Proposal for Common Baccalaureate Requirements and General Baccalaureate Education at UAF

General Education Revitalization Committee March 2014

Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

The General Education Revitalization Committee proposes a new set of requirements for students attaining baccalaureate degrees at UAF, facilitating students' achievement of the **Learning Outcomes** (see Chapter 2) passed by Faculty Senate in May 2011. The proposal emphasizes the traditional and enduring goals of general education viewed broadly: students gain exposure to a broad array of disciplines and content areas and acquire essential skills in scientific inquiry, quantitative literacy, critical and creative thinking, and effective communication in a variety of modes. The proposal reflects the view of the committee that general education should take place throughout a student's baccalaureate degree and not be restricted to the first two years or to a small selection of lower-division courses. However, this proposal also respects the desire of the Board of Regents to use the term "general education" to refer to a collection of lower-division courses that can be tightly aligned across UAA, UAF and UAS.

With these goals and challenges in mind, the proposal contains a more flexible and customizable set of requirements for baccalaureate students, encompassing a broad sense of general education throughout the baccalaureate degree experience, which we are calling **Common Baccalaureate Requirements**.

The proposal for new Common Baccalaureate Requirements (discussed in detail in Chapter 3) consists of the following:

I. General education requirements

- 34 credits described in University Regulations under "general education" (https://www.alaska.edu/bor/policy/10-04.pdf)
- fulfillment of Learning Outcomes 1 and 2
- prohibition against counting the same course for more than one GE requirement

II. Civic engagement requirements

- fulfill Learning Outcome 3
- consist of courses identified with attributes
- may overlap with General Education courses, degree requirements, or major requirements

III. Integrative learning requirements

- fulfill Learning Outcome 4
- will be satisfied only by upper-division courses
- subsume and replace current W and O
- include a capstone requirement

Although the new requirements **Civic Engagement** and **Integrative Learning** are not classified as "general education" in the constrained vision of the University Regulation, we view them as General Education writ broadly, and they are *essential* to the overall value of this effort at General Education reform. They provide students with structured opportunities to: 1) use what they have learned through their lower-division "general education" coursework to become more engaged and aware citizens, better able to not only function but to flourish in a diverse and rapidly changing society; 2) comprehend the particular and universal qualities of Alaska and the Circumpolar North; and 3) make active and practical connections among the various components of their baccalaureate education.

The new proposal addresses the following goals:

- integrate the learning outcomes into common baccalaureate requirements
- synthesize content and theory
- broaden general education course choice and increase student interest in general education courses
- increase faculty opportunities to contribute to the common baccalaureate requirements
- facilitate degree completion
- reduce credit load of the General Education Requirements, while following University regulations.

Chapter 2 Learning Outcomes

In May 2011, UAF Faculty Senate approved the following Learning Outcomes based on the AACU LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes (http://www.aacu.org/leap/vision.cfm):

2.1 Build knowledge of Human Institutions, Socio-Cultural Processes, and the Physical and Natural World

through the study of the natural and social sciences, technologies, mathematics, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts.

Competence will be demonstrated

for the foundational information in each subject area, its context and significance, and the methods used in advancing each.

2.2 Develop Intellectual and Practical Skills across the curriculum

including inquiry and analysis, critical and creative thinking, problem solving, written and oral communication, information literacy, technological competence, and collaborative learning.

Proficiency will be demonstrated

across the curriculum through critical analysis of proffered information, well-reasoned solutions to problems or inferences drawn from evidence, effective written and oral communication, and satisfactory outcomes of group projects.

2.3 Acquire Tools for Effective Civic Engagement

in local through global contexts, including ethical reasoning, intercultural competence, and knowledge of Alaska and Arctic issues.

Facility will be demonstrated

through analyses of issues including dimensions of ethics, human and cultural diversity, conflicts and interdependencies, globalization, and sustainability.

2.4 Integrate and apply learning,

including synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies, adapting them to new settings, questions, and responsibilities, and forming a foundation for lifelong learning.

Preparation will be demonstrated

through production of a creative or scholarly project that requires broad knowledge, appropriate technical proficiency, information collection, synthesis, interpretation, presentation, and reflection.

Chapter 3
Proposal: Common Baccalaureate Requirements

The Common Baccalaureate Requirements consist of three distinct parts: (I) General Education Requirements, (II) Civic Engagement Requirements and (III) Integrative Learning Requirements. By satisfying these three parts, students will fulfill Learning Outcomes 1 – 4.

Note that in addition to the common baccalaureate requirements outlined here, specific degree programs and majors have their own additional requirements.

3.1 General Education Requirements

Students will satisfy

Learning Outcome 1

Build knowledge of Human Institutions, Socio-Cultural Processes, and the Physical and Natural World

Fulfilled by taking the following:

- One course in the Natural Sciences (4 credits; includes a lab)
- One course in Mathematics (3–4 credits)
- One course in the Arts (3 credits)
- Two courses in the Social Sciences (6 credits)
- Two courses in the Humanities (6 credits)

Total credits to satisfy Learning Outcome 1: 22–23 credits

Learning Outcome 2: Develop intellectual and practical skills across the curriculum.

Fulfilled by the following:

- Two courses in Writing (6 credits; currently courses satisfying this requirement are English 111X, English 211X/English 213X)
- One course in Communication (3 credits; current courses that satisfy this

requirement are COMM 121X/COMM 131X/COMM 141X)

- One Quantitative Literacy course; anywhere across the curriculum (3-4 credits)
- Passing the Library Skills competency test, or taking LS 101 as a pre- or co-requisite with ENGL 211X/213X (or any course deemed applicable to the second Writing requirement)

Total credits to satisfy Learning Outcome 2: 12 –14 credits.

Total General Education Credits: 34–37 credits

No course may satisfy more than one general education requirement.

Commentary: Learning Outcome 1

- Courses that satisfy Learning Outcome 1 must satisfy the current or revised[1] University Regulation concerning General Education courses. The current proposal suggests that the list of allowed courses be as broad as possible, while meeting the applicable University Regulation. We anticipate that many of these courses will also have attributes (A) (C) (E) that satisfy Learning Outcome 3. Many courses at the 100- and 200-level currently noted with (h) or (s) in the catalog could satisfy this Learning Outcome, but each course would need to be evaluated—ideally by faculty in the corresponding discipline—as to its suitability before it is approved to satisfy Learning Outcome 1.
- Students will be offered lists of qualified courses in each content area. Courses will be "nominated" by academic programs and departments for approval by the appropriate bodies as designated by the Faculty Senate.
- This proposal allows taking two social science courses or two humanities courses in the same discipline. That will allow students whose majors lie outside of those content areas to gain depth or breadth in the fields most relevant to their interests and areas of specialization.
- Arts courses are those which "introduce the student to the methods and context of the arts as academic disciplines as opposed to those that only emphasize acquisition of skills." Our intention is to exclude three semesters of a one-credit purely skills-acquisition course (e.g., Choir of the North) but to include courses in arts appreciation, music history, art history (etc.) courses, as well as courses that combine theory and practice, as do current offerings such as Beginning Drawing, Music Fundamentals, Introduction to Acting, or Introduction to Creative Writing: Poetry. Having

students take courses that combine skills acquisition with academic theory is a desirable outcome in light of the new Learning Outcomes.

Commentary: Learning Outcome 2

- Students would be provided with a list of courses that satisfy the Quantitative Literacy requirement; such courses would need to be approved by a faculty-led oversight committee as satisfying the Q requirement.
- In this proposal, the quantitative literacy course requirement is a broadening of the requirements in the current Baccalaureate Core, in place of the second currently required natural science lab course. See the rubric in Appendix A for a description of what quantitative literacy courses should be. *It does not replace the second math course required by the BA and BS degrees.* In the current proposal, to satisfy the Common Baccalaureate Requirements, a student could take 2 math courses and one lab science course, 2 lab science courses and one math, or one lab science, one math, and one other course identified as satisfying the Quantitative Literacy requirement. However, that student would also have to take an additional math course to satisfy BA or BS requirements, and additional natural science courses to satisfy the BS degree requirements.
- Although the writing requirement looks the same as in the old Baccalaureate Core, the University Writing Program has revised or is in the process of revising the ENGL 111/211/213 courses to better meet the needs of Learning Outcome 2; see Appendix A.
- Students will meet the information literacy requirement by either passing the competency test or taking LS 101 either before or concurrently with ENG 211/213.
- There are discussions for broadening the list of writing courses that satisfy the writing component of Learning Outcome 2 in a more discipline-based manner, while still incorporating critical thinking in an assessable way. Departments and colleges are encouraged to work with the Writing Program to assure that these course revisions address the needs of their students.

