This PowerPoint presents results from the assessment of the General Education Program. I’m Jonathan Zarecki, associate professor in Classical Studies and Chair of the General Education Council for 2013-2015. Assessment is an important part of our continuing efforts to improve the General Education curriculum at UNCG, and on behalf of the General Education Council and the Office of Assessment and Accreditation I thank you for taking the time to view this presentation.
As you can see, there are two tasks that we hope to accomplish with this presentation. At the end of this presentation, there will be a short Qualtrics survey which will allow you to provide feedback on both the General Education Program and the Gen Ed assessment process. We hope that you’ll take a few moments to complete the survey, since faculty feedback is an important part of the assessment process.

Tasks for Today

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

• Gather feedback on the General Education Program assessment process
This presentation contains four sections. The first section summarizes UNCG’s General Education Program; the second details the assessment process for the Gen Ed Program; third, we will present results from the fall 2012 through fall 2013 assessments of the Program; and finally, we will present faculty responses from both faculty teaching the courses that were assessed and from faculty participants in the assessment workshop.
UNCG’s General Education program consists of 8 categories and 4 markers linked to 5 University Learning Goals. Each of the categories and markers links to one of more of the Learning Goals. The Learning Goals were approved by the Faculty Senate in April 2009, along with a Mission Statement which reads in part:

“The faculty and staff of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro embrace student learning as its highest priority. Our General Education Program provides students with the foundational knowledge, skills, and values necessary to be critical and creative thinkers, ethical decision-makers, effective communicators, and collaborative and engaged global citizens. The breadth of General Education empowers our students to thrive as life-long learners who lead personally fulfilling lives. The mandate to foster an educated person belongs to the entire university, not to a single department, unit or co-curricular program. Thus, the General Education Program provides foundations and alternative perspectives for the more specialized knowledge gained in the major."

For the complete Mission Statement, and more information about the Gen Ed Program, visit genedcouncil.uncg.edu or the relevant section of the Undergraduate Bulletin.
The five Learning Goals, presented here in abbreviated form, represent the key values of a UNCG education. There were originally four Learning Goals, and in April 2010 the Faculty Senate approved the division of the original third Learning Goal into the current LG 3 and 4, and the renumbering of the original LG 4 as the fifth Learning Goal in the revised program. In their current incarnation, Learning Goal 1 encompasses critical thinking, communication, and quantitative and information literacy; Learning Goal 2 stresses the knowledge and application of mathematical and scientific principles; Learning Goal 3 promotes humanism through the study of the religion, art, literature, culture, and history of diverse human societies; Learning Goal 4 endorses the analysis of social behavior and the human condition; and Learning Goal 5 supports life-long ethical, personal, and social growth necessary for becoming a life-long learner.

Again, the full text of the Learning Goals can be found at genedcouncil.uncg.edu and in the Undergraduate Bulletin.
Here you can see how the eight General Education categories link to the University Learning Goals. You’ll notice that all eight link to Learning Goal 1, which focuses on critical thinking, oral and written communication, and quantitative and information literacy, and that each of the categories links to at least one other Learning Goal. Students are required to take 36-37 hours spread over these eight categories:

- One course in GLT
- One course in GFA
- One course in GPR
- And one additional course from one of those categories
- One course in GHP and one course in GMT
- Two courses in GNS, at least one of which must be a lab course
- Two courses in GRD, one of which must be either English 101, FMS 115, or RCO 101.
- Two courses in GSB
This chart presents the links between the Learning Goals and the four Gen Ed markers: Global Perspectives, Global Non-Western Perspectives, Speaking Intensive, and Writing Intensive. Again, each of the markers is linked to Learning Goal 1, with the GL and GN markers also linked to Learning Goals 3 and 5.

Students are required to take four Global Perspective courses, at least one of which must be a GN course; and one WI and one SI course in addition to one SI and WI within their major.

I’ll now turn the presentation over to Terry Brumfield, who will take you through the process of General Education assessment, the results of the latest assessment, and the next steps in the process. On behalf of the General Education Council I want to thank you again for your support of General Education at UNCG. Here’s Terry.
I am Terry Brumfield, an assessment specialist with the Office of Assessment & Accreditation. Under the direction of the General Education Council, I facilitate the assessment of the General Education Program.

As Jon indicated on the previous slide, I will go through the General Education Program assessment process adopted by UNCG faculty, present results from the most recent assessment of the Program, and discuss the next steps in this process.

