

## A Short General Education Survey

**Respondents:** 230

**Status:** Open

**Launched Date:** 12/02/2010

**Closed Date:** 12/13/2010

### 3. What information or ideas about general education do you wish to share with the committee?

1. Courses should be more rigorous  
D+ or lower should not be acceptable (setting up students to fail in the future)  
Courses should be offered in all of the schools  
Writing and critical thinking should be the centerpiece  
  
General Ed should be less complicated. All the study areas and the skill areas are confusing to students and faculty. For example, we need to specify one or two history courses, add one or two political sciences courses. (Students have no preparation in political science.) Students may add onto these courses if they are interested through general electives. I propose limiting choices rather than expanding choices. Each student should gain a common base of knowledge rather than some hodgepodge of unrelated courses called "general education."
2. THE GEN ED PROGRAM HAS TOO MANY CHOICES AND TOO MANY CATEGORIES AND PROBABLY TOO MANY CREDITS. WE NEED A SLEEKER, MORE FOCUSED PROGRAM -- LESS MIGHT WELL BE MORE.
3. It would be nice if Math 101 could count as Skill II credit (or otherwise gen ed math credit) whether or not a redesign is done. This would help many of our students for whom higher level math (while perhaps a good idea!) is not really necessary.
4. 100% of the design of the General Education program should take into account the needs of the stakeholders. Talents of the faculty should not be a consideration. If faculty members have the wrong talents, they should develop the relevant talents.
5. The general education program should be inspirational, not remedial. Why come to college to sit in big lecture halls and take multiple guess exams? CCSU is better than UConn, and can be better yet. The kind of integrative experiences that are available at liberal arts colleges and to the handful of our students who are in the Honors programs should be available to all. Students should have the opportunity and be encouraged to integrate and synthesize skills, knowledge, and perspectives across the curriculum. The nascent diversity, community service, and writing across the curriculum initiatives are steps in the right direction; we also need math, logic, and argument across the curriculum
6. initiatives. General education should not be an add-on, a set of hoops through which to jump; rather general education should be the dynamic, exciting, inspiring core of a liberal arts education. General education courses should include reading and writing-intensive seminar courses, service courses, and independent study and capstone opportunities. Of course, such a general education program requires small classes taught by a stable, supported, full-time, tenured and tenure-track faculty, contrary to the current unconscionable moves by the CCSU administration to enlarge class size and undermine the faculty.
7. We need a greater focus on college redinesses, and informatics.
8. There should be a greater variety of courses available for use in gen ed within each area (including upper level courses). PE 144 should be deleted. Behavioral and social sciences should be combined.
9. We have too many courses and options. We should drastically cut back on the total number of courses which receive general education credit. We seem to have lost site of the word "general" in there. Also, we have too many credits dedicated to gen ed.
10. admissions criteria (even for courses) should be higher.  
similarly, exit criteria should be based on different types of assessments with objective ways of deciding whether the students have met the criteria.
11. I believe the current general education program does meet the needs of all of our students. It has a good balance of study and skill areas and gives the students what they need in this changing world.
12. I would love to see a General Education major put in to our Academic Programs. This would give students another option to stay on track for graduation, get a BA Degree and then go on to get a MA in something they are interested in. Please add this to our programs!
13. More remedial help for incoming transfer students, especially with writing.  
There should be a general education major.
14. Present program lacks coherency, effective techniques for assuring students develop writing and critical thinking skills, and is department rather than learning driven. It does not much help develop cohesion among students because everyone's general education is different. Every time there is a new priority, we add a level of complexity to the program. A reasonably intelligent faculty member should be able to advise students about the program without consulting a gazillion cheat sheets or getting

daily advice from various stakeholders.

