

No 15 (16.7%)
 Yes 75 (83.3%)
 Total 90 (100%)

		W1/W	A	H	V	I taught	Never taught a course with one of these attributes
Q1/Q2	R1/R2	2					
taught	taught	taught	taught	taught	taught		
	24						
45	(26.7	-					
(50%)	%)						

While my courses receiving W1/W2 easily

the questions the application posed were fair and my application was

Everything was straightforward and the [identifier removed] was very helpful. I received feedback from the committee on the objectives and contents that are additionally needed receive R2 attribute. I thought that was a good process to maintain an accepted standard.

The process for applying for W2 required that I make some adjustments to my syllabus, which I was happy to do. I also received support in the types of writing the W committee was seeking, which allowed me to be more informed when making the adjustments.

The R2 designation was a different story. After being declined for a course which is all about [class identifier removed], I was given cryptic feedback and a name to contact. The person was not teaching [identifier removed] at that time so I did not receive any feedback. After trying a second time, based on cryptic feedback, the application was denied again with different feedback. The third time was a charm, but truthfully, I do not believe my third application was as strong as the second.

I appreciated the process to apply for W2. However, I had much of the requested material

The course typically carries an attribute when taught by other instructors	25 (33.3%)
Other	5 (6.7%)

Attended a Summer Institute related to an attribute or subscript	18 (24.3%)
I attended a workshop or presentation during the academic year related to an attribute or subscript	7 (9.3%)
attended a workshop or presentation related to an attribute or subscript that was geared specifically for faculty in my program	3 (4.0%)
I met individually with the convenor of	

Reviewing samples of other applications and attending summer institute as well as emailing with conveners

Meeting with convenor

Past Summer Institutes were helpful. However, conveners need to be aware that everyone applying might not be able to attend the chosen dates due to other university commitments; attendance cannot be a qualifier.

Both equally helpful

I enjoy (somewhat) the summer institutes and workshops - at least in those environments, there is a bit more group discussion and group learning. Once it gets to individuals, it becomes an exercise in massaging language so that you sound like you would teach it like they do for the purposes of the application.

W2 workshop, meeting with faculty writing fellow

I ●

Compensated time in a Summer Institute to prepare the application. Experience serving on a committee to see the process from the other side.

Receiving information provided via email and discussing with prior faculty whose course had the designated attributes were equally helpful in preparing my application for requesting the attribute designations.

Guidance from the subscript convener

Email & feedback were helpful

Individual meeting with the convener

Examples of previous applications & talking with convener

Meeting with the attribute convener

The convener asked for clarifications and recommended contents that were necessary to meet the standard.

Asst. Dean support/intervention

I discussed the application process with a faculty member who had previously applied.

I attended a Summer Institute and meeting individually with convener

Reviewing

Discipline specific resources would be nice, but it would be quite a task to pull these together for each program. Maybe a list of program courses that have the different attributes so new faculty would know who to ask for advice from in their program. Clarity and effective communication around the H subscript expectations would have been helpful.

The resources I had at that time were fine

I would *love* a resource webpage for EACH attribute. Right now, each attribute is on one page and each have varying degrees of information. What would be most helpful for me is a standard page with a set of values/expectations for the attribute, example applications, and the review process/due dates. If we had that for each attribute, i'd probably be more likely to apply for other attributes--but for some attributes like A and V, the website doesn't really tell you much about the process or what to expect.

Clear guidelines and updates to any changes so new applications are not hampered by mirroring older applications.

Summer Institutes always help -- but they just don't always get funded

don't know

N/A

Some already made powerpoints available to describe the process for each subscript

Not sure

None

Advice on HOW to make course suit attribute instead of 'guessing' criteria of convenors.

Reviewing sample syllabi may be helpful.

I didn't need additional resources or professional development training

Samples of successful R2 applications - including the level of detail desired

A sample repository of successful applications, although, I believe some samples are provided by the committee.

Examples of applications and/or a workshop with the attribute convenor

I had all the building blocks I needed

Having a sample related to the specific program would be good as the specifics change with the program of study with attributes.

Center for Teaching and Learning Design - did not apply

I don't really think there needs to be PD resources for attributes.

I imagine that if I had not been able to attend the summer institutes that the directions for the application would not have been enough. Perhaps enhanced directions would be beneficial.

None.

Making requirements clearer, standardizing them across attributes, and streamlining proposal requirements.

