We are at a disadvantage as compared to other universities. It is essential that the major fields of study have more courses in the core. The core needs to have as few classes as possible so the majors can add courses to assist employability. Allow the majors to make the decisions as to what is used in the core. As advise hundreds of students each year and not once has anyone contacted me and told me that the core helped them find a job -- it is always the technical classes that are discussed. Keep the number of core hours as small as possible so the major area can add a class or two.

I personally like the general core as it is laid out, but do not see the need for a KIN class for all students. There are also more than enough options with the current core to develop a reasonably well rounded student as long as too many shortcuts of substitutions are made.

Our SHSU science classes do not seem to be connected to the lecture since transfers with 3-hour sciences can take any unrelated lab to meet SHSU requirement. That does not make sense. Although I think cultural studies is important, I do not see results of more tolerance from the current requirements. I sure don't see healthy behaviors from students after taking KINE 2115. How do they measure effectiveness? This core revision could really be exciting if we took it seriously and not just pro forma. It looks like the time to redo the core is very short. How long have you guys known about this?

I ranked Math as the most needed for our students. What I find is that our students can work the problems by the time I get them but they can not explain their results.

Two composition classes 1 math class 8 hours science minimum 1 poli sci class 1 history class expand cultural studies.

It is difficult to improve our programs when we have essentially open enrollment. This, in essence, mandates remedial work for a large number of students. If you want to improve our university from an academic standpoint, raise or establish entrance requirements.

Between grade-inflation, IDEA-form enforced coddling of students, and the ever decreasing requirement of the state/university for a degree, this process amounts to nothing more than rearranging the deckchairs on the Titanic.

When I promote Communication -- I mean Visual Communication or Electronic Communication. Speech Communication is significantly different -- not nearly as important in terms of university-wide needs.

The 120 hour limit makes it very difficult to train students in their major field when the core is too large. Yes, they need the basics but let's strike a reasonable balance.

I was confused on the question about additional hours in health and wellness. Did you mean an additional hour above and beyond the existing 120 hour I believe we only need 1 hour of Health/Wellness courses in the core. In reality, I think the existing core fits the students needs for becoming productive citizens.

The question regarding wellness and health-related fitness was not clearly worded because of the use of "additional". This could be taken to mean beyond the current core, or it could be taken to mean beyond the new core. In the latter case, "additional" would mean that it would match our current core. My "agreement" is different depending upon the interpretation. I strongly agree that one hour should be in the core. Also, I am troubled that individuals who do not teach in the life and physical sciences are being asked to determine whether a lab science course can be taught effectively in 3 hours. On what would they base their opinion? I am also extremely concerned that life and physical science majors will not be penalized in the core by choosing these majors. If majors courses in these disciplines are NOT part of the core, then these students will lose electives in order to stay "within 120 hours". In some cases, there are no electives in the degree plan, so something required for the major would have to be cut.

My comments would be directed at the entity that dictates these issues rather than our ability to try and accomodate the "maddness"

For areas where certification is required we will need to build in some flexibility at the onset. In order to make sure students graduate in a timely manner we need to be open-minded and allow certification programs determine the specific needs for their students.

I don't teach core curriculum courses, but strong communication skills (written and verbal) seem to be lacking in our student population.

Our students lack practical skill in electronic communication beyond texting, Facebook and Twitter. Their ability to effectively utilize professional communication systems, and their understanding of the social, cultural, and legal implications of electronic communication are severely limited. Without going back to an 'Introduction to Computing' course these issues should be both addressed and adequately assessed within the existing mandated courses.

At which stage are specific courses within each component area going to be considered for inclusion or exclusion.

Our students cannot write (compose) a complete sentence. They have difficulty getting their points across. I think we need to make sure they can read, write, and present by the time they graduate from College.

I don't understand why you would ask all faculty if science with labs can be taught in 3 cr hrs, when only those of us that teach science with labs can really answer that question. Our students in general are horribly ill-prepared to handle science even at the level of day-to-day news and political decision-making they need regularly. Cutting back the level of science in the core would be a major detriment. Similarly, their ability to write and communicate orally in an organized manner needs a lot of work - please don't reduce these in the core. We need more rigor, not less.

