

GENERAL STUDIES COMMITTEE SECOND REPORT


IDEAS FOR FACULTY WORKSHOP CONSIDERATION

JULY 15, 1997



THE
RICHARD STOCKTON COLLEGE
OF NEW JERSEY

TO: The Faculty

FROM: Robert Helsabeck 
Chair, General Studies Comm.

SUBJECT: General Studies Committee, Second Report
Ideas for Faculty Workshop Consideration

DATE: July 15, 1997

The General Studies Committee over the past year has been attempting to fashion some modest reforms which reflect the unfinished ideas of former committees, the May, 96 Faculty Retreat, the Fall Faculty Conference of 97, and our own discussions occurring throughout the year. We have included several documents in the Appendices which reflect the extent of the discussion over some time and provide background for some of the ideas under consideration. (See App. A. to gain a sense of the previous committee's concerns and preliminary ideas leading to the May 96 Retreat and App. B. for the Results of the Retreat.)

In this document, we lay out ideas with enough detail to enable the faculty to engage in a serious consideration of each idea. We hope to gain a clear sense of the faculty disposition on these ideas from an upcoming deliberative workshop sponsored by the Union. (The Workshop is scheduled for August 29th, the Friday before Labor Day.) We expect to have the final document, the one appropriate for faculty "legislative action," ready for the November Assembly Meeting.

To facilitate focused discussions in the workshop, we are laying out the ideas as discrete "chunks" even though they are often connected and interdependent.

This report may contain far too much divergence for a reasonable one or two day discussion. It is offered as a variety of ideas we might consider--some immediately, some in the near future. We could also add to the list. We hope it provides some focal points to our deliberations and does justice to those who have contributed ideas in the past.

Finally, I would like personally to thank the members of this year's committee, the committees of the past few years, and the members of the faculty who continue doggedly to think of ways to improve the general education of our students and deliver courses to our delicious banquet!

REPORT TO THE FACULTY

As we think about the “delivery” of general education to our students, we should have the broadest view of the curricular resources available to us and should agree on the essential nature of General Studies courses. Then we can profitably consider changes in the way we structure the offering of courses and the General Studies requirements. Regardless of the outcomes of discussions of structure, we can consider various ideas which could be implemented regardless of structure.

I

The Curricular Resources: Courses available for the general education of students

As we consider reforming the curriculum, we should recall the variety of course types that are available to us. Some types we have used extensively, others are underdeveloped.

By Subject

1) *Integrative courses* (larger than disciplines)

[A] Broad survey courses that systematically survey our cultural heritage, (currently not developed widely in the curriculum).

[B] Courses focused on enduring questions (currently specified for GIS and occurring elsewhere in the curriculum).

[C] Interdisciplinary courses that introduce students to major divisions of knowledge, e.g., the social science disciplines as distinctive, but related bodies of knowledge (current GSS) or the nature and process of science, (current GNM).

2) *Topical courses* (often arising within the discipline, sometimes independent of a discipline) For General Studies, these topical courses reach beyond the discipline either in application or for additional perspectives. (All current categories)

3) *Program courses* (disciplinary offerings) Currently used for the ASD portion of general education. Used to “stretch” a student’s work beyond the major.

4) *Broad Intellectual Skills courses* (In BASK, General Studies, and across disciplines) Writing and Quantitative Reasoning courses and Critical Thinking.

By Pedagogy/Audience

5) *Seminars* (Most developed is the Freshman Seminar - regular General Studies courses offered specifically to Freshmen.) Currently Freshman Seminars involve infusions of bibliographic instruction, oral communication, and various attempts to connect the student to the larger academic culture.) We approved some years ago the use of the seminar mode for GIS courses and have moved in that direction, (e.g. limiting the size of GIS courses, offering GIS students collaborative-learning opportunities as seminar leaders, and as active-participants in the selection of materials and/or approaches to the reading in GIS courses).

6) *Collaborative Courses* (A special pedagogical approach particularly appropriate to *integrative courses*.) These courses involve the collaboration of several faculty in a common offering. Here at Stockton, we have offered team-taught courses where interdisciplinarity is central. Some years ago, "Bio-ethics" was first offered by a philosopher and biologist - a prototype of optimal team-teaching for our curriculum. A variation on the team taught course is the federated course with three persons from different disciplines teaching three courses which are tied together by a common theme involving a common set of students.

We have less experience with the model in which a larger group of faculty share the main lecture responsibilities followed by discussion sections lead by members of the "team." (Universities sometimes use this model for large intro. sections although those courses usually involve one lecturer and several graduate students. We could be more creative in General Studies.)

Finally, there is the model of a series of existing courses (could be Freshman Seminars or Senior Seminars or regular General Studies courses) sharing a common speaker series which relates to some common subject matter. (See App. for an example.) Allen Lacy in the early 70's put forward an idea he called "Master Courses" in which existing courses became sections of a larger course title reflecting the common intention of the section. "Analysis of Contemporary Issue" with appropriate existing courses making up several "sections" is an example of his idea. (His paper is available.)

7) *Experiential and Creative Courses*: (From the GAH Bulletin description) Courses in which students participate in experiential and/or creative activity in one or more of the arts and humanities disciplines in order to develop their own artistic and intellectual capabilities. (Common in GAH).

8) *Traditional and Non-traditional Lecture courses*: (e.g. Large section taught by Visiting Holocaust Studies Scholar; large-class "College & Careers" course offered by Bill Daly.)

II Nature of General Studies Courses

As regards the nature of General Studies courses, these attributes seem essential:

- 1) that they are transdisciplinary or interdisciplinary in one of several ways: either by applying knowledge beyond what is typical in program courses; or by considering the larger context of the subject; or by the drawing upon several disciplines;
- 2) that they are targeted to the non-major; and
- 3) that they are self-contained, free-standing, i.e., complete educational experiences in themselves.

III Goals of General Education (Outcomes)

In 1991, the Faculty approved a list of desirable general education outcomes (see App C. for revised list of 13 outcomes and the COEP Report which predated the list).

Soon thereafter, Jan Colijn, Dean of General Studies, asked faculty members to indicate which of the outcomes their courses served. He then conducted a transcript analysis to determine the relationship between what students actually take (the real curriculum) and what we desire as outcomes (the ideal curriculum.)

Concurrently, we incorporated the 13 outcomes into the approval/reconsideration process for General Studies Courses, expecting faculty to serve several outcomes in each of their courses.

Based upon the data from the Colijn transcript-analysis, and the day-to-day experience of many of us, we concluded that our students are not experiencing the full array of content areas that we agreed they should experience.¹

¹ A minority of current General Studies committee members are either not convinced of this conclusion, or don't feel that the problem merits our tampering with an otherwise valid general studies curriculum.

IV Achieving the Desired Outcomes

As the committee attempted to improve the "real curriculum" we considered several options. One option, advocated by a minority of the committee, was to leave the current General Studies curriculum in place, but do more to ensure that faculty honor the interdisciplinary goal of General Studies. What is needed, in this view, is much more investment in workshops and overall quality control. For example, if all GAH courses contain both art and humanities, then students are experiencing both arts **and** humanities. (The same could be said for other desired outcomes.)²

A minority of the committee felt that if the Additional Recommendations at the end of this report are adopted the current curriculum structure would do an excellent job of serving our student's general education needs. Other on the committee raised concern that this approach would not be adequate in assuring the content outcomes. (The lack of enough resources on an ongoing basis and the heterogeneous nature of the courses in the current G-categories mitigate against reliable educational outcomes.

A second option was the extensive use of "subscripts" like "W" and "Q" in which we would note an "I" for international awareness or an "A" for artistic sensitivity and so on through the list of desired outcomes. ("Subscript Option") This view has much charm. We would use the entire curriculum as a servant to general education and we could easily cut down on the current redundancy (GNM for science students, for example). After some consideration, we concluded that this was too complex to administer and that it might detract from the current use of such subscripts for the most basic of intellectual skills - writing and quantitative reasoning. (To enrich the workshop discussion however, we've included below (labeled Plan B) a description to show how this option could look.)

We finally chose a third option --the continued "across the curriculum" approach for the *Primary Goals* and *General Competencies* and a refinement of the current General Studies Curriculum offerings (Revised G-categories) to better serve the *General Content Experiences*. (Plan A, below)

² Disagreement occurred in the Committee regarding this definition of General Studies. The other view held that interdisciplinarity should be conceived more broadly. (See paragraph 1, p. 5 above.)

V
**Revised General Studies Curriculum
 (Plan A)**

The Committee believes that the present curriculum is effective in meeting the *Primary Goals* and, with one exception, (oral communication), the *General Competency* outcomes that we seek for our students' general education.

We believe that the two outcomes listed as *Primary Goals* ("1. Commitment to life-long learning and 2. " Commitment to citizenship...") and Items 3 ("Ability to reason..."), 6. ("Capacity for 'reflective reading'...") and 7 ("Development of a Conceptual Framework...") under *General Competencies* are broad outcomes that should be a consequence of the entire curriculum and don't need special notations attached to specific courses.

We also believe that our current system for assuring *General Competencies* in Writing (Item 5) and quantitative reasoning (Item 4) by means of W and Q courses across the curriculum is effective and should be preserved.

To better cover oral communication skills, we should emphasize the seminar-ness of the freshman seminars and perhaps in GIS courses as well. We could also add a unit on oral communication in the rhetoric and composition, as well as argument and persuasion, courses. By this means, we can avoid another "subscript" for these *General Competencies*.

