

University of Arizona
Faculty Senate

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING ON JANUARY 27, 1997

From the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee - Dr. Ann Weekes, Chair

All items have been approved by the ICPC, as well as the appropriate colleges and councils.

AGENDA ITEM #6

- a. **Proposal by the Department of Hydrology and Water Resources to discontinue the Ph.D. degree in Water Resources Administration**
 - The program has a very low enrollment.
 - Those already enrolled will be able to complete their degrees.
 - The Graduate Council approved this request.

- b. **Proposal by the Department of Hydrology and Water Resources to change the name of the Master's Degree in Water Resources Administration to Water Resources Engineering**
 - Water Resources Engineering is a more accurate description of the curriculum, as the majority of courses emphasize the hydrologic and hydraulic aspects of design and operation of the water resources infrastructure.
 - The Graduate Studies Committee in the College of Engineering and Mines (the curriculum approval body in that college) approved this change on May 2, 1995.
 - The Graduate College approved the change on September 20, 1996.

- c. **Proposal to establish a B.A. with a major in Fine Arts**
 - The ICPC approved this request, provided that there is faculty supervision of all three areas, and that the faculty adviser sign off on all three areas, including the thematic area.

- d. **Request to change the name of the Department of Veterinary Science to the Department of Veterinary Science and Microbiology**
 - Letters of support for this request have been received from the Dean of the College of Science, the Head of the Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology, and the Head of the Department of Biochemistry.

Proposed Policy for the University of Arizona Regarding Ownership, Access to, and Retention of Scientific Data

(submitted to the Faculty Senate, January 27, 1997)

History

- Endorsed by Research Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate on March 25, 1996.
- Discussed and tabled by the Faculty Senate on April 29, 1996, with recommendation that proposed policy be published in *Lo Que Pasa* to solicit general faculty input.
- Published in *Lo Que Pasa* and the UA Caucus Web page on November 21, 1996, inviting comment and discussion from faculty before January 17, 1997.
- One query received on November 26, 1996; Vice President Cusanovich responded on December 31, 1996.

Rationale

- A policy on this issue is required by federal funding agencies.
- The University is accountable to outside funding sources for the integrity and legality of research work produced by university employees and sponsored by those sources.
- All University employees need to be alerted about their responsibility to ensure the accuracy and validity of data in their own work as well as that of their co-investigators, fellows and students; and to maintain and retain their data in a format and for periods required by their sponsors.

Highlights and Benefits

The proposed policy

- has been crafted from similar documents already in force in other universities;
- introduces no new data ownership rules over existing regulations;
- primarily alerts university employees to their rights and responsibilities with regard to maintenance and retention of research data;
- identifies procedures that help reduce the risk of appearances of any improprieties and possible charges against the University;
- protects employees against lawsuits by explicitly identifying the University as the party legally responsible for the data;
- sets guidelines on the contractual obligations of nonpermanent employees and students with respect to ownership, maintenance and retention of research data.

Proposed Policy for the University of Arizona regarding Ownership, Access to, and Retention of Scientific Data submitted by the Research Policy Committee, March 25, 1996

1. Data Ownership

The policy of the funding agency, as stated in the grant contract, governs ownership of data. It is the responsibility of the principal investigator to read the conditions of his/her grant contract.

In cases where the funding agency has no stated policy concerning data ownership or in the case of unsponsored research conducted at a University of Arizona laboratory, the University of Arizona retains ownership of the data.

2. Access to and Retention of Scientific Research Protocols and Data

- a. Both the scholar and the University have responsibilities and, hence, rights concerning access to, use of, and maintenance of original research data. Consistent with the precepts of academic freedom and intellectual integrity, the scholar has the primary authority to make judgments involving the use and dissemination of the data. Any disputes regarding access to data should be settled at the lowest possible level, if circumstances permit. Otherwise, each dispute should go before the appropriate University reconciliation committee.
- b. Each scholar is ultimately responsible for the maintenance and proper retention of research records. These records should include sufficient detail to permit examination for the purposes of replicating the research, responding to questions that may result from unintentional error or misinterpretation, establishing their authenticity, and confirming the validity of the conclusions.
- c. Each scholar should maintain a laboratory manual that describes all major procedures. Correspondence with institutional review committees and records of the use of controlled substances and radioactive materials should be maintained as part of the research record in accordance with governmental, regulatory, and University policies.
- d. A system of data organization should be adopted and should be communicated to all members of a research group and to the appropriate administrative person. The appropriate administrative person should be determined by the subunit.
- e. Where feasible, all original primary data are to be retained by the scholar or by his or her designee. Accepted practices for retaining data vary among disciplines and depend on the perishability, nature, and logistics of retaining each type of data. Each investigator should treat data properly to ensure authenticity, reproducibility, and validity and to meet the requirements of relevant grants and other agreements concerning the retention of data. Primary data should be reserved for a reasonable duration to ensure that any questions raised by the researcher, colleagues, or readers of any published results can be answered. It is recommended that, where feasible, data be retained for seven years; in circumstances where there are no federal or other requirements, such as those referred to in the Appendix, subunits of the University may wish to establish standards and procedures for retention and destruction of data. In unusual cases (e.g., data used for a patent application filed by the University), it may be necessary for original data to be kept at the University. Potentially patentable data should be signed and dated by the researcher at the time they are entered into notebooks or maintained by other methods of retention in the event the results are questioned.
- f. In the event the scholar leaves the University, an Agreement on Disposition of Research Data may be negotiated by the scholar and the department chair or dean to allow the scholar's data, notebooks, and other data retention materials (other than clinical research records) to be transferred to the new institution. Consistent with the same precepts, and to fulfill its obligations to funding sources and others, the University will ensure in such agreements access to the transferred data for purposes of review. In unusual cases (e.g., data used for a patent application filed by the University) it may be necessary for original data to be kept at the University. In such cases a separate written agreement shall be signed which preserves the scholar's right to access and copy (where practical) such data. In cases of multi-institutional studies, the institution of the primary study director is ultimately responsible for guaranteeing appropriate access to, use of, and retention of original data.

