

**Millersville University**  
**General Education Task Force**  
**Report on the Fall 2003 Faculty & Student Focus Groups**  
**Revised January 16, 2004**

**Preface**

This report summarizes the findings from a series of eight focus group sessions held between the end of September and the early part of November 2003. Each session was facilitated and discussion recorded generally by two members of the Task Force and included both faculty and student participation (by invitation) – typically 8 to 10 participants per session. Over 40 faculty members and nearly 30 students participated in total. All members of both the Faculty and Student Senates were invited as well as chairs of all departments. Additional faculty were invited at the recommendation of attendees from the first wave of meetings. Faculty members were asked to bring a student from their own department to the session if possible. Twenty-one of the 26 academic departments were represented.

Surveys (see Attachment A) were completed by all participants either prior to or at the beginning of each session. The survey, together with a two-page summary of five major discussion points or principles (see Attachment B), was used to help structure the discussion. Complete survey results are included as Attachment C.

What follows is a summary of the responses across all eight focus group sessions. Each section (prepared by different members of the Task Force) summarizes one of the five major discussion points (principles) with a sixth section summarizing the last portion of most sessions, which was devoted to a “synthesis” that evaluated the comparative importance of the five principles when considered all together. [Because each section has a different author, the format of each summary will vary slightly.]

Report authors include Barbara Bensus, Dottie Blum, Fred Foster-Clark, Phil Riordan, Paul Studdard, and John Ward. Drafts of each section were reviewed and approved by the Task Force on December 1, 2003.

## **Summary of Principle #1: Strong Gen Ed programs explicitly answer the question, “What is the point of General Education?”**

### **1. Survey Results**

Question 1 asked about the source of students’ understanding of Gen Ed. While the modal response for both faculty and students was “4” (leaning towards advisement, orientation, and other more direct and explicit means of acquainting students with Gen Ed), one-third of students rated this item with a “2” (leaning towards the catalog being the primary source of knowledge about Gen Ed).

Question 2 dealt with clarity of purpose. Most students and faculty rated this either a “2” or “3” (mid-point but leaning towards ambiguity or a multiplicity of purposes). Only 7% of faculty and no students felt strongly that the purposes of Gen Ed were “explicit and clear for the faculty and the students” and that there was a “coherent rationale” and “commitment” to Gen Ed.

### **2. Faculty Comments**

#### *Benefits.*

Faculty support the existence of the Gen. Ed. curriculum because it helps give students a well-rounded education, with some exposure to a variety of disciplines and points of view. It also helps students choose a major and career path. It is best for this curriculum to stay broad and “general” as a counterbalance to the major, in which the students pursue in-depth study in a specific discipline.

#### *Suggestions/Disadvantages.*

Students don’t understand the relevance of the GE curriculum; its purpose is not communicated to them well. It is viewed as something they have to “get through”.

The current system has too many rules and requirements, is confusing and not user-friendly.

The GE classes are concentrated in the 100-200 level courses; few upper-level courses are GE.

No coherence on this campus in the GE curriculum.

Need to develop a “culture of learning”.

### 3. Student Comments

#### *Benefits.*

GE curriculum enables students to speak and relate to several fields; helps to diversify students' education and to appreciate other people's experiences and points of view. Helps prepare students for the "real world". Provides a set of core competencies.

Required Related courses made sense as a link to major.

#### *Suggestions/Disadvantages.*

Students are not told the purpose of the GE curriculum by their professors, even their academic advisors. GE looked at as a list to be checked off. Advisors were often not very helpful; didn't want to have to deal with GE.

MU not thought of as a liberal arts institution. (What \*is\* MU?? What is our identity as an institution?)

Students tend to randomly pick GE courses based on how they fit into their schedule.

## Summary of Principle #2: Strong Gen Ed programs continuously strive for educational coherence.

### Survey Results

The survey data for the 4 survey questions related to Coherence are shown below:

FACULTY							
Item #	Label	1	2	3	4	5	Ave.
3	Goals	21%	31%	33%	7%	7%	2.5
4	Coherence	26%	36%	21%	14%	0%	2.2
5	Student Experience	7%	29%	36%	21%	2%	2.8
6	Disciplinary Links	7%	19%	38%	26%	5%	3.0
STUDENTS							
3	Goals	15%	37%	26%	19%	4%	2.6
4	Coherence	19%	22%	37%	19%	4%	2.7
5	Student Experience	11%	11%	41%	22%	15%	3.2
6	Disciplinary Links	4%	24%	32%	32%	8%	3.2

### Broad Interpretation

The two most obvious interpretations of this data are:

- In general, faculty and student ratings are similar-though students provide slightly higher ratings.
- Faculty and students both rate coherence with low to moderate ratings.

