

**University Senate Meeting
May 2, 2022
WebEx Virtual Meeting**

1. Call to Order

Moderator **Dineen** called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of April 4, 2022 University Senate meeting

The minutes were approved as distributed.

3. Report of the President

Presented by Provost Carl Lejuez

Provost **Lejuez**

- Thanks to the Chair of the Board of Trustees, Dan Toscano, who will be joining this meeting at the request of the Senate.
- The Legislative session will wrap up this week. A budget agreement was successfully negotiated.
- Commencement Ceremonies will take place this weekend. The stats are available on the UConn Today website.
- Acknowledged that this will be his last meeting, as he will be leaving the University to take a position at Stony Brook University in New York. Grateful for the role the University Senate plays in shared governance.

Moderator **Dineen** opened the floor for questions.

Several senators shared gratitude and praise for the outgoing provost.

Senator **Schultz** echoed the sentiments shared by others. He then shared that he had learned today of the University of Massachusetts's announced goal of reaching 100% renewal power on its campus by 2032. It is a projected investment of \$500 million. He noted that UConn is no longer the leader in environmental sustainability among New England public universities. Given the volatility of energy markets and the skyrocketing cost of fossil fuel in this generation, he feels it's time for the University to review its progress of solar and renewals on campus. He asked that the President's Office, in coordination with the Office of Sustainability and with the approval of the Senate

Executive Committee, deliver a report to the Senate on achieving net-zero carbon emissions and its progress on campus production of renewable energy.

4. Report of the Senate Executive Committee

Attachment #1

Presented by SEC Chair Del Siegle

Senator **Long** asked if the Athletic Director had presented to the University Senate this year. Senator **Siegle** explained that the Senate receives only one outside report per meeting instead of the two per meeting schedule of the past. This allows for a more in-depth report and Q&A session. It also means that some reports cannot be presented on an annual basis.

Senator **McCutcheon** asked how the Senate operates during the summer. Senator **Siegle** shared that the SEC meets as needed, and information is shared with the Senate and/or the administration if necessary. There are no regularly scheduled meetings during the Summer, but a special meeting can be called if needed.

5. Consent Agenda Items:

Report of the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee

Attachment #2

Annual Reports of Senate Standing Committees

Attachment #3

Senator **Schultz** moved to remove the Planning Committee Report and Senator **Long** seconded the motion.

By voice vote, the consent agenda passed unanimously.

The Planning Committee Report was opened for discussion. Senator **Schultz** stated the report mentions a sub-committee being put in place and that there were recommendations made by this sub-committee. Senator **Burr**, speaking for the University Planning Committee, share that the sub-committee will work to get that information to the Senate as soon as possible.

Moderator **Dineen** called for a vote to accept the Planning Committee's Annual Report. By voice vote, the report passed unanimously.

6. UConn Board of Trustees Chair Dan Toscano

Moderator **Dineen** welcomed UConn Board of Trustees Chair Dan Toscano to the meeting. Chair Toscano provided information on his background. He then answered questions and engaged in discussion with senators.

Moderator **Dineen** called for any new business, for which there was none.

7. Report from Senate Nominating Committee

Attachment #4

Presented by Senator Burkey

VOTE of 2022/2023 Senate Standing Committee Rosters

Senator **Burkey** highlighted changes made to the rosters since its presentation to the Senate in April.

By voice vote, the 2022/2023 Senate Standing Committee Rosters passed unanimously.

8. Presentation of motion to amend the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, II.C.2. General Education Curriculum

Attachment #5

Presented by Senator Wilson

Senator **Wilson** presented proposed changes to the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate as part of the proposed Common Curriculum program. A vote on these amendments will take place in the fall.

Senator **Wilson** offered the following overview of the changes:

1. Replacing "General Education" with "Common Curriculum"
2. Replacing "General Education Oversight Committee" with "Common Curriculum Committee"
3. Replacing "Content Areas" with "Topics of Inquiry"
4. Editing related to the details of credit distribution across the Topics of Inquiry and Competencies, and the consolidation of the Competencies.

9. Presentation and vote on Guidelines for Interpreting Student Evaluation of Teaching Results

Attachment #6

Presented by Senator Holle

By voice vote, the updated guidelines passed unanimously.

10. Annual Report on Graduation and Retention

Attachment #7

Provided by Nathan Fuerst, Vice President for Enrollment Planning and Management

A written report will be provided by Vice President **Fuerst**. Comments and questions should be sent to Cheryl Galli.

11.New Business

No new business

12.Adjournment

Senator **Morrell** made a motion to adjourn.

Senator **Long** seconded.

Motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:57 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christine S. North

Secretary of the University Senate, 2021-2022

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Del Siegle, Chair

Pam Bedore

Marisa Chrysochoou

Maria-Luz Fernandez

Angela Rola

Manuela Wagner

Pam Bramble

Gary English

Gustavo Nanclare

Irio Schiano

Ethan Werstler

University Senate Curricula and Courses Committee
Report to the Senate
May 2, 2022

I. The Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommends ADDITION of the following 1000- or 2000-level courses:

A. ARTH 2020 Global Jerusalem (#10286) [CA1, CA4-Int]

Proposed Catalog Copy

ARTH 2020. Global Jerusalem.

3.00 credits.

Prerequisites: None

Grading Basis: Graded

An introduction to the art and architecture of Jerusalem and the diverse religious, social, and political contexts of related re-creations across the world, from prehistory to the contemporary period. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

B. COGS 2500Q Coding for Cognitive Science (#9226) [Q]

Proposed Catalog Copy

COGS 2500Q Coding for Cognitive Science

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: None

Grading Basis: Graded

Introduction to computer programming for students with little or no prior programming experience. Core concepts and essential skills, with special emphasis on typical tasks and applications in the Cognitive Sciences.

C. HIST 2845/W Global History of Capitalism (#9324) [Approved for CA1, CA4, and W]

Proposed Catalog Copy

HIST 2845. Global History of Capitalism

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

Exploration of definitions of capitalism in existing literature, its place(s) of origin, and the initial period of the genesis of capitalism from late medieval times. Examination of how capitalism has changed throughout time and space. Explanation of why some individuals and countries are rich while others are poor, as well as the impact of capitalism on global history, notions of time, slavery, class, race, gender, law, and the contemporary world. CA 1. CA 4.

HIST 2845W. Global History of Capitalism

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011.

Grading Basis: Graded

Exploration of definitions of capitalism in existing literature, its place(s) of origin, and the initial period of the genesis of capitalism from late medieval times. Examination of how capitalism has changed throughout time and space. Explanation of why some individuals and countries are rich

while others are poor, as well as the impact of capitalism on global history, notions of time, slavery, class, race, gender, law, and the contemporary world. CA 1. CA 4.

D. POLS 2807W Women and the Law (#10547) [W]

Proposed Catalog Copy

POLS 2807. Women and the Law

3.00 Credits.

Prerequisites: Not open for credit to students who have passed POLS 2998/W when offered as “Women and the Law.”

Grading Basis: Graded

The development of constitutional and statutory standards for treatment of women under the law in the United States.

POLS 2807W. Women and the Law

3.00 Credits.

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011; Not open for credit to students who have passed POLS 2998/W when offered as “Women and the Law.”

Grading Basis: Graded

The development of constitutional and statutory standards for treatment of women under the law in the United States.

E. POLS 2827W Criminal Justice in Practice (#10645) [Approved for W]

Proposed Catalog Copy

POLS 2827W. Criminal Justice in Practice

3.00 Credits.

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011. Not open for credit to students who have passed POLS 2998W when offered as “Criminal Justice in Practice.”

Grading Basis: Graded

Exploration of the American Criminal Justice system through simulations, interactions with practitioners in the field, visits to institutions within the system, and service projects with organizations working within the system.

F. POLS 2803W Legal Reasoning and Writing (#10585) [W]

Proposed Catalog Copy

POLS 2803W. Legal Reasoning and Writing

3.00 Credits.

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011; Not open for credit to students who have passed POLS 2998W when offered as “Legal Reasoning and Writing.”

Grading Basis: Graded

Simulation of the "Moot Court" experience. Students will develop legal writing and oral argumentation skills in relation to hypothetical appellate cases about free speech, religion, rights of the accused, separation of powers, and equal protection claims.

