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I was at the noon meeting on 2/1/2011 and we were told the "framework" for LE had not been developed yet. How is it that no one wanted to talk about the framework that is posted online as having been revised on 11/11/11?

The wellness requirement.

I think integrative learning is very important. It concerns me that we would no longer require a science lab and we would no longer require a wellness credit. I believe that the requirement for immersion needs to be very broad because not all students can leave Eau Claire.

There seems to be considerable pressure coming from the campus administration to push through reform in a short amount of time, which may not be the ideal way to gain widespread support for major reform efforts. There also seems to be a schism between the faculty-determined curriculum and the Blugold Commitment process for funding new and ongoing initiatives. Could this be problematic?

I would like to see the "assigned" credits incorporated into/under the university goals. I think it sends more of the message of what we are trying to do and still can require students to get a certain number of natural sciences etc.

The proposal does not seem to have achieved a major change in our program design. It is still essentially a distribution model, albeit somewhat simplified vs. our present model. Layered on top of the distribution model is some attention to the LE outcomes, such that we can ensure (or at least hope) each student has had at least some minimal exposure to each of the LE outcomes. (By virtue of having the courses that satisfy the distribution model requirements also address the LE outcomes.) This is a far cry from having a system designed around the LE outcomes themselves. It also divorces the remaining 78 credits from attention to or recognition of attention to the LE outcomes. Here is an alternative proposal: Have the distribution model as proposed. (Math comp, Engl comp, Comm, Ethics, Arts/Hum, Soc Sci, Nat Sci, etc.) There is no specific credit requirement, just be able to check off that each of these bases have been covered as part of getting a well-rounded college education. Separately, we should require each student to have a certain degree of exposure to each of the LE outcomes. These exposures could be scattered across the entire 120 credits. The requirement does not need to be so high that graduating within 120 credits to degree is challenged. Some of the exposure naturally would come from the courses taken as part of the distribution model requirements. But some would come from courses in the major, or elsewhere. This model unifies the entire campus toward the LE goals, rather than making it primarily the responsibility of a 42 credit subset of the students program. I do not envision each student having to individually wade through the course selection in order to find the right courses necessary to satisfy the required exposure to each LE outcome. Rather, the majors could be designed, as a package, to provide whatever minimal exposure is required, beyond that provided by the distribution model. My primary concern here is the implication of the current proposal: Our attention to campus learning goals is contained within 42 credits. The LE goals are broader than that, can be and should be recognized as infused throughout all the majors in this university.
Combining university and GE requirements into a single LE core is a great idea! Reducing it by 10-ish credits is a step in the right direction. Leaving 18 open electives is a good idea, too. I hope they remain pretty much unallocated so students can put unusable transfer credit, courses from prior majors/minors, etc. That will let them still graduate in 120 credits even if they changed their major or otherwise accumulated credit that isn't directly applicable to the program in which they finally graduate. Maintaining service-learning is a good idea. We ought to remove the prohibitions on religious service and remunerated service and add quality constraints so we don’t have accusations that meaningless activity can qualify as service. Requiring an immersion experience is good--as long as it can be part of the major (e.g., an internship). Having a global learning requirement is good--as long as it really is global. Having a regular on-campus course defined as global won’t serve the purpose. Preserving a breadth requirement is good--but see my comments next about how it’s still inadequate because "breadth" still apparently equals A&S. The proposed framework apparently continues the A&S stranglehold on general-cum-liberal education at UW-Eau Claire. This is bad for at least two reasons: 1) it maintains the same old turf and resource allocation and hence kills any real innovation in its crib. 2) Students will continue to get the same point of view in their liberal education which, though certainly one valid viewpoint, is not the only one. Instead, for example, UW-Eau Claire biology students should take at least some of their liberal education courses from the college of business or nursing or education. If integrative Learning is primarily a way UW-Eau Claire instructors are to approach their curriculum development and teaching, then it’s not a learning goal. If it’s something we expect students to learn--i.e., if we expect UW-Eau Claire graduates to be able to engage on their own throughout their lives in integrative learning, then it is a learning goal (that would need to be assessed). The discussion I’ve heard so far has indicated to me that there’s been much more thinking about integrating learning as a pedagogical approach than as a learning goal; thus I think it’s presently premature to make it a UW-Eau Claire learning goal. It needs to be clearly defined as such to be adopted as such. A rubric for each learning goal is necessary for assessment, but they look to me like they could easily become a mechanism for ending academic freedom: "Anything not approved by a rubric has no place in UWEC courses!" Scary. I very sincerely hope this will be explicitly laid to rest before these (or any other campus-wide) rubrics are officially adopted. The homegrown rubrics (race/class/gender and global learning) need to be validated at a regional/national level before being adopted. After all, a major use of them will be for HLC accreditation.

I attended the presentation at the College meeting on Tuesday. I believe the elements of the framework are well structured, except the "Additional Requirements," which include immersion and service-learning. This aspect of the structure is not really unified with the other items -- naming it "additional requirements" suggests it does not really have a place. But its place would be obvious if the service-learning requirement were just subsumed under immersion. Then this whole category could be called "immersion." But I am not just talking about the naming of requirements. Someone suggested that some service-learning projects might not live up to an "immersion" ideal -- implying a certain grandness to the immersion experience. However, we are not in a financial position to make the immersion experience so grand. If all students need to complete such an experience, it make sense to start with modest or more-short lived experiences -- for example, service-learning -- that still constitute immersion. Moreover, the established guidelines for what constitutes service-learning would be a reasonable starting point for defining what kind of assessable activity constitutes immersion more generally.

I graduated from a school that emphasized liberal education, so I have taken 21 credits of philosophy and theology, 6 credits of math, 6 credits of English, 6 credits of European history, 6 credits of math, 12 credits of economics, etc. At our ULEC meeting, we suffered through one presentation last week during which we were told, "there is no framework". Within five minutes of returning to my desk after the
meeting, I printed the non-existent framework from UWEC’s website. ULEC has seriously damaged its credibility. In addition, ULEC reps said UWEC needed to get away from a distribution model based on solid research and then proceeded to present a NEW distribution model that incorporates only A&S classes. Seems to me ULEC’s contribution is to include English and Math competences into LE. Can you imagine the nightmare this will be for our transfer students—just under 10% of our student body? What about the UW-College student with 2-year degree? Do they meet LE? How is the transfer student with 60 credits supposed to meet 18 credits of integrative experiences and complete the required courses in a major? I thought one of our objectives was to facilitate transfers, not hinder. No one addressed this issue. The questions as to how the professional schools could contribute was not addressed adequately.

I didn’t see any reference to foreign language education. I assume there will be a foreign language competency component to this plan. Global learning is basically empty without this component; it is like saying "study abroad in English speaking countries only, please."

How will LE reform impact interdisciplinary program requirements and elective offerings? What changes may need to be made to the current LE reform proposal to assure that the limitations to the number of credits under a certain prefix does not limit the indisciplinary offerings under prefixes like AIS, LAS, WMNS, and IDIS?

Clarity, the relationship between integrative learning as a general principle of liberal education in the reform proposal under consideration versus integrative learning as one of six specific liberal education learning goals. Clarify the relative weight we plan to give to each of the six liberal education learning goals and associated outcomes. Clarify why we will maintain the kind of compromise between an outcomes-based model of liberal education and a distribution-based model that we are currently considering. Clarify how this change from the current general education system will be implemented, in what stages and phases, and involving what delegation of authority and responsibility to whom. Clarify how emphasis on teaching that results in engaging in processes as well as teaching that results in producing products will be effectively assessed. Clarify as well how knowledges and skills which are sites of conflict and struggle, of difference and contestation, will be effectively assessed. Clarify what will happen to existing general education courses once the new model for liberal education is passed.

