GETF Subcommittee on Student Opportunities and Constraints:
Analysis of Commonwealth Campus Meetings

The GETF Subcommittee on Student Opportunities and Constraints was charged to 1) determine potential opportunities and challenges… 2) elicit student perceptions…. and 3) create a master list of opportunities and challenges perceived by students and as recognized by faculty and staff advisers. The members of our subcommittee have been diligent in carrying out this charge, striving to ascertain the required viewpoints by speaking with students and advisers throughout the Commonwealth.

In addition to conducting student focus groups within the colleges that comprise the University Park campus, as well as with non-traditional student groups, our subcommittee has facilitated consistent and meaningful discussions with both cohorts of students and cohorts of faculty and staff at the Commonwealth campuses at 18 Commonwealth Campuses (more than 36 meetings in total).

This document provides a preliminary analysis of the data we have collected from our Commonwealth Campus visits. We are grateful to Patrick Luo, Research Associate, and Jae-Young, doctoral candidate in Workforce Education, from the John A. Dutton e-Education Institute in the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences for conducting this analysis.

Analysis of Student Comments

Six major themes were identified from our discussions with the students at Commonwealth Campuses. The description of each theme and supporting evidence were listed in below:

THEME #1: Students had limited knowledge of General Education requirement and its role in the curriculum.

Many students seem to have limited knowledge of General Education (GenEd) and their first impression of GenEd courses is that they are “required,” “classes that everyone take,” and “stuff you have to take” in the first one or two years and need to “be gotten out of the way” before taking major-specific courses. However, in several of our focus group meetings, students did not know the required credits for GenEd and could not tell if a course they took belonged to GenEd or not. For example, many students at one campus were surprised to learn that CHEM 111 is actually a GenEd course.

Many students had no idea why they needed to take GenEd courses in college and how it was related to their own majors. One student commented, “(General Education) seems like an extension of high school. Feels like you are all over the place and have no
specialization.” Another student raised a question regarding the role of GenEd, asking “What’s the point? How does this impact my major?”

THEME #2: Students had mixed opinions about General Education.

Students have mixed feelings towards General Education. The most recognized benefits of GenEd include the opportunity of exploration, the development of fundamental skills and knowledge, and enhancement of GPA:

• **GenEd allows students to explore courses outside their majors and gain a better understanding of different options.**
  This helps undecided students to explore and experiment before making up their mind about their major. It also helps students to see the connection between different courses and their major field. For example, one student commented, “It is good to be able to take diverse classes...it lets me explore areas outside of my intended major. I might even discover something I’d like to major in more…or even minor in.”

• **GenEd provides students with a well-rounded education and teaches students fundamental skills and knowledge to be successful in college and in society.**
  While many students are questioning the relevance of GenEd, some students pointed out that the skills taught in GenEd courses were “transferable skills” and recognized the importance of GenEd by saying, “PSU is guaranteed to produce good readers, writers and people who can function in the workplace”; “I love GenEd courses, they can help in an interview.”

• **GenEd can boost students’ GPA.**
  Another noticeable motivation for taking GenEd courses is to get a higher GPA. Students admitted they took GenEd courses “for easy A’s”, as many of them heard that GenEd courses were “GPA savers” and were very much needed.

However, many students also expressed their dissatisfactions with the current GenEd, including the perceived irrelevance, poor quality, and time and money concerns.

• **GenEd is too general and doesn’t contribute to students’ academic and career goal.**
  Some students had no interest in taking GenEd courses as they believed those courses to either have nothing to do with their majors or overlap with their major courses. Some of the complaints are:
  - “(I am) learning things that aren’t what you are going to specifically use for a career”;
  - “Most general education courses won’t help with transition to the workforce.”
  - “Lab requirements are ridiculous especially for Liberal Arts majors”;
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o “You need courses to help you prepare for a major like econ for business - other GenEd (courses) do not help me with my major and I don't understand how they will help me.”

