

Component I A:

1. Good focus on writing
 2. Concerns: diversity of content
 3. Need to define role of “writing fellow”
 4. Will individual students have a composition improvement program? Who does the initial evaluation/diagnosis of level of composition skills?
-

Role of writing fellow unclear and devalues writing

Like credit for forum/seminar

Unsure of _____ with other seminars

CAP – purpose unclear

How will instructor integrate?

First year advisor – will students change advisors after 1st year? What value is there in this practice? Undermines building relationships with advisor in area.

Clearer, more equal connection with writing and content

1 c. - make clear/define the difference between informative literacy and computer literacy

1f. – I don't think there is any way to assess this – it's not really a “learning goal”

This appears to make the “writing fellows” 2nd class citizens ~ how do they participate in topic selection. How are they integrated? Many of us are not trained to be writing instructors.

I like the idea of clusters/thematic courses in the first or second year.

Implementation will be difficult – will “writing fellow” be an instructor?

Requiring all depts.. to provide teachers for these courses will be problematic for depts.. where all faculty teach overloads on a regular basis.

I like including elements for freshman forum in course work.

I am very concerned about a student mentor being responsible for teaching information literacy.

Will the instructor or writing fellow teach discipline-specific reading skills?

Negatives:

#F? Development Dept.

Why use mentor?

Who is writing fellow? Elevate to instructor status.

Positive:

For credit

The goal of “developing a sense of membership...” seems difficult – perhaps impossible – to measure and not an education goal. Including a student mentor solely because Forum students didn’t detest that part of FRM001 is silly. Include student mentors if they bring something important to the course

Role of writing fellow unclear and devalues writing

Like credit for forum/seminar

Unsure of _____ with other seminars

CAP – purpose unclear

How will instructor integrate?

First year advisor – will students change advisors after 1st year? What value is there in this practice? Undermines building relationships with advisor in area.

Clearer, more equal connection with writing and content

I like the idea of integrating basic writing into courses in other disciplines

I support this model with reservations:

I think writing-focused colleagues could help the rest of us improve assignments (writing across the curriculum). I’m not convinced of the mentor led sessions. I’m glad to see this as a full, graded course built into student and faculty load.

I support this model with reservations:

Why not just make it 2 courses, 3-hours each? Why do we always make our 1st year program always midway between a requirement (now 2/3 course; new 1 2/3 course?).

I certainly like a 1st year seminar however.

I understand the mentor issue, but having 5-days just to include a mentor isn’t great. That is, how to implement a mentoring program is a question. How do you make it flexible enough to change later on?

It also seems like a lot of “stuff” put together.

I do not support this model:

Eng101 – a course dedicated entirely to critical writing skills – is desperately needed.

I support this model with reservations:

CAP is too ambitious for 1st time freshman. This model presumes a college commitment to writing across the curriculum that remains to be demonstrated.

I support this model with reservations:

Cohesiveness of content – needs to be determined

Writing skills need to be emphasized – students lack major writing ability
(20 pp. final writing product?)

I do not support this model:

Students need to learn grammar.

I do not support this model:

Overly complex – student mentor models don't work. We should not abdicate our work to them.

Forming linkage to two of seminars limits me.

1 course unit but 2 salaries and pay for mentor – budget issue.

I support this model with reservations:

I am concerned about student mentors – the faculty should have ownership over the implementation of the curriculum

I do not support this model:

Cumbersome and poorly organized

Presumes too much collaboration

Keep English 101 and 102 and make them more rigorous and be willing to fail students who don't meet requirement.

Take WAC out of English dept. Make it a separate dept. with campus wide implementation.

I support this model with reservations:

Not sure – needs lots of work

International students will need an alternative – special attention

Need placement for writing and critical reading

Training and preparedness of mentors

Needed coordination between writing and the course – not sure how to make it happen

Depts. Can not just be told to send faculty – the implications are great and not everyone can and will devote the needed energy

I like the freshman seminar/advisor piece!

Some freshman seminar is needed for credit, but I don't support this particular way. I would like to see tracked students but not a single course.

I support this model with reservations:

It will be challenging to integrate the teaching cohesiveness between instructor, mentor, and assistant

I support this model with reservations:

Quality of teaching is critical here. Depends upon how well structured the course is. I love that it replaces freshman forum (impart) with a for credit course.

I fully support this model:

Like credit for Freshman Forum

Like shared responsibility for Intro English Composition with Non-English Department and English Department faculty

I fully support this model:

With additional thought given to teaching structure. Do not give to low F.T.E. faculty but if those given teaching models

I fully support this model:

Writing now an acknowledge focus for entire faculty

Eliminates the forum...small classes for first year students

I support this model with reservations:

Ability of finding instructors, etc.

I fully support this model:

Takes place of freshman forum – a plus

Incorporates writing across more disciplines

I fully support this model:

Interaction between departments would be encouraged

The mission could be made more clear

Students would better understand interdisciplinary study

I support this model with reservations:

Freshman forum is a must.

I like joining content and writing.

Don't like separating content and writing instruction. Instructors should teach content and writing with help for instructor for teaching writing.

Also 5 hour course is ponderous. Do 4 hours instead: 2 hours instruction, 1 hour support, 1 hour writing recital

I support this model with reservations:

2 semesters with credit is an improvement

Addition of writing fellow fills an important need

Going from 15 students to 45 in the 2nd semester is a major difference that could dramatically change the students' experience

I support this model with reservations:

Really like the mentors and writing fellows! Implementation in all content areas and majors may be problematic. One question – What happens to the freshman that does not pass 1st semester? What about transfer students and international students?

