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Introduction:

A. Background

The Communication Across the Disciplines Force was appointed by the Provost in January 2011 and charged with evaluating 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, but this document discusses only those recommendations that the Task Force will bring to the Faculty Senate for action.

B. The main recommendation:

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.

This “bottom-up” arrangement has several advantages compared to the present CAC system. Primarily, it will provide integrated, not isolated, communication experiences: each department will identify, develop, and refine communication education components and weave them throughout its major curriculum. This intentional integration of communication throughout the area of study, rather than a selection of individual courses without coherent connections to each other or to a discipline’s communicative practices, should result in a far more effective and coherent student learning experience.

C. Original purpose of WI and SI course marked courses:

According to the “Formal Review of the Communication Across the Curriculum Program” (2010):

The program is founded upon three principles, each supported by research and by practical experience:
1) Beyond elementary levels, capabilities in written and oral communication, and also in critical reasoning, are best acquired in the context of disciplines and domains of application. Communication issues are not separate from issues of particular substance.

2) Beyond elementary levels, learning in the disciplines cannot be separated from the ability to communicate effectively in them. Knowledge in academic disciplines cannot be advanced, applied, or assessed without reference to written and oral communication in them.

3) Small classes that give particular attention to issues of communication within the discipline are particularly rich learning environments that should be made available to (and required of) all students. Ensuring some minimal number of such classes is a matter of particular importance for a large, state-supported, research-oriented university.

In its principles, therefore, especially principles one and two, the UNCG CAC Program originally conformed to what remains a nearly universally accepted precept. As Helen Drury of The Learning Assistance Centre at the University of Sydney put this general precept in 1999, “It is now widely recognised [sic.] that the most effective way to ensure that students graduate with generic skills is to integrate the teaching of these skills into discipline course curricula. In this way, skills are taught together with disciplinary knowledge and concepts” (“Providing the discipline context for skills development,” HERDSA Annual International Conference, Melbourne, 12-15 July 1999). Following this precept, the CAC Program’s WI and SI courses were intended to be upper-division courses required by the majors (normally 300-level and above), that focused on communication issues specific to the particular discipline; they were not intended to be lower-division, general education courses (200-level and below) focused on “foundational skills.” Regrettably, this is precisely the direction in which the program began to drift.

D. Problems with the current program:

The external reviewers of the CAC Program, Chris M. Anson and Ted Scheckels, identified the following problems in 2010:

- Inconsistent adherence to the program’s original principles and criteria (especially since the program came under GEC control)
  - Pressure to certify 100- and 200-level courses when the CAC principles are inappropriate for lower-level, general education courses.

- A paucity of marked sections. This has led to additional problems, including
  - inadequate quality control, because of the pressure to provide enough marked courses;
  - seniors taking the available WI and SI seats first, even when these are lower-level courses, because they have registration priority;
  - students taking courses merely to fulfill the WI or SI requirements, leaving courses populated with students having no genuine interest in the subject;
  - steadily increasing class sizes, further reducing incentives for faculty to offer marked courses.

- Currently, there is a “gap” in communication instruction between the two required General Reasoning and Discourse (GRD) courses and disciplinary communication instruction. This creates a lack of continuity between introductory foundational skills and their practical application in the disciplines.

- Additional problems have resulted from the recent budget reductions including
- even fewer marked courses being offered, primarily because of the termination of lecturers who often teach the marked courses;
- even further increases in the seat limit of WI and SI marked courses—currently at 30, as opposed to the original limit of 20.

* Problems with assessment of WI / SI programs:

Assessment is the most serious problem facing the current program. All Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive programs, like UNCG’s, that impose similar course criteria “across the curriculum,” suffer from the impossibility of there being any “authentic” assessment—for authentic assessment can occur only at the disciplinary level. In “authentic assessment,” educators determine the tasks that students will perform to demonstrate their competency, and then develop a curriculum that will enable students to perform those tasks well. Here, competency would include the acquisition of essential knowledge and skills, especially communication skills required to perform in the discipline. Curriculum scholars refer to this as “planning backwards” (e.g. J. P. McDonald, “Dilemmas of Planning Backwards: Rescuing a Good Idea,” Teachers College Record 94 [1992]: 152-169).