To: LE Reformers  Re: Initial Impressions 2/15/12 Hello, I have taken a few moments to respond to the LE reform proposals with some of my initial thoughts. I included some quotations which can be ignored or heeded accordingly. First, I would like to state I support rethinking Liberal Education. I sincerely hope that the motivations for these changes will remain focused on students’ ability to synthesize knowledge and on pedagogical concerns and not on increased four-year graduation rates and increased assessment ease. I hope that we do not begin to create educational products for consumption. Revisions to General Education are not going to keep students from being indecisive and changing majors nor will it make the difficulty of assessing the creative arts’ contributions to society cleaner or less recalcitrant. “…not simply because it can be reduced to a statistical fact, but also because it has been reduced to a commodity. In such a system there is no space for experience…Nor is there space for the social function of subjectivity. All subjectivity is treated as private, and the only (false) form of it which is socially allowed is that of the individual consumer’s dream.” Another Way of Telling, John Berger A few concerns I have with the current six credit requirement in the arts is that I would like to distinguish between two types of Humanities. These categories might be defined in several ways, but I think descriptions such as Theory and Practice, Reflection and Generation, or Theory and Process might serve as beginning points. Such categories would separate requirements between courses where creative action is primary, such as writing a poem, making a painting, or performing or interpreting a song or composition as opposed to courses where critical reflection is primary. Obviously these approaches overlap. We do not make a poem without thinking critically, and we do not write about
philosophy without some creativity. But the primary origin of brain activity emphasized in these activities is different, especially in the visual arts or music where language is obscured and communication is complicated. I also acknowledge that such terms as reflection or creativity are loaded terms already assimilated into the Liberal Education reform proposals. Perhaps a recommendation might take the form of nine credits required with at least one of these involving a generative action as a primary outcome rather than reflection as the primary outcome. I think that this might be applied in the sciences much like the lab requirement, but that is outside my immediate sphere. I also understand that perhaps the 6 credits in each area was a necessary compromise, and so then it could be one and one. I would suggest departments and instructors would define their courses as being primarily reflective or generative. If this is viewed to be impossible, I would then argue for distinguishing Arts from Humanities, though in my mind, any distinctions made in this way would be less effective and honest to what actually separates student activity in courses than the proposal above. “On the part of the consumer, the enjoyment of beauty is a kind of contemplation, but on the part of the producer, art is action.” The Arts of the Beautiful, Etienne Gilson “It is a queer thing that so few reviewers seem to realize that one writes poetry because one must… It is quite possible to have a feeling about the world which creates a need that nothing satisfies except poetry and this has nothing to do with other poets or with anything else.” Wallace Stevens Next, I’m curious about the pyramid structure of 60, 42, 18. Sciences, Arts and other areas are being reduced from 15 credits to 6. Yet, the pyramid shows a net reduction of only 3 GEs with the 42 in place. I can only assume these other credits will be absorbed by new GE requirements, but without knowledge of what those courses entail, who teaches them and what form they take it is difficult to exert enthusiasm or skepticism. Finally, I would suggest that the definition of immersion be broadly interpreted to incorporate more courses than is currently practiced. Immersion, for the arts, might involve a workshop with a writer, musician or artist—a studio visit or a reading/interview. It might include a “behind the scenes” view of a non-profit arts organization, publisher or radio station. It might involve going to a music festival or a writing conference. In the past, immersion has implicitly been defined to me as having an ethical or moral dimension which I think is encouraging. However, I think the arts are a perfect place for immersion and have been overlooked in the past. I do not think this should be confused with Service Learning which has always had a specific goal of involving the student in a social relationship within the Eau Claire community, whereas the immersion experience does not imply or necessitate the Eau Claire community at all, perhaps the contrary. Service Learning has always been about building up and supporting the community of which you are currently a part. Furthermore, I may be alone in this, but I do not think students should receive credit for Service Learning. Though I am aware that requiring service at all dilutes the concept of volunteerism or service, offering credit for such experiences will obfuscate this to point where I could not explain it or justify how it is different than an immersion or integrative learning experience to a student. Immersion, in my understanding, exists to remove the student from their normal social and geographical comfort and immerse them in new social and cultural situations, as well as engaging them in new ideas and concepts. I also think this should not be confused with integrative learning, which might involve collaboration with community organizations on projects conceived within the structure of a course. In conclusion, we must be careful that clear definitions are in place if we are to require these expectations for students across the disciplines. “…We can count on it/when we’re sure of nothing and curious about everything…” from A Few Words on the Soul by the late great, Wislawa Szymborska, Translated from the Polish by, Stanislaw Baranczak and Clare Cavanagh “To suppress the freedom of the artist is not only to cut off knowledge of the actual movements of human feeling but also, and more disastrously, contact with the realities of life.” Joyce Carey, from Art and Reality I’m a degree auditor, so my primary concerns are: 1) How will we explain this to students? Many of our current requirements are not clearly understood by students or some advisors. Anything you come
up with needs to be clearly understood and practical. This means, of course, that our students will continue to view these requirements as a checklist to be crossed off -- but I don't see any way around that. 2) How will we track this? At the moment checking service learning (which can be met several ways) requires an office with 20 hours a week of clerical help, a part-time director, and student workers. Will we need a similar level of effort to track integrative learning? Immersion experience? Anything that is not easily coded as a course attribute will be a challenge. 3) PLEASE consider modifying the "maximum two courses from any one prefix" requirement. This is extremely difficult to code and takes a huge amount of processing time. Many students will look only toward checking off the requirements and will not think until too late about the max two courses from any one prefix. It seems to me that by excluding major courses from the 42 credits you are creating diversity. An added complication with the PeopleSoft degree audit program (that we hope to bring up next year) is that when there is a limit like this, the system only sees and only prints the first two courses taken chronologically in a given prefix. It might be in a student's interest to use course #2 and #3, but I don't know how we'll do that. 4) There are some requirements that I don't see addressed here at all. We have residency and senior residency requirements, major/minor concentration and overlap requirements, and requirements for a minimum number of upper-division credits. Some of these may no longer be necessary as part of the new philosophy. If not, state explicitly that they are going away. 5) Implementation is not a trivial exercise. Students are held to the requirements outlined in the catalog during their first UW-Eau Claire term unless they request a change to a more recent catalog. If the student body perceives the new requirements as better (or easier) there is going to be a mass shift to the newer catalog and a high demand for courses to meet the new requirements. DON'T change the requirements until a means of meeting them is in place. Other comments: 6) We have one University-wide set of requirements now. Each college has tweaked the University requirements for reasons that have to do with that College's mission. Teacher education majors will still have to take the courses required by DPI (economics, conservation of natural resources, Wisconsin history) as well as the teacher education courses as well as their major courses. Social Workers, Communication Disorders majors and Nurses will need to take the courses outside the major required for certification. No matter what philosophy you start with, majors that are preparing students for a given career will have requirements beyond the liberal education requirements. 7) It has not been 30 years since GE was looked at. The redefinition of the baccalaureate degree in the 1980s was a huge undertaking. Becky Drout

Here are some of my major concerns: 1. Departments/discipines remaining "territorial" about LE courses, rather than focusing on students' needs for meaningful learning and the university's obligation to advance an educated citizenry. 2. Ensuring that any new LE program can be meaningfully assessed in terms of learner outcomes. 3. Developing a coherent, integrated system that works for the university as a whole and that remains true to major national standards for LE frameworks, philosophy, and goals/objectives. 4. Establishing student learning outcomes with sufficient academic rigor and advanced cognitive development to ensure that UWEC graduates demonstrate the distinctiveness envisioned in our university vision/mission statements. 5. The challenge of providing student and faculty supports to deliver the kinds of high-level teaching/learning envisioned in our centennial plan. 6. Developing and sustaining a shared university culture of commitment to effective liberal education learning outcomes.

The concept of liberal education seems to be a good one. My concern is how to measure outcomes (achievement). I don't agree with vague statements that don't measure it. I would like to see colleges across campus working together more. Why can't we team up and develop clinical experiences for nursing students with our colleagues?

