

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY

RESPONSES TO THE FEBRUARY 2019 ASCSU GENERAL EDUCATION TASK FORCE REPORT

BACKGROUND: The Academic Senate of the California State University (ACSCU) established a task force in November 2016 (AS-3271-16/AA) to examine general education in the CSU system, with a charge to imagine possible structural and global reforms for GE in the CSU. The General Education Task Force (GETF) held its first meeting in March 2017, and completed its work on February 8, 2019, sending the report to the ASCSU Chair, Professor Catherine Nelson. She contacted campus Senate chairs to have them ask campuses to review the report and provide feedback. At the same time the ASCSU also established a portal on their website for submission of responses.

The chair of HSU's General Education and All-University Requirements (GEAR) Committee, Professor John Steele, composed a survey and created a portal for responses from the HSU campus. The request for feedback was sent to the campus on February 25, 2019, with a deadline of April 28, 2019. When the portal closed, Professor Steele, along with Professor Julie Alderson, chair of the Integrated Curriculum Committee, and Professor Mary Ann Creadon, ASCSU Senator and chair of the Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee, compiled the survey results. What follows is their summary of the responses.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: The entire campus community was invited to respond to the report. There were 40 total responses. Almost half of the respondents were tenure-track faculty (45%), followed by staff (27.5%), lecturers, (15%), and students (7.5%). The survey was composed so that a respondent could provide feedback in three different ways. First, the survey asked respondents, on a scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," to gauge their feedback on the report's various recommendations: reorganization, reducing units, the distribution of units in Essential Skills and in Disciplinary Perspectives, a new area designated "Integrative Experiences," and the Development of GE Pathways. Second, the survey asked for written responses, with explanations, to the following questions:

- 1) Do you have concerns about how the proposed reforms to the structure of GE would impact the General Education Program at HSU?
- 2) Do you have concerns about how the proposed reforms to the structure of GE would impact your department or major program?
- 3) Do you have concerns about how the proposed reforms to GE structure and unit distribution would impact transfer students?
- 4) Do you have concerns about how the proposed reforms to the GE structure would impact assessment of GE or other programs on campus?
- 5) Do you have concerns about how the GE Pathway Models could potentially impact your department or program?

As a third method of response, the survey concluded by asking respondents to provide any other comments about the potential negative or positive impacts, on GE structure or on their

programs, of the proposed reforms and to comment on any other concerns or thoughts they wanted to share about the report.

There was some overlap in the responses because certain concepts are interrelated (e.g., comments on the structural model can be interrelated with those on the effect of the model on transfer students). Nevertheless, it is possible to order the frequency of the responses by categories. The highest number of responses was about the structural model, followed by the reduction in units, then double counting, the Pathways Model, American Institutions, and assessment. There were three discipline-specific comments, and two comments on the embedding of Area E in other courses.

CONCERNS: Criticism and concerns about the recommendations were expressed more frequently than praise or suggestions for alternative recommendations. Regarding the structural model, for instance, there were concerns that, although the model aims at more intentionality and transparency for students, it is not any clearer than the current GE Program and in some ways less so. There were also concerns that the model does not scaffold skills, that the model would make transfer to the CSU difficult, and that assessment would be harder to do with the proposed model. There was strong criticism of the recommendation to reduce or eliminate double counting, which some respondents thought was pedagogically harmful to students, damaging to some programs and departments, and less efficient for students in time-to-degree. The Pathways Model earned a more mixed response. There were some concerns about how Pathways might integrate with the student's pursuit of a major, how that part of the model would affect transfer students, and how some disciplines could productively participate in Pathways. However, some believe that Pathways should actually carry more of the GE units, and that they work well at other universities and so ought to be tried at HSU. There were strong criticisms about what appears to be a recommendation to reduce the American Institutions requirement from six to three units, and in particular the effect such a reduction would have on the CSU's responsibility to develop engaged and knowledgeable citizens. General comments repeated some of these same specific criticisms, but there were also concerns about how the unit reduction might harm the breadth and well-rounded education we desire for CSU students.

ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS: The responses also contained some alternative recommendations. There was more than one suggestion to make general education more flexible, allowing students to choose any course they want to take as long as they meet the prerequisites of a course. There was a suggestion to allow upper division GE to be composed of interdisciplinary courses that would serve as a capstone experience for a GE program. There was a suggestion to move more fully to a competency model as opposed to a content model. There also was a suggestion to allow Studio Art and not just Art History courses in the Disciplinary Perspectives segment of the model.

HSU INSIGHTS: Finally, as with the alternative recommendations noted above, there were responses from the HSU community that provide some insights, suggestions and observations that the GE Task Force did not appear to consider when composing the recommendations, and

are worth more deliberation in any GE reform process. For instance, there was a suggestion that a lab requirement should not only be required, but be part of Essential Skills. One respondent warned of the need to be ready for the chaos that might attend the first year of implementation. One respondent worried, not about the high-unit majors, but the low-unit majors, whose students would have to fill out their load to achieve 120 units if the required GE units are reduced. One respondent noted that the key to making articulation and transfer work well under a model with Pathways is being highly flexible about GE substitutions. One respondent said we need to think about how IB or AP classes would articulate in such a structural model. One respondent was concerned that there was no required course on the topic of climate change. One respondent asked if there is a way to design GE Pathways for particular departments or majors. Lastly, one respondent wondered how “cross-cutting values” would be assessed, and what its student learning outcomes would be.

CONCLUSION: There was more criticism than praise for the recommendations. The majority of concerns, as well as praise, was about the structural model itself. The most consistent praise of the recommendations was that the model displays a worthwhile effort to make GE more transparent and intentional for students and faculty. There was also some consensus about the possible virtues of GE Pathways. The harshest criticisms were about whether or not there was a need for any GE reform, about the elimination of double counting, about the apparent loss of one-half of the American Institutions requirement, and about the reduction in units, which seems to serve only time-to-degree and not the educational needs of students.

HSU’s response to the GE Task Force Report will be sent to the ASCSU portal for review. We believe that our feedback, including our unique observations and suggestions, demonstrates the fruitfulness of our response process, as well as provides the CSU with ways to revise the recommendations and move forward with reform of general education in the CSU.

Appendix I: Summary of Responses

Roles on Campus

Tenure Track Faculty: 18/40

Staff: 11/40

Lecturers: 6/40

Students: 3/40

Administrators: 1/40

Academic or Program Advisors: 1/40

Please mark the extent to which you agree or disagree with the GE Task Force Report's recommendations... (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)

Data are summarized for Tenure Track Faculty, Staff, Lecturers, and Students and shown as the median response.

- i. Reorganization of GE into Essential Skills, Disciplinary Perspectives, Cross-cutting Values, and Integrative Experiences, as described in the report
 - TT Faculty: Neutral (mean = 2.83/5)
 - Staff: Agree (mean = 3.5/5)
 - Lecturers: Disagree (mean = 2.5/5)
 - Students: Strongly Disagree (mean = 1.33/5)
 - Overall: Neutral (mean = 2.85/5)
 - On the topic of reorganization of GE into Essential Skills, Disciplinary Perspectives, Cross-cutting Values, and Integrative experiences, overall median response was Neutral. Median staff response was Agree, whereas median tenure-track faculty response was Neutral and median responses for both lecturers and students were Disagree and Strongly Disagree, respectively.
- ii. Reduction of GE requirements to 42 semester units
 - TT Faculty: Agree (mean = 3.22/5)
 - Staff: Agree (mean = 4/5)
 - Lecturers: Disagree/Neutral (mean = 2.83/5)
 - Students: Disagree (mean = 2/5)
 - Overall: Agree (mean = 3.3/5)
 - On the topic of reduction of GE requirements to 42 semester units, overall median response was Agree. Median response was Agree for tenure track faculty and staff, whereas median responses were Disagree/Neutral and Disagree for lecturers and students, respectively.
- iii. Distribution of units in Essential Skills Area (12 units, 3 per area at lower or upper division)
 - TT Faculty: Neutral (mean = 2.83/5)

