## GENERAL EDUCATION: SIZE AND PURPOSE

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE, SPRING 2017

## SCOPE

For the 2016-2017 academic year, Faculty Senate charged the General Education committee to "Review the size and purpose of the Gen Ed Program in the context of assessment data mined and analyzed by Patrick Barlow and Natailie Solverson." This document describes the review performed by the General Education Committee in response to this charge.

## ASSESSMENT DATA

## COVERAGE OF OUTCOMES AND COURSE ENROLLMENT PATTERNS

In the spring of 2016, General Education sought data from IR related to the question of whether the General Education program was actually achieving its purpose as enumerated by the student learning outcomes. One of the primary concerns was the possibility that students could take a pattern of courses that both satisfied the program requirements but also failed to expose them to some subset of the student learning outcomes.

General Education specifically requested the data related to courses that a particular student body actually took to complete their undergraduate degree. IR then gathered data on the group of students who a) enrolled as firstyear students in the Fall of 2011 and b) who graduated with an undergraduate degree between July 1, 2014 and June 30 , 2015. This group included 723 students. IR compiled data on all General Education courses actually taken by these students (numeric results available online ${ }^{1}$ ) with a focus on answering the question of "what percent of these students took a course in which a GE SLO was actually assessed".

There are six GE SLOs, and the data suggests that the program is, in fact, exposing students to each of the six student learning outcomes. The IR data is summarized below

1) $65 \%$ of students took at least one class that assessed "Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Natural World"
2) $100 \%$ of students took at least one class that assessed "Creative and Critical Thinking"
3) $100 \%$ of students took at least one class that assessed "Aesthetic Perspectives and Meaning"
4) $99 \%$ of students took at least one class that assessed "Effective Communication"
5) $90 \%$ of students took at least one class that assessed "Interaction in Intercultural Contexts"
6) $99 \%$ of students took at least one class that assessed "Individual, Social, and Environmental Responsibility"

The committee notes that this data provides a narrow but quantifiable view of the SLO coverage provided by the program. It is highly likely that the actual exposure to GE SLOs is much higher than what this data suggests, since most courses cover multiple SLOs but are assessed a) only every 2 years and b) assess only a single SLO even if the course covers multiple SLOS.

[^0]GE uses course-embedded assessment to measure whether the program is meeting its stated purpose as defined by the six student learning outcomes (SLO). Each General Education course is required to assess at least one SLO every two years. Each of these course-embedded assessments requires that each student be assigned a task and that, using a rubric approved by GEAC, each student's performance is classified as one of the following: exemplary, proficient/more than satisfactory, competent/satisfactory, under-developed/less than satisfactory and unsatisfactory.

This course embedded assessment is one of the primary mechanisms, along with the NSSE and CLA instruments, for measuring the success of the program. In the 2015-2016 academic year, the UW-L Assurance Argument document included that fact that "from 2010 to 2015, 83 percent of student works assessed were rated competent or above" ${ }^{2}$ as a means of advancing the argument that the program is achieving its purpose. Note that while GE understands that this argument may have merit, it nonetheless cautions against drawing conclusions from aggregating the competence categories across assessments due to a) large variance in assessment tasks, b) large variance in rubrics and c) the lack of standardized definitions for the levels of competence themselves.

Additionally, the HLC Final Report of 5/16/2016 includes the following observation: "In summary, UWL meets all the requirements of this core component and in many areas, UWL excels in providing needed services and required facilities to assure a good learning experience for its students."

## SURVEY OF PERCEPTIONS RELATED TO THE GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

In the spring of 2017, GE distributed a survey to all faculty and IAS as well as college advisors. The survey focused directly on perceptions related to the size and scope of the GE program. The survey data are summarized below and the raw survey data is publicly available at https://ql.tc/IK07vw.