### Analysis by Individual Questions

Question #3 asked participants to describe GENED as either “a list of courses that students must take” or as a “set of goals for student learning.” Faculty and students both gave this question very low ratings. It is worth noting that 9 out of 42 faculty rated this item as a 1.

Question #4 asked students whether GENED was either “fragmented” and required students to search for commonalities or whether the GENED program strives for a “coherent” educational experience. 26 out of 41 faculty and 11 out of 27 students rated this question as either a 1 or a 2.

Questions 5 and 6 deal with specific forms of coherence and on these two questions faculty and students both rated coherence a bit higher – very close to a 3 rating. Question 5 asked whether GENED helps students connect classroom ideas with student’s histories, ideas, and attitudes. Students rated this question relatively high. One explanation is that the description of a 1 used the word “faculty.” It is likely that students view the efforts of their professors to make content relevant more positively than they view the overall relevance of the GENED program. Question 6 dealt with the relationship between GENED and disciplines. Again, the ratings were in the moderate range. A possible interpretation is that students and faculty rate their programs fairly high and do see the value of GENED as a connection to their discipline.

**Focus Group Discussions**

The major theme of the discussions by both faculty and students was that the GENED program is more like a list of courses than a program that purposefully builds links between courses, concepts, or skills. 23 of the 84 comments fit easily into this description. This theme is amplified by the comments of several faculty comments (5) that not only is coherence not descriptive of GENED, but that it is not expected and is not part of the overall mission of the university.

Although the GENED program as a whole is not seen as aiming for coherence, several faculty and students discussed specific courses, teachers, and mentors that value and promote coherence. 5 faculty comments and 6 student comments related to specific examples where coherence does occur. Several participants noted that coherence is developed through discipline-based courses (2 faculty, 1 student).

Generally, faculty and students were in agreement about the quality of coherence in GENED. There was a difference in faculty and student focus related to solutions. Faculty tended to describe barriers to creating coherence (9 comments such as lack of staff, large classes, and too broad a range of students). Faculty also discussed possible policy changes to fix the problem (9 comments including learning communities, capstone courses, freshman seminars, more perspectives courses). Students, on the other hand, did not describe either the institutional barriers or any possible policy solutions. Instead, several of the comments related to how students personally attempted to create coherence either by their selection of classes or by making connections on their own without help from their professors (5 comments).

A related issue was the fact that GENED is not taken very seriously by students and that students simply want easy GENED courses so that they can concentrate on their majors (3 faculty comments, and surprisingly, 5 student comments). These comments connect the idea of purpose and coherence. Students do not see the value or meaning of their GENED courses and therefore are not engaged.

Finally, 3 faculty comments questioned whether coherence should be an explicit focus in teaching. The sentiment behind these comments was that coherence depends on depth of subject matter knowledge. In this view, attempts to develop coherence before the development of knowledge would not be substantive and might undermine the focus on depth. Coherence was valued by these faculty, but they felt that it is something that occurs later perhaps as students finish their programs or even later in life.

**Conclusion**

Overall, the data provide a well-rounded picture of coherence of the GENED program. The credibility of the data is enhanced by the fact that faculty and students were in general agreement and by the fact that the survey results were consistent with the focus group comments. The broad picture is a GENED program that does not systematically promote or achieve coherence, but individual students, faculty, mentors and courses do sometimes find ways to make meaningful connections. With this in mind, the GENED program is still best described by both faculty and students as a list of requirements rather than as a purposeful program.

**Summary of Principle #3: Strong Gen Ed programs are self-consciously value-based and teach social responsibility.**

The third issue discussed in these meetings dealt with the following principle:

- Strong Gen Ed programs are self-consciously value-based and teach social responsibility. (p. 18)

In addition the following questions were posed:

- In what ways are students at Millersville prepared to meet the Gen Ed objective related to “personal, ethical, and civic values and decision-making?”
- Are values and social responsibility conveyed intentionally (i.e., self-consciously)?
- In what ways do our programs reflect a commitment to global perspectives, multiculturalism, and other aspects of diversity?