It seems there are a lot of choices that mask what students really need, so let me be clear - they need to know how to write (english, communication, whatever you want to call it), they need to be able to speak (communications, public speaking, etc.), and they need critical reasoning skills (e.g., philosophy, political science, etc.).

Anything we can do to strengthen writing skills will help our students for life...we should not lose touch with that fact as we fight over territory.

Lab science course require 4 hours!
My concern is that everyone is focusing on courses and protecting departments (such as speech) instead of focusing on what the students need.

We should first decide what makes a culturally literate and then worry about the courses that teach that literacy. Our culture is heavily technological, and yet our students are technologically and scientifically illiterate. This creates a great disconnect. More humanities courses won’t help them understand why the process of science leads naturally to advances that improve and extend lives. I strongly recommend that the institutional designation be anything BUT more humanities/social sciences.

As faculty, I am frustrated to see our academic independence compromised by meddling of statehouse into issues of the academy that they are much less well equipped to understand than the local experts. I believe that the minimal possible legal adjustment should be instituted. I perceive no pressing reason to upset an existing satisfactory balance in the core that has already been refined over much time. In particular, the prospect of compromising science laboratory instruction is unacceptable. It is moreover quite impossible to maintain coverage that is minimally satisfactory in both detail and generality under a scenario that maintains laboratory sections while shoehorning them into the time allocation normally reserved for lectures.

I think that it is important to retain the 6 hours of ENGL and I think a COMS course need be added. I don’t think the cultural course or the KINE courses meet the objectives set for them. A lab science course without a lab makes no sense to me.

Of the schools in the Texas State University System (8) only 3 DO NOT include a communication course as a required course in the communication core component area. They are: Sul Ross State University – Rio Grande College Lamar Institute of Technology Sam Houston State University Is this really the company we want to keep? Isn’t our university a better quality than the other two listed? It seems that we are seriously out of step with other universities in our system. Not to mention when you look at the NUMBER 1 thing employers say they want in their employees is good communications skills. The Public Speaking course requires students to learn to research, fact check, organize, WRITE detailed outlines (with proper citation), and then be able to deliver that distilled and refined content in a conversational and engaging way. It is not some joke or toll off skill that can be taught by simply having student read a paper in another course. Currently, students read the a paper written in an English course and that “meets” the required communication component. Hardly. Speaking well is a skill that most people think they have but they are seriously lacking. They will never learn this skill if they are not taught all of the components.

I hope that we are not considering that the sole purpose of a college degree is job placement. I would hope we are still under the belief that we are preparing students to live healthy and productive lives. This would include, then, social and emotional development and the pursuit of happiness.

Taking the experimental laboratory component out of the science courses is like taking reading out of an English course. No application. The national numbers on science literacy in Texas and the US argue in the strongest possible terms that deleting the lab component would be deleterious. Understanding and appreciating science is critical to our citizens in this technological age, and in making decisions related to stem cell research. vaccines. cancer. alternative medicines, nutrition and diets, etc.

Oral and visual communication competence is the most glaring omission in SHSU’s core. A public speaking class (such as is offered in the core at almost ever other university in the state) would address these needs.

If the primary objective in core curriculum revisions is addressing employability, the TOP PRIORITY in that discussion should be about developing writing for undergraduates. Most students at this university seem woefully unprepared for writing. This is partly a question of basic composition, grammar, and related skills, and it is partly a question of logic, critical thinking, and skills application. Students largely do not know how to write, do not have any interest in developing as writers, and seem to have no concept of the importance of written communication. Writing, much more so than the facts and principles they acquire in topical courses, will be the foundation on which they are evaluated, promoted, and valued in their eventual careers. This phenomenon is not discipline-specific and it is not transient. I have no idea how writing can be emphasized structurally, given the constraints of the pending curriculum revisions. I am sure, however, that our students would benefit from doing more of it, more consistently, and at a higher level. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Our students' written communication and mathematics skills are deplorable! We must bolster these areas as much as possible, and design a core curriculum that will help them in their careers.

