

Initial Report

Last Modified: 01/15/2013

1. How do you feel about the direction that the CCAC is taking with regard to the changes to the core curriculum, the component areas, and the six core objectives?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Approve		49	28%
2	Disapprove		65	38%
3	Neutral		58	34%
	Total		172	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	3
Mean	2.05
Variance	0.62
Standard Deviation	0.79
Total Responses	172

2. Do you currently teach a course in the core?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes		85	49%
2	No		87	51%
	Total		172	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	2
Mean	1.51
Variance	0.25
Standard Deviation	0.50
Total Responses	172

3. If you would like to provide specific comments concerning the CCAC, please do so below.

Text Response

This is a test.

I have completed this survey, but am not convinced it will be of much assistance or help in moving forward re: the new Core Curriculum. It is not clear to me what actions might be taken in response to the results ... except perhaps no new action if the results are overwhelmingly, or even marginally supportive of the current path. Perhaps it will be of value to those doing the work on these committees to know if they have the general support of the faculty at large or not, but it is not clear what kinds of tangible changes might occur with that knowledge.

I am dismayed that, while I agree that college graduates need stronger oral & written communication skills, the "component" hours were dictated to be communication type courses, leaving already truncated degree plans to try to find room for additional math & science courses that their graduates will need to compete for and function successfully in their future careers.

The changes were pushed through without appropriate input from faculty, chairs, and deans. The feedback that was provided appears to have been ignored. Furthermore, the influence of non-voting members of the CCAC threatens the integrity of the process, especially in terms of faculty governance. More importantly, the lack of attention to this matter by the faculty senate is disappointing, especially their avoidance of the more difficult aspects of this topic during their December meeting.

I feel that foreign languages are essential for our students, especially given the global scope of future occupations, be it in the sciences, business, or the arts. A minimum of two semesters of a foreign language should be a part of the Core. Studying a foreign language improves the student's native language as well. Many of our students come in under-prepared in terms of reading and writing English—learning the grammar of another language improves their grasp of English grammar. By the way, I am not a foreign language professor, so this would not affect my teaching load, but if our main goal is to help the students, then requiring at least six credits in a foreign language is essential.

The Core Curriculum selection process and the Core Curriculum Assessment process are still very much connected, and the non-inclusion in the core is being held over the faculty's head as a threat for complying with assessment. The two should have nothing to do with each other. Assessment needs to be considered "only" for those courses that are selected for the core and "only" after that selection process is complete... which, of course, means the selection process is in no way based on the proposed assessment procedures for the course.

The 120 hour rule has penalized our majors. We are not allowed to use our non-core classes to substitute for core classes in order to meet the 120 hour rule and not weaken the major. For example, our department teaches a communication class which is required, but it is not in the core so it cannot be used to meet the core communication requirement. We were turned down when we tried to get this class in the core. It is not fair that we had to sacrifice courses in our major to meet the 120 hour rule with no equal reduction in core class hours. It should be an equal reduction, which can be met if we were allowed to substitute courses in our major for core requirements.

I agree with the CCAC's decision to dedicate the 6-hours in the optional area to the communication field, but I disagree with their limiting foreign languages to only 1 course in the core (3 hours). I think students should be able to take 6 hours of foreign language in the core. I disagree with the contention of some on the CCAC that 131-132 level courses cannot effectively teach oral communication. If this is the case, then why allow even just 1 foreign language course to remain in the core? The THECB has consistently held that introductory foreign language courses belong in the communication field of the core. Since the LEAP report that the new core is based on emphasizes global awareness, it seems to me that students would benefit from being able to be exposed to a year of a foreign language. What better way is there to increase one's global awareness than learning about the language of another country/culture? I do not think reducing the amount of foreign language in the core serves our students' interests, and I strongly believe there are ways to assess 100- and 200-level foreign language courses to demonstrate they meet the required objectives. I want to note that no one who teaches a foreign language was on the CCAC. It is not fully representative of all the curricular areas in the core, and there should have been greater faculty input on a matter as important as kicking a particular area out of the core. I also want to emphasize that courses should not be expected to meet all aspects of each objective. I know that the CCAC voted against this, but there is still strong sentiment in that body to pressure faculty to include assignments that address all parts of an objective. For instance, it is not appropriate for an ENG 131 course to have to be responsible for oral or visual communication, as this is a course dedicated to written communication. Similarly, 200-level literature courses should not be responsible for the civic engagement part of the social responsibility objective, which would put an unrealistic service-learning burden on those courses and even threaten to politicize the teaching of literature.