In general, a wide divergence of opinion seemed to surround many of these interrelated issues. Of particular contention was whether values and ethics should be taught and, if so, what should be taught. In some minds, values don't belong being “taught” in university classrooms; while others saw values being “taught” daily in each professor's approach to his or her topic/discipline and in how they interacted with students and other faculty. Students through modeling thus absorb values in much the same way as children absorb values from their parents. Moving from “what should be” to “what is,” the conversations suggested that ethics, social responsibility, global awareness, and diversity issues were present in some courses but certainly not infused across the curriculum. Many saw Perspectives courses as bearing responsibility for addressing many of these concerns. Otherwise, some courses (e.g., in philosophy, government, and history) seemed better situated to deal with globalization, diversity, and ethics, but many courses were seen as devoid of these concerns. Some viewed ethics as being more the province of courses in the major than in Gen Ed courses. Students conveyed the sense that values, diversity, and social responsibility don't need to be directly taught (as in a didactic mode) but instead need to be experienced through exposure to diverse perspectives and through classroom dialogue that allows an exchange of viewpoints where students get both exposure to different ideas and the opportunity to explore and express their own views. With some exceptions the comments from both students and faculty suggested that ethics, diversity, and social responsibility do not get adequately addressed in Gen Ed. Neither group seemed sure of the methods by which to best approach the teaching of these topics.

Survey responses provided something of a contrast to the open discussion. One question asked about the emphasis placed on the “political, moral, and ethical dimensions” (using a 1 to 5 scale). The modal response was “4.” This was the highest scoring item on the entire survey for both faculty and students. Fully 70% of students rated this as “4” or “5” suggesting a high perceived emphasis on developing civic responsibility. Responses to questions about global perspectives and multiculturalism were quite varied, reflecting a lack of any strong consensus, especially among faculty, about how Millersville's Gen Ed program deals with these dimensions. However, students seemed to view Gen Ed more favorably on these two items than did faculty. For example, over 50% of students rated MU high (4 or 5) on the diversity/multicultural item versus only about 20% of the faculty.

**Summary of Principle #4: Strong General Education programs require and foster academic community.**

**Statistical Findings**

- 43% of participants agreed that faculty and students in our general education program rarely interact outside the classroom (Question 10).
- 60% of participants agreed that general education faculty teach with little or no consultation or dialogue with other faculty (Question 16).

**Responses**

- Everything seems fragmented; “turf wars” are prevalent between some departments
- There is no incentive (or time) for faculty to make connections with other faculty
- Even in learning communities, faculty collaboration seems non-existent
- Physical constraints are a problem (e.g., Stayer faculty just can’t drop in on other faculty)
- Commuters, non-traditional and students living off campus don’t feel that they are part of the university community; academic or otherwise
- Students reported that there is some sense of community between and among majors which is often promoted by faculty
- Some dialogue occurs between faculty informally
- A student reported that the faculty member’s enthusiasm makes a difference in promoting community (“He still knows my name and asks how I am.”)

**Summary of Principle # 5: Strong Gen Ed programs reach beyond the classroom to the broad range of student co-curricular experiences.**

**Faculty Comments:**

- Learning community may be too much like high school – traveling to classes together.
- Co-curricular involvement seems variable – depends upon demands of major.
- Not practical for commuters and job demands.
- Extra credit for seminar attendance seems to encourage the habit of participation.
- Departmental clubs bring in major speakers.
- Theme to dorm experience (living/learning environments).
- Are outside activities brought into the classroom such as outside speakers?
- Many courses have service learning components.
- Students don't go just for stimulation.
- Non-traditional students and commuters don't have the same opportunity for taking part beyond the classroom.
- Learning communities need to be formed from the bottom up.
- Seems hit or miss; coops or internships.
- Individual attitudes dictate involvement.
- Student demands of curriculum; 20-30 hours working outside of school; difficult to get involved with co-curricular experiences.
- Cultural affairs; frustration-students don't come out for planned activities.
- Very few classes on Friday and Friday afternoon, encourages students to go home for the weekend.
- Technology has become a problem; students stay in their rooms and Instant Message each other instead of getting out.