APPENDIX

RECORD RETENTION: GRANTS AND OTHER TYPES OF AGREEMENTS

General Regulation:

OMB* Circular A-110 (Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements of Higher Education, Hospitals and Other Non-Profit Organizations). This regulation applies to all federally funded grants and other types of agreements.

Records must be retained for at least three (3) years from the date of the submission of the final expenditure report.

Specific Agencies (for example):

- a) Health and Human Services: 45 CFR** 74(D):

Records must be retained for at least three (3) years from the date of the submission of the final expenditure report.

- b) US Department of Education: 34 CFR** 74(A):

Records must be retained for at least three (3) years from the date of the submission of the final expenditure report.

Records and Reports: Clinical Trial Agreements

- 1) Food and Drug Administration: 21 CFR** 312.62

In general, records must be retained for at least two (2) years following the date a marketing application is approved for the drug for the indication for which it is being investigated; or, until two (2) years after the investigation is discontinued and FDA is notified.

- 2) Food and Drug Administration: 21 CFR** 56.115:

Regarding IRB records: Records required by this regulation shall be retained for at least (3) years after completion of research.

*OMB: Office of Management and Budget

**CFR: Code of Federal Regulations

This form is to be used only where original data are to be kept by the faculty member. In unusual cases, for example, data used for a patent application filed by the University, it may be necessary for original data to be kept at the University. In such a case, an individual written agreement shall be signed which preserves the faculty member's right to access and copy (where practical) such data. Any disputes shall be resolved by the Provost. Patient medical records shall remain at the University and copying shall be only as permitted by law.

AGREEMENT ON DISPOSITION OF RESEARCH DATA

In recognition of both the right of the undersigned faculty member, who is leaving the employ of The University of Arizona to continue his/her research, and the necessity for the University to be able to fulfill its contractual and legal commitments, respond to any allegations of research misconduct, and carry out its administrative, ethical, or moral duties, the faculty member and the University agree as follows:

1. Research data developed or generated by the faculty member while employed by the University shall be preserved for a period of not less than seven (7) years (or such lesser period as designated below) from the later of the date on which the data were created or the date of the first publication utilizing such data.

Lesser period * (if applicable)

Years

Faculty
Initial

University
Initial

2. The faculty member shall have the right and responsibility to remove and preserve the data provided that he/she make the data available (including the right to copy) to authorized representatives of the University, at the University's request, for any lawful purpose including, but not limited to, the carrying of legal, contractual, administrative, ethical or moral obligations. In case of dispute, the Provost shall make the final decision which shall be binding on both the University and the faculty member.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 199_____.

The University of Arizona

By:

Faculty Member

Department Chair or Dean

*Please note that federal regulations require retention of records for a period of at least three (3) years after termination of a grant or other agreement. The FDA requires records of clinical trials to be retained for at least two (2) years following the date a marketing application is approved (21 Code of Federal Regulations 312.62).

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ARIZONA®
TUCSON ARIZONA

Faculty Senate

Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee

Mailing Address:

Faculty Center
The University of Arizona
PO Box 210473
Tucson, AZ 85721-0473

E-mail: facsen@u.arizona.edu

Location:

Faculty Center
1400 E. Mabel St.
Tucson, AZ 85721

Phone: (520) 621-1342
Fax: (520) 621-8844

14 January, 1997

Dear Faculty Senators:

This letter accompanies the Senate Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee's descriptive report on the "Proposal for a University-Wide General Education Program" and a copy of the full draft of the proposal. The ICPC unanimously approved (6-0) the proposal, which now appears on the Senate floor as a seconded motion.

The accompanying report answers questions raised in the Faculty Senate's December 1996 Meeting, and we hope Senators will have time to read it fully before the January Senate Meeting.

Page 1: Items 1, 2: A comparison of the current general education situation in several colleges and the proposed structure, in answer to Senate questions on what is being attempted, and on what the differences are between the present system and the one proposed.

Page 2: Item 3: The Rationale: an explanation of student, faculty, and institution problems with the present system, in answer to questions from the Senate on why work was begun on this proposal.