The core curriculum needs to be structured so that students are exposed to courses designed to make them employable. Many students lack basic knowledge in areas such as math and science. These two areas especially need to be expanded in the core curriculum. Computer science, life sciences, chemistry, etc. are especially lacking.

We are grossly out of step with other Texas universities (and probably with U.S. universities in general) in not providing our students with a clear and definitive core course in primarily oral communication, one taught by experts in that area. This has to change for a number of reasons. To mention just one, much research over the last several years has routinely shown that employers value oral and people-oriented communication skills more highly than any other characteristic in new employees.

The key to a successful core is one that involves critical thinking rather than technical skills. However we select courses for core, it is crucial that those courses have building critical thinking skills as their foundation—not just information accumulation. Students have computers that can do that.

It is very unfortunate that the requirements of the revised core curriculum are just now, at the end of the semester, are being brought to the attention of the faculty. This survey is being rushed through and the town hall meetings are arriving late in the process and largely over the summer. We are way off the schedule listed in THECB's own timeline. It appears that our administration dropped the ball on this one. The suggested revisions are eroding academic freedom.

It’s imperative that major life and physical science courses count in the revised core curriculum, otherwise, given the 120-hour rule, these majors will have to skip upper division electives that are some of the most useful courses in their fields. These majors have already been cut to the bone.
Students need a technology applications course in the core. Although it has been argued that students graduating from high school have the necessary technology skills to be successful, this is not the case in general. Students do not typically understand how to effectively search or evaluate digital media nor are students proficient with basic computer programs such as Excel. This translates to a great amount of remediation that has to take place in other courses taking away from content instruction. More focus also needs to be placed on professional writing and research. These are skills very much lacking in our students.

Long overdue. Looking forward to the challenge and the rethinking of the core from the perspective of the demands of the 21st century.

Our undergraduate students often are very poor writers and speakers. They are more directed toward learning information to take tests than to be critical thinkers and problem-solvers. Many have a sense of entitlement that they should do have to do only the minimum amount required to get a grade. This perspective will not aid them in the real world.

Communications and Speech courses taught within the major should be included in the core. Communications and Speech are courses that teach skills. They are different from literature and philosophy classes that expand a student's world view.

Cutting any part of the current curriculum is unthinkable. I am a scientist; however, my life and professional work are greatly enriched by the arts. There are some areas of study where professors may be able to be more collaborative, such as mathematics, music, and computer science. Students should not be limited from wanting to take any course they desire to take; however, the requirements for a degree could possibly be adjusted to meet new mandates. Rather than cutting our core curriculum, perhaps we should optimize it instead.

Though I find any cuts to the core curriculum disconcerting, I'm most troubled by the idea of our students' taking only one composition (ENG) course. Most of the courses that I teach require ENGL 1301 and 1302 as prerequisites, and I find that students still sometimes struggle with their writing. I can only imagine how their communication skills would be damaged if they were taking half of the composition requirements. Equally important, their abilities to reason, act, and communicate in a variety of situations (whether writing or speaking) would be diminished. More than ever, our students are communicators (bloggers, Tweeters, Facebookers, etc.). The social and cultural implications of ineffective communication are significant by themselves. If we also consider that employers are now using our students' public and private writings to judge them as people and prospective employees, then the importance of fortifying our students with effective communication skills only increases. More than just part of our students' curricula, communication is at the core of our lives. To continue graduating students who are thoughtful, articulate, and otherwise able to live up to the motto of this institution, we must keep the requirements for two composition courses in the future core curriculum.

I want to address the importance of maintaining 6 hours of English language/composition courses in the core curriculum. Despite the fact that some large universities such as UT and ATM are going to one composition course, SHSU must retain 6 hours. Our students' skill sets in English are diminishing, not improving, and they need more work at the foundational level.

Literacy, specifically writing, is a weakness in our students.

Please keep those 2 English Comp classes!!!! My students can barely write as it is. Also, although I am not a science teacher, please keep labs etc in science. Our country is terribly behind in science right now.

We must maintain the six hours of composition courses in the core curriculum. Our students typically need a lot of help with writing and taking away one of the composition courses would remove an important component in their general education. Students need to be able to write effectively in order to be successful in their majors and future careers. Condensing two semesters of composition work into one course is not possible. Students will lose out.

