
USF St. Petersburg Faculty Senate Committee: General Education: Meetings USF St. Petersburg Faculty Senate Committee: General Education

12-13-2013

General Education Committee Meeting : 2013 : 12 : 13

General Education Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fac_senate_committees_gen_ed_meetings

Scholar Commons Citation

General Education Committee, "General Education Committee Meeting : 2013 : 12 : 13" (2013). *USF St. Petersburg Faculty Senate Committee: General Education: Meetings*. 59.
https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fac_senate_committees_gen_ed_meetings/59

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by the USF St. Petersburg Faculty Senate Committee: General Education at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in USF St. Petersburg Faculty Senate Committee: General Education: Meetings by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Agenda

Friday December 13 Davis 100 10 am

Committee Members:

1. Kathy Arthur, Chair
2. Deni Elliott (Arts and Sciences)
3. Kathy Carvalho-Knighton (Arts and Sciences)
4. Gary Austin (Library) excused
5. David John (Arts and Sciences) excused
6. Deanna Michael (Education)
7. Morgan Gresham (Arts and Sciences)
8. Hugh LaFollette (Arts and Sciences) excused
9. Adrian O'Connor (Arts and Sciences)
10. Rick Smith (Business)

Attached documents

- o Draft of Nov. 22 minutes
- o SACs GE documents concerning distance learning
- o SACs GE & Online assessment documents
- o Course Certification document
- o Current Assessment document

AGENDA

10:00-10:10- Minutes from Nov. 22 approval

10:10-10:30- Chair and Committee updates

- Nov. 22, 2013 Senate vote approved campus-wide vote for GE SLOs and Philosophy
- Nov. 25-Dec. 6 Faculty Wide Vote by eligible voting faculty Vote on SLOs and Philosophy Results

	PHILOSOPHY		STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
ED (15)	5	0	5	0
BUS	11	2	11	2
CAS (62)	24	2	25	0
LIB (7)	6	0	6	0
Total (84+)	46	4	47	2

- State Steering Committee Wed. Dec 4 4-5pm with Linda Crossman
No changes in course list or subject areas proposed
- System GE Meeting Dec. 12, 2013 summary
- Fall 2013 Assessment Collection and Webpage content changed to reflect current GE Chair collecting assessment
- Spring 2013 Assessment Collection
- ENC 1101 & 1102 Assessment?
- PHI 2010 for next meeting
- Status of Assessment Tool

- Set Spring Schedule

10:30-11:00- Course Certification Process- CAS Chair Questions based on Dec. 4, 2013 meeting with Chairs to review process

- All parts of Application form for recycled courses?
- Course levels limited to 1000-2000 for all courses?
- Online and hybrid course restrictions?

11:30-12:00- Assessment

Document outlining current Assessment plan
Thoughts on Drafting 2015 Assessment plan

Spring Topics

Course Distribution of USFSP GE hours

Title of GE program?

Assessment Method/plan

Course Application Reviews

MINUTES

Minutes from Nov. 22 approved

Nov. 22, 2013 K. Arthur met with USFSP Faculty Senate

- o FC vote approved campus-wide vote for GE SLOs and Philosophy
- o VC Fueyo will ensure that the Course application form is posted on UC, GE, and Academic Affairs website. K. Arthur confirms it is posted, now request that the form be posted on CAS, BUS, and Ed Faculty Resource pages

Nov. 25-Dec. 6 Faculty Wide Vote by eligible voting faculty Vote on SLOs and Philosophy Results both the Philosophy and SLO passed the vote

	PHILOSOPHY		STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
ED (15)	5	0	5	0
BUS	11	2	11	2
CAS (62)	24	2	25	0
LIB (7)	6	0	6	0
<u>Total (84+)</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>2</u>

State Steering Committee Wed. Dec 4 4-5pm K. A listened with Linda Crossman to this conference call

No changes in course list or subject areas proposed

Rule added to Communication subject area: Any student who completes a course with an ENC prefix for which ENC x101 is an immediate prerequisite shall be considered to have completed the communication core.

System GE Meeting Dec. 12, 2013

- o Tampa and Sarasota Chairs will forward to us and each other revised SCNS applications for review. USFSP had not developed any of the State required course applications. We are waiting on CHM X020 from Tampa and USFSP. Major change was that outcomes on the applications list only the State outcomes and NOT campus specific SLO. Expectation that we will have faculty agreement on all campuses by Dec. 21 and forward the applications to state in early 2014.

Fall 2013 Assessment Collection

- o email was sent out by K. Arthur requesting assessment to all faculty
- o IR and GE Webpage changed to reflect current GE Chair collecting assessment
- o Academic Affairs confirmed hiring someone parttime to help with assessment data entry in the spring.

ENC 1101 & 1102 Assessment

- o Morgan stated it will be completed by the end of next week.

Status of Assessment Tool- no new updates

Course Certification Process- CAS Chair Questions based on Dec. 4, 2013 meeting with Chairs to review process

- All parts of Application form for recycled courses?

After much discussion the committee decided that for all courses all parts of the application must be completed.

- Course levels limited to 1000-2000 for all courses?

