

**2010-2011 ACADEMIC SENATE REVIEW OF THE
GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM:
FOUNDATIONS OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES**

Internal Review Team

Ronald Vroon, Undergraduate Council, Slavic Languages and Literatures (Review Team Chair)
Aaron Blaisdell, Undergraduate Council, Psychology

External Reviewer

Jaye Padgett, Department of Linguistics, University of California, Santa Cruz

Date of Site Visit: February 10, 2011

Date of Report: March 18, 2011

Approved by the Undergraduate Council: May 20, 2011

Appendix I: External Reviewer's Report

Appendix II: Additional Statistical Data on GE Arts and Humanities Courses

Appendix III: Site Visit Schedule

Appendix IV: Self-Review Report (The self-review was *previously distributed*. If you need a hard copy, please contact the Academic Senate Office at extension 62959.)

**2010-2011 ACADEMIC SENATE REVIEW OF THE
GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM:
FOUNDATIONS OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES**

Introduction

The present report constitutes the third and penultimate review of the General Education Curriculum. This campus-wide program emerged from a thorough review of the old General Education (GE) requirement initiated in June 1997. It was implemented for incoming freshmen across the College of Letters and Science effective Academic Year (AY) 2002-03 and for transfer students effective AY 2004-05. The new curriculum was subsequently adopted by the university's other schools. As of the AY 2006-07 all UCLA students must fulfill their GE requirement under the new system.

The hallmark of the present GE curriculum is a structure that assigns all GE courses to one of three foundation areas: 1) Scientific Inquiry; 2) Society and Culture; and 3) Arts and Humanities. These foundation areas, in turn, are divided into two or three subgroups. The foundation targeted in this review includes the subgroups: 1) Literary and Cultural Analysis; 2) Linguistic and Philosophical Analysis; and 3) Visual and Performance Arts: Analysis and Practice. An additional feature of the curriculum is the Freshman Cluster program, which brings together a three-course GE sequence — usually two large lecture courses with discussion groups followed by a third quarter seminar — the completion of which assigns credit in several foundation areas and subgroups. The GE requirement varies, depending on the college or school. In the College of Letters and Science and the School of Nursing, students must complete ten GE courses, three of them in Arts and Humanities, one in each of the aforementioned subgroups. The School of Theatre, Television and Film, which also requires ten GE courses, requires five in the Arts and Humanities, with no more than two in any given subgroup. The School of Arts and Architecture requires eight GE courses, with three in Arts and Humanities distributed equitably across the three subgroups. In the School of Engineering the total is five, two of which must be in different subgroups of Arts and Humanities.

The chief academic officer of the GE Curriculum is the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. General oversight is exercised by the GE Governance Committee, a fifteen-member advisory body (including two student representatives) to the Undergraduate Council that makes recommendations to the Undergraduate Council concerning courses submitted for GE accreditation, evaluates existing courses, assists faculty in developing new GE courses and clusters and periodically assesses the GE curriculum and program, its values and goals. The Committee has three sub-committees corresponding to the three foundation areas; each is charged with reviewing and making recommendations regarding offerings within its foundational purview.

The structure of GE Curriculum reviews has been predicated on the structure of the program itself. Rolling eight-year reviews of the three foundation areas were mandated by the Undergraduate Council, each involving a two year process that would yield a comprehensive self-review by the end of the first year and a final external review by the end of the second. The Scientific Inquiry area underwent its review in 2006-2008 and Society and Culture in 2007-2009. The review of Arts and Humanities area began in 2009 and will conclude with the present Academic

Senate review. We were given to understand that a fourth two-year review, this one of the Freshman Clusters Program, is to be initiated in the Fall Quarter of 2011, and it will conclude a full eight-year review of the entire GE Curriculum. Since Art and Humanities is the last of the three foundation areas to be reviewed, however, we are positioned to make certain comments and recommendations that are applicable not only to the area we were mandated to review, but to the other foundation areas and the program as a whole. These will be noted in the conclusion of this report.

