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Executive Summary

The Task Force recommends that the governing departments should—within standards that the Faculty Senate shall establish—determine each of its degree program’s discipline-specific communication competencies and their method of achievement. Accordingly, UNCG should eliminate the current Writing and Speaking Intensive markers from the General Education requirements. Further, UNCG should disestablish the current Communication Across the Curriculum program; establish a new entity to oversee the Writing, Speaking, and future Digital Literacy Centers; and institute a new program that shall require every degree-granting program in the University to create and implement an appropriate “Communication in the Discipline” plan. A new Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council, with the support of Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program (the current CAC Program restructured), should administer this plan.

Should the Faculty Senate reject the plan to eliminate the Writing Intensive (WI) and Speaking Intensive (SI) markers (Plan A), the Task Force recommends an alternative Plan B. Plan B will disestablish the current Communication Across the Curriculum program (CAC). It will retain the WI and SI markers, but will remove them as General Education program requirements and make them University requirements. Each department shall add two WI and two SI courses to each of its undergraduate degree program requirements, and each department shall be responsible for the assessment of the WI and SI courses they offer. The oversight of this program, including the certification of writing and speaking intensive courses according to more stringent and explicit criteria, shall be the responsibility of a standing, elected Senate “Communication Across the Curriculum Committee.”

Should the Senate not approve the resolutions of either Plan A or Plan B, the Senate should strictly enforce its current rules. The oversight of the Speaking Across the Curriculum and Writing Across the Curriculum programs—including the development of assignment parameters and student learning objectives, the approval of WI and SI course proposals, the training of faculty, and other duties currently undertaken by CAC (which has never been formally established by the Senate)—should pass back to GEC, and the CAC should be dissolved.
Introduction:

Background

Establishment of the Task Force

The University conducted an external and internal review of the Communication Across the Curriculum program in 2010. The external review’s first recommendation is as follows:

Drawing on input from all stakeholders, thoroughly consider the advantages and disadvantages of moving from a WI/SI [Writing Intensive / Speaking Intensive] model to a vertical curriculum, beginning with a revised set of foundational courses through the second year and moving into a departmentally-managed, localized system within the major.

The internal review concurred with this recommendation, and, in response to both reviews, the University established the CAC Task Force, jointly appointed by the Office of the Provost, the Faculty Senate, and Undergraduate Studies in January 2011. During the spring 2011, the Task Force reviewed the current General Education requirements respecting communication instruction, which include the Reasoning and Discourse (GRD) category courses and the WI and SI marker designations, and it reviewed the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) and Speaking Across the Curriculum (SAC) programs under CAC’s oversight. In May 2011, the Task Force submitted a preliminary, “Phase I,” report to the Provost, the Chair of the Senate, and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies (see http://www.uncg.edu/cac/cac_task_force/CAC_Task_Force_Phase_1_Report.pdf).

The Phase I Report

Problems with WAC and SAC. The Phase I Report detailed the many problems it found with the current Speaking Across the Curriculum (SAC) and Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) programs. These included inadequate criteria for WI/SI course proposal approval; inappropriate approvals of courses that had no disciplinary content; unequal distribution of WI/SI marker courses across the units; insufficient offerings of marked courses within many majors; the lack of a program of regular re-certification; and, because the markers are part of the general education program but designed to complement disciplinary major programs, no way to authentically assess SAC and WAC as programs.

Related to the assessment problem was the serious, and, to the Task Force, crippling issue of the WI/SI system’s lack of intentionality. Largely because only one WI and one SI are required to be in the major, some departments tend to use WI and SI markers as tools to draw non-major student populations into their courses and so ensure that courses with ordinarily poor enrolments will “make.” Consequently, they do not tend to use the markers’ requirements intentionally as a means to integrate discipline-specific communication competences with discipline-specific learning goals. Similarly, other departments rely heavily on the marked courses offered by other departments, often regularly allowing substitutions of non-major-marked courses for the required major-marked courses. The unfortunate result is that UNCG’s WI and SI offerings are a haphazardly developed, random assortment with little to no programmatic coherence. And, as a result of this, students often take courses merely to fulfill the WI or SI requirement, thus populating courses with students having no genuine interest in the courses’ subjects.
**The Phase I Report’s Recommendations.** The Task Force reviewed the problems with the current SAC and WAC programs, paying particular attention to the WI/SI markers’ apparently unredeemable lack of programmatic intentionality and their consequent resistance to authentic program assessment. The Task Force then reviewed the available literature on the difference between communication across the curriculum programs and pedagogy (where the instruction is concentrated in WI and SI courses) and communication in the disciplines programs and pedagogy (where the communication instruction is integrated with disciplinary content and focused on the genres that the discipline or profession uses to accomplish its work). (See Appendix 11 for a brief bibliography.) Ultimately, the Task Force agreed with the internal and external reviewers that UNCG should replace the current system with one that would allow departments to integrate into their existing programs the instruction in the communication skills that their students must acquire in order to perform effectively in their discipline or profession.

Accordingly, the Task Force made six major recommendations in its Phase I Report:

1. To eliminate the current WI and SI marker system
2. To institute required “Communication in the Discipline” (CID) Plans for all degree programs
3. To address the gap in communication instruction between the two required General Reasoning and Discourse (GRD) courses and the “communication in the disciplines” instruction by requesting the units to require that their students take a transitional, multi-modal (i.e. that include written, spoken, visual, and electronic discourse instruction) communication course designed, taught, and assessed by the unit, department, or concentration faculty
4. To enrich General Education category courses with communication instruction by including in each course at least one communication-related assignment that involves its assessment, revision, resubmission/re-presentation, and reassessment
5. To establish a Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council to provide faculty oversight for the CID program
6. To rename the current Communication Across the Curriculum Program the “Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program” and restructure it to fit the needs of the new CEC program.

**Feedback and Task Force Response**

Over the summer of 2011, the Chair of the Task Force consulted with the Provost, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Deans Council about the Task Force’s recommendations. The Administration’s response to most of the proposal was favorable, but resisted the provisions of Recommendation 3 (to ask the units to require their students to take one transitional, multi-modal communication course), and they rejected Recommendation 4 (to require the inclusion of at least one communication-related assignment in all courses carrying general education category markers). They requested that the Task Force study the budgetary impact of implementing Recommendation 3. They rejected Recommendation 4 because Learning Goal 1 (“think critically, communicate effectively, and develop appropriate fundamental skills in quantitative and information literacies”) is associated with all general education category course markers. Some administrators felt that because so many general education courses are taught in large sections and/or online, the requirement would be either too burdensome for faculty to grade, or too expensive for the units to implement.

Upon its return to work in fall 2011, in response to administration feedback, the Task Force revised its Phase I Report into the form of a “Proposal to the Faculty,” eliminating the Phase I Report’s
Recommendations 3 and 4. It distributed this proposal by email to all department heads and program
directors, asking them to forward it to their entire faculty. The Chair of the Task Force then gave
presentations on the proposal at several department meetings, most unit assemblies, and at a Faculty
Senate Forum—each time reporting to the Task Force on the feedback received from faculty at these
meetings.

As these meetings were being held, the Task Force conducted a study to determine the cost to the units
of implementing the Phase I Report’s Recommendation 1 (requiring the transitional, multimodal
communication courses). It concluded that to implement these courses across the University would cost
approximately one million dollars per year. In view of the current budgetary crisis, the Task Force
reluctantly decided to abandon this proposal.

After the meetings were concluded, the Task Force concluded that most faculty were in favor of the
Communication in the Discipline plans, but some were wary of two likely consequences to eliminating
the WI and SI markers. One objection was that some department’s courses would suffer enrolment
losses if they lost the markers students needed in order to graduate. The Task Force rejected this
criticism, because the Senate had intended that these markers be pedagogical enhancements, not
enrolment management devices. The other objection was that, because so many freshman and
sophomore courses carried the markers, however inappropriately, they had nevertheless served to
provide some communication instruction at these lower levels. The Task Force agreed that the
elimination of the WI and SI markers might well have the unfortunate consequence of reducing the
amount of communication instruction currently offered at the lower course levels. However, the small
amount of communication instruction at the lower course levels that the markers provide does so at the
expense of communication instruction in the major, and disciplinary communication instruction is what
the markers were intended to bolster. The solution, the Task Force believes, is, in addition to improving
disciplinary communication instruction by implementing the CID plans, to strengthen communication
instruction for the first- and second-year students.

The Proposal to the General Education Council (GEC)

Both to strengthen communication instruction in the lower levels and to comfort those who feared that
eliminating WI and SI markers would endanger enrollment levels in their courses, the Task Force
developed two proposals to present to the General Education Council (see Appendix 10). Since, unlike
the CID plan proposal, these two proposals involved the general education program, the Task Force did
not wish to submit them to the Senate without the GEC’s prior approval and support.

Proposal 1 was to replace the current requirement that students take two WI and two SI courses with a
requirement that students take one “CE” (Communication-Enriched) course outside their major. CE
courses would have both speaking and writing components, and they would have to meet specific
course parameters and share a common set of student learning objectives. Moreover, in this proposal
the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council, not the General Education Council, would be charged
to oversee the program, including the approval of course proposals and the assessment of the program.

Proposal 2 was intended to strengthen the General Reasoning and Discourse category courses by giving
them more stringent assignment criteria and a revised set of student learning objectives.

The General Education Council rejected both proposals, but the GEC did not explain why they rejected
the Task Force’s proposals and did not offer counter-proposals. In consequence, because the Task
Force’s members felt that the proposals should have GEC support, the Task Force decided against presenting these resolutions to the Senate. Although the Task Force strongly feels that the current level of communication instruction in the general education program and in the lower-level courses as a whole is inadequate, we believe that further proposals to address this particular issue should be postponed until the CID plans have been fully implemented and full assessment of the Communication-Enriched Curriculum program’s impact on upper-level communication instruction can be compared to the General Education program’s impact on lower-level communication instruction.

Proposal Overview

This report is divided into four main sections.

