



3 January 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Theodore Garland, Jr., Chair, Executive Committee
College of Natural and Agricultural Science

Re: [Campus Review] Report and Proposal of the Senate Ad Hoc
General Education Review Committee

The CNAS Executive Committee (EC) has reviewed this report and proposal. We had various comments and discussions, with the points by various committee members outlined below.

We remembered a while back reading a preliminary document that had sort of three competing proposals or scenarios that the committee was considering. So I don't know if I missed something or is this just the next iteration, but it seems like they decided, based on based on consultation, they picked one, and what they've come up with here seems really well developed and convincing to me as someone who has not thought much about general education requirements. It read really well.

The only question I had is it retrenching the buckets in which the courses go in, but we're not really changing the courses. But then the back end of it, it did have a mechanism for creating new course. So, the only thing I'd say is there isn't a very large amount of clarity for the line that says, "faculty incentives to create new classes in the general education curriculum." So, if this is implemented as written, but a bit of clarity on what those faculty incentives are so that we can create new good gen ed classes that fit this mantra rather than just taking classes we already have and putting them in a different box.

I really enjoyed reading this report amazingly and I liked the structure of it, but in a similar way, whenever I see these things, I think, what does this mean for my department or what does it mean for me personally? I think the ideas are really great, but I don't see that there's a lot of resources around to execute this in the way that this report intends. I don't see how people in my department, for instance, can be developing any more courses or teaching any more courses. There may be some courses that could be refashioned in line with this report, but that's the issue whenever you have a new initiative. How are you going to get the current system to accommodate it? I think it needs more resources and was very interested in the incentives. But, those incentives could never work in our department because we don't have the money to provide incentives and we don't have enough faculty to give course release. So, if the incentives were meaningless in real terms for my department?

Seems like much of this proposal was taken from what BCOE has for their breadth requirements now. They now require a student to take upper division classes to meet their breath classes. Where it says upper division from A, B, C, D or E, the Ad Hoc Committee is now asking that our students also take an upper division. They might want our students to concentrate on breadth courses (similar to social science or humanities), but that are more specific to their discipline. I'm not sure what they mean by perspectives on living and if that would be from a Literature type course or not. Also on page 149, it mentions IGETC, but CNAS has never allowed IGETC to come in for transfer students. IGETC basically means that the student has completed all of their general ed requirements at a community college. Although, all of the General ED Community College courses transfer in, if at that community college they didn't take a perspective for living course, CNAS would hold the student for that course. Therefore, we would not allow IGETC to fulfill their requirements. If a TR student completes 6 of the 8 general ed at the Community College, IGETC would say they have completed all eight courses. However, CNAS holds them to the other two courses that weren't completed at the CCC.

Commented on the prospective for living course. A two-unit perspectives for living requirement will teach students strategies that promote academic success, psychological and physical health, professional development and financial literacy. So, it's like how to be an independent human being, basically. So, who would teach that course? Would CHASS be the one to teach the course?

I find it difficult to have anything to say about this sort of document without just looking at the table and trying to see what a student would do, but here's what you're saying they would have to do instead is to take those additional courses they didn't meet at the CCC. And I suppose from an advising perspective, advisors need to tell the students this is what you need to complete.

Sincerely,

Ted Harland