## DEMOGRAPHICS

The survey was distributed via email to 599 individuals. A total of 207 individuals completed the survey for a response rate of $35 \%$. The following tables give demographic distributions of respondents.

| Classification | Count | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Faculty | 164 | $79 \%$ |
| IAS | 36 | $17 \%$ |
| Non-Instructional AS | 6 | $3 \%$ |
| Administration | 1 | $0 \%$ |

Table 1: Demographic breakdown by employment classification

| Years | Count | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| None/NA | 5 | $2.5 \%$ |
| First year | 4 | $2 \%$ |
| $2-5$ years | 40 | $19 \%$ |
| $6-10$ years | 48 | $23 \%$ |

[^1]| $11-15$ years | 35 | $17 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $16-20$ years | 35 | $17 \%$ |
| More than 20 years | 40 | $19 \%$ |

Table 2: Demographics breakdown by years of college-level teaching experience

| Years | Count | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Never | 53 | $26 \%$ |
| Infrequently: About every $6^{\text {th }}$ semester | 21 | $10 \%$ |
| Occasionally: About very other semester | 21 | $10 \%$ |
| Regularly: About every semester | 112 | $54 \%$ |

Table 3: Demographics breakdown by the frequency of teaching courses in GE

| Level of Knowledge | Count | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Not at all knowledgeable | 6 | $3 \%$ |
| Slightly knowledgeable | 24 | $12 \%$ |
| Moderately knowledgeable | 75 | $36 \%$ |
| Very knowledgeable | 67 | $32 \%$ |
| Extremely knowledgeable | 35 | $17 \%$ |

Table 4: Demographic breakdown by self-reported levels of knowledge of the GE program

## PERCEPTIONS OF THE GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Table 5 shows the responses to the question: 'Do you agree with the stated purpose of the UW-L General Education program that "The primary purpose of general education is to cultivate knowledge, skills, and dispositions essential for independent learning and thinking"?'

| Level of agreement with purpose | Count | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Strongly disagree | 20 | $10 \%$ |
| Somewhat disagree | 11 | $5 \%$ |
| Neither agree not disagree | 8 | $4 \%$ |
| Somewhat agree | 69 | $34 \%$ |
| Strongly agree | 97 | $47 \%$ |

Table 5: Level of agreement with the stated purpose of the GE program
Table 6 shows the responses to the question: 'Do you agree that the current structure (categories, student learning outcomes, and goals) of the UW-L General Education program achieves this purpose?'

| Level of agreement with program structure | Count | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Strongly disagree | 15 | $7 \%$ |
| Somewhat disagree | 44 | $21 \%$ |
| Neither agree not disagree | 43 | $21 \%$ |
| Somewhat agree | 76 | $37 \%$ |
| Strongly agree | 27 | $13 \%$ |

Table 6: Level of agreement with program structure

Table 7 shows the responses to the question: 'The stated purpose of the General Education program is "to cultivate knowledge, skills, and dispositions essential for independent learning and thinking". The UW-L General Education program requires 48 credits. In your opinion, is this credit load sufficient to achieve the stated purpose of the General Education program?'

| Credit load | Count | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| The credit load is far too large | 44 | $22 \%$ |
| The credit load is somewhat too large | 60 | $30 \%$ |
| The credit load is neither too large nor too small | 78 | $39 \%$ |
| The credit load is somewhat too small | 11 | $6 \%$ |
| The credit load is far too small | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| No opinion | 7 | $4 \%$ |

Table 7: Perceptions of the credit-load of the GE program
Reponses to this question showed variance by college as illustrated in Figure 1.


Figure 1: Response to credit load by college affiliation

Table 8 shows the responses to the question: 'The stated purpose of the General Education program is "to cultivate knowledge, skills, and dispositions essential for independent learning and thinking". The UW-L General Education program includes approximately 165 courses distributed over 10 categories (including an elective category). In your opinion, does the General Education program include a sufficient number of courses to achieve the stated purpose?'

| Number of courses | Count | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| The program includes far too many courses | 28 | $14 \%$ |
| The program includes somewhat too many courses | 41 | $20 \%$ |
| The program includes neither too few nor too many courses | 95 | $47 \%$ |
| The program includes somewhat too few courses | 11 | $5 \%$ |
| The program includes far too few courses | 6 | $3 \%$ |
| No opinion | 21 | $10 \%$ |

Table 8: Perceptions of the number of courses in the GE program

Table 9 shows the responses to the question: 'The UW-L General Education program includes approximately 165 courses distributed over 10 categories (this includes an elective category). The UW-L General Education program has arranged courses into the following 10 categories: literacy ( 6 credits plus 2 writing emphasis courses OR writing in the major) mathematics/logical systems and modern languages ( 7 credits) minority cultures or multiracial women's studies (3 credits) international and multicultural studies (6 credits) science (4 credits) self and society (3 credits) humanistic studies ( 3 credits) arts ( 4 credits (i.e. 2 courses from 2 different departments)) health and physical well-being (3 credits) electives ( 9 credits) In your opinion, is the credit load associated with each category sufficient to achieve the stated purpose of the General Education program?'

