

COMMON CURRICULUM ANNUAL REPORT (2017-2018)

[submitted to the AAC by John Cramsie, Director of General Education, 19 July 2018]

GEN ED BOARD (2017-2018)

John Cramsie; Director of General Education (DofGE)

Kristin Bidoshi; Division 1 Rep

Andy Feffer; Division 2 Rep

Zoe Oxley; Division 2 Rep (Fall 2017)

Christina Tønnesen-Friedman; Division 3 Rep

Bill Keat; Division 4 Rep

Sophia Foster; Student Rep (Winter-Spring 2018)

Jason Sindoni; Student Rep (Spring 2018)

Joe Johnson; Writing Center (ex officio)

Kathy Basirico; Program Administration (ex officio)

I would like the AAC to recognize the exceptional work and commitment of all members of the Gen Ed Board. The faculty representatives took on particular burdens in 2017-2018 and the Gen Ed Board would not be an exemplary democratic decision-making council without everyone's strong commitment to faculty governance. I particularly want to acknowledge the wise counsel and expertise of two departing members, Kristin Bidoshi (Division 1) and Christina Tønnesen-Friedman (Division 3). Finally, there is no way to overstate the outstanding administrative support provided by Kathy Basirico to the program, Board, and DofGE (since 2011). – John Cramsie, DofGE

CONTENTS

1. Mellon Presidential Project for Global Learning
2. Common Curriculum Designation Review
3. Foreign Language Requirement
4. SRS/SCH-150 and FPR/FPR-H Staffing, Administration, and Oversight
5. Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Implementation Plan
6. General Education Reform
7. Program Assessment (Executive Summary)
8. Appendices

1. Mellon Presidential Project for Global Learning (PGL)

We prepared for and completed the faculty study tour to Berlin in June 2017. The faculty directors and the Director of General Education lead on-campus team-building workshops that included preparation for travel to Berlin itself, formulation of learning outcomes, and initial ideas for new modules, courses, and collaborative learning. The Berlin cohort included faculty of all ranks from Classics, Computer Science, Economics, History, Library Sciences and Special Collections, Mathematics, Modern Languages and Literatures (German and Spanish), and Political Science with both study abroad veterans and novices. CIEE tailored the tour to include faculty-determined seminar topics, experiential learning opportunities, and additional activities within the budget guidelines.

In and around Berlin, faculty participated in workshops and lectures on the reunification of Germany, including the privatization of state assets in the former East Germany, sustainable development challenges and inequality, the development of an inclusive civil society in the former East; contemporary migration experiences in Germany, government policies, and local responses, media coverage and biases; the Turkish-German community, integration policies, gendered politics of education and identity among women of Turkish descent; Islam, Christianity, and religious politics in Germany, including meetings at the Omar Ibn Al-Khattab mosque; the politics of history and memory, including field work at the Stasi archives; a day-long seminar at the European University Viadrina in Frankfurt an der Oder on the Polish border, including examination of border communities and interactions, economic redevelopment, and grass roots activist groups challenging xenophobia and the new right in the former East; community-led sustainability initiatives in Berlin (through numerous site visits) including green and cooperative housing, urban gardens, policies to combat gentrification and 'social cleansing', and a guided visit to the former Tempelhof airfield to discuss development politics; an exploration of Germany's imperial past and its new influence on post-unification history and memory at Potsdam; the German energy transition; readings by the poet Jenny Erpenbeck and remarkably illuminating discussions about the continuing divides of culture and memory between East and West in Germany.

Berlin faculty completed an instructional-curricular design retreat in August. This was a crucial step for embedding and sustaining the study tour experience in the Common Curriculum. The workshop yielded draft courses and course content:

- First-Year Preceptorial: a revised FYP for Fall 2017; *Narrative Medicine* (grounded in the German experience, especially among immigrants and refugees). A new FYP for Fall 2018 on Identity, Culture, and Society that integrates related issues from Berlin/Germany.
- Sophomore Research Seminars: a new SRS for 2018-2019, *Political Identities in Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States*. Integration of German media and cyber-security policies and attitudes into a Fall 2017 SRS on privacy and cyber-security.

- A new FYP or SRS for 2018-2019 exploring the cultural discourse and politics of waste and disposable societies.
- Three new courses in comparative global history that integrate both Berlin/Germany-related content or the theoretical and conceptual content of the study tour about sustainability, social justice, migration, climate change, urbanism, and history and memory: HST 109 – A History of Sustainability; HST 204 – Wine: A Global History; HST 205 – Clash of Civilizations?
- New modules for MTH 113 – Calculus, MTH 056 – History of Mathematics, MTH 061 – Math in the Public Interest that combines quantification with other the analytical discourses about pollution, and sustainability.
- The incorporation of Berlin/Germany-related and global learning modules beginning with Fall 2017 in the following courses: ECO 101 – Introduction to Economics; ECO 228 – Environmental Economics; PSC 112 – Introduction to Global Politics.

The project ended on 31 December 2017 and Union submitted the final report on the grant to the Mellon Foundation on 26 March 2018. **The new DofGE should be tasked by the Dean of the Faculty to sustain the initial impact of this initiative on global education and learning, actively support the continued growth of global learning arising from this initiative and others, and ensure that global learning informs any process of general education reform, including the active participation of faculty members from both the China and Berlin study tours in general education projects.**

2. Common Curriculum Designation Review [see Appendix 1]

The Gen Ed Board completed its two-year review of CC designations with its report on the relationship between study away programs and the completion of CC requirements in May 2017. The Gen Ed Board unanimously approved and sent revised guidelines to the AAC, Dean Thacker, and Lara Atkins at that time. Despite failing to demonstrate that the new guidelines were detrimental to the college’s academic programs, the AAC Chair (Mark Walker) instructed the Gen Ed Board on 13 November 2017 not to implement the guidelines in 2018-2019.¹ Per the AAC’s suggestion, the Gen Ed Board held divisional meetings to discuss the proposed guidelines. The Gen Ed Board formally submitted revised guidelines to the AAC on 25 May 2018 and requested authorization to implement then beginning in Fall 2019.

¹ Faculty Manual / November 1, 2014 / Section IV – Faculty Constitution C. Standing Sub-Councils of the AAC. *The AAC shall form four standing sub-councils: a Sub-Council on the Standing of Students, the General Education Board, the Writing Board, and a Sub-Council on Courses and Programs. Unless the actions or recommendations of these standing sub-councils are deemed by the AAC to be detrimental to the College’s academic programs, they will normally be sustained by that Council.* (page 11)

The Gen Ed Board voted to implement revised guidelines for the completion of Common Curriculum requirements through study away, adopting a course-credit model. The guidelines achieve four important objectives in support of academic excellence at Union College: 1) that the college follow best practice for the successful integration of high level academic learning with study away; 2) that International Programs continue to create, develop, and administer study away programs to meet the intrinsic goals of study away; 3) that any academic credit granted to students by study away and used to fulfil Common Curriculum requirements be done so through academic coursework that meet the standards, content requirements, and learning outcomes for the program; 4) that guidelines respect the specifications of the program approved by the General Faculty in 2005.

Beginning with programs offered in Fall 2019, students would use individual academic courses completed during full-term study away to fulfil CC requirements, including but not limited to the LCC requirement. Henceforth, no student would receive LCC credit simply for study away or receive LCC credit irrespective of the content of a program's coursework. Under standing policy, students may use individual courses completed during study away to complete these CC requirements: Literature (HUL), Arts and Humanities (HUM), Social Sciences (SOCS), Quantitative and Mathematical Reasoning (QMR), Natural Sciences with Lab (SCLB), and Science, Engineering, and Technology (SET). LCC will simply be added that list.

Mini-terms began after the General Faculty approved this general education program. Mini-terms are credited as single 1.0 credit courses and all carry LCC designations. The Gen Ed Board proposes to implement new guidelines that supersede those created by previous Gen Ed Boards involving so-called 'distribution credits': beginning in Fall 2019, no mini-term could be used to complete the entirety of the two-course LCC requirement.

Under the revised guidelines, students would continue to participate in Union's already over-subscribed collection of study away programs, use coursework to complete CC requirements, and use courses taken away toward their minor/major programs of study. The guidelines make it simpler and more transparent to do so. They encourage deliberateness on the part of students and advisers to aim for completion of distinctive academic coursework during study away. They give a strong incentive to International Programs, the college administration, and other stakeholders to improve the academic quality of existing programs and seek out new, distinctive, and academically-challenging study away opportunities. Finally, they set a high academic and procedural standard for any continuing or new role for study away in the context of general education reform.

The Board asked the AAC to affirm its work on the merits of the revised guidelines in their entirety and in accordance with the standard set in the faculty constitution for sustaining the

actions and recommendations of the Gen Ed Board. **If the AAC authorizes the implementation of the guidelines, this task will fall to the new DofGE. Should the AAC decide not to authorize implementation of the guidelines, the Board is agreed that the guidelines represent best practice and should inform any reform or revision of general education with the respect to the completion of general education requirements through study away.** Here we note the point 2 in the AAC charge to the general education reform task force, which reads as follows: The task force will solicit input from all members of the Union college community. The task force will incorporate feedback on learning objectives and design principles from listening sessions with departments and programs that have occurred over 2018. The work of the task force will also be informed by **research, resolutions, and recommendations of the General Education Board from 2016-2018 concerning foreign language requirements, best practice in academic credit for study away, and implementation of the college's 'Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Draft Implementation Plan 2017-2022'**. The task force's work will also consider models of general education at other institutions and best practices in pedagogy and curricular reform. [*See Appendix 5*]

3. Foreign Language Requirement [see Appendix 2]

Among ranked liberal arts college and our 32-school peer group, Union is an outlier in not having a foreign language requirement, either as a stand-alone requirement or as part of a broader cultural understanding / cultural diversity requirement. More than 75% of our 32 peer schools have some kind of foreign language requirement. Following a productive meeting on 4 March 2015, to which Gen Ed Board members were invited, faculty in MLL and Classics formed a working group to develop proposals for a foreign language requirement. On 1 June 2016, the Gen Ed Board met with the working group. They made very solid progress on the structure of a requirement, seeking broad input from departments across the campus, and thinking through questions related to resources/staffing, enrolment and scheduling, and the relationship of the requirement to the existing CC structure and requirements. The working group collected additional data from comparison schools and further developed a proposal for a foreign language requirement as part of an 'enhanced LCC requirement'. The Board reviewed the proposal and met again with the working group on 17 May 2017.

Since the working group completed its proposal, it has become certain that the college will embark upon some kind of general education reform. As an initial response to the evolving situation, the Gen Ed Board requested that the working group revise the proposal and resubmit it to the Gen Ed Board as an advisory proposal for inclusion in any general education reform. The Gen Ed Board responded to the working group as follows on 16 November 2017: 'the Gen Ed Board unanimously supports the inclusion of a foreign language requirement in any reform or revision of general education. We strongly advise that any charge to reform or revise general education occur with direct reference to your group's proposals and their goals. In short, we agree that the proposals submitted to us by your working group should inform

any reform or revision of general education.’ **Here we note that point 2 in the AAC charge to the general education reform task force, which incorporated this recommendation** as follows: The task force will solicit input from all members of the Union college community. The task force will incorporate feedback on learning objectives and design principles from listening sessions with departments and programs that have occurred over 2018. The work of the task force will also be informed by **research, resolutions, and recommendations of the General Education Board from 2016-2018 concerning foreign language requirements**, best practice in academic credit for study away, and implementation of the college’s ‘Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Draft Implementation Plan 2017-2022’. The task force’s work will also consider models of general education at other institutions and best practices in pedagogy and curricular reform. [See Appendix 5]

4. SRS/SCH-150 and FPR/FPR-H Staffing, Administration, and Oversight *[see Appendix 3]*

Beginning in 2015-2016, the Gen Ed Board determined to exercise greater oversight of the academic components of the FPR/FPR-H and SRS/SCH-150 requirements.² This matter is discussed in the Common Curriculum annual reports of 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017; it is also discussed in the Common Curriculum annual assessment reports of 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. The most recent attempt to complete a satisfactory administrative rationalization of the outstanding issues can be found in Appendix 3. In 2017-2018 the DofGE implemented the successful working plan for joint responsibility (with the Director of Writing Programs) of the following: 1) to collect, review, and report FPR/FPR-H course assessments. 2) to plan and schedule FPR/FPR-H faculty development activities, jointly with SRS/SCH-150 faculty development.

There remain multiple interlinked problems with staffing, administration, and oversight of the SRS/SCH-150 and FPR/FPR-H. The staffing process is incompatible with institutional commitment to and effective student learning in SRS/SCH-150 and FPR/FPR-H. Throughout my tenure, the academic deans have cited the difficulty of recruiting faculty for these core courses and deflected the negative impact of persistent, inadequate resourcing of departments and programs college-wide that incentivize staffing with inexperienced visitors and adjuncts, poor representation of faculty from Center 2 in the course offerings, and last-minute staffing changes. **While the Gen Ed Board accepts that staffing SRS/SCH-150 and FPR/FPR-H is important on some level, ensuring the same quality of academic outcome as in**

² Faculty Manual / November 1, 2014 / Section IV – Faculty Constitution C. Standing Sub-Councils of the AAC. *The AAC shall form four standing sub-councils: a Sub-Council on the Standing of Students, the General Education Board, the Writing Board, and a Sub-Council on Courses and Programs. The General Education Board shall oversee the general education program and shall formulate plans and policies relating to it....The Director of General Education shall serve as Director of the General Education Board and shall be responsible for the administration of the program. The General Education Board shall report to the AAC annually about its activities.* (pages 11-12)

departments and programs is less evident; the primary incentive too often comes down to putting faculty in classrooms, on some occasions ahead of putting the right or best teacher in those classrooms. In short there has been no appetite for a coherent or concerted approach to staffing and resources rather than inaction.

In the case of SRS/SCH-150, the Gen Ed Board has in place an approval and oversight process that is capable of addressing the most persistent academic shortcomings of the course: pedagogical incoherence, divergent conceptions of research and research-based writing, wildly different levels of academic rigour, and disconnections from its partner course FPR/FPR-H. As DofGE, I worked with Joe Johnson, Director of Writing Programs, to develop a similar process for FPR/FPR-H to address the same kinds of critical problems in that course. But attempts to follow through and make improvements were hampered by ex-DADP Sternberg with respect to standing staffing procedures and repeatedly undermined by the outgoing Dean of Studies with respect to administrative rationalizations and oversight.

This is an important reason why we do not meet the academic potential of the core courses let alone reach a consistently high level of impact on student learning; and we have permitted SRSs and FPRs to be taught that manifestly fail the students and undermine the credibility of our program. None of this is helped by the fact that SRS/SCH-150 and FPR/FPR-H are not a 'department' per se or by the division of responsibility for SRS/SCH-150 and FPR/FPR-H between the DofGE and the Dean of Studies office.

It is important that the AAC support and empower its own subcouncil, the Gen Ed Board (and the DofGE as its convener), in this situation. The AAC should hold the academic deans accountable for addressing and resolving these issues. Beyond the immediate need for attention, resolution of such problems will be necessary for the successful reform and implementation of any changes to general education that involve core courses of this kind. As it stands, we do not have the administrative processes or priorities in place to successfully do so. The Gen Ed Board hopes that the simultaneous arrival of a new Dean of Studies (interim and permanent) and a new DofGE will create better pathways to achieving these important goals, but the AAC must make this a priority under its responsibilities for governance of the college's academic programs.

5. Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Implementation Plan [see Appendix 4]

The Gen Ed Board met with the Chief Diversity Officer to review and provide input on the draft 'Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Implementation Plan' on 2 November 2017. The Gen Ed Board unanimously supported the inclusion of the Common Curriculum in the draft implementation plan as laid out, with specific recommendations and revisions. **Here we note that point 2 in the AAC charge to the general education reform task force, which incorporated**

this recommendation and which reads as follows: The task force will solicit input from all members of the Union college community. The task force will incorporate feedback on learning objectives and design principles from listening sessions with departments and programs that have occurred over 2018. The work of the task force will also be informed by **research, resolutions, and recommendations of the General Education Board from 2016-2018 concerning** foreign language requirements, best practice in academic credit for study away, and **implementation of the college's 'Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Draft Implementation Plan 2017-2022'**. The task force's work will also consider models of general education at other institutions and best practices in pedagogy and curricular reform. [See Appendix 5].

6. General Education Reform [see Appendices 5 and 6]

The DofGE and the DADP convened community forums for departments, special programs, and students throughout winter and spring terms 2018; the DADP and DofGE facilitated the forums with the support and attendance of the Gen Ed Board. The forums gathered information from stakeholders about general education reform and encouraged ongoing conversations across campus, especially across disciplinary lines, about the development of a distinctive general education program for Union College. The Gen Ed Board met and reviewed the responses from the community forums throughout winter and spring terms. It met with Dean Fredricks and Dean Thacker to review the findings on 13 June 2018. What follows are the main points about reforming general education that tended to be raised either consistently and/or the Board deemed important to identify. These are not in a ranked order of importance:

- Resources. Union has great faculty and students who have made commitments to general education in its many guises and persist in doing so. But general education reform begins in an atmosphere of diminished expectations ('money is tight', heard *ad nauseum*), apprehension about the financial commitment of the college to academic programs generally, and whether general education reforms will require faculty and programs to take on new work and shoulder new long-term burdens with the same pay and resources. **Will the commitment of faculty and students who wish to transform general education into something rewarding and substantive be valued, supported, and sustained by the college at the highest level? Will reform be a zero-sum/resource-neutral game of allocating existing resources, with inevitable turf wars that follow? Would the college be willing to fund-raise for a general education program as it would for another academic program? Will faculty support new resource allocation for general education in the context of budgets and programs that are just getting by or tearing at the seams?**
- Buy-in by students and faculty. **A strong rationale for general education, clearly and compelling made by faculty and supported by the college as a whole, across offices and staff.** The academic integrity of a general education should be its rationale and its attraction to faculty and students (current or prospective).

- Interdisciplinarity. Faculty, students, individual courses, programs, and departments, abound with disciplinary diversity and reaching across ‘boundaries’. Typically, interdisciplinarity in general education has not been interdisciplinary, but multidisciplinary or cross-disciplinary – taking a set of courses from a menu of options that have something in common (i.e. clusters), but do not integrate disciplinary knowledge or methodology or conceive of interdisciplinarity beneath the program level. Structural constraints and resource limitations get in the way of team-teaching (including faculty development for the distinctive pedagogies of team-teaching), which would allow faculty to bring multiple disciplines together in one class, especially foundation courses like FYP and SRS. **Integrated learning in the liberal arts within general education require resources related to faculty development, faculty staffing levels, and other types of program support.**
- **FYP and SRS. Coherence and integration are weak between these courses as foundational parts of general education and WAC: they are a major missed opportunity to develop students’ capacities for participating in the integrated liberal arts. Might these courses be the place to begin reform? Possibilities for significant reform and revitalization include a two-term first year seminar with shared, staged, and overlapping learning outcomes; some pedagogical consistency and common ground within and among courses; a core mission built around skills, pedagogy, and theme that bridges center 1 and 2 and integrates the diversity of student interests with the pursuit and creation of knowledge in different disciplines, perhaps with community engagement; for example, sustainability and human ecologies.**
- Diversity, inclusion, and intercultural learning are guiding principles.
- Engineering. Engineering is a distinctive feature of Union. The integration of engineering into the Liberal Arts and Union as a liberal arts college isn’t complete unless it is available in general education to all students.
- Undergraduate Research. Another distinctive feature of Union. Its role in general education should more accurately reflect types/stages of research, the distinctions between what undergraduates do that constitutes research (especially original research) in different fields and programs, and the appropriate level of ‘research’ in given courses. Research is strong throughout divisions and programs, but general education may not full tap into those strengths given the lack of definition and clarity in such ways. Coordination of and connections between the college’s rich range of research opportunities and the curricular mission and components of general education warrant consideration.
- Study Away. Study away is community-based academic and experiential learning, whether abroad, within the local community, or places in between. Schenectady, the Adirondacks, regional study away and study abroad came up repeatedly in the conversations. Tension between these (and other features of Union) as marketing versus high-level academic content and learning.
- **Tension between stated desires for flexibility, coordination, integration, thematic purpose, and prescription.** Additional questions about when coursework should be completed in

general education; earlier the better?; something through all four years? Ensuring that general education really broadens students' learning experiences, especially by fulfilling general education requirements outside of home departments, divisions, or centers. A major question for any so-called Research Across the Curriculum requirement, ala WAC.

- Students should learn and develop a set of common skills and competencies. There was significant overlap among them across forums, with some distinctive contributions. General education learning outcome and competency frameworks are readily available.
- Checking Boxes. Lists/sets of skills and competencies carry risks, including doubling-down on the check box mentality or diluting the thematic and pedagogical integration of the program. Important that students do not think of a particular skill or requirement as a one-off disconnected choice or group of choices. Many of our current requirements struggle against this, including QMR, HUL, SCLB and WAC. The expectations for requirements, what's done in courses that fulfill them, and their value should be purposeful and deliberate.

7. Program Assessment [see Appendix 7]

Response Rate. Faculty completed 38% of requests for individual assessments (IARs), 47% of requests for FPR/FPR-H assessments, and 31% of requests for SRS/SCH-150 assessments.

Completion Patterns. Students across departments and programs make good progress in the first year completing the Common Curriculum; they typically complete four to seven CC requirements. Students in the class of 2020 sample who completed at least one LCC courses chose the language track by 63% compared to 37% for the cultural analysis track (8-9). The number of students who completed the SCLB and SET requirements improved overall, though the disparity between Center 1 and Center 2 students doing so reflects the long-standing problem of inadequate seats/sections for non-STEM majors. Students cluster in Economics and Psychology in completing the SOCS requirement. Students in the 2019 and 2020 samples took a broad range of Arts and Humanities courses in completing the HUL and HUM requirements. English and Modern Languages continue to pull in the largest number of students for HUL and LCC.

