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TO: Dr. John R. Halstead, College President
FROM: The College Senate: December 13, 2010
RE: Resolution #10 2010-2011

SUBJ: Revision to the College’s General Education Curriculum (routing #05_10-11 GE)

Signed: Jose R. Torre, 2010-11, College Senate President
Date: 01/05/11

TO: Jose R. Torre, College Senate President
FROM: John R. Halstead, College President
RE: Decision and Action Taken on Formal Resolution (circle choice)

- Accepted - Implementation Effective Date: 2011
- Deferred for discussion with the Faculty Senate on __/__/__
- Unacceptable for the reasons contained in the attached explanation

II. III. Response to Recommendation or Other/FYI

- Received and acknowledged 2/7/2011
- Comment:

Signed: John R. Halstead, President, The College at Brockport
Date: 2/7/11

DISTRIBUTION

Upon approval, the College President will forward copies of resolutions to his staff who will, in turn, forward copies to their staff. The College Senate Office will post resolutions to the College Senate Web at http://www.brockport.edu/collegesenate/resolutions.
Memorandum

To: Jose R. Torre, Senate President
From: John R. Halstead, College President
Date: February 2, 2011
Subj: Resolution # 10 2010-2011

Please find attached the standard response form for the above College Senate Resolution; Subject: Revision to the College’s General Education Curriculum.

Joe, since my response is in two parts as noted below, I thought I would attach this memo so my reply and intentions are clear. I am accepting the bulk of the resolution as recommended and outlined below; yet, I am “receiving and acknowledging with comment” the part dealing with the foreign languages requirement. Further, I am referring the latter to the Provost so that Dr. Anne Huot can work with you and your College Senate leadership.

Therefore, my reply to Resolution # 10 2010-2011 is as follows:

I accept and act upon the parts of the resolution that deal with:

1. Adopting the SUNY 7 of 10 requirement
2. Adopting the elimination of American History as a requirement
3. Adopting the recommendations that deal with transfer students

Thus, this becomes effective Fall 2011.

I receive and acknowledge the part of the recommendation that deals with the foreign languages requirement. In addition:

1. I am referring this matter to the Provost for further deliberation and discussion with the College Senate.
2. Therefore, the current requirement stands until the matter is resolved.

I am also putting this in writing to move this resolution along knowing there are others pending before the Senate. In addition, as Julie has advised you and your office, I will not be able to be with the Senate Executive Committee on Monday, February 7, as I must be in Albany for SUNY. As I suggested at your last meeting, you might want to invite Dr. Huot to discuss any of the other pending Senate resolutions.

cc: Provost Anne Huot
INSTRUCTIONS – please, no multiple attachments – submit each proposal electronically as one Word document.

- Submit only complete proposals. Include support letters from department chair and dean. Signed documents can be submitted as hard copies.
- Proposals must be prepared individually in Word format using committee guidelines available at brockport.edu/collegesenate/proposal.html.
- Fill out and insert this cover page into each proposal as page 1. (collegesenate/proposal.html)
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- Questions? Call the Senate office at 395-2586 or the appropriate committee chairperson.

1. PROPOSAL TITLE: Please be somewhat descriptive, ie. Graduate Probation/Dismissal Proposal rather than Graduate Proposal.

Revision to the College’s General Education Curriculum

2. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:

To review the recommendations of the report from the Academic Affairs Task Force on General Education and make recommendations as to which of the proposed revised models should be implemented.

3. WILL ADDITIONAL RESOURCES AFFECTING BUDGET BE NEEDED? _x_ NO ___ YES EXPLAIN YES

4. DESCRIBE ANY DATA RELATED TO STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT USED AS PART OF THE RATIONALE FOR THE REQUESTED SENATE ACTION.

5. HOW WILL THIS EFFECT TRANSFER STUDENTS:

Will align our general education program with the SUNY mandate on transfer mobility
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REJECTED - WITHDRAWN
Resolution on Revision to the College’s General Education Curriculum  

November 22, 2010

Whereas,

Model A of the Academic Affairs Task Force Report on General Education satisfies the “SUNY 7” requirement, and

Model A reduces the need for adjunct faculty, mainly by dropping the American History requirement, and

Model A reduces the maximum number of credits required to complete the General Education requirements from 51 to 44, and

Model A significantly reduces the complexity of the General Education program by reducing the number of different requirements and by no longer stipulating that no two courses from the same discipline may count toward satisfying the same knowledge area requirement, and

Model A dramatically increases the flexibility of the General Education Program from the students’ point of view by giving them more choice in fulfilling requirements, and

Model A, by allowing two courses from the same discipline to satisfy the same knowledge area requirement, gives students the opportunity to acquire a more in-depth knowledge of that discipline—a kind of “mini-minor,” and

Model A, by this provision, can also have the effect of either enhancing students’ mastery of their major field(s) or of leaving more room for electives in other fields, and

Model A upholds a solid liberal arts component in the College’s General Education curriculum, and

Model A preserves valuable and distinctive components of the current General Education program, including our contemporary issues and perspectives on women courses,

Therefore be it resolved that:

The College at Brockport implement Model A of the Academic Affairs Task Force Report on General Education, effective Fall 2011;

and whereas,

“One of the goals of the SUNY-GER [SUNY General Education Requirement] is to support a seamless education pipeline and degree attainment” (SUNY Academic Affairs Document 1402, section D),

Be it further resolved that:
(a) Transfer students coming with fewer than 24 credits shall be treated just like “native students;”

(b) Transfers with 24 or more credits shall take the following: ENG 112, Math 112, 1 Natural Science course, 1
Foreign Language course, 1 Humanities course, 1 Social Science course, 1 Fine Arts course, 1 “W” course (or this requirement can be attached to a knowledge area or contemporary issues course), 1 “I” course and additional courses from any of the 4 knowledge areas or foreign language if needed to meet the 30 credit minimum;

(c) Transfer students who complete one or more of the SUNY 10 that is no longer a part of the Brockport General Education Program (ex: American History or Western Civilization) will receive credit for that course and not be required to take a different course;

(d) Transfer students who complete the entire SUNY General Education Program (at least 30 credits of SUNY-GER approved courses including Math, Basic Communication and any 5 of the remaining areas) prior to matriculation at Brockport will have met the SUNY portion of their Brockport General Education requirements. These students must also complete the College’s local requirements either by Brockport course work or by transfer equivalency.

and whereas,

the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures is best qualified to assess the foreign language proficiency of our students,

Be it further resolved that:

In the revised program,

1. All incoming first year students who graduated from high school in New York state will be required to take the foreign language placement exam. Those who scored 85 or higher on a Regent’s foreign language exam will be both waived and excluded from 111; by taking the placement exam they may test out of 112 as well. Those who scored 84 or lower on a Regent’s foreign language exam (or who never sat a Regent’s foreign language exam) may test out of 111 and move immediately to 112. Exceptional students in this category may test out of both 111 and 112.

2. All incoming first year students who graduated from high school in another state or another country and who are native English speakers must take the foreign language placement exam to potentially test out of 111 or both 111 and 112, or must provide documentary proof to Brockport’s Foreign Languages Department of competency in a foreign language.

3. All incoming first year students who graduated from high school in another state or another country and whose native language is not English must provide documentary proof to Brockport’s foreign languages department of competency in a foreign language.

4. Any exceptional cases not covered by 1-3 above will be handled by the chair of the foreign languages department.
These checklists (pages 4, 5, and 6) are being circulated to the Senate as explanatory addenda to our resolution rather than as parts of the resolution itself.

Recommendation from the General Education Curriculum & Policies Committee
11/4/10

Model A: General Education Checklist

**Orientation to the College**
- Academic Planning: ___GEP 100
- Seminar (APS): Required for all students entering With fewer than 24 credits

**General Education Knowledge Area Courses**
- College Mathematics: ___MTH 112 or Higher May be waived based on high school performance
- Natural Science: ___L course
- Social Science: ___S course
- Humanities: ___H course
- Arts: ___P course
- Foreign Language: ___112-level course In a foreign language or waiver * See below
- Written Communication: ___ENG 112 Minimum Grade of “C”

**Other Requirements**
- Contemporary Issues: ___I course One course required, taken in junior or senior year
- Perspectives on Gender: ___W course One course required, can also be a knowledge area or contemporary issues course
- Diversity or Other World Civilization: ___D or O course One course that is also a knowledge area course required
Current General Education Checklist
Requirements for New First Year Students Entering in Fall 2009 or Later*

Orientation to the College
Academic Planning Seminar (APS) ___GEP 100 Required for all students entering
with fewer than 24 credits

General Education Knowledge Area Courses
College Mathematics ___MTH 112 or Higher May be waived based on
higher school performance

Natural Science ___L course Two courses required,
___N or L course different disciplines,
at least one with laboratory

Social Science ___S course One course required from
discipline other than HST

American History ___V course One course required

Western Civilization ___G course One course required

Other World Civilization ___O course One course required

Humanities ___H course One courses required, from
different discipline of
Western Civilization course

Arts ___P course Two courses required,
___F or P course different disciplines,
at least one with performance

Foreign Language ___112-level course AP or CLEP credit, or placement in
language course higher than 112
based on high school achievement

Written Communication ___ENG 112 Minimum Grade of “C”
Oral Communication ___Y course

Other Requirements
Contemporary Issues ___I course One course required, taken in
junior or senior year

Perspectives on Women ___W course One course required,
often taken after first semester

Diversity ___D course One course required

Competency Examination Requirements
Computer Skills Exam Examination “S” on Computer Skills Exam

* Checklist from Academic Planning Seminar: What Students Think Students Should Know, Fall 2010;
slight formatting revisions.

September 28, 2010

To: Professor Jose Torre
College Senate President
From: Anne Huot
Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs

Re: Recommendations from the Academic Affairs Task Force on General Education

In February of 2010 I asked a faculty based Task Force, with College Senate representation, to conduct an examination of our general education curriculum for the primary purpose of improving its quality while being mindful of opportunities to reduce our instructional expenditures as appropriate in light of the then newly issued SUNY general education requirements. The charge to the Task Force will be found in Appendix A. The full report from the Task Force is found in Appendix B.

