REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM

UMKC AAC&U GENERAL EDUCATION INSTITUTE TEAM

This document was prepared and submitted by Linda Garavalia, Cindy Pemberton, Lynda Plamann, Tom Stroik, Appie van de Liefvoort and Wayne Vaught. This team reviewed all documents and materials associated with the work of the General Education Advisory Task Force and attended the 2010 AAC&U General Education Institute from June 4 through June 9, 2010. The Institute activities included assigned readings, work group time and presentations by the Institute faculty on topics associated with general education reform and assessment. This report was prepared for Provost Hackett and represents pertinent background information and recommendations for advancing UMKC’s revision of our general education program.

The specific goals for the Institute Team are:

- **Institute priorities.** The Institute Team will focus on creating a general education program plan focused on the process of program revision. The team will be learning from the interactive presentations from the Institute faculty and from fellow colleagues participating in the Institute.

- **High-priority tasks.** The Institute Team will establish a general education revision process plan including developing a communications plan, a ratification plan, a proposed governance structure, a proposed course approval process, an implementation plan and an assessment framework.

In the report, we first excerpt the pertinent background and recommendations from UMKC’s General Education Advisory Task Force, as documented in their recommendations from May 14, 2010.
KEY FINDINGS FROM GENERAL EDUCATION TASK FORCE:

A. What is General Education? Although there is no one true meaning of the term general education, a one-page summary* published by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) provides a view that is shared by many in the academy. This outline of student learning goals acknowledges national concerns regarding achievement shortfalls among our nation’s students in the skills and knowledge to prepare them for the challenges of life in the twenty-first century. These include

- Knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world through studies in math, science, humanities, and the arts;
- Intellectual and practical skills including critical and creative thinking, effective written and oral communication, information literacy, teamwork and problem solving;
- Personal and social responsibility including intercultural competence and civic knowledge and engagement at the local and global levels;
- Integrative and applied learning.

General education should not be something to simply “get out of the way.” While breadth of knowledge is important, it is widely recognized that other qualities and skills are important components of general education. According to the AAC&U, more than 70 percent of employers want colleges to place more emphasis on science and technology, global learning, teamwork skills in diverse groups, written and oral communication and applied knowledge in real world settings.

According to the Higher Learning Commission Statement on General Education (Feb. 21, 2003) “… general education is intended to impart common knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and to develop in them the skills and attitudes that an organization’s faculty believe every educated person should possess.”

“Effective general education helps students gain competence in the exercise of independent intellectual inquiry and also stimulates their examination and understanding of personal, social, and civic values.”
“General education must be valued and owned by the organization ...”

The best general education program is one that fits the learning needs of the students on a specific campus and that the faculty believe in and teach with passion, commitment, and intentionality—only then can faculty help students engage fully with its purposes and opportunities (A. Ferris, 2010).

B. UMKC’s Current General Education Curriculum

There is no common general education program that is required for all UMKC students. The Institute Team noted that there is great variability among academic units, with the general education component for a baccalaureate degree program ranging from a 12 credit hour curricular requirement (conservatory) to a 68 credit hour general education requirement (Arts and Sciences). Review of the general education requirements across undergraduate programs revealed only two common courses/learning experiences; English composition and a state requirement to ensure knowledge regarding federal and state constitutions.

As part of a statewide agreement, UMKC has agreed to identify and accept the MDHE common 42 semester hours of credit that is distributed across a set of skill and knowledge areas. These areas include communication, higher-order thinking (mathematics, managing information, and valuing), social and behavioral sciences, and humanities and fine arts. These requirements are commonly referred to as “the 42-hour block.”

C. Motivation for Revising General Education Curriculum

The General Education Advisory Task Force provided a compelling rationale for a revision of the General Education program at UMKC. The Institute Team would like to either add or emphasize:

1. To establish student learning outcomes for general education, together with an assessment plan to ensure continuous program improvement that will also address concerns identified by the HLC (Higher Learning Commission) regarding the lack of coherent assessment of student learning. UMKC has a deadline of spring 2013 to address these HLC identified areas of weakness.
2. To remediate concerns expressed by a recent site visit in the fall of 2009 by the HLC citing the lack of a unified general education curriculum.

