

1. Given that there is support to help faculty identify topics and teaching partners for “Engaging the Global Community,” along with faculty development to support course creation, would you consider teaching a linked course in “Engaging the Global Community”?

	Definitely Yes				Definitely No	Rating Average	Rating Count
	36.1% (35)	14.4% (14)	7.2% (7)	18.6% (18)	23.7% (23)	2.79	97
answered question							97
skipped question							1

2. Given that there is support to help faculty identify courses that can be linked in “Exploring the Natural World,” along with faculty development to support course creation, would you consider teaching a linked course in “Exploring the Natural World”?

	Definitely Yes				Definitely No	Rating Average	Rating Count
	20.4% (20)	14.3% (14)	14.3% (14)	23.5% (23)	27.6% (27)	3.23	98
answered question							98
skipped question							0

3. Given that there is support to help faculty identify courses that can be linked in “Examining Human Experience,” along with faculty development to support course creation, would you consider teaching a linked course in “Examining Human Experience”?

	Definitely Yes				Definitely No	Rating Average	Rating Count
	34.7% (33)	17.9% (17)	4.2% (4)	17.9% (17)	25.3% (24)	2.81	95
answered question							95
skipped question							3

4. Add any additional comments.

	Response Count
	25
answered question	25
skipped question	73

Q4. Add any additional comments.

1	In my discipline, I'm finding it hard to imagine a three credit course that focuses on a single topic or "theme" that can be linked with another discipline and will still be accessible to nonmajor undergraduates. I can certainly envision a module or something that's 1/3-1/2 of a team taught course that nonmajors could follow and be excited about, but anything more is going to necessarily go too deep. And I'm still deeply concerned about the scheduling issues for the linked courses. There has been no answer to the question of what happens if the person you were expecting to link with goes on leave - particularly if the leave is unanticipated.	Apr 6, 2013 1:10 PM
2	I would be interested in topics such as nanoscience, physics/math of music/sound. Having taught the FYS topic climate change and social justice, I would be interested in exploring a similar linked or team-taught course in the new Core.	Apr 5, 2013 12:53 PM
3	Although I think the linked courses are an interesting concept, I think the implementation of them will be extremely difficult. Trying to ensure that there are not time conflicts among multiple depts will be a nightmare, I think. Also, although some courses might link well conceptually, based on how majors and minors are put together and/or student interests, linking courses may have a negative impact on enrollment in those courses.	Apr 5, 2013 9:46 AM
4	I find it difficult to teach to or discuss my subjects with students who don't know anything about it but they are not in the intro class for that field. The substantive knowledge and methodological rigor is lacking without some training and so all that happens is a batting around of trendy topics and ideas. That's great for porch talk but not sufficient for a college core curriculum.	Apr 5, 2013 9:27 AM
5	The creation of new courses is not a problem in the proposed Core. I doubt faculty would refuse to expand their teaching repertoire, given the needed support to do so. The main problem with the proposed model is its implementation and the impact that it would have on personal, long-term schedules.	Apr 5, 2013 7:11 AM
6	My work has always been extremely interdisciplinary. I am happy to collaborate with colleagues on topics for which I can contribute. Time to develop these courses may be the greatest problem. Money and other resources are helpful, but something has to give, particularly with additional demands on our time in the form of advising and administrative work.	Apr 5, 2013 5:24 AM
7	Linking courses would be an added burden to science students who already have difficulty in finding time to register for all of the required as well as supplemental courses needed for their major. The result will be a distaste for the core courses and a resentment for having to take them. This will affect the current student's image of the university, possibly resulting in negative "publicity" to those interested in joining the JCU community in the future.	Apr 5, 2013 5:04 AM
8	It is absolutely critical that faculty teaching these courses are doing so because they want to, not to fulfill a departmental obligation. If faculty are not energized and engaged by the possibilities of these courses, they should not participate. If, without those faculty there are not enough instructors to man the courses, then this approach to the core will not work.	Apr 5, 2013 4:52 AM
9	Great ideas! Looking forward to hearing your results!	Apr 3, 2013 3:07 PM

Q4. Add any additional comments.