Pages 3-5: Item 4: Responses to College Needs: an explanation of how the proposal has changed from the original "Core" Proposal, as requests and information from many colleges and faculty committees were incorporated.

Page 5: Item 5: Student Input: an explanation of student involvement in preparation of the proposal, in answer to questions from the Senate concerning the involvement of students.

Page 6-8: Items 6, 7, 8: Resources: an explanation of how current resources—faculty (section on Course Availability), teaching assistants, and classrooms—can be allocated in response to the needs of the proposal, in answer to Senate questions on cost and implementation.

Page 8: Item 9: Transfer Students: an explanation of how the proposal affects transfer students, in answer to Senate questions regarding articulation.

Pages 8-9: Item 10: General Education Courses: a suggestion on numbering.

Page 9: Item 11: Benefits of the New Proposal: an explanation of expected benefits, a response to students' and other needs in Rationale, Page 2.

(over)

Page 10: Item 12: Evaluation and Assessment: a suggestion of continued evaluation by a Senate-designated committee, to monitor the performance and results of the proposed General Education program, if implemented, and a suggestion that the committee regularly report back to the Senate. This item answers Senate questions on how we'll know if the proposal works.

The report is followed by the text of the proposal.

The ICPC believes that there is a substantial need to alter the current general education situation and that the proposed program will result in important improvements in undergraduate education. The University-Wide General Education Committee and the Undergraduate Council also approved the proposal. We credit the Provost with initiating the debate, although the proposal has gone through many stages over the past three years and is no longer the core that he envisioned. It should also be noted that the proposal is not a final effort; we expect the Senate-designated committee to monitor and review the situation, suggesting adjustments as necessary. Finally, the ICPC has requested a meeting with ASUA Senators and Student Representatives to the Faculty Senate on 21 January, 1997, to discuss the situation.

Respectfully submitted,



Ann Weekes
Chair, ICPC

1. The current situation

Currently, different colleges have different general education requirements, ranging from 16-18 units of Humanities and Social Sciences in Engineering and Mines to the following shared structure for the Colleges of Science, Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Education, and B.A. degrees in the College of Fine Arts:

I. Study Areas	Total = 32 units
A. Traditions and Cultures	9 units (3 units in non-western and 6 units in western)
B. Biological and Physical Science	8 units (2 four-unit laboratory courses)
C. Individuals, Societies and Institutions	9 units
D. Arts and Literature	6 units
II. Basic Proficiencies	Total = 9 - 29 units
A. Composition	6 units
B. Mathematics	3 units
C. Second Language	Fourth-semester skill level is required.

The categories vary from college to college -- e.g., Engineering and Mines does not use the categories Traditions and Cultures or Individuals, Societies and Institutions. In addition, where the categories are the same the courses within the category can vary. For example, BPA shares with the Colleges of Science, Humanities, Social and Behavioral Science, and Education a 3 unit requirement in non-western civilization, but the courses specified for BPA are not identical with the courses specified for Science, Humanities, SBS and Education.

2. The New Proposal

Foundations

Mathematics:	proficiency in one of three strands, varying with major
Composition:	one of four strands, varying with placement
Second Language:	fourth-semester skill level for all B.A. degree programs second-semester skill level for all non-B.A. degree programs

Tier One

Traditions & Cultures	2 courses
Individuals & Societies	2 courses
Natural Sciences	2 courses
	6 courses

Tier Two

Arts	one course
Individuals & Societies	one course
Humanities	one course
Natural Science	one course
	4 courses of which one could be in major

NOTE: One course in a student's degree program must focus on non-western cultures or on race, gender, class, or ethnicity.

NOTE: Some Colleges and programs have been granted a partial exemption at Tier 2 and for language proficiency; see Section 4.

3. The Rationale

The following institutional issues offer a strong rationale for a change from the current college-based structure to a university-wide structure:

Issue -- Student Paths: When students change Colleges they often must take additional general education courses to satisfy the degree requirements of their new College. (Since roughly 50% of incoming students are undecided as to major and a recent study indicates that fewer than 20% of students graduate with the major they declared at entry, this is a significant issue. In Arts and Sciences alone, over 500 petitions to waive or replace general education courses are received every year, largely from students who began in other campus Colleges.) Further, because general education varies by College, students who transfer to the University from community colleges do not know how to prepare themselves unless they have made a choice of College. (Over one-third of the entering students in any academic year are transfer students and half of these come from Arizona community colleges.)

- **Issue -- Faculty Stakes:** Current general education requirements place heavy obligations on the Arts and Sciences Colleges both for decisions about curriculum content and for teaching, leaving much of the University faculty without either a teaching or a curricular “stake” in general education.
- **Issue -- Institutional Responsiveness:** The complexity of different competing general education programs makes it very difficult to anticipate demand and ensure space for all students in a timely fashion. A single general education program will facilitate modeling and meeting student demand. Given the mandated Hurwitz goals, limited faculty resources need to be used as efficiently as is feasible in order to maintain and increase offerings elsewhere in the curriculum.
- **Issue -- Pedagogical Expectations:** General education courses are spread throughout the student’s experience at the University. Not only do students satisfy general education requirements on the basis of courses at every level of the curriculum (i.e. 100, 200, 300, and 400 level courses), but in addition many students take first-year general education courses during their junior or senior years. This situation prohibits faculty from building on a common basis of pedagogical skills and a minimum level of exposure to critical areas of inquiry in more advanced courses.