This slide is an overview of the next few slides. I will define program assessment, give a brief history of the current General Education Program assessment process that was developed by faculty, and describe the two-step process that involves course faculty and peer reviewers.
Mary Allen, a former director of the California State University Institute for Teaching & Learning and a professor emerita of Psychology from California State University, Bakersfield, states in her book *Assessing Academic Program in Higher Education* that assessment is a framework for:

1) focusing faculty attention on student learning, and
2) eliciting meaningful discussions of program objectives, curricular organization, pedagogy, and student development.

Program assessment is an iterative process designed to monitor and improve student learning. It begins with learning objectives—statements of what students are expected to learn (i.e., know or be able to do by the end of the class, unit, semester, program, etc.). In order to provide students with appropriate learning opportunities, curricula should be aligned with the learning objectives. Evidence of learning is then collected from students and that evidence is used to determine how to improve student learning.

(Source: *Assessing Academic Program in Higher Education* by Mary J. Allen, pp 5-6)
In May 2011, about 12 faculty participated in a planning workshop sponsored by the General Education Council and facilitated by the then Office of Assessment. Faculty developed a two-part process to assess the General Education Program. This process, including a timeline, was approved by the Council in Oct 2011 and then piloted in a few sections in fall 2011.

In spring 2012, the process was then used to evaluate the three recertified categories: Fine Arts, Literature, and Philosophical/Religious/Ethical Perspectives for their Learning Goal 3 (Knowledge of Human Histories, Cultures, and the Self) student learning outcomes.
The Gen Ed Program assessment process includes two parts.

In part 1 of the process, sections of specific Gen Ed categories are sampled. The course instructors of these sections select the assignment(s) that meets the applicable category-specific student learning outcomes (SLOs) and apply the three-point rating scale (Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient) to all student responses to those assignments. Course faculty then record their aggregated class results by student learning outcome in an online survey. In addition, course faculty submit to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation the (unmarked) student work products (from the assignment(s)) of six randomly selected students.

In part 2, the validation process, peer reviewers (category-specific) review and rate—using the same three-point rating scale—the sampled student work products submitted by each of the participating course faculty.

Course and workshop faculty assessment data are collected and summarized by the Office of Assessment and Accreditation and then presented to the University by Gen Ed Council members. In the past, face-to-face Forums have been used. This narrated Powerpoint is an attempt to reach more faculty in a manner that is readily available to them.
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

This slide provides the order of presentation of Gen Ed Program assessment results which have not yet been disseminated University-wide:

- In 2012-13, the Mathematics category was assessed by the Math Dept., using a process their faculty developed. (slides 13-16)
- In spring 2013, the Natural Sciences category was assessed using the Scientific Reasoning test. (slides 17-20)
- In 2012-13, Learning Goal 5 (Personal, Civil, and Professional Development) was assessed by Laura Pipe of the Office of Learning Communities. (slides 21-33)
- In spring 2013, the Language Dept. completed the peer review part of the fall 2012 assessment process. (slides 34-38)
- In fall 2013, three categories—Historical Perspectives, Literature, Social and Behavioral Sciences—were assessed using the Gen Ed Program assessment process to sampled sections. (slides 39-52)
This slide presents the General Education Mathematics (GMT) student learning outcomes in effect through spring 2014. As Jon stated earlier, students are required to take one three-credit hour GMT course. This, in turn, means that every GMT course must provide students the opportunity to demonstrate all five of these student learning outcomes.

**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)
This slide summarizes the process the Math Dept. developed to assess the GMT category.

In fall 2011, the Math Dept. piloted a process where 5 identical multiple choice questions were embedded in the final exams of every GMT course. However, due to variation in course content, they determined this particular process to be unsuitable.

In spring 2012, the Math Dept. revised their assessment process by using questions, again embedded into GMT class final exams, based on course content. Satisfied with the results from this revised process, the Math faculty adopted the process to evaluate the GMT courses.
Beginning in fall 2012, Math faculty mapped questions embedded in each course's final exam to the GMT student learning outcomes. The number of questions varied by course by GMT SLO.

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

The Math Dept. provided its results from the fall 2012 and spring 2013 semesters. In each of the two semesters, approximately 2,000 students were enrolled in seven GMT courses.
This chart shows that results were consistent for both semesters. That is,

- approximately 85% of the approximately 2,000 students passed the course,
- approximately 60% received a grade of C or better, and
- approximately 67% of students gave correct responses for each of the GMT student learning outcomes embedded questions.
I now turn to assessment of the General Education Natural Sciences (or GNS) category.

