Faculty to review

By Wendy Wallace
Lantern staff writer

The Faculty Council has recommended to President Edward H. Jennings that 12 faculty members head a committee to review the curriculum at Ohio State.

Jennings, in his address to the University Senate last October, asked the council to explore whether it is time for the university to undertake "a substantive curriculum review."

Gerald Reagan, review committee chairman, said the other committee members are currently being notified of their appointments. The committee will meet March 5 and will begin gathering information about the general curriculum.

He said the committee will formulate a definition of a general education curriculum and it will look at what comparable universities are doing with their general curriculum programs.

"We've got to do our homework and we're behind on our reading," Reagan said.

Curriculum review has been on Jennings' mind since he first came here in 1981 and has been a recurrent theme in his speeches, said Judy Genshaft, administrative liaison to the committee.

Jennings said in his University
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Senate address that "The goal of a curriculum review would be to identify a basic body of knowledge, thoroughly grounded in the liberal arts, that each of our students would be required to achieve."

He said in the same speech that Ohio State is a diverse institution but there should be "common bonds that unite (its) graduates not only as alumni, but as well-educated women and men."

Reagan said the power of the review committee is limited and that it will function in an advisory role.

"We're not going to go running out and start changing the curriculum," he said.

The committee will try to get the faculty to think and talk about what undergraduates should be able to do when they leave Ohio State, Reagan said.

He said reviewing the curriculum is not out of the ordinary. Sixty percent of all colleges and universities are currently reviewing their curricula, he said.

Reagan said he hopes the committee can finish its work in a year. "We've got no great desire to be the quickest of any university doing a review, but to do as well."
Provost stresses need for exam of curriculum

By Jeff Grabmeier

Provost Myles Brand has called for a complete review and reform of the undergraduate curriculum.

After four months on the job, Brand discussed his agenda for Ohio State in a speech to the University Senate Dec. 6.

See pages 8-10 for the full text of Provost Myles Brand's Dec. 6 address to the University Senate.

He also discussed some of the same issues at a talk before the Ohio State chapter of the American Association of University Professors on Dec. 3.

Brand said he has a dual agenda of enhancing research, scholarly and creative productivity and also of reforming the undergraduate curriculum.

In his call for curriculum reform, Brand noted that several national reports have criticized harshly undergraduate education in the United States.

"While I firmly believe that Ohio State has done a better job than most in educating its undergraduates and is not in a crisis situation, there is room for improvement and it is time for a change," Brand said.

He said that Ohio State has not under-
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gone a full-scale study of general education requirements since 1957.

The University requires students to take a certain number of courses from

Continued on page 10.
Specified areas. Instead, Brand said, it should design a curriculum with the goal of developing in students “the characteristics of an educated person.”

“Our basic education curriculum is more a treaty between various units than it is a coherent educational program,” he said. An underlying rationale for the various course requirements is essential, yet does not now fully exist, according to Brand.

The reform process began last spring when President Jennings appointed the Universitywide Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review. That committee will help define the character-
istics of the educated person that Ohio State seeks to produce.

The process will include a full review of the general education requirements; a college-by-college review of all majors; and a review of support and delivery systems, including such areas as classrooms, technology and teaching assistants, among others.

Brand said he expects full implementation of revised general education programs in autumn quarter 1988 and implementation of revised major programs soon afterward.

The University will continue to reward excellence in teaching as well as in research and scholarship, Brand said.

“Recently, both on and off campus, there have been claims that only research is valued, that only research will be rewarded at Ohio State,” he said. “I am here to tell you that is false. If that is a common perception, it is one that must be corrected.”

Rewards for excellence in teaching will come each year in the form of merit raises and in the long run by way of promotion, Brand said.

Although evaluation of teaching is difficult, Brand said it can be done through peer-group measures.

In his Senate speech, Brand also outlined the reorganization of the Office of Academic Affairs.

The reorganized office, which will go into effect winter quarter, will have one new position: associate provost for faculty recruitment and development.

There also will be associate provosts for planning, for administration, for instruction and curriculum, for evaluation and for personnel and budget.

Brand’s agenda for the future emphasizes planning in order to take advantage of new research opportunities.

While Ohio State has done well in undertaking some highly visible and important projects — such as a new Biotechnology Center and a cooperative effort to build a two-mirror telescope —

Continued on page 11.
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Brand said the University needs to prepare actively for other possibilities.

"We need to create our own opportunities," Brand said at the AAUP meeting. "I don't want to depend on luck."

He warned that Ohio State cannot build excellence solely through highly visible achievements such as the telescope.

The quality of the University's research will be judged by the achievements of its individual faculty members, he said. Brand pledged that the Office of Academic Affairs "will spare no effort" to support these researchers.

Brand said Ohio State has entered a critical phase in its history. In the next 10 years, colleges and universities will be sorted into "those that are truly excellent, those that are quite good and those that are, at best, merely competent."

The excellent colleges and universities will be those that recruit the best new faculty and that make the best use of their resources to support faculty members.

Brand said Ohio State is well prepared to meet these challenges.

"I am fully convinced that Ohio State University can emerge from this sorting process as one of a very small group of truly excellent institutions of higher learning," he said.
Symposium to probe

What shape should form universities’ future?

By Greg Brown

It’s easy to build a case for the importance universities play in American life.

Most leaders of government, industry and business have been educated at our campuses. No other nation spends as much as the United States for research, the lion’s share conducted at higher education institutions.

Yet many schools today are in a quandary about what an “educated” person should have learned by the time she or he graduates. Our nation spews out diplomas in vast numbers, but what do they signify?

Ohio State is in the process of reviewing and altering the basic curriculum requirements for its undergraduates. It’s not the only venerable institution examining required courses. The University of Chicago also is changing its core curriculum, so long a mainstay of quality.

Administrators and faculty members around the nation are clamoring to discern what’s most significant for a good college education and a good college.

Are we training people for jobs? Or to learn critical thinking? Or both?

Should researchers consider the value of their work prior to accepting lucrative contracts?

This spring, Ohio State will host a far-reaching symposium on “The University of the Future.” Organized by the Center for Comparative Studies on behalf of the College of Humanities, the conference will examine the relationships of American universities to science and technology, the marketplace, creative thinking, and how values are established through education, among other broad categories.

Symposium speakers represent some of the most eminent scholars and leaders in the nation including: Jonas Salk, who discovered the polio vaccine; Robert Payton, president of the Exxon Educational Foundation; Germaine Brée, scholar from Wake Forest University who specializes in French literature and the humanistic values of education; Kenneth Keller, president of the University of Minnesota; and Lewis Branscomb, former director of research at IBM.

“We want to use the center to create a forum for discussing intellectual issues that confront the whole University,” says Marilyn Waldman, director of the comparative studies center and associate professor of history. She and Richard Bjornson, professor of Romance languages and literatures, are coordinating the symposium.

“Colleges of education have posed questions about directions for universities, but rarely have the liberal arts contributed much to this discourse. We believe a Continued on page 4.
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real contribution can be made by ad-

dressing the questions of whether a better mode of education is possible," Bjornson says.

The symposium, one part of a seven-

phase project, will be held May 7-9 in the Ohio Union. It will raise a number of specific questions such as the extent to which universities should: serve as the sci-

entific conscience of society; emphasize new fields like women's studies and black studies; or balance tradition and innovation.

The symposium is designed especially for: faculty, staff and students at Ohio State and other Central Ohio universities; community leaders, in particular those who reside near universities; school teach-

ers and union workers; and educators from throughout the nation. About 500 people are expected to attend.

In addition to the symposium, other events and programs will augment the year-long project under the same name, "The University of the Future."

- A questionnaire soon will be distri-

buted to all Ohio State faculty and to se-

lected representatives from the community outside the University. The survey will elicit opinions about what it means to be an educated person. Results will be distributed at the symposium.

- A five-Sunday film festival is sched-

uled between April 4-May 2 at the Drexel North Theatre, 4250 N. High St. The feature-length films chosen for the series will explore a variety of popular images of higher education.

- During the spring a continuing educa-

tion course will be offered that studies the writings of speakers at the sympos-

ium. Attendance at the symposium will be a part of the course.

- Segments of the symposium will be taped and later broadcast to make its ex-

amination of the major issues facing edu-

cation available to a wider audience.

- A bibliography of suggested readings on the nature of the educated person will be made available to local libraries.

- The Center for Comparative Studies will publish a volume of essays based on the discussions held during the symposium.

The year-long project, including the symposium, is sponsored by the College of Humanities, funded in part by the Graduate School and the Ohio Humanities Council, and supported by the Office of the President and the Office of Aca-

demic Affairs and Provost.

For more information about the sym-

posium, or other phases of the project,
call the Center for Comparative Studies at 292-2559.
COLUMBUS, Ohio -- Ohio State University has taken the first steps toward an undergraduate curriculum reform that will change significantly what students learn at the university.

Gone will be a system that allows undergraduates to choose from a "smorgasbord" of classes to fulfill the university's Basic Education Requirements, officials say. In its place will be a coherent program of education whose goal will be to produce graduates who write and speak with precision, reason logically, and are well-versed in the sciences and liberal arts.

Faculty members, departments and colleges all will be asked to participate in developing a new curriculum that university officials hope to have in place by autumn 1988.

The foundation of this reform process is contained in the recently completed interim report of the university-wide Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review.

That report reviews the status of general education at the university, outlines the attributes of the educated person that Ohio State hopes to produce and develops a "philosophical framework" for reforming the curriculum.

"How different our curriculum becomes will depend on what happens in the next year and a half," said Gerald Reagan, chairman of the special curriculum committee, and professor of educational policy and leadership. "But I believe it will be significantly different. I think there will be a completely redesigned program of general education."

University President Edward H. Jennings called for a curriculum review during his 1985 State of the University
address, saying its goal would be "to identify a basic body of knowledge, thoroughly grounded in the liberal arts, that each of our students would be required to achieve."

Provost Myles Brand said the review has been a long time coming. He notes that the university has not examined its entire curriculum since 1957.

The current curriculum, which requires undergraduates to complete 45 hours of Basic Education Requirements, or BERS, can be improved, he said. "We want a curriculum that has a fully developed rationale. It should provide a basic liberal arts education to all students and be fully integrated with the majors programs."

In addition to strengthening undergraduate education, a curriculum review is important because it is a renewal process for the faculty, according to Brand. "Each generation of faculty needs to rethink the curriculum for the current time and state of knowledge," he said. "So even if we were doing everything right -- which I don't think we are -- we would still need to review the curriculum."

With these concerns in mind, the Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review, headed by Reagan, was formed last spring.

The full committee has met about once a week since then, although members have done much of the work outside of these weekly sessions. Members have studied national reports on undergraduate education, examined Ohio State's curriculum and debated issues concerning what students ought to learn.

The result is the 34-page interim report presented to the provost.

Brand said the report highlights several important points.

"It emphasizes that general education is a four-year project. It's not something only for freshmen and sophomores," he said. "It also stresses the importance of a broad-based education, of having a sound foundation in the liberal arts and sciences.

"In addition, the report emphasizes that we need to move beyond our parochialism, that education should focus not only on our culture, but on cultures throughout the world."

The committee expects that these goals can be achieved by requiring students to take a wide range of classes in the sciences, liberal arts and international studies throughout their undergraduate career.

With the committee's interim report complete, the next step will be for colleges to examine their general education programs.
The Colleges of the Arts and Sciences already has begun its review. It began first because the college undertook curriculum reviews in 1970 and 1977 and has a better developed curricular program than most colleges, Brand said. Arts and Sciences will prepare a model curriculum that will serve as a basis for other colleges' efforts, he notes.

The Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review will oversee the efforts across the university.

Beginning this spring, colleges also will begin a review of their majors programs to determine if changes need to be made in required courses or courses offered.

By autumn 1988, Brand expects a new general education program to be in place. Changes in majors programs will follow shortly thereafter.

Students accepted for admission to Ohio State prior to the implementation of the new program will have the option of staying with the present system.

Brand already is beginning to plan for implementation of the new curriculum. "I realize that instituting a new undergraduate program of this magnitude is expensive," he said. "We are prepared to allocate university resources for this purpose. But we won't take money away from research or other programs at Ohio State."

A new curriculum also will not be financed with higher student fees, Brand said. "The university has sufficient sources of funding so that we can enhance undergraduate education without raising fees," he said. "I'm not saying that fees will or won't be raised. But they will not be raised in order to support a new general education program."

Contact: Myles Brand, (614) 292-5881, or Gerald Reagan, (614) 292-5181.

Written by Jeff Grabmeier. (Jeff/251)
A report released Wednesday outlining the attributes of an educated person will serve as the backbone for a university-wide curriculum reform.

President Edward H. Jennings appointed a 14-member committee last spring to define the attributes of an educated person. The university committee was to establish a base upon which to build a new curriculum.

The attributes of an educated person listed in the report include the ability to write and speak with clarity, the ability to read and listen critically with comprehension and the ability to think logically.

Also included in the report were the following criteria for the educated student:

• to learn at least one language other than English.

• to understand the methods of modern science and social sciences.

• to understand the effect of science and technology on the natural and social environment.

• to have a refined historical, artistic and literary consciousness.

• to understand global interdependence of the modern world.

• to appreciate the cultural traditions that have developed our nation.

The report completes the first level of the university curriculum review and reform.

"What the university committee has done is to provide the framework for the review of undergraduate education," said Joan Leitzel, vice provost for the Office of Academic Affairs and liaison for academic affairs on the university committee. "It is a conceptual description. It doesn't talk about courses or specific things a person should know. It talks about what our goals are in educating students.

"Now there needs to be a second level of work done in the colleges in order to provide, within this framework, for a curricular model," Leitzel said.

The second level in the curriculum review and reform process is handled by a special committee in the College of the Arts and Sciences.

The arts and sciences committee will not name specific courses to be included in the curriculum, but will develop a model for its college. Leitzel said. The model will break the liberal arts requirements into separate areas and describe
details reforms

them in general terms.

Charles Babcock, professor and chairman in the classics department, is the chairman of the arts and sciences committee. Babcock said he believes some OSU graduates satisfy the attributes of an educated person.

"Obviously that report is based on a combination of the theoretical and the ideal," Babcock said. "It is unlikely that out of the 40,000 students there are going to be large percentages that meet that level of their goals."

Thomas Willke, dean of undergraduate studies for the College of Arts and Sciences, said, "You can't take that (the report) in the ideal sense. Surely we graduate a lot of well-educated seniors, (but) there is no question that there are some people graduating who have taken the minimum requirements."

Willke, a member of the arts and sciences committee, said the overall goal of the committee is to raise the level of well-educated graduates.

"The interim report is a broad statement of principles. They will be interpreted and shaped (by the arts and sciences committee). At the time being, we won't be specific about courses, but will suggest courses and give descriptions," Wilke said.

David Frantz, professor and vice chairman of the English department, is a member of the university committee and is a liaison for the arts and sciences committee. He said he hopes the faculty will respond favorably to the report.

"The students obviously should be deeply concerned (with the report). It has to deal with the value of a degree from Ohio State," Frantz said.

"To Reclaim a Legacy," a report on
Continued from Page One

undergraduate education from the National Endowment for Humanities, recommends that university and college faculties should put aside departmentalism and shape a common core curriculum.

Faculty members tend to look inward at education within their departments rather than looking at student’s overall education, according to the report.

Fratant said he agreed with the idea.

“We think departmentally at Ohio State. That has been ingrained in our way of thinking. I think that is going to be one of the real challenges for the arts and sciences committee,” he said.

“It is difficult to break out of a mold.”

Willke said, “The shift from departmentalism is difficult.

I hope the faculty will be inclined to teach broad-based (introductory level) courses.”

Fratant said the university committee did not rely heavily on national reports criticizing education.

Willke, however, said national reports did influence the review.

The National Institute of Education issued a report on higher education that criticized the accreditation standards of undergraduate professional programs. The report said the standards require students to take 50 to 75 percent of their undergraduate education in their major area.

Willke said this specialization can damage liberal learning.

“I agree overspecialization has gone way too far,” Wilke said.

“The specializing accreditation agencies want a bigger and bigger piece of the pie.”

In December, Myles Brand, provost for the Office of Academic Affairs, said a new curriculum will be implemented by autumn quarter 1988, resulting from the review and reform.

Willke said, “It is a tight deadline. The closer you get, the tougher it gets. I’d rather do it right than fast. I think most people will agree with that.”

Fratant said, “The provost has set a very ambitious schedule for implementation. Setting an ambitious schedule is good. It pushes people to get things done in a timely fashion.”

Leitzel said, “After the arts and sciences committee get their thoughts together and generate their ideas, then they will go to the faculty of arts and sciences. It is the faculty that makes curricular decisions. Nothing is final until the faculty say it is.”
OSU curriculum on wrong

By Ruth Hanley
Dispatch OSU Reporter

Ohio State University should be more than just a supermarket in which students pick and choose from shelves full of classes with only an arbitrary shopping list as their guide, a 14-member faculty committee says.

"The supermarket approach to general education comes very close to constituting an abrogation of our responsibility to students," said the OSU Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review in a report distributed on campus yesterday.

"Our obligation is not that of providing students a general education that they are interested in, but it is rather to provide an education which is in the interest of students as well as the rest of the human community."

The committee has been meeting since last spring to develop a philosophical framework for reforming OSU's undergraduate curriculum.

Faculty members, departments and colleges will use the report as a basis to develop a new curriculum for the fall of 1988.

The committee defined the attributes of an educated person as a guide to setting up new curriculum goals. It said an educated person should be able to:
- Write and speak with clarity and precision.
- Read and listen critically and with comprehension.
- Engage in careful, logical thinking and critical analysis.
- Speak and understand a language other than English.
- Understand and appreciate the methods of modern and social science, the effect of science and technology on the natural and social environment, and the nature of mathematical knowledge.

Those and other points in the report define in broad terms what students should know and be able to do when they graduate from Ohio State," said Gerald Reagan, a professor of educational policy and leadership and chairman of the curriculum committee.

"How great the (curriculum) changes are will depend on what the faculty of the various colleges do in the next year and a half."

OSU Provost Myles Brand commended the committee for developing a report that "is better than several national reports I've read."

The current curriculum requires undergraduates to complete 45 hours of basic education requirements in three areas: humanities, social sciences, and natural and biological sciences. The courses are aimed at freshmen and sophomores.

The new curriculum will include an integrated schedule of general education courses that will span students' undergraduate years, give them a broad knowledge of the liberal arts and pre-

track, reform panel says

pare them for more specific study in their majors.

Writing, for example, should be taught in an initial composition course, but also should be incorporated into other classes throughout the undergraduate program, Reagan said.

Students admitted to OSU before the new program takes effect will be able to stay with the current system.

The committee said that for a new curriculum to work, OSU must make changes in such problem areas as:
- An undergraduate advising system that is "neither coherent nor conducive to sound direction in general education."
- Class scheduling and registration that are "often chaotic and work at odds with intelligent academic planning."
- An inflexible academic calendar that "may be viewed as an impediment to thoughtful education."
- Too many courses taught by undergraduate teaching assistants instead of faculty members.
- A faculty reward system that emphasizes research and graduate education at the expense of undergraduate teaching.

Although the report focused mostly on what needs to be changed at OSU, Reagan said, "it's not that what we have now is bad — it's good — but we can do better."
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Report solicits renewed vigor in curriculum

Introduction

As the Committee faces the task of defining anew the concept of general education, of shaping once more a vision of what an educated person ought to be, it does so with the knowledge that there is an intense national concern with higher education. Colleges, universities, foundations and organizations of every patch and hue have rediscovered the undergraduate curriculum with an enthusiasm virtually unparalleled in our history.

Many of these re-examinations of the undergraduate curriculum begin, quite properly, by reaffirming the traditional functions of the university, by reminding us that we are chiefly concerned with developing and enhancing the inquiring mind. We are reminded as well that our valuing of the liberated mind and the pursuit of truth both reinforce and are reinforced by the importance we place on the worth and dignity of all human beings. The proper education of the modern university student is not only buttressed by these convictions but also examines and exposes practices, habits, and biases of all kinds (e.g., racism, gender bias, and attacks on the freedom of inquiry) which diminish the achievement of these core values. Our goals, then, are not new nor are they different: Our task remains that of assisting students to liberate their minds so that they become an important part of a more truly human community.

Although our general goals remain the same, the nature of the modern world may demand a sweeping revision of means to achieve our desired ends. The educated person, many authorities suggest, must be prepared for lifelong learning. The rapidity and magnitude of technological and social change will continue to transform our world. Established jobs and occupations will disappear and new ones will appear. Institutions will be radically altered, presenting new and perplexing problems. Educated people, to deal with these changes, will need to develop a much higher level of intellectual flexibility and social intelligence. If this higher level is to be achieved, our students must be informed by the past, knowledgeable about the present, and intellectually prepared to meet an uncertain future.

The literature of educational reform directed at colleges and universities is also clear on some of the obstacles to major revisions of undergraduate pro-
grams. Among these obstacles are (1) intense academic specialization, (2) over-emphasis on professional preparation, and (3) over-reliance on the view that students, like other consumers, should determine what "products" universities continue to offer. In the case of the first, the high degree of specialization that serves well the research enterprise may serve less well the general education needs of students. The second obstacle, an undue emphasis on professional preparation and job-entry training during the undergraduate years, may meet the short-range needs of employers and the short-range interests of students but may as well fail to prepare students to deal with future problems and changes almost certain to affect radically their world of work. The third factor, the notion that the student is a "consumer" who shops and buys and that the curriculum is analogous to a supermarket properly regulated by the laws of supply and demand, calls legitimate and appropriate academic attention to the importance of student interest and motivation. Too much uncritical reliance on this metaphor, however, may lead us to forget that our obligation is not that of providing students a general education that they are interested in, but it is rather to provide an education which is in the interest of students as well as the rest of the human community.

There is no paucity of models and pronouncements on the subject of reforming general education. Neither is there any shortage of problems to be overcome if that reform is to be achieved. Many of the documents produced in the 1980s that reviewed and evaluated the undergraduate curriculum have been useful to the Committee. However, in addition to being informed about what is happening nationally, we recognize our responsibility is that of stating our own principles and illuminating our own vision. These principles and this vision must take into account not only the national context and national concern, but must also recognize the realities, the problems, and the promise that are all a part of the Ohio State University context.

