## Summary report

Lists all the questions in the survey and displays summary information for each question. Text input is not included.

Thursday, March 17, 2005 10:10 AM Report date: Start date: Thursday, March 3, 2005 9:25 AM Stop date: Sunday, March 13, 2005 11:59 PM

Completed responses: 102

1. Have you taught General Studies course(s)?

Item CountPercentCum. countCum. percent 71.57% Yes 71.57%73 28.43%102 100.0% 29 No Total 102 100% 102 100%

Total responses: 102

2. In what department do you teach?

Item	_
Acco	u
Λ 1 / Λ	

	_		_	_
Item	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent
Accounting/Finance	3	2.94%	3	2.94%
Art/Art History	2	1.96%	5	4.9%
Biology	6	5.88%	11	10.78%
Business Administration/Business	1	0.98%	12	11.76%
Education	-	0.3070	12	11.7070
Chemistry	3	2.94%	15	14.71%
Communication Disorders	3	2.94%	18	17.65%
Communications	5	4.9%	23	22.55%
Computer Science and Information	1	0.98%	24	23.53%
Systems	ı	0.96%	24	23.33%
Criminal Justice	2	1.96%	26	25.49%
Economics	5	4.9%	31	30.39%
English	9	8.82%	40	39.22%
Family and Consumer Sciences	5	4.9%	45	44.12%
Geography and Earth Sciences	1	0.98%	46	45.1%
Health/Physical Education/and Leisure	0	7.040/	<b>5</b> 4	FO 0.40/
Studies	8	7.84%	54	52.94%
History	6	5.88%	60	58.82%
Industrial Technology	6	5.88%	66	64.71%
Management/Marketing	4	3.92%	70	68.63%
Mathematics and Statistics	2	1.96%	72	70.59%
Modern Languages	4	3.92%	76	74.51%
Music and Performing Arts	4	3.92%	80	78.43%
Physics and Physical Science	2	1.96%	82	80.39%
Political Science	1	0.98%	83	81.37%
Psychology	8	7.84%	91	89.22%
Sociology and Social Work	2	1.96%	93	91.18%
Teacher Education	9	8.82%	102	100.0%
Total	102	100%	102	100%
T ( )	-			

responses: 102

3. In what college do you teach?

Item	Coun	tPercentCum. coun	tCum. percent
NSS	34	33.33%34	33.33%
COE	20	19.61%54	52.94%
B & T	24	23.53%78	76.47%

FAH Total Total responses: 4. Purpose		24 23.53%10 102 100% 10		100.0% 100%			
Our GS Program is characterized by an absence of clarity about the purpose of the program.		2	3	4	5	The purposes of our GS Program are explicit and clear for both the faculty and students.	Total
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum	8 7.84% 8 7.84% 8	28 27.45% 36 35.29% 64	22 21.57% 58 56.86% 130	89	13 12.75% 102 100.0% 319		102 100% 102 100% 319
Average: 3.13 Median: 0.0 5. GS Council						0.00	
Our GS Council suffers from the lack of a clear mission, and a sense of helplessness.	1	2	3	4	5	Our GS Council is the most intellectually exciting and challenging committee on	Total
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum Average: 2.42 Median: 0.0 6. Goals	19 18.63% 19 18.63% 19	27 26.47% 46 45.1% 73	50 49.02% 96 94.12% 223	102	0 0% 102 100.0% 247	our campus.	102 100% 102 100% 247
(2) To be about supposed to the contract of th						Our CS	
Our GS Program is expressed primarily as a list of courses that students must take.		2	3	4	5	Our GS Program is expressed primarily as a set of goals for student learning and	
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum Average: 2.3 Median: 0.0 7. Institutional Mis	36 35.29% 36 35.29% 36 ssion	26 25.49% 62 60.78% 88	18 17.65% 80 78.43% 142	97	5 4.9% 102 100.0% 235	development.	102 100% 102 100% 235