4. Responses to College Needs

A proposal intended to address these issues was presented to the faculty in fall 1994. The proposal was based on a 'core curriculum', a common set of courses that all undergraduates would take, distributed as follows:

- Foundations (composition, mathematics, second language requirements but lacking detail as to their character)
- Tier 1
 - Natural Science -- two courses
 - Individuals & Societies -- two courses
 - Traditions & Cultures -- two courses
- Tier 2 (area of major field excepted)
 - Natural Science -- two courses
 - Individuals & Societies -- two courses
 - Arts & Humanities -- two courses

The vision was that all students would take the same courses in Tier 1 and Tier 2, in classes of 150 each. Tier 1 was to be completed by the end of the first year of fulltime study; Tier 2, by the end of the second year of fulltime study.

Responding to the (sometimes competing) curricular expectations and demands of the colleges and their faculty members, the New Proposal (found on page 1) is a substantial modification of the original proposal.

- **A Core Curriculum:** Many faculty members found the idea of trying to teach a single course to 4500 freshmen impossible from the beginning. The New Proposal maintains the idea that Tier 1 courses should be foundational, but allows the possibility that the foundational courses need not be identical in either subject matter or delivery. Further, the guidelines for Tier 2 allow the possibility of considerable variety in terms of the courses offered.
- **Delivery:** It is no longer expected that all Tier 1 and Tier 2 courses will be delivered in a single size, an acknowledgement that faculty members -- and students -- differ in where they work best.
- **Timing:** Under the New Proposal, students will be expected to complete Tier 1 by the mid-point in their degree programs (rather than in the first year) and Tier 2 by the end of their degree programs (rather than in the second year). For many students, the first year would appropriately be devoted to Tier 1, but many students must reserve a good portion of this year to preparatory work in the major.
- **Second Language:** With the understanding that the 1998 University entrance requirements will require two years of language in high school, the second language requirement was established in Fall 1994 as a skill requirement rather than a 'seat time' requirement and the expectation was set at the second semester skill level with the option that majors might demand more. This situation was unacceptable to most departments in Humanities and SBS and to some in Science who found the expectation too low. As a result, others worried that there would be a patchwork of language requirements, creating new difficulties for students. A compromise was struck that required all

students with a B.A. objective to demonstrate fourth semester skill level and all other students to demonstrate second semester skill level. Further, if a student cannot demonstrate second semester skill level at entrance and is required to take coursework to meet this requirement, the second language units would not be included in the credit hours computed as part of the degree program. This policy is consistent with the treatment of English 100 and Mathematics 116. However, the College of Engineering and Mines feels any University-level language requirement for Engineering students that cannot be met at entrance is without precedent among its competitors. Thus, students graduating in the College of Engineering and Mines will be allowed to meet the language requirement with two years of a language in high school and a placement examination at entrance.

- **Mathematics:** In first responses to the initial proposal, it was proposed that there be no independent mathematics requirement in general education, but that mathematics be taught as part of Tier 1 and Tier 2 coursework. Given the very broad range of mathematical abilities presented by our undergraduates, this seemed unworkable to many. A compromise was reached whereby all students will be required to take mathematics, but the skill level is specified by the major (and so may be met as part of or a prerequisite to the major). In addition, a terminal course in mathematics has been developed for the general student to replace College Algebra.
- **Composition:** The issue of how best to develop student writing abilities has been contentious from the beginning. Many believe that rather than free-standing composition courses, each Tier 1 and Tier 2 course should have associated with it a 1-unit section devoted to the development of writing; others are just as firmly committed to composition courses. Under the New Proposal, most students will be required to take two semesters of composition, but there is the option of developing courses within Tier 1 to replace an independent composition course for well-prepared students.
- **Tier 1 Natural Sciences:** The expectation in the initial proposal was that all undergraduates would share a single integrative science curriculum in Tier 1. However, the concern was expressed in Engineering and Mines and in other science-heavy majors that this would add units to the degree, because students in these programs required particular science experiences not required by the non-science student. A compromise was reached that allows majors in the College of Engineering and Mines to satisfy their first tier Natural Science with their required chemistry and physics coursework; other technically-based majors may petition, with their dean's approval, a similar arrangement.
- **Non-Western Civilization and Gender, Race, Class and Ethnicity:** Only the general education program shared by the Colleges of Science, Humanities, SBS and Education currently requires both a course in non-western civilization and a course focusing on gender, race, class and ethnicity. Many in Humanities and SBS would like to see both requirements extended to all undergraduates. However, other colleges where neither is a requirement find this a disproportionate commitment within general education. Further, it does not appear that we have the faculty resources to offer sufficient seats to meet both for all undergraduates. (See page 6.) The compromise, then, is that every undergraduate would be required to take one or the other.
- **Composition of Tier 2:** The first idea was that 4 courses (a minimum of 12 units) be required in Tier 2, distributed across two study areas (two of Individuals & Societies, Arts & Humanities, and Natural Sciences). The number of courses was seen by many as too large; further, this configuration substantially increased the number of units in science for many colleges; it did not specify a place in the curriculum for either arts or humanities, a lack felt most keenly by the College of Fine Arts. A compromise was reached that reduced the number of courses outside of the major in Tier 2 overall

from 4 to 3, reduced the number of courses in science (from two in Tier 2 to one), and specified a place for fine arts and humanities. In addition, because of the unit load for their majors, students in the College of Engineering and Mines and the School of Health-Related Professions are required to take only two non-science courses in Tier 2 -- one course in Arts & Humanities and one course in Individuals & Societies. Other majors with a comparable unit load may petition the University-Wide General Education Committee for a similar arrangement.