The Committee was given an extremely broad charge — that of identifying "a basic body of knowledge, thoroughly grounded in the liberal arts, that each of our students would be required to achieve." "General Education" is the term often applied to

"The educated person...must be prepared for lifelong learning."
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To achieve the aims of education, there are certain capacities and understandings, certain qualities, abilities and characteristics which are part of what we understand as the liberating process a university is particularly suited to develop, nourish and hone. Primary among these capacities is the ability to write and speak with clarity and precision; to read and listen critically and with comprehension. Of the same order is the ability to engage in careful logical thinking and critical analysis, including the abilities that permit intelligent responses to problems and arguments which involve quantitative data.

An understanding of and appreciation for the important modes of human thought and inquiry are crucial characteristics of a liberal education. An understanding of the methods of modern science and social science, the effect of science and technology on the natural and social environment, and the nature of mathematical knowledge constitutes part of this knowledge. The development of a refined historical, artistic and literary consciousness is a further part. A liberal education should also develop and sharpen the capacity and confidence to make informed and discriminating ethical and aesthetic judgments.

We believe that a liberal education in a university in our own nation today should foster an understanding of American institutions and the pluralistic nature of American society. It should also promote an understanding of the global interdependence of the modern world and should ensure facility with at least one language other than English. Finally, we think that an American university should seek to develop a deep appreciation for the cultural traditions that have formed and informed our nation and to develop a sense of the place of other cultures in world history.

The Committee is well aware that an attempt to capture in three brief paragraphs the important attributes of the ideal of the educated person is an enterprise which wise people would likely avoid. The brevity and generality are likely to suggest to some that virtually any aspect of the curriculum could be justified as a legitimate part of general education. Others are likely to see the lack of specificity as a potential threat that some favored discipline or sub-discipline may be excluded.

However, we begin with a fairly general statement describing the attributes of an educated person in order to facilitate thinking anew about means to achieve these educational ends. Such thinking must go beyond examination of existing courses. It should consider reshaping of curricula including structure, format and length of courses; methods of instruction; support for instruction; enhancement of faculty preparation to teach in the general education programs; better utilization and training of teaching associates; modifications of the reward system and faculty perceptions of that system; and modification of resource allocation to encourage improvements in general education without constraining our efforts to excel as a national leader in research and graduate instruction.
Rationale

In the paragraphs that follow, the Committee provides the rationale for the attributes of the educated person which we believe our general education should be structured to develop.

The abilities to read and listen with comprehension and critical acuity are requisite to the gaining of knowledge in a university setting. The ability to express oneself with clarity, both orally and in writing, provides the deepest proof of understanding. Only through such expression can one demonstrate the powers of careful thinking and critical analysis.

Further, we recognize that writing especially is a primary tool in learning itself, not just a means of expressing learning that has taken place. Writing is a powerful mode of thinking; writing involves making choices and then ordering those choices effectively. We think that writing should be taught as a cornerstone course for all students, but students should also receive am-
tive, and has the knowledge and ability to make informed and discriminating ethical and aesthetic judgments. Although we do not believe that this traditional core constitutes a sufficient general education, we do find persuasive the many arguments in both historical and contemporary literature to defend this core as a central and necessary part.

In the third paragraph of our statement describing the attributes of the educated person, we have delineated those aspects of general education that deal with the importance of gaining an appreciation for contributions of various cultures. This appreciation is crucial for at least two reasons. First, we can understand fully our own culture and institutions only if we appreciate the diversity and pluralism which mark our nation. Second, our role in a world characterized by global interdependence requires an understanding of other cultures. Not only do we influence others, but we are influenced by them as well. To recognize the recipro-

cal nature of this influence is to accept the responsibility to know both ourselves and others culturally, politically and historically.

In coming to know ourselves, we must first recognize that the United States has a population which is an amalgamation of many cultures. Some of these cultures have been highly assimilated; others have not. It is important that educated people understand the significance of cultural differences within their nation. The United States of America is not — and never has really been — a "melting pot."

For historical reasons, the most obvious of which is the early dominance of European settlers, American higher education curricula have generally reflected a "Eurocentric" bias. This is understandable, and there should be a strong commitment to the study of what has historically been viewed as Western civilization. We should also provide our students with the opportunity to know and understand the other cultures in world history.

A distinct aspect of any cultural or ethnic group is its spoken and written language or dialect. Through this system of signs, it expresses and defines itself. Students should learn proficiently at least one tongue other than English, the dominant language of our nation. This will assist them in coming to understand the culture(s) which use that language. It will also enhance the sense of being different that every ed-
Specialization and Undergraduate Education. Most faculty members in the modern university are highly trained academic specialists. This academic specialization seems absolutely essential for first-rate programs of research and graduate study. First-rate programs of general education for undergraduates, however, require more than specialization, demanding as they do that the academician expend time and intellectual effort to display the field in a way that contributes to the development of the general intellectual perspective of the student.

Although it is surely true that faculty members at typical colleges and universities have the potential to offer first-rate general education, we need to reject the careless assumption that holding a Ph.D. and a faculty appointment (in a field generally held to be a part of general education) is ipso facto demonstration of a person's readiness to offer a good general education course. To participate fully and effectively in the general education process, the faculty member needs not only be a master of the discipline taught, but needs as well to turn needed attention to questions such as how the particular discipline might best be taught and how the discipline fits with other disciplines in contributing to the general education of the non-specialist. In short, one needs an understanding of and a commitment to general education as well as mastery of one's discipline.

It should be emphasized that the academic specialization which is a necessary part of the modern university is not seen here as a weakness to be overcome but as a strength upon which to build. The modern scholar is a specialist, and the need is not to denigrate nor reduce that specialization. It is rather to provide more and better opportunities for scholars to extend their roles within universities by developing curricular and instructional means that enrich the general education of undergraduate students.

We do need to be wary of over-spe-
The National Context

The intense national concern with higher education in the United States during the past five years is both reflected in and encouraged by five major national reports. The first of these reports was the National Institute of Education's "Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education." The text of this report was printed in The Chronicle of Higher Education on Oct. 24, 1984. The second report was the National Endowment for the Humanities report titled "To Reclaim a Legacy," the text of which appeared in the Nov. 28, 1984, Chronicle. The Association of American Colleges Project on Redefining the Meaning and Purpose of Baccalaureate Degrees produced the report "Integrity in the College Curriculum," published in the Chronicle on Feb. 13, 1985. The fourth report is that of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the prologue and major recommendations of which are published in the Nov. 5, 1986, Chronicle. The full report, titled "College: The Undergraduate Experience in America," was published this month, February 1987. The most recent report is that of the National Commission on the Role and Future of State Colleges and Universities, chaired by former U.S. Secretary of Education Terrel H. Bell. Titled "To Secure the Blessings of Liberty," this report was published in the Nov. 12, 1986, Chronicle.

Among the five reports there are, of course, minor differences concerning the recommended goals of general education. The similarities are, however, striking. It seems a fair appraisal to assert that there is general agreement about these goals. This should not surprise us, for the goals are not new or novel: They are the traditional goals of general education which are simply being reaffirmed. They are being reaffirmed in the context of yet another area of general agreement in the national reports: Present general education curricula are inadequate means to achieve the goals of general education.

A common contemporary approach to general education is the use of so-called "distribution requirements." In this approach the student is required to select courses from several different categories, e.g., science, social science, humanities, mathematics. On the surface this may appear to be an appropriate and promising plan, but in practice there are a number of common problems.

Among the problems often cited nationally are: (1) the list of courses in each category tends to grow, and the student selection process may result in a general education program which lacks both breadth and coherence; (2) many courses tend to be developed simply as beginning steps in disciplinary sequences, not as courses designed to meet general education goals; (3) since courses are not specifically designed and designated as general education courses, instructional practices often are not designed in accordance with general educational goals; (4) there is often no systematic attempt to ensure that "across-the-curriculum" aspects of general education are included in all or most courses, e.g., writing, critical and analytical thinking, integration and synthesis.

The literature of higher education reform makes it clear that there are some general tendencies and problems in colleges and universities which exacerbate the difficulties in developing and maintaining a strong general education program. Three of these problems/tendencies were mentioned in the introduction of this report. They are (1) the academic specialization which is a necessary mark of the modern research university; (2) pressures for providing students with narrow and premature professional and occupational preparation; and (3) the view that the student is an "academic consumer" who properly determines what much of the content of university general education is to be. Some discussion of these three problems/tendencies follows:
cialization in the general education curriculum. Given the extent of and emphasis on academic specialization in the research university, it is likely that at least some disciplinary courses intended as general education will be taught as if each student will eventually become a specialist in the field, i.e., the general education course might be taught not primarily as general education but as an introduction preparing the student for more advanced study in the discipline. Although this may be appropriate in some cases, we cannot assume that such an approach is an effective one in general.

If general education is our concern, then we should select the content, the approach to teaching that content, and the evaluation of the students not on the grounds of how the course might contribute to the development of professional scholars but rather on the grounds of how the course might contribute to the development of generally educated persons.

To be prepared to take the second or third course in a variety of highly specialized disciplines may not provide sufficient evidence that the student has made progress toward becoming an educated person. It is not that general education is unrelated to the major field of study, but rather that general education should provide a broad intellectual base which serves both as a foundation and a perspective for the development and use of the specialized knowledge of the major field.

Professional Preparation and Undergraduate Education. During the past 15 years, observers and critics of American higher education have pointed out what they take to be a growing emphasis on professional and vocational preparation during the undergraduate years. Increasing numbers of students seek programs which promise to provide entry qualifications for a preferred occupation, and colleges and universities have responded with curricula to provide students with career entry-level skills and with institutional certification of those skills. Our institutions are appropriately concerned with the quality of the professional and occupational preparation we provide, and we should not denigrate well-designed and effective professional curricula.

We do, however, need to be alert to the tendency to place an undue emphasis on a too narrow professional preparation that may fail to be in the long-range professional interests of our students. A too narrow and specialized professional preparation is not in the student's interest both because of the rapidly changing demands of the professional role and because many students will not remain in the same occupation throughout their working lives.

Such preparation may also discourage a strong general education program in at least two ways.

First, it tends to de-emphasize the importance of general education, both in the minds of the students and in the institutional response to the students' interests. Students with strong vocational orientations are likely to view general education as irrelevant to their personal educational goals. And col-
le and university faculty and officials, seeking to attract and retain these students, may be tempted to allow and perhaps even condone a diminished commitment to general education.

A second way in which over-professionalization may have a negative effect on general education is to encourage the modification of general education courses so that they are more directly related to specific occupational preparation, e.g., philosophy requirements are met by a course in business ethics, a mathematics requirement is satisfied by a course in math for elementary teachers, a science requirement is fulfilled by a course in chemistry for nurses, etc.

The point here is not that general education ought ignore the contribution it may make to professional competence, but that general education is weakened when such competence becomes the primary criterion used in designing general education curricula. An emphasis on professional and occupational preparation is appropriate when that preparation is based on, accompanied by, and buttressed with a strong program of general education.

**Student Consumerism and Undergraduate Education.** For the past two decades it has been common to hear students referred to as consumers of higher education. We recognize, of course, that this metaphor is one which suggests that students are, in important ways, like the consumers in the marketplace. And it suggests as well that a college or university education can be seen as analogous in some ways to "products" which are to be tested on the basis of their appeal to the consumers.

The analogy is not altogether inappropriate, and some aspects of this "student-as-consumer" view seem worthy of not only approval but of applause. Clearly what a college or university promises prospective students should have more than a mere ring of truth. "Truth-in-packaging" requirements may be as important in protecting students from unscrupulous institutions of higher education as are comparable protections for the grocery or drug shopper from unscrupulous advertisers.

The analogy may also serve to remind us of the danger of "goal reversal" in our institutions, i.e., to allow our institutions to function as if the end is the enhancement of the institution, and as if the students are the means to this end. One of the primary goals, we should remember, is the education of students, and a large segment of the institution is properly designed and viewed as a means to achieve that end.

Sometimes, however, the student-as-consumer notion is used in a way which is inappropriate. To extend the metaphor slightly, distribution requirements may be seen as analogous to a supermarket. A multitude of general education courses are on the shelves, and students pick and choose those that fit their tastes and wants. The assumption, or the hope, appears to be that the courses selected will somehow produce a balanced and coherent general education. Given a wise adviser and a motivated student, this assumption or hope may be warranted. In far too many cases, however, the desired balance and coherence are not realized.

The supermarket approach to general education comes very close to constituting an abrogation of our responsibility to students. Although this may have a paternalistic ring, it does seem that members of the academy should collectively recommend in rather specific terms what they regard as crucial in general education. To fail to do so, and to ask students to make these decisions under the guise of "individualizing" their educational programs, may also violate a "truth-in-packaging" concern if we in effect promise students they will receive an adequate general education. It is true, of course, that academicians may not agree among themselves as to what the best general education would be. This lack of unanimity calls for continuing debate and constant evaluation of general education programs. It does not call for nor does it justify asking students to make the decisions because the faculty cannot reach complete agreement. Students may have some sort of wisdom which accures to inexperience, but such a limited wisdom is
The Local Context

The national problems outlined above are reflected in the particular situation of Ohio State. Too often we allow the specialized model of graduate education to influence in inappropriate ways our formulation of undergraduate courses and curricula. Frequently, at one end of the spectrum we allow pre-professional undergraduate programs to dominate an undergraduate's program at the expense of liberal education. At the other end of the spectrum we allow students in less structured programs to flounder in a sea of courses which makes no connections, provides no coherence, and what is most unsettling of all, fosters no sense of what a liberal education is.

There are also difficulties with the way in which we implement the programs we now have in place. We entrust far too much of the teaching of a great many undergraduate courses to graduate teaching assistants (in some cases we even entrust this teaching to other undergraduates). Our present advising system is neither coherent nor conducive to sound direction in general education; registration for and scheduling of classes are often chaotic and work at odds with intelligent academic planning; the academic calendar is not currently employed to give needed flexibility and may be viewed as an impediment to thoughtful education. Finally, the reward system for faculty who might wish to devote more energy to undergraduate education is not as fully or carefully developed and used as is the reward system for those engaged primarily in research and graduate education.

We wish to elaborate on several of these points. What is in the service of general or liberal education here at Ohio State is a list of basic education courses. The three areas of the Basic Education Requirements are so broad and filled with so many courses, it is hardly a wonder that students derive little sense of liberal education upon completing the hour requirements for the BER. Further, the system was conceived for completion during the first two years of enrollment. As a consequence, virtually all the courses that appear on the BER lists are lower divi-
sion courses aimed at freshmen and sophomores. However, many students in fact take their BER courses over four years. While we believe that general education should be spread over the entirety of an undergraduate's education, upper division students ought to enroll in general education courses more appropriate to their greater intellectual maturity.

We compound the problem of a structureless mass of courses by making advising a low priority activity in the University; until a student finds a major, each is only one of hundreds who flock to a non-faculty adviser for guidance through the maze of basic education requirements. Even when a student finds a major adviser, that adviser is usually responsible only for advising about the major. Instructors in BER classes are likely to be little help in placing the particular course within the context of liberal education, since those instructors are more often than not teaching assistants knowledgeable about little beyond their own discipline. In short, neither the structure of the requirements as they now exist, nor the advising which we give students, nor the teaching of the courses themselves is likely to foster any sense of a liberal education.

A final comment upon instruction. The extensive use of teaching assistants as instructors with primary responsibility for so many courses is a major problem. While many of our teaching assistants do well instructing undergraduates, there can be little argument that they are neither so experienced, knowledgeable, nor well trained as are the faculty. Ohio State remains seriously understaffed in terms of regular faculty appointments in those areas where much of the general education occurs; we must move to remedy this situation. We should also explore different approaches to teaching general education courses if we are to reach the desirable goal, placing the primary responsibility for all general education courses on the faculty. Further, we must ensure that where teaching assistants are used, they are properly trained, supervised and supported.

The University has done a great deal to recognize distinguished teaching. However, teaching at the graduate level, supervising graduate work, and research are the activities most highly prized and rewarded in the University. For example, many documents relating to University policy matters routinely ignore such things as undergraduate advising, directing honors theses and so forth. We have a highly articulated ranking of faculty that limits and defines what they are worthy to do at the graduate level; no such system exists at the undergraduate level. The point is not that we believe the incentives too many or the rewards too great for research and graduate teaching, but rather we believe that there is a need for more incentives for excellence in undergraduate teaching.

Until there are more clear incentives, we can hardly expect faculty to devote themselves, even for an assigned period of time, to developing and teaching general education courses; we can hardly expect them to embrace notions like writing across the curriculum or development of innovative undergraduate courses or advising if there is no reward for performing such difficult and time-consuming tasks.

The Task Before Us

The Committee recognizes that developing and implementing a new general education curriculum is no easy task. It should be clear from our discussion of the existing local context
that merely adjusting the current BER will not achieve the reformation we see as desirable. A completely new system should be constructed.

We are aware that past attempts at curriculum reform have led to serious battles over questions of turf and that curricular thinking has been bound by the strong departmental structure of the University. Development of vigorous, innovative cross-disciplinary programs has often been difficult. We urge that faculty charged with the development of curricular models attempt to free themselves from such restrictions.

We are also aware that previous curricular reforms have often bogged down over very difficult issues of staffing and instruction, especially as they are constrained by budgetary concerns. Such issues obviously cannot be ignored. For example, teaching assistants are still going to have to play a significant instructional role, but we hope such concerns will not unduly influence curricular development. It is our expectation that resources will be found to encourage fresh instructional approaches.

For example, we realize that in calling for some form of writing across the curriculum, we are asking for something which requires specially qualified instructors responsible for far fewer students than has been the case heretofore. We believe that a requirement for writing in many components of the curriculum should be developed with the understanding that a commitment sufficient to support such a program will be forthcoming.
What is true in the area of writing instruction might, in fact, prove true for general education courses as a whole. The University should commit itself to a program of faculty development to assist faculty members in preparing themselves to function more fully and effectively in the general education instruction of undergraduates.

Such a program assumes that many of the faculty will want to participate in such instruction, and we recognize that this will not occur if the current reward system in the University is not modified to recognize such participation. Modification and further development of the reward system for faculty should have as its goal greater emphasis on excellence in undergraduate teaching without de-emphasizing in any way the importance of research and graduate teaching.

If we are to elevate the importance of undergraduate instruction, we will need to develop a system for evaluation that is at least as comprehensive and rigorous as is our approach to the evaluation of research and scholarship. Student evaluation of teaching may be a part of such a system, but an adequate system will have to go far beyond this and include peer evaluation of classroom and informal teaching, peer judgment about the unique characteristics of particular academic fields, peer evaluation of instructional materials, and peer evaluation of student advisement activities.

In recognizing that whatever reforms are enacted, teaching assistants will, and should, continue to play a significant role in undergraduate instruction, we believe that new programs for training and supervising teaching associates must be instituted.

Finally, a mechanism must be found for monitoring and supervising the general education program. It is not sufficient simply to construct a new system and expect it to function properly without appropriate controls, constraints, and provision for orderly modification.

We have an exceptional opportunity to develop a new general education program that will truly expand and enrich the intellectual experience of every undergraduate student at Ohio State University. The task is not small, nor will the needed transformation result from merely adapting the rhetoric of reform or by making cosmetic changes in our current program. What is required is the commitment of the University community to a comprehensive rethinking of our undergraduate enterprise. It is a commitment we must make if we are to secure our place as one of the nation's premier centers for higher learning.
Appendix

Excerpts from National Reports

Although there are differences between and among the reports, they all share the view that undergraduate education in general is in need of reform, and that the general education component of the undergraduate experience has become incoherent and ineffective. The reports recognize that each college and university needs to design a general education program that takes into account its particular context and problems. At the same time, the goals of general education are properly similar in the several reports. Some brief representative excerpts from these reports should demonstrate this.

The NIE Report speaks of "liberal education requirements":

Liberal education requirements should be expanded and reinvigorated to ensure that (1) curricular content is addressed not only to subject matter but also to the development of capacities of analysis, problem solving, communication, and synthesis, and (2) students and faculty integrate knowledge from various disciplines.

Here we identify the critical elements of a liberal education and recommend that they be specified in such a way that standards of content are clear. Liberal education seems to have fallen out of favor over the past two decades, particularly with parents and students who have come to believe that the best insurance in a technological society is a highly specialized education that will lead to a specific job. However, no one knows precisely how new technologies will affect the skills and knowledge required by our future labor force. We thus conclude that the best preparation for the future is not narrow training for a specific job, but rather an education that will enable students to adapt to a changing world.

Successful adaptation to change requires the ability to think critically, to synthesize large quantities of new information, and to master the language skills (critical reading, effective composition, clear speech, and careful listening) that are the fuel of thought. Adaptation to change requires that one draw on history and on the experience of other nations, and that one apply the theories and methods of empirical investigation. It requires a disposition toward lifelong learning and the ability to partake of and contribute to the richness of culture and citizenship of our nation. These requirements are as relevant to the future medical technician in training at a community college as they are to the biology major at a university. To fulfill them is to achieve a liberal education.

We know that a liberal education curriculum will not and cannot be the
same for students of all levels of ability, ages and interests. But we are convinced that what should distinguish the baccalaureate degree from more specialized credentials is the broad learning that lies behind it. An increase in liberal education requirements is one way to guarantee that comprehensiveness.

But adding requirements — or offering students a larger set of liberal arts courses from which to select — does not achieve one of the principal aims of liberal education. The ability to integrate what one has learned in different disciplines. What happens too often when liberal education requirements are increased is fragmentation, as politics come to overwhelm learning objectives. Instead, the reform of liberal education must:

- Be based on collaboration among faculty from different departments, such as that which occurs when faculty from all disciplines work together to improve the substance, coherence, and persuasive power of student writing.

- Establish specific integrative mechanisms such as senior seminars and theses that require reflection on the knowledge gained in previous years of college and that students actively apply learning from different disciplines in individual or group projects that open windows of their learning to the world beyond.

We stress the ability to synthesize for three reasons: (1) the evidence strongly suggests that college students have considerable difficulty with abstractions and models that are the grounds of advanced study in the disciplines; (2) the task of integrating knowledge, though central to liberal education, is frequently ignored in favor of analysis; and (3) the ability to synthesize is necessary for the development of judgment and for the application of academic learning to real life situations.
The NEH report "To Reclaim A Legacy" does not deal primarily with the question of the whole of general education but focuses on the major role to be played by the humanities:

A good curriculum. If the teacher is the guide, the curriculum is the path. A good curriculum marks the points of significance so that the student does not wander aimlessly over the terrain, dependent solely on chance to discover the landmarks of human achievement.

