Faculty Survey Aggregate Data

Demographics of faculty respondents (N = 90)

		N	*%*
School	ARHU	11	12
	BUSN	9	10
	EDUC	13	14
	GENS	10	11
	NAMS	21	23
	SOBL	18	20
	HLTH	8	9
Length of time at Stockton	1-2 years	7	8
	3-6 years	15	17
	7-10 years	16	18
	10+ years	52	58
All attributes taught*	Q1/Q2	45	50
	R1/R2	24	27
	W1/W2	63	70
	A	12	16
	H	26	29
	V	27	30
	I	20	22
	None	7	8

Note: Those categories designated with * indicate that respondents could choose more than one response. As a result, percentages will not add up to 100.

Have you ever APPLIED for any of the attributes (W1/2, Q1/2, R1/2) or subscripts (A, H, V, I)? (N = 90)

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

Please choose ALL attributes (W1/2, Q1/2, R1/2) and subscripts (A, H, V, or I) that have been attached to courses you have TAUGHT. (N = 90)

Q1/Q2 taught	R1/R2 taught	W1/W2 taught	A taught	H taught	V taught	I taught	Never taught a course with one of these attributes
45 (50%)	24 (26.7%)	63 (70%)	14 (15.6%)	26 (28.9%)	27 (30%)	20 (22.2%)	7 (7.8%)

Please select the option that best describes your experience applying for the specified attribute/subscript: (N = 75)

	Very Easy	Easy	Neither Easy nor Difficult	Difficult	Very Difficult
W1 N = 14	2 (14.3%)	1 (7.1%)	4 (28.6%)	4 (28.6%)	3 (21.4%)
W2 N = 57	2 (3.5%)	7 (12.3%)	18 (31.6%)	25 (43.9%)	5 (8.8%)
Q1 N = 12	3 (25%)	5 (41.7%)	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)	
Q2 N = 25	4 (16%)	5 (20%)	11 (44%)	5 (20%)	
R1 N = 11	1 (9.1%)	5 (45.5%)	5 (45.5%)		
R2 N = 25	1 (4%)	3 (12%)	12 (48%)	6 (24%)	3 (12%)
A N = 11	2 (18.2%)	7 (63.6%)	2 (18.2%)		
H N = 24	2 (8.3%)	4 (16.7%)	6 (25%)	4 (16.7%)	8 (33.3%)
V N = 19	4 (21.1%)	4 (21.1%)	9 (47.4%)	2 (10.5%)	
I N = 13	4 (30.8%)	5 (38.5%)	4 (30.8%)		

Please explain your response(s):

- While my courses receiving W1/W2 easily qualified, the applications were unnecessarily time consuming, especially for someone who teaches many W1/W2 courses.
- The H attribute was the most straightforward and easy to explain as its relationship with my G-class while the V is simply more difficult to explain as a relationship of any type. The W2 form was simply the most complicated to do compared with the other two.
- The H seemed most difficult, because it wasn't enough to show that the class covered history, but we had to demonstrate that we were covering certain kinds of history. Actually seemed to be a big overlap with the R application. It also took 11 months for me to get approval for the H, even though my application required no revisions.
- The W2 application is lengthy and requires a lot of documentation.
- Following the application instruction / guideline made the preparation go smoother.
- a lot of justification is needed to complete the request for the attribute often resulting in two or three revisions to the syllabus to meet the committee's approval--too much intervention by the committee members on the faculty member's choice of content for the course; it seems the attribute committee members direct the majority of assignments in the courses--ex: writing and the "H" taking sections of classroom/course time in order to fulfill the 50% or above requirement of content in the course for the attribute; other faculty are determining the content of the course and the direction for the course-
- I had to complete proposals and sometimes revise and resubmit parts, but the changes or additional information requested seemed reasonable.
- The instructions have generally been straight-forward and, with the exception of H (which I did not receive), the feedback from convenors has been clear and useful. With H specifically, the feedback that I received concerned a lack of historians among assigned authors (not a lack of readings focused on history, but a lack of professional historians specifically), which raises concerns about whether H attributes and HIST courses are really intended to be distinct.
- I teach courses in other languages, conveners do not like that when applying for attributes
- The process was relatively easy. Because the course already had the attribute, I was able to fill out a simpler form (so I was told).
- Expectations for documentation are burdensome, the goal posts seem to move constantly as to what is required to get a W2 designation.
- The expectations for the H attribute seem to require that we teach history research methods, which it well outside of the scope of my course.
- It was some work, but it wasn't too much work.
- Chose not to renew the H in my GIS course because of the new requirements.
- Applying for an H subscript was the most unnecessarily grueling process.
- The whole process was straightforward and easy, exactly as it had been described to me by the W convener at the time.
- W attributes were very difficult to earn. In one case, I gave up trying to get the attribute though the course has "writing" in the title.
- Some of the feedback required more changes to the class(es).
- the process and the expectations were clear.
- Both the W2 and H were rejected at first as there wasn't enough information. Had that been more clear on the application, it would've saved everyone time.
- W2: Provided samples did not reflect the expectations used for review; feedback was harsh rather than supportive; much of the feedback was not writing oriented (ie -

committee questioned point allocations for assignments and varied grading techniques that were used).

- Besides the fact that Ws are mainly (and unfairly) restricted to courses taught in English (even if composition and writing is taught in other languages at Stockton), the process to apply for a W in any course (including a course taught in English) has become exponentially difficult, cumbersome and time consuming. It is definitely a detraction.
- As a new attribute (R2), there were not a lot of models/resources. The committee was helpful. All applications take time: the most difficult aspect of the W2 applications is that most of my courses come due for renewal at the same time.
- I now avoid applying for any new attributes because it feels more as if there is gatekeeping by groups of faculty and/or programs who do not believe others can teach a particular issue as well as they can. We also need to remember that these are ATTRIBUTES and not ENTIRE COURSES in the attribute area. The course will still be what the course is about - the idea is that students will be introduced to various approaches or skills - with the exception of the W/Q/R *1* courses, the attributes are supposed to indicate that students will use those skills or approaches, not have the course as a PRIMARY instruction mechanism. I have found that "best practices" are used as bullying mechanisms - BPs are teaching preferences by some faculty, and if you don't teach something like they do (for example, with a particular pedagogical style), you are not using best practices. So, then the "recommendations" become how OTHERS would teach the course, and it is no longer the course you designed, nor taught in an authentic manner that represents the best skill sets of the faculty member.
- The process was clear. I met with the faculty *[identifier removed]* fellow before submitting my applications so I had already made changes the helped my application get approved. However, there was confusion from the committee about how my discipline-specific writing met the committees goals. They had a hard time seeing my "high value" assignments as equivalent to a long essay format (assignments they viewed as high value).
- The W2 process was challenging because I've never taught writing before and wasn't clear what the committee was looking for in the application. *[Resources were]* very helpful in making sure my revise and resubmit was successful. The R1/R2 processes were just work. I spent the most time working on my syllabus and course content to make sure I met the content expectations. The committee was very helpful with their comments/feedback and the process was relatively smooth.
- I wanted to apply to keep the H subscript for a class I took over last year but I couldn't get anywhere *[identifier removed]*. The communication about the expectations, process, etc. were incomplete and confusing, so I just gave up. I got the sense that the H subscript wasn't looking to maintain or expand the number of courses. Rather, it seemed they sought to contract the number of courses with that attribute.
- I applied for the W2 over 10 years ago. I did not reapply after the 10 years because I did not think that my course aligned well with the current criteria for a W2.
- I applied for two attributes since I've been at Stockton. With the W2 attribute, I was approved but received some feedback that I needed to work out *[identifier removed]*. I wouldn't necessarily say that the application was difficult, but the application and additional addendum response took some time/effort. The R1 attribute was fairly easy:

the questions the application posed were fair and my application was approved without additional feedback.