Although many were aware of changes in State mandates for the core curriculum, I do not think they realized how the committee was involved in the process. There was not much ongoing communication.

Course that belong in the core should be determined by the content of the course. While assessment is an important function for all curriculum, it should not be a relevant factor in making core curriculum decisions. In other words, we should build our measurement to the course, and not vice-versa.

Any course proposed as a core course ought to have an assessment protocol attached. Certainly, not requiring an assessment protocol make writing course proposals easier, but I expect that there will be plenty of courses submitted that will not be suitable candidates because of the lack of assessment documents. Let's do this right and plan from the start. This is the principal flaw in the work of the committee. Otherwise, it has been dealt with to generate the least amount of disruption from what we have been doing.

The decisions to move the Component Area Option's six hours to the Communications Foundational Component Area was correct. I strongly support this decision, even though I do not teach in the areas and departments affected by this decision. However, the organization of the communications foundational area is fundamentally flawed. First, the subdivision of the area is simply wrong. The first six hours in this area should be ENG 131 and ENG 132, or any other equivalents that the English Department should propose. The remaining six hours should either be six hours of Communication Studies OR six hours of modern languages. We cannot produce globally competent students who any real exposure to other languages. Three hours is simply not enough. Second, this decision to minimize the number of hours in modern languages at three hours is at odds with standard practice at many universities around the state and country. This simply is not a "best practice." We should be embarrassed that we are attempting to send students into the workplace without more language instruction. Business majors are not longer competitive without language instruction – we live in a globalized market! Social work majors need Spanish language instruction – just look at the demographic shift occurring in this state alone. Our majors are competing for jobs against graduates from around the world, not Angelina College. We should be adding additional languages like Arabic, Mandarin, etc, as well as beefing up our Spanish, German, Portuguese, and French language programs. Finally, other universities in Texas including North Texas and Texas Tech sought to minimize changes in their core – if SFASU were to follow that approach, then the new core should contain six hours of English in one grouping and six hours of communication studies or modern languages in the other. However, the real issue is not the organization of the core. The real issue is the new core assessment process, which is not being addressed properly. The Provost, Assistant Provost, and Dr. King are increasingly out of touch on this issue. The faculty are willing to do assessment – that is not the issue. We know how to do assessment, so please start listening to the faculty when we give you feedback on flawed assessment plans.

Strongly opposed to any attempt to require that every core course has to cover every core curriculum objective. The idea of requiring the teaching of math or science in a English comp class, or oral communication in a math class, is absurd.

It was suggested by some in an open meeting that a discipline outside the college of sciences and mathematics was perfectly capable of offering science and math courses for the core. This is not acceptable. Most would not appreciate math and the sciences offering psychology for science and math majors as something acceptable for a humanity core requirement. The point of a broad education (the essence of the university system) is to be taught different fields by those recognized to be experts in those fields. In contrast, in a vocational or trade school it is perfectly acceptable to allow one discipline to manage the focus and the delivery of the educational experience.

The representation of the committee was not done well. There are non-faculty voting members on the committee. The core curriculum should be under the consideration and approval of the university faculty with consultation and approval by the VPAA and Board. In other words, the curriculum is the venue of the faculty and not administrators. The committee composition has compromised the process. I recommend that the non-faculty be placed as non-voting, consulting members to the committee only. The core forms the basis for all other work in the majors and minors and should reflect SFA's values and expectations for its students. Work in the area of communication cannot be over-emphasized and thus the more courses and work that students do in this component the better.