• **Some GenEd courses lack the quality.**
  Many factors contribute to the poor quality such as teacher credentials, teacher attitude, course design, and level of difficulties. The following are some students’ complaints:
  o “Teacher’s attitudes towards teaching general education were poor. A teacher would drink diet cokes and sit behind laptop computer”; o “Lower level science professors treat you like you are an idiot”; o “All KINES courses fail to meet expectations. It is often way too serious - taking a test in a badminton class? None of them have been fun and I don’t like buying the course packet”; o “The content of these courses isn’t always in depth - so it isn’t of great value.”

• **GenEd is not worth the time and money.**
  Given that many students did not see the relevance of GenEd and some GenEd courses are poor in quality, this finding is actually not surprising.
  o Reduction of total GenEd credit hours was viewed as a positive thing. One student suggested to reduce the required credits of GenEd to 25, and another student suggested “keep the liberal arts courses but reduce them so you can focus on what you like.” Another student commented, “I want to get them (GenEd courses) out of the way as quick as possible so I can get to my major courses and focus on them.”
  o Students did not believe GenEd courses should cost more than major courses in terms of the required materials. One student told us that the reason she avoided some GenEd courses was because “the course materials needed to get the grade are more expensive that materials needed for major. Books cost more that the books for the major”.

**THEME #3: The proposed new General Education was well received among students, and students wanted it to be more major-oriented, more flexible, more skill-centered, less tedious, and to include certain subjects.**

Students acknowledged that the current GenEd had its problems, seemed intrigued by proposed General Education reform, and gave rather positive responses to the ideas of “theme” and “outside-the-classroom component”. The following are some of the students’ comments: “I like the themes idea, can get at one of your passions outside of the major”; “classroom can be boring - outside stuff would be good”; “this (outside-the-classroom component) would be a good requirement.”

Students also expressed their opinions about what kind of GenEd best fit their need and suggested several changes to be made, including:
• **GenEd should include more major-specific courses than generic ones.** Students are more likely to see the value of a GenEd course if it is somehow related to their majors. As one student stated, “I am majoring in something. I want to focus. I want to do my major.” Another student suggested that there should be “math for social sciences majors” which has a different focus than “generic math.” An engineering student was convinced that GenEd would not help his/her job-seeking and asserted that “Engineering firms regard Gen Ed as a joke - they only care about your engineering skills.” Many students asked about the connection between themes and majors and said they preferred the concept of a theme that was more major-specific.

• **GenEd should grant students the flexibility to take courses based on individual needs and schedule.** Scheduling is a common concern about GenEd since “so many classes are only offered in a small time frames” and cannot fit students’ needs and schedule. Some students preferred to customize their GenEd, and hope the new GenEd would offer two options to choose from: create your own vs. specified themes.
  o One student said, “We don’t really get to pick our classes, since there aren’t many to begin with and we have to fit what is available into our schedules. We end up taking classes because they are offered and fit and not because they are what we wanted to study.”
  o Another student expressed similar opinion: “you should make sure you think about scheduling…a lot of times I can’t take the courses I want/need because they aren’t offered that semester or they are full – there aren’t enough course options now.”
  o One student also emphasized the importance of personalized experience and commented, “The more personal you can make my Penn State DuBois experience, the more likely I will be to stay here.”

• **GenEd should focus on the development of skills and competencies.** Students wanted GenEd courses to teach less generic theories and to start teaching more practical skills. Some of those skills are essential for students to survive in workplaces, and some skills are considered as important life skills. Students wanted to “incorporate more stuff that we can use in the real world” and believed that “the most important (GenEd) classes are skills classes”. Desirable skills to be emphasized in GenEd include: writing skills, interviewing skills, communicating skills, personal financing skills (e.g. do taxes, banking, mortgage, stocks), and language skills.

• **GenEd should reduce its total credit requirement.** Most students did not like the fact that they need to take many GenEd courses and wanted the curriculum to emphasize on their major courses. Some students suggested to “cut in half” or reduce it to 25 credits. Some students hoped GenEd would also count their club participation or military experience.