- The HLC expressed concern that UMKC appears to lack a common general education experience for students and an appropriate assessment plan for general education. Other compelling reasons exist to reform general education (see report from General Education Advisory Task Force)

3. To update the curriculum to ensure that it continues to meet the needs of graduates.

4. To address dissatisfaction among students regarding the current general education requirements.

5. To simplify the general education requirements, facilitating transfer from other higher education institutions. In fall 2009 and spring 2010, a combined total of 1090 students transferred to UMKC from area community colleges.

6. To lower the barrier that prevents students from exploring alternative majors. Each academic unit (or program within an academic unit) has its own set of general education requirements, which may hinder students who change majors into an academic unit or program with different general education requirements. Similarly, students are discouraged from seeking a double major that crosses academic units because they may be required to meet the requirement of both units.

7. To link the undergraduate experience to the strengths of our faculty and our unique university mission, which is “to lead in life and health sciences; to deepen and expand strength in the visual and performing arts; to develop a professional workforce and collaborate in urban issues and education; and to create a vibrant learning and campus life experience.”

8. To increase student engagement with our unique university mission, potentially increasing student retention and persistence. The university seeks to raise the current six-year graduation rate, which is approximately 45 percent, to 50 percent, and to increase freshman to sophomore persistence from 74 to 80 percent.
9. To ensure alignment with state and national guidelines for general education.

KEY FINDINGS FROM UMKC AAC&U GENERAL EDUCATION INSTITUTE TEAM

A. Challenges with General Education Revision and Reform

1. Great variability in number of hours required to meet general education requirements. This variability often reflects specific needs, (e.g. accreditation) unique to individual units.

2. Lack of faculty awareness of the need for a common set of general education outcomes

3. Low faculty awareness of the report from HLC and its feedback regarding issues with general education program

4. Low general awareness of the consequences of failing to comply with the HLC feedback regarding a common general education experience.

B. What must be accomplished before the HLC site visit in 2013

1. Identify learning outcomes for the general education program and map these outcomes to courses/experiences offered. Make curricular alignment if needed.

2. Identify the approaches to assess student achievement of the learning outcomes.

3. Collect evidence that students are achieving stated learning outcomes (e.g. samples of student work)

4. Analyze samples of student work to identify any weaknesses that may exist in programs

5. Document reaction to any identified weaknesses (e.g., changes were made to course X to develop more complex understanding of Y and that complex understanding is assessed with Z).

6. React to evaluations of student learning outcomes and document reaction to evaluations of student learning outcomes– explain what changes were made to address any problems

7. Measure and analyze any changes that occur as a result of reaction to evaluations of student learning outcomes or student feedback
There are numerous models of general education, and no single model can meet the specific needs, or reflect the unique mission, of every institution. Each model has its own strengths and weaknesses. The faculty team attending the AAC&U General Education Institute found a wide variety of existing programs and proposals for revisions to existing general education requirements. As faculty, students, and other stakeholders consider revising general education at UMKC, they should be aware of some of the most common approaches to a general education program.

There are three basic model component characteristics for delivering and designing learning outcomes for general education and mapping them to the curricular and co-curricular offerings:

A. Many courses from many disciplines vs. a limited number of carefully constructed courses

B. Courses taken in any sequence and at any time vs. developmental models where courses have prerequisite dependencies

C. General education program focused only on academic experiences gained inside the classroom or laboratory vs. focus on the complete undergraduate experience (curricular and co-curricular)

There are various broad model designs:

A. Choice from among many courses (distribution)

B. All students take the same courses (required core/common core-program)

C. All students take a few of the same courses with choice for the rest of the requirements (mixed model – combination of core and distribution)

D. All courses taken at the 100-200 level (foundation, equivalent of community college transfer module)

E. Courses taken at all levels from 100-400 (development, distribution across 4 years alongside the major)

F. Courses taken together to strengthen interdisciplinary perspectives (tandem or clustered courses)
G. Courses taken in sequence to promote study in depth (sequenced or linked courses)

H. Integration of goals into many courses (writing across the curriculum, technology intensive, ethical perspectives, competency based)

I. Program outcomes met with both courses and co-curricular elements (summer reading, study abroad, lectures)

**Which ever model is established, intentionality in the undergraduate experience is paramount to the effectiveness of the program – as an example -- the first year experience to frame the educational experience (e.g., - IUPUI- personal development program), middle years transition (connection with the major-developmental perspective/reinforcement/extension), capstone experience (mastery, mentoring, culmination and transition to workplace)

COMMON GENERAL EDUCATION MODELS

** (A) Distribution Model**: Distribution Models require students to take a variety of courses that cover the range of academic fields. Generally, there will be specific hour requirements in humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. Students may choose from a menu of courses, but will have to be sure that they have sufficient hours in each of the major disciplines.