I believe that the Task Force did an excellent job of seeking broad input and debating the significant issues. The report presents three models for a revised general education curriculum with the relative advantages and disadvantages for each expressed. I am asking the College Senate to review the Task Force report and advise me as to which of the options should be implemented effective fall 2011. In considering this I also ask that the College Senate keep the charge to the Task Force in mind. To be implemented for fall 2011 I will need the recommendation of the College Senate by the end of this calendar year (2010). I am appreciative that this is an aggressive time frame and grateful for the effort to meet the same.

It is my hope that with this debate we have taken the beginning steps in an ongoing and fruitful review of our general education program rather than persisting in our historical pattern of episodic review. There is much to learn from the national dialogue on general education and with more regular, systematic review we stand to gain from participation in this dialogue. I look forward to an ongoing partnership with the College Senate and our faculty at large in this extremely important effort to improve the quality of general education at Brockport.

Appendix A. Charge to the Academic Affairs Task Force on General Education

Academic Affairs Task Force on General Education
02-02-2010

Context for Change

The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) continues to lead the national dialogue on general education. Intentionality and coherence are common threads within that dialogue. Our own general education program has not been significantly revised in more than a decade. This has been partly a function of the general education requirements imposed by the State University of New York Board of Trustees and the reality that meaningful change within the context of those requirements is difficult. The new guidelines for general education adopted by the Board of Trustees this year provide us with the increased flexibility that will allow us to review and revise our general education curriculum and I am asking the faculty to seize this opportunity. A high quality general education program should be both intentional and coherent. Moreover, the general education curriculum should be the College’s common educational experience that provides a foundation for our students’ ability to think critically.

At this time, the College also faces unprecedented financial challenges and we must ensure that our curriculum is of the highest quality and efficiency. To do otherwise would be irresponsible. In addition to ensuring the highest quality possible, a fresh look at our general education program also provides us the opportunity to ensure that the delivery of this curriculum is as efficient as possible. We must examine both as one without the other will not serve our students or our institution well.

Finally, we are not alone in this challenge. These issues are being discussed across many institutions. Quoting from the promotional materials for the upcoming general education and assessment meeting of the AAC&U, “Colleges and
universities are making tough decisions about budget cuts, hiring freezes, and reduction or elimination of programs. General education and assessment initiatives, in particular, can be vulnerable to cuts or to inattention as college and university leaders work to preserve enrollments, meet shortfalls, and maintain basic operations. Yet issues that existed long before the current economic crisis remain—fragmentation and incoherence, a lack of “ownership” of general education among many faculty members, and a desire among students to “get it out of the way.” What also remains is the need, through general education, to prepare all graduates with essential knowledge and skills, including global knowledge, scientific and quantitative literacy, intercultural skills, and ethical competencies."

For the reasons referred to above, we have decided to convene a faculty committee for the purpose of studying these issues and advising the faculty and the administration on the issue of how best to revise our general education curriculum. The recommendations forthcoming will be vetted by the College Senate during the fall of 2010 with the intent that a revised general education program will be adopted in time for the setting of the fall 2011 course schedule.

**Guiding Principles and Goals for a Discussion of Revising the General Education Curriculum**

A revision of general education should reflect the basic theme of student success as our number one priority. Revision of the curriculum is not intended to threaten either the autonomy or viability of any discipline or program. However, a revised general education curriculum may lead to enhanced interdisciplinary opportunities for faculty teaching as well as adding value to our students’ educational experiences.

As with other efforts, the overarching goal is to position the College at Brockport for the future. To this end, we seek to:

- Strengthen our general education program with particular emphasis on intentionality and cohesion.
- Build support for the notion that general education is the responsibility of all faculty and not only those faculty teaching courses that meet requirements of the general education curriculum.
- Develop a model for general education that encourages teaching and learning more broadly across the curriculum including but not limited to interdisciplinary teaching and learning.
- Engage more full-time faculty in the delivery of the general education curriculum.
- Make clear to our students the personal value of Brockport’s general education curriculum.
- Reduce our expenditures by increasing efficiency to the greatest extent possible while improving the quality of our general education program.

**Charge for the Academic Affairs Task Force on General Education**

The Task Force on General Education is charged with facilitating a campus-wide discussion centered on identifying the best way to improve the quality of our general education program and deliver the same in the most efficient manner. This goal includes reducing our instructional expenditures on general education. Special emphasis should be placed on the goals and principles articulated above. Further, the Task Force is to be mindful of the impact of our general education program on a student’s time to degree for both native and transfer students. The Task Force is asked to specifically examine the complexity and breadth of the current general education program in light of the new SUNY guidelines. Elimination of complexity (number of different requirements) and a reduction in total credit hours required (over the SUNY minimum of 30 credits) to complete the program is an expected outcome of a revised general education program.

The Task Force should make every effort to keep the College community informed about its progress and engaged in the process as it carries out the charge. The recommendations must be submitted to the Provost by April 30, 2010. This will enable the leadership of the Academic Affairs Division to consider the recommendations and prepare the materials that will be necessary in order for the College Senate to consider the proposed revisions in fall 2010. It is
understood that there will need to be an implementation process that will then follow with the expectation that a revised general education program will be in place for fall 2011.

The Task Force is asked to submit 2 or 3 alternative revisions to the existing general education program for consideration with the strengths and weaknesses of each stated within the context described above. The Task Force is asked to consider models and best practices in its deliberations.

**Task Force Membership**

Chair – Dena Levy

Staff Support – Carol Giblin

College Senators – Georges Dicker, Rebecca Smith, Conrad Van Voorst

Faculty – Barbara LeSavoy, Eric Monier, Christopher Norment, Jennifer Haytock, Nancy Washer, Paul Moyer, Mary Kozub, Andrea Rubery, Melissa Brown, Sara DiDonato, Cesar Torres, Ruth Childs, Trish Ralph
The Provost Charged us with:

Identifying 2 or 3 alternative revisions to the existing general education program with the intent of:

- Reducing our instructional expenditures
- Improving the quality of our general education program
- Delivering the program in an efficient manner
- Reducing the total number of credit hours required to complete the program
- Reducing the complexity of the program
- Designing a more intentional program

Note: the Models presented below are recommendations only. One may eventually be presented before the College Senate where there will be opportunity for further discussion and amendment before any final changes will be made.

Our Research

- We have spent the last 3 months examining different modes of delivering a general education program (distribution models versus core models)
- We have surveyed the faculty about the strengths and weaknesses of our current system
- We have attempted to identify areas where there is higher than average reliance upon adjuncts to teach the general education courses.
- We have compared our program to other SUNY schools as well as to other comparable programs around the country
- We have identified goals a general education program must meet in order to be considered successful

The Results

- Our current program creates difficulty for some majors and departments such as education and nursing.
- The current program places a considerable burden on some departments, most notably History.
- The General Education program is the only mechanism that seeks to assure that all Brockport graduates obtain the signature feature of a four-year college experience: a liberal education.
- The current program has some components that are unique to Brockport and should be maintained, most notably our Contemporary Issues and Perspectives on Women requirements.

General Education Goals

The goals and structure of these proposals are based on what general education is. General education is not a field or a discipline like physics or economics or history. The term “general education” is not a noun that designates some area of knowledge that transcends or encompasses other areas of knowledge. Rather, it is (conceptually if not grammatically) an adjective that describes a curriculum designed to lead to a liberal arts education.

So to ask, “what is general education?” is really to ask, “what is a liberally educated person?” Such a person is, first of all, one who can effectively use his or her own language, both in speech and in writing, who can reason coherently, and who has a certain level or proficiency in mathematics. These communication, verbal, and mathematical reasoning abilities are fundamental and will here be called “foundations of learning.” Second, a liberally educated person is one who has some grasp of the scope and depth of human knowledge, in other words, one who is to some degree conversant with the natural sciences, humanities, fine arts, and social sciences—the very “knowledge areas” in which this College
already offers courses. Third, a liberally educated person living in the twenty-first century is one who has developed an appreciation of human and cultural differences, and a disposition to interact with fellow humans, regardless of those differences, in a respectful, collaborative, ethical, and empathetic manner.

From this conception of a liberal arts education, the main goals of a general education curriculum clearly emerge.

1. Students should leave their college experience being able successfully to impart information and express ideas in both writing and speech.

2. Students should leave their college experience being able to think critically and creatively—to recognize problems, acquire relevant information, and use verbal and mathematical reasoning toward developing a solution.

3. Students should leave their college experience significantly conversant with at least one discipline in each of the four knowledge areas of the liberal arts—the natural sciences, humanities, fine arts, and social sciences—or familiar with more than one different field in each of those areas.

4. Students should leave their college experience being able to understand human existence from multiple perspectives and with the disposition to interact with their fellow humans in a respectful, collaborative, ethical, and empathetic manner, regardless of the differences among them.

5. Students should leave their college experience with the knowledge and understanding needed to exercise citizenship on a local, national, and global level—with an appreciation of how the world affects them and how their actions can affect the world.

3 Proposals

The Committee has identified three different models for revising the current general education program.

Model A - The first is a distribution model that modifies the existing program while keeping intact its strengths.

Model B - The second proposal shares much with the first proposal but adds a Topics Cluster requirement as a way to encourage students to understand the purpose and intentions of a General Education program. This cluster revolves around a topic so that students can see how different Knowledge Areas engage with the same issues but may pose different questions in the process of studying that issue. Possible topics might include the Environment, Social Institutions and Human Behavior, Power, Identity, etc. Faculty would be expected to be in contact with other faculty teaching in their topic but would not be team teaching. The Topical Cluster courses could be taught/taken all in the same semester or over two semesters, but preferably not more. Students must take a cluster of three courses, from three of the four following areas: Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences. These courses would count toward requirements in the Knowledge Areas and may also fulfill a student’s Perspectives on Gender requirement.