- **Laboratories:** Many, but by no means all, faculty members believe that a laboratory experience is an essential part of general education science. Although the New Proposal does not specify a traditional laboratory, the laboratory experience is embedded in the program in two ways. First, the Tier 1 Natural Science courses that have been proposed do not generally include a free-standing laboratory, but all of them involve hands-on experience for students. Second, the Tier 2 Natural Science courses will be drawn from the current stock of science courses, the vast majority of which do include a more traditional laboratory experience. Further, the College of Science has committed to making the resources available to ensure that Tier 2 Natural Science courses can include a laboratory experience.
- **Sequencing:** Because they are foundational, it is reasonable to require that students will complete the foundations courses at the very beginning of their academic career. Similarly, it follows that students should complete Tier 1 Natural Science before Tier 2 Natural Science and Tier 1 Individuals and Societies before Tier 2 Individuals and Societies. However, Tier 2 Arts and Tier 2 Humanities lack Tier 1 counterparts. At least in the Fine Arts, there is a strong feeling that students should be allowed to complete Tier 2 Arts without having to complete Tier 1. This can be accommodated. It remains to be determined how the instructors of Tier 2 Humanities courses feel about the sequencing of their courses.

5. Student Input

Students have been involved at all stages in the development of this proposal.

- Students were represented on all nine ad hoc committees established in 1994 to discuss various aspects of a new general education structure.
- The Undergraduate Council, the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee and the University-Wide General Education Committee, the major standing committees involved in the development of this proposal, all include student representation.
- In 1994 and 1995, the Vice President for Undergraduate Education presented the vision and the then-state of the proposal to the ASUA Senate. Both times the ASUA Senate approved. In 1996, a presentation was again given to the ASUA Senate for comment; again, the response was supportive.

6. Resources: Course Availability

It is relatively easy to estimate the number of seats required in each area in Tier 1, Tier 2 and the Foundations. Approximately 4500 freshmen and approximately 2500 transfer students enter the University every fall.

- Composition and Mathematics: Virtually all freshmen require composition and mathematics; currently 40% of transfer students require composition and mathematics. Little change is expected in the near future. Thus, given that the University is currently meeting its obligations in these domains, it will be able to meet them with the same resources under the proposed changes.
- Tier 1 and Tier 2: Course availability has been tracked in Arts and Sciences general education for some years. The courses which satisfy the proposed curriculum will be similar but not identical to those currently satisfying general education in Arts and Sciences, but we can use our course availability figures as a measure of our capacity.
 - ⇒ Tier 1, Traditions and Cultures: required space every semester 5500 seats (4500 from entering freshmen + 1000 from transfer students) Arts and Science Traditions and Cultures courses currently offer roughly 6300 seats per semester.
 - ⇒ Individuals and Societies: required space every semester 7750 seats [Tier 1, Individuals and Societies: required space every semester 5500 seats (4500 + 1000) and Tier 2, Individuals and Societies: required space every semester 2250 seats (((4500 + 2000) - 2000 [for students majoring in Individuals and Societies areas]) ÷ 2 semesters))] Arts and Science Individuals, Societies and Institutions courses currently offer roughly 11000 per semester.
 - ⇒ Natural Science: required space every semester 7000 seats [Tier 1, Natural Science: required space every semester 4250 seats (3500 (for students lacking science-based majors) ÷ 750 seats (for transfer students)) and Tier 2, Natural Science: required space every semester 2750 seats (((4500 + 2000) - 1000 [for students majoring in science areas]) ÷ 2 semesters) Arts and Science Biological and Physical Sciences courses currently offer roughly 10000 seats per semester. However, many of these seats are in basic science courses which would not be part of Tier 1 Natural Science.
 - ⇒ Tier 2 Arts: required space every semester 3000 seats ((4000 [excluding students with major in arts areas and a subset of Engineering and HRP students] + 2000) ÷ 2 semesters) Arts and Sciences Arts courses currently offer roughly 3200 seats per semester.
 - ⇒ Tier 2 Humanities: required space every semester 3000 seats ((4000 [excluding students with major in humanities areas and a subset of Engineering and HRP students] + 2000) ÷ 2 semesters) Arts and Sciences literature courses currently offer roughly 2100 seats per semester.
 - ⇒ Gender, Race, Class or Ethnicity and Non-Western Civilization: required space every semester 3250 ((4500 + 2000) ÷ 2 semesters). Gender, Race, Class or Ethnicity seats are currently approximately 3000 per semester; Non-Western Civilization seats are currently approximately 2400 seats per semester. (Note that if both gender, race, class, ethnicity and non-western civilization were required, the projected need would be 6500 seats per semester and our current capacity is 5400.)