I don't think it is too difficult to complete, although sometimes it is difficult to describe the exact relationship/amount of time spent on said attribute (V especially)

A more streamlined application that requires less documentation would be helpful.

eliminate the stringent requirements

I think it is overall working fairly well. Having a committee helps create fairness and a perception of fairness vs. one person

Sessions for new faculty that cover all attributes; consistency in the available materials across attributes; consistency within (as leadership changes) and across attributes in the process

make it more transparent

The description and requirements of some attributes is a little vague (I have been looking into attributes to apply to my G-course to increase enrollment, especially H, I and V) none

Have one consistent process that is used. Establish a rubric to use to determine if requirements are met. Consider reducing the sheer number of attributes as they can be hard to track.

-More detailed guidelines to follow for the R2 application process

Clear outline of expectations for materials

Clearer deadlines for application process and better communication in-program re: which classes with multiple instructors have attributes, so that we can ensure the courses have completed any necessary application prior to the deadline

The shorter, clearer the directions are and the quicker the turn around time, the better.

Examples of excellent applications are great too. Also, tripping an attribute should be a shorter process than getting one for the first time. But I think the real issue might be that more staff and adjuncts ask for attributes and they may not be fully trained to understand how the process works or have the experience to understand how to put this kind of proposal together (some faculty too, I'm sure). This puts a burden on the covenor, who must now teach people how to go about making the course attribute ready.— sometimes going so far as to having to train them how to teach writing (or whatever). While not all governors may see this as an undue burden, it takes time and energy and has the potential for burn out.

While we all appreciate the value of constructive feedback, as a university we should be supportive of colleagues' efforts to present quality curricula to our students throughout all programs. This should be a helpful process, not a judgmental one. As we all seek to retain our enrolled students who are financially strained, we must appreciate the demand for degree efficiency. Often, attributes must be gained within program courses of time-demanding majors. Understandably, application should not yield automatic designation. However, reading all aspects of the application (especially areas that explain content specific writing) is instrumental in a committee's ability to not only appreciate what the applicant is trying to accomplish, but also in helping them achieve it moving forward.

Simplify, please.

We need to respect the approach and expertise of our fellow colleagues. I think there are many ways to do this. We need to support the attribute initiative, but are completely turned off`

someone that uses writing to enhance the students' comprehension and application of material.

Standardizing how much attribute vs. discipline work must be included across the disciplines. I would like to apply for an attribute for my G-course but have heard various horror stories about how hard some attributes are to get compared to others and how the standards keep changing over time. In the end I just haven't bothered since I don't want to deal with all of that, which of course gives our students fewer choices in the end.

Model applications. Clarity around the number of classes the university wants with each attribute type.

Having served on the W2 and Q2 committees I believe both these committees have a much more rigorous application process than they did 5 or 10 years ago. I believe that for some of the attributes we simply need to have another system altogether. Stockton assumes that a faculty member can teach anything which is a fallacy. Writing courses, especially should be taught by writing teachers. The FRST program could be extended to include additional writing and math requirements. The FRST teachers are better equipped to teach writing and math. I realiz

Decrease the number of attributes, there are far too many. Make requirements consistent over time. The requirements often change dramatically as committee members change
Non - it was very straightforward and clear - as long as you can explain what you are doing and why, there shouldn't be any issue (unless what you are doing is inappropriate for the attribute). Most of the

The application process seems too daunting and/or time-consuming	1 (6.7%)
I do not believe any of the subscrip t s or attributes would be an appropriate fit for the content of my classes	4 (26.7%)
I would like to participate in some professional development (such as summer institutes or workshops) before applying.	2 (13.3%)
I would be interested in applying, but I don't know enough about the subscrip t s or attributes to apply.	0 (0%)
I plan on applying eventually, but I just haven't had a chance to.	2 (13.3%)
Other	7 (46.7%)

I find the adding of subscrip~~t~~s and attributes to make a course more likely to be fully enrolled reprehensible - faculty are encouraged by deans and other faculty to add attributes as a way to make the course more marketable rather than because a course truly emphasizes those attributes.

My undergraduate course has two attributes already. I do not have the time to participate in a workshop in order to apply for an attribute. Besides, it is difficult to even be selected for a summer workshop.

I believe someone applied on behalf of all sections.

Allow for narrative justification

I think the use of attributes at all, or to force students to take a certain number, has lost it's meaning as a way to insure a liberal arts curriculum is followed.