|  | Far <br> too small |  | Somewhat <br> too small | Neither <br> too <br> small nor <br> too large | Somewhat <br> too large | Far too <br> large |  | No <br> opinion |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Category | $\%$ | $\#$ | $\%$ | $\#$ | $\%$ | $\#$ | $\%$ | $\#$ | $\%$ | $\#$ | $\%$ | $\#$ |
| literacy | $3 \%$ | 5 | $16 \%$ | 31 | $66 \%$ | 127 | $9 \%$ | 17 | $2 \%$ | 3 | $4 \%$ | 8 |
| math/logical systems and <br> modern languages | $2 \%$ | 4 | $10 \%$ | 20 | $61 \%$ | 117 | $19 \%$ | 36 | $4 \%$ | 7 | $4 \%$ | 7 |
| minority cultures or <br> multiracial women's studies | $6 \%$ | 12 | $14 \%$ | 27 | $60 \%$ | 115 | $9 \%$ | 18 | $5 \%$ | 9 | $5 \%$ | 10 |
| international and <br> multicultural studies | $3 \%$ | 5 | $8 \%$ | 16 | $49 \%$ | 93 | $26 \%$ | 49 | $10 \%$ | 19 | $5 \%$ | 9 |
| science | $3 \%$ | 6 | $17 \%$ | 32 | $69 \%$ | 131 | $6 \%$ | 11 | $1 \%$ | 2 | $5 \%$ | 9 |
| self and society | $4 \%$ | 8 | $12 \%$ | 23 | $65 \%$ | 125 | $7 \%$ | 14 | $4 \%$ | 8 | $7 \%$ | 13 |
| humanistic studies | $4 \%$ | 8 | $12 \%$ | 23 | $63 \%$ | 120 | $11 \%$ | 21 | $4 \%$ | 7 | $6 \%$ | 12 |
| arts | $2 \%$ | 4 | $7 \%$ | 13 | $49 \%$ | 94 | $32 \%$ | 61 | $6 \%$ | 11 | $4 \%$ | 8 |
| health and physical well-being | $2 \%$ | 3 | $5 \%$ | 10 | $59 \%$ | 112 | $18 \%$ | 34 | $12 \%$ | 23 | $5 \%$ | 9 |
| electives | $2 \%$ | 3 | $5 \%$ | 10 | $40 \%$ | 77 | $19 \%$ | 36 | $27 \%$ | 52 | $7 \%$ | 13 |

Table 9: Perceptions of the credit-load requirements for each GE category

## OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

While the full text of every response to the open-ended questions is publicly available at https://ql.tc/IK07vw, this report does not list every response but rather attempts to find meaningful commonalities within these responses. The committee cautions that this analysis is not a sufficient ground for formulating policy, but rather understands that these data are best used as a starting point for future deliberations related to changes to the General Education program.

The survey included 5 open-ended questions. The General Education Committee broke into three ad-hoc subgroups each of which was assigned either one or two questions to analyze. Each of these subcommittees was instructed to list every them that any single response identified and then to code each response according to which theme (or themes) that response mentioned. Please note that using this technique means that a single response might be counted in multiple themes.

Question 9: 'Please share any comments that you have about the stated purpose of the General Education program'. Given the wide array of comments on this question, the General Education Committee struggled to find commonalities among the wide variety of responses.

Question 11: 'Please share any comments related to the number of required credits in the General Education program. ' A total of 75 of the 207 overall respondents of the 207 survey respondents replied to this question. The analysis is shown in Table 10 where the responses are broken down by the answer given to Question 7 which is related to the credit-load of the program.

| Reason | Far too large | Somewhat too large | Neither too large nor too small | Somewhat too small | Far too small | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Too much of overall education, allow for other choice in major | 11 | 9 | 1 |  |  | 21 |
| More than peer institutions | 8 | 2 |  |  |  | 10 |
| Perfect balance |  |  | 9 |  |  | 9 |
| Quality rather than quantity |  | 1 | 5 |  |  | 6 |
| Streamline redundancy | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 4 |
| GE program makes university stronger |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Major programs reinforce skills creating redundancy | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |
| Lack of inquiry based learning |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 |
| Should be determined by program goals and assessment data |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 |
| Imbalance of category requirements |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 |
| Political concerns |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |
| Make student centered rather than faculty centered, department turf wars | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Too prescribed and no freedom |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Delete elective credits | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Students dislike GE | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Restricts major and program development | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Broad experience for students |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |


| Should be more |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Overlap with college core |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |

Table 11: Analysis of opened ended question related to credit load

Question 11 Commentary: The following patterns emerged in the open-ended responses for this item:

- Concern about the impact the GE program has on majors
- Concern that the program is larger than comparable institutions
- Assertion that the program is perfectly balanced in terms of credit load

Further inquiry into these patterns is needed to determine the extent to which they represent faculty and staff perceptions across campus.

Question 13: 'Please share any comments that you have related to the number of courses in the General Education program. 'A total of 65 of the 207 overall survey respondents replied to this question. The analysis is shown in Table 12 where the responses are broken down by the answer given to Question 12 which is related to the number of courses included in the General Education program.

| Reason | $\begin{gathered} \text { Far } \\ \text { too } \\ \text { many } \end{gathered}$ | Somewhat too many | Neither too many nor too few | Somewhat too few | Far <br> too <br> few | No opinion | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Students need many choices |  |  | 8 | 1 |  |  | 9 |
| Just right |  |  | 7 |  |  | 2 | 9 |
| Some categories have limited choices |  | 3 | 4 |  | 1 |  | 8 |
| Courses are designed to fit categories not best for students | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| Courses do not meet goals of independent learning and thinking | 1 |  | 3 |  |  |  | 4 |
| No shared experience for students | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Courses do not meet category SLOs | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 3 |
| Too diverse of classes in each category | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |
| Add course sequences |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |
| Look at course enrollment history to assess |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |
| Too many choices to be effective | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Courses with prerequisites should not be in GE |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Too many "fluff" courses | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Restricting course to single category is problematic |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Too hard to ensure quality of program |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Too many choices for student to see idea of GE | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Some categories are redundant | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| More courses would help meet the goals of GE |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Not enough sections offered for students |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |


| The illusion of choice--it seems that <br> students have choice but in reality they <br> do not |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table 12: Perceptions of the number of courses in the General Education program
Question 13 Commentary: The following patterns emerged in the open-ended responses for this item:

- Concern about student's ability to make choices within the program (flexibility)
- Assertion that the number of courses in the program is just right
- Concern about whether the categories are aligned with the purpose of the program

Further inquiry into these patterns is needed to determine the extent to which they represent faculty and staff perceptions across campus.

Question 15: Please share any comments related to the number and structure of the categories. A total of 75 of the 207 overall survey respondents replied to this question. The analysis is shown in Table 13 where the responses are broken down by college affiliation.

| Theme | CBA | CLS | CSH | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Combine categories |  | 5 | 11 |  | 16 |
| Increase number of courses in specific areas | 4 | 7 | 5 |  | 16 |
| Eliminate/reduce elective category | 2 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 13 |
| Current structure is good as is |  | 9 | 2 |  | 11 |
| Math and language shouldn't be in same category |  | 3 | 6 |  | 9 |
| Decrease categories/credits | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 6 |
| Eliminate health related courses | 2 | 1 | 3 |  | 6 |
| Allow students more choice within categories |  | 1 | 4 |  | 5 |
| Equalize category requirements |  | 4 |  |  | 4 |
| Unsure of purposes of elective category |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |
| Other/Need more information |  | 1 | 2 |  | 3 |
| Keep elective category |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |
| Organize by SLOs |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |
| Courses in major shouldn't be part for GE program |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |
| Some courses/categories too specific |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| GE should provide only basic skills | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Philosophy/logic should be required |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Wording should be changed |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| classes don't address stated goals |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Unsure of how courses added to GE program |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |

Table 13: Perceptions related to category structure

Question 15 Commentary: The following patterns emerged in the open-ended responses for this item:

- Suggestions that the number of categories be reduced and/or simplified with specific concern related to the electives, math/logical systems and languages, and the health-related courses and category.
- Concern about the per-category credit requirements.

Further inquiry into these patterns is needed to determine the extent to which they represent faculty and staff perceptions across campus.

