March 12, 2010

MEMORANDUM

TO: University Senate Members

FROM: Elise Miller-Hooks
             Chair of the University Senate

SUBJECT: University Senate Meeting on Thursday, March 25, 2010

The next meeting of the University Senate will be held on Thursday, March 25, 2010 from **3:30p.m.-5:30p.m.** The meeting will convene in **Room 0200, Skinner Hall (please note the location change from last semester)**. If you are unable to attend, please contact the Senate Office[1] by calling 301-405-5805 or sending an email to senate-admin@umd.edu for an excused absence. Your response will assure an accurate quorum count for the meeting.

The meeting materials can be accessed on the Senate Web site. Please go to http://www.senate.umd.edu/meetings/materials/ and click on the date of the meeting.

Meeting Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the March 3, 2010, Senate Minutes (Action)

3. Report of the Chair

4. Report of the Chair of the University of Maryland College Park Presidential Search & Screening Committee (Information)

5. Reports of Committees:

   a. PCC Proposal to Terminate Inactive Graduate Programs in the College of Education (Senate Document#: 09-10-32) (Action)

   b. PCC Proposal to Terminate Inactive Special Education Undergraduate Programs (Senate Document#: 09-10-33) (Action)

   c. Recommendation to Establish a Family Care Resource and Referral Service at the University of Maryland (Senate Document#: 09-10-36) (Action)

---

[1] Any request for excused absence made after 1:00 p.m. will not be recorded as an excused absence.

6. Special Order of the Day

    Discussion of the Draft Report from the General Education Task Force: Transforming General Education at the University of Maryland (Senate Document#: 09-10-34)

7. New Business

8. Adjournment

---

[1] Any request for excused absence made after 1:00 p.m. will not be recorded as an excused absence.

University Senate

March 3, 2010

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 91

Call to Order

Senate Chair Miller-Hooks called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

Chair Miller-Hooks asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the December 10, 2009 meeting. Hearing none, she declared the minutes approved as distributed.

Report of the Chair

Chair Miller-Hooks gave an update on the work of the General Education Task Force. The draft report will be discussed at the March 25, 2010 Senate Meeting and the senate will vote on the final report in the future. Miller-Hooks gave an overview of the Senate's work on the child care issue. Four committees, staff affairs, student affairs and human relations, have been working together on the issue and hope to make a recommendation this semester. Miller-Hooks announced that she and two other senators would be serving on the Presidential Search Committee and read a statement from the search committee chair, Dean Kettl. Miller-Hooks also gave an overview of the status of pending legislation for the year.

Committee Reports

PCC Proposal to Terminate Inactive EDCI Undergraduate Programs (Senate Document Number 09-10-25) (Action)

Alex Chen, Chair of the Programs, Curricula and Courses Committee, presented the proposal to the Senate and provided background information. Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion; hearing none, she called for a vote of the Senate. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposal to Terminate or Suspend Inactive EDCI Graduate Programs (Senate Document Number 09-10-26) (Action)

Alex Chen, Chair of the Programs, Curricula and Courses Committee, presented the proposal to the Senate and provided background information. Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion; hearing none, she called for a vote of the Senate. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

A verbatim digital recording of the meeting is on file in the Senate Office.

PCC Proposal to Restructure the B.A. in Secondary Education (Senate Document Number 09-10-27) (Action)

Alex Chen, Chair of the Programs, Curricula and Courses Committee, presented the proposal to the Senate and provided background information. Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion; hearing none, she called for a vote of the Senate. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposal to Restructure the B.S. in Secondary Education (Senate Document Number 09-10-28) (Action)

Alex Chen, Chair of the Programs, Curricula and Courses Committee, presented the proposal to the Senate and provided background information. Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion; hearing none, she called for a vote of the Senate. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

PCC Proposal to Add a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Global Health (Senate Document Number 09-10-29) (Action)

Alex Chen, Chair of the Programs, Curricula and Courses Committee, presented the proposal to the Senate and provided background information. Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion; hearing none, she called for a vote of the Senate. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Human Relations Code & Committee Name Change (Senate Document Number 09-10-12) (Action)

Valérie Orlando, Chair of the Human Relations Committee, presented the proposal to the Senate to change the name of the Human Relations Committee to the Committee on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion and provided background information. Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion; hearing none, she called for a vote of the Senate. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Professor of the Practice & Adjunct Professor Representation in the Senate (Senate Document Number 09-10-18) (Action)

Kendra Wells, Chair of the Elections, Representation & Governance (ERG) Committee, presented the proposal to add a single representative on the Senate for the Professors of the Practice and Adjunct faculty to the Senate and provided background information. Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion; hearing none, she called for a vote of the Senate. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Arbitrary and Capricious Grading (Senate Document Number 06-07-51) (Action)

Charles Delwiche, Chair of the Academic Procedures & Standards (APAS) Committee, presented the proposal to the Senate and provided background information on the committee's work. Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion.

Senator Gulick, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, inquired about the procedure for a case without merit.

Delwiche stated that the remedies were recommended only if there was a finding of arbitrary and capricious grading by the committee.

Senator Sachs, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, proposed an amendment to include an undergraduate on the review committee because only a peer could understand where the student was coming from. He rejected the idea that a student on the review committee would advocate for his/her peer. He further stated that the student judiciary board is an example of a review committee where students are able to make fair judgments of their peers.

Proposed Amendment:
D. The Chair shall refer the case to a committee consisting of at least three tenured faculty members at a rank equal or superior to that of the instructor. ***The Chair shall also appoint one undergraduate student to serve on the committee. Normally, this student member will be a third- or fourth-year major student in the department.*** As appropriate within the context of the academic unit, this committee may be a standing committee, or may be appointed ad hoc. The committee should be formulated to provide fair and unbiased consideration of the case, and the charge to the committee should remind them of this responsibility.

The motion for an amendment to the membership was seconded.

Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Delwiche responded that the student judiciary board supports the concept of peer evaluation. He stated that since the faculty member is the one being judged, the review committee should be made of his/her peers. He also stated that he is a strong advocate of students being involved in committees but does not feel it is appropriate in this case.

Senator Tits, Faculty, College of Engineering, stated that he was against the amendment because of the danger of reprisal down the road.

Senator Tervala, Undergraduate, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that he did not believe that there would be reprisal if the students that served on the committee were 3rd and 4th year students who were graduating. He also stated that students are not biased and serve on various high-level committees. He urged the Senate to support the amendment.

A verbatim recording of the meeting is on file in the Senate Office.

Senator Hayes, Undergraduate, College of Engineering, asked whether the committee had looked at the graduate student policy? He stated that the current graduate student arbitrary and capricious grading policy has a membership that is evenly divided between faculty and students.

Delwiche responded that the committee did not look at the graduate student policy but did look at the undergraduate policies of our peer institutions.

Senator Soltan, Faculty, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, stated that we should have a fair and consistent policy for all students and supported the amendment.

Senator Sandstrom, Full-Time Instructor, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that she supported the amendment because instructors teach undergraduates. She thinks that instructors should also be included on these committees; so, she understands the students' concerns.

Senator Crisalli, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, stated that if the existing policy protects junior faculty from reprisal, it shows that the University acknowledges that there could be corruption in this form of peer review. Therefore, we should implement shared governance and include undergraduates.

Delwiche responded that if a senior faculty member is evaluated by a junior faculty member in a review case, there could be reprisal down the road.

Senator Smela, Faculty, College of Engineering, asked if the graduate student policy was intended for them as instructors or students. She also stated that we should not duplicate an unwise policy.

Dean Caramello, Graduate School, responded that it is intended for graduate students who have received grades that they believe are arbitrary and capricious.

Senator Burke, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, stated that there is not enough student representation on university-wide committees. She said that creating a new committee with no student representation is not a good idea. She felt that many students would want to serve on a committee like this one.

Delwiche clarified that the review committee is not a new committee and that their recommendation was to not change the structure of the existing committee membership. He also explained that this is essentially not just a committee but part of a judicial process that is part of faculty review.

Senator Dinman, Faculty, College of Life Sciences, stated a quote, "consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds."

Senator Tobiason, Graduate Student, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that he is supportive of the motion. He believes that this is an excellent opportunity to affirm

---

A verbatim recording of the meeting is on file in the Senate Office.

our dedication to the principles of shared governance. The Graduate School policy respects students to a greater degree than this proposal. He was bothered by the notion that students would advocate for each other.

Delwiche stated that his intent was to improve upon the existing policy. Taking away a grade or changing a grade that a faculty member has given challenges that faculty member's academic freedom. We should look at this from the perspective of the professor who has been challenged. The policy has to defend the rights of the professor and the student while representing the interests of the university.

Senator Buchanan, Faculty, College of Agricultural & Natural Resources & Member of the APAS Committee, stated that the committee considered whether a student would be an impediment to an open and aggressive discussion. They agreed that a student would be an impediment to getting an appropriate and fair solution. He stated that he did not support the amendment.

Senator Bedford, Graduate Student, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that students earn their grade. If we do not allow students to be a part of this process, they will not understand where grades come from.

Dean Hamilton, Undergraduate Studies & Member of the APAS Committee, stated that the committee reviewed this issue thoroughly and came to the same conclusion to not include a student on the committee.

Senator Jacobe, Part-Time Instructor, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that faculty would have reservations about speaking openly if a student were in the room. She stated that she could not support the amendment.

Hearing no further discussion, Miller-Hooks called for a vote on the amendment. **The amendment failed.**

Senator Tervala, Undergraduate, College of Arts & Humanities, made a motion to strike section C.1. of the proposed policy as an amendment.

Senator Crisalli seconded the motion.

Proposed Amendment:
C. The appeal may be dismissed administratively if:
    1. the student has submitted the same, or substantially the same complaint to any other formal grievance procedure; or,

Chair Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Dean Caramello, Graduate School, the intention of the language is to prevent the same complaint from being considered in a different grievance process.

Hearing no further discussion, Miller-Hooks called for a vote on the amendment. **The amendment failed.**

Senator Soltan, Faculty, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, made a motion for an additional amendment to change B.1.

The motion was seconded.

Proposed Amendment:
   1. Appeals must be filed within 20 working days after the first day of instruction of the next regular semester *following the semester in which the grade was issued*.

Delwiche stated that he felt that change was unnecessary but did not object to the amendment.

Hearing no further discussion, Miller-Hooks called for a vote of the Senate. **The amendment passed.**

Senator Tervala, Undergraduate, College of Arts & Humanities, made a motion to strike section C.1. of the proposed policy as an amendment.

Senator Crisalli seconded the motion.

Proposed Amendment:
C. The appeal may be dismissed administratively if:
       1. the student has *concurrently* submitted the same, or substantially the same complaint to any other formal grievance procedure; or,

Chair Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion of the amendment.

Delwiche stated he was concerned that the Legal Office would not endorse this change.

Senator Tits, Faculty, College of Engineering, spoke against the amendment and felt that the current language precludes a student from repeatedly submitting the same complaint.

Senator Gulick, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, stated that he had an issue with the word "concurrent" because it has different meanings to different people.

Hearing no further discussion, Miller-Hooks called for a vote of the Senate. **The amendment failed.**

Senator Celi, Faculty, College of Engineering, asked about a scenario where the entire class is graded in the same way.

A verbatim recording of the meeting is on file in the Senate Office.

Delwiche responded that that is not considered arbitrary and capricious but rather hard grading.

Hearing no further discussion, Miller-Hooks called for a vote on the proposal as amended. **The proposal as amended passed.**

New Business

There was no new business.

Adjournment

Senate Chair Miller-Hooks adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

University Senate
TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	09-10-32
PCC ID #:	09054
Title:	Terminate inactive graduate programs in the College of Education.
Presenter:	Alex Chen, Chair, Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee
Date of SEC Review:	03/10/10
Date of Senate Review:	03/25/10
Voting (highlight one):	1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report
Statement of Issue:	The College of Education wishes to terminate the following inactive graduate programs in order to remove them from the Maryland Higher Education Commission Academic Program Inventory. These programs have no enrolled students or applicants. The programs proposed for termination are as follows: 1. The Ph.D. and Masters programs in Curriculum and Instruction: Early Childhood Education Area of Concentration 2. The Ph.D. and Masters programs in Special Education: Education of the Gifted and Talented Area of Concentration 3. The Masters program in Special Education: Educational Diagnosis and Prescription Area of Concentration 4. The Masters program in Special Education: Integrated Special Education Area of Concentration. The proposal was submitted to the Senate by the Office of Academic Affairs following favorable recommendation by the Academic Planning Advisory Committee (APAC) on January 25; the Graduate Council Programs, Curricula & Courses Committee on January 28 (with email notification to the full Graduate Council); and the Senate Programs, Curricula & Courses

	Committee on January 29.
Relevant Policy # & URL:	N/A
Recommendation:	The Senate Committee on Programs, Curricula, and Courses recommends that the Senate approve these program terminations.
Committee Work:	The Committee considered the proposal at its meeting on January 29, 2010. Stephen Koziol, Associate Dean for Academic Programs, Outreach, and International Initiatives, was present to answer questions. After discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to recommend the proposal.
Alternatives:	The Senate could decline to approve the proposed program terminations.
Risks:	If the Senate does not approve the proposed program terminations, the University will continue to have these unused academic programs listed on the state's academic program inventory.
Financial Implications:	There are no financial implications with this proposal.
Further Approvals Required: *(*Important for PCC Items)*	If the Senate approves these proposals, they would still require further approval by the President and the Chancellor (with notification to the Maryland Higher Education Commission.)

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK
PROGRAM/CURRICULUM/UNIT PROPOSAL

- Please email the rest of the proposal as an MSWord attachment to pcc-submissions@umd.edu.

- Please submit the signed form to the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Programs, 1119 Main Administration Building, Campus.

PCC LOG NO.
09054

College/School: College of Education
College/School Unit Code-First 8 digits: 01203100
Unit Codes can be found at: https://hypprod.umd.edu/Html_Reports/units.htm

Department/Program: EDCI and EDSP
Department/Program Unit code-Last 7 digits: 1310901 (EDCI) and 1312301 (EDSP)

Type of Action (choose one):

❑ Curriculum change (including informal specializations)   ❑ *New academic degree/award program*
❑ *Renaming of program or formal Area of Concentration*   ❑ New Professional Studies award iteration
❑ *Addition/deletion of formal Area of Concentration*   ❑ New Minor
x *Suspend/delete program*   ❑ Other

Italics indicate that the proposed program action must be presented to the full University Senate for consideration.

Summary of Proposed Action:
This cover sheet incorporates multiple deletion proposals. The related proposals were consolidated under one PCC proposal log number to better organize and present multiple proposals put forward by the College of Education in spring 2010. The proposals organized under PCC-log number 09054 include proposals that relate to the deletion or suspension of different Education graduate programs:
09049-Delete EDCI MA/PhD Early Childhood Education area of concentration.
09050-Delete EDSP MA/M.Ed. Education of the Gifted & Talented area of concentration.
09051-Delete EDSP MA/M.Ed. Education Diagnosis & Prescription area of concentration.
09052-Delete EDSP MA/M.Ed. Integrated Special Education area of concentration.
09053-Delete EDSP Ph.D. Education of the Gifted & Talented area of concentration.

==

APPROVAL SIGNATURES - *Please print name, sign, and date. Use additional lines for multi-unit programs.*

1. Department Committee Chair **see attached** _____

2. Department Chair **see attached** _____

3. College/School PCC Chair **see attached** _____

4. Dean **see attached** _____

5. Dean of the Graduate School (if required) _____ 2/3/10

6. Chair, Senate PCC _____

7. University Senate Chair (if required) _____

8. Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost _____

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK
PROGRAM/CURRICULUM/UNIT PROPOSAL

PCC LOG NO.
09049

College/School: College of Education

Department/Program: Curriculum and Instruction

Type of Action (choose one):

Curriculum change (including informal specializations)   *New academic degree/award program*
Renaming of program or formal Area of Concentration   New Professional Studies award iteration
■ *Addition/deletion of formal Area of Concentration*   New Minor
Suspend/delete program   Other

Italics indicate that the proposed program action must be presented to the full University Senate for consideration.

Summary of Proposed Action:

In the MHEC Inventory of Programs, delete the Early Childhood Education area of concentration from both EDCI's masters and doctoral degrees. Many years ago Early Childhood resided in EDCI. However the program was transferred to EDHD at least seven years ago. These programs are now housed in EDHD.

==

APPROVAL SIGNATURES - *Please print name, sign, and date. Use additional lines for multi-unit programs.*

1. Department Committee Chair Anna Graeber _____November 10, 2009

2. Department Chair: Linda R. Valli _____November 10, 2009

3. College/School PCC Chair Anna Graeber _____November 10, 2009

4. Dean _____

5. Dean of the Graduate School (if required) _____

6. Chair, Senate PCC _____

7. University Senate Chair (if required)_____

8. Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost _____

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK
PROGRAM/CURRICULUM/UNIT PROPOSAL

PCC LOG NO.
090

College/School: Education

Department/Program: Special Education (EDSP) – Master's Degree Program

Type of Action (choose one):

☐ Curriculum change (including informal specializations)   ☐ *New academic degree/award program*
☐ *Renaming of program or formal Area of Concentration*   ☐ New Professional Studies award iteration
X *Addition/deletion of formal Area of Concentration*   ☐ New Minor
☐ *Suspend/delete program*   ☐ Other

Italics indicate that the proposed program action must be presented to the full University Senate for consideration.

Summary of Proposed Action:
Deletion of *Education of the Gifted & Talented* Area of Concentration in the Master's degree program in special education: This Area of Concentration has been inactive for several years, and the department has decided to discontinue it due to changes in faculty staffing within the department. There are no students enrolled in this Area of Concentration.

===

APPROVAL SIGNATURES - *Please print name, sign, and date. Use additional lines for multi-unit programs.*

1. Department Committee Chair _____

2. Department Chair _____

3. College/School PCC Chair _____ 12/7/09 _____

4. Dean _____

5. Dean of the Graduate School (if required) _____

6. Chair, Senate PCC _____

7. University Senate Chair (if required) _____

8. Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost _____

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK
PROGRAM/CURRICULUM/UNIT PROPOSAL

- Please email the rest of the proposal as an MSWord attachment to pcc-submissions@umd.edu.

- Please submit the signed form to the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Programs, 1119 Main Administration Building, Campus.