Review Procedures: Overview and Assessment

Overview

The Arts and Humanities review, like those of the other two foundation areas, began with the appointment of an *ad hoc* internal review committee, appointed in the present instance by Vice Provost Judith Smith and GE Governance Committee Chair Robert Gurval; it consisted of thirteen members, all but two drawn from departments within the Division of the Humanities (these two represent respectively the Department of Women's Studies, within Social Sciences, and World Arts and Cultures, within the School of Art and Architecture). The committee was assisted in its work by the administrative staff of the GE Governance Committee, the Registrar's Office, College Academic Counseling and the Undergraduate Education Initiatives.

The *ad hoc* review committee was charged with determining 1) whether the declared content of courses in the foundation area meet the fundamental mission of inculcating the knowledge, skills, and evaluative tools associated with the arts and humanities; 2) whether these course are themselves conducted in a manner commensurate with this mission; 3) whether the frequency and distribution of offering is adequate to the fulfillment of the mission; and 4) whether instructors are sufficiently familiar with and/or trained in the pedagogical goals of the GE requirement to effectively carry out this mission. The self-review process involved the collection and assessment of curricular data and student enrollment statistics; a review of course syllabi; three in-depth course reviews; and the collection and analysis of faculty and student survey data. The resulting self-review report provided by the committee was submitted to the Undergraduate Council administrative staff in September 2010 and to the present review team shortly thereafter. We wish to acknowledge the key role played by committee member Jeff Decker in providing resource support and articulating the review's major findings; to the committee as a whole for providing a comprehensive, professional report; and to the support staff (Michael Soh in particular) for providing additional statistical data on GE offerings in the foundation area.

The Academic Senate review team consisted of two internal reviewers, both members of the Undergraduate Council (Aaron Blaisdell, Dept. of Psychology and Ronald Vroon, review team chair) and one external review (Jaye Padgett, Dept. of Linguistics, UC Santa Cruz). The internal reviewers met on January 6, 2011 with current GE Governance Committee Chair Scott Chandler, Jeff Decker, Michael Soh and Undergraduate Council Policy Analyst Jisoo Kim to discuss site visit logistics and to solicit additional statistical data. On January 26 the same reviewers met with Vice Provost Judith Smith to discuss some of the major issues to be considered during the review. The site visit took place on February 10, 2011. All meetings were conducted in 2325 Murphy Hall. The review team had the opportunity to interview Vice Provost Judith Smith, Chair Scott Chandler and Jeff Decker once again. Subsequent interviewees included the chairs and fa-

culty of several departments that host GE courses, decanal representatives, members of the GE Governance Committee, graduate students who have served as teaching assistants in GE courses and seminar leaders in Freshman Clusters, and several undergraduate students, including representatives of student governance groups, from current or past GE courses.

Assessment

The review process was conducted in sufficient breadth and depth to provide a clear picture of the program and assess both its strengths and its weaknesses, and we laud the thoroughness of the self-review. We would, however, draw attention to two ways in which the self-review might provide useful data in future reviews. First, the three GE courses selected for in-depth analysis, each drawn from one of the subgroups of the foundation area, were not equally representative; those in Literary and Cultural Analysis, and Philosophic and Linguistic Analysis, seemed paradigmatic for their subgroups; the course carrying Visual and Performance Arts credit, *Art and Archeology of Ancient Greece*, seemed less so (and more in line with Literary and Cultural Analysis) precisely because it involved neither performance nor performance analysis. In view of the fact that more than a third (101 of the 281) Arts and Humanities GE offerings are in this subgroup, a more representative choice would have yielded more useful information. And indeed, to the extent that any deficiencies are to be noted in the curriculum, these are, based on our interviews, most probably within the Visual and Performance Art subgroup. Second, since surveys of students are based on self-selection, one cannot draw anything but the most tentative conclusions from them, and even these may be wrong. Our recommendations, therefore, will include a suggestion for modifying the survey process.