I am not familiar enough to comment

Make the application

The subscript system should be abolished without a replacement.	13 (14.4%)
Total	90 (100%)

The current general education structure (G courses, attributes) is too cumbersome for students and faculty.

Creative writing courses should count for Arts (A) attribute.

The problem is that G-classes in particular that have attributes are widely more popular while those that do not are usually under-enrolled, even when the content of those classes may be just as good. In many cases those classes may not have

and diff
that an
degree
to
of
COMPLX

and difficult to navigate. Many students struggle to graduate with honors, and the university learns of this in curriculum, the solution is to add more degree requirements. For example, in the wake of summer 2020, rather than compel all students to examine and elect courses to address racism and incorporate anti-racism, Stockton could add a course to address racism. Not only would this solve all other courses/teachers of critical thinking courses from an anti-racism perspective; it increased the burden on students. The required combination of mathematics, G, and history courses in Stockton degree can be difficult (as evidenced by graduation rates) and the frequency with which preceptors must request assignments from program chairs. The required combination of attributes, which seems to grow over time, can be difficult for students to manage. The two systems together are exceedingly complicated with so many requirements.

Some of the subscripts seem to be run better than others; I particularly heard concerns about the H subscript and how onerous the application was; in addition, at some point I was approached by a faculty member to ask me if they could list my course as H course when my course did not really focus on historical perspectives. An audit of current courses with subscripts is necessary to make sure we have an adequate number of each of the subscripts for students to be able to graduate on time.

I think every accepted G - course should have an attribute of some sort, for the students' sake.

The subscript, at

humanities.

requirements are excessively burdensome and could be dialed back while still offering students a very broad-based liberal arts degree and allowing them to explore areas of their own interest. Since IDEAs unceremoniously dumped the "values" criterion, and since the ELOs have yet to be updated, the subscripts, ELOs, PLOs and IDEA criteria do not mesh well (if they ever did).

We have too many requirements. Getting all of them is especially difficult for transfer students.

Students are more concerned with just "checking off" the number/type of attributes and choose courses for that reason only as opposed to seeking out courses that would satisfy their academic curiosity and stimulate their intellect.

there needs to be consistency

Getting faculty to understand that just because you put the word art, values, international, or history in your title doesn't make it deserve an attribute. [Identifier removed] student at Stockton and took an H course (not in HIST) that had the word "history" in the title, but was lacking in actual critical thinking regarding history. Just having some dates in your class on science doesn't make it an H class. I understand some courses sound good on paper, but how are we actually assessing that they are teaching what they said they would teach? [Identified remover] said it was an okay course, but not history. This made me realize that although I've had my W2 course re-upped multiple times, I'm not being assessed in any way about how I'm teaching writing. I provide my scaffolded writing system and how I assess it [identifier removed] to renew my W. I've been asked to do [identifier removed], but how does anyone know that I've remained current in writing education?

We have imposed so many requirements on what kinds of courses our students must take because we have so many opinions about what experiences or knowledge they absolutely must have before graduating that many of them effectively no longer have the freedom to take any courses just because they are interested in a topic outside of their major. I feel

the such that this effective kneecapping of many students' natural curiosity has a number of

Negative effects, such as the removal of the possibility that they may

kind?

with these attributes; conducting assessment efforts such as additional questions on IDEA forms about specific attributes (just one idea); efforts to explain attributes to students in better and more relevant ways at orientations; visits to classes by conveners to assist in students' understanding of attributes; exhibitions of work completed under attributes that fulfill attribute learning in exemplary ways; fun workshops at orientations or in classes that help students understand attribute value? Overall, we need to do better about communicating the "value proposition." There are many.

Once ELOs are reassessed, it would be good to match the subscript structure to those I'm not 100% sure what the goal of the subscripts is anymore. I think students should have more options to explore what excites them. I also think that if we keep the current subscripts that creative writing and literature should be included in A.

Having some service component or ethics to attributes

In context of tot

	Not at all important	Important	Very important
A percentage of relevant AVHI CONTENT COVERED in the instruction of the course	19 (21.1%)	43 (47.8%)	28 (31.1%)
A percentage of relevant AVHI CONTENT ASSESSED as part of a student's final GRADE	29 (32.2%)	53 (58.9%)	8 (8.9%)
SOMETHING OTHER THAN a percentage of instruction or assessment of relevant content	63 (70%)	23 (25.6%)	4 (4.4%)

that do have a large amount but still a decent amount of one of these attributes to apply for it to be added to their class.