Tier 2 Humanities is the one area where a shortage is revealed by this method. However, a portion of the excess in Tier 1 Traditions and Cultures could easily become Tier 2 Humanities. Humanities 250a-b-c is an obvious candidate and the intent of the Humanities Program is that this course should be Tier 2 Humanities.

- Second Language: Currently 74% of entering freshmen bring 2 or more years of a second language. With the change in the high school entrance requirements for language in 1998, the Center for Research on Undergraduate Education projects that roughly 87% of the incoming freshmen will bring 2 or more years of a second language. A smaller proportion of transfer students currently bring in 2 semesters or more of a second language -- approximately 30%. It is reasonable to expect an increase here as well -- to 50%. The projected demand for language courses generated by one year of students, thus, can be easily estimated:
 - ⇒ first semester: Roughly 60% of the current first semester language enrollments.
 - ⇒ second semester: Roughly 133% of current second semester enrollments
 - ⇒ third semester: Roughly 90% of third semester enrollments
 - ⇒ fourth semester: Roughly 133% of current fourth semester enrollments.

While there will be a shift away from first semester language study toward second and fourth semesters, little or no increase is projected in the total number of students served. Given that the University is currently meeting student demand for basic language study, it should continue to be able to do so using the same resources under the proposed changes.

It is reasonable to conclude, in light of these projections, that the proposed restructuring of general education could allow us to deliver this portion of our curriculum more efficiently than is currently the case.

7. Resources: Teaching Assistants

Graduate assistants currently deliver the bulk of basic language and composition; adjuncts deliver the bulk of entry-level mathematics. If the current system is satisfactory, no changes need be made to deliver the new curriculum.

Graduate assistants are also involved in various support roles in current general education. But because the allocation of this resource is determined college internally, the availability and quality of graduate assistants varies widely from program to program. Although deans and department heads must remain central to decisions about the distribution of graduate assistants, some guidelines would be useful and would clarify resource issues.

- A ratio of one graduate assistant for every 60 students in Tier 1 and Tier 2 courses is reasonable to use in projecting needs. In addition, laboratory science courses generally have one graduate assistant for roughly every 35 students. Ignoring class size and assuming that every class has a teaching assistant, this ratio yields the following:
 - ⇒ Tier 1 Traditions and Cultures: 92 graduate assistants per semester
 - ⇒ Tier 1 Individuals and Societies: 92 graduate assistants per semester
 - ⇒ Tier 1 Natural Science: 71 graduate assistants per semester
 - ⇒ Tier 2 Individuals and Societies: 38 graduate assistants per semester
 - ⇒ Tier 2 Natural Science: 79 graduate assistants per semester
 - ⇒ Tier 2 Arts: 50 graduate assistants per semester
 - ⇒ Tier 2 Humanities: 50 graduate assistants per semester

The teaching assistant resources currently exist within the Colleges to accommodate the projections. In fact, in most cases, Tier 1 and Tier 2 needs would require less than half of the teaching assistant resources that might reasonably be available. One issue that remains is how to ensure that instructors from departments without graduate students or with few graduate students receive the appropriate teaching assistant support. The primary example of such a unit is the Humanities Program; under the scenario sketched above, this unit might reasonably require 6-10 GATs. This doesn't necessarily require new resources, but it may require some reallocation of resources.

- The teaching assistant model might be modified, at least in Tier 1 courses, to a teaching team model: the instructor/instructors, graduate assistants, and undergraduate preceptors. Undergraduate preceptors are used successfully now in many departments on campus to support instruction. A reasonable ratio is 3 preceptors for every graduate assistant.
- Graduate assistants involved in the delivery of Tier 1 courses should be advanced graduate students who have shown through prior teaching experience excellent teaching skills. This means that the training and assessment systems for teaching assistants should be enhanced.

8. Classrooms

Two problems with classrooms have confronted faculty members teaching lower division classes. (1) The classrooms have been in poor repair, with little or no equipment. (2) The University's inventory of classrooms does not match instructional needs.

The first problem is in the process of being remedied. The classroom renovation project has targeted the most heavily used classrooms on campus for upgrading. In addition, all centrally scheduled classrooms have been equipped with basic teaching equipment and the number of classrooms providing high quality technological support has been significantly increased.

The Center for Research on Undergraduate Education has been working on a model to address the second problem. According to its projections, the University is most critically short in classrooms of size 60-69. The Integrated Instructional Facility will increase the inventory of such classrooms, consistent with our projected needs. The classroom renovation project can also provide a partial resolution of this problem by combining some small classrooms to make larger ones. Finally, the Office of Undergraduate Education will work with Room Scheduling to make Tier 1 and Tier 2 courses a scheduling priority.

9. Transfer Students

Students from other post-secondary institutions enter the University at various points in their undergraduate careers and, as a result, they present different challenges.