Cluster courses should be considered essential parts of departments’ curricula, just as 100- and 200-level courses are now. In other words, cluster courses are not to be “watered down” in any way and they are to be “owned” by departments. They may count toward a department’s major program as they do now—as parts of the major or as prerequisites, depending on the department.
Model C

This model represents a variation on Model A and is offered specifically in response to campus community feedback that neither Model A nor Model B go far enough in reducing credits in our General Education Program. The fundamental difference between Model A and Model C is that Model C groups Humanities and Social Sciences together. Students would be required to take 3 courses from this newly merged category with the stipulation that no more than 2 classes can be from the same knowledge area (i.e., 2 S and 1 H or 1 S and 2 H).

Distribution v. Core Models

The Committee opted to recommend only distribution models of general education. The decision to do so was based on two issues. The first was that we preferred a model that maximized student flexibility in course selection. A core model would substantially reduce the wide variety of options students have in selecting courses from different knowledge areas that is available with a distribution model. Moreover, a core model may pose significant barriers for our large population of transfer students. The second reason reflected our concern about the ability to successfully implement a core model at Brockport. In particular, we learned from our research that college’s that successfully made the switch from a distribution to a core model did so with substantial resources being devoted to the project – both in terms of time and money. The Committee felt that given the current financial crisis and other ongoing campus projects such sufficient resources might be lacking. Ultimately, as a group, we felt that the proposed distribution models best met the goals that we identified as important for a successful general education program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>EXISTING PROGRAM</strong></th>
<th><strong>Model A</strong></th>
<th><strong>Model B</strong></th>
<th><strong>Model C</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to the College</td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation to the College</td>
<td>Orientation to the College</td>
<td>Orientation to the College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>APS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills Courses</strong></td>
<td>Foundations of Learning</td>
<td>Foundations of Learning</td>
<td>Foundations of Learning</td>
<td>Foundations of Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 112</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ENG 112</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ENG 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 112</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Math 112</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Math 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORAL COMMUNICATION, CRITICAL THINKING, &amp; INFORMATION LITERACY (infused in multiple courses)</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>ORAL COMMUNICATION, CRITICAL THINKING &amp; INFORMATION LITERACY (infused in many courses)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ORAL COMMUNICATION, CRITICAL THINKING &amp; INFORMATION LITERACY (infused in many courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER LITERACY</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>eliminated</td>
<td>eliminated</td>
<td>eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>(0-6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Area Courses</td>
<td>Knowledge Areas$^2$</td>
<td>Knowledge Areas$^2$</td>
<td>Knowledge Areas$^2$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Fine Arts courses from different disciplines, at least one with performance</td>
<td>Two Fine Arts courses, at least one with performance</td>
<td>Two Fine Arts courses, at least one with performance</td>
<td>Two Fine Arts courses, at least one with performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Natural Science courses from different disciplines, at least one with lab</td>
<td>Two Natural Science, courses, at least one with lab</td>
<td>Two Natural Science, courses, at least one with lab</td>
<td>Two Natural Science, courses, at least one with lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Two Social Science courses</td>
<td>Two Social Science courses</td>
<td>Three courses from Humanities &amp; Social Sciences: no more than 2 from one knowledge area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Two Humanities Courses</td>
<td>Two Humanities Courses</td>
<td>eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Civilization</td>
<td>eliminated</td>
<td>eliminated</td>
<td>eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other World Civilizations</td>
<td>merged (see below)</td>
<td>Merged (see below)</td>
<td>Merged (see below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOCUS AREAS</td>
<td>PERSPECTIVES &amp; INTEGRATION</td>
<td>Contemporary Issues (upper division)</td>
<td>Perspectives on Gender (can be attached to knowledge area or contemporary issues course)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>eliminated</td>
<td>eliminated</td>
<td>eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>0-6³</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>0-6³</td>
<td>(see above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Issues (Upper division)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Contemporary Issues (upper division)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Perspectives on Gender (can be attached to knowledge area or contemporary issues course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives on Women (can be attached to knowledge area or contemporary issues course)</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>Perspectives on Gender (can be attached to knowledge area or contemporary issues course)</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>Perspectives on Gender (can be attached to knowledge area or contemporary issues course)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The computer literacy exam would become a graduation requirement and no longer count as 1 credit towards graduation.

Not more than two courses from any single discipline may count towards fulfilling the knowledge areas requirement.

In the revised programs, a score of 85 on a Foreign Language Regents exam will waive students from both the 111 and 112 course requirements.

| Diversity (All courses meeting the learning outcome tied to this area must also meet at least one of the knowledge area requirements or another focus area requirement) | 0 | Diversity OR Other World Civilizations (All courses meeting the learning outcome tied to one of these areas must also meet at least one of the knowledge area requirements) | 0 | Diversity OR Other World Civilizations (All courses meeting the learning outcome tied to one of these areas must also meet at least one of the knowledge area requirements or else also be either a Contemporary Issues or a Perspectives on Gender Course) | 0 | Diversity OR Other World Civilizations (All courses meeting the learning outcome tied to one of these areas must also meet at least one of the knowledge area requirement) | 0 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **TOPICAL CLUSTER** | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Minimum/Maximum Credits | 35-51 | Minimum/Maximum Credits | 35-44 | Minimum/Maximum Credits | 35-44 | Minimum/Maximum Credits | 32-41 |

1 The computer literacy exam would become a graduation requirement and no longer count as 1 credit towards graduation.

2 Not more than two courses from any single discipline may count towards fulfilling the knowledge areas requirement.

3 In the revised programs, a score of 85 on a Foreign Language Regents exam will waive students from both the 111 and 112 course requirements.
Transfer Students – Models A & B

a) Transfer students coming with fewer than 24 credits are treated just like "native" students.

b) Transfers with 24 or more credits would take the following: ENG112, Math 112, 1 Foreign Language, 1 Humanities, 1 Social Science, 1 Natural Science, 1 Arts. In addition, they would take 1 "W" course (or this requirement can be attached to a knowledge area or contemporary issues course), 1 "I" course and 2 additional courses from any of the 4 knowledge areas or foreign language. Our transfer program needs to include these 2 additional courses to make sure that it meets the SUNY mandated 30-credit minimum for general education.

c) Transfer students who complete one of the SUNY 10 that is no longer a part of the Brockport General Education Program (ex: American History or Western Civilization) will receive credit for that course and not be required to take a different course.
**DISCUSSION**

**Advantages - Model A**

1. Satisfies the “SUNY 7” requirement.
2. Meets the Provost’s charge by reducing the need for adjunct faculty, mainly by dropping the American History requirement.
3. Addresses the Provost’s charge by reducing the maximum number of credits required to complete the General Education requirements from 51 to 44.
4. Meets the Provost’s charge by significantly reducing the complexity of the General Education program by reducing the number of different requirements and by no longer stipulating that no two courses from the same discipline may count toward satisfying the same knowledge area requirement. This model also dramatically increases the flexibility of the General Education program from the students’ point of view by giving them more choices in fulfilling requirements.
5. Allowing two courses from the same discipline to count toward the satisfying the same knowledge area requirement gives the student the opportunity to acquire a more in-depth knowledge of that discipline—a kind of “mini-minor.” If that discipline also happens to be the student’s major, this provision can also have the effect of either enhancing the student’s mastery of his/her major field or leaving more room for elective courses in other fields.
6. Upholds a solid liberal arts component in the College’s General Education curriculum.
7. Preserves valuable features of the current General Education program, like our contemporary issues courses and perspectives on gender courses, which help to make the College at Brockport distinctive.

**Disadvantages – Model A**

1. It does not sufficiently reduce the number of required credits.
2. It does not make the intentions behind general education explicit enough to students.
Model B Notes

- This model is based on models as UNC-Ashville; UNC-Chapel Hill and American University also have similar models. Our committee chair talked with the program coordinator at Ashville, and the coordinator suggested some ideas to keep the Clusters efficient and manageable:
  1. To offer a limited number of Topics
  2. To offer plenty of courses within each Topic (12-15)
  3. To have an administrative position to run the program
  4. To have Faculty Coordinators to keep the clusters focused

- Block scheduling of the Topical Cluster courses would help ensure that students get the courses they need. Sample 3 (below), for example, in which the student takes all his/her Topical Cluster courses in the same semester, suggests that it would be possible to get the cluster done in one semester and without scheduling problems if the cluster were blocked. On the other hand, block scheduling may reduce students’ choices among courses identified for the particular Topical Cluster.

- A variation on the proposal above: instead of requiring courses from different Knowledge Areas, we could require a cluster of courses from at least three different disciplines, at least two of which must be from different Knowledge Areas.

- This model would require an administrative position to coordinate the offerings from the departments.

- It might be desirable to test the feasibility of this model through a pilot program.

- We already have a General Education Committee in the College Senate that could help determine what might be appropriate topics for clusters.

Advantages - Model B

1. Satisfies the “SUNY 7” requirement.
2. Meets the Provost’s charge by reducing the need for adjunct faculty, mainly by dropping the American History requirement.
3. Addresses the Provost’s charge by reducing the maximum number of credits required to complete the General Education requirements from 51 to 44.
4. Integrates learning specifically through the Topical Cluster across Knowledge Areas, addressing one task we were asked by the Provost to accomplish: intentionality. Students would learn how different Knowledge Areas address the same topic or problem.