G. POLS/MAST 2460 Maritime Politics (#10206) [CA2, EL]

Proposed Catalog Copy

POLS 2460. Maritime Politics

Also offered as MAST 2460

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: None

Recommended preparation: POLS 1402

Graded Basis: Graded

The political dimensions of the world's oceans. This course draws upon international relations theories to analyze states, international law, intergovernmental organizations, trade, and non-state actors with respect to the world's largest bodies of water. CA 2.

H. SOCI 2240/W Sociology of Race and Religion (#12585) [Approved for W]

Proposed Catalog Copy

SOCI 2240. Sociology of Race and Religion

3.00 Credits

Pre-requisites: None

Grading Basis: Graded

An introduction to the sociological study of race and religion. Centers on the social constructionist approach to race and religion within the context of North America. Topics may include the Black Church, segregation, theologies of liberation, immigration, identity formation, "ethnic" religion, urban vs. rural practices of religion, diversity, racism, and social change.

SOCI 2240W. Sociology of Race and Religion

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011.

Grading Basis: Graded

An introduction to the sociological study of race and religion. Centers on the social constructionist approach to race and religion within the context of North America. Topics may include the Black Church, segregation, theologies of liberation, immigration, identity formation, "ethnic" religion, urban vs. rural practices of religion, diversity, racism, and social change.

I. SOCI 2720E/W Environmental Racism, Colonialism and Justice (#12607) [Approved for W and EL]

Proposed Catalog Copy

SOCI 2720E. Environmental Racism, Colonialism, and Justice

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

Examination of environmental racism and colonialism alongside movements toward liberation and justice; emphasis on environmental justice as theory, practice, narratives, and collective actions.

SOCI 2720WE. Environmental Racism, Colonialism and Justice

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011.

Grading Basis: Graded

Examination of environmental racism and colonialism alongside movements toward liberation and justice; emphasis on environmental justice as theory, practice, narratives, and collective actions.

II. The Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommends REVISION of the following 1000- or 2000-level courses:

A. CE 2110 Applied Mechanics I (#12345) [Revise description]

Current Catalog Copy

CE 2110. Applied Mechanics I

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: MATH 1132Q

Grading Basis: Graded

Fundamentals of statics using vector methods. Resolution and composition of forces; equilibrium of force systems; analysis of forces acting on structures and machines; centroids; moment of inertia.

Proposed Catalog Copy

CE 2110. Applied Mechanics I

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: MATH 1132Q

Grading Basis: Graded

Fundamentals of statics using vector methods. Resolution and composition of forces; equilibrium of force systems; analysis of forces acting on structures and machines; applications of friction; centroids; moment of inertia.

B. ENGL 1003 Academic Literacies for Multilingual Students (#11026) [Revise title and description]

Current Catalog Copy

ENGL 1003. English for Non-Native Speakers

3.00 credits

May be repeated for credit.

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

Instruction in English for non-native speakers of the language. May be repeated for credit.

Graduate students may elect this course.

Proposed Catalog Copy

ENGL 1003. Academic Literacies for Multilingual Students

3.00 credits

May be repeated for credit up to a maximum of 6 credits.

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

Instruction in rhetorical, reading, and writing skills essential to university work. Intended primarily for international students.

C. ENGL 1301 Major Works of Eastern Literature (#11706) [CA4-Int] [Revise prereqs]

Current Catalog Copy

ENGL 1301. Major Works of Eastern Literature

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011.

Grading Basis: Graded

Important works of poetry, drama, and literary prose from the Middle East, South Asia, China, Japan, and Southeast Asia. All works are read in translation. CA 4-INT.

Revised Catalog Copy

ENGL 1301. Major Works of Eastern Literature

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

Important works of poetry, drama, and literary prose from the Middle East, South Asia, China, Japan, and Southeast Asia. All works are read in translation. CA 4-INT.

- D. GEOG/URBN 1200 The City in the Western Tradition (#9724) [CA1, CA4-Int] [Revise title; add CA4-Int]

Current Catalog Copy

GEOG 1200. The City in the Western Tradition

Also offered as: URBN 1200

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: RHAG students cannot take more than 22 credits of 1000 level courses Grading Basis: Graded

A broad discussion of the role and structure of the city in the western tradition from the Classical period to contemporary America. Special emphasis will be placed on the mechanisms by which cities and ideas about them have been diffused from one place to another and on the changing forces that have shaped the western city. CA 1.

Revised Catalog Copy

GEOG 1200. Global Urbanization

Also offered as: URBN 1200

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

A broad discussion of the role and structure of cities around the world from the first cities to contemporary times. Special emphasis will be placed on the mechanisms by which cities and ideas about them have been diffused from one place to another and on the changing forces that have shaped cities over time and across space. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

- E. PHIL 1109 Global Existentialism (#11145) [CA1, CA4] [Add CA1]

Current Catalog Copy

PHIL 1109. Global Existentialism

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

An exploration of existential philosophy from a global, multicultural perspective. Focus will be on existentialists from the Global South in conversation with those in the Global North. CA 4-INT.

Revised Catalog Copy

PHIL 1109. Global Existentialism

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

An exploration of existential philosophy from a global, multicultural perspective. Focus will be on existentialists from the Global South in conversation with those in the Global North. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

F. SOCI 1251 Social Problems (#10825) [CA2, CA4, W] [Revise description]

Current Catalog Copy

SOCI 1251. Social Problems

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: RHAG students cannot take more than 22 credits of 1000 level courses.

Grading Basis: Graded

Major social problems, their sources in the organization of society, public policies for their alleviation, and questions of ethics and social justice: alcohol and drug abuse, physical and mental illness, sexual variances, poverty and inequality, ethnic and racial prejudice and discrimination, women and gender, the changing family, violence, crime and delinquency, the environment, urban problems, and population planning and growth. CA 2. CA 4.

SOCI 1251W. Social Problems

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011 or 3800. RHAG students cannot take more than 22 credits of 1000 level courses.

Grading Basis: Graded

Major social problems, their sources in the organization of society, public policies for their alleviation, and questions of ethics and social justice: alcohol and drug abuse, physical and mental illness, sexual variances, poverty and inequality, ethnic and racial prejudice and discrimination, women and gender, the changing family, violence, crime and delinquency, the environment, urban problems, and population planning and growth. CA 2. CA 4.

Revised Catalog Copy

SOCI 1251. Social Problems

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

An examination of how institutional and organizational features of societies generate contemporary social problems, public policies for their alleviation, and questions of ethics and social justice. Topics may include substance use and misuse, mental illness, crime, social inequality, racism, gender disparities, climate change, and human rights. CA 2. CA 4.

SOCI 1251W. Social Problems

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011.

Grading Basis: Graded

An examination of how institutional and organizational features of societies generate contemporary social problems, public policies for their alleviation, and questions of ethics and social justice. Topics may include substance use and misuse, mental illness, crime, social inequality, racism, gender disparities, climate change, and human rights. CA 2. CA 4.

III. The General Education Oversight Committee and the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommend ADDITION of the following 3000- or 4000-level existing courses into the General Education curriculum:

A. LING 3700W Field Methods in Linguistics (#10826) [Approved for W]

Proposed Catalog Copy

LING 3700W. Field Methods in Linguistics

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: LING 3310Q or 3410Q or 3511Q; ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011.

Grading Basis: Graded

Hands-on training in the investigation and analysis of an unfamiliar language from scratch through question and answer with a native-speaker linguistic consultant, and in writing scholarly papers documenting the linguistic phenomena that such investigations yield.

B. LLAS/HIST/WGSS 3675 Latina History and Biography (#10885) [CA1, CA4]

Proposed Catalog Copy

LLAS 3675. Latina History and Biography

Also offered as HIST 3675, WGSS 3675

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: None

Grading Basis: Graded

Examination of the history of Latinas in the US with a focus on women, gender, and sexuality. Students will consider how historians use oral histories, life histories, memoirs, biographies, and testimonials as sources to restore Latinas to histories from which they were previously omitted. CA 1. CA 4.

HIST 3675. Latina History and Biography

Also offered as LLAS 3675, WGSS 3675

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: None

Grading Basis: Graded

Examination of the history of Latinas in the US with a focus on women, gender, and sexuality. Students will consider how historians use oral histories, life histories, memoirs, biographies, and testimonials as sources to restore Latinas to histories from which they were previously omitted. CA 1. CA 4.