PCC LOG NO.
0905

College/School: Education

Department/Program: Special Education (EDSP) – Master's Degree Program

Type of Action (choose one):

☐ Curriculum change (including informal specializations)   ☐ *New academic degree/award program*
☐ *Renaming of program or formal Area of Concentration*   ☐ New Professional Studies award iteration
X *Addition/deletion of formal Area of Concentration*   ☐ New Minor
☐ *Suspend/delete program*   ☐ Other

Italics indicate that the proposed program action must be presented to the full University Senate for consideration.

Summary of Proposed Action:
Deletion of *Educational Diagnosis & Prescription* Area of Concentration in the Master's degree program in special education. This Area of Concentration has been inactive for several years, and the department has decided to discontinue it. There are no students enrolled in this Area of Concentration.

===

APPROVAL SIGNATURES - *Please print name, sign, and date. Use additional lines for multi-unit programs.*

1. Department Committee Chair ___Paul Maccini___

2. Department Chair ___

3. College/School PCC Chair ___ 12-7-04

4. Dean ___

5. Dean of the Graduate School (if required) ___

6. Chair, Senate PCC ___

7. University Senate Chair (if required) ___

8. Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost ___

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK
PROGRAM/CURRICULUM/UNIT PROPOSAL

- Please email the rest of the proposal as an MSWord attachment to pcc-submissions@umd.edu.

- Please submit the signed form to the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Programs, 1119 Main Administration Building, Campus.

College/School: Education

Department/Program: Special Education (EDSP) – Master's Degree Program

Type of Action (choose one):

☐ Curriculum change (including informal specializations)　☐ *New academic degree/award program*
☐ *Renaming of program or formal Area of Concentration*　☐ New Professional Studies award iteration
X *Addition/deletion of formal Area of Concentration*　☐ New Minor
☐ *Suspend/delete program*　☐ Other

Italics indicate that the proposed program action must be presented to the full University Senate for consideration.

Summary of Proposed Action:
Deletion of *Integrated Special Education* Area of Concentration in the Master's degree program in special education: This Area of Concentration has been inactive for several years, and the department has decided to discontinue it. There are no students enrolled in this Area of Concentration.

==

APPROVAL SIGNATURES - *Please print name, sign, and date. Use additional lines for multi-unit programs.*

1. Department Committee Chair _~Paula Maccini_____

2. Department Chair _____

3. College/School PCC Chair _____ 12-7-09

4. Dean _____

5. Dean of the Graduate School (if required) _____

6. Chair, Senate PCC _____

7. University Senate Chair (if required) _____

8. Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost _____

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK
PROGRAM/CURRICULUM/UNIT PROPOSAL

- Please email the rest of the proposal as an MSWord attachment to pcc-submissions@umd.edu.

- Please submit the signed form to the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Programs, 1119 Main Administration Building, Campus.

PCC LOG NO.	09053

College/School: Education

Department/Program: Special Education (EDSP) – Doctoral Program

Type of Action (choose one):

☐ Curriculum change (including informal specializations) ☐ *New academic degree/award program*
☐ *Renaming of program or formal Area of Concentration* ☐ New Professional Studies award iteration
X *Addition/deletion of formal Area of Concentration* ☐ New Minor
☐ *Suspend/delete program* ☐ Other

Italics indicate that the proposed program action must be presented to the full University Senate for consideration.

Summary of Proposed Action:
Deletion of *Education of the Gifted & Talented* Area of Concentration in the doctoral program in special education: This Area of Concentration has been inactive for several years, and the department has decided to discontinue it due to changes in faculty staffing within the department. There are no students enrolled in this Area of Concentration.

==

APPROVAL SIGNATURES - *Please print name, sign, and date. Use additional lines for multi-unit programs.*

1. Department Committee Chair _____

2. Department Chair _____

3. College/School PCC Chair _____ 12-7-09

4. Dean _____

5. Dean of the Graduate School (if required) _____

6. Chair, Senate PCC _____

7. University Senate Chair (if required) _____

8. Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost _____

College of Education Restructuring Proposals for Spring 2010 (Submitted by the College of Education in December 2009)
Graduate Programs
09054 – Graduate Program Terminations (09049-09053)
09049 Delete EDCI M.A./Ph.D. Early Childhood Education area of concentration (no students enrolled or in applicant pool)
09050 Delete EDSP M.A./M.Ed. Special Education - Education of the Gifted & Talented area of concentration (no students enrolled or in applicant pool)
09051 Delete EDSP M.A./M.Ed. Special Education - Educational Diagnosis & Prescription area of concentration (no students enrolled or in applicant pool)
09052 Delete EDSP M.A./M.Ed. Special Education - Integrated Special Education area of concentration (no students enrolled or in applicant pool)
09053 Delete EDSP Ph.D Special Education - Education of the Gifted & Talented area of concentration (no students enrolled or in applicant pool)
09057 – Undergraduate Program Deletions and Suspensions (09055-09056)
09055 Delete EDSP B.S. Mentally Retarded area of concentration (no students enrolled or in applicant pool)
09056 Delete EDSP B.S. Learning Disabilities area of concentration (no students enrolled or in applicant pool)

University Senate
TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	09-10-33
PCC ID #:	09057
Title:	Terminate inactive Special Education undergraduate programs.
Presenter:	Alex Chen, Chair, Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee
Date of SEC Review:	03/10/10
Date of Senate Review:	03/25/10
Voting (highlight one):	1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report
Statement of Issue:	The College of Education wishes to terminate the following inactive areas of concentration in the Special Education undergraduate program in order to remove them from the Maryland Higher Education Commission Academic Program Inventory. These programs have no enrolled students or applicants, and have been inactive for years. The programs to be terminated are as follows: The B.S. in Special Education: Mentally Retarded Area of Concentration. The B.S. in Special Education: Learning Disabilities Area of Concentration. The proposal was submitted to the Senate by the Office of Academic Affairs following favorable recommendation by the Academic Planning Advisory Committee (APAC) on January 25 and the Senate Programs, Curricula & Courses Committee on January 29.
Relevant Policy # & URL:	N/A
Recommendation:	The Senate Committee on Programs, Curricula, and Courses

	recommends that the Senate approve these program terminations.
Committee Work:	The Committee considered the proposal at its meeting on January 29, 2010. Stephen Koziol, Associate Dean for Academic Programs, Outreach, and International Initiatives, was present to answer questions. After discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to recommend the proposal.
Alternatives:	The Senate could decline to approve the proposed program terminations.
Risks:	If the Senate does not approve the proposed program terminations, the University will continue to have these unused academic programs listed on the state's Academic Program Inventory.
Financial Implications:	There are no financial implications with this proposal.
Further Approvals Required: *(*Important for PCC Items)*	If the Senate approves these proposals, they would still require further approval by the President and the Chancellor (with notification to the Maryland Higher Education Commission.)

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK
PROGRAM/CURRICULUM/UNIT PROPOSAL

- Please email the rest of the proposal as an MSWord attachment to pcc-submissions@umd.edu.

- Please submit the signed form to the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Programs, 1119 Main Administration Building, Campus.

PCC LOG NO.
09057

College/School: College of Education
College/School Unit Code-First 8 digits: 01203100
Unit Codes can be found at: https://hypprod.umd.edu/Html_Reports/units.htm

Department/Program: EDSP
Department/Program Unit code-Last 7 digits: 1312301

Type of Action (choose one):

❏ Curriculum change (including informal specializations)   ❏ *New academic degree/award program*
❏ *Renaming of program or formal Area of Concentration*   ❏ New Professional Studies award iteration
❏ *Addition/deletion of formal Area of Concentration*   ❏ New Minor
x *Suspend/delete program*   ❏ Other

Italics indicate that the proposed program action must be presented to the full University Senate for consideration.

Summary of Proposed Action:
This cover sheet incorporates multiple deletion proposals. The related proposals were consolidated under one PCC proposal log number to better organize and present multiple proposals put forward by the College of Education in spring 2010. The proposals organized under PCC-log number 09057 include proposals that relate to the deletion or suspension of different Special Education undergraduate programs:
09055-Delete EDSP B.S. Mentally Retarded area of concentration.
09056-Delete EDSP B.S. Learning Disabilities area of concentration.

==

APPROVAL SIGNATURES - *Please print name, sign, and date. Use additional lines for multi-unit programs.*

1. Department Committee Chair **see attached** _____ _____

2. Department Chair **see attached** _____

3. College/School PCC Chair **see attached** _____ _____

4. Dean **see attached** _____

5. Dean of the Graduate School (if required) _____

6. Chair, Senate PCC _____

7. University Senate Chair (if required) _____

8. Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost _____

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK
PROGRAM/CURRICULUM/UNIT PROPOSAL

- Please email the rest of the proposal as an MSWord attachment to pcc-submissions@umd.edu.

- Please submit the signed form to the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Programs, 1119 Main Administration Building, Campus.

PCC LOG NO.
0905 5

College/School: Education

Department/Program: Special Education (EDSP) – Bachelor's Degree Program

Type of Action (choose one):

☐ Curriculum change (including informal specializations)   ☐ *New academic degree/award program*
☐ *Renaming of program or formal Area of Concentration*   ☐ New Professional Studies award iteration
X *Addition/deletion of formal Area of Concentration*   ☐ New Minor
☐ *Suspend/delete program*   ☐ Other

Italics indicate that the proposed program action must be presented to the full University Senate for consideration.

Summary of Proposed Action:
Deletion of *Mentally Retarded* Area of Concentration in the Bachelor's degree program in special education: This Area of Concentration, which has been inactive for years, pre-dates the original five-year Bachelor of Science degree program in Special Education, which was approved in the early 80's and which subsequently has been changed to a combined BS/M.Ed. program in Special Education.

===

APPROVAL SIGNATURES - *Please print name, sign, and date. Use additional lines for multi-unit programs.*

1. Department Committee Chair _____

2. Department Chair _____

3. College/School PCC Chair _____ 12/7/09

4. Dean _____

5. Dean of the Graduate School (if required) _____

6. Chair, Senate PCC _____

7. University Senate Chair (if required) _____

8. Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost _____

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK
PROGRAM/CURRICULUM/UNIT PROPOSAL

- Please email the rest of the proposal as an MSWord attachment to pcc-submissions@umd.edu.

- Please submit the signed form to the Office of the Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Programs, 1119 Main Administration Building, Campus.

PCC LOG NO. 09058

College/School: Education

Department/Program: Special Education (EDSP) – Bachelor's Degree Program

Type of Action (choose one):

☐ Curriculum change (including informal specializations)   ☐ *New academic degree/award program*
☐ *Renaming of program or formal Area of Concentration*   ☐ New Professional Studies award iteration
X *Addition/deletion of formal Area of Concentration*   ☐ New Minor
☐ *Suspend/delete program*   ☐ Other

Italics indicate that the proposed program action must be presented to the full University Senate for consideration.

Summary of Proposed Action:
Deletion of *Learning Disabilities* Area of Concentration in the Bachelor's degree program in special education: This Area of Concentration, which has been inactive for years, pre-dates the original five-year Bachelor of Science degree program in Special Education, which was approved in the early 80's and which subsequently has been changed to a combined BS/M.Ed. program in Special Education.

==

APPROVAL SIGNATURES - *Please print name, sign, and date. Use additional lines for multi-unit programs.*

1. Department Committee Chair _____Paula Maccini_____

2. Department Chair _____

3. College/School PCC Chair _____   12/7/01

4. Dean _____

5. Dean of the Graduate School (if required) _____

6. Chair, Senate PCC _____

7. University Senate Chair (if required) _____

8. Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost _____

College of Education Restructuring Proposals for Spring 2010 (Submitted by the College of Education in December 2009)
Graduate Programs
09054 – Graduate Program Terminations (09049-09053)
09049 Delete EDCI M.A./Ph.D. Early Childhood Education area of concentration (no students enrolled or in applicant pool)
09050 Delete EDSP M.A./M.Ed. Special Education - Education of the Gifted & Talented area of concentration (no students enrolled or in applicant pool)
09051 Delete EDSP M.A./M.Ed. Special Education - Educational Diagnosis & Prescription area of concentration (no students enrolled or in applicant pool)
09052 Delete EDSP M.A./M.Ed. Special Education - Integrated Special Education area of concentration (no students enrolled or in applicant pool)
09053 Delete EDSP Ph.D Special Education - Education of the Gifted & Talented area of concentration (no students enrolled or in applicant pool)
09057 – Undergraduate Program Deletions and Suspensions (09055-09056)
09055 Delete EDSP B.S. Mentally Retarded area of concentration (no students enrolled or in applicant pool)
09056 Delete EDSP B.S. Learning Disabilities area of concentration (no students enrolled or in applicant pool)

University Senate
TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	09-10-36
PCC ID #:	N/A
Title:	Recommendation to Establish a Family Care Resource and Referral Service at the University of Maryland
Presenter:	Eric Kasischke, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee Cynthia Shaw, Chair of the Staff Affairs Committee Kevin Tervala, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee Valérie Orlando, Chair of the Human Relations Committee
Date of SEC Review:	March 10, 2010
Date of Senate Review:	March 25, 2010
Voting (highlight one):	1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report
Statement of Issue:	Over three decades, several University groups created numerous proposals that recommended adding child care centers, an infant care center, an intergenerational center, adult day care, flexible drop-in care, a resource and referral program, and full-time counselors/staff members to address work-family issues. However, despite senior leadership support for several proposals, a lack of resources has blocked all progress in creating any new child, family, and elder care facilities and services during the last 30 years. During this period, our peers added significantly to their portfolios of child care centers and family care services, leaving the University of Maryland far behind. There is currently a plan to develop an infant care center in the East Campus development—an important and greatly needed facility—but this plan is unlikely to be implemented for several years and will benefit a very small number of University families. In Fall 2009, the four Senate Committees resumed exploring ways to increase family care resources at the University. The committees supported developing comprehensive child and elder care services including on-campus infant/child care centers, an elder care facility, emergency/drop-in care, subsidized child care tuition assistance, resource and referral

	services, and a family care website. However, given the current economic climate, there was particular interest in investigating family resource and referral services as an important first step.
Relevant Policy # & URL:	N/A
Recommendation:	The Faculty Affairs, Staff Affairs, Student Affairs and Human Relations Committees of the University Senate recommend that the University of Maryland establish a Family Care Resource and Referral Service for campus faculty, staff and students by September 2010. Specifically, this Service should offer: seminars on quality child care and elder care; professional consultations addressing family care needs, options, and resources; establishment of a family care website; and educational resources to facilitate informed child and elder care choices.
Committee Work:	All four Senate committees examined the extensive 30-year history of efforts to expand family care facilities and services on the University of Maryland campus, drawing materials from the Archives of the President's Commission on Women's Issues (PCWI) and other sources.

In February 2010, 25 representatives of the four committees met with the owner of a full-service, family care consulting company. The owner, who provides child care and elder care resource and referral services at George Washington University, outlined service options and projected costs of such services for the University of Maryland.

Research was conducted on family care services provided at our peer institutions including, UC-Berkley, University of Michigan, UCLA, UNC-Chapel Hill and University of Illinois at Urbana-Champagne. In addition, surveys and research on work/life conflict and the benefits of family-friendly policies were reviewed. |
Alternatives:	The University could choose not to provide this service.
Risks:	If the University does not accept this recommendation, it may not be competitive as a family-friendly environment when compared to peer institutions.
Financial Implications:	A modest financial investment would be required in order to provide this service. We estimate that to be $80,000-$85,000.

Recommendation to Establish a Family Care Resource and Referral Service at the University of Maryland

The Faculty Affairs, Staff Affairs, Student Affairs and Human Relations Committees of the University Senate recommend that the University of Maryland establish a Family Care Resource and Referral Service for campus faculty, staff and students by September 2010. Specifically, this Service should offer: seminars on quality child care and elder care; professional consultations addressing family care needs, options, and resources; establishment of a family care website; and educational resources to facilitate informed child and elder care choices. The proposed Service recognizes the diversity of family care needs among individuals on the campus. A modest financial investment will provide cost-effective family care services that should have an immediate, positive, and widespread impact on the University community.

Rationale

During the last 30 years, numerous government agencies, businesses, and colleges/universities have expanded family care resources for their employees, including child and elder care facilities, resource and referral services, and flexible work policies. Recent demographic trends underscore the need for additional family care services for a wide range of employees:

- Four out of five couples are in dual-earner relationships, an increase from 66% in 1977 to over 79% in 2008 (1).
- Currently 94% of fathers and 71% of mothers with children under 18 are in the labor force (2).
- In 2007, 51% of mothers with children under age one, 60% of mothers with children younger than three, and 64% of mothers with children under six were employed (3).
- The 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce revealed that 43% of U.S. workers had taken regular care of an individual over 65 in the previous five years, and 51% of employees (men and women) expect to have this responsibility (4).
- Work-life conflict for employees throughout the nation increased significantly from 1977 to 2008, especially for men; the percentage of employees reporting work-life conflict rose from 34% to 45% among men and from 34% to 39% among women (1).

Research within academe also reveals significant concerns about work-life conflict. In one recent study of more than 8,300 doctoral students across nine University of California system campuses, 74% of men and 84% of women were somewhat or very concerned about the family friendliness of university employers (5). Among doctoral students who were parents and supported by federal grants (e.g., NSF, NIH), only 16% of women and 35% of men perceived careers at research-intensive institutions to be "family friendly" (5). As a result, many of the best and brightest students from top-ranked doctoral programs are not applying for academic positions in research universities because they do not believe they can balance the demands of work and family life (5). The shift away from interest in research university careers to business, government and industry was greatest among doctoral women in the sciences, a finding deemed especially troubling given the low number of women in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) doctoral programs (5). Studies using data from the national NSF Survey of Doctorate Recipients also reveal that for women with Ph.D.s, the combination of marriage and childrearing dramatically decreases women's

likelihood of entering a tenure-track position (6). Moreover, faculty women who have children within five years of receiving a Ph.D. were less likely to obtain tenure than either men or women who delay or forsake childbearing (6). In a 2006 study of almost 600 faculty members at the University of Iowa, conflict between child care and work demands was the second major cause of faculty attrition (7). Approximately 35% of female and 30% of male assistant professors at the University of Iowa cited access to child care as a major obstacle to faculty recruitment and retention. Taken together, these studies suggest that the convergence of the probationary period before tenure with the prime years for faculty childbearing and childrearing will continue to be a major challenge for universities seeking to recruit, retain, and promote talented faculty.