15. I'm not sure the gen ed requirements need to be totally redesigned, but it has been many years since it has been reviewed in a large encompassing way. It's time.  
A foreign language should be a requirement regardless of the fact that a student had that specific language as part of his/her high school curriculum.
16. More attention should be paid to transfer credits for those students coming to CCSU in the hopes of finishing their degree in a timely fashion. Many transfer students become discouraged and drop out, because they have to take additional credits thereby deferring their degree to a later date.  
General education objectives were shoehorned into an existing framework. The existing program is arcane to our students and lacks focus. General education should focus on writing skills, quantitative reasoning and critical thinking. To paraphrase a colleague, they shouldn't be a chore to take and shouldn't be a chore to teach.
17. Get rid of PE 144  
Within the constraints of a four-year degree program, it is impossible to provide the student with sufficient knowledge and practice in the major and yet require the current requirement of credits in Gen Ed.  
We need to allow upper level classes to count as Gen Ed. It is totally stupid that a student can take a 300 or 400 level class and not have it count as Gen Ed.
20. Also, I still have no idea why British Lit and Shakespeare are not international classes? These need to be changed back to international classes.  
I fear that redesigning GE is a vehicle for reducing or eliminating required courses that are sufficiently broad for our graduates to be, truly, liberally educated. There IS a common corpus of knowledge that everyone who claims to be educated should know.
21. I would consider viewing Gen Ed as a college within the university. Thus, credit and areas of study would be a self-contained requirement prior to students becoming full-fledged Juniors, or something like this concept.  
We should reevaluate general education periodically as our students and the world they inhabit changes. At the last reevaluation, the university-wide general education committee decided that only 100 and 200-level courses should be included in the gen.ed. program, and it is time to reconsider this idea.
23. Many of my students assert that they come to CCSU so that someday they can find a well paying job, but this is still a university and we owe our students an education that prepares them to engage with ideas and cultures as broadly and deeply as possible. So, yes, let's look again at gen.ed. to make it better, but not to get rid of it.  
My last point is that this discussion should include as much of the faculty as possible.  
Thanks.  
Within the general education curriculum, students should be required to take and pass some minimum number of credits (e.g., 6) in writing-intensive courses. (The Writing Across the Curriculum Committee should be consulted for clarification on how such courses are defined.) Otherwise, many students with poor written communication skills purposefully avoid writing-intensive courses and graduate with the same poor communication skills.
24. We should retain the current approach where courses are required in a limited number of content-defined (NOT department-defined) subject areas. (So a lit course can be taken in Spanish; a history course can focus on music.) The old approach where every department required that students take one course from them (or two courses for the powerful departments) does not serve an academic goal (but rather department chairs who need to assign load for their low-demand faculty). The old "one course from every department" approach also demands that nearly all of Gen Ed be taken at the intro level. If Gen Ed is changed, it should demand a certain number (or proportion) of courses beyond the intro level. I would also either add a community-engagement (CE) requirement, or replace the international requirement with CE, or combine CE and Int courses to form a new "beyond-our-campus" (BOC) requirement.
25. There needs to be more emphasis on the following two areas: (1) writing; and (2) Information literacy. Too many of our students write at a lower level than should be expected of a college student and most students rely too much on "Google" for their research.
26. I think each program should look at their specific Gen Ed requirements with a fresh eye.
27. Incorporate more writing skills. Getting tired of students asking "How long does this essay have to be?"
29. Some things can be streamlined. As an example, the PE 144 requirement seems out of date. There are 3 or 4 places in Gen Ed where a number of students and faculty get confused. We should concentrate on changing those.

It does not need to be a drastic re-working. We just need to smoothe the edges out in the most cumbersome parts of Gen Ed.

30. The number of GE credits should be reduced so that students can take more upper-level courses in their major.

The existing general education program is not truly, general education. If a student switches majors he/she is subject to losing many credits within the skill/study areas to elective space, of which then these classes are unused and it is seen as a waste of money and time. To assist students in these harsh economic times we need to review and determine truly what is it that we wish our students to get. Should there be a class for all about 'life after college - how to deal with debt' instead of taking (and forgive me) Intro to Music?

31. Additionally, possibly a general studies major so our students can finish here instead of leaving for other places.

32. Redesign the required course frame so that CCSU students may complete in 4 years.

33. Gen Ed is hardly perfect, but I worry that a revision will result in a further dilution of our commitment to general education and the liberal arts in favor of an even more profession-driven curricular mindset under the guise of "choice," and "electives." I'd love to see Gen Ed redesigned to be more comprehensible to students, but not at the cost of further watering down.

34. Language Requirement should be 4 semesters.

35. Cluster Courses (i.e. see Hoffstra, ECSU, Stonehill)-so that learning be enhanced by cross discipline that relate -time period etc-Art History-History-Humanities. More emphasis on Foreign Language, writing courses (W courses UConn). The Gen Ed is weighted towards Mathematics- a student places out of Foreign Language with high school language program- yet is required to, in some cases, take 12 credits of Math.

36. Moving the passing grade to C would be a step in the right direction.

37. a comprehensive general education program is essential to maintaining the quality of education at CCSU.

38. I believe it is much too complex and should be simplified. If what we want is for our students to have exposure to all these different areas, with specific competencies in a few, then I am not sure why some courses are okay for that purpose while others are not.