WGSS 3675. Latina History and Biography

Also offered as HIST 3675, LLAS 3675

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: None

Grading Basis: Graded

Examination of the history of Latinas in the US with a focus on women, gender, and sexuality. Students will consider how historians use oral histories, life histories, memoirs, biographies, and testimonials as sources to restore Latinas to histories from which they were previously omitted. CA 1. CA 4.

C. PNB 3253W Current Topics in Molecular and Developmental Neurobiology (#10466)

[Approved for W]

Proposed Catalog Copy

PNB 3253W. Current Topics in Molecular and Developmental Neurobiology

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011; PNB 3251. Open to Juniors and Seniors only.

Recommended Preparation: PNB 2274, PNB 2275

Grading Basis: Graded

Current topics from primary literature. Molecular mechanisms of brain and nervous system development.

IV. The General Education Oversight Committee and the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommend REVISION of the following 3000- or 4000-level existing courses within or into the General Education curriculum:

A. HIST/LLAS 3608W The Hispanic World in the Ages of Reason and Revolution (#11045) [Add LLAS cross-listing]

Current Catalog Copy

HIST 3608W. The Hispanic World in the Ages of Reason and Revolution

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011; open to juniors or higher.

Recommended preparation: HIST 3607.

Grading Basis: Graded

The transformation of Spanish America from the Bourbons in 1700, through the wars of independence and the struggle to build stable national states in the Nineteenth Century.

Revised Catalog Copy

HIST 3608W. The Hispanic World in the Ages of Reason and Revolution

Also offered as: LLAS 3608W

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011; open to juniors or higher.

Recommended preparation: HIST 3607.

Grading Basis: Graded

The transformation of Spanish America from the Bourbons in 1700, through the wars of independence and the struggle to build stable national states in the Nineteenth Century.

LLAS 3608W. The Hispanic World in the Ages of Reason and Revolution

Also offered as: HIST 3608W

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011; open to juniors or higher.

Recommended preparation: HIST 3607.

Grading Basis: Graded

The transformation of Spanish America from the Bourbons in 1700, through the wars of independence and the struggle to build stable national states in the Nineteenth Century.

V. Other Business

A. GEOC Alignment Report

GEOC Alignment Report 2021-2022

*GEOC is in the process of reaching out to all departments with courses that did not fully align.

Content Area 1 – Arts and Humanities

AMST 1700. Honors Core: American Landscapes

The department has submitted for review the original CAR from 2007, the Course Overview Form, Content Area 1 form, Supplement A, and three sample syllabi. This course is meant to focus on a different locale in each semester, using that place or region as a window to explore human history. According to the CAR, the intention of the course is to explore the “relationship of nature, history, and literature in a given landscape.” Thus, one purpose of the course is to engage students in interdisciplinary study. Locations, over the years, have included Walden pond, the CT River Valley, and the Hudson River Valley. The alignment documents emphasize that the course explores investigations into historical/critical analyses of human experience and investigations into culture and symbolic representation.

There does seem to be significant variation across sections, making the evaluation of CA1 criteria challenging. Two of the three syllabi submitted clearly follow the model of the original course. They engage students in a combination of historical, literary, and/or artistic explorations of the locales on which they focus, engaging students in both an exploration of human history and symbolic representation. The third syllabi submitted seems to deviate somewhat from this model. As far as the committee could tell, Professor Woodward’s syllabus, focusing on the Connecticut River, did not include exploration of art or literature, although it does explore maps, and thus symbolic representation. This section of the course focuses more deeply on the geological, economic, and industrial history of the region. It still aligned with CA1 learning goals, if deviating somewhat from other models of the course and, to a degree, from the original intention to draw together the fields of nature, history, and literature.

The committee also notes that the catalog copy indicates that this course may focus on “real or imagined” places. All locales referenced, and all sample syllabi, are for real locations. We were curious as to whether imagined locations have ever been taught, and if the catalog copy was still accurate. This is simply a question, and does not impact our decision.

Committee recommends continued CA1 designation for this course, noting the minor variations listed above.

VOTE: 7 yea, 0 nay, 0 abstention.

RESULT: The course aligns with CA1 criteria.

ECON 2102W. Economic History of the United States

Documents submitted for review include the Main Alignment Form, Content Area Form A for CA1, Supplemental A GenEd criteria in CLAS, a syllabus from Fall 2021, and the original CAR from 2004. The course is offered at Stamford, usually by the same instructor, thus little variation exists and the alignment forms claim no deviation from the original CAR. The original CAR also characterizes the course as less a “chronology” of the economic aspects of American history than the “application of economic perspectives and theories to the broader questions of history...[thus] the course...engages in investigations and historical/critical analyses of human experience as well as makes inquiries into philosophical and/or political history.” In particular, the CAR asserts, “economics and political theory are very much intertwined ...because it discusses the effect on institutions and organizations of alternative theories of government (e.g., the economic origins of the American Revolution)” or of slavery.

The syllabus charts a chronology of economic organizations and institutions from the American Colonial and Revolutionary eras to slavery, and from the impacts of the Industrial Revolution on transportation and agriculture—including labor—to the Depression and World Wars. Suggested research topics for student papers range from examining the “growth and decline of unions...during the 20th and 21st centuries” to “the impact of the three waves of the feminist movement on the economy within the workplace, and from the causes and impacts of the Depression on specific sectors to the causes and impact of COVID-19 on the economy. Thus, “since the course uses as its material the economic choices people have made over the [decades], it is very much concerned with day-to-day life in many different places and periods. In this respect, the course very clearly demands that students acquire some consciousness of the diversity of human culture and experience” listed as the first possible option for CA1 conformance.

While it was clear that the course meets broad goals of General Education courses, including becoming articulate, acquiring intellectual breadth and versatility and critical judgment, acquiring moral sensitivity, and awareness of their era and society as well as the diversity of human culture and experience, the CA1 subcommittee was somewhat divided on how to assess whether the course continuing to fulfill CA1 criteria. In general, committee members who voted “yes” agreed that the course speaks to the CA1 criteria for “investigations and historical/critical analyses of human experience.” But some committee members noted that they had to do considerable external research on the assigned texts and suggested research topics to arrive at this conclusion. As one reviewer noted, “Examining the effects on a specific sector during the Great Depression, or the growth and decline of unions in the 20th century, or the impact of the feminist movement on the economy—all suggest that the course will expect students to critically analyze human experience as it was impacted by economic policies. I would encourage the instructor to detail the writing requirements (especially as they relate to the suggested topic and themes) to clarify what primary and secondary sources must be used to ground the research so that it speaks to CA1 criteria.”

The Content Area Form was confusing and inconsistent. It claims that the course meets “2.b - Apply appropriate vocabulary and concepts for the description and analysis of artistic, literary, historical, socio-political and philosophical works. But, as one committee member noted, without a clearer outline of arts- or humanities-related texts considered in addition to or articulated as part of the primary textbooks’ and/or lectures’ content [the exception was an essay in the secondary assigned text titled “The ‘Wizard of Oz’ as a monetary allegory” assigned under the unit on Agricultural Modernization...], it was difficult to see how the course achieved this. Indeed, one no vote explicitly questioned “How is this a CA-1 course? We don’t get much in the way of content from the syllabus, which is perfectly normal, but I’m having trouble seeing how the course meets either of the two measures it claims qualifies it for inclusion under CA-1,” also noting “Criteria 2 was left empty even though in the documents there is a clear description of how the course meets these criteria.”

In general, the CA1 subcommittee members were agreed that more information, a more detailed syllabus and materials—an articulation of learning objectives and how course topics and assignment met them [and, e.g., submission of sample exams] and a clearer articulation of how the course meets *both* criteria 1 and 2 for CA1 were needed. Indeed, it is not the job of the subcommittee to inform the proposer how their course meets the criteria, nor to read between the lines of the syllabus to convince themselves of its conformity to CA1 criteria.

VOTE: 4 yea, 3 nay, 0 abstention

RESULT: The course aligns with CA1 criteria, although the decision was not unanimous, and clarifications are recommended.