I believe that other discipline's degree programs are negatively impacted by the preference that the committee is showing toward the sciences.

reading, riting, rithmetic

Every Department on Campus should have a course in the core. The core should not be the sole "property" of a few departments who have huge faculty teaching core classes and very few Bachelors and Master Degree candidates. SFA has had the most restrictive core curriculum on any university in Texas. This is one of the reasons we have not grown appreciably since the mid 1970's while enrollment at our sister institutions have had major enrollment increases. We have not added the popular majors that other institutions have been able to add because of a lack of faculty in the developing areas. Good Luck changing the course of this institution.

It is more bureaucratic BS that sucks the life out of faculty who teach in public universities like SFA.

Feel that the subjects in the core should be there because the content is what is needed in the core, not because of assessment.

The revisions to the core curriculum are being driven by an end-product of assessment to such an extent that it seems that the actual educational goals are being lost. Assessment is not

the goal, it is a derelict service to describe a portion of the educational process. It is already an incredible burden to faculty, drawing us ever closer to the educational travesty suffered in primary and secondary schools that must "teach the test," distracting from real educational goals. An attempt to cram the rich diversity of the university core education into a one-size-fits-an-assessment-model hole by individuals who are not qualified to judge or understand many of the component courses they are judging is deeply troubling. Several other Texas universities have devised much more reasonable and realistic plans. The current direction of the CCAC is not only unusable by faculty at SFA, it will make us a mockery to other universities and harm our ability to bring in transfer students. We're not just re-inventing the wheel here, we're replacing it with cinder blocks. Why not try to make the core a more elegant buffet system similar to the cores in Arkansas' university systems?

Health and Fitness, Physical Education

The current proposal imposes objectives that may be unreasonable to attain in an introductory level course. The criteria may sound good "in theory" (i.e., personal responsibility), but in practice the criteria are difficult to assess in 100 level courses. The very notion that assignments would need to be approved by an assessment committee trammels upon the right of academic freedom. We are effectively asking persons outside of a discipline to determine whether an assignment is acceptable - the notion is ludicrous. A more appropriate assessment would be done at the departmental level, where persons in the field can make more informed choices. I, personally, do not want approval of my assignments made outside of the department. The very idea that persons across disciplines are reading work from other fields makes absolutely no sense to me. Someone with a degree in political science is not necessarily qualified to assess assignments from unrelated fields. We are frighteningly moving in the direction of public schools (K-12), where assessment is king and learning is secondary. To remove instructors' right to determine their own assignments without the approval of a committee of persons outside of the field of study is frightening - to have those persons determine whether a student successfully applied the principles of the field is even more disturbing. Basically, assignments will have to be watered down fluff that does not truly touch on course content if you expect persons with no training in the field to assess the appropriateness of the answer! The notion that senior level courses are to be incorporated into the assessment is puzzling because comparisons drawn between the core and senior courses would not be appropriate comparisons. It also removes academic freedom from the senior courses that are not even part of "the core" and, again, assignments will need approval from an administrative body and academic freedom lost.

I am happy to see that the general guidelines for the new core have been met, and that very little change to our current core was necessary (pending approval of the specific courses). Thanks to the committee for their hard work!

The 4 hour courses should be mandated to have a 3 hour course as well. It should not be an option for there to be 4 hour courses.

I am glad that the committee agreed to remove assessment planning from the main application. Developing skill based assessment, rather than the current EEO content based assessment, is too large an undertaking to complete in such a short time frame. I am disappointed that foreign languages have been given so little place in the core, especially given the growing emphasis on preparation for working in a global context. Global awareness is part of the SFA strategic plan, and 63% of the employers surveyed in "Are They Really Ready To Work" indicated that knowledge of foreign language will become increasingly important in the workplace over the next five years. Limiting foreign language to one semester seems remarkably short-sighted to me. (I do not teach in Modern Languages. This decision does not affect me personally, but I think it is the wrong one for our students.) Although I am generally a supporter of assessment, this particular assessment plan is poorly constructed in comparison to other available models that meet the THECB guidelines. I would urge the Senate to also look into the matter of core assessment.

