

University Senate

April 8, 2010

Members Present

Members present at the meeting: 97

Call to Order

Senate Chair Miller-Hooks called the meeting to order at 3:50 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

Chair Miller-Hooks asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of the March 25, 2010 meeting. Hearing none, she declared the minutes approved as distributed.

Report of the Chair

Chair Miller-Hooks announced that the Campus Affairs Committee would be holding its annual Campus Safety Forum on Tuesday, April 13, 2010 from 5:00 p.m. – 6:30 p.m. in 6137 McKeldin Library.

Committee Reports

ERG Committee: Plan of Organization for the College of Library and Information Studies (CLIS) (Senate Document#: 07-08-35) (Action)

Miller-Hooks asked the consent of the Senate to move this agenda item to a future Senate meeting. When questioned as to why the change was necessary, Miller-Hooks responded that the presenters could not attend today's meeting. Hearing no objection, Miller-Hooks stated that the item would be moved.

APAS Committee: Policies Concerning Academic Transcripts and Calculation of Grade Point Average (GPA) (Senate Document#: 09-10-35) (Action)

Charles Delwiche, Chair of the Academic Procedures & Standards Committee, presented the proposal to the Senate and provided background information. He explained that this proposed change was just a housekeeping matter. The proposal requests that the obsolete language be removed and be replaced with a reference to the newly revised policy.

Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion; hearing none, she called for a vote of the Senate. **The motion to approve the proposal passed.**

Report of the General Education Task Force

Transforming General Education at the University of Maryland (Senate Document#: 09-10-34)

Miller-Hooks announced that today we would be voting on whether or not to approve the plan. She introduced Ken Holum, Past Chair of the Senate.

Holum gave a brief overview of the genesis of the task force. He explained that the Senate Chair and the Provost created the membership jointly. He explained that the new proposed plan will provide future students with the skills and intellectual equipment to be successful in the future. He expressed his gratitude to the committee and Ira Berlin. Holum encouraged the Senate to approve the plan.

Miller-Hooks introduced Ira Berlin, Chair of the General Education Task Force & Distinguished University Professor of History.

Overview

Berlin thanked the Senate for making the campus governance process possible. He explained that the task force identified issues in the current plan and has come up with innovative solutions in the proposed plan. Berlin explained that we cannot get better until we “write more clearly, speak more effectively and reason more analytically.” We need to deepen and expand the level and quality of our intellectual engagement. This project will not work until we engage ourselves in it. The plan is conservative and innovative. Berlin explained that we must decide if this plan “makes us better.” He explained that a vote of confidence in this plan is a vote for us as a collectivity of students, faculty and staff. A vote against the plan is a vote to play it safe. He explained that the Senate should make the plan better, accept an imperfect document and empower the implementation committee to transform the proposal into a working plan. He asked the Senate to pass the plan.

Miller-Hooks thanked the task force and Berlin for their hard work.

Miller-Hooks explained the protocol for speakers.

Procedure Motion

Miller-Hooks made a motion to adopt time restrictions proposed by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). The plan would be reviewed in six major categories. Amendments would be considered within each category with previously submitted amendments reviewed first followed by amendments from the floor for each category. Each proposer and speaker would be allowed two minutes to speak. Each amendment would be limited to a total of 20 minutes of discussion.

Hearing no objection on the motion for time restrictions, Miller-Hooks called for a vote. **The motion passed.**

Miller-Hooks announced that Chair-Elect Mabbs would time all speakers and Montfort would time each amendment.

Miller-Hooks announced that we would review amendments in the Implementation category.

Implementation

Miller-Hooks invited Senator Jordan Goodman to introduce Amendment #2.

AMENDMENT #2

Proposed by: Jordan Goodman, Physics, CMPS

Page#: 35

Paragraph: 3

Original Text: (addition, no change to original text)

Proposed (Amendment):

If approved, a plan for implementation of the various aspects of the new program will be reviewed by an appropriate Senate committee. Once the program is fully implemented, the program will be presented to the Senate for possible amendments and adjustment.

Rationale:

While some aspects of the plan are clear and the resource implications are understood, others, such as the Oral Communication requirement, the Cultural Competency portion of the Diversity requirement, and the Experiential Learning option need further study prior to being fully implemented. It would be appropriate for the Senate to review these components once they have been better developed.

