The following statements were written based on summary survey feedback from a number of options/divisions: ACM, APh, Ay, BE, BIO, CCE, ChE, CS, EE, Ge, Hum, Ma, ME, and MS/APh, PlS.

Current Science and Math Courses

ACM: Support for the current sequence of Ma and Ph. No recommendation on the lab course.

APh: Support for the current sequence of Ma and Ph courses is strong. Opinions are divided about the additional freshman lab but would generally require it if it were not part of the core.

Ay: Considers Ma 2ab to be both critical and they would require it were it not part of the core, but they are uncertain whether it should be required of all students. There's very little support for the additional freshman lab. Comments from Ay: *"currently we require either Ph2 or Ph12 with the better students taking Ph12. If there were no Ph2 in the core we would probably require Ph12 but this would then not allow students to transfer in to Ay after sophomore year."*

BE: BE would require Ph and Ma sequence were they not part of the core, and supports the additional freshman lab.

BIO: Supports Ma 2a. Wants students to learn probability and statistics, but BIO faculty are not satisfied with the current Ma 2b. Some faculty like material covered in Ph 2ab; faculty are less happy regarding the content of Ph 1. Most BIO students take Bi 10 to fulfill second lab.

CCE: Comments from CCE: *"At our recent CCE division meeting, a minimal core was overwhelming supported (by a 17-4 vote). This sentiment was not so much an endorsement of a specific version of a minimal core, but rather it reflected the view that the current core curriculum is not working well for CCE students. . . There was a sense that streamlining of the core would not involve simply removing the two quarters of sophomore physics and math, but instead would require a restructuring of the first year classes to provide optimal coverage of material."*

ChE: Supports all current science and math courses.

CS: Support for Ma 2ab is consistently strong. *"There was some support for the Ph courses (especially Ph 2a), but ultimately the majority opinion was that it wasn't something that we'd make part of the requirements for the major (but it might be beneficial to have for some tracks within the major)."*

EE: Comments from EE: *"…the faculty unanimously felt that if Math2ab and Phys2ab are no longer part of the core (the new core proposes to have a menu for each), then EE would have to make *both* required. There was some concern since this will inevitably add to our required courses. But I assume most EAS options would have to do the same."*

Ge: Ma 2ab are critical and would be required. There is less agreement about Ph 2ab (and an additional freshman lab) in terms of its relevance to the undergraduate programs in Geology and Geobiology. Support for a freshman lab is mixed with some sentiment that discipline-specific lab courses should be allowed to satisfy the requirement.

Hum: Current math and science courses are not critical to their degree programs but most respondents felt that they should be required of all students. Most felt that they would not require these courses if they were not part of the core.

Ma: Ma 2ab are thought be very important for their majors. If the sophomore physics requirement is reduced, opinions are split between having no physics requirement and requiring Ph 2 or 12. The majority of respondents prefer to have 3 (27 units) additional math-relevant courses.

ME: The Ma sequence is critical to the ME program (and would be required if not part of the core) while the Ph sequence is not. None of the current core courses under discussion (Ma 2, Ph 2, second freshman lab) should be required of all students. The additional freshman lab is not important, but might be required if not part of the core.

MS/APh: Support for the current core is fairly strong. There is less agreement on the value of the additional freshman lab.

PlS: Ma and Ph sequence are critical to their program and are consistently supported. PS is less certain of the value of the additional freshman lab because that need may be met by the proposed new courses (e.g. design and build lab).

Proposed Additional Courses

ACM: Supportive of the proposed programming, algorithms, and science communication courses; however, the programming and algorithms courses should not be required of everyone. ACM faculty members are ambivalent regarding the freshman seminar and design & build lab.

APh: The programming and science communication courses are consistently supported with varying opinions in regards to algorithms, freshman seminar, and design and build courses. The algorithms course has the least amount of support. APh Comment: *"Introduction to Computer Programming (CS 1) does not currently serve the required programming needs of students."*

Ay: Likes the idea of a freshman seminar but would not require it as a part of their curriculum and don't see it as critical to their undergrad program. Design and build course is not valued. Science communication would be required if not part of the core. Comments from Ay about whether programming course should be required: *"Yes if under option control; No if similar to previous CS 1."* Comments from Ay about algorithms course: *"seems useful but description is too vague."*

BE: They would add CS1, the design and build laboratory, and science communication courses were they not part of the core. The algorithms course would not be added, while feelings about the freshman seminar course were mixed.

