KSC Integrative Studies Program Review Task Force: Faculty Survey

1. What role do you play in the program? (Choose all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I teach in the ISP</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I coordinate faculty in the ISP</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a librarian embedded in the ISP program</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I advise students in the ISP</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I served on the ISP Committee</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I play no role in the current ISP</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I have taught isp courses
- I teach an IQL alternative course
- I have taught isp; but no longer do.
- committee member reviewing/revising critical dialogue outcomes
- Who doesn't? Aren't all students in ISP?
- I'm an adjunct assigned to teach an ISP course.
- I am chair of faculty who WANT to teach ISP
- Guest teach only
- I used to teach in the ISP, but do not at present
- I'm also on the Honors Program Advisory Council (within the ISP)
- I am a new faculty member; my first course in the ISP program will be in Spring 2012.
I have been part of a team reviewing Critical Thinking Skills and currently I am in the advisory committee.
I am on the senate task force on ISP now.
I also served on an assessment team for the critical reading objective.
I've done a bit of assessment of ISP student artifacts.
Poor Question - I have taught but not currently -- I am an advisor and my students take ISP -- which is the right answer.

2. Are you Tenure-Track Faculty, Adjunct Faculty, or Professional, Administrative and Technical staff?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track Faculty</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Administrative and Technical staff</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If you teach in the ISP, in what area(s) do you teach? (Choose all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITW</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQL</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never taught in the ISP</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. If you teach in the ISP, please indicate your level of participation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently (every semester)</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally (one semester per year)</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one semester per year</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to structural limitations of the ISP, I have not had the opportunity, despite my interest</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- We teach 2 to 3 information literacy sessions for each ITW. For IQL we teach 1 information literacy session.
- but no more.
- Not a lot of opportunities for Prof. Studies faculty, a real limitation as ISP seems to be primarily set up for A&H and Sciences---PGS has so much to give to ISP.
- I used to. check spelling in this survey (see above!!!)
- 1-4 sections/AY
- I don't teach in the ISP.
- I teach INBIO every semester but have not had contact with anyone about ISP courses
- does not apply
- I taught summer and this fall, but cannot make ends make on this pay even tho I am highly qualified and ABD PhD, am leaving this Dec. for other work
- does not apply
- This is my first term teaching
- I teach 2 courses in ISP every semester, including summer.
- No answer. Do not teach ISP.
- This is my first time
- Guest lect
- I would like to teach an ISP course but am not allowed an overload.
- I taught in ISP every semester for 8 semesters
- Taught previously every semester since SP07 pilot before taking on Coordinator Responsibilities
- Will teach in Spring 2012.
- This seems like a confused question. If one does not teach in the ISP, what is it asking. Also, If one teaches in the ISP, what does a response of "never" mean? I could not get beyond this question without selecting one of the response even though none of the responses pertain to my situation.
- spelling error -- opportunity
- Do not teach in ISP

5. As a faculty member participating in the ISP, I believe I have been adequately prepared to teach according to ISP outcomes.
6. The mission of the ISP is to offer an integrated set of courses to help students develop a range of liberal arts perspectives while also developing important life-long intellectual skills for learning. From your perspective, is this mission being met effectively?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. The ISP is appropriately structured to meet the needs of KSC students and its mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. The ISP in its current format is appropriately distributed across the various academic disciplines that students at KSC should be exposed to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefly explain</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- It's just the old Gen Ed menu with a couple of tweaks. It's not integrated into the majors and only "approved" disciplines are represented. Structure needs to be changed to be more inclusive of all faculty willing to 'do' ISP.
- It doesn't seem like all disciplines are represented. Perhaps not all departments are submitting proposals to teach a ISP course in their discipline.
- There is very little, if any, emphasis in mathematics and reasoning.
- It is too large a a part of our students education, often demanding more credit hours than a student's major. this is wrong.
- I think that mathematics and computer science should play a role in the perspectives area.
- Very little contribution from PGS.
- The program is not effective. The students are overburdened by requirements that are not required at any other liberal arts college I know of. What are we doing? It is overwhelming the majors. There are numerous programs where the isp credit requirement is more than a majors requirement! That should indicate a screwed up program if nothing else does. Its turned into a monster. It is not good for the kids and much of the faculty is, frankly, demoralized, but terrified to speak against it.
- The format should be more flexible
- Too many loopholes allowing students to take ISP courses and count them for majors.
- It seems so. As an adjunct faculty member, I am sometimes not really sure of the "WHOLE". It seemed early on perhaps when KSC had a grant, adjunct faculty were paid [and fed] to attend workshops, orientation,
opportunities for input. Now it seems we have to 'volunteer' and I am losing sight of the long range purpose and next steps.

- Students should be required to take two IA courses.
- I can only speak to ISP courses in my department, which is well-represented. Other departments, though, might be under-represented.
- As an adjunct I go to KSC, teach my classes, and go home. I don't know how the ISP program works or if it is working.
- I don't have a big picture viewpoint.
- I believe that existing courses have been successfully modified for ISP, but I also feel that creating more new courses just for ISP should be encouraged.
- always room for improvement...
- I don't know enough about the program as a whole to respond.
- nothing
- I have no way to form an opinion on this which I think would be valid.
- Based on my limited knowledge of the program, it seems to be comprehensive.
- I am assuming that it is the intent of the ISP format.
- As I haven't been involved in planning the ISP, and don't really understand its distribution, I can't answer this question.
- Most of the IQL courses as they exist today include very little quantitative content. Indeed, students are often asked to approach quantitative issues by "evaluating sources" and considering "diverse" viewpoints rather than analyzing and interpreting data, criticizing the design of studies and experiments, identifying issues with data collection and sampling, asking if particular summary statistics or statistical tests are valid or appropriate in a given context, or reasoning logically using quantitative methods.
- What does "appropriately distributed..." mean?

Since I only teach one ITW course, I don't feel qualified to respond to the statement.

- I am not familiar with all of the offerings within the ISP program.
- Re: Question 5--ISP did not prepare me to teach "according to" its outcomes; so, I assume you are asking if my professional preparation is up to the task.

Re: Question 8--If I treat ISP as a distribution requirement that is intended to force a variety of experiences on students, then I can say that it is appropriately distributed.

- Some disciplines feel unable to participate; other disciplines refuse to play.
- I really don't have much of the big picture.
- Prior questions, especially 7 and 8, presume a program-level knowledge about ISP that not many possess. Most opinions on such questions would be conjecture. Questions 5 and 6 presume simple answers to complex questions. I have been adequately prepared to teach some of the outcomes. I think the program creates a course creation and instructor hiring protocol that permits many who are not to try. In addition I think time has shown the outcomes list to be a bit idiosyncratic, prone to gaps, and a trifle PC. The mission is thus at times being effectively met. At many others not.
- My experience is primarily in IQL. We currently offer a good selection of topics within IQL.
- I don't know enough about the ISP program overall to answer these questions accurately.
- Professional Studies is marginally involved. We are still locked into an old way of viewing that you can only teach a Perspectives course if you have an advanced degree in that discipline.
- No technology component. (CS not allowed in)
- Raising class sizes and reducing sections is not appropriate to a sound liberal arts education. Eliminating underenrolled majors and their tenured faculty is more logical than eliminating successful and popular courses.
- I'm not informed enough about ISP offerings across the disciplines.
- The current program is not inclusive of the various disciplines on campus. Moreover, it exhibits a distinctive bias to some disciplines over others.
- There is a clear absence in participation by Professional and Graduate Studies
Often times there are a lack of options, especially relevant courses, for students taking courses. I do not know the format so cannot form an opinion.

The ISP is the framework in which students take a suite of courses that should provide the foundation for a liberal (arts) education. The move to 4-credits reduced the total number of courses students were required to take - a structured, outcomes-based program (like ISP) was designed to meet those outcomes.

Never taught ISP. Not introduced to ISPs.

Several courses could integrate computer literacy that utilize the staff and facilities of the CS department.

There is not enough upper level participation from departments. there needs to be more II courses. Adjuncts are often not allowed to develop these and depts. seem reluctant to take on the extra work.

I see a variety of different courses made available to students to which ISP principles have been applied.

The courses are being offered, but the delivery is somewhat arbitrary. In other words, the unifying element of integration is being lost somewhere along the way.

Students are not required to have opportunities to gain skills and knowledge to pursue a healthy active lifestyle.

I don't have enough of a sense of what's happening in all the courses, so I have no opinion.

One too many humanity courses.

The most of students I have asked still confused what and when they need to take the classes. Others are forced to enroll and they are highly frustrated with the content. Some of them have told me " I avoid the IH, II, IA don't know what it is"

To answer this question - would require research, data, & analysis.

where is professional studies?

I know very well how difficult it was to develop the program we have in its current form, but I still feel concerns about the way certain key shared liberal arts experiences were considered to be part of "privileged departments" during the development process. History, Foreign Languages, Literature, Biology: that's liberal arts. I am supportive of the program and try to make it work, but I just can't click agree to the above question.

There is very little follow-up quantitatively to the IQL course. Given how that is taught and by whom, it is clearly not preparing students quantitatively. The best evidence is the increasing number of departments that are advising students to take Math 141 as their QL experience.

The ISP still is a distribution list. I'd like to see more II offerings and reduce the distribution requirements. It hasn't changed that much from the old GEN ED program, really.

However, students need to be able to use non-ISP courses within the distributions so that they can meet graduate school entrance requirements...some students need to be able to use basic chem/bio/math etc. and little specialty courses don't work...baseball statistics would not cover an entrance requirement for any grad school I know.

Very limited opportunity for faculty and courses from Professional Studies to participate given the current structure.

Some disciplines, for example Computer Science, are not appropriately represented in the ISP, which is rather incongruous considering the importance of computing technology in our 21st century world. Our students, in general, are doing poorly in basic quantitative skills as we have defined them at KSC, indicating a need for greater participation from the disciplines capable of helping students learn those quantitative skills.

Should be focused on humanities, science, arts. Too much emphasis on social sciences in terms of outcomes.

That participation in physical activity enhances the participant's life is well documented, yet Keene State College has no requirement that necessarily exposes students to this concept or practice. Current research strongly supports the value of exposure to a culture of regular participation in physical activity. Research also indicates that alum of colleges that have a requirement for participation in physical activity are more regularly active than alum of colleges that have no such requirement. Given the trend toward greater levels of sedentary life together with our understanding of how a physically active life contributes to personal well-being and simultaneously reduces the costs to society associated with an inactive lifestyle, it makes sense that a program of general studies would expose students to this important concept. In the ISP program there is no requirement that exposes students to this concept.

From my perspective I find it hard to learn about what the ISP requires and how it is being assessed.

However, the number of credits is high and the ISPs are difficult to complete for those students having a double major.
Given the structural constraints -- e.g., we can't require 60 credits in the ISP!! -- I think the distribution is appropriate.

9. Do you feel invested in the ISP as a college program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly invested</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat invested</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curious to see how it will turn out</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not invested at all</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Which of the following best represents your professional opinion of the ISP? Check all that are appropriate, and please add comments to explain your choice(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISP is mostly busy-work</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP is a rich educational experience</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP is too complicated to be effectively communicated to students</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP is a great idea, but it needs structural and implementation adjustments</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again, the structure and governance interferes with the mission of ISP. It needs to be more inclusive by both discipline (Prof. Studies faculty can do this too) and and the majors. ISP skills should be delivered through major content as well.

Need more tenure track faculty teaching ISP. Perhaps there should be more requirements for faculty to teach an ISP course. Right now it seems like the majority of ISP courses are taught by adjuncts.

We need standards across the ISP so that the skills developed can be used in multiple topic areas. I teach critical thinking, but not everyone uses the same CT skills. It we all agreed on these skills it would be more meaningful and useful to students.

It is crazy the way it is designed. In time, it will hurt the college.

My initial opinion is that the ISP classes are being mostly taught with little to no containment or structure in regards to curriculum. Though outcomes may be stated on a syllabus, there needs to be an analysis of assignments which ensure such goals can/will be accomplished. I believe the problems can be adequately addressed if proper structural changes are made across the entire ISP program. It is a great idea, but its implementation needs to be addressed within each department, and for individual instructors for each course. This need not mean some form of simple repetition of course material for each instantiation of an ISP class. Thematic freedoms ought be maintained. By this I mean, though there may be 4-5 assignment types each individual class must accomplish, the area of specialization each individual instructor has can thematically organize how the course is run. However, the specific techniques being taught need to be the exact same. Whether that is argumentation, critical writing/speaking skills, quantitative/qualitative work, etc...This means more discussions need to occur at the level of course coordinator and individual instructor to insure that assignments are accomplishing their task, even if the themes that are being used to accomplish these tasks vary. This seems to be a simple efficiency issue; however, I have felt that by construing this change in this way that individual instructors (may) feel as though they are being encroached upon. That seems absurd to me. No form of individual instructor freedom is being challenged here; rather, the coordinators and the college at large ought have the right to require that each individual ISP course actually meets its stated purposes and goals. If an instructor cannot adequately show that his/her course material is accomplishing this, then clearly there is a problem. Currently, there does not seem to be a system in place to address that stated ISP goals are being met *prior* to a course syllabus being implemented. Our current system of assessment attempts to garner materials *after* courses have begun their work, and only after the fact is able
to assess whether the course (as a whole, and not individually for each section) has met its goals. This ought be addressed. As a caveat, how the coordinator position and the analysis of assignments are agreed upon ought go through a democratic vote by those who currently teach or have/will teach ISP course for a specific department. Otherwise, the process would feel really top down, and at that point, feelings of forced conformity could be problematic.

- a renaming of general education classes- with the concern of broadening and connecting areas and skills of study- its assessment of success is subject to the same problems as all liberal arts curricula
- Implementation of the program seems to be hampered by several factors including the fact that many of the courses are taught by part-time adjunct faculty.
- i have no opinion on this matter but i was forced to pick an answer
- My initial opinion is that the ISP classes are being mostly taught with little to no containment or structure in regards to curriculum. Though outcomes may be stated on a syllabus, there needs to be an analysis of assignments which ensure such goals can/will be accomplished. I believe the problems can be adequately addressed if proper structural changes are made across the entire ISP program. It is a great idea, but its implementation needs to be addressed within each department, and for individual instructors for each course. This need not mean some form of simple repetition of course material for each instantiation of an ISP class. Thematic freedoms ought be maintained. By this I mean, though there may be 4-5 assignment types each individual class must accomplish, the area of specialization each individual instructor has can thematically organize how the course is run. However, the specific techniques being taught need to be the exact same. Whether that is argumentation, critical writing/speaking skills, quantitative/qualitative work, etc...This means more discussions need to occur at the level of course coordinator and individual instructor to insure that assignments are accomplishing their task, even if the themes that are being used to accomplish these tasks vary. This seems to be a simple efficiency issue; however, I have felt that by construing this change in this way that individual instructors (may) feel as though they are being encroached upon. That seems absurd to me. No form of individual instructor freedom is being challenged here; rather, the coordinators and the college at large ought have the right to require that each individual ISP course actually meets its stated purposes and goals. If an instructor cannot adequately show that his/her course material is accomplishing this, then clearly there is a problem. Currently, there does not seem to be a system in place to address that stated ISP goals are being met *prior* to a course syllabus being implemented. Our current system of assessment attempts to garner materials *after* courses have begun their work, and only after the fact is able to assess whether the course (as a whole, and not individually for each section) has met its goals. This ought be addressed. As a caveat, how the coordinator position and the analysis of assignments are agreed upon ought go through a democratic vote by those who currently teach or have/will teach ISP course for a specific department. Otherwise, the process would feel really top down, and at that point, feelings of forced conformity could be problematic.