3.2 Civic Engagement Requirements

Students will satisfy

Learning Outcome 3: Acquire tools for effective civic engagement

Fulfilled by taking one course per Attribute anywhere across the curriculum with each of the following attributes:

- (E) Civic Engagement (3 credits)
- (A) Alaska and the Circumpolar North (3 credits)
- (D) Intercultural Competence and Diversity (3 credits)

Total credits in addition to the GER to satisfy Learning Outcome 3: 0 – 9 credits

Commentary

- Students will be provided with lists of courses satisfying the Civic Engagement Requirements and such courses will also be indicated in their catalog descriptions. Faculty Senate committees will determine whether a course should have a certain attribute.
- Courses taken to satisfy the Civic Engagement Requirements may also satisfy General Education Requirements or Integrative Learning Requirements (IL) (or both, potentially, although that seems unlikely as GE requirements are usually at the lower-division and IL requirements are at the upper-division); they may satisfy a student's specific degree requirements; they may satisfy a student's major requirements. The Civic Engagement attribute has been designed to be satisfied either by coursework or experiential learning with a strong academic component.
- Although Learning Outcome 3 references "Alaska and Arctic Issues," we named the attribute as "Alaska and the Circumpolar North" to be more inclusive of non-arctic northern regions.
- Although some courses may have multiple attributes, a student must take one course per attribute, for a total of 9 credits in this section.
- These requirements should not necessitate taking additional credits to satisfy a student's common baccalaureate requirements, although depending on the choices, the courses could increase that total.
- *The proposal expects that many students will choose to take courses for the GER (Outcomes 1 and 2) that also are marked A, E, or D, thus satisfying the requirements for Outcome 3 with the same courses.*
- Majors are not required to offer courses marked A, E, or D.
- We expect that foreign languages, Alaska Native or American Sign Language, and many Study Abroad programs would satisfy the D requirement.

3.3 Integrative Learning Requirements

Students will satisfy

Learning Outcome 4: Integrate and apply learning

Fulfilled by:

- A capstone course or experiential learning opportunity (e.g. internship) in student's major or program (0 – 3 credits)
- 3 courses marked C that integrate several kinds of communication practices with upper-division content, typically in a student's major.

Total credits to satisfy Learning Outcome 4: 6 – 9 credits

Commentary

- Courses that satisfy Learning Outcome 4 occur at the upper-division level.
- Typically, capstone courses will also be C courses
- Although writing is required for C courses, disciplines need the ability to tailor the amount and kind of required writing for C courses to the needs and standards of the particular discipline. Departments and majors who feel that their graduates need a certain amount of writing can offer and require very writing-intensive C courses in their major, while departments and majors that want to focus more on multimodal communication can offer C courses targeting this sort of communication.
- Non-written forms of communication may include, but are not limited to: oral presentations, discussions, training, videography, podcasting, or performance.

Commentary: Associate degrees

Students pursuing associates degrees and certificates also have general education requirements. We anticipate that the "General Education Requirements" will satisfy this requirement; however, individual degrees could choose to include some or all of the Civic Engagement Requirements as well. GERC understands that there is a great deal of variation among AA, AS, AAS

degrees and the various certificate programs.. It is likely that AA and AS students will transition rather smoothly to this new version of General Education requirements; while the situation as regards AAS and certificate students will need more study, including active input and guidance from CRCD faculty.

Chapter 4: Rationale

4.1 Philosophy

We assert that it is important for general education to be integrated throughout the four years of a baccalaureate degree, rather than restricted to lower-division courses ideally taken during the first two years. However, we recognize that there is a desire on the part of the Board of Regents for a set of tightly aligned "general education" courses; these are the courses that we are calling "general education" in the current proposal.

We view it as desirable that students have an opportunity to choose courses that they are interested in to fulfill common baccalaureate requirements, while still maintaining the goal that students be exposed to a broad variety of disciplines, especially in the traditional disciplines of the liberal arts (mathematics, natural science, humanities, social science, arts).

We view as valuable that faculty from across the university not just those in CLA and CNSM have the opportunity to contribute in a meaningful way to Common Baccalaureate Requirements at UAF.

4.2 Background

The Core Revitalization and Assessment Group (CRAG) started meeting in 2008 and their work culminated in the approval of the Learning Outcomes by Faculty Senate in May 2011. The General Education Revitalization Committee (GERC) was formed in 2011, with the charge of determining how best to implement the outcomes. It met biweekly to weekly, with a rotating collection of faculty; faculty lists are available at the Faculty Senate GERC website (http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/facultysenate/committees/curricular-affairs-commit/13-14_gerc/, with links to prior years).

4.2.1 Faculty Survey

In order to judge whether there was consensus on whether to change, and if so, what to change, in 2012, GERC developed a faculty survey, which was distributed via email to all faculty in October, 2012. We received 252 responses to the survey, of which 149 were tenured or tenure-track, 95 were non-tenure-track positions (adjuncts, term-funded assistant professors, or instructors), and 7 were "other".

The faculty survey asked, in summary,

1. How many credits should be required for general education?
2. What's the best way to fulfill Learning Outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4
3. Where should Learning Outcome 3 be satisfied (major, college, etc.)?
4. How should Learning Outcome 4 be achieved?
5. How do the Ws and Os do at teaching writing and oral communication?

(The complete text of the questions of the survey and all of the aggregate data and comments are available on request.)

Sixty percent of respondents wanted to reduce the number of required General Education credits to no more than 36, with a mild plurality wanting no more than 34 credits. A majority of respondents thought that Learning Outcomes 1, 2, and 3 should be satisfied "by a broader, more flexible set of courses" (59.5%, 51.0%, and 54.8%, respectively). There was no consensus (department? College? university-wide?) on how Learning Outcome 3 should be administered and assessed. Fifty-six percent of respondents thought that Learning Outcome 4 could be satisfied with a capstone class, and almost as many also liked submission of a thesis or project or completion of an internship, with most respondents feeling that Learning Outcome 4 should happen in a student's major (64.8%).

About 50% of respondents disagreed, strongly disagreed or only partially agreed with the statement that "current Writing Intensive course requirement makes an effective contribution to training students to write at the level expected of college graduates", and almost 60% disagreed, strongly disagreed or only partially agreed with the corresponding statement for O courses. Faculty comments regarding the efficacy of the W and O courses varied from suggesting that they be deleted, to saying they weren't rigorous or plentiful enough, to wanting more integration of writing throughout the curriculum.

Forty-five percent of respondents felt that substantial revision was needed to the current core, and another 35% wanted at least some revision.

Based on the responses to the survey, GERC developed the following working

guidelines:

- General Education required courses should be reduced to 34 credits, if possible.
- Choice and flexibility for general education courses should be substantially increased
- We needed a way to achieve Learning Outcome 3 that did not require additional credits but that also integrated these courses across the university
- We should reconsider the W and O courses

From these working guidelines, GERC developed a number of models for how to implement the learning outcomes, discussed in the next section.

4.2.2 Models

From the initial discussions, GERC was trying to balance the competing tensions of implementing the learning outcomes while being cognizant of the requirements for general education imposed by the Board of Regents and university regulations.