Senator Goodman, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, proposed his amendment (#2) and explained that this amendment would allow the Senate to have a role in reviewing the implementation of the plan.

Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion.

Ira Berlin, Chair, General Education Task Force, stated that the task force is sympathetic to the spirit of the amendment. They hope that the implementation process would continue in the same pragmatic way that the plan was created. The task force views this as a friendly amendment.

Miller-Hooks called for a vote on Amendment #2. **The amendment passed.**

Miller-Hooks introduced Senator Thomas Cohen to introduce Amendment #3.

AMENDMENT #3

Proposed by: Thomas Cohen, Faculty, CMPS

Page#: p. 34

Paragraph: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED PLAN FOR GENERAL EDUCATION – After Paragraph two

Original Text: N/A

Proposed (Amendment):

In addition to the implementation committee, a committee shall be appointed to develop a separate set of general education requirements for the Honors College and to consider implementation details for such a plan.

This plan will be presented to the Senate for approval within one year of approval of the overall General Education Plan. This committee shall have strong representation from the Honors College and be chaired by a faculty representative of the Honors College. Until such a plan is approved, Honors students may choose to satisfy the old Core requirements rather than the new General Education requirement.

Rationale:

The new requirements proposed by the General Education Task Force (along with the elimination of exemptions of old requirements) could increase the number of required courses outside of University Honors, Gemstone, Honors Humanities, Digital Cultures, Entrepreneurship & Innovation or through advanced courses quite substantially. This may well act to undermine the strength of the Honors College.

To preserve the strength of the Honors College, it is essential that Honors students continue to be able to fulfill the vast majority of their general education requirements through courses in University Honors, Gemstone, Honors Humanities, Digital Cultures or Entrepreneurship & Innovation, or through advanced course of intellectual interest to the student. Simply adding honors versions of oral communications, academic writing and the like will not solve this problem: such courses could still act to displace the very courses which make the Honors program special.

The new set of requirements should not require a typical Honors student to take any more courses outside of courses in University Honors, Gemstone, Honors Humanities, or the new programs in Digital Cultures and Entrepreneurship & Innovation, or through advanced level courses of strong intellectual interest to the students than is presently required.

Senator Cohen, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, proposed his amendment and explained his rationale.

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

Dean Hamilton, Undergraduate Studies, stated that a review was conducted last year to review the Honors program. The former director of honors felt that the honors program was excluded from general education in the past. She was looking forward to a program that embraces the Honors College and this plan does that. The issues that Senator Cohen raises will be addressed in the implementation phase and a representative from the Honors College will be a part of the implementation committee. She believes that there is a perfect match between the two and that this amendment is unnecessary.

Miller-Hooks called for a vote on Amendment #3. **The amendment failed.**

Miller-Hooks opened the floor to amendments from the floor. Hearing none, she announced that we would review amendments in the Fundamental Studies category.

Fundamental Studies

Miller-Hooks invited Senator Michael Scholten to introduce Amendment #1.

AMENDMENT #1

Proposed by: Michael Scholten, Graduate Student Senator from CMPS

Page#: 9 & 15-16

Paragraph: Last paragraph on page 9; Last paragraph on page 15/First paragraph on page 16;

Original Text:

The Task Force therefore proposes removing the exemption based on SAT score from English 101-Academic Writing.

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.

Proposed (Amendment):

Remove both of these paragraphs, and keep the existing SAT exemptions.
Exemption from the Academic Writing Requirement:

- SAT verbal score 670 or above
- Exemptions from the Mathematics Requirement:
- SAT Math score 600 or above;

Rationale:

The proposed policy would function to limit students' freedom to take upper level courses outside of their major by requiring them to take additional entry-level courses.

In order to justify the proposed policy, the committee should produce data that shows students who have received the current SAT exemptions are less competent in writing/mathematics than their peers who take the English/Math core classes.

Senator Scholten, Graduate Student, College of Computer, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, proposed his amendment and explained his rationale.

Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion.

Senator Gulick, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, stated that the Mathematics Department was consulted extensively on this matter. This change would affect very few students.

Dean Halperin, College of Computer, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, stated that there is a real value in having a student take advanced classes as opposed to certifying basic mathematical literacy. A student will take classes at their level.

