

D R A F T

Integrative Liberal Studies Faculty Survey
Spring 2009



Office of Institutional Research
April 30, 2009

Table 1: Survey Response Rate by Program Area and Faculty Rank

	Pop N	Completed	Response
		Survey	Rate
Humanities			
Full Professor	20	15	75.0
Assoc Professor	21	17	81.0
Asst Professor	18	7	38.9
Lecturer	18	7	38.9
Area Total	77	46	59.7
Natural Sciences			
Full Professor	19	14	73.7
Assoc Professor	16	11	68.8
Asst Professor	17	8	47.1
Lecturer	14	6	42.9
Area Total	66	39	59.1
Social Sciences			
Full Professor	23	19	82.6
Assoc Professor	22	17	77.3
Asst Professor	17	6	35.3
Lecturer	13	4	30.8
Area Total	75	46	61.3
Humanities	77	46	59.7
Natural Sciences	66	39	59.1
Social Sciences	75	46	61.3
Full Professor	62	48	77.4
Assoc Professor	59	45	76.3
Asst Professor	52	21	40.4
Lecturer	45	17	37.8
Total	218	131	60.1

ILS Components	Humanities (N=46)	Natural Sciences (N=39)	Social Sciences (N=46)	Total Faculty (N=131)
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
	Taught	Taught	Taught	Taught
Diversity Intensive Crs	45.7	5.1	41.3	32.1
Hum 124	21.7	2.6	6.5	10.7
Hum 214	23.9	0.0	2.2	9.2
Hum 324	30.4	0.0	13.0	15.3
Hum 414	15.2	7.7	10.9	11.5
ILS Arts crs	32.6	2.6	4.3	13.7
ILS Foreign Language crs	10.9	0.0	0.0	3.8
ILS Health & Wellness Crs	0.0	0.0	6.5	2.3
ILS Lab Science Crs	0.0	33.3	0.0	9.9
ILS Math Crs	0.0	20.5	0.0	6.1
Information Literacy Crs	50.0	48.7	45.7	48.1
LSIC 179	43.5	48.7	54.3	48.9
LSIC 379	21.7	28.2	28.3	26.0
LSIC 479	8.7	0.0	6.5	5.3
Lang 120	21.7	0.0	0.0	7.6
Nat Sci Crs in a Cluster	2.2	71.8	0.0	22.1
Quantitative Intensive Cr	4.3	43.6	26.1	23.7
Soc Sci Crs in a Cluster	6.5	2.6	67.4	26.7
Writing Intensive Crs	71.7	74.4	65.2	70.2

Table 3: Participation in ILS Activities

Have You:	Humanities (N=46)	Natural Sciences (N=39)	Social Sciences (N=46)	Total Faculty (N=131)
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Participated in Advisor Training for ILS?	58.7	61.5	63.0	61.1
Participated in an Intensive Workshop?	69.6	61.5	80.4	71.0
Constructed a New Course for a Cluster?	40.0	25.6	34.8	33.8
Redesigned a Course to Conform to Intensive Guidelines?	78.3	71.8	82.6	77.9
Served on an Intensive Subcommittee?	17.8	20.5	23.9	20.8
Coordinated a Cluster?	6.8	12.8	8.7	9.3
Been Involved in Organizing a Cluster?	35.6	18.4	37.0	31.0
Served on ILS Oversight Committee?	13.3	2.6	10.9	9.2
Presented ILS Teaching/Learning Topic at Conference?	30.4	28.2	21.7	26.7

Table 4: Importance of ILS Components

ILS Component	N	Importance Rating (Percentages)			
		Not Important	Marginal	Desirable	Essential
First-Year Composition Requirement	131	0.8	2.3	11.5	85.5
Lab Science Requirement	131	2.3	6.1	22.9	68.7
Mathematics Requirement	131	2.3	2.3	15.3	80.2
Health & Wellness Requirement	131	7.6	18.3	40.5	33.6
Foreign Language Requirement	130	0.8	5.4	16.2	77.7
Arts Requirement	131	3.1	4.6	32.8	59.5
Humanities Sequence	130	3.1	9.2	38.5	49.2
Information Literacy Requirement	131	3.8	16.0	36.6	43.5
Writing Intensive Requirement	130	3.8	5.4	23.8	66.9
Diversity Intensive Requirement	131	7.6	15.3	42.0	35.1
Quantitative Intensive Requirement	128	6.3	14.1	32.0	47.7
Intro Seminar Req. for Beginning Students	129	7.8	7.0	50.4	34.9
Intro Seminar Req for Transfer Students	131	9.9	16.8	50.4	22.9
Cluster Requirement	131	26.0	34.4	30.5	9.2
Natural Science Requirement in a Cluster	130	21.5	22.3	30.0	26.2
Social Science Requirement in a Cluster	130	19.2	22.3	34.6	23.8

Table 5: Importance of ILS Components by Area

(Rating Scale: 1=Not Important 2=Marginal 3=Desirable 4=Essential)

ILS Component	Humanities (N=46)		Natural Sciences (N=39)		Social Sciences (N=46)		Total Faculty (N=131)	
	Importance		Importance		Importance		Importance	
	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std
First-Year Composition Requirement	3.9	0.4	3.8	0.4	3.7	0.6	3.8	0.5
Lab Science Requirement	3.5	0.8	3.8	0.4	3.5	0.8	3.6	0.7
Mathematics Requirement	3.6	0.7	3.9	0.2	3.7	0.7	3.7	0.6
Health & Wellness Requirement	2.8	0.9	3.2	0.8	3.0	1.0	3.0	0.9
Foreign Language Requirement	3.7	0.6	3.8	0.5	3.7	0.7	3.7	0.6
Arts Requirement	3.7	0.5	3.5	0.8	3.3	0.8	3.5	0.7
Humanities Sequence	3.5	0.6	3.3	0.8	3.2	0.9	3.3	0.8
Information Literacy Requirement	3.2	0.9	3.2	0.8	3.2	0.9	3.2	0.8
Writing Intensive Requirement	3.5	0.8	3.6	0.8	3.6	0.8	3.5	0.8
Diversity Intensive Requirement	3.1	0.9	2.8	0.9	3.2	0.8	3.0	0.9
Quantitative Intensive Requirement	3.0	1.0	3.3	0.8	3.4	0.9	3.2	0.9
Intro Seminar Req. for Beginning Students	3.2	0.8	3.0	0.8	3.1	1.0	3.1	0.8
Intro Seminar Req for Transfer Students	3.0	0.9	2.7	0.8	2.9	0.9	2.9	0.9
Cluster Requirement	2.2	0.9	2.0	0.8	2.5	1.0	2.2	0.9
Natural Science Requirement in a Cluster	2.5	1.1	2.6	1.1	2.7	1.1	2.6	1.1
Social Science Requirement in a Cluster	2.5	1.1	2.6	1.0	2.8	1.0	2.6	1.1

Table 6: Faculty Perceptions of ILS Program

ILS Perceptions	N	Rating Scale (Percentages)					
		No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Stongly Agree
ILS Requirements Easy to Explain	130	0.8	30.8	23.1	10.0	28.5	6.9
Not Enough Courses Available	129	4.7	13.2	26.4	10.1	30.2	15.5
Too Many Requirements	128	1.6	15.6	13.3	18.0	19.5	32.0
Too Difficult to Get Course Approved As Intensive	128	12.5	15.6	19.5	18.8	19.5	14.1
All Faculty Should be Required to Teach In ILS	131	2.3	36.6	17.6	16.0	18.3	9.2
Students Are Making Connections Between Courses in Cluster	130	13.1	35.4	19.2	15.4	13.1	3.8
Participating in ILS Has Been Personally & Professionally Satisfying	130	3.1	13.8	10.0	11.5	33.1	28.5
Faculty Merit Raises Should be Tied to Participation in Program	130	1.5	32.3	17.7	21.5	17.7	9.2
Participation in ILS Has Increased My Collab With Faculty in Other Discip	130	3.8	20.8	18.5	10.0	24.6	22.3
Exper Developing New or Adapting Old Courses Made Me a Better Teacher	130	6.9	15.4	6.9	18.5	31.5	20.8

(Continued)

Table 6: Faculty Perceptions of ILS Program

ILS Perceptions	N	Rating Scale (Percentages)					
		No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Stongly Agree
4-Year Students Are Able to Complete Requirements in Timely Manner	130	6.2	7.7	18.5	19.2	35.4	13.1
Transfer Students Are Able to Complete Requirements in Timely Manner	130	10.0	20.8	32.3	14.6	19.2	3.1
Collaboration Among People Teaching in a Cluster is Essential	131	9.2	8.4	3.8	13.7	26.0	38.9
No. of Writing Intensive Crs Required Should be Increased	129	0.8	34.9	24.8	17.8	13.2	8.5
No. of Diversity Intensive Courses Required Should be Increased	130	1.5	37.7	27.7	19.2	10.0	3.8
No. of Quantitative Literacy Intensive Courses Required Should be Increased	130	0.8	33.8	26.9	24.6	10.0	3.8
No. of Info Literacy Intensive Courses Required Should be Increased	129	0.8	37.2	29.5	23.3	6.2	3.1
Difficulty of Organizing a Cluster Has Discouraged Me From Doing So	129	23.3	17.8	9.3	21.7	16.3	11.6