I don't know what the current professional standards are in history, but given that

I would replace these

social identities and multiple forms of inequality and resistance develop and

The AHVI convenors are not compensated for their work. Any additional work you ask of the convenors (in terms of revising and reviewing the applications) should be reviewed and negotiated by the Union.

too much intervention

I'm glad to see this committee in action, and hope that Stockton takes this opportunity to rethink the entire structure of the degree

none

See comment above about redundancy and how the H attribute seems arbitrary.

The system works. If anything it should be systematized and streamlined. So, if when proposing a G-course, the instructor wants to pursue the attribute, rather than having to research the covenant, then get in touch, wait for an answer, try something out, send it back, have a meeting, etc., the applicant could fill out an application across the board, with gathered accompanying materials, and submit it to the covenant. This would give everyone something to work with in one email. Revisions could then be made within one or two meetings.

When advising students in an accredited program, finding specific courses which will meet multiple criteria (attributes and subscripts) is

movements in a symphony and the exposition, development and recapitulation; or
History--understand western civilization, the importance of "Citizenry" and the benefits
of having a democracy / Constitution and Freedom; or Values--a philosophy or

There are way too many attributes for students to keep track of now. It's making it hard to keep track of them all. The system needs to be simplified to make it less complicated to track all the different expectations. Outsiders have a hard time following. We should review the practices of similar institutions for a possible updated structure that's not as complex.

This the secondary attributes that get "confusing." While a similar percentage of content and grade would make an application process more consistent, I'm not sure it is the right thing for each of these attributes. But I believe that 30% of content/ grade is about the right percentage.

The differences seem minimal and so continuity for "like" attributes is logical. However, if attributes argue their percentage is best for that specific attribute, that's fine, too.

There needs to be a better definition of what "-related" means in terms of writing (and the other topics) and what feedback needs to look like. I get so tired of getting different interpretation of what "related" means in terms of grades, and what feedback is supposed to "look" like. Again, it often comes back to the comparison of what pedagogies people like and don't like - just because it works for you, does not mean it will work for another faculty member. Instead, if a faculty member can document and demonstrate they are providing relevant content and/or grading, it is about academic freedom and working in a way that is authentic to the faculty member. Not everyone has to "think-pair

in a class (which implies "fewer" or "less" than primary). Rather, it seems more like the content is just being learned WITHIN a particular CONTEXT--which implies it taught and learned alongside and throughout a class.

I don't understand the rationale for having R1 and R2 but not A1/A2, H1/H2, V1/V2, or I1/I2. What makes the R attribute more important such that it requires two courses instead of one like AHVI?

I don't equate R1/R2 attributes with writing and quantitative reasoning; therefore the above question is needed to parse out R from the other two essential attributes. And why do R courses have the largest 25% expectation? Such thinking does not compute???

The W2, QUAD and R1/R2 Committees are qualified to determine what should be required for W2s, Q2s, R2s.

The entire attribute system is dated and cumbersome and creates more roadblocks for students to fulfill degree requirements. Students who enroll in well designed courses (program and non program) will be exposed to the experiences and content without mandating them to take courses with a particular letter attached to it. ~ b " ò when foq X

My main issue is with the 2 level. I teach a W2 course. Students often do poorly in the course, but their writing is fantastic OR they do well but their writing is horrible. 15-20% means that the final letter grade doesn't really tell you how well or how poorly the person is writing. It hurts to see a student who writes reasonably well, but is having subject content trouble not get their W2. I also have students who have done well in previous W1 courses yet write in sentence fragments. Something is not working. There are so many different types of writing and some are going to pull you in different directions (i.e., writing poetry versus writing a scientific research article). I'm seeing less of a disconnect with Q courses, but that could be because the students doing poorly in Q courses tend to switch out of science majors before reaching the upper levels. I teach a course that will be submitting for R2 consideration. I've been impressed with student knowledge coming into my course, but I suspect the topic of my course tends to self-select for students who have greater R knowledge coming into the course regardless of what ara

support writing, math and racism education course requirements as content level course -1.
Not thrilled with some content standard -2 courses.

The amount of time spent on writing and quantitative reasoning should remain separate from the R attributes. The first two are skills based and the latter are competency based. Hence, my "neutral" responses.

There should be some flexibility wrt to using percentages allowing for real time issues that arise with the folks involved or external circumstances.

