I am a/an (select one only)  
1. Graduate Student  
2. Faculty Member  
3. Faculty Member  
4. Faculty Member  
5. Graduate Student  
6. Graduate Student  

What do you like about the proposed changes to the BA program?  

What are your concerns about the proposed changes to the BA program?  

If you have any other feedback about the proposed changes to the BA program, please type it below.

As a part-time teacher, I'd just point out how important it is to have information available outside the scheduled meetings. Fiducial sculpture instruction, for example, is, as far as I know, only represented by past-termers like myself. I'm probably pretty typical in having limited time available to read over things and very few opportunities to attend events. This discipline has its own issues within the larger department.

In my world, we'd have three streams of co-taught gateway courses (Humanities, Social Science, Fine Arts) and every student would have to take one from each. Period.

First, it concerns me that the proposal includes occasional nods to improving the quality of the BA, but on the whole says very little about what constitutes a quality education in Arts. The key selling point of the plan (list of advantages, p. 9, and also throughout the proposal) seems to be improved flexibility for students. While I can see why students would certainly appreciate as much flexibility as possible, I think this falls short as a primary rationale for changing the BA requirements. Is it not our responsibility to ensure that BA students receive an actual education? To me, that means making some areas of study unavoidable. In my opinion, students should have to learn how to write. They should be required to gain at least a little historical awareness. And in an officially multicultural and bilingual country, they should have to learn at least the rudiments of a language other than English. At least as I understand the proposed plan, students will be able to avoid these or any other parts of what it means to be educated that they don't like. That strikes me as nothing short of abandonment of our responsibility to educate (rather than merely please) our students. A student's desire to avoid certain kinds of classes does not invalidate the importance of those classes to an Arts education.

Second, I'm not particularly persuaded by the argument that we should make these changes to harmonize our requirements with those of other institutions. If every other university in Alberta jumped off a bridge, would we jump too? In my opinion, we should focus our efforts not on being like everyone else, but on distinguishing ourselves as uniquely excellent and attracting students who want the best education they can get. Mimicking other institutions may serve no one's purpose. If we win over students by offering them a reduced-to-zero-core, we may soon be having a fire sale. The best and the brightest will choose UBC over U of A and the student who wants a fast and easy B.A. will come to the U of A.

I write with my feedback on the B.A. curriculum proposal. I appreciate the boldness and the clarity with which you outline the process and the goal. Thanks for pushing this ahead. In striving to be bold and solve certain problems (of inflexibility for transfer credits, of favoring certain departments, of complexity), I fear that we would introduce greater problems by having no B.A. core. I'd like to see a scaled-down version of the core that answered the problem of our current over-restriction by lowering the total credits but one that will require a Humanities/Social Science/Fine Arts breadth.

1) The Value Question: Core requirements tell students what it is we value in a B.A. By having none, I fear we've succumbed to something like our students' relativism problem: "everything is subjective and all opinions are equally right." Aren't we saying a similar thing by saying that they can take whatever they want, just not too much of one thing? I was reminded of a conversation I had with Mary Possey when she was here as a DV last year. In her mind, the Arts started losing out when we "gave up values". We do value certain educational principles, we named them as attributes last year. If we water-down our values too much, we might not have a future.

2) Our comparators: The proposal argues for the need to compete with U of C and MacEwan and allow for ease of transfer between institutions. But I would rather use our comparators -- U of T, McGill -- as our competitors. Those institutions have very clear requirements. I fear that if we win over students by offering them a reduced-to-zero-core, we may soon be having a fire sale. The best and the brightest will choose UBC over U of A and the student who wants a fast and easy B.A. will come to the U of A.

3) Essay writing/Analytical skills: Under the proposed B.A., a student could conceivably get a B.A. in the Faculty of Arts without ever writing an essay since many social science disciplines have courses that do not require essay writing. Since one of the enduring arguments for the Arts is that we teach critical thinking skills, to not require students at some moment to grapple with formulating an analytical argument -- rather than lecturing or summarizing -- seems imperative to me. Of course, this does not have to be in English. My own preference would be for first-year inter-disciplinary, thematically-based and setting intensive co-taught Arts-core classes. But these are expensive.