Table 7: Faculty Perceptions of ILS Program

(Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Somewhat Disagree 3=Neutral 4=Somewhat Agree 5=Strongly Agree)

ILS Perceptions	Humanities (N=46)		Natural Sciences (N=39)		Social Sciences (N=46)		Total N=131	
	Rating		Rating		Rating		Rating	
	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std
ILS Req Easy to Explain	2.6	1.4	2.4	1.3	2.7	1.4	2.6	1.4
Not Enough Courses Available	3.3	1.3	2.8	1.2	3.2	1.4	3.1	1.3
Too Many Requirements	3.4	1.5	3.9	1.2	3.0	1.5	3.4	1.5
Too Difficult to Get Course Approved	3.4	1.3	2.9	1.2	2.7	1.4	3.0	1.3
All Faculty Should be Required to Teach In ILS	3.1	1.3	2.0	1.2	2.3	1.5	2.4	1.4
Students Are Making Connections Between Courses in Cluster	2.3	1.2	2.1	1.2	2.2	1.3	2.2	1.2
Participating in ILS Has Been Personally & Professionally Satisfying	3.7	1.4	3.3	1.3	3.5	1.5	3.5	1.4
Faculty Merit Raises Should be Tied to Participation in Program	3.0	1.4	1.9	1.1	2.6	1.3	2.5	1.4
Participation in ILS Has Increased My Collab With Faculty in Other Discip	3.5	1.4	2.6	1.4	3.1	1.6	3.1	1.5
Exper Developing New or Adapting Old Courses Made Me a Better Teacher	3.4	1.3	3.2	1.3	3.5	1.4	3.4	1.4

(Continued)

Table 7: Faculty Perceptions of ILS Program

(Rating Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Somewhat Disagree 3=Neutral 4=Somewhat Agree 5=Strongly Agree)

ILS Perceptions	Humanities (N=46)		Natural Sciences (N=39)		Social Sciences (N=46)		Total N=131	
	Rating		Rating		Rating		Rating	
	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std	Mean	Std
4-Year Students Are Able to Complete Requirements in Timely Manner	3.5	1.2	3.0	1.1	3.4	1.2	3.3	1.2
Transfer Students Are Able to Complete Requirements in Timely Manner	2.5	1.2	2.4	1.1	2.5	1.2	2.5	1.2
Collaboration Among People Teaching in a Cluster is Essential	3.8	1.3	3.6	1.3	4.3	1.1	3.9	1.3
No. of Writing Intensive Crs Required Should be Increased	2.4	1.3	2.2	1.3	2.4	1.4	2.4	1.3
No. of Diversity Intensive Courses Required Should be Increased	2.3	1.2	1.8	0.9	2.3	1.2	2.1	1.2
No. of Quantitative Literacy Intensive Courses Required Should be Increased	2.1	0.9	2.4	1.3	2.2	1.2	2.2	1.1
No. of Info Literacy Intensive Courses Required Should be Increased	2.2	1.2	2.1	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.1	1.1
Difficulty of Organizing a Cluster Has Discouraged Me From Doing So	3.0	1.4	2.9	1.2	2.9	1.5	2.9	1.4

Appendix A: Strengths of the ILS Program

Humanities

- good breadth
- We turn out well rounded liberal arts educated students, but then we did this before ILS and perhaps better, in my opinion.
- 179, with its integration of advising and teaching is excellent. The intensives are a really good idea as well, especially writing intensives. Clusters are theoretically a great idea, but am not sure they are working as intended. In general I am strongly in favour of ILS, even though it's not perfect.
- Cross departmental collaboration; interdisciplinary teaching and learning
- I really do not see any strengths of the ILS program. New courses were developed to assist incoming students - Freshman or transfers in their adaption to the UNCA culture . The rationale for this was to increase retention numbers. In the second semester of advising I found that UNCA had not convinced several students that their degree should emanate from UNCA. Change of desired majors, desire to be closer to home, loss of interest in college degree and severe personality and medical problems were the reasons given.
- The integration of the intensives into the individual degree programs, where they can be adapted to the requirements of the major. The Arts and Ideas and Humanities programs are very strong as well. Finally, the Freshman Colloquium is a great way to introduce freshmen to the campus.
- Forcing the student to take a liberal arts agenda, The ideas behind it are good, the execution is not.
- Diversity of topics and opening student perspectives on varying fields and areas of study
- Writing and diversity are named as important. Information literacy does not slip through the cracks. The LSIC (first year and transfer) seem to help provide community.
- Just what they were--the core reqs & sequences
- Collaboration with other disciplines
- Principles behind the intensives are good -- students should be learning these skills. Humanities program rationale is good.
- Common, core courses like Humanities
- Humanities sequence
179/379
The new DegPar program has made it much easier to navigate, but it's still too complicated.
- The attempt to integrate education into a larger framework -- a real and not apparent reflexion of the special mission of UNCA -- is laudable. the devil, of course, is in the details.
- Serious attention to writing and research skills.
- neutral
- I have had the opportunity to develop as an intellectual through collaboration with colleagues. In what is rapidly becoming a 'customer-service' environment on campus, it serves as a reminder to students that there are critical, intentional linkages between courses.
- Interdepartmental/interdisciplinary collaboration
- I think it's good that the program is a part of a student's experience in all four years (as opposed to being something the student might complete in the first two years). Idea of making connections across disciplines an important part of the educational experience of liberal arts, and I think ILS is designed in part to achieve this.
- Clear expectations are given; goals are realistic; overall idea is a good one
- It has many facets.
The HUM program: good for students to have this cultural literacy, as well as an emphasis on discussion involving their own thinking: not just trivia. Good for them to have this common experience--and great for so many tchrs. to have this common teaching/learning experience.
- that it is not just for freshmen. Considerable interdisciplinarity. AMBITION to incorporate diversity, writing, information literacy, and quantitative literacy in courses after freshmen year, though the achievement is spotty, from what I can tell.

Appendix A: Strengths of the ILS Program

- When courses overlap and students see connections, that works. When Info Lit and writing practice pays off in unrelated courses and students are able to successfully apply skills and insights, that is a strength. Exposure to common pool of knowledge and expectations for a common competence in writing, thinking, math, and research skills are strengths of our program.
- The interdisciplinary nature of the curriculum, both for professors and students.
- It increases students' writing opportunities in more than one context. It insures at least some exposure to diversity and the goals of the other intensives. It gives them an opportunity to examine a topic from more than one disciplinary perspective. It adds breadth to their education to compliment the depth of their majors.
- The process of proposing those courses stimulates conversation and thought about some core values and principles in teaching and learning. Teaching such courses has helped me focus on elements I think are valuable to students, faculty and community. Collaboration with both faculty and staff across disciplines in order to accomplish the goals of these classes has been exciting and reinvigorating for me.
- Collegiality
Interdisciplinarity
Supports sense of community
- diversity among students
- Good intentions. As an adjunct, I'm not involved enough to know how well those intentions are realized.
- It extends over four years; it emphasizes interdisciplinary learning.
- I honestly see no strengths in the ILS program.
- flexibility and ability to develop unique courses between academic departments
- The well established Humanities Program.
- The Humanities Program, which existed long before the ILS, is and ought to be the greatest strength of UNCA's ILS program.
- 1. it looks to me like the transfer colloquium is helping students make the adjustment to UNCA and learn about how to maneuver and make the most out of their time here.
 2. the push to create new courses is spurring faculty creativity in many cases
 3. the topical nature of the colloquia is providing a great opportunity for teaching in specialty areas while meeting specific student needs
 4. many of the diversity intensive courses are providing a very strong and transformative experience for students and faculty
 5. many of the writing intensive courses are successfully making explicit important parts of the writing process and fostering improvement in student writing (and thinking)

Appendix A: Strengths of the ILS Program

Natural Sciences

- 179 and 379 courses are a great idea, we'll see if these courses are truly helping retention intensive courses help increase the likelihood that our graduates have a well-rounded set of skills
- Students receive a formal introduction to the university through the LSIC 179 classes. I like advising my students and they appreciate having me accessible several times a week without specifically tracking me down. The writing component of this seminar is wonderful. In all, students receive a well-rounded education, which is the point of liberal arts.
- First year course for freshman - sets them on the right track
Exposure to both natural and social science components of a cluster
- focus on integrative liberal studies, just what it says
- writing intensives can be filled outside traditional Language dept.
attempted to foster environment of collaboration across disciplines
LSIC colloquia have potential to be good
- I guess it makes our students well rounded
- The intent to coordinate content in a wholistic manner, while providing time for free electives and major requirements is a positive. The program is improving as more faculty become engaged.
- Takes students outside their major courses a bit. The LSIC179 class size is a great learning environment; smaller than my typical class size. The service learning component of LSIC179 was very valuable.
- Writing and information intensive courses.
- I particularly like the topical clusters. Some of these are working as intended and students are studying a topic from diverse perspectives.
- Focus on intellectual integration
- There is a lot of choice, it opens up students to take a wide range of courses for credit, improves advising.
- Unique approach to education (I've not seen another program like this at other universities)

Requirements draw upon different learning styles and knowledge fields

Engaging course topics and co-curricular activities are formed from cluster themes and collaboration
- There are numerous strengths of the ILS program.