In our discussions, we developed several models for revising the current Core. Potential models included

- A "tight core" model, with required courses to be taken at the first-, second- and upper-division levels

- A "broad distribution" model: take one course in each of a list of categories, including categories that would satisfy Learning Outcome 3

- A broad distribution with required capstone and some requirement taken via distance delivery

- A distribution model where each course satisfying general education was paired with an attribute that it would satisfy

- A broad distribution of general education courses, including requiring a course with each of 4 attributes, along with a required First Year Experience, and no Ws and Os

We converged on the model proposed in this document because we felt that it did the best job of being sensitive to the desire of faculty to reduce credits going towards

general education, while maintaining desirable breadth in the disciplines of the liberal arts; mandating incorporation of the "civic engagement tools" into common baccalaureate requirements, while allowing students to take them where convenient for their own particular educational plan; and of updating the Ws and Os (which in the survey were identified as being problematic in their current incarnation, for various reasons) to better incorporate modes of communication other than pure research-paper-writing while still maintaining appropriate writing- and communications-standards at the upper-division.

4.3 Benefits of the current proposal

4.3.1 Learning Outcomes

The consensus from the faculty survey was that the current Baccalaureate Core did not address the new learning outcomes. The current proposal explicitly addresses the learning outcomes. In particular, it introduces methods to satisfy the Civic Engagement outcome, which was not part of the old Core at all, and it makes explicit the requirement—which was being implemented by some departments and programs as part of their major requirements (but not all) that students integrate and apply learning as part of their the upper-division requirements.

4.3.2 Greater student flexibility

In the faculty survey and in discussions with students and advisors, one of the main frustrations with the current core has been its rigidity. This proposal allows for student choice in selecting courses to fulfill the Learning Outcomes. However, it will also be straightforward in allowing for certain programs to mandate that students in their programs take certain courses to fulfill the various requirements if such structure is desirable for that major.

4.3.3 Connection to the UA and UAF mission

The current proposal, more than the existing Core Curriculum, also speaks directly to certain aspects of the mission of the University of Alaska and of UAF in particular.

The UA mission:

> The University of Alaska inspires learning, and advances and disseminates knowledge through teaching, research, and public

service, emphasizing the North and its diverse peoples.

The UAF mission:

> The University of Alaska Fairbanks is a Land, Sea, and Space Grant university and an international center for research, education, and the arts, emphasizing the circumpolar North and its diverse peoples. UAF integrates teaching, research, and public service as it educates students for active citizenship and prepares them for lifelong learning and careers.

The Civic Engagement requirement in particular emphasizes "the circumpolar north and its diverse peoples" through the (A) and possibly (D) attributes and "educates students for active citizenship" in part, through the (E) requirement. The general education requirement and integrative learning requirements "prepare[s] [students] for lifelong learning and careers".

4.4 Assessment

UAF's assessment of Common Baccalaureate Requirements adheres to the following guidelines:

- Assessment will take place through "signature assignments" that will be completed by students in courses that meet the A, D, E, and C attributes. A sample signature assignment for an E course follows.

- Assessment will be carried out in a three-year cycle: C outcomes assessed in the first year, D in the second year, A and E both in the third year. Accreditation is on a seven-year cycle, which would allow each outcome to be assessed twice during the accreditation cycle. Assignments will be completed and collected every semester (not only in years in which the particular attribute is assessed).

- Critical thinking will be assessed in all four outcomes.

- The same committees that approve courses for the attributes will also be responsible for their assessment. Assignments will be chosen randomly from a number of courses.

- Assessment is not done for its own sake: it is a part of curricular improvement. Assessment results should be used to revise guidelines and procedures for courses meeting particular outcomes.

- As an additional assessment measure, selected first year students and seniors take the ETS proficiency profile each year. "The ETS® Proficiency Profile was developed to measure and demonstrate the outcomes of general education programs in order to help institutions improve the quality of instruction and

learning. It is a test of college-level skills in reading, writing, critical thinking and mathematics designed to measure the academic skills developed through general education courses."

4.4.1 Signature assignments:

A "signature assignment" is an assignment designed to collect evidence and measure students' performance on specific learning outcomes. While a signature assignment can be created and completed solely for the purpose of outcomes assessment, it makes most sense if it is integrated or embedded into the course itself. For General Education assessment, we ask that instructors follow these general guidelines in designing the signature assignment, but we strongly encourage them to tailor the assignment so that it is useful to them and their students in the context of the course. The assignment may or may not be graded as part of the course, but the grade will not be factored into assessment.

4.4.1.1 Sample signature assignment guidelines for A, D, and E courses:

The assignment should be a 750-1000 word paper, written in edited U.S. English, that asks students to:

- Using the tools and knowledge acquired in the course, analyze a conflict, problem, or area of controversy (the details of this conflict will be determined by the instructor and will reflect the content of the course and the outcomes of the attribute)
- Discuss more than one perspective on the issue
- Propose a potential solution, supported by evidence
- If outside resources are required, students should be instructed to practice accurate and ethical referencing/ citation practices of source material as they pertain to source authority, academic honesty, and personal credibility.

4.4.1.2 Sample signature assignment guidelines for C courses:

A signature "C" assignment would be one that asks the student to reflect in writing on the choices behind a "C" paper, presentation, or project.

The assignment should be a 750-1000 word reflective paper, written in edited U.S. English, that asks students to do one of the following:

- Select at least one moment in a critical or creative process where a decision was made and discuss its relevance to the final product (presentation, paper, or project).

- Imagine a different audience or medium for the paper, presentation, or project and ask students to discuss what they would change about it in order to make the paper, project, or presentation successful in this new situation.

- Compare two different papers, presentations or projects and explain how certain features of these examples reflect audience, purpose and context.

4.4.2 SAMPLE SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENT for CIVIC ENGAGEMENT (E)*

*This is not from any particular class. Individual instructors will be encouraged to design their own assignment based on the content and needs of their course. We wrote it to show the scope of the assignment and how we should be prompting students. This prompt reflects best practices for signature assignments as it draws from the rubrics and has clear expectations as to the kind of writing we seek to elicit from students.

Compose a 750-1000 U.S. edited English written argument about a particular academic value and the role it could or does play in a context outside the university.

This reading is a sample of the kind of argument the instructor is expecting for this paper. You do not have to cite Hill, unless you decide to for the purposes of your argument.

The attached article was chosen from *Academe* magazine written by San Jose State University History Professor Patricia Evridge Hill titled "Making a Case for Academic Values." Hill's argument draws on her identity as an academic, as she discusses the patterns and values of thinking in her discipline of history and then applies them to "make a case" generally for academic values in 2014.

Think critically about "academic values." Are there one or two which seem to be the most compelling for the relationship between the University where Hill works as a seminar leader and the courtroom where Hill finds herself as a jury foreman? Use this question as a way of leading you to the values you will discuss in your paper—you do not need to argue the same values as Hill unless you find them compelling.

Keep in mind:

- University Audience is familiar with this article, but perhaps not in the particular way ***you understand an aspect of it*** as being important or worthwhile exploring.

- Purpose is to take a position on the role of Academic Values outside the classroom.

- In preparing to write your argument, you should recognize that academic values are not necessarily the "norm" in contexts outside of the classroom, because they

will conflict with other values. You will need to resolve this conflict in your paper and take a position on academic values. You should use specific evidence for your position. Your evidence should come from your experience. You should discuss the alternatives to your position in the argument.

4.5 Transferability

We believe that the current proposal allows greater flexibility for students transferring from outside the UA system than the current Core. Transfer of the General Education requirements (Learning Outcomes 1 and 2) should be fairly straightforward. Students will still need to complete the Civic Engagement and Integrative Learning requirements (Learning Outcomes 3 and 4) to complete a baccalaureate degree, much as they need to fulfill W, O, and upper-division Ethics requirements now. We propose that a course that transfers as a substitute for a UAF course that bears an attribute should fulfill the attribute requirement. For example, if a student transfers a course to UAF that is judged to be a substitute for WGS 201 (Introduction to Women's and Gender Studies) and if WGS 201 carries a (D) attribute, then the student is considered to have met the (D) requirement. C attributes would benefit from similar treatment. If the syllabus of a transferred upper-division course indicates sufficient, graded and guided training in relevant modes of communication it may be applied to that requirement.

4.6 Responses to questions and issues from previous drafts of the proposal

4.6.1 GELO and University Requirements

The current proposal allows more flexibility in the choice of courses allowed to satisfy Learning Outcome 1 than current University Regulation would permit. However, there is a parallel inter-University initiative to revise University Regulation on general education that will include a broadening of the description of courses that satisfy "general education" requirements. The current proposal is/will be in compliance with the revised regulations. If the revisions do not pass, the GERC proposal would still work using the current definitions of humanities and social sciences courses.