While I understand concept of statewide core curriculum, seems THECB should allow universities to set their own across each campus. That way, students could more reasonably select where they wish to go to school. Communications and transportation has altered the notion of regional colleges.

While we are up against the 120 rule, we need to try as best as possible to allow departments to continue to offer courses from their degree plans in the core. I think anything less than this will be perceived incredibly unfair on many levels by the faculty. I think it is important to find a way to include some sort of business or economics course into the core. The social responsibility aspect of the objectives could be an important part of the course (I'm not in the College of Business, so I'm suggesting it here.) I think it is imperative that faculty be given coaching (and/or instruction) on how to successfully submit their courses to the choosing committee so that we don't have important courses being turned away because the submission didn't mention particular buzz words that the committee was looking for. Faculty also will need serious help and suggestions on how to assess the objectives.

I don't think the literature requirement is necessary, nor is the health & wellness course. The 4-hour science courses are very strongly needed as a reduction to a 3-hour course taught as a 2.2 is not adequate at all. ENGL 1301 & 1302 should be the only options for the communication component. Finally, there should be quite a few more faculty on the core curriculum committee than the current number.

I think it is essential to maintain the traditional 4-hour/course lab science requirement. This is because the labs provide students the opportunity to apply the concepts learned in class (learn by doing) and they provide the opportunity for group work - both of which are sound pedagogical approaches to learning. Given that America is in the midst of science literacy 'crisis' which renders many Americans unable to make informed decisions regarding science-related issues (such as climate change and the merits of vaccinations), it would be detrimental to reduce the number of hours of science. This can only lead to a further diminution in science literacy. Also, on a practical level, a reduction in labs would translate into a reduction in the number of paid graduate teaching assistantships for those who teach labs, and this could adversely impact our science graduate programs by limiting the number of assistantships that could be offered.

I teach graduate level classes. I have little involvement as an instructor of core classes. However, I recognize I am a consumer of gen. ed. outcomes in students. I applaud the group for your work.

I don't teach undergraduate courses so I lack the experience to truly understand the issues. Sorry.

Strengthen core curriculum courses through rigor and strong faculty.
SHSU is a liberal arts university—not a vocational school or specious on-line degree-awarding institution—therefore, our DUTY to our students is not only to make them employable or to accommodate their current work schedules. It is also incumbent upon us to give our students a broad knowledge base, and stripping the core curriculum of humanities-based classes robs them of the opportunity—for some the only opportunity—to learn about and experience elements of our cultural heritage and of the world outside of the United States. That said, the currently required English classes, two freshman composition classes and two world literature classes, not only give our students a cultural base for the acquisition of knowledge, they also give them practical, measurable skills: everyone needs to know how to write well and persuasively, regardless of major or profession, and English classes are the only place where students can learn this skill from professors whose entire careers are focused upon writing, reading, and critical thinking. Such courses cannot conscientiously be removed from the core curriculum.

I believe our university has a relatively strong core. The KINE requirement seems outdated and should be removed. The students get very little from this course. There should also be a bit more flexibility in the core.

I am in the sciences, but above all our students need more work in communication (writing and speech). If this turns into a dog fight as it was in the 1970s, then I would think ALL disciplines ought to be represented in the process at some point in the decision making process -- and not just a select few who somehow always seems to find that their discipline is more important than most. Hopefully this will not be as divisive as it was earlier.

The categories of communication and language/philosophy/culture are confusing. Does communication include writing, or does that come under the heading of language? This survey needed to be framed better.

Because our students spend so much time "communicating," thanks to the technology that they have been provided, we tend to assume that they do it well. We tend to believe that because they spend hours every day in front of screens, watching TV, downloading videos, surfing the Internet, that they have, by mere exposure, acquired a kind of visual and digital literacy that will serve them—and the culture—well in the future. But my experiences in the classroom indicate quite the opposite. Our students, as a whole, struggle far more than we realize with fundamental skills related to comprehending, analyzing, critiquing, and producing both written and visual texts. These skills are necessary not just for their potential job prospects, but for their ability to contribute positively to our culture, a culture that bombards them every moment with information, visual and textual and aural, and it’s essential that we provide our students with a firm foundation as readers of that culture and writers to that culture. The mere phrase "freshman composition" smacks of dullness and necessity, but it is necessary, especially in a culture that screams for entertainment and shallowness and short-sightedness. We cannot be as short-sighted as the culture that we inhabit. It is here that we must lead.