39. More upper-level Gen Ed class options.  
Ability to go into greater depth in a selected area.  
More flexibility in the sorts of courses that would count towards Gen. Ed.

40. One of the purposes of this univeraity is to provide a wide range of people from central Connecticut with the opportunity to earn a liberal arts education. This makes them better citizens and increases their ability to enjoy life to its fullest. It also makes them employable in an economy where almost every technical skill can be out sourced except a high level of literacy that a liberal arts degree provides. Every year, efforts are made to degrade and shrink the general education requirements. This does a dis-service to our students and our state.

41. Too many credits.  
Big Department ensure their courses are required.  
In over 13 years here I only had 1 student take language classes here.... why are we so undedicated to language?  
My suggestion: Less broad yet more in-depth

42. The Gen Ed program should not be a buffet of disparate courses designed to maintain enrollment in "service" departments, but should instead be a (much smaller) set of carefully designed courses that transmit a common education on humanity's knowledge and experience to sutdents.

43. Recently, senator Christopher Dodd on his lecture at CCSU the importance that our students be bilinguals, and Latin American should not be a minor. It is time to reinforce the foreign language requirement form one year to two years.

44. Looking at the catalog requirements, I see a fair balance among the various study and skill areas. I think that when students complete these requirements they will have been exposed to a variety of studies and gain a broad range of knowledge and skill.

45. Removing specific courses such as ENG 110 from the curriculum. Objectives of course could be satisfied with a writing requirment in courses across the curriculum (such as a w-requirement at other colleges).  
Remove specific courses like PE 144. Transfer students are not required to take this, so why make incoming freshmaen? Remove whole category from gen ed.  
Don't allow little fiefdom's like study area II (must take history) or study area I (must take literature).  
Kill the FYE program.

Don't ever allow the diveristy requirement (D designation). What a bad implementation of the plan! You could have a course like CHEM 111 that has the D-designator, but only for a particular section. How ridiculous would that be?!?

Lower the total number of gen ed credits required. Or, let majors over 45 credits have a reduced requirement.

A redesign of the "General Education program" cannot be done. It would be like driving on the highway and changing your tires. Does someone believe that redesign to be something like a software program that can simply be dropped in place? Even if that were possible, does someone believe that a system can be designed well enough that it would be fully operational on the first show as it would need to be in order to address the needs of the students?

46. On the other hand, maybe there is such a secret idea that can address the situation. Please, tell us so that we can understand what "General Education Program redesign" means...

Would this be another "Blame the teacher" campaign?

47. More room for electives.

48. The existing general education requirement leave the student with little, if any, room for experimentation with other disciplines. In some instances, the combination of gen ed, major and minor requirements prevent the students from other exploration and it's not until they are about to graduate that they realize that they don't want to spend the rest of their lives in the particular field.

49. Reduce Gen Ed credit requirements by at least 6 credits.  
Make the system less cumbersome.

50. Make it like a restaurant menu--"two from column A three from column B etc." Allow a student to completely opt out of any one of the currently required areas (skill or topic).

51. they need to add content in the area of special education, especially in the area of behavior management, the federal law, differential instruction.

52. What are we doing with the gen ed requirement? Creating well rounded individuals? Giving them a high school education? Helping them follow their dreams? Keeping them in school another two years?
- Skiill Area 4 is a waste of time for transfer students with more than 15 credits.

53. In lieu of the current General Education requirements, it seems that students would take either (a) more courses in their majors or minors (where class availability is already an issue for many majors), or (b) more free electives (where the goal is often to take the easiest courses available.)

54. No matter how gen ed is (re)designed, students will continue to view any required courses outside their major (and possibly minor) as disjointed and pointless. Is what we have the best it might be, no, but the efforts to revise (as we've seen in the past) will not materially improve it in relation to the massive effort it will take to change it (again see history of CCSU gen ed). In addition, given that many complain that our students come to CCSU woefully underprepared, I don't see how requiring fewer hours in diverse gen ed courses will help them.

I was not part of the list-serve conversation, so I am not aware of what changes were being proposed. However, "meeting students' needs," however defined should not result in the downsizing or elimination of Arts & Sciences programs so that the university can focus on training students for jobs. A university education ideally teaches students how to think and how to express themselves; how to apply their knowledge to their specific fields and develop careers, not jobs.

55. The General Education program ideally is designed to expose students to a wide variety of educational experiences. Many of our students are the first in their families to attend university and often come from public school systems that are uneven in their preparation of these students for university level work. The General Education program is designed to fill in some of those gaps in their experiences. This program should be reviewed periodically by the faculty to determine its effectiveness, and thus, fine-tuned, but, not radically altered.