My primary concern revolves around what the phrase "liberal education requirements common to all
degrees” means. The draft of the proposal I saw said that colleges and majors could add requirements but they wouldn't be considered part of the liberal education requirements. I think we need to be very clear about this. Students don't care what is part of the “liberal ed core”--- they just care about what courses they need to take. So let me ask specific questions:: 1) Will the B.A. be "allowed" to require a foreign language? Will A&S be "allowed" to require more humanities in the B.A. 2) Will Nursing students be "allowed" to count their science courses and their Psychology 230 as part of liberal education? If G.E. courses are grandfathered as L.E. for a while, then these would count as L.E. I assume. I could go on, but you get the idea. If these are allowed, then the phrase "common to all degrees" means exactly what it means now and time to degree will not be helped. We have common G.E. requirements, but no one follows them. I understand the reasoning behind the different requirements, I just don't want people to think that we are really streamlining requirements if we aren’t. We will advise students exactly as we do now--- if you are Nursing you take these G.E. courses (now L.E.) and if you are Education or Business, etc. you take these. Secondly, I am concerned about the lack of any developmental component to this plan. I really liked the original L.E. plan with Gateway and milestone courses. I think it is crucial to have something at the freshman level that transitions a student from the way they are taught in high school to the way they need to think at UW-Eau Claire. I would prefer to have another one at the sophomore level, because I think you can introduce more at that level. But I really would like to see a capstone L.E. course. If we don't do something like that, this model will be no less like a "check-box, pick twofers and threefers" than hte current model is. Some specific comments: 1) I have concerns about reducing the global culture to one course---- which is not at all in keeping with our mission statement. 2) We can't sustain two courses in "race, class and gender equity" without dramatic changes in our staffing or diluting the requirement. I also hope that we don't go with the multi-cultural rubric that is currently under consideration. It biases the curriculum in ways that I don't think are in keeping with helping our students to think critically. 3) The ethical reasoning requirements seems like a "throw-in." Since we need to look at the learning outcomes anyway, broadening that one would be helpful. "Individual and social responsibility" is about much more than "ethical reasoning"-- as the AAC&U outcomes indicate. Moreover, I thought that one of the ideas of our redefining our liberal education was to get away from "one course equals one outcome" and looking at the entire baccalaureate experience. 4) I think we need to broaded the math requirement to be more about quantitative literacy, as the AAC&U has it. And I think "information literacy" is even more important. A technical issue -- We can say that courses in the major can't be used for L.E., although even that gets very tricky with multi-disciplinary majors. The no more than 2 courses in any departmental or program prefix gets much more complicated. We can't do departments, since they change and the degree audit wouldn't know. If you do prefixes, you could just have the proliferation of prefixes--- and "home departments" of cross-listed courses become even more crucial. While I applaud the work of ULEC, I want to make sure that everyone understands that this is no less complicated than our current model--- it is in some ways more complicated. Good luck. Thanks for your work and thanks for the opportunity to have input. Debbie Gough

Students may potentially have less GE requirements that they can take while studying abroad. For academic disciplines where students easily can study abroad in their major/minor, this change may have a limited impact. However, for others with more rigid curricular requirements and sequencing, it could make it more difficult to study abroad. Under the proposed framework, students will have 42 credits of “Common Liberal Education Core”, which encompass university requirements such as math requirement, writing, communication, and some of the former GE categories: Arts and Humanities, Social Science, and Natural Science. Students will also need to take 18 credits in integrative learning, these are cross disciplinary courses that help student integrate learning across academic disciplines. As I understand it, students would only need to take 6 credits in each of these former, remaining GE
categories, meaning they most likely will have fulfilled many of these requirements by the time they are eligible to study abroad. First-year students will still be fulfilling them during much of their first year since they often don’t have a declared major or minor and can’t necessarily access major/minor course work due to the priority registration system. Also I see in advising students that many of them fulfill GE requirements through AP and test credits, which further reduces what they need to take at UWEC and consequently can take on study abroad. At this point, it is not clear to me whether students would be able to take the integrative learning credits abroad. The impression that I received is that it could be difficult to fulfill the integrative learning requirement abroad unless the student can demonstrate that the course is purposefully making connections across disciplines. I would hope that study abroad would be considered when defining what qualifies as integrative learning at UWEC and how transfer credit would be evaluated for integrative learning. I also think further discussion on how study abroad students could fulfill integrative learning while abroad would be useful.

The only concern I have is the efficiency in which students that have a declared major and minor at UWEC will be able to graduate. For example, as nursing professor we have a number of undergraduate students that are also Spanish minors. The students work hard and have a demanding schedule that requires them to work their additional Spanish classes around their core nursing courses. If we limit them to choose no more than 2 classes from one of the listed headings (i.e., Arts & Humanities) can be used to graduate, meaning they need courses from other areas within this heading, will this impact the timeliness of their graduation or their choice to choose a minor?

It is very important that the committee consider how transfer students will meet the requirements. Nearly all students attending the Marshfield site for nursing are transfer students and need to meet the Liberal Education requirements for UWEC.

Dear colleagues, In our department, Foreign Languages, we have been discussing the university-wide foreign language / foreign culture requirement for graduation. As you know, currently there are three ways to satisfy this requirement. Does the proposal from the ULEC to reform our GE program subsume and replace this university-wide requirement? If so, what is your rationale given that this is a university requirement and not part of the current GE program? To us this seems to work against the Goal #3 of the Centennial Plan which looks to accelerate global learning on campus. If the proposal presented were to take the place of the current requirement, students could end of taking one class, instead of studying abroad, or the 9 required credits of foreign culture, or a foreign language. Thanks for considering these comments. Carter Smith

I am concerned that the proposed LE framework fails to maintain sufficient 'breadth' across the disciplines of the Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences. In fact, I believe the new LE Framework flies in the face of a long history of faculty participation (which are actually documented on the LE reform webpage): 1) The final report of the General Education Reform Committee states on page 3 (The Faculty Voice page with 'We Heard You!' stamped across it) that one of the first primary faculty desire is to MAINTAIN BREADTH, and the following page (p. 4) indicates reform efforts SUCCEEDED in this goal; 2) The final report of the Strategic Planning Group 2, on page 5, recommends as Objective 1, Academic Breadth, to... 'Create and approve a simple, balanced, and flexible provision that requires a minimum number of credits across a few general areas, perhaps 9-10 credits in each of the following: social sciences, humanities, and natural sciences’ How did the 6-6-6 plan ever get hatched. This plan cuts breadth requirements by 50%. Please FIX this!

Please do not eliminate lab science from the undergraduate liberal education requirements. Currently, it is one of the few required courses that incorporates high impact pedagogical practices of active learning and immersion, which have been shown to be especially effective for students from underserved populations (including first-generation, off-the-farm students). True, if some lab science
courses are failing to provide our general education students what we want them to get, than we can identify that with our new assessment instruments and fix them. But it seems the only reason to ELIMINATE this requirement would be for financial reasons, and this is counter to what LE reform at UWEC was supposed to be.

I think it is very important that a serious discussion be held about high impact practices with the curriculum, and how they are going to maintained and enhanced under the new curriculum. Exactly how high impact practices, immemions experiences and other activities are going to be developed and integrated is very unclear, and cannot be left to figure out at a later date. For example, it is apparent that the poll taken on the role of lab science in the natural science curriculum has been ignored. This is an opportunity to develop a set of truly integrated high impact lab sciences within and across disciplines that would revolutionize the current system, and replace a number of less useful experiences. This idea should be explored, not ignored.

I have two concerns about the nature of faculty feedback with the use of this particular Qualtrics survey:
1) I think the effort at publicizing this feedback form was weak, at best. The link was contained in an email sent by 'Paula Collins', but I think it would have generated significant more interest if it came from Dean Marty Wood, and had in the email the presentation of the proposed new framework with an explicit itemization of what is NEW and DIFFERENT about the new framework compared to the existing one.  2) I very much hope that comments submitted through this portal do not end up in a 'Black Hole', that is that they are published somewhere so that we can all see the concerns of the faculty with this radical change in the liberal education of our UW-Eau Claire undergraduate students.

I have always heard that Liberal Education teaches one HOW to think, rather than WHAT to think. I had an excellent Liberal Education from Madison, and learned a lot about many subjects I would not have thought would be at all practical. I have had a long life, and it is amazing how the skills and subject matter I learned in my late teens and early twenties has helped me in a huge variety of employment experiences and life adventures. I took one language in college, and the techniques that I learned have helped me read and even speak a few others. I have used my smattering of science, anthropology, even the two courses I took in Library Science to help me in advancing the education of my children. Today, I teach--not in the original plan! But shifting from parenthood to the workforce to graduate school to my current role was made possible by the excellent background Madison forced me into! I deplore the loss of the General Education in favor of a more vocational approach. I am concerned that the "get them out of here in 4 years" approach is not necessarily favorable for the student, or the society at large. Are we going down a road that will guarantee a work force of pliable and sheep-like workers who don't have the background to question, to change, to think? Do we want to be a vocational school--because that is where the money is?

