

Comments Sheet for the Faculty General Education Advisory Council Feedback Form

Please note, comments are taken directly from the surveys and are not altered in any fashion. Comments are bulleted for clarity.

Question B5

Comments regarding Learner Outcomes:

- Obviously performance indicators need to be somewhere. But the schools we have as models don't have specific performance numbers in their lists of outcomes or goals; that's under assessment or done within courses, etc.
- I think the learner outcomes developed by the AACU (Association of American Colleges and Universities) are much more appropriate for MSU. These outcomes are measurable and guide teaching as well as evaluation of learning.
- I would suggest looking at the Essential Learning Outcomes supported by the Association of American Colleges and Universities. Since MSU seems to be scraping the bottom of the barrel in general education, one would think we would be looking outside to assist in fixing the problem. Internal problems being fixed by an internal process equals continued problems. Let's try and think out of our box!
- Some desirable outcomes are of course not measurable. I would like to see the FGEAC distinguish between desirable outcomes that the curriculum should support (e.g., a requirement that freshmen attend the performance of a theatre department dramatic production, a concert sponsored by the music department, a lecture by an outside authority in the area of philosophy, political science, etc.) and targeted measurable outcomes that will be used for assessment purposes. It would also be wise, I think, to separate out essential and clearly measurable outcomes from less important or "fuzzy" outcomes. I would hope that every MSU graduate would have an appreciation for the arts and literature, but it would not be as distressing to know that someone lacking this appreciation received a degree as it would be to know that someone minimally literate graduated from MSU.
- We need to use EMU and spell out specific performance indicators.
- I prefer the approach of Portland State because it breaks through the "silo" mentality of Gen Ed.
- It is impossible to assess the quality of other model programs without also seeing how they assess the program. The quality of the program is not in the statements of learner outcomes, but in the quality of the assessment procedures that reliably and validly inform the institution whether students are achieving the outcomes. Outcomes that can't be reliably or validly measured are not useful. The problem with MSU's program is not so much in the student outcomes, but in the institution's commitment to providing the resources to appropriately measure them and address identified program needs.
- I have taught at MSU for a number of years and some of our students resistants to learning what you are suggesting with the outcomes has to do with their values and beliefs. Values and beliefs are much more difficult to change and they can actualy block learning when it is in conflict with a deeply held belief.
- I think we need to put more power in the Major and less to General Education. Therefore Communication skills as written is too broad. It is important that they can write well. IF their chosen major requires speaking well, then let that department focus on public speaking. Currently our "speech courses do not teach public speaking". Intellectual skills and Quantitative Skills are very important. Knowledge of the Physical and Natural World should take priority over Knowledge of the Human Cultures. It should also include knowledge of human behavior. Appreciation of Aesthetics should be reserved as an elective. Personal and Civic Responsibility is not a goal of an institution of higher education, that is what K-12 should have already accomplished. It should be eliminated. So 1. Comm. Skills, 2. Intellectual Skills 3. Quantitative Skills 4. Knowledge of

Physical, Natural and Human Behavior . The students could choose from GEN ED Electives: Such as Knowledge of Human Cultures and Appreciation of Aesthetics. I would like to add that CIS should be eliminated from Gen. Edu. College Freshmen come already equipped with general computer skills. Let the individual majors teach the specific Computer programs that may be unique to that discipline.