The first section describes the proposed “Communication in the Disciplines” plans, explaining what they are, why the Task Force believes they will ensure better disciplinary communication instruction than the current system of Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive courses, and how the Communication in the Disciplines plans should be designed, certified, implemented, and assessed.

The second section explains why a program of Communication in the Disciplines plans needs a faculty council to oversee it, what the duties of such a council should be, and why the director of a complementary administrative program whose primary responsibility is to provide faculty development in communication instruction should chair the council.

The third section explains why the current Communication Across the Curriculum program should be restructured and divested of its involvement in communication peer consultation services. Instead, the new Communication-Enriched Curriculum program should focus upon providing administrative support to the CEC Council, research support to the departments undergoing the CID design and implementation process, and instructional development support to units, departments, and individual faculty.

The fourth section presents the Task Force’s three alternative proposals in order of preference. Plan A and Plan B each present specific actions to be taken by the Faculty Senate and by the Administration.
Communication in the Disciplines Plans

A. What a CID Plan is:

A CID (Communication In the Discipline) plan articulates how communication competencies that are specific to a discipline will be (1) integrated into the program’s plan of study and (2) assessed in order to provide guidance for the program’s improvement. In the current Communication Across the Curriculum program, students can fulfill at least half of their WI and SI requirements by taking courses across departments and disciplines. They choose whatever is available and may do so for no particular reason. Moreover, WI and SI courses conform only to a limited set of assignment criteria and a very general, elementary set of student learning objectives designed to be applicable across all majors at all levels of instruction. In contrast, the CID plans are intentional curricular mechanisms that each department will customize in order to ensure that its students achieve the specific communication competencies that its faculty has determined its students must achieve. CID plans make clear the division between the teaching and learning of communication practices at the general education level (e.g., English 101 and CST 105) and the teaching and learning of communication practices at the major level. Another key difference between CID plans and the current/outgoing structure of WI and SI markers is the approach to communication in relation to the discipline or major itself. Whereas WI and SI “markers” were a means of promoting a kind of “added value” for a course—adding a writing or speaking component to the existing content of the course—CID plans will provide a deep integration of communication practices into the courses at their root, making communication an organic tool for learning the disciplinary material itself. A final key difference between CID plans and the current WI / SI system is assessment. Because the Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) of WI and SI courses were not subordinated to the goals of a larger program—not even those of the General Education program—they could be assessed authentically only course by course and only in reference to the individual instructors goals for the course. CID plans, however, include assessment mechanisms that evaluate communication as an integral component of the degree plan itself, not as a desirable but inessential “add-on” to the “real” competencies of the major.

CID plans will, in sum, provide a map for each department or disciplinary unit to visualize and articulate (1) how communication is endemic to the work of its field, (2) how students should be taught to view communication as inextricable from the intellectual work of the field overall, and (3) how the efforts in communication-related instruction can be continually improved.

B. Why the CID Plans will ensure better communication instruction than WI and SI courses:

1. Unlike the guidelines for WI and SI courses, CID plans will be written by faculty in the department or disciplinary unit, i.e., those with expertise in the area of instruction. WI and SI guidelines are generic and meant to bend to specific courses across a variety of disciplines, but without particular pedagogical attention to the communication principles guiding the discipline within which that course resides.
2. Unlike the WI / SI program, CID plans are comprehensive strategies for delivering communication instruction (written, spoken, visual, and digital) within existing courses in each department or disciplinary unit, using existing resources. The CID plans may involve curricular changes, if the department or disciplinary unit decides these are necessary, but inherently they do not require additional resources or changes to the major plan(s).
3. Unlike the WI / SI program, which requires students to take only half of their communication instruction within their degree program, the CID program returns to the departments and disciplinary
units intellectual control over the ways in which their students use communication to advance their knowledge. Such local control will promote better student understanding of the key concepts, theories, and practices of their chosen discipline or profession.

4. Unlike the WI / SI program, the CID program will allow departments to integrate communication competencies with the other disciplinary competencies they already assess annually as part of the “objectives for the major” they now use for their annual reports. This will enable them not only to gauge the impact of communication upon the other competencies endemic to the field, but also to regard as a primary goal of the major’s course of study the development of their students’ ability to produce and perform the discursive acts by means of which the discipline or profession does its work.

5. Unlike WI and SI courses, which target specific courses (and in some departments or divisions, perhaps only one or two such courses), the CID plans will diffuse communication instruction across as many (or as few) courses within the major plan as a division or a department desires. For example, departments and divisions could enact a saturation model, spreading writing, speaking, visual, and digital communication instruction across many courses in small doses.

C. How the CID Plans will be designed, certified, implemented, and assessed:

Each department or disciplinary unit, in consultation with the appropriate liaison from the CEC council, will design its own CID plan. The CEC council liaison, in consultation with the CEC Director and the Faculty Development Officers, will assist the department or unit as much or as little as the department/disciplinary unit desires, providing a measure of expertise regarding possible implementation strategies and assessment models for the department to adapt to its needs. Ultimately, however, the plan itself will be the responsibility and purview of the department or disciplinary unit itself.

Much as the University Curriculum Committee approves all individual new course proposals, the CEC Council approves all departmental CID plans. Once a department or disciplinary unit finalizes its plan, it will submit the plan to the Council for review and comment. If the Council suggests changes, the CEC Council liaison will work with the department or disciplinary unit on any revisions prior to final approval by the Council. Once the CEC Council certifies a plan, it will be in effect for five years, at which point recertification will occur, using the same procedure as above (for more details, see VI.B. of the CEC proposed bylaws, Appendix 4).

The individual departments or disciplinary units will be responsible for implementing their CID plans. The department head will notify the chair of the Council once the plan is implemented (see Bylaws VI. E.). Typically, throughout the five-year plan cycle the department head or director of undergraduate studies will oversee the execution of the plan and answer any questions or provide any requested/necessary modifications or waivers for students. Additionally, departments and units will be responsible for designing assessment mechanisms that are appropriate to the discipline and that measure the success of the CID plan as well as the individual communication skills of the department or unit’s majors.
The Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council

A. Why a Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council:

A faculty body that is under the purview of the Faculty Senate should oversee and provide support for the campus-wide implementation of the departmental “Communication in the Discipline” plans, as described in Part I of this report. The Task Force recommends that this body be called the “Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council” and be established under the bylaws found in Appendix 4.

The Task Force believes that voting members of this Council should be faculty because at UNCG all curricular matters are the responsibility of the faculty. Indeed, it is a principle of SACS that the University should place “primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty.” Moreover, the Council should be established by and report to the Senate because, according to the Constitution of the Faculty (Article III: The Faculty Senate, Section 1: Powers and Duties), the Senate shall “approve general University requirements” and “approve policies and regulations governing the condition under which the instruction of students takes place.”

Furthermore, the Task Force concurs with the University Curriculum Guide (Article I: General Procedures and Directions, Introduction) that “All curricular actions originate in the academic department” and that the final step in the approval of curricular actions should be “by a University-wide committee or council that has been charged by the Faculty Senate with the governance and coordination of curriculum.” Currently, “three committees fulfill this charge: the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC); the Graduate Studies Committee (GSC); and the General Education Council (GEC) and its Subcommittees on Writing and Speaking.”

The CEC program is concerned with discipline-specific communication instruction, and the General Education program is concerned with general communication instruction. As the “UNCG General Education Mission and Goals” state, the “General Education Program provides foundations and alternative perspectives for the more specialized knowledge gained in the major. Likewise, the major builds upon and integrates knowledge, skills, and attitudes learned in General Education Courses and the co-curriculum.” The Task Force does recommend, however, that General Education Council and the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council continually consult one another. This would best be done by having a representative of the CEC Council be an ex officio member of the General Education Council, and having a representative of the General Education Council be an ex officio member of the Communication-Enriched Communication Council.

B. What the Council will do:

In order to accomplish its mission (see Appendix 3), the CEC Council will perform three primary functions (see the Council Bylaws, Appendix 4, for further details):

1. The Council shall establish a set of minimum standards and general criteria for the Communication in the Disciplines (CID) plans that each department in the University will develop, implement within its disciplinary curriculum, and evaluate as part of its regular annual assessment.
2. The Council shall provide guidance and assistance to the units, to the departments, and to individual faculty, in their efforts to further the enrichment of the University’s curriculum with communication instruction and practice, in the following ways:

   a. through its membership (who will serve as liaisons to their units),
   b. through its Chair (who will also be the Director of the CEC Program),
   c. through the Faculty Development Officers of the CEC Program (who are under the supervision of the CEC Director), and
   d. through support in obtaining consultants for research and training workshops, as its budget allows.

3. The Council shall initiate and through the Director of the CEC Program provide oversight for special programs that would promote the enrichment of the curriculum with communication practice and instruction. Examples might include a Distinguished Communicator certification program that would encourage undergraduates to seek out communication experiences, a University Lecture Program that would bring visiting scholars to speak on theoretical and practical disciplinary communication issues, an annual Communication Fair or contest displaying student achievement in communication projects, etc.

C. Why the Director of CEC Program should chair the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council:

   Although for most Senate-established committees, such as the General Education Council, the members of the committee elect their Chair, the Task Force recommends that the Director of the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program chair the CEC Council (see Part III of this report) for the following reasons:

   1. The Council’s work is a complicated process continuing in multiple cycles over time. Having the Council chaired by an appointed director who specializes in the kind of pedagogy and assessment with which the Council is involved will assure programmatic continuity and expertise.
   2. The Director of the CEC Program will be able to provide administrative support to the Council.
   3. Unlike most other Faculty Senate-established committees, the CEC Council will need a budget for faculty development and special programs (see bylaws), and the Director will be able to provide budgetary oversight.
The CEC Program: Administrative Support and Faculty Development

Explanation and Rationale:

The current CAC Program has two major components: (1) a curricular development component, which includes the Writing Intensive Committee, the Speaking Intensive Committee, and the Faculty Development Coordinators; and (2) the peer consultation services component, which includes the Writing Center, the Speaking Center, and the future Digital Literacy Center. The activities of the components are coordinated by the CAC Steering Committee, which is chaired by the CAC Director and whose members include the Directors and Assistant Directors of the Speaking and Writing Centers. The Program Assistant, who also coordinates the disposition of WI and SI proposals, and performs other essential duties, maintains CAC’s budget. The Director oversees the entire program and its budget.

