

Program Review Committee Report General Education Program

Review Process

The Director of the General Education Program prepared a self-study following program review guidelines. A two-person external review team then visited the campus, meeting with a wide variety of campus constituencies. Because the General Education Program is a university-level program, the Program Review Committee (PRC) sought additional input from a variety of campus groups. The Program Review Committee Report on the General Education Program is divided into seven sections: (1) a summary of the Program's self-study; (2) a summary of the external review team's report; (3) a summary of the concerns of the academic deans; (4) a summary of concerns received through the Faculty Senate; (5) a summary of proposals forwarded by the Student Achievement Assessment Committee; (6) the PRC's findings; and (7) the PRC's recommendations.

Summary of the Self-Study

Introduction

The Director of General Education reports to the Vice Provost for Academic Programs. Since the fall of 1999, the General Education Committee has been a sub-committee of the Undergraduate Council. The General Education Committee has eleven members, including the Director of General Education; seven faculty, representing each of the seven colleges, are elected by the Undergraduate Council; three faculty are appointed by the Vice Provost for Academic Programs. The General Education Committee has a sub-committee on cultural diversity in the United States. The Director also forms development groups of faculty to consider such issues as internationalizing the curriculum and skill development.

The Director of General Education is responsible for the coordination, development and implementation of the general education curriculum. She works with the General Education Committee and the Committee on Cultural Diversity in the U.S., plans faculty development activities, disseminates information to the faculty, communicates the rationale for general education to all students, and maintains the General Education Bulletin. During the budget crisis of 1991-92, the general education office was moved to the College of Arts and Sciences and the Director's position was reduced from a twelve-month to nine-month appointment. Since the return of the office to the Provost's area in 1997, secretarial support for the Director has been limited to that provided by a student assistant.

General education has long been a priority at Bowling Green. The present organization can be traced to the establishment of the University Division of

General Education in the College of Arts and Sciences during the early 1970s. It was replaced in 1980 by the Center of Academic Options.

A number of important steps were taken during the 1980s, including:

- 1) the approval of a general education curriculum of eight required courses across the University divided into four knowledge domains of social sciences, natural sciences, humanities and arts, and cultures other than one's own;
- 2) the establishment of the interdisciplinary "great ideas" course;
- 3) the establishment of a general education requirement in cultural diversity in the United States (which replaced cultures other than one's own);
- 4) the development of an upper level general education curriculum; and
- 5) the publication of the General Education Bulletin.

The General Education Review Committee, established in 1990-91, formulated a proposal, which was adopted by the Undergraduate Council in 1993. The proposal led to the establishment of faculty groups in each domain, which were responsible for developing criteria for implementation of skills, especially in the cognitive area. The North Central Association review of 1993 focused attention on the need for assessment of general education. In recent years, renewed attention has been given to the undergraduate curriculum, leading to the establishment of the Chapman Learning Center, the return of general education to the Provost's area, the appointment of a Dean of Undergraduate Studies (since discontinued), greater attention to communicating with students and faculty about the general education curriculum and purposes, and a mandate for assessment of general education.

In implementing the self-study review, the General Education Committee decided to survey faculty and students, but lacked the time for an in-depth assessment of the program.

Mission

In 1990-91, the General Education Committee drafted a mission statement, which, after incorporating suggestions from faculty, underscored the objectives of self-reliant learning and participation in a democratic society, with emphasis on assisting students to synthesize knowledge. The realization of the objectives of general education is related to the responsibilities of the Student Achievement Assessment Committee (SAAC). Based on learning outcomes in the majors, the SAAC formulated the university learning outcomes, which have substantial overlap with the goals of the General Education Program. Likewise, the Program is instrumental in promoting the vision statement and core values of the University.

Unit

The General Education Program has four knowledge domains - natural sciences, social sciences, humanities and arts, and cultural diversity in the United States. The upper level curriculum is intended to provide an integrative function and require extensive reading, writing and research. Students are required to take

a total of eight courses, two in natural sciences, two in social sciences, two in humanities and arts, and one in cultural diversity in the U.S. The eighth course is intended to be a requirement for an upper level course, but at the present time the eighth course can be selected at any level.