UNCG’s WI / SI program works in the opposite way, and with predictable results. As Colleen Garside has noted, “forcing communication-discipline specific standards of communication on other disciplines,” as UNCG’s current WI / SI program does, “sets up failure of CXCPs [Communication Across the Curriculum Programs] because CXCPs are unable to meet the needs of other disciplines through our communication models. Efforts to enhance communication competence will likely be ineffective (or at least not as effective as they could be) for the purposes of specific disciplines.” In fact, she says, “the designs and structures of such programs are inherently problematic when they fail to account for discipline-specific communication practices)” (“Seeing the Forest Through the Trees: A Challenge Facing Communication Across the Curriculum Programs” Communication Education 51.1 [2002]: 51-64. See also D. P. Dannels, “Time to Speak Up: A Theoretical Framework of Situated Pedagogy and Practice for Communication Across the Curriculum,” Communication Education, 50 [2001]: 144–158; J. T. Morello, “Comparing Speaking Across the Curriculum and Writing Across the Curriculum Programs, Communication Education 49 [2000]: 99–113; and R. B. Rubin, Communication Competency Assessment Instrument. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1982.)

Assessing communication “across the curriculum” is inherently problematic because communication is inherently “situation-specific.” For thousands of years, rhetoric scholars have acknowledged that discourse, of whatever kind, always and necessarily must be adapted to its purpose, time, place, and audience. This does not mean that Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive courses are necessarily ineffective; it means that their effectiveness can be evaluated only locally: there is no possible “rubric” applicable across-the-curriculum for communication practices (see Alfie Kohn, “The Trouble with Rubrics,” English Journal 95.4 [Mar. 2006]: 12-15.)

Because authentic assessment of such programs is impossible, most assessment of WI/SI CAC programs like UNCG’s is merely “consumer-based assessment”—student self-reported satisfaction indices (e.g. Thomas L. Hilgers, et al., “Doing More Than ‘Thinning Out the Herd’: How Eighty-Two College Seniors Perceived Writing-Intensive Classes” Research in the Teaching of English 29.1 [Feb. 1995]: 59-87). Such “feedback” is an inadequate guide for developing a program. The solution is to acknowledge that the communication processes that occur within a discipline are an integral part of the discipline, not separate “add-ons” which, if eliminated, would leave the discipline intact, and to acknowledge that the students’ competency in their disciplines cannot be legitimately assessed independently from their competency in their discipline’s communication processes.
Part I: From CAC to CEC: New Communication Goals and Requirements

**Recommendation 1:** Eliminate the current WI and SI marker system.

**Rationale:** The primary reasons to eliminate the current University Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive requirements are as follows:

A. The problems with the current program mentioned above in Part D of the Introduction.
B. The tendency of faculty and departments to think the communication needs of students are met simply by having them take a few Writing and Speaking courses, thus segregating communication into a relatively few courses.
C. The current system encourages faculty to regard communication as a competency distinguishable from competency in the discipline itself, when in fact, for example, “doing Chemistry” is inextricable from “communicating Chemistry.”
D. The current system relies upon an outmoded view of communication as writing and speaking only, encouraging the neglect of more contemporary practices and media.
E. The current system encourages students to regard their education as a “fill-in-the-blank” process instead of as a continually expanding and complicating integration of knowing what to think and knowing how to do.

**Proposed action:** Senate Resolution to eliminate the requirement as described in the University Requirements > General Education Program (GEC) > Writing and Speaking Intensive Courses section of the online Undergraduate Bulletin and remove all references to Writing and Speaking Intensive courses from the Undergraduate Bulletin.

**Recommendation 2:** Institute required “Communication in the Discipline” (CID) Plans for departments.

**Explanation and Rationale:**

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 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.

Although the CEC Council will determine the specific guidelines for the CID plans, in general, CID plans will:

1. Be written by faculty in the department or disciplinary unit, i.e., those with expertise in the area of instruction.
2. Provide a comprehensive plan for communication instruction (written, spoken, visual, and digital), usually within existing courses required by that department or disciplinary unit, although CID plans may involve curricular changes, if the department or disciplinary so decides.
3. Allow departments and disciplinary units to gain intellectual control over the ways in which their students use communication to advance their knowledge.
4. 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 to gauge the impact of communication upon the other competencies endemic to the field.

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

As mentioned above, CID plans will allow departments and disciplinary units to gain control over the ways in which communication instruction happens within their major programs as a whole. This is a comprehensive benefit over WI and SI courses because these target specific courses (and in some departments or divisions, perhaps only one or two such courses). In contrast, 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.