10	I support the proposed new Core and want to be involved in it in some way. I am not sure the best way for me, but would consider any of the possible three Integrated Courses.	Apr 3, 2013 2:03 PM
11	Thank you to CAP for conducting this survey. Still, I would like to emphasize that a curriculum should be based not on what faculty feel like teaching, but on what students need to learn.	Apr 3, 2013 8:04 AM
12	These linked courses will be a lot of work, but I really like the idea.	Apr 3, 2013 6:57 AM
13	I am concerned about the logistics of coordinating faculty schedules (including leaves and courseload reductions) as well as coordinating 6 cr around student schedules, particularly when labs are involved.	Apr 3, 2013 4:48 AM
14	Would like to see another core proposal	Apr 2, 2013 1:11 PM
15	I am very concerned that Education as an academic discipline, is being ignored. Certainly many of the foundation of education courses should/could be included in the Core?	Apr 2, 2013 12:06 PM
16	[1] Remember FYS? When it was introduced with the last "new Core," there was great enthusiasm and excitement. But this gradually faded over time as FYS became more of a chore than the opportunity to explore new ideas and the administration grew less willing to compensate the faculty for their efforts. I see the team taught course and the linked courses as FYS times 3. They are in theory fascinating ways to present information to our students, but the JCU administration has a poor track record on sustaining programs over an extended period of time. Faculty dedication eventually burns out. [2] I looked at the linked course example most closely related to my area of expertise. When I began to replace disciplines and departments with the names of faculty who could actually offer such a course, the selection was very slim. More importantly, it would include faculty who offer courses they developed at JCU, but are not part of the courses they were hired to teach or their department expects them teach for the major. (This is based on firsthand experience.) While the faculty members might be willing to teach a linked course for "three times in four years," their departments may not be as willing. Especially when various leaves and administrative release time are involved.	Apr 2, 2013 10:31 AM
17	Here are my primary reasons for answering "Definitely No" for each question. (My own 1, 2 and 3 in what follows do not correspond directly to the Survey's question numbers.) 1) I remain unconvinced that a Core focused so heavily upon globalization and integration ("linked") is academically and pedagogically sound. Calls for evidence that it is have been made often, in one venue or another, over the last two years. APTF Committee members (and others) repeatedly fail to provide any. I myself know of none, though it is certainly true that claims about their soundness are easy to find. But what is wanted is evidence, and evidence the sources of which we all have time, as scholars as scientists, after all, to critically assess and discuss. (All too often, e.g., we are told in open hearings that "this is the way to go," and "you have to stop 'silo-ing up' and go with integration." Neither of these claims, nor ones like them, constitute evidence for anything; and, about the second, no--we do NOT have to stop believing in our disciplines.) Not very high quality stuff, these replies to questions about evidence. There are here real troubling questions about	Apr 2, 2013 9:07 AM

Q4. Add any additional comments.

academic and pedagogical integrity that the Proposal's supporters continually ignore. That, by itself, is plenty reason to not be supportive of these elements of the Proposal, should it pass. 2) It is quite simply not sufficient to add the hypothetical presumption of support for the proposed Core in answering these questions--we need to know about the LEVEL of support and the CONSISTENCY of the support. A mere few hundred dollars for FYS preparation, say, is support, but not nearly enough, I believe. Providing support for the initial years of the new Core is equally insufficient. Moreover, what it would take to make oneself professionally ready to teach a course in globalization and, at least in some cases, integration, is rather more than, say, one summer workshop (an old FYS standby), but nearly a whole academic year, or more, requiring something along the lines of a sabbatical. Preparing oneself for one's own discipline takes many years of intensive study; in some cases, anyway, globalization and integration courses might require the same. Will there be THIS level of support? Administrative support for the FYS program waned severely after its first several years, even though it remained part of the extant Core. So: for how long will there be support in this case--and why the difference? Along these same lines, it is tremendously worrisome, to say the very least, that the means by which this alleged support will come has yet to be adequately explained. At what expense to extant programs--programs in which I still believe--will support for the new Core come? Even a cursory read of the Proposal makes it plain that many departments/disciplines will quite simply be incapable of sustaining themselves if the Proposal passes. (E.g., If there is no literature or math requirements in the new Core, as there are in the present one, then courses AND THE FACULTY THAT TEACH THOSE COURSES, will quite simply be in less demand. On the whole, the only recourse for those faculty will be in fulfilling our new globalization/integration needs. But, first, this means that those programs--literature and math, in this case--have been weakened to that extent; and, second, this may dramatically change the faculty member's professional life in ways that may not be to his or her professional liking and/or in keeping with his or her professional and pedagogical beliefs. Perhaps this means that, for those faculty, job satisfaction plummets; perhaps it means that they leave JCU. Either way, these are all real costs to the University. I believe that either one of these costs by itself is already too high a price to pay merely in order to support the globalization and integration elements of the Proposal...especially in light of point (1) raised above. 3) I remain passionate about the discipline to which I have devoted a lifetime of study (and toil and money, etc.). My interest in it hasn't waned. Moreover, the amount of time I desperately want and need to complete some research projects is already hard to come by. I will certainly not wish to exchange that for instead devoting myself to preparing globalization/integration courses, especially in light of points (1) and (2) above.

18	Where is the alternative proposal to this disaster of a core?	Apr 2, 2013 8:03 AM
19	I am in the Humanities, so I may be less inclined to teach in the sciences, though I could imagine some topics. For example. I could do a literary/historical portrait of natural disasters or environment.	Apr 2, 2013 7:50 AM
20	My course load is pretty well defined by the specific content I teach in my department. If there were enough people to teach the courses I usually teach, I would be more interested in teaching a linked course. At this point, I can't see how I would fit in the new core, even though I am supportive of it.	Apr 2, 2013 7:43 AM

Q4. Add any additional comments.

21	This whole thing is a disaster! Improvements need to be made in the core curriculum, but this is definitely not the solution. Students interested in getting into a professional school need to concentrate on areas in their major in order to be competitive.	Apr 2, 2013 7:36 AM
22	The Report of the CWG does not provide enough evidence of the feasibility of actually realizing the integrated course structure. In addition, by restricting the disciplines that may serve as coordinators of two of the integrated course areas, the Report contradicts the interdisciplinary ambitions for which it argues.	Apr 2, 2013 7:29 AM
23	"support" needs to be described more fully	Apr 2, 2013 6:39 AM
24	Like the integrated idea a lot.	Apr 2, 2013 6:38 AM
25	As the administration has pointed out several times, the funds required to support something like faculty development must come from somewhere. It is my opinion it is likely to come from what otherwise might be faculty compensation.	Apr 2, 2013 6:37 AM