- They seem reasonable. How will they be translated into courses and assessed? Since so much of what takes place in general education doesn't have much more than an impressionistic effect, and, then, not until much later, a disproportionate amount of energy seems to be spent on comparing various models. Nobody knows if any of these models work at the other institutions, at least not from what the materials seem to reveal.
- The learner outcomes must be broad themes, but performance indicators must be identified below.
- There are parts of Human Cultures, Aesthetics, and Responsibilities for which assessability is unclear to me.
- Why, in goal 1, do we concern ourselves with creative text but not technical text? I question whether the goals as listed are testable. This, in my opinion, is the real need for a change in our current system of gen ed. The current system could be overhauled rather than throwing it out completely. The goals of the current system and the drafts are extremely similar, and having courses show how they can meet an added evaluation system and setting it up so students have to have a variety of the current outcomes would fix the problems that I have heard discussed. This would be much less work for everyone than reinventing gen ed from scratch.
- 1) Many of them, as written, are not measurable (especially 3, 4, 5, 6) 2) Outcome #1, Communication skills, as proposed, seems to cram many different skills into one goal, which has the effect of watering down the importance of the differing skills. Given the importance of basic communication skills in the workplace, and the poor grasp many students from our service region have on them, it seems the approach should be to have more intensive studies in these areas than MSU currently does, especially in writing and presentation/speaking. Joining these into one class should be avoided at all costs. These are real world application skills that must be mastered by our students at a fast pace since most of our students do not enter with the foundation they should already have. 3) The term "Aesthetics" is perhaps too general. Additionally, "appreciation" does not completely cover what instructors in these areas are trying to teach. Perhaps more important is the demonstrated understanding of the connection of aesthetic movements with social movements, and/or the historical connections and significance. This synthesizes and reinforces the understanding of basic aesthetic principles, the analytical skills, and the knowledge of human cultures, among other things, that students will be learning in other subjects and classes, as liberal arts education is supposed to do.
- Missing technology literacy
- I think the outcomes must be broadly stated so as to allow for discipline based specifics. I think disciplines or discipline-based combinations must have some freedom to decide HOW we get students to the outcomes.
- Overall proposed program seems to be just a different way of saying the same old thing. The outcomes as defined do not seem to reflect the spirit of reform as articulated in sources such as the Spellings report, Academic Leadership text, and other sources calling for transforming higher education.
- How do these respond to the 21st Century society and workplace? What would indicate to a reader that these were developed in 2008, not 1908?
- I think the committee made good efforts to describe in detail each of the learner outcomes, however the effect is to obfuscate the meaning of each one rather than clarify. For instance by including the phrase "in standard English" in the speaking section of the Communication Skills area, this implies that listening, reading and writing might be in any language. This weakness is inherent in each of these outcomes. By trying to specify what each outcome includes, the descriptions invariably omit crucial details for each one. I imagine that this specificity was born out of an attempt to make these outcomes "measurable" but it falls short of that goal. Phrases such as "ability to think" or "ability to understand and appreciate" are not measurable. I would suggest using broader terminology to describe the outcomes would actually serve us better. A

good model for this is “The Essential Learning Outcomes” as described on page 22 of the report “College Learning for the New Global Century” prepared by LEAP for the AACU. In addition, this report includes a few items in the learning outcomes which would serve us well but are not represented in the MSU draft, i.e. (1) Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies or (2) Foundations and skills for lifelong learning. When the guest speaker from AACU (his name escapes me at the moment) was on campus and was asked the question “how do we go about constructing our own learner outcomes?” his answer rang very true to me. In a nutshell he said we don’t need to start from scratch trying to invent our own. We can use the published AACU learner outcomes as several other universities have done, or I suggest that we start with a well-developed program such as Eastern Michigan or Portland and adapt it to our needs. The AACU learner outcomes represent the conglomerate thinking of university faculty across the US and are a good standard to use. I concur that we need not re-invent the wheel, let’s use the AACU learner outcomes and go forward in the process of creating the curriculum to reflect these outcomes.