- For the V, I filled in the form and submitted the required information and was approved. The W2 was much more involved with the committee, requiring more information multiple times, and had to meet with them to explain how I teach things in the classroom.
- When applying for an H subscript, I was told that "75%" of the course had to focus on "people, cultures, and society." The H is not meant to be a full blown history course, it is meant to be "historically conscientious". The fact a group of faculty can change the definition of an attribute/subscript, something that impacts all faculty and students, without having to go through Faculty Senate and Administration is shocking and needs to be changed.
- From my experience, some attributes have gotten harder to gain (i.e. the H), some easier (i.e. W2)
- Tried to renew H attribute on a GNM course, but was rejected because the course does not satisfy the new H attribute requirements. Changed a few elements in the course to align with the H attribute requirements, but it was not enough.
- The W2 application is much more involved than the R2 application.
- When I applied for my Q2s, I never received an approval email. Apparently they were approved for at least a semester before I listed them as such. The feedback I received on my most recent W2 application was AMAZING.
- W-1 was challenging as we had to convince non-EDUC faculty that writing lesson plans was, in fact, writing.
- Requirements changed for W and H.
- Q2 application was straightforward. W2 committee seemed to be in the process of changing their standards for approval and therefore the review process was difficult and unclear.
- Racism is covered rather indirectly in my course because *[class identifiers removed]* and many of the questions and responses in the discussion forums for this online course inherently include a discussion of racism and the racial experience *[class identifiers removed]* must traverse as they lead or make contributions to change society. My course was rejected for the R2 attribute.
- I do not understand for why each professor who teaches the course needs to apply (for accredited programs, we MUST use the same syllabus)
- The process was straight forward since I provided all of the appropriate information and justification
- Over time, applying for subscripts/attributes has become much more burdensome
- The W2, Q2 and R2 processes all carried particular and somewhat demanding requirements that took time to fulfill and involved multiple rounds of exchange with convenors. The Q2 was for an "intrinsic" course on behalf of my program so that involved some internal work among our faculty. The R2 process took a long time to get a response and actually add the attribute, well after I had attended the institute and incorporated feedback.
- The process was fairly easy given the course content already aligned with the attributes.
- The process felt needlessly cumbersome. I understand that the committee wanted to make sure the course was appropriately aligned, but much of what I was asked to submit felt like busy work.

- 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 already prepared so it was not a burden to supply.
- The recently revised form for Q2 attributes is lengthy but clear and fairly easy to follow
- So far all the application processes have been smooth, rigorous and fair
- Both the W and R committees have very particular criteria and somewhat prescriptive ideas about how those criteria should be met. They require a fully fleshed out course with assignments that demonstrate particular goals and metrics. Even if you have extensive knowledge and experience teaching writing or about race and racism, if your theory and methods diverge from the committee's expectations, you will be asked to revise and resubmit. The I attribute is more straightforward checking off boxes.
- I followed the instructions and attended the monthly meetings in the year that I applied.
- The W2 Q2 course with new faculty teaching had difficulties as the specifics were not very clear
- It used to be much easier to be approved for attributes/subscripts. The renewal process is tedious, time consuming and difficult.
- I have encountered no unreasonable expectations in the application process.
- W2 has been more or less difficult depending on who is administering it. Nevertheless, under each regime it has a different focus, which requires modifications to syllabi which is challenging when these are established courses that I like to teach in a particular way.
- The W2 seemed more challenging than it should be. The others were fine. For the Q2s it was easy once I got the former coordinator to finally respond after cc'ing their dean to my third request.
- I had to go through multiple rounds of revisions for the W2 attribute. However, for the R2 attribute, once I submitted the app, there were no revisions. I attended the relevant summer workshops for both W2 and R2.

Of the options below, please identify all reasons you decided to apply for an attribute or subscript: (N =75)

Asked by program chair, dean, or other faculty member	19 (25.3%)
Wanted to increase student enrollment	37 (49.3%)
The course was already aligned with the focus of an attribute	64 (85.3%)
In order to strengthen file for tenure or promotion	21 (28%)

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

From the options below, please identify any professional development that assisted you in preparing your application for any attribute or subscript. (n = 75)

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 an attribute or subscript (either f2f or online).	31 (41.3%)
I exchanged email correspondences with the attribute or subscript convener prior to applying for an attribute	54 (72%)
I sought and received feedback on my application prior to applying for an attribute or subscript.	36 (48%)
I reviewed examples or sample applications from faculty colleagues or from the Stockton website.	32 (42.7%)
I discussed the application process with a faculty member who had previously applied	30 (40%)
None of these	6 (8%)

Of the options you selected, what was the most helpful for you in preparing your application? (If you chose "None of these," please skip ahead to the next question.)

- Reviewing sample applications
- Discussing the attribute/subscript with convener by email/feedback
- Direct feedback from the convenor was helpful.
- Direct feedback received from the particular convener.
- feedback from the chair of the committee before submitting the final document for committee approval
- Summer Institute (for Q2, R1, R2)
- Both were equally helpful - speaking with a faculty member who had applied & email correspondence with the convenor
- email
- Meeting with the convener.
- Email exchange
- Working with the convenor.
- Nothing could help you gain H subscript on a course.
- Talking with the convener.
- Attending a workshop to review expectations and having clear samples of what is required
- I reviewed example or sample applications from faculty colleagues or from the Stockton website.

- Reviewing samples of other applications and attending summer institute as well as emailing with conveners
- Meeting with covenor
- Past Summer Institutes were helpful. However, convenors 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 exchanged email correspondences with the attribute or subscript convener prior to applying for an attribute.
- The individual meetings/conversations with *[identifier removed]* were really helpful. The written feedback from the R1/R2 committee was also helpful.
- discussing the application with the convenor
- For W2, I had attended a Summer Institute *[identifier removed]*, but frankly, I didn't think it was all that helpful other than getting me started on drafting the application, itself. I would have liked to see more discussions of innovative classroom practices and best practices/theories to approach teaching writing. For the R1, I didn't do any prof dev't but it all worked out anyway.
- *[Identifier removed]* was the W coordinator at the time and was very helpful in answering all my questions about applying for a W2 for a course that already aligned with the requirements.
- It seemed that the W2 committee required a lot more information than previously required, so discussing and reviewing older applications was not very helpful. I met with the W2 convener after applying to clarify things and still had to reapply.
- To be perfectly honest, the Race and Racism workshop was not helpful and really needs to be revamped. I am still not really sure what constitutes an R course.
- Emailing coordinators and having them review you materials was very helpful.
- As a former convenor, I think in general the more hands on advise, assistance, and guidance applicants can get before (esp. from the convenor), the better
- Discussions with H attribute convenor were helpful.
- I reviewed example applications.
- Summer W institute was super helpful
- Meeting with convenor.
- Initially viewing examples and then receiving advance feedback.
- Emailing back and forth with the covenor
- None of the above because the application was rejected
- Email exchange
- Too many attributes are now being required and such makes advising and getting a timely degree more cumbersome--especially since 75% of our incoming students are transfer students who require sets of "sequenced courses"
- Specific feedback from the convener about what the committee/convener was looking for in the course/application, and how to implement requirements within the course.

