

Question 20: What do you think are the strong points of the current program? (check all that apply)

Other (Please specify): (30 Full-Time, 0 Research, 7 Adjunct Responses)

- An excellent piece of the program is that there are many DI courses specifically designed for Gen Ed.
- Arthurian Legends (PPDI) is my favorite class to teach of all the courses I teach here at PSU and that's precisely because the goals of Gen Ed are so clear to me and I've worked to make the class meaningful to students and to myself in a way I haven't with my "in-major" classes.
- can't think of any.
- Connecting the dots for students about the goals will need to be more direct for them to see Gen Eds as anything but a chore. They fall short in stimulating interest/knowledge of other ways of thinking for many of my advisees who see them as a waste of time. When I get students in my WRCO course and they've never used the library catalog, I question quality as well.
- Currently is run by a committee that seems out of touch with the spirit that guided the program's creation and made this fairly useless survey in terms of efficacy.
- Enhances the quality of the courses taught.
- Having never taught one of these courses, I only see these courses through the eyes of students. Students take whatever gen eds are available to fill their schedules. There does not seem to be much engagements (with exceptions when the instructor is "awesome"). Most students do not seem to approach these courses with curiosity.
- <http://chronicle.com/article/Curriculum-Proposals-at/130461/>
- I am not sure of many of the above b/c there has been little authentic assessment
- i don't know
- I find the question a bit confusing - do you wanted these rated in order of importance f so I think you should have stated that since it would have changed my answer Each of these are foundational in the original organization of the program, therefore I cannot choose several out of the original vision.
- I have not been at PSU long enough to have an informed opinion here.
- is hard ofr both students and faculty to understand
- none
- Presents a huge variety of course options for students
- Some vocal faculty complain about the program, but I think we have an excellent program.
- The absurdity of the current Gen Ed program never ceases to amaze colleagues from other institutions.
- The Gen Ed courses vary so tremendously that I cannot answer this question.
- The ideas/philosophy behind the current program seem logical and admirable.
- This is a really good question. I'm not sure why, but, I'm finding it difficult to check many of the boxes.
- We can't forget that this component keeps some of the smaller programs alive, and add on teaching credits to all the programs and faculty.
- who knows? i have seen any assessment of it.

Adjuncts (7)

- Not sure where to add this but I teach IS-3530 and did not see the IS selection in the listing. I've taught this course with 2 others each spring since 2006.
- no idea
- na

- I'm speaking strictly of my own experiences in my own classes.
- I do not know enough about the program to offer an informed opinion.
- Has potential for 2 or more simultaneous courses to have shared or parallel assignments. This may be happening already, but I have not heard of it.
- Don't know.

Question 21: What do you think are the weak points of the current program? (check all that apply)

Other (Please specify): (80 Full-Time Responses, 1 Research, 18 Adjunct Responses)

- 1. Does not instill in students the necessity of WORKING at studying while in college. 2. Does not weed out the lazy and hopelessly under-prepared. 3. Does not establish in students a belief in Plymouth State University as an institution whose degrees imply graduates who think and write clearly.
- 1) It does not require that students take their second language requirement during freshman and/or sophomore year. 2) It does not require all students to study a second language.
- A high percentage of 1st-year seminar sections are not taught by regular faculty.
- Allows lower level courses to count as connections.
- Although it is good to get different approaches and a breadth and depth, this seems to confuse students somewhat when they get to upper level GEP courses required for the major. For example, particular terms carry different meanings and have different expectations across disciplines. I have most recently been challenged with this in teaching research methods.
- Apparently, when students register, most, if not all, of the sections are quickly filled. Thus, we can't say it is a point of pride, which could very well be the intention, since the students don't have an option, except the availability.
- As an advisor, it can be difficult to have students taking courses in majors, changing majors, and then having to take directions courses from the old major. Credit-wise it's a problem. Yes, we can petition to have those courses count, but the effort on the part of student and advisor makes it not easy to administer and does not meet the "not a chore" goals. I have far too many advisees who complain about gen ed courses for it to be a "point of pride". It's not that there is something fundamentally wrong with the courses, it's that the students don't know why they are taking them. Again, I think we need to connect the dots for them in some prescriptive way. I wrote a response to question 19 that relates to this item. Not sure how your results will come out, so I'll share it again. I questioned whether students get why they are studying the breadth of knowledge. Connecting the dots is needed. I also find students coming to my WRCO course are unprepared to do any research.
- badly designed survey folks it required me to answer this even though I didn't want to check any box
- can't answer the first 6 b/c i've never seen an assessment. but if i could change it i would based on what i do know.
- Causes small programs to duplicate courses or omit either a major course or a Gen Ed course. Many major and Gen Ed courses are similar, have to secretly warn students off certain Gen Ed courses that duplicate required courses. Never have understood the problem with allowing Gen Ed courses to count for a major. Our program "loses" major courses because we use several great course ideas for Gen Ed. Program is enormous, much larger, more complicated for students/advisors, more duplicative than at other schools. Evidence that "other schools envy ours" often claimed, never systematically presented. Gen Ed Committee in the past has not welcomed change or revision.
- Course evaluations and faculty opinions are of limited value. Genuine outcomes assessment is missing.
- current program limits the growth/improvement of some professional programs
- Depending upon who teaches the courses, students get different experiences related to the requirements of the gen Ed curriculum
- empathizes current fads versus more traditional liberal arts

- Faculty lack sufficient expertise to teach many of the courses being offered.
- I am finding that upper division students are not as well prepared as they need to be in general education skills. Somehow, these are just not registering!
- I am generally very favorable of the general education program; I am happy to agree to teach the goals and objectives of specific programs, and I strive to teach them well. The only piece that bothers me is the the requirement of the FYS critical thinking texts. I wish I did not have to choose or use any of the FYS Critical Thinking books in my section.
- I do not wish to be forced to identify weak points.
- i don't know
- I don't know if faculty/advisors are "cheerleading" enough for the program to students. In addition to being enthusiastic supporters of the program, faculty need to talk frequently with their students/advisees about how central general education is to education overall, and how much these courses work in tandem with major programs. Faculty need to communicate to students the pedagogical and philosophical underpinnings of this education in order for classes to feel "relevant" to students' lives. Not enough major programs participate in Gen Ed to "present breadth of knowledge" (where are the Creative Thought classes from Art?) and some major programs offer too many Gen Eds (English, which I'm a part of). An English major can do PP, SS, and CT all within the English department, which does not necessarily serve students very well in terms of breadth, various scholars, different approaches, etc. Finally, I don't know how successful the Gen Ed program is in meeting many of these goals because I don't see course evals, do teaching observations, or hear in Reflective Practice groups about how faculty are teaching these classes. There is a built-in method of assessment of the program, but I don't know how successful that is.
- I have not been at PSU long enough to have an informed opinion here.
- I have often heard from students that (not all but many) Gen Classes are boring and filled with busy work. In our Dept many of the gen ed courses are not taught by our best teachers. That being said I very seldom teach Ge Ed courses because there is not someone else to teach the major courses I teach.
- I think that there are not adequate controls in place to ensure that Gen Ed courses are consistently delivered in terms of content and rigour. I believe this is especially a point of concern (in some cases) when there are many sections of a Gen Ed offered by both adjunct and full-time faculty.
- I think the Directions component should be reduced.
- I think these weaknesses have more to do with university systems in general than specifically with the general education program.
- Is an obstacle to majors in which a great deal of focus and skill level are required.
- Is generally viewed by faculty, students, and especially the cabinet as secondary to the major.
- Is too complex, with more required classes than are necessary.
- It does not allow students to take more rigorous courses (e.g. General Chemistry, Physics, University Physics) for their science direction--this is a travesty! These kinds of courses provide more critical thinking skills because of the quantitative reasoning needed.
- It does not seem to be directly or specifically connected to the current NH DoE Part 609 General Education Content Standards (Ed 609.01) http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rules/state_agencies/ed600.html and the PSU rules allowing a course taken by one person to transfer in but the same course not to transfer in by another person because of the majors they are in create barriers for potential and actual transfer students, delays progress to graduation, prompts student requests for exceptions to be made, and

creates a great advantage to our competitors who make complete transfer of credits very easy. Also, in terms of the first 6 goals statements above, I have not been aware of a comprehensive assessment tool used at PSU that measures those specific things. There may be one that I have not seen, but I am not aware of it. However, for our NH state accreditation, it would seem to make sense to work with the language provided by the DoE rules if possible in the redesign or description of the general education curriculum at PSU.