This slide states the five learning outcomes of the GNS category. As with the GMT category, these student learning outcomes (SLOs) are in effect from 2011—2014, and each GNS course must provide students opportunities to demonstrate all five of the SLOs.
The GNS category was evaluated using the *Scientific Reasoning* test, a standardized test of 49 multiple-choice questions. It was developed by science and mathematics university faculty for use at the program level and was created to demonstrate student learning resulting from participation in scientific components of general education programs.

Our GNS faculty determined that this test aligned with the GNS student learning outcomes.

More information about the *Scientific Reasoning* test may be found at Madison Assessment’s website: www.madisonassessment.com.
This slide presents the results from the spring 2013 administration of the SR-9. The test was administered by the Office of Assessment & Accreditation on various days, including a Saturday, and at various times to accommodate as many students as possible. Of the 1,454 students enrolled in 17 GNS sections, 325 students (or 23%) took the SR-9.

Results show mean scores for all UNCG students who took the test as well as mean scores for each class of UNCG students. Freshmen and sophomores scored similarly (around 66-67% correct) and juniors and seniors scored similarly (around 71-72% correct).
In addition, results from the SR-9 indicated that approximately 27% of the 325 students who took the test scored at the Faculty Standard of 37.7 (or approximately 76% correct). Results indicated a progressive increase, by class group, in meeting the Standard—from 20% of freshmen to 37% of seniors.
In the next few slides, I will discuss the results from the part of the fall 2012 assessment of the General Education Program that was attributable to the Language Dept.

This slide provides an overview of the two-part Gen Ed Program assessment process: first, course faculty assessment, and second, peer reviewers’ assessment.

In fall 2012, 143 Gen Ed sections were sampled; 25 of those sections were in the Language Dept. While the first part of the assessment process (i.e., faculty course assessment) took place in fall 2012, the second part (peer review) for the Language Dept. did not take place until the spring 2013 semester. This means that at the Feb 2013 Gen Ed Program Assessment Forum, the peer-review results presented came from the non-Language Dept. sections only.

After presenting results from the Language Dept. peer reviewers only, I then combine these results with the other Gen Ed sections that participated in the fall 2012 assessment process, thereby providing a complete picture of the Gen Ed Program assessment process (that is, course faculty assessment results compared with peer review assessment results).

This slide tells us that 23, of 25, Language Dept. sections participated, and that 17, of the 23, submitted student work products for peer review. Keep in mind that while a Gen Ed course can have only one category, it can have more than one marker (GL + WI).
This slide summarizes the total number of student work products submitted from the participating Language Dept. sections:

- For the Global (GL) marker, 77 student work products (SWPs) from 13 sections, with a total of 83 ratings (one of the GL sections had 2 raters);
- For the Global non-western (GN) marker, 12 student work products (SWPs) from 2 sections, with a total of 12 ratings (one rater/SWP); and
- For the Writing Intensive (WI) marker, 18 student work products (SWPs) from 3 sections, with a total of 18 ratings (one rater/SWP).
Again, these results are from the Language Dept. peer reviewers only.

Summarizing across all three student learning outcomes for each marker:

• Of the 77 GL student work products, peer reviewers determined that:
  • 80-88% were proficient or above,
  • 1-8% were not proficient, and
  • 4-18% were unrated

• Of the 12 GN student work products, peer reviewers determined that:
  • 66-75% were proficient or above,
  • 25-33% were not proficient, and
  • none were unrated.

• Of the 18 WI student work products, peer reviewers determined that:
  • 81-100% were proficient or above,
  • 11% were not proficient (WI SLO-3 only)
  • 8% were not proficient (WI SLO-3 only)
These new few slides include all data collected from the fall 2012 assessment of the Gen Ed Program; that is, Language Dept. peer reviewer data have been combined with the non-Language Dept. peer review data.

For GL student learning outcome 1:

- Course instructors rated 85% of student work as proficient or above, and peer reviewers rated 75% of (sampled) student work the same.
- Course instructors rated 15% of student work as non-proficient; peer reviewers rated 10% of (sampled) student work the same and 13% as unrated.
For GL student learning outcome 2:

- Course instructors rated 83% of student work as proficient or above, and peer reviewers rated 74% of (sampled) student work the same.
- Course instructors rated 17% of student work as non-proficient; peer reviewers rated 11% of (sampled) student work the same and 15% as unrated.
For GL student learning outcome 3:

- Course instructors rated 80% of student work as proficient or above, and peer reviewers rated 67% of (sampled) student work the same.
- Course instructors rated 20% of student work as non-proficient; peer reviewers rated 10% of (sampled) student work the same and 23% as unrated.
For GN student learning outcome 1:

- Course instructors rated 70% of student work as proficient or above, and peer reviewers rated 41% of (sampled) student work the same.
- Course instructors rated 30% of student work as non-proficient; peer reviewers rated 29% of (sampled) student work the same and 30% as unrated.
For GN student learning outcome 2:

- Course instructors rated 83% of student work as proficient or above, and peer reviewers rated 37% of (sampled) student work the same.
- Course instructors rated 17% of student work as non-proficient; peer reviewers rated 29% of (sampled) student work the same and 34% as unrated.
For GN student learning outcome 3:

- Course instructors rated 86% of student work as proficient or above, and peer reviewers rated 30% of (sampled) student work the same.
- Course instructors rated 14% of student work as non-proficient; peer reviewers rated 47% of (sampled) student work the same and 23% as unrated.
For WI student learning outcome 1:

- Course instructors rated 87% of student work as proficient or above, and peer reviewers rated 81% of (sampled) student work the same.
- Course instructors rated 13% of student work as non-proficient; peer reviewers rated 15% of (sampled) student work the same and 4% as unrated.
For WI student learning outcome 2:

- Course instructors rated 91% of student work as proficient or above, and peer reviewers rated 56% of (sampled) student work the same.
- Course instructors rated 9% of student work as non-proficient; peer reviewers rated 8% of (sampled) student work the same and 36% as unrated.
For WI student learning outcome 3:

- Course instructors rated 92% of student work as proficient or above, and peer reviewers rated 36% of (sampled) student work the same.
- Course instructors rated 8% of student work as non-proficient; peer reviewers rated 3% of (sampled) student work the same and 61% as unrated.
This slide presents a summation of the reasons given by peer reviewers as to why they could not rate a particular student work product (or set of student work products):

• The assignment either did not elicit, or only partially elicited, the particular student learning outcome.
• The assignment may have provided options, some of which were not directly aligned with the student learning outcome.
• No drafts of essays were provided (for WI slo-3 student work products).
Moving on to the assessment of the General Education Program’s Learning Goal 5—
Personal, Civil, and Professional Development, this slide provides the statement of LG 5 as
approved by the Faculty Senate in April 2010.

Data on LG 5 were collected in fall 2012 by Laura Pipe of the Office of Learning
Communities.
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

OLC used data collected from:

- 291 (of 498) 1st-year students who completed the 2011 National Online Survey of Learning Communities
- 596 (of 745) 1st-year students who completed the 2012 National Online Survey of Learning Communities, and
- 609 1st-year students who responded to a prompt related to Learning Goal 5 in the fall 2012 Integrated Studies Laboratory Course Evaluation.

OLC used these data to explore the early stages of students’ introductions to the topics within LG5 and to benchmark students’ progress during their entry to the University.
OLC divided Learning Goal 5 into six competency areas:

- Personal growth and social responsibility—broken down into Integrated Learning and Problem Solving competencies
- Active citizenship, or Civic Engagement competency
- Ethical reasoning competency
- Lifelong learning competency
- Intercultural knowledge (in a global society) competency
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

The data collected suggested to OLC that the emphasis of ISL 101 be shifted away from study and success skills to the LG5 competencies. In response to what they learned, OLC transitioned all the ISL 101 learning outcomes to focus specifically on Learning Goal 5, and OLC added two new courses (ISL 102 and ISL 104).

In addition, in May 2013, OLC held an Instructor Institute, asking participants how they would utilize LG5 in their fall 2013 course. Pre-Institute responses focused on disciplinary definitions of LG5 and traditional methods of service learning for delivery. Post-Institute responses were further developed, outlining specific assignments and the inclusion of *The New York Times* in course discussions.
In fall 2013, the Office of Learning Communities will pilot its new ISL 101 course which will be focused solely on LG5 and integrated course content between disciplinary courses.
The next section of this presentation will discuss the results from the fall 2013 assessment of the General Education Program.

This slide provides an overview of the two-step assessment process as applied to the Historical Perspectives (GHP), Literature (GLT), and Social and Behavioral Sciences (GSB) categories in fall 2013.

