JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Norman campus)

The University of Oklahoma

Special session -- May 3, 1982 -- 3:00 p.m., Dale Hall 218

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Dr. Gary Thompson, Chair.

Present:

Baker	Ford	Hebert	Locke	Seaberg
Biro	Foster, J.	Howard	Love	Self
Brown, H.	Foster, T.	Huseman	Maletz	Smith
Brown, S.	Gollahalli	Kiacz	Menzie	Sonleitner
Christian	Graves	Lanning	Moriarity	Stock
Christy	Gross	Lehr, Robert	Murphy	Thompson
Conner	Hardy	Lehr, Roland	Patten	Wainner
Covich	Hayes	Levy	Rinear	West
Driver	Heaston	Lis	Schliefer	Whitmore
Dunn				

Liaison, Women's Caucus: Morgan

Guests: OU Regent Dan Little
Alexander Holmes, Vice Chair, General Education Committee

Absent:

El-Ibiary	Hibdon	Ragan, J.	Ragan, T.	Scharnberg
Fishbeck				

Provost's office representative: Ray

PSA representatives:	Clinkenbeard	Guyer	McNeil
	Cowen	Little	Powers

UOSA representative: Sevenoaks

(Secretary's note: In accordance with precedent, faculty absences are not charged to the individual's record. Attendance at special sessions, however, can be used to offset absences from other meetings during the same academic year.)

TABLE OF CONENTS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Senate Journal for March 15, 1982, was approved with the following additional item on page 2:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Senate Journal for the regular session on February 8, 1982, was approved with the following correction on page 2 (approval of minutes): February 8, 1982, should read January 18, 1982.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM S. BANOWSKY

(1) Proposed University retirement plan: President Banowsky acknowledged receipt of the pertinent Senate action of April 12 with the following comments addressed to the Senate Secretary on April 19, 1982:

> "Thank you for your comments concerning the proposed University retirement plan. I am receiving comments from the various campus groups and will make a final recommendation to the Board of Regents after the remarks of each group are received and evaluated."

(Please see page 4 of the Senate Journal for April 12, 1982.)

(2) Proposed revisions - Faculty Appeals Board procedures: In his memorandum of April 19 to the Senate Secretary, President Banowsky made the following comments concerning the Senate recommendation of April 12 regarding proposed revisions of the Faculty Appeals Board procedures:

> "I have received the proposed revisions of the Faculty Appeals Board procedures that have been suggested by an ad hoc Committee appointed by the Faculty Senate. After an appropriate review, we will respond to these proposals."

(Please see page 15-21 of the Senate Journal for April 12, 1982.)

(3) Faculty reception following General Faculty meeting, April 8: President Banowsky acknowledged receipt of Senate reaction to the social following the spring meeting of the General Faculty on April 8, with the following remarks addressed to the Senate Secretary on April 16:

> "I am pleased that you have received many favorable comments concerning the faculty awards reception. I am hopeful that we will be able to have this reception each spring. I believe that it added a fine touch to the final General Faculty function of the semester."

(Please see page 32 of the Senate Journal for April 12, 1982. Please also see item immediately following.)

ACTION TAKEN BY SENATE SECRETARY: Message of appreciation, President's reception, General Faculty meeting on April 8.

On April 13, 1982, the Senate Secretary forwarded the following message of Senate appreciation to President William S. Banowsky regarding the reception that he had hosted following the General Faculty meeting on April 8:

> "At the Faculty Senate meeting on April 12, many favorable and laudatory comments were made about the reception hosted by you, President Banowsky, following the April 8 meeting of the General Faculty on this campus.
>
> "The consensus of the Senate was that this precedent-setting social function was a most appropriate opportunity to honor recipients of various faculty awards and honors and, at the same time, allow Norman campus faculty to experience collegiality and fellowship. The large turnout certainly attests to the favorable reaction of the faculty. The faculty would like to see this event become an annual function.
>
> We appreciate very much your making the affair possible by providing the food, refreshments, and music."

(Please see item immediately preceding.)

REPORT OF SENATE SECRETARY: Spring meeting, Oklahoma Conference of Faculty Organizations.

Dr. Anthony S. Lis, Senate Secretary, represented the Norman campus Senate at the spring meeting of the Oklahoma Conference of Faculty Organizations on Friday, April 16, at Oscar Rose Junior College, Midwest City. Because of schedule conflicts, the Senate Chair and the Senate Chair-elect were unable to attend the meeting.

Thirty-seven faculty members represented seventeen private and public institutions of higher education throughout Oklahoma.

The morning session featured the following panel on the subject of "How Faculty Organizations Can Influence Quality Education":

Dr. Joe Leone, Chancelor, State Regents for Higher Education
Dr. Leon Hibbs, President, Southeastern State University, Durant
Dr. Anthony S. Lis, Secretary, Faculty Senate, (Norman campus)

FINAL REPORT: Senate Committee on International Dimension of University

Background information: Last fall, several Senate ad hoc Committees were appointed to prepare in-depth reports on areas of faculty concern for subsequent inclusion in the 1982 Faculty Position Paper. One such area was the international dimension of the University of Oklahoma. (Please see page 4 of the Senate Journal for October 19, 1981.)

Copies of the final report were distributed to Senate members in advance of this meeting.

Senate action: In formally presenting the report for Senate consideration and action, Professor Sidney Brown, Committee Chair, called the document "an honest but not altogether flattering report of the University." In his view, the in-house report was meant for perusal by primarily individuals inside the University. "We are giving some free advice to the administration."

Professor Brown next introduced the following members of the Committee present at this session:

Jidlaph Kamoche Director, African and Afro-American Studies
William Meyers Latin American Studies Committee
S. R. Gollahalli (AMNE)
Yusif El-Ibiary (Electrical Engineering)
William Huseman (Modern Languages)

After calling attention to some of the committee's recommendations, Professor Brown moved acceptance of the report. Following a short discussion of this question, the Senate approved, without dissent, the report that is reproduced in full on pages 7-12 of this Journal.

FINAL REPORT: Senate Committee, General Education

Background information: At the Norman campus General Faculty meeting on April 19, 1981, Regent President Dee A. Replogle, Jr., urged that the general education requirements at the University of Oklahoma be investigated.