4) The Problem of Specificity: By abdicating responsibility for setting requirements to departments rather than to the Faculty, we contribute to the growing specialization of knowledge production where we no longer share a discourse and each discipline sets its own rules. Even if students are forced to take courses outside their major, they can specialize in whatever they want. My own sense is that Arts disciplines are specializing themselves out of existence where we don't share general conversations with each other (inter-disciplinarity is often another form of specificity, just about a topic rather than a method) and we're talking to fewer and fewer people.

In my world, we'd have three streams of co-taught gateway courses (Humanities, Social Science, Fine Arts) and every student would have to take one from each. Period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am an (select one only)</th>
<th>What do you like about the proposed changes to the BA program?</th>
<th>What are your concerns about the proposed changes to the BA program?</th>
<th>If you have any other feedback about the proposed changes to the BA program, please type it below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>More flexibility</td>
<td>Don't like that there is no language requirement. I was not looking forward to doing my LOE requirement initially. However, this requirement opened me up to a whole other skillset and world I did not know existed. I never would have thought that I would be in 300 German in my last year, almost fluent. It taught me about other cultures and taught me how to stretch myself to learn something completely new. I do not know any arts students who regretted taking their LOE and who disliked their language course.</td>
<td>I don't think it's a good idea. Students will get a MUCH less well rounded education, and won't be motivated to broaden their horizons. They won't be forced to stretch their capacity and they might miss an opportunity to uncover something they love and didn't know about. Languages are incredibly important for cognitive and cultural development, and if the requirement to take language courses is removed, new future students will be experiencing a monumental injustice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>I don't think it's a good idea.</td>
<td>I don't think it's a good idea. Students will get a MUCH less well rounded education, and won't be motivated to broaden their horizons. They won't be forced to stretch their capacity and they might miss an opportunity to uncover something they love and didn't know about. Languages are incredibly important for cognitive and cultural development, and if the requirement to take language courses is removed, new future students will be experiencing a monumental injustice.</td>
<td>I think that lowering the amount of junior-level credits is inappropriate. I think that the value of learning (even to a small degree, considering the very light requirements for Arts minors as it is) how another discipline works is indispensable as it provides a deeper understanding of a way of thinking other than that of one's own discipline. Without doing a minor, there is the risk that students will obtain only a very superficial idea of all of diversity that makes up the Faculty of Arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>I think everything is like the overall idea.</td>
<td>I think the value of learning (even to a small degree, considering the very light requirements for Arts minors as it is) how another discipline works is indispensable as it provides a deeper understanding of a way of thinking other than that of one's own discipline. Without doing a minor, there is the risk that students will obtain only a very superficial idea of all of diversity that makes up the Faculty of Arts. I think the MLCS department will suffer greatly with the removal of the basic requirement to take a LOE. This is really too bad, and I think that the opening of the mind that occurs with the learning of a second language is what Arts is all about. But maybe times are changing and we need to make our system more flexible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>More freedom for students to choose their own courses.</td>
<td>I highly support the changes to the Non-Arts Discipline category which now sees students not limited to the Faculty of Science. This change, I suspect, will greatly improve the enrollment and retention of students with specialties in the Faculty of Arts now that it is no longer limited to only science options.</td>
<td>I think that the MLCS department will suffer greatly with the removal of the basic requirement to take a LOE. This is really too bad, and I think that the opening of the mind that occurs with the learning of a second language is what Arts is all about. But maybe times are changing and we need to make our system more flexible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>The possibility to have multiple minors</td>
<td>I disagree with getting rid of the ENGL requirements, which I think really help students to learn basic academic writing, how to do citations, use the library system etc. I think without that requirement, the foundation of the basic Arts degree at our university will be eroded and the quality of the overall education will be downgraded. I foresee that either 100-level professors will be forced to teach basic writing, which will become redundant, or else that they will not provide this education and the level at which future students will be able to write will generally fall. Further, getting rid of the necessary to have a minor will hurt the overall education of students who choose to take advantage of this regulation. Yes, they will be able to either focus more on their major or diversify their studies, but I think that the value of learning (even to a small degree, considering the very light requirements for Arts minors as it is) how another discipline works is indispensable as it provides a deeper understanding of a way of thinking other than that of one's own discipline. Without doing a minor, there is the risk that students will obtain only a very superficial idea of all of diversity that makes up the Faculty of Arts.</td>
<td>I think that the MLCS department will suffer greatly with the removal of the basic requirement to take a LOE. This is really too bad, and I think that the opening of the mind that occurs with the learning of a second language is what Arts is all about. But maybe times are changing and we need to make our system more flexible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>The possibility to have multiple minors</td>