Our students (in Texas) are currently ranked low in mathematics and verbal skills. Until we can bring in students that are prepared for college-level communications, mathematics, and science courses, we must provide that foundational education at the college level. Reducing and/or combining the requirements in these areas, though a potential long-term goal, is not currently helpful in preparing our students for their real world, post-baccalaureate careers. "The majority of Texas students do not leave public schools prepared for college. Fewer than one in two students met the state's "college readiness" standards in math and verbal skills on ACT, SAT and TAKS scores in 2010. Though average SAT scores in both verbal and math dropped between 2007 and 2010 — a trend that state education officials have attributed to an increase in students taking the test — more students in the same period of time have met the state's standards for college-ready graduates, largely because of improvements on their state standardized tests and the ACT" (Smith, 2012). cite: Smith, M. (2012, Aug. 4). Struggling for students' readiness. "The New York Times." Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/05/education/most-texas-students-found-not-ready-for-college.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0

I believe that, overall, this committee has done some excellent work, but after reading the minutes from the meeting and seeing how voting was done (specifically regarding the place of Modern Languages) I have strong feelings that ex-officio members of this committee took more control than allowed by their role on the committee. This does raise questions of "no confidence" in what was to be a very democratic process.

The whole idea of an external committee deciding what should be in the core is ridiculous. The present core courses should automatically be included. The core belongs to the faculty, not to this committee.

It appears that this is predetermined, and that faculty input is perfunctory.

The CCAS does not provide an appropriate demographic of faculty members invested in the CORE; decisions are being made by people who do not work directly with CORE matters. This is not a good practice. The loss of Modern Languages from the CORE is unfortunate. It seems that more students will choose to take ENG 273 than they would a course in language; this goes against the mission of the CORE when it is supposed to focus on global awareness.

2nd Math is more important than another communication course. 4 credit science classes are enough of a change.

I appreciate assessment of our students' progress, however it needs to be done in a way that is both effective and efficient. A method that places an undo burden upon faculty (for review of materials etc.) or too much reliance upon students (uploading of materials) has little likelihood of producing a quality product reflecting the effort needed to compile the data. We have bright, creative, and focused faculty members here at SFA, I certainly hope the administration will take advantage of this resource and, in cooperation with the faculty, produce a plan that meets or exceeds state requirements while providing the types of information we need and desire.

I believe the new core, which requires us to prove achievement of objectives, infringes upon academic freedom with the assumption that all courses of that level must have the same lesson plan and assessment of core objectives. Furthermore, it was discussed within our college that we want to focus heavily on preparing students for overseas career opportunities. The problem I see with this is that there has been discussion of eliminating modern languages from the core requirements. This seems counter-intuitive.

At this point it is a confusing and unrealistic mess of an approach that very few people seem to understand and even fewer administrators can explain.

It is strongly recommended that a language requirement be retained as a core requirement. A graduate with no exposure to a modern language, especially a latin based language is at a severe disadvantage in the modern world.

Our core classes are what actually provide our students with the ability to absorb and articulate the information that they receive in the curriculum of study they have chosen to follow. Without the basics readying them for the in-depth study to come, they will not be armed with tools needed to pass those courses. Not only do the core classes prepare the students for the drastic difference between high school and college life, the core classes also prepared the student to think for themself. These core classes also implement the beginnings of the intense importance of critical thinking and reading so that the student is better prepared to embark upon the college career portion of life.

I'm concerned about the plan to assign every core objective to every course (some seem a very bad fit—especially some of the community involvement/responsibility/ service measures) and the apparent plan to evaluate every core objective every semester, which seems like frankly excessive and unnecessary labor when we could get the necessary statistics by cycling objectives in groups of two per semester as is currently done.

To offer 3 hours of a foreign language (and with resistance at that) as merely an option sends the message that SFA is not interested in challenging its students and preparing them for work abroad or within a global economy. The proposal does not include any sequence of language courses. SFA's mission statement includes the following: "prepare for the challenges of living in the global community." Requiring one semester of a language - or none - indicates that the proposed core does not ally with our mission as a university. To put it bluntly, the new core decreases challenges to students, encourages the path of least resistance (other classes listed to opt out of a language are, bluntly put, easier than taking a language) and makes our students less competitive in their applications to graduate study and for future employment. It seems evident from various committee votes, campus wide meetings and general feedback that the faculty on the whole are against such a feeble/virtually non-existent language requirement. This hurts their students' future opportunities. If the plan goes through, it is without consent of the faculty and takes us one step closer to becoming a diploma mill.

