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Tasks for Today

- Develop recommendations to improve student learning in UNCG’s General Education Program

- Gather feedback on the General Education Program assessment process
Overview

- UNCG’s General Education Program
- General Education Program assessment process
- Results
- Discussion

UNCG’s General Education Program

- 5 Learning Goals
- 8 categories
- 4 markers
General Education Learning Goals

Learning Goal 1: Foundational Skills
Learning Goal 2: The Physical & Natural World
Learning Goal 3: Knowledge of Human Histories, Cultures, & the Self
Learning Goal 4: Knowledge of Social & Human Behavior
Learning Goal 5: Personal, Civic, & Professional Development

General Education Program: Categories (8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories:</th>
<th>Learning Goal 1</th>
<th>Learning Goal 2</th>
<th>Learning Goal 3</th>
<th>Learning Goal 4</th>
<th>Learning Goal 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts (GFA)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Perspectives (GHP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature (GLT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (GMT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences (GNS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical, Religious, &amp; Ethical Principles (GPR)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning &amp; Discourse (GRD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences (GSB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**General Education Program: Markers (4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Markers:</th>
<th>Learning Goal 1</th>
<th>Learning Goal 2</th>
<th>Learning Goal 3</th>
<th>Learning Goal 4</th>
<th>Learning Goal 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Perspectives</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Perspectives</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Western (GN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Intensive (SI)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Intensive (WI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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---

**General Education Program Assessment Process**

- What is program assessment?
- History of current process
- Two-step process
  - Course faculty
  - Workshop peer reviewers
What do we want students to know and be able to do?

How are we using that evidence to improve student learning?

What is Program Assessment?

Do students have the opportunity to know and do the things we value?

What evidence do we have that students have learned?

Gen Ed Program Assessment Process

- History
  - May 2011: Faculty Planning Workshop
    - Scoring Scale: Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient
    - Survey
    - Timetable
  - Oct 2011: GE Council approved process
  - Fall 2011: Piloted assessment process
  - Spring 2012: Process used to evaluate LG3 recertified categories (GFA, GLT, GPR)
Gen Ed Program Assessment Process

Two steps

Step 1: Course instructors

• Identify student work products (SWPs) aligned with category-specific (e.g., GFA) SLOs.
• Submit SWPs of six randomly selected students*.
• Use 3-point scale (HP, P, NP) to score all students in the class and enter aggregate results into online survey (Qualtrics).

*provided by Office of Assessment & Accreditation

Step 2: Peer reviewers

Peer instructors (with category-specific experience) score student work products.

Presentation of Results

• 2012-13 GMT assessment by Math Dept.
• 2012-13 Learning Goal 5 assessment by Office of Learning Communities
• Spring 2013 GNS assessment (SR9)
• Spring 2013 Languages Dept. peer review completed
• Fall 2013 GHP, GLT, GSB assessed using Gen Ed Program assessment process to sampled sections
GMT student learning outcomes

1. Employ problem solving strategies in fundamental mathematics that go beyond routine mathematical operations and data manipulation. (LG1, LG2)
2. Reason in mathematical systems. (LG1)
3. Formulate and use mathematical models and apply mathematical concepts effectively to solve real-world problems. (LG2)
4. Evaluate decisions based on mathematically valid principles. (LG1, LG2)
5. Communicate mathematical solutions clearly and effectively. (LG1)

GMT Assessment Process

- Fall 2011 initial pilot
  - Five identical multiple choice questions embedded in final exams of every GMT class
  - Each question measured one of the five GMT SLOs
  - Unsuitable process due to variation in course content
- Spring 2012 revised pilot
  - Embedded questions into GMT class final exams
  - Questions based on course content
  - Every GMT SLO was represented by a number of questions assigned to measure it
  - Process adopted to Math faculty to measure GMT
11/3/2014

GMT Assessment Process

- Beginning with fall 2012 semester
  - Math faculty map the final exam questions of each course to the five GMT student learning outcomes
  - Number of questions vary by course by GMT SLO
- Results from 2012-13 academic year
  - Fall 2012: 2,141 enrolled students
  - Spring 2013: 2,021 enrolled students
  - Courses represented: STA 108, MAT 112, MAT 115, MAT 120, MAT 150, MAT 151, and MAT 191

Fa2012 (n=2141)  Sp2013 (n=2021)

2012-13 GMT results from Math Dept.
GNS student learning outcomes

1. Demonstrate an understanding of the principles of scientific inquiry (i.e. the “scientific method”) (LG1, LG2, LG5)
2. Demonstrate knowledge of basic principles as they apply to broader concepts (e.g. global warming) (LG1, LG2)
3. Evaluate the credibility of sources of scientific information. (LG1)
4. Analyze qualitative and quantitative empirical data. (LG1)
5. Demonstrate an understanding of the impact of science on technology and society. (LG1, LG2, LG5)