- It is an embarrassment.
- It's more complicated than the above statements may infer.
- It's not that it's a chore, but rather due to small department with too few faculty members, full time faculty do not get to teach general education. Hence, general education courses are overly taught by adjuncts. It would be a better program overall if taught by full time faculty
- no comment
- no concerns
- no double-counting doesn't always make common sense
- None in particular
- Other than our own courses, we have no idea whether "most courses" achieve any of the goals represented by the bullets above. For example, I teach one "method of inquiry," but have no idea what others are being taught.
- Our method of assessment("sunsetting courses" is ridiculous, time consuming and unnecessary.
- Process can be too restrictive. Someone who has taken a science class may still need to take SIDI for example. Or intro to sociology will not count toward ssdi. Yet we may use that course for a transferee.
- Requires too many total credits out of overall student programs; unreasonably bars discipline-introductory courses from use as GenEds
- Should be abbreviated (why is it necessary to take two different Directions courses?)
- Students aren't forced to take gen ed outside of their major, thus creating an insular view of gen ed (all one discipline).
- Students often have very limited choice and simply take a course because it will fill a requirement. Range of offerings is quite limited and skewed to a handful of perspectives in some cases.
- Students report that some Gen Eds are so easy as to be a joke. We need to get across the idea that Gen Ed classes are still to be rigorous. Too many faculty seem to use Gen Eds as a place to discuss personal issues and lose their professionalism.
- Taking 2 courses each in directions area is not making program any better or helping students. Just like connection courses please make one course per area of direction course. Convert remaining 9-12 credits to electives so students can choose area of their interest to gain deeper knowledge of courses which are not their major (or their major). At the same time advisors can also suggest courses which would reinforce areas of weaknesses of advisees. This will help students to graduate faster with comprehensive knowledge of wider area.
- The assessment tool and process is poorly designed. The students don't seem to learn how to write in their required English class. There needs to be greater emphasis on the development of writing and comprehension skills. While the concept is interesting because courses close so quickly they are forced into "pet" courses of faculty because they are the only ones still open.
- The current General Education program is composed of too many credits. It also requires too many credits.
- The goals of the program seem good. I'm not sure if the current version of the program meets them. And, students sometimes don't take the Gen Ed program seriously.

- The intent of having "broad" lower level general education courses is good but most of them are weirdly narrow and obscure and represent, in fact, what I would consider to be narrower and less applicable content than students might receive in basic lower-level courses in a major.
- The main weakness of the program is a student can't take a majors course that would satisfy the goals and skills of the Gen Ed and have it count toward their Gen Ed program. This is simply ridiculous.
- The number of required credits of gen ed: too many.
- There are not enough directions courses to accommodate the needs of our students.
- There should be a CT (for Creative Thought), etc. in the course codes as many titles could fit in more than one category.
- This is a difficult question since I find it depends on the instructor's experience and course.
- This survey has been educational. I regularly teach a general education course and now I'll use some of the items on this survey to make sure I do a better job of meeting some of the intent of the General Education program. It's too easy to be complacent once you've offered a course once. This survey does a good job on educating faculty. My problem is in wondering if there are others like myself who do a good job in paying attention to and meeting some of the goals, but not necessarily others. This wondering left me undecided on how we are doing as a campus in meeting the goals. I haven't paid enough attention until now to thinking about what it means if I'm not following all the goals. If this is also true of other faculty members, then we're not doing an adequate job. I can only hope that others filling out this survey will reflect on areas where they could strength their offerings to do a better job in meeting the goals. While I'm commenting, I'll add that when I read question 13 and 15, I thought who would answer negatively. Then, I read subsequent sections of the survey and I understood better, but I'm still wondering about the usefulness of these questions the way they are worded.
- Too many credits are required that prevents any expansion of the required major courses. The clever (?) course titles are impossible to easily transfer.
- Unsure
- wages war on the disciplines, assumes that disciplines are defined by subject matter, requires teaching outside one's formal preparation, is primarily taught by lecturers who are often teaching outside their training
- Weak point: Primarily use adjuncts to teach several Gen Ed courses because full time faculty too busy to teach these courses, to fit their schedule. Adjuncts get tired of teaching these courses over and over.
- When the skills for each Direction were devised class sizes were smaller. Today, given the trend toward larger classes, it is not realistic for all skills to be addressed in a meaningful way. Directions requirement should be pared from two of each to one of each. And of the 15 credit hours of electives, it should be specified that at least three be at the upper level. As it is, with so many Directions classes, the GenEd becomes a burden on students, faculty and the administration. And with so many students filling lower level classes, enrollments are dropping in upper level classes and majors are suffering by having to close low-enrolled upper classes while opening up more lower level Directions classes. The fact that any discipline can offer courses covering any Direction means that professors are teaching outside their area of expertise. So for some 24 credit hours, students would be as well served by attending community college. The prohibition on double-counting removes the ability of disciplines to decide how best to teach majors and non-majors and leads to some awkward course offerings and staffing requirements.

Research (1)

- I think that the current assessment system does not provide useful data to say that the program is accomplishing many of these--specifically "skills for academic success and life long learning" also, I feel like the data should be compiled across different gen eds and presented to really get a feel for the system as a whole. While I may know these things about my course (20-25 students a year, I certainly don't know about its effectiveness for the student body as a whole.

Adjunct (18)

- Not familiar enough with Gen Ed courses other than the one that I teach to comment on this.
- doesn't allow major courses to count as general education courses. this is particularly true in the sciences.
- Don't know.
- For the courses I am familiar with, there is some degree of 'mile-wide, inch-deep' phenomenon, and emphasis on facts, especially in the textbooks. Some students, and maybe faculty, seem to have the impression that the courses should be easy.
- I believe it is a living document that adjusts to the needs of the student and general population. It would be nice to offer more gen courses.
- I do not know enough about the program to offer an informed opinion.
- I find the Gen Ed courses I teach a point of pride and I teach all of them with passion, intellectual rigor and love doing so. I also believe the students in my classes learn and have fun doing so. However, I am an adjunct and I find that others do not look upon these courses in the same way...I find that sad.
- I get a sense that the gen ed program is viewed (by full-time faculty) as a "job" for adjuncts. I especially see this in relation to composition. It's not considered serious teaching.
- Is divorced from advising components. If adjunct faculty teach the majority of the Gen Ed program, yet can not tie it to the rest of the PSU academic experience for reasons of being separated from advising faculty roles, how will PSU improve its retention of students beyond the first year?
- na
- no idea
- No Opinion
- None
- not administer under my function
- Seems to be carried on the shoulders of too few departments.
- Students feel that the gen ed requirements are not necessary and don't treat the courses with the full respect they deserve.
- The teaching of General Education courses is delegated to adjuncts in my department. This indicates, to me, that the full time faculty and the administration do not value the program.
- While it may have lofty ideals, many students coming straight out of high school are not prepared for the level of inquiry expected of them. Consequently, I find myself watering the courses down to make them easier - which is contrary to the goals of the program.

Question 22. Is the current application and sunset process reasonable and accessible?

If you select "no", please explain: (47 Full-Time, 1 Research, 18 Adjunct Responses)

- The sunset process is too labor intensive and occurs at intervals that are too brief. This creates an impediment to faculty that might be thinking of teaching or introducing a gen. ed. course.
- A slightly longer sunset time would be better, as I did not see enough change in courses (if any) for the four year window during my six years in the gen ed committee. Other than that I am fine with it. Would have put "yes" above, but would not let me comment unless I answered "No"
- Additional options for self-design and double counting for certain majors would create a higher level of accessibility.
- Assessment tool poorly written. Questions do not apply to all courses. Too general. Defense of course in front of committee is just a hoop.
- Assessment criteria don't seem standardized or rigorous enough.
- Because almost all of our courses are Gen Ed courses, the sunset process is onerous. Perhaps consider revisiting a course on the current time table for the first time and then extend the timetable.
- Busywork for all.
- Countless hours are being spent composing, evaluating, revising, and reevaluating course syllabi or course content to meet the general education standard. What is this exacting standard that so many faculty are failing to meet in one way or another? A sufficiently broad or general course content? What does that really mean? There is no general knowledge or wisdom paradigm in the academic community today in relation to which the success of any general education program or what was once known as the liberal arts curriculum can be evaluated. As I see it, the most general course that students could and should take at a university would be a philosophy course, since philosophy is the most encompassing of all the academic disciplines and is also the most focused on developing critical thinking and posing the most fundamental questions. This generality is precisely why philosophy departments have fewer majors these days--you can't do anything specific with it other than teach it, however helpful it may be in giving one a broader outlook on life or the ability to question and evaluate fundamental assumptions. I am persuaded that the general education ideal was best being realized when a philosophy course was a requirement at PSU for graduation, and students had more freedom to choose electives in accordance with their personal interests and skills. Again, because there is no general consensus about what we should be teaching students, is it any wonder that the general education courses are generally failing to inspire or even please the general education committee as well as some of the faculty and many of the students? You can't integrate academic disciplines or human knowledge just by combining or juxtaposing them in some vague way or another. What is needed is not a blizzard of more or more information but a greater depth of understanding. All general education programs and especially the liberal arts are floundering for the same reason they are floundering at PSU. You can't make everything come together unless it is meant to come together. Either all knowledge is unifiable or it is not. At present there is no agreement on that question let alone even the vaguest idea of how all human knowledge is to be integrated. (There isn't even a final unified "theory of everything" in physics, the "most scientific of the sciences," that people agree on.) Consequently, I strongly recommend that the PSU general education program be discontinued on the grounds that it is in principle fatally flawed. Then give the professors the freedom and time they need to pursue unification on their own terms if they are so inclined or to stay within the boundaries of their academic training if that is their preference. Creativity and integration can't be forced from the outside. It can only be inspired. For the sake of academic freedom, economy, and peace of

mind we should end this general education experiment that has failed. It is not worth all this time and aggravation. The previous perspectives program was not a trainwreck.