• **Students favor certain courses and hope those courses to be emphasized or included in GenEd.** Those courses include: technology courses, language
courses, communication courses, first year experience seminar, ethics (e.g. academic integrity), personal finance courses, GWS, and ENGL 015.

**THEME #4:** Students recognized the benefits of integrating experiential learning opportunities and engaged scholarship in General Education, but also had their concerns.

In general, students liked the idea of engaged scholarship and cherished the out-of-class experiential learning experience. Such learning experience kept them engaged and brought many unique benefits to students, such as real-life experience, development of leadership skills, and a professional network. The following are comments from the students.

- **Increased engagement.**
  - “These ideas get you more experience. This being a part of the class would make it more interesting. Hands-on real life experience is more beneficial and efficient for my learning.”
  - “If I could get my science learning, along with other Gen Ed subjects, through service learning instead, that would keep me here.”
  - “I would rather do real-world internships than take classes.”

- **Unique benefits of engage scholarship.**
  - “Any practical real world experience enhances education so extracurricular linked activities would be good; internships, coops, research are great - all majors should have that opportunity & require one of these.”
  - “Outside assignments are very valuable - I learn more there than in the classroom.”
  - “It is great to interact and network with other students.”
  - “It will give actual experience before internships, also for building good leadership.”
  - “Field trips really do help us learn….Activism and community work could be good.”

However, several students also expressed their concerns about engaged scholarship, including:

- **The evaluation and regulation of out-of-class activities.**
  - “How do you keep track of student activities?”
  - “Out of class experiences should be imbedded within course description so you know what you are taking (many students in the class agreed)
  - “Include much more clarity in course descriptions – it is frustrating to not know that you have to do external research when you first sign up…”

- **The effectiveness of engaged scholarship.**
  - “Engaged scholarship is not going to work because so many people participate in these activities at a very low level.”


• **Increased workload.**
  o “I don’t like it when a course has a service learning requirement that we have to do on top of going to class and all of our other assignments – if we did it instead of some of that, it would be great!”
  o “Research is very different to a senior than to a freshman, who can find that overwhelming.”

**THEME #5: Students were mostly concerned about the financial impact and flexibility of the proposed “themes” in General Education, especially for transfer students.**

Students were worried that they could no longer “double dip” under the new “theme” requirement therefore had to pay more tuition. For example, some students complained “taking classes away from the major (i.e., firewall) would mean taking more courses, which means more cost to student.” And there were worries that “students can ‘get lost’ because of financial issues if graduation is delayed.”

Many students asked what would happen if a student wanted to change his/her theme in the middle of the program. Some students pointed out “freshmen may be pushed to choose a theme too quickly, (and they) may regret later” and wondered whether the change of mind would hurt students in anyways.

How a theme would work for transfer students was another major concern. Many asked how a transfer student’s credits would fit into the existing themes in the current school. For example, would there be “any reduction in transferrable credit hours”? How would themes affect “students transferring in who have a wide range of credits”? “Will they (transferring students) need to be here longer to ‘fit in’ a theme”?

**THEME #6: Students suggested different kinds of support that would help them succeed in the proposed new General Education, including (1) proper advising, (2) pre-assessment, (3) regulated consistency, (4) clear course descriptions, and (5) tutorials.**

• **Advising is essential for helping students understand GenEd and selecting the right courses.** Supporting evidence from the notes include:
  o Students said “Make sure there is good advising at the campuses - knowing what to take and what not to take is almost an education itself.”
  o Students wanted to know more about the GenEd reform (e.g., themes) and asked questions such as “Would there be an introductory course that explains this?” and “Will there be a cap on certain exploratory classes so you can get in to find out?”

• **There needs to be assessment to evaluate students’ current condition and guide them take the right themes.**
Some proposed that “it would be cool if we could take some kind of self-assessment that would use the results to match our areas of interest with gen ed courses that cover those areas.”

One student complained that “Many GenEd review what I had in HS – I feel like I’ve taken them (three psych courses) before. We should be assessed first, like we are in English, Math, Chem on placement tests”.