Konstantina Trivisa, Member of the General Education Task Force, the proposal does not impose the requirement that a student must take a lower-level course. There will be no major impact on the resources of the University. This will raise the standards of the University.

Steve Glickman, Non-Voting Ex-Officio, President of the Student Government Association (SGA), introduced Shelly Cox, Vice President of the SGA. She stated that the SGA endorses a mathematics exemption but not one for English.

Steve Glickman, Non-Voting Ex-Officio, President of the SGA, made a motion to split the amendment into two parts, one for the mathematics exemption and one for the English exemption.

Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion to split Amendment #3 into two parts.

Senator Cohen, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, called the question on the discussion of the amendment to the amendment.

Miller-Hooks called for a vote on the motion to call the question and end debate on the amendment to the amendment. **The motion passed.**

Miller-Hooks called for a vote on the amendment to the amendment. **The motion passed and the amendment was split.**

Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion of the English exemption.

Dean Hamilton, Undergraduate Studies, introduced Barbara Gill, Assistant Vice President of Undergraduate Admissions, stated that she opposed the amendment. She explained that the SAT is not designed to be used for the purpose of exempting students. The original scores were set arbitrarily. We do not know if they have any relevance in determining whether a student will perform well in a course.

Jeanne Fahnestock, Member of the General Education Task Force, stated that removal of the exemption was inspired by SGA testimony. She reiterated that the SAT is not a predictor of success in academic writing ability. Studies show that high school students come in with a low ability to write persuasively even if their SAT score is high.

Senator Sachs, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, stated that he opposed both parts of the amendment. The data shows that SAT scores are not a metric for ability. The writing of students is not where it should be.

Senator Coleman, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that the greatest single predictor of success at the University was prompt completion of the English 101 requirement. However, the predictive value of that went down with higher SAT scores and particularly for those who exempted out.

Steve Glickman, Non-Voting Ex-Officio, President of the SGA, introduced Shelly Cox, Vice President of the SGA. She stated that the SGA is opposed to the exemption because it does not show a student's ability to write.

Miller-Hooks called for a vote on Amendment #1a, Re-Instating the English Exemption. **The amendment failed.**

Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion of the mathematics exemption.

Senator Cohen, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, stated that he reluctantly supported the amendment. He believes that the level of the math requirement is low and there is no AP test at this level.

Dean Hamilton, Undergraduate Studies, introduced Barbara Gill, Assistant Vice President of Undergraduate Admissions. She stated that she opposed the amendment. The SAT is not designed to predict success in a particular math course.

Senator Levermore, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, stated that the SAT is ill equipped to measure math competency. AP courses do not prepare students well either. He favored voting against the amendment.

Senator Tervalva, Undergraduate, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that he came in with a math exemption, but feels that it did not prepare him for college-level math. He asked the Senate to vote against the amendment.

Elizabeth Beise, Member of the General Education Task Force, stated that there are only about 150 students per year that are influenced by this exemption. The vast majority of students already take math for one reason or another.

Senator Tits, Faculty, College of Engineering, stated that he was opposed to the amendment. The SAT is an aptitude test, not a competency test. He does not believe that a multiple-choice test can test competency in basic mathematics.

Miller-Hooks called for a vote on Amendment #1b, Re-Instating the Mathematics Exemption. **The amendment failed.**

Miller-Hooks invited Senator Thomas Cohen to introduce Amendment #4.

AMENDMENT #4

Proposed by: Thomas Cohen, Faculty, CMPS

Page#: p. 18

Paragraph: MATHEMATICS REQUIREMENT – At the end of the section entitled Proposal for Fundamental Studies: Analytical Reasoning

Original Text: N/A

Proposed (Amendment):

A course with Math 111, Math 112, Math 113, Math 115, or Stat 100 as a prerequisite shall be deemed as satisfying both the Mathematics and Analytic Reasoning requirements. Similarly a student with a score of 4 or above on either the Calculus (AB or BC) or the Statistics AP tests shall be deemed to have satisfied both the Mathematics and Analytic Reasoning requirements.

