

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for  
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting  
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
General Education Program, 2015-2016**

**Date:** 05/09/2016

**Time:** 3:30-4:30

**Place:** Laurentide Hall 4120

**In Attendance:** Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; Deans David Travis, Bob Mertens, John Chenoweth, Katy Heyning; Program Coordinator Liz Hachten; GERC Committee Chair, Beth Olson; faculty and staff in the General Education program/s, including Jessica Bonjour, Barbara Bren, Karl Brown, Jonathan Ivry, JP Villavicencio; Audit & Review Team Chair Corey Davis; Audit & Review team members Dale Splinter, Kim Knesting-Lund, Joan Littlefield Cook

- 1) The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m.
- 2) Attendees introduced themselves.
- 3) Davis provided an overview of review team evaluation, program comments. Davis said there was not much negative to say, noting that General Education is a good program and that the concerns are mostly about support and resources for the program.
- 4) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments: Hachten recognized other who contributed to the report, especially Barb Bren and Beth Olson.
- 5) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
  - a) Davis stated that the review team was extremely impressed by the high quality of general education at UW-Whitewater, particularly in light of several substantial structural and fiscal challenges (e.g., extraordinarily large class sizes, no assessment budget). Further, the review team believes the GE program is making progress in assessment efforts.
  - b) Davis posed the question, "How much variation is there across different sections of core GE courses? Assuming even some variation across sections, how are these differences reconciled for assessment purposes?"
    - i. Hachten said all courses have objectives, and that some have formal themes. Some courses have common texts. There's an assumption that instructors will teach to their strengths.
    - ii. Brown said that some courses have workshops to discuss best practices, thematic ideas, etc.
    - iii. Ivry said courses have variety but there are core outcomes. He said most are skill-based and have a signature assignment. He also acknowledged there have been some instances when faculty were removed from a core course until they gain the necessary professional development to sufficiently facilitate the course.
    - iv. Regarding assessment, it was acknowledged that it's harder to do embedded assessments. Development of the signature assignments has helped. Discussions have led instructors to identify commonalities. Because of the difficulty adapting embedded assessments, and in response to a previous HLC review, General Education also used standardized tests for a while. The University also sent a group to the AACU General Education conference to get assessment ideas. Before the development of the core course structure, there was much greater variance across GE curriculum.

- v. Travis noted that there's value in the courses not being "cookie cutter" or completely uniform. He said having more freedom encourages more buy-in and helps with faculty retention.
  - vi. Littlefield Cook observed that the process of discussing GE learning objectives and signature assignments is very helpful in identifying commonalities.
  - vii. Greg Cook commented that the University actually has a more focused GE with less variance than it used to.
- c) Davis posed the question, "How is GE funded at UW-Whitewater? Does GE need a dedicated budget?"
- i. The budget comes primarily from L&S and A&C Colleges. However, there is staffing from every College. The Provost's office and the Colleges provide professional development for staff. For example, the Provost funded the Signature Assignment Workshop. However, there is not a dedicated budget.
  - ii. The Group that attended the AACU GE conference made several recommendations. One was to increase the visibility of GE by having the coordinator report to the Deans *and* the Provost. The GERC was also reorganized as a result. There is hope that the University may work toward a dedicated budget, or more consistency, at least for assessment.
  - iii. A dedicated budget could be helpful in providing more support to core course coordinators as assessment needs increase. A dedicated budget would also support more consistent professional development and would be helpful in funding strategic initiatives.
  - iv. Travis and Mertens both observed that a major fiscal challenge is trying to fund additional sections that have to be added late. Mertens noted that WOTA sections, alone, have increased by 70% since 2006.
- d) Davis commented that the review team agreed that there is an impressive system in place for the assessment of the GE core. However, he said the review team would like to see more intentionality and consistency with how the GE electives are assessed in their various home departments across the University.
- i. Greg Cook suggested that GE could make use of available workshops.
  - ii. Littlefield Cook acknowledged that it might take several years for GE to collect sufficient data to satisfy the review team's request.
- e) Davis asked what the process will be for recertification of GE electives, and what resources will be available for faculty who are required to recertify their courses?
- i. The process will take about a year and a half. New Essential Learning Outcomes have been distributed. This August (2016) there will be a GE electives retreat to discuss the GELOs addressed in different types of electives, and to begin a discussion of the recertification process.
  - ii. The process will also include a discussion of the appropriate number of electives.
  - iii. Chenoweth commented that part of the discussion will include an examination of classes to essentially answer the question, "Are these courses really essential to GE or are there courses that need to be there." Similarly, Knesting-Lund observed that some professors have never considered the GE ramifications for the courses they teach that happen to have GE designations.
  - iv. There have not been any discussions about resources for faculty who are recertifying their classes, but it's also not yet clear what would be required.
- f) Davis suggested a broader discussion of resources for GE.
- i. Davis specifically asked if class sizes are a problem in GE core courses.
  - ii. Travis acknowledged that as positions are given to programs per the growth agenda, that the