The Chapman Learning Community provides interdisciplinary courses to 150-200 first-year students; some of the Chapman courses earn general education credit. The Honors Program enrolls 965 students, nearly all in general education courses, each with a capacity of 25 students. In the spring of 1999 and fall of 2000, 35,000 students were enrolled in courses in the four knowledge domains; 37% of tenured and probationary faculty taught general education courses. Instruction in a number of courses is heavily dependent upon instructors, lecturers, adjunct faculty and graduate students. Large lectures, sometimes with lab or discussion sections, are common in some disciplines.

Instructional staffing of general education courses is dependent upon college budgets. The Program has a modest operating budget and receives a student assistantship funded by the Provost.

Assessment

The Director of General Education has not conducted an assessment of individual general education courses. She did, however, conduct faculty and student surveys to assess program quality and issues. The survey went to 730 faculty and 500 randomly selected students, with return rates of 238 (33%) and 92 (19%) respectively.

Among 447 faculty not teaching in the General Education Program, 167 (37%) responded. The responses indicated that faculty:

- 1) consider breadth of knowledge, more than skills or modes of inquiry, as the rationale for general education;
- 2) regard the General Education Program as not well connected to instruction in departmental majors;
- 3) support strategies for coherence rather than a 'smorgasbord' of courses, but not a senior capstone in their area connecting general education skills;
- 4) responded positively to developing and assessing information literacy skills and a writing across the curriculum program;
- 5) selected higher level thinking skills as the most important outcome when offered that as a choice versus communication skills or the mastery of modes of inquiry; and
- 6) favor overwhelmingly the importance of emphasizing international and multicultural learning.

Of 283 faculty teaching in the General Education Program, 72 (23%) responded. Their responses indicated that they:

- 1) also chose breadth of knowledge over skill development and development of higher level thinking skills as the primary mission of general education;
- 2) approve strongly of service learning connections;

- 3) favor seeking strategies for coherence in the program and more technological support for instruction;
- 4) find students only sometimes understanding why general education courses are required; and
- 5) considered themselves only 'somewhat' supported in their departments.

From the faculty responses, it is clear that means need to be developed to explain the General Education Program and to create communities of faculty. "Your place in the United States and world communities" has been suggested as a theme to connect service learning or other community activities. An emphasis on developing higher level thinking skills might be successful.

The student responses indicated that they:

- 1) consider the quality of general education instruction as generally not of the same quality as that in their majors, but most rated the instruction as 'good';
- 2) believe that breadth of knowledge is the central aspect of general education;
- 3) consider themselves to be active participants in their classes, but only a slight majority find faculty accessible during office hours or interested in providing assistance;
- 4) expect to study no more than three hours a week for a three credit general education course; and
- 5) find lectures difficult to follow and welcome tutoring groups and study guides.

Student responses indicate that instruction in general education needs to be improved, that expectations for students may not be sufficiently high and that connections to 'real life' through residential communities or service learning may make the program more meaningful.

Overall, the survey results suggest that efforts need to be made to develop a more coherent general education program with better instruction for students and support for faculty as part of the University's objective of becoming a 'premier learning community.'

The University has not provided funds to faculty for development of general education, but the Center for Innovative and Transformative Education was recently started and its mission can be supportive of general education in several ways. Last year another program, Creative Imaginings for Student Success, was also started and five faculty teaching general education courses received awards through that program. Another developing initiative is additional residential learning communities.

Relatively few external funding agencies support general education, and the nine-month position of the Director makes it difficult to prepare applications for those funds.

Planning

The strategic plan for the next five years has the following goals:

- 1) to enhance curricular coherence and cognitive skills through a complete curricular review, beginning with the humanities and arts, cultural diversity, and the natural sciences in 2000-01, and continuing with the social sciences in 2002, a complete review in 2003, and forming clusters and a coherent program in 2004-05;
- 2) to develop an integrative upper level general education curriculum, with full implementation in 2003;
- 3) to connect capstone curriculum within majors, integrating general education and the program theme of citizenship in the United States and world communities;
- 4) to develop an assessment plan in cooperation with faculty teaching in the program;
- 5) to provide ongoing faculty development, including development of pedagogy for large lectures and means of focus on higher level thinking skills; and
- 6) to seek external support.

Results of Previous Reviews

This is the first cycle of program review for the General Education Program.

Summary of External Report

The site visit of Fred Janzow and Marcia Bundy Seabury on October 22-24, 2000 included interviews with the following: General Education Committee, general education faculty, department chairs, Student Achievement Assessment Committee representatives, Women's Studies representatives, interdisciplinary directors, Committee on Cultural Diversity, Chapman Learning Community, individual faculty and administrators.