- Faculty participation in ISP courses is hit-or-miss. Many (tenure-track) faculty don't teach ISP courses, and some faculty (both tenure-track and adjunct) who teach in the program don't *follow* the program: they simply teach content-based courses in their discipline without an intentional emphasis on ISP outcomes. This makes a student's experience of the entire program spotty, with outcomes emphasized in some ISP classes but not in others.

- Better communication with chairs and faculty
- There is too much variation between sections of the ISP. Depending on what section a student enrolls in, they can have a very different experience. Some sections are far less rigorous than others.

- Department chairs and course coordinators play a significant role in communicating to faculty what the program is, what its benefits and limitations are, and how it will be implemented in a specific department. It's vital that they fully understand how the program works.

- ISP is a program and a concept. It mirrors today's society where many fields/industries/ideologies are becoming more integrated and diverse. ISP is a great asset to KSC and should be continually developed.

- Honestly, aside from ITW, I know very little about ISP.

- unknown

- The "busy work" is not my personal opinion, but it seems to be the opinion of many of my students in the ISP classes. Even as an experienced teacher, I'm finding this attitude frustrating and haven't found a consistent remedy ... yet.
• Being an adjunct and not knowing the details, I suspect that the balance between academic rigor and real-world application should be reevaluated to produce optimum results.

• I strongly feel that the ITW course should be offered in the sophomore year, rather than the freshman year. I think the range of skills we are expected to teach students in their first semester in the current ITW format is too difficult for the students to manage effectively. They need to have time to develop some of their own interests before being asked to invest significant time into a research project when they can't fully comprehend why this is being asked. The motivation for this investment should come from their own interests. In the first semester, their interests are so vague and unformed that most of the class time needs to be spent encouraging and cajoling the students to actually dig into something they care about.

• IQL students are largely occupied with writing long project reports, often including many graphs and statistics, typically copied from outside sources rather than generated by students, and rarely discussed in any meaningful way. Instructors seem focused on their special topics and ancillary skills such as "information literacy" or "library skills". Very little attention is given to working with numbers and graphs, interpreting them carefully in context, and criticizing such interpretations logically using the standard methods of scientific inquiry, mathematics, or statistics.

• It has been my experience that many students do not know what the ISP is for and simply see it as required courses.

• Re: Question 9--The meaning of ISP is ambiguous. It could refer to the program as potential (the form in which I worked to help design it ******, and the form in which I "sold" it ******); it could refer to the form that my major supports it (with all FTT teaching ISP sections every semester), or it could refer to the bureaucratic entity that draws down my time. I assumed the first two forms.

• 9 seems a bit strange but consistent with the programs external image. "Investment" in ISP is not something that I am sure instructors or students need, any more than they need investment in a gen ed program. It feels like being asked whether I "believe in ISP."

10 needs better answers for me to check:
- ISP is a source of busy-work and time consumption
- All classes including ISP have the potential to contribute to a rich educational experience
- ISP as currently written about and discussed is too laden with edu-speak and vague phrasing to be effectively and non-ironically communicated to students who recognize this.
- ISP could be a great idea but needs a structural and implementation overhaul

I have answered them to move on and get to the end, not because I choose any choices provided until edited as above

• I've had a great deal of experience writing and coordinating curriculum. Less is more.

• Based on what I hear from fellow-adjuncts teaching in IQL, I'm not sure that all put the same amount of effort into matching assignments with outcomes. Not all students have to meet the same expectations.

• We are greatly improving the consistency of outcomes across the various IQL courses this semester. Some changes in assessment need to be adjusted to match.

• Given the lack of preparedness of our freshmen to think, read, and write, I believe we should extend ITW: one semester 4-credit with intense instruction in thinking & writing, and one semester 2-credit for the research paper.

• Some of my students come in interested in science and don't really need the class most seem to see it as a requirement to be gotten through, but not why.

• I know this is an unpopular opinion, but the ITW paper is FAR longer than it needs to be. It is intimidating to students, and really, the point of the whole thing should be the length, not the scariness. I don't know that making them suicidal is really the kind of challenge we should be giving them. It seems arbitrary. Why do they learn more about research in 15 than 10 pages? Is there really follow up, institutionally for such a long paper? My students come back as seniors and ask why it had to be so arduous when they were freshmen, when they were never again asked to write such a long and complex paper. I would like to see a survey done of upper level instructors that asks do you really require 15-20 page papers? If not, or if only one or two departments do, why are we taking 750 freshmen and preparing them to be English majors? To torture adjuncts and make sure they have no time to do anything but grade KSC papers when we often have to work at other institutions as well? I know the founders of ITW are strongly wedded to that length for some inexplicable reason, but ***? IS it supported by future assignments they will ACTUALLY be asked to do at KSC? Hope this survey truly is anonymous, because I will otherwise probably not be rehired for expressing that opinion, but this is very frustrating to the adjuncts who teach ITW.
I have no idea

The ISP is a rich educational experience for some students and has the potential to be a rich educational experience for all students. However, the fact that so few tenure-track faculty are teaching and assessing the foundations courses (and perhaps other courses) is definitely an implementation problem. An additional implementation problem is the lack of accountability to meet the course outcomes ISP courses. For example, the IQL assessment has repeatedly shown that students are not meeting the course outcomes, yet no substantive changes have been made to address this.

Advising needs to be improved. Particularly, students need to take more seriously their ITW 101 choices.

I'm sure that there are good reasons why the administration came up with ISP, but it is a bureaucratic nightmare to figure out, and doesn't seem worth it.

I can only speak to my class.

It needs to be centrally administrated and faculty need to be held accountable for ISP outcomes. There needs to be more thought put into how courses are integrated (instead of just hoping that students manage by themselves to integrate the random courses they select).

The mission/vision is incredible, but the program is undermined by lack of passion/investment on part of the campus as a whole.

Other disciplines--the applied sciences--should be allowed to participate (CS, Health Science),

Many TTF have consistently failed to buy into the ISP program. I believe the administrative leaders of KSC from Pres. thru deans need to more effectively "sell" ISP to TTF.

I like the fact that the ISP is not discipline-specific and that it encourages particular ways of knowing. I think that there is more that we can do as faculty to help students make links between the courses and that program adjustments (such as including students' reflection across the courses in portfolios or in reflective writing opportunities) to help students make those connections.

As an adviser I feel that I'm not informed well enough of all of the course offerings in ISP. There should be one place to go for information on all ISP courses available across all disciplines.

Too many rules and exceptions to those rules. Developing an outstanding program is by no means trivial, but neither is it rocket science. What is required is honesty, openness, and tolerance.

There doesn't seem to be a lot of consistency among the courses.

Based my experience and some student feedback there is a clear disjunction between what the ISP aspires to do and what it accomplishes. When I ask students why they are in my class, the common response is that they need a certain number of IS courses to fulfill their requirements. According to some, the were 'placed' in the course by the Registrar. Many say that they were not specifically drawn to the discipline or subject matter, but that it fit their schedule and was an ISP course they needed to get out of the way. I'm not sure if they understand why they need to take ISPs; they just know that a certain number in different categories are necessary.

I think it does need work, but overall it is very useful and interesting.

Teaching in an adjunct capacity there has been no feedback on the overall program, only my department's specific course areas

The ideal is a good idea. But the real is very different than the idea and therefore it amounts to lip service & busy work.

Some pre-determined percentage of available academic time needs to be pre determined. That time should then be allocated by a committee such as yours.

ISP has turned out to be an ineffective program

More complicated than it needs to be; idea is right, balance is wrong.

ISP is a marvelous program for students. It needs to be its own dept. with its own dept. head, training, tenure track faculty, budget, and support. ITW is a great model. IQL should have the structure that ITW has - with training, workbooks, and an active Math Center for student support.

The assessment of ITW is especially problematic, since there is such a wide variation in the approach to the substantial research paper.

I wonder how many students, were they polled, would be able to tell us what ISP means to them.

My impression is that the program is not being delivered as cohesively as it might be. In other words, we have spent a great deal of time working on foundational issues around writing and yet these are principles are not being worked with as students progress through the program.

The current status of the outcomes has never been clear to me (or to students I've spoken with). I understand
that they are being revised, but I have no idea what to put on my syllabus that reflects current outcomes. Even
the handbook released last spring seems outdated, from what I can tell based on subsequent emails about
proposed outcome changes.

- I think that one of the greatest impediments to the ISP is class size. When I work with students across the
curriculum, I need to work with them individually to help them adjust to working within my disciplinary
area. I was extremely disappointed to see the class size go up to 38 per class this semester. The very classes
that require the most intensive labor from the professors have the largest number of students in them. The
fewer students in these classes, the better I can do my job well.

I also feel that some tenured and tenure-track faculty have a disparaging view of teaching in the ISP program.
Many faculty in my department don't want to teach in the ISP program because they would rather work with
majors only. I think the program would be much richer if all tenure/tenure track faculty were given some
incentives to participate in it, say, at least one course per year.

Finally, the prerequisites could be managed more rigorously. Supporting the ITW program more effectively
would mean that more sections were available of that course, and students would be sure to take ITW before
taking other ISP courses. This would give the ISP instructors more support and be better for the students. If
I have 1/3 of my students who have not taken ITW yet, that means I will spend significant amounts of class
time covering materials that are mostly covered in ITW. Not to say that I wouldn't have to review some of
this material anyway, but the preparation would sure help the students.

- More courses should count as ISP.
- I think each semester I have improved about the implementation of the program, however I live such

isolation to comment about improvement/challenges among faculty.

- It's much better than the gen ed prog that we had before.

I don't agree with any of the above statements, but was forced to choose one.

- ISP is a solid general education program, but is too involved in its own catchy lingo for its own good -
parents & students understand and support the idea of 'general education', they don't understand 'integrative
studies.' IS, IN, II, IA, IH - this stuff has got to go! Let's face it, we reinvented the wheel & called it
something else to make ourselves feel smart. Let's get back to basics, stop fooling ourselves, and confusing
everyone else.

- The Perspectives aspect fell apart 3 years ago...few attend the meetings, and outcomes were never
achieved...what is listed as outcomes is actually a list of objectives, as *** agreed in the Senate meeting long
ago. Where is the Perspectives component going?

- I am deeply invested in the program but remain unconvinced by the effectiveness (and collegiate-level
appropriateness) of the skills outcomes, especially.

- There are problems with the program--perceived problems and real problems. For me, if anything, the
primary problem is that faculty do not see teaching in the ISP as a primary professional activity. The other
problem I would mention is the failure of a larger percentage of the faculty to offer (and enjoy offering) the
first-year courses.

- ISP is a big mistake. It's too cumbersome, too bureaucratic, and has far too many requirements. It's ill
conceived period.

- I feel I lack a full understanding of program operations and how students navigate through the program

- The current structure closely resembles that of our old General Education program (i.e. select courses from
this list). The one piece that differs would be the program outcomes and skill outcomes, which I believe is a
plus. However, the current structure is the same.

- The program lacks focus and cannot be assessed as a program.

- I believe that the ISP program is founded on wonderful intentions and resulted from good work by the faculty
involved. Whenever there is a major shift, such as this one, in a college's requirements, there are bound to be
growing pains. I applaud all of the efforts that have been put into this effort and find that students generally
have a favorable impression of the courses in the ISP which they take. Still there are problems with students
not being able to get the courses that they need. As an example, students are not able to take 300 level
courses before they complete 8 courses at the 100-200 level. Yet, when they have completed the required
number of courses at the 100-200 level, they often find that there are not sufficient courses available at the
300-400 level in the particular disciplines of the ISP program where they still need to fulfill requirements. This is a major problem. Perhaps the courses are available, but in conflict with single-offering major courses. In such cases, students have little recourse than to spend more time at KSC or to supplement their studies with summer studies—the fairness of this is questionable since most of our students have to put in significant hours at work that will help to pay for their education. In many cases it becomes the luck of the draw at registration and, as a result, some students must take summer courses at home or extend their time to graduation at KSC. I do not think this is an advising problem—I think it is a problem of not having sufficient courses in ISP available for students to take.

- Assessment of ISP courses is burdensome and too limited to assess impact of courses.
- The emphasis on assessment of student learning outcomes is a little overbearing at times. Assessment is important, but it shouldn't get more attention than training faculty to teach ISP courses effectively.
- There does not seem to be a simple explanation of expectations, especially in submitting work for assessment
- ISP is not too complicated but could be better explained to students—they need to come to understand the world from multiple perspectives; every course does not need to be integrative
- Much too pretentious in its wording! I was told to “dumb down” my classes, and then a committee tells us to use big, overblown words to describe everything. Is that to make the “dumbed down” classes sound like they are more intellectual?
- If it could work the way it is intended, I think the ISP is a GREAT program—there was clearly an enormous amount of thought put into it. However, there are many, many problems in PRACTICE (as opposed to in theory). Two quick examples: (1) because we have not committed adequate resources (and never will, as far as I can see, especially given budget problems), in 300-level ISP courses, majors are taught alongside students who have never taken a course in the discipline. This is simply not workable and creates frustration for BOTH groups. (2) Students are still confused about ISP prefixes. A very, very simple fix would be to put the ISP prefixes at the END instead of the beginning, e.g. IS-SOC-260 would become SOC-IS-260. Students would know the course is still part of a major, as well as still being able to find ISP courses in various disciplines they might be interested in. (3) Too few faculty have the “burden” of teaching too many ISP courses. I enjoy teaching ISP courses, but I sometimes teach 3 in one semester, which means I have to make sure I am meeting all the various requirements of the ISP objectives as well as my course objectives as well as going to various meetings. I am overwhelmed!!
- Students are not demonstrating important skills, such as effective written communication, any better than they were before ISP.