The impression I get from the current draft document is that the process has been far too centralized. I understand the challenge of implementing the HECB's initiative, but it seems to be a step toward too much standardization, with some curriculum and instructional "approval" coming from the committee, which to me would be an infringement on academic freedom and would also have the opposite effect that we hope to accomplish. Instead of increasing academic rigor and accomplishment it would lessen it, as standardization always seems to do.

Bravo to all for keeping the foreign language component in the core!

At present, I am incredibly disappointed in the current draft of the proposed core to be implemented in the fall of 2014. My concerns are as follows: 1. The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board approved a major revision of the Texas Core Curriculum on October 27, 2011. Despite the fact that a university-wide committee already existed that dealt with core curriculum assessment issues and an entire office is dedicated to this process, no meetings, discussion, or additional committees were held or appointed, respectively, to address this critical issue until eleven months later. Eleven months? ELEVEN MONTHS?!? The university lost nearly a year of time that could have been used to sort through the process and begin work on the new core in a thoughtful, calm, pragmatic, and logical manner. Instead, we are now in a situation that we are seriously pressed to meet looming deadlines. Additionally, the February 15, 2013, deadline has been thrown in our face every time faculty have raised the point that we need more time to achieve a true level of shared governance in this process. 2. At

present, the core curriculum proposal includes one semester of a foreign language. In an increasingly global world, in which American students are lagging for any number of reasons, the inability to communicate in any language other than English or in any country outside the United States sets them up for all but automatic failure on a state-wide level, much less a national or international stage. The decision to require but one lousy semester of a foreign language is laughable at best and appalling in reality. When pressed on this issue, the chair of the advisory committee answered that students really don't learn to communicate effectively in one semester of a language so anything beyond that was unnecessary or useless. Really? Many of our students do not learn to effectively communicate after two semesters of English composition, but no one is suggesting that we eliminate English composition from the core. If it is true that one in five American students will have to seek their first job overseas by 2025, do we really think that is a viable option with one semester of a foreign language? I think not. In any case, SFA is watering down the curriculum to appease whom or whom, I am not sure, but this decision does a grave injustice to our students, and one that fear will reap awful ramifications if it does become the status quo. 3. Finally, I regret to inform the powers that be—Berry, Larry, and Mary—but this committee no more represents authentic faculty influence in this process than a man on the moon. While the core curriculum and core curriculum assessment is an issue that affects and effects everyone at the university, it plays a more significant role in the daily professional lives of full-time faculty that actually teach core classes. To that end, I seriously question the description of this committee as being representative of the faculty when nearly half (six out of thirteen) members of the committee are not full-time faculty (Steward, Szafran, Oswald, Langham, King, and Brunson) who teach and whose individual professional lives are directly tied to the outcomes of this proposal. I also question the fact that while the large majority of classes in the present, and likely future, core are housed on the College of Liberal and Applied Arts and the College of Science and Mathematics, the composition of this committee does not reflect that reality; hence, the core faculty have not experienced a proportionate voice or influence in this process. If particular attention is not paid to this critical cohort of the faculty, they will not hold themselves bound by university doctrine in which they have little voice or adequate representation.

I don't like the idea of lessening, narrowing, cutting or any other euphemism that applies to requiring fewer core courses, especially in the humanities. For many of these students, those core courses are the only exposure they will have to some of the most culturally significant works in human history.

I feel that modern language has been de-emphasized, and I have a number of concerns about English 132 being moved from the communication area to the component area. If for some reasons it turns out to "not" be required in the component area, I believe students will be hurt irreparably. I have heard many students voice opinions about the growth they experienced in the argumentation course—a number of whom return from post-degree careers indicating that the course prepared them for the work they were doing in those careers. The study of composition and modern language go hand in hand in developing the entry-level work force abilities employers desire. As the conference board (tasked in developing the report used by the UEAC to change the core) has surmised, there is a significant difference in students entering the work force from a two-year institute and those entering from a four-year institute; the four-year students most often have had two courses in written communication AND two in foreign language. The combination allows students to develop a level of communication which includes the ability to consider an abstract level of language, one which directly improves their critical thinking about communication. To remove either component is to block the synergy of our best practices.