- University needs to keep in mind that GE staffing also needs an increase to keep pace.
- iii. Bonjour noted that lecture sections of science courses are not identified as a major concern other than typical distractions in large lecture sections (e.g., students having side conversations; increased numbers of distracted students). The problem there is the (very large) 24 student lab sections that accompany these courses.
  - iv. WOTA students found it easier to get lost and or hide in larger classes.
  - v. Bonjour noted that student survey responses suggested students did not seem to be discouraged from asking questions in larger sections.
  - vi. Hachten noted that COMM 110 had increased by 110% and that English and Math GE core courses had increased by 114% across the review period. She said that the increases are being managed but acknowledged that the academic home departments for those programs have lost positions in key areas.
  - vii. Davis and Ivry commented that English and Communication courses are way over the recommendations of their respective national associations. For example, MLA recommends a class cap of 20, but UW-W has 24-25, and staff teach 5 sections.
- 6) Littlefield Cook summarized by noting that there was an impressive assessment system in place, but the review team would like to see more intentionality in the assessment of electives.
  - 7) Hachten said she would like guidance from the review team on how to do this.
  - 8) Littlefield Cook thanked all four deans for attending, noting that their support serves as good PR for the GE program campus-wide, as it helps faculty and staff to see the value of GE.
  - 9) Davis reviewed the recommended actions and the final result (see below).
  - 10) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists the following recommended actions (see page 14, points 2-5 for details), related to:
    - a) Discussions with campus leadership and related constituencies about large class sizes in core GE classes.
    - b) Fiscal Resources
    - c) Strategic Planning
    - d) Assessment
  - 11) **Recommended Result:** Continuation with minor concerns.
    - **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
    - **Next full self-study will be due in October 2020.**
  - 12) The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Submitted by Corey Davis.

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater**  
**Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies**  
**Undergraduate Programs, 2014-2015**  
**Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation 03/30/2016 Short Self Study (SS\*) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Program General Education Program Major X Minor X

**Evaluations submitted by:** Corey Davis, Rashiqa Kamal, Dale Splinter, Kim Knesting-Lund, Joan Littlefield Cook

**Review meeting attended by:** Corey Davis, Rashiqa Kamal, Kim Knesting-Lund, Joan Littlefield Cook

**I. Program Purpose & Overview: A. Centrality**

**1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's core values, Mission, and Strategic Plan.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**2. The program supports general education, proficiency, and/or other programs at UW-W.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**3. The program has achieved or is appropriately working toward achievement of at least two goals of Inclusive Excellence.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**4. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review Report; Progress Reports have been submitted, if relevant.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

**Comments**

- I.A.1. The program contributes tremendously to the University's core values and Mission. I like how the self-study summarized it: "GE serves as the unifying educational foundation for all of the university's baccalaureate degree programs."
- I.A.2. The program was not required to address this question, but there is plenty of evidence for this point.
- I.A.3. Need some clarification about "Intercultural curriculum/co-curriculum." Which specific GE

courses are included in this reference? Is this goal limited to GE courses designated as Diversity electives, or is this a goal for other GE courses? Good concrete examples for the third mentioned IE goal (Support).  
 I.A.4. This is the first review for the program.