For the *General Content Experiences*, we propose the following typology to increase the likelihood that our students encounter the full array of content areas. It is based upon the notion that we should try to bring our G-categories into alignment with our desire for the six *General Content Experiences* and that the more homogenous G-categories will more effectively serve these outcomes

General Studies Requirements Under New Structure: One course in each of the following categories: GAR GHU GSS GNS GIM GIS GEN. In addition, one elective G-course would be taken from a Division outside of the student's major. (See "Junior Year Experience" under Additional Recommendations.)

Content Objectives with Current Approach and Corresponding New Categories

Objective	Currently satisfied by courses in:	Would be better satisfied by courses in:
8. Artistic experience	GAH	GAR* (General Arts)
9. Science	GNM	GNS*(General Natural Sciences)
10. Historical Consciousness	GAH	GHU* (General Humanities)
11. International, Gender, Ethnicity	Across the Curriculum?	GIM* (International, Multi-Cultural)
12. Social Science	GSS	GSS (Social Science)
13. Values, Ethics	GIS	GIS (Integration & Synthesis)

* Newly defined G-category

We know that these objectives **cannot** be adequately fulfilled with only one course. We expect, however, that each content area will be served primarily in the named category, and secondarily in other G-courses and program courses. For example, values and ethics (an important component of GIS), would be addressed in many GHU and GSS (humanities) courses as well as GIS. It's just that GIS would have a special responsibility in values and ethics.

Also, it needs to be clear that some courses might have more than one reasonable "home," but would be a better fit for a particular g-category given its **primary** intent. For example, a given course in literature, might be offered in GAR if the emphasis were on contemporary creative expression or in GHU if a more historical perspective were taken, or in GIS if the emphasis were on broad value questions.

Several of you requested wording for each of the new categories. The following is preliminary language to facilitate the discussion.

GAR - General Arts courses are designed to further develop students' appreciation and understanding of artistic experiences - visual, performed, and written art. These courses sometimes involve the direct experience of the creative act and sometimes involves study of the products of other creators.

GHU - General Humanities courses are designed to provide students with an appreciation and understanding of the breadth and depth of the human experience. In the pursuit of the range of humanity, these courses draw from philosophy, literature or history. To gain a full perspective, courses in this category take a broadly historical approach.

GNS - General Natural Science courses are designed to accomplish at least one of the following outcomes: to increase students' understanding of the process of doing science, to deepen their appreciation of scientific ideas, or to experience the lives of real scientists. (The current excellent description for GNM (in the Bulletin) would remain essentially intact.)

GSS - General Social Science courses are designed to help students understand the process of developing social scientific knowledge; evaluate the fruits of others' research; and to analysis personal and social problems with an eye to effective personal decision-making or the creation of good public policy.

GIM - General International and Multi-Cultural courses are designed to broaden students perception beyond their own groups, nations, and cultures. Here the emphasis is upon understanding the relations between groups and cultures and gaining an awareness of the rich contributions of various cultures, and groups, whether based upon ethnicity, gender or class.

GEN - General Interdisciplinary Skills and Topics. [This description would remain essentially unchanged with only the addition of more explicit reference to both verbal and quantitative skill development.]

GIS - General Integration and Synthesis [This description would remain essentially unchanged.] It should be noted that question of an enduring quality, that transcend disciplines endure and transcend because they deal with matters of basic human values. It would be interesting to look at our GIS courses and see if they not only transcend a single discipline but also deal with human values. (We might wish to take the additional step of including the ethical and moral dimension of human activity as noted in the COEP report, App. C, p. 4)

Subscript Option (Plan B)

In this option, we would serve the *Primary Goals* and *General Competencies* as we do now, but we would address the *General Content Experiences* by the use of sub-scripts as we currently do for writing and quantitative reasoning "W" & "Q." **We would not change the current G-categories or requirements.** Students would still be required to take 32 General Studies credits, and 32 (BA) or 16 (BS) credits at some distance from their major.

We would label all courses which are appropriate for general education purposes (General Studies and selected Program Studies) with a sub-script to reflect the primary content. For example, courses in GAH which focus upon arts as well as Program Arts courses suitable to non-majors would carry the letters "AR." For Outcomes 8 through 13 we could use AR, NS, HI, CC, SS, VA. Students would be required to take two courses in each of the content areas.

A virtue of this schema is the more effective use of Program Courses in the ASD category to further our shared general-education goals. Science majors, for example, would automatically fulfill their "NS" requirement and would have room for other general education experiences more distant from their program.

The serious downside is the accounting problem. Various administrators hold varying views of the difficulty.

Mixed Option (Plan C)

In this Option, (a blending of Plans A and B), we would streamline the current G-categories to correspond to the discipline-based content areas that are less suited to an "across the curriculum" approach (arts, humanities, science, social science). We would deliver on the other *content experiences* (historical consciousness, #10; international and intergroup awareness, #11; and Values/Ethics, #13) by means of sub-scripts across the curriculum. For example, "International Awareness" could be served in any G-category. Asian Art and Ideas (currently in GAH) could carry an "I" as could "The World of Islam" currently in GIS. However, we would use a G-category to serve arts because art is a primary and distinctive way of knowing, not as likely to exist "across the curriculum."

This option could have six required G-courses and two electives as well as one (or two) courses in the sub-script areas. (If interest emerges on this option, we can work out the requirements and other features.)

VI Additional Recommendations

The following set of ideas have been discussed over the past few years and can stand alone, i.e. are not dependent upon a new topology. They are numbered for ease of reference in the workshop.

1. Implement A General Studies experience at the Junior Year perhaps tailored to incoming transfer students but also appropriate to our four-year students. We have considered several ideas for "collaborative courses" under this heading.

A.) The creation of a "Great Ideas" course taught by a dozen or so faculty, either as a special Junior GIS course, as part of the new GIM category, or in its own category, perhaps GHS (General Humanities and Science.)

B.) The development of several courses each involving 6-10 faculty members which might encompass the entirety of one of the new G-categories. For example, "Encounter with the Arts" for GAR; "The History of Ideas" for GHU; "World Civilizations" or "Science, Gender & Race" for GIM; "Breakthroughs in Science" for GNS are a few possibilities. (See the Walsh Proposal, App. D for a version of such courses.) Where appropriate, these courses could use existing or home grown video materials, outside speakers, and break-out discussion sections.

C.) The grouping of Junior level General Studies courses around common themes with a speaker series to support the courses. (See the Matlage/Ghorashi Proposal implemented last Fall, App E.) By offering these new courses at the Junior year, after the major is chosen, we could reasonably require students to choose a G-course from a category at some distance from their major. This junior courses would provide more humanities for the scientist and more science for the humanist.

2. Strengthen the Freshman Seminar. We would like to give some special attention to the freshman seminar effort. The freshman seminar can be seen not only as a course with a particular content, but also a linking structure to the broader academic culture. We have discussed ideas of linking freshman seminars to senior seminars in public debates or speeches; agreeing upon a theme for the year that all freshman seminars would link to at some point in the semester, much as we do now in bibliographic instruction and the AIDS presentation; ways of linking to the freshman convocation speech, the Student Senate Guest Speakers, and other invited speakers.

We need to have some workshop time and perhaps an ongoing coordinator/convener. A group dedicated to enriching this experience for first year students led by a convener seems a reasonable step at this time.

3. Sharpen the seminar'ness of the GIS Senior (or Capstone) Seminar. We wish to emphasize the interactive quality of the students' experience in their GIS courses while they engage enduring questions of human life. We have discussed also limiting the current GIS courses to seniors but some on the Committee like for students to take their GIS course in the second semester of their junior year. (We agree that taking the Senior Seminar in the first semester of the Junior Year, particularly for transfer students, is probably not optimal.) Perhaps we should consider a gathering of those of us teaching in this category, perhaps with the GIS convener, to explore some new possibilities for these courses.

4. Introduce a distinguished lecture series that can serve as a meeting ground for courses throughout the General Studies curriculum, particularly courses which "cluster" around a common theme. (Freshman or Senior Seminars or "collaborative" Junior-level courses. See App. E. for an example of a successful "trial.") Such a lecture series would contribute to the enrichment of the college-wide academic culture. The theme could be simply "Contemporary Issues" and deal with a variety of issues as they have emerged in a given semester. One of the educational benefits of such a lecture series is the development of the critical listening component of oral communication and the improvement of critical thinking and argument in general.

5. Improve our use of the ASD courses. Some of us believe that we should adopt a distribution requirement in the ASD requirement to insure a reasonable breadth of study. Other believe that we need the flexibility of the current unstructured requirement of ASD in order to allow for the pursuit of minors and adequate space for exploration. The latter view prevailed in the committee. We all believe however that it is important that ASD courses be, in fact "at some distance" from the major and not merely extensions of the major. With that concern in mind we think that the General Studies Committee, acting for the faculty as a whole, should engage in conversations with programs about their decisions as to what is at some distance from the major. The presence of minors which might be done in the ASD area makes these conversations all the more important. The definition of a student's general education is certainly a faculty-wide issue, not a program decision.

6. Reduce the Redundancy of a student's general education and his or her major. Related to the concerns in item 5 are the "opportunity costs" of a student in a particular major taking General Studies courses in that same area of study. An arts student taking an arts courses in General Studies or a science student taking a science General Studies courses, while perhaps gaining a useful generalists' perspective on their respective fields are foregoing a course which would provide him or her with greater breadth of study. A suggestion at the May faculty meeting to use pre-requisites (constraints?) on courses, e.g.,

“Not open to Biology majors” is one solution. The Junior requirement in Item #1, above is another.)

Another area needing attention under the redundancy problem is our current G-requirement for transfer students. Currently, students with 64 credits need only take a GIS course and any three G-courses. Perhaps we should specify that the G courses should be at some distance from the student's major. The committee considered recommending that Junior-Transfer students be required to take a GIS course, and that remaining general studies courses be from at least two different G-categories. (Again, some of the ideas in Item #1, above could be helpful here.)