Colleges and universities have a responsibility to design general education curricula that identify these landmarks. David Savage of the Los Angeles Times expressed the consensus of the study group when he said: "Most students enter college expecting that the university and its leaders have a clear vision of what is worth knowing and what is important in our heritage that all educated persons should know. They also have a right to expect that the university sees itself as more than a catalogue of courses."

Although the study group embraced the principle that all institutions
should accept responsibility for deciding what their graduates should know, most members believed that no single curriculum could be appropriate in all places. The study group recognized the diverse nature of higher education under whose umbrella are institutions with different histories, philosophies, educational purposes, student body characteristics, and religious and cultural traditions. Each institution must decide for itself what it considers an educated person to be and what knowledge that person should possess. While doing so, no institution need act as if it were operating in a vacuum. There are standards of judgment: Some things are more important to know than others.

The choices a college or university makes for its common curriculum should be rooted firmly in its institutional identity and educational purpose. In successful institutions, an awareness of what the college or university is trying to do acts as a unifying principle, a thread that runs through and ties together the faculty, the curriculum, the students, and the administration. If an institution has no clearly conceived and articulated sense of itself, its efforts to design a curriculum will result in little more than an educational garage sale, possibly satisfying most campus factions but serving no real purpose and adding up to nothing of significance.

Developing a common curriculum with the humanities at the core is no easy task. In some institutions it will be difficult to attain. But merely being exposed to a variety of subjects and points of view is not enough. Learning to think critically and skeptically is not enough. Being well rounded is not enough if, after all the sharp edges have been filed down, discernment is blunted and the graduate is left to believe without judgments, to decide without wisdom, or to act without standards.

Based on our discussions, we recommend the following knowledge in the humanities as essential to a college education:

- Because our society is the product and we the inheritors of Western civilization, American students need an understanding of its origins and development, from its roots in antiquity to the present. This understanding should include a grasp of the major trends in society, religion, art, literature and politics, as well as a knowledge of basic chronology.

- A careful reading of several masterworks of English, American, and European literature.

- An understanding of the most significant ideas and works in the history of philosophy.

- Demonstrate proficiency in a foreign language (either modern or classical) and the ability to view that language as an avenue into another culture.

In addition to these areas of fundamental knowledge, members recommended that undergraduates have some familiarity with the history, literature, religion and philosophy of at least one non-Western culture or civilization. We think it better to have a deeper understanding of a single non-Western culture than a superficial taste of many. Finally, the study group thought that all students should study the history of science and technology.

The AAC Report, "Integrity in the College Curriculum" includes the following general statement concerning the goals of general education:

Our message to administrators and professors alike is that the curriculum requires structure, a framework sturdier than simply a major and general distribution requirements and more reliable than student interest. We do not believe that concern for coverage and factual knowledge is where the construction of a curriculum should begin. We propose a minimum required program of study for all students, consisting of the intellectual, aesthetic and philosophic experiences that should enter into the lives of men and women engaged in baccalaureate education.

We do not believe that the road to a coherent undergraduate education can be constructed from a set of required subjects or academic disciplines. We do believe that there are methods and processes, modes of access to understanding and judgment, that should inform all study. While learning cannot of course take place devoid of subject matter, how that subject matter is experienced is what concerns us here.

We are in search of an education that will enable the American people to live responsibly and joyfully, fulfilling their promise as individual humans and their obligations as democratic citizens. We believe that the following nine experiences are essential to that kind of education: Some of them might be thought of as skills, others as ways of growing and understanding; we think that all of them are basic to a coherent undergraduate education.

The nine experiences, as summarized in the Chronicle of Higher Education, are:

Inquiry, abstract logical thinking, critical analysis. To reason well, to recognize when reason and evidence are not enough, to discover the legitimacy of intuition, to subject inert data to the probing analysis of the mind — these are the primary experiences required of the undergraduate course of study.

Literacy: Writing, reading, speaking, listening. A bachelor's degree should mean that its holders can read, write, and speak at levels of distinction and have been given many opportunities to learn how. It also should mean that many of them do so with style.

Understanding numerical data. Students should encounter concepts that
permit a sophisticated response to arguments and positions which depend on numbers and statistics. Such concepts would include degree of risk, scatter, uncertainty, orders of magnitude, rates of change, confidence levels and acceptability, and the interpretation of graphs as they are manifest in numbers.

**Historical consciousness.** The more refined our historical understanding, the better prepared we are to recognize complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty as intractable conditions of human society.

**Science.** The report says students should not only understand the scientific method, but also study the "human, social, and political implications of scientific research."

**Values.** Students must learn to "make real choices, assume responsibility for their decisions, be comfortable with their own behavior, and know why."

**Art.** "Without a knowledge of the language of the fine arts, we see less and hear less," the report says. "Without some experience in the performing arts we are denied the knowledge of disciplined creativity and its meaning as a bulwark of freedom and an instrument of social cohesion."

**International and multicultural experiences.** Colleges must create a curriculum in which the insights and understandings, the lives and aspirations of the distant and foreign, the different and neglected, are more widely comprehended by their graduates.

**Study in depth.** Depth requires sequential learning, building on blocks of knowledge that lead to more sophisticated understanding and encourage leaps of the imagination and efforts at synthesis.

---

**There seem to be three of the major recommendations of the Carnegie Foundation’s College: The Undergraduate Experience which focus on the goals and curriculum of general education. They are:**

**The First Requirement.** Proficiency in the written and the spoken word is the first prerequisite for a college-level education. Students need language to grasp and express feelings and ideas effectively. To succeed in college, undergraduates should be able to write and speak with clarity, and to read and listen with comprehension.

We urge that the reading and writing capability of all students be carefully assessed when they enroll. Those not well prepared in written and spoken English should be placed in an intensive, noncredit, remedial course that meets daily during the academic term. And good English usage must be reinforced by every professor in every class.

While the need for remedial pro-

---

**Photographs throughout the report were taken by Jo Hall and Lloyd Lemmermann.**

---

grams is a fact of life, we are convinced that the long-term answer is better precollegiate education. Every college and university should work closely with surrounding districts to improve the teaching of English in the nation’s schools.

We also recommend that all college freshmen, not just those with special problems, begin their undergraduate experience with a year-long course in English, with emphasis on writing.

Language and thought are inextricably connected, and as undergraduates develop their language skills, they hone the quality of their thinking and become intellectually and socially empowered. The goal must be to extend, through language study, the common knowledge of its students and, in so doing, sustain the heritage of our culture.

**General Education.** The weak and ineffective approach to general education — through distribution requirements — should be strengthened. To achieve this essential goal, we propose an approach called an integrated core. By the integrated core we mean a program of study that introduces a student to essential knowledge, to connections across the disciplines, and, in the end, to the application of knowledge to life beyond the campus.

To translate the purpose of the integrated core into practice, we suggest seven areas of inquiry that touch the disciplines and relate knowledge to experiences common to all people. The following academic framework for general education is suggested:
• Language
• Art: The Aesthetic Experience
• Heritage: The Living Past
• The Social Web
• Nature: Ecology of the Planet
• Work: The Value of Vocation
• Identity: The Search for Meaning

It seems clear to us that an exploration of these universal experiences — through courses, seminars, all-college convocation, and the like — is indispensable if students are better to understand themselves, their society, and the world of which they are a part. Ideally, general education, the integrated core, is not something to "get out of the way," but should extend vertically from freshman to senior year. And in a properly designed baccalaureate program, general education and specialized education will be joined.

The Enriched Major. The baccalaureate degree is now divided into two separate parts, general education and the major. We believe these two essential segments of the baccalaureate experience should be blended in the curriculum just as, inevitably, they must be blended during life. Therefore, in tandem with the integrated core, we propose an enriched major. By an enriched major, we mean encouraging students not only to explore a field in depth, but also to put the specialized field of study in perspective.

The major, as it is enriched, would respond to three essential questions: What is the history and tradition of the field to be examined? What are the social and economic implications to be understood? and What are the ethical and moral issues to be confronted and resolved?

Every student, as an essential part of the undergraduate experience, should complete an enriched major. Beyond the separate courses, the field of study should include a written thesis that relates some aspect of the major to historical, social, or ethical concerns. Every student should write a senior thesis and we further suggest that each student participate in a senior seminar in which he or she presents the report orally to colleagues and also critiques the papers of fellow students.

As the major begins to intersect with the themes of common learning, students return, once again, to the considerations of language, heritage and social institutions, and the rest. At a college of quality when a major is so enriched it leads the student from depth to breadth and focuses, not on mere training, but on liberal education at its best.
The National Commission on the Role and Future of Two-Year Colleges and Universities report states that:

America's colleges and universities have become too utilitarian, too vocational in their orientation, too parochial in their world outlook, with their curricula incoherent and in a state of disarray. Campuses have become "supermarkets," the critics charged, with narrow specialities the order of the day and the humanities on the decline.

Public colleges and universities should respond to these concerns by agreeing on and adopting a set of minimum academic skills and levels of proficiency that all students should attain, preferably by the end of the sophomore year. This should be done on the basis of faculty recommendations and administered in a way that will assure the public that the necessary skills expected from a college education are, indeed, being achieved.

Students should be required to match or exceed these threshold requirements, which would provide a basic accountability and a standard upon which individual institutions can build. Each college and university should further specify clearly not only the skills but also the means by which it will facilitate their acquisition by every student before a bachelor's degree is awarded. Recipients of baccalaureate degrees should have obtained knowledge and experiences that equip them with a sense of competence, relevance, and pertinence for the future.

Not only must they function well in a multilingual, technological, global society, but they must also contribute to its advancement and quality. It would be tragic if America's colleges allowed baccalaureate graduates to be monolingual in that global society; to be technologically naive in an age demanding technical skills and sophisticated understandings; or to be uninitiated to the "real life" worlds of work and of social responsibility.
by Jeff Grabmeier

Within a few years, undergraduate education will be reborn at Ohio State.

The University is in the midst of an undergraduate curriculum reform that will change significantly what students learn.

"How different our curriculum becomes will depend on what happens in the next year and a half," says Gerald Reagan, a professor of educational policy and leadership. "But I believe it will be significantly different. I think there will be a completely redesigned program of general education."

Reagan is chairperson of the Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review, a faculty panel that is leading the reform effort.

The re-designed curriculum will be a coherent program of education whose goal will be to produce graduates who can write and speak with precision, reason logically and are well-versed in the sciences and liberal arts, according to University officials.

It will replace the present system, which allows undergraduates to choose from a "smorgasbord" of classes that fulfill the University's Basic Education Requirements.

Faculty members, departments and colleges are participating in developing the new curriculum that University officials hope to have in place by autumn 1988.

The foundation of this reform process is contained in the interim report of the special committee, which was released early this year.

The report reviews the status of general education at the University, outlines the attributes of the educated person that Ohio State hopes to produce, and develops a philosophical framework for reforming the course of study.

Currently, a committee within the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences is reviewing its general education program and developing its own model curriculum, Reagan said.

Arts and Sciences model curriculum will serve as a basis for other colleges' efforts, Reagan said.

Provost Myles Brand said the curriculum review has been a long time coming. He noted that the University has not examined its entire curriculum since 1957.

The current program, which requires undergraduates to complete 45 hours of Basic Education Requirements, or BERs, can be improved, he said.

"We want a curriculum that has a fully developed rationale. It should provide a basic liberal arts education to all students and be fully integrated with the majors programs," Brand said.

The interim report of the special committee highlights several important points about curriculum reform, Brand said.

"It emphasizes that general education is a four year project. It's not something only for freshmen and sophomores," he said. "It also stresses the importance of a broad-based education and of having a sound foundation in the liberal arts and sciences.

"In addition, the report emphasizes that we at the University need to move beyond our parochialism, that education should focus not only on our culture, but on cultures throughout the world."

Course review clarified

By ALAN VANDERMOLEN
Lantern staff writer

During Tuesday's convocation speech in Weigel Hall auditorium, Myles Brand, vice president for academic affairs and provost, hinted at some of the results of the university's revision of the undergraduate curriculum.

"Ohio State is in the midst of revising its undergraduate curriculum," Brand said. "The goal of this review is to provide undergraduates an education that is second to none."

Brand, filling in for President Edward H. Jennings, continued that the new curriculum would stress a blend of the basics and a broad general education.

The new curriculum is expected to be in place for certain areas in the autumn of 1988.

The convocation also served to introduce 21 deans and administrators to a crowd largely consisting of students.

According to Robert G. Rodda, assistant dean of student life, the convocation's main purpose was to give students and deans a chance to meet one another and have a personalized start to the school year.

On a lighter note, Brand encouraged students to get to know the campus community and the city.

"As vice president for academic affairs," Brand said, "I must warn you that I expect you to study, and study hard." As the crowd laughed, Brand continued to say that learning must go on outside of the classroom.

Although the convocation was forced to Weigel Hall from the Oval due to threatening weather, Steve Sterret, director of news services for university communications, estimated attendance at 350.
Revised curriculum set

By EILEEN MALONE
Lantem staff writer

A new, university-wide undergraduate curriculum with enhanced liberal arts requirements will be instituted by autumn quarter 1988, if a proposed curriculum report is approved by a special committee in the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences, said Myles Brand, vice president for academic affairs and provost.

The Interim Report of the Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review was developed by members of the faculty senate.

President Edward H. Jennings called for a curriculum review during his 1986 State of the University address, saying the goal of such a review would be "to identify a basic body of knowledge, thoroughly grounded in the liberal arts, that each of our students would be required to achieve."

Gerald M. Reagan, chairman of the Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review, said he and other committee members developed the report with these concerns in mind.

The report reviews Ohio State's present general education curriculum, outlines the attributes a person should have upon graduating from Ohio State, and provides a framework for reforming general undergraduate curriculum at Ohio State.

"Perhaps we haven't been giving the students the best general education we could give them," Reagan said. He added that more liberal arts courses need to be provided in every student's general education curriculum in order to receive the most broad-based education.

The Special Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee was asked to develop a model for undergraduate general education based on the principles set forth by the Reagan committee report, said Charles L. Babcock, chairman of the ASC committee.

"Because most of the general education classes fall in the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences, we asked them to set up a committee to develop the first new curriculum model," Reagan said.

If approved by the ASC committee, the proposed model for general education curriculum will be sent back to the Reagan committee for modifications and then resubmitted to the ASC committee for final approval.

Other colleges will then develop their own curriculum based on the ASC model, though there will be some variation to the model in each college, Babcock said.

Babcock will meet with his committee Monday to discuss its reactions to the Reagan committee report.

"All the committees can do is make recommendations," Reagan said. "Until the (ASC) faculty accepts the model, we don't know what the exact changes in BERs (Basic Education Requirements) will be. It will then be up to the Arts and Sciences faculty to create new BERs with the new general education curriculum ideals in mind."

Brand said courses proposed will not be class-specific. Instead, each college will develop general courses, such as integrated science sequences and various communications courses involving writing, oral presentation and critical thinking.

"Because the portion of the report entitled Attributes of the Educated..."
The report describes the educated person as having "the ability to engage in careful logical thinking and critical analysis, the development of a refined historical artistic and literary consciousness and the capacity and confidence to make informed and discriminating ethical and aesthetic judgments."

"We need to be strong in acquainting students with the diversity of our own society and other cultures throughout the world," Brand said.

According to the report, there are three obstacles to major revisions of the undergraduate general education program: intense academic specialization, over-emphasis on professional preparation and over-reliance on the view that students can appropriately determine which courses to include in their curriculum.

Brand said that though ASC students are required to complete 100 hours of BERs, most other colleges only require 50 hours.

"We educate them enough to get entry level jobs, but do we educate them to move up to managerial positions? Unless they have a solid liberal arts foundation, they won't be able to move forward in their careers," Brand said.

"In the past, general education has been consumer driven," Brand said. "There's been a wide variety of BER courses from which students could choose and they could stock their own curricula."

This "smorgasbord" of BERs leaves many undergraduates, particularly those in General Bacca-

'In the past, general education has been consumer driven...there's been a wide variety of BER courses from which students could choose and they could stock their own curricula.'

— Myles Brand

... laureate Curriculum, not knowing which classes to take. These students take classes with no goal in mind, Brand said.

"Most importantly, the Reagan committee report emphasizes that a student must have a sound rationale for goals of general education classes," Brand said.

BERs should be more related to major courses so that the general education experience extends over the entire four year period instead of only the freshman and sophomore years, he said.

Brand said he thinks students will readily accept the new curriculum.

"I would presume students would see it to their advantage and would take all or some of the new, specially designed classes which could better prepare them, not only for entry level jobs, but for a lifetime of learning," Brand said.

According to Brand, the Reagan committee report is a forerunner in general undergraduate curriculum reform.

"I'm very excited about this. I think this curriculum review and reform for undergraduates at Ohio State is one of the most important things happening at the university in a number of years," Brand said.
Lecture series will focus on undergrad education

By Jeff Grabmeier

A lecture series focusing on the education of undergraduates will begin this month with a presentation on the teaching of science and technology.

The Undergraduate Education Distinguished Lecture Series, sponsored by the Office of Academic Affairs, is being held in conjunction with the curriculum review currently underway at Ohio State.

The purpose of the series is to "stimulate our thinking about the shape of the educational experiences that we will offer to our future undergraduate students," says Myles Brand, vice president for academic affairs and provost.

The first of four lectures will be held Dec. 7 at 8 p.m. in Weigel Hall. The lecture is free and open to the public.

The speakers will be Ann Friedlaender, dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and Frank Westheimer, Morris Loeb Professor of Chemistry, emeritus, at Harvard University.

Friedlaender's presentation is titled "Technology and a Liberal Education." Westheimer will speak on "Diminishing the Place of Science in American Education."

A panel of three Ohio State faculty members will question the speakers after their presentations.

Friedlaender has been with MIT since 1972, when she was named a visiting professor of economics. In 1974, she became a professor of economics and civil engineering, a position she holds today. She has served as associate head and head of the Department of Economics and was named dean of her school in 1984.

She is vice president of the American
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Economic Association and a member of the board of directors of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

Westheimer joined the Harvard faculty in 1953 as a visiting professor. In 1960 he was named Morris Loeb Profes-
sor of Chemistry, a position he held until his retirement in 1983. He served as chemistry department chairman from 1959-62. He was a distinguished visiting professor at Ohio State during spring quarter 1985.

Earlier this year, Westheimer was selected to receive the American Chemical Society’s Priestly Medal for 1988. The medal is considered ACS’s highest award.

The other lectures in the series include:


• April 6. Donald Stewart, president of the College Board and former president of Spelman College.

The provost’s office is making arrangements to invite at least one more national leader in higher education to speak at Ohio State during spring quarter.
Plan boosts undergrad

By EILEEN MALONE
Latern staff writer

Under the proposed general education curriculum plan, all undergraduate students will be required to take three freshman writing composition courses and 20 hours of a foreign language.

Charles Babcock, chairman of the Department of Classics, said the freshman composition and foreign language requirements will make all students better prepared to meet challenges after graduation.

"The freshman composition requirement is a big assignment," Babcock said. "The first course is similar to English 110, but the second and third courses should be quite different from what exists now."

Arts and Sciences students presently fulfill the writing requirement by choosing either one advanced English writing course from a list of six, or choosing two courses from a list that includes English, comparative studies and communications courses. English 110 is also required.

"I think with the present national and world situation, it is vital for any citizen to have knowledge of a foreign language," Babcock said. Knowledge of another culture makes a person better appreciate his own culture and that of another's, he said.

The new model would require every student to complete 105 to 125 general education hours. Some colleges presently require only 75 hours of general education requirements. Arts and Sciences students are required to take between 100 and 120.

Brand said he hopes to have the new curriculum set for full use by autumn quarter 1988 entering freshmen.

Pilot programs will be set this spring if the model is approved, Provost Myles Brand said. Students enrolled before autumn quarter 1988 will have the option to continue on their existing plan or switch to the new curriculum.

"It's a very good model," Brand said. "It's a very strong, new curriculum with emphasis on the arts and sciences and basic skills and competencies. I'm enthusiastic about it."

President Edward H. Jennings called for a review of the undegraduate curri-

writing requirement

In October 1985, he appointed a committee of faculty, chaired by Gerald Reagan, professor of Educational Policy and Leadership, to provide a definition of general education and to define the responsibilities of Ohio State to provide a broad-based, liberal arts education.

The model was released to the Arts and Sciences Faculty Senate, Student Council and faculty at the Main Campus and regional campuses. These groups will submit comments on the model through January 1988, and the Arts and Sciences committee will draft a final version for the approval of all Arts and Sciences faculty.

Reagan's committee will then propose to other colleges that they develop similar curricula according to the Arts and Sciences model. Specific courses will also be designed to meet the requirements of the model.

There are slight variations between the bachelor of arts and bachelor of science models.

The proposed B.A. plan, which differs slightly from the B.S., includes:

15 hour freshman composition
5 hours of mathematical and logical analysis
5 hours of data analysis
10-20 hours of foreign language
20-25 hours of natural science
35 hours of arts and humanities
10 hours capstone experience (contemporary issues)
Speaker to discuss issues affecting course reform

By MOLLY GRIFFIN
Lantern staff writer

The president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Ernest L. Boyer, will speak Wednesday about issues related to reforming undergraduate curriculum.

The speech, to be given at 8 p.m. in Independence Hall, is the second in the Undergraduate Education Distinguished Lecture Series, sponsored by the Office of Academic Affairs.

The series is being held in conjunction with Ohio State's undergraduate curriculum review.

Boyer is expected to discuss his book, "College: The Undergraduate Experience in America," in which he analyzes the forces that affect the American college system.

The book is based on the Carnegie Foundation's 1986 report on undergraduate education, which concluded that the American undergraduate college is "a troubled institution."

"The program was designed to challenge (the university's) thinking about undergraduate education," said Bonnie Redenbarger, assistant to the provost.

Gerald M. Reagan, a member of the committee for undergraduate review, said the university used the Carnegie report as a resource in its review.

"(Boyer's) review is one of the major works in the curriculum reform movement," Reagan said.

