<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supports student research and creative activities (through LBC credit)</td>
<td>Increasing number of sections taught by PT lecturers and GAs</td>
<td>Gen Ed Review, if disseminated properly could go a long way toward dispelling persistent myths about the program.</td>
<td>Misconceptions (Gen Ed is just a credit hour grab by CAS; there are too many Gen Ed courses) among faculty could threaten prominence of the program. These misconceptions are not borne out by the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service/citizenship/leadership is a required element of LBC (Group 2)</td>
<td>No specific mechanism to support interdisciplinary course offerings. Is this a flaw of the program (for example, “knowledge of the disciplines” does not encourage interdisciplinary thinking), or endemic to the university, or both? Despite this, there is a handful of cross-listed courses.</td>
<td>Develop a mechanism for promoting interdisciplinary course offerings.</td>
<td>High use of lecturers and GAs suggests either that a) some departments do not value Gen Ed sufficiently to assign faculty to teach GE courses; or b) departments do not have enough faculty members to teach both Gen Ed courses and major program offerings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robust selection of courses 211 courses in fall ’08 (886 sections), 241 in fall ’11 (1154 sections), 234 in fall ’14 (1126 sections)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a mechanism/strategy to “enculture” PT lecturers, GAs so they understand role/importance of GE.</td>
<td>Insufficient resources campus-wide to ameliorate challenges faced by underprepared students; deficiencies are blamed on Gen Ed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>