MAST 1200. Introduction to Maritime Culture

The department has submitted for review the original CAR, the Course Overview form, CA1 Form, Supplement A, the syllabus, and discussion board prompts. This course is currently taught online, asynchronously, by only one faculty member, so the materials submitted are a full representation of how the course is currently taught. MAST 1200 was created to offer a specifically humanities-focused introduction to maritime culture, and to be “equal parts literature and history.” The syllabus and discussion questions submitted fully align with the original stated intention of the course. Students are asked to critically analyze the experiences and philosophies of those whose lives are deeply engaged with the sea, to evaluate the impact of maritime culture on popular culture, and to analyze literary themes and devices. The content of the course draws on fiction, non-fiction and memoir, film, theatre, music, and poetry. The course clearly meets CA1 goals and aligns with its original intention.

The committee recommends continued CA1 designation for this course.

VOTE: 7 yea, 0 nay, 0 abstention

RESULT: The course aligns with CA1 criteria.

Content Area 2 – Social Science

ECON 1201. Principle of Microeconomics

There was one concern about the clarity of the syllabus in communicating the fulfillment of Criterion 2 for ECON 1201. An edited quote from one subcommittee member states:

Criterion 2. Introduce students to methods used in the social sciences, including consideration of the ethical problems social scientists face.

While the course easily checks off the methods portion of this criterion thanks to economic analysis that is introduced across the syllabi, we are somewhat unclear about the articulation of the consideration of ethical problems in the syllabi.

The ECON 1201.pdf and 1_Main Form Gen Ed.doc mention positive vs normative theories (as “nonnative” in the latter), but we don’t see a uniform, explicit consideration of ethical problems across all the syllabi. It could be that the texts used cover these dimensions in appropriate depth, but an instructor may or may not cover some textbook material, so we feel that the syllabi should be improved to include language that guarantees coverage of the ethical dimensions.

We do find evidence that ethical dimensions are probably covered. Johnson’s syllabus includes special topics on minimum wages and monopolies like Amazon. Smirnova has a minimum wage debate. All have public goods and externalities. Still, I’m not sure these rises to “ethical problems social scientists face” since discussion could center entirely on efficiency (as Smirnova explains in the last course objective as a means for analyzing externalities and public goods).

The course is approved with a friendly recommendation. For example, one sentence like the following could assure that all instructors are aware that their course is responsible for covering the ethical dimension as required in criterion 2:

“As part of an introduction to the social sciences, this course will consider the social scientist's responsible use of economic concepts such as monopoly power, externalities, public goods, and price ceilings/floors (including minimum wage) in ethical debates and public decision-making among self-interested agents.”

RESULT: The course align with CA2 criteria with recommendations.

PSYC 1101. General Psychology II

No notes.

RESULT: The course aligns with CA2 criteria.

Content Area 3 – Science and Technology

CHEM 1127Q. General Chemistry I

Summary:

CHEM 1127Q is an introductory chemistry course. The basics of chemistry have been the same for a long time and there is no reason to believe that the current content differs in any major way from content included in syllabi submitted when the course was first approved. This is also confirmed in the submitted forms.

The only concern regarding the CA3 goals derives from criterion 3 (Introduce students to unresolved questions in some area of science or technology and discuss how progress might be made in answering these questions). Although this criterion could easily be addressed in the course content, it is not uniformly described in the course syllabi. One form suggests batteries as an unresolved questions, which is apropos and reasonable. Another form suggests solubility in a very vague statement. The committee is worried about this specific CA3

goal and encourages regular exchanges between all instructors to ensure uniform standards in incorporating this specific goal in the courses.

Syllabi comments:*General education goals*

The course is taught at Storrs and all regional campus, except Torrington. The basic general education goals are fulfilled as much as can be expected. There are seven general education goals. Goals 4 (Acquire moral sensitivity) and 7 (Acquire consciousness of the diversity of human culture and experience) had no entries on the form supposed to describe the basic general education goals. This seems reasonable considering the nature of the course.

CA3-specific goals

The course content has not changed since 2007 when the course was approved, according to the submitted forms.

The course is taught in a manner that is highly uniform at a specific campus, but varies between campuses.

Syllabi: The committee received ten syllabi for evaluation. We received 6 syllabi from Storrs courses, all essentially the same. One syllabus was outdated, used the old three-digit course number and did not identify which campus it was taught. The committee disregarded this syllabus, assuming the instructor no longer teaches the course. We also received syllabi from Stamford, Hartford and Avery Point.

Although there are differences in course books and lab topics between campus, the committee concludes that all courses fulfill the original course goals.

Delivery

The only change since approval in 2007 is that a discussion section has been replaced with a lecture section. This is justified by student comments on the discussion section and seems reasonable.

Laboratory

The lab section of the course fulfills the same goals as in the original proposal and adheres with CA3 goals.

RESULT: The course aligns with CA3 criteria.

PSYC 1100. General Psychology I**Summary:**

PSYC 1100 is a core course introducing the scientific fundamentals of Psychology. As a 1000-level class, the basics of psychology are well-established, but there are numerous ways in which the discipline can be introduced with new findings and examples that are relevant to introductory students.

The committee has not all voted, but the current votes approve the alignment of PSYC 1100 as continuing to meet the CA3 criteria. The main concern seems to be in the variability of syllabi, particularly across campuses. We urge the department to make sure all versions of this class being taught meet the CA3 criteria.

Syllabi comments:

General education goals

The course is taught at Storrs and all regional campus, except Torrington. The basic general education goals are fulfilled in most of the syllabi, but there is considerable variation in how this is expressed in the objectives stated from one syllabus to the next. All of the general education areas are addressed.

CA3-specific goals

The course content has not changed since 2004 when the course was initially approved, according to the submitted forms.

The course is taught in a manner that is highly variable from instructor to instructor and campus to campus, but the core objectives appear to meet the CA3 criteria for each version of the class.

Syllabi: The committee received five syllabi for evaluation: two from Storrs, one each from Avery Point, Hartford, and an online version.

Although there are differences in stated objectives, approach, course books, and topics between campuses, the committee concludes that all courses fulfill the original course goals.

Delivery

The classes are primarily delivered as lectures and/or online materials, with high variability in other activities and assessments ranging between laboratory activities (especially at the Storrs campus), online video, interactive activities, and participation as a research subject for extra credit.

Laboratory

Although the class is listed as CA3-Lecture, a lab section is part of the class when it is taught on the Storrs campus. It appears that the lab provides added, hands-on benefit to these classes, but the class is not set up to have a separate introductory Psychology class that would be a lab class fulfilling the CA-3L criteria.

RESULT: The course aligns with CA3 criteria.

Content Area 4 – Diversity and Multiculturalism**AAAS 3212. Asian American Literature**

Based on the readings, it seems like the course has wide range across Asian populations (East, Southeast, and South). Is there benefit to highlighting that explicitly given historic tendencies to treat South Asians as distinct from East and Southeast Asian groups? The instructor alludes to the Korematsu decision that upheld the constitutionality of Japanese internment during WWII--along with Plessy v Fergusson, the most egregious miscarriage of Supreme Court jurisprudence in US history, but unlike Plessy, which was overturned by Brown v Board of Ed, the Korematsu decision still technically stands as precedent despite widespread contemporary condemnation. But, even previous to that, the Supreme Court (Ozawa v US) upheld California law that made it illegal for immigrant Asians to own farmland on the grounds that only Whites and Blacks could be US naturalized citizens. In a subsequent case just one year later, an Indian American (Thind v US) sued for naturalized citizenship claiming northern high caste Indians were Caucasian, but the Supreme Court rejected that argument and decided that South Asians were also ineligible for naturalized citizenship (birthright citizenship had been established two decades earlier in the Ark case). In any event the treatment of South Asian populations,

themselves greatly varied, viz a viz other Asians is obviously very interesting and may warrant a mention in the syllabus or course description.

RESULT: The course aligns with CA4 criteria.

AFRA 3505. White Racism

No notes

RESULT: The course aligns with CA4 criteria.

AMST 1201. Introduction to American Studies

As would be expected from a course taught by multiple faculty from different departments, each with different areas of expertise, there is a great deal of variation in the content coverage across the syllabi that were provided. To increase the clarity of how each course offering (1) satisfied specific objectives of the Multiculturalism and Diversity requirement and (2) the material that gave voice to the populations being studied, we would strongly recommend that instructors develop a common syllabus structure that addressed these points even as they used a variety of particular examples. The submission documents that explained how the course met the CA-4 requirements and especially the syllabus provided by Prof. Vials seemed like an excellent foundation for doing so.