The students gain a broad understanding of the natural and social sciences, arts and humanities, among others.

Faculty are encouraged to explore and develop new and exciting courses that they may otherwise not be able to teach (e.g, LSIC or cluster courses) that can expand their own knowledge and understanding in their field while also addressing counting toward their teaching load.

My experience with developing a cluster course and new cluster has enabled me to work closely with faculty outside of my department - this has made me better understand UNCA, its faculty, our mission as a liberal arts university.

The flexibility and creativity in the ILS program can also bring about faculty finding/developing new teaching and learning strategies in the scholarship of teaching and learning. I have done this in developing a new cluster course and cluster and presented this work at several national and regional conferences.
- The intensives that are offered in the courses. Also, the freshman and transfer experience in 179/379 courses helps to provide a better start at UNC Asheville, which should help with the retention. The opportunity to present a topic related to your specific discipline (or not!) to non-majors is intriguing.
- Good question. Uniqueness? It is hard for me to understand what changing to ILS actually accomplished.
- The goals are commendable. The introductory colloquium are a good way to build community. In practice, having clusters that integrate a students non-major courses should allow students to develop strength outside their majors.
- Allows a greater variety of subject matter in line with our Liberal arts stance

Appendix A: Strengths of the ILS Program

- I suppose students are doing more writing in their discipline. More creative courses seem to be offered on campus, so as to incorporate additional writing, information gathering, and quantitative reasoning, or to incorporate certain topics desired for certain clusters.
- emphasizing connections between disciplines, keeps students taking a variety of courses, faculty exposed to good information on pedagogy (eg. how to improve student's writing)
- 179/379 classes are good introduction to new students. Intensives are a good way to require certain skills/content but also to provide students with different vehicles (choices) to acquire those skills and content.

- Strengths:
 1. The 179/379 course for incoming freshmen and transfers
 2. Learning foundations (Writing, language, math, HW, science)
 3. Arts
- has created some unusually interesting courses

- The closest thing to a 'strength' that I can find in the ILS program is the set of Liberal Studies Introductory Colloquia - 179 and 379. These courses give instructors across campus the opportunity to explore almost any subject in a small class and provides students a topical writing environment. Of course, the merits can still be debated when I teach upper level courses with easily twice as many students.
- SOME of the components of the ILS program are well planned and well executed, and I believe that students truly do benefit from those components that are well designed.
- It is a comprehensive program that encourages faculty to develop non-traditional courses that may appeal to a new generation of students. Main positive changes over the previous system are:
Freshman Seminar,
More options for Hum 414,
More writing classes.

- None. It's an administration stimulus program. One can debate the value of making students take courses in a variety of disciplines---I think it's overrated, but it's debatable---all ILS does is slap labels on courses in an arbitrary fashion and then force students to take courses with matching labels. It's a pointless nuisance. Students will make connections between courses or not as they wish and are able.
- Freshman colloquium, intensives, good overall balance, clusters have potential to help students make connections

- I like the humanities program.

I think the intensives fit in to a liberal arts environment very well, if the requirements are a bit pliable when decisions are made whether or not to make a course XXX intensive. This process has improved over time. Kudos on this.
- I think the 179 and 379 courses benefit incoming freshmen, because of the shared freshman experience with writing across the curriculum, the social connections that result from the small class size, and the fact that those teaching the classes have volunteered (at least so far) which I hope means the teachers want to teach both the subject and the freshman.
- The benefits of the ILS program are negligible. This program does more harm than good.

- strong core program; essentials; great vision and goals

- I think we have a two-edged sword here. Our strengths can also be our weaknesses. I taught humanities for 20 semesters. I have been to 20 x 15 = 300 staff meetings in humanities where faculty discuss the next week's assignments. I remember some years where the room was half filled with faculty that today hold the BOG award. I was proud to be part of this dedicated group. I cannot image a more qualified staff committed to educating undergraduates.

Then I have other experiences - e.g., when I stood in the back of the room of the main lecture in Lipinsky and counted that 1/3 of the 450 students were in attendance at the 14th week. Clearly, the material of the large lectures is not present on the exams; otherwise, 2/3 of the 450 students would have failed. The 14th lecture on existentialism was moving and profound. Yet few were there. There is no way students would pass my ILS science courses with this kind of attendance behavior. So a strength giving us national attention can give us serious management challenges to maintain quality control.

- I like the idea of having an introductory course for the freshmen and the transfers. I like the intensives - I'm not sold on the clusters. But I think the intensives are a good idea - I like the Writing, Information Lit, Quantitative, and Diversity Intensives.

Appendix A: Strengths of the ILS Program

Social Sciences

- It builds on our history; it forces interdisciplinary collaboration (at least in the structure if not in the practice); it is faculty-driven and largely faculty-administered; it affects nearly all departments.
- It encourages faculty creativity and provides opportunities for faculty to interact in the development of student learning experiences.
- It does make it clear that writing matters.
And it does sound cool.
- the ability to introduce students to college level work via 179. Ability to engage students in interdisciplinary / multidisciplinary learning
- double counting has lowered the overall number of hours devoted to general education.
- I've really appreciated the summer workshops. I also am a big fan of promoting literacy and numeracy within subject areas, as is done with the writing and quantitative intensives. I'd like to see the data on the connection between the introduction of the ILS 179 requirement and retention, but my experience has been that I make a much deeper connection with my freshman advisees under the ILS 179 system than I ever did under any of the other systems we used in the past. My suspicion is that helps retention and is valuable to the students I advise. I'm still advising one of my former freshmen who is now a senior at Chapel Hill!
- (1) the cross disciplinary connections of the clusters, (2) the fact that the intensives are done within the disciplines
- The four course HUM requirement is key. I appreciate the DI course requirement, but it is difficult to get a course so designated.
- Students study a variety of disciplines AND gain important competencies/skills. Theoretically, they see connections among ideas across disciplines.
- Looks good on paper ..., and apparently it impresses a lot of external review boards, but...
- connections students make by taking a cluster
- it has created a better opportunity for intentionality in a person's education. The so-called difficulties in explaining the requirements seem to be hurdles to people who either have failed to attend an advising session to Learn about the program or are unwilling to embrace new models. I can get excited about the connections this program offers students but because a traditional curriculum doesn't encourage that kind of thinking they can perceive the ILS program to be overwhelming and fraught with conditions, requirements and obstacles.
- The opportunities for interdisciplinary learning and collaboration through the clusters is a real strength. I do think that some clusters function in a more interdisciplinary way than others. I also think that the intensives are quite helpful providing a broad perspective student experience and in developing important life skills.

I do not know much about the Humanities sequence, but have a sense that it is functioning well.

I think it is a strength that we have a health and wellness requirement as part of the ILS.

Faculty development opportunities to learn about how to participate/teach the intensives and colloquia have been very helpful to me.
- Interdisciplinary approach to general education which was not really there before
- Affording students an opportunity to see the relationships of different disciplines to a number of topics.
- Imbedding Intensives within majors to teach students discipline based writing, information literacy, diversity, and quantitative reasoning is a strength.
The Introductory Seminars appear to have value in acclimating students.
- LSIC program helps student acclimation to UNCA. Intensives encourage further development of important skills
- Gives students an impression of the overall goal of a liberal arts education early in their college careers. Most don't know or appreciate that as freshmen.
- I really do not see any
- The program is appealing even though I haven't had the chance to participate.

Appendix A: Strengths of the ILS Program

- The strength of the ILS program is that it builds on what we know and pushes us as teacher scholars to make connections and communicate our understanding to others inside and outside our home departments. I have watched our faculty become more engaged in the teacher-student learning process since the ILS program has been instituted. It is unfortunate that those who are most critical of the program have not always made a good faith effort to get involved. Change is never easy (or always positive) however, we need to make this program work as its pluses clearly outweigh its negatives. I can tell you from talking with colleagues at other universities, we are the envy of other schools who have become so compartmentalized that there is little room for innovation and collaboration. Our students are lively and interested in learning and to a large degree they are motivated by our innovative curriculum. Can it be done better? Of course we can...more offerings and more collaboration between participating faculty would help.
- None that I can see other than promoting the careers of a few people invested in it.
- It seems to be more in line with SACS expectations than the old Gen Ed.
- I would assume that the 179/379 program is helpful to students, though I'd be interested in what the data suggest (e.g., do they feel they benefit, does it aid in retention).
I think the breadth of the requirements outside of the humanities sequence is an asset, preserving some element of choice and variety for students while covering all the essentials (i.e., requiring A lab science or A math rather than prescribing set courses).
- LS 179, 379
Learning Foundations Courses
Humanities Cluster
- It offers opportunities for learning to become more integrated and multidisciplinary (e.g., via a cluster). Through W-I courses, it offers students a chance to become better writers.
- I like the first-year seminar. This is a classic approach in other liberal arts colleges, and distinguishes us from other schools in the UNC system.
- fundamentally sound core of requirements -- intensives in general
- It was a big step in the right direction, away from the pure menu approach and toward greater coherence, as driven by our mission statement.
- getting faculty to collaborate
- Breadth of exposure to faculty, dept's, and ideas for students unfamiliar with interconnections in the liberal arts.
Possibilities for fun and interaction in the LSIC courses, as well as new and 'blended' topics.
- encourages breadth and well-roundedness
- The new ILS program is interesting and meets several objectives of a Liberal Arts place such as ours. It is certainly a big improvement over the General Ed program we had.
- Nice idea, a logistical nightmare. Some of this may be due to transition pains. There are not enough cluster courses offered regularly to enable students to complete the cluster requirements. Students have no idea what they are supposed to do, once they have a clue, it is then difficult to fulfill all the requirements. It is unclear particularly on transcripts we use to advise what counts as what, especially for transfer students.
- The fundamental strength is greater flexibility for students in their choice of free electives. I am seeing more and more students with double majors as well as students adding a minor. The intensives (if delivered properly in conformity to guidelines) are working well. Overall, the philosophy of ILS is very solid. Our implementation has not been so successful
- Exposes students to a range of ways of looking at the world.
- The strength comes from the energy people put into it. Strong leadership has meant strong programs; weak leadership, weak programs. Opportunity to work with other colleagues is one of the major benefits.
- The idea, goals and vision of the program is great. But actual outcomes are far below from the goal and expectation.
- Non. A complete waste of resources
- exposure to the different facets of a liberal arts education.