Program Assessment: Mission and Implementation

Course Range, Content and Availability

The aim of courses in the Foundation of the Arts and Humanities, as set down in the mission statement of GE Curriculum, is

to provide perspectives and intellectual skills necessary to comprehend and think critically about our situation in the world as human beings. In particular, the courses provide the basic means to appreciate and evaluate the ongoing efforts of humans to explain, translate, and transform our diverse experiences of the world through such media as language, literature, philosophical systems, images, sounds, and performances. These courses introduce historical development and fundamental intellectual and ethical issues associated with the arts and humanities and may also investigate the complex relations between artistic and humanistic expression and other facets of society and culture.

It appears to us that over the review period the number and variety of courses were generally sufficient to address this mission: between Fall 2002 and Fall 2009, 201 courses in the foundation area were offered, hosted by 34 different programs or departments, with a total iteration of 1851 offerings over 7 years (SR 11). The number of students working toward B.A. and B.S. degrees is fairly well distributed over the range of offerings, with GE courses in Linguistics, Art and Architecture, Philosophy, Music, English and Classics dominating (see SR Table 4, 14). Students interviewed did not complain about accessibility in general, nor did this appear to be an issue in the student surveys. However, several students did say that they had to settle for their second or third choice in picking GE courses, and a very substantial number (over 90% of survey responders) indicated that scheduling played a very important role in the selection of GE courses. Coupled to these concerns were remarks by students about the desirability of more courses on non-European

cultures and those dealing with diversity issues –ethnic, social, religious and gender-related. It is impossible, however, for us to gauge how widespread this view is based on the limited number of interviewees.

Related to the issue of course availability per se is the current status of Freshman Clusters. Virtually all those interviewed – faculty, TAs and students – were enthusiastic about this program. Although a review of this particular part of the GE Curriculum as such does not fall under our purview, we mention it here because it was foremost in the mind of most of the Teaching Assistants we interviewed, as well as several undergraduates and a number of department chairs. For the former the principal desideratum was *more* clusters, viewed as among the richest and most satisfying academic experience of both instructors and students. Among faculty we found a similarly enthusiastic reception of clusters (though not unanimous), but coupled with concerns about how staffing such courses presents a resource problem to cooperating departments, particularly since departments currently receive only about \$5000 for course buy-outs, a substantial reduction from earlier years, and compensatory support in the form of additional TA-ships is too haphazard to be useful in planning graduate student support. This matter is addressed in our recommendations.

Among the issues that remain unresolved is the appropriate status of foreign language courses in the GE Arts and Humanities curriculum. Some argue that the acquisition of foreign language proficiency does not appropriately address the mission of GE courses, while others are convinced that such study, particularly beyond the first year, involves a level of skill-training that does raise it to a level commensurate with GE goals, particularly because more advanced study is usually culturally grounded and introduces students to new ways of thinking about the world that are uniquely linked to the study of another language. We strongly support the Self-Review's recommendation that this issue be revisited. We also support, at the very least, granting GE certification to courses taught in foreign languages whose content and structure fulfill all the demands of GE courses taught in English. The fact that these courses require knowledge of a foreign language has no bearing on whether they can meet the broad goals set for GE courses.

Finally, the question of resources for Arts and Humanities courses within the GE curriculum in general must be addressed. We learned to our satisfaction that the anticipated rise in the number of incoming freshmen has prompted the administration to provide deans with additional resources to increase the number of available seats in GE courses. This development, needless to say, is welcome. At the same time we were surprised to learn from the Humanities Dean's office that no real statistical guidelines have been established for resource allocation, i.e. a statistical measure for determining how many GE courses in which foundation areas are needed to meet the demands of a given number of students. The precipitous increase (600+) in the size of the incoming (2011) freshman class highlights the need to develop a holistic approach to the deployment of resources across the GE curriculum. Without it resources will be wasted and/or spread unevenly, and may unfairly privilege those departments that already host large GE courses.