56. The students should take less general education courses which will allow them to take more courses from their majors.

57. Students should have opportunities to explore at higher levels. We need to reduce the numbers of "majors only" sections of general courses. Students should not have to be serial declarers in order to have access to what interests them. There should be more interdisciplinary offerings to convey that all knowledge is related. Service and experiential learning should be recongnized and encouraged. Technology and business should be incorporated. Diversity should be broadly defined if a requirement.

58. General education should be exactly that, general. Currently the general education program is focused specifically on the liberal arts and that leaves several academic areas out. The focus should be on skills every student needs to be successful in life and should not be a purely academic exercise.

If this is just to tweak course requirements, it should be left alone. If there is a cogent, pedagogical philosophy behind the change, that's different. I would like to know what it is. Change for the sake of change just makes everyone's life harder, and there is nothing wrong with our current distribution requirements.

What I like about our present requirements: our math requirements are greater than those of most comparable schools. People have to be numerate!

59. We have a language requirement. (This I would strengthen were it up to me, but just having it is a plus.)

The current requirements are less confusing than other comparable schools I have seen.

If the purpose is to give breadth, the requirements now do that to the extent possible. I don't know how much introductory courses make our students conversant in a discipline, but if they put time in, they should be learning the major ideas in several important fields. Whether they care those ideas over to their own majors I also can't say. In my experience, very few do. If there is a way to make that carry-over more successful and widespread, I support that.

60. I think redesign would take a lot of time and effort from faculty who would better put their energies to use in working on any revisions they think would be appropriate to the General Education courses they themselves teach, working on their majors courses, and conducting research in their fields. Faculty who are so inclined can ask themselves whether the General Education courses they teach really cover what they think non-majors should know about their fields. Faculty wishing to propose new General Education courses have been accommodated under the present General Education system. I don't think top-down changes imposed without the motivation of individual faculty teaching General Education courses are likely to succeed. Different faculty members' teaching strengths are so diverse that a great deal of flexibility must be allowed to allow each faculty member to teach in the way that best suits his or her method of conveying information to students and involving students in their own learning. If possible students should be made more aware that they can petition to have appropriate upper-level courses counted toward General Education requirements, and of how to submit such a petition.

61. Student placement testing for Math 099 or English 099, should be revisited to insure that students are placed correctly.

62. Languages are not the same for our students. An intermediate I level student in French will perform better than a student in Arabic in the same level due to the sharing between French and English of course.

So, talking about number of semesters must take in consideration which language we are talking about.

63. The current general education is too constrictive for most majors in the School of Engineering and Technology. If each school were given equal opportunity to discuss the restructuring and/or allowing each school to encumber general education in the various degrees I would support changing or modifying general education.

64. The current general education requirements provides students with the right balance of different educational experiences within different disciplines. Speaking as an alumni of this university as well as a current administrator, the current requirements fit the needs of the students.

65. From my experience, the more stringent the general education requirements become, the longer it will take students to graduate, especially if they change their majors a time or two. If you want a higher graduation rate, then leave it as it is. If the GE requirements increase across the board in all academic areas, then students will delay graduating or even drop out before graduation.

66. I think the Gen Ed component of higher education should have deliberate scaffolding built into the process. For example, skills and knowledge developed in the writing component should be used, reinforced and extended in all other Gen programs. Academic freedom is nice, but if we really want to make a difference we will cooperate to develop inter-connected, coordinated, and scaffolded programs.

67. Increase entrance requirements  
Eliminate 30 credits of gen ed  
Shorten BS degree program to 3 years  
Students to take courses in their major in the first semester

68. I hope that this committee will have a series of university-wide forums to gather ideas before making recommendations. The President's forums organized by the Faculty Senate have been very useful in allowing a large amount of participation in the process.

A European model of higher education might be appropriate for our students. Students would complete rigorous programs in a major field and a minor one. Such programs would consist of far more major and minor courses than are now required for an undergraduate degree.

69. In addition, various university departments could sponsor an array of lecture courses each year from which students could make selections that were based on the recommendations of departmental (major or minor) advisors. Such lecture courses could be audited, their purpose being to provide

students background deemed necessary by their departments. (Such lecture courses might also be taken for credit, if desired.) Having a complement of required audits might encourage students to delve into many fields that they might otherwise shy away from.

70. Our students continue to have an increase in the number of required courses for their programs and this creates serious load problems. Some education programs are already 130 hours and additional requirements are coming from the state - we barely have enough hours for 'content' related courses. Any relief in the gen ed requirements would give us an opportunity to meet the expanding needs of state required topics for our education majors.

