

I'm grateful for having had the opportunity to be a part of General Education at Texas Tech. I've learned a lot, and I hope that I have done some useful things. This is a good committee. I've enjoyed the interaction and the fellowship.

I'm certain that General Education has been a plus for Texas Tech. We do not have a core curriculum, and I'm sure that all of you have heard criticisms directed to this end. But General Education requirements do mandate that every student have some math, some science, some humanities and/or fine arts, and so on, and this has been a good thing.

Still, we should be able to go beyond the cafeteria menu that we have. --- We tried to do that in the area of Technology and Applied Science but our proposal was rejected for lack of funds. --- In the original General Education proposal, the capstone course was deleted largely because it added hours. --- And we still need to achieve more integration and synthesis. Our students have to do this; unless they themselves integrate and synthesize their course work, they are only receiving instruction and training; they are not becoming educated.

I don't see much progress being made, though, without a driving force, a catalyst, an advocate, or at least a gadfly. We can create this impetus, this driving force, I hope by appointing a director and by providing funding for his or her office.

A director would have clear-cut responsibility and would, therefore, have to be granted authority and given a budget.

There would still be an oversight committee such as this one but it could deal more with policy. As chair, I've spent many hours working on course lists, talking to advisers about details, answering routine mail, and such things. These are matters that would be seen to by a director -- only he or she would do many other things, as well.

General Education should also bring under the director's umbrella the Writing Intensive program, also known as Writing Across the Curriculum. This was originally part of General Ed, was separated from it, and then assigned to the individual colleges, where, so it seems to me, very little has been done. Bringing Writing Intensive back under GE -- assuming that GE has a director -- would help make this requirement more meaningful.

The Oversight Committee also needs to look ahead to the next assessment report, due to the Coordinating Board in May 1996. Without an Office of Assessment and without a director, someone on this committee -- probably the chair -- will have to write the next assessment report. Because the Coordinating Board has yet to provide a format or guidelines for assessment of general education, we may, perhaps, assume that assessment will be a meaningless, unchallenging ritual. This would be a dangerous assumption. Our regional accrediting body, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) requires that we have an Office of Institutional Assessment. And the Coordinating Board has told us that measurement guidelines for General Education must be developed. In all fairness, the Coordinating Board should help the colleges and universities do this, but don't count on it.

I anticipate that, across the horizon, the question of multiculturalism within General Education will resurface. The original GE proposal in fact had a

multiculturalism component but this was dropped as the number of hours committed to GE seemed, to some, to be excessive. But multiculturalism, as a theme, will return and you will have to give some careful thought to it.

For better or for worse, I'll be available as a resource person for GE. As you know, Larry Hovey will be the new chair and will convene the committee in Spring Semester. I wish you well. You are a good crew. I'll miss you.

Otto Nelson