- Staff: Agree (mean = 3.73/5)
 - Lecturers: Neutral/Agree (mean = 3.17/5)
 - Students: Disagree (mean = 2/5)
 - Overall: Neutral (mean = 3.08/5)
 - On the topic of distribution of units into Essential Skills Area (12 units, 3 per area at lower or upper division), overall median response was Neutral. Median response for staff was Agree, for lecturers was Neutral/Agree, for tenure track faculty was Neutral, and for students was Disagree.
- iv. Distribution of units in Disciplinary Perspectives (15 units, 3 units in each area at the lower division only)
- TT Faculty: Neutral/Agree (mean = 2.89/5)
 - Staff: Agree (mean = 3.45/5)
 - Lecturers: Neutral/Disagree (mean = 2.83/5)
 - Students: Disagree (mean = 1.67/5)
 - Overall: Neutral (mean = 2.95/5)
 - On the topic of distribution of units into Disciplinary Perspectives (15 units, 3 in each area at lower division only), overall response was Neutral. Median response for staff was Agree, for tenure track faculty was Neutral/Agree, for lecturers was Neutral/Disagree, and for students was Disagree.
- v. Integrative Experiences (6 units at the upper division only)
- TT Faculty: Neutral (mean = 2.56/5)
 - Staff: Agree (mean = 3.55/5)
 - Lecturers: Neutral (mean = 3/5)
 - Students: Disagree (mean = 1.67/5)
 - Overall: Neutral (mean = 2.85/5)
 - On the topic of distribution of units into Integrative Experiences (6 units at the upper division only), median overall response was Neutral. Median response for staff was Agree, for tenure track faculty and lecturers was Neutral, and for students was Disagree.
- vi. Development of GE pathways, minors, badges, etc
- TT Faculty: Neutral (mean = 2.67/5)
 - Staff: Agree (mean = 3.45/5)
 - Lecturers: Neutral (mean = 2.83/5)
 - Students: Disagree (mean = 2.33/5)
 - Overall: Neutral (mean = 2.85/5)
 - On the topic of development of GE pathways, minors, badges, etc, overall median response was Neutral. Median response for staff was Agree, for tenure track faculty and lecturers was Neutral, and for students was Disagree.

Summary: While overall ratings were neutral, one category achieved a median response (from all respondents) of Agree – Reduction of GE Requirements to 42 units. Staff typically responded in agreement to all categories, whereas tenure track faculty typically responded as neutral. Lecturers responded as neutral or in disagreement, and students typically disagreed with each category.

Overall comments and common themes about proposed changes:

1. Concerns were expressed by all groups of respondents about whether such an effort would reduce the quality and breadth of general education because students would be required to take fewer upper division units to satisfy degree requirements.
2. Student respondents stated that proposed re-organization seemed to be a “waste” of time and resources, and considered the proposed changes to be “distracting” or “busy work”.
3. Concerns were expressed specifically about the possible reduction of required units in American Institutions, Politics, Government, and/or U.S. History.
4. Concerns were raised about the possible reduction of required courses in Area E, which were recently moved to the lower division in order to support student transition into 4-year institutions.
5. Concerns were raised about the possible reduction or loss of required laboratory courses, or where these courses would or could fit into the “Integrative Experiences” given the restructuring of unit requirements.
6. Concerns were raised about how this restructuring of units would impact the 120 unit requirement for graduation. A more thorough accounting of how the proposal would change total units for the degree, in light of the proposal to remove double counting, is important in understanding the full impact of this proposal.
7. Concerns were raised that the proposal for reform to GE by the GETF may not be in compliance with Title V and existing Executive Orders that relate to GE requirements. This should be more clearly and directly addressed in the report.

Comments about impact of proposed structure on GEAR at HSU:

Many comments by staff and tenure-track faculty were generally supportive of making changes to the structure of the GE program in some way, but asked for more specific details about the proposed structure or noted that reduction in double-counting or upper division GE units might negatively impact student mastery of these skills/topics. Some concern was raised that Area E skills and knowledge might be challenging to fit into the proposed structure, and it was unclear how these proposed changes would continue to support student growth through the Area E curriculum. Some comments gave specific examples of how lower division Area E courses are positively impacting students. Student respondents generally viewed changes to the GE curriculum negatively. A common question asked whether this type of reorganization would impact efforts toward assessment of GE.