Strengths

The strengths of general education at Bowling Green are:

- 1) the Director's commitment to general and liberal education;
- 2) the published statements of skills and knowledge domains;
- 3) the rigorous review process and commitment to general education of the members of the General Education Committee;
- 4) the development of a strategic plan with clearly identified goals;
- 5) the focus on developing interdisciplinary learning experiences for students, which is in line with current thinking in the field of liberal education;
- 6) the residential and curricular community model; and
- 7) the placement of the Director for General Education in the office of the Vice Provost for Academic Programs, which provides greater campus-wide responsibility for general education and fosters collaboration with the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology and the assessment program.

Challenges

The program also faces important challenges:

- 1) the institution needs to develop a broader base of support for general education;
- 2) the responsibilities of the position require that the Director be given a twelve-month appointment;
- 3) a clerical position is needed to support the demands on the Director;
- 4) a substantial increase in the budget of the Director of General Education is essential to the realization of the program's objectives;
- 5) a commitment of resources is needed to implement the general education initiatives under way and at the planning stages;
- 6) the Vice Provost for Academic Programs needs to have the authority and resources to take advantage of the opportunities to develop the general education program and create closer collaboration across campus;
- 7) the institution must foster faculty and student commitment to general education by promulgating its rationale and implementing support and reward systems for faculty teaching general education; and
- 8) a long-term faculty program is essential to support integrative learning in general education's interdisciplinary component.

Recommendations in the External Report

To build on existing strengths and to meet the challenges, a number of curricular, budgetary and administrative recommendations are advanced in a number of general areas:

Strategic Planning

- 1) The Vice Provost for Academic Programs should direct a discussion of the strategic goals of the General Education Program within the Undergraduate Council and the University community at large.
- 2) The Vice Provost for Academic Programs should work with the Director of General Education and the General Education Committee in formulating a plan to engage the campus in a continuing discussion about the nature and objectives of the General Education Program.

Program Structure, Coherence, and Participation

- 3) If the University is committed to an upper-level integrative curriculum, it needs to provide resources and to provide faculty rewards for faculty to develop and teach these courses. This recommendation reflects the concerns in the self-study and the external review concerning the uneven department commitment to upper-level general education.
- 4) The 1991 review committee's recommendation that all colleges contribute to general education and that no college can 'prescribe or proscribe' general education courses needs to be reinforced by the Vice Provost for Academic Programs and the Undergraduate Council.
- 5) The General Education Committee and Undergraduate Council should work with academic units in all colleges to provide courses for the General Education Program.

Pedagogical Issues

- 6) The University should commit resources to reduce large class sizes, and where they are unavoidable, the use of smaller break-out sections should be increased.
- 7) The University should encourage additional learning communities, developed through faculty initiatives.
- 8) The University should consider a closer linking of the learning communities and the General Education Program.
- 9) The Director of General Education and the General Education Committee should work with academic units to create additional course clusters and provide assistance to faculty in developing interdisciplinary teaching skills.

Program Administration

- 10) The General Education Committee should encourage team-taught courses that foster interdisciplinary learning.
- 11) The Director of General Education should become a twelve-month appointment.
- 12) The University should fund a full-time clerical staff position for the Director of General Education.
- 13) The University should provide adequate student worker funds for the Program.
- 14) The General Education Program and the Vice Provost need a substantial budget to support the program's mission.
- 15) The General Education Committee should explore additional ways to further the goals of general education on campus.

Visibility of General Education Program

- 16) Faculty need to understand their role in the General Education Program, and the Director of General Education should increase orientation and communication efforts with them.
- 17) The Director of General Education should explain the Program as part of the annual new faculty orientation.
- 18) The Director of General Education and General Education Committee should develop a workshop or colloquium series focusing on general education issues.
- 19) An appealing informational brochure should be developed and distributed to all faculty, staff and students.
- 20) The Director of General Education should develop a web site that explains the program and provides information on courses and advising.
- 21) Departments and colleges should insure that a faculty member's participation in general education is significantly rewarded within the promotion, tenure and merit system.
- 22) Faculty teaching general education should include in their syllabi the fact that a particular course meets general education requirements, noting the knowledge domain, the learning outcomes and skills and how the course seeks to develop those outcomes.
- 23) The Director should implement new and effective ways of communicating to students the purposes, structure and curriculum of general education.
- 24) The Director should work with the freshman orientation staff to provide an effective orientation to the General Education Program.