The major structural changes that will result from changing from the CAC to the CEC are as follows:

- The curricular development and peer consultation services components of the current CAC will split administratively. The Director of the CAC Program will become the Director of the CEC Program, and one of the current directors of the peer consultation centers will become the Operations Director of a newly constituted Communication Peer Consultation Services unit. Each of these reformed units will have their own operations budgets and administrative support personnel.
- The Writing and Speaking Intensive Committees will be dissolved.
- The CEC Program Director will chair the CEC Council; provide administrative support for the Council; and coordinate the unit, department, and faculty support that will be required to design, implement, and assess the CID Plans and further the goals of the CEC Council.
- The Faculty Development Officers (formerly the Faculty Development Coordinators), will be scheduled and supervised by the CEC Director in coordination and cooperation with the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons. The CEC Faculty Development Officers will continue, as the Faculty Development Coordinators did in the past, to offer workshops in communication instruction as well as provide consultation to individual faculty. However, they will turn their primary focus from individual Writing and Speaking Intensive course development to department Communication in the Disciplines plan development.
- The Unit Liaisons, who represent their units on the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Committee and whose duties include assisting departments within the units they represent as they design their Communication in the Discipline plans, will coordinate their efforts with the Director of the CEC.
- A Program Research Assistant position will be added, and most likely, it will be filled by a graduate assistant.

The changes that will take place within the CEC Program are the consequence of the changes in the Program’s mission:

- In the current system, CAC and GEC impose the criteria for WI and SI courses upon the units, departments, and faculty from the top down, allowing for little guidance or “fertilization” of the program’s leading ideas from those who are doing the actual instruction. In the new system, although the Director of CEC chairs the CEC Council, the Director does not direct the Council;
instead, the Director’s job is to facilitate the curricular communication aspirations of the Council—a Council of faculty representatives—who, in turn, continually interact with their unit colleagues as Council liaisons.

- In contrast to the present CAC Program, which incorporates no ongoing, systematic methods for developing and improving WI/SI courses, the proposed Faculty Development Officers will provide ongoing peer mentorship to colleagues, working with departments and units to develop, realize, and monitor the communication competencies taught in the disciplines. Faculty Development Officers will support the CEC Council liaisons, who will be bridges between the faculty and the program. Such bridges are conspicuously absent from the current CAC Program.

- The new program will facilitate continuous quality improvement. Currently, WI/SI designations are not subject to regular monitoring, updating, or revision. This lack of ongoing development contributes to (a) wide variations in what counts as WI/SI; and (b) no institutional means to aspire to emerging best practices. The Faculty Development Officers would, through their professional development via the CEC Program and from research gleaned via the CEC Research Assistant (see Appendix 7, Part 5), offer ongoing support for departments to provide up-to-date, relevant modes of communication instruction.

### Three Alternatives

Below, the Task Force presents three alternative proposals, in order of their desirability.

**Plan A** is the Task Force’s preferred proposal. It would eliminate the current University WI / SI requirement; require all degree programs to design, implement, and assess a Communication in the Discipline program tailored to its disciplinary requirements; and establish a Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council to oversee the program.

**Plan B** will retain the University WI and SI requirements, but will remove them as general education requirements. Accordingly, it will remove the program from the General Education Council’s oversight, disestablish the current Communication Across the Curriculum program as an administrative unit, and place the oversight of Writing Across the Curriculum and Speaking Across the Curriculum into the care of a newly established Faculty Senate Communication Across the Curriculum Committee.

**Plan C** will disestablish the current Communication Across the Curriculum program and return oversight of the Writing Across the Curriculum and Speaking Across the Curriculum programs to the General Education Council.
Plan A: Establish the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program

I. Senate Action: Submit the following resolutions to the Faculty Senate

1. Resolution to remove writing and speaking intensive courses from the General Education program. Submit a resolution to the Faculty Senate that would discontinue the general education Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive course requirements and remove the following language from the Undergraduate Bulletin under General Education Core Requirements (GEC), Section II. GE Marker Requirements,

   Fulfill the following requirements:

   **One writing intensive course** (indicated in the online Schedule of Courses by marker WI) in any discipline
   [In addition to this GE Writing Intensive requirement, students must also complete a second Writing Intensive course within the major. The College of Arts and Sciences requires additional Writing Intensive courses]

   **One speaking intensive course** (indicated in the online Schedule of Courses by marker SI) in any discipline
   [In addition to this GE Speaking Intensive requirement, students must also complete a second Speaking Intensive course within the major.]

   **Rationale:** Many of the problems the Communication Across the Curriculum program is experiencing could be remedied, or their severity alleviated, by taking certain administrative measures and by adjusting the criteria and guidelines for the Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive course proposals. (“Plan B” attempts to make these adjustments.) However, merely adjusting the current regulations cannot resolve several important issues:

   a. **Lack of intentionality.** Because students can take one WI and one SI outside the major, the markers are not connected to anything (such as a plan of study) that might give the system coherence. As a result, departments cannot program their students’ communication instruction, and students take courses more or less at random, merely to fulfill the WI or SI requirement, leaving courses populated with students who have no genuine interest in the subject.

   b. **Isolation of instruction.** Because it tends to relegate communication instruction to specific courses, the current system encourages students and faculty to regard
communication as a competency distinguishable from competency in the discipline itself.

c. **Difficulty of program assessment.** The founding assumption of the WI and SI program was that these marker courses would serve to increase and improve communication instruction specific to the disciplines. However, the criteria and student learning goals for the current WI and SI courses, because they must be applicable to all disciplines at all levels of instruction, are so general that they necessarily cannot be “authentically assessed” as a program. In “authentic assessment,” educators determine the tasks that students must perform in the discipline, and then assess a curriculum that enables students to perform those tasks well. For this to occur, the WI and SI courses would have to be tied to specific degree programs, not the general education program. Program assessment is further hampered by the fact that communication is “situation specific,” making standardized assessment impossible except for the most basic of communication conventions, such as grammar and spelling.

2. **Resolution to make Communication in the Discipline (CID) plans a requirement for all undergraduate degree programs.** Submit a second resolution to the Faculty Senate that would (1) require all degree programs to create a Communication in the Discipline plan that articulates how communication competencies specific to a discipline will be determined by the department’s faculty, integrated into the “Objectives for the Major,” taught within the major’s required courses, and assessed in order to provide guidance for the program’s improvement, (2) add to the *Undergraduate Bulletin*, under “University Requirements,” the following section (see Appendix 1):

**Communication Competencies**

In addition to basic technology skills and information literacy, the acquisition of fundamental communication competencies is an important Learning Goal of the General Education Program. Moreover, instruction, practice, and informed responses to communicative acts in both general and discipline-specific situations and in multiple communication modalities are essential and should be integrated into the academic curriculum. To assist students in gaining these competencies, UNCG provides the following:

1. First-Year Undergraduates—Because all students need to be instructed in general, fundamental, communication competences, upon which later instruction in the disciplinary communication practices of their majors will depend, students take one introductory writing course and one additional course from the General Education Reasoning and Discourse requirement list.

2. Upper Division Undergraduates—“Communication-Enriched Degree Programs” have integrated into their programs of study sets of distributed competencies in communication using multiple modes appropriate to the disciplinary work they teach (Communication in the Disciplines plans).

**Rationale:** In contrast to the WI and SI courses that cross departments and disciplines, and that are governed by a set of criteria that are generalized toward university-wide goals for
graduation, the CID plans are intentional curricular mechanisms that each department will customize to meet its specific goals for communication skills within its disciplinary standards. CID plans make clear the division between the teaching and learning of communication practices at the general education level (e.g., English 101 and CST 105) and the teaching and learning of communication practices at the major level. Another key difference between CID plans and the current/outgoing structure of WI and SI markers is the approach to communication in relation to the discipline or major itself. Whereas WI and SI “markers” were a means of promoting a kind of “added value” for a course—adding a writing or speaking component to the existing content of the course—CID plans will provide a deep integration of communication practices into the courses at their root, making communication an organic tool for learning the disciplinary material itself.

A final key difference between CID plans and the current WI / SI system is assessment. CID plans become part of a department’s “Objectives for the Major,” they include assessment mechanisms that evaluate communication as an integral component of the discipline itself, and these become part of the annual assessments that degree programs submit each year through Compliance Assist.

CID plans will, in sum, provide a map for each department or disciplinary unit to visualize and articulate (1) how communication is endemic to the work of its field, (2) how students should be taught to view communication as inextricable from the intellectual work of the field overall, and (3) how the efforts in communication-related instruction can be continually improved.

3. **Resolution to establish a Faculty Senate Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council.** Submit a third resolution to the Faculty Senate that would do the following:

   a. Formally establish a Faculty Senate Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council (CECC) as a standing committee, modeled upon and parallel to the Senate General Education Committee (GEC), and having the Mission and Goals articulated in Appendix 3 of this report.
   
   b. Charge the CECC with the responsibility for ensuring that degree programs that will carry the required “communication-enriched degree program” certification meet the parameters for CID plans set by the Senate.
   
   c. Constitute the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council according to the Regulations and Procedures document in Appendix 4 of this report.
   
   d. Modify the CID plan requirements, as appropriate, for those interdisciplinary degree programs having multiple required courses from different departments.
   
   e. Declare that the transition from the current Communication Across the Curriculum program to the new Communication-Enriched Curriculum program shall proceed as closely as possible according to the “Tentative CAC to CEC Transition Plan (see Appendix 2).
**Rationale:** The Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council will replace two current subcommittees of the General Education Council—the Writing Intensive Committee and the Speaking Intensive Committee. These two current subcommittees simply determine whether individual course proposals meet previously established criteria. Because the CECC will approve customized curriculum plans, a faculty body that is under the purview of the Faculty Senate should direct this effort.