Our institutional mission provides no guidance for establishing priorities for undergrad. education. Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum  Average: 2.97 Median: 0.0  8. Student Unde	1 10 9.8% 10 9.8% 10	2 24 23.53% 34 33.33% 58	3 40 39.22% 74 72.55% 178	4 15 14.71% 89 87.25% 238	5 13 12.75% 102 100.0% 303	Curriculum decisions are grounded in our mission statement and history/traditions	Total
Students are informed about our GS Program primarily through our institutional catalog.		2	3	4	5	Students gair an understanding of our GS Program through orientation, brochures, workshops, etc.	
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum Average: 2.56 Median: 0.0 9. Structure	25 24.51% 25 24.51% 25	25 24.51% 50 49.02% 75	29 28.43% 79 77.45% 162	16 15.69% 95 93.14% 226	7 6.86% 102 100.0% 261	eic.	102 100% 102 100% 261
Our GS Program reflects a distribution structure, in which students select courses from lists.	1	2	3	4	5	Our GS Porgram reflects a corcurriculum structure.	e Total
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum Average: 2.26	40 39.22% 40 39.22% 40	21 20.59% 61 59.8% 82	23 22.55% 84 82.35% 151	10 9.8% 94 92.16% 191	8 7.84% 102 100.0% 231		102 100% 102 100% 231
Median: 0.0 10. Coherence Students experience our	1	2	3	4	5	Our GS Program	Total
GS Program as fragmented.	1	2	S	4	ວ	strives for a coherent	าบเลเ

						educational experience.	
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum	34 33.33% 34 33.33% 34	19 18.63% 53 51.96% 72	29 28.43% 82 80.39% 159	12 11.76% 94 92.16% 207	8 7.84% 102 100.0% 247	10 10 10	)0% )2 )0%
Average: 2.42 Median: 0.0 11. Values and S	Social Respo	onsibility					
Our GS Program does not include political, moral, of ethical dimensions.	)	2	3	4	5	Our GS Program includes political, To moral, and ethical dimensions.	otal
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum	9 8.82% 9 8.82% 9	13 12.75% 22 21.57% 35	32 31.37% 54 52.94% 131	31 30.39% 85 83.33% 255	17 16.67% 102 100.0% 340	10 10 10	)0% )2 )0%
Average: 3.33 Median: 0.0 12. Global Persp	pective						
Our GS Progran does not give special attention to international and global		2	3	4	5	Our GS Program recognizes the internationalization To of America's interests and	otal
issues. Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum	15 14.71% 15 14.71% 15	17 16.67% 32 31.37% 49	33 32.35% 65 63.73% 148	25 24.51% 90 88.24% 248	12 11.76% 102 100.0% 308	10 10 10	02 00% 02 00% 08
Average: 3.02 Median: 0.0 13. Multiculturali	ism						
Our GS Progran has no multicultural or diversity component.	n 1	2	3	4	5	Our GS Program recognizes the richness To and changing composition	otal
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum Average: 3.44	7 6.86% 7 6.86% 7	10 9.8% 17 16.67% 27	35 34.31% 52 50.98% 132	31 30.39% 83 81.37% 256	19 18.63% 102 100.0% 351	10	)0% )2 )0%

Median: 0.0 14. Student Experience

The bind stopp of depleted, 174 feet month, channel, is that the bin point for and leader.	ered to the New York season work and cornel

						Our GS Program recognizes	
Our faculty members know little about the lives of the students.	1	2	3	4	5	and takes seriously students' histories, ideas, attitudes, &	Total
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum	10 9.8% 10 9.8% 10	21 20.59% 31 30.39% 52	38 37.25% 69 67.65% 166	25 24.51% 94 92.16% 266	8 7.84% 102 100.0% 306	perceptions.	102 100% 102 100% 306
Average: 3.0 Median: 0.0 15. Student Diffe	erences					The fearth.	
The faculty who teach in our GS						The faculty who teach ou GS courses	ır
Program consider their students to be similiar and interchangeable.	1	2	3	4	5	are responsive to students at different levels of development	
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum	11 10.78% 11 10.78% 11	17 16.67% 28 27.45% 45	33 32.35% 61 59.8% 144	29 28.43% 90 88.24% 260	12 11.76% 102 100.0% 320		102 100% 102 100% 320
Average: 3.14 Median: 0.0 16. Articulation							
No effort is made	e					Articulation agreements ensure that	
to address articulation issues for transfer students	1	2	3	4	5	students can transfer to ou institution without credi loss.	ır Total
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum	4 3.92% 4 3.92% 4	17 16.67% 21 20.59% 38	46 45.1% 67 65.69% 176	28 27.45% 95 93.14% 288	7 6.86% 102 100.0% 323		102 100% 102 100% 323
Average: 3.17 Median: 0.0 17. Continual Ch	ange						
Our GS Program	n 1	2	3	4	5	Our GS	Total