This would not only benefit students, who could clearly identify how any instance of the course was meeting the Multiculturalism and Diversity objectives, but also make subsequent alignment reviews easier to prepare and critique, as the faculty member in charge of submission could present to this subcommittee a justification taken directly from the syllabus of the form: "These are the Multiculturalism and Diversity objectives that every course version addresses. In the course taught by Instructor X, this is met in topics A, B, C using material a, b, and c. In the course taught by Instructor Y, etc."

RESULT: The course aligns with CA4 criteria.

PSYC 3102. Psychology of Women

The two syllabi included made no reference to diversity and multiculturalism and there was no description of the readings for us to assess their ability to reflect diverse experiences and interpretations. We asked the faculty for more information and we found the changes they made to the syllabus acceptable.

RESULT: The course aligns with CA4 criteria.

Quantitative Competency

CHEM 1127Q. General Chemistry I

The committee members agreed that the courses easily meets the three Q criteria and there really wasn't anything to discuss. Course syllabi explained how these criteria are met (using algebra for CHEM 1127Q, calculus for ECON 2211Q, and statistics for PSYC 2011WQ).

RESULT: The course aligns with Q criteria.

ECON 2211Q. Microeconomic Theory

The committee members agreed that the courses easily meets the three Q criteria and there really wasn't anything to discuss. Course syllabi explained how these criteria are met (using algebra for CHEM 1127Q, calculus for ECON 2211Q, and statistics for PSYC 2011WQ).

RESULT: The course aligns with Q criteria.

PSYC 2100WQ. Principles of Research in Psychology

The committee members agreed that the courses easily meets the three Q criteria and there really wasn't anything to discuss. Course syllabi explained how these criteria are met (using algebra for CHEM 1127Q, calculus for ECON 2211Q, and statistics for PSYC 2011WQ).

RESULT: The course aligns with Q criteria.

Writing Competency

ACCT 4997W. Senior Thesis in Accounting

The materials originally did not align, but materials received subsequently did align.

RESULT: The course aligns with W criteria.

AFRA 4994W. Senior Seminar

No notes.

RESULT: The course aligns with W criteria.

ECON 2102W. Economic History of the United States

The materials originally did not align, but materials received subsequently did align.

RESULT: The course aligns with W criteria.

MARN 4030W. Chemical Oceanography

The submitted syllabus is missing the F clause. This syllabus needs to make clear that students will be required to submit a minimum of 15 pages (or 4500 words) of revised writing. This syllabus does not make clear the relation between writing and learning in the course.

RESULT: The course does NOT align with W criteria.

PSYC 3100W. The History and Systems of Psychology

The submitted syllabus does not make clear the relation between writing and learning. The syllabus does not make clear the feedback process. It is also unclear how the 15 page (4500 word) requirement will be met.

RESULT: The course does NOT align with W criteria.

SLHS 4254W. Introduction to Language Disorders in Children*

*Note: This course was a rollover from last year's alignment that now meets criteria.

No notes.

RESULT: The course aligns with W criteria.

Respectfully Submitted by the 21-22 Senate Curricula and Courses Committee: Suzanne Wilson (Chair), Alana Adams, Mary Ann Amalaradjou, Tom Bontly, Mark Brand, Peter Diplock (ex-officio), Kate Fuller, Marc Hatfield, Dalton Hawie (USG Rep), Matt McKenzie, George Michna, David Ouimette, Makenzie Robinson (USG Rep), Sharyn Rusch, Eric Schultz, Steve Stifano, Manuela Wagner (Ex-Officio), Julia Yakovich, Cindy Zhang, Terra Zuidema (Registrar alternate), Nu-Anh Tran (Alternate for M. McKenzie, who is on sabbatical)

From the 4/4/22 and 4/18/22 meetings

Senate Nominating Committee
To the University Senate
April 4, 2022
2022/2023 Senate Committee Membership Rosters

Curricula & Courses Committee

***Suzanne, Wilson, Chair, Ed Curriculum & Leadership**

*John Chandy, Engineering, ECE
*Louis Hanzlik, SFA, Music
*Matt McKenzie, History, Avery Point Campus
*Tina Reardon, Waterbury, History
*Pam Bedore, Chair of GEOC, (Ex-Officio)
Peter Diplock, Associate Vice Provost, CETL (Ex-Officio)
Registrar's Office Designee (Currently Marc Hatfield, alternate
Terra Zuidema)
Sharyn Rusch, CLAS Academic Services
Eric Schultz, CLAS, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
Steve Stifano, CLAS, Communication (C&C Chair)

Faculty Standards Committee

***Dan Burkey, Chair, Engineering, Associate Dean**

*Bede Agocha, CLAS, Africana Studies Institute
*Valarie Artigas, School of Nursing
*Masha Gordina, CLAS, Mathematics
*Lisa Holle, Pharmacy Practice
*Elizabeth Jockusch, CLAS, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
*Elaine Lee, CAHNR, Kinesiology
*Vicki Magley, CLAS, Psychological Sciences
*Betsy McCoach, Neag, Educational Psychology
*George McManus, CLAS, Avery Point
*Erika Skoe, CLAS, Speech, Language, & Hearing Sciences
Douglas Degges, SFA, Art and Art History
Martina Rosenberg, CETL, Faculty Development
Jeffrey Shoulson, Senior Vice Provost, Ex-Officio member
Dave Weber, Business, Accounting

Enrollment Committee

***Catherine Little, Chair, Education, Educational Psychology**

*Robin Bogner, Pharmacy, Pharmaceutical Science
*Jamie Caruso, Waterbury, Staff
*Miranda Davis, CLAS, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
*Dan Mercier, AVP, Staff
*Nate Trumbull, AVP
*Susana Ulloa, ISS Academic Program Center
*Fiona Vernal, CLAS, History
*Mark Zurolo, SFA, Art & Art History
Nathan Fuerst, Vice President for Enrollment Planning &
Management (Ex-Officio Member)
Vern Granger, Office of Admissions
Christina Irizarry, ISS
Jennifer Morenus, PRLACC
Mansour Ndiaye, CLAS Academic Services
Brian Rockwood, Registrar's Office

Justice, Equity, Diversity & Inclusion Committee

***Joseph MacDougald, Chair, Law**

*Becky Bacher, CLAS Advising
*Inge Marie Eigsti, CLAS, Psychological Sciences
*Caitlin Elsaesser, School of Social Work (sabbatical sp23)
*Kristen Govoni, CAHNR, Animal Science (sabbatical sp23)
*Micah Heumann, ISS, ACES
*Diandra Prescod, Neag
*Greg Reilly, Business, Management
*Jennifer Pascal, Engineering, Chemical & Molecular
*Margaret Rubega, CLAS, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
*Lynne Tirrell, CLAS, Philosophy
*Sarah Willen, CLAS, Human Rights Institute
*Cindy Zhang, CLAS, Geography
Cinnamon Adams, The Graduate School
Mona Lucas, Enrollment Planning & Management
Maryann Markowski, OVPR's Office
Willena Price, African American Cultural Center
Stephany Santos, School of Engineering, Biomedical
Engineering
Audrey Silva, Center for Students with Disabilities
Frank Tuitt, Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion & Chief
Diversity Officer

Senate Nominating Committee
To the University Senate
April 4, 2022
2022/2023 Senate Committee Membership Rosters

Scholastic Standards Committee

Chair to be determined

*Maureen Armstrong, Dean of Students Office
*Kelly Burke, Engineering, Chem & Biomolecular
*Jason Chang, CLAS, History
*Robin Coulter, Business, Marketing
*Carrie Fernandes, Financial Aid
*Jamie Kleinman, AVP, CLAS, Psychological Sciences
*Diane Lillo-Martin, Linguistics
*Joe Madaus, Education, Education Psychology
*Morty Ortega, CAHNR
*Dave Wagner, CLAS, EEB
*Lawrence Walsh, Office of Admissions
Kelly Bartlett, Student Services, Waterbury Campus
Greg Bouquot, Registrar's Office
Karen Bresciano, The Graduate School
Erin Ciarimboli, Enrichment Programs & University Advising
Sarah Croucher, Director of Academic Policy
Lindsay Cummings, SFA, Dramatic Arts
Holly Fitch, CLAS, Psychology
Jennifer Lease Butts, Assistant Vice Provost for Enrichment Programs (Ex-Officio Member)
Lauren Schlesselman, Director of Learning Initiatives & Educational Technologies, CETL

