

**2018-19 ACADEMIC SENATE PROGRAM REVIEW OF
GENERAL EDUCATION:
FOUNDATIONS OF THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES**

Internal Reviewers

Adriana Galván, Review Team Chair, Undergraduate Council, Psychology
Yuen Huo, Review Team Member, Undergraduate Council, Psychology

External Reviewers

Elizabeth Loizeaux, Boston University, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs

Date of Site Visit: April 19, 2019

Approved by Undergraduate Council: May 31, 2019

Appendix I: External Reviewers' Reports
Appendix II: Site Visit Schedule

2018-19 ACADEMIC SENATE PROGRAM REVIEW OF GENERAL EDUCATION: FOUNDATIONS OF THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

1. Introductory Statement

The current General Education (GE) curriculum at UCLA was instituted in 2001. As of Fall 2006, all incoming freshman satisfy their GE requirements by taking a requisite number of courses across three foundational areas: Arts and Humanities, Society and Culture, and Scientific Inquiry. This review committee was tasked with reviewing the Foundations of Arts and Humanities.

The Review Team consisted of Adriana Galvan (Review Team Chair, Undergraduate Council Member), Yuen Huo (Review Team Member, Undergraduate Council Member), and external reviewer Elizabeth Loizeaux, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs (Boston University). The Review Team learned about the program through interviews with select administrators, faculty from various departments who service GE courses, teaching assistants and undergraduate students on April 19, 2019. We also reviewed the following documents: Self-Review Report of the General Education Governance Committee's Ad Hoc Review Committee, Review Report from 2010-2011, memos from Dean and Provost of Undergraduate Education Patricia Turner, and from Antoinette Gomes, Chair of the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity. This report is based on these collective sources of information about the Foundations of Arts and Humanities GE area.

Prior to the site visit, on 3/19/19, the internal review team members met with Professor Michael Hackett, Chair of the General Education Governance Committee and Director Brooke Wilkinson, to discuss the self-review. The team also met with Assistant Vice Provost Lucy Blackmar on 3/26/19, to discuss the self-review.

2. Strengths and Achievements of the Program

The mission statement for the Society and Culture Curriculum is as follows: *'The aim of courses in the Foundations of the Arts and Humanities is to provide students with the perspectives and intellectual skills necessary to comprehend and think critically about our situation in the world as human beings. In particular, these courses provide students with the basic means to appreciate and evaluate the ongoing efforts of humans to explain, translate, and transform our diverse experiences of the world through such media as language, literature, philosophical systems, images, sounds, and performances. These courses will introduce students to the historical development and fundamental intellectual and ethical issues associated with the arts and humanities and may also investigate the complex relations between artistic and humanistic expression and other facets of society and culture.'*

Students select courses from a list of courses approved by the General Education Governance Council (GEGC) in three subfields: (1) Literary and Cultural Analysis; (2) Linguistic and Philosophical Analysis; and (3) Visual and Performance Arts Analysis and Practice. The number of required courses for each subfield varies by academic unit.

There are currently 399 courses approved for the GE Foundations of Arts and Humanities, including 134 new courses approved from Fall 2009 to Spring 2017. These courses span 44 distinct departments/programs. Two-hundred five of these courses are approved for Literary and Cultural Analysis credit, 70 are approved for Philosophical and Linguistic Analysis credit, and 171 for Visual and Performance Arts Analysis and Practice credit. Forty-seven courses are approved for Writing II credit. According to data provided in the self-review, many courses (58%) are taught by ladder faculty (1378 courses) and 42% are taught by non-ladder faculty (1012 courses).

Student enrollment in the Foundations of Arts and Humanities courses during the last review period totaled 205,357. This equates to an average of 25,670 enrollments per year. Of the 399 total AH courses, 61 accounted for nearly 64% of all enrollments. The 10 most heavily enrolled courses between 2009-2017 are: Linguistics 1 (10,784 enrolled), Film TV 106A (4,808 enrolled), Philosophy 7 (4,192 enrolled), Arts & Architecture 10 (3,978 enrolled), Classics 30 (3,923 enrolled), Chicano Studies 10A (3,772 enrolled), Linguistics 20 (3,424 enrolled), Scandinavian 50 (3,397 enrolled), Near Eastern Languages and Cultures 10W (3,374 enrolled), and Philosophy 6 (3,075 enrolled).