Provost J. R. Morris appointed the following Administrative Advisory Committee during the summer of 1981 to study procedures for implementing general education requirements:

Provost J. R. Morris, Chair
Associate Provost Joseph Ray
Dean James Burwell, College of Arts and Sciences
Dean Martin Jischke, College of Engineering
Dean Jerome Weber, University College
Professor Greg Kunesh, Senate Chair, 1980-81
Professor Gary Thompson, Senate Chair, 1981-82

The final report of the Committee, which was presented to the University Regents on September 16, 1981, recommended that the Faculty Senate (Norman campus) appoint a committee to work with the Administrative Advisory Committee in exploring some of the questions raised concerning general education on this campus.

In October, 1981, in a speech to the Norman campus General Faculty, President William S. Banowsky endorsed the efforts to implement general education requirements at the University of Oklahoma, Norman campus. He urged the Faculty Senate to take the initiative in investigating available methods of structuring general education requirements and formulating specific recommendations.

In October, 1981, a special Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on General Education was established. The Committee was composed of 17 faculty members from various colleges and included an ex-officio student member. Professor John Dunn (Anthropology) was the Chairperson. (Please see pages 17-18, Senate Journal, November 9, 1981, and pages 7-8, Senate Journal, December 14, 1981.)

The Committee was charged to report to the Faculty Senate after undertaking the following:

(1) Study the nature and the extent of the general education at the University of Oklahoma, as well as the character of the courses provided for students to meet these requirements;

(2) Review studies of general education at other universities; and

(3) Make recommendations concerning general education at the University of Oklahoma.

In March 1982, the General Education Committee submitted a preliminary report to the Board of Regents on the progress made by the committee to date. The Committee reported its findings regarding the status of general education at other universities and stated its conclusions regarding the objectives to be served by general education at the University of Oklahoma. This report received considerable attention, both on and off the campus. (Please see pages 10-13 of the Senate Journal for February 8, 1982.)

This topic was discussed at great length by the Executive Committees of the Faculty Council, Oklahoma State University, and the Faculty Senates on the Norman campus and at the Health Sciences Center at their annual retreat on April 2-4, 1982, at the Kerr Conference Center in Poteau.

On April 26, 1982, the General Education Committee issued its final report including specific recommendations regarding a general education model for the University of Oklahoma. These recommendations encompassed the following three areas:

(1) institution of admission requirements for entrance to the University;

(2) adoption by the various colleges of distribution requirements to assure each student a broad and meaningful general education experience; and

(3) formulation of a senior-project requirement by the various colleges to integrate the student's major field of study into general knowledge.

Senate action: Professor Thompson, Senate Chair, reviewed the history of this issue on this campus. He noted that Professor John Dunn, Committee Chair, had attended a national conference on this subject in Baltimore last week.

Professor Dunn prefaced his 30-minute, informal presentation with expressions of appreciation to Regent Dan Little for his presence at this session, to Provost J. R. Morris for funding his attendance at the Baltimore conference during the previous week, and to the Committee members who had joined him at this meeting of the Senate.

He next called attention to the fact that the Appendix B is an abstract of a 23-page report prepared by Professor Gordon Atkinson, Committee member. The full report will be submitted to the Senate office for faculty review and study.

Following the progress report last spring, the Committee contacted all units on campus for permission to submit a questionnaire to the faculty. Most units participated. The 112 responses (about 25 percent of the faculty involved) indicated the following faculty reaction:

66 percent felt that the Committee recommendations would result in improved general education in their college,
22 percent were uncertain, and
12 percent responded negatively.

Professor Dunn next detailed some of the findings reported in various national studies of general education programs. He noted particularly the current deliberations and proposals being considered at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville.

In the Committee's opinion, general education includes the following components: (1) so-called remedial work, (2) distribution requirements, and (3) a bridge between the major and general knowledge. Distribution requirements were defined by the Committee in terms of educational goals rather than discipline categories--a unique and rare approach, according to Professor Dunn.

In conclusion, he called his Committee "a fine group of people who had worked very hard in producing a proposal that constitutes a master plan for one of the best programs in general education in America."

Taking note of Regent Little's presence, Professor Smith raised the issue of the State Regents' articulation policy and stressed the need to work closely in this matter with OSU counterparts.

Professor Gross urged that course sequencing "not become a grab bag." To avoid "Mickey Mouse" courses, he urged establishing "rigorous standards and insisting on a commitment from the University to reward faculty with released time." He suggested that the largess now being utilized for research, salary raises, and the like also be used to fund the improvement of general education.

Professor Thompson, Senate Chair, reiterated several times the feeling of the Senate Executive Committee that this report represents the keen interest of the faculty in raising the academic standards on this campus, that the report should be submitted to the Provost with the strong recommendation that the various colleges give this matter serious consideration, and that any implementation by the various colleges should be monitored carefully and consistently. Professor Baker moved the approval of the Committee report in accordance with the recommendations of the Senate Executive Committee.

Professor Biro stressed the vital role of effective advising in each college in implementing any general education programs. He moved that the colleges be asked concurrently to consider their advising systems in the light of their decisions to implement the general education proposal. The motion was approved without dissent.

The Senate then approved, also without dissent, the acceptance of the Committee report as amended.

In responding to Professor Smith's comment, Regent Little stated that, in his opinion, this issue can be approached from two levels--the "superior" student who should be given the opportunity to become a truly educated person and (2) the student seeking minimal requirements. In his view, "If we can persuade the State Regents and the junior colleges of the legitimate, genuine role of the junior colleges in providing remedial education, the articulation policy could be changed." He concluded with the comment, "I see this proposal as an opportunity for the University of Oklahoma. I am very encouraged by all this and hope that we can do something with this."

(The full text of the report follows on pages 13-29 of this Journal.)

The Senate adjourned at 4:45 p.m. The next regular session of the Faculty Senate will be held at 3:00 p.m., on Monday, May 10, 1982, in Dale Hall 125.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony S. Lis

Anthony S. Lis
Professor of
Business Administration
Secretary, Faculty Senate

REPORT OF THE SENATE ad hoc COMMITTEE ON THE INTERNATIONAL DIMENSIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

(approved by the Faculty Senate, Norman campus, on May 3, 1982)

INTRODUCTION

This Senate ad hoc Committee was commissioned to examine the international dimensions of academic programs at the University of Oklahoma and the University's utilization of, and assistance to, its international faculty and students. Subsequently, the Committee met six times, and it presents herewith its findings, together with recommendations for action by the University.