Assessment and the Strategic Plan. The connections between CC learning outcomes and the goals and objectives in the 2013 Strategic Plan have been laid out more clearly for faculty. This information is now available on the CC advising guide and under the resources section of the CC website (among other places). **There is little direct connection between the CC learning outcomes and one goal of the strategic plan: D2-G1, Union students will engage in disciplinary, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches, and will have opportunities to learn at the intersection of fields of study. It might be recalled that the General Faculty voted in 2012 to eliminate the dysfunctional Cluster requirement because of its failure to**

achieve such a goal. Learning outcomes B (making connections or original contributions) and C (reflective learning) are areas of particular concern. The 2020 sample found the highest numbers to date of faculty reporting no data/not observed/not applicable at 47.3% and 69.5% respectively. By comparison, almost all FPR/FPR-H and SRS faculty reported on these learning outcomes. These outcomes are directly connected to two important goals of the strategic plan and these findings indicate that the CC is failing to advance them adequately: *D1-G3, Union students will develop and enhance their understanding of their own and others' race, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, and other dimensions of our diverse community and cultures; F2-G4, Union students will develop a sense of themselves as a "whole person," with the skills necessary for the pursuit of life-long learning, global citizenship and effective work with others, through co-curricular programs that complement the academic mission.*

FPR/FPR-H. The distribution of students in 2016-17 and 2017-18 in the main learning outcomes related to critical and analytical thinking (A1-A4) are what one would expect: the majority of students were in the middle categories of mastery or proficient. For 2016-17, between 14% and 22% of students were found to be in the developmental and insufficient categories. Those numbers show a slight rise in 2017-18, 16% to 26%. FPR-H students were consistently half or less likely to be evaluated at these levels, and significantly less so in 2017-18.

SRS/SCH-150. For 2016-17, students in SRS struggled with learning outcomes A3 (evaluation of evidence) and A4 (developing an evidence-based argument); a traditional pattern for the course. For 2017-18, the deficiencies in these outcomes were less pronounced and tended to track with others in Learning Outcome A; Fall 2017 was an exception, but consists of reports from only 1 SRS section and probably should not be considered as typical. For 2016-17, SCH-150 students clustered in the mastery category for all learning outcomes with fewer in proficient, a few at developmental, and none found to be insufficient. For 2017-18, SCH-150 students in the aggregate moved dramatically toward the exceptional, mastery, and proficient categories, leaving none at development and a tiny number at insufficient.

Student Reflective Responses on the Common Curriculum. We completed the first comprehensive assessment sample with the classes of 2017 and 2018, including the Student Reflective Response. *Student responses in both cases were low but provided thoughtful comments that the Gen Ed Board, DofGE, and the general education reform task force should consider. In particular they speak to the importance of FPR/H and SRS/SCH-150 and early foundational courses like them, the value of ensuring Engineers engage the Liberal Arts via general education, the importance attached to LCC and language learning, and a desire for general education experiences with social purpose; there is also evidence that the big menu*

approach to using almost any class to complete requirements robs the program of a coherent and deliberate purpose for students, though this has long been accepted.

Faculty Development Projects. FPR/FPR-H assessment has now been incorporated within the responsibilities of the Director of General Education's office; transferred from the Dean of Studies. The Director of General Education and Director of Writing Programs assumed joint responsibility for faculty development for FPR/FPR-H and SRS/SCH-150. They successfully mounted two multi-session Faculty Institutes in Fall 2017 and Winter 2018.

Assessment Process Revisions. The Director of Assessment reviewed the Common Curriculum assessment process in Summer 2017 and the recommendations have been put in place.

Looking Ahead. Many faculty (rightly) view assessment as another 'unfunded mandate' imposed on them by managerial/business-minded administrators, assessment directors, and the Middle States accreditation agency. They also have thoughtful and supportable reasons, both practical and philosophical, for scepticism toward assessment that somehow must supersede, stand alone from, or needlessly duplicate the assessment instruments, pedagogy, and grading in the course. **We have probably reached a point where this particular assessment process has reached its maximum potential and, consequently, outlived its original usefulness. As the college embarks on general education reform, it very much needs fresh and innovative thinking about assessment, beginning with its rationale and goals, integration into courses and pedagogy, and processes (especially geared toward simple, qualitative information that can be used most effectively by instructors). As it stands, assessing the two core courses and the SRRs are the most valuable parts of the current process and have sufficient utility that they or something like them should carry over into any reform of general education assessment in the future.**

COMMON CURRICULUM ANNUAL REPORT APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

STUDY AWAY GUIDELINES

[submitted to the AAC on 25 May 2018]

Lewis Davis; Chair
Academic Affairs Council
25 May 2018

Colleagues,

The Gen Ed Board has carefully reviewed the letter of 13 November 2017 from the then-chair of the AAC, Mark Walker, concerning the revised guidelines for use of study away credit in completion of Common Curriculum requirements. At that time, the AAC instructed the Gen Ed Board not to implement its revised guidelines in 2018-2019. While we were pleased to read the AAC found that ‘None of this detracts from the content of the proposal, which some faculty may well see as an improvement on our current practice’, we regret that the guidelines were drafted in such a way that the AAC took issue with one part of our rationale rather than the merits of the guidelines in their entirety.

We would like to acknowledge the concerns raised by the AAC and respond to them here, since we have left them out of the guidelines that follow. The creators of the *Common Curriculum* understood the problems with how students completed cultural learning under the ‘Other Cultures’ requirement in our previous general education program, particularly the provision by which students could complete the requirement simply by virtue of study away. The November 2004 draft of our current general education program did not include study away as a path to fulfil the Linguistic and Cultural Competence/Languages and Cultures (LCC) requirement. Following faculty and student input in 2005, the reform subcommittee added the following provision for completing LCC: ‘Term Abroad courses that deal with a cultural tradition outside the US’. They explained it as follows: ‘Term Abroad courses are an option here if these courses deal with cultural traditions outside the US. Other term abroad courses can count toward other general education requirements.’ They explained their response to student and faculty input:

In response, the subcommittee made explicit that courses taken on Terms Abroad would in most cases fulfill the Cultural and Linguistic [LCC] requirement, because those courses usually do deal with a culture outside the US. In the unusual cases when students take courses not dealing with the culture and society of their host country on a Term Abroad, these courses would usually fulfill some other general education requirement or some major requirement for the students.

The creators expected that, in most instances, students would complete academic coursework during study away that fulfilled the requirements for LCC. We took away from this the vital importance that the reform subcommittee attached to course-based completion of

requirements through study way. This was one consideration that guided our work over the past two years.

The analysis of Mark Walker and Mark Wunderlich, on behalf of the AAC, focussed on the period of implementation and ‘interpretation’ of the program approved by the General Faculty in 2005. The 13 November letter concluded that the current guidelines for completion of LCC through study away emerged from a ‘give-and-take’ from 2005 to 2008 as the AAC, Gen Ed Board, Dean of Studies, Dean of Interdisciplinary Studies, and other administrators and faculty ‘interpreted’ the general education program approved by the General Faculty. The letter noted information that suggested the proposal left open the possibility that study away itself would be treated as equivalent of one course of the two required LCC courses. The letter also pointed to a Gen Ed Board meeting of 10 January 2008 that approved waiving one LCC course for participation in any full term abroad, regardless of courses taken. The AAC also obtained testimony from former-Deans Doug Klein and Kimmo Rosenthal and the Registrar’s office that tried to account for the current guidelines and their relationship to the program approved in 2005.

We returned to the program approved by the General Faculty in 2005. In proposing these revised guidelines, we simply ask the AAC to respect this Gen Ed Board’s right of interpretation and implementation in the same way its 13 November 2017 letter affirmed that of previous Gen Ed Boards and administrators. We ask the AAC to affirm our work on the merits of the revised guidelines in their entirety and in accordance with the standard set in the faculty constitution for sustaining the actions and recommendations of the Gen Ed Board.

Find here, then, the revised guidelines governing the completion of Common Curriculum requirements through study away, approved by the Gen Ed Board. We request that the AAC approve these for implementation beginning with study away in Fall 2019. We ask that the AAC authorize the Gen Ed Board to supply the necessary changes for the Academic Catalog to facilitate implementation. The Director of General Education and Gen Ed Board will work with International Programs and the Director of Advising to make this information easily and readily available upon approval.

On Behalf of the General Education Board (Kristin Bidoshi, Division 1; Andy Feffer, Division 2; Christina Tonnesen-Friedman, Division 3; Bill Keat, Division 4; Joe Johnson, Writing Programs),



John Cramsie, Ph.D. (St Andrews), B.A. (Minnesota), Fellow of the Royal Historical Society, British & Irish Studies and World History, Director of General Education
e-cc. Strom Thacker, VPAA; Lara Atkins, Director of International Programs

THE COMMON CURRICULUM

Guidelines Governing Completion of Requirements through Study Away

[approved by the Gen Ed Board on 23 May 2018]

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.

- The Gen Ed Board voted to implement revised guidelines for the completion of Common Curriculum requirements through study away, adopting a course-credit model.
- *Objectives.* These guidelines achieve four important objectives in support of academic excellence at Union College: 1) that the college follow best practice for the successful integration of high level academic learning with study away; 2) that International Programs continue to create, develop, and administer study away programs to meet the intrinsic goals of study away; 3) that any academic credit granted to students by study away and used to fulfil Common Curriculum requirements be done so through academic coursework that meet the standards, content requirements, and learning outcomes for the program; 4) that guidelines respect the specifications of the program approved by the General Faculty in 2005.
- *Full-term Study Away Guidelines.* Beginning with programs offered in Fall 2019, students will use individual academic courses completed during full-term study away to fulfil CC requirements, including but not limited to the LCC requirement. Henceforth, no student will receive LCC credit simply for study away or receive LCC credit irrespective of the content of a program's coursework. Under standing policy, students may use individual courses completed during study away to complete these CC requirements: Literature (HUL), Arts and Humanities (HUM), Social Sciences (SOCS), Quantitative and Mathematical Reasoning (QMR), Natural Sciences with Lab (SCLB), and Science, Engineering, and Technology (SET). LCC will simply be added that list.
- *Mini-Term Guidelines.* Mini-terms began after the General Faculty approved this general education program in 2005. Mini-terms are credited as single 1.0 credit courses and all carry LCC designations. The Gen Ed Board will implement new guidelines that supersede those created by previous Gen Ed Boards involving so-called 'distribution credits': beginning in Fall 2019, no mini-term may be used to complete the entirety of the two-course LCC requirement.
- *Impact.* Under the revised guidelines, students will continue to participate in Union's already over-subscribed collection of study away programs, use coursework to complete CC requirements, and use courses taken away toward their minor/major programs of study. The guidelines will make it simpler and more transparent to do so. They encourage deliberateness on the part of students and advisers to aim for completion of distinctive academic coursework during study away. They give a strong incentive to International Programs, the college administration, and other stakeholders to improve the academic quality of existing programs and seek out new, distinctive, and academically-challenging

study away opportunities. Finally, they set a high academic and procedural standard for any continuing or new role for study away in the context of general education reform.

BACKGROUND. Union College rightly points with pride to the opportunities for its students to study away from campus, to enrich their education and personal growth as global citizens through academic coursework and carefully planned, pedagogically sound experiential learning. The college's commitment to study away did not originate with the completion of general education requirements. Study away programs exist for their own purposes. Programs allow students to concentrate in coursework for a major program of study, sample a wide variety of courses from a host institution (ideally allowing students to access coursework unavailable at Union College), or place themselves in a culturally immersive and intensive learning environment built on language study. Both in the current general education program, Union's Common Curriculum, and its predecessor (General Education), students could fulfil requirements aimed at developing linguistic competency and cultural understanding through study away.

In *General Education*, students could fulfil the entire three-course 'Other Cultures' requirement simply by completing a full-term study away. At the creation and adoption of *General Education*, the requisite individuals and governance bodies did not undertake a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between the learning goals for the 'Other Cultures' requirements and the actual coursework in study away programs. Instead, the overlap between study away itself and the acquisition of linguistic competency or cultural understanding was assumed. This would no longer be considered best practice, either for developing and administering study away on its own or in its relationship to academic curricula and student learning outcomes.

In the *Common Curriculum* students currently fulfil the two-course Languages and Cultures (LCC) requirement simply by participating in full-term study away. Mini-terms now allow students to complete one LCC course and, in some cases, receive a 'distribution credit' for completion of the rest of the two-course LCC requirement. In addition, individual courses completed on full-term study away programs can be used to complete other (non-LCC) requirements in the Common Curriculum. These requirements include: Literature (HUL), Arts and Humanities (HUM), Social Sciences (SOCS), Quantitative and Mathematical Reasoning (QMR), Natural Sciences with Lab (SCLB), and Science, Engineering, and Technology (SET).

In 2016 and 2017, the General Education Board examined and reviewed the current relationship between study away and the requirements in the Common Curriculum, including focus on the LCC requirement. This review followed on from the Board's survey of faculty and students regarding the LCC requirement in April 2014 and the comprehensive review of all Common Curriculum requirements begun in 2015. The Board also followed on from the completion of the document 'A Union Education and International Programs' (July 2015) by the Director of International Programs. Our review took in all the information available about study away programs, information from and via individual faculty, the Registrar, the International Programs Office, and meetings with the Director of International Programs. Gen Ed Board representatives received input across multiple division meetings and the entire Gen Ed Board conducted open division meetings in Winter 2018. Three members of the Gen Ed

Board have direct experience leading or directing one or more of Union's study abroad programs, have served on the Liaison Committee on Study Abroad (LCOSA), worked directly with International Programs in other capacities, and/or have direct expertise with research on academic learning and study away. Finally, the current Common Curriculum Learning Outcomes and LCC content requirements guided the review: <https://www.union.edu/offices/gen-ed/documents/cca-programassessmentoverview.pdf>.

REVISED GUIDELINES. Based on its review, the Gen Ed Board proposes to implement revised guidelines for the completion of Common Curriculum requirements through study away beginning in Fall 2019. These guidelines permit completion of CC requirements only on the basis of completed academic coursework:

- *Full-term Study Away.* The Gen Ed Board will discontinue the current study away guidelines that pertain to LCC. Henceforth, students will use individual academic courses completed during full-term study away to fulfil the LCC requirement on the same basis that they use such courses to complete other CC requirements. Under that standing policy, students may use individual academic courses completed during study away to complete these CC requirements: Literature (HUL), Arts and Humanities (HUM), Social Sciences (SOCS), Quantitative and Mathematical Reasoning (QMR), Natural Sciences with Lab (SCLB), and Science, Engineering, and Technology (SET). LCC will simply be added that list.
- *Mini-terms.* The Gen Ed Board will discontinue the so-called distribution credit system adopted by previous Gen Ed Boards c. 2008.³ This permitted the completion of the two-course LCC requirement through completion of the mini-term (for 1.0 credit) and associated ad hoc pre-departure or post-return non-credit bearing activities. Henceforth, mini-terms (for 1.0 credit) only may be used to complete or toward the completion of CC requirements. Ad hoc pre-departure and post-return activities will no longer be accepted as a course or distribution credit for LCC.

RATIONALE. The Gen Ed Board oversees the general education program and formulates plans and policies relating to it. The Director of General Education serves as Chair of the Gen Ed Board and is responsible for the administration of the program. In discharging their responsibilities under the governance system, both have been guided by:

- 1) the detailed examination of Union's current study away programs completed over many months in 2016-2018; for every program, we examined prerequisite structures, required and elective academic coursework, the academic credentials of the educational institutions or providers, the relationship of non-classroom activities to academic courses and programs, student living situations (e.g. with host-families, segregated international housing, etc.), and the degree and type of immersion by Union students within host communities.
- 2) input from International Programs, faculty, the AAC, and Dean of the Faculty across multiple venues and meetings.

³ See LCC Study Away documents at: <https://nexus.union.edu/mod/folder/view.php?id=264468>

- 3) the specifications of the general education program approved by the General Faculty in 2005, specifically the narrative explanations of completion of Common Curriculum requirements through study away.⁴
- 4) the expectation that any academic credit granted to students during study away and used to fulfil Common Curriculum requirements be done so through academic coursework that meets the standards, content requirements, and learning outcomes for the program.
- 5) the evolution of best practice in study away since *General Education* and the creation of the *Common Curriculum*, and that Union College follow those practices.⁵
- 6) the increasing importance Union attaches to a global education in the Liberal Arts that creates and nurtures students' capabilities for intellectual diversity and cultural understanding that embrace complex global realities.
- 7) the broader commitment to strengthen the quality and rigour of Union's academic programs and reputation, signalled, for example, in the last two Strategic Plans.
- 8) The freedom for International Programs to create, develop, and administer study away programs to meet Union's broader mission and the intrinsic goals of study away.

We have thought carefully about the future of the Common Curriculum and general education. The college has embarked on the reform of general education: a revised Common Curriculum may be approved or an entirely new general education program may emerge. In either case, the General Education Board is agreed that completion of current, revised, or new general education requirements through study away, whether as part of the Common Curriculum or another program, should be on the basis of completed academic courses (on a non-Pass/Fail basis). This is the strongest academic basis on which to ensure that students meet the standards, content requirements, and learning outcomes for general education, and do so in ways that meet the college's mission to educate students broadly and rigorously in the Liberal Arts. It constitutes best practice for the integration of academic learning and study away whether in a current or revised Common Curriculum or an entirely new program. There is no academic rationale to hold back the college in adopting those best practices.

We want to reiterate that the Gen Ed Board developed its guidelines based on a systematic study of existing terms abroad, their program requirements, and information on courses offered through host institutions. Our review included consideration of the extent to which each program encouraged cultural immersion, awareness, and understanding beyond that achieved simply by 'getting off the plane,' through such elements as homestays, program activities, and local excursions. The board's review included judging the balance between coursework and the broader cultural experience – not merely the academic demands of specific curriculum – to assess the degree to which available courses combined with program activities to bring significant intercultural learning. That review consistently affirmed the importance of course-based completion of CC requirements, including LCC. This is the essential foundation for intercultural learning within the study away context, of ensuring our

⁴ <https://nexus.union.edu/mod/folder/view.php?id=264468>

⁵ The literature on the subject is expansive, but two useful starting points include Michael Vande Berg, R. Michael Paige, Kris Hemming Lou (eds.), *Student Learning Abroad: What Our Students are Learning, What They're Not, and What We Can Do About It* (Sterling, VA, 2012); Neal W. Sobania (ed.), *Putting the Local in Global Education: Models for Transformative Learning Through Domestic Off-Campus Programs* (Sterling, VA, 2015).

students receive the full benefit of academic study away as opposed to travel away or simply 'getting off the plane'. The reform subcommittee's conception in 2004-2005 has also guided our own, particularly when it wrote that 'courses taken on Terms Abroad would in most cases fulfill the Cultural and Linguistic [LCC] requirement, because those courses usually do deal with a culture outside the US. In the unusual cases when students take courses not dealing with the culture and society of their host country on a Term Abroad, these courses would usually fulfill some other general education requirement or some major requirement for the students.'

IMPACT. Union's study away programs are anything but uniform – quite rightly, in many instances – and are likely to become more diverse and heterogeneous as the college's mission and place in the world evolve, and the world evolves around it. We believe it is essential that International Programs have the freedom and flexibility to operate and thrive in that context. Our revised guidelines (and the standards it sets) respect the diversity of Union's study way programs and strengthen their academic role in a Union education. The revised guidelines do not mandate changes in the existing mission of any study away program. Overall,

- In the 25 full-term study away programs, students can fulfil CC requirements through completed coursework. There are long-standing policies for pre-approval and post-approval of coursework that faculty, staff, and students are familiar with.
- In 19 of 25 full-term study away programs, students will continue to complete the LCC requirement simply by completing the coursework already specified in the programs' requirements.
- Four of the remaining six full-term study away programs (Ireland: Galway; England: London and York; Czech Republic: Prague) include one or more courses pre-approved for LCC credit and/or director's courses typically approved for LCC on a one-time basis.
- Only two of 25 full-term study away programs (France: Lille and Belgium: Antwerp) do not have any existing LCC coursework already approved. However, the eight to twelve students in those programs typically apply two, three, or four courses toward the Economics major. This means that completing LCC courses at Union will not crowd out space for electives or major requirements for that small number of students; here we would note that Common Curriculum assessment shows that many students who study abroad as juniors actually complete one or both LCC courses in their first and second years, especially students in Arts & Humanities and Social Sciences. Finally, the guidelines will encourage students in the two programs to consider taking LCC-eligible coursework that makes more of the study away opportunity they have.

Under the revised guidelines, students will continue to participate in Union's already over-subscribed collection of study away programs, use coursework to complete CC requirements, and use courses from study away toward their minor/major programs of study. The guidelines will make it simpler and more transparent to do so. They encourage deliberateness on the part of students and advisers to aim for completion of distinctive academic coursework during study away. They give a strong incentive to International Programs, the college

administration, and other stakeholders to improve the academic quality of existing programs and seek out new, distinctive, and academically-challenging study away opportunities. Finally, they set a high academic and procedural standard for any continuing or new role for study away in the context of general education reform.