With the imposition of the 120 hour credit limit for degree plans by the state, it is critical that students be able to satisfy their core with classes that are a part of their major. The public perception of our institution is more closely tied to the preparation students receive in their major than to any specific class in the core. We already have less flexibility than many institutions, we need more.

I am retiring.

Is anyone asking the students for their ideas?

Do we want our students to be ‘critical thinkers’ or not?

How would most non-science faculty know if it is possible to effectively teach a lab science course within a 3-hour time frame? Most faculty should answer that they "don’t know." Even though it may create a very large committee, the enormous impact that this revision may have requires that every department be represented. Divide the committee into subcommittees to consider each of the component areas. The change was approved in October, 2011. The faculty were notified in May, 2012...in the middle of finals week. The proposals are due 7 weeks into the Fall semester. The revised core is due to the CB in November, 2013. The "process and forms" are "coming soon" according to the CB website. The departments either need more time, or if the committee rejects a proposal, then the department should have an opportunity to revise and re-submit.

Students need foreign language (not Spanish) so they can function in an increasingly global society. Our math skills are abysmal. Science seems so mysterious to people because they think it is too hard.

Why must our students be as uneducated as the members of Texas’ legislative bodies?

The revised core is clearly the invention of someone (a group) with interests in psychology and philosophy of education, emerging from the trickle-up process form K-12 curricula. It is an infringement on academic freedom, and ultimately will be detrimental to the academic atmosphere of the university environment. The timing of this is also questionable. Other universities have been working on the revised core for long enough to have a preliminary revised core already in the proposal format.
KINE 2115 needs to be maintained in the core curriculum at SHSU! Students entering higher education are not prepared with the health content they need to successfully complete college and maintain a healthy lifestyle. The content areas of the class include: nutrition, disease prevention, STI awareness, safe relationships, stress management, suicide prevention, alcohol-drug-tobacco awareness, components of physical activity prevention, and cancer screening. Students who are at risk for chronic diseases in the U.S.—heart disease, cancer, COPD, and diabetes. Unfortunately, health is no longer a required elective in the state. This legislation poses a significant problem with students entering college—they do not understand the fundamentals about the content listed above, and they are entering a new environment that allows them social freedoms which could conversely compromise their health. Additionally, this course is taught by professionals who are approved by the Health and Kinesiology faculty. The instructors for the course are excellent teachers with terminal and graduate degrees. They continuously receive outstanding student evaluations. These instructors are observed each semester by the chair and mentor faculty members in the department. Each semester coordinators/directors from student programs serve as guest lecturers in the class. These professionals include: Dr. Drew Miller, Dr. Rosanne Keathley, Mr. Eddie Gisemba, Ms. Sarah Hanel, and Ms. Lisa Chaddock. I welcome any questions or concerns regarding the content or facilitation of the KINE 2:15 course. I will also be happy to visit with this committee and discuss the critical importance of the KINE 2:15 course.

It is my hope that the core curriculum be thought of in terms of making sure that Sam students receive a general liberal arts background necessary for being part of an educated citizenry. Don’t restrict the core by focusing overly much on future employability.

As a scientist, my opinion is a little biased, but I believe that we have a responsibility to the people of Texas and the nation to produce graduates that have a good foundation in science and math. The world is becoming a much smaller and more technical place. For our students to compete in the global market, we need to see that they have a good foundation in science and math. So, this is a plea to not reduce the current 4 hour lab science courses to 3.

It is distressing there is no longer a computer literacy component to the core. Additionally there should be some information literacy component, perhaps computer literacy and information literacy could be combined in one course.