Currently, many of our ensembles are repeatable for credit. For example, non-music majors take a choral ensemble for three semesters to satisfy GE-4. In the new LE model, how would this work? Perhaps, since this is a single course that is repeatable for credit, students could take it for their 6 credits of Humanities/Creative Arts, taking 3 credits of, for example, Concert Choir 188, and three credits of Concert Choir 388. OR it could be interrupted to mean that only 2 credits (for example, 1 course repeatable for credit, taken twice) could ‘count’ in their degree for the 6 credits of Humanities and Arts. It would seem that any course that is repeatable for credit could be repeated for the maximum amount of credit in a category. I do not think music, theatre and dance are unique in this. For our non-majors, this has been a recruitment factor for our department. In some form, I hope we can keep these credits as a potential in a liberal arts education.-Vanissa Murphy  How would the new proposal change this?

After reading through the minutes of many of the APC meetings, attending College and university-wide
meetings to present the various iterations of the LE reform proposal, it is still unclear to me if the College requirements will remain or if the reform will subsume them. Has this been, or will this be, discussed?

It is important for students' overall citizenship skills that we significantly improve their scientific literacy. This means that ALL students should be exposed to courses that enable them to experience the scientific reasoning process (not merely memorize some "scientific facts"). It is VITAL to our future that citizens understand how science is conducted and can both appreciate the value of scientific evidence as the result of a systematic process of controlled inquiry and understand the limitation of scientific knowledge as only giving information about what is quantifiable. Students must learn to critically consume scientific information to be prevented from either blindly waiting for scientists to tell them what to do OR rejecting all scientific evidence out of hand. Our efforts toward LE reform represent an opportunity to fundamentally re-evaluate how we're promoting these literacies in our students. Let's take advantage of all this work and really get it right this time!!

I hope that ULEC and APC are able to keep the proposal reasonable simple, so that the number of sub-requirments are not excessive. For instance, I don't think there should be disciplinary breadth requirements within the integrated learning requirements. Whatever can be done to make the new system simple enough that students & faculty can easily follow it should be done. The current system includes a great deal of subrequirements, not only through disciplinary categories/subcategories, but because of minimum requirements for upper division GE courses, upper division courses overall, etc. These policies affect everyone in that they're visible on everyone's degree audit, but they only apply to small numbers of students. It's not worth making overall requirements more complex in order to target these small populations. Please go on to pass a reasonable reform, but keep it simple, and save everyone some time and headache that accumulates on a daily basis with more complicated (but un-assessed) systems.

So it is a matter of record, I am submitting a copy of a possible rearticulation of the ULEC Framework for Undergraduate Liberal Education Core Requirements, that I first shared with APC colleagues on April 3, 2012. This rearticulation is simply an attempt at offering one possible way of overcoming some hesitancies and confusions in moving forward within APC, in considering specific requirements as part of an overall framework. It also attempts to provide a structure which more directly reflects and aligns with our liberal education learning goals and outcomes. And it further incorporates suggested modifications and additions to the framework that reflect and respond to where many faculty, academic staff, and others have expressed concern and offered recommendations for modification. In doing so, this rearticulation attempts to incorporate these concerns and recommendations logically so that we can carefully consider whether they make good sense, and if we find them strongly compelling. Finally, this rearticulation attempts to offer a potentially more elegant presentation of our liberal education core. In sum, however, this effort is only an attempt to help move discussion and decision past obstacles that have slowed the process, and it is not a new framework but based directly upon the ULEC framework. It is not 'my framework'; it is merely an attempt to help us work our way through discussion and revision of the ULEC framework effectively, so that we within APC can bring to University Senate as soon as is reasonably possible a framework that Senators, and colleagues across campus, will be able to support. Bob Nowlan  *****  Possible Rearticulation of ULEC Framework for UWEC Undergraduate Liberal Education Core Requirements  A. Requirements: Knowledge of Human Culture and the Natural World  1. Arts and Humanities:  a. At least nine credits, from at least two different prefixes.  b. At least three credits should be in the Arts and at least three credits should be in the Humanities.  2. Social and Behavioral Sciences:  At least nine credits, from at least two different prefixes.  3. Natural Sciences, Physical Sciences, and Mathematics:  a. One course or the equivalent in Mathematics and/or
b. One natural or physical laboratory science course or the equivalent.  
c. One additional natural or physical science course, or the equivalent, from a prefix other than that from which the student earned laboratory science course credits.

B. Requirements: Creative Thinking, Critical Thinking, and Effective Communication

1. Creative Thinking: one course, at least one credit, or the equivalent. According to the AAC&U Creative Thinking Value Rubric, Creative Thinking involves “both the capacity to combine or synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways and the experience of thinking, reacting, and working in an imaginative way characterized by a high degree of innovation, divergent thinking, and risk taking.” Moreover, “creative thinking in higher education can only be expressed productively within a particular domain. The student must have a strong foundation in the strategies and skills of the domain in order to make connections and synthesize. While demonstrating solid knowledge of the domain’s parameters, the creative thinker, at the highest levels of performance, pushes beyond those boundaries in new, unique, or atypical recombinations, uncovering or critically perceiving new syntheses and using or recognizing creative risk-taking to achieve a solution.” A minimum of one credit of the course must be dedicated to these topics. Courses meeting these requirements are identified by “CREATE” in the catalog.

2. Critical Thinking: one course, at least one credit, or the equivalent. According to the AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric, Critical Thinking “is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.” Moreover, critical thinking integrates articulation of a position (perspective/thesis/hypothesis) as well as of conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences) with rigorous explanation, rigorous selection and use of evidence, and rigorous analysis of context and assumptions. A minimum of one credit of the course must be dedicated to these topics. Courses meeting these requirements are identified by “CRIT” in the catalog.

3. First-Year Writing requirement: one course or the equivalent.

4. Intensive Oral Communication requirement: one course or the equivalent.

C. Requirements: Individual and Social Responsibility, Respect for Diversity Among People, and Integrative Learning

1. Ethical Reasoning: one course, at least one credit, or the equivalent. At least one course which includes a focus on all the following topics (from the AAC&U Ethical Reasoning VALUE rubric): ethical self-awareness, understanding different ethical perspectives/concepts, ethical issue recognition, application of ethical perspectives/concepts, and evaluation of different ethical perspectives/concepts. A minimum of one credit of the course must be dedicated to these topics. Courses meeting these requirements are identified by “ER” in the catalog.

2. One Immersion Experience. Immersion experiences may be completed by either coursework or non-coursework activities. The following experiences may meet the immersion experience criteria: study abroad, domestic intercultural immersion (including relatively short, inexpensive options), faculty mentored scholarly/creative activity, national student exchange, internships, student teaching, and clinical/field experience. Courses meeting the immersion experience requirement are noted by “IM” in the catalog.


4. Race/Class/Gender Equity Studies: two courses in race, class, and/or gender equity studies. At least one of which will focus on the following ethnic groups in the United States: African-American, Native American, Asian-American, and Latino/a-American consistent with the UW-System’s “Cultural Diversity graduation requirement. Courses meeting this requirement are noted by “RCG” in the catalog.

5. Global Learning: at least one global learning course or a study abroad experience. Courses meeting this requirement are noted by “GL” in the catalog.