7. Continue to improve the GS course review process. The committee is pleased with the recent efforts to review all courses in General Studies, but are struck by the unwieldiness of the process. Many Assembly-related faculty meetings take up the meeting modules and the process of course review is scattered across time and attended by only the convener, those with courses to be reviewed, and a few other loyal souls. Perhaps we can do better if we concentrate our efforts. Dedicating a special day in the Fall and Spring is one suggestion to make the process more central. (A point made from the retreat last summer.) A newly formed task force will be looking at a number of calendar issues this year. If the faculty supports a G-review day, implementation would be referred to the Calendar Task Force.

Standing committees to oversee each category may be superior to the “rolling membership” that seems common currently. The committee is open to suggestions. (If we create more homogeneous G-categories, perhaps the current approach will work better without revisions.)

8. Seek Greater Administrative/Institutional Support for General Studies Teaching. We feel acutely the need for a greater use of institutional resources to support faculty efforts to improve the existing General Studies Curriculum, to socialize new faculty into this curriculum, to reward their contributions, and to support collaborative efforts of the faculty to develop new courses, and to fund books, videos, speakers. This curriculum, perhaps more than most, requires collegial effort.

9. Revisit the “Alternative Avenues” issue in general education. Although the Committee has not had time to deal with this issue, it was raised at the Retreat and has been an issue for some years. The idea is simply that we should allow (encourage?) students to meet a higher standard of liberal education if they choose to and that we should articulate a few alternatives. Some years ago, Bill Gilmore developed an alternate route through the General Studies curriculum called *Legacies and Currencies: A Liberal Arts Curriculum for International Electronic Based Civilization*. (It is available upon request.) Also, two years ago, a group of faculty and administrators developed an honors curriculum which made heavy use of the general education component of a student's

education. (It also is available.) Perhaps it is time to take up these plans again or at least discuss the value of an articulation of "alternate avenues."

10. Recommit to the 2- or 1-course standard for General Studies teaching. Over the years, under the pressure of program needs, we have become too relaxed about the yearly standard of two-courses per faculty member in arts and science, and one-course for professional studies faculty. If General Studies teaching becomes voluntary, we run the risk of "The Tragedy of the Commons." Furthermore, demonstrating to the senior administration that we in a particular program can "get by" by teaching fewer General Studies courses harm ourselves and the general education of our students. The corollary is a matching commitment of the administration to value General Studies teaching.

We hope that this report will provide a sufficient range of ideas to stimulate a lively and productive discussion of the best course to follow after twenty-five years of experience. We know that the deliberative engagement of this faculty will be valuable regardless of the substantive outcome. We will either affirm what we are doing or we will change it. In either case we should be stronger in our resolve to provide the ideal general education for our students.

Appendix A

**March 25, 1996
Invitation to a Faculty
Reconsideration of
General Education
at
Stockton**

TO: The Faculty

FROM: Robert Helsabeck, Chair *Robert Helsabeck*
General Studies Committee

SUBJECT: An Invitation to a Faculty Reconsideration
of General Education at Stockton

DATE: March 25, 1996

After twenty-five years of providing for the general education of our students, we would do well as a Faculty to take stock of what is still working and what needs revision. This is what good faculties do, we oversee the curriculum. With this responsibility in mind, the General Studies Committee has undertaken an effort to prepare for and to promote a faculty-wide discussion of the state of general education at Stockton.

Over the past twenty-five years, we have made revisions in our manner of providing general education. Subsequent to the original design, we have instituted a writing requirement, a GIS requirement, a freshman seminar, a quantitative reasoning requirement and have reconfigured the G-categories. We have adopted various emphases such as international awareness, gender, race and class concerns, the impact of technology on society and have provided topical concentrations. We have tried federated courses, public lecture series, master courses and other initiatives. All these efforts have been done within our current structure — a highly discretionary, individually created set of courses, contributed to large substantive G-categories.

In many ways our structure has served us well and we may decide to make only incremental adjustments to solve some current problems. Conversely, we might conclude that radical revision is in order. In any case, it seems to some of us that the time is right to take a more comprehensive look at our structure and the aims underlying it. We then can decide either to reaffirm our approach or change it.

I would like to share with you some of the current thinking of the Committee pertaining to some strengths and weaknesses of our current efforts in general education and to indicate some of the ideas that are ongoing in our discussions. We would like also to invite you to contribute to the discussion both individually and collectively in a faculty-wide deliberation. We are planning a faculty event immediately after classes are concluded to engage in a consideration of general education at Stockton.

As we on the General Studies Committee have discussed our current approach to the provision of general education, we have reminded ourselves that our approach has two distinct aspects: the General Studies curriculum itself and Program Studies used for general education. Any serious look at the general education of Stockton students must include our use of both types of courses. First we considered General Studies per se.

Several virtues inherent in our approach to General Studies:

1. Because we teach as intellectuals as well as specialists in General Studies, we provide models of breadth of education. Also by teaching in this curriculum, we maintain a breadth of academic interests ourselves. Here, we address either a concern of our specialty relevant to a public beyond our majors or we address a concern that is larger than our disciplines. In either way we are required to think beyond the preparations of majors.
2. Because our courses are designed by ourselves individually, we generally bring greater vitality and interest to the course than would be the case in a course predesigned by textbook authors or a committee.
3. The requirement that all faculty contribute to our shared curriculum has been a uniting force in our academic life together. (Until the past few years, we benefited from our associations in college-supported workshops, bringing us in contact across program lines.) The G-group approval process for all General Studies courses and the Union-sponsored workshops are current manifestations of the "shared" curriculum.
4. Our interdisciplinary offerings reflect the reality that "real world" phenomena occur often across disciplinary lines. These offerings provide an important alternative to disciplinary courses.

Some problems inherent in our approach to General Studies:

1. We as a faculty have abrogated our responsibility to offer a collective judgment of what we consider most essential for a liberal education. We have assumed that we could, by agreeing upon broad underlying intentions, generate a good curriculum which reflects an implicit collective judgment. Through the summative effect of our personal judgments, we have created an extraordinary curriculum, but we deprive our efforts of collective wisdom. In addition to ourselves as individuals, we, as members of programs, divisions and the faculty as a whole, should work together in the creation of general education.
2. Although our students have available to them a rich and varied range of options, they don't experience a *coherent* academic culture. They study very little in common and therefore share no common academic experience. In this regard, a core curriculum has much to commend itself.

We need to determine if the benefits inherent in our current approach outweigh the costs. In addition to the "virtues and vices" of our fundamental approach, we have some "fixable" shortcomings in General Studies and our use of Program Studies (At Some Distance). We should address these either within our current structure or along with any substantial revision we might make.

1. The current G-categories are so heterogeneous, we have no assurance that a given student will have experienced even a reasonable sampling of the range of great ideas and matters of beauty that are part of our heritage. A refinement of the categories and more ongoing faculty collaboration might mitigate this shortcoming.
2. The faculty, absent the nourishing effects of annual workshops, has lost the keen edge of commitment to this curriculum. (We believe the recent Union workshops have certainly helped, but more is needed.) Some of the newer faculty have gotten the impression that the administration doesn't value the faculty's work in General Studies, others fail to see the underlying rationale of this curriculum and don't value what they do in General Studies, while still others feel "resource strapped" in their programs and have pulled back from General Studies. We must face these developments.
3. A few other inadequacies trouble some of us: the lack of sufficient work in oral communication, not enough General Studies tailored for the Junior/Senior student, and perhaps the inadvertent redundancy and "opportunity costs" of students' taking General Studies courses in areas in which they are majoring.

Beyond General Studies

In the use of the entire curriculum for a student's general education, we have rather successfully implemented an "across the curriculum" approach to serve two basic intellectual skills – writing and quantitative reasoning. However, we face some problems in the use of the "At some Distance" category. We conceived this use of program courses to assure breadth beyond a student's major, while allowing flexibility of design. In some cases it is being abused. (It was always considered a part of our general education effort. In the earliest years we required 64 credits in General Studies for BA students.) Some programs have virtually taken over the ASD category, either by severely limiting the definition of "cognates" or by over specifying requirements, effectively cutting back the students' general education to one quarter of the BA. The former DHE, before its demise, had adopted a state-wide policy requiring that *one half* of any student's work toward the baccalaureate be in general education. On paper, we meet that requirement. In practice, we do not. We need to consider some ways to make more effective use of this "second quarter" of a student's undergraduate work – the ASD.

This listing of inherent and "fixable" problems in no way suggests that we should abandon our approach to general education. It does suggest that we have some work to do.

To bring the Faculty up to speed with the Committee's deliberations, I have included a condensation of some ideas brought forth in the committee proceeding. We indulged ourselves with an assignment to imagine that each of us was Czar and could prescribe "de novo" the general education of our students. Rather than subject you to these papers at this time, we're providing a condensation of some of our ideas as a way to stimulate additional thinking in the faculty and administration.

I.

Ideas of one sort suggest an elaboration of "common intellectual competencies" required of all students. Currently, we have a writing and a quantitative reasoning requirement, delivered "across the curriculum" as well as an additional requirement in critical thinking in the BASK program. Some of us have proposed that we think comprehensively in terms of (1) *Acquiring Information* (reflective reading/listening, bibliographic skills, computer use; (2) *Processing Information* (numerical analysis, argument, writing); and (3) *Presenting Information* (writing, speaking, numerical presentation, graphic presentation. We could extend the current coding of courses ("W" and "Q") to include "S" for speaking and "C" for computer use. For this part of the student's general education, the entire curriculum is available for the fulfillment of such requirements.

II.