<td>I disagree with getting rid of the ENGL requirements, which I think really help students to learn basic academic writing, how to do citations, use the library system etc. I think without that requirement, the foundation of the basic Arts degree at our university will be eroded and the quality of the overall education will be downgraded. I foresee that either 100-level professors will be forced to teach basic writing, which will become redundant, or else that they will not provide this education and the level at which future students will be able to write will generally fall. Further, getting rid of the necessary to have a minor will hurt the overall education of students who choose to take advantage of this regulation. Yes, they will be able to either focus more on their major or diversify their studies, but I think that the value of learning (even to a small degree, considering the very light requirements for Arts minors as it is) how another discipline works is indispensable as it provides a deeper understanding of a way of thinking other than that of one's own discipline. Without doing a minor, there is the risk that students will obtain only a very superficial idea of all of diversity that makes up the Faculty of Arts.</td>
<td>I think that the MLCS department will suffer greatly with the removal of the basic requirement to take a LOE. This is really too bad, and I think that the opening of the mind that occurs with the learning of a second language is what Arts is all about. But maybe times are changing and we need to make our system more flexible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>I think the value of learning (even to a small degree, considering the very light requirements for Arts minors as it is) how another discipline works is indispensable as it provides a deeper understanding of a way of thinking other than that of one's own discipline. Without doing a minor, there is the risk that students will obtain only a very superficial idea of all of diversity that makes up the Faculty of Arts.</td>
<td>I think the value of learning (even to a small degree, considering the very light requirements for Arts minors as it is) how another discipline works is indispensable as it provides a deeper understanding of a way of thinking other than that of one's own discipline. Without doing a minor, there is the risk that students will obtain only a very superficial idea of all of diversity that makes up the Faculty of Arts.</td>
<td>I think that the MLCS department will suffer greatly with the removal of the basic requirement to take a LOE. This is really too bad, and I think that the opening of the mind that occurs with the learning of a second language is what Arts is all about. But maybe times are changing and we need to make our system more flexible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>I feel like they will have a positive impact on me. This is because as someone who loves history, I want to dedicate as much of my university time and credits to history courses, and the current BA requirements do interfere with that because in all honesty, I don't have an interest in taking a course such as music. I welcome these proposed changes because they will allow me to pursue my interests to the fullest extent.</td>
<td>I feel like they will have a positive impact on me. This is because as someone who loves history, I want to dedicate as much of my university time and credits to history courses, and the current BA requirements do interfere with that because in all honesty, I don't have an interest in taking a course such as music. I welcome these proposed changes because they will allow me to pursue my interests to the fullest extent.</td>
<td>I think that the MLCS department will suffer greatly with the removal of the basic requirement to take a LOE. This is really too bad, and I think that the opening of the mind that occurs with the learning of a second language is what Arts is all about. But maybe times are changing and we need to make our system more flexible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I'm concerned about the proposed changes to the BA program. I don't think it's a good idea. I am a/an (select one only) Undergraduate Student. This is an overhaul of Canadian content for a BA, be it a Canadian Literature, History, Art History etc. Additionally, there is an opportunity to include 3 of mandatory native studies content, which is appropriate given that we are currently at a time when we are trying to achieve reconciliation/correction during that first year English no longer required? Perhaps 3 of WRS would be valuable; every student in the faculty of arts will likely have to write a paper during their program. The way I made it through was to take my two introductory courses in Spring season, where I could focus exclusively on the coursework. The only way it made sense was that we had to do everything together. I wish I had 5-10% given to this first week of my life. For what? Six weeks after the courses ended, I realized that I had forgotten practically everything I learned. How is that a part of getting an education? I highly support the changes to the Non-Arts Discipline category which now sees students not limited to the Faculty of Science. This change, I suspect, will greatly improve the enrollment and retention of students with specialties in the Faculty of Arts now that it is not limited to only science options. I highly support the changes to the Non-Arts Discipline category which now sees students not limited to the Faculty of Science. This change, I suspect, will greatly improve the enrollment and retention of students with specialties in the Faculty of Arts now that it is not limited to only science options.
I think we should be encouraging [red, forcing] students to take a course that deals with things like gender, race, etc. These are good topics because they’re covered by almost every department (you can take an archeology course on race and gender, or a sociology one, psychology, etc). People graduating with an arts degree should have some basic understanding of these concepts to ensure that they enter the world as educated, understanding citizens in the 21st century. The simple fact that “no other university is doing it” is not a reason not to do the right things. I also think we should have a requirement for a native studies class (or class that deals with native history/issue). This is something that some other universities are introducing and it’s high time. I realize that you might argue your proposed structure gives students the freedom to take these classes if they wish, but that’s not the same. Some may choose not to, some may not know they exist, and some may be so busy satisfying degree requirements they won’t feel they have the time. Giving a T+ year old the option to take classes that make them confront their (potential) privilege and deal with complicated issues is not enough. You have to make it required. I don’t think you’re thinking about it the right way. Students don’t choose their university based on the requirements for the degree program (I was a student not long ago and that never would have occurred to me or any of my friends - I’ve asked around). That is not going to help us “compete”. Additionally, you need to ensure that a BA from the University of Alberta continues to mean something. And simply removing requirements isn’t necessarily the way to do that. Changing requirements, however, definitely is.