Disadvantages - Model B

1. Would require considerable start-up time, energy, and funding. Summer stipends might provide incentive and support for faculty to develop courses and Clusters.
2. Enough clusters of sufficient size would have to be offered to allow students to proceed efficiently through the curriculum. Would require careful planning by faculty, departments, Academic Advising, and Registrar’s Office (probably others).
3. It does not sufficiently reduce the number of required credits.
4. It would not offer as much flexibility as Model A and, as a result, may not be as efficient.
**Model B – Sample Schedule**

**Assuming a Topical Cluster with course offerings from Biology, English, Political Science, and Sociology:**

**Sample Student 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Year 1</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG 112</td>
<td>ENG Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Science: Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO Topic</td>
<td>Arts: Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLS Topic</td>
<td>Perspectives on Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language I</td>
<td>Foreign Language II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Year 2</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Student 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Year 1</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG 112</td>
<td>ENG Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>SOC Topic [replaces Failed Topic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO Topic</td>
<td>Science: Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLS Topic [FAILED]</td>
<td>Arts: Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language I</td>
<td>Foreign Language II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Year 2</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives on Women</td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Student 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Year 1</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG 112</td>
<td>Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Arts: Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO Topic</td>
<td>Science: Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLS Topic</td>
<td>Perspectives on Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG Topic</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Year 2</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language I</td>
<td>Foreign Language II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes – Model C**

1. This model is put forward in reaction to feedback we received from the campus community concerning Models A and B; specifically, that neither model went far enough in reducing credits in our General Education Program.
2. The committee took a hard look at the question of credits and came to the following conclusions: (1) Since students still need 120 credits to graduate, cutting credits in general education simply for the sake of cutting credits would not, in itself, create any greater efficiencies in our college-wide curriculum. (2) That maintaining the integrity and quality of our General Education Program must take precedence over any desire to simply reduce the credit load associated with the program.

3. The committee came up with Model C as the best option for cutting credits in our general education program while at the same time maintaining quality.

4. The signature feature of Model C is that it collapses the Humanities and Social Sciences knowledge areas into a single category and requires students to take 3 courses across these two knowledge areas (with the stipulation that not all three courses can be taken in the same knowledge area). This structure maintains one of the key aspects of our efforts to improve our General Education Program: flexibility.

5. Our justification for this change in the Humanities and Social Sciences is that (1) there are enough affinities between these two knowledge areas in terms of what they study and how they study it to join them together into a single category, (2) that there are additional affinities between the Humanities and Fine Arts courses without a performance component, and (3) that students have a good chance of encountering courses in the Humanities and Social Sciences in their Contemporary Issues (I) courses and an excellent chance of encountering a course in these two knowledge areas in a Perspectives of Gender (W) course. Taking all of these considerations together, the committee felt that this reduction in the number of credits taken in the Humanities and Social Sciences could be made without seriously eroding the quality of the General Education Program.

6. Finally, the committee felt that this change could be justified because it provided an opportunity to reduce expenditures in and increase the quality of our General Education Program in terms of the classroom experience. The spare capacity/surplus seats created in the Humanities and Social Sciences under Model C could be used to: (1) reduce our dependence on adjunct instructors and place more students with tenured/tenure track faculty [Note: the Departments of English, History, Communications, and Women’s Studies are some of the most adjunct-dependent on campus—all have 40% or more of these general education classes taught by adjuncts.] and (2) enable departments in the Humanities and Social Sciences to move away from large enrollment classes to meet demand for general education seats. Reducing class size would enable instructors to assign more writing and more individually engage students in discussion and critical thinking. Finally (3), Model C would allow seats in classes from departments in the Fine Arts currently allotted to our Western Civilization and Other World Civilizations requirements to migrate back to the Fine Arts knowledge area and perhaps alleviate some of dependence on adjuncts and large-enrollment classes there.
Advantages - Model C
1. Has all of the advantages (1, 4, 5, & 7) listed under Model A.

In addition, it:
2. More fully addresses the Provost’s charge concerning reducing expenditures related to general education. Model C would more significantly cut costs by reducing the need for adjunct faculty across the Humanities, Social Sciences, and even Fine Arts.
3. More fully addresses the Provost’s charge of reducing credits required to complete General Education requirements. Compared to our current program, Model C reduces the maximum number of credits by 10 (from 51 to 41) and the minimum number of credits by 3 (from 35 to 32).
4. Has the potential to improve the quality of students’ classroom experience in general education in the Humanities, Social Sciences (and perhaps even Fine Arts) by freeing up resources that could be used to reduce class size (and thus enable more writing assignments and student-faculty engagement) and to assure that a greater proportion of students take their general education courses with full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty.
5. Could support the “Topical Clusters” envisioned in Model B.

Disadvantages – Model C
1. Represents an erosion of students’ exposure to the liberal arts.
2. May be difficult to build consensus around this model because it appears to devalue the Humanities and Social Sciences relative to the Natural Sciences and Fine Arts.
3. It does not make the intentions behind general education explicit enough to students.

Appendix 1 - General Education Survey Results

The Academic Affairs Task Force on General Education is charged with “facilitating a campus-wide discussion centered on identifying the best way to improve the quality of our general education program and deliver the same in the most efficient manner.” Building on the belief that general education is the responsibility of all faculty, our committee is seeking input by administering this survey to elicit responses from our colleagues. We ask that you respond to the following questions. Additional comments or concerns are welcome.

1. What is your department’s vision of General Education?
2. What works in our current General Education program?
   a. There are enough courses offered for students to easily complete the requirements. 33%
   b. There are enough choices for students to allow them to pick courses of interest. 31%
   c. The program achieves the goal of ensuring that students graduate with a solid general education. 31%
   d. Other – please explain 5%
3. What does not work in our current General Education program?
   a. There are not enough courses offered to allow students to easily complete the requirements. 7%
   b. It is overly burdensome – there are too many courses required. 24.5%
   c. The program lacks coherence. 17.5%
   d. There is no capstone course tying the program together in a meaningful way. 10%
   e. It relies too much on adjuncts to teach the necessary courses. 24%
   f. It is not sufficiently interdisciplinary. 10.5%
   g. Other – please explain. 6%
4. What changes in the General Education program would allow it to better serve your department, our students, and the College as a whole?
   a. Decrease in the number of requirements. 20%
   b. Decrease in the number of learning outcomes. 10%
   c. Increase in the number of sections and/or courses offered in a given semester. 9%
   d. More flexibility for students to select classes that they would like to take. 16%
   e. Introduction of a meaningful capstone course to better tie the program together. 8%
   f. More training for faculty about how to teach general education courses. 8%
   g. Making it more interdisciplinary. 11%
   h. Have smaller class sizes 13%
   i. Other – please explain. 4%

5. What do you think are the barriers to making those changes?
   a. Financial 42%
   b. Entrenched support for the status quo 53%
   c. Other – please explain. 5%

6. How do you feel about teaching general education courses?
   a. I enjoy it very much. 31%
   b. I don’t mind teaching them. 24%
   c. I have never taught a purely general education at Brockport, so I don’t know 30%
   d. I prefer not to teach them but will do so if asked. 1%
   e. I dislike teaching them. 4%
   f. Other - please explain 10%

7. In the previous question if you answered that you do not like teaching general education can you explain why?
   a. students are taking the course simply to satisfy a requirement. 33%
   b. I think courses in the major are more important. 21%
   c. Other - please explain. 46%

Appendix 2
General Education Survey Responses if answered “Other” to any of the questions.

1. Question #3 "other:" Departments that use adjunct faculty to teach Gen Ed courses are doing themselves a disservice. The average first year student will change her/his major at least once; and they tend to reject their first major and/or select their new major based on their experience in introductory, Gen Ed courses. It makes sense to assign experienced, committed, full-time faculty to these introductory courses for the purpose of recruiting or retaining their majors! Question #4, "Other:" It seems that many faculty members have already reduced the number of learning objectives unilaterally. I find that most Gen Ed Breadth Component courses that should have a writing component in reality do not, for example. This may be a function of burdening adjunct faculty members with large numbers of students for very low compensation, it may be due to full-time faculty feeling burdened by and reacting poorly to their assignment to large, lower-division courses, or it may simply be due to ignorance of the requirements of Gen Ed Breadth Component courses. Question #5 "Other:" I’m afraid that the General Education Program has been and continues to be treated like the poor stepchild, barely a member of the family of
majors’ courses.” Family resources never seem to be directed toward Cinderella. Question #7 “Other:** I enjoy teaching general audiences in General Education courses. Doing so is a welcomed break from the rigors of pure science; and the rewards for making a connection with your non-science students seem so much greater.

2. **Question 4:** I am sympathetic to the idea of less Gen Eds. I like the concept that the set of Gen Ed requirements could vary within our campus depending on the student’s major. If this committee finds a way to maintain the two Gen Ed purposes that I listed in Question 1, I will support the change. I have a suggestion, which I will offer in the next comment box. I am, however, troubled about the idea that students could opt out of a major concentration area altogether. We may be opening a Pandora’s box because students naturally drift towards the areas where they feel stronger or perceive as easier, and away from the areas where they have difficulty or they perceive as harder. This will exacerbate the deficiencies that students already have coming from High School compared to the knowledge that College students around the world have.

3. I believe that some of the general ed program is working. I believe that forcing the students to become more well rounded is a good goal but right now the program is burdensome with too many tacked on requirements to the original requirements we started with.

4. I haven’t answered other, but the survey is making me answer this question anyway!

5. Not sure if adjuncts are heavily relied on for GE courses, but if so I see that as a weakness.

6. 5. - resources (financial, space, and people) 6. - I am not an instructor.

7. #5-There are serious philosophical differences in what a general education program should accomplish. Some of these differences cannot be resolved easily.

8. I’ve taught only Gen Ed. I find that students resist the rigor of the writing that is part of Gen Ed course and they are looking for multiple choice tests and ways in which they do not have to think about the material and relate it to other courses and to their lives. Gen Ed should prepare students for the real world of work and life, where the answers are not cut and dry and the student must think about implications.

9. It is unfortunate that some requirements, like oral communication, critical thinking, and upper-division writing, are simply “infused” into certain courses. For instance, if a student speaks poorly, does he or she have to repeat the class? Students would be well served to take, for instance, a second writing class, logic, public speaking, and so forth.

