Recommendation – Model 1b

Rationale –

- While the faculty was deeply divided over the best direction for Seminar, a near majority of the overall point total in the vote went to Models 1a and 1b—almost as many votes as Models 2-5 combined (463 vs. 491). This indicates to us that the a large plurality of the faculty continues to favor the four-semester Western chronology, which Models 1a and 1b share.

- In terms of absolute points, Model 1a slightly edged out Model 1b. This is due to the fact that those who voted for Model 1a tended to give a much higher percentage of their votes to this Model than did those who voted for other Models. (This is especially true of the lecturers who overwhelmingly voted for Model 1a.) By contrast, those who wanted a change tended to spread around their votes to multiple models of change. Only Model 1b received at least one vote from a majority of those who voted.

- However, the Likert scale results, which asked each faculty member to rate each of the possible models, showed that Model 1b was actually much more preferable to the faculty overall than Model 1a. In essence, faculty either loved or hated Model 1a equally—44.2% found it unacceptable (scores 1 and 2), while 43.6% preferred it (scores 4 and 5). By contrast, 54.4% of the faculty found Model 1b preferable, while only 31.8% found it unacceptable. (None of the other models were rated as preferable by more than 38% of the faculty, which indicates to us that Model 1b would win in any runoff.) Since the primary distinction between Model 1a and Model 1b is that Model 1b employs developmentally scaled reading (i.e., significantly less reading, esp. in the earlier Seminars), we deem the reason for the preference of Model 1b is that the majority of faculty favor a developmental component.

- In sum, this data demonstrates that the faculty, while divided, has a majority preference for the four-semester Western chronology, with the readings structured developmentally (i.e., Model 1b).

- We note that the trends in the data outlined above are somewhat weakened if the input from lecturers is excluded. E.g. The full-time faculty combined vote for Models 1a and 1b was 315 (53 x 3.15 + 53 x 2.79) while that total for Models 2 through 5 was 417. If only full-time faculty input was considered, a case could be made for having a run-off between Models 1b and 3. We still find that the data from the Likert scales supports the recommendation for Model 1b.

- Other notes:
  - A large majority of the faculty deem greater context acceptable or preferred. The CSGB will use this information to implement greater context for the texts.
  - Model 1b affirms the CSGB’s current project of working to include more diverse texts in the chronological sequence. This will continue.
• The decisions about how to best arrange the modified chronology of Model 1b will begin in earnest this fall.