IMPLEMENTATION. The implementation of the revised guidelines will involve new copy for the Academic Catalog and the Common Curriculum guide on policies, administration, and advising posted to the program website, as follows:

COMPLETING COMMON CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS THROUGH STUDY AWAY

- Courses completed during a full-term study away program that are accepted for full academic course credit (1.0) on a non-Pass/Fail basis by Union College may count toward the following CC requirements, as appropriate: HUL, HUM, LCC, SOCS, QMR, SCLB, SET.
 - a) Many standard or required courses completed as part of study away have been pre-approved to fulfil CC requirements. *Courses will be coded in Datatel and a comprehensive list provided via the Common Curriculum and International Programs websites. See below.*
 - b) Other courses completed during study away not pre-approved may count toward CC requirements contingent upon *review and approval by the Director of General Education with the Gen Ed Board and/or appropriate department.* Such courses must meet the standards, content requirements, and learning outcomes for the Common Curriculum and/or the relevant department. A complete course syllabus and supporting materials such as assignments must be submitted with the request: no reviews or approvals will be made without such materials. Submission of materials and review do not guarantee approval. *Once a course is approved for CC credit, the approval will be recorded permanently with the Registrar.*
- Full course credit (1.0) mini-terms are typically approved for one LCC credit. No mini-term may be used to complete the entirety of the two-course LCC requirement, whether or not it has pre-departure and/or post-travel program-related activities. *Courses will be coded in Datatel and a comprehensive list provided via the Common Curriculum and International Programs websites. See below.*
- No mini-term or academic course completed during a full-term study away program can count for more than one CC requirement (LCC and SOCS, for example). In cases where a mini-term or academic course has been approved as capable of fulfilling more than one CC requirement, students must choose which ONE requirement to apply it toward. *This restates the existing policy on double-counting concerning all CC requirements, including mini-terms and study away programs.*
- No mini-term or academic course completed during a full-term study away program can be used to fulfil the FPR/FPR-H or SRS/SCH-150. These courses have unique pedagogical requirements and learning outcomes designed for the Common Curriculum and Union College's academic program. *This restates the existing policy with respect to these particular courses.*

The revised guidelines will require some modification of the information on the completion of

the Languages and Cultures (LCC) requirement, as follows.

COMPLETING THE LANGUAGES AND CULTURE (LCC) REQUIREMENT

Complete the two-course LCC requirement by one of these tracks:

A. LANGUAGE TRACK

Complete a sequence of TWO language courses beginning at 101 or higher.

PLEASE NOTE: Because of the numbering systems in Latin and Greek, you must complete LAT 102 and LAT 103 or GRK 102 and GRK 103; LAT 101 and GRK 101 do not count for LCC language sequence credit.

B. CULTURAL ANALYSIS TRACK

Complete any TWO cultural analysis (non-language) LCC courses.

PLEASE NOTE: Mini-terms that have been approved for LCC credit can fulfil one (only) of the two LCC courses under this track.

C. INTEGRATED LANGUAGE-CULTURE STUDY AWAY TRACK

Complete a language course and a connected non-language LCC course (on a non-Pass/Fail basis) as part of a full-term study away program.

PLEASE NOTE: The language course cannot be an Anglophone language or in a language or cultural tradition/society taught as part of Union College's curricula. Both courses must be completed in a culturally immersive setting as part of the same study away program. A Language course and a non-language LCC course cannot be combined to fulfil the LCC requirement in any other circumstance.

Explanation of Track C. The Gen Ed Board integrated tracks A and B via track C to address peculiarities associated with using study away coursework from certain programs to complete LCC. The programs that contain courses approved for completion of LCC under track C are Cambodia, India, and Kenya. First, we agreed on the intellectual benefits and cultural learning of combining formal language learning with dedicated coursework in cultural analysis in these particular locales. The reform subcommittee foresaw this in its emphasis on language learning and cultural diversity/complexity in the LCC requirement. Second, the particular instances where this occurs in study away involve languages and cultures not offered or studied at Union College. These opportunities neither compete with existing academic programs and course offerings at Union nor are they available to our students outside these unique programs and situations. That said, we strongly advise International Programs to work with faculty and partners abroad to strengthen the level of language instruction and the interconnectedness of the courses involved. The Gen Ed Board will not approve the use of study away coursework in any other program in this way if either the language or specific cultural tradition/society is taught as part of the academic programs and curriculum at Union College.

Advising. We have seen a significant increase in the number of students seeking to apply courses completed during study away to Common Curriculum requirements; this is part of a general increase in applications to use transfer, AP, and IB courses for the same purpose. Advising for study away needs to catch up to this new reality. In particular, the open menu or 'breadth' approach of some programs works against one of the most powerful rationale for and

benefits of study away: to intentionally use the unique and different academic and/or cultural setting of study away to enhance and multiply the effects of academic coursework. More simply put, students should be encouraged, advised, even required to a) directly link academic coursework in study away to the locale and intercultural learning and b) engage academic coursework and learning not available at Union College. We should actively encourage students to treat study away as an opportunity to expand the global content and inflection of their coursework and education. Overall, there is a lack of deliberateness on the part of students seeking to fulfil CC requirements with study away; the existing guidelines feed the problem. This is also an important consideration for the Gen Ed Board with the revised guidelines. It is incumbent upon International Programs and faculty advisers to see that students develop those unique learning connections and opportunities, however interested they may be in 'checking boxes' in general education with study away coursework.

PROGRAM SPECIFIC EXPLANATIONS. We have assessed certain programs individually.

- *Czech Republic-Prague (1LCC):* this program builds experience in the major (depth), specifically in Engineering. *Existing coursework permits students to complete one LCC under the revised guidelines.*
 - a) Students on this program have the opportunity to fulfil the equivalent of one LCC course by completing for credit both TAB 104T Czech Language for Beginners and TAB 320T Czech Culture (see Appendix 1). The Gen Ed Board reviewed the course syllabi for both courses and obtained additional information about them through the Registrar and International Programs (see Appendix 2). Based on course content, contact hours, and course duration, we have determined that these courses should be converted to Union College academic credits by the Registrar as follows: TAB 320T, 0.70 course credit; TAB 104T, 0.30 course credit. These course credit conversions should not be adjusted or changed except upon further review of the courses by the Gen Ed Board and AAC approval.⁶
 - b) Many students complete TAB 320T while fewer complete TAB 104T. We strongly recommend that these two courses be made mandatory so that students, especially those in highly structured programs, are able to complete one LCC during the program. If the two courses are not made mandatory for students, then advising and advisers will need to ensure students plan their course selections for the Czech program carefully. Students who complete TAB 320T and TAB 104T under the revised guidelines would be required to take one Cultural Analysis (non-language) LCC course at Union.
 - c) Thinking outside of the current routine, there are a number of additional considerations. First, students typically transfer in only one Engineering (elective) credit out of 4 credit courses/course equivalents. Therefore, scope exists within the program for students to expand the non-Engineering coursework taken. Our review of student audits going back to 2009 found students doing so in several instances, taking courses in Social Sciences and Humanities beyond TAB 320T and/or TAB 104T. International Programs and advisers should work with students to explore, identify,

⁶ This stipulation is consistent with both long-standing practice for approving academic credit for study away coursework applied to Common Curriculum requirements (see above) and the authority entrusted to the Academic Affairs Council, its sub-councils (including the Gen Ed Board), and academic departments and programs to make determinations about academic coursework.

- and establish such opportunities if completing CC requirements and preserving free electives is a priority.
- d) Conversely, International Programs and Engineering departments could again review the opportunities for students to transfer in more than one Engineering course that counts toward students' major program requirements. If such coursework is not available or does not meet the necessary standards of academic content and rigour for Union engineers, that may well be a reason to re-evaluate Union's participation in the program.
 - e) We note here the ongoing work within International Programs at the behest of the academic administration to develop a new study away location (or locations) more suitable for Engineering students. Edinburgh University has been mentioned as a possible location for a study away program that addresses the issues of intercultural learning/coursework and suitability of coursework toward the Engineering major. We encourage bringing such negotiations to a successful conclusion. Finally, we strongly encourage the AAC to use these guidelines to incentivize International Programs and the academic administration to do so, especially to 'do better' by students in Center 4.
 - f) The Gen Ed Board respects the importance of study away for Engineering students, especially in pursuit of high-level intercultural learning. The Board leaves open the possibility of considering a request for an extension of the application of the revised guidelines to the Czech program in these circumstances: i) that a sunset date for the program is set within the next two academic years; ii) that, despite concerted effort by International Programs and other stakeholders, the academic authorities in Prague are unable or unwilling to support the needs of Union students under these guidelines. This does not predetermine the outcome of such a request to the Gen Ed Board. Further, the Board will not consider such an extension for any other study away program.
- *Ireland-Galway (typically 2LCCs):* this is a broad-based curriculum (breadth) program. *Existing coursework permits students to complete one LCC with strong likelihood of completing a second LCC under the revised guidelines.* The program is run under the auspices of the Partnership for Global Education with Hobart-William Smith. Faculty directors alternate between Union and HWS and teach one course. Students complete a second required course, *GAL 210 Contemporary Irish Culture and Society*, which has been pre-approved by the Gen Ed Board to fulfil the LCC, HUM, or SOCS requirements. Faculty directors are expected to offer a course relevant to Ireland, Irish Studies, and/or the locale. In practice, the directors' courses (in the eight year window reviewed by the Gen Ed Board) would typically be approved for LCC credit. Further, anecdotal information suggests that most students complete at least one other course at NUI-Galway that would be appropriate to fulfil LCC. In other words, completing LCC and other CC requirements is already built into this program.
 - *England-London (1LCC):* this is a broad-based curriculum (breadth) program. *Existing coursework permits students to complete one LCC under the revised guidelines.* Students complete three specified courses. All of these courses are appropriate SOCS courses; of them *Analyzing and Exploring the Global City: Modernity, Empire, and Modernization* is an appropriate LCC course and has been pre-approved by the Gen Ed Board as such under the revised guidelines. London is the most culturally complex city in Britain and voted overwhelmingly to remain within the European Union. Students should be strongly

advised and encouraged to complete appropriate coursework in Arts and Humanities and Social Sciences at Union College that prepare them to understand the cultural complexity of London, the history and contemporary realities of Britain as a multi-ethnic society, and similar questions. It might be worth considering as well changing one of the existing required courses to better take advantage of the location and opportunity to engage this profound moment in the history of Britain and Europe.

- *England-York (typically 1LCC)*: this is a broad-based curriculum (breadth) program. The Union faculty director teaches one course and students complete other courses at York – St. Johns University. The modern United Kingdom (including England) witnesses profound thinking about and practical challenges to the national identities and political union of the peoples and nations of Britain and Northern Ireland. Faculty who apply and are accepted to lead this program should be strongly encouraged to submit courses (and associated experiential learning activities) that tackle these questions from diverse disciplinary viewpoints. In this context every Union faculty directors’ course should aim for approval as an LCC course. Further, students should be strongly advised and encouraged to engage the complex, interconnected cultures and histories of the peoples of Britain and Ireland outside an Anglocentric perspective.
- *Belgium-Antwerp*: this program builds experience in the major (depth), specifically in Economics. Students are required to complete four courses in Business Administration or Economic Policy. Students typically apply two, three, or four courses toward the Economics major. Consequently, completing LCC courses at Union will not crowd out space for electives or major requirements. The revised guidelines should also encourage advisers and students to seek out coursework with broader cultural implications that leverages their location, perhaps in lieu of more technical coursework that might be as readily completed at Union College.
- *France-Lille*: this program builds experience in the major (depth), specifically in Economics. Students are required to complete up to six courses from the IESEG School of Management. Students typically apply two or more courses toward the Economics major. Consequently, completing LCC courses at Union will not crowd out space for electives or major requirements. The revised guidelines should also encourage advisers and students to seek out coursework with broader cultural implications that leverages their location, perhaps in lieu of more technical coursework that might be as readily completed at Union College.
- *Turkey*: this program is on hiatus because of the current political situation and the Gen Ed Board will take up the specifics of this program when its status changes.
- *Mini-Terms*: beginning with mini-terms offered in Fall 2019, the Gen Ed Board will discontinue the policy of permitting a mini-term associated with pre-departure and/or post-return ‘coursework’ to fulfil the entirety of the two-course LCC requirement. Mini-terms were not included in the program approved by the General Faculty in 2005. The current guidelines were adopted on an ad hoc basis through administrative processes and without robust guidelines governing implementation. We have found scant evidence in the review of existing mini-terms that such ad hoc ‘coursework’ constitutes the equivalent of

1.0 academic course. We note that the 2010 survey about mini-terms never considered offering academic course credit to this ad hoc ‘coursework’, just ‘distribution credits’. This Gen Ed Board is no more persuaded that a three-week mini-term with such associated ‘coursework’ constitutes the equivalent of 2.0 academic credits. We are also unconvinced that mini-terms with ad hoc coursework are comparable to a full-term study away program or able to achieve fully the intercultural learning specified in the LCC content requirements and learning outcomes during its short duration. For those reasons, our guidelines will supersede those created by the previous Gen Ed Board. We strongly encourage International Programs and faculty to develop robust linkages between mini-terms and courses approved for academic credit on a permanent basis via the normal course approval process through the AAC and Gen Ed Board. As the final step in its multi-year review of Common Curriculum designations, the Gen Ed Board will review CC designations assigned to mini-terms in Fall 2018; in keeping with past practice, the Gen Ed Board may request limited resubmission of individual mini-terms to confirm CC designations.

APPENDIX 1. TABLES detailing coursework and Common Curriculum Designations in Study Away Programs

<i>Table 1. FULL TERM STUDY AWAY PROGRAMS and CC DESIGNATIONS</i>		
PROGRAM	LCCs/ TRACK	COURSES and CC DESIGNATIONS
Argentina	A/B	SPN 204T Intermediate Spanish Abroad, <i>LCCS(panish), HUM</i> SPN 205T Advanced Spanish Abroad, <i>LCCS, HUM</i> TAB 228T Argentine History, <i>LCC, SOCS</i> TAB 212T Argentine Culture, <i>LCC, SOCS</i>
China (Shanghai)	A	CHN 204T, <i>LCCC(hinese), HUM</i> CHN 205T, <i>LCCC, HUM</i>
France (Rennes)	A	FRN 204T, <i>LCCF(rench), HUM</i> FRN 207T, <i>LCCF, HUM</i> FRN 208T Contemporary France, <i>LCCF, HUM, SOCS</i> FRN 306T Readings in French and Francophone Culture, <i>LCCF, HUL, HUM</i>
Germany (Berlin/Freiburg) – Track 1	A	GER 100, <i>HUM</i> GER 101, <i>LCCG, HUM</i> GER 238T German Civilization, <i>LCCG, HUM</i>
Germany	A	GER 102 or above, <i>LCCG(erman), HUM</i>

(Berlin/Freiburg) – Track 2		GER 201 or above, <i>LCCG, HUM</i> GER 300T German Civilization, <i>LCCG, HUM</i>
Italy (Florence)	A	ITL 104T Italian Studied Abroad, <i>LCCI(talian), HUM</i> ITL 116T Italian Renaissance Architecture, <i>LCCI, HUM</i>
Japan (Osaka)	A	JPN 204T, 252T, 350T, or 450T, Japanese Abroad, <i>LCCJ(apanese), HUM</i> JPN 251T, 253T, 351T, 451T Written Japanese, <i>LCCJ, HUM</i>
Spain (Seville)	A	SPN 204T Spanish Language Abroad, <i>LCCS, HUM</i> SPN 208T Spanish Civilization, <i>LCCS, HUM</i> SPN 300T Special Topics in Spanish Literature, <i>LCCS, HUM, HUL</i>
Australia (PGE)	B	TAB 350T History and Culture of Australia, <i>LCC, SOCS, HUM</i> ENS 300T, <i>LCC, SET</i> BIO 350T, <i>SET</i> BIO 352T, <i>SET</i>
Brazil (PGE)	B	POR 104T Portuguese Abroad, <i>LCCP, HUM</i> SOC 323T Survey of Brazilian Society, <i>LCC, SOCS</i> MLT 286T Contemporary Brazilian Cinema, <i>LCC, HUM</i>
Fiji	B	ANT 285T Peoples of the Pacific, <i>LCC, SOCS</i> ANT 226T Culture and Education, <i>LCC, SOCS</i>
Greece (CYA)	B	Modern Greek Culture and Language, <i>LCC, HUM</i> Second required course in Greek History, Religion, Mythology, Art, Archaeology, <i>LCC, HUM, HUL, SOCS</i>
Russia (Siberia)	B	RUS 101 and above, <i>LCCR(ussian), HUM</i> REE 300T History and Environment of Siberia, <i>LCC, SOCS</i> MLT 300T Siberia Internship, <i>LCC</i>
National Health Systems	B	TAB 323T National Health Services, <i>LCC, SOCS</i> TAB 324T Historical and Cultural Factors, <i>LCC, SOCS</i>
Cambodia	C	PSC 201T Crossing Cultures: Cambodia Study Abroad, <i>SOCS, LCC</i> TAB 105T Introduction to Cambodian/Khmer, <i>LCC, HUM</i> IDM 491T Internship with a Mission
India	C	Hindi 100, <i>LCC, HUM</i> ANT 255T Culture and Work, <i>LCC, SOCS</i>

Italy (Sicily)	C	ITL 104T Italian Studied Abroad, <i>LCCI, HUM</i> TAB 329T History and Culture of Sicily, <i>LCC, HUM, SOCS</i>
Kenya (NY6)	C	SWAH 101, 102, 103, <i>LCC, HUM</i> ANT 241 Culture, Environment, and Development in East Africa, <i>LCC, SOCS</i>
Vietnam	C	ANT 350T / TAB 327T Vietnam: Culture and Society, <i>LCC, SOCS</i> TAB 100T Vietnamese Studied Abroad, <i>LCC, HUM</i>
Ireland (Galway)	(2 LCCs)	GAL 210 Contemporary Irish Culture and Society, <i>LCC, HUM, SOCS</i> Faculty Director's Course, <i>LCC</i> (subject to one-time submission and approval by the Gen Ed Board) Courses completed during a full-term study away program that are accepted for full course credit (1.0) by Union College may count toward the following Common Curriculum requirements as appropriate: HUL, HUM, SOCS, QMR, SCLB, SET, LCC.
England (London)	1 LCC	TAB 360T The Global City: London, <i>LCC, SOCS</i> TAB 302T International Marketing, <i>SOCS</i> TAB 365T Western European Government and Politics, <i>SOCS</i> PSY 240T Child Development in a British Context, <i>SOCS</i> Courses completed during a full-term study away program that are accepted for full course credit (1.0) by Union College may count toward the following Common Curriculum requirements as appropriate: HUL, HUM, SOCS, QMR, SCLB, SET, LCC.
Czech Republic (Prague)	1 LCC	TAB 104T Czech Language for Beginners (0.30 Union academic credits), <i>LCC</i> TAB 320T Czech Culture (0.70 Union academic credits), <i>LCC</i> (Total = 1.0 LCC)
England (York)	(1 LCC)	Faculty Director's Course, <i>LCC</i> (subject to one-time submission and approval by the Gen Ed Board) Courses completed during a full-term study away program that are accepted for full course credit (1.0) by Union College may count toward the following Common Curriculum requirements as appropriate: HUL, HUM, SOCS, QMR, SCLB, SET, LCC.

Belgium (Antwerp)	OTHER	Courses completed during a full-term study away program that are accepted for full course credit (1.0) by Union College may count toward the following Common Curriculum requirements as appropriate: HUL, HUM, SOCS, QMR, SCLB, SET, LCC.
France (Lille)	OTHER	Courses completed during a full-term study away program that are accepted for full course credit (1.0) by Union College may count toward the following Common Curriculum requirements as appropriate: HUL, HUM, SOCS, QMR, SCLB, SET, LCC.
Turkey	OTHER	Hiatus

Table 2. STUDY AWAY MINI-TERMS and CC DESIGNATIONS

Number	Course Title	CC DESIGNATIONS
HST 277T	Civil Rights	<i>LCC, SOCS</i>
HST 278T	South Africa	<i>LCC, SOCS</i>
MLT 341T (2LCC)	Summer Mini-Term in Senegal	<i>LCC, HUM</i>
REE 341T	Holocaust Mini-Term	<i>LCC, SOCS</i>
SOC 378T (2LCC)	Community Service Mini-Term	<i>LCC, SOCS</i>
TAB 273T	Coffee and Ethiopia	<i>LCC</i>
TAB 275T	Mini-Term Study in Cuba	<i>LCC</i>
TAB 321T	Argentina	<i>LCC</i>
TAB 330T	China	<i>LCC</i>
TAB 332T	France (Dawn to Print)	<i>LCC, HUM</i>
TAB 333T (2LCC)	New Zealand Mini-Term	<i>LCC, SET</i>
TAB 336T	France (Three Weeks in Louvre)	<i>LCC, HUM</i>
TAB 339T	India	<i>LCC</i>
TAB 341T	London Theatre Mini-Term	<i>LCC, HUM</i>
TAB 342T	Cordoba (Spain): Religion and Technologies	<i>LCC, HUM</i>
TAB 344T (2LCC)	Ancient and Modern Egypt	<i>LCC</i>
TAB 348T	Mexican-American Border Mini-Term	<i>LCC</i>
WMC 354T	Balinese Performing Arts	<i>LCC, HUM</i>

(2LLC) = currently counts for two LCC 'distribution' credits, not two academic credits. Beginning with programs offered in Fall 2019, no mini-term (whether or not it has pre-departure and/or post-travel activities) may be used to complete the entirety of the two-course LCC requirement. Mini-terms are currently credited as single 1.0 credit courses and carry LCC designations faculty may continue to submit mini-terms for additional CC designations.

APPENDIX 2

PROPOSALS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RATIONALIZATIONS OF ACADEMIC AND CURRICULAR RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE COMMON CURRICULUM

[submitted to VPAA Strom Thacker on 14 December 2017]

1) ADMINISTRATIVE RATIONALIZATION

To be appropriately phased in over the 2017-2018 academic year:

Assigned to the Director of General Education:

- Provide information and support related to the Common Curriculum, including FPR/FPR-H, during new student orientation beginning in Fall 2018, working with appropriate offices.
- Receive and review FPR/FPR-H course evaluations beginning in Fall 2017 for use in programmatic assessment and faculty development (as outlined below).
- Collect and review SRS/SCH-150 course evaluations beginning in Fall 2017 for use in programmatic assessment and faculty development (as outlined below).

Assigned jointly to the Director of General Education (working with the Gen Ed Board) and Director of Writing Programs (working with the Writing Board):

- Collect, review, and report FPR/FPR-H course assessments.
- Plan and schedule FPR/FPR-H faculty development activities.
- (See the work plan laid out below.)

Retained in Dean of Academic Departments and Programs Office:

- Recruitment and allocation of staffing for FPR/FPR-H and SRS/SCH-150.