One Committee limited its survey to the following subjects: (1) foreign language instruction, (2) the international component of general education, (3) foreign area studies, (4) faculty and student experience abroad, (5) international students, (6) foreign faculty, (7) foreign language newspapers in the University Library.

In the course of our investigations, one or another of the committee members conferred with Richard Hancock, International Service Officer; Millie Audas, International Student Advisor; Joseph Ray, Associate Provost, and Hugh MacNiven, former Chairman of the World Affairs Council, which is now defunct.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The Committee's conclusions are (1) that the University of Oklahoma is generally doing a good job with its large contingent of international students, who make up 8% of its student body as opposed to a national average of 2% (2) but that the University has historically underemphasized the international dimension of its academic program. The Committee is encouraged, however, by the recent observation of President William S. Banowsky that "the era of educational parochialism is drawing to a close" here. The President was also quoted as saying that "our inability to talk in a second language is scandalous," implying that something will be done about the problem. Furthermore, the Committee is gratified that Dean James R. Burwell of the College of Arts and Sciences has recently cooperated in authorizing positions in Chinese history and in Japanese language and literature.

Underemphasis on the world outside America and Europe in the curriculum of the University of Oklahoma derives in part from geographical location. Its interior position insulated it from international concerns in an earlier, simpler age. Still, the University of Kansas and the University of Colorado. similarly located, have done much more than we have. Inconstancy of administrative purpose is another cause of the underdevelopment of international studies at the University of Oklahoma. Isolated initiatives have not added up to a coherent program. World War II led President Joseph Brandt to commission a course on the Far East under Drs. Royden Dangerfield and William E. Livezey, for example, and to arrange for courses on the Japanese language. The postwar years brought abandonment of the Japanese courses, though a continuation of a limited program on the Far East.

When the nationwide movement to establish language and foreign area centers flourished from 1958 to 1962 under Title VI of the National Defense Education Act (in the wake of Sputnik), the University of Oklahoma received none of the 105 center grants awarded across the country. Nor was any NDEA center ever located in Oklahoma, though Kansas had four at that time.

Note should be taken of a limited initiative in Russian studies, building on the pioneering work of Dr. Stuart Tompkins--a major historian of Russia--and continuing with the organizational contribution of Dr. John Ericson in the 1960s. Afterwards, the Russian program, including the Munich Center, was dismantled in the face of budget crunches.

Unevenness has characterized many of our international undertakings. All of us are justifiably proud of World Literature Today, which awards the Neustadt Prize, "America's Nobel" in literature. Yet it is sobering to reflect that there is no Department of Comparative Literature at the University of Oklahoma and that our students are unable to study the literatures and the languages of most of the countries covered in that journal.

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

The Committee is agreed that one aspect of the erosion of academic quality at the University of Oklahoma has been the dropping of the foreign language requirement, which even in its heyday affected only those students in the College of Arts and Sciences.

The Committee strongly supports the ad hoc Committee on General Education in its proposals to restore the language requirement through the intermediate course, a minimum of five hours of sophomore level work in one language. Only the College of Arts and Sciences has had such a requirement in the past, and restoration of that requirement is a minimal recommendation. The College of Business Administration should give consideration to directing a substantial number of students into appropriate language courses now that international competition and interdependence are part of reality for most modern business enterprises.

At the same time, the Department of Modern Languages should be encouraged to try innovative approaches to teaching, and it should develop the languages of the future, Japanese and Chinese, along with the European languages which are part of our heritage. Japan, the principal overseas trading partner, and newly opened China, home of a billion people, will figure prominently in the lives of University graduates of the 1980s.

GENERAL EDUCATION

One of the six basic characteristics of educated men and women, according to the 1981 Harvard Report on "Core" Curriculum, is an awareness of "other cultures and other times." "Other cultures" as interpreted by Dean Henry Rosovsky, chief patron of the report, means the cultures of the world beyond Europe. Our Committee concurs. It believes that the holder of the Bachelor of Arts degree might reasonably be expected to take one three-hour course on a non-Western culture. If the General Education Committee recommends a list of courses

from which the student may select his humanities and social science requirements, some of those should be courses on Africa, Asia, Latin America, or Russia, designed to acquaint the student with the history, art, literature, religion, philosophy, and society of one of those areas.

FOREIGN AREA STUDIES

To provide a base for such offerings and to effect a more cosmopolitan academic environment, the University of Oklahoma should strengthen its foreign area studies programs. A perusal of the list of public and private members of the Association of American Universities reveals that those are the institutions which have the strong area studies programs. The term "area studies" has come to refer to interdisciplinary programs, involving such fields as political science, history, literature, sociology, and the foreign languages of a particular region or country. Africa, East Asia, Latin America, and Russia are the areas most commonly selected. In 1976, twenty-four of the federally funded NDEA centers were awarded to fourteen of the twenty-four public members of the AAU.

To qualify for such a center, a minimal local contribution must be made--e.g., the applying university must offer two languages relevant to the area. Portuguese, as well as Spanish, must be taught in a Latin American studies center. In none of the areas did the University of Oklahoma qualify; nor were applications submitted from here.

The four programs that have been authorized at the University of Oklahoma are those in African and Afro-American Studies, in Asian Studies, in Latin American Studies, and in Russian Studies. In the first, a "concentration" of work is offered; in the latter three, a major is given in the College of Arts and Sciences. The rationale for these programs is that they allow a select group of students to focus on an area in depth and they also provide courses for the general student who is majoring in one of the disciplines. Ideally, a small faculty of persons trained in the languages and cultures of their respective areas should be assembled for each.

It is the observation of the Committee that most departments in the humanities and social sciences have their specialists on Latin American and Russia; but hardly any have bona fide specialists, schooled in language and culture, on East Asia and Africa. Departments tend to be conservative and provincial. They hire more and more persons with local and regional interests--or at best national but remain understaffed in the foreign area studies field. It is the departments which "make or break" the programs. Under the existing university system, departments determine their own curriculum, establish specialties for personnel to be recruited, and determine how library funds shall be expended.