Ideas of another sort pertain to the organization of General Studies *categories*. How we arrange categories of courses affects very much the emphasis of a student's general education and makes a statement of what we value.

The first model is a slight modification of the current structure - broad areas of knowledge corresponding to the arts and sciences divisions. GAH would be separated into arts and humanities. The other categories would remain as they are.

The second model is based upon the idea of "Sound Judgment and Good Taste." (Erasmus.) The categories might include Aesthetic, historical, literary, scientific, ethical, and civic (public policy).

The third model is an organization based upon area studies, civilizations, or cultures. The categories might include: American, European, African, Asian or Latin American, and would include great ideas, events, books, and other creative works in arts and sciences from these "areas." This structure would require a high degree of collaboration and planning among faculty.

III.

Ideas of a third type highlight the resources we currently have available in the curriculum and additional resources that we could develop.

Types of Courses

1) *Integrative courses* (larger than disciplines) [A] Broad survey courses that systematically survey our cultural heritage, (currently not developed widely in the curriculum). [B] Courses focused on enduring questions (currently specified for GIS and occurring elsewhere in the curriculum). Either of these types of courses might be candidates for some form of a core curriculum.

- 2) *Topical courses* (raised within the discipline for an audience outside the discipline) One idea is to raise topical courses to the Jr./Sr. level to provide study at the "cutting edge" for the general student and to make better use of our General Studies requirement for transfer students.
- 3) *Program courses* (disciplinary offerings) Currently used for the ASD portion of general education. Used to "stretch" a student's work beyond the major, but are not systematic as a distribution requirement would be.
- 4) *Broad Intellectual Skills courses* (In BASK and across the curriculum) Writing and Quantitative Reasoning courses and Critical Thinking. (Possible extensions as suggested above.)
- 5) *Freshman Seminars* (Regular General Studies Courses offered specifically to Freshmen.) Currently these courses involve infusions of bibliographic instruction, oral communication, and various attempts to connect the student to the larger academic culture.) We could be more consistent in our efforts here.

Several ideas have been discussed in committee which have either been tried, proposed in the past, or seem to have promise: A freshman year package of prescribed courses; a Junior Year Colloquium involving a set of public lectures serving a series of related courses (Alan Matlage and Reza Ghorashi conducted a trial run of this idea this Fall Semester); a core curriculum offered as a set of three or four courses for Freshmen and Sophomores or as a core for Juniors and Seniors; Master Courses which pull together several existing courses under the common intentions (an early Alan Lacy idea); and integrating themes as done at Evergreen College. Ideas are continuing to emerge.

We of the General Studies Committee would like to invite you to propose your own idea of what you'd like as a general education approach at Stockton. (Another communiqué with specifics will follow.) At the end of the semester, "if the way be clear," we will hold a faculty working retreat to hear from one another on changes we might consider. Then the committee, with newly elected members in place, will resume work to see what revisions we ought to propose for consideration by the entire faculty. A fitting way to mark our 25th year as a college, don't you think!

Appendix B

**August 14, 1996
Report to Faculty on
May 1996 General Studies
Retreat**

TO: THE FACULTY

FROM: ROBERT HELSABECK *Robert Helsabeck*
CHAIR, GENERAL STUDIES COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: GENERAL STUDIES RETREAT (Late May, 1996)

DATE: AUGUST 14, 1996

On Friday, May 31, approximately 35 faculty and met from 9:30 until 2:30 for the purpose of considering the general education of our students. We taped the proceedings so a word-for-word record is available to those of you who might like some auditory diversion. (Thanks to Steve Kubricki for taping to proceedings and to Tom Kinsella for his note-taking.) In this communiqué, I will attempt to distill from the discussion the overall sense of the meeting as well as some areas of concern and some ideas proposed. I hope these "markings" will stimulate fruitful discussions this Fall. (I will not ascribe the comments to specific persons, but will merely note the substance, except when a fuller proposal is involved.)

The General Studies Committee conceived of this meeting as an opportunity to look at general education at Stockton "de novo." We didn't want to limit our ideas to only those suggestions which would fit into the current structure. However, as we got into the discussion, the opinions ranged from "starting over" to preserving the current structure, but fixing some of the deficiencies and engaging in other incremental changes. The prevailing view was that we have a system currently (the G-categories) that is quite open to almost any reforms we might wish to adopt and therefore ought to be preserved. Further, some concern was expressed that a "total overhaul" might result in the baby ending up in the yard with the bath water.

What was clear to us was the great value we place on our approach to general education at Stockton, and a concern that we preserve what we value. We value the individual initiative and creativity that our current approach encourages and even requires. We think our current courses offerings, while flawed (like any curriculum) provides an engaging and often exciting experience for our students. We take pleasure in personally providing to our students models of life-long learners, capable of some degree of breadth beyond the areas of our graduate study. Finally, we have appreciated over the years the occasions to work with one another as colleagues in this common curriculum.

However, even with those affirmative sentiments, we are aware that all is not well in our efforts to generally and liberally educate our students. In the meeting, we attempted to itemize some of our concerns and some of our suggestions for reform.

Some Concerns

The list of concerns is presented tersely, assuming you can fill out the arguments to fuel the Fall discussion.

1. Currently, we collaborate far too little as a faculty. We don't have the workshops we used to have and we haven't fashioned elements of our curriculum which would require us to collaborate. We have a highly individualistic curriculum that very much needs faculty collaboration for quality control and colleague support of common goals. Also, we suffer from the absence of curricular elements which would inherently involve collaboration, such as master courses or a core curriculum.
2. We make no statement, as a corporate faculty, of what we consider the most important ideas and creative offerings in our heritage. Presumably, we do the best we can as individuals in designing our courses, but we do little to make the more powerful collective value statement. We do say collectively that students should be able to write effectively, reason quantitatively, and have a sense of courses across broad areas of knowledge. Is this enough?
3. Some of us are becoming increasingly distressed at the absence of a vital academic culture at the college. We have too few colloquia, shared thematic commitments, and other student/faculty events which would bring us together intellectually. What we have is good but fragmentary.
4. We are distressed over the economic forces in the immediate geographic area and nationally that place a premium on efficiency and narrow career preparation. As we at the college respond to these pressures, we run a real risk of diminishing the classic liberalizing function of the college experience. We must preserve our dedication to civilize as well as to certify our students.
5. Over the years of the college, we have done less and less well in rewarding faculty for good work in General Studies. The newer faculty have the distinct impression that General Studies is an optional, add-on activity that takes a clear second place to offerings for the major. It is unnecessary to itemize the foundation for this perception. It is real. In addition, the ever-present tenure quota tends to focus a new faculty members on the next job to the detriment of General Studies.
6. We all feel good about the benefits of the Freshman Seminar, but feel that more needs to be done for the entering student, both the freshman student and the transfer student.

7. We are concerned that we may be paying "opportunity costs" in having students take G-courses in the same division of their major. These are courses that may be worthy, but take the place of other courses which might provide more breadth in a given student's course of study.

8. For some, the "At Some Distance" (ASD) category is unclear. For others, it is a place of program encroachment. The category, which was a simple attempt to "stretch" a student beyond cognate work, has too often been used in service to the major. We probably can do better with this segment of the graduation requirements.

9. We identified several "structural problems" in our efforts in general education. For example, if we want General Studies to be responsive to thematic concerns of the day, then an expectation that we plan courses two years in advance creates strains. If we place a premium on shortening the time students spend as undergraduates, then we squeeze the general education of those students. The use of four-credit courses, instead of three-credit courses, may limit the range of experiences students can have in their general education, and creates a feeling among programs that more courses are needed to "cover" the major. Furthermore, an inadequate allocation of faculty lines to stay up with the program demands tends to pull faculty away from General Studies teaching. The personnel process, focusing on the divisional rather than the college, emphasizes program rather than General Studies contributions. In general, we need to be on guard about matters of structure which work against our best efforts.

10. We obtain too little systematic feedback from our students about the effectiveness of General Studies. Although students are not in a position to determine their education, they are able to tell us how they are perceiving its effect. We may then be able to make adjustments to increase their sense of benefit.

11. Some of us are de-emphasizing General Studies in the advising process. (Spending time considering specific courses in the major, but leaving it entirely up to the student in choosing General Studies.)

These represent a distillation of the concerns raised. We invite each of you to bring forward your concerns if they are not represented here.

Suggested Revisions

During the proceedings, we considered a number of ideas for revision in General Studies. Some are incremental adjustments and other are more substantial reforms.)They are presented here in a conceptual rather than temporal order.)

1. The Creation of an Academic Culture. Several suggestions pertained to the desirability of improving the academic culture for both faculty and students. We could, for example, adopt a common theme for incoming freshmen with a common reading and some attention given in all freshmen seminars. A concrete suggestion for this Fall was the 96 election. (Its too late for a full blown program for this Fall, but some "tilting" in the direction of this theme is still possible.)

Various ideas for some element of "core" in the curriculum would also contribute to faculty collaboration and the strengthening of a common culture. Another idea was the drawing together the Freshman and Senior Seminars to address great issues of the day. Perhaps a debating society (a la Oxford Union) would be helpful.

Two ideas in a somewhat different vein still addressing the idea of academic culture, included the restoration of the "State of the Art" in General Studies in which all course syllabi in General Studies are published for a given year. Also more workshops to address curricular development in General Studies were also called for. We need to do more than teach good classes.