The proposed model pushes requirements to the based more on interest rather than to fulfill requirements. That students can choose what classes they want to take smart attributes to try to attain, but the proposal as stated is off the mark.

I like that there is flexibility to try courses from other disciplines other than the major.

I think the proposed model pushes requirements to the based more on interest rather than to fulfill requirements. That students can choose what classes they want to take

I'm concerned that this is about a “race to the bottom” – “all the kids are doing it, reducing requirements” rather than about any pedagogical justification. It seems to me that we should be advocating the virtues of a U of A Arts degree as being something more than others. I think we should keep the Language other than English – people who are working in the 21st century live in a world that does not just speak English – and I think that students should need to have either a minor or a double major. This would not be complicated to administer, but would ensure both breadth and some specialization.

I don’t think the people speaking at this forum understand that this is, to some extend anyway, an administrative change that puts more power in the hands of departments to define the BA degree. A faculty member must agree that what they propose with the Campus Alberta degree outcomes (http://www.caps.gov.ab.ca/media/5230/handbook_april_2015.pdf, pages 140-143) I don’t think from the discussion right now that they are aware of these. I don’t think you’re thinking about it the right way. Students don’t choose their university based on the requirements for the degree program (I was a student not long ago and that never would have occurred to me or any of my friends - I’ve asked around). That is not going to help us "compete". Additionally, you need to ensure that a BA from the University of Alberta continues to mean something. And simply removing requirements isn’t necessarily the way to do that. Changing requirements, however, definitely is.

I think the LOE removal. Language Other than English is an extremely important component to any BA and should not be removed.

That it’s no longer necessary to have a minor. The increased flexibility there is good.

I don’t think the people speaking at this forum understand that this is, to some extend anyway, and administrative change that puts more power in the hands of departments to define the BA degree as being something more than others. I think we should keep the Language other than English – people who are working in the 21st century live in a world that does not just speak English – and I think that students should need to have either a minor or a double major. This would not be complicated to administer, but would ensure both breadth and some specialization.

I think it’s incredibly time for a new BA model - the university landscape is changing; the typical Arts student is a different student from a decade ago. Generation now is looking for any, and every, leg up once they enter the workforce. Changes that increase the breadth and diversity of a BA degree are paramount to boosting and maintaining enrolment numbers.

I like the changes to the minor requirement upon declaring a major. The LOE removal.

The lack of breadth and diversity in learning. Science, language, and other requirements allow for a richer education. In my experience, although some of my required courses have been tedious at times, they have all contributed to my learning and have actually benefited my ability to understand different topics within my classes. The lack of breadth and diversity in learning. Science, language, and other requirements allow for a richer education. In my experience, although some of my required courses have been tedious at times, they have all contributed to my learning and have actually benefited my ability to understand different topics within my classes. Do not remove the requirements of science, language, english, etc. It is what makes the BA program and creates international learners--promotes breath and diversity.

The changes to the minor requirement upon declaring a major. The LOE removal.