Senate University Budget Committee

***Lisa Park Boush, Chair, CLAS, Earth Sciences**

*Mary Ann Amalaradjou, CAHNR, Animal Science
*Robert Bird, Business, Marketing – stepping down as chair
*Eleni Coundouriotis, CLAS, English
*Elena Dormidontova, CLAS, Physics
*Steve Marchillo, SSW, Director of Finance
*Michael Morrell, CLAS, Political Science
*Michael White, Dining Services
Lloyd Blanchard, Interim EXVP and CFO (Ex-Officio Member)
Jeffrey McCutcheon, Engineering, Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering
Lauren Slingluff, University Libraries
Michael Vertefeuille, SFA, Digital Media and Design

Student Welfare Committee

***Leo Lachut, ISS, Academic Achievement Center**

***Sheila Andrew, CAHNR, Animal Science**

*Laura Burton, Neag
*Fabiana Cardetti, CLAS, Mathematics
*Cora Lynn Deibler, SFA, Art & Art History
*Kate Fuller, UConn Libraries
*Erica Granoff, Stamford, Student Services
*Tina McCarthy, SHaW
*Sarah Scheidel, ISS, First Year Experience
*Leslie Shor, Engineering
*Colleen Spurling, CLAS, Molecular & Cell Biology
Bryanna Anderson, Center for Students with Disabilities
Kimberly Duby, Dean of Students Office
Arthur Galinat, International Student & Scholar Services
Michael Gilbert, Vice President of Student Affairs (Ex Officio Member)
Laine Kingo, Business, Advising & Compliance Specialist, Hartford
Katherine McCarthy, Admissions
Suzanne Peters, Financial Aid
Claudia Pina, SHaW, Waterbury Campus
Jennifer Gattilia Tibbetts, Registrar's Office
Peter Tribuzio, Student Services, Hartford Campus

University Planning Committee

***Bonnie Burr, CAHNR, Extension**

*Amvrossios Bagtzoglou, Engineering, Civil & Environmental
*Oksan Bayulgen, CLAS, Political Science
*Joanne Conover, CLAS, Physiology & Neurobiology
*Carl Rivers, Office of the Registrar
*Mike Shor, CLAS, Economics
Mehdi A Anwar, Engineering
Tutita Casa, Neag School of Education
Bethany Javidi, OVPR's Office
Jessica McBride, CAHNR, Communications Office
Jeffrey Shoulson, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (Ex-Officio Member)
Rachel Tambling, CLAS, Human Development & Family Sciences

Senate Curricula & Courses Committee
Report to the University Senate
May 2, 2022 presentation

By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, II.C.1.c. Exemptions and Substitutions and II.C.2. General Education Curriculum

Background: The Senate C&C Committee presents these changes to the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate as part of the proposed Common Curriculum program. A vote on these amendments will take place following discussion and vote on the upcoming implementation plan. These changes are being presented now and will serve as the required due notice.

II.C.1.c. Exemptions and Substitutions

Students who for any reason, desire to be excused from any requirements, or to substitute other courses for those prescribed, shall consult the dean of the school or college concerned. Such exemption or substitutions must be recommended by the dean of the school or college and approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

For transfer students (those admitted to the University with advanced standing from another institution of higher education), exemptions and substitutions in the General Education Common Curriculum Requirements for their prior academic work must be approved by the dean of the college or school to which the prospective student is seeking admission. These exemptions and substitutions should be made at the time of the student's enrollment at the University.

2. General Education Common Curriculum

The General Education Common Curriculum provides academic breadth with a set of intellectually rigorous and challenging courses that foster skills and attributes associated with leadership and global citizenship.

Every undergraduate student in a baccalaureate degree program in the University, on all campuses, must complete the General Education Common Curriculum. The General Education Common Curriculum ~~comprises four content areas and four competencies, and Environmental Literacy~~ involves immersion in six Topics of Inquiry and five Competencies.

The purpose of General Education the Common Curriculum is to ensure that all University of Connecticut undergraduate students ~~become articulate and acquire intellectual breadth and versatility, critical judgment, moral sensitivity, awareness of their era and society, consciousness of the diversity of human culture and experience, and a working understanding of the processes by which they can continue to acquire and use knowledge.~~ are experienced with different ways of knowing and many kinds of knowledge beyond career preparation, and that they enter society

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Left

Formatted: Left

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

and their professions with a strong sense of moral, ethical, and social responsibility. It is vital to the accomplishment of the University's mission that a balance between professional and general education be established and maintained in which each is complementary to and compatible with the other. A leader and global citizen needs to be able to listen, speak, and cultivate compassion with those outside their own majors, disciplines, professions, communities, and cultures and to make connections between their own knowledge and perspectives and those of others.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

a. *Content Areas**Topics of Inquiry*

Students must pass at least ~~six~~ three credits of coursework in each of ~~four~~ content areas six Topics of Inquiry (TOI): ~~Content Area One—Arts and Humanities; Content Area Two—Social Sciences; Content Area Three—Science and Technology; and, Content Area Four—Diversity and Multiculturalism.~~ TOI-1—Creativity: Design, Expression, Innovation; TOI-2—Cultural Dimensions of Human Experiences; TOI-3—Diversity, Equity, and Social Justice; TOI-4—Environmental Literacy; TOI-5—Individual Values and Social Institutions; and TOI-6—Science and Empirical Inquiry. ~~Content Area~~ Topic of Inquiry courses may be counted toward the major.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

~~Students must pass at least seven content area courses of at least three credits for a total of at least~~ The 21 credits of TOI courses must be from at least six different subject areas as designated by subject code (e.g., ANTH). ~~However, up to three credits of repeatable one-credit courses may be included in Content Areas One and Four. Exceptions to this rule are subject heading designations that group interdisciplinary studies through cross listing, such as LLAS, AFRA, WGSS, AAAS, URBN, ENVS, EVST, or HRTS. At least one course must be passed in each Topic of Inquiry (some courses fulfill two)~~

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

~~The courses fulfilling Content Areas One, Two, and Three must represent at least six different subjects as designated by subject code (e.g., ANTH or WGSS). The courses within each of these content areas must be from two different subjects. In Content Area Three, one of the courses must be a laboratory course of at least four credits. However, this laboratory requirement is waived for students who have passed a laboratory course in the biological and/or physical sciences. In Content Area Four, at least three credits shall address issues of diversity and/or multiculturalism outside of the United States. Students must also satisfy a Focus requirement, by either successfully completing three courses in a single Topic of Inquiry or all requirements of at least one Theme. Students may also take a set of courses that comprise a faculty-designed Theme spanning multiple disciplines. Themes are recommended but not required. No more than six credits with the INTD prefix may be elected by any student to meet the~~ General Education Common Curriculum Requirements.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

b. *Competencies*

The ~~General Education Common~~ Curriculum includes competencies in ~~information literacy~~, quantitative skills, second language proficiency, and writing. ~~Two additional competencies--information and digital media literacy and dialogue--are infused across the Common Curriculum within TOIs. The coursework required to demonstrate Information Literacy is established by each major field of study.~~ Quantitative Literacy is established by completing two courses that are designated for this purpose as Q courses. One Q course must be a MATH or STAT course. Second Language ~~C~~ompetency is established by passing either 1) the third-year high school level course in a language other than English or 2) the second semester course in the first-year sequence of college level study in a language other than English. Writing ~~C~~ompetency is established by passing two courses that are designated for this purpose as W courses, one of which must be in the major field of study at the 2000-level or above. First-year writing courses are prerequisites for W courses.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

~~a. Environmental Literacy~~

~~Students must pass at least one course of at least three credits in Environmental Literacy. Environmental Literacy courses are designated for this purpose as E courses. Environmental Literacy courses may be counted towards the major.~~

~~b.a. Courses~~

All courses offered for ~~General Education Common Curriculum~~ credit must be recommended for approval by the ~~General Education Common Curriculum Oversight~~ Committee (~~CCC~~) (see II.C.2.e, *Oversight*).

