introduction," above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Development workshops are held for continuing Inner Core committee members and faculty. Stipends awarded. Workshop includes a review of course as it has been taught. •Orientation workshops for faculty who will teach Inner Core courses for first time during 1995-96. Stipends awarded. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Development workshops are held for continuing Inner Core committee members and faculty. Stipends awarded. Workshop includes a review of course as it has been taught. •Orientation workshops for faculty who will teach Inner Core courses for first time during 1995-96. Stipends awarded. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Selected faculty receive stipends to develop Outer Core courses. These faculty take part in an orientation to General Education program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Selected faculty receive stipends to develop Outer Core courses. These faculty take part in an orientation to General Education program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Selected faculty receive stipends to develop Outer Core courses. These faculty take part in an orientation to General Education program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Selected faculty or groups of faculty receive stipends to develop interdisciplinary capstone seminars or develop, modify departmental general education capstones. These faculty take part in an orientation to General Education program.

General Education Pilot Implementation, approved by the Academic Senate February 23, 1994

Time Period	Implementation Committee	<i>Inner Core</i> Foundations Language and Composition	<i>Inner Core</i> Language and Communication Math Literacy Science Literacy	<i>Outer Core</i> Quantative Reasoning Language in Context	<i>Outer Core</i> United States Traditions Individuals and Civic Life	<i>Outer Core</i> Know/Disciplines Kiscip Know/ Culture Discip/Qual of life	Capstone
FALL 1996	<p>Implementation committee approves capstone seminars for pilot testing during spring of 1997. New courses to be offered as 89 courses.</p> <p>*Provost solicits recommendations of faculty to serve on General Education Coordinating Committee (see page 27 of proposal), should program receive final approval.</p> <p>*Implementation Committee issues final report on piloting process and a recommendation to Academic Senate.</p>	<p>*Limited offerings of Inner Core courses continue. Some sections are taught by faculty different from those who have taught courses previously. (These faculty have participated in summer workshops.)</p>	<p>*Limited offerings of Inner Core courses continue. Some sections are taught by faculty different from those who have taught courses previously. (These faculty have participated in summer workshops.)</p>	<p>*Selected Outer Core courses are offered.</p>	<p>*Selected Outer Core courses are offered.</p>	<p>*Selected Outer Core courses are offered.</p>	<p>*Faculty who have developed capstone seminars share syllabi and course descriptions with university community and solicit input.</p>
SPRING 1997	<p>Academic Senate votes on final approval of General Education Program.</p>	<p>*Sample offerings of Inner and Outer Core Courses continue.</p>	<p>*Sample offerings of Inner and Outer Core Courses continue.</p>	<p>*Sample offerings of Inner and Outer Core Courses continue.</p>	<p>*Sample offerings of Inner and Outer Core Courses continue.</p>	<p>*Sample offerings of Inner and Outer Core Courses continue.</p>	<p>*New capstone seminars are offered.</p>