- courses are evaluated/approved/rejected by people who don't understand the disciplines or subject matters involved, but maybe that's part of the plan
- Happens too often. Seems like we just finish one cycle and the next one, for the same course, is on the horizon.
- Hard to follow if you are not department chair.
- I don't like that if I want to write a comment I am only able to select "No" above. I think the sunset process is necessary, although I haven't completed the forms yet.
- I think that after the first sunset process has been approved, the second sunset application should be made easier to apply for.
- I think this process could be improved and is sometimes a deterrent to the development of courses. More of the responsibility could be placed at the departmental or college level rather than university level.
- I want to check yes but I also want to comment and the survey won't let me do both so I have to check "no." The process seems reasonable but not meaningful.
- If a department says that a course has remained the same, it should not have to go through a meaningless sunset process.
- It counts by years and not offerings of the course. For courses taught every other year, assessing it should not be ever four years.
- It is a lot of busy work and is a joke. Have any courses been rejected for anything other than bureaucratic reasons(mistakes on the forms etc.)?
- it is not
- it is not at all substantive, and therefore waste's many people's time. The idea that a syllabus is effective for evaluating student outcomes is not sensible.
- it is onerous on the faculty who teach the courses.
- It is paperwork that means nothing
- many courses should simply be permanently approved, or have longer sunset times, especially those that are within the discipline.
- na
- Not clear on what is actually accomplished by the sunset process.
- Not needed at all. I don't think any courses should be micro-managed in this fashion.
- Once a course has been accepted as a gen. ed. course and successfully passed the initial sunset process, I believe the course should go for a longer period that 4-5 years before having to undergo another sunset, unless the course has undergone significant revision.
- Places an unnecessary burden on faculty and administrators
- seems bureaucratic and not meaningful.
- Seems like more of a rubber stamp/busy work process
- somewhat burdensome esp. to chairs what's done with the data with the on-line evals fewer students will complete the evals of the ge classes
- tedious paperwork
- Tedious, unnecessary. Time consuming.
- There is insufficient data regarding outcomes assessment.
- Time consuming - too frequent.
- Too burdensome
- too much needless paperwork

- Too much red tape--the process has more hoops than are reasonable.
- Too much work involved. Renewal is too frequent.
- Unnecessary step
- Very burdensome to departments and Gen Ed committee.
- Waste of time and too much paperwork; meaningless and cumbersome. A course that is approved is only when Gen Ed mission/perspective is copied on the first page of the syllabus. Students do not read or care to read; they do a course only to make sure they graduate.

Research Prof (1)

- I do not have experience with the sunset process but the initial application process is vague and confusing to the first time applicant. There are not clear directions, explanations of the forms, nor sample forms.

Adjuncts (3)

- Yes, except that adjuncts usually are excluded. I've conducted 2 such assessments and applications but was told I was not supposed to. But the courses--which I've now lost though popular--were not taught by anyone else so who would have submitted the application if I had not?
- I did a re-eval on one of my courses and it was fine on my end I am not sure about the administrative aspects of the process
- As an adjunct faculty, I am not exposed to the review process and cannot judge the 'reasonable and accessible' aspect. Yet, since I am not exposed, maybe that is an indication that the process is not accessible. I have not seen any effort to query adjunct faculty on the gen ed courses, apart from lunchtable/hallway discussions.

Question 23. Does the current application and sunset process help assess the quality of our General Education program?

If you select "no", please explain: (49 Full-Time, 1 Research, 3 Adjunct Responses)

- A course that is in Gen Ed or not is irrelevant. A course that is relevant to my discipline, i.e., it reflects a method of inquiry and interest in my discipline that I want to impart to my students. To arouse my students' interest in my discipline is more important. I am not clear what "quality" means in Gen Ed.? Gen Ed does not have quality in my opinion, it's the subject and the teaching of that subject that is how quality is measured.
- As the Gen Ed Committee varies, so do the requirements for new courses and sunseting courses.
- Assessment is not taken seriously.
- Because only syllabi are assessed, there is no real data about what happens inside the courses. Using student evals alone to assess this seems problematic.
- Class observations and conversations do more than forms can.
- Criteria not useful.
- Faculty present the same materials required for original certification as a General Education program.
- From the departmental perspective, a rote, unnecessary exercise
- How good/reliable is this assessment?
- I am not sure that it does. More evidence is probably needed, but would require additional time to the process.
- I think our focus on what's written about a course is sound. I think we don't focus enough on the quality of experience for students in a given section. The delivery of Gen Eds in some cases varied far too much in my opinion.
- I think we have some "drift" in courses that could possibly be missed by the general education committee. Also, there is no mechanism for determining whether there are things missing in our current program. For example, I'm very concerned about the technology piece of the program. I don't think we are doing a good job of making our students tech literate. We wrote the program with the assumption that our students are digital natives, a notion that I disagree with (based on my anecdotal experience) and many researchers have found to be a falsehood. There are 3 "in the disciplines areas--writing, QR and tech. Writing courses are preceded by composition. QR courses are preceded by math foundations. But the tech courses are preceded by nothing. This is a serious problem and nothing about our assessment procedures will identify it as such.
- I'm not convinced changes are made in light of the data.
- It appears instructors take a snapshot of information from course evaluations that may not represent the long running results from course evaluations.
- It assesses whether the courses are still what they are categorized as being and that is all it was ever intended to do.
- it assures that faculty include the "correct" language in the syllabus but depends largely on feedback from students who don't read the syllabus and hate any course that can be identified as gen ed
- It does not adequately assess differences among instructors who are each teaching a section of a particular course.
- It doesn't look at student outcomes.
- It doesn't seem to really get at how well the program is performing--just using one semester of student evaluations is ridiculous as the primary means of evaluation and faculty self-reporting.

- It is meaningless process, not substantive.
- It seems that we need an output assessment.
- It sort of does because student opinion is included, but students get pretty tired of completing those assessments!
- Looking at individual courses is fine if you assume that the broader program is sound, but we need to assess the program more broadly so that we can ensure breadth (especially at the Directions level)
- na
- Need better assessment tools.
- no
- no - seems more like a rubber stamp process w/little constructive feedback
- see above
- Student surveys are of limited value.
- Students detest the evaluations that we are required to do; so do I. They really prove nothing.
- Students may take one course that could satisfy math foundation or quantitative connection. They may not know which.
- The current application and sunset process fails to assess the quality of the program on several accounts. First, it focuses far too much on crossing t's and dotting i's and hardly at all on whether the actual quality of a course / instructor; if paperwork is not filled out properly, a course will not pass, but if a course that is quite obviously a bad one comes up for review, and its paperwork is properly filled out, it will pass.
- The current application is driven by faculty desire, self-protection, and job security rather than student need and relevant generational change. Quality and current educational relevance cannot be assessed by senior faculty members.
- The fact that we have a review process is solid, but the information asked for is somewhat lacking, as student evaluations are the major input for decision making. Quality needs multiple sources of information from various stakeholders (student, faculty, grad schools, employers, etc)
- The Gen Ed committee has on occasions abused it's power by unnecessarily requiring Gen Ed instructors to justify a directions course designations in person.
- The method of assessing courses in the program is not in any way a method of assessing the program itself. A course may be a great fit to the program, this does not assess the program.
- There must be better ways to address/assure quality.
- this is an almost automated process. i have seen no review incorporated into the sunset and reapplication process.
- Unnecessary
- We do not need excessive assessment.
- Well, I have not gone through the sunset process, but I did go through the application process twice. I found the application process relatively straightforward, although sometimes I was confused by the communication with the then GenEd chair as what should be done by when.
- Well, yes and no. Syllabus review and course evaluation data are helpful, but, again, assessment of skills/outcomes is missing during Sunset review
- who knows I haven't seen an assessment of it.

Research

- my concern is that only one semester of evals are required in the renewal process. I however also don't know what metrics are really used to evaluate the course when it comes up for

renewal or what % of courses don't get renewed.

Adjuncts (4)

- It's accessible and reasonable to administer, yet often I am at a loss as to what faculty are supposed to be learning from it. From my perspective, it appears to produce a packet of information that is filed.
- I believe the measurement of assessment of quality is flawed.
- assessment is not built into every program
- As an adjunct faculty, I do not get much exposure to other gen ed courses or their instructors. I can see that there is a review process, but I don't know how effective it is. For instance - has any course instructor been tasked to overhaul a course because it was outdated or not achieving gen-ed goals?? I do not know the answer to that question.

Question 24. It has been suggested that the timeline for sunset renewal should be changed in the following way: After initial approval, the first sunset renewal would occur within a relatively short time (e.g., 4 years, which is the current time limit). Subsequent sunset renewals would be given longer renewal times (e.g., 6 years). Would you support this change in the sunset renewal process?

Additional Comments: (35 Full-Time Responses, 1 Research, 6 Adjunct)

- A simpler process by which departments and programs certify that the course has not changed significantly should suffice.
- Again, I'm forced to clock "yes" though my answer is I don't know. What's the rationale for either of these times? Are there any issues with Gen Ed courses that are primarily taught by adjunct faculty?
- four years is fine, I Think if a course is not changed/evaluated in four years it becomes out of date.
- Give a longer time over all if we need to continue this farce.
- Given this appears to be the major method for assessing the courses, I think it should stay 4 years not extending it to 6.
- Great idea. Even better would be if the faculty had passed the proposal to allow departments to police their own "connections" courses, especially those within the disciplines.
- I chose "no", but it should be "I don't know". I've only participated in sunset renewal once. I honestly don't know what the process of evaluating them was once I turned them in. I don't know whether that process is working or not.
- i don't know
- I might support it but in general, I think it's probably a bad idea because the longer a course is taught, the more likely "drift" is to occur as we forget and move away from the original reasons that certain things have been put into a course.
- I need more information. You are forcing an answer that is too important to make via the internet with out greater understandings of how this impacts both the university and individual programs. Therefore my answer of "no" is invalid data in this survey and I request you do not count this towards any reportable section of your survey, rather individuals should have been given an option to abstain in any question they felt they could not answer at this time. In the future I would not say you "may" provide additional feedback, since I wish you had provided opportunities under other sections. I would find it counter productive to make a decision on a proposal from a form that is limited (such as this form) in that it lacks institutional history, data, historical documents and current context.
- I stated that same thought up in my answer to question 22.
- I think 4 years is the correct balance between what is necessary and what is convenient.
- I think this is an excellent idea that will ease the burden on instructors, departments and chairs, and the Gen Ed Committee. if courses are held to high standards during the initial application and first renewal, I see no reason for not extending the renewal time for subsequent renewals.
- I'd like all restrictions removed.
- Less unnecessary bureaucracy is something I support.
- na
- not sure
- Not unless real assessment occurs
- probably wise to review every 4 years.
- Regular course assessment will prevent curricular drift.
- Sunset, sunrise -- take it off!! It is a waste of faculty time and paperwork. Again, it is

meaningless. It makes us all absolutely angry with the whole program. Why are we subjected to this tortuous process? What's the point? Does it make us a better university?