Some modification of administrative procedure is essential if foreign area studies programs are to flourish at the University of Oklahoma. A different balance between the interests of the department and those of the university as a whole must be effected. To have the proper offerings, and to balance its academic programs in the humanities and in the social sciences, the central administration of the University of Oklahoma must declare a policy of support for foreign area studies programs and advance incentives and rewards for faculty

members and departments that consciously promote the policy of enlarging international perspectives.

One possibility is that chairmen of the existing committees on Latin America, Africa, and Asia should have control of salary budgets and a voice in faculty expansion decisions, sharing these with the departments. Such proposals, put forward sporadically by the committees, have not won endorsement. A more realistic proposal might be that an Associate Dean in the College of Arts and Sciences should have authority, including financial control, to develop comprehensive programs among all departments. If broader perspective is desired to include academic departments beyond the College of Arts and Sciences--e.g., art history, music, and economics--an Associate Provost might take control. In any event, the person in charge should be someone in the academic chain of command conversant with the programs, not a person outside it. As matters now stand, several of the social science departments virtually ignore the experience of a vast majority of the world's people in their teaching and research. To take the example of the Asian Studies program, several departments dropped their Asia positions or courses in the 1970s--geography, art history, political science, and anthropology (the specialist on India). Sociology has never had such positions. Resolution of the administrative problem of creation and selection of appropriate positions is fundamental to the development of foreign area studies at the University of Oklahoma.

FACULTY EXCHANGE AND STUDY ABROAD

Foreign experience is indispensable to the area specialist. But it is broadening to any professor or student in the 1980s. The University of of Oklahoma now operates a number of programs which take professors and students abroad. Some of the best are in the technology of coal and oil--exchange agreements with the Technology University of West Berlin and the Central University of Caracas, Venezuela. The Department of Modern Languages sponsors an annual eight-week summer program for students of French at the University of Grenoble, while the Classics Department has recently sponsored tours of Greece and Rome. The Oxford Seminars of the College of Liberal Studies represent other equally good contributions to study abroad.

In spite of individual or departmental initiatives, the University of Oklahoma does not offer the range of opportunities for experience abroad available at other institutions in its peer group. Relatively few graduate students obtain Fulbrights. When it happens, it is an occasion. Successful competition for Fulbright grants should become routine. The International Service Officer will make a greater recruiting effort as his position reaches its potential. Individual professors ought to groom their brightest students for the competition.

What the Committee proposes is to provide a regular and certain avenue to foreign experience, as opposed to individual and unplanned travel. An administrator at the highest level, the President or the Provost, should establish ties with a sister university in a foreign country. Only one such link should be forged at the outset. A university comparable in status and development to our own is the logical partner. Committee members have advanced the names of universities in Kenya, in Mexico, in Germany, and in Japan as possibilities. Those students who go should be our very best students, groomed especially for the junior year abroad, supported by University Associates money,

so that not just those who can pay for it go.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Whenever possible, American students should be placed in contact with international students of whom there were 1617 from 80 countries on the campus of the University of Oklahoma in the fall of 1981. Twenty-eight formally recognized international student organizations represent them (at least that was the number when the preliminary draft of the report was made).

The International Office acts as a liaison between international students and the rest of the university and the community. It is doing a commendable job. The only suggestion for improvement is for an International Center in which periodicals from various countries, lounge space, and meeting rooms are available. It is noted also that the International Office has a small number of professional advisers for such a large number of students. More might be employed.

FOREIGN FACULTY

The University has recently taken steps to smooth the process of hiring foreign faculty members by assigning visa problems to a single person, the International Service Officer, who is responsible to the Provost directly. These faculty members provide us with a cosmopolitan atmosphere especially in the College of Engineering and in the sciences. They are the logical persons to initiate faculty and student exchanges with their home countries and to provide a flow of guest lecturers from them. Because it promises to add to the foreign contingent and to give local professors foreign experience, Provost J. R. Morris should be commended for his memorandum of November 24, 1981, calling the attention of all faculty to the opportunity of entering into a faculty exchange arrangement with a foreign institution of higher education.

FOREIGN NEWSPAPERS

Our recommendation to the Library is that foreign newspapers, and especially foreign language newspapers, be carefully selected in the future. It is our understanding that a review of newspaper subscriptions is currently underway and that the list will be revised. Often the Library receives, sometimes without charge, foreign papers which represent narrow political viewpoints but do not exemplify the journalistic excellence of major newspapers published in the same country. We should identify the most important paper in each country and, insofar as resources permit, subscribe to it. Put the propoganda organs in the stacks.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, the ad hoc Committee on the International Dimension of the University makes the following specific recommendations:

1) Restore the foreign language requirement to the program of the College of Arts and Sciences.

2) Introduce an international component into the general education

program to make students aware of "other cultures and other times," particularly the cultures of Africa, Asia, Latin America, or Russia.

3) Make a University commitment to develop viable foreign area studies programs, appointing an administrator with real authority as Associate Dean or Associate Provost, to give rewards and incentives to individuals and departments which cooperate.

4) Encourage faculty exchange and study abroad by developing a sister university relationship with an appropriate foreign university for across-the-board exchanges.

5) Continue the generally excellent program for international students but support it when funds become available with more professional advisers, an international center, and more balanced selection of foreign students.

6) Use foreign faculty members for facilitating exchanges.

7) Replace second-rate foreign newspapers in the daily press section of the Library with papers of the first rank.

Respectfully submitted,

Sidney D. Brown (History), Chair
Yousif El-Ibiary (Electrical Engineering)
Subramanyam Gollahalli (AMNE)
William Huseman (Modern Languages)
Jidlaph Kamoche (African/Afro-American Studies)
William Meyers (Latin American Studies)
James Wainner (Music)

April 26, 1982

University of Oklahoma
Norman

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION

I. Introduction. Most if not all issues of concern in higher education seem to come and go like the tides. The coincidence of national concerns and the concerns of the higher education community thrust these issues into prominence and then bury them under new issues. The issue whose time has come now is general education. By general education, we mean that body of courses that is clearly outside the requirements of students' major disciplines. Such courses are intended to educate the student to be a thinking, functioning member of society and not just a technician.