Having attended the meeting at which faculty were invited to provide input to the CCAC, I was very dismayed that the Assistant Vice-President of Academic Affairs produced a proposal less than a day after the meeting. Although a range of opinions was expressed at the meeting, none of them are really reflected in the Assistant Vice-President's proposal. Furthermore, the Assistant Vice-President attended the meeting herself, and said nothing. What's more the committee seems to have accepted the Assistant Vice-President's proposal very quickly, even though other proposals had been made. I'm inclined to think that the meeting with faculty was nothing other than a public relations gambit.

It's time to rethink the concept of core courses. In light of changes in students' needs and technological developments in higher education leading to more online (and even MOOC) courses, the core should become focused on the what is truly the core of college education—focusing on a return to face-to-face interaction with students emphasizing philosophy and the arts. The opposite extreme—which reflects the direction of the current and probable future core—is toward mechanized petrification, infused only with a misguided sense of self-importance that is rooted in an imagined 'tradition.'

I worry that the failure to make foreign languages a strong part of our curriculum is a fundamental mistake that is out of touch with the needs of students and creates the impression that SFA is out of touch with globalism and lowering our standards. I understand that much of the problems with the six core objects originates in the bureaucracy of the THECB. However, the mish-mash of objectives being assigned to courses virtually ensures that the goals will not be met. In trying to make these course teach everything we will have undermined the ability to teach anything effectively.

Change is needed. Change is difficult. I've long felt that the existing core was just "more of the same" of what students are taught in high school. I believe it should be based on the knowledge/skills needed to survive and thrive in life today and in the future. Communication skills and exposure to art & literature are important but are we helping students learn how to have good relationships, deal with family & parenting issues, feed themselves and their family, maintain a healthy lifestyle, manage their personal business & finances, select & purchase products based on aesthetic consideration? I base these questions on the fact that most individuals do eventually marry and have children. All American citizens should be responsible for using resources wisely. Many college graduates do not know how to complete tax forms when they are employed. Some don't even know that they are required to pay federal income tax. I could continue, but I think you get the point. Thanks for the opportunity to voice my concerns.

The committee should simply not accept 4 hour science courses if the state does not allow for it. It did not go far enough with "encouraging" the three hour science course. Our major degree program simply has been cut and cut and cut. We do not have two extra hours to give to Science. This will impact our degree in a HUGE way. I know this is not a popular decision in Science, and frankly, morally, I don't believe it is the right decision for Science by the state. I'm sorry for the decision. Many of the decisions made by the state in the last decade are not the best decisions for educating a "universal student". It has adversely impacted our degree in a large way. However, the state simply did not allow for it, and neither should YOU, the core curriculum committee. Unfortunately, I will be very tempted to advise my students to other colleges for their SIX hours of science credits, since I'm aware that more than 60% of other universities in the state offer this. Please reconsider this issue.

I do not think the assessment committee should be involved in the approval process for core curriculum classes. Decoupling the approval of the two committees only creates an unnecessary two-step process. The assessment committee should provide assessment guidelines and a centralized resource for the gathering of assessments. Departments should be responsible for assessing themselves because they are subject-matter experts of the discipline. If a separate entity needs to approve assessments, it should consist of experts for each discipline; non-experts are not qualified. As for the latest decisions about the core, I think it is a mistake to reduce the foreign language requirement given that we are also being told by our dean that globalization and changes in the worldwide economy will increasingly cause many of our students to land jobs in other countries over the coming decades. Also, the material covered in ENG 273 is not suitable for freshman. The course is more appropriate for a college student who has developed greater expertise in his/her discipline, has more subject-matter expertise to apply to assignments, and is ready to work on his/her CV.