Again: each requirement is worthwhile; in totality they are onerous and confusing to students.

R1 and R2 should be well established in terms of specific behavioral objectives.

I think these should be revised slightly. I think there are serious graduation bottlenecks with these attributes. Also, students often take a class just for an attribute, which suggests that more classes should contain the attributes. Perhaps, the threshold to get an attribute should be lowered.

The differing requirements across the 2s is weird

R1	4 (4.4%)	13 (14.4%)	25 (27.8%)	19 (21.1%)	29 (32.2%)
R2	5 (5.6%)	15 (16.7%)	27 (30%)	19 (21.1%)	24 (26.7%)
W1	14 (15.6%)	29 (32.2%)	39 (43.3%)	7 (7.8%)	1 (1.1%)
W2	12 (13.3%)	28 (31.1%)	36 (40%)	13 (14.4%)	1 (1.1%)
Q1	18 (20%)	22 (24.4%)	38 (42.2%)	9 (10%)	3 (3.3%)
Q2	18 (20%)	22 (24.4%)	33 (36.7%)	16 (17.8%)	1 (1.1%)
A	6 (6.7%)	20 (22.2%)	38 (42.2%)	18 (20%)	8 (8.9%)
H	7 (7.8%)	20 (22.2%)	40 (44.4%)	.	Ât

4-6	4 (4.4%)
7-9	2 (2.2%)
10+	1 (1.1%)
Not sure	23 (25.6%)

	Q2	R1	R2	W1	W1	A	H	V	I
Q1									
6(6.7%)		19	15						
	7 (7.8%)	(21.1%)							

I work with *[identifier removed]* and teach them to be strategic about their choices. They often

I do not believe this can be answered by *[identifier removed]*
Simplify simplify simplify!

Provide incentives faculty to develop R1 courses and/or schedule more sections of the R1 courses that are already offered.

Thanks for working on this.

Again, I would drop the AHVI attributes. For the core attributes, I believe an C (computational) attribute should be added. Most students lack basic knowledge. For example, I have to teach my students how to create and find folders in their own laptops! *[Identifier removed]* However, I think it is silly that we have all these hoops to jump through for students. Writing, math, arts, ethics etc are all important but requiring so many mini hoops to jump through will only result in the bare minimum effort for most people that it really isn't the challenge that students ultimately need.

Consider establishing a way for faculty/staff to submit concerns/issues with our attribute structure based on our own and/or student feedback. Currently, there is no way to address problems. At one point I was so discouraged I gave up applying for a course that should have an attribute due to the individuals in charge of the attribute at the time. Perhaps an oversight committee can be formed to track the overall function of the system, any issues with the system, and handle appeals to allow students on a case-by-case basis to be considered for exceptions to standing rules. This system has been in existence since Stockton was established. We are way overdue for a serious overhaul of how we track competencies in the degree. We would benefit from analyzing sister institutions and seeking a way to uncomplicate the structure we have in place. Consider forums to discuss ideas/options to do that.

Look into Q1/Q2 requirement and allow students to graduate with

Wskgh

enrollments more and more this leads to professors losing a course because it does not have an attribute.

I'm so grateful you're taking on this work and I look forward to the exciting changes that I hope are coming!

Overall I don't think that the subscripts or attributes should go away, however, I do think that better communication to students on earning these during their time at Stockton needs to be improved; there are still many students who search specifically for an attribute/subscript and don't realize that they are attached to other required/elective classes

It is my opinion we need to abolish the attribute system. It provides an unnecessary burden to students. I believe writing and math are important for the curriculum because these are basic skills. I believe the FRST courses should focus on writing and math. Most schools have two semesters of first year writing. We could do this and have one program course designated as a writing course. Most schools have Q2 program courses already so we can get rid of this attribute. The only school that might not have a Q2 course is ARHU. I don't know for sure, but a required course could be created for them. Getting rid of the attribute system would save us a lot of time. Perhaps each school should have a curriculum committee, keep the GENS committee, and have a university curriculum committee.

objwio

I am not sure why the R is a 1/2. Q and W make sense as these are skills that can be used within different domains. The R is not a skill, and should be changed into an R subscript that students have to take one course (4 credits). Also, the fact that we require 4 W's and 3 Q's is a bit much. That should be reduced to 3 W's and 2 Q's. The G-course system is what makes Stockton special, the

sq

Wskgh 1,

bjsgc _____ for _____ place
place for courses to carry a