71. The General Education requirements as they stand are somewhat confusing and will become even worse with the addition of Diversity courses. However, this is mitigated, in part, by the ability of students and faculty to run a degree evaluation. If the committee can come up with a more streamlined way for students to get a broad-based general education, it would most certainly be welcome.

72. Strengthen the foreign language study requirement.

I am a graduate student worker at CCSU.

I have one recommendation pertaining to the General Education curriculum.

SKILL AREA III - Foreign Language Proficiency

73. If the GE Program is really interested in students graduating with a basis proficiency in a foreign language then you must re-examine the 6-credit requirement currently in place. Six credits in a language is insufficient to achieve the goal of proficiency. The university should increase the number of credits to at least 9-credits to allow students' to obtain a level of proficiency in a foreign language; personally I would go with 12-credits. The alternative would be to redefine the goal (title). Is the goal language proficiency or exposure/global appreciation for another cultural by way of language? Whatever the goal for Skill Area III might be - something more is needed.

74. Overall, the program is decent. I would not want to see radical reform of it, but some improvements could be made through revision or polishing some troubled areas. My personal and professional interest is in having a foreign language requirement that reflects the institution's "international" sloganeering and makes a genuine effort to contribute to a degree of multilingualism among our students, a skill that will indisputably serve our community well as our economy and culture continues to become more global. A two-year, proficiency-based language requirement similar to that at SCSU would go a long way toward meeting that goal.

75. The existing General Education program is good as it is.

76. The GE program should be simplified but requirements should aimed at enhancing both written and oral communication skills, critical thinking, and an intermediate level of proficiency in foreign languages.

It should be simplified: there are too many study and skill areas

All Gen Ed requirements should be completed during 1st year of study

77. Some non-credit tests should replace courses

Requirements should be 4: good writing in English, one foreign language at the intermediate level, basic mathematics, basic history.

78. Simplify number of learning outcomes; emphasize skills-based learning outcomes. Anticipate challenges of assessment in specifying learning outcomes. Distribute courses that fulfill general education throughout the four academic schools and throughout the four years of college.

79. I appreciate the diversity that we have now, but it is overly complicated.

80. We should have fewer categories (not both study areas and skill areas); students could be asked to take X credits from one category and Y credits from the next category, and so on, with no more than six categories (right now we have eight!). A system like this would allow greater flexibility. Keep foreign language requirement. Keep math requirement. Continue literature requirement. Remove laboratory experience requirement, now in Study Area 4. Remove having both study areas and skill areas, so they are all called one or the other.

I'm open to considering a completely different organizing principle, though I don't have one to propose.

81. My suggesting would be less drastic. Combining social and behavioral sciences (but retaining the overall number of credit hours) Eliminating the university requirement or merging it with an expanded FYE. Transfer credits satisfying Gen Ed should not have to be identical to our offerings, any reasonable course in the required study or skill area should qualify. The goal is to have a student well rounded in knowledge and experience that has developed critical skills, not to check specific courses.

82. There need to be themes for courses rather than the general headings we have now. We definitely need a diversity element to the courses. We need to change to a 3-3 4 credit model that would engage more students and provide faculty with more contact with the students they have.