Comments about how the proposed reforms to structure of GE would impact the department or program.

Concerns were raised by tenure-track faculty who teach in major programs that rely on GE courses. Specifically, the concern was that loss of GE courses might cause the entire major program to collapse, resulting in a loss of all related course offerings in that field at HSU. Concerns were raised about the negative impact on student education in U.S. History, Politics, Institutions.

General concerns were raised about how these changes would impact lower unit majors and how they would impact higher unit majors. For lower unit majors, concern was expressed about how those programs would need to adjust their curriculum to make sure students get to the 120 unit graduation requirement. For higher unit majors, the concern was with the potential for loss of double-counting, which might require a reduction of major-specific units (most/many of which may be required by external accrediting bodies). Loss of double counting raised concerns among many tenure-track faculty respondents, specifically noting that higher-unit science majors could see increased total required units and therefore delayed time to graduation.

Comments about how the proposed reforms to GE structure and unit distribution would impact transfer students.

Concerns were raised about coordination of GE efforts with transfer students from community colleges and the UC system, generally stating that more information on coordination of GE across these systems would be helpful. Specifically, multiple respondents asked about how these changes would impact articulation agreements. A general concern shared by respondents was that the proposed changes to GE structure would focus on building skills and knowledge through pathways, which transfer students would enter midstream and therefore may not receive the same benefits or feel like the “belong”. Concerns typically focused on how transfer students would satisfy these more structured requirements.

Comments about how the proposed reforms to GE structure would impact assessment of GE or other programs.

One respondent raised the question of how Advanced Placement (AP or IB) courses would articulate into this new model. Generally, respondents either did not think there would be an impact on assessment or were not clear on how specific aspects of assessment would be managed with the new changes. Tenure-track respondents asked about how some of the integrative experiences or cross-cutting values would be assessed, and others asked for more specific information about how core competencies/skills would be scaffolded into the proposed GE curriculum.

Comments about how the GE Pathway Models could impact departments/programs.

Concerns were raised about transparency of the naming and objectives of GE Pathways for advising purposes, and how advisors can effectively advise their students to navigate this type of model and their major program. Multiple comments noted that the GE Pathways section of the report lacked specific detail for how these pathways or certificate programs might be structured, leaving readers unclear of exactly how these might be executed or how they relate directly to University curricular needs and unit burdens. Concerns were raised about how such pathways would interact with high unit majors in the absence of double counting. Tenure-track faculty respondents noted that it

was unclear whether the GE pathways would integrate into or intersect with major programs and how transfer students would navigate these pathways.

Other comments about the potential negative or positive impacts of the proposed reforms to GE structure.

Other Staff Comments: “I believe that as an institution, the CSU should examine the way it teaches its students. I am concerned that many of the goals outlined by the GE task force are lofty and consideration about real world implementation has not been given the weight needed to move forward with discussions in the ASCSU. I also believe that it is a bit naive to think that the process of working towards a degree from CSU isn't also innately marked in "check marks". At the end of the day, we are pairing meaningful educational experiences with system required procedural benchmarks in order to award degrees.”

Other Student Comments: “I do have concerns with limiting the GEs. Personally, I think they are needed to form a well rounded education, and that comes with exploring topics outside of your interests. If we all just focused on our major, we would not grow to widen our perspectives. I can understand the frustration that comes with taking these extra classes, but I think they are needed. I am wondering if these pathways would be designed for each department or ones that are similar. For example, having a GE pathway for students in fields like Political Science, International Studies, and History.”

Other Tenure-Track Faculty Comments:

“I am in favor of reducing the number of required GE units. I like the idea of encouraging students to go deeper in a certain area via badges or minors. “

“My biggest concern will always be with FLEXIBILITY in the GE program. If the program can be made flexible enough to allow our students to actually use the college experience to understand what they want to do after graduation and what career they want, that will be a success.”