State required courses are mandated by the state to be 1000-2000 level. However, we decided that concerning the USFSP specific courses it would be cumbersome and timely, if we required all courses to be 1000 to 2000, considering we have 17 already on the books. We also came to the consensus, that the course application form will serve as a basis for determining if the course is too specific to be considered GE course and thus there is no need to make a rule.

- Online and hybrid course rules?

SACs requires that distance learning courses the same assessment and content as face to face courses.

We decided we would like to strongly encourage that all courses offered as distance learning are taught face to face periodically. We recognize that programs/departments responsibility to decide scheduling.

- Kathy C. will make a adobe fillable form of the Course Application version.
- Kathy C. will make an outline of a sample syllabus for submission with course application. She will email both to Kathy A.

Gordon Rule

K. Arthur based on discussion at the USF system GE meeting, offered that each USF campus has different Gordon rule word count requirements and that each campus can define their own Gordon rule requirements. We are looking for a copy of the USFSP Gordon Rule requirements—we will ask Linda Crossman, and search for State Senate requirement, Tampa written statement, USFSP Reaffirmation Confirmation 3.5.1 report, USFSP Catalogue and bring these materials together for a discussion at our next meeting. We need to clarify prior to the application deadlines.

Assessment Plan

K. A learned at the SACs meeting that we should have an Assessment Plan document. K.A could not find one and put together a draft that includes text from our Reaffirmation Confirmation 3.5.1 report. We will review and discuss this at our next meeting for confirming and then move forward to draft a new assessment plan for 2015.

Set Spring 2014 Schedule Fridays at 10am Davis 100
Jan 10 (DIFFERENT TIME 12:15), Jan 24, Feb 7, Feb 21, Mar 7, April 4, April 18,
May 2

Spring Topics

Gordon Rule

Course Distribution of USFSP GE hours

Title of GE program?

Assessment Method/plan

Course Application Reviews



Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Colleges
1866 Southern Lane
Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097

DISTANCE AND CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATION

- Policy Statement -

Definition of Distance Education

For the purposes of the Commission on College's accreditation review, distance education is a formal educational process in which the majority of the instruction (interaction between students and instructors and among students) in a course occurs when students and instructors are not in the same place. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous. A distance education course may use the internet; one-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband lines, fiber optics, satellite, or wireless communications devices; audio conferencing; or video cassettes, DVD's, and CD-ROMs if used as part of the distance learning course or program.

Definition of Correspondence Education

Correspondence education is a formal educational process under which the institution provides instructional materials, by mail or electronic transmission, including examinations on the materials, to students who are separated from the instructor. Interaction between the instructor and the student is limited, is not regular and substantive, and is primarily initiated by the student; courses are typically self-paced.

Policy Statements

1. At the time of review by the Commission, the institution demonstrates that the student who registers in a distance or correspondence education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the credit by verifying the identity of a student who participates in class or coursework by using, at the option of the institution, methods such as (1) a secure login and pass code, (2) proctored examinations, and (3) new or other technologies and practices that are effective in verifying student identification.
2. At the time of review by the Commission, the institution demonstrates that it has a written procedure for protecting the privacy of students enrolled in distance and correspondence education courses or programs.
3. At the time of review by the Commission, the institution demonstrates that it has a written procedure distributed at the time of registration or enrollment that notifies students of any projected additional student charges associated with verification of student identity.
4. An institution that offers distance or correspondence education must ensure that it reports accurate headcount enrollment on its annual Institutional Profile submitted to the Commission.
5. Institutions must ensure that their distance and correspondence education courses and programs comply with the *Principles of Accreditation*. This applies to all educational programs and services, wherever located or however delivered.

Guidelines in the Application of the *Principles of Accreditation* To Distance and Correspondence Education

With the underlying concept that the *Principles of Accreditation* apply to all programs of the institution, regardless of mode of delivery, institutions should consider the following guideline statements in implementing and reporting on distance and correspondence education programs.

Mission

If an institution offers significant distance and correspondence education, it should be reflected in the institution's mission.

Curriculum and Instruction

The faculty assumes primary responsibility for and exercises oversight of distance and correspondence education, ensuring both the rigor of programs and the quality of instruction.

The technology used is appropriate to the nature and objectives of the programs and courses and expectations concerning the use of such technology are clearly communicated to students.

Distance and correspondence education policies are clear concerning ownership of materials, faculty compensation, copyright issues, and the use of revenue derived from the creation and production of software, telecourses, or other media products.

Academic support services are appropriate and specifically related to distance and correspondence education.

Program length is appropriate for each of the institution's educational programs, including those offered through distance education and correspondence education.

For all degree programs offered through distance or correspondence education, the programs embody a coherent course of study that is compatible with the institution's mission and is based upon fields of study appropriate to higher education.

For all courses offered through distance or correspondence education, the institution employs sound and acceptable practices for determining the amount and level of credit awarded and justifies the use of a unit other than semester credit hours by explaining its equivalency.

An institution entering into consortial arrangements or contractual agreements for the delivery of courses/programs or services offered by distance or correspondence education is an active participant in ensuring the effectiveness and quality of the courses/programs offered by all of the participants.