Results: Spring 2013--GNS (SR-9)

- About the *Scientific Reasoning* test
  - 49-item multiple-choice test
  - Developed by science and mathematics university faculty for use at the program level
  - Created to demonstrate student learning resulting from participation in scientific components of general education programs
- GNS faculty determined that SR-9 aligned with GNS student learning outcomes

*available through Madison Assessment (www.madisonassessment.com)
Spring 2013: GNS (SR-9)

• Of the 325 UNCG students, approximately 27% met the SR-9 Faculty Standard of 37.4 (or 76% correct of 49 items)
  – 20% of freshmen met the Standard
  – 21% of sophomores met the Standard
  – 35% of juniors met the Standard
  – 37% of seniors met the Standard
Results: Spring 2013 (Language Dept)

Step 1: Course Faculty
- GL, GN, WI markers
- 23 of 25 sections
- 92% response rate

(GL = Global; GN = Global non-western; WI = Writing Intensive)

(Note: took place in fall 2012)

Step 2: Peer Reviewers
- GL, GN, WI markers
- Of 23 sections:
  - 17 submitted SWPs
  - 8 used multiple choice questions (MCQs) (no SWPs)

(Note: took place in spring 2013)

2012-13 Language Dept. Results Only (GL, GN, WI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gen Ed Lrng Goals</th>
<th>SLOs</th>
<th>Nbr Crses Sampled within Category/Marker</th>
<th>Nbr of Sections Represented by SWPs</th>
<th>Nbr of SWPs</th>
<th>Total Nbr of Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LG1</td>
<td>GL slo-1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG3</td>
<td>GL slo-2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG5</td>
<td>GL slo-3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1</td>
<td>GN slo-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG3</td>
<td>GN slo-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG5</td>
<td>GN slo-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1</td>
<td>WI slo-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1</td>
<td>WI slo-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG1</td>
<td>WI slo-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* one GL section's SWPs had 2 raters
2012-13 Language Dept. Results Only (GL, GN, WI)

GL SLO-1: Find, interpret, and evaluate information on diverse cultures. (LG1)

*non-Language and Language departments

Assessment by course instructor

(n=296 students)

Highly Prof: 42%
Prof: 43%
Not Prof: 15%

Assessment by peer instructors

(n=157 ratings)

Highly Prof: 45%
Prof: 32%
Not Prof: 13%
Unrated: 13%
2012-13 (ALL* participating sections)

**GL SLO-2:** Describe interconnections among regions of the world. (Must include substantial focus on at least one culture, nation, or sub-nationality beyond Great Britain and North America.) (LG3)

**Assessment by course instructor**

(n=388 students)

Highly Prof 29%

Not Prof 17%

Prof 54%
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**Assessment by peer instructors**

(n=157 ratings)

Highly Prof 42%

Not Prof 11%

Prof 32%

04/02/2014

2012-13 (ALL* participating sections)

**GL SLO-3:** Use diverse cultural frames of reference and alternative perspectives to analyze issues. (LG5)

**Assessment by course instructor**

(n=396 students)

Highly Prof 27%

Not Prof 20%

Prof 53%
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**Assessment by peer instructors**

(n=157 ratings)

Highly Prof 47%

Not Prof 10%

Prof 20%

04/02/2014
2012-13 (ALL* participating sections)

**GN SLO-1:** Find, interpret, and evaluate information on diverse cultures. (LG1)

**Assessment by course instructor (n=675 students):**
- Highly Prof: 34%
- Prof: 36%
- Not Prof: 30%

**Assessment by peer instructors (n=102 ratings):**
- Highly Prof: 19%
- Prof: 22%
- Not Prof: 29%
- Unrated: 30%

---

2012-13 (ALL* participating sections)

**GN SLO-2:** Describe interconnections among regions of the world. (Must include substantial focus on cultures, nations or sub-nationalities in the Caribbean, Latin America, Middle East/North Africa, Asia, Africa, pacific Island, or indigenous peoples around the world.) (LG3)

**Assessment by course instructor (n=662 students):**
- Highly Prof: 37%
- Prof: 46%
- Not Prof: 17%

**Assessment by peer instructors (n=102 ratings):**
- Highly Prof: 15%
- Prof: 22%
- Not Prof: 29%
- Unrated: 34%
**2012-13 (ALL* participating sections)**

**GN SLO-3:** Use diverse cultural frames of reference and alternative perspectives to analyze issues. (LG5)

- **Assessment by course instructor**
  - (n=611 students)

- **Assessment by peer instructors**
  - (n=102 ratings)