- outcomes based assessment is a fad that is at the end of its cycle and we are a bit late. none of these options is an improvement over what we do now, which is not all that great.
- I know and respect several of the people on the Gen Ed Task Force. However, the whole effort to create (very) simple learner outcomes and connect them to a systematic assessment mechanism is misplaced. If you want to see an example of what systematic assessment does to classes, take a look at the business programs (Marketing, Management, etc.) The courses are very generic and bland but are readily assessed. If the university carries through with its assessment project in relation to gen ed, it will significantly reduce the quality of General Education at Morehead State University. The best professors won't want to teach gen ed and the gen ed courses themselves will become much more generic. The Gen Ed commission needs to recognize how deep the lack of interest in assessment runs among the faculty at this University. I'm a full professor in CCH and I've never heard one faculty member make a positive comment about assessment in the ten years of assessment efforts. I teach 3 gen ed classes a semester right now. When the new gen ed program is instituted, I'll try to get out of it altogether and force it on junior faculty instead. That's apparently what happens at James Madison.
- "Appreciation" is difficult to measure and it is part of two of the learning outcomes.
- The MSU document contains overlapping elements in its descriptions of the outcomes. For example, analysis and ethical issues are mentioned twice in the MSU Learner Outcomes document. The Portland State model does a much better job keeping them separated. It is important to keep them separated, I think, to design adequate assessment.
- With regard to essential learning outcomes, our departmental representative has shared with us the Executive Summary of College Learning for the New Global Century. In that document are Essential Learning Outcomes that are appropriate, bold in direction, and developed through a multiyear dialogue with hundreds of colleges and universities. AACU has published these findings -- linked to employers' views -- to chart a vision and direction. My suggestion would be to adopt the entire set of essential learning outcomes based upon a far-reaching collection of faculty input at universities and colleges all across the country. If MSU needs to refine the measurement of the essential learning outcomes to fit our environment, then this would be a good focus for future work of the committee. In comparing the DRAFT MSU Learner Outcomes with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes, the latter distills essential learning outcomes to four overarching themes that can be developed through a series of “learning acquisitions”. I would strongly recommend adoption of the Essential Learning Outcomes that emerged from a strong national effort.
- PSU's are too floppy and don't provide our students with clear improvements in subject areas they need to be exposed to. That is, I believe our students need to have a wider, more diverse education and experiences than what they come in with. I see this best achieved through a prescriptive learner outcomes model that shows them that they need exposure to many different areas of learning to develop into mature thinkers and have a well-rounded education.
- I think the Association of American Colleges and Universities provides a more usable and measurable set of outcomes than any proposed.

- I believe that the conceptualization and use of "learner outcomes" is flawed because such outcomes often do not manifest themselves until months or even years after students have taken a course. It seems to me that the process of learning is much too complex and diffuse to be measured by the usual institutional methods.
- They must be measurable. How do you measure "understanding" and "appreciation"?
- The examples of learner outcomes, and their articulation in these models, seem to lack attention fundamental skills. This is my concern for interpreting the models, or replying to the survey questions. MSU students need a stronger foundation of course work in what we traditionally call the core subjects. Presently we rely upon the core courses to prepare students in fundamental skills. It's too easy to see the difference when we have a student who has not completed these courses prior to "our" course. Given successful completion of that foundation, MSU students could take the type of course that seems to be typical in the proposed models. As an example, there appears to be an absence of computing or technology skills in the general education requirements. MSU students do not possess greater pc competency than their predecessors. They appear more techno-savvy because they like to use the Internet for communicating (facebook) and play with their phones and ipods. Without attention to a technology/pc/problem solving requirement in the general education foundation (core), the students would be unprepared to utilize technology in any college courses. Managing information and information resources is a requirement for college, career, and post-college success in this century.
- Because MSU has many nontraditional students who do not finish an undergraduate degree in 4 or 5 years, it seems important to tie specific outcomes to specific required courses. Then, when courses are revised it will be simple to see from a student's transcript which outcomes have potentially been mastered and which need attention. I also think specifically linking outcomes to courses will assist with articulation agreements with KCTCS.
- learner outcome on communication does not address scientific or technical material
- There are parts of these models that would be supported and parts that would not be supported. I'm not sure how to make the questions more appropriate. It seems to be an either or and the questions seem to be set up for a response that is desired before hand. This looks like a set up.