**I. Program Purpose & Overview: B. Program Mission, Goals, & Accomplishments**  
**1. The program’s mission statement reflects the nature and scope of the program.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**2. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve or advance the program.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**3. The program has a process for setting and assessing goals, and making decisions about changes to the program goals.**

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**4. The program is considering potential revisions to mission, goals, or objectives; the program has a “vision” for where it wants to be in the future and how to get there.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**5. The program earned recognition or awards.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

**6. The program has achieved or maintained program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

**Comments**

I.B.2. Good use of LEAP teams to identify and address goals for general education.  
 I.B.3. How often does GERC meet? How often does GERC meet with ELARC and UCC?  
 I.B.3. It appears that the program relies mostly on feedback/ recommendations from the various stakeholders. This feedback can certainly be valuable, but the review committee members were curious if there is a more systematic process for collecting feedback. Also, this seems to be how feedback is collected for the General Education core. Is there a process for discussing electives?  
 I.B.5. & 6. The program was not required to respond to these two questions.

**II. Assessment: A. Curriculum**

**1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, including options or emphases within the program (if applicable).**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**2. If program offers dual-listed courses, the expectations of graduate students differ from undergraduate students; otherwise NA**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

**3. Appropriate assessment data were used in making curricular revisions.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**4. The program provides opportunities for students to learn in ways that extend beyond the classroom, and discussed the extent to which students are involved in these activities and opportunities.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

**5. Online courses are evaluated in ways that ensure effective delivery, continuous improvement, and student learning (if applicable)**

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	3
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

- II.A.2. There are no dual-listed courses.
- II.A.3. Individual course changes have been made, but it does not appear assessment data have been used to revise the program.
- II.A.3. Granted, it is very difficult to do especially with respect to GE elective courses. Still, the review team would like to better understand how some of these changes were made. For example, what was the rationale for changing the process for GERC approval of GE electives?
- II.A.4. The program was not required to answer this question.
- II.A. 5. The self-study mentions that Quality Matters is employed in delivery of online courses. Otherwise though, the report did not provide any evidence of course evaluation or student learning documentation with respect to online delivery.

**II. Assessment: B. Assessment of Student Learning****1. The program has a clearly articulated learning outcomes for students, courses are "mapped" to these learning outcomes, and some outcomes received specific attention during the review period.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**2. Student learning outcomes are aligned with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**3. The program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**4. The program collected a variety of appropriate assessment data allowing judgments about the extent to which students are achieving learning outcomes.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**5. Program faculty consider assessment data in making changes to the curriculum, students' learning outcomes, and/or other aspects of the program.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

## 6. Results of assessment efforts have been shared with appropriate internal and external constituencies.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

### Comments

- II.B.1. A small point, but something to consider-- In the new GE Learning Outcomes, is the wording "the ability to" needed? For example, they may be easier to assess if the LOs are stated as "students will demonstrate their critical and creative thinking by: Explaining and analyzing relevant ideas, argument, and problems." This avoids the potential issue of whether students have the ability to do something--they either do or don't engage in the behavior. The new GELOs are a big improvement. Thank you for the work that went into developing these.
- II.B.2. Good alignment with LEAP ELOs.
- II.B.3. The assessment plan is comprehensive and well-designed. A challenge is likely to be identifying specific individuals to oversee and manage specific pieces of the plan, particularly for assessing the elective courses.
- II.B. 3-5. Evidence of assessment in GE Core courses; however there is little evidence in electives. Does this mean that elective GE assessment is done in home departments?
- II.B.4. Extensive and diverse array of assessment data for multiple GE courses, especially the GE core. Incredible detail. A great deal of data has been collected on specific learning outcomes in core courses. Assessment of the electives is still needed (as noted in the self-study). Good inclusion of both direct and indirect data. Good use of NSSE data. The program has collected an impressive amount of data, which has led to useful information about our students' strengths and weaknesses, particularly in the areas of writing, oral communication, and critical thinking. Assessment in other areas (e.g., information literacy), are beginning to yield useful information as well. It appears that some GELOs are not yet being assessed. On pages 38-39, it appears that conclusions regarding oral and written communication may have been inadvertently left out of the report?
- II.B.5. Data have clearly been used and had an impact on individual instructors and for core courses, and faculty development opportunities have been made available based on weaker areas identified by assessment. The use of data is particularly evident in some areas, such as English and Mathematics.
- II.B.6. Results are regularly shared with a variety of other constituencies (e.g., GERC, ELARC, GE instructors, campus via LEARN Center sessions and Assessment Day, students).