The changes to the minor requirement upon declaring a major. The LOE removal.

I think that having almost no requirements is not a good idea. As a graduate of the U of A BA program, I think the old system wasn’t perfect, but I could understand the purpose of taking “breadth and diversity” courses. I think that every student should take an English course, but not the ones we have now - I think there needs to be English courses that focus on writing strategies. I also think every student should take a Canadian History and Native Studies course to learn more about our country and the issues that face it. I also think Arts students should take Science courses, and vice versa - this allows people to learn different ways of thinking (i.e. Arts courses teach critical thinking better, but learning scientific methods is needed as well). This proposed change is going to decimate departments such as Fine Art, Fine Arts, and Languages as many people will not take these courses if they are not required. Personally, I would not have taken any fine arts or language courses if I were not forced to, although I could understand the value of these types of courses.

I think that having almost no requirements is not a good idea. As a graduate of the U of A BA program, I think the old structure gives students the freedom to take these classes if they wish, but that’s not the same. Some may choose not to, some may not know they exist, and some may be so busy satisfying degree requirements they won’t feel they have the time. Giving a T+ year old the option to take classes that make them confront their (potential) privilege and deal with complicated issues is not enough. You have to make it required. I don’t think you’re thinking about it the right way. Students don’t choose their university based on the requirements for the degree program (I was a student not long ago and that never would have occurred to me or any of my friends - I’ve asked around). That is not going to help us "compete". Additionally, you need to ensure that a BA from the University of Alberta continues to mean something. And simply removing requirements isn’t necessarily the way to do that. Changing requirements, however, definitely is.

I think the proposed model pushes requirements to the based more on interest rather than to fulfill requirements. That students can choose what classes they want to take
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am a/an (select one only)</th>
<th>What do you like about the proposed changes to the BA program?</th>
<th>If you have any other feedback about the proposed changes to the BA program, please type it below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Faculty Member            | Strengths: simpler, more flexible, more choice and freedom through less specific requirements. Minor is an option but not required, makes it easier to get transfer students, students can take additional courses in ALES, Native Studies, and Science (but no longer must take courses in Science). | Concerns about "Attributes": 
- I am uncertain about this switch from a focus on content to attributes, although I think I understand the idea behind it and I could be supportive of it. 
- But what will students understand by the idea of 5 core "attributes" (qualities, values, and dispositions) rather than taking a distribution of classes based on specific fields? Will it have any real meaning to them? 
- I plan to draw on attributes used by U.S. and Australian universities, but are these used in Canada too? Would we be a leader in this approach in Canada? 
- Aren't all arts courses addressing these 5 core attributes in some way? (A course title and description does not tell one how a course is actually taught) 
- How does addressing attributes in our BA help students see that they have developed transferable skills for the workforce by simply labeling courses in this way? 
- Should we help students by taking more clearly about why their History courses, etc. have honed skills that are useful in the job market - isn't the key in translating the academic world to the world of work something students can learn through career workshops and other forms of information dissemination (websites) rather than structured into the design of the BA? |
| Undergraduate Student     | As a former student member of the steering committee, I am thrilled at how it has ended up. Increasing the simplicity of the system is a huge improvement over the onerous and complicated set of check-boxes that preceded it. This fundamentally does move in the right direction by increasing the level of neutrality between faculties/subjects (instead of everyone wanting their discipline to get special required status) and reducing the channelling of students en masse into a few mandatory avenues. The non-arts requirement is a far simpler way of encouraging people to branch out without undermining their autonomy as students. Overall, this new curriculum is far better at treating students as capable academic adults who can find the 'breadth and diversity' that actually suits them. One area in which I believe the changes ought to go further is by increasing the ceiling on credits taken under one's major (now standing at . It remains very baffling to me that a student who gets a degree in History will end up studying History less than half of the time, at most. If a student likes their major subject and wants to fully explore it, they should be able to heavily immerse in it. Even if we accept the idea that capping major credits is necessary for people to branch out, this surely doesn't justify such a low cap. If one could take, say, 75 credits in their major, that still leaves a massive chunk of their courses to come from other places. In my own experience and that of many fellow arts students, the major cap has prematurely curbed our ability to get the most out of the subject we came here with intent to study. In my view, somebody who comes to this University knowing they want to study English should be able to devote at least half of their course time to English. Overall, the BA review moves in the right direction - encouraging breadth more passively and with a greater respect for the intellectual autonomy of the adults who study here. The low cap on major credits, oddly, remains a holdover of the inflexible paternalism this review has otherwise shed much of it. |
| Undergraduate Student     | Not exactly pleased.                                    | Don't change Basic Requirements, LOE and English. If the goal is to add something, perhaps structure the Basic Requirements as 2/3 groups or something. |
| Librarian                 | Greater flexibility, better ability to accept transfer students | Many departments may be adversely affected by this change (e.g. MLCS), and the LOE requirement should perhaps not be dropped, as this is traditionally part of good BA programs. |
| Staff Member              | Much more flexibility for students, and the ability for them to easily create more customized degree experiences | |