2. Some Form of a Core. Several participants suggested that we might adopt an element of a core curriculum without replacing the entire current General Studies requirement. Joe Walsh, unable to attend, submitted a proposal for several large courses, drawing heavily upon media support, which would present the three major divisions of knowledge (Arts and Humanities, Social Science, and Natural Science.) Joe suggested Eugene Weber's *The Western Tradition* as an example of an interdisciplinary course in the humanities. Others have suggested a similar type of course using "great ideas" courses tailored especially for junior and senior students, leaving the more topical courses for entering students. Fred Mench proposed that the faculty hold a major retreat every four years to consider the major question around which the General Studies courses should be organized. Many of the existing courses could, with a modest adjustment, be made to address the broad questions. Bill Gilmore has had on the table for several years a proposal called "Legacies and Currencies" which lays out a coherent sequence of courses (again drawing mainly from existing courses) confronting students with the best of the past and present viewed internationally. (Bill urges that we not look for one best approach to general education, but provide a variety of avenues to reach the same destination.) Ken Tompkins proposed an anti-core core (a core in the sense of areas of coherent and common concern, but not a core in any sense of permanence) which would be renegotiated every year. (Ken urges us to keep from becoming over invested in ANY structure.) He proposes to invite groups of three faculty to form alliances to offer three courses addressing a common theme. Students would enroll in three or four of these groupings to meet most of their general education requirement. (For those of you who remember the federated courses, may immediately understand this idea. Some of us have felt that the federated courses would have worked better for incoming transfer students rather than first year students.)

3. Other Ideas Consonant with the Current Structure. Some felt that the freshman seminar idea was a good one and should be expanded to a full year experience. Others felt that we should "beef up" the senior seminar to make a more substantial general education experience to end the students' education here at Stockton. Another participant suggested that we build upon the skills approach to general education but expand the list of desiderata. (A version of this idea went out to the faculty last spring, along with other possibilities. See attached memo.) Still another member suggested that we expand the G-categories to include GPROS with an emphasis on such things as the relationship of the individual to institutions, ethical concerns in the professions, communication skills and group process skills. Finally, one of us made the case that we should focus our attention on the kinds of students we want to be graduating from the

college. We should focus on the student as outcome, but go beyond the usual skills or knowledge outcome to something more fundamental - the nature of the person.

4. Some Ideas Beyond Program Changes. Several participants reminded us to consider the larger concern of the general education of our students, and not focus entirely upon the General Education curriculum. Several thought that the corporate faculty should re-gain control over the ASD category. (Some Programs have asserted advising control over that function of the curriculum.) Others thought the whole idea of "At Some Distance" from the major was devoid of affirmative meaning and should be replaced by a distribution of courses to insure breadth of study. One person suggested that we exclude the requirement of G-courses in the division of the student's major and instead, substitute G-courses from other areas.

Several suggestions pertained to the need for continuing quality control. The idea of a review of all General Studies courses on a five year cycle was applauded. However, it was agreed that, with some exceptions, such a review was not occurring. When it was, too few faculty members were involved. We may need to consider finding a structure (a day-long retreat/workshop?) that involves fewer different meeting, but promises to get more results at a given meeting. (The more general idea of streamlining our committee efforts was discussed as well.)

We need to be constantly vigilant in the hiring process. We need to hire persons of breadth who can contribute to and enjoy the General Studies opportunities at this college. When they arrive, we need to acclimate them to General Studies, while at the same time respecting and learning from their experiences and perspectives which differ from our approach.

Finally, several suggested that we do better by gaining the perspective of our seasoned students and graduates regarding the quality of their education. The idea of using students in GIS courses and surveys of alumni were brought up. For a more general good, someone suggested that we hold annual "conversations" with a panel of students to gain helpful feedback on their entire experience at Stockton.

A Final Comment

In this retreat, we began a broad faculty discussion. We, of the General Studies Committee would like to keep the floor open for additional concerns and ideas for reform. We will continue the deliberations at the Fall Faculty Conference and then into the academic year in committee. During this year, we plan to present several concrete proposals for faculty consideration.

The general education of students is serious business. We should move with due consideration, careful to preserve the present "goods" and open to productive change.

Appendix C

**General Education
Outcomes, and
narrative on the
goals of General
Education at
Stockton State College
excerpted from the 1989 COEP Report**

GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOMES

PRIMARY GOALS

1. Objective I: Commitment to life-long learning, to the exploration of new ideas outside one's specialization, and, to placing one's own knowledge in the context of other disciplines and of society as a whole.
2. Objective II: Commitment to citizenship, through the ability to make informed decisions about public issues - while conscious of one's responsibility for doing so, and of one's responsibility as an individual for the social whole.

GENERAL COMPETENCIES

3. Objective III: Ability to reason logically and abstractly and to comprehend and criticize arguments.
4. Objective IV: Ability to understand numerical data so as to be able to comprehend arguments and positions which depend on numbers and statistics.
5. Objective V: Ability to write and speak effectively and persuasively.
6. Objective VI: Capacity for "reflective reading" - entering into personal dialogue with a text.
7. Objective VII: Development of a conceptual framework with which to assimilate new experiences - and the ability to adapt it as necessary.

GENERAL CONTENT EXPERIENCES

8. Objective VIII: Appreciation and understanding of artistic experiences as reflections of the depths and quirks of the human spirit.
9. Objective IX: Scientific knowledge of the physical and natural world, and understanding how that knowledge is attained and evaluated.
10. Objective X: Historical knowledge of the continuities and conflicts common to humans across eras and cultures.
11. Objective XI: Awareness of the achievements and perspectives of people of different nations and cultures, and of different races, genders, and ethnicities.
12. Objective XII: Understanding of the techniques, findings, and procedures of the social sciences as they relate to social structures and to evaluating issues of public policy.
13. Objective XIII: Critical understanding of one's own values and those of others, and of their role in making ethical choices.

THE GOALS OF GENERAL EDUCATION AT
STOCKTON STATE COLLEGE

PRIMARY GOALS:

A wide variety of assumptions and aspirations underlay general education at Stockton, most notable among them the importance of individual students' free and responsible choices and each faculty member's freedom and creativity. In addition, general education through the General Studies curriculum has always been central to the mission of the college "to help our students adapt to changing circumstances in a highly multicultural and interdependent world and develop the capacity for continuous learning and the ability to adapt to changing circumstances, by insisting on breadth, as well as depth."*

The college has always believed that "the breadth inherent in an interdisciplinary approach to a liberal education provides the soundest basis for adapting to the inevitable changes in one's career, while enriching one's life." Furthermore, the freedom to venture into new fields of teaching that has been one of the chief hallmarks of General Studies plays an important part in maintaining faculty vitality, one of the challenges that direct the on-going planning process of the College.

Nonetheless, beneath this diversity there have been two fundamental and widely shared goals: education for life-long learning and education for citizenship. For the Stockton faculty the imparting of information has never been an end in itself; the shaping of students' future lives has always been the goal of our teaching and of our relationship with students in general.

We want graduates who have derived such pleasure from learning that they will always make room for it in their lives, students who have so learned to recognize relationships between different elements of knowledge and experience that they will continue to recognize them in their work and in their personal lives.

*(Mission Statement adopted by the Board of Trustees, Stockton State College, 1982). See also the General Studies program description attached as part of Appendix A."

**Ibid.

We want graduates able to make informed decisions about public issues, conscious of their responsibility for doing so and of their responsibility as individuals for the social whole. Education for citizenship requires consideration of the purposes of civil society. This inquiry into ends encompasses all facets of general education: religion; philosophy; art and literature; history; science; race; class, and gender; and international affairs. Each is related to the question, "what are proper goals for citizens of a nation truly committed to liberty, justice, and equality?" and of citizens in a world of emerging global interdependence. If we examine these facets with our students carefully and without preconceived answers, we will be laying the foundation for responsible citizenship.

In addition we want students whose education has introduced them to the ideas, works, experiences and perspectives of people of different races, genders and ethnicities. The General Studies curriculum is our common tool as a faculty for achieving those common goals, although each of our separate Programs ought to contribute to the attainment of those goals in some way as well.

It is also the case that although we at Stockton have always seen General Studies as an innovative departure from other ways of doing general education, its goals are not unrelated to the goals of liberal education as they have traditionally been defined. We too seek to free students of the provincialism they bring from their previous familial, local and cultural setting by exposing them to worlds they have not dreamed existed, and we do so as a state college in a shrinking world where their attention and interest is far from guaranteed.

GENERAL COMPETENCIES:

If education for life-long learning and citizenship are the specific goals of the General Studies curriculum, certain kinds of educational experiences and competencies necessary for achieving them can be seen as extensions of the goals. These competencies, and experiences are of three kinds: general competencies, general content experiences and general modeling experiences. Beyond the basic skills of effective writing, reading comprehension and numerical computation necessary to undertake college work, there are certain other competencies necessary for further participation in the upper levels of the General Studies curriculum as well as for becoming a life-long learner and informed citizen. These include the ability to reason logically and abstractly and to recognize faulty reasoning, shoddy argumentation and inadequate evidence for asserted claims.

Also included is the ability to write and speak effectively and persuasively for public impact and to understand numerical data sufficiently so as to be able to comprehend "arguments and positions which depend on numbers and statistics"* Further within this list of general competencies lies what might be called the capacity for reflective reading, the ability not just to understand a text in the elementary sense, but to be able to enter into it sufficiently to recognize it as a challenge to what the student already knows, believes or assumes, demanding in turn a personal re-examination and response. Finally life-long learners have a conceptual framework with which to position themselves in relation to life's new information and experiences and so to assimilate them without being threatened or overwhelmed, while remaining capable of adapting and changing their framework as social, occupational or personal experiences may demand.

GENERAL CONTENT EXPERIENCE--ADDITIONAL OUTCOME DESIDERATA:

In addition to these general competencies, there are general content experiences that are a part of an education for life-long learning and citizenship. Among these are the appreciation and understanding of artistic experiences--visual, performed and written art or literature. Life-long learning and good citizenship both require an awareness of the depths and quirks of the human spirit that lie beyond the getting and spending, making and marketing in everyday life which the appreciation and understanding of artistic experience can uniquely give.