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 convenor
- 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 convenor
- Reviewing sample applications from faculty in my program.
- Talking with a faculty and the sample
- Seeking advice from other faculty who had gone through the process.
- Feedback from the convenor.
- Talking with the coordinator and getting feedback on what I do already and need to do to qualify.
- Center for Teaching and Learning Design - did not apply
- The summer institutes were particularly helpful to orienting me to what would be expected of a class with that attribute as well as what would need to be shown in the application. For the W2 process, I appreciated that the convenor was direct and honest about the changes the committee needed to see in order to approve the attribute application.

What additional resources or professional development would have been helpful for you during the application process?

- None
- none
- None needed
- Sample applications to review.
- a faculty member from the committee assigned as a mentor as I progressed through the processes
- No idea.
- Consistent practices for the establishment of an attribute. Every convener/attribute seems to want different things. Some are much more strict than others.
- NA
- none, it wasn't that difficult. this could be unique to the attribute i have experience with.
- It is helpful for quality/updated samples to be available on the website, so expectations are consistent.
- Sample applications
- More opportunities for compensated time to attend workshops or summer institutes. Sometimes that ONE week in the summer just does not work.

- 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 fuded
- 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.

What recommendations do you have for strengthening the attribute/ subscript proposal, review, and assessment process?

- 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 faculty (like me) who very much want to support the attribute initiatives, but are completely turned off by the application process. I don't mind an application process, but it becomes an evaluation tool for how you don't "really" know about arts, values, history, or international approaches. When it comes to W2, I WANT to teach more of these (since I do have my students do writing), but it becomes a race or competition as to how MUCH writing and feedback you provide. I am not a writing instructor (W1) - I want to be

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 realize this might increase staffing burdens, however, faculty from other areas of the university such as Literature, Communications, and History who have extensive writing experience could also teach these course.
- Standard website, standard deadlines, standard review process across all attributes and subscripts. Seems like each of the attributes/subscripts operate in their own universe with their own review process and deadlines. It's hard to keep track of everything.
- None
- Some consistency would be appreciated from year to year, especially with the W2 and what is expected when submitting an application.
- Allowing for "appeals" and "resubmissions with corrections" within the same application cycle.
- I honestly don't think the idea of making the applications uniform or the same makes any sense. These are different attributes with different goals, backgrounds, histories, expectations. So, why would the applications be the same at all, really?!
- Clear timeline for when application decisions will be made
- someone from each program on the committee
- Consistency
- Consistent clear standards
- have a clear centralized place with all of the subscripts, the covenor, powerpoints of application process.
- Is the application enough? Did the convener need to see the questions I pose to the students in my discussion forums for the online course? Would that have been helpful in meeting this R2 category? Not sure.
- As a previous convenor of the A- it would be helpful if people would read all of the requirements and align their course appropriately.
- Simplify. Why do students require R1 AND R2? Why do faculty who inherit a course section with a Q/W designation on it already ALSO have to apply for same?
- I am satisfied with the current process, however, I have only seen the email regarding course proposals sent to the faculty email list. Perhaps sending the email to faculty and staff may elicit a larger pool of proposals.

- Decrease the number of attributes, there are far too many. Make requirements consistent over time. The requirements often change dramatically as committee members change
- None - 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 problems I have seen (faculty who've asked me to review their proposal prior to submission) are due to lack of familiarity with how to assess something relative to the attribute (e.g., writing courses that weren't assessing writing in any meaningful way) or lacking in college-level attribute content (AHIV attributes that didn't really have the content in anything but a superficial way). In other words, the faculty member applying had an inaccurate understanding of what the attribute was about.
- Consistency in expectations for attributes/subscripts
- Provide a clearly listed objectives and standards document.
- Provide samples of successful applications; otherwise, applicants may be going into the process blindly. Also, summer institutes available online could increase access
- Video tutorials are always helpful
- More uniformity in the application procedure across attribute types and easy-to-find resources online
- Fold the HIVA conveners into the General Studies Committee and handle course approvals (including program courses) together under the aegis of an expanded GENS committee?
- More room for a broader understanding of how to teach writing (especially in literature courses); face to face/zoom meeting discussions rather than online review only. Hard to engage in dialogue with the current process - it feels very top down, like so much else at Stockton these days.
- Contact others who have recently been through the process.
- Identifying the program specific needs and having someone from the program guide through the process.
- Putting the students first and trusting the intent of faculty applying for subscripts/attributes. Faculty and programs who use the process to either advance their respective careers or "hijack" certain designations hurt everyone.
- It is already strong
- Because of how much work it can entail, there has to be a driving reason to apply for these subscripts. The instructor really believes in them; the students really need them; They're necessary to fill a class. Without a strong pull, it's hard to get people to mobilize to apply.
- Work closer with adjunct faculty to educate them on this process. Hold more workshops specific to adjunct faculty with flexible times and ways to attend.
- Get rid of the HIVA attributes. They are superfluous given the acronyms and often restrict students choice of coursework. The attributes are also implemented largely to increase enrollment, which seem antithetical to the idea of general studies courses.
- I'd like to see it simplified. When applying for multiple attributes, it's hard to keep track of what is required for each. It'd be great to see more consistency across the instructions and requirements. I also think recertification is silly and a waste of time.

If you have not applied for any attributes or subscripts, what have been your biggest obstacle(s) in applying for an attribute or subscript? Please select from the options below: (N = 15)

The application process seems too daunting and/or time-consuming	1 (6.7%)
I do not believe any of the subscripts 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 subscripts 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%)

If you wish, please provide additional comments about your responses above. (If you have not applied for any attributes or subscripts, what have been your biggest obstacle(s) in applying for an attribute or subscript? Please select from the options below:)

- I find the adding of subscripts 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.

What recommendations do you have for strengthening the attribute/subscript proposal, review, and assessment process?

- 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 consistent, with a couple of questions to nuance the application to specific attribute.

The current subscript structure allows any course--General Studies or Program course to be designated with a subscript (A, H, V, I). Of the options below, what best represents your view on the current structure (N = 90)

	#
The subscript structure is functioning properly.	26 (28.9%)
The subscript structure could be improved.	36 (40%)
The subscript structure should be abolished and replaced with a different structure.	15 (16.7%)

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

If you think changes should be made, please explain your answer

- 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 enough of any one attribute to justify getting a full attribute but do smatterings of all of them. Another more significant problem is that the sciences are totally excluded from the current subscript system, and while students are required to take a "science-related" class in GNM (although only sort of since transfer students do not have to take GNM necessarily), there is such a diversity of scientific topics out there that students are not getting enough science. This is well indicated by the prevalence of climate change deniers, anti-vaxxers, etc. that are widespread in the general public. It is also problematic that basic math classes such as Algebraic Problem Solving and/or Intermediate Algebra are counted as GNM courses, often times further reducing the actual number of "real" science classes that students might/do take.
- I'm okay with us keeping the current structure, provided that we establish rules/time limits for review. There's no reason why an application that does not need any revisions should sit for 11 months before being approved.
- I strongly recommend that we abolish the subscript system. I think students have too many requirements to complete their degree in four years. Through General Studies courses and Minors, they already have access to the content these attributes cover. But if we cannot abandon the attribute system, I strongly recommend that the Historical Consciousness attribute be removed. It is the only one that is directly affiliated with an academic program. All of the others are interdisciplinary in nature, and not tied to a specific academic program.
- Instead of making a huge change, make small ones, such as give student option to take three out of (A, H, V, I) instead of all four. It will make their course selection more based on the student's interest rather than just taking a course to meet the 'requirement'. It will also impact student's attitude in classroom. They would be there because they WANTED to take the course, rather than they wanted 'certain subscript'.
- Do we have any evidence that the subscripts actually affect students' worldview? What are our expectations for the effects the subscripts would have? I'm very much on board with requiring some ethics content (for example), but what can we reasonably expect from a single course?
- see other comments on the form
- It seems to be very hard to get some subscripts, some much harder than others to obtain, and the fact one person is making the decisions leads to a perception of unfairness at times (although decisions may always be fair!)
- I *[identifier removed]* had the opportunity to supervise many students as they worked towards their degrees. Broadly speaking, the Stockton curriculum is needlessly complex