Strengths: simpler, more flexible, more choice and freedom through less specific requirements. Minor is an option but not required, makes it easier to get transfer students, students can take additional courses in ALES, Native Studies, and Science (but no longer must take courses in Science). Limitations: could be too flexible and reduce the breadth beyond the Major, no clear direction for students on which courses to select, they could get lost and their BA could lose coherence, the direction must come from clear requirements for Majors and Minors. A Minor is no longer a requirement.
When would departments design minors in a Faculty in which the BA permits multiple minors (3 or more was mentioned at the Town Hall), yet we don’t know how many a student might “choose” to take? We are imagining, I take it, that students would still finish in 4 years. I’m not sure that multiple minors and a 4–8 year undergrad degree will be terribly appealing to most undergrads. In other words, we would need to define how many minors are possible, in what timeframe, and with what kind of requirements that will make them actually potential and viable choices for students. If students could take, as was cited, 3 minors and a major, how minimal would the minor requirements become as a result – would a minor mean much?

What research can the Faculty provide for this process that tells us change(s) might address the proposal’s central concern – student enrolments? And what research can it provide and draw on that tells us where students go when they leave Arts for the remainder of their degree in another Faculty or discipline, or why they don’t choose Arts in the first place? For example, the Harvard study on declining enrolments in the Humanities tells us that Humanities undergrads leave for the Social Sciences, not for another institution that may be 3 hrs away because it has no BA core requirements. Finally, what market research might the Faculty have access to or undertake that would tell us why students might choose MacEwan over the U of A? They have a great market campaign, for one.

Faculty of Arts

I am interested in students being able to move around more freely, and the no requirement for a single minor seems interesting.

Faculty Member

If I articulates no pedagogical principles or motivation for change nor any pedagogical principles to the changes it suggests. And I think it was a rhetorical error at best to suggest in the opening remarks at the Town Hall that the BA core we have now rather emerged from pedagogical principles nor provides any for its core. The proposal articulates market principles instead of pedagogical principles for proposed change – the student as consumer who should be free to choose and the idea that remaking or instituting what “competencies” do together as ways to increase student enrollment. Even if the new proposal stuck with the “attributes” model presented as a way of communicating the value or skill set of the BA to employers, the gov’t, etc, it would at least have a rationale for its appeal to the market. The new proposal deconstructs student enrolment as the issue yet provides no data or research about whether a BA without a core (which this would be apart from the mandate to sample of Arts and Sciences) does increase student enrollment, student satisfaction, or an understanding of the value of the degree. It does not seem to have considered how departments can forecast demand and so staff a teaching plan sustainably. It downloads to departments, and calls it departmental control or determination over requirements, any coherence to an Arts degree – the degree comes to be a major and collection of minors or certificates, nothing more and so Arts means little to nothing apart from a collection of departments. In fact, that downloading makes the motivation appear to change: the BA core be largely about the new governance and budget management decentralization at the university as whole. It offers as a rational for removing writing ENG 104 and LIT requiremen from the BA Core 2 courses but provides us with 8 of 11 in its appendix that require 3 or more in both of their BA. So, really the comparator set tells us that if we were just to going to have a BA that was online with where other schools are or seem to be headed, we wouldn’t make the changes proposed. Though of course what matters in degree requirements are pedagogical principles, neither the market nor being like other schools, otherwise we really are reducing the Faculty as we where students to invite students to pay a lot of money to take “stuff” that we haven’t clearly articulated as arrived through pedagogical, rather than market, values and principles. Finally, since writing across the curriculum did not result in departments other than English and Writing Studies teaching writing (decks may offer writing intensive courses, but that’s not equivalent to teaching writing), how is writing as a work and life skill articulated as a core in this degree? It is articulated as a core in degrees across campuses, yet in Arts we wouldn’t see it as one.