But why has this concern for general education arisen now? It is related to a new mood in the student body, reflecting and/or reacting to a changed set of values in society. In the sixties, the dominant cry was "relevance." The universities attempted to respond even though the response was often as ill defined and disorganized as the cry. The universities did become more involved with student concerns and problems. Despite the great tensions caused by the Vietnam War, the economic times were good and few students worried about their economic future. After all, everyone who went to college improved him/herself.

Now the economic and political situation has changed, and with it have come new student attitudes. There is still faith in higher education as a means to a better life. But that faith is being expressed more and more as a concern with vocational education. Enrollments in fields such as engineering, business, and geology are booming. Enrollments in many traditional arts and humanities fields are dropping. In this respect, the recent demise of the Arts and Sciences language requirement is more a symptom than a disease.

The University's response to these changes has been mixed. Clearly, there are practical self-serving concerns as some departments are buried in warm bodies while others must cancel classes for lack of enrollment. At the same time, there is a very real worry about graduating narrow individuals incapable of functioning as intelligent citizens in our pluralistic society and greatly shrunken world.

The University must be more than an upper-level vocational training school. We do have a responsibility to educate students not just prepare them for a job. This report is intended to address this problem in the context of the University of Oklahoma. We are a state university in a state whose desire for higher education has generally surpassed its ability to pay for it. Reviewing the history of this University, one is constantly amazed by the quality of education provided considering the funds available. Truly the students at this university have received a far better education than they had any reason to expect. Yet a vast number of students who enter the University of Oklahoma never graduate. Many who do graduate are not well prepared to compete in an increasingly stringent national job market. We do no favor to students from mediocre secondary schools when we pass them through the University with a combination of high school remedial work and college courses and then turn them loose in the world.

Very early in this Committee's deliberations it became clear that we must address general education in a context that extends from high school preparation to beyond graduation from the University.

II. General Education Programs at Other Universities. The Committee surveyed the general education programs of a select group of regional AAU universities and other large comprehensive universities that generally have a good reputation for offering quality education. The group consisted of (i) regional AAU universities: Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Texas; (ii) other comprehensive universities: California at Berkeley, California at Los Angeles, Harvard, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Purdue, Stanford, Washington--13 universities in all.

The Committee collected two kinds of information about the general education programs at these universities: (i) the general education requirements for the specific colleges within each university, (ii) the kinds of general education courses offered.

Most of the universities identified three categories of requirements: (i) science and mathematics (13 out of 13); (ii) humanities (11/13); and (iii) social sciences other than American government and American history (12/13). Several (8/13) required foreign language and/or a foreign culture area. All required English composition. A few (4/13) required American history and/or American government. On the average, about one-third of the total baccalaureate curriculum was devoted to general education requirements.

None of these universities offered general education cores; i.e., sets of uniform, universally required courses. All took a "shopping list" approach to general education, allowing many, if not all, courses offered to satisfy one or more general education requirements. Harvard's much publicized "core" is in fact a somewhat restricted shopping list. Appendix A summarizes the general education requirements for the College of Arts and Sciences (or their equivalents) from the 13 universities. Appendix B summarizes the general education course offerings from the universities surveyed.

Most of the universities surveyed have some sort of mechanism (general education committee, council, director, dean) for generating and monitoring a list of courses that satisfy distribution requirements. In very few cases did the list appear to be actually selective. Although most of the universities offer interdisciplinary and integrative courses, in no university do such courses play an especially prominent role in the general education program.

The Committee found the general education programs surveyed (with the exception of those at Harvard and Stanford) to be uninspired and disappointing.

The committee then considered a number of published sources dealing with curricular reform and general education, esp.,

(i) the Carnegie Foundation's "Quest for Common Learning Symposium," University of Chicago, April, 1981;

(ii) Arthur Chickering and others, Developing the College Curriculum, Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1977;

(iii) William Berquist and others, Designing Undergraduate Education, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981;

(iv) David Wee, On General Education: Guidelines for Reform, New Haven: Society for Values in Higher Education, 1981 (a report from the Project on General Education Models funded by Exxon Corporation and the Lilly Endowment).

The Committee's recommendations (see part IV of this report) were developed out of both its survey of the 13 comprehensive universities and its research in the curriculum reform literature.

III. Current General Education Programs on the Norman Campus. Degree requirements and, consequently, requirements in general education, are determined by the faculty of each college at the University of Oklahoma. As a result, there is no university-wide program in general education, and there is, in fact, marked variation from college to college in requirements stipulated as part of a general education program.

In terms of credit hours, the general education program of each of the colleges[1] is shown below; all of these numbers represent minimum requirements.

Arts and Sciences	33 hours of total 124
Education[2]	47 hours to total 124
Business Administration	32 hours of total 131 (plus 9 prescribed hours of mathematics)
Engineering	24 hours of total 127-133 (varies with program) (plus 27 prescribed hours of mathematics and science)

These numbers make possible a quick assessment of the portion of the degree program each college allots to general education. However, more important than the number is the nature of the coursework in each program. Part A below summarizes the coursework within five categories: language arts, social sociences, humanities, science and mathematics, and fine arts.

---

[1]The College of Fine Arts is omitted from the summaries since there is no college program in general education. Each school (e.g., Art, Music, Drama) devises its own curriculum; even within a school there are different curricula (e.g., music theory, music history, music composition, etc.). Appendix C attempts to give the College of Fine Arts some representation in this summary by listing two programs in general education, one for the degree in General Fine Arts and one for the specific degree in Art History.

[2]This summary reflects the current (1981-82) general education program in the College of Education. A new 52-hour program is to become effective with the fall term of 1982; it is included as Appendix D.

A. Nature of the Coursework in the General Education Programs. All the requirements listed here are college minima; many major programs have their own additional general education requirements.

1. Language Arts (Communications Skills). Every college requires six semester hours of freshman grammar and composition (English 1113, 1213, or equivalents).

Both Business Administration and Education require an additional three hours in this category. In Business Administration, the requirement is Communication 1113; in Education, the course must be one emphasizing "student proficiency in the use of the English language," selected from English, speech, journalism, library science, and drama.

No other college has an additional requirement in this category, although in Arts and Sciences, the student may elect to take additional work as part of the 33-hour general education core.

2. Social Sciences. Every college requires U.S. history (History 1483 or 1493) and U.S. government (Political Science 1113), both of which are regentially mandated. Note that Business Administration lists U.S. history under humanities rather than under social sciences.