Course quality

We are convinced by the Self-Review's assessment that the overwhelming majority of courses meet university expectations for GE offerings in the Arts and Humanities (SR 15). The certification of courses is sufficiently rigorous, and the quality of these courses in subsequent iterations

has not resulted in degradation, judging by the *ad hoc* committee's review of course syllabi and close analysis of three GE courses, and by student surveys. Very substantial majorities (in the 70-90% range) report that these courses enhanced their appreciation of the humanities, increased their awareness and understanding of diversity, strengthened critical thinking, and improved writing skills (NB: the percentage of those concurring that GE courses improved their writing skills is cited at 65% [SR 24], whereas the accompanying graph [SR 25] indicated 75%). A scarce majority found that the classes improved oral communication skills. Our interviews with students, with rare exceptions (as noted below), revealed that students found their GE courses as a rule to be more rigorous and more time-consuming than upper division courses in their majors.

Three issues, nonetheless, need to be addressed in the area of quality. The first is that for some courses there is indeed "drift" or "slippage" in rigor. The Self-Review identified 16 such courses in multiple iterations (SR 15-16), and we discovered others in our interviews with students. Most of these, perhaps not coincidentally, are in the Visual and Performance Arts subgroup, suggesting the need for greater oversight here. There also appears, in the "slippage" category, to be a problem with insufficiently detailed syllabi. The Self-Review recommends that faculty teaching courses with Arts and Humanities "provide certain kinds of course information in their syllabi, e.g. course aims and contents, assignments, grading policy, readings and weekly subject matter" (SR 16), and also that an automated electronic notification system be introduced to encourage compliance with GE norms (SR 26). We concur with both recommendations, adding that the development of an electronic course evaluation specific to the structure and requirements of GE courses would help to insure compliance with GE norms and assist in future reviews of the curriculum. It could also achieve the same goals, and therefore render redundant, the instructor survey recommended by the *ad hoc* committee (SR 26). We also suggest a simple recertification process whereby departments would be obligated, at specific intervals (for example, four years) to confirm conformity of their GE offerings with the GE-mandated template.

A second issue concerns the function and status of discussion sections. Faculty and students alike affirmed the importance of such sections, primarily because they allow for greater personal attention by the instructor to students' writing and expository skills. At the review team's request, Michael Soh and Jeff Decker provided us statistics for one year (2008-09: see Appendix III) revealing that five classes, all in the Visual and Performance Arts subgroup, had enrollments over 100 (one as high as 495!) with no discussion sections. With these outliers removed, 11 courses without discussion sections were registered with enrollment over 20 students (one with 88 students). We were informed that the GE Governance Committee had already taken corrective action with respect to some (those in Musicology), but not all (those in Theater and Design and Media Arts) courses. It was, perhaps, an awareness of these problems that has led the GE Governance Committee to adopt, in 2009, a rule to the effect that GE courses with an enrollment greater than 25 add one or more discussion sections,¹ and led the *ad hoc* self-review committee to recommend that discussion sections be limited to 20 students. We believe these measures to be well intentioned and in the spirit of the original GE curricular reform, but they may be unrealistic given current resources. Since the principal reason for smaller classes (both primary and discussion sections) is to facilitate greater personal attention by the instructor to student academic

¹ We have not seen this rule promulgated in any official communication of the GE Governance Committee with departments; it came to our attention via personal communication from current Faculty Executive Committee Chair Raymond Knapp.

needs, the availability of readers, or a combination of readers and TAs, should be explored as alternatives (or amelioratives) to rigid enrollment caps.

A third issue concerns the writing requirement for GE classes. All those whom we interviewed were in agreement that the writing component is absolutely central to GE courses. Indeed, it struck the review team as incongruous that GE courses in other foundation areas do not have such a writing requirement, in that the ability to logically and effectively communicate one's ideas is as important in the physical, life and social sciences as it is in the humanities. That being said, we are not entirely convinced that unqualified recommendation of a ten-page writing assignment (in the Art and Humanities area or elsewhere) is the wisest approach. A more nuanced requirement that would allow for shorter assignments but with the submission of several drafts could certainly serve the same purpose and be equally, if not more, effective.

Recommendations

The GE Art and Humanities Foundation area is an indispensable, robust part of the GE Curriculum. It is conscientiously and efficiently administered. The recommendations below reflect our confidence in the fundamental merits of the curriculum and are intended to fine-tune a well-run program.