- 25) The Director should work with academic advisers to insure that they understand the Program and can communicate its goals and structure to students.

Staffing of General Education

- 26) The University should consider needs for general education faculty lines as a significant factor in allocating FTEs.
- 27) The Vice Provost for Academic Programs should be given authority to collaborate with academic deans and advocate in regular administrative meetings of the deans for positions to serve general education needs.
- 28) The University should consider allocation of non-tenure track lectureships as a percentage of college or university faculty, rather than of the departments.
- 29) The University should explore offering reduced teaching loads to faculty representatives within departments doing substantial general education teaching, so they can serve as general education coordinators and mentors with their departments.
- 30) Departments should explore ways of mentoring faculty to help them meet the challenges of general education and interdisciplinary education.
- 31) The University should include in position announcements a statement about the importance of general and interdisciplinary education at Bowling Green.

Summary of Academic Deans' Comments

General education was discussed in Deans' Council meetings in the fall of 2000, resulting in consensus on the following points:

- 1) the purposes of the General Education Program are not communicated to students or faculty;
- 2) faculty lack awareness of which courses are part of the Program; they also lack understanding of the learning outcomes of the areas within general education;
- 3) assessment of student achievement in general education is inadequate;
- 4) too much general education is provided in large classes or is taught by graduate students and temporary faculty;
- 5) the Program is not succeeding in meeting a number of its purposes;
- 6) there is a need to focus on orientation and development programs for faculty, including part-time and temporary faculty.

Summary of Faculty Senate Forums

During the spring semester 2001, the Faculty Senate conducted forums dealing with three aspects of general education: curriculum, assessment and instruction. A member of the PRC and the Vice Provost for Academic Programs met with the full Senate at its March 6 meeting. The Chair of the Faculty Senate met with the PRC on April 23 and summarized the discussions in the forums. Even though participation in the forums was limited and there were relatively few questions asked at the Senate meeting of March 6, the Senate concerns tended to center on the following points:

- 1) a need for better organization, publicity and monitoring of general education;
- 2) the number of general education courses being taught by part-time or temporary faculty;

- 3) the importance of integrating general education program review with program review of departments having a substantial mission in general education.

Summary of Comments from the Student Achievement Assessment Committee

The PRC met with the Chair of the Student Achievement Assessment Committee (SAAC) on April 16. That committee has concerns about program assessment of general education learning outcomes, especially given the imminence of the NCA re-accreditation self-study. It advances a number of proposals to strengthen the General Education Program, particularly by increasing faculty self-awareness. The proposals include:

- 1) the widespread publication of the rationale for general education requirements;
- 2) regular meetings of faculty teaching general education courses;
- 3) the incorporation of relevant general education outcomes in all general education course syllabi;
- 4) the incorporation of general education learning outcomes in course activities and requirements;
- 5) label general education courses in the university catalog with a common prefix or letter;
- 6) further conversations to align general education learning outcomes and the university learning outcomes, leading to benchmark scales for assessing student achievement of these outcomes within general education courses;
- 7) the establishment of joint appointments in their home departments and to-be-created Faculty of General Education;
- 8) the establishment of an independent merit increment pool, peer-review of courses and assessments for the Faculty of General Education.

Program Review Committee Findings

In its review of the reports and documents that constitute this review, the PRC draws the following principal findings:

- 1) The General Education Program is fundamentally sound; there appears to be a reasonably strong consensus on its objectives and there is no advocacy of a thorough restructuring. A few minor structural changes are in order, however, as described below.
- 2) The purposes and nature of the General Education Program are not adequately understood by most students and faculty. The purposes of the Program might include all of the following, to different degrees:
 - a) to ensure students have breadth of knowledge in content areas;
 - b) to develop skills and abilities that are common to different content areas;
 - c) to learn the “ways of knowing” of different content areas;
 - d) to lead students to their first success with academic material at the college level;
 - e) to connect life experience that builds on study;
 - f) to prepare students for life outside their major; and
 - g) to recruit students into the major.