Faculty

An institution offering distance or correspondence learning courses/programs ensures that there is a sufficient number of faculty qualified to develop, design, and teach the courses/programs.

The institution has clear criteria for the evaluation of faculty teaching distance education courses and programs.

Faculty who teach in distance and correspondence education programs and courses receive appropriate training.

Institutional Effectiveness

Comparability of distance and correspondence education programs to campus-based programs and courses is ensured by the evaluation of educational effectiveness, including assessments of student learning outcomes, student retention, and student satisfaction.

The institution regularly assesses the effectiveness of its provision of library/learning resources and student support services for distance or correspondence education students.

Library and Learning Resources

Students have access to and can effectively use appropriate library resources.

Access is provided to laboratories, facilities, and equipment appropriate to the courses or programs

Student Services

Students have adequate access to the range of services appropriate to support the programs offered through distance and correspondence education.

Students in distance or correspondence programs have an adequate procedure for resolving their complaints, and the institution follows its policies and procedures.

Advertising, recruiting, and admissions information adequately and accurately represent the programs, requirements, and services available to students.

Documented procedures assure that security of personal information is protected in the conduct of assessments and evaluations and in the dissemination of results.

Students enrolled in distance education courses are able to use the technology employed, have the equipment necessary to succeed, and are provided assistance in using the technology employed.

Facilities and Finances

Appropriate equipment and technical expertise required for distance and correspondence education are available.

The institution, in making distance and correspondence education courses/programs a part of its mission, provides adequate funding for faculty, staff, services, and technological infrastructure to support the methodology.

Document History

*Adopted: Commission on Colleges, June 1997
Updated in accord with the revised Principles, December 2006
Revised: SACSCOC Board of Trustees: June 2010
Edited: January 2012*



Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Colleges
1866 Southern Lane
Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097

Guidelines for Addressing Distance and Correspondence Education

A Guide for Evaluators Charged with Reviewing Distance and Correspondence Education

This Guide provides assistance for committee members when preparing to serve as evaluators of distance and correspondence education. It should be used in conjunction with the *Principles of Accreditation*, the *Resource Manual*, and the *Handbook for Peer Evaluators* as well as the Commission policy “Distance and Correspondence Education.” It is divided into four sections:

1. An Overview of Commission Expectations
2. Commission Definitions, Standards, and Policies
3. Distance and Correspondence Program Review Activities
 - The design of the review
 - Key persons to be interviewed
 - Generic questions related to distance and correspondence education programs being reviewed
 - Expectations and questions related to standards and requirements of the *Principles*
4. The Application of Findings

An Overview of Expectations

Accreditation is a higher education self-regulatory mechanism that plays a significant role in fostering public confidence in the educational enterprise and student learning, in maintaining minimum standards, and in enhancing institutional effectiveness. It also serves as a means by which institutions recognize and accept one another.

Accreditation’s review process involves making collective professional judgments. The committee’s responsibility is to provide an objective professional judgment to the Commission’s Board of Trustees and to the institution as to (1) the

institution's status of compliance with the *Principles of Accreditation* and (2) the quality and acceptability of the institution's Quality Enhancement Plan (applicable to reaffirmations). The committee also provides advice on other areas of educational improvement.

The role of the evaluator is to examine the institution's mission, policies, procedures, programs, resources and activities that relate to one or more sections or subsections of the *Principles* and then bring to the full committee the findings and any proposed recommendations and comments. To do that, the evaluator will carefully review the institutional documents, interview faculty, staff, and students, and gather information that will enable the evaluator to provide an accurate assessment of the institution.

A committee member is responsible for the following:

- Preparing extensively for the visit/review by studying all training materials, reviewing the institution's documents and materials, studying the *Principles*, and becoming familiar with the specific assignment to review distance and correspondence learning.
- Participating in all scheduled or special meetings of the committee, including those arranged before the actual review period/visit
- Applying the standards to the institution's distance and correspondence education programs and services as well as providing input regarding the application of the other standards.
- Coordinating input from other committee members assigned to review various aspects of distance and correspondence education.
- Contributing to the committee's collective decisions.
- Developing and writing, or revising and updating, assigned sections of the committee report.

Commission Definitions, Standards, and Policies

The Core Requirements, Comprehensive Standards, and Federal Requirements of the *Principles of Accreditation* apply to distance and correspondence education as well as other, more "traditional" methods of delivery. Institutions are responsible for the quality of programs and courses delivered by means of distance education and for ensuring that distance and correspondence education programs offered are complemented by support structures and resources that allow for the total growth and development of students.

The Commission expects institutions to not only meet the *Principles* as applied to distance learning, but also to comply with all related Commission policies. Outlined below is the definition for distance and correspondence education and a summary of policy statements and standards related to distance and correspondence education.

Definition of Distance Education. For the purposes of the Commission on College's accreditation review, distance education is a formal educational process in which the majority of the instruction (interaction between students and instructors and among students) in a course occurs when students and instructors are not in the same place.

Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous. A distance education course may use the internet; one-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband lines, fiber optics, satellite, or wireless communications devices; audio conferencing; or video cassettes, DVD's, and CD-ROMs if used as part of the distance learning course or program.