To the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education:

- 1) *Essential.* Initiate a holistic statistical analysis of the number of GE seats needed to accommodate the student body and their approximate distribution across the foundational areas and sub-areas. This analysis is essential for divisional deans as they determine where to deploy instructional resources to individual departments. Although this recommendation only extends to the foundation area under review, it would obviously be desirable in all of them.
- 2) *Important.* Devise a procedure for notifying faculty of the requirements associated with GE offerings whenever they offer such courses, and implement, if possible, an automated electronic labeling system that specifically identifies courses as belonging to the GE curriculum.

Initiate work on an electronic course evaluation form specific to GE courses, to be administered at the end of each GE course offering, that would help to insure compliance with GE requirements for courses (including both class size and the writing component) and facilitate subsequent Academic Senate reviews of the GE curriculum. In the interim, consider instituting a simple recertification protocol for GE courses at fixed intervals, e.g. every four years.

- 3) *Desirable.* Concurrent with the fourth and last review of the GE curriculum in 2011-13, that of the Freshman Cluster Program, initiate a review of the entire GE curriculum to determine if its current disciplinary-based structure (Humanities, Social Sciences, Scientific Inquiry) continues to answer the demands of an evolving and increasingly interdisciplinary-

nary curriculum. Explore at the same time ways to expand the Freshman Cluster Program, acknowledged by many as the jewel in the crown of the present GE curriculum.

To the Undergraduate Council:

- 4) *Essential.* In consultation with the General Education Governance Committee, formulate a nuanced, less rigid policy on the writing requirement in the Arts and Humanities Foundation area that takes into account both the length of writing assignments and the reworking of drafts with instructional feedback.

Formulate a less rigid policy on GE class size that 1) takes into account the difference between courses taught with and without discussion sections and 2) allows greater latitude for classes (primary or discussion) that use readers rather than TAs (or a combination of the two) in the correction of substantial writing assignments.

Grant GE certification to courses taught in foreign languages whose content and structure fulfill all the demands of GE courses taught in English.

- 5) *Desirable.* Consider making a writing requirement mandatory for all GE courses, regardless of foundation area.

To the Review Team, AY 2011-12 Senate Review of the Freshman General Education Clusters:

- 6) *Important.* Attention should be given to faculty involvement in the Cluster Program. Consider the current faculty buyout practice in order to determine whether it needs to be systemized with either promised funds or guaranteed TA support over the duration of the department's commitment to provide GE instruction, which may both facilitate and encourage greater involvement by faculty in the Cluster Program.

Final Recommendation

Pending a satisfactory progress review and renewal of the General Education Curriculum, the Undergraduate Council recommends that the General Education Foundation: *Arts and Humanities* be reviewed on a regular eight-year schedule in Academic Year 2018-19.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald Vroon, Undergraduate Council, Slavic Languages and Literatures, Review Team Chair
Aaron Blaisdell, Undergraduate Council, Psychology

Appendix I: External Reviewer's Report

Jaye Padgett, Department of Linguistics
University of California, Santa Cruz



Jaye Padgett
Department of Linguistics
Stevenson College

SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA 95064

March 8, 2011

(831) 459-3157
padgett@ucsc.edu

Academic Senate Office
UCLA

Re: External review of Arts & Humanities general education curriculum

Dear Colleagues,

On February 10, 2011, I participated in an external review of UCLA's Foundations of Arts and Humanities general education curriculum. My colleagues on the External Review Committee were Aaron Blaisedell and Ronald Vroon (chair), both members of the Undergraduate Council. We met for dinner on February 9, and spent February 10 in an intensive series of meetings with the many constituencies involved in the GE curriculum, including members of the GE Governance Committee, the Dean/Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, members of the Self-Review team, relevant department chairs and faculty who teach GE courses, deans, graduate student instructors, and undergraduate students.

I would like first to compliment the senate staff for their excellent organization of the external review events.