*04/02/2014*

---

**2012-13 (ALL* participating sections)**

**WI SLO-1:** Demonstrate the ability to write clearly, coherently and effectively about a particular discipline. (LG1)

- **Assessment by course instructor**
  - (n=424 students)

- **Assessment by peer instructors**
  - (n=224 ratings)

*04/02/2014*
2012-13 (ALL * participating sections)

**WI SLO-2**: Adapt modes of communication to the audience. (LG1)

**Assessment by course instructor**
- Highly Prof: 39%
- Prof: 52%
- Not Prof: 9%

**Assessment by peer instructors**
- Highly Prof: 16%
- Not Prof: 36%
- Prof: 42%
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2012-13 (ALL * participating sections)

**WI SLO-3**: Incorporate constructive feedback from readers to improve the written work. (LG1)

**Assessment by course instructor**
- Highly Prof: 40%
- Prof: 46%
- Not Prof: 8%

**Assessment by peer instructors**
- Highly Prof: 8%
- Prof: 28%
- Not Prof: 61%
- Unrated: 3%
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Reasons given for “Unrated”

- Assignment either did not elicit, or only partially elicited, the particular student learning outcome.
- Assignment may have provided options, some of which were not directly aligned with student learning outcome.
- No drafts of essays were provided (for WI slo-3 student work products).

Spring 2013: LG5 Assessment

Personal, Civic, and Professional Development:
- Develop a capacity for active citizenship, ethics, social responsibility, personal growth, and skills for lifelong learning in a global society.
- In so doing, students will engage in free and open inquiry that fosters mutual respect across multiple cultures and perspectives. [GFA, GPR, GNS, GSB, GL, GN]
Spring 2013: LG5 Assessment

- In fall 2012, the Office of Learning Communities (OLC) collected data on students’ perceptions of the Integrated Studies Lab (ISL) course, particularly in regard to the skills and competencies outlined in LG5.
  - National Online Survey of Learning Communities
  - End of year course survey for ISL 101

Spring 2013: LG5 Assessment

- OLC divided LG5 into six competency areas:
  - Integrated Learning (personal growth and social responsibility)
  - Problem Solving (personal growth and social responsibility)
  - Civic Engagement (active citizenship)
  - Ethical Reasoning (ethics)
  - Foundations for Lifelong Learning (lifelong learning)
  - Intercultural Knowledge (in a global society)
Spring 2013: LG5 Assessment

- Data suggested a shift of ISL 101 away from study and success skills to LG5 competencies
  - ISL 101 transitioned all learning outcomes to focus specifically on LG5
  - Two new courses (ISL 102, ISL 104) were added
- In May 2013, OLC held Instructor Institute
  - Prompt: “How will you utilize LG5 in your course this fall?”
  - Pre-Institute Responses: definitions; delivery
  - Post-Institute Responses: assignments; course discussion materials

Spring 2013: LG5 Assessment

- Fall (2013), OLC will pilot a new ISL 101: Collaboration, Connection and Inquiry focused solely on LG 5 and integrated course content between disciplinary courses
Results: Fall 2013: *GHP; GLT; GSB*

**Step 1: Course Faculty**
- GHP: 9 of 13 sections
  ~ 70% response rate
- GLT: 11 of 13 sections
  ~ 85% response rate
- GSB: 20 of 27 sections
  ~ 74% response rate

**Step 2: Peer Reviewers**
- GHP: Of 9 sections
  - 9 submitted SWPs
  - 0 used MCQs
- GLT: Of 11 sections
  - 10 submitted SWPs
  - 1 used MCQs
- GSB: Of 20 sections
  - 15 submitted SWPs
  - 5 used MCQs

---

**Fall 2013**

**GHP SLO-1:** Use a historical approach to analyze and contextualize primary and secondary sources representing divergent perspectives. (LG3)

**Assessment by course instructor**

**Assessment by peer instructors**

---
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**Fall 2013**

**GHP SLO-2**: Use evidence to interpret the past coherently, orally and/or in writing. (LG1)

**Assessment by course instructor**

- **GHP slo-2**
  - (n=353 students)
  - Hi Prof 32%
  - Not Prof 16%
  - Prof 52%

**Assessment by peer instructors**

- **GHP slo-2**
  - (n=94 ratings)
  - Hi Prof 17%
  - Not Prof 30%
  - Prof 45%

---

**Fall 2013**

**GLT SLO-1**: Demonstrate the reading skill required for the study of literary texts. (LG3)

**Assessment by course instructor**

- **GLT slo-1**
  - (n=419 students)
  - Hi Prof 45%
  - Prof 42%
  - Not Prof 13%

**Assessment by peer instructors**

- **GLT slo-1**
  - (n=113 ratings)
  - Hi Prof 9%
  - Not Prof 21%
  - Prof 70%
Fall 2013