I am not teaching a core course this semester but I do almost every semester. In addition, I am the core assessment coordinator for a course this term. I disapprove of allotting 6 hours to communications. Communications is represented elsewhere in the core and should not need so many credit hours to accomplish its goals. I also disapprove of encouraging departments to submit 3-hour versions of their 4-hour courses. The curriculum should not be altered to fit an assessment protocol. Assessment should not drive the development of courses in this way to fit an arbitrary credit-hour requirement; if assessment data supported changing courses for educational purposes, I would consider supporting such a change.

Thanks to the committee for their work. I believe the direction taken is sound and will meet the programmatic needs of my college.

In my department we have an incredible amount of ghost hours because we are expected to cover certain material but cannot go over credit limits. Students need these specialized materials (and more!), and so we have no choice but to make what should be a 3 or 4 credit hour class into a 1 credit hour class. A large number of our students' credit hours go toward core classes that A) should have been covered in high school and B) seem excessive. I don't think it is too much to ask for other departments to carry the same burden of lessening the credits some of their classes carry as we have ALWAYS had to do in order to facilitate a little equitability throughout departments. To me, we are a very core-intensive university, and while we certainly want well-rounded students, it seems considering what is best for the students as well as raising admissions standards are things that should be considered.

I do support foreign language being a degree requirement instead of a core requirement.

Requiring more easy communications courses and fewer challenging modern languages courses? Yeah, that will help our academic reputation.

This statement appears on the survey and is incomplete. Passed a proposal that the original 6 semester credits of Communication and the 6 semester credits from the Component Area Option that were allocated to Communication (please see table above); This flaw in the design of this survey is unfortunate as this is the central concern. If curriculum belongs to the faculty many do not feel represented, feel the core should be determined in terms of skills only and AFTER that is complete then a determination should be made as to how to handle the assessment. Assessment should not dictate content of the core—only the required skills. Also the committee does not seem to be considering what effect this will have on attracting transfer students as we seem to be going in a direction different than many other institutions.

I believe the new plan meets the needs of students at SFASU for a general education core.

How about translating this gibberish into English for the sake of those of us who are educators rather than educationists?

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	58

Actions of the Core Curriculum Advisory Council Cross Tabulation(1)

		How do you feel about the direction that the CCAC is taking with regard to the changes to the core c...			Total
		Approve	Disapprove	Neutral	
Do you currently teach a course in the core?	Yes	19	45	21	85
	No	30	20	37	87
	Total	49	65	58	172

		How do you feel about the direction that the CCAC is taking with regard to the changes to the core c...
		Do you currently teach a course in the core?
	Degrees of Freedom	2
	p-value	0.00

Comments directly about the committee

Not appropriate input from faculty/representation of faculty on committee	12
Generally positive	3
Faculty feedback ignored	1
Lack of communication about the process	1

Comments about Assessment

Flawed Assessment Plan	6
Loss of academic freedom	3
Treat of non-compliance with assessment means a course will not be in the Core	3
Separate the Core Application from the Assessment	3
Curriculum should not be changed to fit Assessment (3 to 4 hour courses)	2
Combine Core Application with Assessment	1
Senior level courses should not be assessed in the same manner	1

Comments about Core Objectives

Courses should not have to meet all of the aspects of an objective (e.g. Written, Visual, OR Oral)	8
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Comments about Core Courses/Component Hours

Need more foreign languages in Core*	14
Do not understand why hours went to Sciences	3
Do not understand why hours went to Communications	3
All 4 hour courses should have a 3 hour counterpart	3
All departments should be represented in the Core	2
Choices are out of line with the SFA Mission of Global Awareness	2
Communication hours were divided erroneously	1
Need more communication courses	1
There will no longer be any core substitutions	1
Core courses should be face to face not online	1
Foreign languages a degree not Core requirement	1

Miscellaneous Comments

Negative comment, but not substantive	4
Do not understand the point of survey	1
Lack of attention at Faculty Senate level	1
We need better entering students	1

* These comments were followed by our students cannot compete in a global economy without the knowledge of a foreign language which they will not get with one semester of a language.