- **New GenEd needs to be regulated to make sure it is consistent across campuses.** Students asked “Do general education classes have a curriculum?” and pointed out a need for consistency in rigor and learning goals for GenEd in all campuses.

- **GenEd faculty should provide students with clear course description in the course syllabi.** Students urged course descriptions to be more useful and well-written so that “we know what the course will really be about,” and “we can make better choices when selecting classes.”

- **It is preferable to have a tutorial that students can refer to when selecting GenEd courses.**

**Analysis of Faculty and Staff Comments**

Five major themes were identified from our discussions with the faculty and staff at Commonwealth Campuses. The description of each theme and supporting evidence are listed below.

**THEME #7: Faculty and staff are aware of the problems in General Education, but they would rather tweak the current General Education system than make radical changes.**

Faculty and staff were fully aware the problems in GenEd such as perceived irrelevance, poor quality, students’ resistance, and lack of flexibility. However, they believed that most of those problems can be solved or alleviated by making minor changes to the current GenEd system. Those changes include:

- **Providing more advising time and effort to help students understand the value and relevance of GenEd.** Supporting evidence from our notes include:
  - “Students look at GenEds as not being important to their major. This has to be addressed at the faculty & student level. Faculty must articulate to students that a degree—in order to be meaningful—has to contain liberal arts courses that also have value in addition to the courses in the major.”
  - “The message about GenEd is not consistently delivered.”
  - “We should do a better job, across the University, of introducing Gen Ed to students…of explaining why we do this.”
“This past year we started doing it at orientation (summer) – why we do it, why it is important, the logistics of it, etc. Give them a list of the Gen Ed course offerings so they can begin to see what might appeal and they take the sheet to their advising session. This also introduces Gen Ed to parents… advisors also help students see how Gen Ed will help them with prospective employers….even for internships (that might begin 1.5 years after orientation!)”

- **Rebranding GenEd and removing the label “general” from its name to emphasize its relevance to students’ academic and career goals.** One comment from faculty/staff is that, “GenEd is labelled as supplementary and not as important and may be a waste of time and money. We need to get rid of that label—get rid of 'general'—courses are just courses and are part of distribution requirements in the major.”

- **Making GenEd courses consistent across campuses.** Faculty/staff pointed out that “We have had students who have started here, transferred to another PSU location, then came back and they tell us that the courses are not consistent from one location to another (i.e., content…one campus might incorporate more science/math in a given course than another campus),” and argued for “more consistency across campuses in courses and course content (same books, same foci).”

- **Enhancing the credentials of GenEd faculty.** It is suggested GenEd should hire less Graduate Assistants, Fixed Term 2 faculty, and adjunct faculty.
  - “Idea of ‘GenEd faculty’ might be seen as 'back of the bus faculty’ - how can we avoid this? By principle, GenEds are not to be taught by Grad Assistants or FT2 faculty…but they are at some campuses (FT2).”
  - “We need less adjunct faculty teaching GE - they can’t help students bridge the course content”.

- **Promoting the 2+2 and 3-6-9 models that were proven to be successful to increase the appeal of GenEd to Commonwealth students.** Both models provide students with certain flexibility.

Faculty and staff did not want radical changes to be made the current GenEd system, and many believed the proposed GenEd reform (e.g., the introduction of themes) might create more problems rather than solving them.

- **Faculty and staff thought the current GenEd was not completely broken and was still fixable, and fixing would be more cost-effective than reinventing.**
  