11. Which of the following best represents your professional opinion of the General Education (GE) program(s) that you have seen at other institution(s)? Check all that are appropriate, and please add comments to explain your choice(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GE program is mostly busy-work</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE program is a rich educational experience</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE program is too complicated to be effectively communicated to students</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE program is a great idea, but it needs structural and implementation adjustments</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Have not viewed any recently
- Most GE programs that I know of at other institutions can be accomplished freshman year.
- N/A
- We are not talking about a rational General Education Program. That is not what KSC has.
- ISP has created a division between courses FOR majors and courses for NON majors. Before we often had both groups in the same classes and I think that was an enriching experience.
- GE programs are needed and reveal the commitment to the school's overall mission.
- Again, as an adjunct other than searching catalog and online KSC, on my own, I do not have the big picture anymore.
- The above opinion reflects my experience with previous GE programs at KSC.
- I have no opinion on this matter but I was forced to pick an answer.
- I'm sure every GE program needs work.
- ??I'm not sure what GE is. Are you talking about required courses for majors of a certain type?? I just checked the first box to complete the survey.
- GE works most effectively when students understand the rationale for taking a specific course and the connections between course offerings are explained/demonstrated. So, intensive advising is needed. Otherwise, it's the 'menu' approach...
- And, hopefully, this is exactly what the committee is doing with the ISP curriculum.
- Being an adjunct and not knowing the details, I suspect that the balance between academic rigor and real-world application should be reevaluated to produce optimum results.
- The general education ISP here lacks the coherence of other general education programs. (This question assumes the respondent has some basis for comparison.)
- I think it CAN be a rich educational experience, but the courses need to be timed to be in sync with students' developmental capabilities.
- No experience so can't respond.
- The closer a GE program gets to the "menu" model, the less effective it is--and that's where many of the programs I've seen have been stuck at.
- For the same questions
  - Rarely
  - Sometimes (as above)
For the question below, by the way, I do not think complexity is the essential issue, though I do think the language and communication around the program is a discouragement to comment or participation.

Again, answered to move on

- Outcomes are rarely well thought out and well communicated to the stake holders.
- My son has attended two other colleges, and I see the same problems there. Pretty much, there are some instructors who are just there to get a paycheck.
- In my own college experience GE was an interesting exposure to disciplines outside my major and minor, however it needed to be adjusted to achieve more breadth.
- They are all different, some better than others.
- I have only participated on other GE curriculum as a student at one institution, and none of these choices reflects my experience.
- no comment
- I have no idea
- I think almost every institution struggles with development and implementation of GE. This belief stems from anecdotal evidence from colleagues at other institutions and the fact that GE continues to be a popular topic at higher education conferences. Very few institutions seem to have implemented a truly successful GE program.
- Actually, I'm not too familiar with GE programs at other institutions, so please ignore this answer.
- The mission of ISP far outweighs that of traditional GE programs
- Just because specialists/scholars cannot buy into course work outside their areas of specialization/departments does not mean the Gen Ed/ISP is not important. For most of us general education was how we began to "find our way" in the academic world.
- I have limited experience with GE programs at other schools, but feel that the ISP attempts to do better and I believe, in its ideal form, it is better.
- Some of the structural biases that exist in the current ISP also seem to appear in some GE programs.
- I think all of these responses are "loaded" with the adjectives chosen to describe the program. I would say that I GE program ensure that graduates have the fundamental knowledge and skills expected regardless of their major.
- My view is student usually retain little from courses they took mainly to meet a requirement
- Having taught at other institutions with traditional GE programs, I found them to be generally successful. Clearly, all had some room for improvement. The value of these programs from my perspective is that they did not place undue burden on departments by having them teach additional courses that did/could not count toward their Majors/Minors. The ISP program sometimes results in departments teaching courses geared toward ISP students, but that are not intended for Majors/Minors due to lack of specific content thought necessary for adequate preparation to pursue higher level courses within the discipline.
- It can be a rich educational experience
- Not familiar with other institutions or the GE program. Only chose the answer because the survey said I had to.
- Many institutions fall into the trap of just going through the motions, with no outcomes evaluation.
- The other programs I have seen were not outcomes based and consisted of a set of courses with no particular relationship to other courses - in effect, a curriculum, not a program.
- None of these choices but I must pick one or my survey is halted...I have not seen Other GE programs
- I recognize and greatly appreciate all the hard work that the ISP founders have done. That said, I see other colleges doing similar things but with less fuss and apparent administrative oversight. Of course, I am looking at other campuses from an outsider's perspective and may not have all the information I need to
make a valid comparison. I also realize some of the "fuss" is required by accreditation standards and requirements, etc.

- It should be, it isn't always.
- Interdisciplinary training and perspectives are what is needed in today's complex, multifaceted world. ISP brings that to the students - introduces them to new ideas and disciplines they might not have considered. it gives them diverse skills and independence and creativity in thought.
- I really don't have an opinion on this, which is why I checked off the response that I did.
- I would reword that to say, GE program COULD be a rich educational program.
- I have worked at other institutions and taught in the general education program at those places. I have always seen it as part of my mission as a public-institution professor to make my disciplinary knowledge available to non-majors and hence to the general population. In my experience, general education has often been under-supported by the institutions I have taught at. The class sizes have been huge, and the prerequisites have been poorly managed. I am remembering one situation in which I was teaching the complex theories of my discipline to a class of people who were not prepared for it. This was a challenging task, but the experience of managing this situation made me a better teacher.
- Don't see the point of this. I mean, if we want to improve educational skills, for sure it will be "busy-work", I think, I do not agree with your naming of "busy work" - Also, let's integrate that academy as institution needs innovations in order to keep going and competitive we are part of a marketing, sadly or not.
- GE programs - the simpler, the better. We're trying to make the experience more than it needs to be. It doesn't need to be this difficult. Bring back discipline prefixes & stop the discipline bias in ISP committees.
- Too complicated for the little achieved in terms of assessment. We submit documents and never hear of any results about individual courses. This disconnect between submission of documents and feedback about individual courses is very disatisfying...too much work for few results...many people I have talked to would like to give up on it. ITW, in my opinion, needs restructuring to avoid a long research paper...our students don't need the depth and longevity of that paper. They need stronger critical thinking and writing skills, not the skill of proving a complicated thesis...that skill, the skill of development, can't happen for all at the intro level; it's something a writer learns over the four years...I would teach in ITW, but not until that long research paper is no longer the only option for the course.
- There's probably no perfect formula for the breadth that one hopes will be part of the undergraduate experience for all students.
- KSC should follow the model of genuine liberal arts colleges. Amherst has no gen ed. Either does Hamilton. Institutions such as Middlebury, Williams and Bowdoin have very reasonable gen ed (distribution) requirements. The students from those colleges are very well rounded and liberally educated and successful. If a streamlined program is good enough for them, it should be good enough for KSC, if KSC takes a liberal arts education seriously.
- I haven't had much exposure to other programs to provide an insightful comment.
- A little of this and a little of that don't add up to an education.
- It's been a long time--I'm not sure this is a fair question for most faculty.
- Too varied to choose one answer.
- I cannot compare with other institutions -- poorly worded question -- seems too similar to previous question
- GE at most institutions is simply a menu of courses. We are trying very hard for our ISP NOT to be that. I think we are partially succeeding -- I see this first-hand when students comment on how one of their other courses did something similar to their course with me. But we a have a long way to go.

12. The ISP in its current format is (check response(s) that you agree with):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensible with negligible explanation</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensible but only after appropriate clarifications are provided</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too unnecessarily complex to be explained to students</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. I have read the ISP Manual and am familiar with its contents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ISP in its current format is (check response(s) that you agree with):

- Comprehensible with negligible explanation
- 71.1%
- 28.9%
14. I use the ISP Manual in the following way(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be familiar with the ISP</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To use as a frame of reference when advising students</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not use it at all</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. The ISP Manual appropriately clarifies the program for the college community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. I fully understand the purpose of the ISP Executive Board, and believe its role is appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. In my experience, the ISP encourages faculty development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. In my experience, the ISP courses lead to enhanced student learning and understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefly describe your experience:</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It's very rare for students to speak highly of ISP. Occasionally they will praise a single course or two but the program itself seems extraneous to their goals.

Not sure. Since our involvement is not actually teaching a whole class, but just teaching portions of it.

They are supposed to but are they?

does just the opposite.

Standardized outcomes are no good without standardized methods of achieving those outcomes.

Not sure--very little investment from the tenure track faculty.

It can; but most likely won't.

In my courses and through my evaluations scores and comments, I have found that ISP courses have enriched the lives of my students and have made me attend to course material in a critical and developmental fashion. I love teaching ISP courses. I just would like to know that others who teach these courses are actually attempting to accomplish the stated goals of our ISP courses and I would like to have a system in place which assures this.

Any good courses would do that.

The one thing that does work is that students do get the idea that there is a common language between different courses. I would push the intersciplinarity of the whole shebang.

hard to determine, as I rarely teach upper level classes where the skills and knowledge should appear, older students I do teach range in their display of "learning and understanding"

It's possible. Not entirely sure. ITW seemed at one point to prepare students better for writing and citing in papers. Now I see a slide in my course. Not sure if it the 'underprep' of newer incoming KSC students or connected to ITW and ISP

At least the potential for enhanced learning and understanding is there.

In my courses and through my evaluations scores and comments, I have found that ISP courses have enriched the lives of my students and have made me attend to course material in a critical and developmental fashion. I love teaching ISP courses. I just would like to know that others who teach these courses are actually attempting to accomplish the stated goals of our ISP courses and I would like to have a system in place which assures this.

If taught as they "should" be, ISP courses enhance student learning by emphasizing intellectual skill development & by encouraging students to draw connections among the disciplines. But cases where faculty teach their individual ISP courses in isolation, those outcomes and connections can get lost.
I do assessments at midterm and final that seem to work well with what students are learning. I believe some of the ISP courses lead to enhanced student learning and understanding. Students often refer to their ITW experiences, linking their learning there to what they are learning in my class. My experience teaching in ISP has been hugely rewarding—it builds a richer more inclusive culture amongst the students. And it's a joy to teach non-majors from a stimulating variety of disciplines. ITW meetings are places where instructors share practices and questions—excellent components of PD. Purely anecdotal from student and faculty perspective: I find it basically a game of dice, with results fluctuating wildly from semester to semester. Sometimes it's simply the chemistry of the class, as with any groupings, but other times it seems more arbitrary. Many students (and at least one documented parent) have been pleased by understanding, discovering and developing their individual personalities, interests and strengths, and applying them to creating personal value for themselves and the economy in general. Course: Personal Economics (ISECON 199, and previously 399).

Major premise: People need to take a more pro-active position in being economically productive in their area of interest to achieve their life's vision. I agree, but again, I think the ITW class would be much more effective if offered in the sophomore year. At best, students in most IQL courses learn very little of a quantitative nature. In some cases they are being misled as to the nature of quantitative inquiry and reasoning. Re: Question 18: The meaning of "the ISP courses" is unclear. I can deem courses that participate in ISP to be positive contributors to student learning even if they do not perform some task that is specific to the "ISP." when they're taught by faculty who have bought into the program, yes....when taught by faculty who use the old Intro to Discipline X attitude, no. For questions 13 - 15 the manual is a good idea but should be rewritten from the perspective of a non-insider trying to help well-meaning instructors effectively understand their piece of the student's requirement to complete ISP. Without the feeling that true participation requires "investment(belief)." We do not want the ISP to seem cultish.

For 16 the executive board conveys the feeling of being a club, repellent to outsiders or skeptics. For 17 finish the sentence: ... of faculty invested in ISP. For others it is a drain of scarce professional development resources. For 18 as before the statements provided are too blanket and encompassing. As with gen ed. sometimes yes sometimes no. The trick is when and how.

Answered as before to get off this page of SMonkey: Could be better! I think it has exposed some students to science who would not have been otherwise; not sure if it has enhanced their learning or understanding in any way. It just needs CONCISE clarification. We get these long, involved explanations in a manual that, frankly, no
one has time to read. We are busy actually trying to teach. Give us some bullets points. It's a great idea, but why do we have to fall for all this political BS surrounding assessment, which is just an attempt to quantify and quantitatively experience.

- It could if the students were help more accountable.
- It depends on the professor.
- I agree that ISP courses lead to enhanced student learning and understanding for some students, but the results are too variable. As the assessment has shown, these results are not consistent across the program.
- ItW 101 certainly benefits the top third of students, but may be too demanding for the rest.
- I added the ISP section to the class I already taught, but I did not change the course in any way, except to change my assignments so that one of them could be submitted to the program for review.
- Again, I think we expect our students to make connections. We do not provide anything that will help them to make connections (cluster courses, linked courses, etc.).
- I have seen skills transfer over, and I have heard many students reference their other ISP courses and make connections with my course material.
- Over the course of one semester, I definitely see learning and growth in my students. As an adjunct, however, I do not have the opportunity to teach them as they move on in the program. I wish this could be a routine part of the program, rather than a special case of having an upper level course approved, etc.
- It always depends on the motivation of the instructor...
- I think it would depend on the course, but I also think that course that are not ISP also can lead to enhanced student learning and understanding.
- I have no evidence that ISP accomplishes this. In my courses I'm seeing more or less the same level of learning and understanding as I did under the previous GE program.
- Not explained to them and they do not make the connections we are hoping they will. Also no comment box for this but I have never seen an ISP manual.
- ISP courses are necessary to give students a broader base for their education and knowledge.
- Starting to see it now after all these years.
- I served on the ISPC for six years (as ******) and worked with faculty from all Schools in designing and then implementing the Program. I also teach a lower-level IN course.
- Dilutes rather than strengthens.
- Question Number 13 is double-barreled.
- Mostly positive experiences.
- The courses teach students how to think, write, communicate and be leaders in their approach to academics. I have seen a vast improvement in student's ability to think independently and express themselves effectively as a result off the ISP program. Speak and presentation skills should be a part of required ISP too.
- Many students have expressed a sense of accomplishment at completing their 20 page paper in ITW. They reference it years later as a context for research papers that they do in other courses.
- As I understand the concepts, if implemented appropriately within each course, the outcomes are positive.
- I'm just not sure about this--how can I judge this?
- I have had excellent experience with teaching in the ISP program here at KSC. My evals have been good and I feel that the students in my ISP sections have received a good quality introduction to my discipline in the course. Sometimes I feel that prepping each class is like putting together an NPR radio program on my topic, and maybe this is why I love teaching these classes so much. It's wonderful to have the chance to assemble such creative materials, and to work with students across the campus to get them as excited as I feel about what I research and teach about.
- I believe that depends upon the individual student, and the course / professor.
- I see no difference between the current program and our old general education program. The current program over focuses on skills the the expense of discipline specific content.
- I teach interdisciplinary content before ISP in KSC.