**Student Comments:**

- Make usable connections – organizations and majors.
- Education blocks – too much time together.
- Learning Community idea – perhaps same classes but different times.
- Lot's of students don't take advantage of opportunities that do exist.
- Commuter status cuts down on ability to be involved. Miss some of the college experience.
- What is University accomplishing if commuters are not involved? It isn't really a university then – should just have a virtual university.
- Students mentioned that some classes require attendance at lectures given by outside speakers, but that most of the time, the lecture is never discussed in the course for which it was required. Usually there are reflection papers to be written.
- Belonging to organizations and involvement in other extracurricular activities can help one see how gen. ed. skills can be used outside the classroom.
- The real world is not equal to general education.

- Student felt disconnected after moving off campus, missing out on some academic opportunities and finding it harder to meet with other students.
- Dorm living helps you learn to get along with other people, including upper level students.
- Doesn't encourage community involvement.
- Use my public speaking at national conferences.
- Greek organizations have a number of opportunities; i.e. food drives, used my persuasive writing to encourage participation; collected 3,500 pounds of food.
- Some students are forced to go to cultural programs as part of their classes.

**Survey Results:**

Question 11 rates where the Gen Ed program happens with "1" reflecting an exclusive focus on "classroom teaching and learning" and with "5" recognizing that learning can also take place outside the classroom in the cafeteria, dorms, student organizations, etc. Two-thirds of faculty respondents rated this question at 1 or 2. Student responses tended to be just slightly higher (54% at 1 or 2). Only about one-fourth of students and even fewer faculty perceived even a modest recognition (i.e., rating of 4 or 5) of co-curricular learning.

**Summary:**

It appears there is a disconnect with the co-curricular experiences on campus. Faculty do not incorporate speakers and cultural programs into their curriculum. There seems to be some interest in expanding the living/learning concepts, and using Service-Learning. The co-curricular seems to be an after thought with faculty.

The students do not take advantage of the opportunities provided on campus. Students admit that once they move off campus, they are less likely to participate in co-curricular activities. Students get frustrated when they are told to attend a speaker or cultural event, and then it is not discussed in class. What is the importance of going if it is not discussed?

Clearly, faculty and students struggle with the concept that a strong general education program reaches beyond the classroom to the broad range of student co-curricular experiences.

### Summary Of Topic # 6: Synthesis

Among the eight focus groups that took place, five of them had enough time to devote to the sixth topic whose purpose was to synthesize the ideas put forth during the meeting and to discuss the general education principles that seemed to be the most important or least important. Here is a summary of these remarks.

Principles # 1 and # 2 (purpose and coherence) were mentioned most often during the synthesis as the most important principles, though most groups commented that all of the principles were interconnected. Some thought that coherence is a natural result of purpose and that once the purpose/importance of general education was understood/achieved, all of the other principles would be as well. Still others thought that the strengthening of coherence would cause the other principles to “fall into place”. However, there were participants who felt that Principle # 3 (social responsibility) was most important and there were participants who believed that Principle # 4 (academic community) was most important. Principle # 5 (reaching beyond the classroom) seemed to be the least relevant among the five principles under discussion by the focus groups.

A number of “mechanical” reasons were noted that work against achieving coherence in the current general education program. Among them are:

- 1) difficulty in scheduling general education courses due to
  - a) various restrictions
  - b) unavailability of courses
  - c) student work schedules
- 2) students don't always know what they want right away
- 3) the perception of general education as “filling up a sheet”
- 4) too many courses
- 5) students being forced into schedules during their freshman year

Several remedies were suggested to help improve coherence and achieve a better understanding of the purpose of general education. Among them are:

- 1) general education courses should be more structured and have more purpose
- 2) some major courses should be allowed to count towards general education
- 3) general education courses could be organized around the academic theme
- 4) general education should be strong, but not so prescriptive
- 5) faculty should be encouraged to cooperate more such as in Learning Communities
- 6) faculty should articulate the importance of general education on the first day of classes and continue to remind students of those reasons throughout the semester
- 7) there should be more options for general education
- 8) there are too many general education requirements
- 9) make general education courses more fun and exciting so as to eliminate the perception that they are a chore to be completed
- 10) do not “turn off” students with a narrowly focused program of requirements

A number of insightful comments also were made. Among them are:

- 1) general education should open opportunities for learning after graduation
- 2) many students come to college for professional reasons and are not looking for a strong general education program which seems to them to be designed as an obstacle to their progress
- 3) understanding the purpose of general education and making connections seem to become clearer during one's junior year (student)
- 4) general education is not appreciated until about age 30 (faculty)
- 5) the definition of general education seems to occur in the Learning Communities
- 6) developing a sense of community is more important among majors and faculty in the same department than it is in general education
- 7) values and ethics are better dealt with at a capstone level, not at an introductory level

### **Survey Results**

The survey data for two questions are pertinent here. Question 12 asks about the strength of support for Gen Ed. Faculty responses were widely distributed but centered about at the midpoint (3). Student ratings were concentrated at ratings of 2 and 3. Nearly a quarter of the faculty and even more students strongly or modestly endorsed the view that "few on campus would care if our general education program were cut in half". Question 15 deals with the overall image of Gen Ed and contrasts the view that students regard the Gen Ed program as "standing in the way of taking courses in their major" (rating of 1) with the view that Gen Ed is a selling point for the university (rating of 5). While 2 was the modal rating for both faculty and students, nearly 1 in 5 respondents gave this question a 1. Very few students or faculty saw Gen Ed as a selling point.

**Attachment A: ASSESSING GENERAL EDUCATION (Revised Survey)**

Please respond to the following questions about your campus’s general education program. Choose a number from 1 to 5 which best represents your view, where 1 indicates agreement with the first statement and 5 indicates agreement with the second statement in each pair. (Numbers between 2 and 4 indicate agreement with some aspects of both the first and the second statements.)

**1. Student Understanding**

1	2	3	4	5
<p>Students are informed about our general education program primarily through our institution’s academic catalog.</p>				<p>Students gain a good understanding of the rationale and structure of our general education program through orientation programs, freshman seminars, meetings with advisors, brochures, workshops, peer advisement, or similar means.</p>

**2. Purpose**

1	2	3	4	5
<p>Our general education program may be characterized by an absence of clarity about the purposes of the program, by the inclusion of too many purposes, or by too many compromises in the design of the program.</p>				<p>The purposes of our general education program are explicit and clear both for the faculty and for the students. Our general education program is based on a coherent rationale and reflects the central educational values and commitments of our institution.</p>

**3. Goals**

1	2	3	4	5
<p>Our general education program is expressed primarily as a list of courses that students must take.</p>				<p>Our general education program is expressed primarily as a set of goals for student learning and development.</p>





**11. Co-Curricular Activities**

1	2	3	4	5
<p>Our general education program is focused exclusively on classroom teaching and learning.</p>				<p>Our general education program recognizes that valuable student learning can take place not only in the classroom but also in cafeterias, dormitories, student clubs, car pools, hallways, families, employment, and other settings.</p>

**12. Support**

1	2	3	4	5
<p>Few on campus would care if our general education program were cut in half.</p>				<p>Our general education program has strong support from many constituencies, including students, faculty members, department chairs, graduates, trustees, and employers of our students.</p>

**13. Image**

1	2	3	4	5
<p>The students regard our general education requirements as an obstacle that stands in the way of taking courses in their major department.</p>				<p>Our general education program is an important selling point in recruiting students, talking with students' parents and employers, and attracting contributions from our graduates.</p>

**14. Coordination**

1	2	3	4	5
<p>Our general education program exists primarily as a set of requirements and a list of course offerings in the catalog, along with staff who verify that students have fulfilled the requirements.</p>				<p>Our general education program has an administrator who coordinates the program, a faculty committee that considers changes and establishes policies, clear lines of responsibility and authority, and its own budget.</p>



**18. Teaching (faculty only)**

1	2	3	4	5
<p>Faculty and department chairs regard teaching in our general education program primarily as a service to students majoring in other disciplines and as an academic chore or burden.</p>				<p>Faculty and department chairs regard teaching in our general education program as an opportunity for investigating new ways in which one's discipline can illuminate the problems and questions of our common life and an honor within the academic community.</p>

**19. Faculty Development (faculty only)**

1	2	3	4	5
<p>Support for faculty development related to general education is minimal at our institution</p>				<p>The faculty who teach in our general education program have continuing and ample support for faculty development activities such as development of new courses, learning new course content, and acquiring new approaches to teaching and learning.</p>

Source: This survey was adapted from *Assessing General Education: A questionnaire to initiate campus conversations* by Jack Meacham, Association of American Colleges and Universities. Some of the original 28 items have been dropped, 3 have been revised slightly, and the order has been adjusted to fit our present needs.