Courses in ~~Content Areas One, Two and Three~~ the six Topics of Inquiry may have only ~~General Education Common Curriculum~~ courses as prerequisites and corequisites, ~~excepting with the exception of (a) Honors courses for which Honors student status may be is a prerequisite, and (b) TOI-6 courses and TOI courses that are also Writing Competency courses.~~ Courses in Content Area Four, Environmental Literacy, and Writing Competency, which may have prerequisites and corequisites that are not ~~General Education Common Curriculum~~ courses.

Any academic unit may offer courses for any ~~Content Area~~Topic of Inquiry or Competency ~~and for Environmental Literacy~~. Courses approved for the ~~General Education Common~~ Curriculum are approved for ~~content areas~~Topics of Inquiry or ~~C~~ompetencies in all Schools and Colleges.

A course may be approved to satisfy one ~~Content Area, two Content Areas, or three Content Areas if one of the three is Content Area 4, or two Topics of Inquiry.~~ Students may use a course that has multiple ~~Content Area~~TOI designations to fulfill the ~~Content Area~~TOI requirements for which the course

has been approved, if the regulations listed in II.C.2.a. ~~Content Areas~~Topics of Inquiry are met. ~~An Environmental Literacy course may be approved for and count for one Content Area or two Content Areas if one is Content Area 4.~~ Courses at the 2000-level or above may combine Quantitative and Writing Competency designations. Courses with Quantitative and/or Writing Competency designations may also be approved for ~~Content Areas and/or Environmental Literacy Topics of Inquiry.~~

No academic unit may set enrollment bars or priorities for its own students for any ~~General Education Common Curriculum~~ course, with the following exceptions:

- An academic unit may reserve any percentage of seats for its own students in a 2000+-level or above W course that is not also approved for a ~~content area~~TOI.
- An academic unit may reserve a maximum of 50% of capacity for its own students in any section of a 2000-level or above Content Area 4 (Diversity and Multiculturalism) ~~course that is not approved for an additional content area.~~

Students seeking an Additional Degree or a Double Major must complete each degree's/major's ~~Information Literacy and Writing~~ Competency coursework. If an individual course is approved for a competency in both degrees/majors, passing that course will meet that requirement for both degrees/majors.

All students entering the University of Connecticut or changing School or College within the University are expected to complete the ~~General Education Common Curriculum~~ of the academic year in which they enter the ~~new School or College~~University. Adjustments to coursework for the Second Language and Quantitative ~~Competencies~~ can be made by designees of the Dean of the admitting School or College, as well as by the ~~Academic Adjustments Committee~~Center for Students with Disabilities (CSD) in consultation with relevant faculty, which will. The CSD will submit a report of such substitutions by the end of the Spring semester each year.

Undergraduate students with Bachelor's degrees from institutions that have been accredited by regional accreditation agencies (e.g. NECHE) are exempt from the ~~General Education Common Curriculum~~ Requirements.

e. *Oversight*

The ~~GECC~~Common Curriculum Committee (CCC) is a subcommittee of, and reports its actions to, the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee. The ~~CCGECC~~ receives financial support for its activities from the Office of the Provost.

The GEOC is charged with:

- proposing to the Senate goals and objectives of the ~~Content Areas~~ Topics of Inquiry and Competencies;
- proposing policy regarding the University-wide ~~General Education~~ Common Curriculum program;
- reviewing proposals for including, revising, deleting, and offering in intensive sessions of four weeks or less, courses that are in the ~~General Education~~ Common Curriculum;
- reporting on enrollment in courses in the ~~General Education~~ Common Curriculum and how the courses are staffed;
- monitoring courses in the ~~General Education~~ Common Curriculum to ensure that they continue to meet curricular goals and objectives approved by the Senate, and recommending removal of courses from the ~~General Education~~ Common Curriculum that no longer meet these criteria; and,
- reviewing the ~~General Education~~ Common Curriculum to ensure that its goals and objectives are aligned with the academic plan of the University.

The ~~CCC~~ Chair ~~of the GEOC~~ need not be a Senator. The Chair serves one three-year term and may not be re-appointed for a consecutive term. Responsibilities of the Chair in leadership of ~~GEOC-CCC~~ include management of ~~GEOC-CCC~~ meetings, coordination of all ~~GEOC-CCC~~ functions, communication with the University community about the ~~General Education~~ Common Curriculum, and recognizing and responding to the changing needs of the University with respect to the ~~General Education~~ Common Curriculum. Because of the unusually demanding nature of this position, the chair will be given at least 50% release time and be provided with administrative support.

The membership of the ~~GEOC-CCC~~ will be representative of Schools and Colleges. Appointment to the ~~GEOC-CCC~~ will follow Senate Nominating Committee practice and will include consultation with the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. Voting members of the ~~GEOC-CCC~~ will be faculty appointed by the Senate and an undergraduate representative. Non-voting members of the ~~GEOC-CCC~~ will include the Chair of the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee, Directors or Associate Directors of the Quantitative and Writing Centers, Directors or Associate Directors of the First-Year Writing Program, and one individual who represents the following five institutes: Africana Studies Institute, Asian and Asian American Studies Institute, Center for Judaic Studies and Contemporary Jewish Life, El Instituto, and Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Program. When a Director or Associate Director of these units is a ~~GEOC-CCC~~ subcommittee chair and is faculty, they will retain voting rights in the ~~GEOC-CCC~~.

Voting member appointments to the GEOC-CCC are for two years, except the student member who serves a one-year term. Any voting member who has served for two consecutive two-year terms may not be re-appointed for another consecutive term.

The GEOC-CCC appoints members to ~~Content Area~~Topic of Inquiry and, Competency, ~~and Environmental Literacy~~, subcommittees. Subcommittees are chaired by voting members of the GEOC-CCC and are representative of Schools and Colleges. Each subcommittee must review and recommend courses for inclusion, removal, and revision in their respective area.

GEOC-CCC approvals of changes to the General Education Common Curriculum are submitted to the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee and then to the Senate for final approval.

The Senate Budget Committee is charged with determining if sufficient resources are available to support the General Education Common Curriculum.

Faculty Standards Committee
Recommendation to the University Senate
May 2, 2022

Background:

In March 2010, the University Senate passed a motion endorsing the use of student evaluations of teaching (SETs), recognizing that they provide information that can be useful for improving teaching and evaluating teaching performance. However, the Senate also urged caution in interpreting numerical values from SETs as an indicator of teaching competence because no set of numerical values can be sufficient as the sole indicator of teaching effectiveness and that research shows that SET results are sometimes influenced by factors other than teaching performance, such as student bias.

Because when used in performance evaluations, SETs can have significant consequences for the careers of both full-time and part-time instructors, the University Senate asked the Faculty Standards Committee to develop guidelines for the appropriate use of teaching evaluations. These guidelines were prepared by the Faculty Standards Committee and approved by the Senate in April 2011 and are available at: https://oire.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/35/2017/09/FE_Univ_Senate_SET_Guidelines_Fa12.pdf

The Faculty Standards Committee has updated these guidelines based on several new factors:

1. The collective bargaining agreement between the University of Connecticut Board of Trustees and the AAUP explicitly prohibits reliance on SETs as the only evidence of teaching effectiveness.
2. Although an overall score on an individual teaching evaluation can be an indicator of teaching performance, research shows that SET results are only moderately correlated with teaching effectiveness and can be influenced by factors that are not under the control of the instructor and are unrelated to teaching performance, such as course level/topic/field of study or instructor's race or ethnicity, primary language, gender/sex or age, as a few examples.
3. SETs are student ratings intended to represent the collective views of a group of students who have experienced the learning environment created by a faculty member. Student ratings are not a measure of student learning.

Recommendation:

The University Senate approve these updated guidelines for deans, department heads, and PTR committee faculty on interpreting SET results.

Interpreting Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) Results: Guidelines for Deans, Department Heads, and Faculty

Prepared by Faculty Standards Committee (FSC), April 4, 2022

Approved by the University Senate May 2, 2025

In March 2010, the University Senate passed a motion endorsing the use of student evaluations of teaching (SETs), recognizing that they provide information that can be useful for improving teaching and evaluating teaching performance. However, the Senate also urged caution in interpreting numerical values from SETs as an indicator of teaching competence. This caution is based on three premises.