Retained in the Dean of Studies Office:

- Collect, review, and approve FPR/FPR-H descriptions and new course proposals.
- Enrollment management of FPR/FPR-H sections/students.
- Funding for and administration of FPR/FPR-H instructor stipends (\$300).
- Funding for faculty development for FPR/FPR-H as requested under the provisions above.
- Receive and review FPR/FPR-H course evaluations for current purposes.

WORKING PLAN for shared responsibilities between DofGE and DofWP.

Working Plan: Assessment. All CC assessment is now collected and stored electronically via the WebApps platform. The Gen Ed Board, DofGE, and Kathy Basirico administer, aggregate, and review assessment information for all parts of the CC. The DofGE and the DofWP will complete the annual assessment of FPR/FPR-H for inclusion in the report of the Common Curriculum submitted to the Director of Assessment in September of each academic year.

Work Plan: Faculty Development. The DofWP and DofGE will plan and execute faculty development for the Common Curriculum. In particular, DofWP and DofGE jointly plan for and carry out a faculty institute each term. Faculty institutes provide focussed instruction and training that integrates FPR/FPR-H and SRS/SCH-150 learning outcomes. Faculty institutes are open to all faculty and faculty teaching in either core course are strongly encouraged to attend all workshops. The DofWP and DofGE take the lead in preparing materials in advance of faculty institutes and producing a summary update of each institute/session for Nexus or/and program websites. The typical academic year schedule will follow this pattern:

TERM	FACULTY INSTITUTES
FALL	<i>Theme: Course Design and Improvement</i>
	A sequence of four linked micro-seminars in consecutive weeks over a common lunch hour (Mondays seem optimal); typically between weeks 2 and 6.
	Focus on teaching the core components of academic-level argumentation, including ‘reading’ for meaning, modes of academic inquiry and debates, assignment design that leads students from the evaluation of academic argumentation to its practice in their own work, best practices for feedback and evaluation. Particularly geared toward training new faculty and renewing the pedagogy of experienced faculty in the foundation courses of the CC, but transferable to other instructional settings.
	DofWP and DofGE will take the lead in developing these workshops jointly.
WINTER	<i>Theme: Teaching Demonstrations</i>
	A sequence of three linked micro-seminars in consecutive weeks over a common lunch hour (Mondays seem optimal); typically between weeks 3 and 6.
	DofWP and DofGE will recruit and work with faculty to lead workshops and conduct teaching demonstrations that emphasize pedagogical choices, lesson design, assignment design, discussion facilitation, in-class writing assignments or workshops, oral and poster presentations, effective content, and the like.
SPRING	<i>Theme: Assessment and Program Improvement</i>
	Week 3: Review Assessment Data with faculty in both courses
	Week 4: Consider program improvements based on assessment data and taking stock of experiences with the course over the academic year with faculty in both courses
	Week : work with faculty in both courses teaching new courses in the program in the coming academic year, focus on analytical and research-based writing

2) REVIEW OF SRS/SCH-150 and FPR/FPR-H COURSE EVALUATIONS by the Director of General Education

The Gen Ed Board considers it very important that the Director of General Education regularly review the course evaluations for FPR/FPR-H and SRS/SCH-150 with a view to programmatic assessment and faculty development.

SRS/SCH-150 course evaluations are currently kept on file in a faculty member's home department and by the program assistant for the Director of General Education.

FPR/FPR-H course evaluations are currently kept on file in a faculty member's home department and the Dean of Studies office.

The Director of General Education will review course evaluations for SRS/SCH-150 and FPR/FPR-H programs. The DofGE will do so for the following purposes:

- To identify aggregate patterns that might suggest the value of particular faculty development activities and programming to be offered campus wide.
- To identify sections of these courses that presented difficulties for faculty members, students, or both, particularly as revealed by narrative comments. As appropriate, the DofGE will work confidentially with the DADP in the case of SRS/SCH-150 and the DADP and Dean of Studies in the case of FPR/FPR-H to review recruitment and staffing assignments.
- At the request of individual faculty members, department chairs, the DADP, or Dean of Studies, the DofGE will offer appropriate support aimed at course improvement.

APPENDIX 3

GEN ED BOARD RESOLUTION ON A FOREIGN LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT for UNION COLLEGE

[submitted to the AAC on 16 November 2017]

Charles Batson, Peter Bedford, Kristin Bidoshi, Megan Ferry, Stacie Raucci
Language Requirement Working Group
Union College
16 November 2017

Dear Colleagues:

As you know, the Gen Ed Board studied two language requirement proposals from your working group, one submitted for our review in Spring 2017 and another submitted in Fall 2017. The Gen Ed Board also met with members of your working group on 1 June 2017.

We found both proposals to be practical, workable, thorough in their examination of the matter (conceptually and in terms of implementation), and constructed out of widespread consultation and stakeholder buy-in. We also found the proposed language requirements entirely in keeping with the critical importance Union College and general education attach to nurturing our students' capabilities for intellectual diversity and cultural understanding that equips them to embrace complex global realities with respect and humanity.

We supported going forward to the General Faculty via the governance process with the first 2017 proposal. However, it became clear in June 2017 that general education would undergo revision or wholesale reform during the timeline needed to move the proposal through the governance process to a vote of the General Faculty.

In Fall 2017, your working group submitted a revised language requirement proposal with a view to the reform or revision of general education. Between September and the start of November 2017, the Gen Ed Board reviewed the revised proposal and the division three and four representatives sought further input from their respective divisions.

The Gen Ed Board's view of this matter is as follows.

It would not be right for the Gen Ed Board to state that the Fall 2017 language requirement proposal must be part of a reform or revision of our general education program; any reform or revision process initiated at the college level would be expected to act on an appropriate charge out of the governance system.

That said, the Gen Ed Board unanimously supports the inclusion of a foreign language requirement in any reform or revision of general education. We strongly advise that any charge to reform or revise general education occur with direct reference to your group's

proposals and their goals. In short, we agree that the proposals submitted to us by your working group should inform any reform or revision of general education.

On Behalf of the General Education Board (Kristin Bidoshi, Division 1; Zoe Oxley, Division 2; Christina Tønnesen-Friedman, Division 3; Bill Keat, Division 4; Joe Johnson, Writing Programs),

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "John Cramsie". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Dr John Cramsie, Ph.D. (St Andrews), B.A. (Minnesota), Fellow of the Royal Historical Society, British and Irish Studies, Director of General Education

e-cc. Strom Thacker; Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty
Jennifer Fredricks; Dean of Academic Departments and Programs
Mark Walker; Chair, AAC

Towards a Foreign Language Requirement for Union College
Respectfully submitted Fall 2017

Charles Batson, Modern Languages
Peter Bedford, Religious Studies
Kristin Bidoshi, Modern Languages
Megan Ferry, Modern Languages
Stacie Raucci, Classics

Background: In Winter 2015, a meeting of professors in Classics, Modern Languages and Literatures, and Religious Studies revealed a shared concern that, without a language requirement, Union students were not getting the global education envisioned in the College's Strategic Plan. In early Spring 2015, a committee representing these departments was formed to pursue research on what a language requirement would look like for the College. We examined Union's curriculum in light of standards-based best practices among our peer institutions, devised what the committee saw to be a workable plan given the College's current General Education program, and shared our work in meetings with colleagues in departments and programs across all divisions.

In a Fall 2016 warm and helpful meeting with the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Strom Thacker, we were informed that the General Education program will most likely soon be reworked in its entirety. He encouraged us, however, to present a summary of our work to the General Education committee, which we did in Winter 2017. As that report included specifics related to the current GenEd program (the details of which we include in Appendix 3), we were asked to resubmit our proposal for Fall 2017 as a basis for conversations towards building a new program that would have global education at its heart. Given the significant research and work our committee has been pursuing for over 2 years, we have requested that we be invited to the table for subsequent revisions of the GenEd program and its committee(s). We are grateful that Vice-President Thacker has expressed support for that request.

In these brief paragraphs, then, we present for your consideration a summary of our work and our proposal. We especially urge your consideration of terms of the actual proposal (see pages 3-4), as they are based on what our research has revealed to be standards-based best practices.

Current situation for language study for Union graduates: 55 % of our graduating students have taken at least one foreign language course at Union. 45% have not.

Comparisons with our peer institutions:

* The National Survey of Student Engagement asks students if they "have done or plan to do an enriching educational experience in foreign language coursework."⁷

Union students had statistically significantly lower rates (two asterisks in the report we were given) in comparison *both* to our Carnegie classification/selectivity peers and to our Peer 32 group.

⁷ Shared with the committee as Table 3.2.10 ["Data from NSSE 2006 and NSSE 2009 related to Reflective Activities and Understanding a Diverse World"], from the College's WPAD 2009-2010 documents.

* Of the list of comparison schools given to us by the GenEd Board, Union is an outlier in not having some language requirement. Of the 28 schools on this list, only 7 are like Union in having language an optional way to fulfill requirements.

- The committee feels it important to note that, among these 7 are places like Middlebury and Williams, where we know language *already* to be an integral part of the campus culture, and where a strict “requirement” may not be needed to show the importance of language in a liberal arts education. Middlebury and Williams, for example, have similar or smaller student populations and larger faculty numbers for each of Union’s programs.

The context of Union’s Strategic Plan:

- Union’s Strategic Plan establishes a *differentiator* of a Union education as its being “global and diverse,” reflecting “the diversity of the world.”
- To provide for this education, the 2013 Plan says that Union will “Internationalize the campus to provide an academic, research and work environment that embraces a global education.”⁸

Importance of language study:

In such a context, the obvious seems to be worth stating: our world is not an English-only world; our cultures are not only Anglo-American.

Furthermore, national groups from beyond traditional humanities-based organizations are calling for language skills and the cultural awareness that come with them. The National Security Education Program reports that “lack of language skills among US business[persons] is an enormous barrier.”⁹ Others report that some 23 million jobs in US are tied to international trade. Business-led groups, like Committee for Economic Development, bemoan lack of “language skills and cultural awareness.”¹⁰

The 2017 report on *America’s Languages* from the American Academy of Arts & Sciences includes the following in its executive summary:

- The ability to understand, speak, read, and write in world languages, in addition to English, is critical to success in business, research, and international relations in the twenty-first century.
- The study of a second language has been linked to improved learning outcomes in other subjects, enhanced cognitive ability, and the development of empathy and effective interpretive skills. The use of a second language has been linked to a delay in certain manifestations of aging.
- The United States lags behind most nations of the world, including European nations and China, in the percentage of its citizens who have some knowledge of a second language.

⁸ Documents to be found at <https://www.union.edu/about/president/publications/strategic-plan>

⁹ Summary accessible, among other places, in document <http://www.linksmedia.net/extras/languagemagazine.pdf>

¹⁰ Summary accessible, among other places, in document “Education for Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language Education for U.S. Economic and National Security” <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED502294>

In light of these calls and with an awareness of Union’s strengths in STEM fields, we note with interest these recent movements:

- Institutions from Valparaiso and Northern Arizona University to University of Rhode Island have moved to internationalizing their STEM programs, with formalized language study as a part of their curricula.
- The Association of American Universities calls for increased attention to both “undergraduate STEM and foreign language education,” saying that “our nation lacks the level of language and cultural knowledge needed to confront successfully” its challenge.¹¹

Findings from peer institutions: As a part of our research, we reached out to chairs of programs of both classical and modern languages, to learn from their successes and to pay attention to what has not worked. These conversations brought two important warnings for us to consider in crafting a language requirement based on best practices.

- 1) They warn against having a test-out procedure that reduces the possibility of acquisition of the multiple competencies related to language study, either by (a) having a test that does not reflect competency in these multiple skills (including culture) or by (b) offering a de facto method of having large numbers of students avoid meaningful college-level language study that focuses on the multiple knowledges and competencies related to cross-cultural understanding and communication
- 2) They warn against creating a system where one course (say, Spanish 200 or Latin 101) would be a “revolving door” kind of course, where students come only to fulfill a requirement and do not extend meaningful learning experiences

In these conversations, we discovered that our peer institution Connecticut College just recently implemented a 2-semester on-campus requirement for all students, with support from their full faculty. (See below, Appendix 1.) The take-home lesson for us on the committee: a language requirement is doable.

Our proposal: It is, in particular, these two warnings along with Connecticut College’s successful initiative that have influenced the following recommendation for Union College.

All students would take (at least) two credit-bearing courses in a foreign language during their career as Union College students, normally completing such courses by the end of their sophomore year.

This recommendation is based in part on calculations that suggest implementation of this requirement would be cost-neutral to the College (see section below on staffing).

Recognizing, however, the extensive value of prolonged engagement for language study, from employment opportunities through cognitive and personal development to cross-cultural

¹¹ Summary accessible, among other places, in <https://textlab.io/doc/4127955/government-needs-and-shortages-in-foreign-language-and-re...>

understanding and communication (see our extensive bibliography Appendix IV, including the searing 2017 report from the American Academy of Arts and Sciences), our committee wishes to make a further recommendation:

That the College invest in its students and the Strategic Plan's goal of an education predicated on an understanding of our "global and diverse" world by providing resources that would allow for a requirement of a full year (3 trimesters) of language study for all students, no matter their proficiency upon arrival at Union College.

We also recommend yet more careful study and possible emulation of Connecticut College's investment in global education in their support of yet more language-related curricular initiatives wherein "students will integrate language and culture study into their academic program over four years" (see Appendix I).

We look forward to how we can construct together a meaningful language requirement in a revised GenEd curriculum.

In our meetings with colleagues in other divisions, departments, and programs, we were grateful to find support for required language study at Union. In Appendix 3 below, we wish to report on what our colleagues found to be a challenge for our committee's original proposal in the context of our current GenEd system. Given those concerns, we are excited to begin work on crafting a new GenEd system.

Staffing: We have carefully considered staffing needs in our proposal. Calculations suggest that we have capacity for this 2-course on-campus requirement without significant increase in staffing. As an example:

- To place the entire first-year class into 2 courses over the course of a year, we would need (approx) 1160 spaces. In most years, we have (approx) 550 seats more than that, spread across our 100- and 200-level courses.

As we still work with what the numbers mean, we note that Connecticut College has a similar student population and has, with similar figures, determined they have capacity.

Further steps towards making this work: We foresee the following as steps towards making this proposal a feasible one:

- In order to avoid staffing pressures on high-service languages, while also encouraging students to take traditionally lesser-studied languages, we foresee working with the Registrar to enforce and respect enrollment caps. [This system is the one that Connecticut College has put into place.]
- To help with assigning and advising, we potentially foresee a system in which
 - (a) we and the Registrar's office would make appropriate language assignments after students rank their language preferences, similarly to how they rank preferences for FYP or SRS, and
 - (b) we require students "normally" to fulfill the requirement by the end of their 2nd year, thus avoiding pressures for, say, Spring-term seniors who absolutely need their Latin 103.

- We foresee spending time prior to implementation of the requirement crafting a workable placement system that does not overburden faculty
- We foresee working with the Registrar and our colleagues in finding blocks in the timetable in which students can enroll in our classes without competing time pressure for labs, etc.
- We welcome our work with colleagues from across the campus to find workable structures

We look forward to our work together to bring this requirement to bear and to offer to each of our students a global education nourished by linguistic competencies and cultural awareness.

In the pages that follow, we present 4 appendices.

1. The new language requirement from our peer institution Connecticut College.
2. A brief presentation of some of the relevant standards used in our fields, following the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language.
3. The context of our original proposal as it would fit into the existing GenEd program, followed by a list of non-language courses carrying LCC credit.
4. A representative list of references and data-sources we consulted.

Appendix 1: From Connecticut College

Motion on World Languages and Cultures within Curricular ReVision

Preface: As Connecticut College students actively engage in global communities, both domestically and internationally, it is imperative that they develop an ability to empathize, communicate, and collaborate with others from diverse cultures in their own languages. The study of world languages and cultures, present and past, provides a unique catalyst for fostering a mode of critical thinking that creates true cultural understanding, one that recognizes relationships shaped by power, privilege, identity, and social location. The ability to understand others and to engage communities locally, across borders, and across spectrums of difference is thus foundational to inclusive excellence.

In order to gain the critical tools and language skills necessary to address the challenges they may face, students will integrate language and culture study into their academic program over four years. Language and culture study will be infused throughout all dimensions of the curriculum: in first-year seminars and ConnCourses; in interdisciplinary strands; in Foreign Language Across the Curriculum (FLAC) sections; in experiential learning (study away, domestic and international internships, community learning courses); and in research for honors theses and senior integrative projects.

Motion:

1.1. As a foundation for incorporating world languages and cultures into students' academic programs, each student will complete a minimum of two semesters of study of one language at any level, either at Connecticut College or at a comparable institution. Normally, language courses will be completed by the end of the sophomore year so that students may incorporate and deepen their knowledge in culminating work in the junior and senior years.

1.2. Additionally, students will work with advisors to apply their language study to scholarship and other activities that reach beyond the traditional classroom. These experiences may include, but are not limited to: study away and SATA programs with intensive language study; course TRIPS with

language and culture components; certificate programs through the academic centers; science practica or internships involving international collaborations; international internships; community learning components in languages other than English; student teaching; FLAC sections; participation in the World Languages program in the New London schools; CC Language Fellow and Language Assistant positions; honors theses and Senior Integrated Projects employing research in languages other than English. These practical applications are strongly recommended to build upon the required language coursework.

Students who achieve advanced-level proficiency in a language, and who apply their language in an international or other practical context, will have this noted on their academic transcript.

1.3. The curricular changes in this motion will go into effect for first-year students and transfer students entering the College in the Fall of 2016.

II. Appendix 2: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Standards

The ACTFL proficiency standards define what students need to know and be able to do using a second language in a standards-based, [performance-oriented](#) context. The range of proficiency is from Basic, or beginning, through Intermediate, Advanced, and Superior levels, with Advanced to Superior-level proficiencies needed for most professional settings. Students work on three communication areas: Interpersonal, Interpretive, and Presentational, where they learn to interact and negotiate meaning, share information and emotions, interpret texts and cultural practices, and demonstrate concepts, ideas, persuade, and narrate in the target language. Proficiency is assessed in the domains of the [5Cs](#) (Communication, Cultures, Comparisons, Connections, and Communities). Thus, students demonstrate competencies in interpretation of and interaction with diverse cultural communities in a variety of contexts outside the classroom, as well as build and reinforce their knowledge of themselves, their culture, and other disciplines, connecting language learning to the broader context of knowledge acquisition. Recognizing the importance of advanced proficiency in at least another language and culture other than English in this global world, ACTFL's philosophy states the following: "Language and communication are at the heart of the human experience. The United States must educate students who are linguistically and culturally equipped to communicate successfully in a pluralistic American society and abroad. This imperative envisions a future in which ALL students will develop and maintain proficiency in English and at least one other language, modern or classical." These standards and competencies have been endorsed by the US Departments of State, Defense, and Education, The Association of American Medical Colleges, The National Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, The American Academy of Arts and Sciences, The Modern Languages Association, Association of American Universities, and the Committee for Economic Development.

III. The context of our original proposal as it would fit into the existing GenEd program, followed by a list of non-language courses carrying LCC credit.

We crafted a proposal in which this requirement would satisfy certain aspects of Union's current GenEd program. It is this program that we understand will soon be subject to major revision.

This requirement would have fit into what could be called an “enhanced LCC requirement” of 3 courses, in which

- 2 courses must be fulfilled in language courses
- 1 course can be taken as an LCC course (if it carries the classification) from any other department on campus. This third course could also be counted, where appropriate and approved by GenEd, as fulfilling any other Common Curriculum category. HUM, HUL, SOCs, SET, etc.
- [Say, ANT 101 is a SOCS and LCC; in this system, it could be counted as both]

We considered potential impact on other programs in our current GenEd system.

- Data from Institutional Studies suggest that most students who take language also already take other LCC courses in other departments; we would thus not expect students not to take courses in other LCC-centric departments.
- With a 3-course “enhanced” LCC requirement – as opposed to a 4-course “enhanced” LCC requirement (which would have perhaps interested members of our committee) – we do not encroach greatly on other programs that are not LCC-centric.
- We saw our proposal thus as not radically changing our GenEd requirements as they affect our colleagues while also re-emphasizing the linguistic and cultural competency aspects of the requirement.

Potential concerns: In our meetings with colleagues in other divisions, departments, and programs, we were grateful to find support for required language study at Union. We wish to report, of course, on what our colleagues found to be a challenge for this particular structure of the requirement, given the context of our current GenEd system.

Firstly, some faculty from programs structured around heavily scaffolded sequences (in which a student must take a certain sequence of courses in a particular order, say, 100, then 101, then 102) expressed concern about scheduling 2 terms of sequential language study before the end of a student’s sophomore year. The committee would of course be interested in seeing how extending the timing of the requirement (to, say, the end of the junior year or even senior year) could allay such concerns. Indeed, some faculty reported to us that such an extension would make this a workable proposal.

A second series of concerns touched on the LCC component of the requirement. Non-language programs that are LCC-centric expressed concern about the potential for reduced enrollments in their programs, particularly if students with heavy curricular demands in their majors made the choice to take only language courses to satisfy the “enhanced LCC” requirement. And some faculty reported concern that students had difficulty finding or enrolling in LCC courses. We note with interest the data from Institutional Studies that report that, even in the current system, some 4/5ths of our students already complete at least 3 LCC courses before they graduate, and that some students have already completed the LCC requirement by very early in their sophomore year. We also note that, in the course of the regular academic year, there are 20 or more non-language courses offered per term that carry LCC credit.