Definition of Correspondence Education. Correspondence education is a formal educational process under which the institution provides instructional materials, by mail or electronic transmission, including examinations on the materials, to students who are separated from the instructor. Interaction between the instructor and the student is limited, is not regular and substantive, and is primarily initiated by the student; courses are typically self-paced.

Policy Statements and Standards.

1. At the time of review by the Commission, the institution must demonstrate that the student who registers in a distance or correspondence education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the credit by verifying the identity of a student who participates in class or coursework by using, at the option of the institution, methods such as (1) a secure login and pass code, (2) proctored examinations, and (3) new or other technologies and practices that are effective in verifying student identification. (*Note: This applies to courses in which the majority of instruction occurs when students and instructor are not in the same place.*)(See also Federal Requirement 4.8. of the *Principles of Accreditation.*)
2. The institution must have a written procedure for protecting the privacy of students enrolled in distance and correspondence education courses or programs. (See also Federal Requirement 4.8. of the *Principles of Accreditation.*)
3. The institution must have a written procedure distributed at the time of registration or enrollment that notifies students of any projected additional student charges associated with verification of student identity. (*Note: The publication of fees may also be incorporated into official student documents or institution's web page that list academic/activities fees for students.*) (See also Federal Requirement 4.8. of the *Principles of Accreditation.*)
4. An institution that offers distance or correspondence education must ensure that it reports accurate headcount enrollment on its annual Institutional Profile submitted to the Commission.
5. Institutions must ensure that their distance and correspondence education courses and programs comply with the *Principles of Accreditation*. This applies to all educational programs and services, wherever located or however delivered.

Distance and Correspondence Program Review Activities

The Design of the Review

The design of the review is dependent on a number of factors, some of which include:

1. ***Accountability for the delivery and quality of programs.*** Consider whether the accountability for the quality of distance learning courses and programs is centralized or decentralized. Is there one office that coordinates the development and quality of distance learning courses/programs or is the accountability decentralized by academic departments or schools? By another means?
2. ***Scope of the programs.*** Consider the geographical scope of courses and programs offered through distance and correspondence education. Review design might include (1) the review of one site of a similar group of distance learning activities and (2) the review of multiple sites of distance learning activities geographically remote from the main campus (by direct visit, interaction by electronic conferencing, telephone, questionnaire distributed in advance of visit, etc.
3. ***The extent of course work/programs.*** Consider the number and variety of courses/programs involved where the majority of instruction occurs when students and instructors are not in the same place.
4. ***Modes of delivery.*** Consider the various modes of instruction offered through technology and student access to those delivery modes.
5. ***Access to information regarding the programs.*** Consider all information provided by the institution in advance of the review and determine additional information needed to successfully inform evaluators of the courses/programs.

Key Persons to be Interviewed

The distance learning evaluator should review carefully the organizational chart of the institution and study the administrative structure created for the accountability of distance learning activities. Who is accountable for distance learning activities? Although the persons to be evaluated depend on the structure, size, and scope of distance learning activities, the people who should be considered for interviews are:

- Students currently in the programs
- Students who have completed one or more distance learning courses
- Main campus deans and directors responsible for distance learning activities, including those responsible for evaluating student learning
- Main campus faculty and student support and librarians/learning resource personnel involved in the distance learning activities
- Off-site deans, directors, coordinators, faculty, librarians and administrators
- Operational people, such as academic and student services (even though they are neither the driving force behind the programs nor the persons accountable for the quality of programs)

Generic Questions Related to the Distance and Correspondence Education Programs being Reviewed

Before beginning the review, the evaluator should have received information from the institution that addresses the following questions:

- What distance and correspondence learning courses and programs are being offered?
- What are the modes of delivery for the programs? The description should include hybrids of online/face-to-face, etc.
- Where are they offered?
- Why did the institution choose to offer these programs through a distance learning mode?
- Who are responsible for the academic and administrative coordination of the programs?
- Who are “teaching” the courses? Are the faculty of record the same faculty employed by the institution?

If the evaluator is unclear as to the answers to the above questions, then he/she should contact the committee chair so that sufficient background is provided in order for evaluators to begin their reviews.

Expectations and Questions related to the standards and requirements of the *Principles*

The Commission on Colleges bases its accreditation of degree-granting higher education institutions on requirements outlined in the *Principles of Accreditation*. These requirements apply to all institutional programs and services, wherever located or however delivered. This includes programs offered through distance and correspondence education. Consequently, member and candidate institutions completing a compliance certification or receiving a committee visit and applicant institutions completing an application for membership should at a minimum address the following areas.

Mission

Expectations: If an institution offers significant distance and correspondence education, it should be reflected in the institution’s mission.

Questions: Is there evidence that the governing board has been involved in the decision to include distance education courses or programs as a part of the institution’s mission?

Are distance learning programs part of the mission statement of the institution? How does the mission of distance learning “fit” the overall mission of the institution?

Is there evidence of understanding on the part of the governing board, the administration, and the faculty concerning how extensive distance education should become?