I will not rehearse the background on the GE curriculum or its history, which are extensively discussed in the Self-Review. Instead let me highlight two issues that were raised by the Self-Review and which Vice Provost Smith particularly drew our committee's attention to (see p. 26 of the Self-Review):

- Implement a minimum 10 page/quarter writing requirement for courses carrying GE credit in the Foundations of Arts and Humanities. In addition, strongly encourage two or more writing assignments or a longer paper with multiple drafts to allow for instructor feedback.
- Implement an automated electronic notification system whereby instructors scheduled to teach a course carrying GE credit are alerted to this fact at least one month prior to the start of instruction.

Before addressing these specific issues and one other, I will note that the External Review Committee (ERC) concurred with the Self-Review (which was excellently done) that the curriculum achieves its stated goals very well. In what follows I understand my task as being to present my own conclusions on more specific issues.

Minimum writing requirement

There are few things that faculty agree on more consistently than that students should write better than they do. This recommendation seems excellent in principle, though it obviously raises resource questions.

A substantive question raised by this recommendation is, Why should a writing minimum be required only for Arts and Humanities GE courses? There is by now a well-known point of view, associated with terms like “Writing in the Disciplines” and “Writing across the Curriculum”, that the teaching of writing should not be confined to disciplinary areas in this way. If I were to state very briefly the reasons for this point of view, as I understand them, I would say i) few careers do not benefit from writing skills; ii) the conventions of writing vary from field to field; and iii) we learn through writing, so writing is useful for teaching anything. My thinking on this is influenced by recent events at UC Santa Cruz, where we implemented a Disciplinary Communication requirement.

It seems necessary to state a minimum in terms of pages (or probably better, words), if there is to be a requirement at all. But more important than number of pages is the requirement that students create multiple drafts of a work and get feedback on those drafts. I (and I believe the ERC) strongly endorse this latter aspect of the recommendation.

Automated notification system

There is a large concern one might identify in the background of this recommendation. Courses with GE designations are originally approved by committees with their eye fixed firmly on the specific goals of general education. But there are many reasons why those goals may fail to be met in the classroom, especially over the long term.

One reason is that instructors change, a fact that motivates this second recommendation. An electronic notification system, however it might be implemented, would presumably be reliable at least in the sense that it doesn't rely on the memory or good will of people (such as department chairs or managers) to convey information. But because faculty are flooded with email notifications all of the time, I have my doubts about how effective this strategy would actually be, at least if this were all that is done (see below).

The related recommendation that a suffix “G” be added to GE course numbers is interesting. But it assumes that an instructor who does not know that a course she is about to teach is a GE course would think to ask someone why a suffix “G” appears on the number. A helpful answer to that question, presumably, would convey all of the information about what the G designation should entail. This brings us back to the above recommendation; what ensures that new instructors understand GE expectations?

A step toward an answer to this question, I think, would be to build feedback on GE goals into GE course evaluations. (My understanding is that UCLA is establishing online evaluations, something that could conceivably help with standardizing practice in this regard.) This would be possible assuming that the educational goals of a specific GE designation are well enough articulated so as to allow them to be translated into course evaluation questions; and this of course would be a good thing. Changing evaluations would not *directly* address the worry stated above, that faculty would not be clear on the goals of a GE course before teaching it. But it

would very likely cause a change in culture that would make people more likely to remember to discuss GE expectations or to pay attention to emails that talk about them.

GE Clusters

In my view the GE clusters are the most innovative aspect of UCLA's general education system. We have been attempting to emulate them at UC Santa Cruz. Here is a relevant passage from the University of California Commission on General Education in the 21st Century:¹

As one alternative to the "cafeteria approach" to general education, in which students choose a set of core courses from an unwieldy list of general education courses, campuses should develop a discrete number of thematic, interdisciplinary bundles or sequences of courses around substantive and timely topics...Students could select any given thematic package voluntarily, but once selected, all of its constituent parts would be required.