To me it was necessary the inclusion of interdisciplinary perspectives in that way I agree that KSC entered in a commitment to enhance student learning.
- I don't know much about what is happening in other people's courses.
- I agree, but don't think it has enhanced learning much beyond our old general education program. The program has re-energized the curriculum with new courses - this has been a plus to the college! Class sizes
are far too big for 'enhanced' learning to take place.

- Well, it can, and I believe that it could work...but it is entirely too cumbersome and the assessment piece is on the bottom rung of efficiency and information for faculty. We spend a lot of money and time on this program with not many results. I think the whole ISP needs serious consideration, especially in this era of dwindling funds...
- I used to teach Econ 360 to econ students alone. It involves reading Adam Smith, Karl Marx and John Maynard Keynes. The econ students did too little of the reading, and I came to accept that. Now that students from other disciplines are enrolled in it as an ISECON, both econ majors and students from other disciplines do most of the reading. The peer pressure of students from more literary majors was the effective change.
- As in any formulation of required courses I have found that most students are able to engage, learn, and reach in these courses. I still see the achievement as happening in different courses and not so much as a program, though.
- I've seen no difference among my students since the program began. In fact, the quality of student work has declined.
- The potential for enhanced student learning is huge but is not always realized based on faculty attitudes and pedagogy.
- I hate to say this but my students are much worse at writing and math than they were 10 years ago...even after completing IQL and ITW courses.
- I don't think we are there yet. I don't believe there is cohesiveness in the program where students make the connections - particularly with the skill based outcomes.
- Students are merely checking off boxes. The lack of focus and direction renders this program useless in their perception of it, even though some or even many of the courses are individually valuable.
- ISP courses CAN lead to enhanced student learning and understanding, but results vary widely, depending on the effort students are willing to invest in the courses.
- As Steve Jobs said in his speech at Stanford, we cannot connect the dots until later. Thus he used his knowledge of calligraphy to design the font for Apple computers. Rest in peace.
- I have never given out so many low grades until we started this spoon-feeding program. The students don't care about the materials, and the grades reflect it.
- Overall, I have enjoyed teaching ISP courses -- but see my previous comments, please.

19. What role does your department play in the ISP? Is this adequate and appropriate? What additional role could your department play in enhancing the ISP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We can only teach II course due to structural restriction of the ISP. The current structure is a waste of full-time faculty who could capably deliver ISP outcomes through courses in this discipline.</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This department could deliver ISP seats through several existing courses if they were modified to make ISP skills/outcomes more overt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians are embedded in ITW and IQL. Every section of ITW and IQL are assigned a librarian to work with that section/class. We would like more involvement in upper-level ISP courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty members in my department play a limited role in the ISP. The majority of ISP courses taught in my department are taught by adjunct faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A number of our faculty offer interesting and varied courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department is very actively engaged in the ISP program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few faculty members teach in the ISP. More faculty buy in is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking each department to enhance ISP is the root of the problem. ISP needs to be administered top down with clear outcomes AND agreed upon tools and methods for meeting those outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advising students and meeting prereqqs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little role in the ISP...given our major requirements very little opportunity to participate by program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
faculty. Make more courses in ISP connect to the major---no reason to not have a dual purpose with a course.

- Our dept. is a very involved in the isp program.
- Minimal, no
- We offer lower level courses as well as 300 level. This Spring we will offer 10 courses.
- My department does not have a lot of time to participate in the ISP. Those who do are successful and seem to enjoy the experience.
- We teach a fairly large number of sections of IA courses which generally fill up. Both on the lower levels and the upper levels. It seems that lately the upper levels have gotten more popular. Without ISP, we would not have the adjuncts we currently have. The thing I dislike the most is that we are virtually subsidizing the ISP by having adjunct faculty (primarily) to teach them. And yet the numbers don't necessarily count toward the numbers of our program, they count for ISP. This has come up in department assessment as well. Do we assess the ISP courses?
- general humanities requirements- offering classes that could be also listed as upper level ISP classes- cross-listed
- IIGWS is inviting of adjunct faculty to participate, but it's on volunteer basis.
- Our department has created a cohort that meets on occasion to discuss issues of concern to the faculty (primarily adjunct) teaching in the ISP program. More meetings would be beneficial, however, many of the adjuncts are part-time and it has proven difficult to schedule more meetings.
- The role of Modern Languages in the ISP is limited, in that language is one of many disciplines from which students select two IH courses. Modern languages should play a much stronger role in a program which emphasizes global education.
- We offer ISP classes.
- My department offers faculty development for the ITW 101 faculty cohort. The various ISP prefixes within my department can be confusing. Although I teach in the English department, I teach ITW, II, and IH courses. Sometimes it feels like each of these prefixes/cohorts is (or should be) a separate department. If I have a problem in a given class, whose jurisdiction does it fall under?
- My department really needs to address the goals to faculty
- I work in Modern Languages and, as far as I know, implementation has been delayed.
- As an adjunct that teaches the Freshman IQL I don't really have an answer to this.
- Not much. Departmental goals could be made clearer
- Our department has a large number of IH sections which are appropriate. Clearer communication regarding ISP to individual instructors by the course coordinator is vital.
- Our department Film Studies is quite involved in developing the ISP--I think we can continue to create additional dynamic classes for ISP
- As a part time adjunct, I don't know what role they play, though I assume it is substantial.
- A very strong role since we have many students who register for the ISP classes.
- There have been a couple of adjunct faculty meetings that helped me to better understand the process.
- Some essential course contributions that may become more important as major requirements are adjusted.
- We are strongly invested in ISP since it replaced a good number of our majors courses.
- n/a
- The ML requirement is essential to a complete and valuable liberal arts experience. The institution needs to raise the bar for the current language requirement-- it is much too easy!
- I am an adjunct and don't know enough about the issue to submit any useful information at this time.
- Departments should have sole authority over course offerings and requirements for ISP.
- The mathematics department appears to currently have little direct involvement with IQL. They provide support to the very few faculty who seek it out. It would seem natural for the math department to play a larger role in clarifying the nature of descriptive statics and mathematical reasoning within the IQL program, strengthening the IQL faculty’s understanding of the quantitative material they are expected to teach, and sharing with them strategies math faculty have found successful in teaching this material
- English department implements the ITW courses. As I am an Adjunct teaching just one course at this point, I am not sure what additional role the English Department could or does play.
- fully supports ISP and interacts with ISP faculty transferring classroom practices
- sustainability
• Very little.
• More than adequate. Several perspectives courses with multiple sections are taught at both the 100 and 300 level.
• I don't know
• Giving clearer expectations and specific curriculum implementations
• Providing Natural Science Gen. Ed's. It is adequate and appropriate.
• My department contributes regularly at lower and upper levels to the ISP. Adequate and appropriate. Could be clearer and more positive about why we teach in this program and its relationship to our major
• 19: I am in Political Science. We are committed to ISP; and we ensure that our FTTT faculty teach as many “lower-level” courses as our adjunct faculty.

• Our 5 most-heavily enrolled 200-level courses meet both disciplinary objectives and ISP objectives.

• We use ISP courses to introduce students to our major.

• Using course listings from 10-17-2010, I find that in Fall 2010 we had 248 students in ISPOSC courses (of which 144 were taught by our 3 FTTT faculty), while we had 119 students in POSC courses (of which 56 were taught by our FTTT faculty). Fall Semester, 2 of our FTTTs had 1 course release apiece

• Using the same source, I find that in Spring 2011 we had 266 students in ISPOSC courses (of which 89 were taught by only 2 FTTT faculty), while we had 51 students in POSC courses (of which 30 were taught by our FTTT faculty). Spring Semester, 1 of our FTTTs had 1 course release; and 1 other FTTT was on sabbatical.
• A role explained by one of my colleagues.
• I am housed in CELT and we play some peripheral support and training roles in the ISP. I think this could be enhanced, and that if/when the ISP has clearer stated outcomes around the areas of development we provide (i.e. AT, EE, and ID) we will be able to assist even better.
• I really can't see what role it plays.
• I feel that our department liaison works hard to make sure we're meeting the expectations. We have frequent meetings to discuss what we need to do differently.
• My department offers some courses in ISP but we are too understaffed in the discipline to do more.
• My department teaches several ISP courses but there isn't strong support within the department. Meetings to address how each department member is implementing the ISP goals in their classes.
• I don't know. Adjuncts are really not involved.
• I guess it has a fine role.
• Physics offers several ISP classes, which I think is appropriate - I'm [unable to] speak to adequacy or additional roles.
• No idea
• There are many ISP courses in my department.
• Very little. If there were more tenure track faculty, more encouragement, and less red tape was involved, more Education faculty would teach in the ISP.
• Further planning in offering an integrated curriculum
• In the Mathematics Department, one tenure-track and several adjunct faculty members teach IQL101. Several tenure-track faculty members teach IIMATH310 and IIMATH315. The Mathematics Department, especially the tenure-track faculty, would like to play a larger role in teaching and coordinating IQL. While quantitative literacy is not the same as mathematics, we do feel as if we should be the quantitative stewards on campus. However, scheduling limitations have not allowed us to play as large a role as we should. The addition of a tenure-track faculty line with an emphasis on statistics would help this.
• Modern Languages offers ISP classes. Sometimes there are conflicts between Modern Language program needs and ISP needs.
• I never got any information from my department about ISP, despite the fact that I was hired to teach an ISP class.
• We provide a number of 100- and 200-level II courses every semester and an occasional 300-level II course.
• It would serve the program well if those who deliver nearly 70% of the ISP courses--adjunct faculty--were
valued and advocated for by their department chairs. I have not experienced this in WGS, but I have in ITW and CJ. I am minimally involved with the Philosophy department, thus cannot comment re: their role

- I have no idea. I am assigned this, I work hard to apply it.
- We (CS) do not yet have a role other than the ability to provide IQL courses. We could provide both IS and IN courses.
- I think the English department plays an appropriately vital role in the program.
- We need a communication center at KSC and the Comm department should lead the way on this.
- My department provides a number of IS courses, along with some IQL and II courses. Most of these are taught by adjunct faculty members.
- We contribute to 200 and 300 level ISP courses and teach ITW each year as well.
- My department plays an unusually large role in the ISP program when compared to the size of our program. We are quite proud of our contributions to it.
- My department provides faculty member(s) who have assisted in teaching and/or coordinating quantitative literacy courses. Due to structural limitations of the ISP, my department has been denied the opportunity to offer courses in the program, despite our willingness to do so.
- We offer ISP courses that count toward out major/minor and this aspect always poses a constraint on the the issue of content vs. ISP skills to emphasize. If we had more faculty we could have played an enhanced role in a better way.
- minimal
- We already offer many sections of ISP courses at multiple levels. Based on staffing needs for our Majors/Minors, we cannot afford to devote more to the ISP program.
- We offer more IH then anything else; we could expand but only with additional lines.
- Minimal...difficult for Education Dept. to play a significant role.
- Provides one lower level course. Could address upper level course options in ISP.
- As an adjunct I do not know as I am working my day job when they meet. I do know we are given the information we need to participate in the gathering of evidence (work) and choosing an ISP outcome for our classes.
- All non major classes are ISP.
- My department (Geology) plays a significant role in providing both lower and upper-level experiences for the Program. Although the majority of these courses are taught by our adjunct faculty, we do not believe that the students are being shortchanged. All faculty in the department teach in the ISP on a regular basis.
- I teach both a management course and an IQL. I see no presence of the Management Department. The IQL adjunct faculty meet to improve outcomes.
- Our Dept struggles to meet our own students needs...ISP means searching for more adjuncts.
- Not very much. We could do more by teaching ISP courses. I would like to teach an ISP course but our faculty are needed to teach a host of required (non ISP) courses for the major and have little time/resources to develop ISP courses or even electives.
- We serve the campus community with various courses at all levels. These courses fill and we could offer more sections, but reductions have been made to adjunct and FT faculty workloads recently that doesn't allow this.
- Very little that I'm aware of.
- American Studies and English play a large role.
- My Dept. could be a Dept. I teach all ISP - with no dpet.
- Little. We have a hard time staffing all of the courses needed to meet the demands of our majors; allowing faculty to participate in ITW or II courses is a challenge.
- Significant participation at the dept. level and at ISP sponsored meetings.
- I am not actively teaching in an ISP course.
- Currently we teach one course within ISP and no representative yet on the board/committee or task force. We could get more involved in those capacities.
- We teach 100/200 level coursers in ISP.

Occasionally a 300 level ISP.
More than adequate— we will be cutting ISP courses to service our majors.

- Not applicable.
- My department offers many sections of lower-level ISP courses every semester. I don’t think we could do more without seriously straining resources needed for the major.
- My department provides courses for the ISP but does so by throwing adjunct professors at the program. I wish that my colleagues thought of the ISP in the same positive terms that I do. I sense a sort of “elite attitude” among the professors in my program. Those with seniority select the upper division majors only sections, and see this as the best use of their “expertise.” It’s too bad because teaching non-majors often lends a useful perspective to teaching the majors. I think that if all tenured and tenure-track faculty were given some incentives to develop ISP courses in their disciplines, this would invigorate teaching styles and give more of a fresh perspective to some folks who would greatly benefit from explaining what they do to those coming from another point of view entirely.
- My department offers IQL alternatives and upper level II courses and our adjuncts offer IQL courses.
- We offer two upper level II courses.
- We offer some courses mostly taught by adjuncts. Our program can hardly offer the courses for the major so at this time a small roll in ISP is appropriate.

I don’t want the department playing a larger role since the premise behind ISP is flawed.

- Our department teaches several IN courses, and we work together to align our ISP assignments and outcomes.
- We expect to increase our student participation in artifact submission this year.
- Librarians teach information literacy.
- I teach an II 300 level course.
- We should dedicate time to really discuss. The agendas are full of many items and non all the time we arrive to a conversation about it.
- Yes.
- We converted all of our formerly gen ed courses into ISPs, created a number of new courses, and continue to offer a dozen separate ISP courses per term. Now we can’t staff the courses because of the cuts to adjunct contracts.
- Minimal—two upper level II classes.

No opportunity for lower level classes.

- Many of us teach in the program. One colleague has served on interdisciplinary committee.
- My department offers courses in four areas and at both the introductory and advanced levels. If anything we could encourage and reward full-time faculty for developing new ITW sections.
- We are committed to ISP. We ask the ISP

committed to us: our samples are in FR, GER, SP, and

that only we have the expertise to evaluate them.