6. Integrative Learning: at least fifteen credits or the equivalent of integrative learning. According to the AAC&U, “integrative learning” is an understanding and a disposition that a student builds across the curriculum and co-curriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus. Integrative Learning may include thematic bundles, which center on fundamental questions and are defined, developed, and delivered by a team of educators, linked courses, interdisciplinary
Dear Members of the Academic Policies Committee: We write as concerned members of the English department faculty, representing the literature and creative writing programs, to advocate for the inclusion of a “Creative Thinking” requirement in the revised LE core. The Short Version: 1. We believe that, given the explicit inclusion of “Creative Thinking” among the approved Liberal Education Learning Goals, and given UWEC’s expressed commitment to outcomes-based education, and given UWEC’s expressed commitment to intentionality in matters of instruction and curriculum, that the omission of a specific “Creative Thinking” requirement from the proposed LE core represents an obvious and problematic oversight. 2. We believe that “creative thinking” is a specific set of processes and modes of thought (such as metaphorical/analogic thinking, imagination, narrative construction, explorative risk-taking, intuition, connection-making/synthesis, and so on) that transcends the commonplace conception of creativity as “thinking outside the box.” 3. We believe that while “creative thinking” as a specific set of processes and modes of thought (see above) may be present in many disciplines, the logical home for required courses in “creative thinking” would best be situated in the arts and arts-related humanities, where creative thinking processes used across intellectual domains are the overt subject of the discipline. 4. We believe, based upon much external evidence and AAC&U endorsement, that in the 21st Century, our students will need a heightened ability to understand, nurture and apply their creative aptitudes in whatever intellectual domain they engage. 5. Therefore, we propose the creation of a three-credit (one course) “Creative Thinking” requirement, to be designated “CT” in the catalog. We believe that the inclusion of a “Creative Thinking” requirement in the LE core is essential to the fulfillment of the LE Goals. 6. We suggest (although we stop short of a proposal, as this is a separate discussion) that APC might consider a reduction in the number of “Integrative Learning” (INT) credits from 18 to 15, as a means of leaving the total credits for the core at 42. Full Rationale At the moment, the LE framework does not specify any requirement or set of requirements to address the “Creative Thinking” goal. It does, however, associate numerous specific requirements with other goals: the first year writing requirement and an additional “communication intensive” requirement appear to be linked fairly explicitly to the “Effective Communication” goal; two courses in the natural sciences would appear to address the “Knowledge of the Natural World” goal; courses in the humanities and social sciences account for the “Knowledge of Human Culture” goal, and so on. In addition, there are several requirements that seem designed to address specific learning outcomes, such as the proposed “ethical reasoning” requirement, the proposed two-course requirement in race/class/gender equity studies, a one course (or “experience”) requirement in “Global Learning,” and of course the proposed eighteen-hour “Integrative Learning” requirement, for which ULEC took the extraordinary step of creating an additional LE Learning Goal, since it was the view of the committee (full disclosure: Jon Loomis is a current ULEC member) that requirements should align as specifically as possible with goals/outcomes and, apparently, vice versa, in the spirit of curricular “intentionality.” In that light, the lack of a specific requirement designed to address the “Creative Thinking” goal/outcome appears to many of us in the arts and humanities as a glaring inconsistency in the proposed framework. (No doubt there are others, but those are separate issues for another day.) Artists, and those who study the creative processes practiced by artists, might recognize “creative thinking” as a specific set of skills or processes, including metaphorical thinking, imagination, narrative construction, risk-taking, intuition, connection-making/synthesis, and so on. These are non-linear, right brain, often very subjective modes of thought that allow for skipping steps and thinking around corners. The specific “creative thinking skills” such as those noted above are essential to areas outside the arts and humanities, but it is within the arts and humanities that such subjects as metaphoric thinking, narrative, aesthetics and the creative process actually overtly define the field. If we are, in fact,
designing an LE core that is truly “outcomes based,” and if we are doing so in a truly “intentional” way—which is to say, leaving as little as is feasible to chance—and finally if we recognize that “creative thinking” is a specific set of processes and modes of thought that transcends the commonplace conception of creativity (i.e., “thinking outside the box”), then it’s reasonable to suggest that there is a need for a specific “Creative Thinking” requirement within the LE core. We would suggest exactly that. We would suggest further that the logical home for such a requirement would be located mostly in the arts and humanities (particularly those of the humanities that focus on the arts). We thank the members of APC for their time and attention in considering this matter. Sincerely, Jon Loomis Allyson Goldin Loomis Jenny Shaddock

I’d like to urge the committees to discuss ways that a civic engagement component could be added to courses across the curriculum as we continue to refine our ideas about Liberal Education requirements. I believe a civic engagement component should be a part of ALL the LE breadth requirements. I know you’re about to begin discussion of the "Knowledge of Human Culture and the Natural World" learning goal. To my mind, one of the best ways to increase the effectiveness of student learning toward this goal would be to place students in all programs into meaningful community partnerships that enable them to experience the rich complexity that accompanies the application of their knowledge in realistic situations. I know that civic engagement is both expensive and logistically more complicated than delivering instruction entirely within a classroom setting, but I believe the benefits to such engagement/partnerships will justify the additional cost and trouble. Thanks for reading and considering my feedback!

My primary concern about the proposed Social Sciences requirement relates to the “outside the student’s major” language. I support the idea of not counting courses in the major to ensure greater breadth and exploration of other disciplines and topics. But I wonder how this would apply to our comprehensive major in criminal justice. Students are required to take Crmj 103, Pols 110, Psyc 100, and Soc 101 for the criminal justice major. Would that satisfy the proposed Social Sciences requirement or would these four courses be considered “inside” the student’s major since they are major requirements? I assume it would be the former, but the language leaves open the possibility of the latter interpretation.

Dr. Pratt, Thanks for keeping me posted about developments with regard to Liberal Education reform. Thanks to you and APC for your hard work in this debate – it goes to the very heart of the UWEC educational experience. I have spoken with my geology faculty and other science faculty about Liberal Education reform. However, I am only speaking for the Dept. of Geology in this message. Based on what you sent to chairs, I understand APC just voted to amend the motion as follows: “Liberal Education Breadth Requirement comprising 18 credits of intentionally designed, integrative learning Arts and Sciences experiences with 6 credits in each of the following three major categories: Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences.” I think this language is largely designed for the three-credit courses that are common all across the university. However, I think this structure is a strong disincentive for students to take lab science courses. Lab science courses are typically four credits (three hours lecture and two hours lab). Labs are places where students have the chance to perform simple experiments and observe processes at work in the natural world. In doing so, students can work in groups, receive more feedback from faculty members, and discover how learning pertains to the real world – some activities classified as high-impact practices by Kuh (2008). In Geology specifically, we use labs in 100-level Liberal Education classes to help students make observations and interpretations in the field. Of course, we take students to sites with nice rocks. However, students also visit a landfill and the Eau Claire wastewater treatment facility (not necessarily “highlights” for most students, but potentially life-changing experiences for educated citizens….!). This is not just a trendy thing being
One of the assumptions I had going into the Liberal Education Reform process is that it would also result in more flexibility for the student should he/she change majors. I see nothing new here as far as flexibility -- it is still up to the individual colleges/majors to determine what courses will satisfy particular requirements. How are we assisting with the goal of improving time to degree? I also question why the Race/Class/Gender requirements are so restrictive. There are certainly many more cultural groups than those listed; and there is no apparent opportunity to satisfy this requirement by studying the issue of diversity of socioeconomic class. The current system is over-complicated; I believe we have replaced it with nothing more than a re-configuration of the status quo.

The requirement of only 2 learning experiences in K3 and K4 combined, enabling students to take only 2 courses in the humanities and none in the arts or vice-versa, seems to be strongly antithetical to our mission as a liberal arts university.

1) It is far too complex! The point of reform was to streamline things and what's happened is just the opposite. 2) It virtually eliminates the humanities from what is supposed to be a liberal arts institutions’ degree requirements.

It is difficult for me to be enthusiastic about a diversity requirement that entails gender race and class without seeing a clear identification of what courses would relate or fill the class portion of this. Do
we have courses that deal with class issues in a meaningful way? I assume we’re speaking of economic class. How would a requirement regarding economic class be fulfilled - by economics courses, literature courses, social sciences, or some other courses? I’m unclear what we have in place right now. A list of courses would be helpful. Otherwise, we should remove the suggestion that we can offer students a diverse experience regarding class. That said, I think class is the most important issue of the three with regards to this country.

No, I do not think that a diversity requirement should be added at this time.

I believe strongly that there should be a university requirement for issues surrounding racial inequity. I would like to see 6 credits attached to this requirement. I also don’t believe that broader activities should fulfill part of these 6 credits, as there needs to be careful accountability for how these issues are addressed. Our student body, which remains so homogeneous, really deserves this. They deserve the coursework that will change engrained ways of perceiving the world. We are not going to create a more diverse campus without changing the way that the broader student body thinks about issues of racial inequity.

Please limit the requirements and let the students choose courses that meet the goals. Let them prove they have met the goals. We do not need to micromanage their college experience for liberal education. Let the departments that have majors dictate what courses are needed. Students will make connections between the courses they take when they have a advisor who asks questions that lead to students choosing courses to meet the lib ed goals. Stop adding requirements and number of experiences. Let’s try this for 4-5 years and look at the data....then make changes if needed.