Charles L. Babcock, chairman for undergraduate curriculum review in the College of Arts and Sciences, said the committee is working with faculty members in designing a model curriculum for the college. Ohio State has 45,526 undergraduate students.
Speaker says curriculum improving

By ANN-MARIA NOLAND
Lantern staff writer

Ohio State is in the center of the renewal of the undergraduate experience, said Ernest L. Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer spoke on issues related to undergraduate curriculum reform Wednesday afternoon at a news conference at the Fawcett Center for Tomorrow.

"Ohio State is taking the right steps and asking the right questions," he said.

Boyer said the faculty are looking at curriculum, teaching, quality of campus life, evaluation of a college education and the transition from high school to college.

He said he views education as having three essential functions: information, integration and application.

"We're enormously successful in providing information," he said. But he said colleges are less successful in showing the relationship of this knowledge and only marginally successful in helping students understand how this knowledge applies to consequential issues.

Ohio State faculty are inquiring into these issues, Boyer said.

"I find a more serious and thoughtful inquiry into the right questions on campuses such as Ohio State than I have seen in a very long time," he said.

Characterizing undergraduate education today, Boyer said students overwhelmingly want an education to get a job.

"When we (the Carnegie Foundation) did our study on college, we surveyed 1,000 high school students. Ninety-five percent of them said they were going to college to improve their job possibilities," Boyer said.

The Carnegie Foundation released the report in 1986. The foundation is a public organization whose goal is to strengthen teaching and higher education.

"When we surveyed 5,000 undergraduate students, 40 percent of them said if they thought their degrees wouldn't get them a better job, they would drop out today," he said.

"The first expectation of most students today is to become credentialed," Boyer said. "College, therefore, is, in this culture, very much a credentialed institute, not educating."

Undergraduate curriculum needs to provide more classes that have questions for students to debate without expecting them to draw single conclusions, he said.

"In my opinion, college is an experience that does not provide a very integrated view of life or an understanding of larger issues," Boyer said.

"Being credentialed is not the same as being educated," he said.

"I worry about preparing for work in such a narrow way that you have no judgment, no perspective," Boyer said.

He said students still care about major issues when they are being confronted.
Boyer: Teaching now back on track

By Jeff Grabsmeier

Undergraduate education, once a troubled institution in America, is making a comeback.

Ernest Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, said in a speech at Ohio State Feb. 24 that he believes there is "a great sense of renewal" in higher education today.

"There is a more serious and a more authentic search for quality in American higher education now than I've seen in 30 years," he said.

Complimenting Ohio State's undergraduate curriculum reform, Boyer added, "I believe this campus is a dramatic example of this exciting quest."

Boyer is author of the book College: The Undergraduate Experience in America. The book is based on the Carnegie Foundation's report released in 1986, which concluded that the American undergraduate college is "a troubled institution."

The book charged that many colleges have replaced a liberal education curriculum with narrow vocational training and have lost their "sense of mission."

Higher education has made dramatic improvements since the Carnegie report was released, according to Boyer. But he identified several issues that still are crucial for the continued renewal of collegiate education.

Most importantly, colleges and universities must stress writing and speaking.

"Language is not just another subject, it's the means by which all other subjects are pursued," he said. "It is in the broadest sense what makes us truly human."

One way to make the use of language important to students would be to require all seniors to write a thesis on a consequential topic, he said.

A second issue facing higher education is the lack of coherence in general education programs, according to Boyer.

Universities should provide an education that makes connections between sub-Continued on page 7.
Boyer said combining disciplines — such as biology and physics to make biophysics — has resulted in some of the most important scholarship today. Undergraduate education also should make these connections between disciplines.

“Somehow, during the undergraduate experience, students must go beyond the isolated facts to gain a more coherent, more comprehensive and more reverential understanding of our world,” Boyer said.

While many students go to college primarily to get a good job, Boyer said they must go beyond their major area of study to gain a broad education in the liberal arts.

This broad education will give them ability to think and act morally in the workplace.

“The crisis we face is not careerism. The crisis is careers unguided by ethical perspective,” he said.

Boyer called this lack of perspective “the Boesky syndrome,” after convicted insider stock trader Ivan Boesky.

Students won’t know how to act ethically if universities provide nothing more than the skills to perform a job, according to Boyer. He called this “credentialing.”

“If we are engaged in credentialing rather than educating students, we will have failed at (our) most fundamental goal.”

The value of teaching is another key issue higher education must face, according to Boyer.

While research is an important and vital mission for universities such as Ohio State, undergraduate education must not be forgotten, he said. The scholarship of research has long been recognized, but teaching is sometimes not seen as a scholarly activity.

“Let’s recognize the scholarship of presenting knowledge, too,” he said. “Teaching is the culmination of scholarship. It’s not at odds with scholarship.”

Colleges and universities also must make a special effort to attract and keep more minority students, Boyer said. He noted that the percentage of Blacks and Hispanics going to college has declined, although they are becoming a larger percentage of the population.

“I consider this a national disgrace, and unless we begin to close the gap between the haves and the have-nots, I think the future of this nation is in peril.”

Boyer was the second speaker in the Undergraduate Education Distinguished Lecture Series, sponsored by the Office of Academic Affairs. The series is being held in conjunction with the undergraduate curriculum reform underway on campus.

The next speaker in the series will be Donald Stewart, president of the College Board. He will speak April 6.
Funds earmarked to curriculum

By Jeff Grabmeier

Ohio State has committed $3 million over the next year to implement reforms in the undergraduate curriculum, President Jennings announced at the March 4 Board of Trustees meeting.

Money will go toward developing new courses to fit the proposed curriculum, Jennings said.

Funds also will help implement the new courses and provide for increased enrollment in departments affected by the new curriculum. Decisions about funding for subsequent years will be made as the needs become more clear, Jennings added.

"Ohio State is making a commitment to provide the best possible undergraduate education," Jennings said. "We want to assure that our curriculum will prepare students for leadership in the 21st century."

He added, "Curriculum reform is one of the most important things going on at the University — not only right now but in a historical context."

The reform began at Ohio State in 1986, when Jennings appointed a faculty committee to examine the University's curriculum and suggest ways it could be improved.

Last November, a related committee in the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences completed a proposed general education curriculum for undergraduates. It emphasizes writing and critical thinking, as well as race, gender and international issues, says Joan Leitzel, associate provost for instruction and curriculum.

The model is being reviewed and modified by faculty members in the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences.

When it is approved, the arts and sciences model will become the basis for changes in other colleges at Ohio State, Leitzel says.

The new curriculum will replace the current system, which allows students to choose from a "smorgasbord" of classes to fulfill the University's basic education requirements, Leitzel says.

"We have tried to develop a goal-oriented model that has cohesion in the choices available to students," she says. "It is more than just offering classes in a cafeteria style."

Officials hope to have the new arrangements in effect by autumn quarter 1990.

Many courses now offered at the University will be adjusted to fit this model and some new courses will have to be developed. That's why part of the $3 million will be used to give faculty members released time to develop courses, Leitzel says.

Some of these new courses will be offered on a trial basis next year.

Part of the $3 million will go to depart-
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ments that have increased costs as a result of the new curriculum. For example, the proposed arts and sciences model, with its emphasis on writing, may result in increased enrollment in departments that offer writing courses, Leitzel says. These departments may need more funding. New science courses also will clearly require additional money, she adds.

The new curriculum will affect the general education portion of the undergraduate curriculum. General education broadly includes all classes that deal with the basic skills of communications and analysis, and the subjects of humanities and the arts, the social sciences and the natural sciences, Leitzel says. General education is separate from the requirements of a student's major.

The arts and sciences model contains two new proposed requirements, she says.

The first is a three-course series called "Reading, Writing and Critical Analysis."

The second requirement, for juniors and seniors, is composed of two "capstone experiences" courses. The first would be an "integrative course" for bachelor of arts students that would show relationships between two or three major subject areas, including natural science, social science and arts and humanities.

The second would be an interdisciplinary course for all students that considers "contemporary issues of broad and worldwide significance."

An example of how the new curriculum is more "goal oriented" than the current curriculum can be seen in the social sciences.

Now, a bachelor of arts student is required to take 15 hours of social science classes, chosen from at least two departments. A student can choose from among 38 different courses in 10 departments.

Under the proposed curriculum, a student also would take 15 hours of social science classes. But the courses would have to be in a structured set. The first course would focus on individuals and groups; the second, organizations and governmental processes; and the third, resource allocation and use.

The faculty committee that developed the proposed curriculum is making revisions in the model in response to comments from faculty members, Leitzel says.

After the revisions have been made, the entire faculty of the colleges will vote whether to accept the model. Finally, the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences Senate, which consists of one faculty member from each department of the colleges, will vote on the curriculum.

After the model is approved, it will go to other colleges for use in their curriculum reforms.
Board president seeks curriculum alteration

By Frank Scott III
Lantern staff writer

Ohio State needs to reform its curriculum in order to attract and support an increasingly diverse group of undergraduate students, said Donald M. Stewart, president of the College Board, a non-profit educational association.

Stewart spoke Wednesday night in Independence Hall.

His curricular reform ideas will be circulated to the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences for approval next week, said Joan R. Leitzel, assistant for Curriculum and Instruction.

The Arts and Sciences faculty is working on developing new undergraduate standards, she said.

Don Good, acting dean of undergraduate studies in the College of Arts and Sciences, said the provost recommended the curriculum be revised because the basic education requirements were deficient in the areas of math and language.

Stewart predicted Ohio State will respond positively to his proposal. However, he said there may be a problem in introducing a new curriculum to the university because some classes and teaching positions will be eliminated.

Stewart said the university's curriculum not only affects undergraduates and the future pool of faculty recruits, it also influences upcoming middle school and high school students.

"Curriculum is responsible for changes in American life," Stewart said.

A relaxation of standards at the high school level and the college level is partly responsible for the lack of minorities, Stewart said.

The low standards cause a high drop-out rate among minorities in high schools, he said.

The key to finding a solution may be to change college curriculums, Stewart said.

This is a process that must begin with proper course selection, encouragement of minority students and higher standards in high schools, he said.

A high school curriculum, which emphasizes math and linguistic skills through specialization and analysis, will also help get the brightest people into our schools, he said.

Stewart presides over 2,500 members of the College Board, which includes college universities and other educational organizations.

The board is responsible for Scholastic Aptitude Tests, Financial Aid Forms and Advanced Placement Programs.

Stewart is a former president of Spelman College, a black women's college in Atlanta. He was executive assistant to the president and associate dean of Arts and Sciences at the University of Pennsylvania.

Stewart was also a member of the staff of the Overseas Development Division of the Ford Foundation.

Currently he is a trustee for a group of institutions which include: The Martin Luther King Center for Non-violent Social Change; Grinnell College; and the Teacher's College at Columbia University.

Stewart's lecture, held in conjunction with the curriculum review, was the last in a series of three sponsored by the Office of Academic Affairs.
Curriculum to meld with other efforts

By Jeff Grabmeier

While Ohio State is committed to improving its undergraduate education, this reform won't come at the expense of research or graduate education, says Myles Brand.

"Research, graduate education and excellence in undergraduate instruction are compatible and mutually supportive of each other," says Brand, vice president for academic affairs and provost. "They are all an integral part of the mission of Ohio State."

The University has budgeted for the increased costs expected with the proposed new undergraduate curriculum, as well as continued support for graduate education and research.

"This is not a zero-sum game in which funds allocated to one activity will be subtracted from another," he says. "Improved undergraduate and graduate instruction, as well as research and public service, support the University's efforts to increase its state, federal and private funding."

The Colleges of the Arts and Sciences are developing a new undergraduate curriculum model that will be the basis for reforming general education across the University.

Next year will be devoted to developing and implementing the new curriculum, Brand says.

"We hope and expect that faculty will be fully involved and supportive of the implementation process," he adds.

Officials hope to have the new, stronger general education program in place by autumn quarter 1990.

The proposed arts and sciences curriculum would require more writing and critical thinking of students, and would have a strong science component. It also would emphasize race, gender and international issues.

University administrators have estimated that the new curriculum will cost about $3 million a year, which President Jennings already has earmarked.

In addition, Brand says the University will seek external funding from sources, such as foundations, that are interested in supporting general education.

Because of the changes in undergraduate education at the University, Brand says "certain areas will have different teaching levels than they have had in the past. We are prepared to help departments cope with these increased responsibilities."

Some of the ways the University plans to help in the implementation of the new curriculum include:

- Departments that experience greater teaching loads will receive additional financial assistance from the University.
- The University will fund release
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time for faculty members who are involved in developing new courses. Brand says the procedures for obtaining such funding will be announced after the proposed curriculum is approved.

- The Department of English will be asked to conduct workshops for faculty members outside of English who will be teaching writing-oriented courses.
- The Columbus campus will have 36 more classrooms in autumn quarter 1989 than it did in 1987, in order to accommodate an expected increase in the number of course sections. Most of these classrooms will be for sections of 30-60 students.
- Science laboratories will be improved to meet the demand caused by the proposed curriculum’s emphasis on science education.

The Colleges of the Arts and Sciences were chosen to begin the reform process because their general education curriculum is the “core learning experience at the University,” Brand says. “It prepares students for lifelong learning and gives them the ability to change jobs and professions as the world around them changes.”

But arts and sciences will not be expected to bear the whole burden of general education, according to Brand.

“We expect that faculty in other colleges will contribute in appropriate ways,” he says.

For example, the professional colleges could propose general education classes that would fit the requirements for the capstone courses of the curriculum. The capstone courses would be required for juniors and seniors and would be designed to tie together what students have learned in a broad range of classes.

The proposed curriculum has a goal of providing a basic education to all students, but it also recognizes that incoming students have different levels of preparation and ability, Brand says.

Ohio State will continue to offer programs for students who come to college with educational deficiencies, he says, although the number of such students should decline in coming years.

Brand expects that high schools in the state will take Ohio State’s new general education program into account when they plan their own curriculums. If they do, better prepared students will be entering the University, he notes.

Also, he says that the stronger general education program will “make Ohio State more attractive to minority students. As a result of taking this curriculum, minority students will be better prepared for life outside of college.”

While the new curriculum may affect what faculty members teach, it will not change how they are hired, promoted or achieve tenure, Brand says.

“We will continue to expect quality research, teaching and service from all faculty members,” he says. “While we recognize that different faculty may excel in one of these three areas, we nevertheless expect high quality performance in all of them in order for faculty to be hired and to achieve promotion and tenure.

“We will not have a special cadre of faculty to teach undergraduate courses. We feel that undergraduate education is intimately involved with the entire mission of the University.”

The renewed emphasis on general education will not weaken the majors programs at Ohio State, Brand emphasizes. A review of the majors programs will begin when the general education review is completed.

“In particular, we will want to ensure that the majors programs complement the new general education curriculum,” he says. “The majors should be well-integrated with the general education program and, as a result, increased in strength.”

Faculty to consider model

Faculty members in the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences soon will review the second draft of a proposed curriculum model.

More than 100 faculty members and groups offered suggestions and comments on the first draft, which was distributed late last year.

As a result of that input, the first draft was modified by the Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review in Arts and Sciences.

After faculty members have an opportunity to comment on the second draft, a final version will be prepared by the committee.

The Arts and Sciences Senate, which consists of one faculty member from each department of the colleges, then will vote whether or not to recommend approval of the curriculum.

Finally, the entire faculty of the colleges will vote on the model.

Once the model is approved, it will go to other colleges to serve as the basis for their curricular reforms.

Colleges that offer tagged degrees — those degrees other than a bachelor of arts or a bachelor of science — will be able to meet with the University’s Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review to determine to what extent they will adopt the arts and sciences model as a basis for their own reforms.
Faculty approves course model

By Zinnie Chen
Lantern staff writer

The College of Arts and Sciences is moving closer to revising its curriculum requirements.

The Faculty Senate of the college approved the proposed curriculum model last week 35-2, with one abstention, before passing it on to faculty members for further review.

About 1,200 faculty members of the College of Arts and Sciences are reviewing the proposal, said Charles Good, secretary for the Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review, and acting dean of undergraduate studies.

After reviewing the proposed model, faculty will vote for or against it by Wednesday, Good said.

If approved, planning stages of the new curriculum proposal will begin in the fall, and by 1990-91 most of the courses in the model should be established.

Joan Leitzel, associate provost for academic affairs, said the Office of Academic Affairs has set aside $3 million for course planning.

"We need money to enable us to develop courses," Leitzel said.

Course planning involves the improvement of existing facilities to accommodate enrollment shifts that might occur with changes in curriculum requirements.

Other colleges within the university will follow the proposed model in developing curriculum revisions.

David Solinoff, a senior from Upper Sandusky majoring in biology/pre-med who is a member of the review committee, said, "Our job was to come up with ideas for courses to provide a broad-based education.

"You should learn how to think, generally gain an education, not gain a technical trade ... the idea is to make you an educated individual first, then to train for a specific area," Solinoff said.

Components of the model stress:
- Writing and related skills - The first course would be a freshman writing course. The second would be a continuation of expository writing offered in the sophomore year. The third writing course would be offered within the student's major, during the junior or senior years.
- Quantitative and logical skills - In addition to general math requirements, this would include a required fundamental course in data analysis that would involve computers.

Bostwick Wyman, professor of math, said the addition of a data analysis course is a major addition to the curriculum plan. He also said the university is negotiating with various computer companies for grants and donations of computers.

- Foreign language - Requirements will generally remain the same, with the completion of a four-course sequence.
- Social diversity in the United States - The proposal states that "A liberal education in a university in our own nation today should foster an understanding of American institutions and the pluralistic nature of American society." Courses in this area would address issues of race, gender, class and ethnicity.
- Natural science - The student would complete two two-course sequences from an approved list.

In one sequence at least one course must be from the basic physical sciences; in the other, one must be from the basic biological sciences. In the other sequence the student will complete five courses from an approved list, at least one course from both physical and biological sciences.

- Social science - Students would take one course from each of the following categories: Individuals and Groups; Organizations and Politics; and Human, Natural and Economic Resources. One course should have an international focus, the proposal states.

- Arts and humanities - Students would take five courses, including a two-quarter broad historical survey, and three courses aimed at analysis of literature and art.
- Capstone experiences - Bachelor of Arts students would take a more specialized upper-division course that would build on general education introductory courses outside the major.

They would also take one or more courses dealing with contemporary world issues, including energy, urbanization, race and gender, war and peace, disease and hunger, and social responsibility. Requirements of such courses should include writing or research, the proposal states.

After the model is approved, departments within the College of Arts and Sciences will submit proposals of courses designed to meet the curriculum requirements. Many existing courses will be suitable for the new curriculum with little change.

Other colleges within the university will also follow the proposed model in developing curriculum revisions.

"(The curriculum) shows a modest improvement," Wyman said. "There's really not much change in the requirements ... in many areas there's a small improvement."
A MODEL CURRICULUM DEVELOPED BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE FOR UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM REVIEW IN ARTS AND SCIENCES AND APPROVED BY THE FACULTY OF THE COLLEGES OF THE ARTS AND SCIENCES, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, JUNE 8, 1988

In his October 1985 address to the University Senate, President Jennings called for a University-wide review of the undergraduate curriculum, with the goal "to identify a basic body of knowledge, thoroughly grounded in the liberal arts, that each of our students would be required to achieve." At the suggestion of the Faculty Council of the University Senate, he subsequently appointed a Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review broadly representative of the University faculty chaired by Professor Gerald Reagan of Educational Policy and Leadership. In its interim report, published as a special supplement in On Campus on February 12, 1987, the Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review has set an ambitious goal for the University's undergraduate degree programs. The committee has, in effect, provided a definition of general education that ably argues its case on both the broader theoretical level and from within the more particular responsibilities of The Ohio State University. In relating what it defines as the attributes of the educated person to the curricular goals of the various faculties of the University, the Committee has therefore taken into consideration the mission that is envisioned in the University's motto, disciplina in civitatem ("training for citizenship"), and its particular charge as a land-grant, flagship institution.

In December of 1986 Provost Myles Brand further implemented the process by the creation of a Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review in Arts and Sciences, which he charged "primarily, with directing the revision of the undergraduate curriculum in Arts and Sciences, a revision which will be a point of departure for undergraduate curricula in all the colleges on campus." The committee was asked:

1. to propose a model for general education in the Arts and Sciences,
2. to supervise the implementation of that model when it had been approved by the faculty, and
3. to oversee the review of major programs in the five colleges.

The provost requested the committee to move as rapidly as possible with its deliberations and asked it to interact with members of the Arts and Sciences faculty, chairpersons, and deans, and to communicate and coordinate throughout with the University-wide Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review and as needed with the standing Curriculum Committee in Arts and Sciences.

Curriculum is an evolving and continuous factor in an academic institution. We recognize that the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences have undertaken several major reviews of curriculum in recent decades, the last put in place for classes entering Autumn Quarter 1983 and later, at which time substantial reduction of the Liberal Arts Core (hereinafter LAC) options was effected and the current Liberal Arts Requirements (hereinafter LAR) instituted. In addition, there are many modifications of offerings each year. The committee has
kept this situation in mind as it considered options for the proposed model. Another factor has been important: In the turbulence of the 60's and 70's many colleges and universities dropped or reduced a number of requirements, many of which are now being reintroduced. The Ohio State University largely maintained its degree requirements and standards. The wisdom of this decision has become evident, and the present review of the undergraduate curriculum in the Arts and Sciences can therefore be founded on a solid tradition.

Starting in January 1987 the committee met weekly during the winter quarter and twice a week during much of the spring quarter. In addition to local consultation and documentation, members of the committee read widely in the extensive literature on undergraduate curriculum and examined curricula from a variety of colleges and universities. At the invitation of the Lilly Endowment four members of the committee attended its Workshop on the Liberal Arts at Colorado College, where they were able to discuss curriculum with teams from 23 other colleges and universities and prepare a draft model based on the committee's deliberations. This draft as revised by the committee formed the basis of the report presented to the faculty on 1 November 1987 as a model for the General Education component of the curriculum in the Arts and Sciences.

As of 15 March 1988 the committee received over 110 written comments on the proposed model from individuals, committees, and academic units. In addition, the committee held two open hearings for the entire Arts and Sciences faculty and, individually and in groups, met with numerous committees, councils, and faculty groups. On April 27, 1988, we distributed a second draft and requested responses primarily from teaching units. The document here presented represents a revision based upon these latter responses.