and difficult to navigate. Many students struggle to graduate within four years. It seems that, any time the university learns of a gap in curriculum, the solution is to add more degree requirements - for example, in the wake of Summer 2020, rather than compel all programs to examine core and elective courses to address racism and incorporate antiracism, Stockton added two additional attribute requirements (R1 and R2). Not only did this absolve all other courses/teachers of critically assessing their courses from an antiracist perspective; it increased the burden on students. The required combination of major, cognate, G, and ASD courses in Stockton degrees can be difficult (as evidenced not only by graduation timelines but the frequency with which preceptors must request adjustments from program chairs). The required combination of attributes, which seems only to grow over time, can be difficult for students to meet. The two systems together are exceedingly complicated. With so many requirements, I also worry that the goal of attributes (and the major/cognate/G/ASD structure) fails to come through. Students do not necessarily see an emphasis on breadth and diversity in their learning, so much as a lengthy set of checkboxes. Many universities are able to accomplish the same ends through having a series of school-wide core requirements (e.g., 1 math course, 2 writing courses, 1 arts-focused course) without creating such a burdensome and confusing system. I suggest shifting to that kind of structure.

- it all feels very arbitrary
- I think it's unfortunate that we need to modify courses to include attributes so students actually take them (or even see them, since they typically filter for the attributes). For some courses, such as History- and Arts- related courses, adding an attribute may be straightforward, but it is a stretch for other courses. Maybe attributes could be fulfilled with At Some Distance courses? For example, students could be required to take an Arts and Ethics course. Because I believe ASD courses could fulfill these requirements, I disagree that they are vital to liberal arts education.
- We keep adding things to the curriculum and never reflect on how it is all working together. The requirements keep getting more and more complex and it is unclear if any of these are helping us attain the outcomes they are intended to. What actually are the outcomes? Have we collectively articulated them since these subscripts were introduced?
- There is redundancy in this. Why require two GAH courses AND an A attribute? Why require R courses AND a V attribute? Aren't R courses, by definition, dealing with with values? Why is there an H attribute? I see the need for students to learn about history. But I can also see the need for them to learn about economics, politics, literature, biology, etc. Why privilege the discipline of history? The makes no sense.
- Students should have to opportunity to explore their interests in the GENS without some required aspects - it creates funneling into specific courses, it puts additional stress on their semester scheduling.
- There seem to be a lot of attributes for students to have to require and, as a preceptor, can make it hard to advise students if courses with these attributes always fill fast. Having less attributes with more classes available to cover them may alleviate this issue.
- There are inconsistencies in expectations to earn the attribute. It can also be hard to get some attributes vs others. Beyond that, it can be very hard for students to navigate various attributes. With so many it's hard to keep track of them. In some cases, there is overlap in the areas (V & I have some similarities for ex). Now with an R1/R2 how is that different? I could see an R2 having elements of V and/or I.

- 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 times, can feel redundant and as a duplicate of the nature of a G course (ie - GAH or GSS) and/or an attribute (ie - R and I)
- We need to add the L subscript for language study in a multicultural, multilingual, global environment so that we can stop graduating monolingual students.
- There are, likely, too many. I worry about students' progress toward graduation.
- The application process should be more uniform and less gatekeeping. Also, I getting really annoyed by the fact that I need to be checking EACH semester a course is offered that all of the correct attributes are listed. I am VERY committed to the idea that students should be required to have classes that focus on different approaches to topics, but the process is laborious.
- These are seen as simply a check box by students and many faculty in terms of their use in courses. I don't believe students are fully engaged with the subscripts as a way of generating a well rounded educational program.
- I have a hard time seeing how these 4 subscripts connect to the mission of the university in a clear way, and in a way that helps advance the mission and improve the education experience for the students. The subscripts also fail to distinguish Stockton in any way from other institutions. I think it would be much better to connect our courses and our mission to Critical Thinking. That is a theme that would advance and improve the education experience for our students and would distinguish Stockton from other institutions. If CT were our primary focus, we would enjoy a kind of clarity in our education mission that currently seems disjointed and confusing with this attribute system.
- The subscripts have created a scheduling nightmare. Students must adopt a strategy to take a GAH with an A, GSS with an R, another GAH with an H, Very few GNM's have the attributes. The GIS courses with A's, R's, and H's are in extremely high demand. About half our students get a GEN with Rhetoric and Comp so it makes it difficult for GEN courses to run. ASD courses are being replaced by required FRST courses so students are limited to G courses to get their attributes. Stockton's mission with G courses was to provide students with a broad liberal education. Instead it has turned into an attribute frenzy in which students select courses based on the attribute. A student must wait to take G courses until they have a enough credits to get priority registration for the course with the attribute. Our students are having to take additional courses because they take G courses without the right mix to get an attribute. I predict that students who are unable to get the G courses to fulfill attributes will take their program courses and cognates and then get a job. Employers don't care about attributes and the public already has a devalued perception of a college degree. Some courses have multiple attributes which makes me question what are they really focused on teaching? Students no longer have the freedom to choose G courses that they like. GAH courses are for arts and

humanities. This should suffice for an A requirement. GSS courses by nature probably have a values aspect to all of them. The H courses are a joke. They don't really teach history. They put a spin on some aspect of history, but don't really teach a cohesive history course. In our global world I would say most programs have international issues addressed in some places in their program's curriculum which would be enough for students to get a cultural perspective. Having two R courses is not necessary. Furthermore, the notion that a faculty member can go to a two day institute and be qualified to teach an R course is fallacious. There is public debate about students being indoctrinated to critical race theory. There are now problems in the workplace with college graduates analyzing normal behaviors for microaggressions.

- I like the subscript structure: I think "designating" classes helps with enrollment and pushes students to take classes that they may not otherwise take. It may be that we consider DIFFERENT subject areas, but the ability to designate courses, I think, works well.
- The subscript system is tedious and pointless.
- I am not sure what should change or if it should change.
- Some of these subscripts seem harder/easier to get than others. Also, there are still courses listed with more than one of these, which I thought was not possible.
- The G-course structure seems to be a fine system. I am not sure why the AHVI is even needed. It is like having two slightly mutually exclusive systems imperfectly interposed atop one another. Also, in my experience, students do not seem to understand the point of the AHVI system. In a time where the importance of college degrees is being questions, I think it is imperative we make changes to remove "pointless" course work from the curriculum.
- The truth is that we have adopted quite an alphabet soup, and as much as I applaud the introduction of the R1/R2 it made it that much more tricky for all parties involved.
- A consistent set of expectations of the A, H, V, I attributes would be useful.
- Some majors have program courses that have one or more of these attributes but other majors do not. I think the attributes should only be applied to General Studies.
- The subscripts are confusing and feel repetitive related to the G categories. Students see them as a checklist and nothing more.
- All attributes should have the same rules/expectations regarding transfer courses, graduation requirements, etc.
- a specific program- like writing or history should not monopolize the decision
- Possibly utilize Sharepoint where all information can be easily submitted and located by program members. Have deadlines of when to submit, ie 3x's a semester at the beginning of the month. Forms for faculty to fill out and submit instead of extensive email threads back and forth.
- Times have changed and students need to be retained and graduated in a timely manner. Over time, there appears to be a trend of students taking G courses (with needed attributes/subscripts) from faculty within their program(s) or taking G courses with attributes/subscripts that merely fit their time/life schedule!
- I cannot meaningfully address the subscripts divorced from the greater context of the onerous set of curricular requirements Stockton students must meet to graduate (mainly General Studies and Cognates). I think current Stockton students all desperately need a basic science course (rather than GNM, science-specific). GENS and Cognate