I am deeply concerned at the inclusion of service learning in the LE core. There are so many SL projects that are simply walking dogs at the humane association or or basic menial tasks that really have no relationship to LE at all. I'm concerned this is simply another example of turf protection sneaking back into the LE core.

This sounds alot like affirmative action and I hate affirmative action. It is inequitable!!!! I DO NOT support making race, class, and/or gender equity a university requirement. Accept the best students regardless of race, class, and/or gender. Reverse discrimination is a horrible thing.

Please be explicit about the focus on race in the curriculum. It is vital for the future of the university.

RE: Race, Class, and Gender Race, class and gender are three main variables used in inequality research, across disciplines, and across nations. To address equity, inclusivity, and diversity one must at the minimum have a basic understanding of how these three factors affect the individual, social interactions, and social institutions. I strongly support the inclusion of these "big three" dimensions of inequality as a university requirement.

In October, the APC approved language to require all UWEC students to complete 6 credits of coursework in the broad area of Race, Class, Gender, and Sexuality studies. By UW-System mandate, 3 of those credits will provide perspectives on four historically underrepresented groups (American Indians, African Americans, Asian-Americans, Hispanic/Latino). The APC vote in October approved 3 additional credits to be designed locally, but could focus on any relevant area pertaining to race, class, gender and sexuality. I attended this meeting, heard the vote, and thought this vote indicated passage of this requirement. I was shocked that the issue returned to Senate this week; obviously there is a process issue when a vote is ignored and not supported over time. I believe the original vote should stand and that this is what should move forward to Senate for final approval. This lack of transparency reflects poorly on the entire process and raises questions about the veracity of the effort.

Preference - option 2: Use a “Race, Class and/or Gender Equity” label with corresponding text to be
Thanks for your work on this complicated and important issue. Integrative learning -- One of the big drivers of LE reform was the lack of integration in our old program. However, whether we have one Integrative experience or three won’t make a difference unless ALL the LE courses are intentionally integrative. All courses will have to be reapproved to become part of the LE program. Seems to me it would be better to reduce IL1 to one experience but make it more explicit that all LE courses should strive to be more integrative. This should be discussed as courses come to ULEC for approval. If all LE courses are more integrative, this will address the original problem. Three IL1 experiences is too many for the LibEd core. Trust major programs to provide integrative learning experiences outside of the LE core. Don’t add extra obstacles to student graduation. Service learning – Our service learning program is a 30-hr service checkoff. It does not require true university learning. As such, it does not belong in the LE core. Until service learning projects truly require service and learning, SL should not be included. If changes occur and faculty wish to include it in the core -- fine. We also have service learning embedded in some courses. However, I have talked to several students who have met the SL requirement without knowing what they did to fulfill the requirement. Why? Their service check-off came from a course. I suspect they took a course on the approved SL list offered by an instructor different from the one who proposed the course. Thus, even if SL is embedded in a course, it doesn’t necessary involve service. I strongly oppose including SL in the LE core until it is defined as a rigorous experience. I suggest requiring one experience to meet the R3 requirement, and that experience COULD be a rigorous SL project involving true learning AND use of creative and creative thinking to address civic, social, and environmental challenges. I have supervised some SL projects that would have been very appropriate for meeting the true spirit of R3. I suspect the S3 learning outcome might have to be pulled out of the LE core and made a university requirement. I think all majors will require this sort of experience, but I do not see how sufficient experiences can be provided in the LE core without requiring overworked faculty to work even harder for no extra compensation. Responsibility is a good thing. Requiring SIX experiences in R1, R2, and R3 is too many. It seems like this new framework is becoming more difficult for students and advisors to navigate. Let students register for more of these experiences if they wish. However, don't require them for all students. Try to keep the framework as simple as possible.

Please, please, stop the madness. Go back to your mission! Lib Ed reform was intended to allow more flexibility not less. R1 covers all additional requirements. No more check off boxes, let students make some choices. I will vote against more requirements. You already have too many! Lets try what you have now, you will be pleasantly surprised when you see the diverse classes students will choose. They will take a good variety of classes if given the opportunity. Trust the students......and trust the faculty to create courses that fit in the outcomes.

Lib Ed reform is supposed to be about outcomes, not check boxes. No outcomes, No requirements!

Hello– I would like to voice my concern for the disappearance of wellness in the proposed liberal ed reform. In the spring of 2009, I was part of a group called the Think Tank for Wellness, and our task was to determine if the wellness/physical activity requirement was contributing positively to students' present and future health and well-being, which we know are crucial components for productive citizens. The Think Tank compiled evidence, including articles from scholarly journals, and determined that the wellness/physical activity requirements were evidence-based and served our students well in terms of their overall health and wellness. APC’s question and answer sheet does respond to my concern about the wellness/physical activity requirements on pages 5/6, saying that "non-curricular opportunities are available to emet these needs. The Office of Student Affairs has several initiatives in
place for wellness. Freshman Orientation is an excellent opportunity for students to learn about some of the wellness concepts. I would argue that although the Division of Student Affairs does provide excellent wellness opportunities, the curricular aspect is crucial for students' health and wellness. The wellness curriculum helps students understand more deeply the broader wellness concepts and also asks them to apply those concepts to their own lives. Given that health issues are increasing in number and severity (obesity, diabetes, etc.), it seems that it is even more critical that we make room for wellness in the liberal education reform. I understand that the new framework is not as simplistic as General Ed was, and that a separate "Wellness Requirement" might not make sense in the proposed framework, but I'm wondering if you could find room somewhere in there for wellness. I would hope that if it were the case that the current wellness courses are not sufficiently meeting the learning outcomes associated with those courses, the courses themselves would be restructured but that we could still have some kind of overarching wellness requirement for students. Wellness permeates everything we do as citizens, workers, family members, etc. It is an important aspect of the holistic development of the student. Thank you for listening!

Please explain, in detail, how those transfer students who already have earned an associate degree will fit into the liberal education requirements? Will they be allowed to bypass our requirements and work on their major, minor, or concentration or will they be required to take something from the liberal education requirements?

It would be helpful in making the decision if we could see a draft of a document/catalog copy that provides directions to students as to how to go about satisfying the Liberal Ed requirements. We say we want them to become independent self-directed learners; are the expectations clear enough to provide them the ability to self-advising?

Integrative Learning outcome #5 on self reflection may come from good intentions, but seems to me to only trigger self-serving answers. If a student is asked to write an essay on how much they've grown as a student, they are certainly not going to say they have not grown. I cannot envision a course in which this can be assessed in any meaningful way, and think it is a total waste of time as an outcome - especially in light of the general societal preference for political correctness.

Under the global initiative I do not envision our students having substantial likelihood to achieve the 4th level benchmarks. They seem very unlikely for any second year student, and somewhat unlikely for most of our 4th year students.

There are 4 levels of benchmark provided for the learning goals. Who decided on those levels, is a group of students expected to have some certain configuration of 1-4 achievements, if all students achieve level 1 does the course not meet its LE goal - and is it therefore implied that the professor is not doing their job correctly?

I am concerned how easily these requirements can increase the number of credits students need to graduate. This seems in direct conflict with the push to get students done in 4 years (a goal that frankly, has never been realistic). However, if promoting timely graduation is a goal, then we should ensure that these liberal ed expectations are constrained so that course bloat doesn't happen. To that end, it should be made patently clear to students and advisors how "experiences" may be grouped/combined in coursework. That requires the program to be clear how things may be combined. The end result should not create any more GE credits than we already have.

Concern 1: My sense is that nobody is energized or excited about the proposal. This does not imply flaws with the proposal. But maybe nobody cares. Do we really want to risk our present "liberal arts brand" on an alternative that gets our support only from ennui? Concern 2: The proposal is pathetically weak on disciplinary content. There is nothing wrong with content. What is an experience?
Concern 3: What's the difference between LE Core and baccalaureate requirements?