- 3) The present organizational structure, with the Director of General Education reporting to the Vice Provost for Academic Programs, appears to be an appropriate means of providing visibility to general education and of signifying its significance in the university curriculum.
- 4) Despite limited resources, the Director of General Education has worked diligently to develop a coherent general education curriculum.
- 5) The principal shortcomings of the general education program at the 'delivery' level are:
 - a) faculty are unclear about the purposes of general education and about the general education learning outcomes their courses are intended to serve;
 - b) much of general education is delivered in large, lecture-format classes, which frequently do not include opportunities for active learning;
 - c) students are unaware of the purposes of general education and treat general education classes as just "hoops to jump through"; and
 - d) too many courses and sections are taught by temporary or part-time faculty.
- 6) Only the President and Provost can provide the kind of leadership that will assure the realization of greater departmental commitment to general education. The problem is more than providing faculty lines; it is one of transforming university expectations of faculty, so that faculty see their role in helping to achieve a fundamental set of academic requirements for all students.
- 7) The PRC finds that assessment of general education lags behind assessment of the majors. However, the PRC also finds that pilot work on assessment of general education courses has been initiated. The student learning outcomes of the general education program need to be assessed in a systematic manner, most likely at the level of individual courses.
- 8) A systematic review of general education courses is underway. The PRC finds that this review promises to be productive, although it should be coupled with assessment of student learning and with faculty development to be most successful.
- 9) The Vision and Values Committee has proposed a plan, one component of which would be the redirection of the eighth general education course from "upper level" to "values exploration." The PRC supports this development.
- 10) No formal or informal relationship exists between what is taught in the general studies writing curriculum and what is taught in the general education curriculum.
- 11) Because of its belief that general education ought to be central to academic departments, the PRC does not endorse the suggestion that a General Education Faculty should be established. Not only would that accentuate divisions between general education and the 'real business' of the departments, it would also be difficult to identify the General Education Faculty. Although the PRC acknowledges that the creation of a General Education Faculty would create substantial political means to accomplish the general education goals outlined above, we also believe this strategy would create another level of administration and faculty review, and would thus add unnecessary bureaucracy.
- 12) As noted in recommendation number 4 of the external report, all colleges should participate in offering courses in the General Education Program.

Program Review Committee Recommendations

The Program Review Committee believes that a strong liberal education – as embodied in our program in general education – is fundamental to the educational experience at BGSU. Together with general studies writing, it comprises the common academic ground for all students at BGSU. The skills and abilities emphasized in the general education curriculum are foundational to work in the majors, while the distribution requirements familiarize students with many branches of knowledge beyond their individual majors. Given its central role in the educational experience, the General Education Program deserves particular attention as BGSU strives to achieve its vision of becoming the premier learning community in the state of Ohio and one of the best in the nation. Toward that end, the PRC offers the following recommendations:

- 1) The PRC asks the President to include general education among the annual priorities and strategic future directions, and to support this placement in the Opening Day and State of the University addresses. Similarly, the PRC asks the Provost to support general education in his discussions with Deans about their priorities and personnel planning.
- 2) The most important responsibility of the Director of General Education, the General Education Committee, and the Vice Provost for Academic Programs is to undertake a major effort, at various levels, to educate faculty, students, parents and prospective students about the objectives and nature of the General Education Program. The Director of General Education should report progress in the following initiatives in her annual reports.
 - a) It is essential that faculty who have general education instructional responsibilities understand what learning outcomes their students are supposed to achieve. The Director of General Education should work with the CTLT to offer a variety of workshops and seminars in general education, beginning in fall, 2001.
 - b) The Director of General Education and the Vice Provost for Academic Programs should engage College Deans and the Vice Provost for Academic Services in similar efforts directed toward advisers in academic departments and college offices.
 - c) The Director of General Education should begin working with Marketing and Communications to ensure that the philosophy and requirements of general education become a prominent part of recruitment materials, freshman orientation, university publications, the web-site and other informational materials.
 - d) The Vice Provost for Academic Programs must work with academic deans to ensure that general education is valued in decisions regarding scheduling and staffing of general education courses, personnel requests, merit guidelines, promotion and tenure decisions, and operating budgets – decisions about allocation of resources must be guided by the purposes and needs of general education.
 - e) The President or Provost should be encouraged to develop an award, perhaps modeled on awards for advising or faculty sponsorship of undergraduate research, for contributions to general education. The PRC

recommends that the award be to a department, and be a substantial one-time input to operating budget (\$5,000 to \$10,000).