Appendix E includes the draft of University Regulations that was/will be/is in process to be sent to Faculty Alliance.

4.6.2 Critical thinking

The development and application of critcal thinking abilities are essential components and goals of higher education. GERC, following AAC&U, believes that critical thinking cannot be taught or evaluated in isolation from the attainment of other skills but *is* a process which can be assessed through student writing. A process to achieve this, as mandated by Learning Outcome 2 is well underway.

This spring, the University Writing Program is meshing two AAC&U rubrics on Critical Thinking and Writing. We will use the new rubrics as a tool to assess lower-division, or General Education, writing requirements. The method for data collection is Google Drive, through which each writing class creates a course portfolio of three assignments. In May, five English 111X sections will be selected, and five each from 211X and 213X. Also in May, Dr. Sarah Stanley will hold a calibration training session, where the assessing committee will learn about the rubric. Finally, the trained committee will review the selected data and apply the rubric. After this assessment process, we will have evidence of students' critical thinking and writing which we intend to ground discussions about writing at UAF. Please contact Sarah Stanley, Director of University Writing for details or questions.

Currently, our first year writing sequence draws on philosopher John Dewey's image-metaphor of a "forked road" situation for the critical thinking process. Dewey uses the idea of being at a crossroads and the decision-making that occurs at a crossroads as a metaphor for the cognitive processes that form a critical thinking process. First, the traveler/writer must recognize that there is a choice to be made. This metaphor presents decision making as a constructed process, located in a specific time and place under certain conditions. Embedded in the metaphor is the fact that we also are a result of past decisions that lead to the "forked road" situation and in order to improve our journeys we should learn from our past experiences.

Faculty at UAF may recognize the process as one that is used in scientific thinking, creative thinking, and collaboration as observation, analysis, synthesis and reflection. What we do in 111X is e-x-t-e-n-d that metaphor for our curriculum, and although students are always generating options, analyzing them, synthesizing them, and reflecting on their reasons, each unit in the 111x curriculum highlights one of these processes. The units each culminate in a "capstone" paper/project that draws on inductive analysis and challenges students to take risks as they explore academic writing. In the 21/3-level writing curriculum, students are assigned deductive micro-writing and two capstone projects which challenge them to write arguments for diverse audiences.

4.6.3 BA and BS requirements

Addressing the current BA and BS requirements is beyond the scope of GERC's charge, and thus beyond the scope of this document. However, we have received recommendations from faculty that the acquisition of foreign languages, Alaska Native languages and American Sign Language be better supported and integrated into the baccalaureate experience. Therefore, we hope that Faculty Senate will separately consider a new BA requirement of two semesters of a foreign language (including Alaska Native Languages and American Sign Language). We also encourage any committee(s) that may take up this issue to introduce such a requirement in ways that would complement, coincide or overlap with the humanities General Education Requirements; i.e. assure that it is not considered an additional and burdensome requirement by students, faculty and advisors

The BS granting departments might also want to explicitly require that a BS student takes three semesters of a natural science lab course, including a two-semester sequence, especially in the situation where a student fulfills her Quantitative Literacy requirement using a non-lab-science course.

4.6.4 Curricular Affairs' comments on previous drafts

CA: We do not like the proposed attribute system. We feel it is complicated, cumbersome, difficult to implement, and will require numerous faculty committees to approve and oversee courses.

GERC response: *We recognize that change of this magnitude will take time to adjust to. However, broader integration of faculty into the common baccalaureate requirements is desirable, whether by teaching courses or by assessing them. In particular, developing committees of faculty who are members of the discipline to assess and evaluate whether courses that are proposed to satisfy certain disciplinary requirements actually do is probably the right choice.*

CA: As you know, the proposed GER for social science, humanities, and arts courses will require significant modification of the BOR General Education regulations for before they can implemented. We would be happy to forward proposals for such changes to the Faculty Senate but wish to first see some evidence that such changes are necessary.

GERC response: *A modification of University Regulations of general education requirements is underway. In addition, chairs of departments in CLA, CNSM, and CRCD were asked for and gave input on the proposed updating of the general education categories. Commentaries on the relevant aspects of this proposal also explain how it may function well within the parameters set by existing regulation.*

CA: We feel that the single greatest deficiency that afflicts our baccalaureate students concerns their written communication abilities. The proposed GER does nothing to address such needs (e.g., additional or different courses to satisfy the "two written communication courses" requirement).

GERC response: *Revisions to the ENGL 111/211/213 courses are already underway, although the course numbers may change to facilitate transfers, etc. We do not feel that requiring students to take more stand-alone English composition courses will address the issues with student writing at the upper-division level.*

CA: Further, the proposed 'C' attribute dilutes and weakens the current 'W' requirement by allowing a variety of non-writing activities to substitute for writing.

GERC response: *The upper-division communications (C) requirement has been revised to explicitly require more writing. However, we also think it is important to emphasize at the upper-division level that there are more modes of communication and even more forms of writing than the typical "research paper" that is perhaps emphasized by the current W requirements. We think it best that each discipline be able to determine the types of communication most important to address in their (C) courses.*

4.6.5 Other issues raised about previous drafts

CNSM

Five of the six departments housed in CNSM (excluding DMS) drafted a memo regarding their concerns about the previous draft of this proposal. The bulk of the memo is excerpted below, with responses to the concerns interleaved.

CNSM: The Biology & Wildlife, Geology & Geophysics, Chemistry & Biochemistry, Physics, and Atmospheric Science Departments appreciate the efforts of the GERC to revise the UAF Core requirements to align them with the new General Education Learning Outcomes. We are pleased with many aspects of the proposed requirements, including the increased flexibility, the capstone or experiential learning requirement, and the option of completing the GE requirements with fewer than the current 38 credits. However, we are concerned about several aspects of the proposed requirements. We summarize those concerns in order of perceived importance below, and offer alternatives.

The replacement of W and O by C courses. Our highest concern is the proposed merger of W, O, and graphical communications into a single communications (C) designator. We find that most of our undergraduates are challenged to produce clear, persuasive, well-organized arguments in writing, even as seniors. If anything, our undergraduates need more instruction and practice in writing than they currently receive. We are concerned both that some C courses may contain little emphasis on writing skills and that the combination of written, oral, and visual communication in single courses will reduce the frequency and depth of the writing assignments and associated feedback, thereby degrading the effectiveness of writing instruction across the curriculum. In contrast, we find that the ability of students to deliver effective oral presentations has improved

over the years. If the C designator is implemented, we suspect that our students will receive less focused writing instruction and experience, which would have an impact on their academic and professional development. We propose that the requirement for two upper division courses with the W designator be retained.

GERC response: *We have revised the C designator in response to this feedback, as well as feedback from the College of Engineering and Mines. We certainly think that it is critical that students receive effective teaching of writing in their disciplines. However, we are also sensitive to the fact that different disciplines may want to require different quantities or types of writing, as well as other modes of communications.*

Should the proposal be approved, we encourage departments to require students in their major to take C courses housed in the major, which require the right types and quantities of communication (written and otherwise) for the needs of students in that discipline.

In particular, this means that if a particular program wants to require students to take C courses that require lots of writing, the program can require such a course.

We think that—with appropriate faculty guidance and participation—C courses can be constructed and required that do not allow students to game the system, without requiring that every major teach a course whose writing component may be appropriate for some disciplines (e.g., history) but not others (e.g., engineering).

CNSM: The proliferation of letter designators and expansion of core credits. We believe that adding A, D, E, and Q designators to the curriculum will make the curriculum confusing and unnecessarily complicated for students and advisors. These changes also increase the number of required credits, which will reverse our recent efforts to streamline our degree programs. Therefore we pro- pose that the following learning outcomes be incorporated into the general core as described below.