Essential also is scientific knowledge of the natural world so as to be able to comprehend its inner structural unity and human being as part of it. Here a firm grasp on how that knowledge is attained and evaluated is essential as natural sciences rapidly move because of related social problems from the laboratory or field station to the center of public political life.

Historical knowledge, too, is required for students' grasp of the continuities, struggles and conflicts common to humans across eras and cultures. It plays an important part also in shaping the conceptual framework for assimilating and evaluating new information and experience referred to above.

Just as it is essential to understand the bond between humans and nature, so it is increasingly ever more important

*American Association of Colleges, Integrity in the College Curriculum, p. 18.

to recognize the experiences that bind humans contemporaneously and internationally across nations and cultures. The social sciences' understanding of the social structures that operate across as well as within these borders play an important part here as do the perspectives gained from the classic works of the human spirit. Understanding the techniques, findings and procedures of the social sciences are important as well in evaluating the policies, programs and panaceas presented to the citizen and consumer daily for action and decision.

Finally in this list of general content experiences, education for life-long learning and citizenship requires exploration and investigation into the ethical and moral dimension of human activity, the fundamental but often unexamined goals and consequences of the economic, scientific and political activities humans undertake. Here students need to learn to uncover the existence of this dimension in earlier human peoples, in themselves and their contemporaries and the ethical, moral and religious basis on which they and others have made similar choices.

These are each, it needs to be noted, general content experiences. As general experiences they can be achieved in a variety of courses and do not have to be limited to courses specifically designated only for that experience. Thus, historical consciousness or ethical awareness need not be linked only to history or philosophy courses but can be achieved in topical courses that incorporate historical materials or ethical analysis as, for example, Social Issues in World Literature or Death and Dying. In this way General Studies courses serve multiple ends and make it possible within the limited number of available courses to achieve the variety of objectives encompassed within education for life-long learning and citizenship. Because these general content experiences are taught in a variety of content settings, they cannot be measured by instruments which test only for specific forms of knowledge.

Furthermore it is not reasonable to expect that every student will have been exposed to or grasp each of these experiences in equal depth or identical ways. Ideally these experiences permeate a student's general education and our entire General Studies' curriculum, i.e., they are found in all of its categories and permeate General Studies courses as a whole.

It is in this connection that the inter-disciplinary or perhaps better put the trans-disciplinary nature of General Studies becomes most important. The Stockton faculty have always believed that students' general education is not well served by a required distribution of introductions to the

various disciplines. We have always believed that courses whose themes or topics deal with problems and issues that by their nature cannot be handled within the confines of any one given discipline are best suited to general education. By definition such courses teach students to see the connections between different fields of study and apparently unrelated human experiences, an integral part as we noted above of education for life-long learning. Furthermore, since the problems and issues that confront the responsible citizen extend beyond the limits of any one approach to knowledge, this kind of general education is particularly well-suited to education for citizenship, the other fundamental goal of our general education.

GENERAL MODELING EXPERIENCES:

Finally, there are general modeling experiences, i.e., experiences in which students see personified the fundamental goals of life-long learning and education for citizenship. The extraordinary freedom given to the Faculty of General Studies has always had as its correlate faculty members as co-learners with their students, pressing to understand problems and issues for which their professional training gave no answers but only the training and appetite to explore. In the zest sparked by the freedom to carry out this joint search comes the students' model of a life-long learner. In faculty members not limited by the canons and perspectives of their disciplines, but passionately concerned with the social impact of their knowledge comes the modeling for citizenship that is an essential part of a good general education.

It is here also that another unique feature of General Studies at Stockton finds its rationale. All Stockton faculty, regardless of training and discipline, contractually obligate themselves to teach in General Studies because Stockton faculty, whatever their field or professional training, offer themselves in general as models of the life-long learning and concerned citizenship that are goals of the General Studies curriculum.

Furthermore, the General Studies' curriculum affords excellent opportunities for faculty and students together to leave the confines of the classroom and to explore firsthand in the world outside ways of grappling with and understanding the problems and possibilities of modern life. These are situations that do not present themselves within the parameters of academic disciplines or within the sequenced course of study necessary to master a discipline but are well suited for general study.

Appendix D

**General Studies 1996
Some Reflections
prepared for Faculty
Workshop, May 31, 1996**

GENERAL STUDIES, 1996: SOME REFLECTIONS

Prepared for Faculty Workshop, May 31, 1996

A number of fundamental assumptions underlay the origins of the General Studies curriculum at Stockton in the minds of the original designers and those who were attracted to teach in it in the earliest years. Among these assumptions I believe were the following: 1) the explosion of knowledge and cultural awareness had destroyed the credibility of the previous consensus on general higher education in the U.S. viz, that there was a unified intellectual culture transmittable to students via introductory courses in the various disciplines or through a canon of agreed-upon classic works; 2) this same explosion had created a host of social and cultural problems for which students as future citizens regardless of their training in any given discipline needed to see themselves responsible; 3) given the absence of an agreed-upon tradition, the primary task of general education now became developing the habits of mind that would enable students to see the connections between their academic training and those social responsibilities, including the connections or interdisciplinarity of the various academic fields they were studying; 4) students could only get a general education of this kind if they were taught by faculty who embodied personally these habits of mind. There was in these assumptions no necessary hostility to the classic figures and texts of the cultural tradition, only a strong sense of its incompleteness and its limitations. There was, I think, a hope and perhaps an expectation that the kind of general education just described could in general lead students to seek an understanding, on their own, while in college and afterwards, of this tradition as well as of the others, against which and in some instances out of which, it had been formed.

This was a highly innovative and challenging approach to general education and a wide range of outside evaluators and consultants attested to this fact as well as to its workability.

Alumni evaluations, when undertaken, indicated in general a high degree of satisfaction with their general studies courses, but there has also been a gradually growing sense in the faculty that the results generally have not been what had been hoped for.

There are it seems to me two major reasons for this outcome: inadequate program development and mistaken assumptions about students. Regarding the first cause, it must be recognized that many faculty members with the interdisciplinary background and awareness necessary to teach these courses no longer do so or cannot do so often enough. In addition the kinds of courses linking various faculty interests to new and developing emerging problems and intellectual trends of interest to students capable of engaging them in outside-of-the-classroom learning have not developed as they did in the first years of the curriculum's existence. This situation has in turn arisen out of a number of causes but two of the most significant are: 1) insufficient personnel in the various Programs to enable interdisciplinary faculty to teach regularly in General Studies while meeting the needs of their Program majors and 2) failure to continue and expand the General Studies faculty workshops for the external stimulation and local cross fertilization needed to produce this kind of curriculum.

In addition to insufficient General Studies program development, the other major reason for the unfulfilled expectations lies I believe in an initial faculty miscalculation about the background and intellectual preparation of our students. I think many faculty assumed in students coming to participate in this kind of general education curriculum a level of previous training and intellectual culture that was unwarranted and unrealistic.

At this juncture it seems to me that there is a widespread feeling on the part of many faculty that significant changes are necessary in order to re-invigorate the curriculum and achieve

the initial expectations. One possible route is to seek collectively as a faculty the resources necessary to bring the program to its original and only partially fulfilled expectations. I think this is an important option that I would like to see widely and thoroughly discussed among the faculty and with the administration of the college. It is also the case, however, that this choice alone does not deal adequately with the second reason given above for the generally pervasive sense of unfulfilled expectations, viz, the background and intellectual awareness of Stockton students. Thus another option might be considered which would preserve the original emphasis on an interdisciplinary faculty committed in general to general education. It might be possible to create in the various disciplinary based categories (GAH, GNM, GSS) one general course required for all students that would be media-based along with on-site supplementary and explanatory discussions led by local Stockton faculty. These courses could draw upon existing whole packages of interdisciplinary courses where they exist (Eugene Weber's *The Western Tradition* is one such course in the Arts and Humanities) or could be put together from various single existing films and videos where they do not. The advantage of this approach, if implemented in the three "G" categories, is that it would give our students a substantial core of common knowledge and it would do so without requiring faculty in general to develop entirely new courses. It would still allow for one elective course in the existing categories, thus retaining many of the best existing G courses without excessively disrupting existing faculty courses.

An alternative here would be an attempt to create one or perhaps two, general required courses following common themes and using common texts, but taught in individualized ways by existing faculty. Trenton State has developed two such required courses I believe. The major problem here would be recruiting sufficient faculty, each semester, to guarantee enough offerings.

Over time, I fear, these faculty would end up in teaching these courses almost exclusively with the unwanted professional consequences that would entail for them and for students. I also fear that such an approach while useful in the arts and humanities, would not likely result in a core of scientific knowledge necessary in a well-educated person.

There are of course other possibilities to be researched and discussed. As a minimum next step I would recommend the formation of a faculty task force with sufficient time and funds to survey existing other programs and media resources that could be used to suggest possible revisions in our existing curriculum. Some actions of this kind are necessary to preserve and improve what has up until now been Stockton's most distinctive curricular innovation.

Joe Walsh

May 28, 1996

Appendix E

**Great Issues
Evening Lecture Series
Proposal**

GREAT ISSUES EVENING LECTURE SERIES PROPOSAL

submitted to General Studies Dean Jan Colijn
by Alan Mattlage and Reza Ghorashi

Introduction:

The increase in full-time, resident students at Stockton presents the college with both an opportunity and an obligation to expand valuable, co-curricular, academic activities during the evening hours. Many universities fulfill this obligation by attracting noted teachers and scholars to campus to speak on subjects of general interest to the academic community. Indeed such events are often among the most valuable experiences that students gain by attending a university. Colleges, however, often find themselves at a disadvantage due to smaller student populations and limited funding.