Faculty of Arts

Change is good, and i am in favour of renewing the curriculum of the BA. I like the thinking behind the current proposal to allow students more flexibility in their programs. I agree that “BA is too many core requirements, in view of other institutions are doing and that it may work against us in recruitment.” Like the idea that the students will be responsible for thinking through their own programs and designing what fits best within their interests and abilities. Some programs have successfully done this and the best example is perhaps Brown University. If the proposal is to go forward, i would recommend that the Faculty look at how Brown created their "Open Curriculum": "Brown education is a community of students and professors interested in meeting challenges. The two related documents posted on that page document the strengths and challenges of this initiative which has been in place for a while now. I should caution, though, that i’m unsure if we are in the same position as Brown (financially and otherwise) to implement such massive changes.

Faculty Member

Faculty of Arts

Many. While I believe renewal is a good thing overall, what is being proposed here is so radical that I worry we may not be yet in a position to successfully implement the proposed changes in the near future. Here are a few of my concerns:

1. Advising. The idea of an open curriculum, as the Brown case indicates, requires an entire overhaul of the advising system. As someone with extensive advising experience, I am still amazed at the things that students don’t know about our programs. The current proposal would require appointing and training an army of advisors and reaching out to students in a major way. Given all the demands on our time, and the growing pressures of our profession, I am unsure of our resources. When I came to U of A in 2003, I was given a course release for acting as Advisor. How many of our colleagues who might lose students because of this. I understand that overall, students will have to enrol in fewer, while still having all other demands (research, service) be the same. What research can the Faculty provide for this process that tells us change(s) might address the proposal’s central concern – student enrolments? And what research can it provide and draw on that tells us where students go when they leave Arts for the remainder of their degree in another Faculty or discipline, or why they don’t choose Arts in the first place? For example, the Harvard study on declining enrolments in the Humanities tells us that Humanities undergrads leave for the Social Sciences, not for another institution that may be 3 hrs away because it has no BA core requirements. Finally, what market research might the Faculty have access to or undertake that would tell us why students might choose MacEwan over the U of A? They have a great market campaign, for one.

Faculty of Arts

The proposal would require us to be in direct contact with many of our students frequently and devote many hours to advising. How will this be achieved, given all the other requirements of our jobs?

Faculty of Arts

In essence, given that under the current proposal the core is limited to 146, there might not be a lot of room for the Departments to include courses from other disciplines (and this is what is implied by the fact that the "core" would be within the major anyway). Let me give an example: Political Science might want to require some courses from History in their program, but they don’t control the scheduling of those courses. How will that be handled?

Faculty of Arts

5. Proliferation of minor programs: The Brown Open community initiative has had the implication that hundreds of programs have been created. I quote from their report: "Certainly, the proliferation of concentration programs at Brown in the last four decades—from about forty in 1969 to nearly a hundred today—offers a clue about the integrative potential of Brown’s curriculum, especially when one realizes that more than half of those programs cross departmental lines." In a day when we are cutting programs that have less than 10 students in our Faculty, do we want to commit to changes that would necessitate the proliferation of programs instead? Also, how would Departments collaborate on such programs? My experience is that our University is highly departmentalized and it’s hard to generate those "integrative potentials". Not that I don’t believe in them. I’d like to see how those changes would affect our students or how we would go about implementing them. I would be interested in how we would communicate and create consistency within the Faculty about what they require for their programs. In essence, given that under the current proposal the core is limited to 146, there might not be a lot of room for the Departments to include courses from other disciplines (and this is what is implied by the fact that the "core" would be within the major anyway). Let me give an example: Political Science might want to require some courses from History in their program, but they don’t control the scheduling of those courses. How will this be handled?

Faculty of Arts

6. Evidence that this will solve our enrolment woes: The Faculty of Arts has been losing enrolments. While I agree that we need to create a more attractive degree, I would like to see as part of the proposal how the proposed changes will generate a perception of the value of the new BA for students, employers, parents, etc. A more detailed statement about this needs to be part of the proposal. My input is above.