[List of non-language LCC courses taught on campus from Fall 2015-Winter 2017](#)

Winter 2017 (26 courses)

ANT 110
ANT 223
ANT 230
ANT 283
ANT 390
AAH 194
AAH 206
CLS 110
CLS 126
CLS 163
CLS 186
EGL 259
EGL 266
HST 108
HST 231
HST 288
HST 383
HST 402
LAS 202
MLT 200
MLT 257
MLT 293
MLT 339
PSC 342
REL 103
SOC 207

Fall 2016 (24 courses)

AFR 100

Winter 2016 (20 courses)

ANT 110
ANT 184
ANT 225
ANT 234
ANT 243
ANT 390
CLS 110
CLS 126
CLS 163
EGL 233
HST 108
HST 132
HST 171
HST 181

ANT 110
ANT 214
ANT 222
ANT 225
AAH 104
AAH 105
AAH 322
CLS 121
CLS 132
CLS 153
CLS 200
EGL 255
EGL 258
HST 161
HST 182
HST 232
MLT 256
MLT 300
AMU 132
PHL 245
REL 103
SOC 212
ATH 140

Spring 2016 (33 courses)

ANT 110 01
ANT 110 02
ANT 181
ANT 210
ANT 210

HST 288
HST 304
MLT 201
MLT 281
AMU 131
ATH 325

Fall 2015 (26 courses)

AFR 100
ANT 110-01
ANT 110-02
ANT 210
ANT 230
ANT 280
AAH 101

ANT 214
ANT 221
ANT 227
ANT 254
AAH 120
AAH 223
AAH 366
CLS 129
CLS 151
CLS 160
EGL 258
EGL 306
EGL 406
HST 231
HST 257
HST 270
HST 282
HST 287
HST 289
MLT 205
MLT 260
MLT 301
AMU 134
PHL 245
PSC 236
PSC 243
REL 103
ATH 120

AAH 105
AAH 110/CLS 134
CLS 121
CLS 143
CLS 146
EGL 248
HST 131
HST 184
HST 274
HST 285
HST 302
MLT 204
MLT 255
AMU 320
PHL 166

PSC 253
PSC 349
REL 103
ATH 140

IV. Appendix 4: Representative list of sources consultedOrganizations and Government Offices

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL)
 US Department of State (DOS)
 US Department of Defense (DOD)
 US Department of Education (DOE)
 The Association of American Medical Colleges
 The National Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine
 The American Academy of Arts and Sciences
 The Modern Languages Association (MLA)
 The Association of American Universities (AAU)
 The Committee for Economic Development (CED)
 Partnership for 21st Century Skills <http://www.p21.org/>
 The Joint National Committee for Languages and the National Council for Languages and International Studies (JNCL-NCLIS)
 Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL)
 National Foreign Language Center, University of Maryland (NFLC)

Policy Briefs and Reports

American Academy of Arts & Sciences . 2017. *America's Languages: Investing in Language Education for the 21st Century*. Commission on Language Learning. Cambridge, MA: AAA&S. https://www.amacad.org/multimedia/pdfs/publications/researchpapersmonographs/language/Commission-on-Language-Learning_Americas-Languages.pdf

American Academy of Arts & Sciences . 2017. *The State of Languages in the US: A Statistical Report*. Humanities Indicators. Commission on Language Learning. Cambridge, MA: AAA&S. <http://www.humanitiesindicators.org/binaries/pdf/State-of-Languages-in-US.pdf>

American Councils for International Education. "Languages for All? Final Report" White Paper 2013. https://www.americancouncils.org/sites/default/files/LFA2013_FinalReport.pdf

Attaining High Levels of Proficiency: Challenges for Foreign Language Education in the United States (Center for Applied Linguistics, M. Malone, B. Rifkin, D. Christian and D. Johnson, 2005)

Building the Foreign Language Capacity We Need: Toward a Comprehensive Strategy for a National Language Framework (NFLC and CAL, F. Jackson, and M. Malone, 2009)

Committee for Economic Development (CED). "Education for Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language Education for US Economic and National Security." 2006. <https://www.ced.org/pdf/Education-for-Global-Leadership.pdf>

Defense Language Transformation Roadmap (US Department of Defense, 2005)

[Educating for Global Competence: Preparing our Youth to Engage the World](#) (Council of Chief State School Officers' EdSteps Initiative & Asia Society Partnership for Global Learning, 2011)

Educating Leaders for a Global Society (The Goldman Sachs Foundation and The Asia Society)

Education for Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language Education for U.S. Economic and National Security (Committee for Economic Development, 2006)

Languages Are Vital to U.S. STEM Competencies (JNCL-NCLIS and GALA-Globalization and Localization Association, 2013)

National Academy of Sciences. "International Education and Foreign Languages: The Keys to Securing America's Future." National Academies Press.

2007 <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/11841/international-education-and-foreign-languages-keys-to-securing-americas-future>

National Defense Education and Innovation Initiative: Meeting America's Economic and Security Challenges in the 21st Century (AAU, 2006)

National Language Policies: Pragmatism, Process, and Products (JNCL-NCLIS, 2009)

Oral Proficiency Levels in the Workplace (informational chart) (ACTFL, 2015)

Princeton University's new increased language requirement

Resource Guide to Developing Linguistic and Cultural Competency in the United States (National Foreign Language Center and StarTalk, 2010)

Scientific American, "How Morality Changes in a Foreign Language" Sept. 14, 2016

Succeeding Globally Through International Education and Engagement: US Department of Education International Strategy 2012-2016 (US Department of Education, 2012)

Trends in the Demand for Foreign Languages (International Association of Language Centers, 2016)

What Business Wants: Language Needs in the 21st Century (The Language Flagship, 2009)

Yale University's increased language requirement

Data and Lists provided by various Union College entities

Foreign language requirements at other institutions (list provided by the GenEd Board)

LCC enrollment and completion rates

MLL, Classics, and Biblical Hebrew enrollment figures

Incoming students' language backgrounds

Engineering students' international experiences

Representative Union College documents

Strategic Plan documents

Our Shared Humanities documents

APPENDIX 4**GEN ED BOARD RESOLUTION ON DEI DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

[submitted to the AAC on 3 November 2017]

Gretchel Hathaway; Chief Diversity Officer
Union College
3 November 2017

Dear Gretchel:

The Gen Ed Board appreciated the opportunity to meet with you and discuss the 'Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Draft Implementation Plan 2017-2022'. The Board unanimously and enthusiastically supports the inclusion of the Common Curriculum in the draft implementation plan as laid out, with our recommendations and revisions included.

The implementation plan addresses general education through our current program, the Common Curriculum. It is likely that general education will undergo revision or wholesale reform during the timeline of this implementation plan. The Gen Ed Board is agreed that:

- any review of the Common Curriculum begun under this plan should directly inform the revision or reform of general education at Union College, and/or
- any process of revision and reform to general education that supersedes a review of the Common Curriculum under this plan should occur with direct reference to its goals.

General education at Union College in any form should advance the goals of this plan through its mission to educate students broadly in the liberal arts, create and nurture capabilities for intellectual diversity and cultural understanding among students (and their faculty-mentors), and empower all of us, through our respective roles, to embrace complex global realities within our shared humanity.

On Behalf of the General Education Board (Kristin Bidoshi, Division 1; Zoe Oxley, Division 2; Christina Tonnesen-Friedman, Division 3; Bill Keat, Division 4; Joe Johnson, Writing Programs),



Dr John Cramsie, Ph.D. (St Andrews), B.A. (Minnesota), Fellow of the Royal Historical Society, British and Irish Studies, Director of General Education

APPENDIX 5***CHARGE to CREATE and EMPOWER A GENERAL EDUCATION REFORM TASK FORCE***

CHARGE. The Academic Affairs Council charges the Dean of Academic Departments and Programs and the Director of General Education to form and co-chair a task force empowered to undertake the reform of Union College's general education program as follows:

1. All aspects of our current Common Curriculum will be examined. Any part of the curriculum may be altered, and the whole curriculum may be remodeled. The committee is charged with outlining the academic rationale, learning objectives, design principles, curricular requirements, and measurement of expected outcomes for a new general education program.
2. The task force will solicit input from all members of the Union college community. The task force will incorporate feedback on learning objectives and design principles from listening sessions with departments and programs that have occurred over 2018. The work of the task force will also be informed by research, resolutions, and recommendations of the General Education Board from 2016-2018 concerning foreign language requirements, best practice in academic credit for study away, and implementation of the college's 'Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Draft Implementation Plan 2017-2022'. The task force's work will also consider models of general education at other institutions and best practices in pedagogy and curricular reform.
3. Every department and program will be surveyed with regard to its capacity to contribute to the General Education curriculum. Existing capacities and additional resource needs will be taken into account when designing the general education reforms and planning their implementation.
4. The task force will work with the appropriate offices and administrators to identify and evaluate funding opportunities for program development and implementation, especially faculty and curricular development that supports new and changed program components.
5. The task force will be led by the Dean of Academic Departments and Programs and the Director of General Education. Committee members will include five faculty members (four representatives from the four divisions of the college and one from interdisciplinary programs), two students, and the Director of Writing Programs. The DADP and DofGE may add faculty members on an ex officio basis to provide specific expertise as needed. The DADP will seek nominations for committee members and will consult with DofGE on the faculty composition of the committee. The nominating and selection processes will prioritize

recruiting and selecting faculty members with expertise and interests informed by general education, the Liberal Arts, and college-wide perspectives. The students will be appointed by the Student Forum.

6. The DofGE will inform and seek input from the General Education Board throughout the task force's work frequently and on a regular basis.

7. The proposed timetable is as follows:

September 2018.

The task force begins work. This will include: (1) a discussion of key themes emerged in listening sessions; (2) review of the annual assessment reports for the Common Curriculum; (3) initial discussions of design principles, learning objectives, and assessment of outcomes; (4) a careful analysis of goals in the current Strategic Plan and how then can be supported or met through general education; (5) a thorough survey of relevant best practices in colleges and universities; (6) a scrutiny of our capacities and capacity expansion with regard to offering courses, including sustainability; (7) a careful evaluation of the practical difficulties inherent in any new curriculum (scheduling, etc.); and (8) throughout the process, reminders that we are changing the Common Curriculum in order to improve it, to achieve some things [specify based on feedback from workshops, etc.] that we are not currently doing.

March 2019

The committee will prepare an interim report to the AAC on status of first year of task force.

September 2019

The task force will discuss the draft proposal with the Union community. This will include faculty forums, individual meetings with departments and programs, discussions with the academic deans, meetings with other administrators (directors, International Study, the Registrar's office, etc.), and consultation with the Student Forum. The task force will submit the draft proposal to the Gen Ed Board. The task force will respond to queries and requests for changes from the Gen Ed Board in order to finalize the draft proposal.

January 2020

The proposal is sent to the AAC. The task force will respond to queries and requests for changes from the AAC in order to craft the final proposal. The proposal will be brought first to the Sub-council on Courses and Programs and then to the full AAC.

February to May 2020

The task force will hold multiple forums across the latter part of winter term and beginning of spring term to respond to faculty input on the proposal voted out from the AAC.

September 2020

The proposal will be brought to faculty for a vote in either May or 2020 or September of 2020.

Academic Year 2020-2021

The transition to and implementation of the new program begins. Depending on the extent of the change to the curriculum, the implementation may be phased over time.

APPENDIX 6

*COMMUNITY FORUM on GENERAL EDUCATION REFORM 2018: Gen Ed Board
Overview and Responses*

[3 June 2018]

<i>WINTER TERM FORUM SCHEDULE (Final)</i>	
WEDNESDAY	Department/Program
10 January (1)	Anthropology / Music
31 January (2)	Theatre & Dance / Sociology
7 February	<i>Student forums</i>
14 February (3)	Political Science / Modern Languages
21 February (4)	Classics / ESPE
28 February	<i>Student forums</i>

<i>SPRING TERM FORUM SCHEDULE (Final)</i>	
MONDAY	Forum Type
16 April (5)	Economics / Physics and Astronomy
23 April (6)	Math / Computer Science / Geology
30 April (7)	Psychology / Visual Arts
7 May (8)	English / Mechanical Engineering
14 May (9)	Chemistry / Religious Studies / Philosophy
21 May (10)	Biology / History
4 June	Special Programs: Library, International Programs, Scholars Program

Community Forums 2018: Gen Ed Board Overview

The Gen Ed Board met and reviewed the responses from the community forums throughout winter and spring terms. What follows are the main points about reforming general education that tended to be raised either consistently and/or the Board deemed important to identify. There was often overlap between what makes Union distinctive, design principles, and learning outcomes. Therefore, we have not separated them by question, but drawn them together from all three questions. Individual responses can be found in the Appendix, so we will not over-explain the points that follow. These are not in a ranked order of importance.

- 1) Resources. Union has great faculty and students who have made commitments to general education in its many guises and persist in doing so. But general education reform begins in an atmosphere of diminished expectations ('money is tight', heard *ad nauseum*), apprehension about the financial commitment of the college to academic programs

- generally, and whether general education reforms will require faculty and programs to take on new work and shoulder new long-term burdens with the same pay and resources. Will the commitment of faculty and students who wish to transform general education into something rewarding and substantive (in areas below) be valued, supported, and sustained by the college at the highest level? Will reform be a zero-sum/resource-neutral game of allocating existing resources, with inevitable turf wars that follow? Would the college be willing to fund-raise for a general education program as it would for another academic program? Will faculty support new resource allocation for general education in the context of budgets and programs that are just getting by or tearing at the seams?
- 2) Buy-in by students and faculty. A strong rationale for general education, clearly and compelling made by faculty and supported by the college as a whole, across offices and staff. The academic integrity of a general education should be its rationale and its attraction to faculty and students (current or prospective).
 - 3) Interdisciplinarity. Faculty, students, individual courses, programs, and departments, abound with disciplinary diversity and reaching across 'boundaries'. Typically, interdisciplinarity in general education has not been interdisciplinary, but multidisciplinary or cross-disciplinary – taking a set of courses from a menu of options that have something in common (ie. clusters), but do not integrate disciplinary knowledge or methodology or conceive of interdisciplinarity beneath the program level. Structural constraints and resource limitations get in the way of team-teaching (including faculty development for the distinctive pedagogies of team-teaching), which would allow faculty to bring multiple disciplines together in one class, especially foundation courses like FYP and SRS. Integrated learning in the liberal arts within general education require resources related to faculty development, faculty staffing levels, and other types of program support.
 - 4) FYP and SRS. Coherence and integration are weak between these courses as foundational parts of general education and WAC: they are a major missed opportunity to develop students' capacities for participating in the integrated liberal arts. Might these courses be the place to begin reform? Possibilities for significant reform and revitalization include a two-term first year seminar with shared, staged, and overlapping learning outcomes; some pedagogical consistency and common ground within and among courses; a core mission built around skills, pedagogy, and theme that bridges center 1 and 2 and integrates the diversity of student interests with the pursuit and creation of knowledge in different disciplines, perhaps with community engagement; for example, sustainability and human ecologies.
 - 5) Diversity, inclusion, and intercultural learning are guiding principles – see in particular the student forum input below. Also see the recommendations of the Gen Ed Board about a language requirement and participation in the college's diversity and inclusion plan.
 - 6) Engineering. Engineering is a distinctive feature of Union. The integration of engineering into the Liberal Arts and Union as a liberal arts college isn't complete unless it is available in general education to all students.

- 7) Undergraduate Research. Another distinctive feature of Union. Its role in general education should more accurately reflect types/stages of research, the distinctions between what undergraduates do that constitutes research (especially original research) in different fields and programs, and the appropriate level of ‘research’ in given courses. Research is strong throughout divisions and programs, but general education may not full tap into those strengths given the lack of definition and clarity in such ways. Coordination of and connections between the college’s rich range of research opportunities and the curricular mission and components of general education warrant consideration.
- 8) Study Away. Study away is community-based academic and experiential learning, whether abroad, within the local community, or places in between. Schenectady, the Adirondacks, regional study away and study abroad came up repeatedly in the conversations. Tension between these (and other features of Union) as marketing versus high-level academic content and learning.
- 9) Tension between stated desires for flexibility, coordination, integration, thematic purpose, and prescription. Additional questions about when coursework should be completed in general education; earlier the better?; something through all four years? Ensuring that general education really broaden students’ learning experiences, especially by fulfilling general education requirements outside of home departments, divisions, or centers. A major question for any so-called Research Across the Curriculum requirement, ala WAC.
- 10) Students should learn and develop a set of common skills and competencies. There was significant overlap among them across forums, with some distinctive contributions. General education learning outcome and competency frameworks are readily available. See the individual responses under question III below.
- 11) Checking Boxes. Lists/sets of skills and competencies carry risks, including doubling-down on the check box mentality or diluting the thematic and pedagogical integration of the program. Important that students do not think of a particular skill or requirement as a one-off disconnected choice or group of choices. Many of our current requirements struggle against this, including QMR, HUL, SCLB and WAC. The expectations for requirements, what’s done in courses that fulfill them, and their value should be purposeful and deliberate.

Community Forums 2018: Responses

The Gen Ed Board collected written responses from faculty during community forums and added its own notes about the conversation/discussion.

QUESTION I. What’s unique about Union College that allows us to develop a distinctive, attractive, exciting general education program?

Forum 1 (10 January; Music and Anthropology) Engineering in a Liberal Arts setting; breadth across the faculty; Union attracts a demographic that would benefit from the effects of a liberal arts

curriculum; broaden their minds/outlook on the world; undergraduate research is very widespread and we do this much better than other schools' the openness of our curriculum allows students to choose their paths. Liberal arts plus engineering -> more science and engineering than most LA college; several efforts to integrate these curricula but with limited flexibility; terms abroad plus mini-term options; music offers various opportunities to coordinate various people and include team building, along with theatre; are in a community we could engage more widely with service-learning. GeBd Notes: creative education; OT & ID majors. Engineering, Broad faculty, UGrad research, open&flexible academic paths, attract students benefit from thinking outside credentials, some students apply without being sure that they want the liberal arts, terms abroad and mini-terms, program that reach across student body, Schenectady as a learning opportunity, creativity, OT major.

Forum 2 (31 January; Sociology, Theatre & Dance) Engineering in a liberal arts setting; interaction with faculty; small size; emerging strengths in Visual Arts and connections across disciplines/programs; term schedule (including mini-terms); regular re-evaluation of general education; academic potential (unrealized fully) of Minerva program. Liberal Arts + Engineering, Minervas (a lot of promise, follow-through issue, sustain), Visual Arts strength (emerging) + Linkages w/depts. And programs (incl. cross-listing), size + terms

Forum 3 (14 February; Political Science, Modern Languages) Challenging the question: is Union unique and should this even guide us; inter-disciplinarity, opportunity for creative thought; what we do well/what is interdisc; need not be sci + (sci/eng more valued); love it or hate it, the trimester system has benefits (double majors/ID majors); diversity of program options in small place (due to engineering); term abroad faculty led; outside of classroom (study away/fellowship/internships); Engineering, Classics Dept., Greek system, Attractive campus, Transdisciplinary opportunities, Conservative student body/liberal professors, Gender ratio (more men).

Forum 4 (21 February; Classics, ESPE) levels of interdisciplinarity (within courses and programs); classroom populations are highly interdisciplinary (range of majors and minors in classes); focus on independent research; required skills instruction (esp. writing); travel opportunities; location (access and non-college town as opportunity for community learning); faculty flexibility in teaching and interests; range of specialities within each discipline.

Forum 5 (16 April; Economics, Physics & Astronomy) Engineering and liberal arts context, larger and more active science division compared to other liberal arts colleges, term abroad, and undergraduate research. Engineering program allows us to address issues of technology and society. Campus is organized in a way that allows for cross-pollination between disciplines. Academic calendar is flexible compared to semester system, which helps some of the distinctiveness above. Some aspects of our location — close to city and the north woods, also access to transportation

Forum 6 (23 April; Geology, Math, Computer Science - no one in attendance from CS) Engineering (but our other students don't take engineering). Geographic location and History (Adirondacks center (has been under-utilized). Strong science program (grants for instrumentation, summer undergraduate research) compared to other liberal arts colleges.

Forum 7 (30 April; Visual Arts; Psychology - represented by the dept chair only) Excellent programs in Science and Engineering and the Arts and Humanities, but little dialogue between these courses/requirements. Emphasize interdisciplinary in the title instead of general education or Common Curriculum, (confused with Common Core).

Forum 8 (7 May; English, Mechanical Engineering) "The premise of this question [#1] is that uniqueness will lead to something 'attractive.' We are more concerned about an effective GenEd program. I'm not sure that what makes Union unique will lead to effectiveness. Some anecdotes shared in the meeting indicate that engineers come here *b/c* they want to take other courses." "Focus not on attractive or exciting! These are marketing terms. Reframe as what is or is not effective."

Forum 9 (14 May; Chemistry, Religious Studies, Philosophy) Trimester: plus, only 3 courses at a time, not likely to blow off something; minus, 1/3 of time and will tend to feel its precious time to spend on something outside their comfort zone. Attract science and engineering majors who are interested in liberal arts. Since 2004-2005, Union has gained more international students, students interested in interdisciplinary studies, and shift away from Arts and Humanities majors into other divisions.

QUESTION II. What values and design principles should guide our approach to general education?

Forum 1 Open curriculum; independence: students can choose their path, become strong independent thinkers in so doing; interdisciplinary: working across disciplinary divides without erasing the importance of specific disciplines and traditions; diversity: thinking about the world beyond one's own bubble. Engage in methodology as opposed to distribution requirements; techniques like capstones, first year writing, sophomore seminar, something for the junior year needed, perhaps campus debates – topics that would require communication and ethics or research across the curriculum; developmental and skills-based design principles; important to be flexible – different ways to achieve the same competencies and developmental goals; major + minor requirement to develop depth and breadth at once; avoid ability of departments to give exceptions and help students choose intentional paths; debate across the curriculum about certification of requirements. Flexibility (intentionally), not overly complex, minor in different disciplines required to build breadth, away from distribution, openness, independent thinking, understanding diversity, interdisciplinarity, junior project, staged across skills and content (a la WAC but with several skills), competency across the curriculum (research, writing ethics).

Forum 2 Integration across disciplines, particularly strengthening Engineering's responsibility to reach out to Social Sciences and Arts & Humanities; simplicity; be able to communicate effectively

the what and why of our program; class size; engagement with students outside of the classroom; flexibility in completing the program; breadth of Liberal Arts represented in the program; defined capabilities that cross the curriculum rather than having a discipline- or program-specific distribution requirement of skills and learning outcomes. Simpler and more straightforward, easier to communicate what and why [pro checkbox]. Help students explain their education. Competencies across disciplines. How prescriptive?