**Advantages**

- Easy to staff
- Flexibility in course offerings
- Does not get in the way of the major
- Students like choice and can find some course they like in an area
- Exploration often leads students to a major they might have not have considered
Disadvantages

Students do not recognize the program
Leaves it up to students to create a "whole" out of the parts
Too often nothing distinctive about the courses or program may "drift"
Departments try to get many courses to count to shore up small major
Turns some departments into "service" while others do not contribute and therefore have limited commitment

(B)Core Programs Model: Core models are characterized by a common course of study required for all students and are often designed around major values or themes of the university

Advantages

Creates a common experience for all students - may be a campus signature
Typically has a beginning, middle and end
Makes the campus and program distinctive
Often interdisciplinary to create connections
A few examples of this program model are designed around competencies that are carried through all courses

Disadvantages

Difficult to shift from distribution to core
Not all faculty are prepared to teach this type of course
Courses have some overlap with introductory courses but can’t count toward the major
Needs constant faculty development to keep focus
Difficult to fit in transfer students

(C) **Mixed Model:** Mixed models combine elements of the distribution and core models.

- Aims to get advantages of each model which minimizing disadvantages
- Small core can represent the "signature" of the institution
- Challenging to keep the core meaningful as faculty change, requires faculty development and collaboration
- Very few faculty are responsible for the "signature" piece of the curriculum

(D) **Foundation Model:**

- All courses taken at the 100-200 level is advantage for transfer students
- Fits well with some but not all majors
- Treated as something to "be gotten out of the way"
- Students claim 100 level should not be "hard" - surveys and introductory courses do not lead to deeper learning
- Problematic when seniors in a 100 level course (advanced students in lower division courses)

(E) **Developmental Models:**

- Courses taken at all levels from 100-400 (distributed across the four years)
- Clusters designed to integrate learning
- Sequences help deepen and reinforce learning - upper and lower tier courses
- Over time the sequences and clusters break down as faculty and administrators change
- Not developmental if no prerequisites just higher numbers and overlapped with major
- Difficult for transfer articulation
(F) **Integrated Designs**: Curricular and Co-curricular Experiences

Advising/mentoring/1st year seminar

Integration/intentionality/mapped to connect to major and service/reinforcement of outcomes

Deepen intellectual engagement through active pedagogy, simulations, etc. and co-curricular experiences/symposia/reading programs

Research intensive/information literacy/practical application/community projects

Integrate assessment at all levels, direct and indirect/portfolio/student self reflection
RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE “NEW “GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

The General Education Advisory Task Force provided a number of recommendations for the UMKC General Education program. The Institute Team would like to either add or emphasize the following recommendations:

A. Is based on measurable student learning outcomes and should be reflective of the LEAP outcomes (AAC&U)

B. Reflects our unique university mission

C. Addresses the needs of our student population (transfers, etc.) and facilitates students success (timely degree completion and student retention)

D. Models intentionality (students understand the purpose, goals and values of the general education program and clearly see the connection to the major and to life/career goals)

E. Requires students to have at least one high impact learning experience (as defined by the research literature) as part of their general education course experiences (study abroad, undergraduate research, service learning, internship)

F. Is a mixed model design (see examples attached – IUPUI and UNL)

RECOMMENDED NEXT STEPS IN GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM REVISION PROCESS

1. Establish a clear communication plan that ensures that all stakeholders are aware of the effort to revise the general education program and to ensure broad participation in the process, see also below.