- Sure, but also please make the process more streamlined.
- The process is a waste of precious time.
- the sunset process should be abolished completely for the reasons mentioned above
- There should be a review of both process and material used during the process.
- there should be no sunset rule
- Uncertain
- Yes, most definitely. See 22 above.

Research

- I think that it will breed complacency.

Adjunct (6)

- My feelings are neutral, but since that isn't an option here, I've clicked No.
- I'm not familiar with this term.
- i would need more details
- I favor frequent review.
- I don't know enough about this to give a relevant answer.
- As an adjunct I have no idea what sunset renewal is nor has it ever been explained to me.

Question 25. Are there any courses in your program that could or should be General Education courses but are not? In other words, do you have any courses that you might consider applying for them to become General Education courses, but you have not?

If you chose "yes", please explain: (37 Full-Time, 1 Research, 4 Adjunct Responses)

- A possible past and present for a course that is now not offered very often
- Because if they become Gen. Ed. courses they no longer can be a program requirement.
- Business Computer Applications Introduction to Business and Globalization
- But since they don't double count, what would be the point? (We still need to offer them to our majors)
- But, it can not be a Directions course under the current guidelines (it used to be under the old Gen Ed program).
- By making more courses GenEd(UL)more students will be attracted to them. There are far too many credits required in GenEd to allow students any real freedom in electives..
- Children with Disabilities could be a Diversity elective. At the present moment it is closed to all but CS majors.
- Climate Change
- Courses required by a major should qualify as gen Ed. Just make sure departments offer alternatives as well. This is the positive aspect of the new gen Ed - some good curricula were developed.
- Every single "Intro to the major course" - if done correctly - should satisfy a Gen Ed direction. Its a shame that if a student wishes to take General Chemistry or Intro to Psychology that they do not and cannot receive Gen Ed credit for this. I would be that 99% of all institutions don't have this silly rule.
- Francis Williams has developed a new course entitled "Race, Class, Crime and Justice" as a new elective in CJ. Should be considered in the future.
- I am developing components within my existing courses that could be developed for a more diverse audience outside of my department but departmental demands for course coverage make it unlikely that I will construct a gen ed course.
- I am forced to click "yes" because "I don't know" doesn't let me comment. I think it's annoying that English has a Creative Writing course for majors and a Writing and the Creative Process for Gen Ed. I yearn for double-counting!
- I don't have the faculty to offer these courses as Gen Ed courses, so as a dept we have chosen to keep them as electives. And, if some of our courses became Gen Ed directions courses, we could not require them.
- I favor almost any course that can provide a breadth of experience. Why limit courses? If a student wants to be challenged by taking higher level offerings, I say go for it.
- I have a general education scientific inquiry course that I will consider modifying and requiring of majors. I think the application components are valuable enough to do so.
- Information Technology should be a TECO
- My physics courses should fulfill the gen ed science requirement. Since they are required for majors, they are not counted. This is ridiculous.
- na
- No, but we have courses that we'd love for our majors to be able to count, and I know there are other majors that would use some of their intro courses as Directions if they were allowed to double-use them.
- Not sure what you me by "your program," as gen ed is a PSU program and as such "belongs" to

all.

- only yes on this very "loaded" question. what is this information going to be used for?
- Some additional courses could count as connection courses but we have not applied for the designations because students already have lots of options in these designations.
- The inability to count GE courses in a major is a hardship to our students, and also prevents including all possible courses relevant to gen ed in the program (we can't teach two sections)
- There are a couple of courses in our program that I believe should be included in GE but because my feeling is the course is best taught by me it probably won't work.
- There are many courses that could be Gen Ed. In fact every courses I teach could be a Gen Ed. course but why bother? The sunset-sunrise and paperwork that involves GEN Ed - what's the point here? Why do we have to have be a Gen Ed University?
- There may be. I will have to look at our courses again to see if any could be applicable as Gen Ed options.
- There should be a way to allow students to take more rigorous science courses (like University Physics) as scientific inquiry.
- University Chorale Chamber Singers These courses focus on global experience, history, culture, etc. The curriculum changes each semester and includes focus on poetry, history, language, politics, and art, as well as music.
- We have a number of courses that might be tech in the disciplines courses but since this is something that students only need one of and is specified by the discipline, there's not really a need to make more of them TECO courses. Also, I have an idea for a course (not yet created) that could be a math foundations course but was told all math foundations courses must be MA (and therefore taught by the math department). That seems like a problem to me but I haven't had time or energy to challenge the description of math foundations.
- We review this on an annual basis and make recommendations as appropriate.
- Yes -- discipline specific introductory courses that cannot be considered because they count towards a major; discipline-immersive courses for non-majors that are fewer than three credits

Research

- I have not gotten around to it.

Adjunct

- Introductory courses are by nature more broad than upper division courses. At other institutions where I have taught, for example, a course like "Intro to American Government" would have been a normal requirement of all students regardless of major. I have been fascinated here by the extent to which effort has gone in to creating special course designations rather than considering what General Education is at its base.
- instead of the BCA course.... there should be a course that goes through "all" the software applications that students will use at PSU and also teaches them or gives them some insight about computer hardware.
- I believe that there are many courses within every academic program that could and should adequately address the goals of General Education. Program courses which embrace General Education goals would give the students a sense of purpose and encourage the development of academic rigor.
- Creative Writing should be a Creative Thought course. Writing & the Creative Process is a good one, and there's very little about the Creative Writing course that should limit it specifically to the English dept.

Question 28. Please provide any additional feedback regarding the number of types of General Education courses offered and the seats available within them:

(41 Full-Time, 2 Research, 11 Adjunct Responses)

- Although I am very involved in this gen ed and will continue to be, I believe we require too many gen ed credits. We need to adopt greater faith that any course will build toward an educated graduate who meets our standard of what we want a graduate to have upon graduating.
- As a teacher of just one of the many, I really am not able to answer the above.
- first and second year students who register late in the process have little variety from which to choose and often there are few seats. Gen Ed choices aren't based on their interests or what will help their majors but what is available, essentially making the Gen Ed experience miserable for them. As a "consumer", it seems important that in addition to broadening the scope of their education, we are also considering their needs.
- Frost makes it look like there are enough seats/sections. There is not enough buy in from TT faculty and thus too much taught by adjuncts
- I do not feel any one individual at PSU could accurately assess what you are requesting in this section. I know what my advisee's "like" or "want to" take, this does not mean in anyway they are more valuable than those they find more challenging and therefore may not want to register for each semester.
- I have check "need more seats" for everything, not because I know the actual numbers, but because I see how difficult it is for students to complete their course schedules and how often they come back to tell me a course is closed.
- I have had many students and advisees complain to me that there are not enough different types of Creative Thoughts courses. As one student put it "they are not very creative about the kinds of Creative Thoughts courses they offer." Frequently these are seniors who have put off taking Creative Thoughts until their very last semesters, hoping there would be more options made available. They note there are few, if any, in some of the more obvious "creative" disciplines, such as theatre, music, and dance. Frankly, I agree with them.
- I hear a lot of complaints about this from students during advising.
- I think there would be more CT courses if they could double-count within a major.
- I'm not sure what is being ask of me on questions 26 & 27
- Introductory science courses should qualify as Gen Ed
- It seems that the major criterion for course selection is whatever is the easiest.
- Our gen ed courses are always full and we often add students beyond the cap.
- Part of the explanation for me checking so many "I don't know's" is that I haven't had advisees for that long yet as my position changed. I didn't use to have advisees.
- Please more Creative Thought, and more Scientific Inquiry that students want! My advisees cluster in a few SIDI courses and wait until the ones they want are available, sometimes waiting semester after semester. But the CTDI is the worst problem of sheer availability--it has gotten better, but there were still too few.
- put the seminars in the depts. if the dept. wants to teach one for their majors. it would help alleviate the seats issue,
- Regular faculty probably pay very little attention to this, and are unaware of problems unless they are specifically forced to notice them (e.g, Provost appealing via email for more courses in a particular direction).
- Scheduling is sometimes an issue for our student athletes who need courses earlier in the day.
- The GE requirement must be reduced.

- There are not enough seats in courses students want to take.
- There is something to be said for letting the English Dept. teach English and the Math Dept. teaching math. Why is a Gen Ed course that is more major-specific such a problem?
- These courses always seem to fill too rapidly.
- uncertain
- We can increase the number of Gen Ed courses offered by simply allowing courses required by majors to count for Gen Ed.
- We should be able to use some of the lower division courses for our major requirements, e.g., human biology.
- Well, it is my impression that seat availability is always an issue during orientation, particularly for the later ones.
- Why are you asking me about my impressions of whether there are enough seats available? Isn't that a numerical value that can be looked up?
- You didn't include a choice that suggests that there are too many course types and too many people teaching in disciplines and subject areas that are more hobbies than professional areas of expertise. I believe I do a disservice to students if I teach outside my areas of expertise. Under the current program, I suppose I could teach courses in every direction and connection. I have read some science books, I passed some mathematics course, my mother believed I was very a very creative kid, I love historic novels and I take vitamins daily.