The tradition and practice of general education embodied in the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences envision the development of knowledge, perceptions, attitudes, and skills that allow a student to move into society with an understanding of its traditions and past, of its accomplishments and aspirations, of its relation to and responsibility for the natural world, of its diversity and plurality, of its problems and needs. It is hoped that the individual will attain a sense of self within that society that inspires a continuing ability and desire to learn and to work with others for further development of the human potential.

In proposing a model for undergraduate general education in the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences, the committee took as its point of departure the interim report's "Attributes of the Educated Person":

"To achieve the aims of education, there are certain capacities and understandings, certain qualities, abilities, and characteristics, which are part of what we understand as the liberating process a university is particularly suited to develop, nourish, and hone. Primary among these capacities is the ability to write and speak with clarity and precision;

to read and listen critically and with comprehension. Of the same order is the ability to engage in careful logical thinking and critical analysis, including the abilities that permit intelligent responses to problems and arguments which involve quantitative data.

"An understanding of and appreciation for the important modes of human thought and inquiry are crucial characteristics of a liberal education. An understanding of the methods of modern science and social science, the effect of science and technology on the natural and social environment, and the nature of mathematical knowledge constitutes part of this knowledge. The development of a refined historical, artistic, and literary consciousness is a further part. A liberal education should also develop and sharpen the capacity and confidence to make informed and discriminating ethical and aesthetic judgments.

"We believe that a liberal education in a university in our own nation today should foster an understanding of American institutions and the pluralistic nature of American society. It should also promote an understanding of the global interdependence of the modern world and should ensure facility with at least one language other than English. Finally, we think that an American university should seek to develop a deep appreciation for the cultural traditions that have formed and informed our nation and to develop a sense of the place of other cultures in world history."

In developing these drafts to meet the broad expectations of this set of aspirations, the committee has worked within this set of principles:

1. The traditional components of the bachelor's degree, general education, major concentration, and elective elements, are in the main sound and should be retained as a framework.
2. General education should provide a basis for life-long learning, one of the most important principles of the liberal arts education.
3. General education courses should not be limited to the early quarters or years, but should extend throughout a student's curriculum.
4. General education is best served at Ohio State by a variety of course formats and class sizes.
5. General education, emphasizing goals rather than disciplines or departments, should not be thought of as a series of introductions to the subject matter of many discrete disciplines.
6. The goals of general education should be realized not only in "general education" courses, but also in appropriate major and elective components.
7. Students should gain from their courses both substantive knowledge and an appreciation of different methodologies.

8. A synthesis of knowledge that transcends the boundaries of discrete disciplines should play an important role in general education.

9. General education should introduce students to contemporary knowledge and also give them a sense of the historical context in which it arose.

10. Understanding the rationale of the requirements for a degree is as important for a student as understanding the goals and expectations of individual courses.

11. To the extent possible, the general education element in a degree program should be an experience that provides for appropriate interrelation of courses or requirements.

12. The regular faculty must assume a larger degree of the responsibility for developing, teaching, and maintaining general education courses.

13. General education must bear responsibility, but by no means all of the responsibility, for developing a sensitivity to social concerns and, in particular, for fostering sensitivity to race, ethnocentric, and gender biases; it should enhance a student's awareness of, and respect and appreciation for, the physical and cultural diversity of individuals within society and of societies within the larger world community.

14. The student should have an opportunity to explore the world community beyond Europe and the United States.

15. While general education certainly includes much that is traditional in content and even in presentation, it is also an area of the curriculum that should respond to experimentation and new curricular approaches; the faculty will likely need to expand their personal horizons and abilities in order to design and teach in ways not envisioned in their earlier training or experience.

The committee strongly endorses the retention of the existing fifteen credit hours as free electives for every Arts and Sciences undergraduate degree student. The spirit of this requirement should be accepted and enforced by all those responsible for the implementation of the total degree program in the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences.

The committee is aware that not all elements desirable in general education can be addressed in specific course assignments. Consequently the proposed model does not accommodate every suggested change or addition forwarded to the committee. Although special emphasis on writing and critical analysis skills has been proposed for particular courses in general education, the committee strongly believes that substantial writing expectations of varying kinds should be included in all appropriate general education courses. Faculty members are urged to include similar elements across the entire range of the curriculum. As a second example, faculty members are urged to make use of modern technologies, particularly computers, in all courses where these tools can extend the human facility in knowledge acquisition, organization, analysis, and synthesis.

The University Honors Program and the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences Honors Programs have developed special courses and sequences that complement the current B.A. and B.S. degree requirements. The committee expects and encourages departments and individual faculty members to continue their support for honors versions of general education courses and to include in their responses to this new model consideration of how the goals of the Arts and Sciences Honors program might best be accommodated.

Education at the University is predicated on the continuum of preparation through which a student moves from kindergarten through grade 12. Any post-secondary curriculum must presume this preparation at a certain level of quality and intensity. The recent initiatives at Ohio State and the other state universities toward college-preparatory matriculation requirements and the positive response from the secondary schools have allowed the committee to assume continuing improvement in the preparation of students new to the University.

The following description of the proposed model assumes a five-credit-hour course norm for convenience in comparison. However, the reshaping of curricula must necessarily include reassessment of appropriate patterns of instruction. The flexibility of the current academic calendar based on the quarter system, as well as alternative course formats (e.g., credit hours, contact hours, number and length of class meetings per week), needs to be considered. The goal should be the establishment of class schedules that preserve the academic integrity of courses, enhance programmatic goals, and accommodate the needs of students and faculty. The need for flexible scheduling is particularly important for Ohio State's regional campuses.

The committee wishes to stress that the following curricular model for the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science degrees in the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences has been designed with an academic breadth intended to engage the creative thinking of a broad spectrum of the faculty whose interests and expertise will form the basis of undergraduate general education.

Academic units within the College of the Arts which have tagged degrees will be invited to work with a special committee on tagged degrees in the arts in responding to the University's Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review.
COMPONENTS OF THE MODEL

FOUNDATIONS

1. WRITING AND RELATED SKILLS

The University Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review has clearly stated the rationale for having a component in the curriculum designed to develop skills in writing, reading, critical thinking, and oral expression:

"The abilities to read and listen with comprehension and critical acuity are requisite to the gaining of knowledge in a university setting. The ability to express oneself with clarity, both orally and in writing, provides the deepest proof of understanding. Only through such expression can one demonstrate the powers of careful thinking and critical analysis.

"Further, we recognize that writing especially is a primary tool in learning itself, not just a means of expressing learning that has taken place. Writing is a powerful mode of thinking; writing involves making choices and then ordering those choices effectively."

To develop these abilities the curriculum should first provide for the acquisition of college-level writing skills. Once the basic skills have been introduced, students should then move on to experience writing and oral expression as integral parts of the process of thinking and learning. That means that while the English Department will continue to provide students with a foundation in basic writing skills, the mastery of such skills and the integration of them in the learning process must take place in all disciplines and at all levels of study. In other words, instructors from all disciplines must assume some responsibility for teaching students to write, speak, and think clearly, critically, and effectively.

A set of three courses with an emphasis on writing, extending from the freshman to the junior/senior level, will enable students to progress from the development of fundamental skills to their application and mastery. These courses must be kept to a size appropriate to the realization of the goals of college composition courses.

First Course

The first course is a freshman-level course designed to train students in the fundamentals of expository writing. As such, this course is a prerequisite for the remaining two courses in the required set. This first course will be housed in the English Department and will most likely be taught by graduate teaching associates on the Columbia campus and by English faculty and lecturers on the regional campuses.

Second Course

In the sophomore year skills in expository writing as well as in oral discussion and/or presentation will be developed through the study of major topics and writings pertaining to the United States (e.g., women in United States society as they appear in literature, the assimilation of immigrant populations, the United States in the world community, the impact of technology on contemporary culture, equality and individual freedom in the United States, public and private patronage of the arts).

Topics that deal with the pluralistic nature of institutions, society, and culture in the United States, with special attention to issues of race, gender, class, and ethnicity, are particularly appropriate.

The principal thrust of such a course will be analysis, discussion, and writing with the goal of extending the student's ability to read carefully and to express ideas effectively.

This second course will be taught by instructors from the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences as well as other colleges. Courses will bear the departmental designation of the discipline in which they are offered.

Third Course

In the junior or senior year students are required to take an upper-level course in their major that contains a significant writing component (e.g., a writing component that would combine essay examinations, out-of-class writing assignments, and requirements of revision after the instructor's feedback). Departments may choose to accept 1) one or more courses each of which meets this requirement, 2) writing sections of single courses each of which meets this requirement, 3) a group of courses, each containing a writing component, which together meet this requirement, or 4) a course which counts for the major but is outside of the major department.

In addition to requiring students to apply writing skills to their major, this third course should also develop students' skills in the oral articulation of ideas as well as their critical and analytical abilities in reading demanding texts and synthesizing ideas. Course work might include a research project that exposes students to scholarly literature in their majors and requires them to improve library skills or to access information through computer systems. As is the case with many of the proposed requirements in general education, it is assumed that many courses presently offered by major programs may be adapted and that a variety of patterns may be proposed to meet the spirit of this requirement.

This third course will be taught by faculty members from an area related to the student's major. Class size should be carefully limited to the number of students commensurate with the goals of a writing skills course at this level.
The quantitative and logical skills area of the curriculum model has three components. A basic computational skills requirement serves as a prerequisite for the remaining branches, and will frequently be set by means of a placement test. Mathematical and logical analysis requires course work emphasizing both the conceptual background and practical methods for presentation, interpretation, and analysis of quantitative data.

A. BASIC COMPUTATIONAL SKILLS

As a prerequisite to further work in the quantitative and logical skills area, a student must achieve mathematics placement level 8 or above, or complete the corresponding mathematics courses. This requirement reflects a working understanding of high school mathematics on the algebra I level, and a general understanding of topics on the algebra II level. Students at this level or higher will be comfortable with standard algebraic manipulations, and they will have the ability to apply these skills to fairly involved practical or "word" problems.

B. MATHEMATICAL AND LOGICAL ANALYSIS

A student in a B.A. program must take one course that focuses on argument in a context that emphasizes natural language, mathematics, computer science, or quantitative applications not primarily involving data. Courses which emphasize the nature of correct argumentation either in natural languages or in symbolic form would satisfy this requirement, as would many mathematics or computer science courses. Some courses should be available which require only the basic skills of part A. The courses themselves should emphasize the logical processes involved in mathematics, inductive or deductive reasoning, or computing and the theory of algorithms. A student in a B.S. program will satisfy this requirement by completing two quarters of calculus or the equivalent.

C. DATA ANALYSIS

A fundamental course in data analysis should enable a student to deal with problems of data-gathering, presentation, and interpretation. The student should develop an understanding of problems of measurement, deal critically with numerical and graphical arguments, and gain an understanding of the impact of statistical ideas in daily life and in specific fields of study. Students should develop the ability to present the salient features in data using summary measures and graphical techniques as well as the ability to recognize the uses and misuses of statistics and related quantitative arguments. The development of these skills requires exposure to the fundamental ideas of probability. This course should also introduce the students to the use of the computer in problems of data analysis.

The curricular model requires that both B.A. and B.S. students each take one course in this area. Two types of courses meeting the above described below. Courses proposed for B.A. students should have at least a mathematics prerequisite consonant with A above; those for B.S. students should have a calculus requirement. As described in paragraph (ii) below,
the data analysis content in a group of courses may fulfill this requirement under certain circumstances, and in some instances the data analysis course will double-count within the major.

(i) General data analysis. Whether for B.A. or B.S. students, this course should emphasize both concepts and applications following the general principles discussed above.

(ii) Specialized courses in data analysis. Departments or divisions within the University may wish to design a data analysis course within their own programs. Courses in this area should cover topics and emphasize points of view similar to those in the general data analysis courses above, but in the context of a particular subject matter. In particular a conceptual background including some use of probability must be included. Such courses, if of a suitable level, could cross-count in the student's major program. Under some circumstances a group of courses, each containing some data analysis, might be presented for this requirement, but a single course with a primary emphasis on data analysis will be the usual situation. Departments will be invited to cooperate in the proposal of a model data analysis course. Many courses in applied or mathematical statistics or probability theory will also be suitable for this requirement.

3. FOREIGN LANGUAGE

In an increasingly interdependent world, the ability to understand and communicate across ethnic, cultural, ideological, and national boundaries should be a primary goal of education. Cultural mores and concepts are closely reflected in language, which can, therefore, provide one vital access to that understanding and lead to the potential of real communication. Linguistic differences are fully as important as linguistic similarities, and although full mastery of a second language requires much more than academic course work, elementary and intermediate study of language can reveal much about the patterns of thought and culture of another people as well as of one's own. Access to the literature and comparable artistic achievements of another culture enhances one's consciousness of the creativity and aspirations of many others in a world wherein the dominance of a single mode of thought and expression should not be assumed. The careful study of a foreign language, including general attention to critical thinking, provides a desirable, practical, and often necessary resource for the personal and professional life of the individual and the community within and outside of national boundaries.

The minimal level of proficiency required for both the B.A. and the B.S. degrees will be the successful completion of the fourth course of a foreign language. Three patterns for meeting this requirement will be usual: (1) a student will choose to continue a language already begun elsewhere and will be placed through testing in the proper level of language study, thereafter proceeding to the completion of the requirement; (2) a student will demonstrate proficiency through the last required level by testing and will not be required to take further language work as a part of general education;

(3) a student will decide to begin a new language and will enroll in the first course, proceeding through the last required level.

In the language sequences the first two courses will normally be devoted to the developing of basic language skills of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, with the additional goal of introducing a student to the cultural context that has produced the language and in which it is used. The student will learn of the relationship between language and culture, as well as learn that the proper approach to language is not through a set of translation equivalencies but through a combined linguistic and cultural study that should lead to an understanding of the people and how they express themselves. The third and fourth courses should continue the acquisition and development of skills and further enhance the understanding of the culture. Class size should be carefully limited to the number of students commensurate with the goals of a foreign language skills course at this level.

As with most other elements of education, the study of a foreign language is not, and cannot be, simply a classroom experience. As language itself is a changing mode of expression and communication, so a student must seek every opportunity to hear and use the language in a variety of contexts. Only through such extended study and application can the intent of any component of general education be realized and its minimum requirements serve their proper purpose. Many options are open to a student through the departments of foreign languages and the programs of the Office of International Affairs. Students should be strongly encouraged to take more advanced courses in the language, to participate in foreign study programs, to take courses in other subjects taught in the target language, to take advantage of the many language- and culture-based events on the campus and in the community, and to recognize the potential of one of the University's notable educational assets, its students from other cultures and countries.

In practical terms, language study is simple common sense for students in the foreseeable future. In a world of rapid change the continued dominance of any single language as a lingua franca cannot be assumed. Nor can we assume that mechanical handling of language will provide a viable alternative tool for communication. More important, however, is the need to recognize that neither the predominant use of one language, however temporary, nor the use of mechanical aids to basic communication can contribute adequately to real understanding in the international community. In addition to access to a rich and diverse foreign experience, a student should thus be able to appreciate more fully his or her own equally rich and diverse heritage.

4. SOCIAL DIVERSITY IN THE UNITED STATES

The Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review asserts that "A liberal education in a university in our own nation today should foster an understanding of American institutions and the pluralistic nature of American society." Only with such understanding can citizens appreciate the
significance of diversity in our society and the importance of the values of tolerance and equality.

To that end, each student must select a course that gives significant treatment to the pluralistic nature of institutions, society, and culture in the United States with special attention to issues of race, gender, class, and ethnicity. Such courses or sections of courses will be designated by a special symbol.

Social diversity courses can be offered by any appropriate department in the University. Historical, normative, interdisciplinary, or international perspectives on social diversity in the United States might be included in such courses.

This requirement will not add credit hours to a student's degree program. It should be possible for a student to select a designated course from among general education requirement courses, major courses, and electives.

NATURAL SCIENCE

Natural science is the study of the laws and structure of the material universe, ranging in size from subatomic particles to galaxies, in time from billionths of seconds to billions of years, and in complexity from idealized spheres to ecosystems and beyond. The Interim Report of the Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review lists among the attributes of the educated person "an understanding of the methods of modern science" and "the effect of science and technology on the natural and social environment."

Two other aspects of science education—history and basic information—are not explicitly mentioned, but may be inferred.

Developments in the natural sciences and in technology over the past century have produced profound changes in knowledge and understanding of the material universe, in means of communication, in social and commercial organization, in philosophy—indeed in almost every aspect of life—on a global scale. While it is possible to exist without knowledge or understanding of modern science and technology, it is dangerous to do so and is hardly the hallmark of an educated person. The University has a responsibility to provide students with insights and understanding about the natural sciences and technology and their relations to life and society. Natural science should be presented not as a collection of isolated facts but as a highly unified and consistent view of the physical world. Attention should be given to the nature of scientific evidence, to the means by which it is obtained, and to the interdependence of experiment and theory.

GENERAL LEARNING OBJECTIVES

1. To understand the basic principles and central facts of the physical and biological sciences, and their interrelationships.

2. To understand when, where, and how the most important principles and facts were discovered, thus understanding the key events in the history of science both as events in human history and as case studies of the methods of science.

3. To understand the interaction between science and technology.

4. To understand the social and philosophical implications of major scientific discoveries.

Students can fulfill the general education requirements in natural science by completing one of two options. Students pursuing the B.A. may complete Option 1 or Option 2 below. B.S. students must complete Option 2.

OPTION 1. The student will complete two 2-course sequences from an approved list. In one of the sequences, at least one course must be from the basic physical sciences; in the other sequence, at least one course must be from the basic biological sciences. At least one course of the four must contain an appropriate laboratory component.

The approved list may contain already existing courses with possible alterations as required for general education. However, new 2-course sequences prepared specifically for this requirement are encouraged. These new sequences could be given within a single department, or they could be shared between two departments within a college or from two different colleges. There is no assumption that such courses will involve team teaching although some faculty may find that desirable. While the specific new courses on this list must await the creative efforts of the faculty proposing them, a few possible examples might be:

- A sequence shared between chemistry and biochemistry on the development of life on earth; a sequence shared between chemistry and physics involving quantitative measurements; a chemistry and geology sequence on hazardous waste and the environment; a physics and geography sequence on atmospheric sciences; a physics and engineering sequence in applied physics and technology.

This list of examples is, of course, intended to be illustrative rather than restrictive. In each case, the designer of a course will specify the nature of an appropriate laboratory component, if any. Such laboratory experiences may range from familiar experimental work to field trips, astronomical observation, or the like.*

OPTION 2. The student will complete five courses from an approved list that should include one 2-course sequence, at least one course in basic physical sciences, and at least one course in basic biological sciences.

Option 2 is essentially identical to the present requirement for the B.S. degree. At least three of the courses in this option will include a laboratory to provide concrete experiences of the principles being presented and of the problems of observation, measurement, and proof in the natural
sciences. Recognizing that knowledge in the natural sciences is especially hierarchical, it is understood that some of these five courses are prerequisite to courses required in natural science majors. This option—which requires students to take courses in both the physical and biological sciences and which assumes appropriate preparation in mathematics—provides a general base for students who then proceed to take more specialized courses in the sciences and will be useful also for pre-medical students.

The committee notes an interest among some faculty in developing an integrated three-quarter sequence in the basic natural sciences. In the event that a proposal for such a sequence materializes and meets goals and quality standards for the natural science requirement, the committee would see this sequence, followed by a fourth course in natural science or technology, as an acceptable method of satisfying the requirements of Option 1.

SOCIAL SCIENCE

Social science consists of the systematic study of the behavior of individuals; of the structure of human societies, cultures, and institutions; and of the processes by which individuals, groups, and societies allocate and use resources. Social scientists recognize that historical and cross-cultural perspectives are important in understanding social, religious, and political phenomena.

The knowledge gained from social science enhances the understanding of human behavior and cognition and is often used to direct social problem-solving and policy-making. In that context, the underlying importance of human values is recognized.

GENERAL LEARNING OBJECTIVES

1. To understand the behavior of individuals, the social and cultural contexts of human existence, and the processes by which groups, organizations, and societies function.

2. To become familiar with theories and methods of social scientific inquiry so as to gain an appreciation of their applicability and limitations.

3. To examine human differences and similarities (e.g., physical, social, class, gender, ethnic) in psychological, social, religious, cultural, economic, geographic, and political contexts.

4. To appreciate the contemporary world from an understanding of the past and to make cross-cultural and cross-temporal comparisons.

5. To develop a sense of the world's social, political, economic, and cultural diversity, with special attention to the institutions of the United States and other nations as well as to international perspectives.

6. To develop an ability to comprehend and assess individual and social values and an ability to participate in social and political communities.

Students will take one course from each of the following three categories. These courses should come from two or more departments. One course should have an international focus (a non-United States, cross-cultural and/or world focus). Courses in each category will be broad general education courses that contribute to the general learning objectives noted above although no single course can be expected to meet all of the objectives at once. Each category will include courses from several departments. A department might offer courses in more than one category. The topic(s) of each course could fall in one or more of the areas listed below each heading.

1. Individuals and groups
   Perception, cognition, and language as a human phenomenon
   Behavior of individuals and groups
   Individual identity and development
   Value formation
   Human similarities and differences (e.g., race, gender, ethnicity, class, religion)
   Relations and interaction (individuals, groups, cultures, societies)
   Cultural identity and change
   Social structure and change

2. Organizations and politics
   Power and authority
   Ideologies
   Institutions and organizations
   Politics and governments
   Policies and policy-making
   Interrelations among nations

3. Human, natural, and economic resources (e.g., land, labor, capital, population, and environment)
   Use
   Distribution/diffusion
   Allocation
   Exchange
   Decision-making
   Policies
   Global interdependence

Note that an additional course in the area of social science might be taken to fulfill the advanced study requirement (see Capstone).
ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Humanistic inquiry is most often pursued through the study of what are commonly called the humanities and the arts. The humanities, according to a definition accepted by the National Endowment, are "fields of study and branches of learning which record, investigate, analyze, and evaluate the products of human imagination, activity, and culture." This broad definition is meant to include the history and criticism of the arts. To it must be added production of all forms of artistic expression and the capacity to understand and judge them aesthetically and in cultural context. Humanistic inquiry assesses, across temporal, cultural, or theoretical divisions, how humans view themselves in relation to other humans, to nature, to the divine; what questions they ask about important concerns; and how they express their responses to the conditions of their existence. Language, memory, and symbol are central to the study of both the humanities and the arts. Both also ask questions about the values by which individuals and societies live and the tolerance and mutual understanding needed to allow the full realization of human potential and diversity. Therein they cultivate an appreciation for the unique, particular, and distinctive, for the dated and the placed, often focusing on "tradition" as well as on the intangible aspects of human activity and on the ability of individuals to push against constraints. Therefore, the continuing forms by which humans communicate with, advise, and entertain one another are important, but equally so are those individuals and moments through which new possibilities are opened for the human experience.