GERC response: *As described in Chapter 3, the new proposal does not require that students take more than 34 credits to fulfill Learning Outcomes 1, 2 and 3. (Students are required to take an additional 9 credits to satisfy learning outcome 4, which is similar to the old Core, where students were required to take 9 credits of W, W, O.)*

CNSM: Q courses (Quantitative) The current core requires two laboratory science courses and one math course. We support the GERCs recommendation for one science course, one math course, and an additional course with a quantitative emphasis. However, since the vast majority of courses that satisfy the quantitative requirement will be math and science courses, the Q designator seems unnecessary. The requirement could be re-written as one math course, one laboratory science course, and one course that is either math or laboratory science or is chosen from a short list of additional courses.

GERC response: *This is a philosophical difference, not a difference in required content. GERC feels that it is less confusing to have a list of courses labeled Q, rather than "choose one from here, or one from here, or, well, maybe one from here too."*

While it is true that many of the students will likely fulfill their Q requirement either with a math course or with a natural science course, the existence of a Q attribute (1) indicates a philosophical underpinning to students looking for courses and (2) allows for other departments to either identify or develop new courses that will integrate quantitative reasoning into their curricula. For example, there are certain business courses that would be good Q courses, and possibly even courses at in AA/AS or AAS programs that would be reasonable candidates. In addition, it is easier to choose a course from a list (here's a list of all the Q courses) as opposed to (choose one course from these math courses or these lab science courses or this collection of other courses). Finally, the necessity of taking a Q course might spur students to taking a course in a discipline they might not otherwise have investigated.

CNSM: A courses (Alaska and Arctic). We agree with GERC that UAF students should learn about their Alaskan environment in particular and high latitude systems in general, however we do not think that a special designator is necessary. Most courses in our departments make frequent reference to Alaska. Therefore, we suggest that each major ensure that their students receive adequate background in relevant Alaskan and Arctic issues rather than adding the requirement of an "A" course.

GERC response: *Many courses in departments outside CNSM do not make frequent reference to Alaska. Departments whose courses include A-attributed courses are encouraged to require one of these courses for their majors; however, expecting, e.g., DMS to offer a math course (or decide to require a specific A course of their majors) seems more restrictive and confusing than the current proposal.*

GERC thinks that it is less confusing and less complicated to have a global requirement for an A course, rather than requiring each program to decide for its students what A course that student should take. Moreover, it has the advantage of allowing students to choose A-attributed courses in areas that interest them.

CNSM: D courses (Intercultural Competence and Diversity). The need to designate a separate set of courses that fulfill the diversity criterion could be avoided by merging this intended outcome into the core requirement that students take two courses in social science and two courses in humanities. Many social science and humanities courses already fulfill the diversity criterion. Therefore, the lists of social science and humanities courses could be tailored to both satisfy Board of Regents regulations for GE social science and humanities courses (broad survey and introductory courses) and address intercultural competence and diversity.

E courses (Civic Engagement). The tools for effective civic engagement include critical thinking, willingness to consider alternative viewpoints, ability to organize and integrate information from a variety of sources, knowledge of social science and history, and the ability to express oneself clearly and persuasively in writing and speech. We think that the proposed curriculum integrates these tools without the additional requirement of an "E" course. However, this could be addressed more directly by including courses that address civic engagement in the list of acceptable core social science courses.

GERC response: *The current proposal encourages attributing of (especially) Humanities, Social Sciences, and Arts to have E and C (and A) attributes. In fact, we think that many, many students will take courses that have these attributes as part of the process of fulfilling their General Education requirements.*

However, we do not want to require that all H, SS, Arts courses that fulfill Learning Outcome 1 must have attributes, nor do we want to restrict attributable courses to only be those that can fulfill Learning Outcome 1.

CNSM: By integrating Alaskan and arctic issues, cultural diversity, and effective civic engagement into the larger GE curriculum, rather than requiring specially-designated courses, the core curriculum could be simplified over the current GERC proposal and reduced to 34 credits, the Board of Regents minimum, which would help our students complete their degrees within a reasonable timeframe.

GERC response: *Yes, we agree. This is precisely what the proposal is trying to accomplish. However, we want to also allow students flexibility to take attributed courses outside the courses that satisfy Learning Outcomes 1 and 2.*

CEM

CEM: If the goal of the Core Revitalization is to revamp, revitalize and reinvent our core, then we need to be careful and not try to package the requirements so that the old core courses, without modification, still apply. Certainly a number of the fundamental components of those original core courses still apply, but this is, after all, a revitalization effort to step boldly into the 21st century and apply the forward-looking AACU (American Association of Colleges and Universities) LEAP (Liberal Education and Americas Promise) outcomes to our curriculum. There are a number of features proposed that we applaud. Particularly, capstone courses have become an important component of our engineering curricula, both for teaching and assessing student outcomes, while being very beneficial to students. We would like to give some input regarding some other aspects of the GERC proposal.

GERC response: *We think the courses in the old core were good. But we think there are other good courses too.*

CEM: We propose to have the A, E, and D (Alaska, Civic Engagement, and Intercultural Competence and Diversity) attributes come from the proposed Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts (SSHA) courses (15 credits), rather than from courses in every major. Justification: The A, E, and D attributes naturally fit within the SSHA milieu. Also it is much easier to assess and regularly certify a small number of classes rather than several hundred classes that would be required to meet these attributes if they were done independently in every major. Assessment is a requirement of all courses used to meet these requirements, and it does take time to regularly assess each of the courses that will be used. Further, the A, E, and D attribute system will be cumbersome to implement in the wide variety and large number of courses that make up each major on campus. We see this as a difficult management challenge at best and, likely unworkable. Certainly it will require an inordinate amount of effort on the part of the faculty senate to oversee, and the departmental faculty to implement. If the A, E, and D attributes were met/applied at the level of the 15 credits of core Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts courses, the complexity and management challenges will be reduced substantially. Finally, it is easy to envision superior coverage of these three attributes in the SSHA courses by SSHA faculty, compared to the many courses specific to each major, generating better attainment of the intended LEAP results. However some programs may have A, E, and/or D material in their discipline and may wish to use those courses to satisfy these attributes.

GERC response: *We certainly did not mean to imply that each major would be required to contribute attributed courses. However, we do not wish to restrict a priori the departments who can contribute attributed courses. In particular, we think that it benefits students to have the flexibility to take, for example, courses with attributes as part of their upper-division major requirements if their major is so constituted. (Geology in particular has A courses.)*

We also don't think it serves students well—and that it would significantly increase complexity— to require that students take all their attributes as part of the General Education/Learning Outcome 1 and 2 courses, or to require that all H/SS/Arts courses that satisfy those requirements have attributes.

CEM: We oppose combining the "W" and "O" attributes into a single "C" attribute. Writing and oral communication are distinct, and both are essential to success in the engineering fields. Our students must be competent in both communication modes, so we need to assess courses (and student performance) in both areas independently. We believe the 2 to 1 ratio of "W" to "O" is correct. It seems logical that many oral presentations will include visual material, but some communications may be visual only. A possible approach is to put in a

dividing line between written "W" and non-written communication "C" attributes. Writing is a critical skill that UAF graduates must possess. Public school students are learning oral presentation basics by using PowerPoint in elementary school. By the time they get to high school, they have grasped some of the fundamentals of oral communication. Over the last ten years we have seen improvement in students oral communication abilities. Clearly there are still topics UAF engineering students need to learn about oral communication at the fundamental level (in a Comm 131/141 type course) and in the engineering field (in our "O" or "non-W, C" courses). We find that students struggle more with writing, particularly writing that is clear, containing well developed arguments, and with logical presentation of pertinent information. Hence, keeping some portion of the communication in a "W" category best benefits our students. One characteristic of engineering that may escape most UAF faculty is that hardly any of our courses have the majority of their grade determined by writ- ten English. That is why the previous core curriculum had fractional "W" and "O" designators (http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/curriculum/course- degree-procedures-/guidelines-for-core-desig/). This allowed engineering to dis- tribute the writing requirement across a number of lab courses. An unexpected advantage that we have noted over the years is that now we don't wait until a senior-level "W" course to tell the students that they don't know how to write. We are able to do that with a fractional "W" at an earlier stage of their curriculum. We propose that GERC include the option for engineering, and other technical fields, to continue to use fractional communication attributes and that a substantial portion of the communication attributes remain in written form.