Rationale:

There is a possible ambiguity in the Mathematics and Analytic Reasoning requirements. The report of the Task Force does not address the question of whether a single course with Math 111, Math 112, Math 113, Math 115, or Stat

100 as a requirement simultaneously fulfill both the Mathematics requirement (Math 111, Math 112, Math 113, Math 115, or Stat 100 or any MATH or STAT course for which any of the courses listed above is a prerequisite) and the Analytic Reasoning requirement (which includes higher-level mathematics). Miller-Hooks announced that we would review amendments in the Distributive Studies/I-series category.

Senator Cohen, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, proposed his amendment and explained his rationale.

Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion.

Cynthia Clement, Member of the General Education Task Force, stated that the task force is opposed to the amendment. It is much more specific than what they intended. They proposed that students take one course in analytic reasoning and gave some suggestions, but the specific courses would be part of the implementation process. They have also structured the proposal to set a minimum math requirement. All students need to grow in their ability to reason and evaluate information, which is the intention of this requirement.

Senator Buchanan, Faculty, College of Agriculture & Natural Resources, asked for a clarification on the amendment and whether other courses that require math courses as a prerequisite would also count as fulfilling this requirement.

Senator Cohen, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, clarified that the amendment was only related to math or statistics courses.

Elizabeth Beise, Member of the General Education Task Force, stated that the language of the amendment opens up the exemption to all courses with a math prerequisite.

Senator Gulick, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, stated that he was confused about what was meant by analytic reasoning.

Dean Halperin, College of Computer, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, stated that he was opposed to the amendment. You must take a math class at the university to satisfy this requirement. The implementation committee will have to figure out what qualifies as analytic reasoning. It is premature to try and decide what qualifies now.

Konstantina Trivisa, Member of the General Education Task Force, stated that the goal of the analytical reasoning requirement is to promote critical thinking. Students should be able to construct a reasonable argument, know how to

evaluate and assess data and how to draw conclusions. This amendment speaks to a very specific situation.

Senator Cohen, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, stated that Senator Gulick's point was valid. If we cannot define the term analytic reasoning, we should not support this aspect of the report.

Senator Levermore, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, stated that he was opposed to the amendment. He believes that the details can be worked out in the implementation phase.

Jeanne Fahnstock, Member of the General Education Task Force, stated that there is a definition of analytic reasoning in the plan. It has to do with the meta-awareness of procedures of reasoning, so students think about the sources of data. She opposed the amendment.

Chair-Elect Mabbs stated that Senator Cohen's concerns about implementation are addressed in Amendment #2 that was passed today.

Miller-Hooks called for a vote of Amendment #4. **The amendment failed.**

Miller-Hooks invited Senator Thomas Cohen to present his amendment.

AMENDMENT #5

Proposed by: Thomas Cohen, Faculty, CMPS

Page#: p. 10

Paragraph: Proposal for Fundamental Studies: Writing Section – At the end of the section entitled *The Existing Exemption Structure*

Original Text: N/A

Proposed (Amendment):

Departments and other academic units *may* choose to develop a series of courses certified as "writing intensive." A student who takes and passes two such courses in his or her major shall be exempted from the Professional Writing requirement.

Rationale:

In recommending the continuation of the Academic and Professional writing requirements and eliminating various exemptions to these, the General Education Task Force quotes a faculty member as saying that "the only way to learn to write is to write." The Senate concurs with this. However, this does not necessarily mean that the best way for students to improve their writing is in writing classes centered in the English department. An alternative approach is to have "writing intensive" courses in departments throughout the University. There are clear advantages of such an approach. Students may well take "writing

intensive” courses in a field of interest to them far more seriously than a pure writing course. Moreover, students have the benefit of learning about a subject of their interest while working on their writing. Finally, in many fields the development of writing in the context of the subject is critical to success in the field.

It is noteworthy that leading universities from the University of Virginia to MIT have writing requirements that can be fulfilled either in whole or in part by some variation of “writing intensive” courses in academic departments outside of English.

Senator Cohen, Member of the General Education Task Force, proposed the amendment and explained his rationale.

Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion.

Senator Hayes, Undergraduate, College of Engineering, spoke in favor of the amendment. He stated that he is disappointed by the content of his professional writing course. He believes that embedding the writing into a student’s major would be more effective and would allow students to learn to write in their field. He introduced Shelly Cox, Vice President of the SGA. She stated that the SGA supports the amendment. They feel that students should have the opportunity to take writing intensive courses in their major.