was formulated, approved, and implemented several years ago, and has remained static.						Program is continually improved due to evaluations by outside reviewers, & student	
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum	40 39.22% 40 39.22% 40	28 27.45% 68 66.67% 96	23 22.55% 91 89.22% 165	10 9.8% 101 99.02% 205	1 0.98% 102 100.0% 210	reactions.	102 100% 102 100% 210
Average: 2.06 Median: 0.0 18. Faculty Expe	rience						
Many of the GS faculty have little or no understanding of the		2	3	4	5	GS faculty have a good understanding of the purpose/rational	f Total
purpose/rationale of the curriculum						of the curriculum	
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum	15 14.71% 15 14.71% 15	23 22.55% 38 37.25% 61	33 32.35% 71 69.61% 160	22 21.57% 93 91.18% 248	9 8.82% 102 100.0% 293		102 100% 102 100% 293
Average: 2.87 Median: 0.0 19. Teaching				0			
Faculty and chairs regard teaching GS						Faculty and chairs regard teaching GS	
courses as a burden and a service to non-	1	2	3	4	5	courses as an opportunity and an honor	
majors. Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum	3 2.94% 3 2.94% 3	12 11.76% 15 14.71% 27	51 50.0% 66 64.71% 180	25 24.51% 91 89.22% 280	11 10.78% 102 100.0% 335		102 100% 102 100% 335
Average: 3.28 Median: 0.0 20. Faculty-Stud	ent Interactior	ns					
The faculty and students in our GS Program rarely interact outside of the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	Our GS Program fosters close interactions between faculty and students outside of	Total

						alassas	
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum	13 12.75% 13 12.75% 13	31 30.39% 44 43.14% 75	33 32.35% 77 75.49% 174	18 17.65% 95 93.14% 246	7 6.86% 102 100.0% 281	classes.	102 100% 102 100% 281
Average: 2.75 Median: 0.0 21. Faculty Com	munity					At LINIX for order	
At UNK, faculty members teach						At UNK, faculty interacts across	<i>'</i>
his/her own GS courses without consultation with other faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	disciplinary lines to interdisciplinary projects & team planning.	Total /
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum	33 32.35% 33 32.35% 33	31 30.39% 64 62.75% 95	28 27.45% 92 90.2% 179	7 6.86% 99 97.06% 207	3 2.94% 102 100.0% 222	team planning.	102 100% 102 100% 222
Average: 2.18 Median: 0.0 22. Coordination						Our GS	
Our GS Program exists as a set of	f					Program has an administrator	
requirements an a list of course offerings in the catalog.	<sup>α</sup> 1	2	3	4	5	who coordinates the program, a budget, and a faculty committee.	Total
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum	30 29.41% 30 29.41% 30	20 19.61% 50 49.02% 70	22 21.57% 72 70.59% 136	18 17.65% 90 88.24% 208	12 11.76% 102 100.0% 268		102 100% 102 100% 268
Average: 2.63 Median: 0.0 23. Support							
Few on campus would care if our	· 1	2	3	4	5	Our GS Program has strong support from students,	Total
GS Program were abolished.	•	-	ŭ	•		faculty, chairs, trustees, graduates, & employers.	. 500
Count	5	13	32	37	15		102

Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum Average: 3.43 Median: 0.0 24. Image	4.9% 5 4.9% 5	12.75% 18 17.65% 31	31.37% 50 49.02% 127	36.27% 87 85.29% 275	14.71% 102 100.0% 350		100% 102 100% 350
The students regard our GS Program as an obstacle that stands in the wa of taking majors courses.		2	3	4	5	Our GS Program is a important selling point in recruiting students.	n Total
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum	24 23.53% 24 23.53% 24	38 37.25% 62 60.78% 100	25 24.51% 87 85.29% 175	10 9.8% 97 95.1% 215	5 4.9% 102 100.0% 240		102 100% 102 100% 240
Average: 2.35 Median: 0.0 25. Disciplinary  Our disciplinary major courses are not grounde with what the students encounter in the GS Program.	d 1	2	3	4	5	Our GS courses provide an important foundation for coursework students encounter in	ır Total
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum	11 10.78% 11 10.78% 11	18 17.65% 29 28.43% 47	31 30.39% 60 58.82% 140	26 25.49% 86 84.31% 244	16 15.69% 102 100.0% 324	their majors.	102 100% 102 100% 324
Average: 3.18 Median: 0.0 26. Faculty Deve	elopment					The faculty	
Support for faculty development related to GS is minimal at UNK.		2	3	4	5	who teach G courses have ample support for developing new courses and new	Total
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum Average: 2.18	41 40.2% 41 40.2% 41	20 19.61% 61 59.8% 81	27 26.47% 88 86.27% 162	10 9.8% 98 96.08% 202	4 3.92% 102 100.0% 222	techniques.	102 100% 102 100% 222

27. Improved Teaching Student Student evaluations of evaluations of teaching in teaching in GS GS are tied 2 3 4 5 Total are nonexistent closely to a or generally faculty ignored. development program. Count 10 47 23 5 102 17 46.08% 4.9% Percent 9.8% 16.67% 22.55% 100% Cum. count 10 27 74 97 102 102 Cum. percent 9.8% 26.47% 72.55% 95.1% 100.0% 100% Cum. sum 10 44 185 277 302 302 Average: 2.96 Median: 0.0 28. Co-Curricular Activities Our GS Program Our GS Program recognizes is focused that valuable exclusively on 2 3 5 student Total classroom experiences teaching and occur in and learning. out of the classroom. Count 20 23 44 10 5 102 19.61% 22.55% 43.14% 9.8% 4.9% 100% Percent Cum. count 20 43 102 102 87 97 19.61% 42.16% 85.29% 95.1% 100.0% 100% Cum. percent Cum. sum 20 66 198 238 263 263 Average: 2.58 Median: 0.0 29. Course Evaluation Student course Student course evaluation is an evaluation is 5 important in Total expectation, but 1 2 3 4 does not occur in deciding what all courses. courses will be offered. Count 9 13 50 23 102 12.75% 49.02% 22.55% 6.86% 100% Percent 8.82% 22 102 Cum. count 72 95 102 100.0% Cum. percent 8.82% 21.57% 70.59% 93.14% 100% 35 Cum. sum 185 277 312 312 Average: 3.06 Median: 0.0 30. Assessment Although There is a

2

individual

3

4

5

Total

continuing

Median: 0.0

courses may be evaluated by students, there i no evaluation of our GS Program						process of assessment of whether our GS Program is achieving its purpose.	
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum	34 33.33% 34 33.33% 34	16 15.69% 50 49.02% 66	31 30.39% 81 79.41% 159	15 14.71% 96 94.12% 219	6 5.88% 102 100.0% 249	purpose.	102 100% 102 100% 249
Average: 2.44 Median: 0.0 31. Quality							
Our GS Program satisfies the minimal accreditation requirements.	n 1	2	3	4	5	Our GS Program surpasses in quality those of our peer institutions.	Total
Count Percent Cum. count Cum. percent Cum. sum Average: 2.66 Median: 0.0	17 16.67% 17 16.67% 17	24 23.53% 41 40.2% 65	43 42.16% 84 82.35% 194	13 12.75% 97 95.1% 246	5 4.9% 102 100.0% 271		102 100% 102 100% 271