I support this model with reservations:

I like that the models both support/manifest Albright's strength in inter and corss-disciplinary education.

I fully support this model:

This is better than the freshman forum

I do not support this model:

Not a teachable course, how do necessary institutional resources exist?

Need to support down road with writing across curriculum

I support this model with reservations:

How would the topic or the freshman seminar be defined? Good job combining writing with freshman forum.

I support this model with reservations:

Ambitious –

Good idea to bring elements from freshman forum and English 101 and 102 together. We all have to be responsible for critical reading and writing development. Writing across curriculum has to be emphasized as well!

I support this model with reservations:

Better than existing forum

Implementation issues: instructors need to be committed and trained...don't assume that all/any faculty can just do it!!

“Writing fellows” – so many already seem incompetent

Assessment?

Honor's sections?

Good point – no exemptions

CAP good idea for OCDs

What about RACC and other 2 year...

I support this model with reservations:

I have reservations about the relationship and workload of the “writing fellow.” Also there seems to be too many profs. needed.

I do not support this model:

Problem of content US form. Writing professor not being expert in field papers written about. Elimination of freshman composition seems inadvisable. Adding separate content seems confusing. Problem of IDS (3 seminars together) - takes skill to pull this off.

Have to be trained in interdisciplinary thought to be effective

I support this model with reservations:

Positive: now a course with credit, Info. literacy and understanding liberal arts good.

Staffing questions, FTE concern, Integration of writing fellow with instructors (could be problematic if outside field)

Course with folding English 101 into Seminar, lose something in the process

I support this model with reservations:

At this point I lean more toward foundations, but I am not sure about the implementation

The possible combinations could also be a problem

I support this model with reservations:

One semester with student

Not really sure how the writing assistant would work.

One faculty person.

What format would students use for writing – APA vs. MLA vs.?

I do not support this model:

Students need a composition course. Writing experts are faculty in English Department do not approve this model

I support this model with reservations:

Great idea (especially mentoring) but not with 2-3 instructors and not 5 hours. This sacrifices content and confuses student (whom does s/he go to? Some fields have content and form combined!). Also, this cannot replace English 101-102. There is a matter of methodology and rigor that is necessary like in other fields. Grammar method is key to analysis across the board.

??:

A separate freshman writing course is essential
Good to give credit for FF

I support this model with reservations:

Coordination between instructor and writing fellow is problematic
Where is the science and technology competency being developed?
The number of FTE's required seems very large.

I support this model with reservations:

Will the instruction in writing be diminished from what the students would have in ENG 101?

I support this model with reservations:

Lack of English instruction
Five contact hours per week would be difficult to implement

I support this model with reservations:

You're asking the Freshman seminar to do too much. Would there be enough writing instruction? Students might be confused by the multiple instructors. Perhaps instructor should handle the writing instruction writing fellow as coach.

I fully support this model:

Explicitly expresses the interdisciplinary of our approach. Assigning credit as motivation missing in current forum.

I fully support this model:

I am very pleased to see the goal of “developing membership in the Albright community.” This could apply to any community they are part of after graduation
LIKE the idea of interim being utilized.

I fully support this model:

This pushes further what’s good about freshman forum

I support this model with reservations:

Mentor component is good

Advisor and writing fellow would need to coordinate to make this work!

Do we have sufficient instructors for this?

Feeds into IDS goals quite well

Overall happy with structure, goals, and philosophy

I fully support this model:

Some concerns about enough hours for writing component.

I support this model with reservations:

My concerns are with the coordination required between instructors and in properly defining topics to neatly allow the 3-1 combination in the 2nd semester.

I fully support this model:

Clarity and strengthen writing - this is key

CAP – needs to be flexible so students feel able to add/lose courses

Advising – compared to in major

How topics determined 1st and second

Overly complex in a multitude of ways. Dropping ENG 101 and 102 is a mistake.

I fully support this model:

Should be started next year

Implementation issues are important!!

What do you do with honors students?

Coordination between instructors for two semesters?

Component I B:

I am concerned as to how the 3 instructors will be teamed, how the topics will be selected. Will there be a formative evaluation component to measure improvement in composition skills on the part of students?

Small class sizes should be especially important in the freshman year especially at a school which markets itself as a school which offers small intimate class size. 3 instructors from 3 disciplines team teaching a course -> bag of worms!

The logistics

The three instructors seem to undermine the integration of writing, ideas, etc. Small class size seems especially important in the freshman year.

Advising for teacher certification must remain in the education department even in the freshman year.

Logistic problems evident with linking 3 disciplines of instructors.

Small classes would be more personal than combining 3 groups into a large class.

I am concerned that the level of writing/reading instruction will be lowered by making the “fellow”

Integration of _____

3 hour

First semester to second semester

Size of class

Again, the inclusion of student mentors seems an afterthought. The benefit of devising a CAP is not clear to me. In both of these semesters, the writing-taught by whom?

Adjuncts? – seems marginalized and fragmented. Having low-paid, low status faculty teach writing makes writing seem unimportant and devalued. Team-teachers with equal control of class (and grading?) content and structure seems more appropriate.

End-year skills acquisition...tested, minimum skill level?

Class size too large for small liberal arts college (45 students)

Concerned about sufficient # of “quality” mentors, training, etc.

I like integration of writing in the Freshman Seminar

I support this model with reservations:

I think the 2nd semester is a good idea. I like the academic planning assignment. I'm not sure the 3-instructor collaboration is necessary – could be more trouble (in design, prep) than really pays off.