- My department plays a minor role in ISP. I think we could play an important role but it would require a more open process and additional faculty resources.
- We offer several 100 level and occasional 300 level II courses. It is difficult to see an expanded role beyond this limited offering because of limited full time and adjunct faculty.
- The department offers several ISP classes. They take away from our major and departmental offerings.
- Faculty offer 1/3 to 2/3 of their loads in the ISP.
- Minimal— we are not included in the Perspectives area so are only involved in II and a few ITW.
- We offer courses at both levels.
- It plays an active role in offering a full range of ISP courses. If anything, its role could be curtailed given the limited role that other departments play.
- Our department played a very strong role initially in helping develop the quantitative literacy outcomes and courses. Due to “resource issues,” a small number of ISP courses are taught by full-time faculty in the department, unless one counts IQL alternatives.
We contribute two II courses. No, this is not adequate and appropriate considering that we could offer courses that fall under the traditional perspectives categories (natural sciences and social sciences).

Currently offer II class. Not enough faculty resources to participate more.

We offer many courses.

several of our departmental faculty have offered courses within the ISP.

In PE we currently have two courses in the ISP: one offered by a PE faculty and one offered by a Music faculty member. There certainly are many potential possibilities for course offerings by PE faculty, but I believe that the major must have priority relative to making sure that major course offerings are met by faculty in the program. It is a delicate trade-off. If faculty within a major teach in the ISP program, who will pick up the coursework that was previously part of their load in the major? This seems to be less of a problem in disciplines which traditionally offered General Studies courses as part of their faculty load, but is not as feasible for faculty who already have a full load within the major to try to also teach in the ISP program. I believe that our department could play a greater role in the ISP program, but there would need to be arrangements for coverage of required courses within the major--who would do this? It is a more delicate balance than in disciplines that have been major supporters of the former General Education program.

this is my 1st semester at keene, so can't say

Teaching basic scientific concepts to non-science majors, an adequate and appropriate role.

Our dept teaches an introductory IN course. But I really don't know how the outcomes of ISP are being used. I spend too much time trying to figure out what is expected.

The involvement has been variable. Many departmental needs and hard to pull away from those courses.

We teach a number of ISP courses. I believe my department's role is adequate.

My department used to play a major role in the former General Education program. We now mostly struggle to find minimally qualified part-time adjuncts to teach marginally relevant ISP courses.

Limited role, as my department is in the School of Professional and Graduate Studies

Way too much! It was a lot more fun when we had classes that had majors in them, too. They helped to bring up the interest of the non majors. Now teaching classes with students who don't care about the material is horrible!

Honestly, I think many faculty on this campus would say to this question, "Are you kidding? It's our department's job to enhance the ISP?" We need more faculty buy-in and that will ONLY come through more FINANCIAL RESOURCES. Tenure-track/tenured faculty were supposed to teach more ISP courses. In reality, adjuncts do. Given their crappy pay and no benefits, how can they do what we want them to do?

It offers IQL, ITW and perspectives courses.

20. In your opinion, how does the ISP compare to other General Education programs you have experienced at KSC or other colleges?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It looks like most other &quot;menu&quot; Gen Ed programs though less clear. Way too complicated and restrictive.</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least in the ITW much better than ENG.101. Other that that I have no other experience at other colleges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the ISP is a good idea and provides more flexibility then a GE program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really do not see that much difference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP at KSC requires way too much. It is not an appropriate GE program when compared to other Liberal Arts Colleges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same song ... different verse ... but with a lot more paperwork.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't think most courses are interdisiplinary or integrated....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It doesn't</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Vast improvement over the "menu" version of GE
• It's better because it is thoughtfully planned as a comprehensive program.
• More innovative.
• In some ways, it is better in the fact that students are learning to cross disciplines. In others it is worse because it is so complicated and cumbersome to navigate.
• similar
• I think that KSC has made a strong effort at ISP, general education and provided initial faculty development
• The ISP fares fairly well in comparison to other GE programs that I have experienced at other colleges.
• I believe that ISP goes beyond other GE programs at KSC in attempting to enhance perspectives interdisciplinary understanding.
• complicated.
• I don't know enough to compare.
• It works well...the interdisciplinary focus (which should be the focus of courses anyway) help explain the significance...the "why we are taking this" part of the course
• The ISP at KSC college is more extensive and more complicated (unnecessarily) than other GE programs I have seen.
• I have no opinion on this.
• As an adjunct that teaches the Freshman IQL I don't really have an answer to this.
• The secondary objectives, like ethics and diversity, are very different. But the material seems a little too narrow in some cases. For instance, I'm not sure that if students are only going to take one class in a field, that a specific class is more worthwhile than a general one
• It's better. More focused on developing an intellectual skills set while 'covering' content.
• The concept of integrated studies is more meaningful

and values the connections between subjects and methods--more than the concept of general education.
• Not enough knowledge to answer.
• complicated
• A better approach, more articulation across the curriculum.
• I found the GE courses more pleasant to teach since students were selecting from "other majors" courses based on some level of interest. I've not found that to be similarly true of the ISP courses.
• n/a
• An improvement--heading in the right direction
• I am an adjunct and don't know enough about the issue to submit any useful information at this time.
• It is very complex and exploits adjuncts.
• There is a very wide range of programs. The IQL program at KSC is frankly very weak. Other colleges experience similar difficulties, but this is little comfort.
• At other colleges I have taught, students do not engage in an in-depth research project in their first semester. I think this project should grow out of students' developing interests, rather than being something they are required to do in their first or second semester, when students often choose a course because it fits their schedule, rather than because the topic interests them.
• I have no other experiences other than those at KSC so cannot respond
• other colleges - University Maine, Maryland, Penn State great efforts, varying success depending on promotion and marketing to student and faculty groups
• A good program
• ISP is a vast improvement over the former General Education experience. Student outcomes are verifiable. Skill sets are learned or improved upon.
• I don't know
• very similar
• The ISP compares favorably to other Gen Ed programs that I have experienced at other colleges.
• My personal experience is that a General Ed program is better and allows students more freedom of choice. Students also are more likely invested in the classes as they are their chosen electives
• Way better than the old KSC model.
Experiencing the same growing pains that other GE programs are.

- At KSC ISP is a significant administrative drain compared to colleges where GE is folded into departments and self-administered. I understand the claim that it is superior but do not know for sure that it is worth the sacrifice.
- I think it is much more complicated than it needs to be and that I have seen elsewhere. I have worked at other institutions where ISP-like requirements were thematically linked, and I think that this works better.
- I've only experienced them at other colleges, and I feel KSC is doing better than others.
- I think it suits the student body at KSC but might not be the best for all student populations.
- The ISP program doesn't seem as clear as some other General Education programs. My perception of the difficulty seems to be getting instructors to implement ISP effectively in their classrooms.
- I have no idea.
- I like the idea of the ISP, I just wish it wasn't so over-explained.
- I have not taught elsewhere
- Still no idea
- It's basically the same with a different name.
- It's a 21st century paradigm--much better.
- Much more extensive; less focused
- The ISP is more intentional the other GE programs at KSC, but has much less faculty buy-in.
- Probably an improvement over the previous GE program.
- I don't have much to compare with.
- I think the ISP is better than the previous GE program, insomuch as it has been intentional in its planning. I don't know that it has been implemented as intentionally. And I certainly don't think that the students experience or understand the intentionality of the ISP program.
- Much preferred
- It has more integrated and interdisciplinary outcomes, and is more global in scope, with a greater emphasis on liberal studies.
- With the necessary explanation, so students are aware of the objectives, ISP is stronger than traditional gen ed programs.
- ISP is a much more intellectually rich curriculum.
- The math component is weak (IQL); but, it is not necessary to require math of all college students
- I have limited experience to compare
- As I mentioned earlier, I believe that the focus in other GE programs on disciplines can feel, for students, like it is simply busy work or that fulfilling requirements is simply a list of courses that they have to take. I know that some students at KSC feel the same way about the ISP, but I think that the program's structure, emphasizing ways of thinking/knowing rather than disciplines, helps to emphasize how students might make connections between courses and to incorporate/apply what they've learned across their collegiate experiences, including their major courses. I like the fact that students can take responsibility for their ISP courses, choosing many different possible trajectories, rather than simply taking courses required on a list.
- I believe in its ideal form the ISP is far superior to typical GE programs.
- The ISP is similar to GE programs in that it provides students with a set of courses designed to make them more rounded and prepared to function in the real world.

The ISP is better than many GE programs in that it attempts to have the courses integrated.

The ISP is worse than some GE programs in that it ends up being heavily biased in favor of certain disciplines and against others. This is unfortunate, since the students are the real casualties.
This seems to be the trend at a lot of other public liberal art colleges. I believe they treat it like a general education program. It allows greater flexibility. It is similar, but with more impact on workload for departments that are already struggling. I see ISP as sacrificing knowledge of content for skills development. I think it is interesting and many times more useful then other gen eds. Better. Clearer purpose more closely aligned with my personal philosophy of general education. If the GE program is the old way of doing things I prefer it over the ISP. not that different than sciences elsewhere. It is far better in that it is outcomes based. It could be improved with more interaction between faculty teaching in each of the perspectives areas as well as a broader consensus around a single, assessable Perspectives outcome.

I do not have that experience base to compare. No better. Unnecessarily complicated. The former GE program was easier for students to understand and allowed for a wider choice of courses available to them.

Mostly positive at KSC and other colleges. Better. More integrated and supported.

Students understand the requirements; selecting courses is challenging because of the complicated prefix system; the program assessment system is very complicated.

I like the interdisciplinary focus in the ISP approach.

It is unnecessarily cumbersome. No. I believe it is worth making it work but the outcomes and measuring the outcomes need to be clarified.

Most in my dept. think the previous GE was better. I think the Thinking and Writing course is potentially far more useful than our old English 101. There are too many different prefixes, outcomes, and ways of meeting the criteria. The prefixes do make sense, but students are very confused by them. It's especially confusing on the program planning sheets when "one additional IH course is needed" but can't have the same prefix as another IH course already taken, etc.

I think that our ISP program holds up well. In my other positions, general education courses could have class sizes that were even larger than those here at KSC. Of course, we see ourselves as a liberal arts college. If, in this time of recessions, we want to retain this identity, it's so important that we look at the issue not only of class size in the ISP program, but also of faculty teaching outside their disciplines and fostering cross-disciplinary conversations.

I think its better than the previous Gen Ed program at KSC.

It is more narrow in scope. Too complex, too bureaucratic. the outcomes make no sense, and it over focuses on skills over content which is our primary mission, to impart discipline specific knowledge. They should come to college with the skills.

I have little basis for comparison, but I think the ISP holds up against GE programs, by using the strengths of existing KSC faculty and courses. Obviously not at KSC, if anyone thinks what we had before ISP was gen ed. My experience with gen ed. elsewhere is that it had been embedded from the first, was simple and understandable, a lot more so than KSC. I'm just glad KSC has a real gen ed. program after all these years.

No opinion.

No experience in other colleges.

In a way general education was a better frame relating learning languages. Within the ISP languages become different and KSc has not mechanisms to evaluate lanaguage learning as ISP better.
Too complicated in its structure. Too laden w/ jargon and high-minded complexities, designed to make KSC 'look good' to AAC&U audiences (rather than keeping our real audience in mind, the students of Keene State College).

better

It may look similar to other programs...but other schools have larger faculties to contribute, and a lot more funding.

It's more ambitious in terms of academic standards.

The prefixes are bizarre and I think we should admit it. I am concerned that students graduate with minimal or no foreign language study and minimal or no study of history (including the history of literature and other arts). This seems less than intellectually rigorous to me. At the same time, the "menu" approach at other colleges does not guarantee rigor and has no upper level requirement.

All colleges periodically change their GE requirements in response to the times. ISP is an intriguing new approach

While there is room for improvement I like the concept and feel with some adjustments the ISP program can serve the campus well.

I think the ISP program as I understand it is a great idea. I think the way it is structured here has the potential to be much better than general education programs at other colleges.

KSC's program is such that, if I were a student, I would either not attend the college or would transfer. See comments above regarding other college programs.

AS strong or stronger

ISP is an improvement of our previous Gen Ed program. Other colleges that require a CORE have strong programs, and others leave it up to student (usually colleges that respect their students' abilities to learn and make sound choices.)

Worse

I think the GE program that existed prior to ISP was as effective if not more effective.

Because college leadership at KSC has very little leverage on KSC tenure track faculty, the great concept of the ISP has limited

Very much the same as our old General Education program at KSC - select courses from this list.

The general education program allows for more flexibility for the student and makes it easier for transfer students to graduate on time. In accredited programs the general education program allows for students in science heavy programs to have those classes count toward graduation requirements. It seems ridiculous to ask students that are already taking complex and upper level science class to take IN classes in addition. It is also ridiculous that a class like PSYCH 101 does not count toward a liberal arts degree. There are so many examples like this and under general education this would not happen.

Less focused, less assessable.

comparable

see above

NA

Quite favorably.

Can't compare.

The ISP courses at Keene State Compares favorably to others I have experienced. Among our strongest components are interdisciplinarity and the development of critical skills.

more cross-curricular

Pedagogically and intellectually bankrupt, poorly designed.

Allied courses that students need in their major program often cannot be used for ISP.

I miss the General Education program! Everything was much more intergrated. Now everything seems separated.

What we are TRYING to do compares very, very favorably. What we do in practice, unfortunately, isn't that much better.

It's no better but no worse
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think the mission is good. If followed, it could be a catalyst for real change in our ISP.</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers broad perspectives on many varied issues. I like how the ITWs are centered around a theme as it gives students many choices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requiring students to take 300 level ISP courses and providing a variety of topics for students to choose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time to address a subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The integrative outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It hopefully exposes students to a range of material and professors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>broad array of courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interdisciplinary concept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing. We took a basic gen. ed. program that needed reforming--which I supported and work on years ago-and turned it into a monster that is penalizing our students by adding unnecessary curriculum burdens. Now it is hard for many to get out of college in 4 years. That should not be.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forces me to rethink my approach to teaching and move beyond a focus on content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The concept of the II courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging students to make connections, think critically and be more reflective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sense that what you learn in one course can be compared and applied to another.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the recognition that education requires a wide range of disciplines to be taught.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to continue to teach interdisciplinary coursework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many opportunities for professional development were offered to faculty teaching in the ISP. Unfortunately, many of those opportunities were unavailable to the part-time adjunct faculty delivering the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the inherent focus in modern language classes on perspectives and cultural diversity and identity is part of a college-wide program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes you think about teaching in a different manner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching interdisciplinary courses that stretch me beyond my academic field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That I get to teach a variety of subjects that relate to my interests and education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My favorite part of the ISP, as an adjunct professor, is having the opportunity to interact with students across a range of disciplines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No experience with ISP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like teaching quantitative material in an applied setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The freedom to choose course material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The passion and innovation which faculty have regarding their ISP courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's potential for building new connections between faculty, students, subject areas and methods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a wonderful thing.

