

From: Bernhardt Saini-Eidukat
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 10:25 PM
To: Larry Peterson
Cc: Uwe Burghaus; Mark Clark; Erin Gillam; Kathryn Gordon; Friedrich Littmann; Gang Shen; Pinjing Zhao; Laura Thomas; Kenton Rodgers; Scott Wood
Subject: Re: CULE concerns

Hi Larry,

Here are three items I hope you and the committee will consider:

1. In your email to Kent Rodgers of Jan 22, and again at the Senate meeting today, you stated: "The emphasis is now on transferable, non-discipline specific learning such as "Critical Thinking, Creative Thinking, and Problem Solving" and on "Personal and Social Responsibility."

Names are important. As brought up in the senate meeting today, what better way to eliminate consideration of an area of study than to erase its name from the curriculum? (Arts, Sciences, all gone in the new scheme). Now, if the entire university would reorganize to eliminate college and department "silos" then we could start getting somewhere with this model. But, realistically, that's not going to happen at a large university.

2. In your email to Kent Rodgers of Jan 22, and again at the Senate meeting today, you stated "Fine Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences goes from 14 credits to 6."

Really? In the proposed new model, there are 6 credits for Human Societies, 3 for Diversity and Global Perspectives, and 3 for Personal and Social Responsibility. In all likelihood, all these credits will not be taken in disciplines we normally consider as "science" - they'll probably be taken in AH&SS and the like. So, in reality Fine Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences goes from 14 to 12 in the new model.

(remember, the College of Science and Mathematics currently supports a liberal curriculum for its undergraduates, by requiring 6 additional credits of AH&SS over the university standard! (18 credits total, plus wellness, which would bring it to 20!) So, please don't take my support of the science credits for non-STEM majors as mere turf protection.)

3. It's very possible and probably easier than the CULE committee has considered it to be, to map the Undergraduate Learning Outcomes approved by the faculty senate onto the current Gen Ed scheme. For example, Global Perspectives is already embedded in GE courses.

The CULE committee should consider modifying the current scheme to meet the approved Learning Outcomes, while keeping two 3-credit courses in Science and at least a 1-credit lab course. I agree that some Gen Ed courses may need to be upgraded to meet the desired higher standards.

thanks for your consideration,
-Bernie

cc: College of Science and Math Senate Representatives, Kent Rodgers, Dean Scott Wood