2. Commission a General Education Oversight Committee (or Task Force, GEOC, see also below), charged with reviewing and making recommendations regarding UMKC general education program learning outcomes, the general education program model and its assessment plan. An announcement should explain the need for review of our general education program and ensure that all faculty, students and staff will have an opportunity to participate in the process. It is
recommended that nominations be solicited for faculty participation on the GEOC. In addition, specific communications should be made to ensure all internal audiences have wide knowledge and understanding of the initiative. It is recommended that:

1) the announcement will identify specific concerns as outlined in the key findings section of this document

2) the communication will make clear that this is a faculty driven process necessary to address curricular concerns

3) the Provost will communicate with the Deans of each academic unit and explain the importance of this initiative and ask for assistance in identifying members for GEOC.

The Provost’s office will set up a website/Blackboard site that will become the primary access point for communication between the General Education Oversight Committee, faculty and administration as the process of general educational review progresses. The site will contain the relevant documents related to general education revision, minutes from GEOC meetings, feedback from faculty and students, etc. The GEOC will ensure that the communications site is updated regularly and will provide ongoing communication with faculty and students.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GOVERNANCE AND RATIFICATION:

Establish a Governance Structure to Oversee General Education Reform that starts with a transitional phase,

**Phase 1(2010-2013):**

UMKC must respond to HLC mandates regarding our general education program(s) and prepare for the HLC site visit in 2013. To do so, the Provost will commission an ad hoc General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC). This committee will have a single charge: to develop a general education program (including an assessment plan) for UMKC that not only will bring it in compliance with HLC expectations but also will be a signature UMKC program that emphasizes student success and builds on faculty expertise and that strengthens UMKC’s degree programs and supports UMKC’s Mission. The membership of GEOC will consist of one representative from each
School, except for the College of Arts and Sciences who has three representatives (one from each academic division). Among these, or in addition to, there should be three members of the Faculty Senate, and three members from the 2009 General Education Advisory Task Force. These members will serve from Fall 2010 through Spring 2013. The Provost should call the first meeting of GEOC in the second week of classes in Fall 2010. At this meeting, the members will elect a Chair and set their working agenda.

The work of the GEOC will include the adoption of outcomes for general education, development of a curricular mapping, devising a set of assessment activities to monitor student achievement, and to adopt programmatic changes if warranted. Specific steps and dates are outlined in the section on Ratification. The work of GEOC will involve and entail:

1) Reviewing the reports on general education at UMKC from the General Education Task Force and from the AAC&U Institute Team

2) Reviewing current national perspectives regarding general education experiences for undergraduate students in higher education

3) Reviewing current practices in the state of Missouri regarding entrance and exit competencies and consider this work in the revision of the UMKC general education requirements

4) Reviewing any additional material to assist in the development of an outstanding general education program

5) Consulting with the Provost’s Office, the Office of Assessment, and unit advising offices

6) Engaging with the university campus in discussions regarding the revision of UMKC’s general education program

7) Placing student engagement at the forefront of general education plans

8) Integrating concerns for student recruitment and retention into the general education plans.
Phase 2 (2013-__):

Once the transitional phase of general education revision has been completed, the ad hoc General Education Oversight Committee will be dissolved and all its oversight duties and responsibilities will be distributed to the following faculty bodies, which will have authority and oversight duties over the university’s curriculum and establishing and assessing the degree requirements, including general education requirements.

1) Faculty Senate has authority over university-wide degree requirements, including general education requirements

2) Academic units have authority over school-wide (college-wide) degree requirements, including any additional general education requirements for the specific unit.

3) Academic departments have authority over program degree requirements

CREATE A RATIFICATION PLAN TO ENSURE ALL ACADEMIC UNITS HAVE VOICE IN GENERAL EDUCATION REFORM

Phase 1 (2010-2013):

At the first meeting of the GEOC, the AAC&U Institute Team shares the draft student learning outcomes for the general education program.

By October 15, 2010, GEOC proposes student learning outcomes for general education, and submits these learning outcomes to the academic units for ratification and adoption (the ratification process must be finalized by December 15, 2010).

It is strongly recommended that an assessment process will be piloted as soon as consensus appears to exist on one general education outcome: for this outcome, an assessment plan should be devised and piloted, preferably during the Spring 2011 semester.
By February 15, 2011, GEOC develops a model of UMKC’s general education program, built around the ratified learning outcomes, and submits the model to academic units for ratification and adoption (the ratification process must be finalized by May 15, 2011).

By October 1, 2011, GEOC develops an implementation plan for the UMKC’s “new” general education model, and all campus units begin the implementation process.