Our students come poorly prepared for college level and work place writing demands. It is imperative that we maintain 6 SCH of composition instruction in the core curriculum. Our second semester freshman composition course includes developing an oral presentation, which helps students acquire skills in speaking in public. However the course goes far beyond that in providing information literacy skills and in providing multiple opportunities for academic writing.

I teach health and physical education at the undergraduate core curriculum but not completely knowledgeable about it.

I do not feel I possess the contextual information to contribute meaningfully regarding questions outside my field. I do have faith that our administrators are imminently capable of steering us in the right direction and appreciate that they have solicited our opinions. This is just another reason SAM is such a good place to work. Thanks for allowing us to weigh in!

There should be a broader selection of courses for the various Component Areas such that the choice can facilitate the major or primary area of interest.

One of the most serious issues that need to be addressed is the need for all students to have a literacy of mass media because television, the internet, social media, books, news and magazines are a primary combined in an individual’s life. I think a media literacy class taught in a department that focuses on mass communication is essential to the new core.

The change in the core depends on what type of college degrees we want to provide our students. We (SHSU) are pulling a lot of students with major deficiencies. The student’s lack of basic skills reflects the inadequacies of our secondary education system; just review the National Report Card for the State of Texas, The ACT Texas report, and the SAT Texas report. We should stress English (writing – two courses and let’s make sure they can write before they pass the course), Mathematics (we should require student to pass a real math course, not an O31/O32 before they can take any sophomore level courses), and Natural Science (they should take basic Biology 101/102, or basic Chemistry 101/102, or basic Physics 101/102 and not allow weaker, pseudo-science courses to count towards meeting the Natural Science requirement). The PE course is a joke, students relate it is a “show up” course, it gives the PE department tickets, it gives the students little for their health or well-being. The visual literacy may just be an AV course, a course in subjective interpretation of visual stimuli or a course in making and interpreting propaganda. It doesn’t take much mental ability to do a power point, Bill Gates has made it very user friendly. The success of the cultural diversity course is reflected by the lack of cultural understanding and diversity, just look at the area outside the LSC at noon or the mix of racial/cultural groups in your classes. I think the core will provide us an opportunity to raise the academic standards of our students or to dumb down the process. No matter what SHSU does on this imposed mission from the Texas Legislature and THECB, we will be stuck with the poor quality students. The students that transfer in from junior (community) colleges with weak core requirement will not advance the academic standards of this institution. I am concerned that SHSU will move to provide a core that will continue to attract the academically weak students, which will generate a lot of class tickets, graduate a lot of poorly trained students, and make the Texas Legislature and THECB happy. I wish the committee member well on this political odyssey, make it look good!!

Composition classes are extremely important, competent writing skills are necessary for every other course on campus. Don’t cut the composition component in half.

It is absolutely crucial that we maintain 6 hours of composition (English) for freshman students. Our students would suffer greatly from a reduction in the number of required hours in this field.

How are we coordinating our plan with other members of the Texas State system? with the UT system? with A&M?

It’s an important process. My view is from graduate courses.

I’m curious as to why the faculty were not called upon to participate in the development of the "new" core curriculum. While faculty have a role in submitting specific courses, they had no say as to the specific components to be included. I also seriously question the benefit associated with the faculty and departments being informed of this process as such a late date. Redeveloping the core is not a process that should proceed without considerable notice.

Be sure to imbed 21st Century Skills of Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, Digital Literacy, and Collaboration

Our students need help in WRITING and in SCIENCES (both "social" and "hard" sciences). Some don’t even accept the legitimacy of scientific knowledge or understand the process that goes into the creation of scientific knowledge and the role it should play in policy development.
Because possible courses may fit into academic areas that have several different components, the discussion should focus more on content rather than on home-base or even title. The home-base/title encourages political approaches to these decisions.

I strongly believe that a core which consists of a simple distribution of courses, especially with "substitutions," is neither particularly beneficial to students nor conducive to interdisciplinary cooperation and collegiality to faculty/departments/colleges.