I am troubled by the tenor of comments accumulating here of late. This University has been committed toward working on reform of our current general education system for more than a decade, and a critical mass of faculty have agreed, for even much longer than that, that it needed substantial reform. The APC core proposal represents the culmination of a vast amount of work from a vast amount of people at this institution over many years in many groups; the APC proposal is an attempt to synthesize as much of all of that as possible and to articulate a proposal upon the most logical possible foundation: the liberal education learning outcomes devised by the chairs and directors across campus and passed unanimously by University Senate last fall. This proposal incorporates ideas that have come up again and again for years now as clearcut points of emphasis in the liberal education reform this institution was pursuing. The APC proposal represents many compromises, seeking to work with and respect the vast array of constituencies and sensitivities that are directly affected by this prospective change. People who are unable to become excited about it are failing to look at the larger picture and are too narrowly focused on imagining that a reformed liberal education core would represent a perfect ideal that would completely please and satisfy everyone. Not getting everything just the way you ideally would like to see it has held back this process for too long. Does this proposal represent a substantial improvement upon what we currently have in place? Yes. That should be reason enough to be plenty excited. And the opportunity to create the substance of what this proposal is going to mean in practice by articulating connections with existing courses, modified courses, and new courses (as well as out of the classroom experiences that provide substantial educational value but which do not take the form of traditional courses) should provide additional reason for ample excitement. Does this proposal much better serve our students, short-term and long-term, than what we have in place now? Yes. And we should be excited about that. Daunted about the challenges involved in the transition and implementation, fine, but excited about living up to our commitment to do our very best by our students--we should be excited at a great opportunity to do so. If this proposal is rejected we are not likely to see anything emerge in its place for another decade--that is if faculty are still left in charge of the process. The alternative is for outside consultants selected by the central university administration to come in and do this for us, and then to have that imposed upon us. Is that what people really want? Nothing about this proposal downgrades any existing field of knowledge that currently contributes to general education; every single arts and sciences department and program should be readily able to offer many courses (and other kinds of experiences) that respond to a majority of the core requirements, in alignment with a majority of the liberal education learning outcomes--which is a significant increase over what is the case now. And every single core requirement in relation to every single outcome will, of necessity, make abundant use of knowledge based in and derived from disciplines, including by drawing connections across disciplines, and strengthening disciplines through enabling disciplines to work all the more readily and extensively together.

I cannot begin to imagine how to explain these liberal education requirements to students or their families. I am not sure that I can clearly identify what is not working in our current GE structure that is improved with this new system. What is lacking, missing, incomplete? Are there not ways to achieve our goals and make adjustments within our current structure? As I look at other schools in the UW system and in our WI/MN area none have general education requirements anywhere close to as complicated and confusing as this. How will you possible have a degree audit with these requirements, and what about once the colleges but their own requirements on top of these? I think many many hours have been put into this reform that folks are now afraid to go back and undo decisions even though I don't think a better product has been created. In times of limited resources, less students applying to UWEC, rising tuition, a liberal education as complicated as this one is not the way to go for UWEC.
The definition of Learning Experience is internally inconsistent. The first sentence declares this as a credit earning activity, a class, while later sentences say it is more open - could be a service learning or other activity. Isn't the idea for the student to demonstrate the learning rather than the idea to specify how they can show it. I certainly presume that this LE reform will lead to a broadening of the view of how we assess student learning in various ways. Tying everything to classes means we are limiting ourselves to A&S courses, which is both unwise and unfair.

With integrative learning, it bothers me that you are proposing to measure learning across disciplines and perspectives but are limiting the options to A&S fields, fields taught in what will be LE courses. I am a COB prof, and we certainly measure learning across disciplines and perspectives. Why are your disciplines more worthy than ours? In a way, this is a bigger topic: since we acknowledge that the LE goals are not entirely achievable at the 100 and 200 level courses, why are the learning outcomes limited to courses outside the majors? It seems like protectionism.

There are far too many credits in the LE proposal. What ever happened to the idea of flexibility? We want more choices and more freedom. The more you lock things down and mandate the worse our program is for the students. The bundles idea - forcing students into sets of classes - is the ultimate terrible idea. It is simple to see that the students do not fall for it either. Every bundle of 3 has at least one course for which there is no real demand in the absence of a bundle mandate. All the bundle section seats are the ones open at the end of each registration each term. The fact that Schofield people want bundles does not make any difference to our students. Unless you get with the reality of the situation on campus and quit running everything as though your thoughts are the only important ones, stagnation and unhappiness will continue to prosper. The faculty do not broadly support the LE reform. We see it is a a step backward. The fact that the assessment director, the provost, the APC, ULEC force it through means nothing. Those are all political bodies. Wringing your hands about 'how far behind we are in assessment' is also perceived as silly by most of us. If you want LE reform we will accept, let students take some modest number of LE credits, say 39, a minimal one course per old GE category, and put the assessment measures in the senior year. Let departments who their majors meet the goals of the major as well as the LE goals. Whereever the students learn the stuff is fine. Our system is not better for being highly regimented, it is diminished. Keep all the learning goals, throw out all the implementation stuff (it just leads to artificial demand for courses) - e.g. the physical activity requirement. It's a 1950's idea that UWEC perpetuates so coaches can get paid to teach gym classes. Real universities like Madison dropped the requirement 40 years ago. UWEC is being run (right now) by about 10 people who think you are smarter than everyone in the world. You know better than the faculty and the students. You can see the future and know what students need. You think 4 year degree plans will magically mean students will graduate in 4 years. You think giving better advice leads to students graduating in 4 years (and you think you know the format that advice should take and who should give it). You never bothered to find out why they don't (or whether they want to) graduate in 4 years, you've just made assumptions. You're also just afraid of the governor and the state government. Who among you has actually been a professor in the last 10 years? None? Some of you have never been professors. Get a grip.

If K3 and K4 are separate goals, why are they grouped together for learning experiences? A student may never have a K4 experience? Why do R1 and R2 have credit values but no other outcomes have specific credit values?

The proposed framework is too large. By allowing or perhaps encouraging or requiring a course/experience to meet more than one outcome merely results in a lower level of attainment of each outcome. There are only so many hours per course per semester to be used to have a course meet one outcome, let alone more than one. The proposal to allow a course/experience to meet multiple
outcomes is being made to make an inappropriately large framework look better: it is putting lipstick on a pig. A better solution is to decrease the size of the framework. I encourage the senate to simply require each student to take one class/experience for each outcome. In addition students should have to complete these within the first four semesters. These are foundational courses which start the student along the road toward command of the learning outcomes. The gain that command through taking courses in their programs of study.

I strongly encourage senate to require students to have to have taken all their LE Core courses by the end of their sophomore year. By definition, LE core courses are foundational. Students should take these courses early to ensure they increase their command of each outcome by the time they graduate. I also encourage you to decrease the size of the framework. Please don't try and compensate for what is clearly a burdensome framework by simply allowing for double or triple dipping as is currently done in the existing GE system.

It seems like if we really care about breadth in liberal education, we should make sure students take a certain number of credits outside their major.

Why was the math competency the only requirement that was not seriously discussed? Our students need quantitative and computer literacy, but there are multiple ways to get this. Moreover, the lack of emphasis on technological literacy is a serious omission. And why do students need a C in a math course when they don’t even need C’s in their major courses in many cases? How do we justify this if we are competency, rather than course or grade based? A “C” in writing is understandable (although I don’t think it is necessary) since writing is required in most courses and is attainable for our students. Many of our students do not need math for anything else in their undergraduate career and have forgotten it by the time they graduate.

While the presentation at Senate made it seem like integration is crucial to our new system, it is really just one more add-on requirement. It is not integrated throughout the curriculum. Which leads to another point--- Research and internships have been mentioned as ways of integrating learning. These would not normally be considered part of liberal education. There are lots of activities that can be considered integrative--- but they don’t all qualify as what would usually be L.E. So my question is: what criteria are we using to define what is L.E.? Can discipline specific, very focused activities such as research be considered L.E.? That changes the identity of L.E. and makes it much less of a program. This is a crucial question to answer. Putting it on ULEC is not fair--- there has to be a shared understanding of this.