Stockton College is well situated to overcome these difficulties. Three factors are relevant. First our full-time, resident student population is larger than ever, and as a result of our suburban location, many of these students are likely to find a properly publicized academic lecture series an attractive evening activity. Second our General Studies curriculum offers numerous overlapping, interdisciplinary courses which creates a curricular base upon which co-curricular lectures can develop. Finally our location in southern New Jersey is within reasonable driving distance from universities, institutes, and government offices from Washington to New York, thus reducing travel and scheduling difficulties for a large population of speakers of international significance.

General Proposal:

As a result of these opportunities and obligations, Stockton should establish a continuing Evening Lecture Series to be supported by a reliable and dedicated fund.

The awarding of the funding for the lecture series could take place in the following manner:

Faculty members acting as Proposal Co-ordinators would each obtain from colleagues teaching allied courses an agreement to participate in a lecture series proposal. With assistance from their groups, each Proposal Co-ordinator would write and submit a proposal for a lecture series that would be associated with all their participating classes. Proposals would be submitted to a Joint Faculty-Administration Committee (perhaps the General Studies Committee) one year in advance of the semester in which the courses would be taught. A lecture series proposal should be united around a fairly general topic of broad interest to the academic community, but of interest to the wider community as well. Topics which are of interest to a variety of disciplines and campus divisions should be encouraged. In this respect our General Studies curriculum is likely to serve as a good basis for

these lectures, but we need not limit proposals to include only General Studies. The number of speakers in such a series could vary as seems appropriate to the subject.

Possible topics for the series might include broad philosophical or methodological issues that would otherwise not find a prominent place in our curricular offerings. For example, faculty from various divisions might submit proposals as follows:

- * SOBL and NAMS: The Methodologies of the Sciences
(social and/or natural)
- * ARHU, GENS and SOBL: Problems of Interpretation and Translation
(anthropological, artistic, historic, linguistic, literary, psychoanalytic, and sociological)
- * PROS and SOBL: Private-Public Sector Relations
- * ARHU and NAMS: Ethics and Technology
(e.g., bio, medical, and environmental ethics)

Such lectures would be especially useful in supporting our GIS courses, but proposals might also suggest lectures on special, current, topical issues of general interest:

Aging, Alternative Energy, Bio-Diversity and Extinction, Community Values, Constitutional Reform, Crime, Cultural Diversity, Democracy, Educational Policy, Freedom and Artistic Expression, Genetic Engineering, Global Warming, Hate Crimes, Health Care, Homelessness, Human Rights, Indigenous Peoples, International Development and Finance, Internet Technology, Labor-Management Relations, Law, Leisure Activities, Mass Media, Medical Research, Nationalism, Natural Resources, the "Nature-Nurture" Debate, Ozone Depletion, Population and Immigration, Poverty, Prisons, Racism, Sexism, Starvation, Toxic Waste, Trade, War and Violence, Urban Planning, etc.

Once proposals for a lecture series have been designed and submitted, one such proposal would be selected for funding in the subsequent year, though a series could be run during each of the Fall and Spring semesters. One or more of the participating courses would be scheduled as an evening class in order to guarantee a live audience for the lecture series. The lectures would then be arranged and publicized on campus, in the community, and on Stockton's cable channel. Each lecture would be videotaped by the Media Center for use in the participating courses, for general instructional use, for broadcast on Stockton's cable channel, and for wider distribution. Finally the videotapes could be transcribed by student workers, edited by the speaker, and published either on paper or electronically.

Funding for the proposal would support travel expenses, food, hotel accommodations, honoraria, publicity, video production, and one course release time for the Proposal Co-ordinator of the selected topic.

A Prototype Series for the Immediate Term:

To test the viability of an on-going lecture series, the General Studies Division should help fund a prototype lecture series this fall semester.

This semester Alan Mattlage and Reza Ghorashi are teaching two related classes: "Human Rights: Moral Theory and Practice" and "The UN and A New World Order". These classes would support and be supported by a lecture series titled: "Human Rights and World Affairs". Others have informally expressed an interest in such a lecture series: Elaine Ingulli, "Perspectives on Women", Carol Vernallis, "Introduction to Communications", Fred Bjornstad, "International History", and Carol Rittner, "Religion and Society". The interdisciplinary character of the associated courses is clear: the faculty represent three divisions and six degree and certificate programs. Ghorashi is teaching on Tuesday and Thursday evenings and is willing to provide some class time for speakers, though some non-evening lectures might be necessary for this prototype series.

Mattlage has gained in principle commitments from:

Prof. Morton Winston, a philosopher at Trenton State and author of several books, editor of The Philosophy of Human Rights, and Member of the Board of Directors of Amnesty International--USA.

Angela Berryman of the Friends Service Committee of Philadelphia, with long experience living and working in Latin America. Currently she is working on a project in Guatemala to identify victims of mass murders during the civil violence in Guatemala during the 1980's and to date.

Phillip Berryman, author of Inside Central America, Liberation Theology, Our Unfinished Business, and translator of Report of the Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation, a two volume document of major historical significance which details human rights violations in Chile, 1973-1991.

Prof. Edward Herman, Emeritus from the Wharton School of Finance at the University of Pennsylvania, and author of Corporate Control, Corporate Power, Beyond Hypocrisy, The Real Terror Network, and co-author of The Political Economy of Human Rights (two volumes), Manufacturing Consent, Demonstration Elections, and others.

Winston has tentatively agreed to come on Thursday, Oct. 12, to speak at 6:00 PM. The Berrymans have indicated that they are quite flexible about the date they could appear. Herman has agreed to come on Tuesday, Nov. 7, to attend a gathering at the Stockton Art Gallery, and then to speak at 4:30.

There is also no reason to limit our participants to external speakers. For example, Jackie Pope, currently attending the Women's Conference in Beijing, is teaching "From Freedom to Enslavement" on MWF evenings this Fall. Due to her presence in

China, we have not yet been able to contact her about this series, but she would be an excellent addition to it.

For publicity, Michael McGarvey has already enlisted his senior graphic design students to design attractive promotional material. Dean Robert Regan has agreed in principle to provide some funding from ARHU to help defray publicity costs.

Expenses:

As the speakers for the prototype are thus far fairly local, travel expenses will not be especially steep. The honoraria will be the largest expense. Each of the speakers will likely accept an offer of \$500. Edward Herman will actually require more, but the Stockton Art Gallery has asked to co-sponsor his appearance, and is willing to contribute what is required to make up the difference. Winston and Herman have both asked for hotel accommodations for the nights following their appearances. Each of the speakers will require travel expenses. It might also be nice to buy them dinners. The Media Center will also require funding for the production of video tapes.

Honoraria:

Morton Winston	\$ 500
Angela Berryman	\$ 500
Phillip Berryman	\$ 500
Edward Herman	\$ 500

Hotel Accomodations:

Morton Winston	\$ 75 (estimated)
Edward Herman	\$ 75 (estimated)

Travel Expenses:

Morton Winston	\$ 30 (estimated)
Angela Berryman	\$ 30 (estimated)
Phillip Berryman	\$ 30 (estimated)
Edward Herman	\$ 30 (estimated)

Dinners:

Morton Winston	\$ 20 (estimated)
Angela Berryman	\$ 20 (estimated)
Phillip Berryman	\$ 20 (estimated)
Edward Herman	\$ 20 (estimated)

Video Production:

Three or four video tapes	Unknown
---------------------------	---------

Publblicity:

	\$ 150 (estimated)
--	--------------------

TOTAL:

	\$ 2500 plus video production costs
--	--

Note: The Berrymans might be scheduled for two separate lectures or for a joint lecture.

Appendix F

**Current Bulletin
Language on General Studies
and on G-categories**

General Studies

In the Office of General Studies

Introduction

Stockton's distinctive General Studies program constitutes the College curriculum's commons, the place where students and faculty with various specializations meet to find common ground. The program was designed on basis of three premises:

- (i) The world of knowledge and ideas is essentially seamless and is not really divided into discrete compartments.
- (ii) The important problems that students should confront, e.g. war and peace or environmental issues, can't be understood by any single academic discipline alone. Not surprisingly, modern scientific advances often depend on interdisciplinary approaches.
- (iii) Changing workforce trends suggest that graduates will change not only jobs but also careers more frequently than has been the case in the past. Flexibility, the capacity for life-long learning and, in particular, the acquisition of generic, transferable skills will be requisite in the current and future economy.

These notions do not mitigate the importance of specialized preparation through a degree major. Specialized education and the resulting expertise in a field will continue to be important to graduates, and to society at large. However, the College believes that specialized knowledge alone does not provide all the preparation that students need for the future: both general studies and the disciplinary major are important in a liberal arts environment where excellence is pursued.

The distinctive feature of the approach Stockton is that General Studies is provided through a separate curriculum and academic division: the College believes that breadth of education is not well-served by simply requiring students to take introductory courses in various disciplines, as is the case at some other institutions. Traditional introductory courses in most disciplines are usually designed as the first step in a major for students who wish to specialize, rather than providing breadth of understanding for the non-major and general student.

General Studies courses are intended to enrich one's learning, to provide for explorations of new fields, to provoke and stimulate new thinking, to encourage experimentation, and to test one's perspectives; these intentions are often addressed in ways that cross the boundaries of individual academic disciplines.

The General Studies course offerings are taught by all members of the faculty in all divisions. The courses may study a problem or theme or offer a survey of related topics. What the courses have in common is that they are designed to explore ideas, stimulate critical thinking, and provide breadth of perspective for all students regardless of major.

As the General Studies curriculum is not a foundation curriculum consisting of introductory courses, students take courses in this area throughout their college career.