I support this model with reservations:

Why not just make it 2 courses, 3-hours each? Why do we always make our 1st year program always midway between a requirement (now 2/3 course; new 1 2/3 course?).

I certainly like a 1st year seminar however.

I understand the mentor issue, but having 5-days just to include a mentor isn't great. That is, how to implement a mentoring program is a question. How do you make it flexible enough to change later on?

It also seems like a lot of “stuff” put together.

I support this model with reservations:

1 instructor – terminal degree necessary

We must encourage freshman engagement with full-time, permanent faculty; not adjuncts.

I support this model with reservations:

Structure/logistics seem too elaborate to be practical.

I support this model with reservations:

Emphasis needs to be on communication skills

CAP project ? Students able to do this in freshman year

I do not support this model:

Overly complex – student mentor models don't work. We should not abdicate our work to them.

Forming linkage to two of seminars limits me.

1 course unit but 2 salaries and pay for mentor – budget issue.

I support this model with reservations:

Overall structure works; integration of ENG101/102 promises to support whole curriculum

I do not support this model:

Too complex and unnecessary

Continue same advisor and mainstream the freshman

Eng102 is a vital course and should continue to teach research methods, maybe in a different way.

I support this model with reservations:

Much preparation and analysis required

Might be successful

I support this model with reservations:

Structure of the course again – success will depend very much upon how the course is structured and the quality of the teaching.

Ideally, students can choose the 2nd semester section of their choice.

I fully support this model:

Alternative of switching second semester is necessary and desirable but fraught with implementation problems (as is the non-switching alternative)

I fully support this model:

Like this idea a great deal. Look at load. Also looking at question of who second professor is and whether the student stays there.

I support this model with reservations:

Questions about staffing

Like overall concept

Switching should be allowed in the second semester but may cause implementation problems.

I fully support this model:

IDS approach good for first-year students. Connects the experience with classroom instruction. Implementation of alternative choice of seminar by students not necessarily desirable given basis for student choice – timing of offering.

I support this model with reservations:

Implementation regarding course load

Implementation sounds theoretically desirable but it is laden with questions/issues

I fully support this model

Only concern – implication on teaching load

??:

It is a good idea to let students change classes. OPTIONS TAKE INTO ACCOUNT HUMAN NATURE.

I support this model with reservations:

This needs more flexibility, both for students and faculty. They should not be committed to a particular course in the second semester.

Also, I don't think the support session is necessary in the 2nd semester.

Get rid of it and have only 4 hours per week.

I support this model with reservations:

Creating courses that can be integrated with 2 other courses in 2nd semester might limit the kinds of courses that can be offered.

I support this model with reservations:

I like this but am concerned about class sizes. I like the idea of the "Interim" for experimenting and especially extending this into the community.

I support this model with reservations:

I like the greater seriousness and deliberateness of the proposed freshman forum models.

I'm wondering about the affect on transfer and on DEP students.

I support this model with reservations:

Could these courses be streamlined into a one semester course?

I do not support this model:

Large sections undercut small class environment and complicated coordination issues

How deal with remediation? Honors?

I support this model with reservations:

Could be difficult to implement in terms of course creations. It would be better to be practical rather than too esoteric.

??:

Concern over size of all three groups together. Would of course add perspective to their experiences. Interim – cross-cultural credit? Experience?

I support this model with reservations:

Double-dipping is good

Implementation – what if a student doesn't complete 1st semester successfully?

Large clan if combined – 60?

Stop reducing course loads for doing “extra work”

Increase course load for students to 5+; faculty to 4

Could it be done in one semester?

Alternative – honors – one semester, all others – 2 semester -- semester freshman seminar

I support this model with reservations:

I like the attempt to gain an interdisciplinary slant, but believe it will be difficult to weave together three different 1st semester seminars.

I do not support this model:

IDS nature – confusion can easily result. Linkage is an interesting idea however. Might be better after more particular knowledge is acquired. Need content first then make links? IDS within divisions seems more do-able at this level.

I do not support this model:

Positive: Integrating courses good idea; perhaps do this in senior year

Too early for them, not enough content knowledge to do a good job

Only need 1 semester Freshman Forum to emphasize information literacy, speaking, etc. and give it credit.

Difficulty pulling 3 faculty together, coverage within major if do this (we are a small school!)

I do not support this model:

Too complicated. Too scripted. Seminars should be in individual sections not combined in groups of three. One instructor per seminar – “content instructor” should grade the papers (after proper training as needed)

I support this model with reservations:

Willing to go with a 2-semester seminar but same problem as above. Also, the time commitment in and outside of class has serious implications for other teaching, and research/scholarship and service (regular meetings with other instructors, etc.)

I do not support this model:
Too complex to interweave.

I do not support this model:
The whole proposal seems too chaotic with respect to creating so many cross-developing courses and double dipping.

I support this model with reservations:
Are students looked into a topic from 1st semester?

I do not support this model:
Team teaching is probably less effective than we imagine. Everyone of Fouad's, Chris's, Gerry's, and Jeri's course is more effective than IDS 100. Sorry, it's true. Also, the thought that a student would be locked into a course for an entire year is unappealing.

I fully support this model:
Builds on the 1st semester also a plus.

I support this model with reservations:
Staffing issues with course release may be a problem
Are you locked into 2 years if you dislike teaching freshman seminar?

I fully support this model:
Credit is given for classes taken rather than pass/fail. Fall course would define 2nd semester work.