From Fall 2011 through Spring 2013, GEOC will ensure that the “new” general education model (including its specified assessment actions) is appropriately implemented throughout the campus.

**Phase 2 (2013-____):**

Once the first phase of general education revision has been completed, all responsibilities for the development and assessment of UMKC’s General Education Program, as well as for the continuation of ratification, adoption and implementation of revisions to this program, fall to the faculty bodies as stated in the Governance Plan.

**RECOMMENDED COMMUNICATION PLAN**

**COMMUNICATION GOALS:**

1) To ensure communication to all stakeholders and to provide quick and easy access to the step-by-step process of general education review and revision.

2) To ensure active participation of all faculty in the review and revision of general education.

3) To allow all stakeholders an effective method to communicate with the GEOC and to provide feedback on general education proposals.

4) To promote general education as a core benefit to all students.

5) To explain the need for general education revision and specific concerns with the current general education program.
o Needs to be updated to reflect student educational needs.

o The need to ensure a common general education experience.

o The need to identify specific measurable learning outcomes to comply with the HLC report.

o The need to ensure that our general education curriculum does not create unnecessary obstacles to degree completion.

6) To foster an ongoing discussion of the role of general education.

7) To ensure that our general education program reflects the unique mission and goals of UMKC.

AUDIENCES

Primary Audiences

Faculty
Students
Advisors
Support Staff

Secondary Audiences

Alumni
Employers
Transfer Institutions

Tertiary Audiences

Kansas City Community

COMMUNICATION CHANNELS

- Face to Face Communication
- Electronic Communication
- Print Communication
ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS BY CHANNEL

**Face to Face Communication**
- Dean’s Council, provost to discuss with deans
- Chairs Meetings
- Unit Faculty Meetings
- Department Meetings
- Staff Meetings
- Strategic Enrollment Management Team
- Town Hall Meetings
- Faculty Senate Meetings
- Advising Forum
- Unit Advisor Meetings
- Curriculum Committee Meetings
- Graduate Council
- Staff Council
- Student Government

**Electronic Channels**
- Web/Blackboard Site: General Education Oversight Committee
- Provost site/Blog
- Links to University A-Z listing
- Student Affairs Website
- Pathway access page
- University Search
- UMatters
- Mass Emails
- Selected emails via blackboard

**Print Channels**
- Unews
- UMKC Student Newspaper
- Limit print communications to reduce costs
Partnerships

All Undergraduate Academic Units
Unit Academic Curriculum Committees
Undergraduate Curriculum Committees
Faculty Senate
Chairs and Deans
Provost’s Office
Chancellor’s Office

RECOMMENDED STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES FOR GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

The currently proposed list of outcomes is reasonable and appropriate and should be adopted as the working model, although slight changes could turn out to be beneficial as the entire process becomes better defined during the ratification phase.

Student Learning Outcomes for General Education

1. Build Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World by
   - using the scientific method to investigate the physical and natural world
   - developing inter-cultural knowledge and competence
   - historicizing cultural developments in the arts, the social sciences, and the sciences
   - making inter-disciplinary connections between the arts, the social sciences, and the sciences

2. Develop Intellectual Abilities and Practical Skills, including
   - effective written and oral communication
   - critical thinking
- quantitative literacy
- information literacy
- problem-shaping and problem-solving strategies
- collaborative engagement

3. Develop Personal and Social Responsibility with emphases on
   - civic and political engagement
   - ethical reasoning
   - global awareness
   - social diversity
   - artistic expression

4. Develop Integrative Learning by
   - incorporating the Intellectual Abilities and Practical Skills noted above in all general education coursework
RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Every committee working on implementing (and executing) this effort should have access to the booklet “Revising General Education – And Avoiding the Potholes”, written by Paul Gaston and Jerry Gaff, and published by AAC&U. Other pertinent information could be gleaned from http://www.wascsenior.org/findit/files/forms. In particular, the document Rubric_for_Assessing_Campus_General_Education_Assessment_Efforts_5_09.pdf is extremely relevant for our UMKC efforts. These are the ‘rubrics’ used by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (the western equivalent of our HLC), when they evaluate the assessment plans for the colleges they review. Other relevant materials can be found on their web-site as well, such as rubrics for program review, learning outcomes, and capstones.

