

Date: November, 2011

To: General Education Council (GEC)

From: Winston Crawley, chair of General Education Coordinating Committee, 2008-2011

The purpose of this report is to give some context for the formation of the General Education Council. There are three components to the report.

1. To understand the current status, it is helpful to have some detailed understanding of the activities of the General Education Coordinating Committee (GECC) from 2004 through 2011. This is dealt with in the main body of the report, with some details relegated to appendices.
2. To understand the current status, it is also helpful to realize that the current curriculum has been in place and almost unchanged since 1985. This is detailed in Appendix A.
3. For a more complete understanding, I include some information on activities relating to General Education which occurred in the 1999-2004 timeframe. This is detailed in Appendix B.

The GEC owes its existence to the ongoing efforts of the GECC. Moreover, the GEC is in a position to build on the work of the GECC. It may decide to make major changes to what has gone before, but however it decides to proceed, I believe it should proceed from a foundation of knowledge about what has gone before.

Table of Contents

Main body: GECC 2004-2011	2
2004-2005	2
2005-2006	2
2006-2007	2
2007-2008	2
2008-2009	3
Feedback from Middle States	4
2009-2010	4
2010-2011	5
Final comments	6
Appendix A: A brief history of General Education revision 1976-2011	7
Appendix B: Activities related to General Education, 1999-2004	8
Appendix C: Vision, Mission, Goals Document	10
Appendix D: Attributes of Curriculum Models	14
Appendix E: Action taken at December 2010 meeting	15

2004-2005

The chair was Dr. Douglas Birsch (Director of General Education). Under his leadership the GECC carried out several major tasks that year.

1. It set membership guidelines which established the GECC as one of the more representative groups on campus. In particular, each department offering General Education courses had at least one member.
2. It developed a set of learning objectives and commonalities for Categories A through E. The method used by the GECC consisted of:
 - a. List the learning objectives for each course currently taught in the category.
 - b. Form the intersection of these lists.

The primary purpose was to serve as the basis for assessment of the courses in the category. A secondary purpose (??) was to serve as guidelines for future courses in the category. There was some objection to this latter purpose, given the method used to develop the objectives.

3. The GECC had a subcommittee which later evolved into the Curriculum Subcommittee. This group wanted to think about curriculum issues, but the Provost was insistent that the GECC focus on the learning objectives and related assessment. However, this subcommittee had two significant accomplishments that year:
 - a. It developed a higher-level set of *goals* for the program. To do this, it adapted the PASSHE goals to the current curriculum at the university. This was approved by the GECC, and in Spring 2006 this list became part of the university's formal 5-year-review report to PASSHE.
 - b. It developed a course proposal for General Education Selected Topics, approved by GECC but not forwarded to UCC.

2005-2006

The GECC built upon the work of the previous year. It created objectives for the Required Skills and Competencies and for the Diversity requirement. It developed a mechanism for assessing whether each course in the curriculum met the objectives of the category. This included working out strategies for actually carrying out the assessments at the department level and reporting them through the GECC's subcommittee structure.

In addition, the five-year review was done during this year. The document listed *a dedicated Director and Coordinating Committee* among the program strengths. In light of some later discussions, it is interesting to note that the review did point out that one PASSHE goal, relating to values and ethical issues, was not being met by our program.

2006-2007

The GECC set up a three-year cycle for assessment, and began the process of obtaining data from departments and analyzing that data. As problems with the mechanism were uncovered, changes were made, not only this year but in subsequent years.

2007-2008

The new Provost transferred the leadership role from the Director of General Education (Dr. Birsch) to the Dean of Arts and Sciences (Dr. Jim Mike). This led to a "co-chair" arrangement with Dr. Birsch and Dr. Mike serving as co-chairs. Later in the year Dr. Mike directed the Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences, Dr. Kim Long, to fill the role of administrative co-chair.

This was the second year of the three-year assessment cycle for assessing whether the courses met the objectives developed based on those courses. The GECC began to realize that additional, higher-level assessments of the program were also needed. To initiate this process, in the fall an open-ended survey was administered to the GECC regarding how our current program is viewed and what, if anything, should be changed. In the spring the results from the survey of the GECC were used to create a survey for the general faculty.

The proposal for a General Education Selected Topics, lost in the year-end shuffle in Spring 2005, was resurrected. It was approved by UCC in May 2008.

2008-2009

This was the third year of the three-year assessment cycle, and the year Middle States would be visiting the campus.