Both Education and Business Administration have additional requirements. In Business Administration, the requirement is a total of 11 hours, which is to include Economics 1113. In Education, the student must complete 15 hours to include Psychology 1113 and Sociology 1113.

No other college has additional requirements, although Arts and Sciences students may select other social science courses as part of the 33-hour core. Also, see "Humanities" for a social science option available to students in Engineering.

3. Humanities. There is no requirement in this category that is common to all colleges; indeed, the category is defined differently from college to college.

Arts and Sciences requires a minimum of five hours chosen from history (not U.S.), history of science, literature, philosophy, and general humanities.

Business Administration requires a minimum of eight hours, but this includes the American history requirement (see "Social Sciences"). Thus, the student

must complete five additional hours selected from literature and any one of the following: history, philosophy, fine arts, classical culture, foreign language, general humanities.

Education (in a category labeled "Language, Literature, Philosophy") requires a minimum of nine hours, with courses from at least two of the areas designated by the title.

Engineering students must complete a 12-hour "Humanistic-Social Studies" program which, together with the six hours of required American history/government, makes a total of 18 hours in the program. Though exceptions may be made, students are expected to fulfill the 12-hour requirement with an integrated sequence from one department (Anthropology, Classics, Economics, English, Geography, History, History of Science, Philosophy, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology).

4. Science and Mathematics. There is no campus-wide requirement in this area, although in every college the student will have to complete at least one course in science.

Arts and Sciences requires a minimum of six hours of science (three in life science, three in physical science). There is no mathematics requirement, although a mathematics course may be chosen to satisfy part of the four-hour (two-course) requirement in a category entitled "Miscellaneous."

Business Administration requires four hours of science and (more as a part of professional preparation than of general education) nine prescribed hours of mathematics (Math 1443, 1743, 2123).

Education requires eight hours of science or mathematics (the hours may be all in science, all in mathematics, or distributed between the two).

Engineering makes no provision for science and mathematics in its general education program but requires 14 hours of mathematics (Math 1812, 1823, 2423, 2434, 3114) and nine hours of physical science (Physics 2514, 2524, Chemistry 1315) as a part of professional preparation.

5. Fine Arts. There is no requirement that is common to all colleges, and there is great variation from college to college in the provision made for the fine arts in general education.

Arts and Sciences has no required work in the fine arts. The student may elect to take a course in this area to satisfy part of the four-hour requirement in the "Miscellaneous" category.

Business Administration has no required work in this area, although a course in one of the fine arts is one of several options available as the third course to complete the "Humanities" component (see above).

Education students must complete six hours in a category called "Applied and Fine Arts" and defined to include home economics, office administration, accounting, management, aviation, photography, art, music, drama. In general, the college expects the student to elect one course from the "practical arts" and one from the "fine arts."

Engineering makes no provision for Fine Arts in its general education program.

IV. Recommendations for the Improvement of General Education on the Norman Campus of the University of Oklahoma. A general education does not consist merely of the knowledge that enables a person to do his/her job, but rather, it helps one attain a truly human awareness and responsibility, the ability to think creatively, and to become a productive citizen of his/her community. A general educaticn is a life-long quest. It can be achieved only partially by a set of undergraduate course requirements. It should have begun before the college years. It should continue beyond the first year of college into upper-division course work and eventually into post graduate life-long learning.

A. Curricular Entrance Requirements. Since a general education begins prior to college entrance, a high school curriculum should include a well-rounded general education for the college-bound student. However, we realize the necessity of admitting students whose high schools do not offer a college preparatory program. We believe the university should admit students from such high schools. However, when such students are admitted without meeting our requirements for an adequate high school preparation, both in terms of course work and level of achievement, they should be required to take remedial courses offered at the university through special programs designed to make up these deficiencies. Such non-credit remedial work should not satisfy general education requirements at the University.

We believe a minimum college preparation includes: (1) four units of secondary English, including both composition and grammar; (2) at least two units of college preparatory mathematics; (3) at least two units of a foreign language; (4) one unit in each of the following: biological sciences (with laboratory experience), physical sciences (with laboratory experience), history or government, and humanities or fine arts.

To put these curricular entrance requirements into some perspective, it is useful to examine the criteria for high school accreditation by the North Central Association. The Association requires the following course offering for full accreditation of a high school (each unit = one year): language arts (four units), science (four units), mathematics (four units), social studies (four units), foreign language (at least two units of one foreign language), fine arts (at least one unit in art and one unit in music), practical arts (four units), health and physical education (one unit).

It is clear that the requirements for North Central Association accreditation are stiffer than our proposed entrance requirements. At the present time, 34.4 percent of the public schools in Oklahoma are accredited by North Central. All but eight counties have at least one accredited high school.

B. College Level Curricular Requirements. General education should be fostered in two kinds of college curricular requirements:

* distribution requirements which give breadth of knowledge,

* major-concentration-support-requirements which relate the student's chosen major or profession to broader knowledge.

The committee believes distribution requirements are preferable to a rigid, uniform, core curriculum for several reasons. A uniform general education experience for all students is not desirable. Students should have received the basic common component of their education in the elementary and secondary schools. It is important that students have differing general education experiences that they can communicate to one another.

Core curricula have met with little success in large American colleges and universities. They have generally become sets of courses that lack the rigor of any

discipline. They have generally tended to provide relatively weak, poor educational experiences that have been disappointing and frustrating to students, faculty, and administrators alike.

The problems of the delivery of a uniform core at a large university are great if not overwhelming. It is generally more expensive than a distribution system. It is difficult to marshal broad-based faculty support for a common core.

1. The Distribution Requirements should give students the opportunity to learn about the experimental, quantitative, and systemic modes of thought. It should give them the opportunity to learn about the social, intellectual, aesthetic, and technological foundations of Western and other societies. The distribution requirements should also give students the opportunity to acquire advanced-level skills in English and intermediate-level skills in foreign languages and formal communications systems.