Question C4

Comments regarding Assessment of General Education:

- In general, the San Jose State model of assessing individual classes seems best. It might be nice to have a shorter form, but that general style of assessment already seems similar to the WEAVE style of outcomes followed by discussion of how that outcome was met.
- Assessment needs to be ongoing and varied in nature. Assessment findings MUST be utilized to improve student outcomes.
- I think a combination of strategies will be essential, offer the most flexibility, and provide the most diverse (and, hence, useful) assessment data. Resources to implement these strategies will be a must and the data MUST be utilized to improve teaching and learning--both at the program and at the course levels.
- To be of maximum effectiveness, the assessment must be embedded in the capstone course -- especially the "skill" based outcomes such as writing, oral communication, quantitative reasoning, etc. -- skills that require a level of maturation beyond a single general education course. There also needs to be consistency across the campus in the assessment instruments and processes used for each outcome.
- What is wrong with GRADES! They have been assessing knowledge for a centuries. Assessment of General Education dangerously destroys academic freedom! First and foremost we need to stop tying evaluations of teaching with pay raises. This would stop the epidemic grade inflation that exists on this campus. Then we could actually teach and give appropriate grades without fear of student retaliation. Currently, faculty do not grade students based on student ability but rather they are buying good evaluations through Easy A's. We are cranking out a bunch of lazy

irresponsible incompetent workers that are not going to show up to work on time or even at all because they have never had to in college.

- Bottom line: how can the impact of general education be assessed? Why does it need to be? A student chooses a college or university over a technical school with the understanding that course outside his or her major will be required. Exposure to different courses broaden a student's perspective in ways that don't need to be assigned a number. General education courses, then, become a "rite of passage" more than a measurable contributor to helping a student get a job (which is basically why they're at Morehead to begin with). We can't measure and shouldn't try to measure what contributes to the richness of a student's life even if he or she doesn't consciously acknowledge it. To be even more abstract, we can't measure what may ultimately contribute to a student's soul or spirit, in the truest "spirit" of the liberal arts. If a student doesn't want what we have to offer (a broadened education), then why are we compelled to have to justify it?
- There needs to be a combination of course-embedded and more general; a specific course cannot do all things, but unless there is course specific assessment, the accountability is lost. This is a problem with our current system--people put in proposals saying they are doing certain things, but there is no followup to see if they continue to do them. (This is partly a problem with instructor turnover, not just someone deciding they don't want to do it anymore).
- It will be a tricky yet necessary problem to solve to ensure departments maintain control of assessment when it is housed in a separate unit.
- Assessment results should be USED for something such as improving teaching and learning - not just DONE because we have to do it.
- Assessment should provide ways for students to demonstrate the ability to apply their learning in multiple ways that relate to their individual strengths, interests, and goals.
- Course assessment should be replaced by outcome area assessment, e.g. Communication Skills in the draft list
- In our current assessment-driven educational climate (on all levels of education), it is important for higher ed faculty to rise above the temptation to over-assess, when students will be looking for a broader and richer culture of classroom learning experiences in college than what they received in high school.
- Assessment is not exclusively a product of national instruments. tradition and effective methodologies should be considered, but have not been.
- The devil will be in the details.
- Leaving it to individual courses means there will be huge variability across professors. The European type exam sounds extremely time-intensive for grading, etc. E-Portfolios aren't well-understood or used all that much at the schools that have them (one of the sites had a research project online about them). Giving a national assessment to entering freshmen and exiting seniors and having an identifier on the forms for matching a particular student's tests together would tell us a lot about what had been learned while they were at MSU.
- There is no information readily accessible about course embedded assessment on the website linked to San Jose State, so it's hard to see what the committee had in mind there.
- Way too much emphasis is being placed on this aspect of our overhaul. How do we know if they're learning what they're supposed to be learning? We professors check on this all the time, with quizzes, tests, writing assignments, lab research, etc etc. Let us do it, and don't bloat the system with more administrators by making the assessment the main focus!! The thing that I think would improve the assessment aspect is by having agreed-upon syllabi and assignments across multiple sections of the same gen ed course on our campus. We all know that some professors are "easy" and don't do much assessment. At least attempt to standardize quality across campus, and within each gen ed course!
- Some component of standardized exams needs to be utilized to compare MSU graduates with their peers. Embedded assessment is also very necessary as formative measures.
- Glad to see the demphasis on TECHNOLOGY SKILLS--using Microsoft Office should not be included in general education offerings.