**GLT SLO-2**: Identify and/or describe some of the varied characteristics of literary texts. (LG3)

**Assessment by course instructor**

*GLT slo-2 (n=415 students)*

- Hi Prof: 44%
- Not Prof: 12%
- Prof: 44%

*GLT slo-2 (n=113 ratings)*

- Hi Prof: 3%
- Not Prof: 0%
- Prof: 57%
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---

**Fall 2013**

**GLT SLO-3**: Demonstrate orally, in writing, or by some other means a fundamental ability to use some of the techniques and/or methods of literary analysis. (LG1, LG3)

**Assessment by course instructor**

*GLT slo-3 (n=417 students)*

- Hi Prof: 40%
- Not Prof: 16%
- Prof: 44%

**Assessment by peer instructors**

*GLT slo-3 (n=113 ratings)*

- Hi Prof: 0%
- Not Prof: 4%
- Prof: 57%
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Fall 2013

**GLT SLO-4:** Identify and/or describe some of the varied social, historical, cultural, and/or theoretical contexts in which literary texts have been written and interpreted. (LG3)

Assessment by course instructor  Assessment by peer instructors

![Pie charts showing assessment results for GLT SLO-4](chart)
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Fall 2013

**GSB SLO-1:** Based on empirical information, describe or explain individual behavior or social conditions, contexts, or institutions. (LG4)

Assessment by course instructor  Assessment by peer instructors

![Pie charts showing assessment results for GSB SLO-1](chart)
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**Fall 2013**

**GSB SLO-2:** Using the theories of the social and behavioral sciences, analyze individual behavior or social conditions, contexts, or institutions. (LG4, LG1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment by course instructor</th>
<th>Assessment by peer instructors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### GSB slo-2
(n=1,106 students)

- Hi Prof: 20%
- Prof: 58%
- Not Prof: 22%

### GSB slo-2
(n=171 ratings)

- Hi Prof: 11%
- Not Prof: 32%
- Prof: 35%
- Unrated: 20%

**Comments from Course Faculty**

- Small sample size inadequate for judging effectiveness of GEC program
- Allowing course instructor to define proficiency level may generate non-comparable results
- Proficiency levels determined based on grades
- To improve student learning, “hire more faculty and offer more courses in smaller sections”
- “I … favor a GEC council that includes dedicated faculty and rotating faculty fellows to maintain a relevant, effective set of GEC requirements, courses, and assessment processes.”
Comments from Workshop Faculty

**Process: Step 1:** Should we continue to have instructors evaluate their own students’ work?

In essence, answer is “yes”. Participation in this process will affect how they teach Gen Ed courses in the future.
- “Made the goals of Gen Ed Program much clearer”
- “Has shown the value of discussing the SLOs”
- “Will more carefully structure my assignments to meet SLOs”

Other comments:
- Smooth process, clear instructions
- Realized importance of assignment prompt
- Value of data collected highly dependent on quality of the prompt
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Comments from Workshop Faculty

Comments specific to faculty training re: Gen Ed Program

Assessment process:
- Presence of former participants in GEPA
  - To share what they learned from their participation in the process
  - To help with assignment selection for GEPA
- Talk about assignment selection
  - Greater guidance needed in the creation of prompts and alignment with SLOs
  - Assignments clearly, explicitly refer to the SLOs
  - Use assignments from middle to end of semester
- Offerings of training
  - One week before classes begin and second week of classes
  - Request faculty bring syllabus with list of assignments
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Comments from Workshop Faculty

**Process: Step 2**: Should we continue to have teams of “external” raters evaluate students’ work?

Majority of faculty agreed that peer review was valuable

Many indicated that the SLOs are problematic—too “major” specific

Next Steps?

**Workshop faculty**:

Communication:
- Provide peer review feedback to course faculty
- Within departments
  - Previous participants in GEPA be a resource for their department
  - Meetings to present results from GEPA process

Other:
- SLOs still problematic (i.e., too major-specific)
Next Steps?

**Forum participants:**

Now, it’s your turn to provide feedback to the General Education in response to this presentation.

Below is a link to a short Qualtrics survey:

https://uncg.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_9vsuhMfsZb9qZHT

Your responses to these questions will be anonymous. They are for the purpose of improving student learning in the General Education Program.

---

Thank You!

Thank you for viewing this presentation and for your interest in the General Education Program.

**Questions?**

- Jon Zarecki, Chair, Gen Ed Council (jpzareck@uncg.edu)
- Jodi Pettazzoni, Director of Assessment & Accreditation (jepettaz@uncg.edu)
- Terry Brumfield, Assessment Specialist (tebrumfi@uncg.edu)