## III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: A. Trend Data

### 1-2. Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0



**3. [MAJORS ONLY] Credits-to-degree show that students can complete the degree in four years, or reasonably efficiently.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	4

**4-5. [MAJORS ONLY] Program has strategies to recruit and retain diverse students. Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	4

**6. Students can enroll in appropriate courses and proceed without delaying graduation.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**7. Claim that the program is oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at optimum level is justified or supported by examples or data.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	1

**Comments**

III.A.3-5. Not applicable because not a major.

III.A.6-7. Modern Language Association (MLA) standard enrollment caps are reported to demonstrate that ENGLISH 101/102 sections skew toward over-enrollment. What standard enrollment caps are recommended for college public speaking and college algebra classes? Are 32 and 35 also higher than the respective norms or disciplinary recommendations? It's good that GE 390 hasn't been pushed beyond 30 students per section, but to suggest 30 students facilitates a "seminar-style experience" seems a stretch.

Note: For a large lecture/lab model for facilitation of the basic public speaking course, the National Communication Association (NCA) cites a typical lab class size of 20-25 students: <https://www.natcom.org/teachingandlearning/basiccourse/developing/> [https://www.natcom.org/uploadedFiles/More\\_Scholarly\\_Resources/Chairs\\_Corner/Standards\\_for\\_Program\\_Review\\_and\\_Assessment/PDF-SPRA-Standards\\_for\\_Undergraduate\\_Communication\\_Programs.pdf](https://www.natcom.org/uploadedFiles/More_Scholarly_Resources/Chairs_Corner/Standards_for_Program_Review_and_Assessment/PDF-SPRA-Standards_for_Undergraduate_Communication_Programs.pdf)

32 is 28% larger than the upper bound of this recommendation. I would be interested to learn what the Mathematical Association of America (MAA) suggests as target class sizes for college algebra courses.

III.A.6. The self-study notes that COMM 110 and ENGL 101-102 are over-enrolled.

III.A.7. There is a clear need for additional sections of core courses in order to meet the revised GELOs

**III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: B. Demand for Graduates****1. [MAJORS ONLY] Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment or continue their education.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

**2. Data suggests that employment opportunities for graduates of this program will remain strong.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

**3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

**Comments**

III.B. 1, 2, 3. Not a major

III. B. 1-3. NA = No graduate from GE Program.

Not addressed in self study.

1-3. Program was not required to answer these questions (it's not a major, no graduates).

**III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: C. Comparative Advantage(s)****1. The program has unique features that distinguish it from competing programs--giving it a competitive edge**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	3
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	2

**Comments**

III.C.1. The program was not required to address this question in the self study, but it would be useful to see this topic discussed with respect to GE programs at other UW System 4 year comprehensives and GE programs at non-UW System comps.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: A. Faculty Characteristics****1. Information is provided about the composition of the department faculty & instructional academic staff (e.g., gender, ethnicity, expertise, academic rank, etc.)**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0

No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**2-3. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

IV.A.2-4. It seems that the problem of turnover could be at least partially addressed if more permanent faculty and academic staff lines were approved for departments with heavy GE commitments.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement**

**1. Faculty & instructional academic staff are engaged in activities to enhance teaching and advising.**

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

IV.B.1. Many faculty who teach GE classes have been active in projects to assess student learning and make pedagogical and/or curricular changes on the basis of the data.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: C. Research & other Scholarly/Creative Activities**

**1. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in research and/or scholarly/creative activities.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

**Comments**

IV.C.1. Program was not required to answer this question.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding**

**1. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

**Comments**

IV.D.1. Program was not required to answer this question.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: E. Professional & Public Service****1. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in professional and public service, beyond the department.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

**Comments**

IV.E.1. Program was not required to answer this question.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: F. Resources for Students in the Program****1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its undergraduate students.**

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

**Comments**

IV.F.1. Program was not required to answer this question, but the program could note the importance/benefit of SI, tutors, etc., which were discussed elsewhere in the report. Also, as mentioned elsewhere in this report, larger than standard class sizes and over reliance on overloads and adjuncts suggest an unsustainable trend that will ultimately lead to a deterioration of the quality of General Education at UW-Whitewater.