Even before the GEOC formally proposes the student learning outcomes for general education, the first group of constituents and stakeholders indicated below (and to a lesser extend the second and third group as well) will be provided with informational material on the value of expressing and formulating the general education competencies in terms of student learning outcomes (student centered learning versus teaching, and the implications of such a shift). In particular, the first group will be informed of the several planned phases and steps and invited to be involved in the process either through direct contributions, or by passing their thoughts and contributions to the unit’s representative. It is important that many of these understand the reason behind the initiative, and several small group meetings or communications are preferred over a few large group meetings. Furthermore, it is not realistic that all stakeholders understand the issues and implications fully with only one meeting or one report.

Once the student learning outcomes for general education have been formally proposed by the GEOC, the plan must be executed and implemented in several concurrent phases and steps, according to various groups of constituents and key stakeholders. Each group will be informed (the message across groups must be consistent although it should be a different message) and invited to participate, if appropriate. The constituents typically fall into three broad categories, and each category plays a critical role.
1. **Those on the operational side of outcomes and outcomes assessment**
(such as faculty and staff who provide the curricular and co-curricular experiences, as well as the operational units that may be charged with tracking the progress). This group will collectively be most involved and there are several steps:

a. The student learning outcomes for general education that the GEOC will propose should be adopted as the working model. However, as the entire process becomes better defined and a curricular mapping and an assessment plan is being developed, it will become clear that adopting slight changes in the proposed student learning outcomes will be beneficial.

b. A curricular mapping will be developed indicating which curricular or co-curricular activities students could use that will allow them to demonstrate the level of achievement toward the (proposed) student learning outcomes for general education. Some curricular alignment (and/or fine tuning of outcomes) can be expected. The different levels of achievement could be the scaffold that structures the curriculum.

c. Once such a mapping comes into focus, an actual assessment plan will be developed, keeping in mind that there are various ways to arrive at a good, realistic plan that can be piloted on a fairly short time, and that can be developed with a general consensus of the faculty and staff. The mapping and the assessment plan is likely the result of several incremental changes reflecting good ideas brought forth by the several faculty groups. The assessment plan will include a rotation schedule indicating the semesters when the various outcomes will be measured. Established and sustainable assessment techniques uses sampling of student work, sampling over various semesters and sampling over the different ways that students could demonstrate their achievements. UMKC's assessment plan should follow this technique, where only a few general education outcomes will be assessed and evaluated in a particular semester, and different outcomes are assessed during the next semester, so that every outcome is evaluated no less than once every few years (say 4 or 5). Of course, should an evaluation suggest changes in curriculum or offering, then the assessment of this particular outcome should be repeated to show the effectiveness of the change.

A plan where assessment of all student learning outcomes of general education is spread over several semesters is sustainable.
d. An important task of the GEOC is evaluating the extent at which our students have attained the student learning outcomes of general education, and with making recommendations for adopting programmatic improvements or practices. Ultimately, this is main task of the committee in the second and permanent phase.

During the steps a, b, and c, it is recommended that various faculty and staff are present with a fair amount of assessment experience or insight who could answer the numerous questions that will arise. Having various webinars, workshops, or even using a consultant is recommended to guide the process and to keep the process moving along according to the suggested timeline. Finally, faculty and staff who are at the front line and who are willing to implement curricular alignments or implement co-curricular experiences or pilot assessment practices should be given the opportunity to prepare themselves and should be recognized appropriately. (Or even rewarded with a TA support, reduced teaching load, or otherwise, professional development time/moneys)

2. **Those who are served by the outcomes and outcomes assessment activities** (mainly current students, and more importantly future students, while recent graduates should not be forgotten). This means that the various outreach offices, admissions offices, advising offices, study abroad office, and others that form a primary interface with students in navigating the curricular framework and other educational opportunities. Having press releases or other forms of communications to inform both the campus community and the community at large should be given strong consideration.

3. **Those who are the primary users of outcomes assessment** (faculty and staff who assess the extent at which the student learning outcomes of general education are attained, and the various governing bodies of curricular and co-curricular offerings, such as the GEOC (or its successor) for discussion and potential action for changes and their potential implementation. Since general education is an important component in all undergraduate program offerings, all curricular oversight committees at the various departments need to be updated as well, so that they can study the potential impact on the undergraduate degree offerings. These groups need to be prepared to accept their roles and responsibilities in this regard.