The voting members of this Council should be faculty because all curricular matters are the responsibility of the faculty. Moreover, the Council should be established by and report to the Senate because, according to the *Constitution of the Faculty* (Article III: The Faculty Senate, Section 1: Powers and Duties), the Senate shall “approve general University requirements” and “approve policies and regulations governing the conditions under which the instruction of students takes place.”

Furthermore, the *University Curriculum Guide* (Article I: General Procedures and Directions, Introduction) stipulates that “All curricular actions originate in the academic department” and that the final step in the approval of curricular actions should be “by a University-wide committee or council that has been charged by the Faculty Senate with the governance and coordination of curriculum.” Currently, “three committees fulfill this charge: the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC); the Graduate Studies Committee (GSC); and the General Education Council (GEC) and its Subcommittees on Writing and Speaking.”

4. **Resolution to eliminate existing WI and SI markers according to the “Tentative CAC to CEC Transition Plan” (Appendix 2).** Submit a fourth resolution to the Faculty Senate that would remove existing WI and SI markers from the University’s class schedule in accordance with the “Tentative CAC to CEC Transition Plan” or a modification thereof made by the CEC Council.

5. **Resolution to make departments responsible for assessing their Communication in the Disciplines plans.** Submit a fifth resolution to the Faculty Senate that would declare the following:

Because the Communication in the Disciplines plans, certified by the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council, are University requirements, but each plan is designed to ensure the instruction of communication practices specific to a particular discipline, the annual assessment and periodic SACS assessment of the communication instruction provided by the CID plans shall be solely the responsibility of the departments that offer the courses. Each department should forward the results of its annual and periodic SACS assessments to the Director of the CEC in order to assist in the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council’s assessment of the program’s overall effectiveness.

II. **Administrative Action: Submit the following recommendations to the appropriate University officers:**
Should the resolutions of Plan A pass, the following should occur administratively.

1. **Disestablish the current CAC Program.** The Communication Across the Curriculum program, including the position of Director of Communication Across the Curriculum, should be eliminated beginning fall of the first academic year after the resolutions pass.

2. **Establish a Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program.** A CEC Program should be established, having the Mission and Purpose as articulated in Appendix 5 of this report. The CEC Program should consist of a director and the CEC Faculty Development Officers, and having either its own administrative support staff or have support provided through the Office of Undergraduate Studies. In addition, one graduate assistant, funded by the Provost’s Office, should be assigned to the CEC Program to provide research assistance. (See Appendix 7, the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Organization Plan, and Appendix 8, the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program Organization Chart.)

3. **Conduct a national search for a permanent director of the CEC Program.** The current Director of CAC should serve as acting director of the CEC Program until a national search can be conducted and a permanent director hired. A suggested position description is in Appendix 9 of this report.

4. **Establish a new program to oversee the University’s communication consultation services.** The Speaking Center and Writing Center, as well as the future Digital Rhetoric Center, are currently under the budgetary and administrative oversight of the Director of CAC. Once CAC is dissolved, a new program, which may be named the “University Communication Consultation Centers,” (CCC) should be established, beginning fall of the first academic year after the resolutions pass. The Dean of Undergraduate Studies, with the approval of the Provost, should appoint one of the current Directors of the Speaking Center, Writing Center, or future Digital Rhetoric Center to be Director of CCC. The director should be given appropriate compensation (the Task Force recommends a two course per year course-load reduction plus an annual administrative stipend of 10% of the current base salary), and be charged with the administrative and budgetary oversight of the CCC. The Director of the CCC should report directly to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

5. **Establish a steering committee for the “Communication Consultation Centers.”**

   **Charge:** The steering committee’s charge shall be to
   
   a. Provide advice to the Director on matters pertaining to long-range planning for the centers’ activities
   
   b. Provide advice and assistance to the Director in the development of grant proposals, annual reports, assessment, surveys, reviews, and other tasks that would impact the program as a whole
   
   c. Review the program’s budget and expenditures monthly and provide advice to the Director on budgetary matters

   **Membership:** The Director of the “CCC” shall chair the steering committee. Members shall include the following: the directors and assistant directors of each center; the Dean of Undergraduate Studies or the Executive Director of the Faculty
Teaching and Learning Commons or another appointed representative of the Dean; the Chair of the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Committee; an at-large faculty representative appointed by the Provost for a three-year term.

6. **Eliminate the current CAC Faculty Development Coordinator positions, and create three CEC Faculty Development Officer positions.**

The Director of the Writing Center and the Director of the Speaking Center hold the two currently existing Faculty Development Coordinator (FDC) positions. These FDCs report to the Director of CAC, and they are compensated by one (1) course-load reduction per semester each, funded by their home departments. Due to cuts to their budgets, these departments will no longer be able to fund University faculty development services.

Beginning in the first semester after the Senate establishes the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council, the following should occur:

a. The current CAC Faculty Development Coordinator positions should be eliminated.

b. To replace them, three CEC Faculty Development Officer (FDO) positions should be created. Existing UNCG full-time faculty who possess the qualifications to assist their colleagues in developing effective pedagogical techniques for enriching their disciplinary courses with oral, written, or digital instruction and assignments should fill these positions.

c. The FDOs should receive one course-load reduction each semester of their service, and the Provost’s Office should fund these course-load reductions.

d. The Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council should write a clear description of the Faculty Development Coordinators’ duties and conduct a University-wide search to fill both positions.

e. In general, the FDOs’ duties are as follows:

   i. Provide individual consultation to University faculty who wish to incorporate communication into their courses.

   ii. Advocate the mission and goals of the CEC Program to faculty, department chairs, and program directors.

   iii. Facilitate faculty, class, and department communication instruction development workshops.

   iv. Assist CEC Council members in their function as liaisons to their unit’s departments.

   f. As necessary to perform the above duties, and with the permission and cooperation of the appropriate communication consultation center director, the Faculty Development Officers shall have access to the facilities and equipment of the appropriate centers.

   g. FDOs shall receive three-year, renewable appointments, subject to review and re-appointment by the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Committee;
h. The FDOs shall report to the Director of the CEC in all matters related to the CEC Program.

i. The FDOs shall attend all Communication-Enriched Curriculum Committee meetings and submit reports on faculty development activities, as the Committee requests;

j. The FDO’s shall receive administrative support through the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program, in coordination with the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons, and shall coordinate with the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Committee’s program development efforts and the FTLC’s faculty development efforts.
Plan B: Establish a Faculty Senate CAC Committee

III. Senate Action: Submit the following resolutions to the Faculty Senate

1. Resolution to remove writing and speaking intensive courses from the General Education program. Submit a resolution to the Faculty Senate that would remove the following language from the Undergraduate Bulletin under General Education Core Requirements (GEC), Section II.

   GE Marker Requirements, Fulfill the following requirements:

   One writing intensive course (indicated in the online Schedule of Courses by marker WI) in any discipline

   In addition to this GE Writing Intensive requirement, students must also complete a second Writing Intensive course within the major. The College of Arts and Sciences requires additional Writing Intensive courses

   One speaking intensive course (indicated in the online Schedule of Courses by marker SI) in any discipline

   In addition to this GE Speaking Intensive requirement, students must also complete a second Speaking Intensive course within the major.

2. Resolution to make WI and SI courses a requirement for all undergraduate degree programs. Submit a second resolution to the Faculty Senate that would add to the Undergraduate Bulletin, under "University Requirements," the following section:

   Communication Competencies

   In addition to basic technology skills and information literacy, the acquisition of fundamental communication competencies is an important Learning Goal of the General Education Program. Moreover, instruction, practice, and informed responses to communicative acts in both general and discipline-specific situations and in multiple communication modalities are essential and should be integrated into the academic curriculum. To assist students in gaining these competencies, UNCG provides the following:

   1. First-Year Undergraduates—Because all students need to be instructed in general, fundamental, communication competences, upon which later instruction in the disciplinary communication practices of their majors will depend, students take one introductory writing course and one additional course from the General Education Reasoning and Discourse requirement list.

   2. Upper Division Undergraduates—Because capabilities in communication and critical reasoning are best acquired in the context of disciplines and domains of application, and because learning in the disciplines cannot be separated
from the ability to communicate effectively in them, as part of their major requirements all students must complete the following:

**Two writing intensive courses** (indicated in the online Schedule of Courses by marker WI). At least one WI course must be within the major; the degree program may or may not require the second WI course to be in the major. [The College of Arts and Sciences requires additional Writing Intensive courses.]

**Two speaking intensive courses** (indicated in the online Schedule of Courses by marker SI). At least one SI course must be within the major; the degree program may or may not require the second SI course to be in the major.

3. **Resolution to establish a Faculty Senate Communication Across the Curriculum Committee.**
Submit a third resolution to the Faculty Senate that would formally establish a Faculty Senate Communication Across the Curriculum Committee (CACC) as a standing, elected committee, modeled upon and parallel to the Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Whereas the UCC is responsible for ensuring that proposals for courses that will carry academic credit meet the standards set by the Faculty Senate, the CACC will be responsible for ensuring that proposals for courses carrying writing or speaking intensive credit meet the standards set by the Faculty Senate. This resolution will convey the oversight and assessment of the WI and SI markers approvals from the General Education Council to the Communication Across the Curriculum Committee. This Committee should be constituted as follows:

**Charge**: The Communication Across the Curriculum Committee shall be the agency of the Faculty Senate responsible for making policy recommendations to the Faculty Senate on matters pertaining to the Writing and Speaking Intensive requirements, including WI and SI course student learning objectives and assignment parameters. The CACC will also perform other duties necessary to the implementation and oversight of the Writing and Speaking Across the Curriculum programs (WI and SI), including the following:

a. To serve as the oversight committee for administration of all aspects of the Speaking Across the Curriculum and Writing Across the Curriculum programs;

b. To design and publish appropriate course guidelines and proposal forms that will ensure that every WI and SI marked course will
   i. Have student learning objectives (SLOs) that include communication competency objectives that are appropriate to the course and to the discipline;  
      **Rationale**: Currently, there are only broad, general student learning objectives for WI and SI courses that cannot be authentically assessed with respect to disciplinary goals. WI and SI proposals should include specific SLOs that are appropriate to the proposing department.
   ii. Require communication assignments that are of appropriate difficulty and type;
   iii. Set minimum requirements for the quantity of oral performances and written products appropriate for WI and SI courses;
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iv. Provide instruction for and practice in the concepts and skills needed for the required communication assignments;

v. Include instructor feedback and guided revision, or opportunities for students to apply what they have learned from previous performances in a subsequent performance;

c. To review and approve all proposals for new Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive courses within the following parameters:

i. The Communication Across the Curriculum Committee will not grant WI or SI marker approvals to instructors, but to departments for specific courses. The Committee will approve markers for courses only when the department affirms that its instructors will teach the course WI or SI, as approved, every time the department offers a section of the course.