“We, members of the CAHSS Council of Chairs, welcome the opportunity to provide feedback on the General Education Task Force Final Report. We appreciate the work of colleagues on this document, and we recognize the many challenges of embarking on this project. Following a Council of Chairs meeting devoted to an analysis of the report, we created a collaborative google document to share a number of compelling concerns about the report (organized by sections of the report), which we have copied into this form.

In addition to concerns with the report as written, we are especially concerned that this report not be “cherry-picked” in ways that advance certain goals -- e.g., reducing overall GE units; reducing or eliminating the mandate of education for citizenship inherent in the American Institutions requirement. Done in this way they are antithetical to the education of our students, offer evidence that they will advance time to graduation, and indeed are at odds with the professed aims of the task force report itself.

****Recommendations regarding the structure of “Disciplinary Perspectives”**

The report recommends reducing the units of GE courses in the Arts and Humanities by a minimum of 3 units, reducing the requirement to one Humanities course and one Arts course. For those campuses, such as HSU, which have introduced a two-semester writing course (in part as a mechanism to replace non-credit bearing remedial courses with credit-bearing curriculum) the report recommends that all such “add ons” be incorporated into GE. If we were to follow this recommendation, then our second semester “stretch” English units would likely be counted as a Humanities course, resulting in only 3 units of GE in Area C. We need to be clear-eyed that stretch English is not a curricular equivalent of disciplinary perspectives in the Humanities. If these recommendations are implemented, students who do not major in the Arts and Humanities will be deprived of meaningful engagement in these disciplines.

****Cross-Cutting Values: Global Awareness and Civic Engagement**

This suggestion for 3 units of GE pairs curriculum on civic engagement (that may focus on the local, state, regional, national or global level) with curriculum on global/transnational analysis. Given the lack of preparedness of many students to engage in meaningful dialogue about global/transnational issues, the requirement to also teach the concept of “civic engagement” within the same course is overly ambitious.

****American Institutions and Cross-Cutting Values**

Title V mandates a curriculum in “American Institutions” courses focused on education for citizenship, a subject that has never been more timely than today. On one reading, this already content-heavy legislative mandate is collapsed into one three-unit course (on ‘Democracy in the US’) within this curricular section; on another, it is also included as “civic engagement” in a second of the three “cross-cutting values.” In the former case, the original intent and value of the institutions requirement is undermined; in the latter case, the distinctiveness of “cross-cutting values” is undermined. Either is equally problematic.

****Recommendation to "Eliminate the practice of 'double counting'" (p. 9)**

We have serious concerns about the recommendation to eliminate “double counting” of courses. We believe that, especially at the lower division level, double counting of GE courses in the major and GE benefits students by enabling timely graduation. In those cases in which the double counting of major/GE course focuses on theories, methods, and perspectives that are central to life-long learning, and understanding of self, society, and/or our environment, then our GE students are served and our majors are served. If we eliminate such double counting practices, many students will experience an increased time to graduation, contradicting one of the expressed goals of the report and the CSU GI 2025 investment. This is especially the case in already unit-intensive majors including the natural sciences and interdisciplinary subjects such as environmental studies and international studies.

****Recommendation to "Minimize the number of non-major requirements outside of GE" (p. 9)**

HSU currently requires 6 units of coursework certified as “Diversity and Common

Ground.” The proposed GE program reduces this requirement to one “Diversity and Social Justice” course (under the GE theme of cross-cutting values). We should be clear about the effect of halving the unit requirement if this recommendation is followed: these are the courses in which students of color first find themselves in the curricula and pedagogies. These courses are thus central to our first and second-year retention efforts and our HSI responsibilities and vision. Furthermore, courses in Ethnic Studies, CRGS, Native American Studies and Women’s Studies will be disproportionately impacted by this change, resulting not only in a loss of GE curriculum that furthers projects of institutional transformation and inclusive success, but also threatening the viability of minor and major programs in these fields of study.