The Review Team had an opportunity to meet with faculty from several departments, including, English, Slavic, Near Eastern Languages and Cultures, History, Classics and Philosophy. All were highly impressive faculty with clear passion and engagement with undergraduate teaching. The interviewed faculty reported an overall positive experience with their classes, including enjoyment in working with students and high quality of graduate instructors. However, the majority of them also noted that when teaching a course that fulfilled the GE AH requirement, they did not explicitly discuss the GE requirement with their students and that students did not have clear expectations of the GE courses. Some also noted concerns about the proliferation and unevenness in difficulty of the courses offered for GE. With almost 400 courses offered, the quality of the courses varies and there is a sense that regulation of them has “drifted”.

Cluster Program. The cluster program was introduced 20 years ago to provide entering freshman with a learning community and the opportunity to focus on a topic in depth from multiple disciplinary perspectives. Faculty and administrators view the cluster program as a successful innovation and a highlight of GE at UCLA. One undergraduate student we interviewed described her cluster course as “the best decision I made coming into college.” The cluster program offers what can be considered a liberal arts experience within a large research university. The cluster program encourages more faculty-student interaction than in typical courses (e.g. faculty and students sharing meals in the residence halls, coffee hours). Offerings are focused on topics and problems that have broad appeal (e.g., “Interracial Dynamics and Race in Culture”, “Biotechnology and Society”). Student learning is guided by a teaching team of faculty from different fields in the first two quarter followed by a small writing seminar in the third quarter. Students view the cluster courses as requiring a high level of work but worth pursuing if they have strong interest in the topic. Students who complete the cluster feel that it was worthwhile. Another benefit perceived by students is that clusters satisfy a large portion of the GE requirement early on in their career.

Despite these benefits, a theme that emerged in discussions is that the cluster path is not for everyone. Students express the desire to have choice which includes whether to spend several quarters focused on a theme aligned with their interest or instead to “dip” into a wider array of coursework by picking and choosing individual courses to satisfy the GE requirement. The undergraduates we interviewed all indicated that they received mixed messages about the cluster program at orientation from peer counselors. Returning students who have taken the cluster course recommend it. Those who have not advise incoming students not to take clusters because it is perceived as a heavy workload and because of three quarter commitment may “make or break” your GPA. There is consensus about the value of the cluster program and the experiences it provides for students, but there is also recognition that it is best to offer students the option to either do the cluster or “stand alone” courses that fulfill the GE requirements.

Course Review

To ensure that courses in the AH foundation area meet the pedagogical aims outlined in the mission statement and advance UCLA’s GE principles, the GE *ad hoc* committee established a process of randomly sampling and reviewing 10% of each foundation area’s course syllabi on a yearly basis.

To achieve new AH approval, courses are reviewed by the GE Governance Committee. Course instructors submit the course syllabus as well as a standardized course information sheet that describes how the course fulfills the AH mission statement and how it adheres to the more general GE principles. The vast majority of applications are approved.

In Winter 2018 51 AH syllabi were reviewed by committee members, leading to the following recommendations for AH syllabi: 1) learning outcomes should be clearly stated; 2) which GE category is being satisfied by the course and why; 3) the page length of 10 pages should be more clearly stated for the writing component of the course; 4) departments should be more involved in ensuring the consistent quality of GEs from their departments; and 5) the GEGC should provide representative syllabi on their website.

Student Experience of the GE Foundations of Arts and Humanities requirement

As based in input from the self-review and course offerings, as well as from our interviews with students, there is no difficulty finding and enrolling in courses that satisfy the GE AH requirements. Based on the UCLA Senior Survey, ~90% of AH students endorse having plenty of courses to choose from, most complete the GE requirements at UCLA, and ~82% endorse enjoyment of exploring topics/disciplines outside their major areas of interest.

Based on a focus group of 15 undergraduate ASK peer counselors facilitated by Professor David MacFadyen (Departmental Chair in Comparative Literature) and Marc Levis-Fitzgerald, PhD (Director of UCLA’s Center for Educational Assessment), it is clear that students are familiar with the GE AH requirement. However, they expressed some concern about why certain courses counted toward one or another of the three subfields with the Arts and Humanities requirement.