Peer Institutions

In response to such research, many of our peer institutions, such as the University of California, Berkeley and the University of Michigan, have taken leadership roles in establishing family care services to facilitate recruitment and retention of the best students, faculty, and staff. These services are viewed as "fundamental to an equitable and productive academic environment" that enhances work/life balance (UC Berkeley, APM-760-0). Our five peer campuses report benefits of family-friendly services that are comparable to those found by business and government employers, including boosting recruitment, enhancing job satisfaction, increasing productivity, lowering absenteeism, decreasing stress-related health problems, and reducing job turnover (8, 9). In one private sector study, a major corporation (Johnson & Johnson) reported saving more than $4 for every $1 invested in its work/family programs, including child care resource and referral services (9). Representatives of the University's five peer institutions reported "improved employee morale," "higher work productivity," and "valuable help for student parents trying to finish their degrees" as among the major benefits of family resource and referral services.

Following is a summary of family care services currently offered by the University and its peers. *Resource and referral services similar to those proposed for our campus are indicated in italics.*

University of Maryland
- Early childhood education program (Center for Young Children): serves 99 preschool and kindergarten children of faculty, staff, and students, ages 3 to 6

University of California, Berkeley
- Early childhood education program: serves 280 children of faculty, staff, and students, ages 3 months to 7 years
- Child care program: serves 80 children of faculty, staff, and students from 6 weeks to 5 years, including children with disabilities
- Subsidized child care for low-income students
- *Elder care counselor: consultations, referrals, support, website*
- *Family support counselor: available on campus two days per week*
- *Family care website*

University of Michigan
- Early childhood education program: serves 800 children of faculty, staff, and students from 6 weeks to age 5
- Subsidized child care for low-income students
- *Family care resource and referral services (used by 2,731 University families between January 2006 and September 2007)*
  - *Individual consultations on day care and elder care*
  - *Parenting seminars and educational programs*
  - *Emergency child care and family helpers*
  - *Elder care services: counseling, assessment, referrals*
- *Family care website*

UCLA
- Early childhood education program: serves 360 children of faculty, staff, and students from 8 weeks through preschool
- Child care tuition assistance for low-income families (including students)
- *Family care resource and referral services: serve more than 1,000 families annually*
  - *Individual consultations/assistance with child care, including location of off-campus care and help with child care transitions*
  - *Child care and parenting seminars*
  - *Elder care services: counseling, assessment, referrals, and seminars*
- *Family care website*

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- Early childhood education program: serves 78 children of faculty, staff, and students from 6 weeks to age 5, including children with disabilities
- Child care center: serves 120 children of faculty, staff, and students from 6 weeks to age 5
- Subsidized child care for low-income families
- *Family support counselor: available on campus twice a week*
- *Elder care services: adult day care, resources and referrals*
- *Family care website*

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Early childhood education program: serves 96 children of faculty, staff, and students from 2 years 9 months to 6 years
- Limited child care tuition assistance for full-time students and employees
- *Child care resource and referral services*
  - *Child care consultations*
  - *Emergency child care*
  - *Child care and parenting seminars*
  - *Written resource materials*
  - *Online referral database*
- *Family care website*

UM History of Family Care Proposals

All four Senate committees examined the extensive 30-year history of efforts to expand family care facilities and services on the University of Maryland campus, drawing materials from the Archives

of the President's Commission on Women's Issues (PCWI). Much of this work was conducted by the PCWI and its subcommittees and task forces, including the Family Friendly Task Force, the Intergenerational Task Force, the Students as Parents Task Force, the Elder Care Committee, the Day Care Committee, and the Child Care Committee. The University's Quality of Working Life Coordinating Group and the Task Force for Faculty Life and Professional Success also examined the status of family care services on the campus, as well as family-friendly services offered at peer institutions.

Over three decades, these groups created numerous proposals that recommended adding child care centers, an infant care center, an intergenerational center, adult day care, flexible drop-in care, a resource and referral program, and full-time counselors/staff members to address work-family issues. However, despite senior leadership support for several proposals, a lack of resources has blocked all progress in creating any new child, family, and elder care facilities and services during the last 30 years. During this period, our peers added significantly to their portfolios of child care centers and family care services, leaving the University of Maryland far behind. There is currently a plan to develop an infant care center in the East Campus development—an important and greatly needed facility—but this plan is unlikely to be implemented for several years and will benefit a very small number of University families.

In Fall 2009, the four Senate Committees resumed exploring ways to increase family care resources at the University. The committees supported developing comprehensive child and elder care services including on-campus infant/child care centers, an elder care facility, emergency/drop-in care, subsidized child care tuition assistance, resource and referral services, and a family care website. However, given the current economic climate, there was particular interest in investigating family resource and referral services as an important first step. In February 2010, 25 representatives of the four committees met with the owner of a full-service, family care consulting company. The owner, who provides child care and elder care resource and referral services at George Washington University, outlined service options and projected costs of such services for the University of Maryland.

Why Family Care Services?

There is significant need for additional family care services at the University of Maryland. Current economic challenges make it very unlikely that the University will construct and subsidize new child care or elder care facilities in the near future (beyond the proposed infant care center). Moreover, there is substantial demand for a wide range of family care services by faculty, staff, and students who have diverse family structures, child/elder care responsibilities, financial resources, geographic locations, work/study schedules, and work and family concerns. Prospective faculty and students are also seeking child/family care information as they make decisions about whether to come to the University. The need for a broad array of family care services is immediate and ongoing. After significant research, the four Senate Committees determined that the most cost-effective way to begin to address this need and serve the greatest number of campus community members is the establishment of a Family Care Resource and Referral Service.

It could be argued that individuals have a responsibility to research these family care options on their own. However, there is clear evidence that time spent investigating child/elder care resources and attempting to resolve family care problems often diverts faculty/staff from their work and students from their studies for considerable periods of time. Offering the expertise of a professional

child and elder care counselor will help families to focus their research and problem-solving and take greater control over their family care situations. The Service will not only enhance individual and unit productivity, but will also be an important step toward achieving the University's goal of establishing a more equitable, inclusive, and supportive campus environment.

Proposal

We propose that the University establish a Family Care Resource and Referral Service comparable to those offered at many of our peer institutions. The Service would provide the following to University faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduates at no charge:

1) Child care and parenting seminars on topics such as: choosing quality child care centers, identifying and hiring home day care providers (interviewing, licensure, background/ complaint checks), preparing for infant care, selecting summer camps, selecting after-school programs, preparing school-age children for independent care, obtaining child care for children with special needs, balancing work and family demands, and other parenting topics.

2) Elder care seminars on topics such as: assessing the needs of aging parents and relatives, selecting elder caregivers, housing options for the elderly, family communication and its impact on elder care, coping with caregiver burden, and selecting high quality nursing homes and assisted living arrangements.

3) Consultations (one-on-one, in person or via the telephone) to identify and evaluate the family's child care or elder care needs, options, and resources, and to provide assistance in locating optimal care arrangements.

4) Website that provides best practices in selecting child and elder care services, recommended family care resource materials, and links to area child care/elder care referral websites and daycare licensing standards (e.g., Maryland, DC, northern Virginia).

5) Educational materials to assist University students and employees in making informed child care and elder care choices (e.g., low-cost pamphlets).

Consultant Option
One option to provide these services, particularly initially, is to hire a consulting company on a renewable annual contract, put out for re-bid each year. It is essential that family care resource and referral staff have extensive knowledge of child care and elder care issues affecting students, faculty, and staff, as well as professional experience with local care services, care networks, care assessment, and related legal issues. The consultant's work may eventually be transitioned to a University staff member or members. Decisions about the best provider(s) of these services should follow an annual evaluation of the Resource and Referral Service (see Evaluation below).

Cost
The total cost of launching the Resource and Referral Service will depend on who provides the services and factors such as the number of seminars, number of one-on-one consultations, cost of

the new website, and expenditures for low-cost educational materials. However, based on services provided at George Washington University, an investment of $80,000 to $85,000 per year (budgeted annually) should provide:

- At least 12 seminars, including informational packets for all participants
- 240 personal consultations (generally two, one-hour sessions per family; consultations will be equitably divided among faculty, staff and students in the first year; additional consultations will be available for a fee)
- Website design, launch, and maintenance
- Low-cost child/elder care pamphlets for at least 2,000 campus community members

Evaluation
Seminar attendance, seminar evaluations, and records of one-on-one consultations are among the data that will be tracked by the service provider. A comment/suggestion box on the family care website will also be established. In addition, an ad hoc Committee on Family Care (see below) will be charged with analyzing evaluation data from the service provider and conducting an independent assessment of first year use of the Family Care Resource and Referral Service. This evaluation will enable the University to determine the desired mix of services (e.g., seminars, consultations) for subsequent years, allocate consultations equitably to campus constituencies, and expand or reduce specific family care services based on their use and perceived value.

Committee on Family Care
The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) will appoint an ad hoc Committee on Family Care, including representatives of the Faculty Affairs, Staff Affairs, Student Affairs, and Human Relations Committees, to oversee implementation and evaluation of the Family Care Resource and Referral Service. The committee will present an annual evaluation of the Service to the SEC, as well as recommend future child and elder care initiatives for the campus.

Who Will Benefit?

A significant fraction of the university community—including students, faculty, and staff—will be direct beneficiaries of the Family Care Resource and Referral Service. These individuals will acquire knowledge and problem-solving strategies to effectively address child and elder care needs, enabling them to devote more time to study, teaching, research/scholarship, service, and family activities. Chairs, directors, and staff supervisors who attend family care seminars may also increase their capacity to guide unit members in resolving work-family problems.

The University will also benefit. Based on previous research and reports from peer institutions, the Service should improve faculty and staff recruitment and retention, boost productivity, lower absenteeism, reduce turnover, and improve students' degree completion rates. Graduate student parents who receive child care assistance may become more confident of their ability to balance work and family demands, increasing their interest in research university careers. The proposed website will broadly communicate the University's commitment to promoting a family-friendly environment. Finally, establishing a Family Care Resource and Referral Service will move the University closer to achieving parity with its peers and support its goals of excellence, equity, and inclusion endorsed in our Strategic Plan.

References

1. Aumann, K., & Galinsky, E. (2009). The State of Health in the American Workforce. 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce. New York: Families and Work Institute. Retrieved March 3, 2010 from: http://www.familiesandwork.org/site/research/reports/HealthReport.pdf

2. Catalyst. (2009, April). Working Parents: Parents in the Labor Force. Retrieved February 28, 2010 from: http://www.catalyst.org/publication/252/working-parents

3. National Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies. (2010). Working Mothers Need Child Care. Retrieved March 1, 2010 from: http://www.naccrra.org/policy/background_issues/working-mothers-need-child-care

4. Galinsky, E. (2010, January). State of the Union: Don't Lose the Family Amidst the Headlines. New York: Families and Work Institute. Retrieved March 3, 2010 from: http://familiesandwork.org/blog/2010/01/27/don%E2%80%99t-lose-the-family-in-the-headlines-about-the-state-of-the-union/

5. Mason, M.A., Goulden, M. & Frasch, K. (2009). Why Graduate Students Reject the Fast Track. *Academe, 95(1),* 1-8.

6. Goulden, M., Mason, M.A., & Wolfinger, N. (2005). Do Babies Matter: Refining Gender Equity in the Academy. In Mentoring for Academic Careers in Engineering (pages 89-105). Santa Barbara: Grayphics Publishing.

7. University of Iowa Gender Equity Task Force. (2006, May 1). Gender Equity at the University of Iowa. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa.

8. Shellenback, K. (2004). Child Care and Parent Productivity: Making the Business Case. Linking Economic Development and Child Care Research Project. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University/Cornell Cooperative Extension.

9. National Child Care Information Center. (no date). Employer-Supported Child Care. Retrieved March 2, 2010 from: http://www.nncc.org/EO/nccic.employercc.doc.pdf

Appendix

**Items Reviewed by the Senate Faculty Affairs, Staff Affairs, Student Affairs,
and Human Relations Committees during their Research**

- 1995 PCWI Summary of Child Care Needs and Issues from 1974-1994
- Proposal for Drop-In Child Care, submitted by the PCWI Child Care Committee, chaired by Elizabeth Platz in 1995
- Survey Results from the 1995 PCWI Child Care Committee's Inter-Campus Child Care Survey, sent to 36 Universities with an 80% return rate
- 1998 Intergenerational Task Force Strategic Plan, with the goal of creating a University Intergenerational Care Center to address issues and needs of individuals from infancy through senior life
- 1998 Women's Resource Guide, prepared by the 1997-1998 PCWI, with listing of current resource programs
- "Task Force Aims to Establish Campus Intergenerational Day Care Center," Outlook news article from March 9, 1999
- List of priorities for the 2000-2001 academic year, which included Intergenerational Care, prepared by Larissa Grunig, Chair of PCWI
- Research on Child Care and Elder Care Services at Peer Institutions gathered by PCWI in 2000
- Minutes of October 3, 2001 PCWI meeting at which President Mote described plans for a potential family care center that would accommodate120 children and 10 elderly adults
- List of priorities for the 2001-2002 academic year, which included an Intergenerational Care Center and Creation of a Staff Person to address Family Care Services, prepared by Larissa Grunig, Chair of PCWI
- Excerpts from the Recommendations of the Quality of Working Life Coordinating Group's Benefits and Services Survey Subcommittee, submitted by Chair Judith Broida on May 25, 2001. Recommendations included: 1) Developing at least one child care facility on or near campus, or minimally, contracting with a private child care provider, and 2) Developing a comprehensive Resource and Referral Service for adult care
- Child care presentation submitted by Bright Horizons Family Solutions at a Child Care Center Retreat in August 2002
- Research on Peer Institutions' Child/Family Care Services and expectations for the vendor, parameters, staffing, fee structures, and other considerations for a center by the PCWI Day Care Committee in 2002
- Request for a Child Care Center site approval and approval to proceed with a Request for Proposal (RFP) reviewed by the Facilities Council in 2002
- "Little Relief for Student Parents," Diamondback news article from 2005
- Survey Results of UM and Peer Institutions' Family Friendly Policies submitted in Fall 2005 by the Family Friendly Task Force

Transforming General Education at the University of Maryland

Report of the General Education Task Force

to the Senior Vice President for

Academic Affairs and Provost and the

Chair of the University Senate

March 2010

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

The program in General Education proposed in this report has its origins in *Transforming Maryland* (See Appendix 1), the University's new strategic plan. The Chair of the University Senate and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost subsequently created and charged the Task Force on General Education. Together they called for a new vision of General Education to ground, inspire, and challenge faculty and students at the University of Maryland. The plan of General Education outlined below addresses that charge. It is innovative yet conservative, exacting yet flexible, practical yet visionary, and dynamic rather than static. It requires intellectual mastery and agility from students and ingenuity and commitment from faculty. Above all, it speaks to the changing character of the University and points to its future, drawing on the University's historic strengths and reflecting its long-term aspirations.

Undergraduates entering the University of Maryland in the twenty-first century will find an educational experience of unprecedented variety in a University that is constantly expanding and enriching knowledge and understanding through new works of art, cutting-edge scholarship, and innovative research. They also will discover that education at the University of Maryland is no longer only a campus-centered experience, but one whose borders extend to all portions of the globe. Students in this new era will be asked, early and often, to engage with that larger universe by acquiring new skills and understandings. Overall, the General Education program outlined in this proposal will prepare students both for this new "multi-verse" of learning and for a demanding and constantly changing world beyond graduation. It will provide them with necessary skills and basic knowledge, complement and expand the University's course offerings, and connect students more fully to the intellectual community of the Maryland-Washington area, the nation, and the world beyond.

The Goals of a General Education at the University of Maryland

General Education at the University of Maryland has many parts because the University of Maryland has many missions. Among its goals, General Education should:

- develop the skills necessary for all students to succeed in their academic careers and professional lives by enabling them to write clearly, speak effectively, and reason analytically.
- complement and strengthen students' major areas of study.
- hone students with a broad view of civilizations past and present.
- enhance the ability of students to thrive both intellectually and materially, and to support themselves, their families, and their community through a broad understanding of the world in which they live and work.
- engage students in defining the ethical imperatives necessary to create a just society, in their own communities and in the larger world.

To achieve these goals, General Education should provide students a broad exposure to different disciplines, improve the students' fundamental academic skills, and strengthen students' commitment to using their knowledge and abilities to better themselves and others. In short,

General Education will prepare the students of the University of Maryland to participate fully in a world that is perpetually changing and will differ from the world they know.

***

As a primary goal, a General Education should provide students with breadth of knowledge and disciplinary diversity. It should allow students to explore unfamiliar fields and ignite new intellectual and professional passions through traditional disciplines, established interdisciplinary programs, and emergent trans-disciplinary fields. General Education should expose students to the arts, humanities, the social and natural sciences, and to the multiple combinations of these approaches to knowledge, sparking new connections and insights within and outside each student's specialty. Opening students to diverse areas of study expands their imagination and encourages them to probe contemporary problems as well as age-old dilemmas. General Education cracks the door open to the world beyond the university and provides students an opportunity to address the most basic questions of human existence. While preparing students for the future, it arms them with the long view of history.

Fostering intellectual dexterity is another goal of General Education. Intellectual dexterity grows not only from mastering a broad range of subjects, but also from understanding the many ways knowledge is produced. The adroit shifting of perspectives, the wielding of a variety of analytical tools, the ability to discern connections — these are scholarly resources for meeting the challenge of change. Rigorous and varied intellectual experiences teach students to evaluate a broad range of knowledge, to recognize what they do not know, to ask penetrating and fruitful questions, to locate existing answers, and to design research protocols that might generate new ways of thinking. In these processes, students become aware of how existing assumptions, theories, technologies, and modes of interpretation can guide, expand--but also limit--knowledge. Students in General Education develop the discipline to postpone conclusions, to seek out and listen carefully to alternative or even opposing arguments, and to examine problems from different perspectives as they formulate their own positions.

Of necessity, education is destabilizing. Exposure to different disciplines reveals the particularity of the histories, cultures, and communities that shape each individual. Through disciplinary studies, students come to appreciate that their set of assumptions, values, and commitments constitutes only one set among many possibilities. They begin to recognize as belief what they once took to be fact, as transient what they once took to be permanent, and as contingent what they once took as certain. The self-questioning that is stimulated by broad learning can liberate individuals to make choices for their lives, to commit and to recommit themselves to values that emerge from conscious assessment of the world as it is.

Aside from specific disciplinary studies, General Education has another essential goal. It should ensure that students have the basic skills in written and oral communication and in mathematical analysis that are critical to their success across the curriculum and in their professional lives. The ability to write and speak clearly and forcefully and the competence to understand and employ analytical reasoning are necessary for all University of Maryland graduates. Success requires both sets of skills, as the earlier radical division between the arts and sciences has ceased to exist. Critical thinking begins with mastery of words and numbers.