Appendix B: Weaknesses of the ILS Program

Humanities

- not flexible
(could the next survey have a space for comments?)
- Too COMPLICATED and CONTRIVED! We should teach students to make connections between everything they study! It's ridiculous to think that we have to make the links for them, by straight-jacketing them into a certain way of making connections! That's not liberal arts thinking!
- Personally, I think the foreign language programme should have its hours increased - 6 credit hours is not enough for meaningful engagement with a language. The clusters are a bit of a mess IMO. There are a few which really work - notably Food for Thought and those that take place in a foreign country, but they take up a quite extraordinary amount of time if done properly and we don't have the resources. Esp in the food for thought cluster, people are being run ragged for no extra reward (I am not a member of this one, but see its results at close hand.) Other clusters are huge - perception seems to encompass virtually anything at all - and I don't see that they are doing what they were supposed to do.
- The same weakness of UNCA overall: we're always asked to do more, not always provided the time/faculty development/ resources with which to do it.
- Overloading of courses for students who wish to focus on their desired major. Complexity of system with clusters, change of students interests are not considered in this system resulting in courses taken in one cluster that does not allow for a student to change direction. Too many courses appear to overlap in content.
- The clusters. There is very little collaboration between teachers in a cluster, and because the courses can be taken at any time in a students' career at UNCA, the linkages between courses are very weak. I would say the clusters should either be strengthened or eliminated. Strengthened by having students take at least two of the cluster courses at the same time, and by having faculty teaching in the clusters working together more closely in the same way that the Humanities program does. Also, the Writing Intensive should be expanded to include speaking as well -- being able to give a presentation is as important to future success as writing.
- The first one was initiating a program that was not capable of sustaining itself at the beginning. Many students were required to petition in order to graduate. The fact that Arts 310 is indeed an Arts and Ideas class and students do not get enough exposure to the arts as a whole.
- cluster organizers and faculty teaching in clusters are not working together enough to make the cross connections essential for them being in a cluster of courses
- cumbersome, confusing, time consuming

too many clusters are a joke--a 'cluster' in name only; others seem to subtract from the the individual course; they revolve entirely around natural sciences, so it has been difficult and in some cases impossible to create a cluster, despite good intentions and preliminary efforts.

So much of my work on the intensives, etc. seems to have pulled me away from students and my scholarship related to my courses. Although i do believe I have learned and am practicing a few things about, for instance, writing and diversity, I do not think the time and effort given to the ILS is quite worth it. And, I think that other programs are suffering. people are stretched so thin in grading all the writing and in preparing new courses and in advising a whole cohort that they are not doing as much as they used to, in some cases. In other cases, a few people seem to like being the ILS experts and keep looking for more to do related to all that.
- Clusters--need to drop them
- Time consuming
- In practice, none of the components of the ILS program are as strong as they could be.
Clusters are very weak -- connections among courses are not always obvious, and the participating instructors do not communicate with one another, therefore common threads among courses are not communicated to one another, nor are they monitored.
- see above

Appendix B: Weaknesses of the ILS Program

- The 'opt out' of Humanities 414 with ILS 479. It was going to be one or the other, but the rules changed after implementation. We should return to one common course at the senior level, either 414 or 479. I hear from students that clusters are not really coordinated.
- Clusters are a total waste of both student and faculty time. Students simply look for the one they can complete with the least amount of pain. This program does not advance student learning or faculty collaboration. In the best of all possible worlds, this program could be effective, but faculty have neither the time nor the incentive for this to happen.

The DI requirement is based too little on sound pedagogy and too much on religious conversion (read its mission statement). If we are not exposing our students in our normal teaching to diversity, then we need to get out of the business. All the DI requirement does is cover our ***** so that we can look like we're actually addressing diversity.

WI is an unnecessary redundancy. Again, if students are not getting a thorough grounding in writing at a liberal arts university, then we ought to shut our doors.

The whole ILS program has become a bureaucratic nightmare. The requirement in the clusters that one needs to fill out two forms to successfully complete the program is ludicrous. Someone needs to apply 'Occam's Razor' to the whole thing.

Finally, the amount of money spent in attempting to buy faculty compliance and loyalty to the program through the ILS summer workshops
- Complexity! -- and in the case of some things (attempting to create a writing intensive course for example), a certain degree of inflexibility. For example, a WI course should use writing to support exploration the subject matter, not make writing itself the subject. Every WI course does not need to reinvent the wheel.
- It is a bit complicated for students and advisors.
- Locks students into a program of study too soon, and locks them out of exploring with curiosity UNCA's rich menu
- neutral
- I think that it has the expected weaknesses of any large-scale institutional change effort. It has taken a long time to become part of the culture.
- Clusters are difficult to arrange, and sometimes seem thrown together. They are also hard to explain to students, particularly when advising or planning schedules.
- should be more formal opportunities for collaboration or team-teaching. May lack continuity of experience (esp. with intensives, where course might be listed as 'writing intensive' but fail to achieve that level)--demands a level of oversight that may not be possible. Too much gatekeeping with diversity-intensive classes. Challenging balance between making participation desirable and offering enough support/training and oversight.
- Too many requirements; too complicated a system; too much paper work to process
- It has too many facets; these do not consistently work well together. The Clusters, for example: according to 90% of the students I ask (plenty), they simply take the courses without having 'an interdisc. epiphany.'

If a Nat. Sci. must be included in a Cluster, then a math course ought to suffice--mathematics is scientific.

I participated in two 'Intensives' workshops in summer; neither was helpful to me: each was simply a pre-packaged, talking-heads presentation.

Though it's good for freshmen to know their advisors, the system of assigning one's 179 students to one as their advisor is unwieldy. There is, then, no way that I'd teach two 179s in sequential semesters (or even sequential years).

I doubt most students need the Info. Intensive, or Computer Literacy, these days.

Transfer students don't need to be burdened with a 3-hr. 379 requirement; a day of orientation for them would do it as well.

A big weakness: the originators of the ILS have problems with changing it. Change is necessary and natural (as are check-ups, like this current survey). Huffiness, and behind-the-scene maneuvers, should be curtailed.

It's too difficult to get a course approved as an intensive.

The definition of 'diversity' that governs DI courses is far too narrow; hence, the DI courses usually do not fulfill the promise of that definition. (It's not a 'national definition,' by a long shot.)

The structure is byzantine: it's more complicated than a good gen. ed. program should be.