The distribution requirement categories identified in the preceding paragraph have been adapted from and represent a synthesis of:

(i) the six general education themes defined by the Carnegie Foundation's "Quest for Common Learning Symposium," (University of Chicago, April, 1981), specifically (1) shared use of symbols, (2) shared membership in institutions and groups, (3) production and consumption, (4) ordered and interdependent nature of the universe, (5) shared sense of time, (6) how values are formed and enforced;

(ii) Howard Bowen's catalogue of most common goals based on his survey of more than 1000 general education programs' goals statements (Bowen, Investment in Learning, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977), specifically (1) verbal skills, including acquaintance with a second language, (2) quantitative skills (mathematics and statistics), (3) substantive knowledge of the cultural heritage of the West and of other (non-Western) traditions, (4) ability to think logically and objectively, (5) intellectual tolerance, (6) aesthetic sensibility, (7) creativeness, (8) integrity, (9) balanced perspective, (10) good judgment, (11) prudence, (12) preparation for life-long learning;

(iii) Harvard's Dean Henry Rosovsky's six criteria for determining the success of an educational program as reflected in the characteristics of its graduates (cit. William Berquist and others, Designing Undergraduate Education, San Francisco: 1981, p. 262), specifically (1) ability to think and write clearly and effectively, (2) critical appreciation of the ways we gain knowledge and understanding of the universe, of society, and of ourselves (including mathematical and experimental methods, as well as the historical and quantitative techniques of the social sciences), (3) knowledge of other cultures and other times, (4) understanding of moral and ethical problems, (5) ability to reject shoddiness in all its many forms, (6) depth in some field of knowledge.

We believe a reasonable set of distributions requirements might include:

(i) at least three courses in experimental, quantitative, and/or systemic modes of thought, with at least one each from the physical, biological, and social sciences. Examples of some of the courses currently offered on the Norman campus that might fulfill this requirement include Chemistry 1614, which critically examines in chronological order the principal concepts and theories of chemistry; Botany/Zoology 2403, Ecology and the Environment; Psychology 1113, which places special emphasis on the scientific method and the mechanisms of adaptation; Philosophy 3123, Logic and the Scientific Method; . . . .

(ii) at least five courses, of which at least two must be upper division, that deal with the social, intellectual, aesthetic, and technological foundations of Western civilization. This requirement should be satisfied with courses from the humanities, from the fine arts, from the history of science, and with substantively oriented courses from the social sciences. This requirement might be satisfied with a sequence or sequences of courses in one discipline or subject area where that/those sequence(s) build into the upper-division level, or it might be satisfied with courses from several disciplines. Examples of some

of the courses currently offered on the Norman campus that might fulfill this requirement include English 2773, American Literature; History 2293, The Industrialization of Europe; Art History 1113, which involves an analysis of the principles underlying the visual arts and a consideration of formal, historical, and other factors in the valuation and enjoyment of objects of art; Philosophy 333, History of Modern Philosophy; History 3430, Women and Family in America; Drama 2713, History of Black Theatre; Economics 3523, Economics of Social Welfare; . . . . An example of a sequence that might satisfy part of this requirement would be History of Science 3013, 3023, 4863, History of Science to the Age of Newton, History of Science since the Seventeenth Century, American Science and Technology.

(iii) at least one course dealing with the social, intellectual, aesthetic, and/or technological foundations of at least one non-Western society. Examples of some of the courses currently offered that might fulfill this requirement include Classics/History 3053, Ancient Near Eastern Civilizations; Anthropology 3893, Maya, Aztec, and Inca: High Civilizations of Ancient America; History 2713, Survey of African Civilization; . . . .

(iv) at least five courses in communications skills. This requirement should be satisfied with at least two courses in English composition, with at least one intermediate-level course in a language other than English, and with at least one course in one of the formal communications systems; e.g., computer science, formal logic, linguistics, mathematics, statistics.

2. Major-Concentration-Support-Requirements. The college major should be more than a set of narrow, specialized, discipline-bound courses. It should include in addition, certain major-concentration-support-requirements that help students relate their major to general knowledge:

(i) an integrated set of courses (in a field related to the major) which adds both depth and breadth to the students' education, e.g., the mathematics sequence currently required of engineering majors, or a sequence of courses in linguistics for the English or modern languages major;

(ii) an upper-division course that places the major curriculum in its socio-historical milieu; such courses might be within the major department, e.g., an education major's course dealing with the role of the school in society, or it might be outside the major department, e.g., History of Science 4863, American Science and Technology, for engineering majors, or Philosophy 3713, History of Social and Political Philosophy, for political science majors and pre-law students;

(iii) a senior project that will allow students to demonstrate their knowledge of their major field and their ability to apply this knowledge to the definition and solution of problems and issues in contemporary life.

The senior project might be accomplished in a regularly scheduled class or as an individual special studies course. The students might work in teams or as individuals. The project should involve a written report. The synthesis and analysis used in the project should integrate the knowledge and methodologies from several courses in the student's curriculum. The successful accomplishment of such projects will require creative imagination on the part of faculty. The responsibility of monitoring these projects should rotate in the department to ensure a variety of approaches and to avoid potential degeneration to the routine. A couple of limited illustrations are given as examples:

(i) in the performing arts, the student might present a recital or other performance and write a report explaining the reasons for the way he/she chose to interpret the work. This analysis might include a study of the context in which the author/composer developed the work and an evaluation of other possible interpretation;

(ii) in history, the project might involve the study of some social or political development at some instant in history. This development could be examined in the context of various forces and parameters. The project might involve a comparison of these forces and parameters to contemporary conditions or to conditions in other historical or geographic settings.

Determination of the support requirements for the various majors should be the prerogative of the faculty of each of the major departments.

V. Administration of General Education. Each college within the University should be expected to implement its own general education program within the framework of the distributions and support requirements outlined above. Each should develop a mechanism for

(i) identifying those courses that have general education merit and that can thus be included in the college's distributions list,

(ii) continuously monitoring the courses in their distributions list,

(iii) giving advice and encouragement to the faculty in the development of new courses, including interdisciplinary ones, with general education value,

(iv) approving and monitoring the major-concentration-support-requirements developed by the individual departments and schools.

There should also be a university-wide mechanism for coordinating college-level general education governance.