In addition, General Education should promote self-understanding and understanding of others. It should endow students with the resources required to thrive, not just as individuals, but also as members of families, local communities, and the larger world. It should remind them that they are the inheritors of vast storehouses of knowledge. It sharpens their awareness of the consequences, intended and unintended, of previous generations' decisions and, by so doing, alerts them to the significance of their own choices. Placing at students' disposal the best ideas and deepest insights that human civilizations have yet produced, General Education invites them to become knowledgeable as well as ethical citizens of the world.

The University of Maryland, with its global reach, diverse student body, outstanding faculty, and proximity to Washington, Annapolis, and Baltimore is uniquely situated to fulfill the imperatives of a broad-based General Education. Drawing on the University's connections to the capitals of both the United States and the state of Maryland, to the offices of numerous national and international associations and resources such as the National Institutes of Health, the Smithsonian Institution, Dumbarton Oaks, the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, the Library of Congress, and the National Archives, the University offers students the opportunity to make history themselves. Real life experience, collaborative learning, and intellectual engagement with these resources and the vast expanse of human accomplishments they embody allow students at the University of Maryland to take the challenges of global leadership.

The following report details the components of the General Education program proposed by the task force to achieve these general goals. It is divided into the following sections covering the major features of the new model.

    I.   Fundamental Studies

    II.   Distributive Studies

    III.   Signature "I'" Series Courses

    IV.   Diversity and Cultural Competency

    V.   Experiential Learning

I. FUNDAMENTAL STUDIES

The primary function of General Education is to assure that students at the University of Maryland can write clearly, speak effectively, and reason quantitatively and analytically. In formulating its plan of General Education, the Task Force has ratcheted up the requirements in writing and mathematics and added a requirement in oral communication.

A. The Writing Requirement

Goals of the Writing Requirement

The Task Force recognizes the importance of writing in every dimension of a university student's education. Writing facilitates learning, reinforces cognitive skills, engages the student's commitment to the subject matter, provides a vehicle for intellectual independence and creativity, and helps in the assessment of a student's progress. Written texts are in fact perhaps the most visible products of an undergraduate education. At the same time writing skills are equally critical to the next phase of a student's life—whether in the workplace or in further education. Employers often solicit evidence of an applicant's writing skills, while success and promotion in a career often depend on writing ability as well as on other communication skills. Graduate and professional schools also require evidence of writing proficiency. It is not surprising, then, that *Transforming Maryland* highlights the crucial importance of writing in an undergraduate education and that, in their charge to the Task Force, the Senate President and the Provost called for increased attention to writing.

The Current Writing Requirement

Under CORE, students are required to fulfill a two-course writing requirement, taking both Academic Writing (English 101), optimally within their first year at the University, and Professional Writing in their junior or senior year (after earning 60 credits). A first-year writing course, preparing students for college-level work, has existed at Maryland in various forms almost since the University began. Professional Writing was created in the early 1980s. Its courses have two purposes: to strengthen students' writing skills and to prepare them for writing in the workplace.

- **Academic Writing** (English 101) exists in a standard version and in several specialized variants offered in a few sections each: 101A, a four-credit course with smaller classes for students who need more intensive instruction; 101X for students whose second language is English; 101H for Honors students; 101S for students in College Park Scholars programs. There are also special sections for students in the Civicus and the Markets and Society learning communities.
- **Professional Writing** offers several courses designed to serve distinct groups of students (e.g., English 391, Advanced Writing; 392, Legal Writing; 393, Technical Writing; 394, Business Writing; and 395, Writing in the Health Care Professions). In the last four years, Professional Writing has developed courses for students with distinct specialties (e.g., English 398A, Writing in the Arts; and English 398N, Writing for Non-Profits)

<u>Recommendation</u>

The Task Force recommends retaining the requirement that students take both Academic and Professional Writing. A two-course writing requirement is standard at peer institutions including the universities of California (Berkeley), Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, and Stanford as well as many other large research-intensive universities. Institutions differ in the specific courses offered to meet the requirement. Professional schools and accreditation agencies in some fields also require students to have taken six credits of writing.

The Task Force also recommends that the Professional Writing Program offer more of the targeted courses in the 398 series (e.g., "Writing for Non-Profits," "Writing Case Studies").

These courses generate high student-instructor interaction and positive student engagement and are likely sites of the increased interaction with external agencies called for in the Strategic Plan. These courses could be increased by substituting them for the current generic English 391. The academic writing program should also enhance its offerings, especially in light of the recommended changes to the exemption structure described below. Writing courses at the 200-level (such as the newly created English 298, "Writing in a Wireless World") could be created for students who are now exempted from English 101. These variations on existing courses will, however, require development and oversight, and they should have the attention and guidance of a University-wide Writing Board (see below).

The Existing Exemption Structure

A faculty member at the University of Maryland has been credited with saying that there is "no one at the University of Maryland who cannot write better" and that "the only way to learn how to write is to write." These truisms are borne of long experience. Yet, under the current rules, students can be exempted from the Academic Writing Requirement if they have an SAT verbal score of 670 or a score of 4 or above on the AP English Composition Test. Approximately 30 percent of each year's entering class is exempted from the requirement in these ways. Transfer students can be exempt from the requirement with an equivalent course at another institution.

Students are currently exempted from the Professional Writing Requirement if they earn an "A" in English 101. Transfer students are exempt if they earn an "A" in a course equivalent to 101 or have taken an equivalent advanced writing course, so many students graduate from the University with only one writing course—one that may have been taken at another University.

Significantly, the process of eliminating exemptions from the upper-division requirement is already underway. The College of Engineering allows no exemptions from Professional Writing on the basis of an "A" in 101 or other first-year writing course. The Smith School of Business strongly recommends that students take the second course. In the case of English 101, testimony from the Academic Council for the Student Government Association strongly endorsed removal of exemptions from English 101, citing as a reason the necessary academic writing skills taught in the first-year course. Other schools, from Penn State to Michigan to Yale, allow no exemption from first-year writing.

<u>Recommendation</u>

The Task Force therefore recommends removing the exemption based on SAT score from English 101-Academic Writing. The Task Force also recommends removing the exemption from Professional Writing on the basis of an "A" in English 101. Exemptions from 101 on the basis of a score of 4 or more on the AP English composition test or a score of 4 or 5 on the IB extended essay would remain, as would exemptions from both courses on the basis of transfer credit.

A further rationale for removing the "A" exception from Professional Writing derives from the fact that the two courses have different goals. While both aim to improve students'

writing skills, the lower-level requirement should prepare students for academic writing, and the upper-division requirements should reinforce students' writing skills and begin to prepare them for writing after graduation. Research suggests that students' writing skills decline over four years of college unless those skills are explicitly reinforced, and upper-division writing requirements are strategically placed to provide such reinforcement. Further, awareness that an "A" exempts students from the upper-division course puts pressure on 101 teachers and skews students' expectations. The most serious negative consequence of this "A" exemption structure is that it sends the signal that writing is a fixed ability, mastered at one time, rather than a skill that requires development and reinforcement. Writing ability is challenged with each new genre and situation.

Writing Center Services

The Writing Center offers targeted help on writing assignments to undergraduates. While the Center originated as an adjunct to both the upper- and lower-division writing courses, it has been expanded under its current Director, Leigh Ryan, to serve students in any course. The Center is staffed largely by undergraduate tutors (who are first trained in a tutoring course with an internship component) and by graduate students hired and trained by the Director. The Writing Center frequently runs at full capacity, much above the national norm of 75 percent capacity for such Centers. It allows students to register on-line for appointments or to drop in for a session.

Instructors in all courses have a valuable instructional resource in the Writing Center because they can recommend that individual students go there for help; course instructors are notified afterward about tutoring sessions and the material covered. Students report high satisfaction with the help they receive. The Center's services are especially valuable to the large number of "Second Language Writers" on campus. Second Language Writers are not necessarily international students. They are instead an uncounted group of students, often permanent residents or citizens, for whom English is not the primary language spoken at home. A recent survey of students in English 101 suggests that approximately 20 percent of those students are Second Language Writers. Their writing challenges vary from the minor to the significant.

Recommendation

The Task Force recommends that the Writing Center expand by offering a new type of service in the form of Course Tutors. Current policy dictates that the Center tutor only individual students who seek its services. However, at the request of an instructor and depending on enrollment, tutors could be assigned to work with students throughout a particular course, providing help for all the stages of planning, drafting, and revision of assignments. This service could be targeted at courses fulfilling Distributive Studies requirements to help students improve their writing skills. Course tutors could be former students of the course to which they are assigned. Tutors who are new to the course could be required to sit in on lectures. Required or recommended tutoring sessions could be incorporated in the course syllabi.

Outreach and Reinforcement

In its current configuration, the Writing Program has no direct or continuing contact with the faculty members across campus who are assigning and responding to students' writing. However, staff from the Program recently proposed the creation of a campus-wide <u>Writing Board</u>. The Board is to provide a forum in which Writing Program directors can hear faculty concerns about the quality of student writing and about the expectations that faculty have for certain types of assignments. At the same time, the Program staff could explain their goals and adjust their offerings to meet the evolving expectations of faculty. Many other benefits could come from regular meetings of such a group. The Dean of Arts and Humanities and the Provost have approved the creation of a Writing Board and it is now in the process of being composed. It will begin to meet in the spring 2010. The Board will include representatives from half of the schools and colleges on campus.

<u>Recommendation</u>

The Task Force supports the Writing Board as a promising source of outreach for the Writing Programs and a means for creating a culture of attention to writing on campus. Such a site for collaboration between Writing Program specialists and faculty in other disciplines could lead to creative new models for increasing the amount and quality of writing that students produce throughout their years at Maryland. Similar boards already exist at many peer Research I Universities (for example, the universities of Michigan, Minnesota, and Stanford have Writing Boards), which enhance undergraduate education. The University of Maryland can create its own model of enriched writing instruction through such a forum.

Writing courses that fulfill the Fundamental Studies requirement should offer students intense, targeted, and even individualized instruction. But new technologies have expanded the kinds of writing required in the classroom and the workplace, as well as their modes of distribution. So in addition, the required writing courses should be enhanced to ensure that students taking these courses also practice composing in online environments. These new settings often require "multi-modal" documents combining visual and often even audio and video components.

Beyond the dedicated writing courses, students need sustained guidance and practice to maintain and improve their writing skills. To that end, the Task Force recommends that courses fulfilling Distributive Studies Requirements--especially I-courses (see below)--be targeted as sites of experimentation with various forms of writing instruction. It is especially important to give students experience with forms of writing that exercise the unique methods of argumentation and verification used in different disciplines. Although a majority of students are unlikely to pursue graduate work, their exposure to discipline-specific writing will enhance their career preparation. Such written genres are best introduced by instructors from individual fields and disciplines, while the more generic skills of organization, coherence, sentence form, and editing can be reinforced throughout the undergraduate curriculum. It is not enough, however, simply to assign writing; specific guidance and feedback are also needed in these disbursed settings. New models of writing to ensure effective writing instruction in all settings could include the following:

- Linked Courses: I-courses (see below) could feature concurrent enrollment in sections of Academic Writing or with newly developed writing courses at the 200-level that could fulfill the first-year writing requirement.
- Special sections of Professional Writing could be taught in the English 398 series, cross-listed as courses in other departments and taught by instructors in those departments who interact with the existing Professional Writing program.
- Graduate tutors or advanced undergraduate writing tutors, who are majors in a discipline and who have been trained in the Writing Center, could be attached to large lecture sections of Distributive Studies courses. They could provide special tutorials in the writing skills required in that course and could coach students through all stages of their assignments.
- The Writing Board would also provide a natural site for planning new methods for reinforcing students' writing skills throughout their four years at Maryland.

B. The Oral Communication Requirement

Goals of Oral Communication

Effective oral communication is a goal of General Education. In additional to good writing skills, students should also develop their skills at communicating orally in situations that call for either prepared or extemporaneous presentations. Skills at listening and speaking support success in personal relationships, educational undertakings, professional advancement, and civic engagement. Even the brightest applicants cannot get the job if they perform poorly in an interview and even the most industrious employees cannot advance if they cannot explain their work and even the most concerned citizens cannot make their case—in Parent-Teacher Associations, faculty Senate, or the US Congress—if they cannot explain themselves. Human relationships, from the most formal to the most intimate, rest in large measure on skilled listening and effective speaking.   Experience has demonstrated that oral communication can be enhanced by systematic instruction.

Recognizing the centrality of oral communication for success in life, many of the University's peers have instituted an oral communication requirement, as have some Departments and Colleges at the University of Maryland. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, for instance, includes an oral communication course among its general education requirements. Here at the University of Maryland, the College of Business and Management requires COMM 107 of all its majors and the College of Journalism likewise has its own communication requirement. In addition, many of the science and engineering departments have embedded some form of oral presentation into required courses.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that students at the University of Maryland could represent themselves much more effectively if their oral communication skills were stronger. An informal survey of officials in multiple colleges revealed a unanimous sense that the University is failing its students in this regard. Some reported that students who had survived fellowship competitions to the final round, for instance, failed because of poor performance in face-to-face

interviews. The Task Force recommends all students be required to take a course in oral communication.

Recommendation

       The Task Force recommends the establishment of a requirement of one oral communication course for all undergraduates. The requirement could be satisfied in a number of ways. Existing courses can be expanded and new courses can be created.

- Communication 107, Oral Communication: Principles and Practices, which already serves nearly half of the undergraduates at the University of Maryland.
- The College of Journalism has agreed to reformulate an existing oral communication course, currently taught to majors, for the proposed oral communication requirement.
- The Theatre Department has indicated a willingness to create a class to fulfill the University's General Education requirement in Oral Communication. The course would be appropriate for students from any college or enrolled in any major. It would challenge students to explore multiple facets of the art of effective communication.
- The Department of Hearing and Speech has indicated a similar interest. The course will address topics including the physical production of the voice, effective listening, clarity of articulation, intercultural communication, and effective rhetorical strategies.
- The Task Force expects that other departments might mount courses in oral communication that could also satisfy the requirement.

Oral Communication across the Curriculum

       Like writing and computation, the ability to communicate effectively through speech is not acquired all at once or forever. It is a skill that can always be improved and that must be practiced to remain sharp. As such, it is a skill that the Task Force believes should be woven consistently through the general education curriculum, so that graduates have matured as oral communicators.   The value of practice in this area has moved the Task Force to include oral communication as an enrichment factor to its list of courses that satisfy the Distributive Studies requirements, and the Task Force urges all colleges and departments to continue offering every opportunity for majors to present their research orally and participate in group discussions.

Implementation of Oral Communication

       The Task Force recommends the creation of a committee chaired by the Dean for Undergraduate Studies and composed of a member from each of the departments that teach Oral Communication; members of the committee will be appointed by the deans of said departments. The committee would be responsible for overall administration of the Oral Communication Fundamental Studies requirement.

       The committee would be charged initially with developing a set of learning outcomes common to all courses that could be taken to satisfy the requirement. Courses could have specialized learning outcomes in addition to the basic set, in order to focus on a variety of different aspects of oral communication. The Committee would be responsible for evaluating

and approving a sufficient number of existing and new courses to meet the needs of students. The committee would also be responsible for on-going course oversight. This oversight should consist of a variety of different assessments, including but not limited to learning outcomes assessments, student evaluations, and observations. Rather than a set distribution of courses among departments, some flexibility should be built in so that courses that are working well could be expanded, and courses that are not meeting student needs could be revamped or removed.

Recognizing that students enter the University with a range of experience in oral communication, the Task Force recommends the development of a student skills assessment tool. Students would use this to identify strengths and weaknesses, and it would serve to point students towards the courses that would provide the greatest benefit.

C. The Mathematics Requirement

Goals of the Mathematics Requirement

Like prose and speech, mathematics is a language that people use to communicate, to solve problems, to engage in recreation, and to create works of art and mechanical tools. It is a language of words, numbers, and symbols that are at times interrelated and interdependent and at other times disjointed and autonomous.

The goal of the Mathematics Requirement at the University of Maryland is to convey the power of mathematics demonstrated by the variety of problems that can be modeled and solved by quantitative means. Ability in mathematics is a critical measure of how well Maryland students are prepared for meeting the challenges they will face in their lives beyond school.

Reading and comprehending mathematics is a multifaceted task because the reader is challenged to acquire comprehension and mathematical understanding with fluency and proficiency in the interpretation of numbers and symbols, in addition to words. Courses that now fulfill the fundamental studies requirement cover data analysis, systems of equations and inequalities, elementary linear algebra, the mathematics of finance, and probability. Existing courses' requirements include applications of these topics to problem-solving and decision-making in economics, management, and the natural and social sciences.

The Current Mathematics Requirement

Under the current Mathematics Fundamental Studies requirement every student is required to pass one of the following courses with a grade of D (1.0) or better: MATH110 (Elementary Mathematical Models), MATH111 (Introduction to Probability), MATH112 (College Algebra with Applications and Trigonometry), MATH113 (College Algebra with Applications), MATH115 (Pre-Calculus), STAT100 (Introduction to Statistics and Probability), or any MATH or STAT course for which any of the courses listed above is a prerequisite.

Undergraduates are required to attempt the Fundamental Studies Mathematics requirement within their first 30 credits, and to complete the requirement by 60 credits. Exemptions from the Mathematics Requirement include:

- AP [Advanced Placement] score of 4 or above in Calculus AB or BC; OR
- AP score of 4 or above in Statistics; OR
- CLEP [College Level Examination Program] Calculus Exam score of 50 or higher.

Description of Courses

MATH 110 is considered to be the basic course for the fulfillment of the Mathematics Fundamental Studies requirement. This course and other basic courses in mathematics that can be used to fulfill the Mathematics requirement are:

- MATH 110: Elementary Mathematical Models: Strongly recommended for students who do not take a suitable mathematics course to satisfy a major requirement, for example students in the College of Arts and Humanities. The great majority of students satisfy the requirement without taking MATH 110.
- MATH 111: Introduction to Probability: Prepares students to take more advanced probability courses.
- MATH 112: College Algebra with Applications and Trigonometry: Strongly recommended for students in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, or Life Sciences, and for those needing PHYS141.
- MATH 113: College Algebra with Applications: Strongly recommended for students in Social and Biological Sciences.
- MATH 115: Pre-Calculus: Strongly recommended for students in Engineering, Mathematical and Physical Sciences.

MATH 112, MATH 113, and MATH 115 prepare students to take calculus.