For our students, six (6) hours of freshman composition is an absolute necessity. If one of the composition courses were to be eliminated, the entire university would suffer drastic consequences. In the composition classes, students are taught to analyze and synthesize, they learn to argue and persuade using logic (both orally and in writing), and they learn to collaborate and communicate both as members of teams and individually. Academic writing and academic speech are taught in freshman composition classes. Students also learn social and personal responsibility and, first and foremost, critical thinking skills. --Within the past two years, I have interviewed all those instructors who regularly teach Composition I and II; they all agree strongly that it would be impossible to teach our students to become academic writers in anything less than two semesters. The students learn the basic format of a research paper, they learn to use sources and cite them (according to the conventions of their majors), and they learn to present their research both orally and in writing. We also teach the students to edit their work according to the conventions of written academic English--a process that takes some time. --Later, the sophomore literature survey teaches the students further critical thinking and communication skills and social and personal responsibility. I strongly recommend that we keep the requirement of three English core courses.

What the students do not necessarily need as part of their academic education is the one hour of kinesology.

In a time when we have national awareness of the need to improve students' science and math abilities, it seems ludicrous to even consider decreasing required core hours in that area. Likewise, composition should not be given away to speaking or other forms of communication.

You learn by DOING. Lab experience is important! Would you be able to learn basketball online by watching videos, demonstrations, java-based clicking to dribble and shoot? No. That is absurd. It is just as absurd for someone to think that a non-major could get a "feel" for the uncertainties associated with real lab work by watching videos, etc online, or by watching a 1-hour in-class demonstration of labwork.

I insist that we maintain the two-semester (six-hour) freshman composition courses.

Surveys of this nature are useless and do not allow for a range of responses that address the complexities of the issue. Why waste our time?

It is critical that we maintain the current wellness core component. It is my understanding that its status, as with other core courses, is in jeopardy. Our students require knowledge of healthy lifestyles and behaviors, content no longer taught in our school systems. It is clear when one examines the health status of our culture that such lifestyles and behaviors are not being practiced. Students will learn core aspects of healthy living including fitness, nutrition, disease prevention, sex safety practices, mental health and well being, sun protection, alcohol and drug abuse, etc.

The core curriculum should provide a coherent body of thinking skills (quantitative reasoning, scientific reasoning, social reasoning, ethical reasoning, etc.) so our students can engage in critical thinking across a range of disciplines. The specific courses, departments, colleges are really irrelevant provided our students get these essential skills. I'd like to see some effort to ensure that the selected core curriculum courses provide those skills.

Communication as noted in my choices refers to mass communication, NOT to communication studies (the dept formerly known as speech)

For communications, our students need technology, computer science application, smart phones, twitter, etc. So do the faculty.

---Note that in the three rankings Social & behavioral Sciences would self populate and i could not remove it to replace it with Communication. 2-One could correctly conclude that visual communication is an important component of the vast majority of our courses, especially our core courses. Even a writing course could display the "Scream" painting and request a reflective interpretation; physical and life sciences employ numerous images of oral and abstract models to construct understanding of concepts.3-Why are you asking the general community about the content and pedagogy of science courses? Are you going to ask the scientist about the content of the cultural and social studies components? For all of science and the process of doing science begins with observation, and that science is inherently experiential, how can an institution so many academic integrity consider delining labs? 5-The real issue is rigor. As 52% of last years graduates can not find jobs, society rightly questions the value of all of those worthless diplomas. Return to the faculty academic quality and allow us to require an honest, demanding level of performance and we can change the lives of those students who want to commit to the requisite transformation. Allow the faculty to fail the party-goers and attendees. Continue to put pabulum in the core and we will continue to "graduate" village idiots with the same eighth grade thinking abilities they had when they entered their freshman year. Make the core demanding.

I feel maintaining the health and wellness course is critical to help students maintain their health. I do not see a need to limit double dipping as it can help students efficiently move through college.

As a professor, I feel like I am picking up the slack teaching undergraduates information that they should be learning in high school. This is the aftermath of the era of teachers having to "teach to the test." to get appropriate scores. Our undergraduates are scientifically illiterate and soft in critical thinking skills, I think it would be folly to eliminate lab classes from the core.

I strongly favor the continued presence in the Core of the two English composition classes--Engl 1301 and 1302.