- Assessment of general education at MSU should include an integrative model which, in my mind, means a model that can be applied to a course independently and in concert with other courses in a curriculum (gen ed) or a discipline. This model would have common elements which could be identified and articulated in both general and specific terms. E-PORTFOLIOS: The use of e-portfolios requires a structure that includes assessment, procedures and support. To merely adopt the use of e-portfolios without agreeing to a procedural framework seems risky.
- Because of the high number of transfer students (especially from KCTCS) I think that assessment should be tied to specific courses. I'm concerned that any assessment created by an outside agency will encourage MSU to conform to another agency's standards/goals instead of focusing on specific needs of the MSU population. Because we are a regional university we have regional and specific needs that are clear to faculty at MSU but may not be captured on a national assessment. The comprehensive exam is a fabulous model that my undergraduate school used, but I cannot imagine trying to assess the number of students at MSU with this model. Again, the number of transfer students must be considered when contemplating use of a subjective, comprehensive exam. I believe this would be a useful model for specific programs, but am not sure it would be useful for the general education curriculum. Please keep in mind that I have only glanced at this assessment information and have not studied the models (pros/cons) in depth and am making many assumptions.
- "Outcomes of assessment should be utilized to improve the general education program" What kind of question is this? This is like asking if you support gravity or not! We are not in Europe and do not have their social and economic structures.

Question D2

Comments regarding First Year/Freshman Programs:

- The orientation material in MSU 101 is fine, but the class should have some academic content and not just be a class where showing up gets you an A. A common reader for the campus could be unifying, but a choice between various topics classes would be fine too.
- A comprehensive first year program can be a great way to bring students into the academy but some programs end up incorporating classes that are not taught by specialists (such as writing-intensive classes taught by people not trained to teach writing) and so the danger is that if not properly designed programs can end being incredibly ineffective
- Fairleigh Dickinson provides a useful model for combining orientation and computer skills in an *academic* course.
- In my opinion, the curriculum for MSU 101 is not appropriate for our students. Not that the students cannot benefit from "time management" or from lessons on locations of offices on campus, but I feel as if much of what is addressed could be handled via a mandatory orientation session to campus and a mandatory module-like program to be completed online their first semester. MSU 101 could then address more pertinent issues, like how to understand self and others and communicate well in a global society.
- I do not feel we need two separate courses. There should be other ways to impart the information provided in MSU 101 rather than in a course format. A course with academic content and rigor would serve our students better. And, if this is a Gen Ed course, then it should not be discipline based, but rather apply to all disciplines--an interdisciplinary "big questions" type course would be ideal.
- It is impossible to respond to the question of whether MSU 101 "meets the needs of incoming freshmen" since we have never had, nor had the support for, a comprehensive and regular assessment of the course. To the degree that we saw improvement of the freshman retention rate after implementing the course, it was meeting some portion of the needs of incoming freshmen.
- First Year programs are not necessary.