Courses MATH 111, MATH 112, MATH 113, and MATH 115 have double-duty, namely they serve as a way to satisfy the Mathematics Fundamental Studies requirement but, at the same time, prepare students to take more advanced courses in selective areas relevant to their major.

Recommendation

The Task Force recommends:

- Continuing the current three-credit one-course requirement that can be fulfilled by one of the courses listed above.
- Removing the SAT [Scholastic Aptitude Test] exemption from the Mathematics Requirement (current wording of exemption: "SAT Math score 600 or above"). The Scholastic Aptitude Test is a test, specifically a predictor of how well a student will do in college ("indicator of college success" according to the College Board), not a test of competency in a course of study or a body of knowledge. Thus, it is not

> relevant as a course substitute at an institution of higher learning. In contrast, exemptions for AP or CLEP scores are tests based on syllabi for particular courses, and thus are suitable exemptions.
- The Task Force recommends an admissions policy whereby, with rare exceptions, transfers are admitted only if they come in having satisfied the Mathematics Fundamental Studies requirement.

D. The Analytical Reasoning Requirement

Goals of Analytical Reasoning

Fundamental Studies addresses the communication skills of undergraduate students in the writing and speech requirements and their quantitative skills in the mathematics requirement. The Task Force believes Fundamental Studies should also speak to undergraduates' reasoning skills, their ability to think clearly when assessing issues, analyzing information and developing arguments. Such skills are essential since they provide students with a framework for solving both concrete and theoretical problems. Courses that teach such skills are typically labeled "critical thinking" or "analytical reasoning". The Task Force employs the latter term. The American Association of Colleges and Universities provides one rationale for adding such a requirement to Fundamental Studies in its recent survey of what employers expect of college graduates. Eighty-one percent of employers surveyed valued "Critical Thinking and Analytical Reasoning" and fully 75 percent valued "Complex Problem Solving" abilities (see "Raising the Bar: Employers' Views on College Learning in the Wake of the Economic Downturn", January 2010; at 89 percent, Written and Oral Communication Skills had the highest rating).

Although the survey offers welcome confirmation of the utility of an Analytical Reasoning requirement, the rationale for such a requirement can stand on its own merit. Students face a world filled with data in the guise of information. Given trends over the past several decades, the amount of information they will be asked to master is only likely to increase, and when information is filtered through newspapers, public debates, and various official reports, problems of analysis become increasingly complicated. To participate actively rather than passively in society, students must be able to reason incisively and systematically. They must become competent problem solvers, with a full understanding of how meaningful data are appropriately generated, valid inferences drawn and tested, and convincing arguments constructed.

The Analytical Reasoning requirement is also consistent with the two-stage writing requirement recommended by the Task Force. The Task Forces believes two courses are the bare minimum a student needs to develop and to apply writing skills, regardless of major. Some students prove mastery of the first stage (basic academic writing) via AP credit and thus can skip to the second stage. All students need to take Professional Writing, and the proposed changes in General Education push in that direction. The current Mathematics requirement is similar to the first writing stage. Students must demonstrate basic comprehension and mathematical understanding. The new Analytical Reasoning requirement essentially adds a second stage, but broadens it to include not only mathematic but also other forms of reasoning. Mathematics is one way to reason analytically, but there are other systematic ways to develop critical assessment skills. By adding Analytical Reasoning to the current Mathematics Requirement, the new

Fundamental Studies requirement will include a first phase, ensuring that students have basic mathematic skills, and a second stage which enables students either to apply those skills to empirical analysis or to develop sophisticated reasoning abilities. Some majors (as noted below) already include courses in mathematics, statistics, scientific research methods, or logic, so they currently meet this requirement.

Description of Courses

Any course fulfilling the Analytical Reasoning requirement would have the following aims: it would enable students to examine proofs or probable arguments in detail, from identifying initial assumptions and definitions to drawing conclusions. Along the way, they should be able to follow the train of inference. By learning established problem-solving protocols or patterns of reasoning, students would be encouraged to examine problems "frame by frame". They would learn to assess the degree of certainty in a conclusion against the validity of the steps followed and, in the case of applied problems, against the nature and sufficiency of the evidence. Students would be trained to appreciate when the evidence enabling a certain or even a highly probable conclusion is available or not. They would also learn to acknowledge what they do not yet know and what, in some cases, cannot be known given the methods employed. Such Analytical Reasoning is clearly cultivated in higher level mathematics undergraduate courses, but there are other ways to develop analytic reasoning skills. A course in statistics would also fulfill the Analytical Reasoning requirement. Students as voters (and prospective policymakers) are constantly presented with statistics and manipulated data. In order to function as responsible citizens, successful entrepreneurs, and capable leaders, they must understand policy alternatives that are often supported with competing sets of statistics and diverse discursive arguments. As necessary critical equipment, a university graduate should understand how populations are defined and reliably sampled, how definitions are operationalized, and how estimates are generated at different levels of confidence. Similarly, courses that teach students the steps of the scientific method will provide a template for how scientists collect, organize, and evaluate data in an objective manner. Students learn that power and authority are not privileged in the pursuit of knowledge and one needs to be constantly on guard against personal prejudices and faulty procedures.

Courses that examine reasoning discursively (in natural language), as opposed to formally should teach students how to isolate an addressable problem and identify issues in contention, whether they concern facts, definitions, causes, values, policies, or jurisdiction. These courses should also make students aware of the pitfalls in reasoning as they apply to different disciplines.

Analytical Reasoning Requirements at Peer Institutions

Among peer schools, the University of Illinois requires two courses in quantitative reasoning of all students, and the University of North Carolina requires one dedicated course and students may take a second course in quantitative reasoning to satisfy a broader quantitative intensive course. The University of Michigan and University of California, Los Angeles, do not have a two-course requirement, but Yale does, and Harvard University, in its new General Education curriculum, stresses the category of "Empirical and Mathematical Reasoning." By requiring a course in Analytical Reasoning, the University of Maryland would be well within the

norm of its peers.

Recommendation

The Task Force recommends the addition of a one course requirement in Analytical Reasoning. Most of the courses in the CORE category of "Math and Formal Reasoning" (MS), would satisfy this requirement. Students in the Natural Sciences and Engineering typically take further courses in Mathematics, most of which would naturally fulfill this goal. Essentially all majors in the colleges of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Business and Management are required to take a course in statistics and research methods. In the College of Arts and Humanities, students often take "Introduction to Logic" (PHIL 170) or further study in mathematics or statistics. Thus, this requirement is already being met by the majority of our students, and the Task Force believes that all Maryland graduates could profit from the rigor added by such attention to their analytical reasoning skills.

II. THE SIGNATURE OF GENERAL EDUCATION: THE *"I" SERIES*

Goals of the Signature

Transforming Maryland charges the Task Force to create a unique signature—or brand—for General Education at the University of Maryland. The "I" series courses answer this challenge. These courses speak to important ***Issues*** that spark the ***Imagination*** demand ***Intellect, Inspiration,*** and ***Innovation*** and conclude where feasible with real-world ***Implementation.*** The "I" series inverts the common pedagogical pyramid. Rather than starting with a survey of existing knowledge, an "I" course offers Maryland students an opportunity to view large problems from defined disciplinary and interdisciplinary perspectives (for example, African American studies or cognitive studies) or from the perspective of particular fields of study (for example, education and engineering). "I" series courses have two purposes: first to investigate a significant issue in depth and second to understand how particular disciplines and fields of study address problems. How does a biologist, engineer, poet, or sociologist think?

The "I" series serves a number of purposes within the General Education curriculum. In its very name—**Issues, Imagination, Intellect, Investigation, Inspiration, Implementation**—the "I" series reflects its purpose as the signature of the University's General Education curriculum. It begins the process of defining what is unique about education at the University of Maryland and thus embodies and communicates the aims of the entire program. Allowing entering students to wrestle with Big Questions, the series provides a mechanism for all Maryland students to glimpse the utility, elegance, and beauty of different disciplines and to appreciate how such areas of investigation might become the subject of extended study, as a concentration, a major or even as a lifelong commitment.

Description of the Signature "I" Series

"I" series courses are not surveys of particular fields of knowledge. Their goals do not focus primarily on coverage; say, for example, mastery of the basic facts of plant biology, or

early modern history between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries, or the course of romantic poetry. Instead, they provide students with the basic concepts, approaches, and vocabulary of particular disciplines and fields of study as well as an understanding of how experts in those disciplines and fields employ terms, concepts, and approaches. Indeed, while "I" courses ask questions—when did life begin? what is the solution to the energy crisis? how can poverty be abolished?—they do not necessarily attempt to answer them. Rather, they aim to examine the ways in which diverse intellectual traditions and disciplinary protocols address such questions. In short, "I" series courses raise the level of generality and infuse students with the excitement of learning by putting "the good stuff" up front, while offering a practicum that addresses the gritty work of the mind on a matter of significance.

"I" series courses are built around contemporary problems such as economic climacterics, disease pandemics, or state terrorism. But they also can be based on enduring questions about such matters as the nature of political authority and power, the sources of human creativity, diversity and sustainability, or the meaning of freedom and equality. In pursuing these subjects, "I" courses can be linked to experiential learning or to research projects, internships, study abroad programs, or service learning. They can also incorporate transferable skills including writing, oral communication, and use of library and other research technologies.

The "I" series wars against compartmentalization of knowledge. It encourages cross-campus collaboration and interdisciplinary exploration. In the future, it might be possible to link "I" series courses on the biology of human diversity, the politics of human diversity, and the history of human diversity. Other series might speak to the science of sustainability and the politics of sustainability; the literature of the Great Depression and the economics of the Great Depression; or the geology of the landscape and the art of landscape. Students could take one or more of these courses. It also could be possible to link each pair of courses with a third, perhaps a seminar on an allied subject or with English 101 or an appropriate math course. Statistics, for example, could discuss concepts used to meet the challenge of calculating a census, estimating the scope of the slave trade, or determining the possibility of life on another planet. In short, the "I" series might provide a mechanism for interdisciplinary teaching across the campus.

The "I" series encourages students to bring their own interests, knowledge, and experiences to the classroom and to see themselves as active agents of their own education, hence the "I."

***

The "I" courses serve another important purpose. While allowing students to engage matters of enduring significance—the origins of religion, the rise (and fall) of empires, and the struggles for freedom of speech—their flexibility provides a means for faculty and students to address so-called hot topics, such as, for example, sustainability, terrorism, or wellness. While the University has enormous resources to speak to such matters, these often are lodged in specialized, upper-division courses with substantial prerequisites. "Hot topics," however, lend themselves to more general exploration, often across disciplinary lines. The "I" series provides a venue where courses or clusters of courses might address such concerns, even as they are regularized and incorporated into the larger University curriculum.

Implementation of the Signature Courses

The implementation of the "I" series has already begun through a number of pilot courses. In 2009, as this General Education proposal was being developed, the Task Force issued an RFP [Request for Proposals] inviting the faculty to propose "I" courses to be delivered in spring 2010. In December 2009, a second RFP was issued for the academic year 2010-2011. These RFPs serve as a model for the creation of the "I" series (see Appendix 2).

The new General Education plan incorporates "I" courses into Distributive studies under the appropriate categories (see "Distributive Studies" below). It mandates that all University of Maryland students, including transfer students, be required to take at least two "I" courses, which would represent roughly one fourth of Distributive Studies requirements. Meeting that goal will require the campus to mount some eighty "I" courses per semester. This number might be enlarged over time, but the Task Force believes that a minimum of two "I" courses per student would make the "I" series an intellectual signature for the new General Education program.

For reasons of institutional stability, colleges and departments will take ownership of various "I" courses. But it is important that "I" courses be continually renewed, with perhaps 10 to 15 percent removed each academic year and replaced with new entries. This replenishing keeps the corps of "I" courses relevant and fresh and also will allow for participation across the campus. The supervision of this process, along with allied matters of quality control, should fall to the Office of Dean for Undergraduate Studies.

III. DISTRIBUTIVE STUDIES

Proposal for the New Distributive Studies Requirement

Just as Distributive Studies is central in the CORE curriculum, it is the central component in the new vision for General Education. Distributive Studies ensures that all students acquire an exposure to a variety of disciplines even as they concentrate on a chosen field of study. The goal is a "wide-angle" view of the fields of learning, both established and emerging, that are pursued at a major university; however this sampling must be more than cursory. General Education courses should also offer students insights into the methods of the different disciplines, the kinds of questions disciplines ask, and their standards for judging the answers. Courses should provoke in students new perspectives and also challenge students to apply their new understandings.

The New Distributive Studies Requirement and CORE

To meet the goal of a renewed General Education experience, the Task Force builds upon CORE's Distributive Studies protocols, but proposes changes in the number and nature of the courses required. These changes, described below, offer an expansion of the current program, specifically the "I" series (see above) and Experiential Learning and Diversity (see below), but also a simplification, eliminating some subcategories. The aim is to enlarge student choice and

simplify administration by making the Distributive studies requirement more transparent, knowable, and effective.

Overall, the new Distributive Studies requirement meets the enduring goals of a higher education, while at the same time incorporating the advantages that a large, diverse university is uniquely positioned to offer.

Description of the New Distributive Studies Requirement

The new Distributive Studies requirement will, first, preserve the established areas of learning in the arts and humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences that are the essential features of CORE. Students will continue to take courses in these areas of study to fulfill the Distributive Studies requirement. A new fourth area best understood as "Scholarship in Practice" has been added to encourage students to sample courses that put traditional learning into practice. Courses in this area will be those that produce a defined outcome such as a performance, a product, a policy, or an artistic work. Such courses may come from any departmental unit or college in the University. Schools and colleges including Architecture, Agriculture, Business, Education, Engineering, and other applied disciplines, may find this area to be a new niche in General Education that is well suited for their offerings.

Courses in the Distributive Studies areas -- like those in Fundamental Studies and Diversity -- may also count toward the requirements for a student's major, minor, or certificate program. Some courses also will count toward special citations or notations in living-learning programs. For example, an "I" Course on New Media could count (1) as one of two "I" Courses, (2) as one of two courses required for the Scholarship in Practice area of Distributive Studies, and also (3) as an elective needed for the journalism major. This flexibility in how courses may be used will streamline the new General Education program. Although it may appear to be as large as the CORE program, the new proposal offers students many opportunities to choose courses that will satisfy several goals at once.

In the following sections, the Task Force has defined each area in the four new Distributive Studies requirements for all University of Maryland Students.

A. Natural Sciences

This area introduces students to the concepts and methods of the disciplines studying the natural world. It includes courses in the traditional physical and life sciences, environmental science, animal and avian science, and plant science, among others. It also includes a substantial, rigorous laboratory experience.

B. History and Social Sciences

Courses in this area introduce students to history and to the social science disciplines and their combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. It includes courses in criminology, economics, history, psychology, sociology, and other social sciences.

C. Arts, Humanities, and Literature

Students fulfilling this area take courses in the foundational humanities disciplines that study history and the genres of human creativity. It includes courses in literatures in any language, art, art history, classics, history, music, and music history as well as courses in the foundational disciplines of linguistics and philosophy.

D. Scholarship in Practice

In its most general conception, Scholarship in Practice speaks to the process whereby abstract knowledge is transferred into some tangible form. Through courses in this area, students will learn by applying a body of knowledge to create professional products or works of art. Areas such as architecture, business, education, and journalism will offer courses in this area that lead to products such as architectural designs, new technologies, innovative publications, new computer software, business plans, advertising campaigns, and educational curricula. In addition, courses in creative and artistic performance will lead students to produce such works as writing portfolios, plays, operas, dance productions, art exhibits, and creative media. The Scholarship in Practice area also will include competency in speaking and writing in a foreign language. Courses in Scholarship in Practice offer students a chance to innovate by exploring the material basis of ideologies and exposing the ideology upon which material reality rests.

Rationale for the new "Scholarship in Practice" Category

The new fourth area thus reinforces and enhances the foundational portions in the arts and humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences with courses that put these areas of learning into practice. In the fine and applied arts, students learn to tackle the challenges associated with realization of an artistic vision, be it a stage production, symphony or skyscraper. In the language arts, in order to demonstrate competence in a foreign language, a competence that increases in importance every year, students must rewire their internal cognitive function through diligent study and practice. If the ability to communicate a concept, idea, or investigative result, is the objective, students must develop the ability to internalize information and produce compelling curriculum, news stories, or press releases. In the realms of technological innovation and entrepreneurship, this area will serve to strengthen the ability of students to confidently approach and identify sustainable solutions to complex real world challenges facing our nation and world, such as economic development, global poverty and hunger, and responsible management of our natural resources.

Courses in Scholarship in Practice will exercise intellectual skills to complement learning in the liberal arts and sciences. These courses require students to shape and define a desired outcome and to select and combine knowledge from relevant areas of learning to achieve that outcome. They encourage the study and critique or "reverse engineering" of successful models and best practices, as well as an examination of failed attempts. They teach the stages required for the pursuit of a tangible goal through planning, modeling, drafting, testing, revising, perfecting, and assessing. They emphasize the critical need to adjust and adapt a project to the contingencies of time and place and to the particular population involved. Such courses develop and exercise the skills of collaboration required to bring about large-scale outcomes, as well as

the need to convince and recruit others to invest in or accept a new idea or vision. At the same time, courses in Scholarship in Practice foster an awareness of potential impacts of new or altered practices or products, of consequences for those immediately affected, and of distant and future repercussions. Courses in application and production should also teach an appreciation for craftsmanship as well as an ethic of responsible productivity. Overall, they should give students an appreciation for how successful outcomes can be defined and assessed, how feasibility tempers and corrects optimistic intentions, and how realistic achievement requires discipline and hard work.

In addition to fostering students' intellectual development, the new Scholarship in Practice category also supports the overall purpose of the "Distributive Studies" category by expanding students' exposure to the academic endeavors across the large, diverse institution that is the University of Maryland. It would, in particular, correct a current imbalance: while students from the applied disciplines like business and engineering are required under the current requirements to take courses in the humanities and social sciences, students in the humanities and social sciences are rarely exposed to the intellectual synthesizing of the applied disciplines. The overall result of adding this new fourth area will be, in the spirit of the best definitions of a complete education, to foster a more broadly prepared, aware, and academically well-grounded University of Maryland graduate.

Enrichment Features

Courses fulfilling the Distributive Studies requirements should reinforce the Fundamental Studies competencies expected of a Maryland student. Ideally, Distributive Studies courses also will be enriched by addressing broad topical themes, such as globalization, sustainability, the environment, diversity, civic engagement, ethics, and social justice. These elements are likely to change over time and will keep the curriculum fresh and relevant to new students coming through the program. Such enrichment factors will be taken into account as courses are considered for each category within Distributive Studies.