I fully support this model:
Would need to be matched to the fall section?
Continuity through the year is good

I fully support this model:
Good – structure, continuity

I support this model with reservations:

Combination difficulties

Mentoring ++

Students possibly choose form in 2 different areas

Concerns about integration and team teaching aspect in 2nd semester

Implementation issues are important!

Component II C:

Forces student to have courses across the liberal arts curriculum

In the sciences we currently count intro and science courses as gen. studies/science and quant. measuring. This model then adds courses to # req. within major.

All students should not need 2 science labs

Why should students take 2 science courses? Many of our students struggle with one. This requirement may dissuade some potential candidates from attending Albright. We can't currently provide one GS science for all of our students. Now 2?

OK – understand as similar to “intro” courses to provide breadth of knowledge/academic experience

Support pre-req of courses

I fully support this model:

This really is just a distribution requirement, albeit at an introductory level.

I support this model with reservations:

Notionally sound, but the assumption seems to be that students know their concentrations by the start of their sophomore year.

I fully support this model:

I like the exposure to all 4 divisions

I fully support this model:

Emphasis on students reaching outside their concentration area is a value-added feature of this curriculum.

I fully support this model:

Great Idea!

Get rid of “major” reference

Take all 4 and let 1 be major later!

I fully support this model:

Makes sense.

I fully support this model:

Gives students more choice

I fully support this model:

This model is better than the divisional clusters. It can be an ordeal to provide the divisions needed for the students.

I fully support this model:

A standard distribution model – fine

I fully support this model:

Strength is the development of G.S. courses separate from the concentration course... acknowledges two different audiences in many departments

I fully support this model:

This seems like a suitable track for students to pursue with the Div. Cluster.

I support this model with reservations:

Not sure how all departments are included in this model.

For credit – is a positive change from freshman forum

I support this model with reservations:

Basically this is a distribution requirement. I don't think such requirements work especially well but it's no worse than what we have now. I do like that students have to complete these early in their studies.

I do not support this model:

Similar to current requirements, but divisions are broader, especially in the humanities – so this could limit the need for certain courses offered now.

I fully support this model:

I like the four divisional bases of the foundations. I believe these do represent four distinct aspects of the liberal arts.

I support this model with reservations:

One course in each division may not be enough. For example, in Humanities, at least one course in history and literature should be taken, i.e. some of the divisions are too broad.

I do not support this model:

Assumes a unity of divisions that does not exist and rewards capturing

I support this model with reservations:

How does writing across the curriculum fit into this model?

I support this model with reservations:

Good distribution requirement

I support this model with reservations:

Interim proposal – sounds good to me – find funding to send students to x-cultural employment overseas or in community

ELEM Education etc. – how easy/difficult to fulfill requirements

Similar to distribution requirement

Requires excellent advising – holistic and know your advisees(s) will be/is very important

I fully support this model:

I like the fact that they can “double-dip.” They should have to take a course in each area with fine arts representing a separate section.

I support this model with reservations:

Does not seem so different from present gen. studies – BUT – humanities loses 2 courses unlike any other division

I do not support this model:

Prefer flexibility of current system rather than pigeon holding it!

I fully support this model:

Seems comparable to what we are doing now.

I do not support this model:

Do not like “home division” prohibitions.

Do not like reduction in humanities requirement

I do not support this model:

The idea is great, really. The logistics will be a nightmare, even with double-dipping.

Also, including courses from within one’s division means people are not exposed properly (e.g. you are in history but do not take a foreign literature in English course)

Also, clusters are minors by any other name, and this implies co-ordination of departments; this is very hard in light of what we already experience with offering courses to service programs and other majors.

I do not support this model:

Split with major/non-major course unacceptable.

I support this model with reservations:

This section fulfills the distribution requirement

Finishing these courses in the freshman year along with language, seminars and concentration will be impossible for science concentrators.

I support this model with reservations:

Whatever. They would be taken in the freshman year. Potential flexibility enough?

I fully support this model:

Good so long as if they switch concentrations they can still count for that division in G.S. requirements.

I support this model with reservations:
Gives students a taste of the various divisions.

I fully support this model:
Similar to our current style. We like it.

I support this model with reservations:
Electives as part of clusters is a good idea. The implementation may be overwhelming particularly with scheduling.

I support this model with reservations:
Can this be taken freshman year – give alphas a chance to get a broad understanding
How do they feed as pre-reqs for thematic clusters?

Component II D:

Too diverse – hard to form concentration

Some disciplines may not integrate easily and well but overall good concept.

I think this would allow use of many of our current courses except it would double the current requirement for gen. studies science courses. This would create a need for more science faculty.

Will they be broad enough to allow electivity? Students will need to determine clusters as freshman? Fine arts should be included.

Connected learning is more meaningful. Research supports it.
Should cross at least 2 divisions including fine arts. Don't require all 3. Add F. arts.

Can all dept. participate?

Some disciplines/instructors may not integrate easily into the cluster model, learning some members out of this part of the GE model and possibly placing undue burdens on others.

“Loose clusters” doesn’t support making connections
Too many prices
Support faculty collaboration
Support IDS connection

I would eliminate the distributional requirements except that each cluster must include courses from at least 2 divisions.
+ include fine arts as a fourth divisional option.

I fully support this model:
I support this model with reservations:
I’m very supportive of themed courses but I’d like to see some co-enrollment options, more explicitly tied options available. Seems to me that a student choosing from a long list of themed options, taking theme in three different semesters, is not so different from the current “laundry list” selection.
I’m very interested in interdisciplinary learning and exchanges with colleagues. But finding the time and space for this kind of work and course development is a concern.