- If a student enters with a completed general education program from one of the state's community colleges, the University accepts this as completing our general education. This is a reasonable position to take in regard to students from other institutions as well.
- At the moment, however, most students enter having only partially completed general education. These students programs will need to be evaluated on a course-by-course basis; such a system is required for the present general education requirements and is currently in place. We do not foresee any articulation problems with the New Proposal that have not already been addressed and resolved under the current situation.

10. Implications for Departmental Curricula

One possible consequence of the New Proposal that departments might want to consider is some regularization of the curriculum. Foundation courses, Tier 1 courses, and other prerequisite courses would be reasonably numbered in the 100s. Many Tier 2 courses and introductory major courses would

reasonably be numbered in the 200s; others might reasonably be numbered in the 300s. This would leave the 400s for advanced undergraduate coursework.

Some departments have begun to restructure their curriculum in response to these likely changes. The University will also have to consider the implications for curricular policies like the 42-upper division unit rule.

11. Benefits of the New Proposal

1. It will not require new resources for the University, although it may require some reallocation of resources, particularly in ensuring appropriate teaching assistant support.
2. The ability to meet student demand more efficiently under the new program will free up resources presently used for general education courses. Units can continue to use these resources in the present manner or to meet other curricular areas and needs. Simultaneously, the Hurwitz lower-division goals will be effectively met.
3. Because students will take Tier 1 courses during their first two years and because these courses will cover the development of a set of skills, faculty members will be able to have pedagogical expectations about their upper division students.
4. Students will be able to change colleges and majors with the assurance that the general education courses they have taken will continue to apply in their new programs.

12. Evaluation and Assessment

It is absolutely essential that the proposed curriculum be monitored for its effectiveness in addressing the problems which led to its inception. Three areas present themselves as possible points of assessment.

- **Changes in student behavior**
Minimally, we would hope for a decrease in the number of petitions filed about general education issues, a decreased time from entrance to declaring a major and a decrease in student reports of course inavailability. We have the capacity to monitor all these and other measures that might be developed.
- **Changes in student learning**
If the idea of providing foundational knowledge is sound, we should minimally expect our students to perform better in their advanced coursework and to perform better on the upper division writing proficiency examination. We have the expertise to develop a system to assess these and other measures of student learning
- **Changes in faculty satisfaction**
Many faculty members report dissatisfaction with teaching at the lower division -- for a variety of reasons. One test of the effectiveness of the proposed curriculum would be an increase in faculty satisfaction, as reported on questionnaires or other instruments.

The Faculty Senate could name a committee to participate in the development of such measures, to oversee their implementation, and to report back on their results within an appropriate length of time.

Proposal for a University-Wide General Education Program

- **A University-Wide Structure**

There will be a university-wide structure for general education, common across all colleges.

- **The Mathematics of the Structure**

The structure will involve 10 courses of non-skills-based (i.e. not mathematics, composition, or second language) coursework -- 6 courses in a first tier to include 2 courses in Traditions & Cultures, 2 courses in Natural Science, and 2 courses in Individuals & Societies; and 4 courses in a second tier distributed across the following four segments -- Arts, Humanities, Natural Science, and Individuals & Societies.

Students will be required to take one course in each of the four segments of the second tier. However, coursework in the major may satisfy one segment of the second tier. (For example, majors in MCB could complete a course in second tier Arts, a course in second tier Humanities and a course in second tier Individuals & Societies; the remaining segment in Natural Science could be completed by coursework required as part of an MCB major.) Each major will identify which segment could be completed within its coursework.

Because of the unit load required for their majors, Tier 2 for students in the College of Engineering and Mines and the School of Health-Related Professions will comprise three segments (rather than four) -- Natural Science, Individuals & Societies and Arts & Humanities. Other majors with a comparable unit load may petition the University-Wide General Education Committee for a similar arrangement.

One course focusing on a non-western culture or on race, gender, class or ethnicity is also required, but may be fulfilled by appropriate first or second tier courses or by designated courses elsewhere in a student's program.

Students entering the University as freshmen will be expected to complete the first tier by the end of the midpoint of their degree (e.g. for a four-year 120 unit degree program by the end of the second year of full-time work or the completion of 60 units) and the second tier by the conclusion of their undergraduate degree.

- **The Content**

The selection of courses in each of these segments will be common across all colleges.

The initial course choices will be selected by the University-wide General Education Committee from those currently approved in the Arts and Sciences general education program, from the core courses already approved and from those which might be submitted to the Committee in the future, building on the first tier guidelines developed by the faculty and the second tier guidelines developed by the Committee.

The long-term goal will be to develop a selective set of courses that offer broad, rigorous treatments of fundamental knowledge and methods of inquiry. Should this goal ultimately preclude the inclusion of introductory chemistry and physics courses, majors in the College of Engineering and Mines will be allowed to satisfy their first tier Natural Science with their required chemistry and physics coursework; other technically-based majors may petition, with their dean's approval, a similar arrangement. [The College of Science and The School of Health-Related Professions have already indicated their desire to petition.]