10. Most general education requirements are reasonable enough to complete if a student registers on time. Many courses have been designed with a lot of effort to meet general education objectives. 3. The letter system highly encourages students to take courses solely based on how many requirements they can fulfill with a single course. Many courses that could be equally beneficial in a gen ed sort of way don’t have exactly what is needed to get a letter (or the letter hasn’t been sought) and therefore students have less choice. This is a big deal when there are so many requirements and students may not have room for actual electives. 4. Make sure students understand why we have a gen ed program and why we have the particular one we do. (I’m a bad APS instructor, so that’s definitely for me next year.)

11. I do not know whether or not the program relies too much on adjuncts. I’m not that knowledgeable about that level of detail.

12. I have taught gen ed courses at another SUNY institution and enjoyed it.

13. I think our Gen Ed requirements are fine but I do think that some of the diversity requirements could be more specifically formulated—the W should take gender and sexuality courses into account, and the D should be defined more clearly in terms of what specifically students are learning. But I do think that the courses themselves go beyond the limited and vague definitions, so this is not really an issue that needs immediate attention. I think the problem to making changes to using too much adjunct labor for gen ed is financial. We should have more full time people teaching our gen ed courses and I think this is an issue of funding, not of having too many requirements.

14. Some of our requirements are well intentioned but operationally difficult to service. We appear to be providing the Foreign Language courses required for the BS degree (3-6 credits). However,
some programs such as English and Anthropology—and I assume others—would more appropriately encompass the BA as the required degree. But, under our current situation, here is no practical way—without major shifting of resources—to make this possible. An alternative would be to follow the direction of most SUNY schools to satisfy the BA requirement with two or three semesters of FL.

15. not a faculty member
16. I am a professional, not faculty
17. Include more course work that would make the students more rounded and globally prepared to function in the real world realm of career choices.
18. #6 Teaching general education courses: I enjoy teaching the students who are interested in the subject, but two thirds of them (or more) are there because they think it is the easiest choice to completing the requirement. They are unwilling to put in any effort to overcome their ignorance of the discipline, and any amount of work assigned is looked at as too burdensome. I’d rather not deal with those students, even if the requirement is for their own good!
19. I am in a graduate department.
20. Well, the survey presumes that through our advising we are aware of Gen Ed difficulties. This is not the case and our department has many transfer students which are a different issue. The Other I listed had to do with my observation that a student may not be able to meet a requirement with a class of their choice because of when sections are times or they are full. This is different from not being able to fill requirement at all, which I have not heard about.
21. For question #3, I think all students should be required to take a basic public speaking course as this is something everyone will use at some point as well as a skill that everyone can improve. A basic communication course would seem to be a logical component of a Gen Ed program yet none are required. On the other hand, Western Civilizations and Other World Civilizations could probably be an either/or rather than both scenario.
22. RE 3: two SPECIFIC requirements should be dropped, the American History requirement and the Other Civilizations requirement. All others should be kept. RE 6: There is no such thing as a "purely general education course." General education is really an adjectival notion, meaning a generally (better yet: liberally) educated person. I believe that courses WITHIN MY DISCIPLINE contribute greatly to a person’s liberal education, and I enjoy teaching them immensely. I would NOT enjoy teaching some sort of generic so-called "general education course," and I would regard any attempt to impose such a course, at any level, as educational malpractice.
23. Whether the GenEd program currently “achieves the goal of ensuring that students graduate with a solid general education” - that’s the $64,000 question, isn’t it. But it’s certainly not one that I can answer; nor do I think many others in a position to answer it. What is the criterion of achievement? What precisely constitutes a "solid general education”? I am not sure I see the logic of a ‘capstone course’. On the contrary, given that most students seem already to perceive - however wrongly - GenEd course as an unnecessary burden, it seems likely that a capstone course would be perceived the same way. Only in this case, I suspect the perception would be correct: for how would one design a course that "meaningfully ties together" such disparate subjects as, say, lab chemistry, modern dance, French language, and history? Each year, I teach 300-400 GenEd students in both large (200+) and regular (45) classes. None of them want to be there. So I take it as an important part of my role, from the first day of class to the last, to convey to the students a clear sense of the relevance and meaning *to them* of the material they are supposed to be learning. This is part of the unique challenge of teaching such a course, and one of the reasons I enjoy it. From my own experience, I would say that a large class is not necessarily a bad thing, though we all know well enough that smaller is better when it comes to teaching. For some courses - say, English Composition - small classes may be absolutely necessary in order to achieve the goals of the course. But in other contexts, one may achieve useful results even in a large class. To be sure, my small classes offer a much more rigorous introduction both to the contents of the course and to the discipline of history. But that does not mean that the goals I set for the large class are not themselves valuable and meaningful. The
better choice is obvious - but the better should not be the enemy of the good. There is nothing wrong with having adjuncts, per se, teach GenEd courses. There are certainly adjuncts in the pool who are eminently qualified to teach Gen Ed (or any) courses - and they ought not to be singled out as a class and blamed for any perceived failure of GenEd. The real problem comes when GenEd courses are taught by instructors with a scant knowledge of the subject matter of the course, with slight pedagogical skills or experience, and/or with little or no desire to rise to the challenge of teaching to a hostile audience. Even full professors may be prey to these faults. So please do not scapegoat the adjuncts.

24. I am not sure how my discipline - a highly specialized one - fits in with Gen Ed.
25. NA
27. Students have a difficult time registering for Foreign Language courses.
28. Students have too much flexibility. For example, for their "S" course, they can choose Recreation. For "H", they can opt for an advertising course. The courses lack coherence.
29. I think several coherently grouped disciplines (e.g., science and mathematics, social sciences, fine arts, and humanities [perhaps two groups]) should be formed to agree on one set of concepts and skills that are critical for a liberal arts education today. In science and mathematics, these topics would certainly include origins of the universe, the earth and life, evolution, statistics, how humans learn, biotechnology and bioethics, computers and society, etc. Once the topics are agreed upon, all departments in the cluster would teach the same course. Some team teaching could be used but for introductory level material it would seem that faculty from any discipline could master the material sufficiently. In this way, all students at Brockport would have the same set of fewer gen ed courses that achieve the critical objectives of the associated disciplinary clusters. This would greatly reduce the need for adjuncts.
30. #3 Ill advised students select one course per alpha character in the soup.
31. It appears there are many gen ed options, but scheduling problems occur due to extended time needed for labs and other courses that take an entire Wednesday morning for instance. Shorter class times and more "slots" during the day would help.
32. Campus politics were rampant in the creation and expansion of the program, so it will continue to remain a major stumbling block to any change.
33. Not a teacher/instructor

Appendix 3 - General Feedback from General Education Survey

1. Please, please, please do not reduce the Natural Science and Laboratory components of the Gen Ed program. State Regents’ requirements in the high school sciences have been reduced (diluted course requirements and lowered standards for a "pass"), even though the number of science courses students must take to earn a Regents’ diploma has been increased. Furthermore, the expense of running a hands-on laboratory experience has caused dilution of the students’ exposure to even the more general laboratory strategies and techniques. Our students are so scientifically illiterate when they enter college that it would be criminal of us to let them graduate without making an effort to try once more to fill this gap in their education.
2. I think the Gen Ed requirements are too complicated and students take courses simply because they have lots of letters as opposed to interest or educational value.
3. Suggestion for consideration If we are capable of implementing different requirements for different major groups (e.g. Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Humanities, Fine Arts) this would be the best way to accomplish the function of Gen Eds without harm to student’s learning. In essence, I believe we should eliminate as a requirement the areas that students already fulfill through their major. For example: Natural Science majors should seek their Gen Ed credits outside the N and L groups; Social Science Students must seek their credits outside S, V, O or Q; Humanities students should seek credits outside H or Languages; Fine Arts students should seek credits outside F or P. It is imperative, however, that students take at least two courses in each of the 3 above concentration groups that are not in the student’s major before graduating.
Therefore, students would need Math + Writing (6 cr) + 2 courses in each of the 3 concentration areas just mentioned (18 cr). The remaining 6 credits would have some flexibility. I do have to say, however, that I find an incredible amount of overlap for Oand Gcodes. Some of these overlap on S codes. I find these absolutely redundant. Lastly, I hope you will take the time to rethink the necessity of our local GenEd requirements (I, W, D). I think they overburden our campus students.

4. Question 1 asks for department’s vision of GenEd; what I have provided is my vision. I do believe Academic Planning Seminar is useful and should be retained. Computer Skills examination should be replaced by a full-fledged course on computer and information literacy; should require only one course in each of foreign language, fine arts, and natural science. The College should specify at most 15 credits of GenEd and allow programs to design the remaining 15 credits of GenEd.

5. Get rid of the alphabet soup attached to most of gen ed courses and give the students more freedom to select courses that right now don’t qualify.

6. The MOST CRUCIAL thing that Brockport needs to deal with is that our main feeder school, MCC, is deliberately non-cooperative about preparing transfer students to come to Brockport with GE done. MCC does a poor job advising, sometimes knowingly misleads, and is a headache for us. GCC does a perfectly fine job so we know it’s possible. What can Brockport do to shake MCC into realizing it needs to cooperate with us? Can Dr. Halstead meet with MCC’s new president and urge her to set a new tone on her campus?

7. For 3 yrs. now I have observed how very diligently and effectively adjunct profs.in the Composition Dept. have worked. We are the heart, the foundation of teaching our students in this college how to write for present and future successes. It IS working well! Full time Eng. profs could not possibly spend as much time per student per essay, per paper as we adjuncts have, do, and will continue doing.

8. The 2 foreign language course requirement is especially burdensome - there are never enough sections - if it will be required at least have the needed number of sections! While I strongly support gen ed, if 2 - 3 of the courses were not required (students could choose which of the required number they would take - for instance some might choose not to take a 2nd fine arts or a world history) it would leave room for some elective choices. In our major, electives can only be taken as a large overload or during extra sessions.

9. It would be good to provide the option for students to take one or two of their general education requirements on a study abroad program or faculty study tour within the US.

10. In my experience advising students, they much more often than not take gen ed courses solely to satisfy requirements (multiple requirements if possible), not because a course is of interest. Thus they tend to not be interested in the material and are unmotivated and generally don’t appear to gain much from the experience. Restructuring the gen ed program is necessary to better facilitate the liberal arts education/learning.