Appendix B: Weaknesses of the ILS Program

- The failure of the clusters to be anything other than registration conveniences and smallish, slightly related menus for distribution requirements (with a few exceptions). Clusters lack intellectual design, genuine integration, faculty collaboration, etc., etc., etc. They seem to have been created to LOOK like learning communities, but have none of the real characteristics of learning communities. I don't believe the average student derives any cross-disciplinary understanding from them. I would exclude Food from these thoughts.
- Students often tell me they are not writing in their 'writing intensive' LSIC courses. To the extent that the program is responsible for oversight, there apparently exists a weakness in that area. I'm not sure whether professors agree on and fully understand what they are undertaking in offering an intensive course, and if the professor changes but the intensive remains, there is possibly a loss of commitment there. Much can be accomplished by ongoing in-department discussion of these courses, I think.
- the clusters seem to be pretty random....
- Students, and some faculty, sometimes find the array of requirements bewildering, at least initially. Students sometimes find it difficult to find all the courses they need in a given semester to satisfy all the requirements in a timely fashion.
- It takes too long for some courses to receive approval. Some advisors remain confused about the process of completing and planning for ILS completion. That confuses and discourages students. There is so much more to learn about these various components and not enough time to do so as thoroughly as I would like. Some faculty labor under the illusion that EVERY course must have some sort of ILS approval. I think that's a false expectation. I also think divisions and departments need to be more strategic in determining how their units will provide for the necessary courses for their students, even when that plan is to collaborate with other divisions to supply some aspect, for example for Literature majors to be routinely directed to math and science courses to get their Q courses and perhaps Math and Science folks to be directed to SS to get their DIs.
- Theoretical
Fragmented
Difficult to assess
- no opinion
- Too complex! I'm not even an advisor, and I constantly have students coming to me utterly confused about what they're supposed to take. Furthermore, my students often feel that they have to neglect work they should be doing in their major field (music in my case) because they are so swamped with writing and research assignments for other classes. While I value the general principles of integration and well-roundedness that UNCA aims for, the balance might be a bit skewed. A student majoring in a certain field should be able to put his or her primary mental focus in that field, and required studies in other areas should complement, not distract.
- The arts are still viewed as a marginal add-on.
- It is too expensive; it is confusing to students and faculty; too many exceptions are made regarding courses that satisfy a cluster requirement without any significant connection among the other courses being made. In fact, students tell me that even with no exceptions, the connections among the topics within a cluster are very often unclear or seem to be non-existent.
- problems with idea of diversity caught up in power battles - stretches student's schedules a little
- It has diverted resources from the Humanities Program and from existing departments. It has required more departmental resources than what was initially told to faculty. Faculty were initially promised that ILS would not impact the delivery of courses in the major, but now departments are 'required' to have faculty teach ILS courses, and the offerings of departmental curricula have been negatively impacted. The disappointment is that this was anticipated by faculty, and told to the leaders who organized ILS, but faculty were not listened to.
We have put a lot of money and time into ILS. One can only imagine what we could have accomplished had we put the same time and money into improving what was already in place and successful.
I recently asked a group of engaged, bright students: how would you improve UNCA? The unanimous reply: get rid of clusters.
- Lack of foresight in implementing the program--vast waste of resources funding useless meetings--requirements for clusters ought to increase interdisciplinary collaboration in fact these discourage it--bleeding the Humanities Program to start the other ILS programs [again, lack of foresight and poor judgement] directly resulted in a crisis of faculty teaching HUM courses--arbitrary judgments about whether courses are approved for intensives--arbitrary approval or denial of petitions students make to avoid or amend ILS requirements

Appendix B: Weaknesses of the ILS Program

- 1. it really is bloody confusing in some ways; the clusters in particular are not well organized
- 2. some (many?) of the clusters are not working as envisioned; they are too loosely connected and there is not enough coordination/information sharing or shared vision among faculty participants; faculty are not always making the cluster components explicit or relevant for students
- 3. the 479 course does not seem to have a clear set of goals and probably needs to be revised
- 4. probably most important is the fact that the program is sucking resources out of departments at a terrific rate in spite of the copious assurances we were given that this would not happen (witness the question above regarding whether merit raises should be tied to this program! as though this were the only important program we have going, or this were the only program that merits merit, so to speak)

Appendix B: Weaknesses of the ILS Program

Natural Sciences

- the cluster system needs to be scrapped, it puts too much of a limit on what students can take as electives
the benefits of the cluster system are far outweighed by its problems (e.g. little or no coordination within a cluster)
the cluster system is quite likely discouraging students from applying to or attending UNCA

- There are too many requirements for certain majors. I suspect that many potential students majoring in my field get turned off by the seemingly unrelated graduation requirements. Students who are already here get frustrated attempting to satisfy the requirements and have less time for special courses related to their major. This leads to very small enrollments in our classes.

- Some topical cluster courses are upper level courses in other departments that have pre-requisites - this makes them inaccessible for most students. It seems that they are put into clusters to satisfy the needs of students in that major.

In my experience there is little/if any communication or connection between faculty offering cluster courses. No coherence.

5 or 6 topical clusters is fine. Now we're up to 11? Too many.

- resources

- (1) cluster system doesn't work
 - it minimizes student choice
 - disliked by students; effectively discourages students from taking many classes
 - no mechanism for designing an original interdisciplinary experience
 - generates undue paperwork and record-keeping
 - confused faculty advisors are still common across campus
 - presents needless difficulty for transfer students
 - no capstone experience or sequence of courses that would enable continuity and help students form connections
 - weak requirements for inclusion of course within cluster
 - embarrassing 'over-clustering' of some courses
 - no clear goals or objectives for learning outcomes in cluster

- (2) LSIC classes have extreme range of rigor and expectations

- I think it puts more of a burden on students making it harder to complete in 4 years. I don't know if there are really strong enough ties among courses in a cluster for students to make a connection

- The program content/organization was dominated by a relatively smaller number of strong proponents. Because the 'preliminaries' took far too long, it had to be implemented too rapidly - the result was a rush to implementation without full consideration. Cluster courses were in some cases thrown together, without sufficient attempts to integrate. Requirements can be labyrinthine and hard to understand for both advisors and students, let alone meet. ILS needs to better address the reality of different student entry points - transfer students represent significant numbers and are a reality; they find it especially difficult to get the courses they need. The result is significant waiving of requirements, which negates the structure and intent. Some ILSOC members/principals should be less defensive and accept that assessment is an important endeavour which can both validate and improve the program.

- Too many ways for students (with the help of their advisors, admittedly) to beat the system by figuring out the 'path of least resistance' (i.e. a cluster that they would come close to fulfilling anyhow by simply taking the courses required for their major).

- Clusters are useless for many science majors because that have so many other requirements that they fall into the trap of taking the cluster that is easiest to fulfill (i.e., the one or two clusters where two of the three courses are also required for their major). As a result, most have little flexibility with respect to which cluster they pick and they are often frustrated by having to take one that doesn't interest them. I would like to drop the cluster requirement altogether. Also, get rid of the cluster forms; they are a waste of time for both faculty and students. Instead, let them declare their cluster when they declare their major and concentration - all as part of one form.

- I think there should be a requirement for a 2-course, each with lab, natural science sequence. I think our natural science requirement is less than that of many high quality liberal arts schools.

- We are too much tied within the boundaries of our own institution...

Appendix B: Weaknesses of the ILS Program

- Difficult to understand, can dominate a faculty load.
- Some clusters are not coherent and/or well-organized

Requirements hard for incoming students to understand at a glance

- Some of the clusters are working well and students are making connections of how social and natural sciences address a common issue/topic/theme. However, some of the clusters are not achieving this goal and demonstrate a weakness of the ILS program. Improving the cohesiveness of clusters could be an improvement.

Sometimes it is difficult for transfer students to achieve all of their intensives in only 2 years. This is because they receive credit for some lower level courses, but not their intensive designation. We need more upper-level courses designated as intensives (especially writing and diversity).

- If you don't teach 179/379 courses you don't get advisees.
- In CSCI we can't be a practical part of a cluster since we are judged to be neither fish nor fowl.
- The biggest is that students (and some faculty) think it is too complicated. I really don't agree with this perception, but it is certainly there. I believe this leads to students being very dissatisfied with the program. I've noticed that transfer students seem almost upset because they believe the program slows down their progress toward a degree.

I see two problems with the clusters. First, they aren't building community. It appears that neither the instructors or faculty involved with a cluster really interact. Second, some clusters have clearly been designed for students in a particular major or program. This is clearly contrary to the goal of having the cluster provide a way of broadening the educational experience at UNCA.

The ILS program should look to the future and require a greater understanding of technology and its implications on the way we leave. Students should understand more about climate change, globalization, economic warfare, and similar topics. They also ought to have some idea of how their iPods or cars work rather than just how to use them.

- Some students are put into courses for which they have no interest
- 1. Clusters do not serve the primary purpose of their creation.
- 2. Having writing-intensive freshman colloquium courses taught by non LANG instructors does not provide incoming students with the writing instruction they should receive in college.
- For most students, choosing courses from the clusters is no different from choosing courses off the old lists for General Education - it is only the 'menu' of course offerings that is different. However, at least with the old Gen Ed model, required courses were offered with regular and predictable frequency. Many cluster courses are offered infrequently, or only certain sections qualify, or the courses have prerequisites. Having only one semester of writing in the LANG department has meant that some students are not being taught to write by someone trained to do that. I can guide students in science writing, but I am not the best person to teach rules of grammar, etc.
- I'm not sure that all faculty understand the requirements well enough to properly advise their students.
- ILS seems confusing to many students. Clusters not linked as tightly as intended by unifying theme. WI intensive application is much too long and complex. Intensive designations should be good for five or six years instead of three. Paperwork becomes a chore for biennial courses. 479 class seems to be just another Humanities course.

Appendix B: Weaknesses of the ILS Program

- Clusters, clusters, clusters!!!! The idea behind 'clusters' is admirable, but most students do not understand the requirements no matter how many 'information sessions' they go to when visiting as perspective students, freshmen orientation, etc. It is incredibly time-consuming for faculty advisors to help students on a case-by-case basis with the requirements (and we have Ph.Ds!!). Yes, you can go on the website and find a list of classes that satisfy the requirement. But some classes are offered only in the spring, or only in the fall, or every other year. Beyond the confusion, though, I would like to know whether the students perceive any benefits to the topical clusters (I hope you will ask them!). As a relatively new faculty member, I taught an ILS cluster course for an entire semester without even knowing that it was a cluster option (it actually satisfies several clusters!). Years later, I have never once been approached by or spoken to any of the cluster organizers about the course, meaning that any connections across disciplines/courses are being left completely to the students. Having said that, I do not advocate MORE time and energy being devoted to improve the clusters because I don't think the cost/benefit ratio will ever be advantageous. The learning foundations/arts/humanities requirements for ILS are very clear, and I think the intensives can adequately be built into existing classes. But the topical clusters confuse everything and bring the whole ILS program down with them. I can only imagine how many perspective students go elsewhere because the requirements for graduation are clearer. Again, I appreciate the intention, but I hope your committee will seriously consider abolishing topical clusters all together.