- I fear these questions are asking responders to merely choose which "nanny" model we want to impose on the faculty who already have to put up with students who don't have the most basic maturity to set an alarm clock and get up in the morning to come to class. If a student is mature enough to hold a job (which is what he or she would be doing not enrolled in higher education), then he or she should be mature enough to "orient" him or herself to higher education at Morehead, which barely qualifies as requiring college-level work to begin with.
- The MSU 101 is not preparing students to enter and be successful at MSU. We need a rigorous academic course that challenges students. True Colors is not a useful way to engage students and assist them in learning about college.
- For whatever reasons, students see MSU 101 as a total waste of time.
- Interdisciplinary courses often water down the contents of many courses and jam them into one. General education courses are, by their very nature, already watered down in content. Students would be better served by taking fewer credit hours, but in more specific subject areas. (IE: Know one area of science really well instead of one course that has three weeks of physics, three weeks in chemistry, etc.) Additionally, MSU 101 courses might be more beneficial if geared towards the student's major. Right now MSU 101 seems to be a waste.
- I request that skills-based be defined. I see no evidence that its meaning is well understood.
- I think MSU should follow the national trend toward building a very strong and attractive first year seminar and we should combine it with some other academic activities that ALL students must engage in. Scholars, writers, artists in residence should be part of this and student work should be challenging and interesting.
- There should be an early link with the student's discipline early. General education skill development could be linked, e.g. writing a paper on an art topic for art majors.
- As a parent of an 07-08 freshman who attended another school in Ky., I was very disappointed in regards to the 'laizefaire' attitude from her faculty advisor. She took overloads both semesters, and although I agree that the freshman year should be a year of exploring, freshmen are typically still just kids, and their orientation experience in year one should be geared toward the higher ed staff shepherding them, coaching them--making sure we do all we can do to bring them back for year two! (College dropout rates strongly indicate we have traditionally not done well in this area).
- First year programs should give substantive academic content across a broad range of disciplines.
- Ideally, a first-year student should not have a "discipline". Also, many students change their majors, so having a first-year program "rooted" in a single discipline would often be counterproductive.
- MSU 101 meets some of the needs of incoming freshmen but there is room for improvement. The idea of a freshman seminar in the discipline and learning communities need to be explored.
- I like the combination of orientation and skills development. I LOVED the courses offered at Appalachian State and Grinnell College, but I don't think students should be tied to a particular discipline. So many come in without any declared major that interdisciplinary would be the way to go. The idea that these courses would be used to get students familiar with researching, reading, synthesizing, and writing is wonderful! I also like the idea of an upper division writing-intensive class. I would like graduate students to have written something in recent memory before they get in my classes!!
- We need a process that discriminates between students who need an orientation to university life and those who don't. I think that the issue of first year programs should be separated from general education.
- First year programs should, at minimum, set an expectation for academic life. An assessment of student learning...ie general education should be conducted in this milieu; review of college-level expectations for writing, study effort, reading requirements, and contrasts to secondary education should occur; exposure to peer-supported efforts -- learning communities in dorms, study groups, other peer-supports on campus; place of University life in relation to Academic life.....etc.

- I think the MSU101 experience is useful, but could be integrated with more of a FYP experience. But NOT the True Colors baloney or touchy-feely stuff. Offer that as a stand-alone course for "questers" about themselves. I disagree with the Grinnell College one, because our students change majors so much, that tying their experience to a major will be a disservice to them. Heaven knows they still need a broad development of skills through a FYP, so we don't need to start specializing them in their proposed major in a FYP.
- Emphasis needed on study skill/how to take notes/ how to study for exams. Students are not prepared in high school they have not had to study in high school and think they can be successful in college by keeping the same study habits. They do not read "because they do not have time" and they do not know how to pull the important material out of book when they do read.
- I think MSU 101 should be required but I don't think studnets should be charged for it. I think it should be a requirement for off campus sites as well. Off campus MSU 101 courses should include a day at the Morehead campus and library. I think we need to decide what the purpose of college. When schools started having AP classes, we were, in effect, implying that high schools were not challenging enough for students. Now we are looking at doing the job of the high school: remediating students who are not prepared for college. I think that the Universities and colleges need to become more vocal with KDE and the legislature and point out the ongoing probelm we have with the need for remdiation. The kids we are teaching now have been through KERA schools and should be better prepared than ever. I think we should require studnets to approach their college career with specific skills already developed.
- Take out the CIS 101 requirement. Most high schools are teaching Office 2007.
- Concern for rooting first year program in student's discipline: Consistency across the university, provision/appropriate solution for the non-major and for the student who changes major, difference in rigor based upon differences in student preparation (e.g., Some majors attract a stronger student.) I support a change in first year programs ... to improve student success.
- Microsoft Office 2007 is now being taught in most high schools. Consequently, during times of bugetary constraints, WHY do we want to repeat this training at the freshman level.
- Is MSU a liberal arts college or a technical college? Our mission will help us determine what we do for the first year.