Organizational Structure

Expectations: Administrative responsibility for all educational programs, including the offering of distance education courses and programs, should be reflected in the organizational structure of the institution.

Questions: What is the administrative structure responsible for the quality of distance learning programs? Does the institution maintain control over distance education programs?

Does the organizational chart for the institution indicate responsibility for distance education?

Does the organizational structure at the institution reflect the relationship between courses/programs offered in traditional formats and courses/programs offered by distance education?

Institutional Effectiveness

Expectations: Comparability of distance and correspondence education programs to campus-based programs and courses is ensured by the evaluation of educational effectiveness, including assessments of student learning outcomes, student retention, and student satisfaction.

The institution regularly assesses the effectiveness of its provision of library/learning resources and student support services for distance or correspondence education students.

Questions: How do distance learning programs fit into the overall plans of the institution?

Who directs the development, planning, and evaluation of distance learning programs? To what extent are faculty members involved?

Has the institution implemented a plan for the collection of data relating to its distance learning programs? Is the collected data used in the planning and evaluation process? Are the research activities for collecting data regularly evaluated?

Is there evidence that outcomes for the program have been identified?

Is there evidence that the effectiveness of the distance education program is regularly assessed and steps taken for improvement of the program? Is the evaluation plan part of a broader institutional plan?

Has the institution developed student learning competencies for the courses/programs offered by distance education? If these are the same competencies for courses/programs offered by “traditional” methodologies, is assessment identified for distance learning students separate from students taking courses by “traditional” methodologies?

Curriculum and Instruction

Expectations:

The faculty assumes primary responsibility for and exercises oversight of distance and correspondence education, ensuring both the rigor of programs and the quality of instruction.

The technology used is appropriate to the nature and objectives of the programs and courses and expectations concerning the use of such technology are clearly communicated to students.

Distance and correspondence education policies are clear concerning ownership of materials, faculty compensation, copyright issues, and the use of revenue derived from the creation and production of software, telecourses, or other media products.

Academic support services are appropriate and specifically related to distance and correspondence education.

Program length is appropriate for each of the institution’s educational programs, including those

offered through distance education and correspondence education.

For all degree programs offered through distance or correspondence education, the programs embody a coherent course of study that supports the institution's mission and is based upon fields of study appropriate to higher education.

For all courses offered through distance or correspondence education, the institution employs sound and acceptable practices for determining the amount and level of credit awarded and justifies the use of a unit other than semester credit hours by explaining its equivalency.

An institution entering into consortial arrangements or contractual agreements for the delivery of courses/programs or services offered by distance or correspondence education is an active participant in ensuring the effectiveness and quality of the courses/programs offered by all of the participants.

The institution's curriculum designed for distance learning is directly related and appropriate to the mission of the institution.

The institution makes available to students current academic calendars, grading practices, and refund policies.

Questions:

How appropriate are the delivery systems for the programs being offered?

Are admissions, degree completion, curriculum, and instructional design policies and procedures the same as those used for traditional campus-based programs?

Does the institution contract for the delivery of instruction of any or all of its distance learning program with an outside party? Do the contracts provide for quality control by the institution awarding credit for the distance learning course or program? Are provisions of the agreement, contract, or arrangement clearly delineated? Is there provision for regular evaluation of the effectiveness of the arrangement?

Are goals and objectives, and skills and competencies for distance learning programs comparable to those expected for traditional campus-based programs?

Does the administrative structure for provision of distance education courses/programs appropriately involve faculty as well as administrators? What role do the academic departments play in the design and coordination of courses?

Are faculty members in distance learning programs also involved in curriculum development, in coordinating syllabi, and in preparing comprehensive examinations?

Is there appropriate technological assistance for faculty charged with developing distance education courses/programs?

If “outside experts” develop and provide distance education courses/programs, what is the role of the institution’s faculty?

Are the technological delivery modes, instructional design, and resource materials appropriate for the courses and programs? Does the technology used enhance student learning?

Does the institution provide adequate technology for its distance education courses and does it upgrade the technology as needed?

Does the institution make training in technology available to faculty members teaching distance education courses?

Is assistance in use of required technology provided to distance education students who need it?

Faculty

Expectations:

An institution offering distance or correspondence learning courses/programs ensures that there is a sufficient number of faculty qualified to develop, design, and teach the courses/programs.

The institution has clear criteria for the evaluation of faculty teaching distance education courses and programs.

Faculty who teach in distance and correspondence education programs and courses receive appropriate training.

Questions:

What role is expected of faculty members relative to distance education courses/programs?

Are there policies concerning the expectations of full and part time faculty planning for, designing, and teaching distance education courses? What is the percentage of full-time/part-time faculty who are involved in courses/programs designated as distance and correspondence education?

Is there evidence that consideration is given to the demands of teaching distance learning courses and do faculty loads reflect this consideration?

What procedures are in place to ensure communication between faculty and students?

What are the defined qualifications for faculty members teaching distance education courses? How does the institution ensure that faculty are qualified to teach those courses?

Is there evidence that the institution has considered the differences between teaching distance education courses and teaching courses offered using “traditional” methodologies?