The primary factors influencing which courses students elect to take to fulfill the GE AH requirement include: perceived difficulty level, amount of work, distribution of grades, time

of day and requirements for attendance. Most students rely on the Bruinwalk website as well as word-of-mouth to make these determinations. It was also stated that these factors, along with considerations about time to degree, perceived competitiveness and the stress surrounding GPA, superseded personal interest in choosing whether or not to enroll in a particular GE AH course. Personal quotes from the focus group regarding course selection and experience in the GE AH requirement are listed in the Self-review. In general, the value of GEs more broadly and the GE AH in particular did not seem to be obvious to many students. Instead, some perceive them to be “a box to check” whereas others recognize the value of them after graduation.

The Review Committee observed the same sentiment in meetings with students. Students expressed high satisfaction with the program and with the wide breadth of available courses. A few students noted that the GE courses gave them the ‘opportunity to explore courses and disciplines I otherwise would not have’ and ‘as an international student, it the GE program is one of the reasons I chose UCLA’ whereas another said there is ‘no clear emphasis on why there are GEs at UCLA’. She went on to ask ‘it broadens your perspective but if I’m paying for education, should I have to take classes I don’t want to?’ Another student said: ‘there is a misconception that GEs get in the way’. Unfortunately, all students also noted that none of their professors discussed the goals and purpose of the GE requirement in their courses and that from the beginning of their education at UCLA, GE requirements were ‘described as something to get through,’ that were ‘never sold as important’.

TA Experience

TAs conduct discussion sections and thus have frequent interactions with students. In the AH courses, TAs also serve the important role of helping students develop their writing skills through feedback on submitted assignments. The TAs we interviewed were committed instructors who show deep concern for student learning. They also share some frustrations. One is that non-majors, especially students coming from STEM disciplines, have the expectation that AH courses would be “easy” relative to courses in the sciences while in reality, these courses are challenging in the amount of reading assigned and the quality of writing that is expected. Misalignment in science students’ expectations emerged consistently as a challenge for TAs. Another challenge in TAing for AH GE courses is that the graduate students feel they have to do more work to help non-majors to brush up on their writing. A recommendation in the program self-review is to cap the number of students in courses with a writing component to no more than 20. All TAs expressed a wish more pedagogy training.

3. Goals and Plans for the Program

Two primary themes emerged from our discussions with senior administrators and faculty about the direction of the GE Foundations of Arts and Humanities program. First, there needs to be greater clarity of where authority of the this program lies in order to ensure quality and rigor. With the concern over “bloat” (too many GE AH course offerings) and “drift” (uneven quality of courses that count towards the GE AH requirement), a centralized body with the authority to oversee and regulate the courses is essential. Second, there is a lack of understanding among both students and faculty about the rationale of the GE Foundations of

Arts and Humanities program. The need for better messaging early in students' time at UCLA was expressed by several stakeholders.

4. Recommendations

The GE Foundations in Arts and Humanities program is well-administered and serves an important function in educating UCLA undergraduates. The following recommendations identified by the Review Team are intended to maintain and enhance this level of quality.

To the General Education Governance Committee and Dean of Undergraduate Education:

- 1. Communication.** Teaching and learning in the GE AH program would greatly benefit from more explicit and frequent communication between the Program and its constituents (students, faculty, department chairs, and TAs). As noted in the first recommendation of the Self-Review, there is a need to “clarify or redefine the value of GE AH classes”.

Students told us they were unaware of the true “purpose and benefits of the GE curriculum”. The general narrative they gave was that GE requirements were ‘something to get out of the way’. To address this issue, we recommend introducing incoming students to the GE program more favorably and clearly. This is currently done at freshman orientation, but there was a suggestion to provide students with more information prior to arriving at UCLA. Orientation advisors and resident advisors (RA) could also be trained to provide more comprehensive explanations of the GE program including explanation of why students may want to choose to enroll in a cluster course versus pursuing GEs through enrolling in a wider array of courses.

- 2.** Provide faculty who teach GE courses with greater knowledge about how their particular courses fit into the program. The review committee views this as an easily addressable problem and recommends three specific ways for doing so:
 - a.** Establish a process to ensure that faculty who teach GE courses know that they are teaching GE courses. It is a disservice to students if their instructor is not sensitive to the impact of their teaching on the GE goals. A statement on the syllabus about the importance of GE, the learning outcomes and how the particular courses fits into those goals would help address this issue
 - b.** “un-automate” the process of course approval. The process of proposing and vetting GE has become increasingly “automated” over time and seems to be entirely accomplished electronically.