I support this model with reservations:
I would like more examples. It “sounds good”, but it needs more clarification. I think there are some disciplines that lend themselves better to this model.

I do not support this model:
Thematic clusters overly restrict student choice, thereby hindering student engagement with the course material.

I support this model with reservations:
How can the themes be defined in such a way as to be feasible?

I support this model with reservations:
Not quite sure how clusters would be determined – to be taught – difficult to teach?
Difficult to have continuity – difficult for students to register and take

I support this model with reservations:
Clusters formation might not achieve the purpose.

I support this model with reservations:
The definition of clusters needs to be clearly defined. There can be multiple definitions.
There needs to be willingness to be flexible with scheduling.

I fully support this model:
Emphasis on breadth is attractive; multiple courses suggest effective emphasis

I fully support this model:
Great Idea. KEEP!!

I fully support this model:
Capitalizes on student interests!
Builds on an Albright strength
Must be broad clusters to make it work – to avoid conflict with single offered dept. courses.
Great concept. Existing programs are a strong start
Will encourage faculty collaborations as well.
Must have a mechanism to ensure the collaborations!
Right # of courses and clusters
Should be noted on transcript as well.

I support this model with reservations:
Will help students to better understand interdisciplinary study
Implementing the construct of the cluster with enough choice and having enough instructors to offer a range of these may be quite difficult.

I support this model with reservations:
Like this model however will be problematic in staffing and some courses would not lend itself to this model. It does fit an interdisciplinary model in giving students an idea of connections to real world.

I support this model with reservations:
This is an intriguing and potentially luring approach. I wonder about whether themes can be created that will be relevant to all students. It creates some potentially difficult team-based challenges to teaching but could also be professionally enriching. Do we have the staff to teach the cluster?

I support this model with reservations:

This is a great idea on paper, but implementation may be possible at a college of our size.

I do not support this model:

Would require extensive new hires in science to complete clusters; concept interesting but would seriously limit what could be done

I support this model with reservations:

I think this is a great model but worry about implementation. Why recombine fine arts here?

I support this model with reservations:

Would allow for breadth and depth. Can a cluster be made up of just two courses? Could the sciences support the clusters? Coordination of cluster could be problematic.

I support this model with reservations:

Difficulty implementing – discipline

Would need to reconsider prerequisites and or how it will affect their concentrations (majors)

I support this model with reservations:

I like the interdisciplinary thrust of this model. I am worried about the administration of this – who will determine what clusters are valid and how, perhaps there should be a defined set of clusters based on programs that already exist.

I do not support this model:

What happens to courses that do not fall into a cluster? Could lose very interesting current topics. Eliminate a degree of faculty creativity.

I do not support this model:

Might work to some extent as a senior seminar capstone

I do not support this model:

I do not understand this model.

I do not support this model:

Do not like forcing diversity of course offerings into a limited number of themes.

I support this model with reservations:
This seems to reorder things a little.

I do not support this model:
Unworkable with teaching commitments

??:

Questions: what if a student wants to switch clusters? Can they transfer courses to a new cluster?

Overall, a nice idea. Will require a good deal of student planning and fore thought to choose a cluster.

I support this model with reservations:
This plan can lead to a loss of flexibility compared to our own plan since clusters will probably be designed based on faculty rather student interests. Could the student design their own cluster?

I support this model with reservations:
Perhaps rather than having a senior capstone a thematic capstone would help the students understand the connections between the themes

I support this model with reservations:
Whatever. How tightly drawn will these be? Could students design their own?

I support this model with reservations:
Can't offering more IDS meet the purpose and still allow us a familiar language while selling our curriculum prospects? How would clusters affect the flexibility allowed students regarding co-concentration?

I do not support this model:
Seems like clusters replace program of studies (minor) and could students double dip and take a cluster and a program of study?
Get rid thematic cluster – offer 1 or 2 IDS courses instead or perhaps make IDS 2 semesters long and do this in place of clusters – expand IDS courses, makes students realize more immediate connect between course in different areas.

3 courses for cluster is too much – make max just 2 classes due to quantity content and staff issues in clusters.

I do not support this model:
Scheduling?

I support this model with reservations:
How much conversation or communication will there be among the courses in the clusters? Or would a set of traditional IDS course be better?

I do not support this model:
Clusters similar to an IDS, liberal arts minor – is this what we want?
Do we lose flexibility of course choices? And scheduling?
Construction of clusters – could it be problematic? Enough courses?
Difficulty in conveying it to students
Could we simply expand the existing IDS requirement and achieve the same goal more simply?

I support this model with reservations:
Finding themes – burden on faculty
Ordering – making sure courses are offered.

I support this model with reservations:
A scheduling nightmare – otherwise it is probably good.

Component VI

Although we're not concerned with implementation, we need to consider the impact on non-liberal arts areas ex. education, accounting, digital media, etc. As an "old" liberal arts girl of the 1960's, I like the basic concept – the proposal helps give a broad view to many of the students who do not read and rarely leave central PA/NJ. I admire the courage of the committee for proposing such a program for change. Kudos.

? no e-portfolios

2 science courses not feasible nor obtainable – some options unacceptable.

??:

GEAC: Thank you for all your hard work and careful thought. You are fighting the good fight! Thanks for leading energetically and keeping the focus on student learning.

I support this model with reservations:

The goals are laudable but the models are overly elaborate and would require a substantial administrative role.

1. Do we have the administrative staff needed?
2. Do we have the faculty needed?
3. Do we have the money?

Very rigid and complicated

Jargon – what does “form of organizing concepts” mean?