Research

- There are never enough seats in any directions course; students take whatever is available and have little opportunity to be thoughtful about it. This is especially true for first/second year students - which is a shame because they are the ones to whom the gen-ed program is geared.
- I do not advise therefore I have no clue about seats available. I do know that my course generally fills and I get requests from students wishing to add.

Adjunct

- There ought to be levels of Composition, at least two (excluding Advanced Comp). If not that, then a separate preliminary course for English language learners would be appropriate.
- There are always students who want to add the CTDI course I teach which indicates there are not enough sections or seats available.
- the BCA course that I teach on occasion should implement some instruction on word and how to make effective powerpoints, this course should not be eliminated, however, re-developed to meet all the needs of the students...
- I have no information about this area of study. My course offerings are upper level and do not leave me qualified to answer all of this.
- I don't know what "sufficient seats available" means. If you're asking if we should raise caps -- no. If you're asking if we have enough sections, then my answer is that we do not have enough Creative Thought classes, particularly given how many of them have (necessarily) low caps.
- I don't know campus wide if there are enough seats in these courses or enough courses. I do know however that the cap is very high and I find that frustrating at times. I am required by my department to have 40 in two of my sections and 34 in the third when I teach 3 sections of the Gen Ed. That is a lot of students to challenge, to come to know, to assess, and to turn them on to my subject matter. Don't get me wrong...I love the challenge...but more money would make it more equitable!
- I believe there needs to be more seats in all of the general education courses. It gets very

difficult for students to register for these courses. I would like to also add that a general education program should expose students to ideas, programs, majors, theories, belief systems etc., that students have not been previously exposed to.

- How do you mean "add more seats"? Capping directions courses at 40 rather than 20 has been a DISASTER for learning in the four departments in which I have taught Gen Ed courses. If more seats are to be added, including another section of a Directions course rescues our students from the warehousing that the current trend suggests is about to occur. Bigger classes have forced us back toward time and resource management models rather than the kinds of learning we can foster in the 20-person class size.
- English seems to have unnecessarily reduced the variety of offerings.
- Courses capped at zero misrepresent, to the student, availability of seats, in an artificial way.
- As an adjunct, I do not have the right to advise students. Because I am not an advisor, I do not have adequate anecdotal information about numbers of types of courses or seats available.

Question 29. Please provide any general feedback you have about the General Education program

(69 Full-time, 4 Research responses, 11 Adjunct)

- While the current program is easy to understand and use, it is a bit too cumbersome for professional degrees within the major, restricting the ability of departments to expand major requirements as needs arise. Within the Art Department studio program, the current gen. ed. works well for the BA degree, but could provide more latitude for the BFA degree.
- 1. Many of the courses, especially DI, are not particularly rigorous. Many of my students have referred to them as 'a joke.' Several students have relayed stories to me about dropping Directions courses after the first day, when they realized they would be a waste of time. There is a general perception among students that these courses should be "easy." I believe this perception is propagated by professors who make these courses easy. Stop wasting our students' time--challenge them and teach them something. 2. Writing, writing, writing--we need WAY more of it. I am continuously appalled at the writing skills of my upper-level students. One Composition course does not come close to addressing this CRITICAL skill. 3. Between the pressure to ensure there are "enough" elective credits in a program, a hard ceiling of 120 credits, and the number of credits required by Gen Ed, it is far too difficult to get enough Major credits in the curriculum to meet the guidelines for approval by some professional societies. One of these areas has to give. Students have a huge variety in choices of Gen Ed courses--aren't these "elective" enough? 4. Why are "computer skills" not on the list of Gen Ed skills? and i don't mean "Information Technology" as is often thrown into a Connections course--I mean the ability to use word processors, email, spreadsheets, simple programming languages, etc. We assume this is the 'technology generation", but they are not. if it isn't a link in a webpage, an app on their iPad, or an updating of their Facebook status, most students cannot do it. In this day and age, students need mastery skills in typing and using office suite software, or there is no job anywhere for which they will be qualified. 5. The "Connections" component of the program needs a serious overhaul. Let's be honest: all that any department does with these things is shoe-horn pre-existing courses into the designations. Majors that are most successful (lucky?) at doing this are able to leave many more elective credits in their curriculum, while those who are not good at this shoe-horning process are reprimanded for not having enough electives. The fact that some courses carry two or three Connections designations is testimony to what I am talking about and is completely bogus. 6. The "no double counting" rule for Directions courses is ridiculous. First, the concept that Directions courses need to be "broader" than intro level major's courses is really just a way of saying they need to be less rigorous. This is garbage. Any student who passes the entrance requirements for the University should be able and allowed to take an introductory-level course in any major and have a reasonable chance at passing it. Otherwise, we need to either change our entrance requirements or readjust the level of our introductory courses. Second, this rule unduly imposes a significant burden on students who transfer or change majors--yes, it is possible to file a Student Request form in some of these cases, but any system that has built into it the necessity to file such forms for cases that are so common is seriously flawed. The rule is arbitrary and dumb.
- All Gen. Ed. courses should be able to be used as part of a major requirement. The current Gen. Ed. program forces some programs to limit course requirements within the major because of the number of credits required in Gen. Ed., thus having a negative impact on the quality of the program. As we try to move to 120 credits for all programs, this becomes increasingly difficult. The new practice of hard scheduling 1st year students into Gen. Ed. seems to go against the philosophy of Gen. Ed. and student choice.

- Although courses may appear to meet equivalent general education standards, students maintain (through feedback in course evaluations; anecdotal feedback; etc.) there is great variability in scope/content/quality/impact on life.
- As an adviser I'm frequently embarrassed by my inability to explain the Gen Ed program to my advisees.
- Every year we have students wishing to transfer into our major based on the information and enjoyment they got from the major's intro gen ed course. They are often delayed in graduating because they then have to retake the course, as the major's course. The decision about whether a student can apply a gen ed course taught within a dept to fulfill a majors course requirement in that dept should be at the discretion of the instructors and faculty chair - only they will know if an equivalency of training exists.
- Far too many credits are required.
- For me the 2 courses I teach that are GEP are ones I already taught that are required for the major, therefore some of the items on this survey seemed to apply less than if the situation were different. Further, these 2 courses did not require no content changes to become TECO and DICO the edits were in the course descriptions only so again, this did not really have an impact on me or the course.
- I am concerned about FY seminars. I am questioning the extent to which courses are really serving as a "cornerstone course". Is critical thinking really being emphasized and learned by the students? What assessment data do we have to show the effectiveness and impact of this course?
- I am generally pleased with the general education program. I much prefer it to the previous program.
- I believe it is bizarre. Its purpose and logic are incomprehensible to students and many faculty. I have yet to find a student who can explain it to me. Most believe that it is primarily hoops we force them to jump through to prove they really want a degree. A program that requires that I teach outside my discipline in which I am well prepared is not really academic. Many current general education courses should be community education courses without academic credit. Conveying a few facts without the rigor imposed by the disciplines is a sorry excuse for a genuinely academic experience.
- I like this program; however I wish we didn't feel that the same size suits all equally well. I would like to see the directions component requirement reduced by at least a couple of courses, if not entirely in half. For example, students could be required to take 6 courses in the 4 directions, or to take 1 each in the Directions. As written, the GenEd Program works better for non-professional degree students, especially those in the B.A..
- I participated in the development of the current General Education program and believe in its merits. I think a particular improvement in this gen ed program is that it allows students more flexibility in changing majors because the same gen ed directions courses apply to all majors. That feature is particularly student friendly. I also think that transferring in general education credits is easier under this program.
- I provided some general feedback earlier. I really wonder about the clause that prevents students from double counting courses, meaning including them for their major. I think all courses should have an application focus and relevance for students' lives. The bottomline is that students should remember something about the course in 5 years. This point isn't related to disciplines, but more pedagogical practices. Students need to be engaged to be effective learners. Engagement to me means having students construct knowledge versus having instructors do all the constructing. I question the title, "global awareness". Is awareness enough? This question arose from thinking about service learning and wondering if we should have a requirement for such activity. However, I don't want to add more requirements. The

point is "action". I'm a big believer in "authentic assignments". Are students doing something that adds value to society?