Rose Weiss, Member of the General Education Task Force, stated that she opposed the amendment. She does not feel she has learned technical writing within her major.

Sheryl Ehrman, Member of the General Education Task Force, stated that she opposed the amendment. In her experience, taking writing courses within her major was not useful.

Jeanne Fahnstock, Member of the General Education Task Force, stated that there is no standard writing intensive course at other institutions. A vote for this amendment is a vote for an unknown entity. She cited the differences at peer institutions that have writing intensive courses. There is evidence that students from writing independent courses are better writers. She explained that there is a mechanism in the proposal for a writing board to open the discussion to having alternatives in the disciplines.

Senator Roberts, Member of the General Education Task Force, stated that he endorses the spirit of the amendment, but not the specifics. He thinks that allowing individual disciplines to develop a writing intensive course in conjunction with the English Department is a good suggestion. He also supports the idea of

embedding the requirement into several courses, but opposes the specificity of the language in the amendment.

Senator Coleman, Faculty, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that we have a rhetoric based writing program. This allows students to understand the process of writing and the rhetorical basis behind effective writing. She was supportive of adding more writing intensive courses.

Senator Jacobe, Part-Time Instructor, College of Arts & Humanities, stated that she teaches in the professional writing program. She teaches students to write the way they need to write when they are in the real world. She opposes the amendment, because this does not get the students the skills they need to get jobs.

Senator Sachs, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, emphasized that the writing intensive courses in his college teach how to frame an argument, not how to write it. These courses are the nuts and bolts. They teach us how to write. The writing should match the content at a high level.

Senator Cohen, Member of the General Education Task Force, stated that we could set up courses that could be certified. Grades would not be based on content, but rather on the quality of the writing. It is natural that these types of courses could work with the proposed writing board. He believes this amendment is a way to make the writing courses more meaningful to students.

Miller-Hooks called for a vote on Amendment #5. **The amendment failed.**

Miller-Hooks invited Senator Thomas Cohen to introduce Amendment #6.

AMENDMENT #6

Proposed by: Thomas Cohen, Faculty, CMPS

Page#: p. 13

Paragraph: Proposal for Fundamental Studies: Oral Communication – fifth bullet

Original Text:

The Task Force expects that other departments might mount courses in oral communication that could also satisfy the requirement.

Proposed (Amendment):

Students in majors that are in a college that has developed an Oral Communications course shall have the option of satisfying the requirement within the college.

Rationale:

The General Education Task Force has recommended a required one-semester

course in Oral Communications. In implementing this requirement, the differences between the various disciplines needs to be taken into account; the nature of oral communications differs from field to field. Accordingly, colleges across the campus may choose to develop their own Oral Communications courses.

Senator Cohen, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, proposed his amendment and explained his rationale.

Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion.

Senator Sachs, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, asked for a clarification in the differences between amendments 6 & 7.

Senator Cohen, Member of the General Education Task Force, responded that Amendment #6 states that an oral communication course requirement can be developed within colleges. Amendment #7 supports an oral communications intensive course embedded in a major as an alternative to an independent oral communications course.

Senator Sachs, Undergraduate, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, stated that he felt that the two were linked and made a motion to consider amendments 6 & 7 together.

Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion on the motion; hearing none, she called for a vote to link amendments 6 & 7. **The motion passed.**

AMENDMENT #7

Proposed by: Thomas Cohen, Faculty, CMPS

Page#: p. 13

Paragraph: Proposal for Fundamental Studies: Oral Communication – fifth bullet

Original Text: N/A

Proposed (Amendment):

Departments and other academic units may choose to develop a series of courses certified as “oral communications intensive.” A student who takes and passes two such courses in his or her major shall be exempted from the Oral Communications course requirement.

Rationale:

The General Education Task Force has recommended a required one-semester course in Oral Communications. The premise underlying that requirement is that oral communications skills are important and that students would benefit from stronger oral communications skills. This is clearly correct. However, the General Education Task Force has not made a compelling case for a required course

devoted entirely to oral communications. An alternative model to improve oral communications skills of our students is to develop oral communication across the curriculum and particularly within a student's major.

Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion of the linked amendments.