Question 16: 'Do you have any other comments related to the size, structure, or purpose of the General Education program?' A total of 56 of the 207 overall survey respondents replied to this question. The analysis is shown in Table 14 where the responses are broken down by college affiliation. Note that the counts in this table are an average of three independent reviewers.

| Response | CBA | CLS | SAH | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| States that the program needs to be updated/changed | 3.3 | 4.7 | 8.3 | 16.3 |
| States that the program credit load is too large | 1.3 | 0.3 | 7.3 | 9.0 |
| States that the program must not be changed | 0.3 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 6.3 |
| States that there are too many classes in the program | 1.3 | 0.3 | 3.0 | 4.7 |
| States that changes should be made based on data | 0.0 | 3.3 | 1.0 | 4.3 |
| Suggests consolidating/simplifying categories | 0.3 | 0.7 | 3.3 | 4.3 |
| Expresses an interest in students opinions about the program | 0.3 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 3.0 |
| Expresses a concern related to insufficient resources to support the program | 1.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 2.7 |
| States that the program should increase its interdisciplinary focus | 0.3 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 2.7 |
| Prefers that the program focus on skills/practical | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 |
| States that concerns of quality are more important that concerns related to quantity of classes or credits | 0.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 2.7 |
| Expresses a concern related to how politics shape/affect the program | 0.3 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 2.3 |
| States that the purpose should include increasing awareness of diversity | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 |
| States that any changes should focus on the mission and ensure alignment with program structure | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 2.0 |
| Is concerned that students have a low view of the program | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 1.7 |
| States that the program has a good category structure | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 1.7 |
| Questions whether the Health Ed courses should be included in the program | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
| States that the program should not move to a skills/practical focus | 0.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
| States that the program should emphasize critical thinking and intellectual discernment | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 1.3 |
| States that a more robust campus-wide discussion is required before any changes are made | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 1.3 |
| Expresses concern that changing the program will affect tenure lines | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 1.3 |
| Expresses concern about the Math/Language (GE2) category | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| Expresses an interest in team-taught big-idea courses | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| States that the program should include courses having similar credit loads | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| Expresses a concern about layering college-level requirements on top of the program | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| States that faculty fail to adequately communicate the importance of the program | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| Expresses concern about how the program affects EDS students | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |


| Expresses a preferences that one class be allowed to satisfy multiple program <br> outcomes | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Suggests bringing in outside consultants | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| States that elective credits from transfers should be increased | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| States that all faculty should teach GE courses | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Expresses a preference for a common UWS program | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |

Table 14: Any other comments
Question 16 Commentary: The following patterns emerged in the open-ended responses for this item:

- There may be support for changing the program (although the broader survey data indicates that the direction in which those changes should be made are often oppositional).
- A significant number of those who replied to this question indicate that the program should not be changed.

Further inquiry into these patterns is needed to determine the extent to which they represent faculty and staff perceptions across campus.

## SIZE OF THE GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM AT COMPARABLE INSTITUTIONS

The General Education Committee gathered data related to the size of the General Education programs of all University of Wisconsin System schools (including UW Madison and the UW Colleges). This data is shown in Table 15.

| School | Credits |  | Categories | Courses |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Min | Max |  |  |
| UW Colleges | 35 | 44 | 6 | 756 |
| Eau Claire | 39 | 45 | 5 | 428 |
| Green Bay | 37 | 37 | 7 | 271 |
| La Crosse | 48 | 48 | 9 | 165 |
| Madison | 22 | 30 | 6 | 228 |
| Milwaukee | 24 | 36 | 5 | 680 |
| Oshkosh | 41 | 41 | 7 | ? |
| Parkside | 36 | 36 | 5 | 130 |
| Platteville | 33 | 54 | 11 | 512 |
| River Falls | 38 | 38 | 5 | 142 |
| Stevens Point | 31 | 52 | 9 | 311 |
| Stout | 40 | 46 | 9 | 188 |
| Superior | 42 | 48 | 6 | 288 |
| Whitewater | 36 | 49 | 6 | 89 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| min | 22.0 | 30.0 | 5.0 | 89.0 |
| average | 35.9 | 43.1 | 6.9 | 321.0 |
| max | 48.0 | 54.0 | 11.0 | 756.0 |

Table 15: Comparison of the size of the general education program with respect to UW System schools.