1. As explicitly recognized by the Senate, no set of numerical values suffices as the sole indicator of teaching effectiveness. The collective bargaining agreement between the University of Connecticut Board of Trustees and the AAUP explicitly prohibits reliance on SETs as the only evidence of teaching effectiveness.
2. Although an overall score on an individual teaching evaluation can be an indicator of teaching performance, research shows that SET results are only moderately correlated with teaching effectiveness and can be influenced by factors that are not under the control of the instructor and are unrelated to teaching performance, such as student bias.
3. SETs are student ratings intended to represent the collective views of a group of students who have experienced the learning environment created by a faculty member. Student ratings are not a measure of student learning.

When used in performance evaluations, SETs can have significant consequences for the careers of both full-time and part-time instructors. Thus, it is imperative that they be interpreted carefully. Given changes in student attitudes and expectations over time, as well as pedagogical methods used by faculty, the Faculty Standards Committee recommends regularly (every 5 years) revisiting the SET survey and guidelines to ensure they are up-to-date and reflective of current thinking and best practices. This process should include a review of the SET survey item, response scales, survey format, and mode of survey recruitment and administration. The following is guidance on the interpretation of SETs as of AY 2021/2022. A university-wide task force to operationalize “evidence of teaching excellence beyond SET” (formerly known as SET+ or SET plus) is being formed for AY 2022/2023.

Overall recommendation: In addition to considering the information provided by SETs, Deans, Department Heads, and PTR committee faculty are contractually obligated to use additional methods of evaluating instructors. All methods, to the extent they are contributing to the evaluation process, should be documented and agreed upon by the faculty in the department, transparent to those being evaluated, and collected from different independent lines of evidence (information sources).

Factors other than teaching competence that can influence SET results: The literature on SETs is both extensive and complicated (see the appendix for a partial list of references). Although it is difficult to isolate contributing factors, research suggests that SET-responses can be influenced by multiple and often intersecting biases, including the following (note – this is not an exhaustive list):

- *Student year:* First-year students tend to give the lowest ratings; graduate students the highest.
- *Course-level:* Students tend to give lower ratings in required courses than in electives.
- *Course topic:* Students may rate instructors lower when the instructor’s perceived view on controversial or uncomfortable topics are contrary to their own.
- *Instructor race or ethnicity:* Students sometimes give faculty identifying as BIPOC (Black, Indigenous and People of Color) or identifying as a cultural minority lower rating.

- *Instructor's primary language*: Students sometimes give lower ratings to instructors who are non-native English speakers, speak with an accent, or don't use what is currently referred to as Standard American English.
- *Disciplinary culture*: Students sometimes give lower ratings to women in male-dominated disciplines such as science, mathematics, economics, engineering, and philosophy, or to men in female-dominated disciplines such as nursing independent of their competency.
- *Gender/sex*: Students can rate faculty lower who do not conform to heterosexual, gender binary and cisgender norms; students can also give lower ratings to faculty based on perceived gender or sex, regardless of actual competence (ie, male students rating female instructors lower).
- *Field of study/discipline*: Classes in sciences and engineering tend to receive lower ratings than those in the humanities.
- *Age*: Students may rate younger instructors lower than older instructors.

Note: Although some anecdotal evidence and popular belief suggest that SET results are correlated with expected grades (with easy graders receiving higher scores), this claim is not supported by systematic research. Rather, evidence shows that there is a strong correlation between instructor ratings and students' perception of learning outcomes.

Guidelines for Interpreting SET results:

Based on research related to SETs, the Senate recommends the following guidelines be used in interpreting SET results.

Individuals or committees entrusted with reviewing files for tenure, promotion, hiring, contract renewals, teaching awards, or other university purposes making use of the SETs should be familiar with SET interpretation guidance. For personnel or promotion decisions in particular, efforts should be made to assess whether numerical scores correspond with other sources of information for teaching evaluation (e.g., peer reviews, substantive qualitative comments from students, instructor self-reflections and teaching statements, and other relevant information).

1. Examine the patterns of instructor ratings across time. Compare multiple and similar courses across multiple semesters to form generalizations about student perceptions of teaching effectiveness. Don't focus on outliers.
2. Avoid comparing the raw SET scores between instructors without any context.
3. Remember that the sample is not random and therefore may not be representative of the entire class
4. Do not over-interpret small differences in median ratings. Variance is normal.
5. Do not use university or department averages (means or medians) as a line separating "failing" and "passing" teaching performance; as noted above, SETs can vary significantly across disciplines, so comparing to university-wide averages may not be appropriate or informative.
6. Do not average multiple, inherently-different SET items into a single value. Composite scores can misrepresent data.
7. Ask: Are one or two low student ratings affecting the results in a small class?
8. Ask: Does this instructor receive consistently better ratings for some skills than others (preparation, clear assignments, receptivity to students)?
9. Ask: Are SET ratings influenced by large class size or courses outside of a student's major?
10. Ask: Is the distribution of SET ratings in particular classes bi-modal, as sometimes occurs in classes that include controversial or politically- charged topics?
11. Do not solely focus on the two questions related to overall ratings of the instructor's teaching and the course – examine the scores holistically.

12. Recognize that when there are responses from small numbers of students, percentages or average ratings may not be meaningful or representative.
13. Ask: Are student ratings consistent with other sources of evidence?

Appendix

Selected Relevant Publications

- Anderson, K. J., & Smith, G. (2005). Students' preconceptions of professors: Benefits and barriers according to ethnicity and gender. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 27(2), 184-201.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0739986304273707>
- Arreola, R. A. (2007). *Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system*. Jossey-Bass.
- Cashin, W. (1999). Student rating of teaching: Uses and misuses. In P. Seldin (Ed.), *Changing practices in evaluating teaching: A practical guide to faculty performance and promotion/tenure decisions* (pp. 25-44). Anker Publishing Company.
- Centra, J. A., & Gaubatz, N. B. (2000). Is there gender bias in student evaluations of teaching? *Journal of Higher Education*, 71(1), 17-33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2000.11780814>
- Cohen, P. A. (1990). Bring research into practice. In M. Theall & J. Franklin (Eds.), *Student ratings of instruction: Issues for improving practice: New directions for teaching and learning*, No. 43 (pp. 123-132). Jossey-Bass.
- Esarey, J., & Valdes, N. (2020). Unbiased, reliable, and valid student evaluations can still be unfair. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 45(8), 1106-1120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1724875>
- Feldman, K. A. (1993). College students' views of male and female faculty college teachers: Part II – Evidence from students' evaluations of their classroom teachers. *Research in Higher Education*, 34(2), 151-211.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00992161>
- Hammermesh, D., & Parker, A. (2005) Beauty in the classroom: Instructors' pulchritude and putative pedagogical productivity. *Economics of Education Review*, 24(4), 369-376. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2004.07.013>
- Hendrix, K. G. (1998). Student perceptions of the influence of race on professor credibility. *Journal of Black Studies*, 28(6), 738-764. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002193479802800604>
- Hollman, M., Key, E., & Kreitzer, R. (2019) *Evidence of bias in standard evaluations of teaching*.
<http://www.rebeccakreitzer.com/bias/>
- Houston, T. A. (2006). Race and gender bias in higher education: Could faculty course evaluations impede further progress toward parity? *Seattle Journal for Social Justice*, 4(2), 591-611
<https://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/sjsj/vol4/iss2/34>
- Ory, J. C., & Ryan, K. (2001). How do student ratings measure up to a new validity framework? In M. Theall, P. C. Abrami, & L. A. Mets (Eds.), *New directions for institutional research: No. 109. The student ratings debate: Are they valid?* Jossey-Bass.

Rubin, D. L. (1998). Help! My professor (or doctor or boss) doesn't talk English. In J. N. Martin, T. K. Nakayama, & L. A. Flores (Eds.), *Readings in cultural contexts* (pp. 149 – 160). Mayfield Publishing Company.

Seldin, P. (1999) *Changing practices in evaluating teaching*. Anker.

Uttl, B., White, C. A., & Gonzalez D. W. (2017) Meta-analysis of faculty's teaching effectiveness: Student evaluation of teaching ratings and student learning are not related. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 54, 22-42.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2016.08.007>