The overall goal of this component is to develop knowledge of the humanities and the arts and a humanistic perspective that fosters capacities for: (1) aesthetic and historical response and judgment; (2) interpretation and evaluation; (3) critical listening, reading, viewing, thinking, and writing; and (4) appreciating the arts and reflecting on that experience. As a result of meeting this requirement, each student should have studied significant writings and works of art that can be shown to be of lasting and fundamental importance for humanistic inquiry.

GENERAL LEARNING OBJECTIVES

1. To have direct contact with major forms of human thought and expression as distinctive and as interrelated cultural phenomena, and to nurture informed responsiveness to them and heightened participation in them.

2. To acquire a perspective on human history and an understanding of the force of the past in shaping human activity. Such a perspective should enable a student to examine the present cross-culturally and cross-temporally; to view cultural phenomena in context; and to be aware of human interaction with the material world.

3. To develop a capacity to comprehend and evaluate critically the personal and social values of one's own world as compared with those of other communities in time and space.

4. To contribute to a student's sense of social and cultural diversity and sensitivity to problems of inequity and of individual similarity and difference (e.g., race, color, gender, ethnicity, religion, and class).

5. To examine the cultures of major regions of the world and through such study to develop international and global perspectives.

6. To contribute to a student's understanding of the foundations of human beliefs, the nature of reality, and the norms which guide human behavior.

7. To learn to appreciate and interpret significant writings (e.g., literary, philosophical, or religious).

8. To develop abilities to be an enlightened observer or an active participant in a discipline within the visual, spatial, musical, theatrical, rhetorical, or written arts.

Each student will complete parts 1 and 2 below. Of the five required courses, students must select at least one course with a focus on the United States or Europe, and one with a focus other than on Europe or the United States.

1. One two-quarter broad historical survey, covering one of the following:
   Africa
   Asia
   Europe
   Latin America
   United States
   World History

The two-quarter sequence should provide a broad chronological overview with special attention to the interrelationships of various types of change (e.g., economic, political, social, cultural, artistic, intellectual, and technological).

2. Three courses aimed at a close analysis of texts and works of art treated in the following ways: cultural, aesthetic, generic, thematic, or foundations/theoretical. Among these choices must be one in literature and one in the visual and/or performing arts.

Students will be able to select from a number of approved general education courses. Groups of departments may cooperatively offer interdisciplinary courses as well as linked sets of course sequences that fulfill these requirements.

Note that an additional course in the area of arts/humanities might be taken to fulfill the advanced study requirement (see Capstone).
1. ADVANCED STUDY (B.A. STUDENTS ONLY)

For general education to be cumulative, students must not only experience a breadth of learning, but must also advance from introductory study to more in-depth study. In the junior or senior year, each B.A. student will take an upper-division course in social science or in arts and humanities. Courses fulfilling this requirement should meet the general criteria of the social science or arts and humanities general education components explained above. In addition, they should build on introductory general education requirement courses to the extent that they present more advanced, specialized, and in-depth study of subjects than would occur at an introductory level. This course can be any upper-division course in an academic unit (other than that in which the student majors) from which the student took a general education course to meet the social science or arts/humanities requirement.

2. ISSUES OF THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

During the senior year each student will select one course that considers one or more contemporary issues of broad and worldwide significance. While issues addressed may arise out of the interests of the sponsoring units, they must also be issues that have worldwide significance and illustrate global interdependence. Topics from which such contemporary issues might be drawn include: energy, urbanization, food production, race and gender, war and peace, technology and the arts, literacy, cross-cultural communication, the role of religion, governmental regulation, environment, illness and hunger, industrial and technological development, social responsibility, and the social impact of the arts or literature.

Each course should bring together students from diverse majors, thereby creating an integrative learning environment in which, through interaction, the students themselves demonstrate the relationships or connections between information derived from different departments. The thematic approach of the course should ultimately permit students to appreciate the application of knowledge from diverse disciplines to contemporary issues.

Given the academic characteristics of the courses in this category, students must be at least level four of their studies. Course requirements should include writing or research components. Such courses may properly be based within a discipline or be interdisciplinary in design. Class size will usually be limited to a maximum of 40 students. However, larger classes might be appropriate provided that accompanying discussion sections are limited to 25 students.

In general, it is expected that courses designed for the existing LAR requirement (III C) can be adapted to fit this new category.

IMPLEMENTATION

The president and the provost have undertaken to provide the fiscal resources necessary to implement the proposed model curriculum. However, the ultimate success of any curriculum revision lies in the hands of the teaching faculty. It is only with their acceptance and active cooperation that improvements in the teaching of students can be achieved. This third draft is now forwarded to the Faculty Senate of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences with a request that it be endorsed before it is submitted by the committee for a vote to the faculty of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences. Acceptance by a simple majority of the votes cast by the faculty will signify approval.

After the model has been approved, the Special Committee will call for proposals of courses designed to meet the model's requirements. Proposals should be submitted by departments and divisions to the curriculum committee of their college. In the event of a joint submission by two or more departments or divisions housed in different colleges, submission should be made to each appropriate college curriculum committee. Submissions should follow the general patterns now in place for new course proposals: in particular, letters of concurrence should be obtained from appropriate departments and divisions within the University.

When a course is forwarded from the college curriculum committee to the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee and is proposed as a general education requirement, the Special Committee will meet jointly with the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee and make a joint decision concerning the course's appropriateness for satisfying the general education requirements. The joint committee may also appoint panels of specialists in the particular areas of the model. The special panels may serve as initial oversight committees for such areas as the writing requirement, social diversity, and data analysis. When the course proposal is approved, possibly after some revision, the joint Special Committee/ASC Curriculum Committee will forward it to the Council on Academic Affairs.

The Special Committee expects that many existing courses will be suitable for inclusion as general education courses with little change and that the approval process for such courses will be routine. In those cases where funding may be required for planning and developing new courses, academic units may wish to consult informally with the committee about the courses' appropriateness to the goals of the model.
Effective Autumn Quarter 1990, after a body of general education courses has been approved and an understanding of the application of the guidelines has been developed, the Special Committee will disband, and the continued approval and maintenance of the general education program will be the responsibility of the ASC Curriculum Committee.

Many thoughtful faculty responses to the previous drafts revolved around problems of implementation and the implications of the model for our colleges. Although implementation of the model must necessarily be a process that will involve the departments, deans, curriculum committees and office of the provost in full consultation about personnel, fiscal, space and equipment matters, the special committee makes certain specific assumptions in proposing the model to the faculty:

1. A curricular revision of this scope will require a phase-in process over several years; 1988-89 will be a year of planning, examining current courses for presentation with such revision as is needed, designing of some new courses, and initial piloting; 1989-90 should see major planning of new courses and piloting as needed; by 1990-91 most of the courses that will effect the model should be in place, but there may well be some more complex or demanding course designing still in process.

2. Important as it is to the University's goals, undergraduate curriculum review cannot be isolated from other aspects of the University's mission, and must be complementary to, rather than disruptive of, the teaching and research roles of the faculty: it is expected that in the process of the University's implementation of the model, and beyond, full and fair attention will be given to the impact of course development and to the increase or change in pattern of teaching that may be required of some units, with particular concerns for appropriate teaching loads and class size, for rewards and incentives for course development and teaching, especially in considerations of promotion and tenure, and for continued strong support for the faculty's research and publication responsibilities.

3. Funding information will, as it presently is, be a regular part of the curricular process: as revised or new course proposals are prepared, they will naturally include a statement about funding expectations and will emerge as a joint effort among faculty, chairpersons, deans, and the provost; if proposals include the suggestion that unusual funding needs are foreseen, an informal proposal may properly be discussed with those normally appropriate to the curricular process and referred to the special committee for an initial response.

These assumptions are made by a faculty committee reporting to the faculty in the expectation that this model will be viewed as a step in a larger process, a process which in implementation will invoke the full cooperative resources of the faculty and the administration in creating an undergraduate general education consistent with the needs of the students, the potential of the faculty, and the mission of the University.
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CONSPECTUS OF THE MODEL*

FOUNDATIONS

1. Writing and Related Skills

Three courses:  first course  
   second course  
   third course  

   5  
   5  

   [within major]

2. Quantitative and Logical Skills

Placement for basic computational skills  

0  

Mathematical and Logical Analysis  
   [Calculus for the B.S. students]  

   5  

One course:  Data Analysis  

0-5  

   [within major]

3. Foreign Language

Two to four courses  

10-20  

10-20

4. Social Diversity

0  

0

NATURAL SCIENCE

Four or five courses  

20-25  

25

SOCIAL SCIENCE

Three courses  

15  

15

ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Two courses:  chronological overview  

10  

10

Three courses:  structured selection  

15  

15

CAPSTONE EXPERIENCES

1. Advanced Study in Social Science or Arts and Humanities  

5  

not required

2. Issues of the Contemporary World  

5  

5

Total credit hours:  

95-115  

100-110

Total courses:  

19-23  

20-22

*for detail, see narrative
OSU planning curriculum of future

By Tim Doulin
Dispatch Staff Reporter

"What we are really doing is totally redesigning the undergraduate experience at Ohio State."

— Myles Brand

programs and, by the time fall of 1991 rolls around, we should have a much improved and much more rigorous experience to offer students."

SOME UNIVERSITY officials believe the current curriculum has grown to the point that students select some courses by whim rather than reason.

"Students were picking a course here and picking a course there without any reason for making the choice," said Charles Babcock, chairman of Classics.

"We want students to have requirements that make these pieces fit together logically." Currently, the curriculum requires undergraduates to complete 45 hours of basic education requirements in humanities, social sciences and natural and biological sciences. The courses are aimed at freshmen and sophomores.

Under the model, the basic education courses will cover students' undergraduate years, offer a broad liberal arts education and prepare them for more specific study in their majors.

HERE IS a closer look at some of the changes proposed in the model adopted by the College of Arts and Sciences:

• Writing: Currently, students are required to take two composition courses. The model requires a writing course at the freshman, sophomore and junior or senior levels. The last course requirement will be an upper-level course in the student's major that contains a significant amount of writing. The English department will continue to provide students with basic writing skills, but all courses will stress writing, speaking and thinking clearly, critically and effectively.

• Quantitative and logical skills: This area includes mathematics and logic requirements. The model includes an emphasis on computer science and a new course requirement in data analysis — reading, analyzing and forming charts and graphs. In some cases, colleges will design data analysis courses for students to take as part of their majors.

• Social diversity in the United States: Each student will be required to take a course that deals with issues of race, ethnic origin or gender.

• Natural science: Requirements are basically the same as before, but new courses may be designed.

• Capstone Experience: Each senior must take a course that considers one or more contemporary issues of worldwide significance. The courses will bring together students from different majors, with each student using knowledge from his or her field to offer ways to solve problems.

SOME REQUIREMENTS will remain the same — students will be required to take 20 hours of foreign language. Other colleges will make alterations on the model to fit their needs.

"The intent is to see how much of the model we can adopt throughout the university," said Gerald Reagan, chairman of the university-wide curriculum committee.
COLUMBUS, Ohio - Within the next several years, undergraduate students at Ohio State University will see major changes in their general education curriculum.

Faculty members in the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences recently voted 468 to 168 to accept a new curriculum model that is more structured and goal-oriented than the current curriculum, said Joan Leitzel, associate provost for instruction and curriculum.

The new curriculum emphasizes writing and critical thinking, as well as including race, gender and international issues, according to Leitzel.

"The overwhelming approval of the arts and sciences faculty is a milestone in our curriculum review effort," she said. "It gives us the basis to move forward and develop important improvements in our general education program."

The model was developed by the Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review in the Arts and Sciences, chaired by Charles Babcock.

"We have tried to develop a goal-oriented model that has cohesion in the choices available to students," said Babcock, chairperson of the Department of Classics. "It is more than just
offering classes in a cafeteria style."

The faculty vote in favor of the curriculum is significant, Leitzel explained, because the arts and sciences model will be the basis for general education in the other colleges at Ohio State. By the end of autumn quarter 1988, every college within the university will have established new general education requirements for its students.

Some pilot courses in the new curriculum will be taught next year. Most of the new curriculum is expected to be in place by the 1990-91 school year, Leitzel said.

President Edward H. Jennings has committed $3 million in continuing funds to implement the curriculum reforms. Money will go toward developing and implementing new courses and also will provide for increased enrollment expected in some departments as a result of the new curriculum.

Under the new model, students will take between 95 and 110 credit hours in general education classes. They currently take between 93 and 115 hours. General education includes those classes separate from the requirements of a student's major.

The arts and sciences model contains three new requirements not found in the present curriculum:

-- A three-course series emphasizing writing. The first course will be for freshmen and the second for sophomores. The final course in the series, for juniors and seniors, will be in the student's major and will require extensive writing, including essay examinations and out-of-class writing assignments.

-- A course emphasizing social diversity in the United States. Courses that meet this requirement will give special
attention to issues of race, gender, class and ethnicity.

-- A "capstone experience" course for juniors and seniors. The course considers contemporary issues of broad and worldwide significance.

As in the present curriculum, students also will be required to take classes in foreign languages, sciences, arts and humanities, social sciences and quantitative analysis. However, Leitzel said the new requirements will be more structured. An example can be seen in the social sciences.

Now, an arts and sciences student is required to take 15 hours of social science classes, chosen from at least two departments. A student can choose from among 38 different courses in 10 departments.

Under the new curriculum, a student also will take 15 hours of social science classes. But each student will take one course that deals with individuals and groups; one on organizations and governmental processes; and a third course on human, natural and economic resources.

In addition, students must choose their three courses from two or more departments and choose one course with an international focus.

#

Contact: Joan Leitzel, (614) 292-5881.

(Jeff/417)
Curriculum changes win faculty vote

By Jeff Grabmeier

By a large majority, faculty members in the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences have approved a new general education curriculum for undergraduates.

In secret balloting, the faculty voted 468-168 to accept the third draft of the curriculum model prepared by the Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review in the Arts and Sciences.

They approved a model that is more structured and goal-oriented than the current curriculum, says Joan Leitzel, associate provost for instruction and curriculum. It emphasizes writing and critical thinking, and includes issues of race, gender, class and ethnicity.

"The overwhelming approval of the arts and sciences faculty is a milestone in our curriculum review effort," Leitzel says. "It gives us the basis to move forward and develop important improvements in our general education program."

The faculty voted on the proposal between May 31 and June 8. Their approval came after the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences Senate voted May 26 to support the new model.

A first draft of the model was prepared by the arts and sciences special committee, chaired by Charles Babcock, and released in November. After comments by the faculty, the committee revised the draft twice.

"We have tried to develop a goal-oriented model that has more cohesion in the choices available to students. It is more than just offering classes in a cafeteria style," says Babcock, chairperson of the Department of Classics.

The approval by the colleges' faculty is significant, Leitzel says, because the arts and sciences curriculum will serve as the basis for general education in the remaining colleges at Ohio State.

By the end of autumn quarter 1988, every college within the University is expected to have established new general

Continued on page 7.
education requirements for its students, Leitzel says.

The process will go like this:

Each college has its own special curriculum review committee, which will use the arts and sciences model as a starting point for its own curriculum. Colleges will submit their proposed new requirements to the Universitywide Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review.

After receiving the committee’s approval, the proposed curricula will go to the colleges for the approval of their faculties.

Meanwhile, the arts and sciences committee will begin this summer to prepare the Request for Course Proposals for the new curriculum.

Some pilot courses will be taught next year. Most of the new curriculum is expected to be in place by the 1990-91 school year, Leitzel says.

President Jennings has committed $3 million in continuing money to implement the curriculum reforms. Money will go toward developing and implementing new courses and will provide for increased enrollment expected in some departments as a result of the new curriculum.

Under the new model, students will take between 95 and 110 credit hours in general education classes. They currently take between 93 and 115 hours.

The arts and sciences model contains three new requirements:

- A three-course series emphasizing writing. The first course is for freshmen and the second for sophomores. The final course in the series, for juniors and seniors, is in the student’s major and requires extensive writing, including essay examinations and out-of-class writing assignments.

- A course emphasizing social diversity in the United States. Courses that meet this requirement give special attention to issues of race, gender, class and ethnicity.

- A “capstone experience” course for juniors and seniors. The course considers contemporary issues of broad and worldwide significance.

As in the present curriculum, students also are required to take classes in foreign languages, sciences, arts and humanities, social sciences and quantitative analysis. However, Leitzel says the new requirements are more structured. An example can be seen in the social sciences.

Now, an arts and sciences student is required to take 15 hours of social science classes, chosen from at least two departments. A student can choose from among 38 different courses in 10 departments.

Under the new curriculum, a student also will take 15 hours of social science classes. But each student will take one course that deals with individuals and groups; one on organizations and politics; and a third course on human, natural and economic resources.

In addition, students must choose their three courses from two or more departments and choose one course with an international focus.
Faculty approves changes

By Karis Andrews
Lantern staff writer

OSU undergraduate students will begin to see changes in their general education curriculum. Autumn Quarter, Faculty members in the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences recently accepted a new curriculum model by a vote of 468 to 168.

The new program will emphasize extensive writing and critical thinking, social diversity in the United States, and worldwide contemporary issues.

"All five colleges within the College of Arts and Sciences will automatically adopt the new curriculum," said Don Good, secretary of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and acting dean of undergraduate studies.

The five colleges within the Colleges of Arts and Sciences include: the College of Arts; the College of Biological Sciences; the College of Humanities; the College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences; and the School of Journalism.

"The understanding is that the other colleges throughout the university will be asked to adopt the new curriculum proposed by the College of Arts and Sciences or explain how they can apply the model in an equivalent way," Good said.

Donald Good

Under the new model, students will take between 95 and 110 credit hours in general education classes. Undergraduates currently are required to take between 93 and 115 hours.

General education courses includes those classes separate from the requirements of a student's major.

Some pilot courses in the new curriculum will be taught next year. The new curriculum is expected to be in place by the 1990-91 academic year.

President Edward H. Jennings has committed $3 million in continuing funds to implement the curriculum reforms, but Good said no real dollar amount could be placed on the new curriculum in this early stage of planning.

"The real cost factor will be providing facilities and professors for all the additional students enrolling in the new writing and foreign language courses," Good said.
Colleges failing, study says
Some seniors in dark when it comes to basics

WASHINGTON — Stating that one college senior in four doesn’t know when Columbus discovered America, an independent federal agency is asking that all students be required to take core courses in cultures and civilizations to qualify for graduation.

The report by the National Endowment for the Humanities contends there are “significant gaps” in knowledge among college seniors on a variety of subjects.

Findings are based on a Gallup survey last spring of 696 seniors at 67 colleges and universities to find out how much they knew about history and literature. Among the results:

- Twenty-four percent thought Columbus landed in the Western Hemisphere some time after the year, 1500.
- Sixty percent didn’t know that the “shot heard ‘round the world” at the start of the American Revolution was fired at Concord, Mass.
- Forty-two percent could not place the Civil War in the correct half-century.
- Fifty-eight percent did not know that Shakespeare was the author of The Tempest.

- Fifty-eight percent did not know that Harry Truman was president when the Korean War began.
- Fifty-five percent could not identify the Magna Carta.
- Twenty-three percent believed that Karl Marx’s phrase, “From each according to his ability, to each according to his need,” is part of the U.S. Constitution.

Fifty-five percent would have failed the survey if the questions had been graded as a test, said Lynne Cheney, chairman of the endowment.

The survey shows that many colleges are doing a poor job of giving their students a basic education, Cheney said.

But Joan Leitzel, associate provost at The Ohio State University, said that’s not the case at OSU, where the new general curriculum surpasses the endowment’s proposals.

“The Ohio State model is substantially stronger than the recommendation” by the endowment, Leitzel said.

The endowment recommends a core curriculum that requires 50 semester hours or 75 quarter hours of study in cultures and civilizations, foreign languages, mathematics, natural sciences and social sciences, Cheney said.

At OSU, a new curriculum expected to be in place by next fall quarter will require students to take 95 to 115 quarter hours in the same areas of study.

“The (endowment) recommendation is a good one,” Leitzel said. “But Ohio State requirements are extending what (the endowment) is asking for.”

Mathematics and foreign language requirements in OSU’s new curriculum and the endowment proposal are similar, but there are a number of differences in other areas, especially science.

OSU will require students to take 20 to 25 quarter hours in the natural sciences, about twice the hours recommended by the endowment.

“I’m disappointed that they did not see science as an important component to a core curriculum because we feel that is a crucial element,” Leitzel said.

OSU’s curriculum also will feature requirements not found in the endowment proposal. For instance, the university will require study of the arts and literature and a three-course writing series. A capstone course on contemporary issues also will be mandatory for seniors.

OSU began revising its curriculum two years ago. The College of the Arts and Sciences adopted a new curriculum model in 1988. Every college in the university must submit a new curriculum proposal by the end of the year.
Ohio State plans new curriculum model for 1990

By Elizabeth Illies
Lantern campus reporter

Ohio State's curriculum model for Autumn 1990 is stronger in some areas than the National Endowment for the Humanities proposed core curriculum.

Joan Leitzel, associate provost of the academic affairs administration, said Ohio State's model incorporated more points than the endowment.

The endowment, a federal agency that supports education, research, and public programs in the humanities, released a report entitled "50 Hours" urging colleges and universities to revise curricula so undergraduates get a thorough body of knowledge.

Ohio State has exceeded the endowment's recommendations in science, Leitzel said. According to University Communications the endowment calls for 12 hours in natural sciences; Ohio State will require 20 to 25.

Ohio State's new curriculum is similar to the endowment's proposal in mathematics and foreign languages, but other areas in Ohio State's curriculum are stronger, University Communications said.

John McGrath, media relations officer for the endowment said, "It's hard to say how Ohio State's curriculum compares with ours because I don't know OSU's curriculum."