Quoting now from a document that emerged from UCSC's recent GE reform effort:

A clustered curriculum has benefits beyond purely academic ones. Clusters...create learning communities..., and one might hope for the sort of benefits to institutional identity, retention, and educational success that such learning communities can foster. Indeed, in a well known cross-institutional study of college learning outcomes, Astin (1993:425) concluded that a "true-core interdisciplinary approach to general education, in which all students are required to take precisely the same set of courses" was the only design feature of general education that stood out in positively affecting many of the learning outcomes. Astin speculates that "the beneficial outcomes of a true-core curriculum may be mediated by the peer group: having students take exactly the same general education courses provides a common experience that can stimulate student discussion outside class and facilitate the formation of strong bonds among student peers."²

The ERC found some cause for concern about the future of the GE clusters. Funding to departments who release faculty has diminished substantially. Departments are under increasing stress as the student-to-faculty ratio worsens. Faculty worry that they are hurting their departments by choosing to teach in clusters. Yet it was the clusters that, in my view, most clearly inspired the faculty and students that the ERC interviewed. I hope that UCLA will view clusters as a forward-thinking priority even as budget issues continue to press.

Thank you for the opportunity to learn about general education at UCLA.

Sincerely,

Jaye Padgett
Professor and Chair, Linguistics

¹ *General Education in the 21st Century*. Report of the UC Commission on General Education in the 21st Century, Center for Studies in Higher Education, UC Berkeley.

² Proposal for General Education Reform at UCSC (p. 17).

<http://senate.ucsc.edu/cep/GE%20History/CEPproposal2.pdf>. Works cited in the quotation: 1. Astin, Alexander W. 1993. *What matters in college: four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 2. Tinto, Vincent. 1993. *Leaving college: rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago University Press.

Appendix II: Additional Statistical Data on GE Arts and Humanities Courses

From: Soh, Michael
Sent: Wednesday, February 16, 2011 10:57 AM
To: Vroon, Ronald
Cc: Decker, Jeffrey L.
Subject: RE: Program Review: GE Arts and Humanities - Draft Schedule and Request for Statistics

[A query was made on February 9, 2011 requesting a snapshot of the 128 GE courses in AY 2008-09 conducted without discussion sections :

- 1) what was the enrollment of the class with the highest enrollment?
- 2) what was the enrollment of the class with the lowest enrollment?
- 3) what was the overall average enrollment of these classes?
- 4) how many classes exceeded an enrollment of 20 students?

The following response was received]

Hi Professor Vroon,

Below please find the information you requested for AH GE courses with no discussion sections. I generated the data; Jeff Decker added the commentary and explanations.

All courses w/o section in 08-09 AY

1. highest enrollment: 495
2. lowest enrollment: 11
3. average enrollment: 53.07
4. classes exceeding enrollment of twenty students: 16

Note that the AY2008-09 data includes five courses with no sections that have enrollment over 100 students. These outliers are:

MUSIC HISTORY 5 (History of Rock & Roll) - 495
MUSIC HISTORY 70 (Beethoven) - 308
DESMA 10 (Design Culture) - 239
THEATER 10 (Intro-Theater) - 150
MUSIC HISTORY 65 (Blues) - 114

You might be interested to know that a few years ago GE Governance recommended that all GE classes with high enrollment add discussion sections. At the time, I believe the only department within the College routinely out of compliance with this recommendation was Musicology. GE Governance consulted Musicology and the department agreed to add discussion sections to its large Music History GE courses in the near future. Beginning this academic year, discussion sections have been added to all large GE classes offered by Musicology. As a result, the three Music History classes included in the list of AH GE courses without discussion sections – i.e., Music History 5, Music History 65, and Music History 70 – are no longer taught without discussion

sections. Here's what the numbers look like for AY2008-09 if – to more closely reflect current enrollment trends – we run them without the three Music History classes.

All courses w/o section in 08-09 AY (minus Music History courses [3])

1. highest enrollment: 239
2. lowest enrollment: 11
3. average enrollment: 33.51
4. classes exceeding enrollment of twenty students: 13

You might also be interested to know that the other two classes on the list – DESMA 10 and Theater 10 – are the only high enrollment AH GE courses without discussion sections offered by Design Media Arts and Theater, Film & TV, respectively. Here's what the numbers look like if we remove these two courses as well as the Music History classes.

All courses w/o section in 08-09 AY (minus Music History/Theater/DESMA courses [5])

1. highest enrollment: 88
2. lowest enrollment: 11
3. average enrollment: 24.31
4. classes exceeding enrollment of twenty students: 11

Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions.