Overview

In brief, the new Distributive Studies program (1) adds a fourth area, Scholarship in Practice, (2) reduces the number of courses required in each area from three to two, (3) eliminates subcategories in each of the areas, (4) requires that two of the courses fulfilling Distributive Studies be I-courses, and (5) incorporates enrichment features that help equip students to engage in an ever-changing global environment.

Taken together, the proposed Distributive Studies curriculum creates requirements that will be simpler to understand and easier to implement. The new Distributive Studies requirement offers greater transparency to students, advisors, faculty, and administrators. It makes the major divisions of learning visible to students, while offering fewer impediments to fulfilling those categories. It simplifies the task of advisors counseling students to plan their course selection efficiently since it requires the filling of fewer categories. The removal of subcategories also gives faculty a broader target for designing courses and clarifies the task of administrators providing seats.

The Task Force also believes that the proposed Distributive Studies program has other advantages for students. First, it will allow students to stay within a single academic field when fulfilling an area requirement by taking a basic course and a second course. Second, the new requirement may also assist students who have yet to decide upon a major by offering greater variety among the disciplines. This variety also could stimulate the intellectually adventurous to develop a concentration or even a second major. Finally, the greater freedom in course selection is also likely to expedite the student's time to degree.

From a departmental perspective, the reduction in overall credit hours required to fulfill Distributive Studies also returns more "curricular space," allowing more control in setting major requirements. At the same time, it reduces any one department's burden for providing seats for General Education, and thus frees resources to serve students in the major. From the University's perspective, the new Distributive Studies requirements will spread the responsibility for staffing General Education courses across the campus, reducing the disproportionate burden now carried by some colleges and departments. This new approach will involve all the colleges and schools, as well as all the disciplines and areas of practice they represent, in a way that is more representative of the University as a whole. In this way, broader participation in General Education can create a sense of a common enterprise in which all participate.

The most important consequence of the proposed changes, however, should be a better education of the kind that the University, as a community of active scholars, can provide.

- Students must complete two courses in each area for a total of eight courses in Distributive Studies. One of the courses in the Natural Sciences must include a laboratory experience.
- Two of the eight courses must be "I" series courses. AP credit may not be used to satisfy "I" courses.
- Advanced Placement credit for distributive studies is limited to six of the eight courses. At least two of the courses must be taken at the University of Maryland, College Park.
- Coursework within one's major area is permitted to satisfy the major and General Education requirements.
- Students may take a two-course series in one discipline.
- Distributive Studies courses do not necessarily have to be at the 100-200 levels, but they should have no prerequisites outside Distributive Studies to satisfy General Education requirements.
- A Diversity requirement may be fulfilled by a course that is approved for both a Diversity category and for a Distributive Studies category (see below).
- Distributive Studies courses that include an internship, research or service-learning project may be used to meet any Distributive Studies requirement.

Implementation of the New Distributive Studies Requirement

Implementation of this new Distributive Studies requirement will necessitate careful planning as the University transitions from the existing CORE to the new General Education. While the Task Force is not equipped to detail exactly how this transition will take place, a

process for implementation and long term oversight is outlined at on pp. 57-60. As new courses are proposed for the new Distributive Studies areas, their selection can be guided by learning outcomes adapted from the current CORE Area Outcomes (see Appendix 3).

IV. DIVERSITY

Goals of the Diversity Requirement

"Diversity is in our DNA," President Mote recently declared in reaffirming the University's commitment to developing and maintaining a student body that mirrors the composition of American society. *Transforming Maryland* also underscores that goal, one that is relevant not only for the University's student body, but also for its faculty, for its curriculum, and for many of its most respected research programs. With that commitment, the University consciously separated itself from a portion of its past, for the aspirations it now represents were not always present. For most of its history, the University of Maryland formally barred African American and women students and discouraged other minorities from enrolling. It denied people of color and women a place on the faculty and created a curriculum that failed to recognize the experiences of women and minorities. But if the University was once a site of exclusion, it has also been on the frontlines of the struggle against "separate but equal." In struggling to transform itself from a segregated academy into one of the most diverse institutions of higher education in the world, the University has embraced the mission of inclusion to be a university for the people and of the people.

Because the University of Maryland is constantly striving to be a truly diverse, multicultural institution, it must continually reassess and improve its curriculum to address the realities of a world in which diversity is now the rule and difference is normative.

Charting new territory in Higher Education is always difficult and not without its dangers. But as recent events on campus, the neighboring community, and the nation at large indicate the need for a meaningful diversity requirement has never been more important. The twentieth-century's most heinous crimes against humanity were founded in the twisted perceptions of human difference. As the United States again becomes an immigrant society, difference has become a constitutive part of American life. Changes in American society parallel global changes, as men and women throughout the world rush to escape rising tides of genocidal violence or simply try to improve their lives and those of their loved ones. Everywhere the number of pluralistic societies has grown and with them the tensions that multiculturalism often engenders. University of Maryland students can expect to live and work with people who are different from themselves in multiple ways. The Task Force believes general education must prepare students for that reality.

The Diversity Requirement in CORE

In mandating that students examine their own "ideas and values in the light of an unfamiliar intellectual or social context," the CORE diversity requirement speaks precisely to the needs of Maryland students (see Appendix 4). However, over the years, the original purposes of

CORE's Diversity requirement have become blurred, in part because of CORE's very success in creating a multicultural curriculum. At present, fully one-third of the courses certified for CORE have been awarded a "D" signifying approval as a Diversity course. Such a broad expanse means that students can hardly avoid enrolling in a Diversity course. Some advisors, by common knowledge, de-emphasize the Diversity requirement, counseling students not to worry, as encountering a Diversity course will almost inevitably "happen". Rather than a requirement, Diversity has dissolved into a happening. This message hardly embodies the spirit of CORE's original purpose.

To be sure, the wide range of courses given a "D" (covering the spectrum from basic courses in the various ethnic and gender histories, literature, or cultures to specialized courses such as "Brazilian Cinema" or "Introduction to Ethnic Dance") gives students a view of the struggles and achievements of marginalized peoples of all sorts. The very number and variety of such courses provide evidence of the enlargement and enrichment that continues to transform the curriculum. But such close examinations are often made at the expense of the complex and confounding realities upon which different cultures meet. Lost also is the Janus-faced nature of various chauvinisms (national, racial, sexual and so on), which produce both in-group solidarity and pride, on the one hand, and, on the other, ostracize outsiders as "the other", often pacing them beyond the pale of humanity. Indeed, rather than engage with the universe of different "ideas and values" as prescribed by CORE, students often focus on those which are most familiar to them. While the Diversity requirement sometimes assists students in exploring their identity, it often reifies that identity rather than challenging it.

Description of the New Diversity Requirement

While applauding the richness of the existing Diversity offerings and reaffirming their permanent place in the curriculum, the Task Force also used the occasion of rethinking General Education to consider another dimension of the University's curriculum, namely the interface, the points of contact, between multiple cultures and perspective. The Task Force therefore recommends a reformulation of the Diversity requirement to emphasize the promises and problems of pluralism and the challenges that must be addressed to achieve just, equitable, productive, and harmonious societies. Courses in this new Diversity requirement will explore the gritty and not always successful on-the-ground struggles through which plural societies are established and maintained—and, all too often, fail. Rather than affirm or celebrate, courses in the new requirement will investigate the complexities of human difference and commonality. In so doing, the new Diversity requirement will create new intellectual demands on students and expand the place of Diversity in the new General Education curriculum.

In 2004, Professor Bonnie Thornton Dill and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Assistant to the President Robert Waters co-chaired a committee that recommended an expansion and revamping of the Diversity requirement. The Task Force draws on the Thornton Dill-Waters report, the experience of CORE, and various surveys of Maryland undergraduates, in recommending a new curricular configuration to satisfy the Diversity requirement and in proposing two required courses for a total of up to six credits. Two different categories of courses are described below: Understanding Plural Societies (UPS) and Cultural Competency (CC). The former is a traditional classroom-based experience, while the latter may

incorporate study abroad or practicum-oriented projects. Students may elect two UPS courses or one UPS and one CC course to meet the proposed Diversity requirement. The UPS and CC courses are described in the following sections.

Understanding Plural Societies

Perhaps the University of Maryland's most important responsibility is to prepare its students to live in a globally competitive society of the twenty-first century by comprehending both theoretical and practical dimensions of human difference. From that perspective, Understanding Plural Societies is the centerpiece of the new Diversity requirement. UPS courses speak to both the *foundations*—cultural, psychological, historical, social, and biological—of human difference and the *operation* or *function* of plural societies. Courses about both the foundations and the human operation of difference will be part of Distributive Studies. To qualify for the "D" under the new Diversity requirement a course must accomplish at least one of the following goals:

- Address the basis of human diversity: biological, cultural, and ideological.
    - i.e., a course in "Race, Genomics, and Human Evolutionary Theory" or "Race, the History of an Idea" or "What is Religion?" or the "Changing Meaning of Masculinity."
- Investigate the processes that create (or fail to create) just, productive, equalitarian, and harmonious societies.
    - i.e., a course in "Religion, Class and Nation in Northern Ireland" or "The Many South Africas: Xhosa and Zulu, English and Dutch" or "Race, Class, and Gender in Oceania," or "The Slave Trade" or "The Literature of Struggle."
- Explore the forms and traditions of thought or expression in relation to cultural, historical, political, and social contexts, as, for example, dance, foodways, literature, music, philosophical, and religious traditions.
    - i.e., a course in "Sex and Marriage across Time and Space" or "Making Jazz" or "Ritual and Performance in Latino Culture" or "Race, Class, and Gender in Latin America" or "We are What We Eat: Foodways across Culture."
- Address how particular policies create or discourage the formation of pluralistic societies.
    - i.e. a course on "Immigration Policy in Comparative Perspective" or "Economic Development of the Middle East."
- Study, within a comparative framework, the experiences, cultures, and relations of two or more social groups or constituencies within a single society or across societies, and within a single historical time frame or across historical time via intersectional analyses of dimensions of difference.
    - i.e., a course in "Making a Family Tree: Genetics and the Middle Passage" or "The Development of a Dance Aesthetic in White and Black America" or "Class, Gender, and Caribbean Literature of the Twentieth Century."

Many of the courses currently satisfying the Diversity requirement under CORE already fulfill one or more of these goals for a UPS course. No doubt many more new courses will also be developed under these guidelines.

Cultural Competency

Goals of Cultural Competency

UPS courses will offer students a broad theoretical and substantive basis for recognizing human differences and appreciating their intersection in plural societies. However, they may not offer students a chance to apply that knowledge in a practical way. University of Maryland students should also understand the practical ways pluralistic societies operate. Therefore, the Task Force also proposes a "Cultural Competency" component for the Diversity requirement. Such training has become commonplace in major institutions such as corporations, hospitals, and government agencies. The Cultural Competency category serves as a practicum for Understanding Plural Societies courses, just as a laboratory section serves as a practicum for a science course or a rehearsal serves as a practicum for a music, dance, or theater class. Cultural Competency courses provide training in practical ways of dealing with human difference and navigating the complexity of pluralistic societies. Whatever profession students envision beyond the University of Maryland—artist, doctor, educator, engineer, politician, stockbroker—the ability to interact on a day-to-day basis with the integration of broad cultural knowledge and cultural awareness will prove invaluable.

Defining Cultural Competency

The Task Force borrows its definition of Cultural Competency from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), which defines it as a set of congruent behaviors, attitudes, and policies that enable men and women to create a successful multicultural society. As they develop competency, individuals gain the "ability to establish effective interpersonal and working relationships that supersede cultural differences." HHS states that a culturally competent individual should be able to do the following:

- Understand the concept of culture and how cultural beliefs influence individual and societal decision making.
- Value diversity and similarities among all peoples.
- Be knowledgeable of relevant data sources required to understand differences and similarity among different groups.
- Recognize personal and societal tendencies toward bias and stereotyping and appreciate how these tendencies can influence individual and societal decision making.
- Understand and effectively respond to cultural differences.
- Engage in cultural self-assessment.
- Understand how individuals, organizations, and communities accommodate cultural differences.
- Understand the relationship between social justice and diversity.
- Understand the role of continuous cultural competency development.

Implementing Cultural Competency

In recommending a course in Cultural Competency, the University of Maryland again places itself on the cutting edge of the pedagogy of Diversity by providing opportunities for

broad based intercultural interaction. While hospitals, corporations, and governmental agencies have considerable experience teaching Cultural Competency, universities do not. In shaping its recommendation the Task Force draws upon the existing resources of the University of Maryland, as well as proposed courses currently being initiated by the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. Initially, there may not be enough courses in Cultural Competency to meet student demand. Hence, the Task Force suggests that initially students be allowed to satisfy the six-credit Diversity requirement by taking two Understanding Plural Society courses, only one of which can count toward fulfilling the Distributive Studies requirement.   The Task Force thus recommends three ways in which the Cultural Competency requirement can be fulfilled: students may select a specially designed course on cultural competency tailored to meet the needs of their field, students may choose a study abroad experience that includes a "Global Competency" component, or students may choose to participate in an Intergroup Cultural Dialogue course.

A.   Cultural Competency

The University currently offers several courses that address matters of cultural competency. Students may select these courses based upon their usefulness to their intended area of study or their general interest. Examples of such courses are Anthropology 260 and Business and Management 463 both of which directly address the practical ways human differences shape behavior.

B. Global Competency: Intercultural Knowledge for Study Abroad

Transforming Maryland mandates enhancement of the University's international presence and increased opportunities for students to gain a deeper understanding of other cultures and societies by studying abroad. Yet, rather than engage a new culture and society on its home turf, many study-abroad students remain cloistered among their colleagues. Global Competency is a course offered by the Study Abroad Office that prepares students to maximize the transformative potential of a study abroad experience. It trains students to understand the elements of culture, to avoid stereotypes, to acquire the skills necessary for meaningful engagement with the host society, and to identify strategies for students to navigate different cultures. In short, Global Competency prepares students to study abroad, helps ensure the success of that experience, and prepares them to live in a diverse society long after they return to the United States.

C. Cultural Competency: Intergroup Cultural Dialogues

For almost a dozen years the University's Department of Human Relations and the College of Education have been teaching a course in Cultural Competency that focuses on Intergroup Relations. This course now has a long, successful track record. It teaches students about the complex social dynamics across culture, class, gender, sexual orientation and gender that can create conflicts in a pluralistic society such as the United States. It then trains them in resolving those conflicts.

Cultural Competency: Intergroup Cultural Dialogues is taught in two parts. The first is a didactic, content-based course (generally meeting once per week, and taught by a faculty

member in the College of Education) in which students develop greater personal and political *awareness* of cultural identity affiliation and difference, as well as increased knowledge about equity and diversity within a pluralistic society, stronger communication and conflict-resolution skills, and growth in active listening, empathy, and complex thinking.

The second part of the course meets in small sections that employ dialogic pedagogy and an inductive, topics-based curriculum to discuss the specific and personalized nature of identity, power, and the social relations presented in the content-based lecture. In these small sections, students review and practice the skills taught in the lecture portion of the class. Students develop: 1) comfort with, and skill in, discourse on difficult topics, toward the end of fostering positive, meaningful, and sustained cross-group communication; and 2) the ability to juxtapose as well as integrate personal narratives (raised in the dialogue) and critical academic analysis (raised in the lecture).

Research conducted at the University of Maryland often in collaboration with other major universities indicates that, in combination, these two parts create a mutually reinforcing approach to developing a students' capacity to: 1) decrease the propensity for stereotyping; 2) reduce intergroup interaction anxiety; 3) increase comfort with multiculturalism (i.e., create a greater appreciation for difference); 4) resolve conflict that arises across identity-based differences, and 5) increase motivation for cross-group bridge-building in a pluralistic society. In undertaking this course, students broadly develop the following learning outcomes: increased multicultural interaction; heightened intergroup knowledge, awareness, and sensitivity; communication, listening and perspective-taking skills and greater commitment to civic engagement.

Overview

The University of Maryland has made substantial progress over the past half century in creating a faculty and a student body reflecting the composition of the state and, indeed, American society. Its commitment to pluralism is unshakable. But the work of "diversity" is never done. The University must constantly reassess, re-imagine, and recommit itself to the maintenance of a diverse academy and the creation of a diverse society. The CORE Diversity requirement has more than done its part; the time has come to take the next step. As the University enters a new decade, its students will confront challenges of a world in flux. A Diversity requirement that alerts them to new realities and provides the intellectual to address such realities is more necessary than ever. The Task Force believes this new Diversity requirement is an important step in that direction.

V. EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

Goals of Experiential Learning

By policy and practice, University of Maryland is committed to the belief that education does not stop at the boundaries of the campus. Opportunities for students to gain formal credit toward graduation outside of the classroom have long been an integral part of the University's curriculum. Indeed, the University's location in an area rich with governmental, non-profit, and

private institutions has been recognized as an asset. Appreciating this, in 2005, President Mote issued his "President's Promise," guaranteeing every Maryland student the opportunity for a sustained, substantial enrichment experience along with mentoring by faculty and staff. *Transforming Maryland* urges an expansion of the President's Promise, specifically recommending that the new plan of General Education incorporate such "academically rich and personally rewarding" experiences into the curriculum. The Task Force supports that goal.

The benefits of Experiential Learning are obvious: active learning in a unique experience, a one-on-one relationship with a faculty member working on a project related to the student's own interest, a direct experience with a foreign culture, or a hands-on service experience with social reality. Numerous studies have testified that Experiential Learning courses have often been the most significant element—what is best remembered—of a student's four years at the University of Maryland.

Description of Experiential Learning

An Experiential Learning component in General Education can take a number of forms at the University of Maryland, including specially designed research experiences, internships, studying abroad, and service learning. The Task Force proposes that courses in Experiential Learning be included in General Education through approval in any one of the Distributive Studies areas. For example, a Government course that includes a six-hour-per-week internship as a legislative research assistant could be included in the "History and Social Sciences" area. In addition to its experiential learning component, this course would also need to meet learning outcomes and other requirements for inclusion in this area of Distributive Studies. The course would need to provide students with challenging assignments that would allow them to expand on and explore all aspects of their active learning in the legislature. Relevant readings, discussions, research papers and journal entries or reflections allow students to benefit fully from Experiential Learning, and these would be expected components of Experiential Learning courses approved for General Education.