McGrath explained "50 Hours" as a report on core curricula that offers examples and includes a hypothetical core curriculum some schools may follow. A number of schools were surveyed and studied and a report of the best curricula was established, McGrath said.

McGrath said, "50 Hours" is not intended to be a model that all schools should adopt, but one which encourages discussion of the requirements of schools and how the requirements should be presented.

"If OSU has put together a strong core, I'm sure it's a development that the endowment would encourage," McGrath said.

Leitzel said the endowment asked for Ohio State's model and it was sent to them. She said there will not be a re-evaluation of Ohio State's curriculum due to the proposal by the endowment.

"Our process is quite far along and NEH recommendations are included," Leitzel said.
Ohio State University's new general curriculum model is bolder and more comprehensive than the core curriculum proposed recently by the National Endowment for the Humanities, according to Joan Leitzel, associate provost.

"Ohio State's curriculum will include the requirements proposed by the NEH, and adds others that the NEH doesn't have," Leitzel says.

50 Hours, a report released Oct. 8 by the NEH, states that too many students are graduating from college without knowing "basic landmarks of history and thought."

As a result, the agency calls for a core curriculum at colleges and universities that includes 50 semester hours of study in five basic areas of knowledge.

Ohio State's new curriculum model — which is expected to go into effect next autumn quarter — will require students to take 95-115 quarter hours in general education, which includes the same basic areas of study mentioned by the NEH.

Each semester hour equals about 1.5 quarter hours, so the NEH proposal calls for about 75 quarter hours of general education.

The five basic areas of knowledge included in the NEH proposal are culture and civilization, foreign languages, mathematics, natural sciences, and social sciences.

Noting that many colleges and universities allow students to earn bachelor's degrees without taking courses in history, literature, science or mathematics, NEH Chairman Lynne V. Cheney's 50 Hours urges trustees and administrators to support faculty members who are working to strengthen general education requirements.

A Gallup survey of nearly 700 college seniors shows that roughly 25 percent of college seniors can't distinguish Churchill's words from Stalin's, or Karl Marx's writings from the U.S. Constitution. More than 40 percent could not identify when the Civil War occurred and most can't link major works by Plato, Dante, Shakespeare or Milton with their authors.

The Gallup survey was conducted under contract to NEH in spring 1989.

50 Hours notes that many American colleges and universities fail to provide enough structure in the curriculum, particularly in the area of study known as "general education."

A required course of study, Cheney writes, gives order and coherence to a college education.

"We have developed a highly structured, cohesive general education program," Leitzel says. "It's goal oriented."

The Colleges of the Arts and Sciences were the first to undergo the curriculum reform process at Ohio State. Their faculty adopted the new curriculum model in June 1988.

By the end of this year, every college will have submitted a proposed new curriculum model. Leitzel says.

These models will closely follow the one developed by the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences, she says.

Students entering Ohio State next autumn will be the first to be held to the requirements of the new curriculum, according to Leitzel.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty  
FROM: G. Reagan, Chair, Special Committee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review  
RE: Progress Report on Undergraduate Curriculum Review

The purpose of this memo is to give you a brief summary of the present status of undergraduate curriculum review/revision. The new general education program will begin for freshmen entering Autumn Quarter, 1990.

The Special Committee for Curriculum Review in the Arts and Sciences and the standing Curriculum Committee in the Arts and Sciences have been hard at work dealing with proposed courses for the new curriculum. We expect that they will continue to be overworked throughout this academic year as more new courses are developed and proposed. Proposals are being submitted both by Arts and Sciences departments and by colleges and departments outside the Arts and Sciences. Attached to this memo is a list of courses already approved for the new general education curriculum and a list of courses under consideration by the Committees.

Special Committees in Colleges and Schools outside the Arts and Sciences have been working for the past two years on their own general education programs. They have been asked to begin with the Arts and Sciences model and the Interim Report of our Committee as partial guides in their deliberations. The task these College Committees have faced is not an easy one. College curricula are crowded, and great care is required as we work to strengthen significantly general education without weakening in any way the strong professional preparation of students. The work of these Committees in dealing with this problem has been truly outstanding. Work has been completed and general education programs have been approved by the

(OVER)
Council of Academic Affairs for the Colleges of Agriculture, Nursing, Education, Social Work, and the School of Allied Medical Professions. The program in the College of Human Ecology awaits action by CAA. All other Committees appear to be close to completing their work, and we anticipate that all other programs will be completed during Winter Quarter.

Following the review/revision of general education, Special Committees in the Colleges will review major and minor programs. Several College Committees are well into this review at the present time. We anticipate that all of these reviews will be completed during this academic year.

Those of us serving on the University Committee are convinced we are working hard at our task. However, we also recognize that this entire process has been one which has required a very large number of faculty members to think carefully about and to spend long hours on curriculum review and revision. These demands on faculty will continue through the year. We are convinced that we will have a greatly improved general education curriculum in place next Autumn Quarter, and that faculty will continue to improve both the curriculum and the instruction we offer to our undergraduate students. The University Committee has no rewards to give to our colleagues around the campus other than our promise to disband gleefully when our final report is submitted next summer.

GMR/jd

Attachments
GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM (GEC)
EFFECTIVE AUTUMN QUARTER 1990

I. Writing and Related Skills

First course

English 110          Freshman English Composition
English 111          Composition and Literature

Second course

English 210 (to be 267) Intermediate Essay Writing
Women's Studies 267  U.S. Women Writers: Text and Context

Third course

Arabic 611          History of the Arabic Language
Communication 528  Topics in the Structure and Functions of Conversation
Communication 604  Ethics of Communication
Communication 605  Advanced Argumentation
Communication 610  Legal Reasoning
History of Art 415  Writing Seminar in the History of Art
Women's Studies 550  Introduction to Western Feminist Theory

II. Quantitative and Logical Skills

Basic Computational Skills

Mathematical and Logical Analysis

Data Analysis

III. Foreign Language

Arabic 101          Elementary Modern Standard Arabic I
Arabic 102          Elementary Modern Standard Arabic II
Arabic 103          Elementary Modern Standard Arabic III
Arabic 104          Intermediate Modern Standard Arabic I
German 101          Elementary German I
German 102          Elementary German II
German 103          Intermediate German I
German 104          Intermediate German II
German 112          Intensive German
German 162          Elementary-Intermediate German for Selected Students
German 163          Elementary-Intermediate German for Selected Students
Hausa 101           Elementary Hausa I
Hausa 102           Elementary Hausa II
Hausa 103           Intermediate Hausa I
Hausa 104           Intermediate Hausa II
Swedish 101         Elementary Swedish I
Swedish 102         Elementary Swedish II
Swedish 103         Intermediate Swedish I
Swedish 104         Intermediate Swedish II
IV. Social Diversity

Biology 597
Women's Studies 210
Women's Studies 267

Biology of Human Diversity: Race, Gender, and Ethnicity
Women, Culture, and Society
U.S. Women Writers: Text and Context

V. Natural Science

Biological Sciences

Botany 101  Introduction to Plant Biology I: Plants, People, and the Environment
Botany 102  Introduction to Plant Biology II: Plants, People, and the Environment

Physical Sciences

VI. Social Science

Individuals and Groups

Anthropology 201*  World Prehistory: An Anthropological Perspective
Anthropology 202*  Peoples and Cultures: An Introduction to Cultural Anthropology
Political Science 201  Introduction to Political Behavior
Sociology 101  Introductory Sociology
Women's Studies 210  Women, Culture, and Society

Organizations and Polities

Political Science 100*  Introduction to Comparative Politics
Political Science 101  Introduction to American Politics
Political Science 165  Introduction to Politics
Political Science 210  Modern Political Ideologies
Political Science 245*  The United States in World Politics

Human, Natural, and Economic Resources

Economics 200  Principles of Economics I
Geography 240*  Economic and Social Geography
Political Science 145*  The Politics of Global Problems

*meets international focus requirement
VII. Arts and Humanities

Part 1.

History 111<sup>a</sup> Western Civilization: Antiquity to the 17th Century
History 112<sup>a</sup> Western Civilization: 17th Century to Modern Times
History 131<sup>b</sup> Comparative Asian Civilizations I
History 132<sup>b</sup> Comparative Asian Civilizations II
History 151<sup>a</sup> American Civilization to 1877
History 152<sup>a</sup> American Civilization since 1877
History 171<sup>b</sup> Latin American Civilization to 1825
History 172<sup>b</sup> Latin American Civilization since 1825

Part 2.

Literature

English 201<sup>a</sup> Selected Masterpieces of British Literature: Medieval through 18th Century
English 202<sup>a</sup> Selected Masterpieces of British Literature: Romantic, Victorian, and Modern
English 220<sup>a</sup> Introduction to Shakespeare
English 260<sup>a</sup> Introduction to Poetry
English 280<sup>c</sup> The English Bible
English 281<sup>a</sup> Introduction to Afro-American Literature
English 290<sup>a</sup> Introduction to American Literature
German 291<sup>a</sup> Early German Literature in Cultural Context
German 292<sup>a</sup> Modern German Literature in Cultural Context
Hebrew 273<sup>b</sup> Biblical and Post-Biblical Hebrew Literature in Translation of the Near East

Judaic and Near Eastern Languages and Literatures 271<sup>b</sup> Sacred Texts of the Near East

Visual and/or Performing Arts

History of Art 210<sup>a</sup> Art of the Ancient World
History of Art 211<sup>a</sup> Art of the Medieval and Renaissance Worlds
History of Art 212<sup>a</sup> Art of the Modern World
History of Art 213<sup>a</sup> Asian Art
History of Art 216<sup>b</sup> Introduction to African Art and Archaeology
Theatre 100<sup>a</sup> Introduction to Theatre
Theatre 271<sup>a</sup> Great Ages of the Theatre

General Humanities

Arabic 241<sup>b</sup> Culture of the Contemporary Arab World
English 270<sup>c</sup> Introduction to Folklore
English 271<sup>c</sup> Introduction to English Language Study
German 299<sup>a</sup> Weimar and the Third Reich in German Literature and Film
Hebrew 241<sup>b</sup> Culture of Contemporary Israel

<sup>a</sup>United States or Europe
<sup>b</sup>non-United States or Europe
<sup>c</sup>non-regional
VIII. Capstone Experiences

Advanced Study

Issues of the Contemporary World

Agriculture 597 Issues Concerning Use of Animals by Humans
Biology 597 Biology of Human Diversity: Race, Gender, and Ethnicity
City and Regional Planning 425 (to be 597) City Planning in the Contemporary World
History 400 (to be 597) Critical Issues of the Twentieth-Century World
Political Science 350 (to be 597.01) Interdependence and Nationalism in World Politics
Political Science 325 (to be 597.02) Political Problems of the Contemporary World
In various stages of discussion and review are the following GEC course proposals.

2nd Writing Course

Communication 305  Argumentation and Debate

3rd Writing Course

Communication 362  Communication, Gender, and Society
Communication 364  Communication for National Development and Change
Communication 366  Communication and Popular Culture
Communication 368  Intercultural Communication
Communication 560  Communication in Culture and Society Practicum
Communication 662  Contemporary Perspectives on Communication and Gender
Communication 664  Contemporary Perspectives on Communication and the Third World
Communication 666  Contemporary Perspectives on Communication and Popular Culture
Communication 668  Contemporary Perspectives on Interculture Communication
Communication 528  Topics in the Structure and Functions of Conversation
English 302  Critical Writing
Theatre 460  Seminar in Theatre

Data Analysis

Agriculture Education 287  Data Analysis in Agriculture
Social Work 570  Quantitative Analysis of Social Data
Statistics 125  Elementary Statistics
Statistics 145  Introduction to Statistics

Foreign Language

Elementary and intermediate language courses

Hebrew 101-104
Modern Greek 101-104
Persian 101-104
Turkish 101-104
Yiddish 101-104
## Social Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences 294</td>
<td>Social Diversity in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication 311</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Social Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics 230</td>
<td>Language and the Sexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics 261</td>
<td>Language and Social Identity in the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music 340</td>
<td>Ethnic Musics in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology 101</td>
<td>Introductory Sociology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Natural Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology 101A</td>
<td>Introductory Biology I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology 102A</td>
<td>Introductory Biology II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology 101B and 102B</td>
<td>Computer enhanced versions of Biology 101A, 102A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology H115-H116</td>
<td>Honors Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 101-102</td>
<td>Elementary Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 121, 122, 123</td>
<td>General Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry H201, H202, H203</td>
<td>General Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 204-205</td>
<td>Principles of Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Graphics 210</td>
<td>Technology and Society I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology 509</td>
<td>Basic and Practical Microbiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics 101-102</td>
<td>Nature of the Physical World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics 111</td>
<td>General Physics: Mechanics and Heat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics 112</td>
<td>General Physics: Electricity, Magnetism, and Light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics 113</td>
<td>General Physics: Modern Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics 131</td>
<td>Introductory Physics: Particles and Motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics 132</td>
<td>Introductory Physics: Thermal Physics and Electrostatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics 133</td>
<td>Introductory Physics: Electrodynamics and Quanta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Social Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication 364</td>
<td>Communication for National Development and Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies 201</td>
<td>Introduction to Peace Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics 202</td>
<td>Introduction to Language in the Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics 203</td>
<td>Language Differences and Language Universals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics 265</td>
<td>Language and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics 271</td>
<td>Language and the Mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics 285</td>
<td>Language Change and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work 230</td>
<td>Individual Needs and Societal Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work 601</td>
<td>Adolescent Parenthood and Sexuality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Arts and Humanities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic 371</td>
<td>Classical and Medieval Arabic Literature in Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic 372</td>
<td>Modern Arabic Literature in Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education 252</td>
<td>Introduction to the Computer in the Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Arts 160</td>
<td>Art and Music since 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication 311</td>
<td>Rhetoric and Social Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 261</td>
<td>Introduction to Fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 262</td>
<td>Introduction to Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 274</td>
<td>Introduction to the History of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 373</td>
<td>American and English Literature and Film</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

-2-
Arts and Humanities (cont'd)

History 200.01  World History to 1500
History 200.02  The World since 1500
History of Art 250  Great Monuments of Western Civilization
History of Art 505  Contemporary African Art 1920 to the Present
History of Art 519  Great Masters of the 17th and 18th Centuries
History of Art 520  19th and 20th Century European Art
History of Art 530  American Art
History of Art 576  Art of China
Linguistics 201  Introduction to Language in the Humanities
Music 140  Music Cultures of the World
Music 141  Introduction to Music
Music 241  Music History I
Music 242  Music History II
Music 243  Music History III
Music 340  Ethnic Musics in the United States
Music 341  Music in the United States
Music 342  Introduction to Opera
Music 343  Symphonic Music
Music 346  Music of Bach and Handel
Music 347  Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven
Music 349  20th-Century Music
Persian 371  Persian Literature in Translation
Yiddish 341  Yiddish Culture
Yiddish 371  Yiddish Literature in Translation

Capstone

German 499  National Reconstruction: Postwar Culture in the Two Germanies
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BERs to be obsolete in new curriculum

By Tammy Galvin
Lantern staff writer

Say good-bye to Basic Education Requirements, commonly known as BERs, because they will soon be obsolete. Taking their place will be the new General Education Curriculum to be implemented fall quarter 1990.

President Edward H. Jennings, in his October 1985 address to the University Senate, called for a university-wide review of the undergraduate curriculum.

He said the goal is "to identify a basic body of knowledge, thoroughly grounded in the liberal arts, that each of our students would be required to achieve."

Robert Arnold, the associate provost for instruction and curriculum, said Jennings established the Reagan Committee to review the present curriculum and to create a model for the new one. The committee decided on basic fundamental abilities each student should attain:

- The ability to read and listen critically with comprehension.
- The ability to engage in careful, logical thinking and critical analysis.
- The ability to respond intelligently to problems and arguments which involve quantitative data.

Arnold said the new curriculum was passed a few years ago for the various schools in the College of Arts and Sciences.

"Since then, other colleges have been either adopting this model or a variation of it," he said. "We expect all colleges to have adopted it by this coming autumn quarter."

"The major changes brought about by the new general education curriculum will be seen most heavily in English, mathematics and data analysis, foreign language, natural and social sciences, the arts, and humanities," Arnold said.

He said the changes will only apply to new students coming in and the students already here will be able to choose from a variety of classes.

Fredrick Hutchinson, vice president for academic affairs and the provost, said there will be an increased emphasis on writing throughout each student's four years.

"In the past, students have taken writing, but only in their first year. Now, there will be writing across the curriculum for all four years," Hutchinson said.

The first course is a freshman-level course designed to train students in the fundamentals of expository writing, much like English 110, Hutchinson said.

The course Hutchinson spoke of will become the prerequisite for the remaining two courses.

In the sophomore year, the expository writing skills will be developed through the study of major topics and writings pertaining to the United States. Special attention will go to issues of race, gender, class and ethnicity, Arnold said.

In the junior or senior year, students will be required to take an upper-level course in their major that contains a significant writing component pertaining to their major.

Other major changes will be noted in math requirements as the new curriculum takes affect.

Hutchinson said quantitative and logical skills inherent in mathematics need to be mastered by each student so they may function in society.

"You know, we read all sorts of things that affect us in everyday life. It's very important to have some type of a knowledge of the quantification or degree to which the information will effect us," Hutchinson said. "These courses will teach the general concepts of how to analyze, interpret and use that information."

Under the new curriculum, students will be required to take a course in basic computational skills, in mathematical and logical analysis, and in data analysis. Foreign language will also be stressed under the new curriculum.

"Right now, not all colleges require their students to take a language through the fourth level, but under the new curriculum, it will be mandatory," Hutchinson said.

Students must also select from the new general education requirement courses, a course emphasizing cultural diversity; courses that study the pluralistic nature of institutions, societies and cultures. This requirement will not add credit hours to a student's degree program.

Other changes will be noted in the natural and physical sciences courses.

Presently, students must complete one two-course sequence in either natural or physical sciences, and one five-credit course in the other. Under the new curriculum, students must complete either two two-course sequences, or five courses from an approved list.

Social science requirements will also change. Students will be required to take one course from each of the following categories:

- Individuals and groups, which will focus on interaction and individual behavior.
- Organizations and policies, which will focus on authority, government and other policy-making institutions.
- And human, natural and economic resources, which will focus on land...
New curriculum to receive funds

By Rebecca Walters
Lantern staff writer

First-year funding for the new General Education Curriculum is estimated to cost about $1.2 million and will be dispersed to a number of colleges within the university.

This amount will be spent on personnel and expendable materials needed to get the new curriculum under way, said Bob Arnold, associate provost for the Office of Academic Affairs.

Money will be given to a college for the first year to develop a new course, and then hire people to try it out.

"If the course works, then the money will probably be dispersed again," Arnold said.

Equipment and renovations will also be funded. A one-time start-up payment will go toward purchasing equipment such as computers and materials costing about $200,000. As of now renovations will cost about $225,000, Arnold said.

The GEC, which will affect incoming students in the fall of 1990, will not increase the number of hours required for graduation, said Howard Gauthier Jr., associate provost for the Office of Academic Affairs and chairman of the GEC Implementation Task Force.

"BERs can be folded into GECs," he said.

There will not be an increase in teaching loads nor will there be a decrease, it is neutral, Gauthier said.

Faculty and teaching associates will be reassigned as part of the responsibility for developing new courses is shifted.

The GEC Implementation Task Force is a temporary group set up to oversee new requirements and developments.

The task force has been meeting every week since February, with subcommittees meeting two to three times a week to go over proposals, costs, space requirements, personnel requirements and project enrollment. A plan will be submitted to the university May 1, Gauthier said.

"A bubble effect will occur the second and third years during the phasing out of BERs," Gauthier said. As one course or program is growing and others are declining, funds will be reallocated and transferred. There will probably be a need for increased funding during this time, he said.

There are three approaches the task force is taking in implementing GECs. The first is to determine what a college graduate should know. Then based on the first, the second determines what learning expectations one should have, and the third decides what courses will facilitate this, Gauthier said.

More emphasis is being put on sequencing, thus making the courses more in depth. Ohio State is the only university using this approach, Gauthier said.

There is not an increase in the number of hours for a degree in any college, just more hours in GEC. Total hours will stay the same, Gauthier said.

"Nothing should add to the amount of time students spend at the university, this may make it easier to get through, time-wise," he said.
Classes in general biology to undergo revision in fall

By Todd Shryock
Lantern staff writer

The College of Biological Sciences is eliminating the current general biology curriculum in favor of a new revised one as part of the university’s curriculum revision.

According to Professor Russell V. Skavari, most students currently take Biology 110, which is the primary biology course for non-biology majors.

The course is constructed around the audio-tutorial method of teaching, which involves listening to taped lectures and self-guided labs rather than having the more traditional lecturer. All testing is done on computer terminals, with results of each testing session shown at the end of each test.

Skavari, head of the current general biology program, said the audio-tutorial method is a proven method of teaching, and he believes students benefit from this class as much as they would if it had a lecture.

“All students learn at different paces. I think it helps them being able to repeat the topics and go at their own pace. I think it gives them a better opportunity to learn the material,” Skavari said.

Under the new plan, Biology 107, 108 and 110 will be replaced by two new courses; 101 and 102. These new course offerings will be available for fall quarter 1990.

Associate Professor Dana L. Wrensch, who will head the new general biology program, said the new classes will cover the same general topics, but with a lot less of the chemical and math extremes.

Another change will be getting away from the current ethnocentrism and anthropocentrism, she said.

“We want to take out the idea that humans are the crown achievement of the biological world. These new courses will help us understand the parts of the environment and how they interrelate, and help us face what we are,” Wrensch said.

“What does the average voter need to know to balance environmental issues? That’s what we want to teach,” she said.

Wrensch explained that the new classes will have lecturers who volunteer for the job of teaching general biology.

“They get excited about stimulating non-science majors to biology, and they are effective,” she said.

Wrensch said the Biology 101 class will have a two-hour lab, but the labs will be new and will contain lots of hands on work. It will be about basic biological principles and how they relate, where 102 will deal primarily with humans in biology, including insights into such things as stress and addictions, she said.

Biology 101 will be a prerequisite for 102, which has no lab.

The new courses will be set up along more traditional lines with big lectures and small labs. Tests will no longer be taken on the computer system, but a system of bonus points will still be available, Wrensch said.

“This is the most exciting and enthusiastic thing that has ever happened to the general biology program. None of this would be possible without the backing of the new dean, Gary Floyd,” Wrensch said.