Rationale: Currently, departments do not necessarily offer sections on the semester course schedule as WI or SI, even though the courses have been posted on the CAC website as approved for WI and SI. Because of this, students often mistakenly take a course believing that it will fulfill a WI or SI requirement when, in fact, it will not, and departments often neglect to schedule a marker when, in fact, the course is being taught WI or SI.

ii. The Committee will not normally grant both a WI and a SI marker to the same course;

Rationale: Doubling the communication instruction and practice within a single course necessarily cuts deeply into the class time that should be devoted to the course’s disciplinary material, and it often creates too great a burden for both the students and for the faculty who adhere faithfully to the WI and SI requirements.

iii. The Committee will not grant a marker to a course carrying fewer than three credits, unless that course is linked to another course in a disciplinary subject that does carry at least three credits;

Rationale: (1) The purpose of WI and SI activities is to improve the student’s understanding of and performance in the discipline. Courses carrying fewer than three credits are seldom disciplinary unless they are linked to another 3-credit course in the same department (e.g. Chemistry labs). Courses carrying fewer than 3-credits that are not linked to another 3-credit course in the same department seldom are taught by faculty with the credentials to teach discipline-specific communication skills and practices. (2) Even when courses carrying fewer than three credits provide disciplinary content, they do not have the class time available to provide adequate instruction in both the disciplinary content and the disciplinary communication practices expected by the major.
iv. The Committee will not grant a WI or SI marker to a course that also carries a General Education Reasoning and Discourse (GRD) category marker;
   
   **Rationale:** GRD courses, by definition, are general, introductory courses intended to improve students’ facility in the use of the basic rhetorical and linguistic conventions that their later courses will expect of them. As such, GRD courses use a “Learning to write or speak” pedagogy. In contrast, WI and SI courses are designed to engage students in the communication practices endemic to a particular discipline. As such, WI and SI course use a “Writing or speaking to learn” pedagogy.

v. The Committee will not grant a WI or SI marker to a course in which the communication assignments are not situated in the context of learning about a particular academic discipline.
   
   **Rationale:** WI and SI courses are intended to make substantial and continuous use of writing or speaking as a way of engaging students with important questions and problems of a particular subject. The work required should be appropriate to the subject being taught.

vi. The Committee will not grant a WI or SI marker to a course unless the department agrees to limit enrolment to twenty-five students (or a 1:25 faculty/student ratio that can include teaching assistants) for every section.
   
   **Rationale:** When properly undertaken, the burden of instruction and the grading of drafts, rehearsals, and final submissions and performances is an unfair imposition upon faculty teaching classes of more than 25 students.

d. To conduct a re-certification of all WI and SI courses every five years, beginning in the second year after the CACC is established;

e. To oversee the Speaking Across the Curriculum (SAC) and Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) faculty development program (the Faculty Development Coordinators);
   
   **Rationale:** Faculty development in speaking and writing pedagogies is essential to the success of the WI and SI courses.

f. To take up for study or action matters referred by the Faculty Senate and General Faculty or any other matters deemed important to the work of the committee.

**Membership:** Voting members: Tenured and tenure-track faculty [one (1) from each School that offers undergraduate degrees and the Library, and three (3) from the College], each appointed by the appropriate unit dean for three-year terms, plus one (1) Senator appointed by the Chair of the Faculty Senate for a one-year term. Non-voting ex officio: The Dean of Undergraduate Studies (or his or her appointed representative). The Committee shall elect its chair annually from among its voting membership.

4. **Resolution to make departments responsible for assessing the WI and SI courses they offer.**

   Submit a fourth resolution to the Faculty Senate that would declare the following:
Because the Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive requirements are University requirements but no longer General Education requirements, and because they are designed to ensure the instruction of communication practices specific to particular disciplines, the annual assessment and periodic SACS assessment of WI and SI courses shall be solely the responsibility of the departments that offer the courses.

IV. Administrative Action: Submit the following recommendations to the appropriate University officers:

Should the resolutions of Plan B pass, the following should occur administratively.

1. **Disestablish the current CAC program.** The Communication Across the Curriculum program, including the position of Director of Communication Across the Curriculum, should be eliminated beginning fall of the first academic year after the resolutions pass.

2. **Establish a new program to oversee the University’s communication consultation services.** The Speaking Center and Writing Center, as well as the future Digital Rhetoric Center, are currently under the budgetary and administrative oversight of the Director of CAC. Once CAC is dissolved, a new program, which may be named the “University Communication Consultation Centers,” (CCC) should be established, beginning fall of the first academic year after the resolutions pass. The Dean of Undergraduate Studies, with the approval of the Provost, should appoint one of the current Directors of the Speaking Center, Writing Center, or future Digital Rhetoric Center to be Director of CCC. The director should be given appropriate compensation (the Task Force recommends a two course per year course-load reduction plus an annual administrative stipend of 10% of the current base salary), and be charged with the administrative and budgetary oversight of the CCC. The Director of the CCC should report directly to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

3. Establish a steering committee for the “Communication Consultation Centers.”

*Charge:* The steering committee’s charge shall be to

   a. Provide advice to the Director on matters pertaining to long-range planning for the centers’ activities
   b. Provide advice and assistance to the Director in the development of grant proposals, annual reports, assessment, surveys, reviews, and other tasks that would impact the program as a whole
   c. Review the program’s budget and expenditures monthly and provide advice to the Director on budgetary matters.

*Membership:* The Director of the “CCC” shall chair the steering committee. Members shall include the following: the directors and assistant directors of each center; the Dean of Undergraduate Studies or the Executive Director of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons or another appointed representative of the Dean; the Chair of the Communication Across the Curriculum Committee; an at-large faculty representative appointed by the Provost for a three-year term.
4. **Transfer the selection of the CAC Faculty Development Coordinators and the supervision of the current CAC faculty development services to the Communication Across the Curriculum Committee (CACC).** The Director of the Writing Center and the Director of the Speaking Center currently hold the two Faculty Development Coordinator (FDC) positions. Currently, the FDCs report to the Director of CAC, and they are compensated by one (1) course-load reduction per semester each, funded by the College.

Beginning in the first semester after the Senate establishes the Communication Across the Curriculum Committee, the following should occur:

a. The FDCs’ course-load reductions should be funded by the Provost through Undergraduate Studies.
b. The Communication Across the Curriculum Committee should write a clear description of the Faculty Development Coordinators’ duties and conduct a University-wide search to fill both positions.
c. FDCs shall receive three-year, renewable appointments, subject to review and re-appointment by the Communication Across the Curriculum Committee;
d. The FDCs shall attend all CAC Committee meetings and submit reports on faculty development activities, as the Committee requests;
e. The FDCs shall receive administrative support through the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons and shall coordinate with the FTLC’s faculty development efforts.
Plan C: Return Oversight of WI and SI Course to GEC

Should the Senate not approve the resolutions of either Plan A or Plan B, the Senate should strictly enforce its current rules. The oversight of the Speaking Across the Curriculum and Writing Across the Curriculum programs—including the development of assignment parameters and student learning objectives, the approval of WI and SI course proposals, the training of faculty, and other duties currently undertaken by CAC (which has never been formally established by the Senate)—should pass back to GEC, and the CAC should be dissolved.
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Senate Resolution: Be it resolved that the following be added to the University Undergraduate Bulletin under “University Requirements”:

Communication Competencies

In addition to basic technology skills and information literacy, the acquisition of fundamental communication competencies is an important Learning Goal of the General Education Program. Moreover, instruction, practice, and informed responses to communicative acts in both general and discipline-specific situations and in multiple communication modalities are essential and should be integrated into the academic majors. To assist students in gaining these competencies, UNCG provides the following:

1. First-Year Undergraduates—students take one introductory writing course and one other introductory course that addresses general, fundamental competences appropriate to the General Education Program.
2. Upper Division Undergraduates—“Communication-Enriched Degree Programs” have integrated into their programs of study sets of distributed competencies in communication using multiple modes appropriate to the disciplinary work they teach (Communication in the Disciplines plans).
Appendix 2

Tentative CAC to CEC Transition Plan

The transition from CAC to CEC will occur in phases, with each phase to be completed before the next phase begins.

Phase I: Establishment

a. Senate approval of CID proposals
b. Submission of changes to “Communication Competencies” section of the Undergraduate Bulletin
c. Election of CEC Council
d. Preliminary meeting of the Council with the Faculty Development Coordinators (2-day orientation to CEC procedures and workshop on liaison techniques)

Phase II: Preparation

Council in place: begins work on procedures, guidelines, and forms for CID certification.

a. Council develops and publishes guidelines and forms for CID plan proposals.
b. Council develops a position description, conducts a University-wide search, and selects the three Faculty Development Officers.