At the first meeting of the year Dr. Kim Long (administrative co-chair) indicated that the Provost had withdrawn the reassigned time for the faculty co-chair. I agreed to take on that office with no reassigned time – I believe faculty must play a significant leadership role in all curriculum discussions, including General Education.

The GECC prepared a proposal to change the Governance Document to incorporate a General Education Council within the formal governance structure. This was delivered to the Forum President in the spring of 2009.

The GECC authorized the distribution of a summary/interpretation of the survey that had been administered in the spring of 2008. Here are some of the key points:

- There was no single part of the current program that a majority of the faculty objected to. However, each part of the current program did give rise to a not-insignificant proportion of the faculty that had issues with that part.
- Slightly more than half of those responding felt the program should be rebuilt from scratch.
- There were a number of general changes that received over 60% support:
 - More advanced courses
 - More flexibility; more electives
 - Interdisciplinary
 - Writing across the curriculum
 - Ethics

The GECC decided that as a follow-up to the survey there should be a series of open forums. These were held in the spring. There were several for faculty, one for administrators and staff, and one for the Advisory Board for the College of Arts and Sciences. The focus of the forums was not “what is wrong with or right with the current program?” Rather, with an eye toward a possible rebuilding of the program, the focus was, “What attributes should describe a graduate of the university, and what experiences should that graduate have had as a part of his/her education at the university?” In other words, the forums were about goals rather than curricular details.

In the spring five members were sent to an Institute on General Education run by the AACU (American Association of Colleges and Universities).

A mini-retreat was held in which many members reported on what other universities are doing in General Education. The universities included our “aspirational peers” as well as others that were of interest to or familiar to particular members of the GECC.

I realized that there was a “gap” between our “Goals” document and our “Learning Objectives and Assessment” document. I wrote a temporary stopgap document to fill this hole for purposes of the Middle States visit, but this document has never been voted on, or even looked at, by the entire GECC.

Feedback from Middle States

The lead paragraph of the final report states: “Shippensburg has a long-standing general education program of 48 credits that has been in effect since 1985. This program provides the necessary skills courses and breadth of curriculum expected from a general education program.” I believe the mention of 1985 was a subtle criticism.

Compared to the rather neutral phrasing of the lead paragraph, the remainder of the writeup had many nice things to say about our efforts to *assess* and *improve* the program. Here are some highlights of their comments.

- “Assessment ... is relatively new, but done very well”
- GECC “has done a commendable job”
- “Clear learning objectives”
- “Extensive survey of faculty views and experiences”
- “More critical thinking” (“wild card courses”)
- “Planned three year cycle of assessment review using clear rubrics” with departments “allowed appropriate variation”
- Has used assessment data to “improve teaching, modify course content, and implement special topics courses”
- Provost sending team to institute “as part of the campus-wide commitment”
- Commends campus on progress, GECC on enthusiasm
- Suggestion – second writing course
- Endorses proposal of GECC to achieve a more permanent status

The Middle States team met with representatives from the GECC. One verbal comment from the team leader that was not included in the final written report was something like this: We know how to use assessment to improve course content and course delivery. The real challenge is to use the data to achieve *program* improvement.

2009-2010

One of the tasks for this year was assessing the assessment process. The Assessment Committee began this difficult task. One component of this involved realizing that assessing courses against objectives that were derived from the courses themselves is less than ideal. The mechanism may be sound, but the objectives need to be derived from the goals of the program, not from the courses in the existing program.

With this in mind, the GECC set the major task for the year as the development of a set of goals, derived from all the program-level assessment that has taken place: the comparisons to peers and to best practices, the information obtained from attendees at AACU-sponsored and other conferences, and – very importantly – the information from the open forums in the spring of 2009.

Two suggestions for improving communication were implemented. First, I was authorized to make a presentation on our status to the various College Councils. This presentation was made at Arts and Sciences, and at Business, and also to the campus Academic Master Plan committee. Second, a

Blackboard group was formed with the entire faculty as members, allowing for the distribution of information by email and the posting of documents for review and feedback.

The GECC expanded its membership to additional campus constituencies. Every department that teaches undergraduates, and every program that teaches general education, has a representative.

The GECC became aware that the Governance proposal had not been taken to Forum. It was redelivered to the new Forum President in the spring. The document was referred to the Forum's Governance Review Committee for work over the summer.