- The real world context. It prepares students for any job.
- the possibility of enhanced, enriched learning
- The concept.
- hhhhhmmmm .... not sure I have a ready answer for this one...
- n/a
- A broad background encourages connections, which in turn will encourage critical and creative thought.
- The fact that it is attempting to address the changing needs of students brought about by a rapidly changing world.
- It provides a reminder about the importance of the integrity of departments.
• Its stated goals and expectations are admirable. The dedication of most of its instructors is inspiring.
• I do like the overall idea of teaching research, critical reading, critical thinking, and writing skills across the curriculum. I like the fact that the ITW courses are based around content areas. This has great potential, but I believe it would be more effective if students really had the opportunity to make their selections based on their interests, and at a time in their educational careers when they had an opportunity to explore a number of areas of study, and to develop some passions of their own.
• Broad range, flexibility, opportunity to make learning relevant to students, options to draw on multiple disciplines
• To have the same goals for our students’ future.
• range of learning opportunities and topics
• Dealing with first-year students
• Developing and implementing new teaching strategies and observing the fruit of my efforts.
• I don't know enough about it to say
• That it requires students to broaden their academic horizons and in the process allows them to develop critical thinking skills.
• I like that it attempts to help students see how various disciplines are related.
• Its stated focus on real-world skills
• Philosophy behind it

Focus on lifelong skills that all our students need

Potential to be a true college program
• 21. Since its inception, I have strongly supported the proposition that “general education” should be developmental and cumulative; and, to the degree that ISP realizes that important program objective I continue to appreciate ISP.
• Its intentionality, a buzz-word I take to mean its deliberate, goal-oriented, and well-intentioned construction
• It exposes students who might not choose on their own to be all different sorts of ideas.
• I'm in favor of unified efforts.
• I love the fact that by making the topic something to which students can relate, it makes the learning more effective.
• It encourages exploration and creativity of those teaching the courses.
• Development and implementation of lessons in classes for ISP.
• Good question -- its concept perhaps
• The fact that it attempts to teach critical thinking and other skills our students need.
• This is my first class
• The institutional support around pedagogy.
• Don't know
• I have developed courses.
• Its goals—integration of one's experience at KSC. ITW is much better than Freshman Comp. IQL is a wonderful idea that needs more support. II is a fabulous idea.
• Offering students with diverse interests an opportunity to gain necessary tools- research, writing, critical thinking, etc.- within a subject area outside of most of their primary interests.
• Its serious attempt to improve the academic standards of this college.
• So far there is nothing I like.
• I like the focus on skill development. I like the various faculty development opportunities that are available.
• The emphasis on critical and creative thinking, whatever the course content.
• That is is structured to educate the whole person, and the courses are designed specifically for the ISP, not just the discipline
• The focus on skills and the connections between disciplines.
• The ITW course really challenges first-year students in a way that freshman composition never did.
• It makes us think outside the traditional departmental boxes
• It is a good idea that needs some work
I think that the foundational courses are far better than like courses I've seen at other institutions, in that their structure allows instructors to focus on helping students develop their writing/research and quantitative reasoning skills. Again, I like the focus on ways of knowing rather than on discipline-specific requirements, though I would like to see students make more connections across courses (through, perhaps, student portfolios or another means).

The interdisciplinary nature of the program.

I like the idea of having an integrative program, and would like to see it succeed.

Interdisciplinary courses I teach allow me to offer a much more comprehensive way of learning the subject matter, than teaching them in my department only

I like the overall concept.

Gives students more variety to meet the requirements

I see little difference between what we had before and what we have now with the exception of more more bureaucracy and hoop-jumping.

The range of courses you can teach

Depth of intellectual experience

It's based on skill outcomes, not necessarily content

The concept.

Students are starting to get it

The mission and the Program's attempt to involve faculty from all schools in contributing to the program - albeit at different levels (at this time).

the accountability, the goals that can be defined for students

Some courses are good but can be equally covered within depts

Team teaching, creative courses, cross-disciplinary learning

Many of the new courses developed by faculty to serve the program are outstanding and creative.

Much room for creativity and professional growth in planning courses; interdisciplinary opportunities

The interdisciplinary approach, the wide variety of offerings, the similarity in core learning. You know what to expect from a student who has completed an ITW class and can give them more complex projects knowing that they will be done well.

I do like the "distribution" aspect of the program; I love the fact that some courses can count within ISP and a major; I like the ITW and IQL requirements.

Again, the interdisciplinary aspect.

It helps the students think beyond themselves and grapple with tough issues across campus and not just within their majors.

Not much

Thinking and Writing

It's ambitious and forces students to experience a range of different disciplines that they might not otherwise be exposed to.

I like teaching in the ISP because I get to exercise my pedagogical skill to explain interesting concepts from my discipline to non-majors of diverse backgrounds and abilities. Not only has this allowed me to discover new techniques to use in explaining concepts from my discipline, but also it has challenged me to learn about what makes our majors different from non-majors. When I turn from teaching an ISP course, with certain objects of study and approaches that work there, to other objects of study and approaches that work in the major courses, this gives me A LOT to think about.

Its integrative concept.

The focus on development of essential skills.

It provides learning experiences for students in a wide range of disciplines.

Nothing

The diversity of students and perspectives in ISP classes. Quantitative Reasoning is now a priority of learning!

that we finally have a real gen ed. program.

Choice for students in the various disciplines.

Interdisciplinarity taken in account and the umbrella of classes
less rigid than what we had before, and more integration of disciplines
We should be proud of the re-energized curriculum (courses) created by the faculty. Many new & redesigned courses.
integrative nature
Interdisciplinarity...
Traditionally, only students interested in business studied econ courses. Now I have students from a range of disciplines in my courses, and this is more fun and more challenging intellectually.
The ITW class is a great way to teach writing. And my experiences so far in teaching 300-level ISP courses have been richer than older 200-level gen ed requirements.
That students are encourage to enrich themselves by
taking our courses.
The concept that is is open across all three schools.
I like that students have expanded options for choosing courses. I also like that it is not that difficult to advise students on course selection.
Nothing.
ITW and the upper-level non-disciplinary requirements
ITW and IQL topical focus

II opportunities
not much
1)The opportunity for course development.

2) The potential that students will become more capable.
That it is a truly integrated program, with a focus on developing the skills and ways of knowing that will help our students be more successful in the world they will live in (not the one faculty used to live in...).
The integration of skill-based outcomes, ITW, and II courses.
The opportunity for the students to learn concepts in a real life and or applied context.
wide faculty involvement
exposure to different areas for student
I do like the concept. I think there are some really interesting courses from which students can select if their schedules allow.
NA
Emphasis on promoting development of core learning skills, many of which our students lack upon arrival at KSC.
I like the interdisciplinary orientation and the emphasis on critical thinking skills.
flexibility for course development to certain interests, variety and liberal choices for students
right
The diversity of courses
Has the potential to give students the "liberal arts" background that college graduates should have.
Trying to inspire a room full of students who don't want to be there!
That in THEORY it is a very coherent program that gives students access to lots of different disciplines AND to interdisciplinary work.
The concept of integrative studies

22. What do you like least about the ISP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure and governance. Lack of vision for real integration throughout the program and through the major. This should be intentional through a student's 4 years. It's still based on the traditional disciplines and it lacks</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relevance. The "integrity of the program" is cited as a reason for exclusion of disciplines yet its integrity is violated in numerous ways.

- No many upper-level courses - 300 on up.
- Students can graduate from KSC with a BA or BS having no experience in a mathematics course.
- I think the assessment component is very weak. Faculty are required to designate ISP goals. Students have to submit electronically assignments related to these goals. Assignments are randomly selected to be read. However, there is no indication on the assignment or from the professor if the goals are mastered. To me it is senseless. All it does in its current state is indicated that the professor has stated the goals but there is no assessment of them.
- everything
- The lack of perspectives courses
- Outcomes that are not attached to any legitimate means of achieving said outcomes.
- complicated system
- Poorly managed-not enough resources allocated to manage the program.
- See above.
- The lack of flexibility.
- The assessment structure is not good.
- The increasing complexity of the rules and the loopholes.
- The lack of departments seeing the need to add faculty to fulfill the mission of the ISP- failure to recognize that classes can satisfy both GE and own requirements.
- That I have NEVER, EVER received ANY feedback after students submit work via ISP/Bb. It goes into a nether world from the instructor's point of view. I'd would really like feedback or collated feedback of all sections of same course, so I could continue to learn, improve, see where students could learn to think and write more critically and consider diversity of human experiences
- As an adjunct, the lack of appropriate explanation of the expectations placed on me, what to include in my course, etc. I received one email when i first began as an adjunct with a copy- and -pasted list of ISP requirements that I had to fulfill, and no more explanation.
- Many opportunities to invest more fully in the program are unavailable to many of the part-time adjunct faculty delivering the program.
- The difficulty of assessment, in the light of disparate criteria across disciplines.
- It is too complicated.
- Lack of job security and benefits for adjunct ISP faculty.
- The lack of communication about the goals and rubrics. Rubrics should be reconsidered and not so clinical.
- My least favorite part of the ISP is the lack of coherent instruction for those teaching the ISP.
- Honestly? From the outside looking in, it seems like one more flash-in-the-pan idea that is here today but will be gone tomorrow. It stands to add one more level of complexity to the already complex task of teaching listening, speaking, reading, writing, and cultural awareness skills all the while engaging my students.
- Many of the communications are for a broad audience and it can be difficult to understand what is applicable to me.
- The idea, as stated by some, that the discipline material is less important than the other materials
- Lack of communication about ISP from the department; the length of time it has taken to understand it
- It can feel more like a mandate than the valuable concept it is. It needs passionate creative advocates to help it flourish.
- Don't know yet.
- I do not advised students but some of my students have not been well advised.
- That I am not teaching in it (yet).
- The lack of commitment on the part of students. The negative energy that can pervade the room. In my field, this is highly unusual. It may relate to the fact that we're not really asked to teach a course in our discipline, but rather, construct a course within our discipline that would have value or merit for people who are not familiar with the discipline. It can make it seem to be a watered down or jerry-rigged course that is not entirely connected to the discipline in which we trained and thus, can be less engaging for both the teacher and the students. I did not find this true of the old GE courses.
n/a
Extra paper work
The language requirement must be made more rigorous.
I am an adjunct and don't know enough about the issue to submit any useful information at this time.
It is very complex and driven by administrators.
In IQL it is becoming a very prescriptive program. Many ancillary goals and outcomes are detracting from the core goals of the courses.
The ITW course that I teach asks a great deal of both faculty and students. To teach research, critical thinking, critical reading, and writing skills, all while also trying to teach some aspects of a particular content area, is challenging, to say the list. To do so with 22 students who are writing many iterations of a long paper, does a disservice to the students, who deserve more of a faculty person's time, attention, and guidance.
some of the measurement tools, a little awkward but manageable
i would like to teach more, but the credit cap on adjuncts, poor pay = leaving
Little recognition from the department or the college on the amount of work I put into my courses or the amount of students I teach. Class sizes are way too large.
I am disappointed that some faculty do not embrace the program and have not changed or adapted their pedagogies to suit the outcomes. My comment is based on student remarks.
I don't know enough about it to say
the time involved in course prep that is not being reimburses
There is nothing that I do not like about ISP.
The frequency with which the learning objectives change.
Its inability to deliver appropriate skills-focused instruction
Lack of faculty leadership in communicating about the program and working with colleagues to make improvements, changes happen
22. Given my *** service on the old Gen Ed committee that created ISP, and***, I hope that I have standing when I say the following:

22.1: I find ISP to be one of the administrative straws that is breaking my back. I am thinking of: tracking relatively frequent changes in magic language that must appear in my syllabus and, potentially, change my course content; trying to respond to the semester-by-semester survey monkeys that ascertain whether or not I’m participating in ISP, and how (I failed to respond this fall.); teaching students (un成功licely) to upload their “artifacts”; and trying (unsuccessfully) to attend ISP meetings.

22.2: I am profoundly skeptical of the merit and validity of extracting a small number of essays from my classes, without examining the whole population of essays in my classes, without examining the assignment, and without having content expertise sufficient to evaluate the question at hand.

22.3: I am strongly opposed to the teaching of disciplinary content—or the appearance of teaching disciplinary content—by people who have not demonstrated to faculty in the appropriate discipline that they are well-prepared to do that teaching. We have learned from experience that we rue that course outcomes are best when we confine the teaching of political science to people who have a terminal degree in the discipline (or a J.D./LLB for Constitutional Law) and who have passed qualifying exams (or comprehensive exams) in the pertinent field.
The enormous contribution it makes to educational code (a disciplinary jargon that must be watched closely lest it be used as an exclusionary device) and gobbledygook (as friends have called it) on campus. The requirement to sift this when seeking to contribute.

The meetings and memos and committees the "program" proliferates and the loss of faculty control that follows when these are deemed too much.
The role the "program" plays in bringing questionably qualified instructors to teach questionably-vetted interdisciplinary courses purporting to convey college-level instruction in a field.

That the program seeks to establish itself as a program -- with faculty and a web page that stands along side but does not play by the same rules as other already strapped and overextended programs.

- Unnecessarily complex - I think it needs to be simplified and more consistently delivered to achieve desired outcomes.
- The "troops" don't really get it. I feel dishonest communicating the expectations to my students because most aren't applicable to the course.
- The fact that some instructors do not really work hard to help students learn.
- The extra work required for assessment.
- There doesn't seem to be oversight in terms of whether instructors are actually meeting ISP outcomes. There is an overall assessment when students submit work but for an individual instructor it is hard to tell whether they are fulfilling the outcomes in classes.
- Not in close enough contact with actual student performance and needs. Too theoretical.
- The fact that it continually changes definitions and asks us to re-assess things we're reassessed ad nausium. It is also caught up in a hot topic (the whole assessment thing) that began with ***, which should be a clue that it is... uh... not truly very conducive to true learning, which is an experience of QUALITY, not quantity.
- The patent and potent lack of interest and investment by most faculty in the program's ability to reinvigorate the meaning of a college education.
- Nothing
- The meetings.
- It's not integrated. Perspectives courses have not come close to their potential. The assessment part is almost worth than worthless because it has set many faculty against ISP.
- Unclear regarding how the various integrated studies collectively work together
- Student confusion about the program.
- It was so hard to understand what to do, and once I figured it out, I still didn't teach differently at all!
- I dislike how difficult it is to hold faculty accountable for the work they do in the ISP. I dislike the fact that logistics (registrar's office, scheduling) frequently limit what we can do with curriculum.