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 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 find that another field of study suites them more than their current major.
- Provide a clearly listed document on the objectives and standards.
- I would like to see a reduction in the grouping of multiple subscripts within single courses, as students overemphasize searching for the courses that check off as many boxes as possible over selecting topics that interest them. Individuals courses might address more than one of these areas, but should have a central focus.
- I support a requirement that students take courses which contain content for the various subscripts. However, I prefer to see these courses taught by program faculty who have expertise in these fields rather than teachers who design a G course in an area of interest.
- I think there are lots of ways to "abolish and restructure," but that would require a potentially multi-year, inclusive effort across schools to rethink and remodel attributes. Attributes, to me, are general education categories, yet do not report to GENS directly. They represent Stockton's commitment across schools to general education, and ultimately demonstrate faculty ownership of general education. Ideas to "abolish" the subscript structure would have to proceed broadly and collaboratively, and with a vision consistent with Stockton's mission. I answered b.) "could be improved." How? Ideas include: improving self-consciousness among students and faculty learning and teaching

with these attributes; conducting assessment efforts such an 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 fulfills 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 total revamp of G subcript the subscripts might be folded back into the g-course requirements structure.
- The current subscript structure is dated and confusing. Models at other schools should be examined and inform a new structure.
- I would prioritize abolition and replacement, but making changes to the existing structure could make it less onerous for students and advisors to navigate.
- usability
- I'm not sure that art and history work as well as subscripts as opposed to requiring them to take an art and a history course (in the program or as a G) in the field. I'm not sure how well these attributes work across the curriculum. Teaching art and history are crafts, and I'm not sure they easily lend themselves to working across the curriculum.
- Subscripts are superfluous given the acronyms (which could be expanded slightly if faculty desired more options) and often restrict students choice of coursework. The attributes are also implemented largely to increase enrollment, which seem antithetical to the idea of general studies courses.
- I think it would be worthwhile to integrate the ELOs and create a new structure that includes all subscripts.
- The requirements are inconsistent, yet they all fall in the same "basket". That seems wrong.

Please indicate the degree to which you agree with the following statement regarding each subscript: *I believe the content of courses with the ____ subscript is vital to a student's liberal arts education at Stockton University.* **(N = 90)**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
A - Arts: Content	5 (5.6%)	2 (2.2%)	14 (15.6%)	33 (36.7%)	36 (40%)	90 (100%)
H - Historical Content	6 (6.7%)	4 (4.4%)	10 (11.1%)	30 (33.3%)	40 (44.4%)	90 (100%)
V - Values and Ethics	4 (4.4%)	3 (3.3%)	12 (13.3%)	23 (25.6%)	48 (53.3%)	90 (100%)
I - International	4 (4.4%)	5 (5.6%)	11 (12.2%)	29 (32.2%)	41 (45.6%)	90 (100%)

Please indicate how important the following statements are to you*: An AHVI subscript should be defined by* (N = 90)

	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%)

Which of the following should define a course with each subscript? (N = 90)

	A	H	V	I
A course with this attribute should be PRIMARILY concerned with the attribute's content (similar to W1, Q1, and R1 courses)	33 (36.7%)	32 (35.6%)	23 (25.6%)	25 (27.8%)
A course with this attribute can be primarily focused on ANOTHER topic and should have the AVHI content as its SECONDARY content (similar to W2, Q2, and R2 courses).	57 (63.3%)	58 (64.4%)	67 (74.4%)	65 (72.2%)

Please indicate how important the following statements are to you. (N = 90)

	Not at all important	Important	Very important
Any content percentages (whether in instruction or in final grades) should be standard across the AHVI attributes	21 (23.3%)	43 (47.8%)	26 (28.9%)
Each subscript convenor should establish their own criteria to define the subscript	56 (62.2%)	26 (28.9%)	8 (8.9%)
The AVHI subscripts should each have a committee of faculty to review and approve courses for the attribute	11 (12.2%)	42 (46.7%)	37 (41.1%)

What changes would you make to the current General Studies subscripts (A, H, V, and I), including adding, removing, or revising the current subscript requirements?

- Add a science subscript - this is the most critical thing about the system. Another potential suggestion (although far distant to the first) would be to consider either creating a 1/2 classification (similar to W, Q and R) BUT then requiring TWO of each category classes (i.e. requiring a H1 and an H2). This would make it easier and better for classes

- 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 we also have the R1/R2, the history standards seem to overlap with that quite a bit. I can also envision useful history classes that do not necessarily address the R2 standards that should probably still be considered for H.
- I would remove the H-attribute.
- Questions above allowed very little place for faculty judgement.
- too much of the course focusing on the attribute requirements at the expense of content; too much paperwork and too many steps for approval
- I would keep these subscripts. I think they each add value to a student's liberal arts degree. Without them, there would be very little liberal arts left for most students.
- I would revise the Stockton degree structure to reduce the number of individual requirements. It's confusing for students to have to navigate both a specific set of AHVI attributes and a very specific set of required G courses (1 GEN, 2 GAH, etc).
- none
- 50% for the A and H attributes is a lot! Again, these could be substituted with ASD Arts and History classes. The description of V- and I- attributes is a little vague, which makes incorporation easier, but at the same time, having examples of courses fulfilling a minimum requirement would be useful for the application process.
- remove all of them
- Revising the H subscript as the bar has been set very high.
- No idea.
- Have a standard percent of the course covering the topic to earn ANY attribute to be considered for the attribute. Consider allowing students to opt out of 1 of the attributes to help with degree completion in a timely matter.
- Make sure the classes that have subscripts indeed cover enough content related to the subscript at specific percentages. Checking if there are enough classes for each subscript for students to take/graduate on time. I would not remove any subscripts unless we have a different system of covering content related to AHVI in G-courses. I think these are important for liberal arts education.
- Streamlining the process and making the criteria similar across the subscripts (I. E., the same percentage weight fit all subscripts) I think that would make it easier on applicants and governors to not have different rules for each subscript.
- We need to add the L subscript for language study in a multicultural, multilingual, global environment so that we can stop graduating monolingual students.
- I'm not sure; it is difficult to remove one subscript without removing them all. While I don't like that option as a faculty member (for the ways in which subscripts often help drive course enrollment), it would likely help students craft their schedules. At any rate--attribute or no attribute--I would still teach the same content.
- I want the process to be something that is value-added, not a chance for a single faculty member and/or committee to decide who is a good/bad professor at something. The rounds and rounds of changes, recommendations, and edits is exhausting, laborious, and demoralizing. No one is competing with other faculty members - we are trying to enhance the curriculum and support the efforts of our other colleagues. That is not what the process represents at the moment.