Elizabeth Toth, Non-Voting Ex-Officio, Chair of the Department of Communications stated that she is opposed to both amendments. She thinks the language in the plan is better, because it encourages more than one oral communications class with an oversight board.

Robyn Muncy, Member of the General Education Task Force, stated that oral communications intensive courses presumes a skill, but does not teach a skill. Most faculty do not have the expertise of colleagues that teach oral communications. She opposed the amendment.

Heather Nathans, Member of the General Education Task Force, opposed the amendment. She stated that the Department of Theatre is excited about the possibility of developing a course devoted to oral communications.

Senator Buchanan, Faculty, College of Agriculture & Natural Resources, stated that he is concerned with the amendments, because the general education courses build a foundation for the higher-level courses. We should not expect that students will not use these courses in their development in the future.

Miller-Hooks called for a vote of Amendments 6 & 7 combined. **The combined amendments failed.**

Miller-Hooks opened the floor to amendments from the floor. Hearing none, she announced that we would review amendments in the Distributive Studies/I-series category.

Miller-Hooks introduced Senator Thomas Cohen to introduce Amendment #8.

AMENDMENT #8

Proposed by: Thomas Cohen, Faculty, CMPS

Page#: p. 20

Paragraph: II. THE SIGNATURE OF GENERAL EDUCATION: THE "I" SERIES - *Implementation of the Signature Courses; Second paragraph*

Original Text:

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.

Proposed (Amendment):

The new General Education plan does not require students to take any fixed number of "I" courses. It does mandate that a substantial number of "I" series courses be offered and that students will have the option of satisfying some or all of their Distributive Studies requirements with "I" courses.

Rationale:

The General Education Task Force has recommended that students be required to take at least two "I" series courses. The "I" series as described in the report is very exciting and should provide important and meaningful educational experiences for many of our undergraduates. However, many of the advantages of the "I" series program appear to exist regardless of whether the courses are required or merely offered. Moreover there is an obvious disadvantage in requiring such courses: the flexibility of the General Education program is reduced. In some cases this could limit the ability of students to take course of greater educational value to them than any of the courses in the "I" series. Thus, the requirement that students take "I" series courses should be imposed only on the basis of a compelling educational rationale. However, the report of the Task Force does not articulate any meaningful educational or intellectual justification for a requirement that all of our undergraduates must take courses in the "I" series.

The central rationale given for this requirement in the report of the General Education Task Force is a desire for a signature or brand for the General Education program. However, the "I"-series can be a distinctive signature or brand of the Maryland General Education program without being a requirement. If the I-series is as intellectually vigorous as is planned, even without a requirement students will take "I"-series courses in large numbers and the "I" series will come to define our program.

Senator Cohen, Faculty, College of Computer, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, proposed his amendment and explained his rationale.

Miller-Hooks opened the floor to discussion of Amendment #8.

Ira Berlin, Chair, General Education Task Force, stated that the I-courses are a signature of the new plan. If they are not a signature, they will just be a group of interesting courses that the University is not invested in. The I-courses speak to what is special about a University of Maryland education. If we do not make the I-courses a signature, they will become less significant.

Miller-Hooks called for a vote on Amendment #8. **The amendment failed.**

Senator Soltan, Faculty, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences, made a motion to call the question and end debate on the report as a whole.

Miller-Hooks called for a vote on the motion to call the question and end debate and go to a final vote. **The motion passed.**

Miller-Hooks explained that no other amendments would be considered and that the Senate would vote on the plan as amended. She called for a vote on the plan as amended. **The proposal was approved.**

Miller-Hooks introduced Nariman Farvardin, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost.

Farvardin stated that the Senate's vote to approve the General Education Plan will help the University enter a new era. This plan will help to mobilize the faculty and energize the students in order to create an environment of intellectual vitality. We will contribute to making our state, country and the world a better place, because of this program. Farvardin also explained that not many universities have the courage to undertake a review of the general education program and complete that review in such a timely manner. He pledged to do everything in his power to ensure that the implementation is done correctly and thoughtfully so that we can make this a program that we can all be proud of. Farvardin thanked the members of the task force for their hard work in creating this plan.

New Business

There was no new business.

Adjournment

Senate Chair Miller-Hooks adjourned the meeting at 5:28 p.m.