To the General Education Governance Committee (GEGC):

- 3. Curricular Drift.** Some faculty expressed concern that when new faculty took over an established course that had received approval with a previous syllabus, the course changed significantly as to need a new round of approval to reflect changes to the syllabus. The committee agrees this is a concern that needs to be addressed. In short, GEGC should play a greater role monitoring new syllabi for previously-approved

courses. This recommendation aligns with a recommendation in the Self-Review (i.e. ‘Standardize and/or monitor the quality of the faculty syllabi’). There are a few specific actions that should be considered:

- a. Re-consider the policy of only reviewing 10% of courses every year and increase the amount to 15-20%. If necessary, GEGC should be increased to account for the additional workload. As related to point 1, this process, although more time-efficient, precludes examination of courses that may have changed over time. This recommendation aligns with one in the Self-Review (i.e. ‘Remove old or irrelevant offerings’).
 - b. As opposed to a random sampling of syllabi, GEGC should examine sample syllabi from all departments contributing to GE. Such a practice may make it possible to identify if there are larger issues related to GE drift in departments. The yearly review should focus more deliberately (if it not already the case) on reassessing highly enrolled courses, which impact more students.
4. As the GE Program has evolved the potential for Department Chairs not only to support teaching in the Program but to nurture innovative offerings seems to have declined. GEGC should work in conjunction with the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education to outreach to Department Chairs and Vice Chairs to communicate the importance departments play in maintaining and ensuring a robust UCLA GE experience.

To the General Education Governance Committee and Director of the Center for the Advancement of Teaching:

5. The review committee met with five TAs. Some reported a very positive experience while others expressed a desire for more training. The specific complaints centered around managing such large courses, dealing with “horrible undergraduate writing” that precludes providing timely and in-depth feedback to students, and poor communication with the professor teaching the course. To this end, the Review Team recommends enhanced TA training, that includes pedagogical training to help student writing skills and how to teach particular aspects of text (e.g. trigger warnings for traumatic content).

These recommendations will, of course, require institutional support but will greatly enhance the experience of both students and TAs in the GE courses.

To the General Education Governance Committee and Undergraduate Council:

6. The Self-Review included additional recommendations that the Review Team endorses and underscores here: ‘Build GE AH classes around transferable skills, including critical thinking written communication, associative thinking and collaborative skills’; and ‘Clarify and promote non-quantifiable abilities or values’.

Final Recommendation

The Undergraduate Council recommends the next review be scheduled for AY2021-22, pending a satisfactory progress review report, to align with the combined review timeline set out in the Proposal for Comprehensive Eight-year Review of UCLA's General Education Curriculum submitted by Dean Turner on November 7, 2018.

Respectfully Submitted,

Adriana Galván, Review Team Chair, Undergraduate Council, Psychology
Yuen Huo, Review Team Member, Undergraduate Council, Psychology

Appendix I: External Reviewers' Reports



Date: May 13, 2019

To: UCLA Academic Senate

From: Beth Loizeaux, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs and Professor of English

Re: Review of UCLA General Education: Foundations of the Arts and Humanities Program

On April 18 and 19, 2019, I participated in a review of UCLA General Education: Foundations of the Arts and Humanities programs. My colleagues on the Review Team were Professor Adriana Galvan (chair) and Professor Yuen Hua, both members of the Undergraduate Council. We met for dinner on April 18, then spent the day on April 19 meeting with Michael Hackett (Chair of the GE Governance Committee), Brooke Wilkinson (Director of Academic Initiatives), Assistant Vice Provost Lucy Blackmar, and faculty, teaching fellows and students involved in GE Arts and Humanities courses. These conversations focused on the structure and oversight of general education, general education courses, and the clusters as one pathway for general education at UCLA. The day ended with a preliminary verbal report of the Review Team's findings to Michael Hackett, Brooke Wilkinson, Provost Scott Waugh, Dean Patricia Turner, Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Jerry Kang, Undergraduate Council Chair Robert Gould and Graduate Council Chair Willeke Wendrich.

The review materials included the Self Review by the *ad hoc* committee and two issue statements, one from Dean Turner noting the Undergraduate Council's approval to combine review of the three foundations areas and asking some specific questions (discussed below), and one from Antoinette Gomes, chair of the Academic Senate's Committee on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, conveying that Committee's recommendations (discussed below).