Phase III: Development and Certification of CID plans and removal of WI and SI marker designations

The departments of the University will be divided into groups, with each group undergoing the processes of review, design, and certification in its turn. Each group is estimated to need one year for preparation and one year for certification, with each following group beginning its preparatory process during the year the previous group is being certified. After Group I has been certified and the WI and SI markers have been removed from the Course Schedule, all WI and SI markers will also be removed from courses belonging to non-degree programs, such as FFL courses. After the first year of preparation, an entire cycle of certifications should take about five years. The groups and the order of their certification are as follows:

Group I: BE
Group II: HHS
Group III: MTD, NUR, ED
Group IV: AS 1 (ANTH, BIOL, CHEM, BCHE, CMPS, GEOG, MATH, PHYS, PSCI, PSYC)
Group V: AS 2 (AFST, ART, CLAS, CMST, ENGL, HIST, IARC, FREN, GERM, SPAN, SPLS, MDST, PHIL, RELS, SOCI, WGST)

In their turn, each group’s departments will undergo the following:

A. Departments will consult with the Council Liaisons and Faculty Development Coordinators in order to
1) receive feedback and recommendations from the CEC Council concerning their current communication instruction practice;
2) submit forms describing current communication instruction practice to the CEC Council for appraisal and recommendations;
3) design a custom CID plan for each of its academic degree programs that will deliver the communication instruction and practice that the department’s faculty have determined their students most need in order to perform in their discipline and profession; and
4) submit the CID plan proposal form and documentation to the CEC Council.

B. The CEC Council certifies the CID plan, or returns the plan to the department for further development.

C. After certification and after the department has implemented its CID plan, the department head sends a letter attesting to the plan’s implementation to the CEC Council.

D. Upon receipt of the department head’s attestation that the department has implemented its certified CID plan, the Council Chair

1) instructs the Registrar to remove WI and SI requirements from the degree plans of majors in the certified department;
2) removes the department’s WI and SI offerings from the published list of approved SI and WI courses; and
3) instructs the Registrar to insert the following at the beginning of the certified academic program degrees’ description in the Undergraduate Bulletin: “This is a certified Communication-Enriched academic program.”
Appendix 3

Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council

Mission and Goals

The mission of the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council (CECC) is to implement and oversee the continuing development of students’ communication skills beyond the General Education curriculum by collaborating with academic departments to equip students as competent communicators in academic, professional, personal, and public endeavors.

In cooperation with the General Education Council, and in conjunction with the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program, the CEC Council will promote across the University the recognition that disciplinary content is inseparable from disciplinary communication.

The Council will pursue this mission primarily through the establishment and oversight of Communication in the Disciplines (CID) Plans. Each CID plan will describe an undergraduate academic degree program’s curricular/programmatic efforts to infuse communication skills into student learning activities and its assessment measures of student achievement.

In addition, through special programs and through the work of its members serving as liaisons to their units, the Council will promote across the University the recognition that communication is a pervasive activity, essential to all learning, taking multiple forms and occurring in many disciplinary contexts. The best and most efficient use of faculty expertise integrates communication with each discipline’s learning processes.
Appendix 4

Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council: Regulations and Procedures

I. Functions

A. The Council is charged with:

1. ongoing review and maintenance of the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program goals;
2. establishing, publishing, and revising, as necessary, guidelines for departmental Communication in the Discipline (CID) plans that reflect current research and best practices in disciplinary communication programs (For the purposes of this document, the terms “department” and “departmental” refer to the lowest-level undergraduate program within the unit conducting annual assessment.);
3. assisting departments with respect to the identification, delivery, and assessment of communication-related student learning outcomes, including support in obtaining consultants for research and training workshops, as budgets allow;
4. establishing timelines for the submission, approval, and recertification of departmental CID plans;
5. creating, developing, and administering special programs for the promotion and enhancement of communication learning in the University, as appropriate and as funding allows.

B. The Council members are charged individually with:

1. serving as liaisons between the Council, the Director of the CEC Program, and their respective departments and units in order to

   a. assist their Unit’s departments with the identification, delivery, assessment, and consequent improvement of communication related student learning outcomes;
   b. assist their Unit’s departments in designing their Communication in the Discipline plans;
   c. organize and offer to their respective Units at least one workshop, forum, or other activity during the year when the Unit that the liaison represents is preparing for the next year’s certification process.
   d. review and suggest revisions, when appropriate, to the Communication in the Discipline Plans of the departments in the Unit before the departments submit them to the CEC Council;
   e. disseminate information from the CEC Council to the Unit’s departments, as required;
   f. offer advice to the Council on ways to further its goals within their units.
II. Reservations.

A. During the transition between the establishment of the CEC Program and the CEC Council and the full implementation of the departmental CID Plans, the CEC Program Director will continue to supervise the Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive Committees and appoint their members.

B. After the transition period, the Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive Committees will be disbanded. The College Additional Requirements (CAR) [soon to be Liberal Education Commitment (LEC)] are administered by the College of Arts and Sciences. After the transition period, any Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive marker certification for the College will be solely the responsibility of the College, and will not be the responsibility of the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council or the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program.

III. Composition. The Council shall be composed of eight voting members who are full-time faculty: three from the College and one each from the five professional schools having undergraduate programs. The Director of the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program shall be an ex officio member and shall chair the Council. Except in the case of a tie, the Chair shall not vote. (See Officers and their Duties, section VIII.) The following shall be ex officio, non-voting members: the Dean of Undergraduate Studies; the Chair of the General Education Council; and the Director of the Office of Academic Assessment, or their representatives; a Faculty Senate Liaison.

A. The voting members shall be nominated by the Deans of their units and appointed by the Provost. The Deans shall nominate candidates with demonstrated expertise in the communication practices of the areas they represent.

B. The Provost will appoint additional ex officio, non-voting members as needed.

C. Initially, the eight voting faculty appointments will be chosen by a blind draw with two members serving a one-year term, three serving a two-year term, and three serving a three-year term. Thereafter, all appointments will be for three-year terms.

D. If any member of the Council shall resign in mid-term, then the Provost, at the recommendation of the appropriate Dean, shall appoint a qualified replacement to serve the remainder of the member's term.

E. Council members serve a maximum of two consecutive terms, but may be appointed to an additional two years after an interim of at least one year.

F. An undergraduate student representative will be recommended by the SGA and appointed by the Provost as a non-voting ex officio member.

G. The administrative assistant to the Director of the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program shall serve as the administrative assistant for the Council. The administrative assistant shall prepare minutes of the proceedings of the Council and distribute them to the members of the Council, the Chancellor, the Provost, the Dean and department heads of each of the academic units, and all undergraduate program directors. In addition, the administrative assistant will arrange to have the Council’s agenda and minutes placed on the appropriate website.

H. The Council may establish ad hoc committees as necessary.

IV. Organizational Structure.
A. The Council will report directly to the Faculty Senate, and will be coordinated through the office of the CEC Program.

V. Voting Procedures

A. Two-thirds of the voting members of the Council shall constitute a quorum.
B. The chair of the Council will not be a voting member of the Council except in the case of tie votes.

VI. Communication in the Disciplines Plan Approval Procedures:

A. All proposed departmental Communication in the Disciplines (CID) plans:

1. Must receive a preliminary review by the department’s unit CEC elected representative liaison before being submitted to the CEC Council. This preliminary review may take place while new or amended courses included in the CID plan are pending approval by the UCC.
2. Must include the appropriate Communication in the Discipline form with an explanation of how the plan meets the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program goals. The form will require the department to specify
   a. student learning outcomes that reflect the kinds of communication skills and experiences their students will need;
   b. its plan for implementing the appropriate communication instruction, practice, and evaluation necessary to achieve these outcomes within the requirements of its major concentrations; and
   c. its plan for measuring its success in achieving these communication outcomes as part of its departmental annual assessment process, which shall include evidence of continuous efforts for improvement based on assessment data.

B. Department CID Plans are certified for five years from the effective date of the certification. At least two months prior to the expiration of certification, requests for renewal of plans without revision may be submitted directly to the CEC Council; requests for renewal that include revisions to the current plan must first be submitted to the unit CEC liaison for review and tentative approval before resubmission to the Council.

C. Under unusual circumstances, a department may request an extension of the deadline for renewal of up to one year.

D. Upon implementing a department’s CID plan (that is, as soon as the department’s scheduled courses for the following semester adhere to the requirements of the department’s certified CID Plan), the department head shall submit a letter to the Chair of the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council attesting to the implementation. The Council Chair shall then notify the Registrar to make the necessary changes in its online registration program (Genie) to remove the WI and SI marker requirements from the department’s majors’ degree evaluations, and to add to the Undergraduate Bulletin description of the plan the following sentence: “This is a certified Communication-Enriched degree program.”

VII. Officers and Their Duties
A. The chair of the Council will be the Director of the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program and will not be a voting member of the Council except in the case of tie votes.

B. The chair shall notify the members of the Council of the time and place of meetings, develop the agenda, distribute the material pertinent to the deliberations of the Council, and preside during regular and special meetings.

C. In cooperation with the administrative assistant, the chair shall forward the minutes of the Committee's meetings to the Faculty Senate for its information.

D. The chair, in consultation with the Provost, may appoint ad hoc subcommittees to review and evaluate any matters pertinent to the work of the Council as a whole: for example, to study new CID Plans, to review existing Plans in the Communication-Enriched Curriculum program, or to evaluate assessment data.

E. The chair may call special meetings when the volume of business before the Committee cannot be transacted in a reasonable period or when matters of unusual urgency come before the Council.

F. The chair shall submit to the Faculty Senate an annual report on the Committee's actions and recommendations.

G. The chair shall submit other reports to the Provost as needed.

H. The Provost will support a course release for the chair of the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council.

VIII. Meetings of the Council

A. The Council shall convene at regularly scheduled intervals to conduct business. The agenda for these meetings shall be placed on the appropriate website at least five working days prior to the meeting so that those who have business before the Council can plan to attend.

B. All meetings of the Council shall be open to any member of the campus community.

C. Speaking privileges at meetings are specifically granted to any member of the Council and to others at the discretion of the chair.
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Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program

Mission and Purpose

The mission of the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program (CEC) is to

- promote across the University the recognition that disciplinary content is inseparable from disciplinary communication;
- enrich UNCG’s curriculum by integrating communication with each discipline’s learning processes;
- promote across the University the recognition that communication is a pervasive activity taking multiple forms and occurring in many disciplinary contexts; and
- collaborate with academic disciplines in equipping students to become competent communicators across these various contexts using the various forms of communication that their academic, professional, personal, and public endeavors may require.