- bureaucratic details

- Bill Sabo's invitation to this survey states that 'the investigation's objective is not to overhaul or redesign the Integrative Liberal Studies program'. This is really unfortunate. The weaknesses of ILS are truly fundamental and no amount of tweaking will fix it. Thus, you might see the weaknesses listed below as too broad, but that's the level of the problems as I see it. I will, however, only outline the problems. This could be greatly expanded.
 - 0) I believe that simpler is better. ILS is too complex. While this might seem vague, the subsequent problems on this list could have been avoided by following this simple axiom.
 - 1) ILS is top heavy. There are far too many faculty hours spent on oversight committees. UNCA is blessed with a great faculty. Trust us.
 - 2) ILS is laden with artificial incentives. Students should decide which Math, History, Language, or Science course to take based on academic considerations. They should not be concerned with peripheral issues, like which cluster or intensive requirement is satisfied.

 - In summary, ILS has created a lot more busy work for faculty in order to weaken our curriculum.

- The sheer number of components to the program can be overwhelming to the uninitiated or unmotivated student, and the program runs the risk of being perceived as an elaborate system of checkboxes rather than a coherent pedagogical philosophy. This unfortunate perception is militated by faculty who openly scoff the program and downgrades its merits, which are real and substantial. Put succinctly, I believe the ILS program has definite weaknesses (the clusters are among the least well-managed of the components, for instance), but it's a system that should be fixed rather than scrapped.

- The administrative energy to run this program far exceeds its benefits. It is far too bureaucratic, to be effectively implemented. I yearn for the days when our curriculum was simple to implement and simple to explain.

- The Clusters are artificially connected, very little faculty interaction ever really occurs. Students should be allowed to take courses they are interested in and to make real connections themselves. Recruiting wise, our ILS program has hurt the university. Prospective students feel that at UNC Asheville they will have a much larger general education program than at other schools.

- See above.

Appendix B: Weaknesses of the ILS Program

- Too complicated. The students (and me) have a difficult time planning to meet all requirements.

- I hate the clusters. The students hate the clusters. Everyone I know hates the clusters. One of the items above was 'Students are making connections between courses that compose a cluster.' Of course they make superficial connections by virtue that they are all in the XXX cluster. I think the clusters send the following loud and clear message to our students: you are too stupid to make your own connections so we will make it impossible for you to miss it, you bunch of morons! I think this is insulting to our students. I think it undermines the very idea of a liberal arts education. It is an abomination and an embarrassment.

Besides the very idea of the clusters, the biggest weakness is oversight of the ILS program, which is a complete joke. I've heard it said that it is our liberal studies program and that is why everyone should teach in it. The problem is, only a select few are permitted to oversee it. It is not 'our' liberal studies program if 'we' cannot criticize it, change it or tweak it. And absolutely no one is permitted to criticize it in any way (this is the first real opportunity). After all, the mastermind behind it sits in Phillips Hall and stands behind the fake award 'our' liberal

- The cluster connections can be obtuse, and at times seem forced.

- ILS is inefficient, and drives students elsewhere. We cannot articulate with any other general education program, so students can't transfer in, and cannot attend here to later transfer to another institution; in both cases, we lose enrollment. UNCA should eliminate the ILS core, and replace it with a distributional requirement that includes Humanities as an option, but also includes distributional options that give greater depth.

The cluster model is an absolute disaster and should be eliminated immediately. It is too complicated, and frustrates both faculty and students. A huge bureaucracy has been created that achieves nothing.

We need to go back to basics, especially in these times of budgetary constraints. Many quality liberal arts institutions have a distributional general education structure that works efficiently and well. We cannot afford to continue on our present path.

Thanks for collecting feedback.

- difficulty of explaining to students; difficulties with transfer students;

not sure it lives up to its vision, particularly with respect to clusters (some seem much more intertwined than others)

Appendix B: Weaknesses of the ILS Program

- The Cluster is a weakness. I started a cluster at the start of the program. Then, to be a good citizen, I expanded my cluster to help other departments participate. The result was that my cluster grew large. I do not think there is much difference between clusters at UNCA and distribution. When students in my cluster see connections - they often come running to tell me. Often it is with courses not in my cluster. Yet, I am not allowed to add these courses because the authorities say my cluster is too big. So I would vote to eliminate clusters. My liberal arts science courses are interdisciplinary with an eclectic reach to many areas. The cluster idea is limiting me because of some quota. So who becomes the judge as to the best courses to include in a cluster that has broad connecting themes?

I think it would be a serious mistake to force faculty to have narrow focus in clusters. I also believe it is a serious mistake to force faculty to meet to plan clusters. This should be optional. My work in ILS is so time consuming that my publications suffer already. I simply cannot go to additional meetings and put in more time as it is. Otherwise, teaching ILS becomes a serious professional hazard. If the alternative is to go to distribution, I say we go distribution. Students will see connections I make with a multitude of disciplines. To give some example: the psychology of perception, the biology of the ear and eye, science in art and music, use of sound and light in multimedia, sound and light in stage production, photography, video techniques in movies involving perspective, light (today we showed Duck Soup and the mirror scene) - later we show Vertigo as they do in a Mass Communications course, a diversity element in the coverage of jazz musicians, and the list goes on and on. The cluster idea limits me.

Also, the ILS Program is too complicated to understand and hard for students to meet the requirements. I advise many students about the basics - I enjoy interacting with students - but in this case, I think it is too difficult to grasp, I had one student who was told by an advisor that my one-hour lab science IS the entire lab science. This student almost did not graduate because the natural science requirement calls for 3 hours in a cluster and a 4 hour science course which includes a lab for a total of 7 hours. But I can understand the advisors point of view. Hey, the lab course is listed with its own course number and it is science, right? So it is a lab science course, i.e., the 1-credit hour course. Well, yes, but no - you need the 3-hour lecture part too. But if you use that for the cluster, then it cannot count for the science. So see what I mean here?

Thanks for the opportunity to give some feedback.

Michael J. Ruiz
Physics

- All the requirements are too complicated. We should probably do the clusters or the intensives, but not both.

Students have trouble finding enough courses to meet their requirements. Not enough sections of SPAN 101 and HWP 153/152 - they all fill up very quickly.

I also don't like the summer readings for the freshmen. There have been many complaints about the books read and I don't see it as a positive way to get to meet my LSIC 179 class. It's usually my worst class since the freshmen usually use it as a chance to complain about the book. We should have them read something that introduces them to what a liberal arts college is like.

Appendix B: Weaknesses of the ILS Program

Social Sciences

- There are too few clusterable courses in the natural sciences, and an unwillingness (or inability) of faculty in the sciences to develop courses which can contribute to clusters. Perhaps we need to modify the requirement so that students need to take an interdisciplinary science class which may or may not appear in a cluster?

As ILS has developed over time, there are many respects in which it does not conform to the initial enabling legislation. An example is the continuing presence of Hum 414 and our inability to develop LS 479 as described in the Senate Document.

It is difficult for transfer students who have not completed the 44-hour core to complete ILS in a timely fashion. We expected this going in, but it has been confirmed.

- Some clusters are outstanding, e.g., the Food for Thought Cluster. They have clearly made excellent use of the cluster concept, to bring faculty together to teach and learn from one another and students together to learn with one another. Too often, however, the opportunities for faculty to interact in developing and delivering a cluster have not been embraced. My sense is, as well, that our Humanities courses are not as team focused as they have been in the past. In summary, integrated learning experiences necessitate intergrated faculty work. Without them student (and faculty) learning opportunities are less than they might otherwise be.

- It chews up much faculty and administrative time, and--I would guess--considerable money. Students appear to view the requirements merely as obstacles to be overcome (though in fairness this will probably be true for any set of all-university requirements).

The biggest weakness is the cluster. Wish I could name even one student who felt more educated because of the cluster they took.

- Except for the food cluster they are an intellectual fraud. Faculty should be required to meet proper collaboration, integration, and planning before being offered, then the cluster should undergo on going assessment to allow it to evolve into an effective learning experience for students. The somewhat dictatorial approach to intensive courses in limiting creativity, innovation, and serious presentation of many intensive courses. Pedagogy should be left primarily to the instructor if they can show their approach meets the learning, skill development expectations of the program.

- It is too complex. The courses in clusters with one or two exceptions are not themed or connected. When all sections of an intro course counts in more than one cluster, this tells you that the courses in clusters are not tied together in a meaningful way. This is not the vision that was presented. It is 'chinese' menu with another name.

- The clusters. Many seem to have been thrown together and are only tangentially related. If the philosophy is 'students can make the connections themselves, so there is no need to integrate the courses,' why have clusters? Students will make the connections no matter what courses they are taking. I'm not sure every cluster needs to be as tightly integrated as the food cluster, but I think clusters like the food cluster better serve a real intellectual need by creating intellectual communities of students and faculty.