83. I believe we should begin a revision by having a serious conversation about what we believe a general education program should do. It should be based on some reasonable number of core competencies that students can master in a variety of disciplines. I do believe that the students should be required to take courses outside their comfort zones, but NOT so many prescriptive requirements.
- We should remember that general education is just that - general. Students should be introduced to a wide variety of fields -- not given a choice of only taking a few limited areas. Give them the breadth that a university education is meant to provide.
84. Perhaps move credits to 4 per course so that we can not kill people with the number of courses they do have to take.
- Cut that Math 101 loophole --
85. I'd like to see a General Education program with more coherence. Basic, college-level skills need to be introduced early in the students' careers at Central, and then built upon with more advanced Gen Ed courses and with courses in their majors/concentrations.
86. The current gen ed program is an inchoate trainwreck. I'd like to see a course like the one described here [http://www.brainygamer.com/the\\_brainy\\_gamer/2010/08/portal-booklist.html](http://www.brainygamer.com/the_brainy_gamer/2010/08/portal-booklist.html) be required of all students--could be taught by faculty from lots of departments. Some sense of agenda-setting, and a serious approach to serious questions, seems desirable.
87. My belief that the general education program should be redesigned comes from my experience as an academic advisor -- both for the department of English as well as, briefly, for the school of A & S this summer. I have a hard time explaining the differences between the study areas and the skill areas and why they are divided the way they are; obviously, the courses in the study areas require and develop a specific set of skills, and the courses in the skill areas require and develop specific content areas ... I wonder if there is a way to streamline the "categories" so they are not two categories composed of four groups each. These 8 divisions have always seemed false or forced to me, although I am not sure what a viable solution may be.
88. Foreign Language Competency; no mandatory courses in American History--it is covered adequately in High School; no science Lab Courses.
89. As a part-timer, I have not been well-instructed on the General Education program, and how I might contribute to it or how it might be improved.
90. The redesign needs to be focused on our students, what they need now and what we expect they will need in the future, not on us, how we were taught, what we "love," or disciplinary "turf." The committee working on this redesign, should it happen, needs to include those who are connected to and participate in the changing world in substantive ways, in addition to those steeped in traditional university values. In addition, the committee needs to understand the complicated, even harsh, realities of the CCSU student population and not plan a program for an ideal student who exists nowhere.
91. GE classes should not be separate from majors classes.
92. More choices by opening it up to any course in the study area. For example, students can take one art history for GE credit and not another.
- Categories are still defined along departmental lines rather than areas or modes of knowledge. Some departments, e.g. anthropology, operate in several of the current categories and yet anthropology courses are restricted to just one.
93. More science, math, and technology.
94. I personally like the Gen ed requirements. I feel as though the students get a true liberal arts education and that is so important for overall competence for life. I would need to hear the arguments as to why others think it should be changed.
95. Get rid of the Physical ED. requirement. Cut back on all other areas by one three credit course. Put some teeth in the language requirement. Get rid of all special designations, such as those directed toward diversity, etc. it is a ridiculous exercise and while we are at it, get rid of the upper administration people who are "in charge" of such fluffy areas of educational understanding. It is a waste of money and time. We are all running in circles already.
96. I would like to see more diversity courses incorporated into Gen Ed. No student should graduate CCSU without having some course that had a diversity component.
97. Although I support the idea of requiring a minor, too many departments are not willing/able to support such a requirement on this campus. Structurally we must acknowledge these limitations and adapt GE and program requirements as a result. Also, I am strongly in favor of moving from 3 to 4 credit classes--students take fewer classes per term, but devote more time/energy to the classes they are taking. Enacting such a change, however, would require us to rethink our GE curriculum.

98. Streamline it so students finish within their first 1.5 years at the university. Reduce the "size" to 1/4 of total credits (30 credits) without hidden prerequisites. Focus on a few clearly stated objectives - improving student reading, writing and critical thinking suffices. Stop adding more requirements, however well-intentioned they may be.
99. Choices need to be much more flexible. Other universities have much broader range of what is allowed in each study area.
100. The current General Education is cumbersome and could be more straight forward.
101. Too many requirements/ too many specific types of classes as requirement. Each section should have the same number of classes required. Plus, very confusing about what counts and what does not for each area.
102. I believe the General Education program is fine. I think the biggest problem for students concerns advisors who do not bother to take the time to understand general Education requirements in detail.
103. The structure is complicated. Students (and faculty) have a hard time figuring out what courses fit into which category (e.g., 112 Language classes don't fit into Skill 3--why not?). There are nonintuitive rules (e.g., Why are behavioral and social sciences separate? why don't transfer students have to take PE 144?). I think the breadth of coverage matches what is considered a liberal arts education, but the applications are confusing. Streamlining and removing some of the constraints would be helpful. A total overhaul is not needed.
104. I have no issues. I teach 1 course 1 evening per week as an adjunct.
105. General Education should be organized around a clear rationale. That rationale should be to provide students an orientation to content and skills that serve their interests in becoming citizens in a democratic society. Right now, GenEd looks like a bunch of random samplings from study areas and skill areas that are not united by a common theme. I would like to see the committee address the actual RATIONALE for General Education and discuss a variety of approaches that serve that rationale, including perhaps the approach that informs the Honor's curriculum. I would also like to see the committee address the question of writing across the curriculum. I think this issue has to be central to any discussion of General Education.
- Thanks for asking for input.
106. Nothing specific to recommend. But it seems to me a good idea to revisit a program that has been in place for a number of years to see if students would benefit from changes.
107. The General Education program should include a strong emphasis on the differentiation of instruction in order to facilitate the productivity of all students.
108. 4 credit system. our students work too much and have difficulties taking 5 classes. There's no reason why they should be here 5-7 years for a BA degree. 4 credit system may make them get out of here in 4 years without huge loans/bills. less confusing. diversity component,
109. I think the discussion is long overdue. Any future conceptualizations of Gen-ed should consider resource and budget issues of departments that offer requirements.
110. GenEd requirements are confusing and overly broad - students end up spending too much time taking GenEd credits, so courses in their majors are restricted... there are often no options for additional electives beyond the bare minimum required courses.
111. I would advocate W-designated courses. I believe that this university needs more emphasis on writing, both within the major and across the curriculum. W-designated courses would move us toward that end. I think there should be several options and requirements for writing courses in all disciplines; writing instruction should not be relegated to the English department.
112. The problem is not really with the General Education Program. In my opinion, the problem is with the pervasive lack of accountability that professors display, from a pedagogical perspective, in trying to achieve learning outcomes in students. The goal is to get students to write and read and learn, not to get them through a course.
113. Our confusing, hard-to-satisfy gen ed is a major impediment to student retention and graduation and is expensive both in terms of dollars and resources. There is no good reason for so many tiny nit-picking rules. Students (and the university) would be much better served with a more general general education. Rather than minutia that must be satisfied, there should be broad categories that can be met with a wide variety of courses. Rather than micromanaging student learning, ensure that students get an exposure to the broad range of human knowledge.
- In particular, the notion of "Study Area" and "Skill Area" should be eliminated. There is no such distinction anywhere else in academia, and the distinction serves no purpose. "University Requirement" is nonsense.
- There should be fewer categories, perhaps only 5. More use should be made of general education in