I have a long-standing interest in general education, participated in two revisions of general education during my years at the University of Maryland, College Park, and have led the development of BU's first university-wide general education program, launched Fall 2018. I came to this review, then, curious to learn more about UCLA's general education program, and fresh from several years of thinking about and implementing gen ed at a large, urban research university with ten undergraduate schools and colleges. My comments on the opportunities and challenges UCLA presents, and on the questions your faculty and administrators have asked, are informed by my experience, which I hope can be helpful. I fully appreciate, however, that while there may be something to learn from what other universities do, each university is distinctive and its gen ed program will necessarily be unique.

I would like here to summarize briefly my understanding of the general conclusions of the Review Team, then focus on my own assessment of the specific questions and recommendations raised in the two issue statements and some related considerations.

Based on the self-study, the issue statements, interviews on April 19, and their own study of the General Education program, the Review Team concluded:

- 1) There is much that is very good in general education at UCLA: the impressive dedication of the faculty we spoke with; the involvement of faculty in the governance and review of the gen ed program; and the innovative clusters that provide a distinctive pathway through part of general education, draw ladder faculty into teaching introductory courses, and challenge the students who participate in ways that clearly inspire them. If it is economically feasible, developing sophomore clusters seems an excellent way to build on what is most distinctive about general education at UCLA and what seems to be working best. Students and faculty also made it clear that they liked having the *choice* between clusters and the selection of a la carte courses. Given that 12-18% of students who start a cluster opt out part way through, having more than one way to pursue gen ed is important. Flexibility and choice should be preserved.
- 2) The General Education Program is in need of clear, central, well-timed messaging about its purpose, value, and distinctive features at UCLA. Despite notifications, some faculty are not aware they are teaching general education courses, and there doesn't seem to be a consistent, compelling narrative about general education that is widely known to faculty and students. I think this is not unusual on a large, diverse campus, but it may be that the vague understanding about purpose and value suggest the need for a renewed campus conversation about these questions.
- 3) Responsibility for assuring quality and rigor is uncertainly located. While the collaboration between the Undergraduate Council and the Dean and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education seems to work well, the GE Governance Committee seems unclear about how to pursue change as the result of review.
- 4) Teaching Fellows want and need better, more consistent training to best serve undergraduate students, both in the areas of pedagogy generally and specifically around teaching sensitive and controversial topics. Comments in the student focus group reported in the Self Review suggest the importance of TF preparation to what students get out of a course and how much they appreciate the experience.

Articulating General Education's Value and Purpose

Bloat and drift are inevitable in large, university-wide programs in decentralized research universities that serve many constituencies, where courses are taught by many faculty in many disciplines, and where the cast of faculty and students is always changing. With nearly 400 courses and faculty who are uncertain of their role in general education, the Arts and Humanities Foundation shows signs of this tendency. General education necessarily needs periodic refreshment. Many universities have recently revamped their general education programs or are in the process, propelled not just by the cyclical need for renewal but also by the crisis in public confidence in higher education and the resulting need to articulate, clearly, what students need to learn and how the university will assure they have the opportunity to learn it.

The development of learning outcomes for the Foundations areas of UCLA's General education Program is a very good idea, and is one way to pursue this conversation from inside the established structures. I would also hope that the larger question about what students need to

know to thrive not just in their professional lives, but also in their personal and civic lives can be approached more broadly so that those aspirations might help shape the content of Gen Ed courses and the composition of clusters. In the Review Team's discussions and the Self Review, we heard concern that more ladder faculty are not involved in teaching general education. Involving ladder faculty in developing learning outcomes and in conversations about how best to prepare students for the future might provide some way forward for encouraging (requiring?) more of them to create and teach gen ed courses.

UCLA's General Education Program vis-a-vis others nation-wide:

The Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education asked specifically for comment about UCLA's general education program in relation to others nation-wide. UCLA's clusters stand out, as was noted in the last review, as the most exciting feature of UCLA's general education program. They bear some similarities to the "cognates" feature at the University of Miami and the clusters at the University of Rochester. Creating specific pathways through general education at large research universities is one way universities are helping guide students' exploration in an interconnected, coherent way, and UCLA is clearly doing this exceptionally well with the clusters.