Does the institution regularly evaluate the effectiveness of faculty members who teach distance education courses? Are the criteria clear for evaluating distance education faculty?

How does the institution orient and train faculty for teaching in these programs?

Does the institution make professional development activities and training available to distance education faculty members and ensure that distance education faculty members engage in that training and professional development?

Is there evaluation of faculty members teaching distance education courses? Is there a clear understanding among distance education faculty members concerning expectations and criteria for evaluation? Does the institution publish its criteria for evaluation of and expectations concerning the teaching of distance education courses? Is there evidence in faculty files of evaluation of distance education faculty members using established and published criteria?

What is the interaction that occurs between students and faculty in these programs and how is the quality of interaction perceived by faculty and students?

Library\Learning Resources

Expectations:

Students have access to and can effectively use appropriate library and learning resources supporting distance learning activities.

Access is provided to laboratories, facilities, and equipment appropriate to the courses or programs

Questions:

What arrangements has the institution made for ensuring that students have access to appropriate learning resources? Are the resources adequate to support the programs?

What learning resources are available to distance education students?

How are distance education students made aware of the available learning resources?

Do distance education students have access to professional assistance at times when they are likely to need assistance?

How does the institution know that its provision of resources and assistance to distance learning students is adequate?

Does the institution make available to distance education students information concerning what will be needed to access learning resources for their enrolled distance education courses?

Does the institution provide regularly scheduled orientation sessions for distance education students?

Is data available indicating that provision of learning resources to distance education is effective and that it is regularly evaluated and improved where appropriate?

Student Support Services

Expectations:

Students have adequate access to the range of services appropriate to support the programs offered through distance and correspondence education.

Students in distance or correspondence programs have an adequate procedure for resolving their complaints, and the institution follows its policies and procedures.

Advertising, recruiting, and admissions information adequately and accurately represent the programs, requirements, and services available to students.

Documented procedures assure that security of personal information is protected in the conduct of assessments and evaluations and in the dissemination of results.

Students enrolled in distance education courses are able to use the technology employed, have the equipment necessary to succeed, and are provided assistance in using the technology employed.

Questions:

Has the institution made appropriate and necessary adjustments to ensure adequate student development services for students involved in distance learning programs? Is there a supervisor responsible for ensuring such services?

Does the institution have a sufficient number of trained student service personnel to ensure provision of appropriate support in such areas as admissions or counseling?

Does the institution have a sufficient number of trained academic support personnel to ensure provision of academic assistance needed by distance education students?

Does the institution ensure that services are available?

Does the institution provide distance education students with material indicating student services and academic services which are available to them and how to access the services?

How does the institution identify distance education students who need academic assistance and how does it intervene to provide that assistance?

Is there data that demonstrates achievement by distance education students of learning outcomes established by the institution?

Facilities and Finances

Expectations:

The institution provides appropriate facilities, equipment, and technical expertise required for distance and correspondence education.

The institution, in making distance and correspondence education courses/programs a part of its mission, provides adequate funding for faculty, staff, services, and technological infrastructure to support the methodology.

Questions:

Does the budget reflect provision of funding for needs of distance education at the institution to include technology, faculty, staff, administrative personnel, learning resources, and services? Are the funding needs reflected in the annual budget and in long-range budgetary projections for the institution?

Are the technological resources, means of delivery, and other physical resources available, maintained, staffed, and current?

Are there sufficient financial resources available and committed to support distance learning activities and how is it supported by the budget?

Is there a financial plan for maintaining the support systems needed for the programs, including upgrading systems currently being used and maintaining currency of technological delivery?

What arrangements has the institution made for required laboratories, workshops, etc. associated with distance learning programs?

Federal Requirements

Expectation 1:

The institution is expected to provide distance education students with processes by which they can submit complaints.

Questions:

Do distance education students know how they may file a complaint and receive feedback on resolution of the complaint? Is there a process by which a distance education student may file a complaint and receive response within a reasonable time is provided to the student upon registration?

Does documentation exist indicating that institutions are responsive to student complaints and to resolving the complaint within a reasonable time period?

Expectation 2:

All recruitment materials accurately represent the institution's practices and policies.

Questions:

Who is responsible for ensuring the accuracy of materials used for the recruitment of students? What is the process for maintaining accuracy? Are requirement materials accurate?

Expectation 3:

An institution that offers distance or correspondence education demonstrates that the student who registers in a distance or correspondence education course or programs is the same student who

participates in and completes the course or program and receives the credit by verifying the identity of a student who participates in class or coursework by using such methods as (1) a secure login and pass code, (2) proctored examinations, or (3) new or other technologies and practices that are effective in verifying student identification.

Questions: What are the methods used by the institution to verify student identity? Are the methods adequate and effective?

Expectation 4: The institution has a written procedure for protecting the privacy of students enrolled in distance and correspondence education courses or program.

Questions: What is the procedure for protecting the privacy of students enrolled in these courses? Is the procedure adequate and effective?

Expectation 5: If the institution charges students additional fees for costs associated with the verification of student identity, the institution has a written procedure distributed at the time of registration or enrollment that notifies students of any projected additional student charges.