- I support the general philosophy of the program and believe that the application has been for the most part successful, but I believe it has been applied too rigidly to the point of irrationality. For example, a student that has taken 30 (just as an example) credits of science courses should not have to take scientific inquiry direction courses. Even though introductory majors courses are meant for majors, they practice all the skills the general education program seeks in the early years. What is happening is that they are coming back and taking the intro courses that are too similar to the courses they already took, when they could have used those credits enriching their education with something different.
- I think all departments should be able to unilaterally identify courses that could be designated as "General Education". The current micro-management is undesirable. The primary purpose of General Education should be to provide a breadth of experience and not dictate how courses should be taught.
- I think the program title needs to be changed, and the program needs to be presented differently in terms of how it is promoted or marketed to students. We need to craft a more uniform talk-track for the program that we use consistently across the campus. I think the program is essential, and we need to do more to help students see and appreciate the relevancy of these courses.
- I think this program is not clear to students nor many faculty. Why can't it be simplified?
- I very much enjoy teaching the course I have.
- I voted against the program in 2003 because the no double counting rule for Directions courses is simply inane. It ties the hands of Departments, it ties the hands of students, leads to gross inequities between how we treat transfer students and our own students and is an impediment to graduation. I honestly believe that everything else about the program is fine. Bottom line: If a course demonstrates that it meets the themes, goals, and skills of the Gen Ed program why couldn't a student take it to satisfy their Gen Ed?
- I wish the general education committee would assess the OVERALL quality of the program rather than always focusing on individual courses. I think there are some structural problems (see my comment about TECO courses) that can only be discovered by having a bigger picture view.
- I'm a bit of a supporter of the program and love that it allows students to tailor their gen ed to their current interests.
- If anything, we need more interdisciplinary courses. But, they shouldn't be too watered down. How do we get the students to take Gen Ed more seriously?
- If the program changes, I hope it is only an incremental change. I think the current program is pretty good, and it only needs some minor tweaking to improve it: more options for first year courses, more seats for popular sections---basic improvements like these.
- In accord with Gresham's economic law, it is time to stop throwing good time and money after bad. I would not be at all surprised if in the future students here come together to form a spearheaded movement to express their "Occupy the General Education Program" opposition since they are "paying for it." It almost happened this past year.
- Infra
- It has never been assessed, it has never been taught as advertised, so I'm commenting on the nebulous program you asked the questions about or the one that stops students from graduating in 4 yrs and makes scheduling a PITA,
- It is horrible! PSU Gen Ed is the worst I ever seen in any university I have taught or seen. My child went to an Ivy League and all this child has is only 5 perspectives. At PSU, it's bulky/too

many courses and complicated; students do not care for them. One of the main causes why our students took 5 or 6 years to graduate, it's because they have to fulfill so many of these Gen Ed courses and not their discipline. I find that they withdraw from Gen Ed courses and wasted so much of their time to make it up later in order to graduate. Why they withdrew? It is because they just didn't feel it's relevant or interesting. They have very little interest and often with exasperation, they asked me -- why do they have to take 6 credits in self and society, 6 in past & present, etc. I do not know how to answer them? They have very few credits left for taking courses in their discipline, they expressed that they wish they have more discipline electives rather than less. They came to a university to specialize in a field they would like to major, why should they take so many general courses and at such expensive price? Many of these intro courses are cheaper in community colleges. PSU should be known for their individual programs like theater, meteorology, environmental science, etc. PSU should be known as just as Gen Ed University. It just doesn't appeal. I have seen many of my first year advisees leave because they felt they have a better education elsewhere, where they could specialize more to the subject/major they come to learn. It's very disappointing how much we have lost in the last 7 years. We are hired in our fields but in the end, we are asked - are you teaching Gen Ed? If not, you should know you are not a good professor, you have not contributed to the university. You are a disgrace!

- it works fine
- It's time to come up with a new program.
- It's time to make the program more flexible and to include less credits. In trying to improve my program or develop new courses, Gen Ed always is in the way.
- Less hours.
- Needs revision, it is ridiculously large. Yes, I know the total amount of credits may exist at other institutions, but none of those don't allow GE to count in a major. The number of minors has gone down, students have less choice, and transfers are worse off for our GE program - I heard it was supposed to be a "cutting edge" model for others, but I do not know a single place that has even looked to PSU for an example fo this type of program, much less adopted what we have done. Most institutions have gone the exact opposite direction to increase student choice.
- One of each Direction would be enough. Free the curriculum! WECO seems like it doesn't belong in the curriculum, so I would get rid of that too; I am guessing that Best Practices suggests that many schools are doing away with such requirements (or their archaic precursor, the PE requirement).
- Open up the curriculum and reduce or eliminate all gen ed requirements.
- Our hearts are in the right place but I think that we do students a disservice in setting up the program the way we do. We advertise Plymouth as a "good buy" but it is often extremely difficult for students to come away with a minor, not to mention a second major without spending extra money on tuition. Many schools are structured in such a way as to allow students to double-major, making those students more marketable (an especially important consideration in trying economic times). It is a hassle to get students registered for the "right" courses in the gen ed program because there are not enough of them, there are no obvious places to go to find complete lists of gen ed offerings and students are confused and dismayed by the fact that they can't take traditional foundational courses as part of gen ed. (e.g., calculus). Furthermore, the seat shortage causes real problems for students, especially first-years, because they can't take the gen ed courses they need and instead fill their schedule with electives that they're not that interested in or major courses that they ideally wouldn't take in their first year simply so that the next year when they have better standing they will have actual options for Directions courses. When they wait until later semesters to take these courses, they have better

choices because of registration standing but they fill up the courses and leave few or no choices for the last of the first-years and so the cycle continues... It's a real issue!

- Please allow broader faculty input into the definitions of the categories. Self & Society is too psych-oriented, especially when you get into the deeper language of how a course is designated. Wellness is too HHP-dominated; the Ossipee Model (sp?) is a faddish-sounding view of wellness.
- See my comments relative to the rigidity of the gen eds
- see previous comment.
- Some faculty do not take it seriously; they continue to teach courses as they prefer, regardless of general education content.
- Sometimes (often?) students are able to take their Directions courses within the department of their major, defeating the purpose of Gen Ed. Is there any way to ensure that students taking a PP actually take a history-type course? that students taking an SI actually take a scientific course? etc. It seems to me that we have watered down the 'liberal arts' part of our mission.
- Students simply do not clearly understand the goals of the Directions courses. Transfer is often a nightmare.
- The current Gen Ed program is an embarrassment. It is inferior to the program it replaced. It should have been assessed years ago. It should have been replaced years ago. By requiring the level of Gen Ed offerings to be lower than college level intro courses, we engender poor academic skills, especially in our undecided students. The first year for undecided students includes many Gen Ed courses. The student gets the idea that college level courses are the same as high school courses, and does not make the transition to the level they will need later. Many do not succeed, and I think this is one disservice we are doing them with the current program. And it is not just that the student can take courses on a level below that which we should be addressing. They are not allowed to take more challenging courses. Right now I have a marketing major in my second semester calculus based physics course. He is doing very well. And under the current program he will not be able to count this course as fulfilling his science requirement for Gen Ed. That is ridiculous. I have lost the diversity I used to have. My algebra based course had about 40% taking it for Gen Ed. Now there are none. No ed majors, history, etc. This Gen Ed program is no good. It must be replaced, not just "tweaked".
- The Directions component is too large and the waiver system of allowing some majors to omit certain Directions requirements lacks consistency and undermines the integrity of the program.
- The focus of the program, skill development, is consistent with the current status of strong General Education programs throughout the country. Derek Bok's recent book on General Education, and the work of the AAC&U, reinforce this observation.
- The program is difficult for students to understand, and they seem to rely on advisees too heavily to tell them what to take rather than considering for themselves what selections would be good for them and their academic interests/pursuits. The program does not empower them to think independently about their education.
- The program lacks opportunities for depth of study.
- The survey should have explained what is meant by sunset renewal. I have an idea but not completely clear.
- To make it easier to find courses, they should have course ID's that indicate if the course is a Direction or Connection, as well as what type of Direction or Connection. As an advisor, I can easily find out what the student has taken. Students don't seem to be able to find this info.
- Too many required credits total; too restrictive regarding discipline-introductory courses and courses with fewer than three credits

- We have an excellent program, the kind other schools are starting to also create. We were ahead of the curve, and need to stay there.
- we need to double the amount of gen ed choices. Give them more to choose from. there are plenty of courses that would fill several of the categories.
- Well, did I read at the beginning that we only adopted the program in 2005? As I remember, it passed with a rather weak majority. It seems to me that it has been running reasonably well. Perhaps we should wait a bit longer, say 10 years, to do a major inspection/revision.
- When the skills for each Direction were devised class sizes were smaller. Today, given the trend toward larger classes, it is not realistic for all skills to be addressed in a meaningful way. The fact that any discipline can offer courses covering any Direction means that professors are teaching outside their area of expertise. So for some 24 credit hours, students would be as well served by attending community college. The prohibition on double-counting is onerous and leads to an awkward and unnecessary situation in which departments often have to offer separate introductory courses for majors and for non-majors. Departments should be trusted to decide whether that is necessary.

Research

- complicated, not enough seats.
- As stated earlier, the application process is confusing and presumes the faculty member completing the forms has a general understanding of the process. It would be beneficial to provide samples of initial course applications as well as sunset course renewals. Details on explanations of the specific information required in the application. BTW: Under the Gen Ed guidelines the link to samples is broken.
- I think the idea behind it is a good one and I support it completely. I do have concerns about the evaluation process and I don't think the current system provides much useable feedback from the students.
- I think the most frustrating thing about teaching a GenEd Directions course is that the students I have had over the last three years all have the perception that the course should be 1. easy and 2. not a lot of work. This perception is coming from somewhere--and if it is true that many of these courses are easy and not taken seriously, it's a total waste of faculty time and student elective credits. Establishing a culture of hard work and scholarship early in PSU students' academic careers would go a long way to improving the student experience here at the university.