??

Needs work and implementation needs to be considered.

Two questions:

What are budget impacts of implantation and maintenance of any program?

How can this be implemented in evening program?

*create 4-6 strawman students to show how each of these programs would work

I support this model with reservations:

Caution about allowing sub-par work to pass

I support this model with reservations:

I like the idea of a capstone because I acknowledge that students want to feel a sense of practical skills learned as well as believe they have something concrete and substantial that they can present to potential employer.

??:

No paper

??:

Look at total picture – bottom-up + top-down processing is necessary.

I support this model with reservations:

These are some good directions, as the interdisciplinary emphases, but I am unclear about how it would effectively be implemented. It seems like it calls for more FTE's which could be a problem. It would be clearer if we could see how a student from each division could negotiate through this.

??:

The committee did a lot of work – but there are real implementation issues and I think this is much too great a change. Freshman seminar does need changing. Also, I agree that 10+ intro courses is not a good way to do general studies.

One person in our group says this is a European model but we also heard Europeans didn't like this??

??:

Overall, the 2 components that look best are a revised first semester freshman forum with credit, and some effort to integrate general studies courses at the end. In between clusters seems like a logistical nightmare.

Current system allows scheduling flexibility that this one may not. If other countries are looking to us, why are we changing it?

??:

This makes our current system look more attractive.

??:

We should have had input before this point. GEAC might have been able to correct obvious errors. The process was deeply flawed and too secretive. This whole model is too complicated, too expensive, too restrictive, and too much change at one time. It is over scripted, imprudent, and leaves too little choice to individual faculty.

I support this model with reservations:

Overall, I favor 1) freshman seminar, 2) divisional clusters, and 3) capstone experiential, all with modifications. I am disappointed by: the failure to account for costs, for time constraints, for what departments have already committed to across disciplines.

We need to change; not sure this is the right move, but I'm willing to see where you take it based on the majority of the faculty. (And no; I won't serve on GEAC. Already on 4 committees.)

Happy to talk/have my mind changed. Thanks for reading and for offering a basis to start with. - Guillaume

I support this model with reservations:

The left-hand model is preferable of the two models but has many details that need worked out.

I do not support this model:

Are we sure that students don't graduate with all our learning objectives already?
Integration with majors?

??:

Issues for international students
Measurement in PC skills

I almost fully support this model:

1. The first year program should be started ASAP. The rest will need more work, although it has a lot of potential.
2. Language requirement change should start ASAP
3. Important to protect student's ability to have some pure elective courses
4. Problems for education program

Component III E:

Would allow for full concentrations with related supporting course work

Seems very complicated – would require development of many new courses

The foundations method makes more sense.

Do we have the capacity to teach 2 sciences for non-science major courses? What would this do to admissions? 3 courses in methods? My students would not have 3 root courses!!

4 methods courses for a bachelor's degree is crazy.

I do not support this model:

Too prescriptive about course development (for faculty) and sequencing (for students)

I do not support this model:

Rather than historical surveys, why not have “big concepts”? Perhaps it amounts to the something...but it seems more relevant. Also seems a bit daunting in terms of the amount of introductory courses that need to be taught at a broad, broad level.

I support this model with reservations:

Move away from methodology/history-of-discipline courses to topic-focused seminar courses.

I support this model with reservations:

Conceptually the idea has merit but the cluster courses would not be popular with either faculty or students; also the whole system appears robustly complicated and unfeasible

I do not support this model:

Co-concentration would have difficulty

I do not support this model:

No comment

I do not support this model:

Too restrictive. Not broad enough.

I fully support this model:

Again, multi-course depth helpful

I do not support this model:

Won't work at all. Survey – method is what they do in their MAJOR.

I do not support this model:

I greatly prefer the thematic option. These clusters would require major new course designs and would involve major investments of interest and effort among non-interested students.

I do not support this model:

Thematic clusters are clearer in the connections that could be made between the courses. Division clusters may be too general because the divisions are very broad in the disciplines that are included – especially in the humanities.

I do not support this model:

I wonder how affective a methods-based class across all from divisions at such early of a student's experience will be.

I do not support this model:

The divisions are too broad, and these clusters do not correspond to actual disciplines – co-concentrators and alphas. What do freshman take?

I do not support this model:

History and methods should be integrated into all courses

I will you well in transforming our comments into a meaningful way

I do not support this model:

Methodology – students will not like

Too ambitious for non-concentrators

I do not support this model:

Difficult to have students take a methodology course outside their major (hard enough within the major!)

Intro. courses are OK – we already do this

I do not support this model:

Too many new courses need to be added to curriculum. Not sure of the necessity of varying methodology courses.

I do not support this model:

Do not like the “outside home division” prohibition

I support this model with reservations:

Worth exploring some more, but please do not lose sight of content. The capstone seminar that does not include new knowledge seems pretty pointless.

??:

Do not understand

I do not support this model:

Seems as though an excessive number of new courses would have to be created.

I do not support this model:

I am more unclear about how this works and am concerned that students would have to take this in their soph. and junior years with might make it difficult to complete their major requirements. I also believe it is too much to require that students learn the methods of different disciplines – this is difficult enough in a major and far too difficult to require that they learn it in another discipline!

I do not support this model:

This creates problems for first year alpha students. I prefer the left side model.

I do not support this model:

Daunting

I support this model with reservations:

If the extended IDS model proposed in component II D is followed.

I do not support this model:

I like the Foundations and Thematic clusters (or variation) better.