Again, webinars, workshops, or a consultant is recommended.
A task force of faculty developed a proposed set of general education learning outcomes. These outcomes were presented to each academic unit and modifications were made. Approval of the general education outcomes required a majority vote in favor of the outcomes in each academic unit.

After the general education outcomes were established, instructors could propose courses to meet general education outcomes. Students could take any approved course that satisfied a general education objective.

The task force developed a process for approving general education courses.

This group presented the proposed process to all units on campus. As they received feedback, revisions were made to the proposed process.

The process of approving general education courses was approved and implemented after the majority of faculty in each unit voted in favor of the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL)</th>
<th>Indiana University Purdue University of Indiana (IUPUI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A task force of faculty developed a proposed set of general education learning outcomes. These outcomes were presented to each academic unit and modifications were made. Approval of the general education outcomes required a majority vote in favor of the outcomes in each academic unit.</td>
<td>The general education learning outcomes were developed and approved by the faculty council (our faculty senate) for the campus. Degree programs could then identify which courses would satisfy the general education outcomes for their degree program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the general education outcomes were established, instructors could propose courses to meet general education outcomes. Students could take any approved course that satisfied a general education objective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The task force developed a process for approving general education courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This group presented the proposed process to all units on campus. As they received feedback, revisions were made to the proposed process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process of approving general education courses was approved and implemented after the majority of faculty in each unit voted in favor of the process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IMPLICATIONS OF THE UNL AND IUPUI GENERAL EDUCATION REFORM MODELS FOR ASSESSMENT AND COURSE INCLUSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who collects evidence that general education outcomes are met (e.g., samples of student work)?</th>
<th>UNL</th>
<th>IUPUI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course instructor</td>
<td>Course instructor AND Every degree program with students enrolled in the course to meet requirements for their degree program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who decides if course outcomes meet general education outcomes?</th>
<th>UNL</th>
<th>IUPUI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course instructor AND University oversight committee</td>
<td>Academic Unit responsible for setting general education requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applying general education reform process models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNL</th>
<th>IUPUI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course instructor/course coordinator determines which general education objectives are being met.</td>
<td>Units/degree programs determine which courses will meet general education objectives for their majors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course instructor creates assessments and collects evidence demonstrating that the assessments are valid indicators of achievement of the general education learning objectives.</td>
<td>As part of program evaluation, each unit/degree program collects samples of their students’ work and demonstrates that those assessments are valid indicators of meeting general education objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course instructor administers course evaluations and shares results with the university oversight committee.</td>
<td>Each unit/degree program administers course evaluations to their students enrolled in any course that has been approved to meet general education objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course instructor reacts to course evaluations and documents any modifications to course when relevant.</td>
<td>Each unit/degree program provides course evaluation feedback to the course instructor AND instructor provides each unit/degree program a plan for improvement when negative evaluations are received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course instructor works with university oversight committee to address any problems.</td>
<td>Each unit/degree program tracks remediation of problems in the course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University oversight committee determines if course should be removed from options to meet general education objectives.</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each unit removes course from list of options to meet general education objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POTENTIAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR UMKC: HYBRID MODEL
(MIX OF IUPUI AND UNL APPROACH)

University oversight committee is appointed by the faculty senate and

1. Solicits courses for review

2. Approves courses that meet (one or more) general education outcomes

3. Reviews sample artifacts of student work (e.g. portfolios, tests, essays, video clips, etc.) from courses as evidence of achievement of learning outcomes

4. When weaknesses are identified, the committee works with the course instructor/course coordinator to address weaknesses or removes course from approved list of general education courses

Each unit/degree program can recommend which approved courses for each general education objective will be acceptable for their degree program**

** (This remains a problem for students transferring between academic units/degree program – there was not Team agreement on this recommendation—this is not a change from the current practice)

Course instructors are responsible for all assessment activities (collecting evidence of achievement of general education objectives and reporting this evidence)

University oversight committee is responsible for reviewing course assessments and evidence of student learning outcomes (e.g., tests, projects, portfolios) and certifying a course meets a particular general education student learning outcome