Respectfully submitted,

Gordon Atkinson, Chemistry
Susan Caldwell, History of Art
Claude Duchon, Meteorology
John Dunn, Anthropology, Chair
Jean Marie Elliott, UOSA
Robert Ford, Finance
David Gross, English
Thomas Hill, Mathematics
Alexander Holmes, Economics, Vice Chair
William Huseman, Modern Languages
Beverly Joyce, University Libraries
Tom Love, AMNE
Jean McDonald, Political Science
Allan Ross, Music
Thomas Selland, Architecture
Jay Smith, Education
George Tauxe, CEES
Henry Tobias, History
Mary Whitmore, Zoology

Appendix A. General Education Requirements in Surveyed Arts and Sciences Colleges

	Regional AAU Universities				Other Comprehensive Universities								
Subject Area	Colorado	Kansas	Missouri	Texas	Berkeley	UCLA	Harvard	Illinois	Indiana	Michigan	Purdue	Stanford	Washington
English	6 hrs	6 - 9 hrs	proficiency or 3 hrs	9 hrs	6 - 9 hrs in comp & lit appreciation		6 hrs & proficiency	4 hrs or proficiency	6 hrs comp	proficiency or 6 hrs comp	6 hrs comp	3 hrs	6 hrs comp
History		6 hrs of West Civ	3 hrs Amer hist	6 hrs @ of Amer hist & gov't	proficiency or 6 hrs in Amer hist/Amer insts							3 hrs	
Humanities	6 hrs		more than 9 hrs	6 hrs of Amer culture	6 - 9 hrs	9 hrs	6 hrs	6 hrs	12 hrs	9 hrs	9 hrs in 3 areas	3 hrs	14 - 20 hrs
Foreign Language	2nd yr proficiency	16 hrs & proficiency		3 courses past 2nd yr high sch & proficiency				2nd yr proficiency	2nd yr proficiency	2nd yr proficiency			6 hrs
Science	6 hrs @ in 2 scs	4 to 5 hrs	9 hrs in sc & math	15 hrs	6 - 9 hrs	9 hrs @ in phys/life sciences	6 hrs	6 hrs @ in bio scs & in math/ phys scs	6 - 8 hrs @ in bio scs & in math/phys scs	12 hrs sc/ math w/lab	6 hrs sc/ math	6 hrs	14 - 20 hrs sc/math
Social Science	6 hrs @ in 2 sciences		more than 9 hrs	16 hrs from 4 diff sciences	6 - 9 hrs	9 hrs	6 hrs	6 hrs	12 hrs	12 hrs	9 hrs in 3 areas	6 hrs	14 - 20 hrs
Math		6 hrs of math or logic	proficiency or 3 hrs										
Other		3 hrs speech										10 hrs in West cult	
TOTALS	36+ hrs	41 - 45 hrs	36+ hrs	60+ hrs	30 - 42 hrs	48 - 51 hrs	24 hrs	28+ hrs	42+ hrs	36 hrs	30 hrs	31 hrs	48 - 66 hrs

Appendix B. Course Offerings in the Thirteen Universities That Have Special General Education Merit

1. Courses that satisfy the freshman English composition requirement.
   - A. Courses that include special and systematic exposure to the masterpieces of literature: Kansas, Texas, Berkeley, UCLA, Indiana, Stanford.
   - B. Writing courses gearing specifically to humanities, social science, or natural science majors: Colorado.
   - C. Specific introduction courses to the novel, short story, poetry, drama: Kansas.
   - D. Course in writing a research paper: Washington.
   - E. Courses which include training in oral communication, as well as composition: Illinois.

2. Courses in history, humanities, foreign languages, and social sciences.
   - A. Courses in Western civilization: Kansas, Stanford.
   - B. Courses in American culture: Texas.
   - C. Department of Integrated Studies: Colorado.

3. Science and Mathematics.
   - A. Special general education courses (not available for major credit, deal with concepts rather than specific skills): Berkeley, UCLA, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri, Texas, Washington.

4. Harvard University requires courses from five core areas. Each core area consists of a highly restricted and specially designed set of courses. One of the core areas is "social analysis and moral reasoning." Sixteen courses can be used to satisfy the requirement in this core area. Some of the titles of these courses are: (1) principles of economics, (2) conceptions of human nature, (3) crime and human nature, (4) reform, revolution, and hierarchy, (5) philosophy of law.

5. Stanford requires students to take a three-quarter course in the Western Culture Program. There are seven separate sequences of courses in the program. However, there is a common reading list for all of the course sequences. Examples of course sequences: (1) Europe from the Renaissance to the Present (History 1, 2, 3); (2) Ideas in Western Culture (Philosophy 5A, 5B, 5C); (3) Major Texts in Western Culture (Comparative Literature 21, 22, 23).

Appendix C. General Education Requirements in Fine Arts: BFA in General Fine Arts and BA in Art History

BA in Art History	BFA in General Fine Arts
English 1113 & 1213, or 1413,	English 1113, 1213,
History 1483 or 1493,	History 1483 or 1493,
16 hrs of humanities with at least one course each from three of the following areas: history, literature, philosophy, music or drama history/ appreciation,	9 hrs of English electives and 6 hrs of history electives,
Political Science 1113,	Political Science 1113,
12 hrs of social sciences selected from anthropology, economics, human geography, government, psychology, sociology,	
12 hrs of science and mathematics with at least one course each from three of the following areas: biological sciences, earth sciences, physical sciences, mathematics,	
4 courses in foreign language, at least two of which must be in French or German	
	12 hrs of fine arts electives

Appendix D. General Education Requirements in the College of Education, Norman Campus

(effective fall 1982)

1. Communication Skills: at least nine hours from courses that emphasize student proficiency in the use of the English language, including English 1113, 1213, and Communication 1113. In addition, students must pass an English proficiency examination.

2. Mathematics: at least one course.

3. United States History and Government: at least six hours, including History 1483 or 1493 and Political Science 1113.

4. Science: at least one course each in the physical sciences and the biological sciences.

5. Behavioral Sciences: at least one course, including either Anthropology 1113 or Psychology 1113 or Sociology 1113.

The general education requirement is for 52 hours of course work to include the five areas specified above, as well as work from areas 6 and 7.

6. Contemporary World Cultures: geography, economics, foreign languages, American ethnic studies, world literature.

7. Arts and Humanities: art, drama, music, literature, philosophy, classics.

Some course work must be taken from each of the above seven areas. In addition, students may opt to take some of their general education courses in the following two areas:

8. Practical Arts: business, home economics, computer science, library science.

9. Health and Physical Education