Experiential Learning courses at Maryland already are a popular and beneficial element in undergraduate education. Under the present CORE requirements, few experiential courses are eligible for inclusion in Distributive Studies categories. The Task Force recommends that the following kinds of Experiential Learning courses be considered for inclusion in appropriate areas of the new Distributive Studies requirement:

A. Research Experiences

As a designated Research I University, the University of Maryland has a mandate to engage students in research. Most upper-division courses incorporate independent research, as it is generally accepted that students gain knowledge and skills through research experiences and that hands-on activities teach how knowledge is created. But some students go beyond such course-specific projects. On-campus research experience fosters faculty-student mentorship, while research off-campus promotes partnerships with the many prestigious institutions in the area and elsewhere. Maryland's proximity to the nation's capital places a multitude of

institutions within the reach of student researchers in all fields of study. Allowing students to substitute well-defined, pre-approved research projects for the more traditional classroom offering would broaden opportunities for those who wish to pursue a topic in depth beyond the usual boundaries of their major discipline.

B. Internships

Internships offer students practical experience in their fields of interest. Some colleges and schools (for instance Education, Journalism, and Public Health) recognize the utility and importance of internships and require them for their majors. Other colleges, schools, and departments encourage but do not require their majors to undertake an internship. All believe internships illustrate and amplify the principles learned in the classroom and often lead to career opportunities after graduation. As with research experiences, internships are a recognized strength of the University; government agencies, businesses, and community organizations in the Baltimore-Washington corridor regularly offer opportunities to Maryland students.

C. Study Abroad

Studying in a foreign country offers students in an increasingly globalized society first-hand knowledge of another culture in ways that classroom study cannot match. The federal government recently recognized study abroad as an investment in worldwide social and political welfare when the House of Representatives passed the Paul Simon Foundation Study Abroad Act. It calls for a four-fold increase in study abroad enrollment among American college students over the next ten years, toward a goal of at least one million students per year, with an emphasis on non-traditional locations and a more diverse student body. Enrollment of Maryland students in Study Abroad has increased by a factor of six in the past twelve years.

D. Community Service-Learning

Among the purposes of state universities that benefited from the Morrill Act of 1862 were the promotion of citizenship and the extension of university expertise to surrounding communities. From its beginnings, the University of Maryland embraced that charge. One hundred and fifty years later, civic engagement and community service are a proud tradition, fueled by the University's proximity to the nation's and the state's capitals and its connections to many local jurisdictions. The University has developed numerous credit-bearing Community Service-Learning (CSL) programs to support civic involvement. CSL programs link the University with local communities and encourage students to become more compassionate and grounded citizens.

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

Research, Internships, Study Abroad, and Community Service learning are just some of the Experiential Learning Programs that the Task Force believes should be incorporated into General Education. Others, too numerous to discuss here, should also be considered.

Implementing Experiential Learning

In addition to pre-approved General Education courses that contain experiential opportunities, some students and colleges construct independent research or internship experiences. These too could be structured to satisfy Distributive Studies requirements. Many colleges and departments already have mechanisms in place to grant credit for on- and off-campus research, because such research experiences are likely to be within a student's major discipline. Often a student and a research mentor will formulate a "learning contract" at the beginning of the research experience specifying that the student will produce a significant piece of work and some form of culminating reflection on his or her experience. In many instances, a college or departmental advisor oversees the contract. Currently, the Study Abroad Office offers some eighty programs that send nearly 2,000 (about 7 percent of all Maryland undergraduates) to study in foreign countries, and it is prepared to expand its offerings. Finally, an informal survey reveals the presence of numerous "shovel-ready" CSL courses within the existing curriculum, especially during winter term. Expanding and formalizing these courses would provide a template for enlarging opportunities for students.

While many students are already participating in Experiential Learning, and more could participate, the Task Force is not convinced that all could. Close investigation makes it clear that it is impossible for some students to take part and that the University does not possess the resources to make participation universal. For some students, it is a matter of schedule and for others it is a matter of expense. Moreover, some colleges and departments do not have the resources to administer Experiential Learning requirements for all their majors. While the Task Force sees many advantages in incorporating a requirement for Experiential Learning into the General Education curriculum, it does not believe that an across-the-board requirement is viable at the present time. Still, the Task Force believes that it would be *highly desirable* to incorporate a credit-bearing Experiential Learning component into the new General Education curriculum. Therefore, it recommends that students be encouraged to participate in the following ways:

- Students should be allowed to apply a credit-bearing "out-of-classroom" experience, to one course in the appropriate category of Distributive Studies, provided the course is approved by the faculty committee that oversees Distributive Studies courses.
- Students should have the option of receiving academic credit for either paid or unpaid research and internship experiences.
- Faculty should be encouraged to develop courses that incorporate experiential learning options within the Distributive Studies portion of General Education.
- Students may take additional Experiential Learning courses; however, only one may count in the total of Distributive Studies courses.

In each of these cases, a process must be in place to screen and approve proposed activities. The Task Force therefore recommends that mechanisms be developed to track these experiences, perhaps through a tag on the student's transcript, and to match mentors with students and develop appropriate learning contracts (through examples, templates, guidelines, etc.). Some programs already administer Experiential Learning quite well and could be called upon to provide examples, while other programs do not have the resources to do so and may need additional support.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED PLAN FOR GENERAL EDUCATION

The implementation of the plan for General Education will be a complex process that can only be accomplished over time. Where useful, the Task Force has made some specific suggestions, based upon experience (as with the trial of the "I" series, which the Task Force has administered) or where proposals have emerged from ongoing discussions with particular units (as with, for example, the Mathematics Department with regard to the Fundamental Studies Mathematics requirement) or where discussions within the Task Force itself have produced useful ideas. However, these do not and perhaps cannot address every element of the proposed General Education plan. The contingencies are too numerous and, frankly, the Task Force's knowledge too limited. The Task Force therefore recommends that the Chair of the Senate and the Provost appoint a special committee whose responsibility will be to implement the proposed plan of General Education. This Implementation Committee will establish the procedures for the creation of the institutions that will maintain long-term oversight. Among the matters that the Implementation Committee should address is that of the chronology of implementation. Here the Task Force strongly recommends that target dates for implementation of various elements be established first for the proposed program and elements within the program.

While the Implementation Committee will be appointed by the Chair of the Senate and the Provost, the Task Force recommends its membership be drawn from the various Colleges and Schools, with Deans or their representatives, particularly their Offices of Associate Deans for Undergraduate Study.

The Task Force, upon due consideration, also recommends that the special Senate-Provost Implementation Committee select someone to take overall responsibility for General Education. It believes that person should be the Dean for Undergraduate Studies, who, in this capacity, will report to the Provost and to the Chair of the University Senate. In so recommending, the Task Force is suggesting a rebalancing of the relationship between the Dean for Undergraduate Studies and the General Education (previously CORE) Committee of the University Senate. Rather than employing the Senate Committee for individual course approvals, the Task Force envisions the role of a Senate-elected Committee to be one that provides **broad oversight** and **supervision** over the entire General Education program—evaluating trends, reviewing learning outcomes and their assessments (where standards for learning outcomes must be established), and maintaining the overall balance of courses, for example, in the I-series (where targets for each College and School have to be established) and in other Distributive Studies categories.

Within the office of Undergraduate Studies, the Task Force suggests that the Dean appoint one or more faculty boards to supervise the semester-by-semester operations of the various elements of the General Education program. Faculty members on these boards will be chosen from among experienced teachers of courses in General Education, nominated by their collegiate deans in concurrence with the Senate. These boards will establish protocols for the various elements of the General Education program, review, and assess those elements, and measure their success. For example, within Distributive Studies, the relevant board will look for a strong match between the learning outcomes for existing courses and those established for the new categories. A subset of the oversight board will be charged, during the transition between

CORE and the new General Education program, with evaluating each course presently approved for CORE Distributive Studies to determine its suitability for the new categories. When an existing CORE course is judged to fit the standards and learning outcomes for a specific category, the course will be moved into the new system for General Education and into the appropriate category for Distributive Studies. Likewise, a faculty board also will be responsible for selection of courses in the I-series and for ensuring the currency and freshness of I-courses and of General Education overall. The Dean for Undergraduate Studies will report annually to the Senate's General Education Committee, providing an evaluation of long-term trends in the program, learning outcome assessments, and program balance. Another board would be responsible for coordinating the requirement for Oral Communication and yet another for Analytical Reasoning.

The Dean for Undergraduate Studies will present to the Senate's General Education Committee a full review of supervisory board membership. The Senate Committee and the Dean for Undergraduate Studies should therefore work actively and cooperatively with faculty proposing new additions to (or removing older courses from) the curriculum.

IN SUM

In sum, the proposed General Education program accomplishes the following:

- It maintains those features of the existing CORE program that have for some twenty years guided Maryland students along the path of academic excellence.
- However, it also expands and enhances General Education with a variety of intellectual and pedagogical innovations:
  - First, it greatly strengthens and expands Fundamental Studies—those matters that all students must master—by eliminating "exceptions" and creating two new requirements, one in oral communications and the other in analytic reasoning.
  - Second, it simplifies and enlarges Distributive Studies by at once expanding the areas of knowledge and reducing the number of required courses, thus widening student choice, making courses accessible, and giving greater transparency to the entire program
  - Third, it creates a signature program—a series of courses that distinguishes the University of Maryland's General Education program and challenges faculty and students to think anew.
  - Fourth, it encourages students to move their learning outside of the classroom by incorporating various experiential learning programs more fully into the General Education curriculum.
  - Fifth, it rethinks and redefines the Diversity requirement, giving it a sharper intellectual focus, a larger place in the curriculum, and an expanded practical range.
  - Finally, it allows all Colleges and Departments to participate fully in General Education, unifying the campus with a shared responsibility.

The most important consequence of these proposed changes should be, overall, a better education of the kind that a university, as a community of scholars, can provide. Universities are unique and privileged institutions in many ways. They have, first of all, a responsibility to the past--to examine it, interpret it, preserve it, and carry it into the future. The traditions, the texts, the accumulated learning of centuries have to be present in living minds as the objects of engaged scholarship. The arts and their performance skills, the specialized crafts and professional practices, have to be passed on, one to one, from teacher to pupil. At the same time, universities add to this inheritance with active investigation in all disciplines, creating new knowledge, new technologies, new practices, new systems and products as a result of their research. This double responsibility to the past and the future means that universities must, to some extent, be apart from the world, resistant to fads, enthusiasms, and skewed agendas. But, at the same time, universities are also a part of the world and responsible for delivering the benefits of their collective wisdom, whether time-tested truths or the latest, cutting-edge discoveries to address contemporary concerns. A public university, in particular, has to be responsive to the community that licenses and supports it, and to the constituencies it ultimately serves. The proposed model for General Education, outlined in this document, should help the University of Maryland balance these goals and shape University of Maryland graduates who are grounded in traditional learning, knowledgeable in their chosen fields, aware of the inheritance they carry, and prepared to take their place in the world.

Respectfully submitted

Andrew Baldwin, Associate Professor, Environmental Science and Technology
Elizabeth Beise, Professor of Physics and Interim Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Programs
Ira Berlin (chair), Distinguished University Professor, History
Cindy Clement, Lecturer and Director of Undergraduate Studies, Economics.
Thomas Corsi, Professor, Business and Management
Sheryl Ehrman, Associate Professor, Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering
Jeanne Fahnestock, Professor, English
Darrell Gaskin, Associate Professor, African American Studies
Lyle Isaacs, Professor Chemistry and Biochemistry
Katherine McAdams, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Studies
Robyn Muncy, Associate Professor, History
Heather Nathans, Associate Professor, Theatre
Charles Olson, Professor of the Practice, Business and Management
James Osteen, Assistant Vice President, Office of Student Affairs
Sarah Peitzmeier, Undergraduate Student, Biological Sciences and Piano Performance
Robin Sawyer, Associate Professor, School of Public Health
Sally Simpson, Professor and Chair, Criminology and Criminal Justice
Konstantina Trivisa, Professor, Mathematics
Rose Weiss, Undergraduate Student, History

The Committee gratefully acknowledges the support of Ms. Beverly Rodgerson, Ms. Helena Iles, and Mr. Michael Colson.

APPENDICES
Appendix 1. Excerpt from the Strategic Plan relating to General Education

[http://www.sp07.umd.edu/StrategicPlanFinal.pdf].

GENERAL EDUCATION

Vision

The University of Maryland promises its students an education grounded in excellence, transmitting and interpreting the values, creativity, and experiences of the past, and set squarely in the context of a new century. In fulfillment of this promise, the University is reshaping its general education program. The new program will provide an intellectual context for academic, personal, civic, and professional life in which students will be challenged to explore how various disciplines contribute to knowledge and to an understanding of the human condition and society. This experience will be embedded in courses in traditional disciplines and also will confront complex issues that cut across disciplinary boundaries.

Through fundamental studies in English and mathematics, the new General Education program will impart to students habits of thought and skills in analysis and communication needed for success in their primary fields of study and throughout their lives. The combination of interdisciplinary, disciplinary, and fundamental studies comprises a new General Education program that will serve students in their majors and far beyond their undergraduate studies.

The new General Education proposal retains the present requirement of Fundamental Studies in English and mathematics for all students. What is presently known as Distributive Studies will be enhanced with a new conceptual structure constructed along three dimensions: "Pathways to Knowledge and Creativity," "2020 Perspectives," and "Ways of Thinking." In this new structure, each course will contain characteristics of all three of these dimensions. The content of each dimension is as follows:

- The "Pathways to Knowledge and Creativity" dimension identifies the particular disciplinary approach to knowledge on which the course is based, which may be studies and/or practice in one or more of three broad areas: Humanities and Arts; Natural Sciences and Technology; and Human Behavior, Societies, and Institutions. Although contributions will be expected from many fields of study, the humanities, arts, and sciences are the foundations of this dimension.

- The "2020 Perspectives" dimension is the signature of the proposed program. Each perspective is a category of courses that focuses on an important issue of our time, bringing a variety of disciplines to bear on the topic. The new program will be designed so that courses related to a particular Perspective will simultaneously emphasize one or more of the Pathways to Knowledge and Creativity. The topics selected for the "2020 Perspectives" will reflect the existing strengths of the institution. This dimension will be dynamic, with sufficient flexibility for faculty to address emerging issues.

- The "Ways of Thinking" dimension identifies which of a variety of intellectual approaches are to be emphasized in each General Education course; categories proposed include critical thinking, integrative thinking, and creative thinking. While courses will primarily be characterized by their content, as described by the first two dimensions, students will encounter and practice the full range of ways of thinking in their General Education curricula.

Placement of courses within the new matrix will characterize both their scope and disciplinary content. The courses that will comprise the General Education program will impart knowledge and encourage habits of thinking associated with a liberal education. These courses will be periodically assessed for content and rigor. All thirteen colleges and schools will contribute to the new program.

GOAL 1. The Provost, in consultation with the Senate, will oversee the development of this broad, conceptual plan into a fully operational General Education program.

Strategies

A. The Provost and Senate will jointly appoint a task force to develop a detailed plan for the revision of the General Education program, which will be submitted to the Senate, and upon Senate action, presented to the President for approval. The plan will include specific requirements for numbers and types of courses to be taken and recommendations for the initial set of 2020 Perspectives. It will be designed to accommodate the current credit limits of existing baccalaureate programs.

B. The work of the task force will involve considerations of the following:

- Articulation of the learning outcome goals for each element of the new General Education program, consistent with existing University policy.

- An inventory of existing courses with regard to how they may fit, or might be modified to fit, within the new three-dimensional framework.

- An analysis of the numbers and types of courses that would have to be developed in order for the proposed program to meet the needs of the entire undergraduate student body.

- An analysis of the fit of General Education requirements with existing major requirements.

- An analysis of General Education courses typically covered through transfer and Advanced Placement or similar credits, to be used to determine how transfer credits may be accommodated within the new structure.

26

THE STRATEGIC PLAN *for the* UNIVERSITY *of* MARYLAND | MAY 2008

- An analysis of potential software and training issues that the new program poses for advisement and registration.

C. The plan will be flexible to accommodate the needs of transfer students and of students entering the university with Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, or other pre-college credits, at least in the early stages of implementation. The task force will consult with representatives of other USM institutions and community colleges in this regard.

D. The task force will prepare the documentation necessary to achieve approval from the Maryland Higher Education Commission for this program. The new structure deviates from the standard state prescription for General Education, but is acceptable under other sections (See 13B.02.02.16D(2)(b)-(c) and 13B.06.01.03 of the Code of Maryland Regulations, COMAR).

E. After the planning stage, the Office of Undergraduate Studies will have oversight of the General Education program. Duties will include maintaining the evolving list of "2020" topics and approving individual courses and their categorizations. The Provost and Senate will jointly appoint a Council representing all the colleges and schools and composed primarily of faculty with student representatives. This Council will be chaired by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and will be responsible for implementing, managing, and maintaining the quality of the General Education program.

F. The Provost will require that the Council establish a robust system of assessments for all elements of the new General Education program. Assessments will determine how well the program fulfills its educational goals and allow for changes as needed.

GOAL 2: The program will require increases in the level of participation of tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the General Education program and in opportunities for student-faculty interactions.

Strategies

A. In consultation with deans and department chairs, the Provost will establish participation goals for each college or school.

B. The General Education program will be set up to provide more opportunities for smaller class sizes than at present. The program, and corresponding assessment measures, will ensure that classes feature innovative and improved teaching methods and generally involve additional writing in depth.

Appendix 2. Second RFP for Signature Courses

"I"-Series Courses:
Issues, Imagination, Intellect, Inspiration, Innovation, Implementation
Request for Proposals
The Task Force on General Education
Professor Ira Berlin, Chair

December 11, 2009

A Second Call for "I"-Series Courses

Earlier this semester, the University's Task Force on General Education initiated the pilot signature set of courses for the nascent General Education Curriculum. The faculty responded enthusiastically, and eventually the Committee received more than 50 proposals for innovative courses. Only 20 courses could be selected for this first round, and sadly many excellent proposals had to be turned away. The finalists were announced on October 19, and since then the selected courses have been placed in the Spring 2010 schedule of classes. Student interest appears to be high. Against this background, Provost Nariman Farvardin and Senate President Elise Miller-Hooks, with the support of Dean for Undergraduate Studies Donna Hamilton, have decided to continue and expand the "I"-Series Course pilot into academic year 2010-2011. These new "I"-Series courses offer another opportunity for faculty to add new, intellectually engaging courses to the undergraduate curriculum.