We need to keep promoting a curriculum that will make US future professionals highly competitive in sciences for many generations ahead. However, we need to start emphasizing the cultural component (history, languages, geography). The cultural aspect is so weak now that it is very alarming, and will kill the first purpose. It needs to be corrected ASAP.
Under the social and behavioral sciences component area, the 3 hours of political science should be removed.

Our students desperately need additional writing skills and a shared-up common curriculum. As of now, the students have so much freedom in choosing classes from the core that they do not have a common educational background. In upper-level classes, it is difficult to find general information that a majority of the students in the class actually know. The labs for science courses need to be maintained. I don't know how those courses could be switched to 3-hour courses without losing a great deal of practical and applied content. The Health and Fitness class (KINE 2115) must be maintained as a part of the core to help promote healthy lifestyles among our student body. A speech/communications class would be helpful, but not at the sacrifice of other language arts courses. A speech course may be a good replacement for the cultural studies course.

The goal of the core should be holistic education. If our changes are based on "practicality," we may be defeating the purpose, e.g., math may seem more practical than art, but a class in college algebra may not serve the holistic "life learning" needs of our students as much as an arts or cultural course.

Just wanting to make sure that when "communication" courses are considered that there is a distinction between communicaiton studies and mass communication as these are very seperate disciplines (and colleges now).

Where is information literacy in the core curriculum? Our students need to be able to evaluate and process the information they are bombarded with daily. They will be severely disadvantaged without the inclusion of information literacy as part of the core curriculum. This skill applies to every class, not just one or two. A one hour online or face to face class on information literacy (to include visual literacy) would greatly benefit our students.

It would be very difficult to teach a lab science without the 1 hr. lab component. The lab experience is one of the most valuable learning experiences we can give students. We should not overlook the value of a lifetime wellness course. The current health stats show the U.S. to be a unhealthy society. Education is the key to developing proper health habits. Poor health is a drag on the American economy.

Revising and re-visiting core curriculum is a worthwhile task - as time passes, there are differences in priorities that serve students and their future lives.

1-1 I would imagine that visual communication is employed in the majority of our courses, to include those in the core. We do not need a specific "core" course requirement, simply a distributed one. 2-Given that the fundamental basis of all of science is observation, I would assert that taking observation and hands-on experience out of the science courses renders them meaningless. 3-Our problem, society's problem, will not be solved by rearranging core chairs on the Titanic, but by redirecting our ship. We must return rigor to core courses. Return academic integrity to the faculty and university education will improve.

Continue to aspire to make "college" easy and entertaining, attainable by anyone with minimal effort so that we can have great retention and lots of graduates, is a fools errand.

Students' visual and textual literacy is vital to their survival in the information age. Students also need to recognize the quality of arguments in the public sphere and be able to react in a responsible way to the myriad of information choices at their fingertips. Our students need 6 hours of writing study and practice at the freshman level, but that study should be about writing and communication across disciplinary constructs. Students need to understand how communication (of all types) works in this information society and our core needs to reflect that. The core should help students build the foundation for advanced studies in any field.

At a minimum, our alumni should be critical thinkers. I am less concerned that they be trained to express their ideas in multiple settings and through various media than I am that they be trained to evaluate their ideas in the light of logic and evidence. At least currently, it seems that we (as a state and nation) excel in the former with little attention to the latter.

I think it is extremely important that the core courses incorporate information literacy components. This is not so much about "IT/technological skills, but more about critical thinking with respect to information sources, the ability to find and critically evaluate information. [The National Forum on Information Literacy defines information literacy as "...the ability to know when there is a need for information, to be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively use that information for the issue or problem at hand."] These skills are currently incorporated, at least at some level, into many sections of ENGL 1302 (though not all sections). However many students test out of basic English classes, so information literacy should be more strongly emphasized across the entire core. Our students demonstrate a distinct lack of skills in finding and critically evaluating information sources.

A student who has completed the core curriculum requirements should have a good foundation in a basic education. I do not believe that core "creep" into peripheral courses benefits the student.

I think it is critical to keep the science labs and the health and wellness course.

We should keep the actual curriculum untached

I believe it is important that the major's courses in the Life and Physical Sciences be a part of the core.