Learning is a life-long process; and as such, one of the most important abilities a student can develop is the capacity to plan and manage learning experiences. At Stockton, the student's preceptor should play an important role by helping the student develop this ability in the major, and in general education courses.

General Education Outcomes

In order to provide concrete meaning to the general concepts outlined above, the College has defined a number of desirable goals for the general education of all students. Although these goals can not all be met through General Studies courses alone (they also need to be addressed in the degree major), each General Studies course at Stockton is designed to help achieve at least some of these outcomes in addition to the goals of one of the five General Studies course categories:

General Competencies

1. Ability to reason logically and abstractly and to comprehend and criticize arguments, including those that depend on numbers and statistics.
2. Ability to write and speak effectively and persuasively.
3. Capacity for "reflective reading" — entering into personal dialogue with a text.
4. Development of a conceptual framework with which to assimilate new experiences — and the ability to adapt it as necessary.

General Content Experiences

5. Appreciation and understanding of artistic experiences as reflections of the depths and quirks of the human spirit.
6. Scientific knowledge of the physical world, and understanding of how that knowledge is attained and evaluated.
7. Historical knowledge of the continuities and conflicts common to humans across eras and cultures.

8. Awareness of the achievements and perspectives of people of different nations and cultures, and of different races, genders, and ethnicities.
9. Understanding of the techniques, findings, and procedures of the social sciences as they relate to social structures and to evaluating issues of public policy.
10. Critical understanding of one's own values and those of others, and of their role in making ethical choices.

General Modeling Experiences

11. Commitment to life-long learning, to the exploration of new areas and ideas outside one's specialization, and to placing one's own knowledge in the context of other disciplines and of society as a whole.

General Studies Course Categories

General Studies courses are divided into five categories that explore broad areas of knowledge, often in interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary ways.

GAH

General Arts and Humanities (GAH) courses are designed to acquaint students with the arts and humanities and provide various cultural perspectives on the past and present.

GNM

General Natural Sciences and Mathematics (GNM) courses examine the broad concerns of science, explore the nature of scientific process and practice, and seek to provide an understanding of mathematics and the natural environment.

GSS

General Social and Behavioral Sciences (GSS) courses assist students in understanding human interactions — how people live, produce, and resolve conflict as individuals and as groups. They focus on topics, problems, and methods of concern to the social sciences.

GEN

General Interdisciplinary Skills and Topics (GEN) courses emphasize the dynamic nature of education. They develop learning and communication skills, explore experimental ways of knowing, or examine topics which cut across or lie outside traditional academic disciplines.

GIS

General Integration and Synthesis (GIS) courses are advanced courses for juniors and seniors which are designed to deal with problems and questions larger than a single discipline. They are intended to gain perspective on the self, on disciplines of learning and their relationships, and on the recurrent concerns of humankind. The require-

ment that students take at least four credits of GIS course work is an attempt to help them bring together their earlier General Studies experiences into some kind of integrated framework.

Courses in General Arts and Humanities (GAH)

Goals of GAH Courses

1. GAH courses introduce students to the arts and humanities as areas of study, and thus provide them with the basis for intelligent curricular choices.
2. They aim to create an awareness among students of the importance of the arts and humanities in their education. They seek to develop the ability of students to make critical and aesthetic judgments.
3. They introduce perspectives, techniques, and attitudes which can be used in the further study of the arts and humanities and suggest ways of continuing to examine such issues.
4. GAH courses describe a number of the conceptual challenges and issues which artists and humanists confront, bringing a variety of approaches and viewpoints to bear on these. They explore the techniques used in the arts and humanities for solving aesthetic and intellectual problems, expressing feelings and ideas, clarifying meanings, defending judgments, and explaining historical transformations.

Kinds of Courses

Tradition and Background Courses:

These courses will provide students with a broad perspective on substantial portions of the world's philosophical, historical, literary, and artistic traditions, seeking to demonstrate the importance of tradition and historical perspective in understanding oneself and one's relationship to the present.

Thematic and Topical Courses:

These courses explore some of the conceptual challenges and issues that artists and humanists confront or focus upon a particular theme, topic, or time period in which material is examined from a variety of disciplines that help to illuminate such themes.

Experiential and Creative Courses:

In these courses students participate in creative and/or experiential activity in one or more of the arts and humanities disciplines in order to develop their own artistic and intellectual capabilities, thus expanding their capacity to appreciate and value the material of the arts and humanities. Students should take their two required GAH courses from two different kinds of courses.

Courses in Interdisciplinary Skills and Topics (GEN)

Goals

The GEN category reflects the realization that the frontiers of education are constantly expanding to include new kinds of knowledge, that the process of knowing and communicating knowledge is of itself worthy of study, and that affective learning has a legitimate place beside cognitive learning in any well balanced curriculum. Such perspectives are an essential part of general education and demonstrate the changing nature of knowledge.

Types of courses

1. GEN courses may focus on the modes and methods of learning, thinking, and knowing or upon the acquisition of certain intellectual skills common to such learning and knowing. They may also provide advanced or intermediate instruction in various communication skills which will help students better organize their knowledge and present it to others.
2. GEN courses may focus upon the students' personal behavior or experience in an attempt to heighten awareness, consciousness, creativity, and intuition. Such courses may supplement the more analytical, linear, and intellectual approaches to learning.
3. GEN courses may explore general themes and topics of current interest that exist outside the established disciplinary or "G" categories, and thus further demonstrate the dynamic nature of knowledge. These might include courses in new or emergent disciplines, interdisciplinary yet introductory courses, and courses in non-traditional academic areas.
4. GEN courses may focus upon innovative approaches to the process of intellectual exploration.

Goals

GIS courses are designed to assist students already acquainted with the various modes of knowledge to understand the connectedness of things. GIS courses seek to help the student transcend specialization and gain perspective on self, areas of knowledge, and the human condition.

GIS courses are not just interdisciplinary but transcend the limits of any one of the existing academic divisions at Stockton either in subject matter or content or by directly addressing those human experiences — individual and social — that transcend the boundaries within academic life.

Types of Courses

GIS requires extraordinary effort on the part of professor and students to bring together diverse ideas and points of view. GIS requires serious reading, writing, discussion, and sustained interaction with people from different disciplines. GIS courses may be taught in two modes:

1. The lecture/discussion where the professor attempts to communicate his or her

Courses in General Integration and Synthesis (GIS)

own integrated view of a particular area or problem, e.g., in courses about the city, energy, the role of science in human life, ecological consciousness.

The seminar mode where faculty participate as intellectuals, not specialists, mutually engaged with each other and with students in an investigation of the material studied, with an emphasis on the process of seeking integration around the topic selected.

Courses in General Natural Sciences and Mathematics (GNM)

Goals

Science is the study of the natural laws governing the physical universe.

The primary reasoning and logical process underpinning science is the "scientific method." The scientific method includes the observation of events and processes, the formation of testable hypotheses, the design and execution of experiments to test the hypotheses, and the development of theories which attempt to explain the facts derived from observations and experimentation. Science is self-corrective; it does not assume an ultimate set of preconceived truths. In the final analysis, however, science derives successive approximations of the truth because science operates within the limitations of the natural or physical world. Science is one way of studying the universe; it is not the only way.

The ultimate goal of a GNM course is to share the nature and processes of science with students. To this end, GNM courses may share common content with program courses, but GNM courses do not simply provide an introduction to a discipline or a diminished version of a program course.

Whereas program courses are often serial links in long chains of knowledge and provide students with an implicit sense of science in general, GNM courses are explicitly concerned with giving students a complete experience which represents the scope of natural sciences and mathematics. The scope of a GNM course thus must allow for the integrated exploration of messages that are usually omitted, abbreviated, or accumulated over many semesters in program courses.

Types of Courses

Probably no one GNM course will attempt to communicate all of the messages; however, a GNM course must explore at least one of the following messages.

1. **On the nature of science:** What science is and is not and why; contrasting science as a way of knowing with nonscientific or pseudoscientific views of the universe; successive approximations of the truth; model making; open-ended questions; cultural and intellectual relationships; the limitations and potentials of science; scientific philosophy.
2. **On the nature of scientists:** observers, experimenters, synthesizers, model builders, real people.
3. **On the process of doing science:** The scientific method, induction versus deduction, experiments, testable hypotheses, development of theories, self-correction; esthetics, creativity, chance; reductionism and synthesisism.
4. **On the skills of scientific practice:** questioning; experimentation; communication; analysis; synthesis.

Courses in General Social and Behavioral Sciences (GSS)

General Social and Behavioral Sciences (GSS) courses aid students in understanding human behavior and interactions — how people live, produce, distribute resources, develop institutions, and resolve conflicts. These courses may focus on topics, problems, and methods of concern to the social sciences.

Goals

The purposes to be served by GSS courses are the following:

1. To expose students to what is available in the social sciences and, hence, to provide them with the basis for intelligent curricular choice.
2. To create enthusiasm in students about a variety of areas in the social sciences and, hence, to encourage them to sample widely.
3. To provide students with an integrative framework which will render more meaningful the information which they have derived or will derive from more specialized courses.
4. To accomplish all of the above within the boundaries set by the necessity to maintain the integrity of the materials presented.

Types of Courses

1. **Multiple Introduction Courses.** These courses are designed to expose students to each of the social science disciplines as distinctive, if related, bodies of knowledge. In particular, they will deal with the distinctive subject matter, modes of reasoning, core concepts, and vocational values of each of the social science disciplines.
2. **Topics Courses.** These courses are designed to focus on a specific topic and bring the perspectives of the various social sciences to bear on it. In doing this, the instructor may either emphasize the distinctiveness of each perspective or synthesize those perspectives.