11. It seems to me that the general education program could use campus wide guidance (I try to avoid the word leadership as I am not thinking of top-down management here) which oversees and gives advice what course offerings would be desirable/needed or are overly redundant. Relevant questions may include for example: Are there sufficiently broad and sensible language options on campus for the second language requirements? (I have notice that German is not offered, which I find surprising.) Are the general education offerings in the sciences sufficient/relevant to enable students to follow science driven discussions and debates? Are there courses on the books which have too many of those letter attached to them? Are there courses on the books that seem redundant? Are there courses on the books offered by different department that seem to have sufficient overlap to consider a combined offering with an interdisciplinary approach to the subject? These are just some examples. When I advise students and it comes to general education, I honestly cannot tell students what the coherent picture is. I just can tell them that they have to find enough courses to cover all the requirements (sufficient courses with the right letters) and that seem interesting to them. Is this really the guidance I should give them?
12. DIWY should be institutional, mission-driven ideals that are embedded in existing general education courses (e.g., V, G O H, S, P/F, GEP 100. GEP 150 has outlasted its value (computer literacy). L courses need to be more available for working students (entirely evening or weekend meetings).

13. I believe it is unnecessary to have students take two arts classes—one with performance and one without. A single arts course should suffice. Foreign language is an appropriate component of the general education program; however, it is nearly impossible to get students into foreign language courses early in their college career due to the lack of sections offered. I'm not convinced the contemporary issues courses are a vital or necessary component of the gen ed program. Similarly, I'm not convinced students should need to take both a Western Civ and an Other World Civ course. For many students, these two requirements, paired with the US history requirement results in taking three separate history courses. This strikes me as not really being about "general" education at all, but about "history" education. History is important, but to have three separate history courses in the Gen Ed program is overkill. Moreover, there are a lot of courses in other departments that should fulfill one or more of these requirements that currently do not. Therefore, I see the present gen ed program as unfairly benefiting some departments (such as history) over other social science departments (such as anthropology, political science and sociology).

14. Although they are quite interesting and useful, some current requirements may be unneeded. Two science classes? Also, many classes in my department would cover women's issues and contemporary issues without the GE requirements.

15. An over-reliance on adjuncts pulls down the quality of instruction in general education and hurts retention rates because students are discouraged by the quality of instruction and cannot build long-term relationships with those temporary instructors. Moving to large-size classes would be equally damaging because faculty would not be able to assign the same number and quality of writing assignments that are now a crucial part of our general education classes in fields like history and English. Sometimes, these general education courses are the only courses that teach our students to write.

16. I realize that some departments rely heavily on Gen Ed classes. However, my department did not complain when we lost the T requirement and I believe it is time to give up others, even if it hurts. I think that 30 hours of Gen Ed is plenty for a student to get a well-rounded education.

17. Some quick notes: 4. There is a spelling error. 7. Is there a way to make this open even to those of us who don't hate the idea of teaching gen ed? (I technically can check the boxes, but the instructions indicate otherwise.) Also, the second option is a bit harsh. I know "qualified" wasn't the greatest choice of a word, but is there a way to not classify it as "importance" as opposed to some courses are simply easier for adjuncts to teach or easier for us to find adjuncts who will teach them well? I do believe gen ed is important, but at least in our department it really does come down this. Edit: Now when I try to submit the poll, it tells me I didn't answer number 7. Also, I think you may want to divide 8 up so that each "Other" can be address separately to better follow what people are talking about. I have no idea if this actually easy to do or not. Thanks for this!

18. You need to simplify the overall structure of General Education.

19. Ensure that all departments are included in final assessment of gen ed as it currently stands.

20. I very strongly feel we should keep the W and D requirements. They are essential to a general education.

21. A major problem is that we have so many learning outcomes and requirements that I am convinced that central SLOs may get minimal or no coverage in designated GE courses. This is particularly a problem when the faculty teaching the course was not involved in the original certification of the course. Also, some courses were certified as GE courses based on totally different syllabi from the ones used by the current faculty. Therefore, a course that was designed with the specific SLOs in mind and thus approved by the Gen Ed Committee may have mutated into a totally different animal after several semesters and faculty changes. The result is that the
cohesion of the GEP becomes eroded and the significance of the GEP gets lost with students and faculty.

22. If the committee recommends lowering the number of GE courses, then the "54 hour rule" must also be examined. How will students reach the required 120 credits to graduate. Native students will have a more difficult time, especially when some departments "lock out" students from their course offerings because they ARE NOT majors, under the reasoning of accreditation.

23. My only complaint with the gen ed program is that the letter codes used in the catalog and schedule are confusing and alienating. I feel silly telling an advisee that she must take an "I" course to graduate. What does that mean? (I know what it means, but it's too complicated.)

24. I have an idea to address coherence. It might be interesting for each department or school to have one or more recommended choices of general education courses to complement their discipline. Of course, students could be free to choose their own courses. (There is nothing to stop departments from doing this on their own, and perhaps some do.)

25. I don't get this. Sure, there are bottlenecks, where there is a greater demand for particular GenEd courses than can be met in a given semester. That's scheduling (and therefore financial) issue. And certainly some students are impatient with the program as it stands. But does that therefore demand a wholesale reconsideration of the program? I think not. From where I sit, the program works well, and Brockport students are being well served (all too often despite themselves) by being required to deal with topics, knowledge areas and intellectual issues that otherwise they might not. They are better off because of it. Indeed, some of the aspects of GenEd that are unique to Brockport (the W, for example) are quite progressive in conception and should be preserved, if only because they make the College stand out as a leader and forward thinking institution. I realize that some (perhaps many) students regard GenEd as onerous. Frankly, I don't have a lot of sympathy for that. Education qua education should not be driven merely by economic/employment considerations. The world is not composed merely of consumers who must be given what they want - despite what our administration seems to think. Students are not in a position to judge what is good for them...and good for the nation, given the sorry state of Americans' cultural and intellectual literacy vis-à-vis the rest of the world. We make young children take medicine they don't like, because we are in a position to see a picture bigger than "like and dislike". Yes, do fix the mechanical problems in the program. Do NOT alter the fundamental structure of the program, and do not diminish it in a misguided effort to streamline the wonderfully messy task of becoming a culturally literate global citizen!

26. The science requirement has Psychology as meeting the requirement. We may be the only college in the country to accept this?

27. There could be more foreign language 111 and 112 courses available to allow transfer students to get this requirement filled the first semester instead of the last year and a half when they are concentrating on their major courses. Most of these courses are full by the SOAR.

28. Gen Ed is very important for a school calling itself a "college" now. "College" implies a broadly liberal undergraduate education. A broad but focused array of courses students can take in smaller class sizes would insure that students begin to see the courses not as hoops to jump through but as meaningful parts of their education. They will see it this way because, in smaller classes, they will be challenged to participate and, thus, to contextualize what they are learning.

29. Consider international education experience as part of the General Education requirements - whether it be faculty-led short term programs or full semester opportunities.

30. I am not sure what kind of "capstone" class you are referring to. If you mean a major writing project that crosses disciplines, I would be in favor of that - the more writing the better. I would not be in favor of just another class that "looks good on paper".

31. Having just gone through the college selection process with my child, I am convinced that our current general education program is discouraging students from attending. Gen ed programs are among the things that students focus on when they are deciding what school to attend. Ours looks overly burdensome compared to other SUNY colleges in this part of the state. Why attend Brockport when you can go to Fredonia or Oswego for the same price and have to take fewer (or
so it seems on paper) gen ed courses? These kids have just spent 4 years in high school being told what they have to take (well, 5 out of the 6 courses). They look forward to having more control in college. The gen ed program has to be trimmed back at least to the same number of credits that other SUNY colleges offer. I’d start by eliminating the “contemporary issues” requirement. Issues courses are upper division, with no prerequisites, and generally on topical subjects. They should be able to sustain enrollments because students need upper division credit to graduate. I doubt that it would substantially affect enrollments.

32. I think the Gen Ed requirements as is makes sense to me and I was not aware that there were problems with it (aside from the fact that in departments like History and English, they do not have enough faculty to teach all the students who need those courses).

33. A very popular class to meet the foreign language requirement is the American Sign Language class yet it is always filled very quickly. More sections should be offered so that students don’t end up waiting until their senior year to be able to meet this requirement if they want to take ASL rather than French, Spanish, etc.

34. Our program could use a little fine tuning (getting rid of idiosyncratic requirements imposed by Candace DeRussy and company), but it does not need a major overhaul. There is no need for us to reinvent the wheel. Could the goal of “scientific literacy” be furthered by requiring that the two “N” courses be in the same rather than in different field, with a lab component in at least one of the courses?

35. We can all be so visionary about this stuff but if a student comes to class without desire to learn, no one can help him/her. How do we engage students (esp. Gen Ed)? Use power point, show movies, etc. etc. Sometimes nothing works. It’s easier to teach in the major.

36. This survey does not seem well designed to me. Intentionally or not, it seems designed to elicit responses which would on the whole tend to support claims that revision of the Gen Ed program is necessary, without offering any information about what the committee’s own perception of the problems may be, or what sort of changes are being contemplated. If it is the purpose of the committee to engage the college faculty in a fruitful discussion of Gen Ed reform, a better way to go about it might be to start by offering some useful data before trying to elicit responses. For example: what are the GenEd requirements precisely (not all of us know)? How many students complete which ones in a given year? How well do they do in their GenEd classes? Compared to classes in their major field of study? It might also be useful to know something about how students perceive the GenEd classes. As burdensome? As important? As both burdensome and important? As ‘easy to get a good grade in’? As hard? As offering serious courses of study taken seriously by the instructors that teach them? Or as offering ‘make work’ that adds an unnecessary burden to their course load? As well taught? Poorly taught? etc.

37. The general education program as currently constituted represents many special interests.

38. General Education classes are important, and expose students to subject matter and experiences that they would not otherwise have. It is the core of their liberal arts education.