Supporting comments from faculty/staff include:
  - “We at this campus are not yet convinced that what we have is so broken as to completely reinvent GenEds – when we don’t communicate the current GenEd program well (or at all) to students.”
  - “Why aren’t we having discussions about how to fix current logistical problems, before we introduce something new?”
  - “We already have a structure that allows the different areas of knowledge.”
• Faculty and staff did not understand the purpose and rationale behind the proposed new GenEd and how it would be implemented across campuses, therefore were unconvinced that it would make any difference. Related comments include:
  o “If you are interested in reform, you challenge every single aspect of what you currently do. We have to know why we want to do this. We have to evaluate and assess the entire existing educational structure in this country. You have to challenge all of your assumptions and be willing to rebuild it. Individual campuses might be willing to do this, but will all of PSU?”
  o “Really a question of what we want these things to do – the WHY – before I can think of structure and packaging – organic, imposed, artificial.”
  o “Much more concerns about the timing and lack of enough discussion before an aggressive implementation timetable – and why decisions were made (themes, firewalling) without enough input.”
  o “The campuses already face significant issues when seeking out new programs to deliver, and so how would themes be any different?”

• Some faculty and staff had foreseen potential problems and disruptions as a result of the GenEd reform. Those problems include:
  o Disrupting the existing successful models. “Original 2+2 mission is worrisome with these proposed changes”; “Can’t afford to lose 2+2 mission – really important”; “Keep the 3/6/9 rule.”
  o Lack of resources. Many felt that the Commonwealth campuses lack the resources to accommodate the proposed changes and might not be able to compete with the University Park or local competitors.
  o Difficulty for transfer students. “Could make it hard for students to transfer in to Penn State or between campuses – just the perception of problems transferring could be enough to scare students off.”
  o Loss of flexibility. “Flexibility may be LOST with themes”; “Much concern here that changes would HURT the current flexibility.”

THEME #8: Faculty and staff were concerned about how the proposed changes in GenEd might affect faculty’s job security and teaching role.

Three questions were raised during the discussion:

• Do changes such as themes enable faculty to be able to teach courses along with their academic strength or specialization classes?
  o “This could push faculty toward teaching courses that they might not think are best representative of the discipline in order to fit a theme—limit faculty autonomy.”
  o “Draw upon campus faculty expertise/research more deliberately.”

• How will the changed curriculum affect faculty’s job security?
  o “Concerns that faculty will lose their jobs if they are no longer needed and if their courses/discipline are not necessary for theme-based Gen Ed.”
• “Hard to imagine creating single positions to teach Gen Ed curriculum instead of part-time…one faculty member is not likely to have the right background for multiple fields.”

- **Will the proposed changes such as themes reduce or change faculty’s teaching role?**
  - “Will faculty complain if the required credits go down and they don’t teach as much?”

**THEME #9: Contrary to students, faculty and staff were more critical of the proposed “themes” in General Education and had identified several potential issues.**

Faculty and staff expressed various concerns regarding the introduction of GenEd themes, including:

- **The decision to introduce themes seemed forced upon and was not supported by convincing evidence.**
  - “Concern expressed, too, that this is once again a change orchestrated by UP forces, that will be forced upon campuses w/o enough deliberation as to why we are making all these changes.”
  - “Forcing campuses to guess what themes students may want – could be a nightmare – not only 1 course they’re not interested, in but a whole theme – smaller campuses – how to do?”
  - “It is insane to go top down and enforce this across all campuses.”
  - “Lack of comfort with the changes and level of (lack of?) transparency thus far in the Gen Ed revision process—analogy drawn between the UP: campus relationship and a colonizer: colonized model.”
  - “Who will really drive themes? Not the faculty at the campuses…”

- **Themes would favor the University Park campus over the Commonwealth campuses.**
  - “So many students will ask to go to UP for their theme.”
  - “We must take into consideration the range of institutional competition faced by many campuses and the ways that students flow into and out of the system (even those who stay in but stop out).”
  - “The campuses already face significant issues when seeking out new programs to deliver, and so how would themes be any different? Would we face the same issues if we seek to deliver a theme developed at UP?”
  - “CCs will only be able to offer limited themes…will that hurt our ability to attract students and/or hurt retention?”

- **Fears of some courses becoming marginalized under proposed themes.**
  - “Are there going to be enough students for the ‘other’ courses? - Our ‘regular’ courses will become marginalized.”
  - There might be “probable unit-specific lobbying for certain courses due to revenue issues.”
Themes would pose many logistic and management challenges.