In April 2010 the GECC approved, as a working document, and distributed to the faculty, a "Vision, Mission, Goals" document. This is included in Appendix C, with additional small changes made in the fall of 2010. Note that one suggestion is a name change from General Education to University Core Program (UCP).

The GECC received a letter from the Provost and President supportive of the committee efforts, and specifically indicating that General Education Renewal would not lead to retrenchment of faculty.

2010-2011

This year began in August, just before the beginning of the fall semester. The GECC held a retreat at which it discussed the goals document in great detail, seeking to move toward using the document to develop models for possible curriculum renewal. Several general principles were approved, with details to be filled in as the discussion progresses. Any model developed by the GECC should include attention to these general principles (additional details in Appendix D):

- Entry year experience
- Capstone
- Breadth
- Depth
- Course designators (at least as a possibility)
- Flexibility
- "Vetting" process

At its October meeting, in reaction to the President's announcement that retrenchment was a possibility on campus, the GECC unanimously passed the following resolution:

Recent events have created an environment on our campus that is not conducive to this body continuing forward with General Education Renewal in the thoughtful, deliberative, and planned manner lauded by Middle States. It is our judgment that in light of these developments we will be unable to meet the timeline set out by this body, culminating in a roll out of the new "University Core Curriculum" in the Fall of 2013.

At its December meeting it amplified and commented on this resolution (see Appendix E). The net result was that the GECC would continue to pursue General Education Renewal. However, its primary goal would be developing possible models for future curriculum rather than developing formal curriculum proposals. Whether/when these models would be turned into proposals would remain to be seen, but certainly the process of moving from the current curriculum to a new curriculum would have to take place carefully and perhaps over a period of years.

The GECC continued to voice concern that the Governance Document has not been discussed by Forum. Ultimately, Forum did take action on the proposal, with some additional changes to the document which were inserted at the Forum itself, and the document was approved in the spring semester. However, up until late August the GECC was under the impression that final approval was still pending and that it (GECC) would be continuing at least through Fall 2011.

In the spring semester and continuing through the summer, the Curriculum Subcommittee worked on possible models for curriculum consistent with the Vision/Mission/Goals document and consistent with the general principles mentioned earlier. It had planned to present its status and obtain further input from the entire GECC at a retreat just before the fall semester, but this was canceled upon receiving the news that the Governance Document had received final approval and that GEC was forming immediately in the fall.

Final comments

This, then, is where we are. I believe that GEC should pursue two major tasks, perhaps among others.

It should continue, through its Program Committee, the work on General Education Renewal that has been carried out by the GECC as a whole and by its Curriculum Subcommittee. The ultimate goal is a cohesive program of General Education developed from the vision, mission, and goals of the university's General Education Program. To the extent that the program developed in this manner differs from the current program, it should also develop a careful strategy for moving from the current program to the new program, perhaps over a period of years, paying careful attention to the effects on the students and to the effects on the departments and faculty.

It should complete the work begun by the GECC's Assessment Subcommittee. The assessment strategy used in the previous 3-year assessment cycle needs to be fine-tuned. More importantly, it needs to be adapted to a set of goals and objectives that have been developed "from the top down," rather than by simply writing down the goals and objectives of the courses that are requirements in an already-existing program.

Appendix A
A brief history of General Education revision 1976 – 2011

Prior to 1985 it was quite simple.

- 60 credits total
- 12 credits electives chosen by student
- 6 credits required courses: ENG 101, SPE 100
- 42 credits distribution (no more than 12 in same division as major; preferably these 12 outside the major)
 - 12-18 credits Humanities, from at least three disciplines
 - 12-18 credits Social Science, from at least three disciplines
 - 12-18 credits Math / Natural Science, from at least three disciplines

1985. The structure was changed to a form quite similar to that of today. Here are the major differences between that program and today's program.

- In 1985 there were 15 credits of electives, not in the major, with 6 of these credits at 200+ level in the disciplines listed in Categories A to E.
- Category A included foreign languages.
- Category A included an ART course, an ENG course, a MUS course, and a SPE course in addition to the MAT, CSC, PHL.
- Category C was only 6 credits, not 9.
- In Category C, 3 of the credits had to be a lab science.
- There was no diversity requirement.

1990. Category C is expanded to 9 credits chosen from 3 different disciplines, and the lab science requirement is deleted. Due to an oversight, the electives remain at 15, so the total is temporarily 63 credits.