Many recent revisions of general education (e.g., University of Kansas, University of Maryland, Boston University) have been driven by learning outcomes, i.e., beginning by asking what students need to know and be able to do. Such an approach is producing more intentional gen ed courses and more interdisciplinary general education programs (see the University of Maryland's "I-series course," for example, or BU's six essential capacities). Here, again, developing learning outcomes for the three Foundation Areas is wise. Making those learning outcomes visible to faculty, students and advisors will be crucial to securing their maximum benefit. Requiring that they appear on the syllabus of every gen ed course would be a good start, as the Self Review recommends.

I also note that revisions of general education nationally are articulating more specifically the habits of mind and other skills students will need—critical thinking, writing, teamwork, creativity, for example. The University of Texas at Austin has developed an interesting "flag" system that requires students to accumulate a certain number of "flagged" courses that teach such skills. Developing the explicit teaching of "transferable skills" in the Arts and Humanities courses (and perhaps across all the areas of UCLA's general education program), and calling them out with some marker might be worth considering. Making those skills explicit and visible to students could help reduce the perceived distance between the Arts and Humanities courses and the transferable skills they foster.

Assessing General Education Learning Outcomes

Dean Pat Turner's Issue Statement asked for comment on best practices in assessing general education, and I am glad to pass on what BU discovered in the course of developing a plan for its first university-wide general education program two years ago. A subcommittee researched the general education assessment literature and surveyed peer institutions, with a focus on large,

complex urban research universities and AAUs. I quote from the report of the subcommittee, chaired by Gillian Pierce, BU's Assistant Provost for Academic Assessment:

Models ranged from highly-distributed, where the responsibility for assessment rests entirely with individual departments and faculty teaching general education courses, to the highly-centralized, where assessment is entirely conducted at the institutional level. The approaches also differed in the extent to which they rely upon direct measures of student performance (evaluation of course work) or indirect measures (surveys, focus groups). The majority of peer institutions are using an approach that blends centralized and decentralized evaluation of both direct and indirect measures of student learning. Nearly all have an institutional general education assessment committee to oversee the process and recommend changes when needed, but the role of this committee can vary from being directly involved in reviewing student classroom work to receiving reports and data from assessments conducted by faculty and departments and monitoring the need for broader action.

UCLA is too large and complex, it seems to me, to rely solely on assessment of GE in departments—the university needs a more holistic picture than can be provided by discrete assessments by department. But the UCLA Self Review recommended “that departments be more involved in ensuring the consistent quality of their GEs” (20). That advice seems worth following, given the issue with faculty awareness of GE and the seeming need for greater ownership of GE at a local level. A blended model may well be the way to go.

The State of the Humanities

Humanities majors and enrollments in humanities courses have dramatically declined nationally since the 2008 economic downturn, and there is clearly consternation and worry about that state of affairs at UCLA, as elsewhere. I was glad to see it addressed head on in the Self Review, and to see that efforts are underway to try to understand and articulate the relevance of the humanities for today's students. Developing courses around “transferable skills” might be a way of helping students understand one of the values of the humanities and of encouraging them to take humanities courses. “Transferable skills,” however, won't do it alone. Other strategies will also be needed. I was impressed by the potential of the “Experimental Humanities” group that is reimaging what the humanities have to contribute and developing courses and programs that unite north and south campus. The relative paucity of courses in Ethnic Studies in gen ed (Self Review, p. 7) may also represent an opportunity. I concur with the Issue Statement from the Committee on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion that “given the increasing diversity in student population and the popularity of courses that address issues related to race, gender, and class, more conscious and sustained efforts to promote the values of diversity, equity and inclusiveness in AHGE would help restore the relevance of Humanity [sic] for today's students.” There did seem to be a large number of Arts and Humanities courses that satisfy the colleges' Diversity Requirements. How/whether those courses overlap with the AH GE courses was not clear to me, but a look at the range and attractiveness of the AH GE offerings that address diversity, equity and inclusion is probably in order. Developing learning outcomes (here, again) around diversity, equity and inclusion might begin clarifying the role the arts and humanities could play in educating students in these values.

Finally: Students Choosing “Easy As”

Course selection behavior arose in nearly every aspect of the Self Review and the Review Team's conversations with faculty, students and staff. I don't think this behavior is going to be

easy to change, but efforts can be made through advising and, maybe, more emphasis on the purpose of an education. Students rely on Bruinwalk's posted grade distributions to help them sort out which courses are the easy "As". Since this posting seems to be feeding undesirable student behavior, the Review Team wondered why grade distributions were made available to Bruinwalk (if, indeed, they are not acquired through other-than-official channels).