I do not support this model:

Require new courses or revamp existing courses – too much description
Similar problems as the thematic clusters

I do not support this model:

I am concerned that lab science courses don't fit this model and the model encourages effectively random selection of courses.

I do not support this model:

Promoting the core concepts and goals delineated here within/amongst the entire faculty would be a far superior solution. Better coordination and cooperation across the

departments without disturbing the current course system would accomplish the mission, in my opinion.

As writing rigor and info. literacy are key, a focused approach toward achieving these key results (student competencies) is worth investigating with all-faculty input. Expand writing center too. Those students who wish to transfer credits to another institution will have problems with these models.

Component IV F:

1 lab science is enough!

I would prefer basic computer course/s for all students

? I think most courses fulfill the #4 ethical values, etc

Placement assessment is a good idea > consider using PSSA reading/writing/math.

There are already prepared placement exams for foreign languages. I see no need to develop one in house. It is probably not necessary to test all 4 skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing) to place students accurately. "201" is not a competency. It is a measure of seat time. The current requirement (sliding) for foreign languages is effective (although placement is not). Why reduce the requirement to 1 semester for students who enter at that level? The proficiency level at the end of 201 is fairly low.

Needs more work, clarification

Not Clear

??:

Really not clear about the options – these don't seem to have been thoroughly developed. What about experiential learning? Is this a requirement that should be addressed here? Or somewhere?

I do not support this model:

Much fuller discussion of these requirements is necessary – judgment is premature.

I support this model with reservations:
These goals are essential

I support this model with reservations:
Again need to be close monitors that the requirements are fulfilled by other courses if not in these.

I fully support this model:
Seems appropriate

I fully support this model:
I really like the idea of remedial requirements. I really like the idea that “if you have no covered the base with other courses, you must take [math, ethics, logic, etc]”

I fully support this model:
No need for admissions tests – the dept. does this well now and respond to student ability.
Keep quantitative and foreign language requirements
Also an info. Literacy or technology requirement

I support this model with reservations:
One quantitative and one logical thinking might be better than just one course as a requirement.

I do not support this model:
Need math and languages at core of program

I fully support this model:
I very much like the idea of measuring competency rather than just requiring a certain # of language courses.

?:
Concerned about 201 being considered adequate level of proficiency. Also concerned about administrating placement tests. Also not sure how this level would ensure “cross-cultural” understanding.

I support this model with reservations:

Tacked on?

Confusing – by piggybacking courses?

Otherwise will add more courses

Faculty advisers will need to be very careful in reviewing students' transcripts

I support this model with reservations:

These other requirements should be included in the clusters. Otherwise, there may be too many other requirements! These should only be for foreign languages.

I support this model with reservations:

Similar to current requirements

I support this model with reservations:

Requirements seem OK

Seems like we do this already

I do not support this model:

Do not like focus on part of G.S. in this, today, and exemption of "other" from close scrutiny.

I support this model with reservations:

You've lost me. Sorry I wish I could help. It sounds good, but the implications are unclear. I know you all called these "details" but when you chair a department and once chaired the whole damned faculty, details loom L-A-R-G-E

I support this model with reservations:

The requirements seem to be tossed in without any connection.

I do not support this model:

Why are these simply tacked on at the end as an after thought?

I support this model with reservations:

Surprised that these have simply been tacked on.

I support this model with reservations:

Aren't 3 and 4 interchangeable?

I do not support this model:
Need for 1 full year of language at least

I support this model with reservations:
Foreign language – should have placement test, not self placement
Should take entire year regardless of where they place
Combine 3 and 4 cross cultural understanding and ethical value together, only 1 course requirement rather than 2

I support this model with reservations:
The foreign language requirement should be 1 year of study beginning at 201 or 301 or 3 semesters beginning at 101.

I support this model with reservations:
1 year language required – minimum at 301 level
Concern that there could be many students only taking one semester
Could certain majors (not science) be disadvantaged to meet cross-cultural requirements?
Could 3 +4 be combined into one requirement?
Like the idea of a designated course for cross-cultural/global

I support this model with reservations:
Not enough foreign language

I support this model with reservations:
Can cross-cultural/ethical be double dipped in the thematic courses?
++ on language validation

I fully support this model:
Language requirement change should be made ASAP!

Component IV F3:

?:
Question marks

I do not support this model:
Seems a bit of a cop-out

I support this model with reservations:
See alt. 1 – can we add critical languages

I do not support this model:
Foreign language requirement needs to be eliminated or needs to be passed at a significantly level of competency

I do not support this model:
Not sure I completely understand the 3rd alternative.

I do not support this model:
Formalistic

I do not support this model:
I can see the foreign language part though we offer no courses in Asian or African languages.
You are not talking about ethics – you are taking about morality – different.

I support this model with reservation:
I'm confused

?:
The alternatives are not well thought out and seem to be manipulated to fit the remaining distribution requirements.

?:
Not nice

I do not support this model:
Similar to alternative 1

I do not support this model:
Like alternative I better.

I do not support this model:
Same as alternative 1?

Component V G:

Good idea to tie the loose ends together as student leaves – Alt. #1
If experience based, OK – Alt. #2

Capstone should be a time to focus...study something in depth. Bringing everyone together from various disciplines suggests a “diluted” course. Great to be broad-based throughout years at college but by senior year one really needs to be focused – for foreign language a “capstone” course would require them to leave their discipline and use their native language to be able to communicate with other students in other disciplines who do not have the 2nd language background and/or ability.