I also think the focus on outcomes-based education and quantitative program assessment is reductionist. It doesn't get at the complex work that faculty and students do in the classroom. When faculty are held to simplistic outcomes (for the sole purpose of assessing those simplistic outcomes) it dilutes the work we do as teachers and the work our students do as learners.

- no comment
- That adjuncts teach most of the ISP classes but our voice is muted.
- That adjuncts mainly end up teach them and that it does not include all the disciplines
- From a teaching perspective, especially ITW, it is overwhelming in terms of what we're supposed to accomplish with students in one semester.
- I don't get to move on with students and see how they progress in upper-level course.
- All the complaining I hear from TTF about the ISP; give adjunct faculty more leadership roles in ISP; the ISP Program is only as good as the attitude of those teaching it.
- I am not sure if we have adequate resources are being invested to it.
- I do find that that outcomes/assessment submission process can be complicated for students and for faculty and I'd love to see a more qualitative assessment that seeks to determine how students talk about their learning across the ISP.
- It is quite complicated and I feel that a single clearinghouse listing all courses and their relevance and how they satisfy degree requirements would be a great help.
- I dislike and am disappointed by the fact that the ISP has not achieved its intent, due to its structural limitations. The program in its current form is not truly integrative. For instance, given the pervasive nature
of computer science, it is both surprising and disappointing that this discipline has been completely omitted from the current ISP.

I am also bothered by the fact that it appears that the current program lacks the faculty support that is required to make it more meaningful.

- I feel that the content is expected to be only filling material to teach certain skills. It's just not possible to treat that way in upper level courses. I think there's a quality in those upper level courses.
- I don't believe as a whole there is a buy in across campus with perhaps the ITW and IQL courses which appear to be very effective.
- Students who show up to do as little as possible to pass a course they do not want to take.
- I have concerns with the oversight of ISP, specifically who determines the eligibility and qualifications for those teaching courses within the program.

I'm concerned that, based on data we were provided last year, ISP depends entirely too heavily on adjunct faculty to deliver most of its courses and that there is considerable inconsistency in who teaches the same course semester to semester. This also impacts workload because we are constantly trying to retrain new people teaching ISP with the expectation that they might not return after a couple of semesters and the process starts all over again. This is of greater concern now that full time adjuncts on whom we could rely are being cut back to two courses per semester and then we need to find someone to stick in the room for a semester as a short term solution to a long-term problem.

The lack of tenure-track and tenured faculty 'buy-in' suggests indifference to or dislike of the program.

In reading the Executive Summary of Assessment Findings 2009-2010 for the ISP Outcomes, it is worrying that the method for generating data for assessment essentially renders the data meaningless. One number (e.g. 78% in Fall 2008 for ITW) compared to one other number as a representation of the skill development of multiple students from different sections of different courses from different disciplines producing different assignments for assessment of that skill cannot be meaningful reduced to one number. Any mathematician or statistician will say that the distillation of all of the data into a single percentage tells us nothing about performance or development. We can't know why numbers go up or down, nor can we say anything about trends in performance in these skills areas from a one-to-one number comparison in this manner. Any conclusions ISP draws from these numbers is heavily subject to conjecture

- the lack of knowledge of students. Always have to assume they know nothing.
- complexity; lack of common first year course
- Haven't heard anything about its impact or effect
- The concept is not fully bought into or implemented.
- It's a lot more work for me, and class sizes are jumping up so not all ISP requirements can be met
- The parts that I like least are not around the design of the program, but around what I believe are misconceptions regarding the commitment of TTF to the program, what is being assessed with ISP assessment, and the difficulty in bringing the faculty together to discuss revision of the Perspectives and Integrative outcomes.
- At this point, nothing
- It takes away (not gives) resources from depts
- It seems unnecessarily complicated. Also, a possible (subtle) divisiveness among faculty - those who teach ISP and those who do not.
- The exclusion of many great courses in disciplines across campus that don't count as ISP courses because they are too area specific.
• The assessment frameworks are fairly complicated.
• Lack of Dept. support and a lack of tenure track ISP positions. The program is well supported but the adjunct faculty are not and we are the ones who mostly teach/drive the program.
• I think it is a shame that so many ITW courses are taught by adjunct professors - I have no qualms about the quality of the teaching offered, but I think that we are missing golden opportunities for our entering students to have terrific experiences with full time faculty members in the first year and who may steer those students to particular majors and courses, the context of which may not be fully understood by adjuncts
• Some of the nomenclature gets a bit fuzzy and verbose.
• I think the outcomes are great but difficult to come up with ways to assess the outcome.
• Class limits, esp. not that KSC will be moving away from the smaller class mindset.
• The lack of follow-through in other courses.
• The "integrative" in the program's title is a misnomer. Students choose courses from a menu that has no coherence to it other than that they satisfy a number of requirements.
• The number out outcomes and lack of clarity about which are being revised, etc. It's hard to be motivated to develop new assignments to address a certain outcome when you know that the outcome might be changed soon and all the work will be wasted!
• I would have to say that the thing that I like least about ISP is the way that the program communicates about its committee structure, assessment procedures, and activities. The lack of a cohesive and effective web site has been an impediment. I believe that there needs to be a prominent link off the main KSC site, under "academics," that leads people into a centralized web site with all the necessary information. A clearer explanation of which committees are part of the ISP program, and who can get involved in these committees, would help. I am mystified about which committees do what -- and would like to participate but am too embarrassed to admit that I am confused (and who would I admit this to anyway?). As for the assessment procedures, I am confused every time the email comes around. What artifact to submit, where? Lord help me! Maybe if I had more involvement with the process, or knowledge about the process, or if there was a web site that could help me to understand what is needed, then I could complete the assessment as expected? Finally, the end of year meetings that took place last year: I could not participate because I had other commitments that I had made. I think that the program would do well to schedule meetings not just once, but more regularly, so that people who teach in the program can compare their experiences. Maybe such meetings are already taking place, but I do not know about them.
• It's not yet fulfilling its potential. Too high a percent of the courses are delivered by adjunct faculty.
• It should provide more learning experiences (require more courses) within IQL & ITW. Also, it should include courses related to wellness.
• The complexity of the program and how it allows people with out specific training in areas to teach course in those areas. e.g. a course on poverty should be taught by a social scientist not ***.
• We have no way to track student submission of artifacts. Where are the results of the artifact assessment?
• Faculty curmudgeons making stupid negative comments; it was because of them we went without a gen ed. program, even though numerous people had put hundreds of hours into it.
• I question the degree to which the skills and objectives are addressed in classes.
• the implementation in KSC and the division among faculty.
• not enough courses offered, which often inconveniences students
• The painful amount of bureaucracy & time that has been spent making an over-regulated program, confusing to students, parents, and faculty. Really, it's been painful to watch.
• inconsistency in ITW classes as reported by students
• The assessment process is very labor intensive on my part, and I never get any feedback as to how my students are doing. Also, all the work I do for raising academic standards in ISP is not used to evaluate my performance, since only student evaluations are so used, and indeed one might expect student evaluations to be rocky given that I am raising academic standards and teaching people a subject they would not have chosen (without the ISP requirements).
• I dislike trying to anticipate the availability of classes my advisees will urgently need. I dislike the difficulties we create for transfer students and our graduates with transcripts that have both odd prefixes (II? IS?) and odd grades (BC?) I don't particularly like being told to list infantilizing skills outcomes on my college-level syllabi.
• The same thing I would dislike about other GE
programs. No matter what changes in GE we make most students see them as just requirements.

- While the concept is that is open to participation across all three schools in reality participation across the board that is not happening.
- As the result of my experience in the assessment process, I'm concerned that there are numerous disconnects between faculty assignments and assessment rubrics.
- Everything.
- Outcomes and objectives are complicated and difficult to describe to students and to faculty. I would rather see fewer outcomes and more commitment to those outcomes. We can't do everything. I would rather see us do a few things well than many things not so well.
- the number of Perspectives requirements and the limits on who can participate and how they can get 'vetted'.
- It makes the assumption that students can be taught connections. Sometimes it is better for students to grow into and understanding of connections and that requires that they are exposed to a broad curriculum including survey courses. We don't give them that opportunity. This is especially true because we are using a 4 credit system which limits what they can take.
- 1) large class sizes (how exactly can I effectively teach 40 students these skills?),
- 2)uninterested students,
- 3)ambiguity of what ISP actually is,
- 4)lack of participation across campus,
- 5) having to teach upper level classes to people who have no interest/background in the subject - how does this make sense?,
- 6)the busy work of surveys and assessment or the fact that there's a manual,
- 7) the fact that people who have no credentials in my discipline are teaching it at ISP level.
- 8) the fact that we further exploit adjuncts in the process of meeting the demands of ISP.
- 9) It appears to me that courses like ITW are incredibly ineffective at teaching key skills like citing.
- Lack of support, participation, and ownership by full- time faculty.
- Seems to be less "buy-in" with IQL and perspectives courses. Lack of accountability.
- It is very complicated for the students to understand. It is very difficult to work with transfer students and ISP impedes their ability to graduate on time. The requirement for 300 and 400 level courses to be taken at KSC is limiting particularly to transfer students. The territorialism of subject matter such as IN courses needing to be taught out of the science departments is limiting. The students complain about the lack of flexibility and having to take courses that they have no interest in when the flexibility of general education would allow a wider variety of course options
- Too wide a scope and lack of liberal arts outcomes.
- I think the credits need to be reduced
- The restrictions relative to course availability. I know the studies that suggest that there are actually enough courses available for students to get what they need --the problem is that this viewpoint ignores the major. Courses in the major are offered at particular times. If the only ISP courses (within the categories that a student needs to fulfill) conflict with single section course in the major--well--ther is the problem.
- NA
- Over-emphasis on assessment of learning outcomes.
- The promise of limiting the number of students in ITW was not kept. Very difficulty to teach 23 first year students in writing. Need to have smaller classes to allow the intense work to guide novice writers. Won't teach again until the numbers are rectified, especially when many upper level courses are small classes.
I would like to see course caps for ISP courses lower.
assessments, busy work, hard to find common assessments that are meaningful to sub-sets of courses
see above
Allied courses that students need in their major program often cannot be used for ISP, increasing the required credits needed to complete their major program
Trying to inspire a room full of students who don't want to be there!
Too few faculty members teach in it, so they do WAY more work than faculty who don't. Lack of resources. Faculty development is a good idea, but unless there are financial incentives, they are just more meetings to go to when most faculty are sick of the number of meetings we have to go to ALREADY.
That it hasn't done anything to improve the skills needed to be successful after college.

23. What changes would you recommend to make the ISP more effective?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- First change the structure to include potentially all disciplines and all majors that could deliver ISP outcomes. The program should be inclusive, invitational, and truly integrative. Need some real support for faculty to encourage them to teach in the program and enhance their ability to be successful in delivering ISP outcomes in different kinds of courses
- Make it mandatory that tenure track faculty have to teach at least one ISP course a year. Offer more upper-level courses.
- Different assessment procedures (see #22)

Another concern, although this is not just ISP. The four credit model was designed so that students could go further in depth for a subject. I think it was assumed that students would be taking four courses for 16 credits. This semester I have two sections of my ISP course. The students in one section are doing much better than the ones in the other section. I asked students in each section how many were taking 20 credits. In the section where the students were much stronger, only 1 student; in the section with some extremely weak scores, 1/3 of the students are taking 20 credits.
- scrap it. Go back to a less invasive GE program.
- Continuing work on an assessment feedback loop
- Get everyone who is teaching ITW, IQL, IH, etc., together and reach a common understanding about the outcomes. ALSO ... We should agree on the METHODS for meeting those outcomes. That way students take a common skill set from course to course and they don't have to feel like they're starting over from scratch each semester.
- I don't have enough experience to comment
- Create a ISP department where professors from various departments rotate into this for a defined term.
- Scrap it. The whole idea was to update the gen. ed. requirement, not create another division (school), but that is what has happened. We will soon be graduating students who have basically majored in Interative Students with not one faculty member who has a PhD in Intergrative Studies! because there is no such prgram.
- see answer to #10
- Provide instructors with examples of best practices related to EACH discipline
- Re-looked at the perspective courses to let them be a gateway into the content of our majors on campus.
- Design a more effective means for assessing ISP courses.
- SIMPLIFY!!!!
- Better ability to cross-list classes, faculty hires to support the classes,
- More paid faculty development to include adjunct faculty at least at beginning and end of semesters.
More feedback, written reports about submitted student work. ISP,

- Required adjunct training in each discipline.
- Commit to and invest in the faculty delivering the program.
- Evaluation of assessments within disciplines.
- See prior comment from answer #10
- Simplify
- Include ISP participation in the list of criteria considered when tenure-track faculty are up for tenure. Too many tenure-track faculty seem to think ISP courses are irrelevant to their career development, so they don't devote time to them.
- Make the rubrics more personal for individual learning style...to revamp the standardization of expectations and make students more actively involved in the design and execution of the courses to fit their needs
- Simplify, simplify, simplify...
- Break up some of the communications into smaller segments.
- Split it. Have some courses required more like the old GE, and some more like the new ISP.
- Stronger links between ISP, departments, and individual faculty teaching ISP courses
- KSC needs to stay committed to ISP, and continue to listen to feedback from faculty and students about ISP and apply that feedback.
- None yet.
- Without stifling the student's learning, attempt to have some standardization of the artifacts so as to better understand what has been asked of the students and compare results, which might also assist the readers in their evaluations
- Cannot think of any.
- I apologize for not really thinking about this, so, again, I don't have a ready answer. But I appreciate the work the committee is doing to provide answers since I know how difficult this task is. Thank you.
- n/a
- Raise the language requirement.
- Reevaluating the real role, redefinition (if applicable) and structure of education today.
- Give the power back to the departments where it belongs.
- I would begin by focusing on the repeated recommendations in the reports on the evaluation of IQL artifacts. Recent responses to these reports within IQL have tended to be along the lines of “If students are not meeting these outcomes, then perhaps we should change the goals”, i.e. water the quantitative content down even further. Some instructors in IQL have expressed the opinion that students are “not ready” to work with graphs and numbers. They would like them to practice “logical reasoning” and other “prerequisite” skills before addressing “higher order” skills and putting them to work with quantitative content. Our students do tend to be poorly prepared – however this is precisely why they need to make graphs, work with numbers, and interpret the results. They learn by doing, not by being prepared to learn.
- Offer ITW in sophomore year. Require successful completion of ITW to move on to junior year. Limit class size to 16 or 18 at most. This would enable students to choose classes based on interests they have already developed, at a time when they are more ready/able to engage in serious efforts reading, doing research, and writing.