This RFP calls for proposals for a second group of signature courses for the new General Education program, 40 to be taught in the Fall semester and 40 in the Spring. Some of these courses will repeat those already part of the "I"-Series course repertoire. But many will be new, enlarging and deepening the pilot program. As with the Spring 2010 pilot, faculty who create new "I"-Series courses will receive a stipend and additional resources to support the course. They (or their department) will be asked to teach their course at least twice during the next two academic years, if the campus adopts the new General Education program. Please read this Request for Proposals carefully and with an eye to creating a new course or reconfiguring an existing course to address the signature as described below.

As in the first call for proposals, the Task Force seeks courses that meet established goals of the University's undergraduate program: critical thinking, effective communication skills, media literacy, technology fluency, and human understanding. Chosen signature courses will improve undergraduate pedagogies and academic culture, elevate the level of intellectual engagement on campus, foster faculty mentorship, and increase students' commitment to their own education. "I"-Series courses are designed to engage students from all majors in thinking about pressing issues from a variety of academic perspectives. In short, the signature courses allow the University of Maryland to continue to strengthen its place among national leaders in undergraduate teaching and learning.

Background: Changes in General Education

The University's new strategic plan, adopted in 2008, charged the Task Force on General Education with revising the University's General Education Curriculum. That work is ongoing, addressing, among other matters, revised requirements for Distributive and Fundamental studies as well as matters of diversity. However, the Committee has established an outline of what it

believes will be the *signature* of the new General Education program: novel courses that are issue-driven explorations into a variety of intellectual endeavors.

The first set of "I"-Series courses (See http://www.provost.umd.edu/GenEd2009/) provides models for proposers who seek to develop new signature courses. This first set uniformly features engaging topics that are issues of societal concern and include both present-day problems and timeless dilemmas of human society. Some "I"-Series courses are interdisciplinary, while others examine compelling subjects through a single disciplinary lens. All selected courses focus on intellectually engaging readings and other instructional materials, and all employ pedagogies that lead to active learning and student engagement. Students in "I"-Series courses will read and write, but they will discuss, debate, explore resources, and present results of research to their peers.

Until the new plan for General Education is approved, the "I"-Series courses will meet qualifications for CORE general education categories. They will be academically demanding, will cover significant materials, and will require that students participate in their own learning through discussion, research and writing.

The "I"-Series Course Signature

As the centerpiece of the University's new General Education program, "I"-Series courses will become the intellectual and pedagogical marker for which the University of Maryland is known: broad, analytical thinking about significant issues. In branding the University's General Education curriculum, the signature courses begin the process of defining what is unique about education at the University of Maryland. Through these courses, students will be challenged from their first moments on campus to master the intellectual tools needed to wrestle with matters of great weight and consequence, the so-called Big Questions.

A signature course could take students inside a new field of study, where they may glimpse the utility, elegance and beauty of disciplines that were previously unknown, unwanted, disparaged, or despised. Students may be able to see how such areas of investigation could become a subject for extended study, a major, or even a lifetime commitment. By addressing both contemporary problems and the enduring issues of human existence, the signature courses will speak to the University's historic role both as a timeless repository of human knowledge and as a source of solutions to burning issues of the day. At their best, the signature courses might do both. The "I" Series offers extraordinary opportunities for increasing the level of intellectual discourse on campus and for providing occasions where new pedagogical methods may be introduced. The possibilities are large and exciting. (For more a more detailed description of the "I"-Series courses, please refer to Appendix B of this document.)

Information for Faculty Submitting Proposals

To expand our pilot test of the "I"-Series in practice, the University will accept up to 40 "I"-Series courses in Fall 2010 and another 40 in Spring 2011. Again, each college will be expected to sponsor at least one new "I"-Series course. Deans and department chairs will take responsibility for each such course to support the "I" Series much as they do CORE or the recent innovation of Marquee Courses in Science and Technology (see http://www.marqueecourses.umd.edu/aboutmarquee.html). The Task Force welcomes new courses in all fields, as well as established courses that can be reconfigured to meet the requirements of the "I" Series.

Each "I"-Series course that is selected as a new offering will receive a faculty overload payment of $5,000. Funding for one Graduate Teaching Assistant will also be provided.

PLEASE NOTE THIS CHANGE: submissions will go first to the department chair and to the office of the dean of the home college of the proposing faculty member (by a deadline established by the college). For example, a proposer who is an English professor will submit their proposal to their chair and to the Dean's Office in the College of Arts and Humanities. Committees in each college will rank proposals from that college and send all proposals and their rankings to the Task Force on General Education by 5:00 p.m. on January 22, 2010.

Professor Ira Berlin chairs the Task Force, jointly appointed by the Provost and the University Senate. Members of the Task Force, with input from the rankings of the colleges, will evaluate the proposals and notify professors whose courses have been selected for inclusion in this second group by February 3, 2010. The Task force will also notify deans and department chairs on February 3. A public announcement of winners will be made on Friday, February 5.

Publicity about "I"-Series courses will appear on the Provost's website and in campus media. Most importantly, scheduling offices in home departments will ensure that each new "I"-Series course will be scheduled and listed in Testudo to be available as students register for Fall 2010. Sixty percent of seats in these courses will be reserved for students who have completed less than 60 credits. A complete timeline for the "I"-Series course process, along with other requirements for proposals, can be found in Appendix A of this document.

Proposal Specifics

Each proposal for an "I"-Series course will be submitted by faculty members (assistant, associate or full professors; also full-time lecturers) to their department chairs and to their college deans, who in turn will rank the set of proposals in the college and forward proposal materials in pdf format to Professor Ira Berlin, Chair, The Task Force on Undergraduate Education, in care of Ms. Helena Iles, at hiles@umd.edu.

Proposals should be no more than two pages, outlining the problem or question to be addressed and briefly stating its significance. Proposals should then explain, again briefly, what problem or question forms the focus of the course and how this question will provide a useful platform on which to build an "I"-Series course as described in this document. Each course that is
proposed must address a topic of significant interest from one or more disciplinary perspectives. Proposals must explain how courses engage students in thought-provoking reading and discussion, encourage timely projects and presentations, and perhaps inspire research and reaction papers. All proposals need to explain what makes the proposed course an "I"-Series course.

Proposals must consider that the audience for the "I"-Series courses will be large and active. Students in "I"-Series courses will be expected to take responsibility for their learning and for demonstrating their mastery of the material in their course work. Courses will be expected to attract an initial enrollment of between 60 and 100 students and to be offered at least once each academic year.

Selected courses, if not already CORE approved, will be eligible for provisional CORE status with an appropriate category designation. Once a new General Education plan is adopted, each course will be evaluated for an appropriate category in the new framework. At the end of the pilot period, "I"-Series courses will be collectively assessed for appropriate learning outcomes.

Questions about "I"-Series course proposals may be addressed to Task Force members Betsy Beise, Associate Provost for Academic Programs at beise@umd.edu, or to Katherine McAdams, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies at mcadams@umd.edu.

Specific details that must be included in each proposal are listed in Appendix B of this document.

Guidelines for Proposals for "I"-Series Courses

Proposals will be submitted to college deans, through department chairs, by a deadline set by each college.

Deans will submit all proposals in pdf format, with rankings, by 5:00 p.m. Friday, January 22, 2010. Proposal materials will go to Professor Ira Berlin, in care of Helena Iles at hiles@umd.edu.

Submitting faculty members, their deans and their department chairs will be notified of selections for the new set of "I"-Series courses on Wednesday, February 3, 2010. The public announcement date will be Friday, February 5, 2010.

Proposals should include the following information:
- Course title. (Titles must be to the point, engaging, and an accurate description of course content.)
- Course description in 200 words or less.
- Proposed course size.
- Need for Undergraduate or Graduate TAs.
- Description of the role of TAs.

Proposals will answer the following questions:
- How does the course fulfill the mission of the "I"-Series courses?
- How will the course provide valuable knowledge to students in all majors?
- How will the course be evaluated?
- How will student learning be assessed?
- Please include two or three sentences that could be used to advertise your course to students. Again, this should be to the point, engaging, and an accurate description of course content.

Proposal Requirements:

All "I"-Series courses will be taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty or by full-time lecturers or professors of the practice. Faculty will be named in the proposal.

Course proposals will bear college or departmental approval and signatures.

Courses must be self-sustaining, that is designed so that others might teach the same course in the future.

Course enrollment will be approximately 60 to 100 students, and courses must be designed to involve recitation, discussion, or learning laboratories for this size class.

Courses must engage students in critical reading, writing, and discussion, and/or making formal presentations in groups or as individuals.

Proposing faculty members must be willing to participate in meetings of "I"-Series faculty and TAs.

It is expected that all "I"-Series faculty and TAs will meet twice as a group during the Spring 2010 semester to discuss goals and progress of the courses.

The "I"-Series courses bearing the University's signature will *investigate* significant *issues* with *imagination* and *intellect* with a belief that they will *inspire* future *investigation* and provide concrete mechanisms to *implement innovative* ideas. Not surprisingly, the Committee has tentatively called the courses the "I" Series: Issues, Imagination, Intellect, Investigation, Inspiration, and Implementation.

The "I" Series attempts to view large problems from the perspective of defined disciplinary and interdisciplinary perspectives (for example, cognitive science or African American studies) and particular fields of study (for example, engineering or education). "I"-Series courses have two purposes: first to investigate a significant matter in depth and second to understand how particular disciplines or fields of study address problems. How does a biologist, engineer, poet, or sociologist think about human diversity? (The "I"-Series draws upon the successful Marquee Courses in Science and Technology, first developed in 2007 to increase scientific knowledge and engagement among students who are not science majors).

"I"-Series courses are not surveys. Their goals do not focus primarily on coverage of specific knowledge: for example, mastery of the basic facts of plant biology, early modern history between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries, or the course of romantic poetry. Instead, they provide students with the basic concepts, approaches, and vocabulary of particular disciplines and fields of study and an understanding of how to employ those concepts, approaches, and vocabulary. Indeed, while "I"-Series courses ask questions--when did life begin? What is the solution to the energy crisis? How can poverty be abolished? Why the Holocaust?--they do not necessarily attempt to answer them. Rather, they aim to examine the ways in which diverse intellectual traditions address those questions.

Courses in the "I"-Series aim to speak both to students with a deep interest and even a degree of expertise in the matter at hand and also to students unfamiliar with the subject but eager to expand their knowledge. Considering this diverse audience, faculty members are not expected to teach a
traditional introductory course in their discipline, but rather to use their disciplines to teach students about how a scholar or practitioner approaches the question at hand. Many of the courses will be problem-based, requiring students to struggle with contemporary issues or challenges (for example,
global warming, immigration, health policy), while others will address the ageless dilemmas of human existence (for example, political power, war, sexuality, ecological sustainability, wealth distribution, leadership). Rather than focusing on the broad content of a discipline, courses in the "I" Series will
aim to equip students with the intellectual tools required to address major questions and issues around which the course is organized. The depth of knowledge involved should be approximately what an attorney preparing for a case or a congressional aide preparing for a hearing would need to know.

By focusing on a specific problem or issue, the students will gain an understanding of the processes, policies, and disciplines employed by a scholar or practitioner to approach problems: What information is needed to address a specific problem? Where can that information be found? What constraints limit the application of potential solutions? How does one discover

what is known on a topic? How does one confirm the reliability of information? What is the process used to acquire new information? How is information applied to provide a solution to a problem? What methods can be employed to assess results or to validate conclusions? Students should develop an understanding and appreciation of how knowledge is created and applied, how it evolves through publication and peer review, and how conflicting theories are reconciled. In short, "I"-Series courses can be eminently practical or deeply theoretical. In either case, they incorporate transferable skills, among them writing, oral presentations, and the use of library resources and other research techniques.

Appendix 3. Learning Outcomes for Distributive Studies

A. Natural Sciences and Mathematics
This area encompasses the traditional physical and life sciences, computer science, environmental science, animal and avian science, plant science, etc. Courses in this area introduce students to the concepts and methods of the disciplines studying the natural world. One course in this area must include a laboratory experience.
Students should be able to:
* Use quantitative information and/or mathematical analysis to obtain sound results and recognize questionable assumptions
* Demonstrate understanding of the broad principles of science and the ways scientists in a particular discipline conduct research
* Make observations, understand the fundamental elements of experiment design, generate and analyze data using appropriate quantitative tools, use abstract reasoning to interpret the data and formulae, and test hypotheses with scientific rigor
* Understand how findings and ideas in science and mathematics can be applied to explain phenomena and events and to influence the larger society
* Understand the role that human diversity plays in the practice and history of science
* Communicate about science and quantitative information using appropriate oral and written means
* Demonstrate proficiency in the collection, interpretation, and presentation of scientific data.

B. History and Social Sciences
This area is satisfied by courses introducing students to history and to the social science disciplines and their combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. It includes courses in sociology, psychology, economics, criminology, women studies, environmental science and policy, among others.
Students should be able to:
* Demonstrate knowledge of findings and theories in the social, political, and behavioral sciences
* Demonstrate understanding of investigative methods used in political history and the social and behavioral sciences
* Demonstrate critical thinking about arguments in history and the social and behavioral sciences and evaluate an argument's major assertions, its background assumptions, the evidence used to support its assertions, and its explanatory utility
* Understand and describe change in history and historiography
* Understand and articulate how culture, society, and diversity shape the role of the individual within society and human relations across cultures
* Demonstrate knowledge of how social science can be employed to: (a) analyze social change, (b) analyze social problems, and (c) analyze and develop social policies
* Use appropriate technologies to conduct research on, and communicate about, social and behavioral sciences and to access, evaluate, and manage information to prepare and present their work effectively.

C. Humanities, Arts and Literature

Courses in this area include the traditional humanities disciplines that study the history and genres of human creativity: literatures in any language, art history, music history and appreciation, Also in this area are courses in the foundational disciplines of philosophy and linguistics.

Students should be able to:

- Investigate the variety of human culture and demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which cultures have changed
- Understand and employ a wide range of humanistic, qualitative, quantitative, theoretical, or philosophical methods for recording and explaining human experience
- Describe ways in which a given language reflects a way of thinking, cultural heritage, larger set of cultural values, or aspects of society;
- Identify and assess their own and others' values; identify the underlying premises in their own and others' arguments
- Investigate the role and value of art in human life and demonstrate an understanding of the significance of specific art forms to the cultures that create them and adopt them
- Describe specific processes by which works of literature, painting, sculpture, architecture, music, dance, theatre, film, multi-media, or environmental art are created; describe general creative processes common to two or more of these media
- Interpret and analyze works of literature, painting, sculpture, architecture, music, dance, theatre, film, multi-media, or environmental art
- Demonstrate the dependence of meaning upon cultural and historical context when analyzing works of art.

D. Scholarship in Practice

Courses in this area teach students how to apply a body of knowledge in a way that leads to an outcome such as a professional practice, a product, a proficiency, a creative activity or a work of art. For example, courses in Business draw on knowledge from economics, psychology, mathematics, and other disciplines to design productive systems and enterprises. Courses in Engineering apply knowledge in the Natural Sciences and Mathematics, as well as other disciplines, to design environments, technologies, and systems. Courses in Education introduce students to a practice by its methods, history and assessment. Courses from the Schools of Journalism and Architecture may also provide students with an overview of well defined professional practices. In addition, courses in Studio Art, Music Performance, Dance, etc., which introduce students to creative skills and performance arts, would satisfy this area. Courses which lead to a proficiency in a skill such as conversation and composition in a foreign language also belong in this category.

Students should be able to:

- Demonstrate an ability to select from relevant areas of learning whatever background knowledge (theoretical or applied) is needed to inform the practice or project at hand
- Be able to adjust a practice or modify a product to fit the setting in which it will take effect and the audience or clients it is intended for
- Understand the stages required to bring about a successful outcome or product, from planning, modeling, and preparing, to revising and perfecting
- Demonstrate an ability to critique existing products, practices, creative works, etc., in order to learn from past successes and failures

- Develop an appreciation of the collaboration required to bring about large-scale outcomes (systems, technologies, performances)
- Be able to produce accessible, effective and persuasive ancillary material (written, oral, visual and/or all modes combined) to accompany, explain and promote a practice, product, creative enterprise, etc.

Appendix 4. CORE Human Cultural Diversity
[http://www.ugst.umd.edu/core/elements/Diversity.html].

Elements of the CORE Program—Human Cultural Diversity
Diversity Statement and Requirement

Human Cultural Diversity courses give you the chance to examine your ideas and values in the light of an unfamiliar intellectual or social context. At the University of Maryland at College Park, we are committed to expanding our range of vision and to challenging all narrowness of thinking about human diversity. These courses will heighten your appreciation of difference itself and increase your ability to learn from people, cultures, ideas, and art forms different from those you know best.

One course (three credits) is required. You may complete this course any time before graduation. Diversity courses include both lower-level (100- and 200-level) and upper-level (300- and 400-level) courses.

Adding cultural diversity to CORE courses in general has always been an important CORE goal. This goal has had much success. Many CORE Distributive Studies courses include diverse aspects drawn from both Western and Non-Western traditions and cultures, and from the works of women, minority groups, and sub-cultures. What is the difference between these courses and courses approved for CORE Human Cultural Diversity? CORE Human Cultural Diversity courses focus primarily on one or more of the following areas:

- The history, status, treatment, or accomplishments of women or minority groups and subcultures
- Non-Western culture
- Concepts and implications of diversity

About Diversity Courses

Students usually seek further education in order to prepare for the future, explore themselves, and examine different fields of knowledge. Diversity courses are designed to help students fulfill these aims. We live in an increasingly multicultural environment, and it is important to understand that environment if we are to adapt and thrive. Diversity courses are designed to acquaint the student with cultures that are either radically different than their own or which have been part of the heritage they bring to the American experience. Examination of these cultures might enable students to understand themselves and their own experience and perspectives. What kinds of traditions, practices, and assumptions lead to different ways of seeing the world or creating knowledge? To what extent are some traditions, beliefs, and ideas universal and to what extent are they shaped by historical and political forces? Diversity is also fundamental to scholarship. Diverse perspectives provide the basis for the creativity and questioning that produce new ideas.

Ellin K. Scholnick Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and Professor of Psychology.

Double Counting Diversity Courses

When a course has been approved for the Human Cultural Diversity requirement, as well as CORE Distributive Studies, that course may be applied to both requirements. When an approved Human Cultural Diversity course (outside your major) also meets the criteria for CORE Advanced Studies, that course may be applied to both requirements. Thus, a single course may satisfy two CORE requirements. Some CORE Diversity courses may also be used to fulfill

college, major, or supporting area requirements. Check with your academic advisor if you have questions about double counting courses.