- I would replace these subscripts altogether. Courses should be including this content where it makes sense, not simply to get the subscript.
- I generally like our categories for subscripts, as long as the requirements allow for multiple attributes (so the percent of content probably can't be too high or multiples wouldn't be possible). For example, I can envision a course where the content covers both the H and R2 requirements.
- I don't think these subscripts add to the education experience here - either for students or for instructors. I think they should be abandoned and replaced with an emphasis on Critical Thinking.
- Expand or change the A subscript to include communications
- Remove all subscripts
- Maybe I'm ignorant of the scholarly area of ethics, but I'm not sure if that is as clearly defined as a content area to warrant a subscript. It certainly is important, but seems to function more as an ELO that courses should consider incorporating in all or many courses rather than a class focused on ethics. For I-International/Multicultural, I think that needs to kinda be defined or redefined a bit more clearly. It used to include a lot of R1/2 classes because it seemed adjacent to discussions of racism, but now what is it exactly? I would also say that "multiculturalism" is a pretty outdated approach to teaching difference: it does not acknowledge systemic oppression and white supremacy in ways that a focus on racism would. Now, if the focus is on global awareness and international cultures, how is that distinct from, say, historical consciousness? Or from a language requirement? The I attribute just does not have a clear definition for me yet.
- Remove the entire subscript requirement
- The subscript convenors should not be able to define their own criteria. The criteria should be established by a wider committee, with the convener only acting as the gatekeeper, approving or disproving courses.
- Remove them all or group them together since they are almost completely redundant to the G-course system.
- I'd get rid of them.
- I like it- gives our students a broad liberal arts education.
- They are all useful. plus R
- I think the program should vote on criteria and this may need to be revised. The above questions do not give us the option. I do not think the requirements should shift, there should be a standard that all convenors follow.
- Subscripts make precepting a nightmare and such confuses transfer students. A LIBERAL ARTS Education ought to make sure students take courses in each of these AHVI areas; however some of the G-courses appear farcical in their ability to really teach this subscript focus in depth.
- Now that we have R1/R2, the "I" attribute should be more firmly distinguished from those as more global/transnational (not merely intercultural/multicultural). As we've created and adapted courses to meet the R1/R2 attributes, non-transnational "I" courses might now be running the risk of being potential R1/R2's that didn't make the cut. If "I" courses are meant to serve a different purpose from R1/R2, that should be firmly clarified, or maybe a "G"/global attribute and/or language/culture option should replace the "I." I do believe students need an understanding of history. I'm not certain they need it more than a critical understanding of social, cultural or political processes through which

social identities and multiple forms of inequality and resistance develop and evolve (i.e. SOBL, vs ARHU).
- Is there a way to require fewer subscripts of transfer students? Or perhaps allow more transfer courses with obvious content to give transfer students some subscripts.
- In order to really answer the aforementioned questions, it would be important to know HOW the Percent of Content of any AVHI is determined
- Make them the main focus of the course.
- I would prefer to eliminate them entirely, but would at the very least want to reduce them, e.g. to (A or H) and (V or I).
- Make the process objective and clear to the applicant.
- I support a requirement that students take courses which contain content for the various subscripts. However, I prefer to see these courses taught by program faculty who have expertise in these fields rather than teachers who design a G course in an area of interest.
- As indicated above, any changes would need to be thought through, but my impression is that we could use better and clearer V and I attributes, and/or consider ways to redefine or reposition them and make them vital to students alongside A and H.
- again, subscripts should align more closely with revised ELOs
- Creative writing and literature should be included in A.
- Not sure
- Fold A & H back into g-group /split GAH = A and H
- Conflict of interest should be removed. The A and H subscript committees should not be led by or primarily comprised of faculty from Arts or History. There has been a movement towards aligning the attributes with traditional discipline requirements at other schools. That was not the original intent. The General Studies' curriculum belongs to all faculty so representation from all schools is crucial. This should also be applied to the I and V, although it appears as though the requirements are less stringent.
- I would remove at least two of these subscripts, or allow students to choose two of four, or replace with a new system that need not be uniform across majors and degrees.
- Use behavioral objectives when revising course goals.
- See comment above
- I believe they are different credits one is a 3 credit course and then the other is 4 credit course
- Remove them. They are redundant with ELOs, IDEA criteria, course acronyms and only serve to complicate Stockton's already complex graduation requirements. Simplify!
- I would suggest streamlining all the subscripts with the ELOs.
- I think the subscript "I" might be a bit redundant now that we have the Rs. I also think, maybe we could make it a "two out of four" requirement as opposed to all four (especially since A and H could be, theoretically, addressed by the 2 GAH course requirement). Or, just get rid of A and H as redundant to GAH. I'd be OK with that too.

If you wish, please provide additional comments about your responses to the statements about the AHVI subscripts above.

- The system is good overall but definitely needs to be revamped. I do not think that getting rid of it or totally "restarting" is the right approach.

- 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 covenor, 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 covenor. 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 needed. It is a challenge for the student if they cannot take those courses until later in their degree due to limited seats/demand; there is a chance that a subscript will no longer be granted and/or the course will not run when needed.
- I don't want to have to assess one more d**n thing - just because we don't count it or assess it, does not mean we don't do it in class. If I am teaching a topic and use a historical lens, I am still primarily interested (And responsible for) assessing that TOPIC, not the lens. The more checkbox assessment we have to do, the less you are going to have faculty participate because we already know assessment is used for nothing other than micro-management.
- This system feels old and out of touch.
- We have a budget crisis and an enrollment cliff. Creating barriers to graduation such as the attributes will make our university less attractive to students. Students want to choose general studies courses that interest them. We need to be able to fill our general studies courses to keep faculty employed. The attributes are detrimental to faculty who do not have them and may endanger their employment. With declining enrollments I do not believe every faculty member needs to teach a G course. We need to offer enough G courses for students and allocate faculty as resources where needed. To avoid retrenchment we need to have options for faculty to teach more G courses and options for those faculty in programs in high demand not to be required to teach G courses.
- More structure needs to be implemented in terms of who AHVI convenors are, how they are selected, and how changes in course approval procedures are handled. Also, an appeals system beyond "complain to the dean" should be implemented for when attributes are denied.
- I think the program should vote on criteria and this may need to be revised. The above questions do not give us the option. I do not think the requirements should shift, there should be a standard that all convenors follow.
- Courses with AHVI subscipts need to be equally available to entering (commuter) ND exisiting resident students. Today, with education so costly, Courses need to teach practical skills (e.g. Arts--take Music Appreciation where one learns how to detect

movements in a symphony and the exposition, development and recapitualization; or History--understand western civilization, the importance of "Citizenry" and the benefits of having a democracy / Constitution and Freedom; or Values--a philosophy or religion course that teaches about Judeo-Christian values but also tenets of other world religions that affect values that affect policies; and International--understand what "globalization" means and simulate living in other cultures to appreciate US culture and the freedoms we have enjoyed...) Depth and Breadth of AHVI aspects would educate students better than bits and pieces of AHVI spread across Gen-Ed courses "d jour"

- I think a committee, not an individual convener, should determine criteria to define the subscript, and committees should review and discuss course applications for subscripts, This time should be compensated. Subscript applications should be reviewed for specific critical components determined by faculty with the relevant background, expertise and time invested to study, develop and/or understand the purpose of the specific subscript/requirement and multiple ways faculty members might successfully address/meet those requirements.
- Although I think the subscripts are important, I would favor a system that combines General Studies courses with attributes in some way. We have a lot of requirements, especially for transfer students.
- 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.
- Provide a clearly explained document on the objectives and standards.
- I hope that the subscripts are not completely dropped or drastically, because I think they still serve the purpose of broadening the types of courses students take within the spirit of a liberal arts education
- Stockton's system has been called Byzantine, *[identified removed]*, I can say ours is not more "complicated" on average than others'. It is unique (and part of what once made us New Jersey's "distinctive" public university). General Education at many universities continues to fade into the background as an appendage to career- or major-focused learning. General Education is threatened to become attenuated into non-existence. Whatever we do moving forward, the attributes we find valuable should be a focus and a priority of a broad effort to promote general education, consistent with Stockton's mission to serve the public good by enriching people as citizens and human individuals.
- AHVI provides depth and breath of general studies material and should continue without percentages attached for evaluation.
- The particular requirements are less significant than the confusion they present to students in totality.