Faculty of Arts
It recently came to my attention the University of Alberta is considering the elimination of the BA core requirements. While I support the idea that undergraduates will no longer require a minor, and fully encourage opening the courses taken outside the Faculty to areas other than science, I feel that removal of the core requirements is counterproductive to meeting the high standards of education for which UAlberta is known. Since graduating with a Bachelor of Arts Degree (BFA) in 1981, I have been invited to exhibit my artwork across Canada and internationally from Kiev to Buenos Aires. My work has been viewed by people of all walks of life, from the ghettos of Guayaquil, Ecuador to various dignitaries and royalty of Europe. And, in all of those events, it has been with pride that I have shared the fact that I have an Arts degree from the University of Alberta. In fact, I was particularly gratifying to have HRH Prince Philip refer to it as my "prestigious University of Alberta background" when he opened one of my exhibits in Geneva (1996).

I have always felt that having an Arts Degree from UAlberta was synonymous with having a well-rounded, grounded education. The curriculum requirements, particularly language instruction, have helped equip many students like myself, with the fundamental communication tools that have assisted University of Alberta alumni to participate in, and contribute globally to our society. This is particularly evident when UAlberta graduates are honoured for their work around the world, at the annual Alumni Awards ceremony. While the BA renewal process is an important and necessary task which keeps the faculty standards up to date, in my opinion, the elimination of BA core requirements will substantially water down, not only the quality, but the value of an Arts degree from the University of Alberta. The proposal in its current form appears to be a "lowering of the bar" and should be reassessed. I therefore, oppose the proposal to eliminate the core requirements of the BA, and hope that the review committee will reconsider their recommendations.

Sincerely,
Larisa Sembaliuk Cheladyn, BFA '81
University of Alberta Alumni Honour Award Recipient (2010)
Graduate Student

The existing core requirements have a clear and still valid pedagogical value (i.e., to improve students’ proficiency in English; to expose them to other languages and non-Arts discipline, and to introduce them to a variety of discipline in the Arts). I find this pedagogical framework far more consistent than the 5 pathways proposal presented during the Town hall meeting. My impression is that several of those thematic pathways tend to overlap, which means that assigning courses for each for those pathways will be a difficult task. It is crucial that the discussion about core requirements be enlightened by a larger reflection on which common pedagogical project (and values) should be endorsed by the departments in the Faculty of Arts. Although considerations such as flexibility and competition matter they should not be put at the forefront.

Making department to take over core requirements will certainly help better align those requirements with the students’ major or minor(s). Given the number and variety of courses available in the Faculty of Arts there should be an advising mechanism in place to help students make the right choices. One would expect such advising mechanism to be student-centered and address his/her particular project. I am not sure to what extend such an individually tailored counseling is realistic and whether undergraduate students have a clear idea of what they want to do at such an early stage of their academic life. One of the possible collateral damage would be an increase in the number of students dropping out and switching courses throughout the semester.

Although it is assumed that students are responsible beings, my experience is that they tend to select "GPA-booster classes" with the lesser amount of work and the better chances of success regardless the content and even their own interests. As a result courses with a CSL option typically requiring an additional 20 hours of work are likely to look less attractive (despite their professional added value). At least this was my experience this semester. In other words, dropping corequisites is bound to intensify the competition between courses within the Faculty of Arts. Such competition is not only detrimental to our quality standards, but also will contribute to increases the volatility in enrolments thereby making programs even less manageable. More generally my assumption is that the new BA as it is proposed will foster the atomization of knowledge with students – especially those who are uncertain about their career path – being granted the option to take double minors and certificates. I am not sure whether that is a good thing or not.

Although adding more flexibility and putting the students’ needs at the center of the Faculty are desirable, I believe that such move should be framed by a clear pedagogical project. The Faculty of Arts should not withdraw its responsibility to the departments but rather act as a mediator to propose a common flexible framework and project. The first step should be to consult with departments on a common pedagogical project for the Arts (I see that first stage also as a propaedeutic move likely to foster a much-needed dialogue within the Faculty). Once that project is delineated and general guidelines are inferred, departments could select individually the courses that best fit those common general guidelines while keeping in mind their particular interests.