1992. A little final "cleanup"

- The few ART, ENG, MUS, and SPE courses are removed from Category A.
- The foreign language courses are moved from Category A to Category B, part 2.
- General education electives are gone, along with the requirement for any depth at all.
- Total is now 48 instead of 60.

1992-2011. Not much *net* change. Diversity requirement added (2000). Paired courses came (2002) and went (2005). ENG 106 Writing-Intensive First-Year Seminar replaced ENG 101 English Composition (2006). In some categories, courses have been added to the list of available courses.

In addition, sometime in the period between 1985 and approximately 1994 a "Writing Across the Curriculum" component came and went. This was not catalog-based. Rather, departments were directed to ensure writing was a significant component of two courses taken by all their majors – one at the freshman-sophomore level and one at the junior-senior level. These courses were designated as (W) courses.

Appendix B Activities related to General Education, 1999-2004

1.– General Education Study Group formed by administration

- Several members attended AACU (American Association of Colleges and Universities) workshop. Several initiatives were investigated and/or initiated as a result of what they learned.
 - Focus – connections
 - Suggested curriculum changes
 - Paired courses at the freshman level.
 - More pairings along with on-campus cultural events in the sophomore year.
 - Cluster of related upper-level courses junior year.
 - Service learning with off-campus component senior year.
 - Freshman-level paired courses were implemented in 2002, abandoned in 2005 due to difficulties with administering.¹ Nothing came of the other suggestions. (There was an unsuccessful attempt to initiate the “cluster” concept.)

1999 – Forum formed committee to investigate diversity requirement. Requirement implemented in 2000.

2001 – 2003 Interim GECC, chaired by Dr. Suzanne Morin and Dr. Mary Stewart

- Oversaw choosing of Director of General Education
- Distributed survey to departments. Here is a very brief summary of the results:
 - The PASSHE goals #1 (critical analysis), #2 (communication skills), #6 (historical consciousness), #8 (diversity) are being well met by the curriculum.
 - The program needs more emphasis on technology, and it needs to add a variety of additional courses.
- Final report on suggestions for program revision summarized:
 - Suggested name change, perhaps Liberal Arts Core Curriculum
 - Broaden and strengthen pairings, abandon clusters and service requirement
 - Reexamine diversity requirement
 - Expand role of technology

2003 – Appointment of a Director of General Education (Dr. David Godshalk), and formation of GECC

- Report by new director. Here are a few items from that report:
 - Continue pairings, perhaps some sophomore pairings.
 - Consider possibility of some non-Arts-and-Sciences courses, with careful guidelines.

¹ **A personal comment.** I believe there are a couple of lessons to be learned from what happened for paired courses.

First, *not every goal needs to be translated into a requirement*. One primary difficulty with paired courses was enforcing the requirement that every student participate in a pairing. Another approach would have been to create the pairings, schedule incoming freshmen into them in the fall semester, make them available but not mandatory in the spring semester, and measure what proportion of graduating seniors had participated.

Second, at some point the university lost sight of its goal of creating academic communities, and began to insist that a pairing isn't a legitimate pairing unless the faculty members involved are expending enormous energy communicating with one another before and during the course. It would have been better to have encouraged such communication between faculty, but to also recognize that some of the goals of the pairing were being met simply by having the students involved recognize that they were taking two courses with the same group of students. In such a situation, students do – some of them at least – begin to form those academic communities.

- Create a set of learning outcomes / goals.
- Encourage service learning.
- Explore renaming.
- Work on assessment, but without undue burden on departments.
- Articulate connections between major programs and general education.
- Create meaningful senior-year capstone.
- Have meaningful writing assignments in upper-level courses.
- Encourage out-of-class contact between professor and students.

2003 – Creation of General Education Grants Program

2004 – Dr. Godshalk resigns as Director of General Education; Dr. Douglas Birsch is chosen to fill the position

Appendix C
Vision, Mission, Goals Document

Vision for the University Core Program (UCP)
(To be included in the catalog, on the web site, and other places for students, faculty and public audiences)

A student's major discipline provides content knowledge and skills needed to be productive *in that discipline*, but a well rounded education cannot, and should not, be the exclusive responsibility of a student's major department. As the *Mission of the University* states:

The curricula are organized to enable students both to develop their intellectual abilities and to obtain professional training in a variety of fields. The foundation of the undergraduate curriculum is a required core of courses in the arts and sciences. These courses prepare students to think logically, read critically, write clearly and verbalize ideas in a succinct and articulate manner; they also broaden students' knowledge of the world, past and present.