- not all clusters are organized in such a way so as to maximize the potential benefits to students

- I like the idea of the QI and the science in a cluster, but question whether students need both the cluster science and a lab science. Likewise with math and at QI.

- The clusters are the weak link, except for the Food for Thought Cluster, which, as I understand it, is operating more as the original design intended.

- ... it doesn't work in practice. We merely changed one 'menu' for another, more complicated one when we adopted the new curriculum. Just naming a course one thing or another doesn't assure the intended experience. Calling something DI doesn't guarantee the students actually learn / demonstrate any specific DI competencies. If we want performance-based results, ie: effective graduates / citizens, then merely checking off a list of courses isn't the way to bring it about, better teaching is. We changed the course names, but didn't change the teaching.

- For the integrated cluster idea to work well all the classes in the clusters need to share syllabi and meet as a group so true connections can be made.

Appendix B: Weaknesses of the ILS Program

- Some clusters are very large and do not appear to function in an interdisciplinary way. I think that it would be good to consider way to encourage or require clusters to function more collaboratively.

The health and wellness requirement needs to be taught more consistently, and would perhaps be more effectively taught in a different model.

- None
- Sometimes seem to lack appropriate coordination across disciplines.
- The clusters. People have had courses included without notice and have had clusters end without notice. Students do not see particular interrelationships.
Foreign language requirement is inadequate.
- Clusters. The idea is good but the connections are weak and the coordination within each cluster varies from excellent to none.
- Students seem confused/frustrated about clusters. The old model of X hours of natural science, X hours of social science and X hours of their choosing seemed simpler to explain. Transfer students especially have a mixed bag of courses, so allowing for 'cross pollination' of clusters -- or a create your own cluster -- would ease the confusion. Students could submit a written rationale for their cluster topic to the Registrar or their adviser for approval.
- Where to start?

One problem is the clusters. Step back and take a look at these and try to convince me (or anyone else) that these courses (and these clusters) are somehow 'essential' to an undergraduate education. This, to me, is vastly wide of the mark. Clusters, in general, might not be a bad idea, but the way that we have structured these is virtually impossible to achieve -- leading to a host of meaningless clusters. The Science requirement, for one, is maddening to achieve and after attempting to start a cluster on two occasions (and not being able to find a Science component), I have decided to ever attempt this again. The rationale that I keep hearing is that the clusters are a work in progress. This may (or may not) be the case, but I see stagnation, I see a faculty that is overwhelmingly disinterested, and perhaps most importantly of all, I see a student body that hates these with a passion. To my mind, it is the worst form of paternalism to say about the latter that this is (somehow) for their own good.

Second would be the intensives. What makes no sense are the courses that are in the intensive -- and those that are not in. But this reflects the almost-Stalinist approach to all of these intensives that there is one way -- and only one way -- of meeting the intensive requirement. People will deny this, but I certainly have found it to be true. And even if this is no longer true, I am not going to keep butting my head against the wall to see if it is.

Finally there is the Humanities Program. This poses as the 'crown jewel' at UNCA, but these courses are undoubtedly the four weakest courses offered on campus. Students would revolt but they are essentially bribed from doing so by the promise of excellent grades in each of these courses. So for the promise of an A with almost no work or effort, students will go through the motions. I think we are capable of much better than that. In fact, I know we are capable of better because all of our 'other' classes ARE better.

- I haven't had the time to organize a new course. I'd like to but haven't had the time.
Also, keeping current with departmental catalog offerings undermines the level of participation. I could develop a new course, participate in the ILS program or I can keep with the semester schedule to assure that our majors graduate with sufficient options.
- It is true we could do a better job at getting together as clusters. I think all cluster courses should be 4 units with one of the four units linked to a core curriculum. I also, think there should be a point person who is in each Department that is committed to the ILS program and can serve in an advisory capacity to others.

Appendix B: Weaknesses of the ILS Program

- Clusters are a real problem. They seem to be efforts to increase enrollment in some classes with little integration. This leaves it to the students to see the differences and similarities in approaches which, based on comments from advisees and casual conversations with students, they do not do. The most pervasive comment is 'getting the requirement out of the way.' Students appear to pick clusters they can satisfy easily without regard as to content.

There is the possibility of many good small clusters, but the requirement of a natural science course prevents this. I have tried to put together two clusters, but I was told the natural sciences 'don't enough resources to generate new courses.' They have a virtual veto power over clusters and use the resource argument to insist that we use classes they already teach. As long as a cluster must have a natural science course, many good ideas will never be implemented and we will be saddled the amorphous groups we have now.

Writing intensives are becoming a joke. Students I encounter regularly don't mind them too much because they are generally easy in the sense that grades are high because, in many cases they do the same paper over and over. If we are going to have writing intensives, there must be substantial instruction in writing, not just doing lots of it. Six of the writing intensive classes I am aware of don't do anything different than they did before.

It appears to me we have a fancy system which sounds good but lacks substance and rigor. In the 'program' areas, for example, Arts and even Humanities, grades are spiraling out of control. Our students are not as good as the grades indicate which indicates faculty in these programs have low expectations and do not demand much nor do they evaluate work carefully.

Faculty are not committed to this program or they would teach in it. If we have to hire adjuncts to support a requirement, that requirement should be jettisoned. Using adjuncts to boost a department's enrollments using ILS as a cover is detrimental to the whole university.

- It makes me an inept advisor. I believe it also dissuades transfer students from coming to UNCA.
- I personally feel that the more requirements we add, the more students are beaten into a 'check off the boxes' mentality, i.e., taking courses because they fill what to them feels like an arbitrary requirement rather than encouraging their exploration of varied disciplines. I'm someone who values choice in the curriculum because I think it enhances the potential for intellectual stimulation - a student who PICKS a class is more likely to find something of value in it than the student who feels forced to take something.

I don't think the cluster program (with a few exceptions) really manages much integration across disciplines - I'm not sure that's the fault of the cluster personnel as much as it was an unrealistic goal.

I think the ILS program is hugely inefficient, requiring enormous faculty time just to organize and oversee each component (how many committees did it add to a campus already overstuffed with committees?), find time for meetings to enhance the cross-disciplinary connections (who has time for MORE meetings?), advise students in something they seem to find unbelievably challenging to comprehend, attend workshops, develop new classes, etc. In an era where increasingly more is being asked of faculty in the realm of campus service, undergraduate research, community service (THE STRATEGIC PLAN), etc., I think it's shooting ourselves in the foot (feet?) to make ILS so time-intensive. And now we'll have no money to support it, either. So we've added work, increased expectations, and now removed resources...was it worth it? (But I could be convinced if someone could show me how students' educations have really been enhanced.) One last thought - in this economy, I feel like our objective must be considering how our efforts enhance our students' chances of landing a job. I know that's anathema - and I do truly love the liberal arts mission (came here for it) - but when my graduates find themselves serving, cleaning houses, and doing landscaping because that's what's out there, and it pays better than entry level liberal arts jobs, I have to question whether we're pursuing the right course.

- Topical Clusters, lack of coordination in some clusters

Neagativity by some faculty, who talk ILS down, affecting students opinions of ILS

Appendix B: Weaknesses of the ILS Program

- The main weakness is that it asked changes of faculty without giving them more money or time to make those changes. An example is cluster coordination. No one makes more room in my schedule (e.g., in exchange for taking part in the cluster, now you don't have to do X) or compensates me for that. I already lack the time to be the best teacher, research and service provider I can be. Asking for more work without any means to do so is not a good road to good clusters or faculty morale in undertaking them.

Another weakness is that it confuses students.

Another issue is that when one makes requirements (e.g., diversity-intensive), then some students wind up in courses they are not interested in or are angry about taking. I understand that this is part of the point -- asking students to stretch and grow. Since the horses are forced to my water trough, I try, but can't always make them drink -- and when they refuse to do so adamantly and vocally in class discussions, it can damage the class atmosphere, making DI courses not as engaging for all students. I've learned via reading circles that sadly most students (nationwide, not just UNCA) are not in college because of an intrinsic love of learning. I would like to see us help them move in that direction, and thus one question is whether ILS helps or harms that effort. As it currently stands, it probably does both.

- I think the Topical Clusters are a good idea in theory, but often there are so many choices in some clusters, that it dilutes the intended effect (of what I think is the intended effect). I tell my advisees that a topical cluster is like a 'mini major': you pick a theme and then choose 3 courses that fulfill that theme. The problem is that if there are too many options in a cluster, then it dilutes the connections of that them between them.

Now, if clusters were to reduce their offerings to fulfill the cluster, then the ILS program would need a substantial increase in the overall number of clusters offered. Another drawback is the 'contortions' my advisees sometimes have to go through in their schedule to make sure they fulfill a cluster, because there may not be enough offerings in a particular section (e.g., not enough electives, or nat science offerings, etc.) So to alleviate this, there should be many more clusters than are currently offered.

Of course that may have its drawbacks, as well. Which generally brings up the point that the Topical Cluster is the most problematic of the

- overly complex - a bit overloaded with humanities/arts - diversity intensive seems too defined by a particular ideology (unless it has evolved since I attended initial DI faculty development sessions) - Are Clusters more hoped-for than real, as an in-depth focus on a subject from perspectives of different disciplines?
- The degree of thematic integration seems very uneven across the clusters.