GERC response: *We want to allow disciplines the flexibility to combine multiple modes of communication to meet their own disciplinary needs. In particular, for Engineering students, Engineering could design and require C courses in Engineering which had the modes and quantity of writing appropriate to the discipline, without having to meet requirements for quantity and type of writing that are more appropriate to, e.g., history, without having students forced to keep track of how many fractions of a W course they still needed (and find courses that would meet that need).*

The C course was designed to meet your needs! Require the writing you need for your students.

Allowing fractional O and W has caused students significant problems in the past (e.g., with majors requiring an O/2 course but leaving students struggling to find the other half-O),so we do not feel that continuing with fractional C/W/O courses is likely to lead to a less complex and more student-friendly curriculum.

Appendix A

Draft Guidelines: Learning Outcome 2

A.1 Writing

A.1.1 ENGL 111: Introduction to Academic Writing

Catalog Description: This course provides instruction and practice in written inquiry and critical reading. It introduces writing as a way of developing, exploring, and testing ideas. The course also orients students to informational literacy, the writing center, and writing technologies.

General Objectives:

This student-centered, inquiry-based writing course is designed to help students through- out their college careers and as they enter communities beyond the university. Inquiry-based writing is designed to engage the student in both problem posing and problem solving. Drawing on the rhetorical situation—specifically, audience, purpose, and context—instruction emphasizes the social nature of inquiry and how writers test ideas to discover the reasons behind and for discursive choices. Students practice recursive writing processes, such as peer review, in order to help them adapt to changing demands of writing within the university and their lives.

By the end of first semester writing (English 111X), students should be able to compose texts that demonstrate the following skills:

- Critical Reading: Identify and explain how features of a text reflect audience, context, and purpose.
- Critical Writing: Select and analyze evidence for a specific purpose.
- Critical Thinking: Reflect on their own past writing to identify its constraints.

A.1.2 ENGL 211/3: Academic Writing about Social and Natural Sciences/Literature

This student-centered, audience-based writing course is designed to help students develop rhetorical strategies for active reading, thinking, writing, and citizenship.

Following English-111x in the University Writing Program sequence at UAF, English-211/213 continues student development of critical reading, writing, and thinking and teaches deductive writing techniques such as micro writing, research reports, and thesis-driven arguments.

Readings in the course are selected by the instructor and organized around a topic or theme. These readings are diverse in terms of genre, perspective, and language. In addition, the course concentrates on how its participants can build authority in both academic and public rhetorical situations.

Catalog description: The course provides instruction in critical reading and writing by examining academic questions from the perspective of rhetorical situations. Concentrates on the research methods and techniques necessary to create extended written arguments and multimodal texts for public and academic audiences. (Prerequisite: Completion of ENG 111x or its equivalent)

Instructional Objectives:

By the end of second semester writing (English 211X or 213X), students should be able to have evidence of the following skills by composing texts which do the following:

- Critical Reading: Select and synthesize information from multiple perspectives, genres, and audiences.
- Critical Writing: Design effective texts in response to changing audiences, contexts, and purposes.
- Critical Thinking: Assess their choices as writers.

A.2 Quantitative Literacy Across the Curriculum

Quantitative Literacy is competency and comfort working with numerical data. Individuals with strong QL skills can

- reason and solve quantitative problems from a wide array of contexts and everyday life situations.
- understand and create sophisticated arguments supported by quantitative evidence

- communicate those arguments in a variety of formats, including words, tables, graphs, and mathematical equations, as appropriate.

Instructional Objectives:

- **Interpret:** provide accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms and make appropriate inferences based on that information.

- **Represent:** skillfully convert relevant information into a mathematical portrayal in a way that contributes to further or deeper understanding.

- **Calculate:** complete virtually all calculations successfully and comprehensively in order to solve the problem. Present calculations elegantly (clearly, concisely, etc.).

- **Apply/Analyze/Model:** use the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for thoughtful judgments, drawing carefully qualified conclusions from this work. Explicitly describe assumptions, provide compelling rationale for why each is appropriate, and demonstrate awareness that the final conclusion is limited by the accuracy of the assumptions.

- **Communicate:** use quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, present it in an effective format, and explicate it with consistently high quality.

Minimum criteria for course approval:

Explicitly address each of the objectives listed above via multiple delivery methods (e.g. lecture, discussion, lab and homework exercises) throughout the semester.

Appendix B

Draft Guidelines: Civic Engagement (Learning Outcome 3)

B.1 Alaska and the Circumpolar North (A)

Definition: Knowledge of Alaska and the Circumpolar North denotes critical understanding of inter-related elements of Alaska's and the Circumpolar North's history, cultures, values, communication styles, natural systems, politics and/or economy.

Subject Areas:

- Alaska/northern ecosystems and/or climate change
- Indigenous peoples, languages and world views
- Intercultural relations and politics in Alaska and the Arctic
- Economic development, industry, engineering challenges, and their relation to the environment in the north
- Natural resources and systems.

Instructional Objectives:

- Demonstrate understanding of the subject matter in one or more of the five broad subject areas listed above
- Analyze critically questions related to one or more of these fields of study
- Recognize and analyze the interrelatedness of these systems
- Compare and contrast circumpolar north regions in examination of a pertinent topic.

Minimum Criteria for Approval:

- Explicitly address at least two of the instructional objectives listed above.
- Address Alaskan and circumpolar issues as a substantial component of the course, not as an "add on."
- Have at least 50% of the readings and assignments of the course devoted to topics relating to Alaska and the circumpolar North.

B.2 Civic Engagement (E)

Civic engagement is "working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political processes."

General Objectives:

To contribute to the fulfillment of Outcome 3, students receiving a baccalaureate degree from UAF should successfully complete coursework and/or experiential learning opportunities that enhance their understanding in at least one of the following areas:

- Civic identity and commitment
- Civic communication
- Civic action and reflection
- Civic contexts and structures

Instructional Objectives:

Students demonstrate significant fulfillment of one or more of the following goals through applicable coursework or some combination of courses work and practical application:

- Apply academic knowledge to the analysis and/or solution of real world problems in contemporary, socio-political contexts
- Explore how historical contexts, issues and developments shape human conflicts and interdependencies from local to global and inform the search for possible solutions to contemporary social problems
- Tailor communication strategies to effectively express, listen, and adapt

to others with the goal of establishing relationships that bridge cultural divides and further civic action

- Identify and/or apply theories and methodologies of sustainability to civic participation
- Demonstrate knowledge of multiple ethical frameworks that inform relationships within and among communities.

Minimum Criteria for Approval:

- Include either direct civic engagement (e.g. a service learning project) with an academic reflection on the experience **OR**
- Address multiple ethical frameworks that inform relationships within and among communities **OR**
- Explore how historical contexts, issues and developments shape human conflicts and interdependencies from local to global and inform the search for possible solutions to contemporary social problems

B.3 Intercultural Competence and Diversity Across the Curriculum (D)

Intercultural knowledge and competence is "a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts."

Instructional Objectives:

- Place social justice in historical and political context
- Articulate insights into one's own cultural rules and biases
- Demonstrate a complex understanding of the complexity of the history, values, politics, beliefs, and practices of other cultures
- Interpret intercultural experiences from more than one worldview
- Articulate a complex understanding of cultural differences in verbal and non-verbal communication

Minimum Criteria for Approval

Courses in this category may focus on differences among people in the United States and/or on understanding contemporary issues from a global perspective or understanding cultures and societies different from those in the United States. Such courses would:

- Explicitly address at least two of the instructional objectives listed above.
- Address issues of race, ethnicity, gender and sexual identity, and other markers of cultural difference as a substantial component of the course, not as an "add on."
- Emphasize the cultural interactions between the Western and non-Western worlds, and/or the interplay between various identity groups within the United States.
- Have at least 50% of the readings and assignments of the course devoted to topics relating to diversity and intercultural competence.

Appendix C

Draft Guidelines: Integrative Learning Requirements

C.1 Communication Across the Curriculum (C)

Communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing or speech. Communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

Instructional objectives:

- Students will be able to revise written work in response to instructor and peer feedback.
- Students will be able to write effectively for diverse audiences.
- Students will be able to recognize and navigate the concepts, genres, and conventions of the course discipline.
- Students will be able to select appropriate writing technologies to collaborate in personal, professional and civic relationships.
- Students will be able to listen effectively and respond effectively to communication practices in the course.