Question E5

Comments regarding Administrative Structure:

- MSU is undergoing a lot of change, mostly imposed from above. We need to be sure that the faculty is in charge of the academic content of Gen Ed, although it may be centrally assessed. We do not need appointed gen ed people making the major academic decisions.
- Faculty should be the primary determining force in curriculum revision at any point as well as in assessment. A board with faculty members from a wide range of departments would help to avoid the problem of protectionism of programs and academic departments and be more apt to result in genuine ongoing assessment.
- The College of Regional and Global Studies seems to be a catch all for those programs which are not favored. The new college will be large and overburdened with programs that the state will not recognize as degree programs. Funding will be problematic.
- I am concerned about the cost to the university of setting up yet another administrative system when already we cannot pay our faculty and staff at an comparable rate with other institutions. I am also concerned about being overseen by someone not in my discipline. Can the same structure and oversight work for disciplines as variant as math and writing?
- If, as we have been told, faculty will remain in their departments, and if, as we have been led to believe, courses in the new program will be approved by an already existing committee that is working on a streamlined approval process, then there is little for a "central coordination" body to

do, save oversee a First Year seminar. The oversight that MSU has been missing involves assessment. A disinterested board could make sure that the assessment is real by holding both assessment gurus and departments accountable, and make sure that whomever coordinates the First Year programs is adequately compensated. Obviously, my main concern is with making assessment and oversight real. A newly created coordinating body could easily become yet another "silo," and the people in charge of such a body could soon feel the pressure to make themselves (and their position) look good by making general education appear more robust and effective than it is. Rather than adding a new layer of administration—an addition that is not preferable at any time, let alone these times of financial exigency, when we have to carefully monitor our expenditures—we would be better off creating a broad based board that literalizes the fact that a wide variety of peoples (indeed, all of us) are stakeholders in general education. On another note, I would like to ask why there are only two models for gen ed administration here. Every other category includes three models that draw on the "promising models" from the AAC&U. Why is this category different?

- We must make sure all colleges and departments are well represented in any administrative structure we choose.
- There needs to be clearly defined responsibility for assessment of Gen Ed--at both the program and course level--and assessment efforts need to be appropriately funded. It is possible to coordinate this with a board model (i.e. responsibility/oversite for course approval and the curriculum in general can be separate from staff responsible for assessment (collection and assessment of assessment data, etc.). The Curriculum Audit model adds layers of bureaucracy at a time when we need to streamline.
- The farther you remove from the disciplines and faculty both the responsibility and accountability for general education instruction, the less potential for it to meet the needs of both the institution and the students. The real issue is not in the structure, but in providing appropriate academic and administrative resources for the program to ensure that (1) faculty and staff are appropriately prepared and committed to teach the general education courses consistent with the "learner outcomes," (2) the outcomes can be reliably and validly assessed, (3) the feedback from the assessment is provided to the faculty and staff on a regular basis, (4) the resources are provided to address identified weaknesses and gaps, and (5) faculty and staff (especially administrators at each level) are held ACCOUNTABLE for addressing the weaknesses within their discipline/area of responsibility.
- I do not think that General Education should be removed from the individual departments. There is too much potential for abuse. Especially the Central Coordination version. We have too many administrators NOW! We need to be eliminating assistants to the Provost, not adding to it. We need to clean house and down size administrators so we can start raising salaries of existing faculty and attract new faculty. Faculty add to to the our fiscal picture, administrators only drain the institutions funds.
- Why are we even being given the option to weigh in on the type of administration? It sounds as if two models have already been chosen. And if the curriculum audit report is the guiding document here, then the central administration model has already been selected. Why can't the administration of this University just come right out and say that certain decisions have been made? It's a narrowing of options like those implied in this section of the survey that confirms for faculty that events are taking place behind the scenes. I don't support any model for general education that takes control of classes in a discipline out of the hands of those individuals most qualified to teach and staff them.
- The faculty who teach Gen Ed must have oversight of Gen Ed. We should elect a director from the faculty to oversee Gen Ed.
- There needs to be broader representation than just one college, even if it is a multidisciplinary college.
- The term "oversight" should be more specific. Oversight as to assessment? content? What exactly will be controlled through this office. It is my sincere hope that there is not a separate faculty for gen. ed. This will lead to elitism and competition among faculty, and many faculty enjoy teaching gen. ed, but do not want to solely teach gen. ed. It is hoped that faculty will still