The ultimate goal is to have students develop to their utmost the intellectual, personal and social capabilities they need to perform as competent citizens prepared to embark on a career immediately upon graduation or after advanced study.

The "foundation of the undergraduate curriculum" goes by different names at different institutions: general education, distribution requirements, core curriculum, university studies, university core, liberal arts core. Regardless of the name, this foundation is the defining characteristic of a university education:

- It provides essential skills for becoming a contributing member in an increasingly complex world. It aims to produce citizens who have a critical, analytical, curious mind and temperament.
- It prepares students to understand, think, and communicate in contexts beyond their major field of study, beyond their geographic locality, and beyond their own position in society. It prepares them for the challenges and choices they face throughout their lives, in all their various roles.
- Beyond preparation, the program fosters an appreciation of the diversity of human intellectual pursuits. Moreover, it develops an appreciation of learning as a worthy human endeavor, to be continued throughout the students' lives.
- Ultimately a university education, built on this strong core, leads to a broader understanding of issues, to a willingness to consider the opinions of others, to a deeper and well-reasoned understanding of one's own beliefs and attitudes, and to an ability to comprehend and address complex problems and situations.
- In short, this broad intellectual foundation is the key element that characterizes a university education.

At Shippensburg University this foundation is titled *The University Core Program*, or UCP. This name indicates the integrated position of the program in the curriculum of the university. The UCP complements and expands the specific learning objectives of a major discipline in order to address the goals of a university education in a consistent and effective manner across the curriculum and across each student's college career.

Mission of the University Core Program (UCP)

The University Core Program (UCP) has a three-fold mission. It *assists* each student in crossing the significant threshold to university-level expectations. It *strengthens* students in areas in which they have already begun to develop. In addition, it encourages students to *stretch* themselves, by exploring previously unknown disciplines, encountering new experiences, and moving deeper into subject matter that is familiar.

More specifically, the mission of the UCP is to offer appropriate coursework and experiences for all students that will, along with the students' major courses of study, address this broad vision. The UCP provides a framework within which students

- Strengthen their intellectual and practical skills, including proficiency in written and oral communication, inquiry techniques, critical and creative thinking, quantitative reasoning, problem-solving, and teamwork;
- Acquire a broad knowledge of the universe, and of the interaction of humans with each other, the earth, and the universe.
- Assume individual and social responsibilities, built on local and global civic knowledge, awareness of and appreciation for local and global human diversity, and ethical reasoning and action;
- Pursue study in a wide variety of disciplines, including but not limited to the traditional liberal arts disciplines of mathematics and natural sciences, arts and humanities, and social sciences;
- Acquire depth of knowledge in addition to breadth of knowledge;
- Integrate ideas and skills, and pursue advanced accomplishment, across both general and specialized studies;
- Apply new knowledge and skills to fulfill the needs of personal and professional lives; and
- Develop the capacity for pursuing the life-long learning necessary to continue this process.

An individual might achieve some elements of a university education through initiative and self-study, and that would be a notable achievement, but it would not be equal to what one obtains and accomplishes through a university education at Shippensburg University.

Many important experiences take place within the classroom, in a setting carefully designed to provide for high-quality personal interaction between students and professor. Students have the opportunity to interact with experts; for example, history is studied under the direct and personal tutelage of a professor who is an accomplished historian, mathematics with a mathematician, and similarly across the entire program.

In addition, the program exposes students to enriching experiences that take place outside the classroom. These experiences provide a foundation for developing a curiosity about the world and the confidence that new undertakings can be successfully surmounted.

Goals of the University Core Program (UCP)

The goals of the program address the question, “What characteristics should Shippensburg University graduates share, regardless of the particular discipline in which they major?” These goals fall into three broad categories:

- Intellectual and practical abilities
- Knowledge and understanding
- Attitudes and values

Intellectual and practical abilities: In our increasingly complex and demanding world, a productive individual must have a set of portable, sophisticated and universal skills or abilities. The UCP is designed to help students acquire, strengthen, and refine these abilities, beginning with coursework early in their undergraduate education.

Shippensburg students will:

- Communicate proficiently;
- Acquire and apply quantitative reasoning skills;
- Develop critical reading and thinking, problem-solving, and research skills;
- Use technology competently and responsibly; and
- Collaborate effectively in a variety of contexts.