In summary

Thank you for the opportunity to review the GE Foundations: Arts and Humanities programs. I came away especially impressed by the clusters, and by the review process itself, which I found to be a serious, well-documented consideration of the Arts and Humanities gen ed program. Thank you, too, to the UCLA Senate staff and my fellow review team members who made my time at UCLA so easy and enjoyable. If you have questions about my comments or if I can be of any further help, please don't hesitate to ask.

Appendix II: Site Visit Schedule

UCLA Academic Senate Program Review
General Education: Foundations of the Arts and Humanities

Site Visit Date: April 19, 2019

Review Team Members:

Adriana Galvan, Review Team Chair, Undergraduate Council, Psychology

Yuen Huo, Review Team Member, Undergraduate Council, Psychology

Elizabeth Loizeaux, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs, Boston University

All meetings before 2pm will be held in 1215 Murphy Hall unless otherwise indicated.

All meetings after 2pm will be held in 2325 Murphy Hall unless otherwise indicated.

April 18, 2019: Organizational Dinner

7:00 p.m. Dinner meeting: Initial organizational session for review team members only (***Plateia at Luskin Conference Center***, 425 Westwood Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90095; 310-794-3563)

April 19, 2019: Site Visit

8:00 Breakfast discussion with Chair of the GE Governance Committee **Michael Hackett** and Director **Brooke Wilkinson** [*Catering arranged by the Academic Senate Office*]

9:00 Meeting with Dean **Patricia Turner**

10:00 Meetings with representative groups of faculty who have taught courses in GE Arts and Humanities

- **Andrea Goldman** | Vice Chair and Associate Professor, History
- **Joseph Nagy** | Professor Emeritus, English
- **Robert Gurval** | Undergraduate Advisor and Associate Professor, Classics
- **Aaron Burke** | Vice Chair and Professor, Near Eastern Languages and Cultures
- **Georgiana Galanteanu** | Lecturer, Slavic, East European Languages & Cultures
- **Christopher Mott** | Lecturer, English
- **Lindsay Wilhelm** | Lecturer English
- **Efrain Kristal** | Professor, Comparative Literature and Spanish & Portuguese
- **Pamela Hieronymi** | Undergraduate Program Director and Professor, Philosophy
- **Samuel Cumming** | Undergraduate Program Director and Associate Professor, Philosophy
- **Janice Reiff** | Professor, History

12:00 Lunch – review team members only [*at the Faculty Center*]

1:00 Meetings with graduate students who have TA'd courses in the Foundations of Arts and Humanities

- **Anna Accettola** | TA for Classics 20
- **Lika Balenovich** | TA for Comparative Literature 2DW
- **Christopher Rorke** | TA for Ethnomusicology 30 and Ethnomusicology/Chicana/o Studies M108A
- **Madeline Barnicle** | TA for Linguistics 1

- 2:00 Meetings with undergraduate students who have taken courses in GE Arts and Humanities
- **Ying Ngai Yu** | 2nd year majoring in Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences
 - **Dustin Oakes** | 3rd year double majoring in Economics and International Development Studies
 - **3rd student TBD**
- 2:30 Closed session for review team only
- 3:30 Meeting with GE Governance Committee Chair **Michael Hackett** and Director **Brooke Wilkinson**
- 4:00 EXIT MEETING (2121 Murphy Hall). The meeting includes Review Team Members, Chair of the GE Governance Committee **Michael Hackett**, Director **Brooke Wilkinson**, Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost **Scott Waugh**, Dean **Patricia Turner**, Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion **Jerry Kang**, Undergraduate Council Chair **Robert Gould**, Graduate Council Chair **Willeke Wendrich**.

Program Staff Contact:

Chelsea Hackett (310-794-5040; chackett@college.ucla.edu)

Academic Senate Staff Contact:

Taylor Lane Daymude (310-206-2959, tlanedaymude@senate.ucla.edu)

Eric Wells (310-825-1194; ewells@senate.ucla.edu)

Deadlines:

Draft Schedule Due: March 29th, 2019

“Final” Schedule Due: April 5th, 2019