ATTENDANCE

✓ Mr. Niraj J. Antani (USG, Philosophy, Political Science)
Dr. Annette L. Beatty, (Fisher College of Business)
✓ Dr. Wayne E. Carlson, (Dean, Undergraduate Education, Academic Affairs)
✓ Dr. Alexis C. Collier (Academic Affairs)
✓ Dr. Prabu David (Communication)
✓ Dr. Esther E. Gottlieb (International Affairs)
✓ Dr. Christopher F. Highley (English)
✓ Dr. Mary Ellen Jenkins (Arts and Sciences)
Dr. Thomas R. Lemberger (Physics)
Dr. Daniel A. Mendelsohn (Mechanical Engineering)
✓ Dr. Edna A. Menke (Nursing)
✓ Dr. Myroslava M. Mudrak (History of Art)
✓ Dr. Mari Noda, (East Asian Languages and Literature)
✓ Dr. Sally V. Rudmann (Allied Medicine)
✓ Dr. Mark W. Shanda (Theatre), Chair
Dr. Elliot E. Slotnick (Graduate School)
✓ Dr. W. Randy Smith (Academic Affairs)
Mr. Zachary H. Usmani (USG, Sociology)
✓ Dr. Harald E. F. Vaessin (Molecular Genetics)
✓ Dr. John D. Wanzer (Enrollment services and Undergraduate Education)
✓ Dr. Carl R. Zulauf (Agricultural, Environmental and Developmental Economics)

Guests:

Dr. Steven S. Fink (Provost Faculty Fellow)
Dr. Terry L. Gustafson (Associate Dean, Arts and Sciences)
Dr. Kathleen M. Hallihan (Arts and Sciences)

Mr. Jay V. Johnson (Academic Affairs)
Mr. Zachary H. Usmani (USG, Sociology)
Mr. Jay V. Johnson (Academic Affairs)

NOTES

The Chair of the University-level Advisory Committee for the General Education Curriculum (ULAC-GEC) provided introductory comments. He suggested the committee may need to focus on a limited set of issues in considering the semester architecture for the GEC because of time constraints and the desire to have a recommendation by the end of the quarter. Further, it is unclear whether enough new kinds of courses could be developed by the time a new model would need to be implemented. He indicated he had developed a template to facilitate the discussion. The template is a slightly modified version of the current GEC and maintains many of the same categories. However, it is somewhat simplified and allows for more student choice. The Chair also presented alternative frameworks for conceptualizing university-wide requirements. In the past an Arts and Sciences (A&S) model was presented for the university as a whole. Other colleges then needed to present arguments for any modifications. The result is that most
programs outside A&S have reduced requirements, notably in language and capstone categories. Another approach would be to forward a minimum core that all students would be expected to complete, and other colleges, including A&S, could then require more. The latter model allows the institution to present a simplified core for everyone.

Professor Zulauf next provided new updates from the task force which is developing program-level outcomes. The prior version listed several expected outcome statements organized by Bloom’s learning taxonomy of knowledge, skills, and attitudes/perspectives. Based on prior committee feedback, he presented two alternative formats, one which combined outcomes for skills and perspectives under a single heading and one which maintained the listing separately. After discussion, the consensus was to have three separate headings of breadth, skills, and perspectives, but continue to find a format that did not appear to advantage one over the other. The committee was also presented with alternative wording for outcomes related to diversity and citizenship. After discussion, the expectation for becoming an ‘engaged global citizen’ was moved to the beginning aspiration section of the document. Alternative wording was also accepted for diversity. Professor Zulauf will make the recommended changes in the documents.

Dr. Joseph E. Steinmetz, A&S Executive Dean, joined the committee to talk about his views of general education and any concerns/issues he had, particularly those related to the budget. He is a strong supporter of liberal education, and believes students should have the best liberal education possible to prepare them for a life of change. He addressed credit hour production and finances, and reinforced the idea that the curriculum should not be constrained by current college boundaries within A&S. In the responsibility management center (RMC) model, A&S is the center, not divisions or departments. Therefore the curriculum should be developed as the one to benefit students the most. He did caution, however, that it would be problematic for A&S if requirements changed such that overall credit hour production within A&S declined. Based on the current overall revenue stream, several long-term commitments have been made for faculty and select programs. A&S has few other sources of revenue and long-term planning is essential in RMC models. In that vein, programs outside A&S that offer general education courses via distance learning may need to be monitored if, for instance, enrollments spike in those offerings and decline concomitantly in A&S.

Dean Steinmetz was asked about other concerns he might have with revision to the GEC. The one he has heard since coming to Ohio State is the issue of stewardship of and expertise for delivering traditional A&S curriculum. There should be oversight to ensure that those who have expertise in a discipline are those who deliver it; thus, liberal education should be taught by those in liberal arts programs rather than professional ones. When asked about areas he thought students needed more work in, he indicated mathematics in particular and science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) disciplines generally. He noted his response was based on experiences at other institutions and nationwide given he has not been at Ohio State long enough to comment on student skills here. In closing, the Dean was hopeful that with the recognition of A&S as the Center for RMC funding, the faculty could use the semester conversion to consider interdisciplinary innovation and creative use of the May term rather than focus attention on budgetary matters.

The committee next turned its attention to two templates to consider for a proposed GEC architecture. The overarching framework of the templates maintained much of the integrity of the current GEC template but was simplified. The templates deviated from the current GEC in that they constituted a smaller core for all students with the assumption that additional requirements
could be added. For example, foreign language requirements were not included in a core but were assumed to remain for Art and Science majors as in the current model. Also, one of the templates included a capstone or capstone like-experience.

The committee began deliberating the templates. Whether a capstone or capstone experience could be delivered was raised. All agreed the concept of a senior-level integrated experience had merit; however, implementation of the current capstone requirement into the current curriculum for all students has not been successful. Another point brought up was that the Ohio Board of Regents guidelines were not explicitly met for the proposed social science distribution requirement, although a case could be made for an exception given the overall strength of program. Also, members noted that the requirements in the templates were based on the number of courses that would be required within a category assuming three credit-hour semester courses. Several programs that effectively control delivery of categories revealed they were planning to adopt five credit-hour semester courses rather than the three credit-hour assumption for the conversion. Doing so would effectively raise requirements. Among those categories expecting to offer five credit-hour semester courses were the natural sciences, languages, mathematics, and writing. Five credit-hour courses, then, would necessarily impact the template. The committee will continue its deliberation of the templates at its next meeting.