Minimum criteria for course approval:

- Explicitly address at least three of the objectives listed above
- At least 50% of the grade must come from assignments utilizing the types of writing and combination of written and non-written forms of communication most appropriate to disciplinary needs and standards and course content.
- Provide guided and prompt feedback and opportunities for student revision on student projects, presentations, and papers.
- In addition to written and spoken communication, address other forms of

communication in the course discipline, such as reading and listening and multimodal, digital, or visual communication.

- Address and practice accurate and ethical referencing/citation practices of source material as it pertains to source authority, academic honesty, and personal credibility.
- Faculty must have attended a training workshop, to be offered every semester.

C.2 Capstone

Capstone courses or experiences will demonstrate students' ability to integrate a wide range of learning. Students will make connections among ideas, skills and bodies of knowledge, and synthesize and transfer their learning to new, complex areas of inquiry, products or situations within or beyond conventional coursework.

Instructional Objectives:

Integrate and apply: learning from multiple disciplines and skill sets.

Demonstrate: the ability to contribute to existing bodies of knowledge, work in demanding professional settings, and/or create products relevant to the students further educational, career and life goals.

Create: a project or experience that demonstrates the students intellectual and practical capabilities at a level expected of one receiving a baccalaureate degree from a major university.

Complete: a body of work that may be evaluated as the culmination of the students total baccalaureate education

Minimum criteria for course approval:

- Require that students demonstrate the appropriate skill levels in communication and/or quantification.
- Try to integrate learning from major requirements or from courses with attributes
- Guide students through a project or experience relevant to their educational goals
- Provide a basis for evaluating students performance in the capstone course,

in a form appropriate to the discipline and subject matter.

- Make completion of all or most General Education Requirements a prerequisite.
- Be suitable as a means for assessing the Common Baccalaureate Requirements, General Education Requirements, or major requirements as a whole (depending on the nature of the capstone course)

Examples

These are currently available courses that may be eligible (as is or with minor revisions):

NORS 484 W/O Seminar in Northern Studies: An interdisciplinary seminar focusing on topics relating to the North with emphasis on the physical sciences, the peoples, and the socioeconomic and political aspects of the area. Specialists in the various fields will assign readings and conduct discussions. Prerequisites: ENGL F111X; ENGL F211X or ENGL F213X; junior standing; or permission of instructor. (3+0)

PS F499 W Senior Thesis: Thesis will draw from the literature in at least two sub-fields of political science (U.S. government/politics, political theory, public law, comparative politics, international relations) in its analysis. Prerequisites: ENGL F111X; ENGL F211X or ENGL F213X; PS F101; PS F222; senior standing; permission of instructor. (1.5+0+7.5)*

Appendix D

Implementation and Assessment

D.1 Implementation

The standards and process by which courses will be approved for any of the new requirements should be determined and controlled by UAF faculty.

Perhaps the current Core Review Committee will need to be extended or replaced with a new permanent committee on general education and subcommittees responsible for each of the new Attributes and categories satisfying learning outcomes 1 and 2; at least in the short term transition period. The subcommittees would apply, assess, and recommend revisions to the requirements for each Attribute.

There will need to be guidelines for all courses that satisfy the new learning outcomes, similar to the guidelines for current core designators.

Draft rubrics and suggested criteria have been developed for assessing the eligibility of courses that would have the new attributes. At this point these should be considered recommendations and models. The establishment of rubrics, ultimately, should be the work of the appropriate bodies of faculty.

D.2. Rubrics for Assessment

With the exception of (A) all rubrics are adapted from AAC&U Value Rubrics, available at
http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/index_p.cfm?CFID=46791212&CFTOKEN=41451744

1) Tools for Critical Thinking

Critical thinking includes elements of inquiry, analysis, problem solving and the comprehensive exploration of ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

	4	3	2	1
Evidence & Analysis	Organizes and synthesizes evidence to reveal insightful patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus. Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/ evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis.	Organizes evidence to reveal important patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus. Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/ evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.	Organizes evidence, but the organization is not effective in revealing important patterns, differences, or similarities. Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/ evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.	Lists evidence, but it is not organized and/or is unrelated to focus. Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/ evaluation.
Strategies & Solutions	Identifies multiple approaches for solving the problem that apply within a specific context. Proposes one or more solutions/hypotheses that indicate a deep comprehension of the problem.	Identifies multiple approaches for solving the problem, only some of which apply within a specific context. Proposes one or more solutions/hypotheses that indicate comprehension of the problem.	Identifies only a single approach for solving the problem that does apply within a specific context. Proposes one solution/ hypothesis that is "off the shelf" rather than individually designed to address the specific contextual factors of the problem.	Identifies one or more approaches for solving the problem that do not apply within a specific context. Proposes a solution/hypothesis that is difficult to evaluate because it is vague or only indirectly addresses the problem statement.
Position & Perspective	Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Other points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue.. Other points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.
Conclusions & Outcomes	Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.

2) Quantitative Literacy

	4	3	2	1
Interpretation	Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. Makes appropriate inferences based on that information. *For example, accurately explains the trend data shown in a graph and makes reasonable predictions regarding what the data suggest about future events.*	Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. *For instance, accurately explains the trend data shown in a graph.*	Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms, but occasionally makes minor errors related to computations or units. *For instance, accurately explains trend data shown in a graph, but may miscalculate the slope of the trend line.*	Attempts to explain information presented in mathematical forms, but draws incorrect conclusions about what the information means. *For example, attempts to explain the trend data shown in a graph, but will frequently misinterpret the nature of that trend, perhaps by confusing positive and negative trends.*
Representation	Skillfully converts relevant information into an insightful mathematical portrayal in a way that contributes to a further or deeper understanding.	Competently converts relevant information into an appropriate and desired mathematical portrayal.	Completes conversion of information but resulting mathematical portrayal is only partially appropriate or accurate.	Completes conversion of information but resulting mathematical portrayal is inappropriate or inaccurate.
Calculation	Calculations attempted are essentially all successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem. Calculations are also presented elegantly (clearly, concisely, etc.)	Calculations attempted are essentially all successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem.	Calculations attempted are either unsuccessful or represent only a portion of the calculations required to comprehensively solve the problem.	Calculations are attempted but are both unsuccessful and are not comprehensive.
Application / Analysis	Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for deep and thoughtful judgments, drawing insightful, carefully qualified conclusions from	Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for competent judgments, drawing reasonable and appropriately qualified	Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for workmanlike (without inspiration or nuance, ordinary) judgments, drawing plausible	Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for tentative, basic judgments, although is hesitant or uncertain about drawing

	this work.	conclusions from this work.	conclusions from this work.	conclusions from this work.
Assumptions	Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why each assumption is appropriate. Shows awareness that confidence in final conclusions is limited by the accuracy of the assumptions.	Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why assumptions are appropriate.	Explicitly describes assumptions.	Attempts to describe assumptions.
Communication	Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, presents it in an effective format, and explicates it with consistently high quality.	Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, though data may be presented in a less than completely effective format or some parts of the explication may be uneven.	Uses quantitative information, but does not effectively connect it to the argument or purpose of the work.	Presents an argument for which quantitative evidence is pertinent, but does not provide adequate explicit numerical support. (May use quasi-quantitative words such as "many," "few," "increasing," "small," and the like in place of actual quantities.)