- **Foundations**

The structure will also involve a third component. This component is intended to build a foundation in certain skills that can be further developed in first and second tier courses, as well as in major courses. It will include a course in mathematics (the character of which will vary with the major), courses in composition, fourth-semester skill level in a second language for all students in B.A. degree programs, and second-semester skill level in a second language for all students in non-B.A. degree programs.

Each segment of this component may be satisfied, at least in part, by demonstration of proficiency, as well as by coursework.

The Structure in Schematic Form

Foundations

Mathematics: proficiency in one of three strands, varying with major

- 'G': Those students whose major requires general knowledge in mathematics only would take Mathematics in Modern Society (Mathematics 122). This is a topics course which naturally lends itself to the possibility of different sections according to the interests of different groups of students.
- 'M': Those students whose major requires moderate knowledge in mathematics would take Finite Mathematics, Brief Calculus, or a statistics courses, where the choice is determined by the major selected. Students in this group would be expected to come from Architecture, Agriculture, BPA, or certain majors in SBS.
- 'S': Those students whose major requires substantial knowledge of mathematics would take calculus. This group would be comprised largely of students in Engineering and Science

Composition: one of four strands, varying with placement

- 1: A two-course sequence of English 101 and English 102 or the ESL equivalents
- 2: A two-course sequence of extended English 101 and English 102 or the ESL equivalents
- 3: A two-course honors sequence of English 103h and English 104h
- 4: A one-semester course in combination with an AP score of 4 or 5 or a placement writing portfolio demonstrating advanced proficiency. The course would be English 109 at least initially, but appropriate courses could be developed for this purpose across the curriculum, given careful design and monitoring.

Second Language

fourth-semester skill level for all B.A. degree programs

second-semester skill level for all non-B.A. degree programs

(see attachment for how this may be demonstrated)

Note: New University entrance requirements taking effect in Fall 1998 require two years of a second language in high school. Thus, if a student cannot demonstrate second semester skill level at entrance and is required to take coursework to meet this requirement, the second language units would not be included in the credit hours computed as part of the degree program. This policy is consistent with the treatment of English 100 and Mathematics 116.

Tier One

Traditions & Cultures 2 courses

Individuals & Societies 2 courses

Natural Sciences 2 courses

6 courses

Tier Two

Arts one course

Individuals & Societies one course

Humanities one course

Natural Science one course

4 courses of which one could be in major

NOTE: For students in the College of Engineering and Mines and the School of Health-Related Professions Tier 2 will involve one course in three segments -- Natural Science, Individuals & Societies and Arts & Humanities

NOTE: One course in a student's degree program must focus on non-western cultures or on race, gender, class, or ethnicity.

Second Language

B.A. degree students may fulfill the second language foundations requirement with one of the following options:

- 1: Completion of a two-course sequence beyond the second semester of post-secondary language instruction.
- 2: Completion with a C or higher of a three-or four-hundred level language course at the post-secondary level.
- 3: Completion of one course beyond the third semester in combination with an AP (Advanced Placement) score or a CLEP (College Level Entrance Program) score determined by the individual language department.
- 4: An AP score of 3 or higher or a CLEP score of 60 or higher in the language.
- 5: A minimum of one semester study abroad in a language program approved by the appropriate language department as the equivalent of fourth-semester skill level.

Non-B.A. degree students may fulfill the second language foundations requirement with one of the following options:

- 1: Scoring the equivalent of second-semester skill level on an entrance or placement examination administered by the University of Arizona.
- 2: Completion with a C or better of a second semester course at the post-secondary level.
- 3: An AP score of 2 or higher or a CLEP score of 41 or higher in the language.
- 4: In the College of Engineering and Mines by a method determined within the College; however, all students in the College must also take a language placement examination on entrance to the University.

American students who are native speakers of languages other than English (e.g. Spanish, American Sign Language, Navajo) will be accommodated by the appropriate department. Foreign students who are native speakers of languages other than English may fulfill the second language requirement through proficiency in English.

University-Wide General Education Program

Segment	Tier 1 (Freshmen complete Tier 1 by midpoint of degree)				Tier 2 (Completion required for graduation)				3rd Component* (* see detail sheet)												
	Traditions & Cultures		Natural Science		Individuals & Societies		Arts		Humanities		Natural Science		Individuals & Societies		Mathematics		Composition		Proficiency Level		
	#	Courses	#	Courses	#	Courses	#	Courses	#	Courses	#	Courses	#	Courses	#	Courses	#	Courses	1 of 4 strands	B.A. Degree	Non-B.A. Degree
Agriculture	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	x	-----	-----	yes
Architecture	2	2*	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	x	-----	-----	yes
BPA	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	x	-----	-----	yes
Education	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	x	-----	-----	yes
Engineering	2	2*	2	2	2	2	2	1 - either segment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	x	-----	-----	yes
Fine Arts	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1 - either segment	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	x	-----	-----	yes
HRP	2	2*	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	x	-----	-----	yes
Humanities	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	x	-----	-----	yes
Science	2	2*	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	x	-----	-----	yes
SBS	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	x	-----	-----	yes
University College	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	x	-----	-----	yes
Nursing	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	x	-----	-----	yes

* as part of prerequisite for major