- 3) The Director of General Education should increase her efforts to communicate to all faculty who teach general education courses, every semester. She should provide faculty with the general education learning outcomes appropriate for their courses and help faculty develop a statement of how their courses fulfill general education objectives. Such material should be a regular part of syllabi and in-class discussion.
- 4) The General Education Committee's plan to review all general education courses over the next four years with the objective of a more coherent program by 2005 should be pursued.
 - a) To address immediate needs, the course review could target "mass lecture" courses for early review. Courses that do not provide opportunities for active learning in small discussion/recitation/laboratory sections are probably in greatest need of early review.
 - b) Review of courses should continue to set high standards, which should include:
 - i) an expectation that all general education courses provide opportunities for active learning in small discussion/recitation/laboratory sections;
 - ii) an expectation that learning outcomes of general education courses will be articulated to students and assessed in ways not limited to paper and pencil tests; and
 - iii) an expectation that course structure and pedagogy will be regularly adjusted in response to information about student learning in the course.
 - c) Courses not living up to the above standards should be put on probation; the Director of General Education ought to work with chairs to correct the problems that resulted in probation. If the course does not come into compliance within two years, however, it should be removed from the general education curriculum.
 - d) The review of general education courses should be ongoing and cyclic.
- 5) Elements of recommendations 3, 4 and 9 should be coordinated. Specifically, some of the workshops and other development opportunities described in recommendation 3 should be designed and timed to prepare faculty/departments for the cyclic course review described in recommendation 4. To the extent that deans support these efforts and expect chairs and faculty to participate, as described in recommendation 9, the success of the workshops and the course review will be increased. Successes in improving general education learning outcomes should be communicated as a positive incentive for faculty participation.
- 6) The departments offering the courses, in collaboration with the General Education Committee, should assume the responsibility for assessment of general education courses. Departments could build on their assessments for the major in designing assessments for general education courses. Departments should report annually to the General Education Committee on their

assessments of general education courses. The General Education Committee should initiate discussions with departments to develop an understanding about the timing and content of these reports. The General Education Committee should submit an annual report to the Student Achievement Assessment Committee summarizing the department reports.

- 7) Feedback from students about general education, like assessment of student learning, is valuable information. After assessment plans are under way (recommendation 6) the Director of General Education should work with faculty to develop a means to collect student feedback on general education courses.
- 8) If it is to achieve its goals, the General Education Program needs to be given greater resources. The expectations laid out above are not reasonable without additional support.
 - a) The PRC recommends that the Director's position be changed from an academic year to a fiscal year contract, effective as soon as possible.
 - b) The General Education Program should be supported by a full-time secretary and funds for student employees.
 - c) The Director of General Education should develop a budget proposal for the support of the General Education Program, and present that proposal to the Provost and the Vice President for Finance and Administration by the end of fall semester, 2001.
- 9) Deans should work with department chairs to make sure that general education is considered a vital part of the curricular mission of academic departments. Probationary and tenured faculty ought to be providing a substantial portion of the general education instruction. The PRC believes that such deployment of tenured and tenure-track faculty will both increase the quality of instruction in general education classes and deliver an important message to students and parents about the educational values of the University.
 - a) With the recruitment of a large number of new probationary faculty in recent years, the Vice Provost for Academic Programs should work with Deans to ensure that Chairs give high priority to staffing general education courses with full-time faculty.
 - b) Deans should review promotion and tenure documents and merit procedures to make sure that instruction, assessment and curriculum development in general education are rewarded appropriately.
 - c) We recommend that the Provost communicate to deans and college promotion and tenure committees that successful contribution to general education will be recognized and rewarded.
- 10) To facilitate identification of general education courses, the PRC strongly recommends that such courses have an appropriate prefix in the course inventory and Undergraduate Catalog, e.g. 'G-PSYC 201', so that both students in registering for such courses and faculty in teaching them would be fully aware of their place in the curriculum. The Director of General Education

should work with the Director of Registration and Records to make this change during the 2001-2002 academic year.

- 11) In the fall of 2001, the Vice Provost for Academic Programs should initiate a curriculum modification, to be reviewed by Undergraduate Council, making the university requirement for writing proficiency part of the general education academic requirements. This would not entail change in the administration of General Studies Writing; the requirements for writing proficiency should merely be included among the academic requirements for general education.
- 12) The Director of General Education and the General Education Committee should work with the Vision and Values Implementation Committee in the development and implementation of courses appropriate to fulfill a requirement for the "critical exploration of values."
- 13) The Director of General Education should continue to work to involve all colleges in offering courses in the general education curriculum.

The Director of General Education should report annually to the Vice Provost for Academic Programs, with a copy to the Provost, on the implementation of these recommendations.