Questions: What is the procedure for notifying students regarding additional student charges associated with such verification? Where is it written and how is the student notified? What is the timing of notification?

The Application of Findings

Following the review of distance and correspondence learning courses and programs, the evaluator, in concert with the other committee members, determines whether the institution meets the standards and the policies of the Commission.

For a reaffirmation of accreditation review or initial accreditation review

If an institution fails to assess its distance and correspondence education in its Compliance Certification when it indicates on its Institutional Summary Form that it offers the courses/programs, then the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee (Accreditation Committee for applicant institutions) will find the institution noncompliant with CS 3.13.

If an institution partially assesses its distance and correspondence education in its Compliance Certification; that is, evaluates its quality in the application of some standards and not others that are relevant, then the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee (Accreditation Committee for applicant institutions) will find the institution to be out of compliance with the specific standard(s) not addressed but relevant to distance learning activities. This would be done in lieu of citing CS 3.13.

***For a substantive change review
with a focus on distance and correspondence education***

In the review of its distance and correspondence education courses/programs, the institution will complete a template listing standards specifically designed for assessing distance learning activities. Therefore, Substantive Change Committees will cite the institution for the standards listed on the template for which it finds the institution to be out of compliance.

For the fifth-year interim review

If an institution fails to assess its distance and correspondence education in its Fifth-Year Compliance Certification when it indicates on its Institutional Summary Form that it offers the courses/programs, then the Fifth-Year Interim Committee will request a Referral Report in which the institution must document compliance with CS 3.13.

If an institution partially assesses its distance and correspondence education; that is, evaluates its quality in the application of some standards and not others that are relevant, then the Fifth-Year Interim Committee will request a Referral Report in which the institution must document compliance with the specific relevant standard(s) not addressed in the Compliance Certification. This would be done in lieu of citing CS 3.13.

Document History

Approved: SACSCOC Executive Council: December 2011

Interpretations to the *Principles of Accreditation*
Approved by the SACSCOC Board of Trustees in June 2009

Interpretation of Core Requirement 2.7.3 (General Education)

Core Requirement 2.7.3 reads:

In each undergraduate degree program, the institution requires the successful completion of a general education component at the collegiate level that (1) is a substantial component of each undergraduate degree, (2) ensures breadth of knowledge, and (3) is based on a coherent rationale. For degree completion in associate programs, the component constitutes a minimum of 15 semester hours or the equivalent; for baccalaureate programs, a minimum of 30 semester hours or the equivalent. These credit hours are to be drawn from and include at least one course from each of the following areas: humanities/fine arts; social/behavioral sciences; and natural science/mathematics. The courses do not narrowly focus on those skills, techniques, and procedures specific to a particular occupation or profession. If an institution uses a unit other than semester credit hours, it provides an explanation for the equivalency. The institution also provides a justification if it allows for fewer than the required number of semester credit hours or its equivalent unit of general education courses. **(General Education)**

Interpretation:

Courses in basic composition that do not contain a literature component, courses in oral communication, and introductory foreign language courses are skill courses and not pure humanities courses. Therefore, for purposes of meeting this standard, none of the above may be the **one** course designated to fulfill the humanities/fine arts requirement in CR 2.7.3.

**USFSP General Education Course Certification Process
For Fall 2015 GE courses**

approved by the USFSP GE Committee Sept. 27 & Oct. 25
Modified December 13, 2013

All current GE courses will be eliminated from the list (except for Exit courses). We will begin a new GE program consisting of the State Core and USFSP courses in Fall 2015, as mandated by State Law Ch.2013-15 and as amended in Spring 2013.

The GE Committee will NOT guarantee that all or even any of the courses that you submit as USFSP specific courses will become future GE Courses.

1. **Materials for Submission.** Each department will need to submit the following completed materials for ALL Courses intended to be part of the 2015 GE Program
 1. Course Approval Form 2013
 2. A sample Syllabus to be used by all those who teach the course under consideration- see Sample Syllabus Requirements
 3. For USFSP specific courses (i.e., all NON-STATE courses) a copy of the minutes from the Department/Program meeting indicating that the course has been vetted and approved by the department faculty

2. Deadlines for Course Applications

- State Courses Monday Feb 3, 2014
- USFSP Courses Monday March 11, 2014

3. Review Process

- a. Each department should have 1 individual (chair and/or designee), who submits ALL the course applications (state and local) to the GE chair via email. We want 1 contact person per department for all GE course proposals.
- b. The GE chair will post your application on google docs and provide you with access to your application
- c. Within google docs there will be a table you have access to that indicates the status of your application, while it is in process.
- d. The GE chair will assign two faculty members for primary review of your application, though the entire committee will discuss and review the course. Faculty members on the GE committee, who are either personally or for whom their discipline are proposing applications, will recuse themselves from review and vote of those applications.
- e. Your department chair/individual who submits the application will be notified if changes are needed, the course is forwarded to the next committee, and when the course is approved by the GE Committee.
- f. The Committees reviewing your Application for Course Certification vary depending on the current status of the proposed course at USFSP
() on this page indicate how a course is labeled on the State Core List, which is provided below p. 5.

