



Office of the Executive Dean

Colleges of the Arts and Sciences  
114 University Hall  
230 North Oval Mall  
Columbus, OH 43210-1319

Phone (614) 292-1667  
Fax (614) 247-7498  
<http://artsandsciences.osu.edu>

May 4, 2007

Dr. Brian Winer  
Chair, Council on Academic Affairs  
3042 Physics Research Building  
191 West Woodruff Avenue  
CAMPUS

Dear Brian:

I am pleased to respond to your request for a summary of the process that has resulted in revised general education templates for the untagged degrees in the Arts and Sciences.

In considering possible changes to the GEC templates for the untagged degrees Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science, the five Arts and Sciences colleges engaged in a two year process of review that involved all 41 departments, the five college curriculum committees, the ASC Committee on Curriculum and Instruction (CCI), and the Arts and Sciences Faculty Senate.

ASC's process began with a coordinated consideration of the recommendations of the McHale Committee in each of the 41 departments. Discussions were held in department undergraduate curriculum committees, and during special convening of departmental faculty meetings. Public forums were held in each of the five ASC colleges with members of the McHale Committee. Departments submitted their reactions to the McHale recommendations to their college curriculum committee.

The CCI created an outline for use by the colleges in their task of responding to the report, so that the sets of reactions from the five colleges would have a similar structure. In early winter of 2006, each of the five college curriculum committees submitted a report on their college's reactions to the CCI on the GEC reform recommendations from the McHale committee. The CCI considered each of these reports, along with additional reports from ASC Advising, ASC Honors, ASC Career Services, ASC Assessment, and the ASC Office of Interdisciplinary Programs. In the spring of 2006, the CCI finalized its recommendations to the ASC Senate, which deliberated in a series of meetings in the spring and then voted on a package of changes to the Bachelor of Arts degree. These were forwarded to CAA following the ASC Senate's June 7, 2006 meeting.

The process for consideration of the B.S. degree involved several additional steps. During the 2006-2007 process outlined above, it became clear to the various curriculum committees that questions about the requirements for the B.S. degree could not be answered without a careful study of the ways in which that degree differs from the B.A. degree. Accordingly, over the summer, a Task Force was convened by the Executive Dean to study the goals of the B.S. degree and recommend specific changes to that degree's general education requirements. The Task Force included representation from all five of the Arts and Science Colleges, as well as from the College of Engineering and the School of Allied Medical Professions in the College of Medicine. The Task Force delivered its recommendations to the CCI in January of 2007. This was followed by CCI deliberations and then several long sessions of deliberation in the ASC Senate.

The result of this process has been the set of changes brought to CAA that, for both the B.A. and the B.S. degrees, brings the total hours to degree down by 10 credits, from 191 to 181 as a minimum. This is accomplished for both degree programs by removing 5 credits from the GEC breadth areas, increasing the flexibility of the distribution of breadth requirements, and broadening the range of courses in the spirit of the GEC that can be utilized as student-selected courses.

One of the goals of the B.S. Task Force and the CCI was to align, as closely as is practical, the GEC requirements for both degrees. Thus, both sets of degrees will allow for 10 credits of student-selected GEC courses from across different areas of the GEC. We are particularly pleased that these reforms allow us to remove the *Drop-a-GEC* component of the B.S. degree, which has been viewed as problematic since it was added during the 1996 review of the B.S. degree.

The revised GEC template that resulted from this process gives students some important latitude in their selection of GEC courses. This speaks to the different kind of student we have today from the norm in 1988, when the present general education model was created. Our student population today comes to us significantly more prepared for rigorous course work, more likely to double major, and more interested in the increasing array of opportunities for discipline based and interdisciplinary minors, study abroad, freshman seminars, GEC Clusters, and internships. The changes enacted in the GEC template should provide the needed flexibility to allow for students to integrate these important opportunities into their undergraduate curricula.

Sincerely,



Edward Adelson  
Associate Executive Dean and  
Chair, ASC Committee on Curriculum and Instruction

- c. Randy Smith, Vice Provost  
Jacqueline Royster, Executive Dean