39. Decreasing the number of gen. eds and giving students more choice (e.g. choose 7 of these 10 categories) would help our graduation rates. If we don’t know whether gen ed courses are valuable, why are we requiring so many? What data is there that tells us these courses are “working”?

40. I believe students would get more from the General Education program if they were allowed have more say in crafting their own Gen Ed experience. Instead of telling them which Gen Ed categories they must fulfill, I recommend giving them some choice in the matter.

41. This may not relate to your agenda, but I would love it if changes to Gen Ed allowed us to move toward a "writing in the disciplines" model; people don’t learn to write well in one course. It has to be meaningfully integrated with content.

42. I teach Gen/Ed courses. I love it. I am also a Brockport alum who appreciates the broad liberal arts education I received in great part due to the Gen/Ed program. One thing that I consistently hear from my students (and that I felt myself when I was a student) is that they would never have taken the course if it didn’t fulfill needed Gen/Ed requirements, BUT that they are very glad to
have discovered it. I have known many students who ended up majoring or minoring in a discipline that they first encountered due to GenEd requirements. I don't think that the local requirements should be changed. They make Brockport unique and because they are offered across the disciplines easily completed. I had no problem with them as a transfer student and history major. I do think that it would make sense to let transfer students get credit for fulfilling these requirements at their former institutions. Even though I am an adjunct I do think that the over-dependence on adjuncts to teach some course can be somewhat problematic.

43. I know 'the basics' about gen ed requirements, but I'm not really familiar with many of the challenges associated with delivering the courses. As an adviser, I know some students have difficulty with the language requirement since courses fill up so quickly.

44. I think that we need to work with student writing issues in a more comprehensive way. Perhaps most students improve their writing during their time at Brockport, but many, many incoming students are deficient in writing ability. I don't see any systematic way that we are addressing those deficiencies.

45. Frankly I like the current Gen Ed requirements. Given that many classes satisfy more than one outcome, I do think students, if they are well advised, can complete the program in a timely manner. Although they may not always get their first choice of classes. Sometimes it seems that the problem may be weak advising, rather than a problem with the system. I know we can't turn back time, but I think getting rid of the oral communications class in Communications and infusing communication skills into other classes was a big mistake. Too many of our students are not prepared to speak effectively in front of others. effectively.

46. I believe that a core skill for the 21st century is information literacy. What is the substantive difference between a blog and a newspaper article, between Newsweek and a peer-reviewed journal, between Wikipedia and an encyclopedia? Do our students have the skills to tell the difference? This is also a critical dimension of citizenship. I do not understand how contemporary issues does not meet the desire for a capstone course. I would also suggest that, as an additional possibility for contemporary issues, that a semester of service learning may be appropriate. I think we will be doing a great disservice if we do not consider comments of professional staff who respond to the survey with the same weight as faculty. Additionally, while I am not one, librarians are faculty.

47. I think that the General Education Program should mirror the SUNY General Education requirements. These requirements should be the same for all students regardless of whether or not they began their college career at Brockport or transferred to the college. I also think that the program has to many requirements and that the committee should consider eliminating the local requirements.

48. Reduce the number of credit hours required Require completion of GenEd prior to selecting a major Make all majors complete-able in 2 years (60 CH) Capstones belong in the major. Create a major called GenED if you want a GenEd capstone Do not allow a single course to count for more than one requirement

49. I my view general education requirements have much more to do with entrenched interest protecting their turf than they do with ensuring students receive a quality education. I think many of the requirements reflect deficiencies in American culture that existed in the 1960's. Women are now a majority of undergraduates and many if not most graduate programs. Given that fact do all students really need to take a woman's perspective gen ed class? Too many examples of this kind of thing in GE.

50. We require too many courses and have too many learning outcomes. We all want students to have solid grounding in common core areas but we have imposed too much with too little coherence.

51. See comments in #8. While many objections could be raised to this proposal, I hope it will be seriously considered as an efficient way of delivering meaningful gen ed to our students while reducing the need for adjunct costs and freeing up faculty for upper division courses, etc.

52. There is an unfortunate tendency among academics to lose sight of this question: "How will the material that I am teaching improve my students' lives, and/or the lives of other people in our
society?" We teach a lot of information that is completely and utterly useless to the non-specialist. However, there is information in all of the disciplines that would be directly relevant and useful to our students – useful for improving their lives, and the lives of everyone else in our society. We should start asking the question: If we are going to make the greatest possible contribution to the common good, then what should we teach? It is time to stop catering to our own narrow, esoteric interests, and start teaching material that is likely to improve life in our society.

53. In addition to "critical thinking," I would urge us to embrace "creative thinking" as a goal for students at Brockport, one that could be incorporated into our Gen Ed program.

54. #2 - I believe the current program forces students to try things they wouldn't ordinarily try and find passions they would have otherwise missed.

55. The D, I & W-worthy local outcomes - could met within programs - identifying courses in the core curriculum in which these might be met.

56. I really don't think Gen Ed is glaringly "broken" but reduction in requirements by sister institutions should be carefully monitored.

57. No thanks

Appendix 4 – Campus Responses to Models A and B

Model A Online Feedback

1. I prefer this model of the 2 options given but I agree with the committee's stated disadvantages that it does not sufficiently reduce the number of gen ed credits. I like that it builds some flexibility in to the gen ed curriculum which could potentially permit students to take courses that are of greater interest to them rather than simply crossing off a requirement.

2. This seems the more reasonable of the two--still too many credits compared to other SUNY schools and not a substantial reduction from the current program. It does make it look less restrictive and cumbersome--and maybe it actually will be. Allowing more than one course in a discipline to fill knowledge-area requirements is a big step in the right direction.

3. I think this is a significant improvement on our current GE program. I am not as convinced that a Contemporary Issues requirement is needed, given that most of our humanities courses (and, I'm guessing, social science courses) speak to contemporary issues in direct and indirect ways. It might be preferable simply to include another humanities or social science requirement.

4. In either model, there are going to be fine arts and science departments unduly impacted by taking away the "two different disciplines" requirement. I mean that Biology enrollments will go up and Chem and Physics will go down. Is this fair? Will this affect the ability of small departments to offer the courses needed for their majors?

5. This is the most effective and efficient model. I strongly recommend this idea. It allows for the flexibility that students need at the same time that it meets our pedagogical goals and budget needs.

6. My disappointment with Model A is that when I heard the provost discuss this issue - I thought there might be 3 - 4 courses freed up from gen ed requirements. For nursing majors, it would finally allow a few opportunities for electives. Right now, most of our students go the entire 4 years of school without even one opportunity to pursue a topic of interest. I see this model as not enough change from our current model.

7. This model best succeeds at addressing the Provost's charge and streamlining a core curriculum.

8. This is a clear, simplified model that solves most of the problems identified by the Provost. It is streamlined and easy to administer.
9. This model seems much more flexible to students than our current model or Model B. I like the ability for students to take 2 courses in the same content area if they have an interest in that area. I support this model over Model B. I also think this model will be easier for faculty to grasp for advisement.

10. These changes do seem to be an improvement.

11. I can see where this offers more flexibility; it would be nice to trim the requirements even further.

12. Eliminating the requirement for 2 course requirements to be in different disciplines contradicts the opening philosophy of broad general education. Doubling Social Science and Humanities requirements at the expense of History likewise narrows the scope of Gen Ed, again, contrary to the opening statement. Simply shifting the load away from history will possibly require adjuncts in the social sciences and humanities.

13. I prefer this option and it would be fairly easy to implement in the near future. It has a number of benefits, with few disadvantages.

14. It looks way too much like the existing model.

Model B Online Feedback

1. I prefer this model as it provides some way of bringing meaning to general education for the students. There are too many credit hours in both models though.

2. This model appears confusing. In fact, after reading the summaries, I still have only a vague idea of how this would be structured. This type of complexity is not going to benefit the gen ed program. I do appreciate the increased flexibility and the potential of a theme between the gen ed courses but the cost/complexity is too much.

3. The topics cluster would seem to make the gen ed program even more cumbersome than it is right now. If the goal is to simplify the program and make it easier for students to get the gen ed courses that they need, then this is going in the opposite direction. Suppose one 'topics' cluster is very popular and two others are not. Even though there are enough 'topics' for a particular incoming class, there will be a backlog of students who want the popular cluster. And how will transfer credit work? What if a student has 35 hours of courses from MCC, but they fall into three different clusters? Does that mean the student has to take more gen ed courses here? It seems like the big push in SUNY right now is for a seamless transition/transfer from community colleges to a 4-year SUNY college and also between SUNY schools. If we place more obstacles in the way of transfer students--Topical clusters as well as issues courses AND an extra semester of a language AND a womens issues course,AND... the transfer process becomes more frustrating and the time needed to complete the program here increases. As it is, students transferring here to pursue teaching certification have to take at least an extra semester beyond the 2-years they were planning. Good students will have many options, and will just attend another SUNY school where their gen ed requirements are already completed.

4. This, on the other hand, is a disaster. This would be replacing a complicated, torturous GE program with an even more complicated, torturous one. The fact that the explanatory paragraph is opaque and jargonish (I had to read it three times to make sense of it, and I am a humanities professor) signals that this is not at all appropriate given the goals outlined in the Summary report. I cannot say how much I loathe this option. By all means we should encourage interdisciplinary teaching, but this is not the way. Can you imagine someone trying to explain this afterward ("Oh, we had GE requirements at Brockport--I studied "Power" or something"). It would look outdated within ten years of being implemented.

5. I cannot recommend this course of action. The "cluster" model will create confusion and frustration amongst staff and students. While the goals are laudable, our ability to reach them will be hampered by the complexity of the design. Simplicity is golden.
6. For majors with many required courses, I see this as a very difficult model. For example, in nursing, the science courses build on and serve as pre-reqs for each other - semester after semester. It seems to me that the clusters would be difficult to fit into this schema. It does not reduce gen ed courses enough. It also seems to me that there would have to be a steep learning curve for faculty advisement. These results seem to be the exact opposite of why this process was started.