Scott Simonson, 23, a graduating senior from North Olmsted majoring in cinema, is taking Biology 110 for the second time.

“I tried taking this course my freshman year but had to drop,” Simonson said. “I procrastinated too much. I think this epitomizes the philosophy of Ohio State being distant from its students.

“I think this is a sad course. You can call and get the lectures on the phone, but the worst thing is there are 10 tests in 10 weeks. It’s like having a gun to your head, especially if you have a full course load and work. I’m glad it’s changing.”
Call for curriculum reform leads to GEC

By Jeff Grabmeyer

The spark that started the curriculum reform process was contained in President Jennings' October 1985 address to the University Senate.

Jennings called for a University-wide review of the undergraduate curriculum "to identify a basic body of knowledge, thoroughly grounded in the liberal arts, that each of our students would be required to achieve."

Later, the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences were asked to develop a curriculum model that would be the point of departure for the rest of the University.

The college faculty approved a model in June 1988. Soon other colleges approved similar versions.

Last March, the Council on Academic Affairs accepted a policy statement mandating that, beginning this autumn, all new first-quarter freshmen will follow the new General Education Curriculum (GEC).

Beginning autumn 1991, all transfer students with less than 45 transferable hours will fall under the new curriculum. All transfer students will follow the GEC beginning autumn 1992.

The GEC is intended to strengthen understanding and skills in writing and data analysis, put more emphasis on international issues, and enhance the learning of literature, history and the arts.

It also will foster appreciation for human diversity and the American experience.

The basic curriculum model contains four new requirements:

- A three-course series emphasizing writing. The first course will be for freshmen and the second for sophomores. The final course in the series, for juniors and seniors, will be in the student's major and will require extensive writing, including essay examinations and out-of-class assignments.
- A course in data analysis that will enable students to deal with problems of data-gathering, presentation and interpretation.
- A course emphasizing social diversity in the United States. Courses that meet this requirement will give special attention to issues of race, gender, class and ethnicity.
- A "capstone experience" for juniors and seniors. This course, designed to integrate knowledge from different fields, will consider contemporary issues of broad and worldwide significance.

As in the present curriculum, students also will be required to take classes in the sciences, arts and humanities, social science and quantitative analysis. The new requirements, however, will be more structured.

Colleges that have foreign language requirements will see no change in those requirements this autumn, says Robert Arnold, associate provost.

But the foreign language component of the GEC will not be phased in until autumn 1991, Arnold says. This will allow the College of Humanities time to develop new courses in Spanish and French.
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Curriculum change ready for autumn

By Jeff Grabmeier

Five years after President Jennings called for an overhaul of general education at Ohio State, the University is poised to put a restructured curriculum into place this autumn.

"The plans have all been set," says Robert Arnold, associate provost for curriculum and instruction. "This will be a milestone in undergraduate education at Ohio State."

The new General Education Curriculum (GEC), approved by faculty committees in the colleges, will replace the Basic Education Requirements (BERs). The new system is to be more structured and goal-oriented for students.

The responsibility for bringing about the curriculum changes has rested primarily with a 15-member committee of college and academic administration officials, headed by Howard Gauthier, associate provost.

The committee -- called the Provost's Task Force for the Implementation of the General Education Curriculum -- was formed in February.

It recently completed a final report to the provost that outlines implementation plans. This report will be sent to college deans for "fine tuning," Gauthier says, and then be made public.

The task force has three main goals:

* Identify departments that need more instructors to meet changing course demands resulting from the GEC, and authorize additional hiring.

* Make plans to renovate classrooms, build new labs and purchase equipment.

Continued from page 1.

* Prepare a curriculum plan by mid-May, in time for undergraduate advisers to be trained for summer orientation of new freshmen.

All of these goals have been met, or will have been met by autumn quarter, according to Gauthier.

Colleges that need new instructors have been authorized to hire them. In this first year of the new curriculum, most of the new instructors will be graduate teaching associates. In the second through fourth years, more faculty members will be hired.

Renovation projects are out for bids, and the work will be completed this summer. Under the GEC, some classrooms will be modified to allow for data presentation capability. For example, in some rooms, computers will be connected to large video screens, so instructors can demonstrate work to the entire class.

Workers will modernize some laboratories and create new ones, including two for the biological sciences and one for data analysis.

In addition, the University will buy new teaching equipment — mainly computers — to meet requirements in the curriculum, Gauthier says.

Officials estimate the GEC will cost $3.5 million over the four-year implementation period, not including costs for new equipment and renovation.

Equipment will cost about $1.2 million and renovation about $500,000, Gauthier says. Most of these costs will come in the first two years.

"It's not a high price for a new curriculum," he says. The cost won't be higher than it is because "resources now going into the BERs will go into the GEC. As we phase in the new curriculum, the BERs will be phased out."

For the same reason, there won't be a large increase in the number of faculty and instructors, or a change in teaching loads.

"This will not come at the expense of faculty," Arnold says. "We will not increase faculty teaching loads. The nature of teaching responsibilities will change, but not the quantity."

Colleges and departments will make decisions about changing teaching responsibilities, he says.

Many new courses have been developed. All new courses needed for the first year are in place, but more are needed to meet the demands of the second through fourth years of the GEC.

Officials are particularly looking for faculty to design courses that fit into these requirements: capstone experience; the second course in the three-course writing series; social diversity; data analysis; and culture.

The University is providing money for faculty release time to develop and pilot new courses, Gauthier says.

Some of the new courses in the GEC will be taught in colleges outside of the arts and sciences, which Gauthier says is "one of the exciting points about the new curriculum."

Courses that meet the capstone experience requirement include Agriculture 597 (Issues Concerning Use of Animals by Humans); City and Regional Planning 597 (City Planning in the Contemporary World); and Anthropology 450 (Cultural Conflict in Developing Nations).
Freshman curriculum changes

By Patty Skidmore
Lantern staff writer

Ohio State is making serious efforts to increase students' global awareness by adding foreign language and culture requirements and by strengthening the Study Abroad program.

The General Education Curriculum, which will be in place for freshmen in September, includes new requirements for foreign language or culture courses, Associate Provost Robert Arnold said. The requirements will vary by college.

Some departments will recommend, but not require, added coursework this coming year because there are too few classes in the most popular languages to accommodate the added students, Arnold said.

A model curriculum developed by the Colleges of Arts and Sciences strongly recommends that students take advanced language courses, participate in foreign study programs, and attend language- and culture-based events to broaden their cultural awareness.

The Arts and Sciences model is being used by other departments.

Howard Gauthier, vice provost for international affairs, said expanding Ohio State’s foreign study programs is an important component of the university’s attempt to increase global awareness. Only one-half of one percent of Ohio State’s students study abroad, while about five percent of the students at most Big Ten universities participate in similar programs, he said.

Impatience to graduate and inability to incur added expenses are some reasons students forgo foreign study, Gauthier said.

The university wants to increase financial support for interested students. The goal is to make study abroad cost the same as on-campus education.

The Study Abroad Office helps interested students select foreign study programs and advises them about the requirements of each program. Director Michael Curran said he will encourage students to start planning their study abroad experience early in their academic careers.

“We have to recognize that we don’t live in an isolated world that is dominated by the United States anymore,” he said. “I think more and more we’re going to have to think globally and act globally, and I think higher education has to be responsive to that.”

He said the opportunities in Eastern European universities for student and faculty research are tremendously exciting.

“What an extraordinary experience it would be to have a chance to study in a country that is groping to form an entirely new conception of society, of politics, of economics,” he said.

Study Abroad doesn’t have to be discipline-specific. Monica Fullerton, Curran’s assistant, said students can study sports in Denmark, mechanical engineering in Paris, agriculture in the Dominican Republic, and business in France.

“It’s really a myth that Study Abroad is just something language majors do,” Fullerton said.

Ohio State sponsors or co-sponsors 29 foreign study programs, and also allows students to participate in programs sponsored by other universities.

Study Abroad is no longer centered on European countries as students now study all over the world.
Incoming OSU freshmen face new curriculums

By Tim Doudin
Dispatch Staff Reporter

When new freshmen at The Ohio State University begin cracking the books today on a new school year, they will also find that the books go with a new curriculum.

After five years of planning, OSU is ready to unveil a revised undergraduate curriculum that requires more writing and emphasizes international issues and social diversity.

"We see this as a definite improvement of the undergraduate curriculum program for students," said Robert L. Arnold, associate provost for curriculum and instruction.

"There has been a curriculum reform movement going on across the country, and Ohio State University is seen as a leader in the process."

The biggest changes will involve the introduction of general education courses — primarily courses outside a student's major — in the humanities, arts, social sciences and natural sciences.

General education requirements will replace basic education requirements, which students fulfilled by choosing among a wide range of courses.

The new requirements are more focused, Arnold said. Students more often will take courses in subject areas that are related to one another. In the past, students were free to take unrelated courses.

"The old curriculum had been in place for 20 years," Arnold said. "It was time to take a closer look at it, which we did. It is a different world than it was 20 years ago."

The curriculum changes include:

- Writing — Previously, students were required to take two composition courses. The new curriculum requires writing courses at the freshman, sophomore, and junior or senior levels. The last course requirement will be an upper-level course in the student's major that contains a significant amount of writing.
- The English department will continue to teach basic writing skills, but all courses will stress writing, speaking and thinking clearly, critically and effectively.
- Data analysis — This area includes an emphasis on computer science and a new course requirement in data analysis or reading, analyzing and making charts and graphs.
- Social diversity in the United States — Each student will have to take a course that deals with issues of race, ethnic origin or gender.
- Capstone Experience — Students in their junior or senior year must take a course that considers one or more contemporary issues of worldwide significance with each student using knowledge from his or her field to offer ways to solve the problems.

Starting next year, all new freshmen will be required to take foreign language courses. At present, not all undergraduate students are required to study a foreign language.

Putting the curriculum into effect will cost $3 million to $5 million. The money will pay for such things as new courses and additional teachers and laboratory equipment.

Arnold said all students enrolled before this quarter will follow the old requirements for graduation, but they will be encouraged to sample the new curriculum.

"We have already seen a dramatic increase in foreign language enrollment," he said.
Course changes confuse campus

By Darsee Welner
Lantern staff writer

This quarter many returning students have been upset by changes in course numbers for basic education requirements, says Donald Good, assistant dean and college secretary for Arts and Sciences.

The requirements are now called general education curriculum courses for incoming freshman. Curriculum changes have led some departments to restructure the classes and change the numbers, Good said.

The confusion can be helped if students pick up a revised liberal arts requirement sheet at the college office, he said.

Course number changes have always caused problems because the process of those changes delayed them from getting included in the master schedule, Good said.

Good said because of the new curriculum for incoming freshmen, the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences are trying to make it easier for the new students to quickly identify the classes that can be taken to fulfill the new general requirements.

For example, most courses which could fulfill the contemporary world requirement are now listed as 597 by the departments.

The same situation applies to the newly required second writing course for new freshmen. Good said courses that can be used to fulfill that requirement will be numbered 367.

He said the problem comes when students who have already been enrolled at Ohio State look at the old liberal arts requirement sheet while trying to schedule classes. They might run into trouble with BRUTUS, which uses the new numbers.

"We're trying our best to inform the returning students about the new numbers. If they have questions they shouldn't hesitate calling someone in the department," Good said.

He said new sheets have been distributed and posted. However, the course offerings booklet needs to be updated, and the master schedule was printed before the numbers changed this year, he said.

Dana Wrensch, associate professor in the department of entomology and director of general biology, said when the old provost was looking at the planned revision of the undergraduate curriculum, he wanted a lot of the department courses evaluated.

Wrensch said the biology department dumped the 110, 107 and 108 courses. In their place is the 101 and 102 sequence.

She said when students look at the old sheet and have already taken the 107 course, they think they should take the 102 course for the substitute in the sequence.
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However, they should take 101 instead, and students are confused by that, she said.

"The university is changing rapidly. We didn't have time to get the changes in the course offerings book for students to read the descriptions of courses. No wonder they are confused about the sequence substitution," Wrensch said.

She said the reason for the course number change is because the course content has changed, and students should not be confused and think it is the same course.

"The new curriculum is complex, but the students will get a better education this way," Wrensch said.

A similar situation has taken place in the plant biology department, known as botany until recently, said Robert Platt, assistant professor in the department.

He said the 112 course has been dropped and the department is now offering the 101 and 102 sequence because of the evaluation of beginning courses.

Platt said changes in course numbers are being implemented in many departments, and more changes such as adding completely new courses and deleting some courses, are also taking place.
... And what college students will study

By SARAH H. MAGILL

More and more Columbus-area college students are pursuing academic programs that teach them not just to crunch numbers but to fashion a phrase too.

While business continues to be the most popular major area of study among undergraduates in Central Ohio, a rapidly increasing number of students are opting for programs that weave together business and communication skills. For example, business/organizational communication, a hybrid of business, journalism and speech courses, is the second largest major at Otterbein College. Seven percent of the college’s 2,718 students are majoring in the 5-year-old program.

Similarly, the applied communication major at Franklin University has swelled 104 percent since 1985. Four percent of the 4,005 students at Franklin are majoring in applied communication.

A revamped curriculum at Ohio State University requires all undergraduates, regardless of their major, to take more writing courses. The new curriculum went into effect with last fall’s freshmen class.

"A lot of companies are placing value on their employees being able to communicate both verbally and in writing," says Daniel C. Thompson, Otterbein’s registrar.

Similarly, Jamie Mathews-Mead, director of career placement services at Franklin, says that as more and more companies downsize, they increasingly are looking for college graduates who can work with a team and communicate well.

Employers want it all, adds Marilyn Wallace of Management Recruiters of Columbus-West, “liberal arts and technical savvy.” Perhaps that’s why the social sciences and humanities are experiencing an upturn in enrollment.

Interest in social sciences

Ohio State’s College of Social and Behavioral Sciences is now the second largest school at the university, eclipsed only by the College of Engineering. Since 1986, the percentage of students in social and behavioral science has climbed from 6 percent to 9 percent of total undergraduate enrollment on the Columbus campus. Total enrollment as of fall 1990 was 41,161.

In comparison, enrollment in Ohio State’s College of Business has hovered at around 8 percent in the same four-year period.

Despite high enrollment in business and business/organizational communication courses, Otterbein, which is predominantly a liberal arts college, is seeing a dramatic increase in the social sciences and humanities. Psychology has leaped from being the ninth largest major to the third.

Thompson attributes the increase to a “trend in society that we are analyzing ourselves more.” Also, as society becomes more tolerant of people of diverse backgrounds, students are curious about what makes people who they are, he says.

Otterbein’s history, English, political science and sociology majors each have experienced increases of between 115 and 270 percent since 1985, though none has more than 80 students.

At Capital University, where the undergraduate enrollment is 1,896, the rise in popularity of the humanities and social sciences is less pronounced. Psychology, political science, English and history have grown by between 2 percent and 7 percent each since 1987.
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The university’s aim is to provide its students with international exposure, to “get them acquainted with another culture and another time,” says Donald Good, assistant dean and secretary of Ohio State’s College of Arts and Sciences.

“People are concerned more with the environment and with issues related to other cultures and international affairs,” Ballard adds.

Not only that but interdisciplinary programs also could prove valuable in the marketplace.

The ups and downs of computer science

While the growth in the social sciences and humanities is consistent at all four of the Columbus area’s four-year colleges, the same is not true of computer science.

The number of computer science majors at Otterbein, for example, has dropped 44 percent since 1983, while at Franklin the number has soared 92 percent. At Ohio State and Capital, the major has been stable.

For awhile there was a national glut of computer science majors; people thought they had to have a major to be proficient at a personal computer, says Otterbein’s Thompson. Now computer science is “one of the fastest declining interest areas,” he says.

Ohio State’s computer major leveled out about three or four years ago, following a significant drop from 1980 to 1986; says Scott Grisson, undergraduate adviser in the computer and information science department.

Most of Franklin’s computer science majors are people who are already employed and are looking to advance within their company, Registrar Jim Noe says.

Engineering slips slightly

Despite the rapid growth of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences at Ohio State, the College of Engineering remains the university’s largest. Engineering has experienced a slow, steady decline in the past four years, however.

In 1986, 12 percent of the students enrolled at the Columbus campus were engineering majors. Today, 9 percent are engineers in training.

Ohio State reflects a national trend, says Marianne Mueller, assistant dean of the College of Engineering. “The problem is making students take the natural sciences in high school and high-level math,” Mueller says.

At the same time, the job market for engineers is not growing at the rapid pace it did in the 1980s, she says. In Columbus, 2,660 new engineering jobs are expected between 1988 and 2000, according to the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services. The number of new engineering jobs expected statewide is 14,150.
New courses start in ’91-’92

By Ruth Gerstner

This autumn, implementation of the new undergraduate curriculum continues with new second-year writing courses.

Begun with last fall's entering freshman class, the new General Education Curriculum is designed to prepare students for lifelong learning through a structured sequence of courses in the liberal arts.

It emphasizes writing, logical and quantitative skills, social diversity, and integration of knowledge from different fields.

Second-year writing courses are offered by many departments and combine study of specific subjects, such as economics, psychology or women's studies, with writing and analysis.

Courses

New major programs in the College of Agriculture are: a combined program in animal, dairy and poultry science; agribusiness and applied economics; and agricultural systems management. Awaiting approval are majors in construction systems management and plant health and protection.

The College of Agriculture will offer the first satellite college course to a consortium of 34 universities over the AG*SAT network in winter quarter.

Foreign languages: A third-year Korean language program will be offered for the first time this year. Large enrollment increases are being seen in German classes as well as introductory Czech and Serbo-Croatian. Also increasing steadily are enrollments in second- and third-year Russian language courses.

Students in other colleges can now have a minor program in these areas offered by the College of Human Ecology: consumer services, family relations and human development, hotel management, human nutrition, restaurant management, and textiles and clothing.

Credit courses offered at the Black Studies Community Extension Center during autumn quarter are: "Afro-American Literary Movements: The Black Revolutionary Aesthetic"; "U.S. Women Writers: Text and Context"; and "Black Political Movements and Organizations."

The College of Nursing has added two new specialty tracks in its master's degree program. The specialty in gerontological nursing prepares graduates to care for emerging needs of an aging population. The psychiatric mental health nursing track leads to advanced practice positions in the care of chronically and seriously mentally ill individuals or people who are chemically dependent.

The Department of English will continue a program that pairs classes of honors students with classes of basic writing students. Each group meets separately with its own instructors, and they also come together to work collaboratively on research papers that explore similarities and differences within and across cultures.

Undergraduates may now select a minor in medieval and Renaissance studies. A major program in this field has been available for some time.

"Introduction to African Literature" is a new course at the Lima campus. It provides a survey of the fiction, poetry and drama of Africa and includes lectures on the historical and cultural background of the writings.

Facilities and equipment

Construction will continue throughout the year on the $16.5 million addition to the Law Building, which includes renovation as well as a new law library.

When the new Museum of Biological Diversity opens later this year in renovated quarters in the former Food Facility on Kinnear Road, all of the collections of the College of Biological Sciences will be housed under one roof.

Now scattered through several buildings, the collections include plants, insects and spiders, birds, fish and mammals. In addition to the specimens, there are extensive collections of taped bird songs, slides of various animals, and other resources.

Work is scheduled to be completed this fall on the Coffey Road Sports Activity Field. It will have five lighted regulation-size flag football fields and five lighted softball diamonds. It is projected that some 200 flag football teams and 450 softball teams, comprising 9,000 students, faculty and staff members will use the fields annually.

The new south stands at Ohio Stadium have increased the stadium’s capacity by about 5,000 seats.

A $2.5 million fund-raising campaign is underway to finance a new baseball park.

The nutrition labs in the College of Human Ecology have been renovated and the home technology lab is nearly completed.

The Lantern, the daily student-run newspaper, will be using an electronic method to process photos within a computer terminal, virtually eliminating the need for a conventional darkroom.

Services

For the fifth season, the Department of Theatre will offer audio descriptions for the blind and visually impaired during the Saturday matinee performances. Patrons are issued earphones and receivers and listen to a trained describer over a closed-circuit broadcasting system.

The Office of Counseling and Consultation Services is continuing its emphasis on career development for Hispanic students. It also is working with Nationwide Insurance to establish traineeships to assist students in making thoughtful career decisions.

The Rape Education and Prevention Program has scheduled a wide variety of programs and workshops throughout the year.

The Wilec Student Health Center has made several improvements in its services. The physical therapy department has reopened; waiting time will be shorter for students who need pharmacy services; and a new central registration system will expedite scheduling clinic appointments. Contraceptive seminars will be offered to students on Mondays and Thursdays at 3 p.m. in the health center.

A biographical registry of cartoonists has been established at the Cartoon, Graphic and Photographic Arts Research Library. Information on more than 700 historical cartoonists is available.

The University Writing Center has substantially expanded its services and staff. The center provides support for the writing-across-the-curriculum component of the new curriculum. It also offers seminars and workshops on writing for students, faculty and staff. The center operates an undergraduate peer tutoring program, which it plans to continue to expand.
Contemporary world classes harder to get

By Angie Johnson
Lantern staff writer

OSU students trying to fulfill requirements in the category ‘Issues of the Contemporary World’ are probably going to have a tough time getting in these classes, said Robert Arkin, associate dean for the College of Arts and Sciences.

Contemporary world classes, which were formerly only required of students in the College of Arts and Sciences, were made part of the General Education Curriculum about two years ago, Arkin said. All students at Ohio State who entered since Autumn Quarter 1990 will also have to fulfill the contemporary world class requirement.

Because of the budget cuts, no funding for additional contemporary world classes will be available this year, said Robert Arnold, associate provost for Academic Affairs.

In the past, contemporary world classes have been the biggest problem in terms of Arts and Sciences requirements, and the college has been just barely able to meet the needs of most students in this area, Arkin said. However, because most of the students who entered in 1990 or after are freshmen and sophomores right now, the need for more contemporary world classes hasn’t been much of a problem yet, but will be in the future.

The university hopes that the future money situation will improve and in a year, will be able to reinstate some funding for these classes, Arnold said. In the meantime, a lot of class substitutions will have to be made, he added.

Arnold said, two other areas of the GEC which will receive no additional funding this year are the Capital program (formerly CAPSTONE) and the third level writing course, which students under the GEC are supposed to take in their junior or senior year.