Forum 3 Process "safe" for faculty/students; safety and Security of positions; Inter-disciplinarity; concern for development of global perspective; respect for faculty time; diversity and Inclusion; Approach it as base of principles (what are those*) about educ (not based on trends) *HUM, CLASSICS, HST, LANGUAGES; develop of counter-discourse (to challenge business discourse); keep FYP/SRS (across disciplines); Gen Ed is foundational (What does this mean?); Acknowledge what our disciplines do well multiple disciplines; Project based learning; What have others done; Bard citizen science; Based on clear vision that are clearly communicated; Be good citizen; Not necessarily needs to be skills based

Forum 4 Student buy-in with a coherent and compelling message/rationale; memorable experiences; understand different ways of thinking and disciplinary perspectives; ownership of projects; ability to design research questions; participation from all disciplines and balance of contributions across the curriculum; historical framework-thinking

Forum 5 The benefits of whatever we do should be greater than the costs broadly speaking (time, resources, hiring, student experience, program and transition). Curricular exploration — students should see many different parts of the Union curriculum, and be able to explore widely but at the same time students should be guided by their interest — flexibility and control. Exposed to all four divisions. Preparing global citizens as a design principle, value — broadly educated as global citizens, cultural awareness. Compelling narrative — we need to have a common language, a common story, narrative, for explaining GenEd. FYP & SRS in need of change — SRS more disciplines, more collaborative, common set of goals and FYP also and some common syllabus with different faculty who are not specialist in their area, or comfort zone — faculty getting together from across disciplines and sharing ideas in FYP. Again flexibility — choosing courses etc., in FYP and SRS in particular and matching students to their interests — clear sense of the goals and outcomes for FYP & SRS. Resources should go to where we things students should be — ethics, teamwork, i.e., teach what students need to learn — and willingness to devote resources to fixing what needs to be fixed so that students are learning what we collectively believe they need to learn. Willingness over the medium to long term to have resources in place . . .

Forum 6 Student should be able to evaluate, develop, and synthesize a situation/problem Critical thinking. (Not parrots). General science class (just like intro to engineering). Graduates should know what facts are. Writing and critical thinking.

Forum 7 Need skills to cross disciplines and collaborate. We want students who can communicate in more than one format. Innovative thinking - limitations in coming up with something altogether

different. Critical thinking and writing -- can they think critically and communicate critically. Where are students required to use their imagination? Too many students can check boxes in general education simply by completing their majors - considerations of limits on double-counting within their home division/center? Improve advising to get students to stretch.

Forum 8 “Continuity; intention / reflection on the part of the student.” “Grow organically out of courses we already have.” “Illustrated Organism Minerva Course: examples that work, but if we want to do a lot more of this, we need to give team teaching full credit.” “In an age where liberal education is under attack, I think our gen ed program should remain focused on extolling the virtues of a liberal education (as opposed to professional, vocational, etc.). In other words, stay on offense. Do not go into a defensive posture, just b/c the newest and ephemeral fashion runs counter to what has always made Union strong.”

Forum 9 Are we limited to existing faculty and resources? Interdisciplinarity in practice is limited by the reality that departments own all the money and resources. Learn skills outside of specific disciplines that can provide guidance for their practice within disciplines; either have a cohesive program with a clearly articulated rationale, or an open menu program; how best to organize, around skills or content? – not both.

QUESTION III. What do we think students should know and know how to do because of general education?

Forum 1 think; write; formulate an argument; good citizen; recognize intellectual traditions within the college and think critically about their own educational experience; evidence-based thinking. Experiential learning integrated throughout; develop a better sense of global diversity and systems of inequality; reading comprehension, writing skills, analytical skills. GeBd Notes: understanding global and local diversity; engaged learning

Forum 2 Think critically, socially, empathetically, globally; create and creative expression; communicate orally, in writing, numerically; solve problems; crafting an evidence-based argument, quantitative reasoning/literacy; social connectedness (sense of ‘we’); gen ed experiences distributed/organized in each year. Think critically, socially, globally, empathetically (ethically), Create/creative expression, communicate orally, writing, numerically. Know: History, Social Skills, Diversity, Creativity, Community Engagement

Forum 3 Literacy - what should they know? Media, technology, global; What is our approach to Gen Ed; Skills: cross difference completely (?); Self-reflection on how students learn new things; Experience; Ways of engaging with culture, text; Skill -> what does this mean?; Value faculty: Know content, have expertise, years of research, experience, we offer something unique re how we've built our skills etc.

Forum 4 how to perform research; analytical skills; formulating interesting questions; respect for life-long learning; writing; close readings; develop capacities for curiosity; working with others as

part of an intellectual community; listen to others; learning to learn through uncomfortable ideas; be critical/skeptical

Forum 5. Critically read any section of the NYT and be able to understand it — critically reading across different subject matters, across the division. Know how to analyze a situation, decide on a course of action, and advocate for course of action. Know how to learn how to learn and do so independently. Being able to make an oral presentation. Basic math literacy and computing — information literacy, cultural literacy. Learning outcome in FYP or SRS related to deciding on a course of action and advocating for it . . . The idea of social action, community engagement -> THOUGHT INTO ACTION. There is a difference between cultural awareness and diversity — focus more on diversity

Forum 6 Programming, statistics, quantitative skills across the curriculum, examples. Have an appreciation for courses outside their major; we're not an R1. Every student take an engineering course? General science class / citizen science? Problem solving.

Forum 7 Creative in addition to critical thinking. Take new courses outside their discipline earlier in their college career. Consider requiring completion of general education by end of sophomore or junior year. Build from outcomes and goals.

Forum 8 "team taught SRS — cross disciplinary project" "problem based / topic based" / "difficult conversations, like Bucknell's model" — "think critically, write clearly, speak articulately, and be able to synthesize: to take information from one area and apply it to something else" "evaluate and make claims" "be able to read a statistical table" "current WAC system short changes students who need help" "students write better when they are interested"

Forum 9 Language other than English; critical thinking; what it means to learn, think, analyze versus learning content; understanding scientific method requires experimentation [can this principle of applied methodologies be applied across general education in all courses?]; engage in conversation with people in other disciplines: model this in practice for students [and each other] through cross-disciplinary team teaching.

Student Forums 2018

(Winter Term, 7 & 28 February)

Forum 1: five students attended; forum 2: two students attended

Outline of topics presented at first meeting by students about priorities for general education and reform:

Why are these priorities?

"Cultural Shock"

Representation (of the campus, of Schenectady, of America)

Culturally sensitive (to address the ignorance)

Facts vs False Narrative (to target the stereotypes and the significance of diversity)

Building Community by discussion (educate and change)

Self-confidence (for students and faculty)

How:

Required courses

-> Intersectional (race, gender, ethnicity, etc)

Professors of Color (to encourage students of color)

First Year Preceptorial (FYP), Sophomore Research Seminar (SRS)

Diversity requirement

To encourage a different perspective.

Comments/Input from students at second forum: diversity of experiences, FYP as writing-based in a way that is designed to explore diversity and difference; better diversity training for faculty (ex. inclusive pedagogy) and the campus community; opportunities across the curriculum to engage difference and complexity, including fine arts and STEM; outside the classroom learning builds strong learning relationships among students and faculty, including internships and research opportunities; broader range of perspectives offered, especially in cultural learning; education that is adaptable and response to unexpected, uncertainty, and the uncomfortable; creative imaginations; connected and skeptical thinking; imagine alternatives; FYP should not be just for transmission of a canon or body of knowledge but taught with an emphasis on or pedagogy of active inquiry, questioning, and making connections beyond just the subject matter itself.

APPENDIX 7
COMMON CURRICULUM ASSESSMENT ANNUAL REPORT
 [19 July 2018]

I. Overview and Learning Outcomes

The primary goals of Common Curriculum assessment are to 1) support reflective teaching and faculty development, 2) encourage pedagogical and curricular innovation, 3) promote transfer of best practice in the Common Curriculum to instruction in other courses, 4) provide a systematic foundation for the on-going evaluation of specific program requirements with a view to improvement, even replacement. We also use this process to review and amend Common Curriculum assessment itself. Our progress on those goals will become more robust and thorough now that the program is fully phased in and we will have year-on-year completed assessment portfolios for each academic class. This year, we assembled and completed assessment of the class of 2018. Additionally, the Director of Assessment (DofA) in 2017 reviewed and reported on the CC assessment program. This annual report reflects changes and responses to the process based on the DofA's recommendations.

The following learning outcomes with instructions and explanations have been revised to meet recommendations in the DofA's review of the CC assessment program. Through the Common Curriculum, Union students will develop the breadth of knowledge and flexibility of mind needed to participate in meaningful conversations relevant to particular disciplines, the Academy, local society, or the global community. They will do so by achieving the following learning outcomes across the breadth of Liberal Arts represented in the Common Curriculum requirements. In doing so, they will advance important foundational and differentiating goals in the Union College Strategic Plan (2013).

- A. **Communicate Critical and Analytical Thinking.** *Students will examine, evaluate, and apply problem-solving techniques to evidence, data, objects, artefacts, arguments, and theories according to the diverse analytical traditions of the Liberal Arts; students will communicate clearly and correctly the results of such analysis.* Explanation: this learning outcome emphasizes the need to learn and practice critical thinking in the breadth of disciplines and analytical traditions in the Liberal Arts. Assessment: instructors assess student learning in this outcome by evaluating a representative sample of assignments. Learning outcome A encompasses the following learning goals in the Strategic Plan and assessment of it should incorporate those goals: F1-G6: Union students will graduate with the skills needed to communicate clearly and effectively, work both independently and collaboratively, have developed information, technological, and visual literacy, be prepared to live and work in a culturally-diverse world, and understand ethical considerations and act upon them; D2-G2, Union students will receive a broad and deep education that includes exposure to important and distinctive connections within and across the full spectrum of disciplines, including the arts, humanities, social sciences, physical and natural sciences, mathematics, and engineering; D2-G3, Union students will learn through a combination of theory and practice, using both critical thinking and expertise.

- B. Make Connections or Original Contributions.** *Through their writings, theories, problems, designs, objects of art, and other projects students will make connections or original contributions to questions and concerns relevant to a particular discipline, multiple disciplines, the Academy, local society, or the global community.* Explanation: this learning outcome emphasizes the importance of deliberately using students' coursework to engage issues, debates, schools of thought, and the like relevant to particular disciplines as well as the Academy, local society, or the global community. Assessment: instructors assess student learning in this outcome by evaluating a representative sample of assignments. Learning outcome B encompasses the following learning goals in the Strategic Plan and assessment of it should incorporate those goals: F1-G3, Union students will develop an attitude of inquiry: they will ask questions that matter, and develop the capacity to engage complex challenges with skill, creativity, and confidence; D2-G1, Union students will engage in disciplinary, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches, and will have opportunities to learn at the intersection of fields of study; D2-G4, Union students will develop a diverse set of skills that can be applied across a spectrum of disciplines and future careers; also relevant components of goal D2-G2.
- C. Reflect on Their Learning.** *Students will demonstrate the ability to link their experiences in the Common Curriculum with their intellectual development as lifelong learners, including possible career and life paths.* Explanation: this learning outcome may be viewed as asking the students to draw together the practical, intrinsic, and idealistic value of the Liberal Arts as they relate to being a life-long learner and reflecting on a meaningful life. Assessment: the Gen Ed Board assesses learning outcome C indirectly through a student reflective essay and student interview; instructors provide direct assessment of this learning outcome if it is observed in their classes. Learning outcome C encompasses the following learning goals in the Strategic Plan and assessment of it should incorporate those goals: F1-G2, Union students will discover lifelong intellectual interests and strive to excel in them; F2-G4, Union students will develop a sense of themselves as a "whole person," with the skills necessary for the pursuit of life-long learning, global citizenship and effective work with others, through co-curricular programs that complement the academic mission; also relevant components of goal D2-G4.

Additional FYP/FYP-H Learning Outcomes for Outcome A

First-Year Preceptorial (FYP) and Honors Preceptorial (FYP-H) have more specific learning outcomes under Learning Outcome A, as follows:

- A1. DISCUSS IDEAS:** critically and respectfully engages in dialogue with others about ideas in texts as well as those expressed in class.
- A2. READ TEXTS CRITICALLY:** shows an understanding of/ability to evaluate complex and sophisticated ideas from multiple and diverse perspectives.
- A3. DEVELOP EFFECTIVE ARGUMENTS:**
- A3a. Supports a focused thesis, including analysis of evidence to support conclusions.
- A3b. Organizes information logically and clearly in essays that guide readers through the text

A3c. Expresses ideas clearly and appropriately, with few, if any, grammar, usage, and spelling errors

A3d. Integrates evidence into one's own argument (e.g., uses quotations appropriately, correct citation, etc.).

A4. INCORPORATE REVISION into the writing process as a means of improving critical thinking and the expression of ideas.

Additional SRS/SCH-150 Learning Outcomes for Outcome A

The Sophomore Research Seminar (SRS) and Scholars Research Seminar (SCH-150) have more specific learning outcomes under Learning Outcome A, as follows:

A1. DEVELOP A RESEARCH TOPIC: Formulate a clear, focused research question or thesis appropriate to the topic of inquiry.

A2. FIND EVIDENCE: Identify and locate evidence appropriate for examining a research question or thesis.

A3. EVALUATE EVIDENCE: Critically and ethically analyze evidence obtained for examination of a research question or thesis.

A4. DEVELOP AN EVIDENCE-BASED ARGUMENT: Develop and organize a logical argument grounded in the analysis of evidence that supports or refutes a research question or thesis.

A5. PRESENT RESEARCH FINDINGS: Present a logical analytical argument supported by evidence in an appropriate written form without errors of grammar, usage, and spelling.

A6. PRACTICE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS OF CITATION: Incorporate and cite evidence in a manner that meets the professional standards of the discipline most appropriate for the topic of inquiry.

Faculty assess all CC learning outcomes according to this standard rubric of proficiencies.

- **Exceptional:** Demonstrates complete learning of the outcome with original and creative contributions; learning exceeds the highest standards for the level and difficulty of the course.
- **Mastery:** Demonstrates complete learning of the outcome without mistakes or flaws; learning meets the highest standards for the level and difficulty of the course.
- **Proficient:** Demonstrates complete or nearly complete learning of the outcome without mistakes or flaws; learning meets the acceptable standard for the level and difficulty of the course.
- **Developmental:** Demonstrates incomplete learning of the outcome and features some minor mistakes and flaws; learning meets the acceptable standard for the level and difficulty of the course.
- **Insufficient:** Demonstrates little or no learning of the outcomes and features frequent, sometimes major mistakes and flaws; learning is below the acceptable standard for the level and difficulty of the course.

The content and distribution requirements (i.e. overall structure) of the Common Curriculum advances students' breadth of knowledge per goal F1-G5 in the Strategic Plan, that Union students will graduate with deep and broad knowledge; deep knowledge is advanced by majors and minors. There are three goals in the Union College Strategic Plan that general education can, should, and sometimes does contribute to, but which are not well integrated

into the program as it exists or its learning outcomes. They are: D2-G1, Union students will engage in disciplinary, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches, and will have opportunities to learn at the intersection of fields of study; D1-G3, Union students will develop and enhance their understanding of their own and others' race, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, and other dimensions of our diverse community and cultures; F2-G4, Union students will develop a sense of themselves as a "whole person," with the skills necessary for the pursuit of life-long learning, global citizenship and effective work with others, through co-curricular programs that complement the academic mission. The Common Curriculum predates both strategic plans by some years. The program from its inception struggled to build into it true interdisciplinarity per D2-G1 and the deliberateness of students engaging in interdisciplinary or multi-disciplinary work in the CC can be highly variable. This is a challenge that any future general education program should address and resolve; otherwise, the academic requirements of the college should be evaluated and revised to ensure all students meet this goal, for example, by requiring an interdisciplinary minor for any student who does not major in a program with strong interdisciplinary content. Finally, the weak, uncertain focus on goals D1-G3 and F2-G4 is the most significant disconnect between general education and the college's strategic priorities. Particularly because of the emphasis they place on understanding cultural complexity and empowered global citizenship, both of such critical importance for our students and our mission as an institution contributing to a sustainable and just future, these goals must have a prominent and essential place in any future general education program at the college.

II. 2017-2018 Assessment Findings.

General Profile of Samples by Academic Concentration. The class of 2018 sample is made up of students who entered as declared majors in Center 2, Sciences and Engineering. For the class of 2019, the Gen Ed board decided to create a sample of just students who entered as declared majors in Center 1, Arts and Humanities and Social Sciences. We hoped with these focussed samples to evaluate and compare the experiences of students in the Common Curriculum from respective centers, to look for 'divides' between C.P. Snow's 'two cultures' as well as commonalities and shared experiences. We returned to a general sample of students across the campus for the class of 2020.

Assessment and the General Education Reform Task Force. Union College formally embarked on a reform of its general education program in January 2018 and formed a general education task force charged to begin work in September 2018 to evaluate and recommend changes to general education. The charge to the task force requires it to use the annual CC assessments in its evaluation. It is probable that the lifetime of the current program will extend no more than three years, which will take the college through general education reform and its next comprehensive accreditation with the Middle States organization. Given that time frame, the Gen Ed Board agreed to revise the assessment process as follows. We will still complete comprehensive assessments of students through the class of 2020, taking in all the program requirements. This will continue to provide information on all requirements for academic classes during the time-frame of the reform process; it will also provide the necessary information from which to complete the general education part of the accreditation process for Middle States. Since reform and revision of the two core courses in the CC, FPR/H and

SRS/SCH-150, will be a priority for the task force, we will focus assessment on those requirements for the classes of 2021, 2022, and any remaining classes that graduate under the current program. This creates the necessary space and time in faculty and administrative workloads to target the parts of general education that are most critical for general education reform and implementation.

Faculty Response Rate to IAR Requests. We continue to seek improvements in the response rate from faculty, the percentage of faculty who receive an assessment request that actually submit an IAR; see *Table CC1*.

Table CC1. Percentage of IARs requested that faculty submitted, by academic year	
2013-2014 (pilot year)	34%
2014-2015	51%
2015-2016	45%
2016-2017	53%
2017-2018	38%

We consider a minimum response rate for a viable sample to be 35%, though undesirable. We want to obtain a minimum response rate per annum of 50% with a goal of 70% as the standard. To achieve better response rates, we improved our notification system to faculty. We send department chairs/assessment coordinators an email with the assessment assignments for their colleagues.

Timely Completion of Requirements. (Please note that the class of 2021 is not assessed on this metric; see explanation above.) We found, overall, students in the all three samples made good progress toward completion of the program in the first year. See *Table CC2*

Table CC2. Common Curriculum Courses completed in Year One (% of all students)				
Number of CC courses completed	Class of 2017 (General)	Class of 2018 (Center 2)	Class of 2019 (Center 1)	Class of 2020 (General)
1	0	0	0	0
2	3.8%	0	0	0
3	7.7%	0	15%	0
4	11.5%	14%	11%	9%
5	26.9%	19%	30%	33%
6	26.9%	43%	26%	28%
7	19.2%	19%	11%	28%
8	3.8%	5%	4%	2%
9	0	0	3%	0

On an ordinary schedule, students complete nine courses per academic year. All students complete FPR/FPR-H in the first year and Scholars complete the SCH-150 (Honours SRS). Students in Center 2 typically also complete courses that fulfil the SCLB, SET, and QMR requirements in the first year. For students in both centers, we define making good progress

in the first year as completing between 4 and 6 courses, especially as students seek out general education requirements as part of the academic advising process or explore their interests across program upon arrival at college.

Table CC3. Common Curriculum Requirements completed in Year One (% of students)

Common Curriculum Requirement	Class of 2017 (General)	Class of 2018 (Center 2)	Class of 2019 (Center 1)	Class of 2020 (General)
FYP/FYP-H	100%	100%	100%	100%
SRS/SCH-150	15% (SCH-150)	14% (SCH-150)	19% (SCH-150)	5% (SCH-150)
Literature (HUL)	62%	57%	37%	60%
Arts and Humanities (HUM)	58%	38%	78%	74%
Social Sciences (SOCS)	77%	62%	78%	81%
Quantitative and Mathematical Reasoning (QMR)	50%	86%	52%	63%
Natural Sciences with Lab (SCLB)	42%	67%	26%	53%
Science, Engineering, Technology (SET)	54%	86%	33%	65%
Languages and Cultures (Course 1/2)	NA	45%	74%	56%
Languages and Cultures (Course 2/2)	NA	23%	44%	19%
LCC – Students on Languages Track ¹²	38%	22%	28%	35% / 63%
LCC – Students on Cultures Track	46%	23%	46%	21% / 37%
LCC – Students on Study Abroad Track	0	0	0	0

Students in the 2020 sample made better progress on all requirements save HUL compared to the 2017 sample. This may reflect a pattern from the 2019 sample of pursuing HUM courses more readily than HUL. Both the 2019 and 2020 results also likely reflect the completion the comprehensive CC designation review in 2016; a number of Arts and Humanities courses that carried HUL designation were, upon review, stripped of that designation and coded as HUM only.

The improvement in completion of SCLB and SET in the 2020 sample was most welcome, though there is no evidence that the general disparity between Center 1 and Center 2 has changed significantly from the pattern in the 2018 and 2019 samples. Better advising is beginning to have an effect here as is improved enrolment management by the Director of Advising, but the long-standing problem of inadequate seats/sections for non-science majors remains. As long as it does, we will continue to fail Center 1 students by denying more of them the opportunity engage these subjects in their first two years. Additionally, it is difficult

¹² Total percentage of students on Languages Track and Cultures Tracks should equal percentage of LCC Course 1/2. The first percentage records the percentage out of the whole sample. The second percentage records the percentage out of the students who completed at least one LCC course in 2017-2018.

to predict the impact of the disruptions in course offerings that may be associated with the rebuild of the Science and Engineering complex beginning in 2017.