Adjunct (11)

- We part time faculty, though completely at the mercy of the budget process and the will of the University, take pride in the fact that PSU students meet us first in their Gen Ed program. For them, we are the face of the University -- we introduce them to what College Life Is, and we hear from them what they think about their classes, their class size, and what and how they learn best. Thank you for taking our role seriously enough to consider our perspective as you examine PSU's program.
- There are too many required courses in the general education curriculum, which detracts from the students major area of interest. I would like to see less Gen Ed specific courses and instead allow students to take intro courses in other programs, so they can get a real sense for other disciplines. In my opinion, the Gen Ed specific classes, are dummed-down versions of courses, and students are only there because they have to be - not because they are truly interested. I find it frustrating to have to convince a student that my class is worthwhile when they are clearly not

interested in being present. Allow students to choose classes they are interested in - rather than because it fits into a certain required Gen Ed category.

- Students really ought to be taking Composition in the first semester. Additionally, (and this is based solely on rumor), if First Year Seminar courses are teaching research writing, they should be doing more than one large paper - and it should be persuasive writing.
- Note my query about the IS courses.
- My sense is that the General Education program is cumbersome to implement and very confusing for students. It is particularly confusing for transfer students. I believe that the goals are sound but I do not believe that the current method of delivery is functioning well.
- More science ed courses would be nice but there is a problem with rooms available.
- I the old General Education Program was satisfactory, but I have no major complaints about the new one. It seems to have accomplished the goals adopted by the faculty
- I find the program admirably intentioned and labyrinthine. It looks to me that there is a lack of balance between courses actually offered each term by depts, but I haven't done a statistical analysis -- it just looks like English staffs far more gen ed courses than other departments. This is good for adjuncts' employment especially, but I wonder if the program as a whole is truly interdisciplinary.
- I feel that adjuncts have little knowledge beyond the classes they are teaching. Personally, I know little about the gen ed program, how it is assessed, the philosophy behind it or what its needs are. Adjuncts go to no meetings discussing curriculum, student needs, etc. I see this as a giant liability for the university: an army of part-time mercenary teachers who have no connection to the institution other than the specific classes they teach. It seems pointless to me that the effectiveness of any student-oriented program would be considered given such a profit driven, bottom line system is in place.
- I don't know enough about the GE program which indicates that adjunct faculty may not well informed, or it may just be me. Perhaps there should be more information made available to all faculty or if it is available, this should be communicated.
- Composition and even Advanced Composition for some students let them depart from PSU still without good writing skills.

Question 30. Please provide specific ideas that could be implemented to improve the program

(65 Full-Time, 2 Research responses, 12 Adjuncts)

- Possibly reduce the requirements for professional degrees (have each department define those degrees). Eliminate @2 courses in the requirements for those degrees (I would look at options to reduce Directions course requirements first). While this does not appear to be a drastic change, it would free up a couple of spots for either: needed courses within the professional degree or electives within the degree that have been eliminated due to curricular needs.
- 1. Lower number of required credits and/or allow required courses to be a part of the Gen. Ed. "count" 2. Eliminate hard scheduling for 1st year students 3. Provide more seats/options for the 1st year experience courses (Eng. Comp.; Math Foundations; First Year Seminar)
- 1. Raise the academic standard of Gen Ed courses. The rule of thumb is that students should spend 2-3 hours studying outside of class for every hour they have in class. Actually insist that Professors design their courses to force students to do this. Let students know from the moment they walk in the door on their first day as Freshman that they will have to do actual work and will not pass the course if they do not. Do not allow attendance to ever be a part of a grade. Seriously, this is a University. Students can pass a significant portion of a course by just showing up in many classes? We should be embarrassed. 2. Implement at least one more Composition course that is taught by people who know how to teach writing (e.g., English or Communications professors). WRCO courses are great, and we should keep them, but many WRCO teachers are not trained in how to teach writing. Every single professor with whom I have discussed this agrees that our students have terrible writing skills. These are absolutely critical skills, and we are failing in our jobs to equip our students with them. 3. Implement required basic computer skills courses. this component should have a placement exam (as Math does), including a typing exam, so that students with good skills can place into higher-level courses or place out altogether. 4. Revamp the Connections portion to reduce the number of Connections types, not allow a course to count for more than one, and generally make the system more equitable between programs. For example, explicitly state how many Connections must be taken outside of the major (such as 1 or 2, which shall be chosen by the department) while all others must be in the major or a part of already-required courses. No program should ever be in a situation where they have to choose between jamming a course into a Connections mold, dropping a critical major-related course, or facing chastisement from the Curriculum Committee for not having enough elective credits. 5. Very simple: allow intro level courses in majors to count as Directions. Give up the ghost on this one. Dumb rule helps no one but hurts many of students.
- Allow GE courses to count in a major. Reduce direction requirements to 3 credits in each area, not 6. Add a sustainability requirement to gen ed
- Allow students that change majors count courses that make sense (mostly thinking of science students with a science waiver then having to take even more science courses)
- As much as I like the idea of a first year seminar, I feel there are areas of student weakness and lack of familiarity that are not addressed that are just as important as those covered in these seminars. Students are lacking study skills, awareness of their learning styles, ability to write on a college level, library skills, use of referencing/ formatting styles, and for many non-traditional and disabled students- a lack of tech skills and support for such. Further, I feel that the PASS Office and the Writing Center are not equipped to address these and other emerging student needs.
- As stated above, I wouldn't make any major adjustments to the Gen Ed program. It hasn't been that long ago that we made the big change to the current system ('06), and students are still

getting used to it. And frankly, I don't think the Gen Ed program as it stands is to blame for difficulties by students in using it. I think it is rather a case of difficulty in navigating the Gen Ed program ONLINE. There is no printed schedule any more and I think that is a mistake. Figuring out a course schedule online is not easy for a student (or a faculty member) to do. PRINT THE COURSE SCHEDULE AGAIN! Students need to see in print the selection of courses available, and how they fit into the list of Directions & Connections we offer. I think this is what is confusing to students. The only clear description of the application of Directions courses and Connections courses is on page 63 of the Academic Catalog. Do you think students find this and read it? Do you think advisers are reading this to their advisees? And if you were a new student, would you understand by going through the website---which is what kids do---the Gen Ed structure and application of Connections and Directions courses to the major? The only thing helpful online is the list of courses needed for a particular major. But if a student hasn't chosen a major yet, they don't use the online list from the Academic Catalog, or from a Curriculum Planning Guide sheet. And many students don't declare a major right away. (My 2¢.)

- ask the students. also allow feedback by discipline. In fact we should allow departments to have more choices in gen eds and give more alternatives for our students.
- cut directions in half or add double counting. allow depts to run seminar for their own majors if they want to. If we're going to have seminar it should only be taught by FTTT faculty. while i agree w/ the idea of gen ed. I do not like how it is put into practice at psu. it is too big, too unweildly, and taught by too many adjuncts. If the FTTT faculty think it is so IMPT they should teach the damn courses or vote the program out of existence. this program was put into place w/ ~40% of the faculty agreeing to it, ~40% against it and 20% who didn't give a shit and it shows. get rid of the "cutsie" names
- Cut number of required credits total; relax restrictions regarding discipline-introductory courses and courses with fewer than three credits
- Cut the number of Directions courses in half.
- Directions requirement should be pared from two of each to one of each. And of the 15 credit hours of electives, it should be specified that at least three be at the upper level. As it is, with so many Directions classes, the GenEd becomes a burden on students, faculty and the administration. And with so many students filling lower level classes, enrollments are dropping in upper level classes and majors are suffering by having to close low-enrolled upper classes while opening up more lower level Directions classes.
- Double counting, new faculty hires to have Gen Ed in their contract, class observations during sunset process, and something added to the water to increase faculty excitement and philosophical commitment to the program.
- Dumb down the structure of the Gen Ed program so mere mortals can understand it.
- every full time faculty member should be required to teach at least one GE class per year - - it should really be more like twice a year if not more - this is the key - every department should be required to refresh their offerings every two years one or two new gen eds every other year from a dept we should allow some of the gen eds to count towards the major -maybe two classes we need a full year foreign language requirement built into the ge program -for all students. It should be hard scheduled in for the first year -
- Fix the "no double counting" rule.
- Gen Ed is a police enforcement agency breathing down our necks. They dictate how whether we are a "good" or "bad" teacher. Why and how did it comes to this? Gen Ed courses should be cut it down to 3 or 5 perspectives: One course in Arts, Science, Humanities....etc. Make it simple for the students; allow them to have more courses in their majors. It is what they came

here for - to become a scientist, a nurse, a social worker, a journalist. Allow them to take more courses in their major. PSU should be known for the faculty who are good in their field of study, not because all the faculty teach Gen Ed.