Departments and divisions can, for example, enact a saturation model, spreading writing, speaking, visual, and digital communication instruction across many courses in small doses, relieving instructors from the perceived burden of being “writing teachers” for any particular course in a major plan. Thus, ideally, the CID will allow students to experience a greater variety of intellectual approaches to communication in a particular field or major, and by extension a greater variety of exercises and assignments that ask the student to illustrate their understanding of those approaches.

Ultimately, CID plans will provide departments and disciplinary units greater flexibility in their major offerings in relation to communication, and, again ideally, will offer greater independence from extra-departmental offerings that fulfill graduation requirements for communication competencies, as is often the case for departments under the WI/SI plan.
C. How the CID Plans will be designed, certified, and implemented:

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 Coordinators, will assist the department or unit as much or as little as the department/disciplinary unit desires, providing a measure of expertise regarding possible structures or models for the plans themselves. Ultimately, however, the plan itself will be the responsibility and purview of the department or disciplinary unit itself.

The certification of the CID plans will occur at the level of the CEC Council. 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 a plan is certified, it will be in effect for five years, at which point recertification will occur, using the same structure as above (for more details, see Section VI.B. of the CEC proposed bylaws, Appendix 4).

Implementation of the plans will be the responsibility of the individual departments or disciplinary units. The department head will notify the chair of the Council once the plan is implemented (see Bylaws VI. D.). Typically, 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, throughout the five-year plan cycle. 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.

Proposed actions: Senate resolution to

A. Add a “Communication Competencies” section to the “University Requirements” list in the UNCG Undergraduate Bulletin, as described in Appendix 1 (especially point 2).
B. Endorse the “Transition Plan” as described in the Appendix 2.

Part II: The CEC Council: A New Process


Explanation and Rationale:

A. Why a Communication Enriched Curriculum Council:

A faculty body that is under the purview of the Faculty Senate should direct the campus-wide institution of 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 Communication Council” and be established under the bylaws found in Appendix 4.

The Task Force believes that voting members of this Council should be elected faculty because 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.” Because of the problems historically generated by the WI and SI marker system, and the problems that accrued from disciplinary courses being certified by the General Education Council (see Part I of the full report), the Task Force recommends that disciplinary communication curriculum issues be put under the purview of the new CEC Council.

The Task Force does recommend, however, that GEC and CEC continually consult one another. This would best be done by having the Chair of the CEC Council (as the CAC Director is now) be an *ex officio* member of the General Education Council, and having the Chair of the General Education Council be an *ex officio* member of the Communication Education Council. 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.”

**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 elected 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 Coordinators of CEC (who are under the supervision of the CEC Director), and
   d. through its 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 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 should chair the 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, and 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.

Proposed actions:

A. Senate Resolution to endorse the Mission of the CEC Council and the by-laws for the CEC Council as described in the Appendix 4 and Appendix 5.
B. Workload reduction: Because each CEC Council member will be responsible for facilitating unit-wide planning and implementation of the CID Program, it is imperative that these members be given workload reduction consideration.
Appendix 1

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 communication competencies is an important Learning Goal of the General Education Program. Instruction, practice, and informed responses to communicative acts in multiple communication modalities and situations is essential and should be integrated into the academic curriculum. To assist students in gaining these competencies, UNCG provides:

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—each degree program has integrated into its program of study a set of distributed competencies in communication using multiple modes appropriate to the disciplinary work it teaches (Communication in the Discipline [CID] Plan).
Appendix 2

Tentative CAC to CEC Transition Plan

The following transition timeline assumes that the Senate will adopt the resolutions instituting the UNCG Communication Enriched Curriculum by November 2011.

Fall 2011

Nov. Senate Approval

Spring 2012

January Submission of changes to “Communication Competencies” section of the Undergraduate Bulletin, effective Fall 2012

March Election of Council

May Preliminary meeting of the Council with the Faculty Development Coordinators (2-day orientation to CEC procedures and workshop on liaison techniques from CAC leaders at NC State.)

Fall 2012

Sept. Council in place: begins work on guidelines and forms for CIDs. Liaison work begins.

Nov. Council publishes guidelines and forms for CIDs.

Spring 2013

May Deadline for departments to submit forms describing current communication instruction practice to Council for appraisal and recommendations.

Fall 2013

Sept. SI and WI Committees dissolved: No new marker certifications.