**IV. Resource Availability & Development: G. Facilities, Equipment, & Library Holdings****1. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, and technological resources to effectively serve its students.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**Comments**

IV.G.1. D2L is a less than ideal platform for the sharing of ever-shrinking resources.

**V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program****1. Program strengths are discussed.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.**

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.**

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

**4. Other comments by the program (not rated).**

Yes	0
No	4

**Comments**

- V.1-3. Very thoughtful discussion of strengths, areas for improvement, and recommendations.
- V.2. Telling survey data regarding need to demonstrate to students (and perhaps instructors) the connections between GE curriculum and major studies.
- V.3. In conjunction with the discussion about class sizes, there should be a discussion among constituencies regarding the over-reliance on adjuncts and overloads to facilitate instruction of GE courses, especially in the core.

**VI. Reviewer Conclusions****1. Strengths of the Program**

- I agree with many of the program's self-identified strengths. The program builds a strong general education foundation for undergraduate education at UW-W. The recent proposed changes in GELOs are also commendable and will definitely make the program better.
- Very critical aspect of educational mission at UW-W.
- Integrated LEAP framework into GE Program on many levels.
- Excellent design. Excellent alignment with LEAP. Excellent alignment with IE goals.
- This program is huge! Its magnitude and the degree to which it is systematically managed is very impressive.
- The program has done an excellent job of leveraging campus resource opportunities to enhance assessment, curricular, and pedagogical changes (e.g., Strategic Initiatives grants, conference attendance, LEARN Center opportunities, LEAP Workshops).
- While assessment of elective courses is still challenging, the program has done a very good job of pulling together assessment from a variety of projects to gather information on student learning.
- A great deal of progress has been made over the past 10 years in curricular redesign, assessment of student learning, and faculty/staff development.

**2. Areas for Work or Improvement**

- It is not very clear how faculty use assessment data to drive course revisions, but this might be difficult given the various numbers of sections that are offered for each course. It is good that the program realizes that they have to work on improving their "image" with regards to students.

- Need to find a way to market the importance of GE to students. Students need to be aware of how GE links to the major and minor. Stressing GE in NSS could easily do this.
- Class sizes, particularly in the GE core classes of MATH 141 and COMM 110, are too large to facilitate sufficiently excellent instruction.
- Large class sizes have also inhibited the implementation of more HIPs in these courses.
- Too many GE courses are taught by adjuncts or are taught as overloads by permanent instructors. This results in high turnover, leading to some GE instructors being not as invested as they might ideally be and lacking ideal levels of training and experience in core GE courses.
- The self-study identified numerous areas to focus on in the coming years. It is important for the program to engage in setting priorities so the program knows what to focus on when.

### 3. Other comments/questions

- Must have been a heck of a task putting all this together. Nice job.
- Excellent data and evidence.
- Great assessment plan; would like to see a clearer plan for GE electives.
- GE could be doing even more with assessment if they had ample resources and if permanent faculty and academic staff with service and assessment responsibilities taught more GE courses.
- How is assessment reconciled when there's such variation in how courses are taught?
- Is there an annual budget for the program?

### 4. Recommended Actions

1. Resources.
  - a. Work with the Provost's Office and colleges to establish a process for providing resources (including funding for professional development, and staffing).
  - b. Address concerns about class sizes in the proficiency and Core classes.
2. Assessment.
  - a. Implement the assessment plan (including assessment of elective courses) and collect data on all GELOs.
  - b. Develop a way to efficiently and systematically track the impact of assessment and data on the program.
3. Strategic planning. Establish a systematic process for identifying program priorities, setting and achieving annual goals.

### 5. Recommended Result\*

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	
Continuation without qualification	
Continuation with minor concerns	X
Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress report to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress addressing the major concerns	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, recommend placing in receivership within the college, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years at the Committee's discretion.	
Non-continuation of the program.	

\* **The program's next full self-study is due October 1, 2020 to the Dean of the College of Letters & Sciences and November 1, 2020 to the chair of Audit & Review Committee.**