In the sample:

- 13 GHP sections were selected
  - 9 (or 70%) participated
  - All 9 submitted student work products
- 13 GLT sections were selected
  - 11 (or 85%) participated
  - 10 of these submitted student work products,
  - and one used multiple choice questions to assess the GLT student learning outcomes
- 27 GSB sections were selected
  - 20 (or 74%) participated
  - 15 of these submitted student work products, and
  - 5 used multiple choice questions to assess the GSB student learning outcomes
This slide provides the results for GHP student learning outcome 1:

- Course instructors rated 84% of student work as proficient or above; peer reviewers rated 56% of (sampled) student work the same.
- Course instructors rated 16% of student work as non-proficient; peer reviewers rated 34% of (sampled) student work the same and 10% as unrated.
This slide presents results for GHP student learning outcome 2:

- Course instructors rated 84% of student work as proficient or above; peer reviewers rated 62% of (sampled) student work the same.
- Course instructors rated 16% of student work as non-proficient; peer reviewers rated 30% of (sampled) student work the same and 8% as unrated.
For GLT student learning outcome 1:

- Course instructors rated 87% of student work as proficient or above; peer reviewers rated 79% of (sampled) student work the same.
- Course instructors rated 13% of student work as non-proficient; peer reviewers rated 21% of (sampled) student work the same and 0% as unrated.
For GLT student learning outcome 2:

- Course instructors rated 88% of student work as proficient or above; peer reviewers rated 60% of (sampled) student work the same.
- Course instructors rated 12% of student work as non-proficient; peer reviewers rated 40% of (sampled) student work the same and 0% as unrated.
For GLT student learning outcome 3:

- Course instructors rated 84% of student work as proficient or above; peer reviewers rated 57% of (sampled) student work the same.
- Course instructors rated 16% of student work as non-proficient; peer reviewers rated 43% of (sampled) student work the same and 0% as unrated.
For GLT student learning outcome 4:

- Course instructors rated 84% of student work as proficient or above; peer reviewers rated 35% of (sampled) student work the same.
- Course instructors rated 16% of student work as non-proficient; peer reviewers rated 63% of (sampled) student work the same and 2% as unrated.
For GSB student learning outcome 1:

- Course instructors rated 76% of student work as proficient or above; peer reviewers rated 81% of (sampled) student work the same.
- Course instructors rated 24% of student work as non-proficient; peer reviewers rated 12% of (sampled) student work the same and 7% as unrated.
For GSB student learning outcome 2:

- Course instructors rated 78% of student work as proficient or above; peer reviewers rated 57% of (sampled) student work the same.
- Course instructors rated 22% of student work as non-proficient; peer reviewers rated 32% of (sampled) student work the same and 11% as unrated.
This slide presents some of the comments that course faculty shared on the online survey. They include:

- small sample sizes are inadequate for judging the effectiveness of the Gen Ed program;
- allowing course instructors to define the proficiency level may generate non-comparable results;
- proficiency levels were 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.”
At the end of the Workshop, faculty are asked about the current Gen Ed Program assessment process. The first question is whether we should continue to have instructors evaluate their own students’ work.

In essence, Workshop faculty (many of whom also participated in part 1 of the process) responded in the affirmative, stating that their participation in this process will affect how they teach Gen Ed courses in the future. Some commented that their participation made the goals of the Gen Ed Program much clearer to them, that it demonstrated the value of discussing the student learning outcomes; and that it helped them realize the importance of selecting assignments that meet the student learning outcomes. Others commented that the process itself was relatively smooth and clear and that it helped them understand that the value of the data collected was highly dependent on the quality of the assignment prompt.
This slide includes comments/suggestions from the Workshop peer-reviewers in regard to faculty training for the Gen Ed Program assessment (GEPA) process:

- Former GEPA participants should be present at faculty training sessions:
  - To share what they learned from their participation in the process, and
  - To help with assignment selection for the assessment process.
- Talk about assignment selection:
  - More guidance was needed in the creation of prompts/assignments that align with the category-specific student learning outcomes.
  - Assignments should clearly and explicitly reference the SLOs.
  - Use assignments from middle to the end of the semester.
- Timing of when faculty training should take place:
  - One week before classes begin and second week of classes, and
  - Request faculty bring syllabus with list of assignments.
The second question presented to Workshop participants was whether we should continue to have teams of “external” raters evaluate students’ work:

- The majority of Workshop faculty agreed that peer review was valuable.
- Many Workshop faculty indicated that the student learning outcomes were (still) problematic—too “major” specific.
Workshop participants were also asked what should be our next steps. Responses included:

- **Regarding communication:**
  - Peer review feedback should be provided to course faculty (currently it is not provided).
  - Within departments, previous Gen Ed Program assessment participants should be a resource for their department, and meetings should be held to present results from the assessment process.
- **Category-specific student learning outcomes are still a problem—too major-specific.**
Now, it is your turn to provide feedback to the General Education Council in response to this presentation.

Below is a link to a four-question 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 for taking the time to view this presentation and for your interest in the General Education Program.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact:
• Jon Zarecki, the General Education Council Chair, or
• Jodi Pettazzoni, the Director of Assessment & Accreditation, or
• Terry Brumfield, Assessment Specialist with the Office of Assessment and Accreditation.