The current attribute structure allows any course--General Studies or Program course--to be designated with an attribute (W1, W2, Q1, Q2, R1, R2). Attributes designated with 1 indicate a primary focus on that content while attributes designated with 2 indicate a secondary focus on the content. These attributes are attached to convenors that are part of the local MOA. Of the options below, what best represents your view on the current structure? (N = 90)

The subscript structure is functioning properly.	38 (42.2%)

The subscript structure could be improved.	38 (42.2%)
The subscript structure should be abolished and replaced with a different structure.	10 (11.1%)
The subscript system should be abolished without a replacement.	4 (4.4%)
Total	90 (100%)

Currently, the requirement for amount of relevant content in a W1, Q1, and R1 class is "the majority of class time". Please rate your agreement with the bolded statement: (N = 90)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Currently, the requirement for amount of relevant content in a W1, Q1, and R1 class is "the majority of class time". **This content requirement should remain the same across all W1, Q1, and R1 attributes**	1 (1.1%)	2 (2.2%)	14 (15.6%)	41 (45.6%)	32 (35.6%)
Currently, the requirement for amount of relevant content in a W2, Q2, and R2 class are different. A W2 class requires 15-20% of the content and at least 30% of the course grade to be writing-related, A Q2 class requires at least 20% of the content to involve mathematical ideas, A R2 requires at 25% of course time and course grade to be relevant to race **This content requirement should be the same across all W2, Q2, and R2 attributes.**	2 (2.2%)	8 (8.9%)	21 (23.3%)	35 (38.9%)	24 (26.7%)

If you wish, please provide additional comments about your responses to the statements about the W1, W2, Q1, Q2, R1, R2 attributes above.

- I originally checked "the attribute structure is functioning properly", but then I changed to "could be improved", because I was reflecting on how many of our students take and pass W1 courses but are completely unable to write sentences. This makes me wonder if the problem is with the attribute structure?
- History requires more than 30%--too demanding in terms of content requirements
- I suspect the W2 is more generous because it was first and people later ramped that up realizing it would be more impactful. Ideally, likely, they'd all be 25%/30% or something like that.
- Similar criteria should guide the 1 vs. 2 levels of these attributes
- The percentage requirements for X2 attributes is confusing. Specific examples of what that looks like would be helpful.

- 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-share" or whatever. We ALL contribute to students' learning experiences in different ways - we need to stop bullying each other into homogeneity.
- These attributes have little impact on student learning - courses should be incorporating content in writing, quantitative reasoning and race when appropriate without this framework.
- The W, Q, R attributes seem more thought out then the AHVI subscripts. Could we add a CT attribute and get rid of the soft, squishy, confusing AHVI subscripts?
- The current percentages for W2, Q2 & R2 imply that they are not all equally important
- I have serious concerns about faculty who are not qualified to teach writing or math teaching W2 and Q2 courses. I am also concerned that the R1 and R2 requires specialized faculty and we do not have the resources to support it. There have not been enough R1 courses offered. Next year we will have a full class of students who need the R requirements. Given the shortage of R's there will be students who can't graduate unless there are more R courses offered. The administration needs to get data on how many student's need R courses to graduate in 2025. We may need to modify this requirement because I am hard pressed to believe that a student who is short an R course to graduate will come back for an extra semester to get that course. As a result our graduation rates will be lower because students will not stick around to graduate when they will be able to get a job with most of their degree requirements fulfilled. There are fewer employers requiring a degree and I believe employers will be satisfied with a student's education even if they are short a general studies courses.
- I'm not sure the 1 and 2 distinctions of the attributes have been all that helpful. For instance, with writing, W2's are defined in a way that makes it seem as though the primary content of the class is wholly and distinct from the writing content of the class. But seems like they go hand in hand? It seems a W2 course isn't that students should be doing "less" writing, but that they're practicing writing within a disciplinary context. In other words, I'm not sure that it's helpful to have W2, R2, and Q2 as "secondary" content

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 questions 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.
- 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 their upper levels. I teach a course that I 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 courses they have taken. Students in my classes care more about R knowledge than they tend to care about W or Q, which impacts how they learn and retain knowledge. I suspect that our system means that we don't have as much quality control or the level a course is taught at across a subscript.
- While a percentage of course grade can be quantified (but often not exactly or well), the percentage of course content seems much more vague. Of what, exactly, is that a percentage? Course time? Some measure of content? Number of paragraphs in a book that have to do specifically with writing, quantitative analysis, or race and racism? What if the course material and attribute-related material are too intertwined to separate out into percentages of one or the other?
- In life, simple is typically more effective. Those not directly involved with developing/approving attributes will not remember the differences in percentages so consistency is best
- The different percentages of content and assessment for the W2, Q2, and R2 attributes are somewhat confusing. However, I can see an argument for W2 courses to be more heavily weighted to writing assessments completed outside of class.
- I would support changing the R requirement to 1 course - either R1 or R2.

- support writing, math and racism education course requirments 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 and unnecessary. It makes application more difficult and, if they all have the same categorization (as 2), shouldn't that mean the same thing?

Classes with subscripts and attributes (A, H, V, I, W1, W2, Q1, Q2, R1, R2) should be renewed every: (N = 90)

3 years	7 (7.8%)
5 years	26 (28.9%)
7 years	10 (11.1%)
10 years	13 (14.4%)
Never (i.e., once approved, they should not need to be renewed)	14 (15.6%)
It depends on the subscript/attributes	20 (22.2%)

The renewal process for classes with attributes or subscripts should require: (N = 90)

A full resubmission of the attribute/ subscript application	3 (3.3%)
A truncated version of the attribute/ subscript application	55 (61.1%)
Attributes and subscripts should not need to be renewed	11 (12.2%)
The requirements for the renewal process should be determined by the convenors and/or attribute committees.	14 (15.6%)
Only when the content changes or a new faculty member is teaching the class	2 (2.2%)
No renewal is needed if the class is inherently W/Q-oriented	2 (2.2%)
Missing	3(3.3%)

Please indicate the degree to which you agree with the following statement: During precepting, students report difficulty in enrolling in classes with this attribute. (N = 90)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

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%)	15 (16.7%)	8 (8.9%)
V	8 (8.9%)	23 (25.6%)	43 (47.8%)	15 (16.7%)	1 (1.1%)
I	6 (6.7%)	24 (26.7%)	43 (47.8%)	16 (17.8%)	1 (1.1%)

How many preceptees, on average, do you regularly have assigned to you? (N = 90)

# Preceptees	
0-10	17 (18.9%)
11-20	13 (14.4%)
21-30	21 (23.3%)
31-40	13 (14.4%)
41-50	10 (11.1%)
51-60	3 (3.3%)
61+	11 (12.2%)
Missing	2 (2.2%)
Total	90 (100%)

In general, in an academic year, how many of your preceptees need to extend their graduation timeline due to them not meeting one or more of the attribute requirements? (N = 90)

Number of Preceptees	N (%)
None	38 (42.2%)
1-3	22 (24.4%)

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

If you have, which attribute(s) held them back from graduation? (Check all that apply) (N = 90)

Q1	Q2	R1	R2	W1	W1	A	H	V	I
6(6.7%)	7 (7.8%)	19 (21.1%)	15 (16.7%)	5 (5.6%)	13 (14.4%)	7 (7.8%)	10 (11.1%)	3 (3.3%)	3 (3.3%)

Please provide any additional information regarding attribute/ subscript renewals and/ or graduation requirements.