Knowledge and understanding: A breadth of knowledge and understanding of other disciplines and how they interconnect provides the necessary framework for the depth of knowledge acquired in the student’s major. Breadth and depth of knowledge promote and support intellectual and practical abilities across a student’s education at Shippensburg University. Cross-fertilization among knowledge areas encourages creativity and innovation, preparing students to listen better, to understand, and to communicate in contexts beyond their major field of study.

Shippensburg students will acquire knowledge and understanding of:

- Human and natural systems, their variety, their interactions, and how they evolve over time;
- Science, its method for generating new knowledge, and its dynamic character; and
- Aesthetics, the creative process, and the contributions of the humanities and the arts to the human experience.

To achieve these goals, students should:

1. Study a variety of disciplines in the sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts.
2. Grapple with complex questions.
3. Attain both global and national perspectives.

Attitudes and values: An individual’s attitudes and values play an important role in shaping success in one’s personal, working, and civic life. These attitudes and values are developed through course work, attendance at campus events, and participation in a variety of other activities. They are enhanced by interactions with individuals from varying backgrounds. They lead to a growing appreciation of our responsibilities to ourselves, to others, to our world, and enhance one’s ability to cope with adversity. They foster respectful behavior toward others, especially in the exchange of conflicting ideas and beliefs. They cultivate a desire to learn and to better understand both ourselves and the variety of natural and social environments.

Shippensburg students will discover, examine, and internalize attitudes, beliefs and habits that:
Sustain individual physical, intellectual and emotional health;
Promote a commitment to integrity, honesty, and fairness; and
Characterize a responsible citizen of a diverse world with finite natural resources.

Appendix D Attributes of Curriculum Models

- There should be an “Entry year experience” taken in the first semester enrolled, not only by freshmen but also by transfer students.
- There should be a capstone course, most likely within the major, but incorporating goals of the general education program.
- The program should include breadth.
 - Connections
 - Certainly across the divisions of the College of Arts and Sciences
 - Emphasis is on expanding beyond your major / division
 - Explore possibilities for CAS students to take courses in other colleges?
- In addition to breadth, students should pursue depth outside their major. The current model lacks this attribute. A variety of possible models were mentioned as ways in which the curriculum might achieve this goal.
 - mini-minor / certificate
 - cohesive set of courses across disciplines
 - totally flexible chosen by students
 - mandatory mid-level courses
- There was general support of the concept of course designations. At its simplest, this is a way to achieve the second writing course without having every student take a second ENG course – courses could have a WRI designation. The GECC generally felt there might be other types of designations as well. (The current Diversity requirement fits this model, for example.)
- There should be flexibility for the student.
- There needs to be a process for “vetting” both new and existing courses. The process should include examining detailed objectives and assessment strategies.

Appendix E
Action taken at December 2010 meeting

At its December 9, 2010, meeting, the GECC chose to amplify and comment upon the resolution passed at its October 2010 meeting:

- We appreciate the President's assurances (*that General Education Renewal will not be the cause for any retrenchment of faculty*), but we do feel that our concerns are real and ongoing.
 - When retrenchment is on the table for the university, it is significantly more difficult to carry on a conversation about major curriculum changes which will almost certainly affect resource allocation.
 - If curriculum changes are approved, it is crucial that the university develop a thoughtful, planned strategy for moving from the current curriculum to the revised curriculum over a period of time. Changes cannot be precipitous.
 - For general education reform to go forward in a way that does not add to faculty anxiety concerning retrenchment and problematic changes in class size, administration must establish a context for program planning that repeatedly underscores the commitment of the university to avoidance of retrenchment and to thoughtful, planned, and strategic program implementation focused on excellent educational experiences.

- At this time, the GECC is pressing forward on the following items. It intends to continue doing so, subject, however, to the considerations highlighted in the preceding bullet item.
 - It is continuing its efforts to become an official part of the governance structure.
 - It is continuing its work on the University Core Program (UCP).
 - Its Curriculum Committee anticipates recommending to the GECC a possible short-term target for Fall 2011, with these basic components:
 - A model or models for the UCP, to be used as a basis for discussion
 - Probably in the form of a *goal* for what a potential UCP *might* look like, *not* as a formal curriculum proposal
 - Discussion commencing in Fall 2011 to include strategies for attaining the goal, and whether or not the goal is feasible

- In the final analysis, we still question our ability to meet our earlier goal of rolling out a new curriculum in fall 2013.