the student's major and minor. People have said that there is a State mandate about the size of general education, but others (Dave Blitz, I think) have said that the mandate does not preclude counting gen ed courses in the major.

Part of the problem with gen ed is that articulation agreements do not seem to be working. Transfer students show up with few of their courses counting for anything. A less bizarre gen ed might make this easier.

114. I don't know enough about the general education program to comment in the particular but I do know that I feel that CCSU students need more writing instruction at every level and that should be a major factor when considering revisions to the program.

115. As a former student, there were some general education classes that I did benefit from. However, most of them were useless to me. I think that students should have more classes that focus on their major. Classes like basic gym/ health class should be eliminated.

116. I would like to see the university require more writing. The evidence clearly indicates that those who write well also benefit in a number of ways personally, academically, and professionally.

117. Double major plus a minor should substitute for gen ed. Real language requirement.

118. My students have significant deficits in basic skills such as reading and writing and basic knowledge that all educated persons should have. General Education now meets the goal of addressing these deficits. Why change?

119. I only have a temporary appointment, but this is my second year teaching in the Math department, and based on what I've seen and heard, I would say that the University needs to take new look at its mission, degree programs and program requirements in light of the changing expectations of Society the changing job market, and the changes in the backgrounds of the students which the University accepts into undergraduate Liberal Arts and other programs. Certainly the General Education program is an important part of the picture.

120. Too many students are being forced to take courses in subjects in which they have absolutely no interest. As such, they do not participate fully in the course, and they don't seem to care about grades or paying any sort of attention in class.

Gen Ed needs to be redesigned, not to perpetuate the territorial claims that have fueled it in the past, but to give students more choices in areas outside their majors.

121. Less box checking. Fewer Math courses required to get up to parr.

122. What is the purpose of General Education? Have the content areas changed in the past 100 years?

123. There needs to be more emphasis on writing across all departments at the University. Students should be tested to see if they meet the requirements for eligibility in English 110 and, if not, they should be required to take English 099. There should also be two Gen Ed writing courses (beyond 099) - English 110 and a writing course in their department. If one does not exist in their department, they should be required to take English 202.

124. Making connections to students current out-of-school interests, passions and strengths.

125. The biggest problem with students I advise is probably with Math 101. I have a problem with a policy that apparently says no matter how well a student does all semester long they will receive a failing grade if they fail the final exam. No matter how easy the developers believe the exam is, students' grades should be calculated based on holistic achievement throughout the course.

126. I am concerned that so many students entering CCSU do not test well on the Math Placement test. Therefore, they usually have to take 12 cr in Math/computers rather than 6 (This includes Math 99 and 101 which do not count for the Math requirement. Is the test too rigorous or High schools not teaching math adequately? Maybe Math 101 should count as a Math requirement. Also in Study Area I, English Lit is required plus 6 cr in the arts or Philosophy/Religion. A student can graduate without ever having taken a course in Art, Music or Theatre. I think this is a loss for a Liberal Arts Education

127. Question 2 is impossible to answer without an assumption as to how general education would be redesigned. Certainly the current framework is workable but could be improved or worsened. I would be against any format that would increase General Education credit requirements but in favor of a less rigid scenario. Writing across the curriculum could benefit student skill development without requiring more credits.