- I want to assert my support of the R1/R2 requirement. Our students need to learn more about the past and present impact of race and racism. Since we offer many R1/R2 courses in the *[identifier removed]*, our student don't experience difficulty registering for these courses. If students *[identifier removed]* are experiencing difficulty fulfilling this requirement, I hope that the University will respond by offering more R1/R2 courses across the curriculum to address this need.
- Every once in a while the C or higher grade in an attribute bearing class becomes an issue (usually just the 3000-level W2). I also work very carefully with all of my preceptees to make the students aware of their requirements so they do not run into the issues. The only exceptions are the students who repeatedly fail to meet with me for precepting and that is entirely on them for not doing so!
- We do not offer enough R1/R2 courses to require students to take two courses and still graduate on time.
- These were tough to answer, in that *[identifier removed]* - but attributes & graduation timelines came up on a very regular basis *[identifier removed]*.
- The biggest problem seems to be new students registering last. For example, all of the R courses are taken by the time the transfer students get to register.
- An analysis is needed on the # of attributes offered vs the # of students that need them. An appeal process should be put in place to allow a student to either "excuse" an attribute OR argue for attribute credit on a course that may not have that distinction.
- W1/W2 may have held them back because of getting a grade below C

- I work with *[identifier removed]* and teach them to be strategic about their choices. They often cannot get into attribute designated courses, which could put them behind in the future. I just don't see that.
- They end up taking courses just for the attribute, rather than the course topic. If the application process is improved, students will take courses that are relevant to their interests AND get the content related to the attribute.
- I'm unsure what the current renewal process is but I think 5 years should be fair; an updated syllabus and assignment list should be provided
- The requirements for attributes change even every year depending on the convenor. I believe the Q1 and W1 attributes are important and should be incorporated into FRST and program courses. Each program could have W2 course.
- We need more classes, which are approved for the R1 and R2. We need more classes with A and H for students that are not liberal arts majors.
- R-1 course fill up quickly - perhaps there needs to be more options
- As a program we try to offer all of the attributes in program course to help them achieve the requirements with program courses. We do not have the Q's/W's but we are trying to consider ways to offer at least a W.
- Renewals vary depending upon convenor/committee folks and process seems superfluous.
- Why do Q1 and W1 COURSES carry the attribute for all faculty who teach the class, but W2 and Q2 courses need to have each instructor approved for the same course?? This makes no sense at all.
- So many attribute/subscript classes are taught at prime teaching hours. They conflict with labs for science majors. Some science majors take them in the summer, which costs them more than they planned. They feel that they shouldn't have to do that (and I agree, although I agree with the spirit of why we have subscripts/attributes).
- If Stockton has approximately 8000 undergraduate students and we want them, on average to graduate after 8 semesters of coursework, we need on average a minimum of 1000 seats in courses with each attribute each semester (except W1 and W2, which each need 2000 seats since students need two of each). Do we have any mechanism at all for making sure we are offering enough seats in courses with each attribute?
- *[Identifier removed]* so I only know what my students report to me about my course attributes
- Transfer credit discrepancy has caused an issue (needed a waiver for one credit to graduate).
- The students who have had delayed graduation due to attributes have either not attended precepting meetings regularly to get advice on their courses or have failed to pass a 3000-level W2
- It is all the requirements together, overlaid on program and G course categories, that presents significant confusion and difficulty for students, not individual requirements.

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

Please provide any additional comments you believe will be important for the Subscript/ Attribute Task Force to consider.
- 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 two or more Q1s and without a Q2.
- I think that the biggest block to the system working is probably faculty buy in (or lack of) and burn out (one more thing to do). I have heard some professors say, I need to trip, but I just haven't done it/ can't be bothered. I'm not sure that anything other than streamlining the process.
- Thank you for gathering this feedback!
- The more courses have attributes, the MORE students observe how these overarching attribute skills/content are relevant to many different fields of study and across fields of study. That, I think, should be our ultimate goal - not gatekeeping.
- The attributes and subscripts are broken - the original vision worked because there were fewer students and courses to choose from for students. Now the attributes and subscripts are used to push students into certain classes over others, creating an unfair environment for enrollments across the board. With administration enforcing the minimum

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 univerisity curriculum committee.
- 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, not the attribute/subscript system. I think Stockton should free up the G-course system and let students take courses they are interested in, not ones they are uninterested in but checks a box. As an instruction, I know I would be happier teaching students who take my G-course because that are honestly interested in the topic I am teaching about. Our students are adults, let them make their own educational decisions within the G-course system without the AHVI subscripts and fewer W's and Q's.
- Can we please take the math classes out of GNM. Students don't get as much science because one of their GNMs is Algebra (a math class).
- Be clear about incoming first years/transfers as to the attribute requirements (especially R)
- Simplify.
- I fully and strenuously support offering two R-designated courses. That said I don't believe there is a defensible rationale (especially in our current climate of anti-science, anti-inclusion re: gender/sexuality, pro-book-banning, and other such rhetoric and related attacks on academia and evidence-based reality) for requiring two R courses and zero gender/sexuality courses. There is already a robust and similarly demanding process in

place for courses to carry a gender/sexuality attribute (the WGSS attribute), and many courses that carry it are regularly offered at Stockton. Even if further study/development is needed for implementation, every student should have a gender/sexuality attribute requirement -- possibly similar to the R1/R2 structure.

- Attributes are cumbersome and do not make our curriculum user friendly.
- We have more requirements than students can bear. It is confusing when they arrive - why are there so many systems and different kinds of check boxes? I agree with the spirit of the attributes and subscripts, but I wish there was a way to 1) ensure that courses are meeting standards without infringing on the creativity of faculty and 2) reduce the complexity of the entire General Studies, AHVI, RWQ systems. Please create one system that does everything our current system does, but is easier to navigate for students. We need to work on improving standards. I get seniors who are taking their last W course, cannot write a complete sentence, and have such a profound lack of writing knowledge that it is hard to have a conversation about what is problematic in their writing. They have A's or B's in their previous W classes. On a different, but related topic, we do not do well by our students who are English Second Language or who group up hearing multiple languages at home *[identifier removed]*....we don't have a lot compared to other places I have been and it is CRITICAL. How are students supposed to do well in classes if we don't provide classes that bridge languages to provide more advanced writing and reading skills in English? How many times have I heard from students who just think they are poor writers when really they are just mixing the syntactical structure of two languages? That is something we should be helping them with *[identifier removed]*.
- I count students who take must take summer courses, courses at other institutions, or go significantly beyond 128 credits in my count above of extending graduation timeline.
- I do not believe this can be answered by *[identifier removed]*.
- Simplify simplify simplify!