**Attachment B: Selected Principles for Effective General Education Programs  
[*Strong Foundations*, AAC, 1994]**

What follows are statements of five of the twelve principles put together as part of a large project at the Association of American College (now AAC&U) intended to “explicate what is basic to implementing and sustaining strong general education programs” (p. xvii). It is around these five issues (and the related items from the modified *Assessing General Education* survey) that the Task Force has chosen to organize our campus conversations about general education at Millersville. A brief expansion of the principle, drawn largely from the *Strong Foundations* monograph, follows each of the five principles stated below.

**Part 1. Articulating a Compelling Vision for General Education**

**1. Strong Gen Ed programs explicitly answer the question, “What is the point of General Education?” (p.3) [Relates to Survey Items 1, 2, & 17]**

“... the single most important thing that colleges and universities need to do to ensure the long-term viability of their education reforms is to keep clearly in mind what the point of general education is.” (p. 3) So what is the point of Millersville’s Gen Ed program? To prepare students for effective citizenship? To provide breadth and some depth in traditional liberal arts? To instill a commitment to lifelong learning?

**2. Strong Gen Ed programs continuously strive for educational coherence. (p.12) [Relates to Survey Items 3 – 6]**

While the purposes of Gen Ed may be to provide diverse perspectives and exposure to intellectual pluralism, at some point it must strive also to demonstrate the “connectedness of things” and help students develop the “integrative habit of mind” (p. 12 -13). There may be several ways to achieve this coherence in the curriculum. Some schools have a “true core” or “modified core” where students all share a common set of courses. Coherence can also be garnered through interdisciplinary coursework. A focus on the development of a particular set of “intellectual and communication skills” or particular personal qualities (e.g., open-mindedness) can also help to tie the curriculum together by providing some unifying framework. How coherent is Millersville’s Gen Ed program? How often are links made from one course to other courses in the curriculum? Is there any sense of skill building across some set of courses?

**3. Strong Gen Ed programs are self-consciously value-based and teach social responsibility. (p. 18) [Relates to Survey Items 7 – 9]**

“... general education programs have a common responsibility to confront multiple problems of the modern world in such a way that students complete our programs prepared not only in their disciplines and professions but also in their abilities to imagine and construct better – more humane, just, and equitable – futures for themselves and for others.” (p. 20) “Strong general education programs provide a rich variety of ways for students to consider the question ‘How should we live?’ ...” (p. 20). In what ways are students at Millersville prepared to meet the Gen Ed objective related to “personal, ethical, and civic values and decision-making?” Are values and social responsibility conveyed intentionally (i.e., self-consciously)? In what ways do our programs reflect a commitment to global perspectives, multiculturalism, and other aspects of diversity?

**Part II. Forming an Evolving Community Based Upon a Vision of General Education****4. Strong Gen Ed programs require and foster academic community. (p. 31) [Relates to Survey Items 10 & 16]**

“... intellectual isolation, disciplinary fragmentation, and minimal interaction among faculty and students are still facts of life at many American colleges and universities. Viable general education programs work to counteract these alienating forces by creating forums for community.” (p. 32) Astin (1993) has identified student peer group interaction and interaction among faculty and students as the two most important influences on undergraduates’ growth and development (in that order!). Cross-disciplinary interactions among faculty are also crucial for maintaining a healthy sense of academic community. Are cross-disciplinary connections made in our curriculum? Are these connections made explicit to students? Are the interactions among students, between students and faculty/staff, and among faculty/staff sufficient to develop this sense of academic community?

**5. Strong Gen Ed programs reach beyond the classroom to the broad range of student co-curricular experiences. (p. 48) [Relates to Survey Item 11]**

“The contexts of students’ meaning-making extend well beyond the walls of our classrooms. ... However, the approaches of many general education programs do little to capitalize on the extraordinary resources for learning that already exist in the varied activities in the daily lives of students.” p. 49 In what ways do co-curricular experiences at Millersville (e.g., life in the dorms, Greek organizations, clubs, campus government, other formal and informal activities outside of the classroom) contribute to the development of a well-educated, liberally educated student? How are these experiences (or how could they) be integrated into the learning that takes place in our classrooms?