Best,

Michael Soh

UCLA Undergraduate Education Initiatives

A265 Murphy Hall

msoh@college.ucla.edu

310.794.5040

Appendix III: Site Visit Schedule

**2010-2011 UCLA Academic Senate Program Review
General Education Curriculum
Foundations of Arts and Humanities**

Review Team

Jaye Padgett, UC Santa Cruz
Ronald Vroon, Undergraduate Council, Review Team Chair
Aaron Blaisdell, Undergraduate Council, Review Team Member

SITE VISIT: FEBRUARY 10, 2011

All meetings will be held in 2325 Murphy Hall, unless otherwise noted.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9:

7:00 p.m. Dinner Meeting: Initial Organizational Session for *Review Team Members Only*
WEST Restaurant, Hotel Angeleno (170. N. Church Lane, LA 90049; 310-476-6411)

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10:

8:00 a.m. Breakfast Discussion with Scott Chandler, Chair of the General Education (GE) Governance Committee, and Jeff Decker, Instructional Coordinator, Freshman Cluster Program

8:30 a.m. Meeting with Judith Smith, Dean/Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education

9:00 a.m. Meeting with the Foundations of Arts and Humanities Ad Hoc Committee
Confirmed Attendees: Professors Richard Yarborough (leave at 9:30am), Andrea Loselle, David Schaberg, Victor Bascara
Tentative or Unconfirmed Committee Members: Elizabeth Marchant

10:00 a.m. Meeting with Department Chairs and Faculty Who Regularly Teach Courses in the Foundations of Arts and Humanities (Freshman Cluster Program and Traditional Quarter-Long Courses)
Confirmed Attendees: Professors Janice Reiff (History), Abigail Saguy (Sociology), Joseph Nagy (English), Efrain Kristal (Comparative Literature), Norton Wise (History), David Blank (Classics)

11:00 a.m. Meeting with the Representatives of the Deans of Arts and Architecture and of Humanities:
Associate Dean Barbara Drucker (Arts and Architecture – on behalf of Dean Waterman)
Assistant Dean Reem Hanna-Harwell (Humanities –on behalf of Dean Stowell)
Professor Ray Knapp (Humanities –on behalf of Dean Stowell)

- 12:00 p.m. Faculty Center.** Lunch – *Review Team Members Only*
- 1:00 p.m.** Meeting with the GE Governance Committee’s Foundations of Arts and Humanities Workgroup
Confirmed Attendees: Professors Joseph Nagy (English), David Shorter (WAC), Jeff Decker (English)
- 1:30 p.m.** Meeting with Graduate Students Who Have Taught Courses in the Foundations of Arts and Humanities (Freshman Cluster Program and Traditional Quarter-Long Courses)
Confirmed Attendees: Hazem Kandil, Jessica Walker, Marisa Pineau, Mac Bunyanunda, Cory Gooding, Julia Tomassetti, Jeremy Schmidt
- 2:15 p.m.** Meeting with Jasmine Hill, Undergraduate Student Association Council (USAC) President, Suza Khy, USAC Academic Affairs Commissioner, and Representative Undergraduate Students (Lawrence Turner, Agyei Tyhimbe, Tierra Moore, Ramanveer Virk, Van Huynh, Hana Khan, Rohit Maharaj)
- 3:00 p.m.** Closed Session – *Review Team Members Only*
- 3:30 p.m.** Review Team Wrap-Up Meeting with Scott Chandler, GE Governance Committee Chair
- 4:00 p.m.** Exit Meeting (2121 Murphy Hall) with Dean/Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Judith Smith, Chair of the GE Governance Committee Scott Chandler, Executive Vice Chancellor Scott L. Waugh, Undergraduate Council Chair Joseph Watson, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee Andrea Loselle, Instructional Coordinator of the Freshman Cluster Program Jeff Decker, and College FEC Representative Kathleen Komar

Appendix IV: Self-Review Report

The self-review was previously distributed.
For a hard copy, please contact the Academic Senate Office at extension 62959.