To these ends, the goals of the CEC Program are to

- provide professional advice and administrative support to the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council’s efforts to assist departments as they develop student learning outcomes relevant to disciplinary communication goals;
- assist faculty as they explore and develop new methods for teaching and evaluating communication; and
- promote the value of communication and communication skills to the broader University community and its constituencies.
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UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO
COMMUNICATION-ENRICHED CURRICULUM PROGRAM

DIRECTOR

PROPOSED POSITION DESCRIPTION

I. The Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program

The mission of the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program (CEC) is to

• promote across the University the recognition that that disciplinary content is inseparable from
disciplinary communication;
• enrich UNCG’s curriculum by integrating communication with each discipline’s learning
processes;
• promote across the University the recognition that communication is a pervasive activity taking
multiple forms and occurring in many disciplinary contexts; and
• collaborate with academic disciplines in equipping students to become competent
communicators across these various contexts using the various forms of communication that
their academic, professional, personal, and public endeavors may require.

To these ends, the goals of the CEC are to

• provide professional advice and administrative support to the Communication-Enriched
Curriculum Council’s efforts to assist departments as they develop student learning outcomes
relevant to disciplinary communication goals;
• assist faculty as they explore and develop new methods for teaching and evaluating
communication;
• provide informed consultation to students as they plan and execute communication projects,
chiefly through the University Speaking Center and the University Writing Center; and
• promote the value of communication and communication skills to the broader University
community and its constituencies.

The Director of the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program provides administrative oversight for
this signature University-wide initiative.

II. Duties and Responsibilities

The Directorship is a 10-month appointment with a negotiable course load (customarily a 1/1
assignment) and an administrative stipend. The CAC program is located in the Unit of Undergraduate
Studies, and the Director reports to the Dean of that Unit. Reporting to the CAC Director are the Faculty
Development Coordinators, along with an administrative assistant and other staff. The Director manages
an operational budget for the program. Primary duties and responsibilities include:
• Providing leadership of and advocacy for a robust CEC Program.
• Chairing the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council and carrying out the Chair’s duties as stipulated by the CEC Council Bylaws.
• Managing the operational budgets and resources of the Council.
• Writing grant proposals, as requested by the Council.
• Overseeing unit, departmental, and faculty development projects and programs as determined by the Council and as requested by its unit liaisons.
• Providing guidance to departments and units relative to assessment of CEC at all levels, based largely on student work artifacts, along with attendant evidence of continuous improvement.
• Overseeing periodic reviews of the CEC Program, enlisting the assistance both of internal and external consultants.
• Preparing and submitting reports as requested to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

III. Qualifications

• The terminal degree in a field appropriate to administration of the CEC program.
• Knowledge of and experience with the scholarship and pedagogy of writing and speaking, and, preferably, of digital discourse.
• Experience with university-wide communication enrichment programs, such as Writing Across the Curriculum or Communication Across the Curriculum programs.
• A thorough knowledge of, and preferably publication in, the theory and practice disciplinary communication pedagogy.
• A record of scholarly achievement in rhetoric, communication, media studies, or related field, preferably related to the study of disciplinary discourse theory and pedagogy.
• Proven administrative capabilities
• Significant outreach, especially workshop experience.
• Ability to work with faculty in a variety of disciplines.
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The Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program Organization Plan

The CAC Task Force recommends that the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program be organized as follows (see CEC Organization Chart, Appendix 8):

1. The Director of CEC Program shall report to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. The Director shall have three primary duties (For a complete list of duties, see the attached job description, Appendix 9):
   a. Chair the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council (see the Council By-laws, sec. VII) and provide the Council with professional advice and administrative support.
   b. Provide administrative support and budgetary oversight for the CEC Council as outlined in the “Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council: Regulations and Procedures” (Appendix 4).
   c. Report the Program’s activities and their assessment to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

2. The Faculty Development Coordinators report to the Director of the CEC Program in all matters related to the CEC, attend all meetings of the CEC Council, and submit reports on faculty development activities to the Council at its request. Faculty Development Coordinators shall be experienced teachers and researchers of one of the following: written communication, spoken communication, or digital communication. Faculty Development Coordinators
   a. Provide individual consultation to University faculty who wish to incorporate communication into their courses.
   b. Advocate the mission and goals of the CEC Program to faculty, department chairs, and program directors.
   c. Facilitate faculty, department, and unit development workshops.
   d. Assist CEC Council members in their function as liaisons to their unit’s departments.

As necessary to perform the above duties, and with the permission and cooperation of the appropriate Center Director, the Faculty Development Coordinators shall have access to the facilities and equipment of the appropriate Centers.

3. The CEC Administrative Assistant reports directly to the CEC Director. The Administrative Program Assistant provides administrative support for all aspects of the program: for the program director, the Faculty Development Coordinators, and for the CEC Council. The primary duties include:
a. Managing, reconciling or adjusting multiple budgets and finances from multiple funding sources.

b. Preparing, Reviewing and Processing Forms, Reports, and Documents.

c. Assisting the Director in organizing the meetings, and preparing and publishing the minutes for the CEC Council.

4. The CEC Research Assistant shall be a graduate assistant provided by the Provost who reports directly to the CEC Director. The CEC Research Assistant shall, as assigned by the CEC Director, research issues and report findings in support of the CEC Council’s assistance to units and departments. The elected representative of the CEC Council, in their function as their units’ liaisons, may request the Director to assign the Research Assistant to appropriate research projects, as work time allows.
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Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program

Organization Chart

- Senate
- CEC Council
- CEC Director
- Dean of US
- Provost
- Program Administrative Assistant
- Faculty Development Coordinators
- Program Research Assistant

41
Appendix 9

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO
COMMUNICATION-ENRICHED CURRICULUM PROGRAM
DIRECTOR
PROPOSED POSITION DESCRIPTION

I. The Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program

The mission of the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program (CEC) is to

• promote across the University the recognition that disciplinary content is inseparable from
disciplinary communication;
• enrich UNCG’s curriculum by integrating communication with each discipline’s learning
processes;
• promote across the University the recognition that communication is a pervasive activity taking
multiple forms and occurring in many disciplinary contexts; and
• collaborate with academic disciplines in equipping students to become competent
communicators across these various contexts using the various forms of communication that
their academic, professional, personal, and public endeavors may require.

To these ends, the goals of the CEC are to

• provide professional advice and administrative support to the Communication-Enriched
Curriculum Council’s efforts to assist departments as they develop student learning outcomes
relevant to disciplinary communication goals;
• assist faculty as they explore and develop new methods for teaching and evaluating
communication; and
• promote the value of communication and communication skills to the broader University
community and its constituencies.

II. Duties and Responsibilities

The Director of the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program provides administrative oversight for
this signature University-wide initiative.

The Directorship is a 10-month appointment with a negotiable course load (customarily a 1/1
assignment) and an administrative stipend. The CAC program is located in the Unit of Undergraduate
Studies, and the Director reports to the Dean of that Unit. Reporting to the CAC Director are the Faculty
Development Coordinators, along with an administrative assistant, research assistant, and other staff.
The Director manages an operational budget for the program. Primary duties and responsibilities
include:
• Providing leadership of and advocacy for a robust CEC Program.
• Chairing the Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council and carrying out the Chair’s duties as stipulated by the CEC Council Bylaws.
• Managing the operational budgets and resources of the CEC Council and the CEC Program, including the submission of requests.
• Writing grant and funding requests, as requested by the Council.
• Overseeing unit, departmental, and faculty development projects and programs as determined by the Council and as requested by its unit liaisons.
• Overseeing periodic reviews of the CEC Program, enlisting the assistance both of internal and external consultants.
• Preparing and submitting reports as requested to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

III. Qualifications

• The terminal degree in a field appropriate to administration of the CEC program.
• Knowledge of and experience with the scholarship and pedagogy of writing and speaking, and, preferably, of digital discourse.
• Experience with university-wide communication enrichment programs, such as Writing Across the Curriculum, Communication Across the Curriculum, or Communication in the Disciplines programs.
• A thorough knowledge of, and preferably publication in, the theory and practice disciplinary communication pedagogy.
• A record of scholarly achievement in rhetoric, communication, media studies, or related field, preferably related to the study of disciplinary discourse theory and pedagogy.
• Proven administrative capabilities
• Significant outreach, especially workshop experience.
• Ability to work with faculty in a variety of disciplines.
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Proposals to the General Education Council

November 30, 2011

Introduction:

In January 2011, responding to external and internal reviews of the CAC Program, the Provost appointed the Communication Across the Disciplines Task Force and charged it to evaluate the University’s Writing and Speaking Intensive program and its relationship to the General Education program. The Task Force paid especial attention to the following statement in the Provost’s charge:

UNCG recognizes that there is a distinction between the goals and purposes of general education and the goals and purposes of disciplinary education. UNCG also recognizes, however, that it is important to the coherence of students’ educational experience that the general learning goals established for the general education program extend appropriately across each student’s entire curriculum and be engaged by campus-wide programs such as CAC.

Attending to this and the other statements in the Provost’s charge, the Task Force thoroughly reviewed the entire operation of the Communication Across the Curriculum Program and evaluated the effectiveness of the Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive marker program. (The complete charge is included in the full CAC Task Force Phase I Report, posted on the CAC web site: http://www.uncg.edu/cac/. The Task force made numerous recommendations, including recommendations to the Provost, the Deans’ Council, GEC, the College, and the Writing and Speaking Centers.

The Task Force presented the recommendations to, and heard concerns and received suggestions about them from, the Provost, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Dean of Arts and Sciences, the Deans’ Council, the Administrative Council of the College, faculty at several unit assemblies, and faculty at a Senate Forum. In response, the Task Force decided to divide its recommendations into three parts, eliminating or modifying many of the original recommendations, and to address the three parts to three different entities: the Faculty Senate, the Deans’ Council, and the General Education Committee.