Finally, the college is set to undertake an overhaul of its general education program. There is a strong likelihood that a language requirement will become part such an overhaul. The distribution of 2020 students undertaking and completing the LCC requirement favors the Languages track: 63% of those completing one or more LCC courses did so in the language track, compared to 37% in the Cultural Analysis track. The overall percentages for the entire sample represent an encouraging trend for languages from the previous three samples. If that trend continues, it will lay a stronger foundation a foreign language requirement in a new general education program.

Breadth in the Common Curriculum. (Please note that the class of 2021 is not assessed on this metric; see explanation above.) As DofGE, I discussed findings in the Mechanical Engineering ABET accreditation report with Brad Bruno in Mechanical Engineering. ABET faulted ME in its review of Performance Criterion 4 under SO (h) concerning the broad education necessary to understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global, economic, environmental, and social context: 25.8% of students surveyed in the senior exit survey were either neutral or disagreed that ‘The General Education Curriculum at Union was effective in providing me with a broad education.’ I brought together assessment information relevant to this concern and sent it to Mechanical Engineering in 18 February 2016. It is worth expanding the perspective to consider the breadth of course selections among students in all the samples. Tables CC4a, CC4b, CC4c provide the first year distributions for the samples of 2018, 2019, and 2020. Beginning with the 2018 sample, the annual report will include a comprehensive report on distribution of course selection for all students in the sample, not just first year distributions.

Table CC4a. Number of courses completed among departments for selected CC requirements after two years for the Class of 2018 (Center 2)					
Requirement	HUL	HUM	SOCS	Languages and Cultures	
Department				LCC 1	LCC 2
Classics	1	2			1
English	15	2			1
Modern Languages	2	4		6	7
Music					
Philosophy		3			
Religious Studies		1			
Visual Arts		1		1	
Anthropology				4	1
Economics			2		
Gender, Sexuality & Women’s Studies (GSW)					
History			2	3	
Political Science			3		
Psychology			7		
Sociology			3		1
Total Courses	18	13	17	14	11

Students in Sample	22	22	22	22	22
--------------------	----	----	----	----	----

Table CC4b. Number of courses completed among departments for selected CC requirements after two years for the Class of 2019 (Center 1)

Requirement	HUL	HUM	SOCS	Languages and Cultures	
Department				LCC 1	LCC 2
Classics		1		5	2
English	9				
Modern Languages	1	3		7	6
Music		1			
Philosophy		7			
Religious Studies		2			1
Visual Arts		8			
Anthropology			1	6	2
Economics			6		
Gender, Sexuality & Women's Studies (GSW)			2		
History			3	1	1
Political Science			4		
Psychology			2		
Sociology			4		
Total Courses	10	22	22	19	12
Students in Sample	27	27	27	27	27

Table CC4c. Number of courses completed among departments for selected CC requirements after one year for the Class of 2020 (General)

Requirement	HUL	HUM	SOCS	Languages and Cultures	
Department				LCC 1	LCC 2
Art History				1	
Classics	7	6		2	2
English	14	1			
Modern Languages	1	6		14	5
Music		2			
Philosophy		6			
Religious Studies	2	3			1
Theatre Arts	1	5		1	
Visual Arts	1	3			
Africana Studies			1		
Anthropology			1	3	
Economics			6		
Gender, Sexuality & Women's Studies (GSW)			2		
History			10	3	1
Political Science			4		
Psychology			9		
Sociology			2		

Total Courses	26	32	35	24	8
Students in Sample	43	43	43	43	43

We should continue monitor advising and course planning that encourage the concentration of STEM students in basic introductory courses. Twelve of the fifteen 2018 students who completed their HUL with an introductory English course did so in their first year: 55% of students in the sample completed the HUL requirement in the first year in this way. By contrast, the nine 2019 students who completed their HUL requirement similarly represented only one-third of the sample; many more of those students chose to forgo completing HUL with an introductory English course in the first year and may well seek out other HUL options in their second and third years, perhaps in Classics (enrolments in whose courses are not well-represented in the 2018 sample) or Modern Languages. Those 2019 students also enrolled in more Philosophy and Visual Arts courses than their 2018 counterparts. They also distributed themselves across the social sciences more broadly; over-representation in Economics no doubt reflects broader national trends nation-wide in favour of lucrative business training. Only two of twenty-two students in the 2019 sample who completed their SOCS did so with PSY 100. Seven of the seventeen students in the 2018 sample who completed their SOCS did so with PSY 100. Especially given the recent increase in STEM rhetoric from the Board of Trustees and senior administration, we would do well to encourage all students to seek out more diverse intellectual experiences and global perspectives in their CC courses and avoid a check-box mentality; this might be particularly valuable or important for Center 2 (STEM) students.

The 2020 sample reveals a couple of patterns worth noting. First, the concentration of SOCS courses in Economics and Psychology continued, with the addition of History courses. Second, Modern Languages and English continue to take the highest number of enrolments in LCC and HUL respectively. Finally, the 2020 sample reveals an increased breadth of distributions among the Arts and Humanities departments as a whole compared to either the 2018 (Center 2) or 2019 (Center 1) samples. Again, we would hope to see students continue to spread themselves more widely in the Arts and Humanities programs, and programs more generally.

Student Proficiencies in Learning Outcomes. (Please note that the assessment of the class of 2021 will be found below under FPR/FPR-H: see explanation above.) We have aggregate proficiency data for all three learning outcomes now that the process has been underway for two years. See Table CC5.

Table CC5a. Proficiency Levels across Learning Outcomes A, B, C in Year One (% of students at the assigned proficiency level in individual assessment reports/IARs)						
NA/NO/ND = Not Applicable / Not Observed / No Data						
	Learning Outcome A Critical and Analytical Thinking		Learning Outcome B Making Connections		Learning Outcome C Reflective Learning	
Proficiency Level / Sample Year	2017 (General)	2018 (Center 2)	2017 (General)	2018 (Center 2)	2017 (General)	2018 (Center 2)

Exceptional	5.1%	4.7%	10.2%	6.3%	8.5%	7.8%
Mastery	28.8%	32.9%	20.3%	28.0%	15.3%	12.5%
Proficient	44.1%	26.6%	30.5%	31.3%	18.6%	25.0%
Developmental	20.3%	32.8%	13.6%	21.9%	6.7%	15.6%
Insufficient	1.7%	3.1%	0	10.9%	1.7%	0
NA/NO/ND	0	0	25.4%	1.6%	49.2%	39.1%
Proficiency Level / Sample Year	2019 (Center 1)	2020 (General)	2019 (Center 1)	2020 (General)	2019 (Center 1)	2020 (General)
Exceptional	14.3%	10.6%	15.9%	9.1%	11.1%	7.6%
Mastery	31.7%	35.2%	28.6%	14.5%	17.6%	4.6%
Proficient	33.4%	37.5%	19.0%	20.6%	6.3%	12.9%
Developmental	20.6%	14.5%	12.7%	7.5%	6.3%	5.4%
Insufficient	0	2.2%	0	1.0%	0	0
NA/NO/ND	0	0	23.8%	47.3%	58.7%	69.5%

Table CC5b. Proficiency Levels across Learning Outcomes A, B, C (% of students at the assigned proficiency level in individual assessment reports (IARs))

	Learning Outcome A Critical and Analytical Thinking		Learning Outcome B Making Connections		Learning Outcome C Reflective Learning	
Proficiency Level / Sample Year	2017 (Year 1)	2017 (Years 2-4)	2017 (Year 1)	2017 (Years 2-4)	2017 (Year 1)	2017 (Years 2-4)
Exceptional	5.1%	4.0%	10.2%	4.0%	8.5%	8.0%
Mastery	28.8%	28.0%	20.3%	32.0%	15.3%	16.0%
Proficient	44.1%	48.0%	30.5%	28.0%	18.6%	20.0%
Developmental	20.3%	16.0%	13.6%	16.0%	6.7%	12.0%
Insufficient	1.7%	4.0%	0	0	1.7%	4.0%
NA/NO/ND	0	0	25.4%	20.0%	49.2%	40.0%
Proficiency Level / Sample Year	2018 (Year 1)	2018 (Years 2-4)	2018 (Year 1)	2018 (Years 2-4)	2018 (Year 1)	2018 (Years 2-4)
Exceptional	4.7%	7.7%	6.3%	3.8%	7.8%	11.5%
Mastery	32.9%	42.3%	28.0%	38.5%	12.5%	11.5%
Proficient	26.6%	30.7%	31.3%	30.7%	25.0%	11.5%
Developmental	32.8%	19.2%	21.9%	7.7%	15.6%	0
Insufficient	3.1%	0	10.9%	7.7%	0	0
NA/NO/ND	0	0	1.6%	15.4%	39.1%	65.4%

We hesitate to draw too many particular conclusions from the raw data in tables CC5a and CC5b for several reasons. First, 2017 was the pilot sample through which faculty learned and implemented the new assessment process for the first time; the DofGE and Gen Ed Board also revised and improved the process and the online platform throughout the first year of the sample. Second, 2017 witnessed the worst faculty response rate, depriving us of assessments across all students and CC requirements. Finally, despite the overall improvements in faculty reporting found in table CC1, the reporting for years two, three, and four of the 2017 sample did not improve significantly over the first year. For these reasons it is very difficult to trust evidence of either static proficiency in learning outcomes or improvements. Any comparisons

between 2017 and 2018 should therefore be made with care, though 2018 did demonstrate a movement toward higher proficiencies that one might expect in years two, three, and four with Learning Outcome A.

Learning outcomes B and C are renewed areas for concern. We have the worst results to date for faculty reporting NA/NO/ND for students in the 2020 sample in table CC5a. The class of 2017 showed small improvement in the percentage of NA/NO/ND between year one and years two thru four in table CC5b. However, reporting of anything other than NA/NO/ND for the class of 2018 declined dramatically in table CC5b. We particularly want to improve the coverage of learning outcome B as it directly addresses linking student learning in CC courses to broader social and global issues/questions/challenges – a vital step for helping the CC assist the college in achieving its strategic goals for global learning and action. The continued weakness of learning outcome B is the best evidence in support of overhauling general education at Union College to emphasize integrated global learning and the deliberate focus on themes of wider importance for our students’ intellectual and personal development into effective global citizens. Results for FPR/FPR-H and SRS (below) are significantly better and suggest that these kind of foundation courses, especially in the first year, can and should play an important role in achieving these learning goals in a new general education program.

III. Special Assessment Findings: FPR/FPR-H and SRS/SCH-150

Because of the importance of these foundational courses in the CC, instructors complete both whole class and individual student assessments of FPR/FPR-H and SRS/SCH-150. Instructors complete and submit an individual assessment report for students in their sections who are part of the academic year assessment sample. Instructors also complete and submit a whole class assessment of all the students in their individual sections. Instructors complete the additional outcomes for learning outcome A listed above for their respective courses; they complete the same assessment of learning outcomes B and C as for other courses that fulfil CC requirements.

	FPR/H	SRS/SCH-150
2016-2017	57%	44%
2017-2018	47%	31%

Proficiency Level	EXC	MST	PRF	DEV	INSF	NO
EXC =Exceptional / MST = Mastery / PRF = Proficient / DEV = Developmental / INSF = Insufficient / NO = Not Observed						
Learning Outcome						
A1. Discuss Ideas	18	31	33	13	4	1
A2. Read Texts Critically	15	33	36	14	1	1
A3a. Focused Thesis with Evidence	18	32	34	13	2	1
A3b. Logical Organization	14	35	36	12	2	1

A3c. Clear and Proper Expression of Ideas	15	26	38	18	3	1
A3d. Integrates Evidence	20	24	38	16	1	1
A4. Incorporates Revision	21	36	32	7	1	3
B. Connections or Contributions	20	28	28	9	1	14
C. Reflective Learning	15	21	31	10	0	24

Table CC6b. Aggregate FPR Assessment Results Winter 2017 (% of all students with 56% of sections reporting)

Proficiency Level	EXC	MST	PRF	DEV	INSF	
EXC =Exceptional / MST = Mastery / PRF = Proficient / DEV = Developmental / INSF = Insufficient / NO = Not Observed						
Learning Outcome						
A1. Discuss Ideas	21	39	23	12	4	0
A2. Read Texts Critically	20	35	31	10	4	0
A3a. Focused Thesis with Evidence	19	34	31	12	4	0
A3b. Logical Organization	19	37	29	14	2	0
A3c. Clear and Proper Expression of Ideas	19	31	31	19	1	0
A3d. Integrates Evidence	16	31	31	16	6	0
A4. Incorporates Revision	19	35	26	14	6	0
B. Connections or Contributions	20	36	30	12	2	0
C. Reflective Learning	20	31	33	14	5	1

Table CC6c. Aggregate FPR-H Assessment Results 2016-2017 (% of all students with 60% of sections reporting)

Proficiency Level	EXC	MST	PRF	DEV	INSF	NO
EXC =Exceptional / MST = Mastery / PRF = Proficient / DEV = Developmental / INSF = Insufficient / NO = Not Observed						
Learning Outcome						
A1. Discuss Ideas	28	28	31	14	0	0
A2. Read Texts Critically	19	47	25	8	0	0
A3a. Focused Thesis with Evidence	22	39	28	8	3	0
A3b. Logical Organization	25	33	33	8	0	0
A3c. Clear and Proper Expression of Ideas	19	33	36	8	3	0
A3d. Integrates Evidence	22	28	44	6	0	0
A4. Incorporates Revision	28	42	28	3	0	0
B. Connections or Contributions	17	44	39	0	0	0
C. Reflective Learning	28	31	42	0	0	0

Table CC7a. Aggregate FPR Assessment Results Fall 2017 (% of all students with 32% of sections reporting)

Proficiency Level	EXC	MST	PRF	DEV	INSF	NO
EXC =Exceptional / MST = Mastery / PRF = Proficient / DEV = Developmental / INSF = Insufficient / NO = Not Observed						

Learning Outcome						
A1. Discuss Ideas	23	26	35	11	4	0
A2. Read Texts Critically	18	34	28	15	5	5
A3a. Focused Thesis with Evidence	14	31	40	15	1	0
A3b. Logical Organization	13	32	32	21	3	0
A3c. Clear and Proper Expression of Ideas	15	22	39	20	4	0
A3d. Integrates Evidence	12	24	40	19	5	0
A4. Incorporates Revision	14	28	38	18	3	0
B. Connections or Contributions	15	36	27	11	2	9
C. Reflective Learning	15	22	24	9	4	25

Table CC7b. Aggregate FPR Assessment Results Winter 2018 (% of all students with 50% of sections reporting)

Proficiency Level	EXC	MST	PRF	DEV	INSF	
EXC =Exceptional / MST = Mastery / PRF = Proficient / DEV = Developmental / INSF = Insufficient / NO = Not Observed						
Learning Outcome						
A1. Discuss Ideas	21	32	25	16	5	1
A2. Read Texts Critically	19	30	28	15	8	0
A3a. Focused Thesis with Evidence	14	31	29	17	9	0
A3b. Logical Organization	19	28	30	14	9	0
A3c. Clear and Proper Expression of Ideas	22	29	30	14	6	0
A3d. Integrates Evidence	22	29	20	14	6	0
A4. Incorporates Revision	19	28	30	14	9	0
B. Connections or Contributions	22	32	26	14	6	0
C. Reflective Learning	22	29	30	14	6	0

Table CC7c. Aggregate FPR-H Assessment Results 2017-2018 (% of all students with of 60% of sections reporting)

Proficiency Level	EXC	MST	PRF	DEV	INSF	NO
EXC =Exceptional / MST = Mastery / PRF = Proficient / DEV = Developmental / INSF = Insufficient / NO = Not Observed						
Learning Outcome						
A1. Discuss Ideas	31	31	36	3	0	0
A2. Read Texts Critically	21	44	36	0	0	0
A3a. Focused Thesis with Evidence	21	36	38	5	0	0
A3b. Logical Organization	36	21	41	3	0	0
A3c. Clear and Proper Expression of Ideas	31	3	62	5	0	0
A3d. Integrates Evidence	31	3	62	5	0	0
A4. Incorporates Revision	36	21	41	3	0	0
B. Connections or Contributions	33	23	38	5	0	0
C. Reflective Learning	31	3	62	5	0	0

Table CC8a. Aggregate SRS Assessment Results Fall 2016 (% of all students with 27% of sections reporting)

Proficiency Level	EXC	MST	PRF	DEV	INSF	NO
EXC =Exceptional / MST = Mastery / PRF = Proficient / DEV = Developmental / INSF = Insufficient / NO = Not Observed						
Learning Outcome						
A1. Develop a Research Topic	20	41	29	6	4	0
A2. Find Evidence	24	39	29	4	4	0
A3. Evaluate Evidence	18	37	27	14	4	0
A4. Develop and Evidence-based Argument	20	39	24	12	4	0
A5. Present Research Findings	16	41	39	4	0	0
A6. Practice Professional Standards of Citation	18	49	29	4	0	0
B. Connections or Contributions	10	35	43	6	4	2
C. Reflective Learning	8	33	45	8	4	2

Table CC8b. Aggregate SRS Assessment Results Winter 2017 (% of all students with 90% of sections reporting)

Proficiency Level	EXC	MST	PRF	DEV	INSF	NO
EXC =Exceptional / MST = Mastery / PRF = Proficient / DEV = Developmental / INSF = Insufficient / NO = Not Observed						
Learning Outcome						
A1. Develop a Research Topic	4	38	43	13	2	1
A2. Find Evidence	6	28	50	13	1	1
A3. Evaluate Evidence	5	26	47	19	1	2
A4. Develop and Evidence-based Argument	4	28	45	20	1	2
A5. Present Research Findings	3	29	35	28	1	3
A6. Practice Professional Standards of Citation	1	34	43	13	6	3
B. Connections or Contributions	2	29	42	19	1	17
C. Reflective Learning	4	23	41	9	0	23

Table CC8c. Aggregate SRS Assessment Results Spring 2017 (% of all students with 40% of sections reporting)

Proficiency Level	EXC	MST	PRF	DEV	INSF	NO
EXC =Exceptional / MST = Mastery / PRF = Proficient / DEV = Developmental / INSF = Insufficient / NO = Not Observed						
Learning Outcome						
A1. Develop a Research Topic	19	32	39	8	2	0
A2. Find Evidence	3	36	36	19	7	0
A3. Evaluate Evidence	7	27	41	20	5	0
A4. Develop and Evidence-based Argument	7	31	41	17	5	0
A5. Present Research Findings	17	25	36	20	2	0
A6. Practice Professional Standards of Citation	10	29	42	14	5	0
B. Connections or Contributions	8	31	37	20	3	0
C. Reflective Learning	8	31	39	19	3	0

Table CC8d. Aggregate SCH-150 Assessment Results 2016-2017 (% of all students with 20% of sections reporting)

Proficiency Level	EXC	MST	PRF	DEV	INSF
EXC =Exceptional / MST = Mastery / PRF = Proficient / DEV = Developmental / INSF = Insufficient					
Learning Outcome					
A1. Develop a Research Topic	0	75	17	8	0
A2. Find Evidence	0	67	25	8	0
A3. Evaluate Evidence	0	58	33	8	0
A4. Develop and Evidence-based Argument	0	67	25	8	0
A5. Present Research Findings	0	83	8	8	0
A6. Practice Professional Standards of Citation	0	83	17	0	0
B. Connections or Contributions	0	92	0	8	0
C. Reflective Learning	9	83	0	8	0

Table CC9a. Aggregate SRS Assessment Results Fall 2017 (% of all students with 10% of sections reporting)

Proficiency Level	EXC	MST	PRF	DEV	INSF	NO
EXC =Exceptional / MST = Mastery / PRF = Proficient / DEV = Developmental / INSF = Insufficient / NO = Not Observed						
Learning Outcome						
A1. Develop a Research Topic	0	15	69	6	0	0
A2. Find Evidence	0	31	69	4	0	0
A3. Evaluate Evidence	0	38	54	14	0	1
A4. Develop and Evidence-based Argument	0	31	54	12	0	1
A5. Present Research Findings	0	23	46	4	0	1
A6. Practice Professional Standards of Citation	0	15	46	4	1	1
B. Connections or Contributions	0	38	46	6	0	1
C. Reflective Learning	0	23	54	8	0	1

Table CC9b. Aggregate SRS Assessment Results Winter 2018 (% of all students with 30% of sections reporting)

Proficiency Level	EXC	MST	PRF	DEV	INSF	NO
EXC =Exceptional / MST = Mastery / PRF = Proficient / DEV = Developmental / INSF = Insufficient / NO = Not Observed						
Learning Outcome						
A1. Develop a Research Topic	20	34	36	9	0	0
A2. Find Evidence	11	34	48	7	0	0
A3. Evaluate Evidence	9	27	50	14	0	0
A4. Develop and Evidence-based Argument	18	27	48	7	0	0
A5. Present Research Findings	16	32	50	2	0	0
A6. Practice Professional Standards of Citation	14	32	50	5	0	0
B. Connections or Contributions	9	36	45	9	0	0

C. Reflective Learning	20	34	41	5	0	0
------------------------	----	----	----	---	---	---

Table CC9c. Aggregate SRS Assessment Results Spring 2018 (% of all students with 42% of sections reporting)

Proficiency Level EXC =Exceptional / MST = Mastery / PRF = Proficient / DEV = Developmental / INSF = Insufficient / NO = Not Observed	EXC	MST	PRF	DEV	INSF	NO
Learning Outcome						
A1. Develop a Research Topic	19	52	21	6	2	0
A2. Find Evidence	19	37	31	10	3	0
A3. Evaluate Evidence	11	40	32	8	5	3
A4. Develop and Evidence-based Argument	11	39	34	8	5	3
A5. Present Research Findings	13	40	32	10	2	3
A6. Practice Professional Standards of Citation	24	27	34	6	5	3
B. Connections or Contributions	11	39	35	10	2	3
C. Reflective Learning	18	35	29	8	2	8

Table CC9d. Aggregate SCH-150 Assessment Results 2017-2018 (% of all students with 40% of sections reporting)

Proficiency Level EXC =Exceptional / MST = Mastery / PRF = Proficient / DEV = Developmental / INSF = Insufficient	EXC	MST	PRF	DEV	INSF
Learning Outcome					
A1. Develop a Research Topic	16	48	32	0	4
A2. Find Evidence	20	56	20	0	4
A3. Evaluate Evidence	20	52	24	0	4
A4. Develop and Evidence-based Argument	20	48	28	0	4
A5. Present Research Findings	24	44	28	0	4
A6. Practice Professional Standards of Citation	20	52	24	0	4
B. Connections or Contributions	24	48	24	0	4
C. Reflective Learning	24	48	24	0	4

IV. Student Reflective Responses

Seniors in the 2017 and 2018 assessment sample had the opportunity to complete the Student Reflective Response (SRR) below. Three students completed the SRR in 2017 and in 2018; students in the sample received multiple requests to complete the SRR. We will work to improve the response rate with the Class of 2019.