** General comments on the weaknesses in the report

The report critiques our current GE program through a discourse of “box-checking,” and it offers a vision of coherence, GE pathways, and intentionality. We believe it is imperative to note that many students enter our fields of study through such “box-checking.” They take a course to fulfill a GE requirement and experience a new way of analyzing their lives and the world around them. The problem of GE exists when the courses we offer to fulfill GE are funded and structured as if they are simply a way for students to check a box (e.g., increasing enrollment in GE sections to redirect funds to major courses, replacing content-rich courses with oversimplified, online, high enrollment GE courses). The solution to weaknesses in GE programs must be grassroots. Departments invested in providing transformative GE classes must be supported. Faculty who successfully teach these courses must be recognized for their labor and talent. When we care about GE at the department level, develop visionary curriculum which helps students understand and address key issues of our day (global warming, increasing inequality, xenophobia, intolerance, hate, religious fundamentalisms, new forms of social control, violence, authoritarianism, etc.) then a box to be checked turns into a journey laying the foundation for lifelong learning. Can we envision a GE program that is intentional and integrates curriculum beyond the course level? Yes, as is evident from our place based learning communities, and our history of integrated GE curriculum at the lower and upper division level. But we need to be clear eyed that this more integrative vision of GE, that which is recommended both through pathways/GE minors and for upper division GE, is not accomplished simply by linking course titles. This is a project that must be envisioned at the grassroots of faculty led collaborations in order to be successful.”

Appendix II: All Survey Responses

Question	Response	Response	Response	Response	Response	Response
1. How do you feel about the current state of the world?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
2. How do you feel about the current state of the economy?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
3. How do you feel about the current state of the environment?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
4. How do you feel about the current state of the government?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
5. How do you feel about the current state of the education system?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
6. How do you feel about the current state of the healthcare system?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
7. How do you feel about the current state of the social safety net?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
8. How do you feel about the current state of the labor market?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
9. How do you feel about the current state of the housing market?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
10. How do you feel about the current state of the transportation system?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
11. How do you feel about the current state of the energy sector?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
12. How do you feel about the current state of the technology sector?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
13. How do you feel about the current state of the media industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
14. How do you feel about the current state of the entertainment industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
15. How do you feel about the current state of the arts and culture sector?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
16. How do you feel about the current state of the sports industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
17. How do you feel about the current state of the fashion industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
18. How do you feel about the current state of the food and beverage industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
19. How do you feel about the current state of the retail industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
20. How do you feel about the current state of the manufacturing industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
21. How do you feel about the current state of the construction industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
22. How do you feel about the current state of the real estate industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
23. How do you feel about the current state of the financial services industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
24. How do you feel about the current state of the insurance industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
25. How do you feel about the current state of the legal industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
26. How do you feel about the current state of the consulting industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
27. How do you feel about the current state of the advertising industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
28. How do you feel about the current state of the public relations industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
29. How do you feel about the current state of the communications industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
30. How do you feel about the current state of the telecommunications industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
31. How do you feel about the current state of the information technology industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
32. How do you feel about the current state of the software industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
33. How do you feel about the current state of the hardware industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
34. How do you feel about the current state of the electronics industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
35. How do you feel about the current state of the automotive industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
36. How do you feel about the current state of the aerospace industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
37. How do you feel about the current state of the defense industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
38. How do you feel about the current state of the energy industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
39. How do you feel about the current state of the oil and gas industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
40. How do you feel about the current state of the coal industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
41. How do you feel about the current state of the nuclear industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
42. How do you feel about the current state of the renewable energy industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
43. How do you feel about the current state of the solar industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
44. How do you feel about the current state of the wind industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
45. How do you feel about the current state of the hydroelectric industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
46. How do you feel about the current state of the geothermal industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
47. How do you feel about the current state of the biomass industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
48. How do you feel about the current state of the bioenergy industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
49. How do you feel about the current state of the biofuels industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other
50. How do you feel about the current state of the bioeconomy industry?	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Other

[File containing responses can be found here.](#)