I want to make sure everyone understands that this proposal is NOT simpler than our current system. To the average student these requirements will just be a different set of distribution requirements for which they look for two-fers and three-fers. To students, I fear, the main difference is that the “categories”--- what we call outcomes--- have abbreviations that are incomprehensible (K-1, R-3). You can list the outcomes on a degree audit, but students aren’t going to read them. And they certainly can’t be easily summarized (I have talked with enough people to know that they are not, in fact, understood by most people). I can tell students that a GE2 is a natural science; I don’t know how I describe an R-2, for example. I would challenge everyone who votes for this proposal to first write a presentation for freshmen at orientation. It is certainly NOT simpler--- while Bob Nowland can count up the number of “subcategories”--- students don’t think like that. To them we have 4 (sometimes 5) G.E. categories and courses that fit under each one. Yes, the other requirements make our requirements more complicated, but they are all, except for the cultural diversity requirement, easy to explain. What makes our current requirements complicated--- and will make these new ones at least as complicated--- are all the additional requirements at the major and degree level. This is what makes it difficult for students to change majors. Until we deal with that problem, we won’t have simplified anything.
While I applaud the attempt to get at outcomes, I don't see anything in the proposal that will get students to actually understand that we are outcomes based. The primary thing that is missing in this proposal is anything developmental that would introduce students at the beginning to what the outcomes really mean and would have them reflect—truly integrate their knowledge at the end. If we added a freshman seminar and a senior L.E. capstone, then the rest of the requirements would be meaningful for students and would really make this proposal different from our current requirements. Without that type of integration, it will be boxes on a degree audit. While faculty can put things on syllabi and tell students which assignments meet the outcome, it is a lot to ask students to truly understand all of our outcomes without an intentional course that does this. Students in the bundles—even those that were integrated—didn't really get it.

We seem to be going in different directions related to globalization. There is actually no outcome that really deals with this—Responsibility 2 talks about evaluating systems at the local and global level—it is a comparative outcome that we currently have very few courses that address. The global rubric that has been established certainly doesn't meet this. Moreover, our foreign language courses definitely wouldn't meet this outcome. Are we trying to internationalize our curriculum or not?

I am concerned that we are trying to pass this without a better understanding of what assessment will be involved. Faculty need to know what they will be expected to do or we won't have meaningful assessment. Will multiple choice tests be o.k. as "artifacts?" How will discussions be used to show competencies? And what will the rubrics really look like? Are the "and statements" in the outcomes really "or" statements?

What exactly does "Create original work, perform original work, or interpret the work of others" mean? If it is taken at its literal meaning, every course we have does that—every course either creates an original work (unlikely at the lower level) or interprets the work of others. So at that level, it is meaningless. If it really refers to the creative arts (which I think limits the meaning of creativity) then it is a very specific requirement that will skew the resources of the university in one direction—everyone needs to know what this outcome means.

Instead of coming up with complicated new requirements, we could make our current requirements outcomes based. Decrease the number of credits in certain categories if you want, and combine the university and G.E. requirements. Since most of our current courses are going to be aligned with one of the outcomes and, at least initially, will have to be counted as L.E. or we won't have courses, why not just keep our current distribution and require that they fulfill the outcomes.

**COMPARISON OF OLD AND NEW REQUIREMENTS**

**K1** Describe and evaluate models of the natural and physical world through collection and scientific analysis of data, and through the use of mathematical or computational methods. 
Old: 9 credits, including one lab science 
New: Two learning experiences required, one of which must be a laboratory science.

**K2** Use knowledge, theories, methods, and historical perspectives appropriate to the social sciences to explain and evaluate human behavior and social institutions. 
Old: GE III---9 credits, 2 categories 
New: Two learning experiences required.

**K3** Use knowledge, historical perspectives, analysis, interpretation, critical evaluation, and the standards of evidence appropriate to the humanities to address problems and explore questions. 
Old: GE IV---9 credits, 2 categories 
New: Two learning experiences required.

**K4**: Use knowledge, historical perspectives, theories, or methods appropriate to the arts to describe their context, function and impact. 
Old: GE I A---9 credits, 2 categories 
New: Two learning experiences required.

**S1** Write, read, speak, and listen effectively in various contexts using a variety of means including appropriate information sources and technologies. 
Old: University writing requirement and GE IA 
New: University writing requirement and one other learning experience

**S2** Use mathematical, computational, statistical, or formal reasoning to solve problems, draw inferences, and determine the validity of stated claims. 
Old: Math competency and GE IB 
New: One learning experience required
before the end of the sophomore year to meet the University Mathematics and/or Statistics requirement. S3 Create original work, perform original work, or interpret the work of others. 

We could require all LE classes to fulfill exactly two outcomes in two different goals. Then, if we structured assessment so that all outcomes in one goal were evaluated in one year on a 3- or 4-year rotating basis, then no single course would ever be assessing more than one outcome in any one year.

A big negative aspect of this idea is that it may be perceived as overly rigid and proscriptive. But I don’t feel that many courses would actually require substantial revision to accomplish this aim. And I’m not sure that any course that can’t meet this should really be a part of the LE core as we’ve envisioned it.

On the other hand, it would have the effect of spreading out the work of assessment and also make it more continuously ongoing which would be beneficial in a cultural sense and would also reduce annual workloads for each course. Additionally, this would eliminate the concerns about “gaming” the LE system by artificially inflating the number of goals addressed by any one course. And it would enforce integration throughout the LE core, not just in some courses. It would finally resolve the ongoing and problematic uncertainty about how many outcomes can be addressed by a LE course. This would allow faculty to proceed in designing courses that satisfy LE outcomes. And it reduces the overall credit load for students, so that (if we chose) it would be possible to mandate 2 educational experiences in each outcome without worrying about credit bloat and time-to-graduation. And this would allow students choice in selecting the remainder of their credits.

I’m a little concerned that R3 states "Use critical and creative thinking to address civic, social AND environmental challenges. Two learning experiences required, one of which must meet the University Service-Learning Requirement." (emphasis added). I could see rich Women’s Studies classes addressing important issues such as domestic violence with a learning experience working in a shelter, but because this would not likely include an "environmental challenge," this course wouldn't count for R3. Perhaps rewording to "civic, social and/or environmental challenges" would offer inclusion of more courses having a "responsibility" emphasis into the R3 category. 

I am concerned about the elimination of a physical education requirement. While it seems silly for every student to be required to take Kins 186, it also is broadly useful to require some sort of physical education during college. There is a growing awareness in our society of the mind-body connection and this is especially important for aspiring health professionals to understand. Additionally, the discipline and hard work required to gain skill through physical activity is analogous to that required to gain skill in rigorous subject matter such as the physical sciences. I believe the recognition of such cross-connections is is part of being a liberal arts college, and the disposal of the physical education requirement seems to me an unfortunate narrowing of our LE curriculum in the name of efficiency.

I would ask our senators to show this LE proposal to any college graduate of the last fifty years—today’s parents and grandparents. Ask them what they think. Is this the education that you would want for your child? Is Eau Claire still the premier UW campus for a Liberal Education? The language is alienating and
incoherent to anyone (including faculty) who has not been immersed in the recent trendy discourse of assessment and education. Have you thought about the fact that our Liberal Education vision and requirements will be in our catalogue and on the university website? Perhaps the structure is sound, once one takes the time to figure out, but I am certain that it will be a disaster to market to parents, students, and the public. Also the bold devaluing of the humanities is a problematic for any institution presuming to provide a “liberal education.”

I’d like to strongly encourage the RETENTION of the 30-hour Service-Learning requirement, but we need to revamp the system to move away from the current "forced volunteerism" model without necessarily curricular support to a new model in which S-L opportunities are woven into curriculum that introduces students to the theory and significance of public work and citizenship. Students, too, are truly excited about this type of experience. Here are comments from one student describing his vision: I think that the purpose of service learning is to learn about, share knowledge with and improve the Eau Claire community. What this learning, sharing and improvement of the community requires the students to do is to identify communal needs and plan ways to address those needs in a manner that results in measurable changes in the health and sustainability of the community. These would be continuous unscripted classes that last from 1-2 years so that students can develop an understanding of the needs in the community and then use community and personal resources to create a program that meets the needs. Examples of needs that can be addressed by students through service learning that can be used for measuring the changes in community health are: - Developing more transparency in medical pricing and increasing medical literacy of patients - Creating a local network/resource bank to incorporate into the electronic medical record so that physicians can use them in prescribing treatment to their patients. - Participating in a course about gardening education, food preparation and preservation and then using these skills to educate people in the community how to do these things. - Recruiting area businesses to sponsor teams of volunteers to maintain a plot and then donate the produce to the community table and other food distributing entities. - Mapping a community food distribution plan to provide food to families during the summer. - Providing community health screenings and also educating about nutrition and wellness in order to influence individuals to make these things a priority. LET’S MAKE THIS HAPPEN! FOR ALL STUDENTS!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>