I do not think this should be a separate component of Gen. Ed -> this should be a discipline/major – The same goals or most of them should be/can be considered from a disciplinary point of view. Actually – the experimental component is fine ~ it can readily be discipline based or study abroad.

Liberal arts needs breadth and depth of experience – senior year is the time for depth and focus. We already have so many co-concentrators – This would dilute the focus of a discipline based community in their own field even more. I understand this is general studies, but the experience described seems more appropriate at the 2nd or 3rd year.

I think that the culminating experience should be within their concentration, including their general studies learning. There should not be two separate capstones. Bu the SR year, depth of learning within the concentration should be the focus. The GS should compliment that disciplinary focus – not be separate.

Incorporate skilled person in to a capstone department

The goals are worthy; however, it may be better for students to consolidate their G.E. core before approaching the senior seminar in their discipline.

Unsure

Many students would have 3 senior seminars with capstone. I have no idea what this course would entail. None of the alternatives are desirable. Integrate some of this into concentration senior seminar

I do not support this model:

It's not clear to me why students would be willing to commit to this seriously. May be there could be a GS "4th hour" component to discuss senior seminar? I can't imagine managing/assessing the course as described here.

??:

Alternative 1: How do you implement this course? Is it just electives? How does contact fit in? Could it be that there is a 300-level course with a reflective paper at the end?

Alternative 2: This doesn't really seem like a senior experience; it would be fulfilled at anytime. Does this matter?

I support this model with reservations:

The concept of joining together the separate strands of gen. ed. is good -> how to achieve that goal in practical terms remains unclear.

I do not support this model:

1. too ambitious and time consuming lay the time they're serious
 2. Alt 1 is especially unworkable
 3. Why the technological fetishes? (c.d. -> p. 9-10)
-

I support this model with reservations:

Not sure students can do 4 year plan?

Alternative I: Can students develop a CAP project as freshman and synthesize and reflection as seniors?

Alternative I: Travel abroad – good component

I support this model with reservations:

Support some capstone but each alternative needs work

I fully support this model:
Excellent – a necessary addition

I fully support this model:
Excellent idea. Require the courses to be completely integrated by students from all areas. Prefer a theme over the open idea.

I fully support this model:
Important to structure a clear evaluative measurement of how the students was able to achieve an acceptable level of clarity in interdisciplinary study.

I support this model with reservations:
I wonder how feasible it will be for students to reflect on their whole classroom experiential learning etc. since their first year. Sounds nice idealistically.

I support this model with reservations:
I don't think the topic should necessarily be the same topic as freshman seminar.

I do not support this model:
A course needs to have content to be worth offering

I support this model with reservations:
Prefer the seminar with a topic – a good idea but I worry about implementation in terms of it really doing what we want it to do. And, once again, how would writing across the curriculum fit into this capstone? I would like to see more of that type of orientation.

I fully support this model: Alternative 1
Topic-based with reflection back on previous work. Like the idea of student-led discussion and bringing student “expertise” forefront.

I support this model with reservations:
IDS seminar – prefer it over experiential

I support this model with reservations:

This may be a good idea in theory but it may be difficult to administrate and I am unsure how the students would be able to pull together the info on a particular topic. And then to contribute info from their own disciplines or from what they learned from their gen. studies? Also, how can the instructor effectively oversee this capstone when s/he doesn't have knowledge of all the different disciplines? Finally, there are already a number of senior sems (if they have co-concentrations) and I am concerned that another one would be too much.

I do not support this model:

Alternative 1: No new course content? Why have this?

Alternative 2: Too vague. Seniors writing these overburdened?

??:

Like idea of something to "pull together" all the pieces

Perhaps senior year = large writing assignment discussing how to integrate what you've learned over your career (perhaps within concentration senior seminars)

How accommodate 2-3 senior seminars (if co-concentrator)?

I do not support this model:

This does not appear to be an attractive option for our students. Implementation is not clear.

I support this model with reservations:

I like some kind of integration senior paper in the senior seminar but we do not need another senior seminar.

I support this model with reservations:

Not sure it would work, but it sounds a lot like Albright works (senior experience), a program introduced in 1996-97 and dead by '98. The principle was sound (as is this one) but implementation will be a challenge.

I do not support this model:

Don't need an additional senior requirement – enabled in current senior seminar

I do not support this model:

Bringing in so many students from different disciplines will be very problematic especially since they will all have taken different general studies tracks.

This capstone model seems to be better suited for humanities major than science majors.

I do not support this model:

I'm not sure why this course is necessary when there is already a senior capstone in the concentration. Alternative 2 may work in terms of an internship advanced research, etc.

I do not support this model:

Alternative 1: do not support

Alternative 2: perhaps could support with reservations

I support this model with reservations:

As opposed to Senior Experience

Could integrate. Need for structure perhaps related to cluster.

I support this model with reservations:

Too many seminars for interdisciplinary co-concentrators.

I do not support this model:

Can students take this in the junior year?

Interferes with taking up fulfilling concentration requirements and seminar

I do not support this model:

Blend goals of this system into our present senior seminars

I do not support this model:

Are existing senior already sufficient to bring GE goals together?

This would create too many seminars (2-3) for seniors

Could a junior seminar experience work?

??:

too many seminars in a busy year

Some aspects could be integrated into major seminars

??:

I like the senior experience

The senior capstone is of dubious value. Most likely will be perceived of as a burden by students

I do not support this model:

Needs to have some academic rigor or be less credits/hours

Alt. 1 and 2 – not fond of either senior experience – work into major requirements

Senior experience good but not the seminar

No sure that students would find the value/introspective nature seems like a fluff course