The Proposal to the Faculty (also available on the CAC web site) recommends the following to the Senate:

The Task Force’s major recommendation is that each department should determine its discipline-specific communication competencies, supervise their instruction, and conduct their assessment. Moreover, the University should eliminate the current Writing and Speaking Intensive markers from the General Education requirements and institute a new program that requires every degree-granting program in the University to create and implement an appropriate “Communication in the Discipline” plan. A new Communication-Enriched Curriculum Council, with the support of Communication-Enriched Curriculum Program (the current CAC Program restructured), should administer this plan.
The Proposal to the Deans’ Council was to have recommended that each unit require all its students to take an appropriate sophomore-level, “transitional, multi-modal communication course” (for instance, a “Communication in the Social Sciences” course). Investigation determined that adding such a requirement for all units would be far too expensive during the current budgetary crisis, and the Task Force has abandoned the recommendation.

The Proposals to the General Education Council are below. These proposals result from the Task Force’s recognition that while the CID plans will greatly strengthen the instruction and practice of communication in the upper-level, disciplinary courses required for the majors, the elimination of the Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive general education requirements would be likely to reduce the amount of communication instruction currently being delivered in courses that are not discipline-specific. The Task Force was also concerned about the kind and amount of foundational communication instruction some courses carrying the GRD marker currently deliver.

The Proposals:

I. Proposal to replace the current WI and SI markers with a “CE” marker

The CAC Task Force will recommend to the Faculty Senate that UNCG redesign the current Writing and Speaking intensive program, and it will recommend that it require departmental Communication in the Discipline (CID) plans that address the improvement of communication in the upper-level, disciplinary courses.

The CID plans will not address communication in the lower-level, general education courses. The CAC Task Force recognizes, however, that eliminating the University Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive requirements may have detrimental effects upon communication instruction in the lower-level courses. The CAC Task Force, therefore, recommends to the General Education Council that it join with the CAC Task Force in presenting to the Faculty Senate a resolution that would create one new communication-based marker to replace the current WI and SI markers, in order to achieve the following goals:

- To ensure the continuation and improve the quality of much of the communication instruction currently being delivered through WI and SI marked courses that are not specialized, disciplinary courses required for the major.
- To reduce the possibility that section limits may increase in the General Education category courses.
- To create parameters that would make the altered marker program assessable in ways the old WI /SI marker program was not.

- Unlike the current WI and SI courses, which range in difficulty and specialization from the 100-level to the 500-level, Communication-Enriched (CE) markers should be associated with an introductory or general level of instruction. Accordingly, the marker should be restricted to courses either (1) at the 100- or 200-level and having no more than one course prerequisite or co-requisite, or (2) at the 300-level with no course prerequisites or co-requisites.
Unlike WI and SI courses, CE courses should share some specific kinds of assignments in order for student performances across courses to be comparable.

With these goals in mind, the Task Force recommends to the General Education Council that it co-sponsor with the CAC Task Force a Faculty Senate resolution that would do the following:

1. Eliminate the current University requirement that each student take one course carrying a Writing Intensive marker and one carrying a Speaking Intensive marker, and additionally take a second course carrying a Writing Intensive and second course carrying a Speaking Intensive marker in within the major.

2. Create a Communication-Enriched (CE) course marker that would replace the current WI and SI markers, and instead require all students to take one CE course. [Note: The reduction in the number of marked courses that students must take will not reduce the amount of communication instruction students receive because the proposed Communication in the Discipline (CID) plans will require departments to deliver discipline-specific communication instruction in the courses required for the majors.] All CE courses will require students to deliver both written and speaking communication work products, and provide detailed feedback on those assignments.

3. For students who initially transfer to UNCG as juniors or seniors (with 60 semester hours or more), the CE requirement will be waived.

4. Require that all CE marked courses meet the following criteria:

   a. Every CE marked course must conform to SACS accreditation principle 2.7.3, which insists that general education courses “do not narrowly focus on those skills, techniques, and procedures specific to a particular occupation or profession.” Because all general education category courses conform to this principle, they all will be considered to meet this criterion. No CE marked course may also carry a GRD marker. [GRD communication instruction is at the foundational level, and uses “learning to write” (or speak) pedagogies, whereas CE criteria are designed to help students learn to adapt discourse to a particular subject and a general audience, or “writing (or speaking) to learn” pedagogies. Moreover, this provision will prevent the possibility that students who take a 100-level GRD marked course could simultaneously fulfill their CE requirement.]

   b. Every CE marked course must provide instruction for and practice in the skills needed for the required communication assignments.

   c. Every CE marked course must include instructor feedback and guided revision, or opportunities for students to apply what they have learned from previous performances in a subsequent performance, as a requirement.

   d. Every CE course should be limited to twenty-five students (or a 1:25 faculty/student ratio that can include teaching assistants).

   e. Every CE course must carry three credits.
5. All courses with Communication-Enriched markers must include the following Student Learning Outcomes as part of their course learning objectives/outcomes:

**Student Learning Outcomes for CE (Communication-Enriched) courses:**

At the conclusion of this course, students will be able to:

a. Construct in writing and present through speaking an argument about a key idea, text, or concept(s) in the course subject, that has the following essential elements:

- A thesis statement, a claim, or a proposition that deals with a matter of probability, not certainty, and not mere opinion.
- Grounds, reasons, or premises that support the thesis.
- Adaptations of organization and style appropriate to the occasion and the targeted audience.

b. Construct in writing and present through speaking an exposition (a clarification, an explanation) of a key idea, text, or concept(s) in the course subject that has the following essential elements:

- A controlling purpose, context, or rationale that recognizes the audience’s preconceptions and guides the audience’s perspective on the topic.
- An analysis and organization of the topic appropriate to the exposition’s purpose and audience.
- Definitions, examples, analogies, and other explanatory techniques appropriate to the exposition’s purpose and audience.

6. A Communication-Enriched (CE) Course Committee will replace the current Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive Committees. The Chair of the CEC Council will appoint the CE Course Committee from among the members of the Council and its Faculty Development Coordinators. Members and Coordinators will not be eligible to serve during the year their units are preparing CID plans for certification.

The CE Course Committee, as did the current WI and SI committees, will design and publish appropriate course guidelines and proposal forms, and will approve all proposals. During the transition period, the CE Course Committee will grandfather current SI and WI courses already carrying general education category markers as CE courses, but departments will need to re-design them and the Committee will have to re-approve them at the time the courses’ general education markers are re-certified.

7. The CE Course Committee will not grant CE marker approvals to instructors, as is the case for WI and SI markers, but to departments for specific courses. The CE Course Committee will approve markers for courses only when the department affirms that its instructors will teach the course CE every time the department offers the course.
8. A department offering CE marked courses will submit a copy of each CE course section’s syllabus to the CE Course Committee at least one month prior to the first day of the semester in which the course will be taught. Although it is expected that sections of the same course will vary, sometimes considerably, in their content and structure, the department head or his or her appointed representative is responsible for ensuring that all sections

   a. have the same CE student learning objectives
   b. meet the minimum criteria for assignments, and
   c. link these assignments to the appropriate student learning objectives.

9. The Communication-Enriched Curriculum Committee will be responsible for determining the schedule and method of assessing the Communication-Enriched Course program, and the office of the Communication-Enriched Curriculum program will be responsible for performing assessments and reporting the results.

II. Proposal to strengthen the General Reasoning and Discourse category courses

The Communication Across the Curriculum Task Force recognizes that the development of Student Learning Outcomes for general education category courses is the responsibility of the General Education Council. However, one of the Provost’s charges to the Task Force was the following: “Consider alternative modes for achieving continuity between the instruction and practice of communication in the general education Reasoning and Discourse core courses into the higher-level, disciplinary courses offered for the majors, in particular along the lines suggested by the external reviewers of the CAC program.” With that in mind the Task Force examined the current offerings of GRD courses, and came to the conclusions and recommendations below. The CAC Task Force hopes that these will be helpful to the General Education Council:

Learning Goal #1 (LG1) in the UNCG General Education Program is the ability to “think critically, communicate effectively, and develop appropriate fundamental skills in quantitative and information literacies” (http://web.uncg.edu/reg/Bulletin/Current/UnivReq/GECProgram.aspx.). In order to ensure that its students have the opportunity to improve their competency in the first two of these four fundamental skills, the University requires every student to earn six semester hours of work in two courses carrying the General Education Reasoning and Discourse (GRD) marker. The UNCG Undergraduate Bulletin asserts that in courses carrying the GRD marker “Students gain skills in intellectual discourse, including constructing cogent arguments, locating, synthesizing and analyzing documents, and writing and speaking clearly, coherently, and effectively” (http://web.uncg.edu/reg/Bulletin/Current/UnivReq/GECDescription.aspx).

The Communication Across the Curriculum Task Force believes that all of these goals are not being achieved, or sometimes even entirely addressed, by all courses that currently carry the GRD marker. The Task Force further believes that in order for GRD marked courses to achieve these goals—goals the University faculty have already determined—the General Education Council should set much more stringent criteria for GRD courses than it has in the past. These criteria should include minimum quantitative and qualitative requirements for writing or speaking, as well as research, and they should
include specific Student Learning Objectives—objectives that can be appropriately assessed—associated with those assignments. The Task Force recommends the following:

**Assignment criteria:**

- Students must write a minimum of 15 pages (typed, double-spaced) of polished prose (*i.e.* not including drafts), or speak a minimum of ten minutes before an audience (not including practice), or produce some equivalent combination of writing and oral presentation.
- Prior to submitting the polished prose or performing the formal presentation, students must receive instructor and peer feedback and guided revision from drafts or practice sessions.
- For at least one writing or formal speaking assignment, students must construct an argument, and they must summarize, quote, paraphrase, and synthesize source material in support of that argument.

**Student Learning Objectives:**

Students should demonstrate their ability to

- analyze the content and structure of complex texts (written, oral, and/or visual in nature);
- compose cogent, evidence-based arguments;
- summarize, quote, paraphrase, and synthesize source material in support of an argument;
- employ drafting, peer review, and revision techniques in order to improve content, style, and structure of their own writing or speaking; and
- appraise their own communication abilities and processes through critical reflection.
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Discipline-specific Communication Theory and Practices
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