BIO: Biology students support the CS 1 addition; the level of faculty support is less clear. Less support for other proposed additions.

ChE: CS1 is critical to their degree program and should be part of the core curriculum. There is no feeling when it comes to the algorithms course or the freshman seminar—neither would be required were they not part of the core. The design and build course is supported and they would require it of their majors but they are not sure it is for everyone. The science communication course is strongly supported.

CS: Supports all the proposed added courses except the freshman seminar. *"We support these as things we'd require for the major (since we do already!, essentially), but we did not get to discuss whether we as an option feel these belong in the core. My feeling is that among my colleagues there is a lot of support for CS1 in the core, and a lot of questions about whether algorithms belongs in the core (many hopelessly entangled with deep concerns about resources for implementation, and the strain it would place on the department)."*

EE: Comments from EE: *"The faculty were more or less supportive of the "algorithms" course added and felt that the "design" course was already there for EEs (meaning that the new core would not add to the EE requirements there)."*

Ge: A programming course is thought to be important but the feeling is not unanimous. An Algorithms course is not important. Scores and comments indicate that a freshman seminar course, while valued, should not be a requirement. Diverse (or no) opinions about design and build laboratory. Science communication is thought to be critical by the majority of participants.

Hum: The proposed courses are not viewed as critical to their programs. There is less agreement as to whether these courses should be part of the core—responses were fairly evenly distributed across categories. The science communication course was strongly supported.

Ma: Overall, opinions seem to be split 60-40, minimal core favored over the current core, with the least amount of support for the CCTF max core proposal.

ME: CS1 is critical to ME and would be a requirement, but should not be required of all students. The design and build laboratory, and science communication courses are valued and would be a requirement but ME is not sure that the D&B course should be required of everyone. The algorithms course is not critical and should not be required but might be made a requirement. The freshman seminar is not valued.

MS/APh: Opinions on algorithms, freshman seminar, design and build are fairly evenly divided among the 3 response options. For the most part, the option would not require these courses if they were not a part of the core. The programming course is valued across respondents but there is disagreement as to whether Ph would make it part of the core. Science Communication appears valued in the same way as the programming course but no one feels they would require it if it were not part of the core. Comment on CS1: *"I do not believe that the current CS 1 serves this need"*

PlS: Computer programming skill is critical to their program but they would not require CS1 were it not part of the core. They need more information on the algorithms course in order to form an opinion. They feel the freshman seminar should be a part of the core but they would not require it. Support for the science communication course is strong.

<u>Humanities and Social Science:</u>

ACM: The HSS courses should be required of everyone; however, they are not critical to the ACM program.

APh: For the most part the current HSS courses are thought to be a valuable part of the APh program. Opinions vary in regard to the additional HSS courses. Interestingly, the scores for the advanced SS course are spread pretty evenly--meaning that this course is viewed less positively than the other Hum or SS courses.

Ay: Hum and SS courses would not be required were it not part of the core. They do see value in the introductory courses. Advanced hums are not important to the program and they would not require them. However, in response to whether Adv Hums should be part of the core, they responded "maybe". Comment from Ay about additional HSS courses: *"should be kept at 4 courses. We also have concerns about denying advanced humanities credit for foreign languages."*

ChE: Intro and advanced hums are critical and should be required of all students. The same is true of introductory social sciences but not advanced social sciences. Advanced social sciences and the additional HSS course are not strongly supported. None of the HSS courses would be required were they not part of the core.

CS: HSS courses are not critical to CS and would not be required. *"These are not critical to the major, but we support the general mission of improving writing skills (and having students who are able to write effectively *is* important to us!)"*

Ge: Writing-intensive courses, while thought to be critical and part of the core by most participants, would not be required if it were not a part of the core.

Hum: Introductory and advanced Hums are strongly supported, while feelings about introductory and advanced SS are mixed. Comment on the proposed reduction in HSS courses: *"It makes no sense to put this change in this format. To cut HSS courses when you purport to be interested in more writing & knowledge of the world is utterly self-contradictory."*

ME: Support for the introductory Hum and SS courses is consistently strong. The advanced courses (and additional HSS course), both Hum and SS are not critical and should not be required of everyone—these courses may be required of all students and might be made a requirement for ME if not part of the core.

MS/APh: Responses related to the Hum courses are positive overall with some disagreement about the advanced Hum courses. Responses related to the social science courses are fairly evenly dispersed across response options except that Ph is not likely to require the courses if they were not part of the core.

PlS: Intro Hum is thought to be critical to their program.