7. Although in theory I have been impressed by topical gen ed programs at other colleges and universities (Willamette University's program comes to mind), they are difficult to execute successfully without a very dedicated communal will and extensive resources. My own experience with Gen Ed at a public liberal arts college in Colorado, where the faculty redesigned Gen Ed along an interdisciplinary topical cluster model, was a disaster, not only because there were not sufficient resources to fully develop the program, but also because neither students nor faculty fully understood the supposed "intentionality" of the model or the rationale of the different categories and courses. Ultimately the Board of Trustees reversed the college's unique and thoughtful (if flawed) program because it deviated too far from other state institutions (especially for transfer students) and the Colorado Board of Trustees forced the college to scrap the whole thing and return to a distributional model; they did not trust that faculty was adequately concerned with teaching students the 3 R's--it was too fancy and "postmodern" for many tastes. The cluster model seems to work best at smaller, elite liberal arts institutions where students are already very self-conscious about their educational process. While we have some of those types of students students here, our overall culture is such that many students take vocational approach to college, and this is a sea change that this institution is not yet in a position to make. We're not able to thoroughly revamp our Gen Ed requirements topically and on an interdisciplinary basis; clustering them instead into rather superficial groupings of existing courses on similar topics (as Option B does) seems impractical and belies the hoped-for "intentionality" of the model.

8. I used to teach in a college that had a model similar to this. It was quite difficult to run efficiently. It was hard to coordinate and became worse every year. After I left for a different institution, colleagues told me that the whole model had been scrapped as ultimately unworkable. It is too complicated and creates unnecessary trouble for all involved.

9. I have grave concerns about the clusters. I am very concerned about students with majors that require many prerequisites such as nursing will have a very difficult time getting in the clusters, as well as prerequisites as well as major courses in 4 years. I also am concerned about the additional cost of administrative needs and start up fees. In this economic time, a change should be without additional costs. This model also would be more difficult for faculty to grasp for proper advisement.

10. I like the idea of topics clusters, but I'm a bit confused. Would there be many topics offered at once? Would the topics change from year to year? Who decides? Who can endeavor to start a new topic? I think it's sufficient to require that the courses be taken in different disciplines.

11. I'm intrigued. Two things trouble me: First, it sounds like a whole new layer of complication in both the instructor and advisor realms. I was surprised to see it *in addition to* rather than *instead* of distribution requirements. At a glance, it looks a lot like Model A plus this other thing. Second, the sample schedules both reflect native first year students attending full time. We have a lot of students working through their degree program part-time, so the cohort effect of a topic cluster would be lost on them.

12. Many of the comments attributed to model A apply here. Lack of reduction in the bottom line credit load will be a liability if sister institutions more effectively streamline. Even if credits to graduate are the same, students will gravitate to programs that allow either deeper penetration into the major, or more free electives. Fewer credits, but more cross-disciplinary courses can provide sufficient breadth, for fewer resources.

13. This option would be costly and time consuming to implement. Although it too has a number of benefits, it comes with several major disadvantages.
14. Too cumbersome. What's the point?

General Online Feedback

1. There is no reduction in the number of credit hours a student needs to take in these models. Adding extra social science and humanities classes to make up for the lost history classes seems to defeat the purpose. One of the main problems with our current program is that it is too cumbersome. This hasn't been solved. I do like that students may now take more than one class in the same discipline in the arts and sciences.

2. My alma mater’s current liberal arts requirement is to take a small set of gen ed courses (4) plus a minor outside of the major's academic division (science, soc sci, humanities). This type of model is very appealing given the simplicity and coherent discipline-specific courses but probably won't satisfy SUNY requirements.

3. When are we going to let go of gen ed courses that make us 'distinctive'? Incoming students don't care about 'distinctive'; current students don't care about 'distinctive'. My guess is that most faculty don't care about it either unless it is producing FTEs for their department. But overall, a disappointing result for the amount of faulty time that went into committee meetings, surveys, etc.

4. I applaud the opportunity to revise significantly our GE program, which in its current state is neither general nor a program. However, if the Cluster model is to be its replacement, I feel I must abnegate any obligation to guide students through such an unwieldy, ill-defined maze.

5. I have reviewed your report and feel that the committee has not addressed the Provost's charge. These options do not reduce the number of credits. Yes the upper end drops from 48 to 44 but the lower end stays at 35. For a student who wants to schedule courses efficiently, there is no reduction. The second area that does not appear to be addressed is in delivering the program in an efficient manner. Specifically since the foreign language requirement became the 112 level of a language, obstacles have been placed in front of students by the Foreign Language Department affecting their ability to complete the requirement at Brockport and there have never been close to enough seats offered to meet the need. Students are "required" by the foreign language department to take a placement exam to determine which course to begin in or to test out of the requirement all together. Since space is limited for these exams, some students put off taking the placement tests. Currently of the 7628 active undergraduate students, 2936 have not met their language requirement. This is approximately 38% and the problem is that this number increases each year. I am all for a simplified General Education program and the committee should recommend that this requirement be consistent with SUNY Board of Trustees guidelines that allow for the waiving of the language requirement if the student earned an 85 or higher on the high school language regents. This information has been shared with the Foreign Language department in the past. While the American History and Other World Civilization requirements are eliminated in both options, an additional Humanities Course Social Science so I do not see how this would reduce expenditures. All you may be doing is shifting the costs from one area to another. Was any serious consideration given to the elimination of the local requirements (Contemporary Issues, Perspective on Women and Diversity)? If not, why not? P Dowe

6. I taught in the old gen ed before V and G/O were required, so going back to what we had before doesn’t phase me. But there are a lot of newer faculty for whom this will be a major shift. Simultaneously faculty are going to move to a new teaching schedule (I assume!) at the same time as many will be serving on Middle States and/or Department Strategic Planning Committees. Moving to a 50/75 schedule does mean a lot of work for faculty - we have to decide how to thin our class material, we have to re-do powerpoint presentations, we have to change class handouts, we have to redesign small group exercises, we have to re-create midterm and final exams, we have to perhaps not only thin but also change class readings. At a time when all of this work related to teaching and service is coming at faculty, I do not think it is a good time to also add the SIGNIFICANT burden of creating Clusters. It seems to me perfectly possible to adopt Model A and then in a few years talk about planning for a potential move to Model B. In the meantime, advisors--and by that I mean the ones who actually fulfill their obligation to advise majors about general education--can informally push related courses. I have
often had majors interested in environmental law take Jim Haynes ENV 202 for the N requirement for example, and a related PLS or SOC course for S.

7. One of the goals was to make the process less complicated, neither of the models appears to be less complicated than our current model - who would oversee this, can Banner support these models? 2. One goal was to decrease the need for adjuncts. In model 2, you write that a sufficient number of courses in each topical cluster (12-15) would need to be developed and offered. How will this impact the need for more faculty, including adjuncts? 3. One goal was to decrease the number of credit hours required in gen ed. Both proposals decrease credit hours from 48-44. Assuming that most courses are 3 credits, will we require students to graduate with 122 credits, or will we offer 1 credit topical cluster courses? At least decrease the number by a factor of 3 so that students aren't required to pick up an additional 2 credits. I don't see advantages in either model, compared to what we have now.

8. Please keep it simple. Gen Ed should really have a fixed and straightforward set of goals and a clear pathway to achieve those goals. Straying from this course to more pedagogically "innovative" efforts undermines the ability of the institution to achieve those goals and empower their students. Distribution models work best.

9. I don't feel either model meets the goal of increased flexibility with gen ed requirements.

10. The rationale for a solid education in the liberal arts is clearly presented by the committee. It provides a great reason to use Model A and does not just work for the complicated Model B, which really could be a disaster.

11. Thanks to the committee for this work!

12. In a country where most citizens know nothing about its history, this model proposes dropping American History? Unbelievable. English will be dropped next in the effort to dumb-down our graduates.

13. Whether there is a reduction in credits should be studied more carefully, since some courses can satisfy more than one requirement. There should be an estimated number of credits based on an average or reasonable amount of such overlap.

14. I think people are reluctant to reduce the number of required credit hours because we want our students to get a broad background. But I think we'd do more for our students if we lessen the credit hours. I'm often disheartened when I sit with an advisee who says, "I'm basically done all my requirements, so I don't know what to take." The fewer requirements we have, the sooner students will have to make active choices. In that sense, I think the goals of gen ed are (paradoxically) better served by making students make choices.

15. It is dangerous to propose general education all in the first three semesters. Not allowing major courses makes it very cost effective to utilize community colleges in the first three semesters and transfer in for the major. Furthermore this concentration makes General Education even more of a perceived "chore" to get out of the way. We do students a disservice to postpone exploration in the major. Consider the possibility that a really rich general education experience can come after a student has matured beyond the first year experience. Finally, it seems that Diversity is perceived by the committee as secondary to gender studies. I think that is a bit backwards...is not gender simply one facet of diversity?

16. Neither! It seems it would be good to know what the minimum requirement is from SUNY for general education and why Brockport’s requirement is different. A drop from 48 to 44 is not much, as you note in both your disadvantages sections. Also, I just quickly reviewed the comments and statistics from the survey and neither of these models seem to address the survey results.

17. The committee did a thorough job of addressing the Provost's charge. I thought the report was very well done (this comment is coming from an administrator).
18. There seems to be too many sacrosanct content areas. I agree with one comment that the general education at Brockport has more courses than many of our sister institutions. Why do we need two fine arts? Two semester of a foreign language? Why does a BA require 12 hours of a foreign language (a local, not SUNY requirement).

19. I would like to see this sentence added to the definition of general education: ‘a certain level of proficiency and/or understanding of genes and DNA in biology.’ Genetic testing is a reality that so many will confront in future and some sort of knowledge in that area seems important for everyone, maybe as important as mathematics! Neither model goes far enough in reducing required courses! Couldn't APS be dropped?