keep one foot on gen. ed. and one in higher level courses in one's content area. This is possible with one coordinating unit. Also, one of the models had a learner outcome statement for out of classroom experiences (for lecture attendance, arts events, study abroad, etc.) I am not clear how this would be assessed or handled on the administrative level, but it seems a fabulous idea to me. Please consider something along these lines. This is, I think, especially important to establishing the idea and love of lifelong learning, community learning as scholars, and making interdisciplinary connections.

- I don't think anyone is currently in charge of General Education. Having served on Faculty Senate Committees, I don't think they provide a good solution because of lack of experience and interest.
- At least with information currently available, it's hard to envision how the coordination model would work effectively. It seems to add a layer of complexity and the value and benefits it would add are unclear.
- Why would this office be in a particular college? Just wondering what the rationale is for this.
- If a board model is adopted it should include a librarian. Why would General Education be run out of a particular college? That seem contradictory.
- Student feedback is important, at least student questionnaires/surveys that take the form of exit interviews as courses or semesters are completed. *One thing I really liked about the Portland State model was its inclusion of a course on ethics. I would think a required course (or two) on ethics/serving/leadership/healthy relationships would be a huge plus for any student, and an attractive drawing card for parents too--as more and more schools of higher ed seem to be offering courses/programs in the area of ethics and leadership (focusing on the all important emotional intelligence and character factors).
- If either model is implemented it SHOULD NOT be in a college and certainly not in a thing called College of Regional and Global Studies, which is an absurd idea for a college in any case.
- SHould not be within a college. University Studies degree should either be two degrees, one oriented to non traditional students and one to traditional students, or be housed in a different unit.
- General Education is too important to bury in an "office" in a particular college. At that point the head of Gen. Ed. would report to that college dean? The other models have at least a vice-provost over Gen. Ed. If we're going to take it seriously then we need to have some high-powered administration over it or Gen.Ed. will take a back seat to whatever else the upper administration is pushing that year, decade, century...
- The curriculum audit recommendation contains several parts, and the question asked does not distinguish them. The idea of an "Office of General and University Studies" is vague. The relationship between general education and university studies is a separate issue from general education reform, isn't it?
- There is ample evidence that the Central Coordination model will contribute to administrative bloat that exists on campus, and will not enfranchise the faculty and students, who are clearly the most involved players in the Gen Ed program. We need as little administrators involved in this as possible, and we need continual opportunities for input from faculty and students.
- I am not passionate about this either way. I think we should devise our own structure to fit our needs.
- Just WHAT is a College of Regional and Global Studies anyway? PS--did NOT know this survey was to be completed this fall--since the link on the Gen Ed page is dated for Spring 08 submission. No wonder you don't have any participation!
- I'm not certain why the Administration would poll the faculty about the general education process, since it seems apparent already that it has narrowed the possible models down to a select few that reflect their own bias. There's no evidence to begin with that the existing general education model isn't functioning appropriately. The entire process, then, of general education reform seems like yet another administrative whim to justify high salaries and little understanding of what challenges instructors actually face in the classroom, namely an increasingly underprepared student population. Yet, the University is hellbent on admitting more and more students despite their deficiencies. No amount of general education redesign is going to change the fact that a

significant portion of our students drain off resources in remediating them that could be used to actually challenge those individuals who can perform at a high level in the state of Kentucky.

- The combination of a board model (example) and central coordination seems to have the potential for "best". The board model suggests better and more direct communication with the faculty and students.
- E2 = I would support neither but that was not a choice. Once again, the questions are loaded and you will get the response you designed this for. This survey is rigged.