- How themes would affect transfer students and return students?
- “It is impossible to deliver a variety of themes at small campuses.”
- “(It is) logistically impossible to have students designing their own themes.”
- “We also have a minimum number of students to run a course. What if students can’t complete a theme because they can’t get the required courses?”
- “I’m thinking about LAS. This idea of themes sounds like systematizing a degree program. As an advisor-intense major, it warns us just how difficult it can be to manage themes.”
- “Theoretically we want students to have more choices; practically we want to ensure that students have enough choices to fit their schedule logistically.”
- How should we handle the issues such as degree audits, transfer credits, roll-out needs, faculty recruit, or co-curricular programming?

Predetermined themes will make GenEd less flexible and exploratory.

- “When creating a theme, we’d have to make sure there were more than just a fixed number of required courses for the theme or we will continue to run into problems where students can’t fit the courses they need into their schedules. Themes will need to have options within them.”
- “If PSU wants to attract transfer students, the current themes plan will discourage them from coming to PSU. Some (transfer students) already don’t start at PSU because of money. They do Gen Ed in first 2 years at other less expensive colleges before they transfer - this is a frame of mind – it’s something you do in first two years and if it is done at a community college, it saves them money and allows them to come to PSU for the last 2 years.”
- “Students transfer both into and out of PSU and need to be able to continue to choose based on what works for them.”
- “Students don’t understand why they have to take Gen Ed courses - having the variety would allow them to explore secondary interest.”
- “Flexibility is the key to exploration.”

THEME #10: The most anticipated benefits of General Education Themes are more in-depth learning, ownership to students, and opportunities for interdisciplinary learning.

Evidence from the notes include:

- “Students would gain a deeper understanding of a particular area, perhaps will gain insight into how disciplines are connected.”
- “I see some real benefits in crossing disciplines.”
“Themes would help faculty at small campuses articulate connections across courses.”
“Themes would help in advising - help to channel them and give them ownership for their future.”

THEME #11: Commonwealth Campuses already lack sufficient resources to support General Education. They are concerned that this situation will only worsen with the introduction of General Education themes.

- **Budget cut/restraints would make it difficult for Commonwealth Campuses to adopt the proposed GenEd themes.**
  - “We have a lack of variety in Gen Ed offerings; had to scale back on course offerings due to budget cuts/restraints – there always seems to be more for us to do, less for us to do it with.”
  - “Budget constraints even affect eLearning. The 100-level Forensic Science offered through the eLearning Coop is not even made available here as a Gen Ed.”
  - “Budget model makes this difficult, too. Some World Campus courses are not open to RI students during fall/spring.”
  - “With a limited budget we have fewer Part Time faculty who can teach some of the “softer” sciences.”

- **Some Commonwealth Campuses did not have the proper human resources to create and operate GenEd themes.**
  - “We will need more resources and more faculty, or we will be stuck having to do more with less. “
  - “We already don’t have enough faculty to teach courses. Could we do extra loads?”
  - “University-wide themes may be difficult logistically because we don’t have enough faculty to teach the extra courses.”
  - “We operate on a skeleton faculty – how will we offer both current and new curriculum as we transition? All of our faculty are already maxed out (one of the few campuses who can claim this)”

- **Some Commonwealth Campuses did not have the capacity to offer a wide spectrum of courses to create themes.**
  - “Themes do NOT sound easy to offer at all campuses.”
  - “Our campus – some GenEd offerings are due to faculty expertise, what is available, reticence to go out and find people (in the Philly area) with skills/expertise to allow us to grow the variety of GENEDs we offer.”
  - “The logistics of doing this on a small campus is a huge concern – we could try to share resources with other campuses via technology…but do our students want this?”
  - “A small campus has difficulty offering a broad spectrum of courses. More online courses should be available…but many students don’t like web-based courses; they’re not disciplined enough to take them.”
“How can the small campuses deliver a larger number of themes?”
“Our campus would have limited options.”