I really can't comment on the rest of the ISP program.

If Adjuncts are to learn all the components of the ISP program, we need be provided opportunities to do so, and these need to be paid. Many of us work multiple jobs and cannot participate in additional meetings unless costs for these are remunerated.

- more open discussion/current practice sessions between ISP faculty and annual updates on designed outcomes
- if KSC is going to use adjunct for the bulk of its teaching then pay professionals what they are worth. ISP or otherwise
- The "mandatory" integration of ISP (in my case IQL) with the library needs work. I (as well as the students) are tired and bored with library professionals taking up class time with sleep-inducing presentations on how to use library resources. Students can figure out how to use library resources own their own!
1. Mentoring of new faculty including adjuncts.  2. Continuity from one section to another of the same course is key to success but not always achieved. Better communication amongst faculty teaching the same courses within disciplines.

- I don't know
- less
- Pick what it is and stick with it. Review every 5 years.
- A bigger focus on skills, less on content.
- this is a start: an open dialogue about how effective the program is and how it can be changed.

Let's go back and look at the Perspectives piece, which has no real core principles (whatever is written down) or cohesive blueprint to communicate to students the purpose and the plan of the ISP. Students GET the ITW and IQL idea; but they haven't a clue (like the faculty) just how and why those multiple-prefixed Perspectives courses exist--except to make their lives more complicated.

- 23. Please consult with the faculty to address my points 22.1 through 22.3.
- I am spent. More in future forums if they permit. However one thing that would make the program more approachable and responsive would be to completely replace the composition of the committee governing it every one or two (max) years. Overlap these terms if two years and consistency is desired. No repeat service for past representative for a significant (six?, eight?) number of years.
- Pare it down to essentials and require departments to discuss them and identify what they look like in their discipline.
- Without having a "big brother watching" atmosphere, I'm honestly not sure how to correct the problem.
- Less time intensive assessment practices
- Meetings of small groups of "ISP instructors" to share work activities and ideas. I would be looking for feedback such as whether what I'm doing in class meets the expectations of the ISP goals. If not how could what I'm doing be improved, adjusted to meet goals.
- Make it possible to get input from a larger population. I am an underpaid and overworked adjunct and I attend as few meetings as possible; I find them unproductive.
- Bullet points. Remember how much time people have and, of that, how little they honestly want to dedicate to assessment and assessment issues.
- No idea
- Hold students more accountable as they get to the higher levels.
- More support, especially for IQL courses. Broaden ITW so there are different models other than 1 huge paper revised many times. I don't object to this but not as THE model, and I support that all models must involve a rewriting component. Revitalize Perspectives courses so that they contribute to the integrative component.
- Have an ISP Department, with reps. from each School. These could be rotating assignments but those faculty would be charged with teaching ISP courses and working actively on the development of ISP--going to conferences, holding workshops, etc. Overhaul the Assessment part of ISP. Faculty development, perhaps through CELT on teaching effectively.
- Clearer guidelines and expectations for an all encompassing curriculum.
- Something needs to be done about IQL 101. Either the course needs to be changed to address the course outcomes more appropriately or the course need to be eliminated. I would suggest a more standard, semester long project that directly addresses several of the course outcomes. This change needs to be lead by faculty members with experience assigning successful quantitative projects. Then other faculty members who would like to teach the course must attend professional development to help them develop an appropriate course project. If the course were eliminated, I would advocate every student being required to take one of the current QL alternative courses.
- Improve advising, particularly for entering first year students.
- If this is really an important program, don't farm it out to your adjuncts, who get paid a fraction of the salary of tenure track profs. How can we be invested and truly trained in it? It's a huge contradiction.
- I would reduce the number of required courses to eight--two linked courses from each school (A&H, Sciences, PGS) and two linked interdisciplinary courses. Faculty teaching the linked courses would work together to ensure that the course material, classroom activities, and overall pedagogy requires students to make connections, to integrate what they are learning across both courses. Faculty would need to develop new courses (not just recycle the same old courses they've always taught) and we would separate courses in
the major from ISP courses.

- Structure it more like a department of sorts, and integrate adjunct faculty into this so called department, providing leadership and professional development opportunities for adjunct faculty. The program will thrive when those delivering it feel the program is as invested in them as they are in it. This, of course, requires loyalty in the form of appropriate notions of job security.
- Require two HIP (High Impact Courses). One at at the 100 level and one at the 300 level (Use the optional course designations..ie. Service-Learning, Undergraduate Research, Learning community designation, etc.).

Allow the applied sciences to participate.

- A two-semester ITW! The skills are so critical, it would be worth exploring a two semester approach to teaching research, critical reading and thinking and writing!
- More clarity and firmer expectations regarding the amount and level of writing that will be expected of students beyond ITW.
- Long serving adjunct faculty should be able to coordinate ISP courses. Using ISP coordination as service for new TTF hires and/or a way to have a course release are not in the best interest of our students and our program.
- I would urge the college administration to do something about the fact that we rely on non full-time faculty to teach a significant number of these courses.
- See above. Also, I would like to see more faculty involved in conversations about pedagogy (those of us who teach in the ISP), like those I’ve experienced in the ITW and II cohort meetings throughout the year. I like the professional development opportunities at the end of the year, but I’d love to see these conversations happen at the beginning of the year and throughout the year as well.
- See answer to #22.
- The ISP needs to be made truly integrative. The intrinsic biases that characterize the current program need to be removed. Every academic department needs to feel and know that they have the opportunity to participate in the program, should they choose to.

The program needs to have a simpler structure that is easy to communicate and understand. The current program has too many rules and exceptions.

Finally, the ISP could greatly benefit from more engagement from the faculty in the various academic departments.

- More emphasis on advising for students. Better coordination of the courses offered in ISP with departmental curriculum.
- Greatly reduce the work it takes to approve a new course.
- If the ISP program really seeks to assess student skill development, it needs to completely overhaul its assessment methodology to produce reliable meaningful data.
- More diverse classes, more options for students
- First Year Seminar required for all students
- More faculty development and more campus-wide communication by ISP leaders
- Time for educators from different subject areas to meet and discuss ways to make it a truly integrated experience. We have done this the last two summers with the Links program and it is getting to the point where we feel as a faculty it is a worthwhile endeavor. But we meet and choose a theme to weave through our courses and do a team teach as well.
- Provide some informational presentations to faculty members, maybe scheduled faculty meetings.
- Better communication about what the program could be, better review of course documents to ensure that all faculty teaching in the ISP are contributing to helping students meet the outcomes.
If the faculty teaching a course designated as part of the ISP doesn't even identify the outcomes for the course, let alone find ways to assist students in meeting the student learning outcomes, the course should be an elective, not an ISP course.

- I would narrow the assignment for the artifacts; I wish I had offered a variety of articles for review rather than allow students to select their own. A common thread would have been helpful in assessing their growth. More commonality in artifacts might also assist the readers with their assessments.
- Acknowledge failure and eliminate program.
- Simplify wherever possible.
- Allow for ISP/non-ISP course substitutions approved by faculty advisors in that discipline.
- Even more emphasis on integration/connections within courses and between courses.
- Restructuring of IQL - more variety of classes (not so much baseball), better training, a shared workbook, a Math lab to support staff/students. And more II support from an established ISP Dept. with tenure track II instructors.
- I would like to see the entire assessment system re-visited; I would like to see clarification of the process by which a faculty member from a non-IA, IH, IS, or IN department could propose a course in one of those designations.
- Strive to keep jargon at a minimum - at meetings and in written communication.
- Example assignments that do work in measuring each specific outcome.
- I would like to see a second year writing course.
- Re-structuring the program to address comment 22.
- Simplify!
- I think that I have written about this in the survey, but here is a bullet list:
  
  * Class sizes that are smaller than 38 students per class. You need to have smaller class sizes when you are asking professors to teach students across the curriculum.

  * Implement clearly enforced prerequisites to support both students and professors as they create these cross-disciplinary collaborations and conversations. As part of this, give ITW more faculty, better support and reduced class sizes and funnel as many entering students as possible into ITW their first or at the latest second semester in the program.

  * Give tenure-track and tenured faculty some kind of incentive to teach at least one class per year in the ISP program. Otherwise you have a situation in which overworked adjuncts are being used by departments to teach the ISP requirements. Full-time professors are missing out on an excellent opportunity. When they don't teach in the ISP program, they cultivate an attitude that their "expertise" is needed for the majors only courses. Teaching in the ISP program becomes some kind of penalty or departmental status indicator, and this can be discouraging to those of us who are tenured/tenure track but do teach in the program.

  * Streamline communications about committee structure, assessment procedures, and ISP program activities. The current email communications are too minimal and don't include enough plain-language explanations about what is needed, when and why. The assessment procedures are particularly hard to figure out. Perhaps a series of beginning of semester meetings would help? Having a higher-quality web site would also help. The manual is definitely a step in the right direction, but it needs to be placed online prominently accessible from the KSC main page.

  * It's still in development and needs time and effort to achieve its potential.
  * Please see above.
  * Scrap it and go back to the old program it was most likely more successful, oh wait we could be bothered to assess the old one to see if it had any strengths because we had do make some changes to justify the *** that administrators "learn" when they go to their ** conferences.

  * Provide assessment feedback in a timely manner so that faculty can make pedagogical changes to their ISP courses.
  * No ideas.
- Reduce the credits to 40.
- The assessment criteria was not welcome. There are many reasons of why that faculty have expressed however is pretty difficult to be aware of feedback. If faculty voices are not integrated why do we ask them (us) feedback?
- more courses
- End the ISP-prefixes, go back to discipline prefixes, simply the language & structure of the program, bring back student choice, admit that no general education program can accomplish the outcomes we've implemented (especially with 40-plus students in a class), allow depts & schools to create and approve II courses (or eliminate II altogether), admit that there's something beautiful about students taking courses outside of the major without obsessing about so-called assessment or about how so-called connections are being achieved across the ISP curriculum, fix the assessment mechanism that allows only certain types of artifacts (digital ones) to be presented via a convoluted means of submission. Make it a 32-credit program, maximum. ITW, IQL, 1 arts, 1 humanities, 1 natural sci, 1 social sci, and 2 'free choice' ISP @ upper level.
- increased representation across campus
- Trim in back considerably...I never saw any reports that our old Gen Ed program was not working, yet we went ahead with a new plan...this program takes a huge investment of faculty time and energy...
- KSC should hire 3 people to assess student work, these people should be on permanent staff, so same assessors every year. The feedback about individual courses should be supplied upon request. If professors desire to keep that feedback about their courses private, they should be able to do so, but not required to do so.
- I dream of a college-wide foreign language requirement (featuring languages such as Chinese, Arabic, Latin, and more German in addition to Spanish and French) that does not count as a "humanities" choice but is a crucial year's work in the liberal arts experience of all students. I would support the need for students to have an advisor's permission and pay additional tuition to register for 20 credits a term to reinforce that 16 credits is expected. I would like to challenge my tenure-track colleagues from across the campus to offer as many ITW and IQL sections as possible--and to get departmental support for doing so--so that this program is as shared and inclusive as it is supposed to be and first-year students get to work with full professors right away.

And, on a friendly note, I would encourage the committee not to get defensive when faculty get cranky. We're not going to turn back to the old gen ed program again, and it wasn't as great as some of us remember it as being. Shake off the negativity if you can, there's good learning going on in most of the classrooms on campus. Thank you for doing this work.
- Consult with departments as a whole.
- I would like the opportunity for some experimentation in courses.
- I think the assessment process need to be reworked. I'm also concerned about the ISP burden being disproportionally placed on adjunct faculty and the consequences that has for course content and rigor. Especially now that our adjunct faculty are bearing the brunt of budget reductions
- Dismantle the monstrosity and have a reasonable set of distribution requirements that would not exceed 5 courses.
- Simplify, simplify.
- reduce overall number of credits, have 2 II courses, provide more opportunity for faculty to teach (by increasing numbers of faculty available to meet upper level departmental courses).
- More standard coursework...the kind of courses that a major would use.
- 1) Smaller classes

2) Staff with credentials in the subject they are teaching.

3) Well remunerated staff, i.e. adjuncts.

4) No upper level classes.
- How does one change a culture in which the key participants are not accountable?
- Inclusiveness of all Schools and disciplines throughout the program.
- The program needs to be simplified while allowing more flexibility particularly for transfer students. Students frequently have taken too many of 1 area of the ISP while being short in another. This confusion is
frustrating to them. An openness to expanding beyond traditional departments for perspective specific content such as the fact that science requirements can be met outside the Biology and Chemistry disciplines. There are too many ISP credit requirements. Remove the 300/400 level requirements which is very confusing to all the students. Those students that declare their major later often have too many lower level ISP’s and then still must take 300/400 level.

- Use a portfolio to base program assessment on individual experience. Allow students to focus more in a single area or discipline, or make it all interdisciplinary courses.
- Please see comments above.
- NA
- De-emphasize assessment and organize more training for faculty (e.g., CELT workshops on pedagogical approaches that can be employed to enhance student learning). Also, providing more time for faculty to participate in this training.
- I would like to see results of past assessments. Also there should be a simple short explanation of how to submit work, as well as a description of what happens to it
- I am not convinced that the 300-400 level courses are necessary and if we can really judge the level of a course by a number, Doesn't it really depend on the expectations of the professor? Isn't that an unknown variable.
- Smaller classes.
- more academic freedom
- Cross-list introductory level courses within departments with the ISP. Do not even THINK of requiring individual faculty teaching these courses to participate in planning or assessment.
- Help students see the connections between the ISP program and their major program(s). Clearly articulate the competencies that faculty should expect students who have completed ITW and IQL courses.
- Go back to the General Education model. It worked!! Ditch all the pretentious terminology. I liken the terminology ISP Program to the use of the words Sanitation Engineer for a Janitor!
- (1) CHANGE THE PREFIXES so that students -- including summer students, many of whom don't go to KSC -- can easily find courses. (2) More financial resources. (Yes, I may be dreaming here.) (3) More recognition (e.g. in DPEC, FEAC) of faculty who spend an ENORMOUS amount of time teaching in the ISP, answering ISP surveys, making sure they are doing all the things ISP wants them to do, etc. etc. etc. Right now, there is NO recognition of the extra work involved -- in fact, many ISP courses look "easy" because most are lower-level.
- Don't let students pass if they can't form a coherent sentence that has proper grammar and punctuation.