I would oppose any effort to reduce the amount of GE our students receive. I disagree that we must have reduced GE requirements for specific major programs. If the revision is intended to permit departments and programs to include more major content under GE, I am opposed.

128. However, I do think that the present system is confusing. I would recommend dropping the foreign language requirement unless we institute some kind of exit exam; I suggest reinstating the philosophical "mode," with the understanding that the Phil dept. shouldn't be expected to staff all of these courses--many courses may take a philosophical stance on a subject; and I would suggest

taking a similar view of the (non-lab) science requirement.

- Question 2 is impossible to answer without an assumption as to how General Education would be changed. Certainly the current format is workable but could be improved or worsened. I would be
129. against any revision that would result in more General Education credits but in favor of a less rigid structure. Initiatives like writing across the curriculum could aid student skill improvement without demanding more credit hours.
130. I would like to know what the alignment is between university elements and Gen Ed- as a baseline measure.
131. it should aim to strengthen students' ability and critical thinking of international/global issues through relevant courses including foreign languages (with at least 4 semesters of study)
132. The program has grown progressively more complicated and inflexible over the three decades since the last complete reconceptualization in 1982-83. It is difficult for CCSU students and faculty to understand and is irreconcilable with many programs completed by transferring students. Structural complexity is no substitute for intellectual quality.
133. Our current general education requirement system is very well thought out and sound.
134. Students should be required to take two composition classes; Freshman comp., along with a comp class which concentrates on writing, but bases its subject matter on literature (novel, play, poem, essay, etc.). Even with the new "Dragon" software, students need further writing skills, and as freshmen, most have not settled in to their academic careers enough to take writing seriously during their first semester at college.
135. Move to a four credit per class format across the board. Thin out sheer number of requirements to accommodate the four credit change. Writing Across the Curriculum and service learning should be the main focus of the additional credit and contact time for classes.
136. I am new to CCSU so don't know much about the General Studies program but I have read the description and think it is a good program. When I see something that says, "re-design," I generally think, "poor leadership."
137. It should include a selection of courses from various disciplines that focus upon critical thinking, effective writing, and an appreciation for the arts and sciences.
138. There are many elements in the current Gen Ed program that I appreciate, even when students don't. The requirement that students do university work outside their majors is in theory very important to me. Too often, programs overload Gen Ed with particular courses that are pretty narrow and undermine the notion of a free intellectual exploration foundational to liberal arts. On the other hand, too many of our students are not equipped for that "exploration" and end up with a very superficial smattering across the "easy" courses in the catalog. A program that allowed for more in-depth learning across the curriculum (not only at 100 or 200 level) and that encouraged inter-disciplinary thinking would be a significant improvement. And students could probably use a less burdensome Gen Ed curriculum in terms of credit hours. I am in favor of more rigorous requirements in Foreign Language and eliminating ENG 110 in favor of a WAC program that operates both in the majors and in "Learning Communities" and "FYE" style clusters of courses. If the logistics could be worked out, requiring each student to complete 2 or 3 such "clusters" (for example, each consisting of 2-3 linked courses in science, humanities, and social science) would allow for the in-depth and more experiential learning and perhaps also allow students to concentrate on issues that are both relevant to them personally but still guided by faculty's superior understanding of what's worth knowing. A series of topics clusters, devised by interested faculty and supported by administrative and departmental resources, could produce really exciting and innovative cross-disciplinary and liberal arts short curricula such as: 1) environmental questions across cultures (or in one specific region), 2) influence of Latin/Greek (or Arabic, Chinese, etc) culture in Western thought and science, 3) globalization and business cycles since the Ancient World, etc 4) the math and cultural history of built environments in XXX 5) The interplay of Art and revolution across the last 1000 years. These are just ideas off the top of my head. In these times, it seems we could and should reinvigorate the purpose and value of a widely-based university education that includes both humanities and science-based knowledge in meaningful dialogue. So, if done right, I would put "Strongly Agree" to a redesigning of Gen Ed, but if the idea is simply to make something easier to manage and less burdensome to all involved, I would then "Disagree" that any reform will be helpful to the students or the university.
139. More flexibility, include upper level classes, only writing courses, and possibly math, should be mandatory.
140. General Education at CCSU needs to include International Education in a meaningful manner. The Internationalization Laboratory has drafted a set of international education competencies for all CCSU students and that document can offer a good starting point.