**Themes Approval process** (from ASCC)

**Background:** The current process for approving Themes courses was developed during GEN Implementation. It entails a dual-review by content experts (“Theme Advisory Groups”) and a subcommittee of ASCC charged with evaluating the alignment to the broad GEN Theme requirements and Integrative Practices (as appropriate). This involves dozens of faculty and has many opportunities for participation, but the workload and consistency of recommendation are challenging. Both ULAC and ASCC have discussed alternatives. ASCC had advanced two motions:

**Motion 1:** *Streamline process and make the GE theme approval process consistent and transparent via the use of rubrics. As it stands, the two Themes Subcommittees and the eight Themes Advisory Groups (TAGs) take somewhat different stances on the same or equivalent ELOs*.

We propose that the process use rubrics, prepared in consultations with all the Themes subcommittee and TAG chairs in 2024-25. These rubrics will streamline the GE themes approval process by providing precise and objective guidelines for course approval. Rubrics will ensure continuity and objectivity as membership to committees changes and will also provide concrete feedback for courses that are returned to the proposer for revision.

Motion passed 14/14 (no abstentions, no nays).

**Motion 2:** Subsume the eight TAGs into the two enlarged Themes Subcommittees*. Currently there are eight themes advisory groups (TAGs) with a membership of 5-8 faculty each. This leads to a total of 49-51 faculty members in the TAGs and an additional ten faculty members who serve on Themes Subcommittees 1 and 2. This proposal reduces the number of faculty members (from 59-61 to 16-24). In addition to concerns about faculty time commitments, recruiting and scheduling is a challenge when the number of faculty participating in this process is this large. This large potential pool of reviewers also contributes to the varying perspectives and priorities that make outcomes less predictable or consistent.*

We propose two GE Themes Subcommittees that each have a membership of 8-12 faculty members representing ASC as well as all other colleges**.** *Each Subcommittee will have at least 1 faculty member whose primary appointment is in a college other than the College of Arts and Sciences. Up to 25% of the Subcommittee may be made up of faculty members whose primary appointments are in a college other than the College of Arts and Sciences, and every effort will be made to be inclusive up to this 25% maximum.* 25-50% of the membership of the two Themes Subcommittees would come from existing TAGs such that streamlining the process does not result in diluting expertise.

Motion passed 14/14 (no abstentions, no nays).

**World Languages in the GE** (from CLLC)

**Background:** Motions centered on the availability of courses taught in a world language to meet GEN requirements as Foundations or 3-credit Theme courses (Motion 1) and on the opportunity for Theme courses to meet the GEN Integrative Practice expectations without being fully taught in a world language (Motion 2). Explanatory text in each motion render in italics to highlight substance of Motion. Amendments or changes from original text circulated prior to meeting in bold.

**Motion 1:** *The intention of GEN to allow world language instruction courses to be part of the Foundations or Themes is not clear. The GEL prohibited courses taught in a world language from being proposed as GE courses in their respective field. The GEN does not include this prohibition. The absence of a prohibition seems to be an insufficient counter to the history of exclusion: most faculty do not realize that GEN Foundations courses can be taught in languages other than English.*

We affirm that courses taught in a world language are eligible to be GEN Foundations or Themes courses and encourage departments offering appropriate courses to consider whether participating in the GEN will support their programmatic goals. These courses cannot be restricted to specific majors or minors or unavailable to students who are heritage speakers of the language. Because of the expectations that GE courses are accessible to a broad and general audience, proficiency or prerequisite expectations are expected not to exceed the three-course sequence required by, e.g. Arts and Sciences or Global option programs.

Motion passed 14/14 (no abstentions, no nays).

**Motion 2:** *No courses have been submitted under the “Instruction in a World Language” High Impact Practice.  The reasons for this are myriad but include imprecision in the expectations of these courses (as articulated in the submission inventory) and a mismatch between the teaching goals for departments and the expectations of this category within GEN and a limited pool of students eligible for such courses.  Conversation with leadership of ASC and the CLLC has identified an approach that is more compelling for departments and more accessible to students while still meeting the learning conditions that make world language learning a high impact practice.*

We propose to expand the World Language HIP to include courses where the learning of a world language is integrated into the class, such that the world language is a key lens through which the Theme content is explored. Language learning is expected to connect to the specific Theme and to constitute at least a quarter of the course instruction of the 4-credit course. In learning and interacting in the target language, students would gain the intercultural competence, depth and variety of perspectives, and self-knowledge that make world language learning a high impact practice and will have the opportunity to explore languages and cultures unfamiliar to them. These courses cannot be restricted to specific majors or minors or unavailable to students who are heritage speakers of the language, and instructors are expected to have explicit plans for supporting engagement of students at different levels of experience with the focal language.

Motion passed 14/14 (no abstentions, no nays).