- General education courses should be able to serve as prerequisites for each other to allow for depth.
- Get rid of it. Keep the three foundations courses, identify the truly academic disciplines and then expose students to some courses of their choice in discipline areas, Nearly thirty years ago we had such a gen ed program, the same one that most quality institutions still employ. It should be simple, discipline based and flexible.
- I believe that there are some courses, currently introduction to the discipline, which could be revised to meet the criteria of the general education program. With concrete changes to meet general education guidelines, I think this possibility should be considered.
- I know "double-counting" is a huge point of contention, but it really needs to be addressed. Courses like Physics cannot count as SIDI because of pre-requisites, but there are programs that require them and there isn't really any good reason they can't count. I know there is a waiver process for majors, but it seems like things could be made much smoother
- I think that some of the general education direction courses should count towards a major when appropriate. Some of the lower level major requirements should count as general ed credits. Students often feel that they are wasting time and money on general ed classes (even after they hear the explanation about the benefits of the program and the breadth of knowledge that it provides). I think more overlap with the major requirements and general ed requirements would encourage students to explore disciplines rather than just "get their general ed credits out of the way."
- I think there should be a technology foundations course requirement (just as there is for writing and math). Our students are not tech-literate in general. They know how to do some basic things but don't understand anything about how those things work so that if there is a problem in their normal way of interacting with the tech, they don't have skills to figure out what the problem is.
- I would like to see double counting (Directions courses) brought back like in the old Gen Ed program. That would reduce the total number of Gen Ed courses that students would have to take to make the program more flexible.
- If the present program is to be retained, wouldn't it be at least advisable to have the FYS require a logic critical thinking component taught by qualified professors of critical thinking who have had courses in deductive, inductive and "seductive" argumentation? The way it is now our program is somewhat like having a mathematics program without much calculus. (Logic and calculus, by the way, come the closest to being the bedrock for forming any kind of agreement as to what a general education program should essentially include. Linguistically, why else are so many of the disciplines named "logy" and the premiere graduate degree named after "Philosophy"?)
- It is important that Gen Ed courses are indeed general, not just limited in scope and outlook to the academic field or department in which they are housed. It requires a wider view than some instructors seem to have or desire. Also team-teaching of such courses is highly recommended. One in which I am involved receives very high marks as faculty and students benefit from others' expertise.
- Let's rename it and re-brand it. This program delivers good value...that promise needs to be communicated in many ways, and more effectively. I also think the delivery of content needs to be monitored more closely to ensure better consistency in terms of content and rigour.
- Make it easier to get waivers, transfer in credits, and switch majors within the Gen Ed requirements.

- Make the gen ed courses about providing education in a particular subject, not about teaching math, writing, reading and other basic skills that are better provided in those disciplines. The program aims to accomplish too much in each course; it is not a reasonable nor efficient approach to training.
- More English composition and grammar is needed for the students.
- More focus on encouraging faculty to teach in the program. Funds for general education course development.
- One directions course should be required, not two.
- Provide an additional reward to faculty who teach successful general education programs, or at least require that it be considered "meritorious" performance.
- Reduce the number of required directions courses for all students.
- Reduce the number of required lower division Gen Ed courses and allow for more overall electives.
- Reduce the requirements in the majors so that students can do more experimenting in other subject areas.
- Reduce the total number of Directions needed to 6, with at least one per category. Allow all to double-count in a major. Add a Sustainability Connection and require EITHER that or Wellness (not sure about this one, but I would explore it). Get rid of TECO--too redundant with QRCO and SIDI, too often met with really silly courses, students get the tech they need in their majors if they need it. Make sure there's adequate training for WRCO. Not satisfied with FYS--too many superficial topics, too many disconnected adjuncts, students don't take it seriously. Not sure what to do about that, but I'd rather see double Comp, or Comp and Logic (rhetorical, not formal) or other Phil (and I don't teach Phil), than weak FYS offerings. Maybe put some broadly applicable tech in a second semester of Comp or a Logic course.
- Restore certain Gen Eds to the disciplines. Math covers Math foundations and no one thinks that others should teach Math foundations courses. English covers composition. Shouldn't the sciences teach science, history teach history, psychology and philosophy teach self and society type courses, the arts teach creative thought?
- See 29.
- See above. Then decide to throw this program out. We would be well served to go back to the program this one replaced. The old one was simpler, better. I never felt embarrassed to describe it to others. The only way to improve this program is to go back entirely to the older one, the simpler, clearer, better one.
- See previous response. If this amount of freedom can't be provided, at least let any introductory type courses in the various disciplines be designated as one way to satisfy a general education offering, especially with directions courses. Under the old program, some of my most memorable and superb students taking calculus-based physics were an Art Education major and an English major. I think that they gained a lot more than they would have taking any of the current science directions courses.
- Tailoring to suit student interests is also a problem with the program. For example, my department is so successful in offering multiple Directions courses that students can fulfill almost all of their Part & Present, Self & Society, and Creative Thought courses in the same discipline as their major, resulting in a lack of breadth and experience.
- The Directions courses should be reduced in number. Why is it necessary to have two courses of, say, Past and Present? Students should have more choice of electives. The General Education program restricts the students' ability to explore possible interests.
- The faculty need to take responsibility for direct assessment of learning outcomes/skills in

General Education courses.

- The General Education Program could be converted, in the main, into a First Year Core Curriculum that would serve all the objectives of the current program. Indeed, such a general education program could make us into a great university. Here is the idea: All first-year students must take a math course (minimal level, Finite Math or Stats I, a physical science course, an English composition course, a history course, a humanities course (anthropology, psychology, etc.), a literature course, an economics course, and two semesters of a (spoken and written) foreign language. The foreign language (which is not my field) will pay huge dividends, as it will force the students to learn grammar. Finally, all first-year students should be graded in those courses with multiple sections on the same set of exams (given synchronously, during a mid-term exam week if necessary), rubrics and standards, and they should have the right to fail these courses, and to flunk out of the University. Those passing this rigorous first-year experience will then become, proudly, the "Class of 20XX," and their shared experience of that wonderful, inspiring, and extremely challenging first year will make them ever-loyal to each other, and to their Alma Mater. Only four or five more advanced General Education courses need be required after the first year, leaving ample space for the majors, and for free electives.
- There is no need for 6 credits in Directions courses. 3 would suffice.
- There should be a foreign language skills component included in the program for all students (B.A. as is, and B.S.)
- This is interesting information for the committee to gather, but it seems that we should be 1) examining the student evaluations of the Gen Ed courses, and 2) developing an assessment plan to examine student outcomes. To do this, means identifying instruments and strategies to assess what students are learning.
- We need to teach regular discipline based offerings instead of these courses where people seem to think they can teach anything. Let us teach what we were trained to teach--that's what our students come for--not these hobby horse classes. This program takes away from the discipline's ability to offer discipline based and major courses!
- When we envisioned this general education program, we envisioned it having more resources devoted to it, including resources to support administration and evaluation. I think that the program has had to make do with inadequate resources. I definitely would not want Intro to Majors courses to count as gen ed courses. The two types of courses are distinct in nature. Counting Intro to Majors courses for gen ed is just a way for the majors to suck up more credits.
- While I do not necessarily think that every major course should satisfy gen ed requirements I do think that some of the basic, traditional courses should be available as gen eds. For example, basic sciences (chem, bio, physics), intro psychology, calculus and/or statistics and foreign languages might be included. These courses should still not "count" as gen eds if they are satisfying a student's only major but they could count in cases of double-majors or when a student is taking them outside of their majors. I guess I'm imagining something that's a hybrid of what we have and the "distribution requirements" model. In offering courses that are supposed to be "broader" than what is typically offered in introductory major courses, we have also narrowed what is offered. Students don't get the traditional "core" if that is what they want. some of the directions courses are based on very obscure content and students take them only to meet a requirement, not because they are the least bit interested in the material.

Research

- More courses offered; or, upperclassmen not allowed to ensure ample seats/choice for underclassmen. Perhaps give underclassmen first shot at registration.

- See 29 above

Adjunct (12)

- The biggest barrier to learning right now is the expanding class sizes. If we take into account that the majority of our students are in their first year or two, and then we bury them in large classes, there are two immediate results. First, they feel at sea, and more easily sink. Second, classrooms that fit less than 30 people for the fire code are not being used, and that is a waste of resources for our University. (I mean this quite literally -- I walk the halls and these rooms stand empty!) If the logic is that dollars for paying adjunct faculty are scarce, the damage to PSU's reputation due to students who leave because their experience does not match the faculty ratio in the brochures is much, much worse than the \$3000 or so it would cost to solve both problems at once.
- Sorry to have lost the Contemporary American Male course and the Living With the Humanities course.
- Since adjuncts teach so many of the general education courses, there should be more professional development opportunities for adjuncts to learn about the entire scope of the program, not just the one or two courses they teach. Adjuncts do a great deal of unofficial, impromptu advising that would be much more effective if they had more familiarity with the gen ed program requirements as a whole.
- Reduce the amount of Gen Ed required courses. Eliminate the Gen Ed "categories". Allow students to take intro classes in other disciplines to meet Gen Ed requirements. Students can then take classes that interest them, while also improving numbers in low class enrollments. I think students are more likely to become interested in a major by taking a REAL class, rather than a GENERAL class.
- Pay the adjuncts who teach all gen eds a decent and equitable wage!
- My only suggestion goes to the faculty that teach Composition. There needs to be guidelines for instruction in ALL these courses. As an instructor who teaches SIDI courses, it is extremely frustrating when students come into my classes and have no clue how to construct a work cited page or how to properly cite (in MLA, APA or other). Students have told me they have never been asked to write scientific (research) papers. After speaking with a few faculty members who I know teach composition (all of them do in fact teach students how to cite), they said this is a choice of the individual instructors. This should not be a choice. It doesn't really matter the discipline, citations are an important across all majors.
- Move away from a corporate model for higher education and both value and demarginalize full-time faculty once again.
- More collaborations between departments. The university's policies need to be changed to encourage rather than discourage team-taught courses, because true interdisciplinarity will not occur until we are more able to collaborate as teachers.
- Increase the size of the physics faculty. Having one professor limits the range and scope of what we offer as a university.
- Incorporate General Education goals within the core curriculum of every program on campus. Open core program courses to students across the campus provided that the students meet the departmental prerequisites. Encourage students to select General Education Elective courses from a variety of disciplines to enrich their academic experience.
- I would suggest a year long combined course in First Yer Seminar and First Year Composition. Combining the two would allow for deeper understanding of both critical thinking and the writing process. I believe separating the two is counter-productive to the goals and intents of these two gen Ed programs.

- Composition should last two terms, maybe one first-year term and one sophomore term.