3) Alaska And The Circumpolar North

	4	3	2	1
Content Knowledge	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of a particular aspect of Alaska and/ or the circumpolar North.	Demonstrates adequate understanding of a particular aspect of Alaska and/ or the circumpolar North.	Demonstrates partial understanding of a particular aspect of Alaska and/ or the circumpolar North.	Demonstrates surface understanding of a particular aspect of Alaska and/ or the circumpolar North.
Critical Analysis	Organizes and synthesizes evidence to reveal insightful patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus.	Organizes evidence to reveal important patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus.	Organizes evidence, but the organization is not effective in revealing important patterns, differences, or similarities.	Lists evidence, but it is not organized and/or is unrelated to focus.
Understanding of Systems	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the multiple systems (political, historical, linguistic, biological, etc.) that comprise	Demonstrates adequate understanding of the multiple systems (political, historical, linguistic, biological, etc.) that comprise	Demonstrates partial understanding of the multiple systems (political, historical, linguistic, biological, etc.) that comprise Alaska and/ or the	Demonstrates surface understanding of the multiple systems (political, historical, linguistic, biological, etc.) that comprise Alaska and/ or the

	Alaska and/ or the circumpolar North.	Alaska and/ or the circumpolar North.	circumpolar North.	circumpolar North.
Ability to present multiple perspectives	Interprets and presents more than one perspective on an issue and demonstrates ability to synthesize multiple positions.	Recognizes intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one perspective.	Identifies components of other perspectives but fails to incorporate them into argument.	Views other perspectives but does so through own cultural worldview.

4) Civic Engagement

	4	3	2	1
Civic Communication	Is able to tailor communication strategies to effectively express, listen, and adapt to others to establish relationships to further civic action	Effectively communicates in civic context, showing ability to do all of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.	Communicates in civic context, showing ability to do more than one of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.	Communicates in civic context, showing ability to do one of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.
Civic Action and/ or Reflection	Demonstrates complex understanding of civic engagement activities, accompanied by reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions.	Demonstrates understanding of civic action, with reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions.	Has clearly participated in or studies civically focused actions and begins to reflect or describe how these actions may benefit individual(s) or communities.	Has experimented with some civic activities but shows little internalized understanding of their aims or effect.
Civic Contexts/Structures	Demonstrates understanding of intentional ways to collaboratively work across and within community contexts and structures to achieve a civic aim.	Demonstrates understanding of intentional ways to work actively within community contexts and structures to achieve a civic aim.	Demonstrates understanding of intentional ways to participate in civic contexts and structures.	Experiments with civic contexts and structures, tries out a few to see what fits.
Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/ concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full implications of the application.	Student can independently (to a new example) apply ethical perspectives/ concepts to an ethical question, accurately, but does not consider the specific implications of the application.	Student can apply ethical perspectives/ concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example) and the application is inaccurate.	Student can apply ethical perspectives/ concepts to an ethical question with support (using examples, in a class, in a group, or a fixed-choice setting) but is unable to apply ethical perspectives/ concepts independently (to a new example.).

5) Intercultural Competence And Diversity

	4	3	2	1
Cultural self-awareness	Articulates insights into own cultural rules and biases (e.g. seeking complexity; aware of how her/his experiences have shaped these rules, and how to recognize and respond to cultural biases, resulting in a shift in self-description.)	Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g. not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)	Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g. not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)	Shows minimal awareness of own cultural rules and biases (even those shared with own cultural group(s)) (e.g. uncomfortable with identifying possible cultural differences with others.)
Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates surface understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.
Ability to articulate more than one perspective	Interprets intercultural experience from the perspectives of own and more than one worldview and demonstrates ability to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another cultural group.	Recognizes intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview and sometimes uses more than one worldview in interactions.	Identifies components of other cultural perspectives but responds in all situations with own worldview.	Views the experience of others but does so through own cultural worldview.
Communication	Articulates a complex understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication (e.g., demonstrates understanding of the degree to which people use physical contact while	Recognizes and participates in cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and begins to negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.	Identifies some cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and is aware that misunderstandings can occur based on those differences but is still unable to negotiate a shared understanding.	Has a minimal level of understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication; is unable to negotiate a shared understanding.

	communicating in different cultures or use direct/indirect and explicit/implicit meanings) and is able to skillfully negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.			

6) Capstone (Integration And Synthesis)

	4	3	2	1
Connections to Experience	Meaningfully **synthesizes** connections among experiences outside of the formal classroom (including life experiences and academic experiences such as internships and travel abroad) to **deepen understanding** of fields of study and to broaden own points of view	Effectively **selects and develops** examples of life experiences, drawn from a variety of contexts (e.g., family life, artistic participation, civic involvement, work experience), to **illuminate** concepts/theories/ frameworks of fields of study.	**Compares** life experiences and academic knowledge to infer differences, as well as similarities, and **acknowledge perspectives** other than own.	**Identifies** connections between life experiences and those academic texts and ideas **perceived as similar and related** to own interests.
Connections to Discipline	Independently creates wholes out of multiple parts (synthesizes) or draws conclusions by combining examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.	Independently connects examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.	When prompted, connects examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.	When prompted, presents examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.
Transfer	Adapts and applies, independently, skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations **to solve difficult problems or explore complex issues in original ways.**	Adapts and applies skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations **to solve problems or explore issues.**	Uses skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation in a new situation **to contribute to understanding of problems or issues.**	Uses, in a basic way, skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation **in a new situation.**
Integrated Communication	Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual representation) **in**	Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual	Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual	Fulfills the assignment(s) (i.e. to produce an essay, a poster, a video, a PowerPoint

	ways that enhance meaning, making clear the interdependence of language and meaning, thought, and expression.	representation) **to explicitly connect content and form**, demonstrating awareness of purpose and audience.	representation)that **connects in a basic way** what is being communicated (content) with how it is said (form).	presentation,etc.) **in an appropriate form**.
Reflection and Self-Assessment	Envisions a future self (and possibly makes plans that build on past experiences) that have occurred across multiple and diverse contexts.	Evaluates changes in own learning over time, recognizing complex contextual factors (e.g., works with ambiguity and risk, deals with frustration, considers ethical frameworks).	Articulates strengths and challenges (within specific performances or events) to increase effectiveness in different contexts (through increased self- awareness).	Describes own performances with general descriptors of success and failure.

Appendix E

GELO and new University Regulations

Draft as of March 10

A. Categories for General Education Requirements for Baccalaureate Degrees

1. Oral Communication Skills

Courses that fulfill this requirement provide guided practice in using oral communication as a tool *for communicating ideas and responding* to diverse and changing audiences.

2. Written Communication Skills

Courses that fulfill this requirement provide guided practice in using writing as a tool *for communicating ideas and responding* to diverse and changing audiences.

3. Quantitative Skills

Courses that fulfill this requirement are those which emphasize the development and application of quantitative problem-solving skills as well as skills in the manipulation and/or evaluation of quantitative data.

4. Natural Sciences

Courses that fulfill this requirement-introduce the student to the theory, methods, and practice of the natural sciences, integrating basic knowledge and disciplinary methodologies.

5. Arts

Courses that fulfill this requirement introduce the student to the–methods and context of the arts as academic disciplines as opposed to those that only emphasize acquisition of skills.

6. Humanities

Courses that fulfill this requirement-introduce the student to the theory, methods, and practice of the humanities, integrating basic knowledge and disciplinary methodologies.

7. Social Sciences

Courses that fulfill this requirement introduce the student to the theory, methods, and practice of the social sciences, integrating basic knowledge and disciplinary methodologies.

B.Minimum Credit Distribution for the General Education Requirements for Baccalaureate Degrees

Written Communication Skills	6 credits
Oral Communication Skills	3 credits
Humanities (non-arts)	3 credits
Arts	3 credits
Social Sciences	3 credits
Mathematics	3 credits
Natural Sciences, including a laboratory	4 credits
Subtotal	25 credits

In addition, students must take:
At least 6 more credits from among arts, humanities, and social sciences
At least 3 more credits from among natural science, mathematics, and quantitative skills

Total General Education credits: 34 credits

C.Assumptions Regarding General Education Requirements for Baccalaureate Degrees

1. All credits must be at 100 level or above.

2. Most requirements will be fulfilled at the 100 or 200 level. In some cases, upper division courses may meet the criteria.

3. No course may satisfy more than one General Education requirement for a single student. However, General Education courses may also satisfy degree or major requirements.

4. General Education requirements may extend beyond the 34 credit minimum described by the common core outlined in this Regulation.

5. Additional General Education curricula beyond these General Education requirements may be implemented by individual institutions for accreditation or other purposes and are not subject to transfer or commonality mandates set forth in Board of Regents policy or university regulation.