Tables 16 through 20 show the same data as Table 15 but broken down by specific quantities.

| Minimum Credits Required |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| School | Credits |
| Madison | 22 |
| Milwaukee | 24 |
| Stevens Point | 31 |
| Platteville | 33 |
| Colleges | 35 |
| Parkside | 36 |
| Whitewater | 36 |
| Green Bay | 37 |
| River Falls | 38 |
| Eau Claire | 39 |
| Stout | 40 |
| Oshkosh | 41 |
| Superior | 42 |
| La Crosse | 48 |

Table 16: Comparison by minimum number of required GE credits

| Maximum Credits Required |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| School | Credits |
| Madison | 30 |
| Milwaukee | 36 |
| Parkside | 36 |
| Green Bay | 37 |
| River Falls | 38 |
| Oshkosh | 41 |
| Colleges | 44 |
| Eau Claire | 45 |
| Stout | 46 |
| La Crosse | 48 |
| Superior | 48 |
| Whitewater | 49 |
| Stevens Point | 52 |
| Platteville | 54 |

Table 17: Comparison by maximum number of required GE credits

| "Average" Credits Required |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| School | Credits |
| Madison | 26.0 |
| Milwaukee | 30.0 |
| Parkside | 36.0 |
| Green Bay | 37.0 |
| Stevens Point | 37.0 |
| River Falls | 38.0 |
| Colleges | 39.5 |
| Oshkosh | 41.0 |


| Eau Claire | 42.0 |
| :---: | :--- |
| Whitewater | 42.5 |
| Stout | 43.0 |
| Platteville | 43.5 |
| Superior | 45.0 |
| La Crosse | 48.0 |

Table 18: Comparison by the midway point of the minimum and maximum required GE credits.

| Number of Courses |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| School | Courses |
| Whitewater | 89 |
| Parkside | 130 |
| River Falls | 142 |
| La Crosse | 165 |
| Stout | 188 |
| Madison | 228 |
| Green Bay | 271 |
| Superior | 288 |
| Stevens Point | 311 |
| Eau Claire | 428 |
| Platteville | 512 |
| Milwaukee | 680 |
| Colleges | 756 |
| Oshkosh | $?$ |

Table 19: Comparison by the number of courses in the General Education program.

| Categories |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| School | Categories |
| Eau Claire | 5 |
| Milwaukee | 5 |
| Parkside | 5 |
| River Falls | 5 |
| Colleges | 6 |
| Madison | 6 |
| Superior | 6 |
| Whitewater | 6 |
| Oshkosh | 7 |
| Green Bay | 7 |
| La Crosse | 9 |
| Stevens Point | 9 |
| Stout | 9 |
| Platteville | 11 |

Table 20: Comparison by the number of categories in the General Education program.

The General Education Committee also gathered data related to the size of the General Education programs with respect to comparable institutions across the country. These institutions were culled from the UW-La Crosse performance peer and aspirant institutions ${ }^{3}$. This data is shown in Table 21.

| Peer School | Credits |  | Categories |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Min | Max |  |
| La Crosse | 48 | 48 | 9 |
| Appalachian State | 44 | 44 | 7 |
| Montclair State | 42 | 42 | 8 |
| Rowan U | 42 | 42 | 5 |
| Salisbury U | 36 | 48 | 5 |
| State U of New York | 36 | 48 | 4 |
| SUNY Brockport | 43 | 43 | 7 |
| SUNY Cortland | 30 | 30 | 12 |
| U of Mary Washington | 43 | 43 | 10 |
| U of Minnesota Duluth | 39 | 39 | 10 |
| U of North Car Wilmington | 42 | 42 | 11 |
| U of Northern lowa | 45 | 45 | 6 |
| UW Eau Claire | 36 | 36 | 4 |
| West Chester U of Penn | 48 | 48 | 5 |
| Winona State | 40 | 40 | 10 |
| College of Charleston | 47 | 53 | 7 |
| James Madison U | 41 | 41 | 5 |
| SUNY Geneseo | 32 | 52 | 9 |
| College of New Jersey | 41 | 53 | 3 |
| Truman State U | 31 | 58 | 4 |


| $\min$ | 30 | 30 | 3 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { m a x }}$ | 48 | 58 | 12 |
| average | 40.3 | 44.75 | 7.05 |

[^2]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ https://public.tableau.com/profile/graceengen\#!/vizhome/UW-LGENERALEDUCATIONCLASSCREDITTABLES/EnrollmentinGeneralEducationCourses

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Assurance Argument, 2/24/2016, page 41

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ https://www.uwlax.edu/institutional-research/peer-performance-aspirant-institutions/