STUDENT REFLECTIVE RESPONSE

THE COMMON CURRICULUM...

First-Year/Honors Preceptorial engages you in the exploration of ideas and diverse perspectives through critical reading, thinking, and writing.

Sophomore/Scholars Research Seminar ensures you have an early hands-on experience thinking and working as an academic researcher devoted to a term-length project.

Arts and Humanities enables you to find yourself and your voice in creative expression and the exploration of works of the imagination.

Literature expands the moral imagination needed to understand yourself and your fellow human beings through literary analysis, interpretation, and reflection.

Social Sciences confront you with the complexity and challenges of our world by analyzing the societies we create.

Natural Sciences (with Lab) changes the way you think about the natural world when you understand the scientific method and put it to work.

Science, Engineering, and Technology introduces you to Union's unique commitment to teaching Science and Engineering as Liberal Arts and examining their impact on our humanity.

Quantitative and Mathematical Reasoning equips you with unique insights and skills necessary to solve complex problems.

Language and Culture Courses empower you as a citizen of a global community to contribute across cultural boundaries and shape our shared future.

OUR BIG PICTURE GOALS...

The Common Curriculum aims to challenge your intellect, open your mind to new perspectives and ways of thinking, teach academic skills, and prepare you to engage life beyond Union:

- The diverse subjects and disciplines examined in the Common Curriculum help you appreciate the breadth and complexity of human knowledge for its own sake.
- The Common Curriculum trains your mind to be flexible and adaptable by engaging ideas and subjects beyond just your major or a focus on job/career-preparation.
- Common Curriculum courses teach practical skills in critical thinking, the construction of evidence-based analyses and arguments, and the ability to communicate effectively in writing and in person.
- The Liberal Arts explored in the Common Curriculum encourage you to ask big questions about humanity, about life, ethics, and meaning.

YOUR EXPERIENCES AND IDEAS...

Thinking about the last three years at Union, how have your experiences in the Common Curriculum made a positive impact on your learning?

If you could ADD one thing that would make general education at Union College truly unique and meaningful, what would that be?

Class of 2017

Student Responses to Question 1. *Thinking about the last three years at Union, how have your experiences in the Common Curriculum made a positive impact on your learning?*

Student 1: The Common Curriculum here at Union has given me the opportunity to explore other areas of study beyond my major that I would not have necessarily taken the initiative to look at if the Common Curriculum was not in place. I got to take a few Literature classes that I really enjoyed but would not have considered taking if it weren't for the Common Curriculum. I was also able to find my second major through the Common Curriculum Language and Culture Courses. If The Common Curriculum did not exist I would have missed out on so many opportunities to explore topics that I might find interesting.

Student 2: I have been able to explore educational topics I would not have naturally

Student 3: The Preceptorial and the SRS were both foundational courses that elevated my writing skills and introduced me to professors outside of my immediate field that I went on to build relationships with. I believe that those two courses are necessary for students of Union

College, and that they are the strongest part of our Common Curriculum.

Student Responses to Question 2. *If you could ADD one thing that would make general education at Union College truly unique and meaningful, what would that be?*

Student 1: As a math major I have always struggled to comprehend why people do not like math. Furthermore, as a math major, I had difficulty finding WAC credits that I could take while still keeping on pace with both of my majors (math and French). If I could add one thing I would add an additional QMR credit along the lines of a life skills class like personal finance (keeping on budget, paying taxes, etc) I think many people struggle with these kinds of things post grad but if everyone had to take a class in the subject I think that would be really successful. But that is a far-fetched dream of mine because I know not many people appreciate math the way that I do. Beyond that I would make it a bit easier for people to get WAC credits. I know science classes have labs that count towards WAC credits. I was and still am frustrated by the fact that I have written dozens of pages of proofs for all of my math classes over the last three years but only got a WAC credit for one of them.

Student 2: Mandatory African American History Class

Student 3: I would say restructuring our "Linguistic and Cultural Competency" requirement. Sixty percent of Union students study abroad, and that alone fulfills the LCC requirement, which means that the majority of Union's students do not need to take an arts or humanities course on Union's campus. I think that this is incredibly problematic seeing as we are a liberal arts institution, and I think that the departments in the arts and humanities suffer as a result of this broad requirement.

The Gen Ed Board and the Director of Assessment met with two students in the sample who completed the SRR to discuss their experiences in the Common Curriculum. One student is a guide in Admissions who regularly met with prospective students and parents and gave them a tour of the campus. This revealed several interesting points for further attention. First, Admissions staff write the information about the Common Curriculum provided to student guides without any communication with the DofGE, faculty, or the Gen Ed Board. I will follow up with Admissions about how they craft their information for prospective students.

Prospective students frequently ask about whether or not Union has a language requirement and our Math requirements. Typically these questions are not asked with a positive attitude about either. Parents are more receptive to how the CC and LCC in particular (including the language track) push students outside their comfort zones than the students. One wonders if this is consistent among prospective students; if so, how is Admissions failing to interest students who have a positive view of languages and a broad liberal arts education? This student also spoke positively about the SRS, especially the opportunity to complete the term-length research project and the presentation skills learned. This student also would like to have seen more team-taught thematic courses as part of CC requirements in place of checking the box with any course in a department or division.

One student who was an Engineer echoed the common frustration that Engineers or students in high structured programs in the STEM fields miss out on opportunities for a broader education and the chances to take courses that really interest them because of conflicts with major requirements. This student also talked about the importance of study abroad for Engineers as a corrective to this.

Both students discussed FYP. One student stated that the student's FYP did not focus much on teaching foundational skills related to critical reading, writing, and speaking. It focused primarily on content. By contrast, the other student reported that the student's FYP focused on teaching argumentation through several in-class workshops. According to this student, FYP focused on teaching skills by way of engagement with the course content. This signals another common issue with FYP, the lack of consistency across sections in teaching the foundational learning outcomes in critical reading, thinking, discussion, and argumentation in writing. The DofGE and Director of Writing Programs, who now share joint responsibility for FYP (and SRS) faculty development (see below), will make this a priority in the Fall 2017 workshops and those held throughout the rest of the 2017-18 academic year.

Class of 2018

It was not possible to convene a general meeting with students in the 2018 sample because of intractable scheduling difficulties. Spring 2018 was a particularly busy year with multiple community forums on general education reform and it is likely the meeting fell victim to a certain 'gen ed' fatigue as well as the complexity of everyone's schedules during the term. Nonetheless, a stronger effort should be made in 2019 to convene this meeting, especially in the context of general education reform.

Student Responses to Question 1. *Thinking about the last three years at Union, how have your experiences in the Common Curriculum made a positive impact on your learning?*

Student 1: I've learned how to think differently in all aspects of learning. Precep and Sophomore seminar really helped me to learn in ways that i thought i never would. They allowed me to expand upon the skills i already as an engineer, as well as teach me better presentation and oral skills.

Student 2: To be honest, the Common Curriculum has not played a major role in my academic time here, merely by virtue of the fact that I already tend towards being interested in an array of fields. With the exception of the SCLB requirement, I have fulfilled every Common Curriculum requirement "accidentally." That is, I never signed up for a class (besides FYP and SRS) merely because I needed a Common Curriculum requirement. That being said, I do enjoy the fact that I have the opportunity to take so many different kinds of classes, and I can definitely say that doing so has helped me expand the way I think. Having the different intellectual perspectives presented by fields from political science to math to philosophy to computer science really broadens the way one thinks.

Student 3: One of my favorite classes at Union was my Scholars Research Seminar in my first year. I have applied similar research skills to subsequent independent projects and my senior thesis. Similar things can be said about the First-Year Preceptorial; although I think while this class is meant to help students with their writing skills, the classes are pretty varied in the number and type of writing assignments required. The classes therefore have different impacts on students. I am also not sure if having so many professors from different disciplines that are not necessarily focused on argument writing techniques serve students well. Other courses required for the Common Curriculum have really expanded by horizons in my academic career. For example, had I not been required to take a lab science, I may not have discovered by interest in geology and have taken many more classes in the subject. The same

can be said for my realized love for history after I took some cultural history classes to satisfy the LCC credits. I have always been a student interested in many different things so completing the common curriculum never seemed like a burden to be. Taking a variety of classes also gives students the full taste of a liberal arts education.

Student Responses to Question 2. *If you could ADD one thing that would make general education at Union College truly unique and meaningful, what would that be?*

Student 1: I would say its on the most unique curriculums already and I've never heard of any other engineers having to take liberal arts classes at any other school. So I wouldn't say anything needs to be added, but i think some of the classes need to be bigger to allow more students to take courses there interested in. The process for registering for classes is always mayhem and it is tough to fulfill all of your requirements when there are restrictions on the number of seniors or juniors that can be enrolled in a course.

Student 2: Maybe split up LCC into languages and cultural requirements, where languages focuses more on learning a modern language or at least reading translated works from other countries, while the cultural requirement would highlight e.g. religion, cultural values, customs, etc.

Student 3: What a tricky question to answer. If I had to guess, I would say that most students at Union feel that the Common Curriculum requirements are somewhat of a burden, especially for engineering students. I would try to make a class in which every student has a different major or a different characteristic that defines why they are at Union. The class of probably 10-12 students would then create a project to a problem the perceive exists on campus, in the Schenectady community, or otherwise immediate area and present ways to solve the problem from different perspectives: economics, history, psychology, engineering, etc. The best project across all classes could win a prize perhaps monetary or with a publication in Union publicity material. I envision a classes like this in students' junior years when they have more information under their belts and have a better idea about doing a project like this. A class like this would not only teach students to critically examine the problems that exist around them, but how to solve those problems and to work with people with different perspectives. I further think that this course could add an important real working world component to the Common Curriculum that remains heavily focused on academics instead of post college experiences for students.

V. Closing the Assessment Loop

The primary goals of Common Curriculum assessment are:

- A. to support reflective teaching and faculty development
- B. to encourage pedagogical and curricular innovation
- C. to promote transfer of best practice in the Common Curriculum to instruction in other courses
- D. to provide a systematic foundation for the on-going evaluation of specific program requirements with a view to improvement, even replacement.

The Gen Ed Board continues to focus overwhelmingly on goals one through three. We see the focus on real classrooms, teaching, and student learning as the essential value of assessment

for the program. Before explaining how we close the loop with assessment, it is appropriate to reflect on the process now that it has been in place for five years and the college embarks on reform of general education.

Many faculty (rightly) view assessment as another ‘unfunded mandate’ imposed on them by managerial/business-minded administrators, assessment directors, and the Middle States accreditation agency. They also have thoughtful and supportable reasons, both practical and philosophical, for scepticism toward assessment that somehow must supersede, stand alone from, or needlessly duplicate the assessment instruments, pedagogy, and grading in the course. Common Curriculum assessment is caught up in all this and it is fair to say the buy-in has only been limited and is declining.

We have worked hard to make the process ‘cost-effective’ and useful, but it still represents a genuine demand on faculty time. We hope the response rate for FPR/H and SRS/SCH-150 will rise as we improve how we close the loop through ‘faculty development’ initiatives (see below). For now, we have probably reached a point where this particular assessment process has reached its maximum potential and, consequently, outlived its original usefulness. The aggregate information on timely completion is helpful. However, the aggregate data on proficiencies is of limited value; it is simply too blunt an instrument to assess the program, what students accomplish in it, and offer explanations for their learning outcomes. In the aggregate, the faculty response rates are not terrible, but what they mask is that we have very few students in any sample class for whom we have a completed assessment for every course/requirement in the program. Absent completed portfolios for most or all of the students in a sample class, we cannot really track the development over time of their proficiencies in the learning outcomes. There are also structural problems in assessing the Common Curriculum. Because the college decided to have an open-menu and loosely structured approach to completing program requirements (except FPR/H and SRS/SCH-150), there is little or no consistency in the specific courses (or instructors) through which students complete their requirements or when they do so in their academic careers. This system (as well as a campus culture that too often exalts the major) entrenched a ‘check-box’ mentality of ‘one and done’ with many requirements, making it difficult to assess learning from one course to another. The poor response rate by students to the SRR reflects this, which makes the responses of those students who do complete the instrument all the more important – they have taken a stake in advising us on the program and encouraging its improvement.

As the college embarks on general education reform, it very much needs fresh and innovative thinking about assessment, beginning with its rationale and goals, integration into courses and pedagogy, and processes (especially geared toward simple, qualitative information that can be used most effectively by instructors). As it stands, assessing the two core courses and the SRRs are the most valuable parts of the current process and have sufficient utility that they or something like them should carry over into any reform of general education assessment in the future.

For the present, we close the loop as follows:

- 1) The questions on the IAR are designed so that faculty scrutinize the pedagogical foundation of assignments with learning outcomes directly in mind. We see evidence that

faculty are doing so in the narrative portion of the IARs and, since 2014, in new course proposals, where faculty are expected to explain how their courses will address CC learning outcomes.

- 2) Faculty currently have direct access to Common Curriculum assessment at three points: a) enrolment in the Nexus course *Teaching the Common Curriculum* explained below; b) the program website that contains all the relevant assessment documents and annual reports; c) the college assessment website.
- 3) Each faculty member is enrolled in *Teaching the Common Curriculum* as a primary support. The folder for Common Curriculum Assessment includes a) practical information, b) pedagogical guides for teaching and evaluating learning outcome A, c) samples of IARs organized by CC requirements, and d) sample IARs designed highlight great teaching in the CC. This folder assists faculty in completing the IAR and in studying teaching and learning in colleagues' classes. We would like the course will evolve to include a dedicated resource folder for each of CC requirement; it currently includes materials for the SRS/SCH-150 faculty workshops, syllabi, and assignments. The initiative for creating these resources currently comes from the DofGE and Gen Ed Board, but much more faculty input will be encouraged.
- 4) The annual assessment report should be a tool for departments and programs to align their courses to the CC learning outcomes and evaluate their success in doing so. We will also follow-up directly with chairs and directors whose departments and programs seem most affected by our annual assessment and recommendations.
- 5) The annual assessment report provides guidance for the Gen Ed Board in the course approval process. More simply put, it gives the board a basis from which to look for strengths and weaknesses in courses proposed for Common Curriculum credit based on best practice and areas of concern. The board now gives faculty better, more specific guidance on revision and resubmission of courses, supported by the resources available in TCC.
- 6) From 2015 through 2018, the Gen Ed Board completed a comprehensive review of courses carrying CC designations and used assessment data to guide its work.
- 7) The DofGE responded to the DofA's review of the CC assessment process in 2017 with the following steps: a) the program learning outcomes are now more readily displayed and accessible on the program website; b) the program learning outcomes have been incorporated into the advising worksheet and program policies online; the annual assessment report has integrated reasonable benchmarks in appropriate instances (e.g. faculty assessment response rate, timely completion of CC requirements); revision of the course proposal form to require that all syllabi submitted include CC learning outcomes when they apply for CC credit.
- 8) Beginning in 2018-2019, the DofGE will annually convene a set of assessment workshops, typically one or two per term following this pattern:

ASSESSMENT WORKSHOPS 2018-2019		
TERM	<i>Workshop 1 Theme: Learning Outcome</i>	<i>Workshop 2 Theme: Best Practice</i>
	DofGE will facilitate faculty discussion of assessment data for specified learning outcomes, student progress across CC requirement and over time, strategies for	DofGE will recruit and work with faculty to lead workshops and conduct teaching demonstrations that emphasize pedagogical choices, lesson design,

	improving student outcomes, and evaluating the effectiveness of learning outcomes for the college’s mission. Workshop in week 1 or 2.	assignment design, and innovative teaching focused on one or two related CC requirements. Workshop in week 8 or 9.
FALL	A. Critical and Analytical Thinking	
WINTER	B. Connections or Original Contributions	
SPRING	C. Reflective Learning	

FPR/FPR-H and SRS/SCH-150 Program Assessment and Faculty Development. As of 1 September 2017, the DofGE and the Director of Writing Programs (DofWP), with the Gen Ed Board and Writing Board respectively, took on joint responsibility for faculty and program development concerning FPR/FPR-H and SRS/SCH-150, including assessment. All CC assessment is now collected and stored electronically via the WebApps platform. The Gen Ed Board, DofGE, and DofWP review assessment information for all parts of the CC. The DofGE submits the assessment of the Common Curriculum separately to the Director of Assessment by the 5 September each year and includes the assessment of CC in the annual report to the AAC.

Faculty Development Institutes. The DofWP and DofGE plan and execute faculty development for the Common Curriculum. In particular, DofWP and DofGE jointly plan for and carry out a faculty institute each term. Faculty institutes provide focussed instruction and training that integrates FPR/FPR-H and SRS/SCH-150 learning outcomes. Faculty institutes are open to all faculty and faculty teaching in either core course are strongly encouraged to attend all workshops. The DofWP and DofGE take the lead in preparing materials in advance of faculty institutes and producing a summary update of each institute/session for Nexus or/and program websites. The typical academic year schedule will follow this pattern:

TERM	FACULTY INSTITUTES
FALL	<i>Theme: Course Design and Improvement</i>
	A sequence of four linked micro-seminars in consecutive weeks over a common lunch hour (Mondays seem optimal); typically between weeks 2 and 6.
	Focus on teaching the core components of academic-level argumentation, including ‘reading’ for meaning, modes of academic inquiry and debates, assignment design that leads students from the evaluation of academic argumentation to its practice in their own work, best practices for feedback and evaluation. Particularly geared toward training new faculty and renewing the pedagogy of experienced faculty in the foundation courses of the CC, but transferable to other instructional settings.
WINTER	<i>Theme: Teaching Demonstrations</i>
	A sequence of three linked micro-seminars in consecutive weeks over a common lunch hour (Mondays seem optimal); typically between weeks 3 and 6.
	DofWP and DofGE will recruit and work with faculty to lead workshops and conduct teaching demonstrations that emphasize pedagogical choices, lesson design, assignment design, discussion facilitation, in-class writing assignments or workshops, oral and poster presentations, effective content, and the like.

SPRING	<i>Theme: Assessment and Program Improvement</i>
	Week 3: Review Assessment Data with faculty in both courses
	Week 4: Consider program improvements based on assessment data and taking stock of experiences with the course over the academic year with faculty in both courses
	Week 6: work with faculty in both courses teaching new courses in the program in the coming academic year, focus on analytical and research-based writing

In 2017-2018, the DofGE and DofWP conducted the following set of institutes. They occasioned strong turn out and consistent week-on-week turn out by a core of interested faculty. For the trial year of institutes, the attendance, quality of pedagogical programming and engagement, and positive response of faculty in attendance exceeded our expectations. The current DofWP and new DofGE will build on these foundations in mounting the institutes in 2018-2019 and also work to align them with the activities of the general education reform task force.

<i>FALL 2017 COMMON CURRICULUM FACULTY INSTITUTE</i>	
18 September:	<i>Teaching Students to Read for Argument</i> : how do we design assignments so that students read for, recognize, and analyze the core of academic argumentation (claim + reasons + evidence)?
25 September:	<i>Training Students to Make Their Own Arguments</i> : how do we springboard from teaching students to read for argument to teaching them how to practice the core of academic argumentation (claim + reason + evidence)?
2 October:	Assignment design workshop building on the previous two sessions with a focus on FPR/FPR-H but open to all faculty.
9 October:	Assignment design workshop building on the previous two sessions with a focus on SRS/SCH-150 but open to all faculty.
<i>WINTER 2018 COMMON CURRICULUM FACULTY INSTITUTE</i>	
<i>Small Teaching: Capture, Engage, Consolidate</i>	
<i>The organizing theme for Winter Common Curriculum Institutes is great teaching in action, with a focus on teaching demonstrations and ready-to-go pedagogy. This year we will take on the pedagogy of ‘small teaching’ as developed by Professor James Lang, Assumption College. Small teaching aims to create high impact reflection and connections.</i>	
Micro-Seminar 1 on 22 January	
<i>The Pedagogy of Small Teaching</i> : how can we use ‘small interventions in a learning session that can capture (or recapture) the attention of students, provide quick opportunities for student engagement, and introduce or seal up new learning.’ Lang, <i>Small Teaching</i> (2016)	
Agenda: Joe Johnson and John Cramsie will introduce the small teaching pedagogy and discuss with participants their own experiences (both deliberate and unplanned) with small teaching. Participants will plan for Micro-Seminar 3 by selecting a chapter in Lang’s <i>Small Teaching</i> to springboard from with their own ideas/lessons for small teaching.	
Micro-Seminar 2 on 29 January	
<i>Small Teaching in Action 1</i> : (Small) Teaching Demonstrations led by Dan Venning (Theatre Arts/English), Marianna Bergamaschi Ganapini (Philosophy), and Kirk Wegter-McNelly (Religious Studies). Presenters will discuss small changes they have made in their classes.	
Micro-Seminar 3 on 5 February	
<i>Small Teaching in Action 2</i> : faculty introduce and demonstrate ready-to-use assignment designs spring-boarding from the reading selected in Micro-Seminar 1.	