Nov. Feedback to departments from appraisal of their current communication instruction practice.

Certification of some departments based on their current practice (no need for letter from department head attesting that the plan is implemented, since the plan is a description of current practice.)

Dec. Chair of the Council notifies Registrar to remove WI and SI requirements from the degree plans of majors in certified departments.

Spring 2014

May Deadline for uncertified departments to submit CID Plans to the Council

Fall 2014
Sept-Nov.  Council conducts certification of CID plans

**Spring 2015**

Jan.  Department heads send letters of attestation of implementation to Council. Council notifies Registrar. Chair of the Council notifies Registrar to remove WI and SI requirements from the degree plans of majors in certified departments.

Registrar notified to remove all reference to WI and SI markers from Bulletin effective with Fall 2015 catalog.

March  Chair of the Council notifies Provost and Unit Deans of non-compliant departments.
Appendix 3

Communication Enriched Curriculum Council

Mission and Goals

The mission of the Communication Enriched Curriculum Council (CEC) 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 a department’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, the 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 (see VI.A.3, below); and
      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 elected Council members are charged with:
      1. serving as liaisons between the Council and the departments in order to
         a. assist their Unit’s departments with the identification, delivery, assessment, and consequent improvement of communication related student learning outcomes, and
         b. assist departments in designing their Communication in the Discipline plans; and
      2. coordinating with the CEC Council and the Director of the CEC Program in order to
         a. organize and offer to its unit at least one workshop, forum, or other activity each year that is designed to further the goals of the CEC Program;
         b. make him or herself available to unit departments for consultation and advice respecting the identification, delivery, and assessment of communication related student learning outcomes;
         c. 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;
         d. disseminate information from the CEC Council to the unit’s departments, as required; and
         e. offer advice to the Council on ways to further its goals within the unit.
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 (a period not to exceed three years—see the Transition Plan), the CEC Program Director will continue to supervise the Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive Committee and appoint its members. The WI and SI markers these committees approve will continue to be sent to the General Education Council for final approval.

B. After the transition period, the Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive Committees will be disbanded, and the CEC will thereafter operate independently of the General Education Council. The College Additional Requirements (CAR) [soon to be Liberal Education Commitment (LEC)] are administered by the College. 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, the Communication Enriched Curriculum Program, or the General Education Council.

III. Composition. The Council shall be composed of eight voting members, 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; the Director of the Office of Academic Assessment; a Faculty Senate Liaison.

A. The voting members shall be nominated by the Deans of their units, and elected by the faculty of their units. 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, members will be elected either to three-year or to two-year terms. The members from the College, the School of Business, and the School of Education shall be elected to initial three-year terms, with the remaining appointments being for two-year terms. 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.

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 the College of Arts and Sciences, the deans, department heads and division chairs in each of the professional schools, and all undergraduate program directors. In addition, the administrative assistant will arrange to have the Committee’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.

B. Unit-level Support Mechanisms for unit liaisons:
At the discretion of its Dean, some units, especially larger units, may wish to provide some form of support for its elected representative to assist with his or her duties as liaison to the unit (see Sec. I. H.). This support may be in the form of course-load reductions, unit-level CEC Committees, graduate assistants, or other forms of support, but, in any case, the responsibility for the performance of the Council member’s liaison duties remains that of the elected representative alone.

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 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 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. Right of Appeal

The Communication Enriched Curriculum Council shall grant the privilege of appeal of its decisions in accordance with the following procedure:

A. At a meeting of the Council subsequent to the one at which a CID Plan was rejected, but within six months of the Council’s decision, the sponsor or sponsors of the CID Plan in question shall appear before the Council to appeal. If from the discussion it appears that the issue cannot be settled by further negotiation, and if the rejected CID Plan has received at least 2 affirmative votes, the chair of the Council shall forward the request to the Faculty Senate for appeal.

B. Upon the Senate’s agreeing to hear the appeal, the sponsor or sponsors of the CID Plan that has been rejected shall represent the affirmative before the Faculty Senate and support motions for the adoption of the CID Plan. The chair of the Council, or members designated by the Council shall represent the decision of the Council.

Note: This appeals procedure defines the role of the Council; it does not preclude or supersede any appeals or review procedure established by the Faculty Senate.

VIII. 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 Dean of Undergraduate Studies, 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.
IX. 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.
Appendix 5

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 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.