The definition of what constitutes diversity for the intensive designation may be overly broad, thereby weakening its intent, I think.

- getting the ILS mission across to students is hit or miss. If ILS could be combined with a capstone in their home dept it would be better.
- Too much micromanagement: 'Pack all this into their heads within their time at UNCA!' as if students will never want to learn anything again post-college. I think we risk that very outcome if we pursue this 'pack it all in' direction. Not enough freedom to form THEIR OWN interconnections among courses. Students have a better 'let's pitch in' attitude about this than I do. I find advising difficult at best. And the intensives! I find such qualification and so much specification ('Must be X pages written per semester...') to be onerous, pushy, and counterproductive. I used to look forward to advising, despite time pressure, as a way to get to know students. Now there is no time: We have to figure out how to fit in all the required specifications in a delicate mix-'n'-match within the student's lifetime here. There is less humanism and less individualism, unless we make a lot more time, and there is a lot more emphasis on petitions, paperwork, tricky strategies ('This can count as BOTH a cluster course AND an Intensive! Lucky you!'), and trying to figure out which coordinator or dean must be appealed to for anything deviating from the ... plan? core? It's not a sequence because it branches off at each level, and levels counter and contradict each other. In sum, it is an unnecessarily complex concoction that is difficult to understand and challenging at best to explain. I find myself feeling luckier all the time that I at least attended an excellent liberal arts university which afforded me CHOICES to meet general requirements and forge my own 'connections.' These not only lasted all my life, but my desire to learn was not quashed by what seems in too many places like a bureaucracy rather than a curriculum. Still, I'll keep trying. I feel I have no choice -- and THAT is the major weakness of the ILS program. The students have few choices -- and faculty have no choice but to go with the party line, which is to pretend support for structure that is downright Rube Goldberg-esque. I guess the secret is sense of humor. Some of my colleagues seem to like it which is great for them. And my students say that some of the courses they 'have' to take are really good. It would be so in any program, I daresay. It's still the devil I don't know well enough yet -- so perhaps as I get to know this devil better, I'll become as fond of it as I did UNCA's varied previous required structures. Thanks for asking our opinion, thanks for designing this survey in such an easy format for response, and thanks so much for your consideration. I know I sound like a curmudgeon, but that could just be time pressure in general speaking. Further, I have participated in many of the ILS offerings. So I will be a good citizen -- though I secretly hope that many of these 'improvements' over past curricula will be repealed in my lifetime. Yay for Spring Break and for all of us!

Appendix B: Weaknesses of the ILS Program

- based on a naive understanding of learning process; interdisciplinary experiences/connections are weak; potential for dictatorial behavior on part of ILS oversight committees that threaten teacher autonomy and risk imposition of teaching philosophies; diversion/dilution of resources needed to maintain strong major programs; teaching arrangements/philosophy in humanities sequence needs re-thinking after 30-some years; overall a great deal of glitz but lacking substance and depth needed by today's students. Too trendy.
- As is, the topical clusters, the colloquia and the intensives are all fit together. However, the 4 course Humanities still have serious problems, which in my opinion are directly related to the administrative structure of the Humanities. The NEH position and the Director position have produced very little if any tangible concrete results for the Humanities, having taught in them for about 8-10 years myself
- The application and renewal process for intensives is arduous, takes way too much work, imposes the committee's parameters (which are often disciplinary specific) too much on courses. I'm often tempted to forego the Intensive designation because of the application, assessment, reapplication process, and probably will drop some designations as a result. I understand and appreciate each designation trying to establish and maintain some integrity, but the application and reapplication process is way too complicated, dictative, restrictive and onerous.
- The fundamental weakness is too many faculty trying to 'tweak' an extant course to make it work for one of the ILS required courses. We seem to have faculty teaching intensives that have not altered their courses in any real and meaningful way. The clusters are a failure at present. The natural sciences control this process. There are many possibilities for innovative and exciting clusters (with tremendous student appeal) that can not go forward as there is no natural science course available. Most of the clusters have no real connection. Certainly, many students do not see and appreciate the connections within their cluster. (There are one or two clusters that are an exception.) When ILS was being discussed, the promise was made over and over that new hires in the natural sciences would be made with consideration for the clusters and ILS. Has this happened? Other clusters exist without extant courses being included that are clearly connected and relevant. Some faculty do not teach courses in a cluster due to the perception that the cluster is just a collection of courses with no plan and without collaboration. Another problem with ILS is advising. Some faculty decided immediately it was all too complicated and have communicated this to their students and advisees. Lastly, many on campus still refer to these requirements as general education requirements! The overall weakness of ILS has been in the implementation and faculty resistance, not necessarily in the structure and rationale for ILS.
- It's cumbersome and confusing.

I think it could be improved, and the spirit of it retained, with clear area requirements (to cover disciplinary exposures) and select intensives.
- Natural sciences have not contributed sufficiently to the ILS program.
Uneven commitment across the faculty has meant uneven results in the program.
The work load of some ILS committees (Writing Intensives and Clusters that are highly coordinated) is not recognized by the institution.
- It is unnecessarily complex with lots of easy way out. Requirements are meaningless with too many options. Intensives are not truly intensive. The whole clustering idea does not work at all. We cluster the unclusterable together. I strongly suspect faculty try to get Intensive or cluster designation for better course enrollment. Overall, I feel ILS has been so dominating that it has affected every aspect of our curriculum. I am afraid that it may lower overall quality of UNCA's whole program. We have to look at it in the context of UNCA's overall program.
- Non coherent.
- variable commitment from the faculty.



Integrative Liberal Studies Faculty Survey

1. In which area is your home department?

- Humanities
 - Natural Sciences
 - Social Sciences
-

2. What is your rank?

- Adjunct
 - Lecturer
 - Instructor
 - Assistant Professor
 - Associate Professor
 - Professor
-

3. Below are the required components of UNCA's Integrative Liberal Studies (ILS) program. Please indicate the ones you have taught **in the last four years**. (Mark all that apply.)

- Language 120
- An ILS Arts course
- An ILS Foreign Language course
- An ILS Health and Wellness course
- An ILS Laboratory Science course
- An ILS Math course
- A Diversity Intensive course
- An Information Literacy course
- A Quantitative Intensive course
- A Writing Intensive course
- Humanities 124
- Humanities 214
- Humanities 324
- Humanities 414
- LSIC 179
- LSIC 379
- LSIC 479
- A natural science course in a cluster
- A social science course included in a cluster

4. Please select the appropriate answer to each of the following questions.

- | | Yes | No |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| a. Have you participated in advisor training for ILS? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| b. Have you participated in an intensive workshop? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| c. Have you constructed a new course to add to a cluster? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| d. Have you redesigned a course to conform to an intensive's guidelines | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| e. Have you served on an Intensive Subcommittee? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| f. Have you coordinated a cluster? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| g. Have you been involved in organizing a cluster? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| h. Have you served on the Integrative Liberal Studies Oversight Committee? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| i. Have you presented on a topic related to ILS teaching and/or learning at a professional conference? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

5. Below is a list of the components of UNCA's Integrative Liberal Studies Program. Please indicate how important each component is to a quality liberal arts program.

- | | Essential | Desirable | Marginal | Not Important |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| a. A first-year composition requirement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| b. A laboratory science requirement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| c. A mathematics requirement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| d. A health and wellness requirement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| e. A foreign language requirement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| f. An arts requirement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| g. A humanities sequence | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| h. An information literacy requirement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| i. A writing intensive requirement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| j. A diversity intensive requirement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| k. A quantitative intensive requirement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| l. An introductory seminar requirement for beginning students | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| m. An introductory seminar requirement for transfer students | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| n. A cluster requirement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| o. A natural science requirement in a cluster | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| p. A social science requirement in a cluster | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
-

6. Please mark the option that best captures your reaction to each statement.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
a. The ILS requirements are easy to explain to students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. There are enough courses available for students to fulfill the requirements.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. There are too many requirements.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. It is too difficult to get a course approved as an intensive.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. All faculty should be required to teach in the ILS program.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. Students are making connections between courses that compose a cluster.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. Participating in the ILS program has been personally and professionally satisfying for me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. Faculty merit raises should be tied to participation in the program.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. Participation in ILS has increased my collaboration with faculty from other disciplines.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. My experiences in developing a new course or adapting an old one to conform to ILS requirements has made me a better teacher.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k. Four-year students are able to complete the requirements in a timely manner.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
l. Transfer students are able to complete the requirements in a timely manner.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
m. Collaboration among people teaching in a cluster is essential.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
n. The number of writing intensive courses students must take should be increased.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
o. The number of diversity intensive courses students must take should be increased.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
p. The number of quantitative intensive courses students must take should be increased.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
q. The number of information literacy intensive courses students must take should be increased.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
r. The difficulty of organizing a cluster has discouraged me from doing so.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. What are the **strengths** of the ILS program at UNCA?

8. What are the **weaknesses** of the ILS program at UNCA?

Submit

Please contact sabo@unca.edu if you have any questions regarding this survey.



[Survey Software](#) | [Idea Management](#) | [Polls](#)