THEME #12: Faculty and Staff want more transparency in the proposed General Education revisions and would like to get more involved in the decision making process. They also wanted more time before implementing the new General Education curriculum.

“Much more concerns about the timing and lack of enough discussion before an aggressive implementation timetable – and why decisions were made (themes, firewalling) without enough input.”
“Why such an aggressive timeline?? If you really want to have substantive conversations about a huge change, it takes more time to consider all things carefully. Is Middle States driving this FA 2016 implementation? If so, did Middle States say we had to completed overhaul GenEd or just examine it?”
“Lack of comfort with the changes and level of transparency thus far in the GenEd revision process—analogy drawn between the UP: campus relationship and a colonizer: colonized model.”
“(More) meetings like this so we can be updated on the progress of the Task Force.”
“ Websites are difficult – we would prefer a mass email periodically.”
“Face to face meetings for updates would be our preference.”

Comparison between Campus Colleges and University Colleges

There are two groupings of Penn State Commonwealth Campuses: Penn State's 5 Campus Colleges and the remaining Commonwealth Campuses that make up the University College. The detailed list of Penn State campus structure beyond University Park is listed below:

1. The Abington College (Penn State Abington campus)
2. The Altoona College (Penn State Altoona campus)
3. The Behrend College (Penn State Erie campus)
4. The Berks College(Penn State Berks campus)
5. The Capital College (Penn State Harrisburg campus)
6. The University College, which includes:
   - Penn State Beaver
   - Penn State Brandywine
   - Penn State DuBois
   - Penn State Fayette
   - Penn State Greater Allegheny
   - Penn State Hazleton
In order to analyze whether the aforementioned themes are representative for both Campus Colleges and University Colleges, we categorized the collected notes into two categories based on the two different campus types and re-examined the notes to see if each identified theme was representative for each category. We subjectively decided that:

- If a theme is true for over 70% of the campuses within a category, the theme should be considered as **representative** for the category.
- If a theme is true for 30%-70% of the campuses within a category, the theme should be considered as **somewhat representative** for the category.
- If a theme is true for less than 30% of the campuses within a category, the theme should be considered as **not representative** for the category.

The results of our comparative analysis are presented in the following table (Table 1):

**Table 1:**
The representativeness of the 12 identified themes for Campus Colleges and University Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Representative for Campus Colleges?</th>
<th>Representative for University Colleges?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme #1: Students had limited knowledge of General Education requirement and its role in the curriculum.</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme #2: Students had mixed opinions about General Education.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme #3: The proposed new General Education was well received among students, and students wanted it to be more major-oriented, more flexible, more skill-centered, less tedious, and to include certain subjects.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme #4: Students recognized the benefits of integrating experiential learning opportunities and engaged scholarship in General Education, but also had their concerns.</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme #5: Students were mostly concerned about the financial impact and flexibility of the proposed “themes” in General Education,</td>
<td>representative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Representative for Campus Colleges?</td>
<td>Representative for University Colleges?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>especially for transfer students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme #6: Students suggested different kinds of support that would help them succeed in the proposed new General Education, including (1) proper advising, (2) pre-assessment, (3) regulated consistency, (4) clear course descriptions, and (5) tutorials.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme #7: Faculty and staff are aware of the problems in General Education, but they would rather tweak the current General Education system than make radical changes.</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme #8: Faculty and staff were concerned about how the proposed changes in GenEd might affect faculty’s job security and teaching role.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme #9: Contrary to students, faculty and staff were more critical of the proposed “themes” in General Education and had identified several potential issues.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme #10: The most anticipated benefits of General Education Themes are more in-depth learning, ownership to students, and opportunities for interdisciplinary learning.</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme #11: Commonwealth Campuses already lack sufficient resources to support General Education. They are concerned that this situation will only worsen with the introduction of General Education themes.</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme #12: Faculty and Staff want more transparency in the proposed General Education revisions and would like to get more involved in the decision making process. They also wanted more time before implementing the new General Education curriculum.</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>