Current GE (labeled **GE**) courses recycled into 2015 Program

Course Application- Fill out entire form!
Sample Course Syllabus
GE Committee Only

Courses (labeled **X**) that we have on campus that were NOT previous GE courses, but now will be part of the 2015 GE program.

Course Application- Fill out entire form!
Sample Course Syllabus
GE Committee Only
Relevant College Committee
Undergraduate Council
Vice Chancellor
Registrations and Records Office

Courses (**green highlight**) that are NEW to USFSP but in the USF system. This includes courses that may have existed at USFSP under a different number and name and are being revised to become a GE State Course or USFSP specific course.

Course Application - Fill out entire form!

Course Syllabus

GE Committee Only

Relevant College Committee

Undergraduate Council

Vice Chancellor

Registrations and Records Office

Courses (**yellow highlight**) that are NEW to USFSP and **not** previously in the USFS System

Course Application- Fill out entire form!

Course Syllabus

GE Committee Only

Relevant College Committee

Undergraduate Council

Vice Chancellor

Registrations and Records Office

SCNS State Course Numbering System Department of Education

4. Criteria for Selection.

- Departments can consider including new courses or previous GE courses
- Courses must be 1000 or 2000 level courses for STATE CORE COURSES ONLY.
- USFSP specific courses that when appropriate include an international focus. Our goal here is to balance the State Core GE List and to reinforce USFSP' Strategic Plan
- USFSP specific courses that expand the diversity of disciplines offered in the State Core List. Our goal here is one of General Education philosophy, which aims to expose students to as many disciplines as possible early in their academic career.

- The number of USFSP GE Courses a department may submit is variable. However, as stated above we encourage courses that add to variation in discipline representation. In addition, we will be limiting the number of courses offered in each Subject Area (State and USFSP specific) to between 10 and 15, which would limit our GE program to 50 to 75 courses. We encourage you to think carefully about which courses you want and to prioritize.

5. Distance learning courses. We want to ensure a quality general education program.

- Course must have the same syllabus content regardless of whether it is an online, hybrid or face to face course, this is a SACs accreditation demand as outlined SACS-COC Distance and Correspondence Education policy statement.
- We strongly encourage faculty who teach distance learning courses to periodically offer the course face to face.

6. Faculty Responsibility. We expect for each proposed course that the department have a full-time faculty member and for it to be indicated so on the Course Approval Form under Department Resources

- who is qualified to supervise the teaching of the proposed course
- to be responsible for ensuring that the course promotes the aims of the GE philosophy for 2015
- to be responsible for ensuring that the course clearly demonstrates thoughtful assessment with “critical assignments” in the course sample syllabi of EACH State and USFSP SLOs for your course’s subject area (see Curriculum Map). You must assess all the SLOs designated for your courses subject area.

General Education Faculty Committee Final Recommendations General Education Competencies and Core Courses = 34

- Not in the USF System= 7 (State and all USFSP Committees)
- Not previously taught at USFSP but a USF course =4 (all USFSP Committees)
- USFSP courses but not currently a GE course = 3 (all USFSP Committees)
- USFSP course and currently GE course= 14 (GE USFSP committee only)
- Currently offered online at USFSP = 5 Gordon Rule= GR

COMMUNICATION

*Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively.
 Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze communication critically.*

	State No. System	USF Course	USFP Course	
ENC X101 English Composition I	Yes	ENC 1101	Yes	GE GR

Any student who completes a course with an ENC prefix for which ENC x101 is an immediate prerequisite shall be considered to have completed the communication core.

HUMANITIES

*Students will confirm the ability to think critically through demonstrating interpretive ability and cultural literacy.
 Students will acquire competence in reflecting critically upon the human condition*

	State No. System	USF Course	USFSP Course	
ARH X000 Art Appreciation	Yes	No	No	
HUM X020 Intro. to Humanities	Yes	HUM 1120	No	
LIT X000 Intro. to Literature	Yes	LIT 2000	No	GR
MUL X010 Music Appreciation	Yes	No	No	
THE X000 Theatre Appreciation	Yes	No	No	
PHI X010 Intro to Philosophy	Yes	No	No	

MATHEMATICS

Students will determine appropriate mathematical and computational models and methods in problem solving, and demonstrate an understanding of mathematical concepts.

Students will apply appropriate mathematical and computational models and methods in problem solving

	State No. System	USF Course	USFSP Course
MAC X105 College Algebra	Yes	MAC 1105	yes GE GR
MAC X311 Calculus I	Yes	MAC 2311	yes GE GR
MGF X106 Liberal Arts Math I	Yes	MGF 1106	yes GE GR
MGF X107 Liberal Arts Math II	Yes	MGF 1107	yes GE GR
STA X023 Statistical Methods	Yes	STA 2023	yes GE GR

Any student who successfully completes a mathematics course for which one of the general education core course options in mathematics is an immediate prerequisite shall be considered to have completed the mathematics core.

NATURAL SCIENCES

Students will demonstrate the ability to critically examine and evaluate scientific observation, hypothesis, or model construction, and the use of scientific method to explain the natural world.

Students will successfully recognize and comprehend fundamental concepts, principles, and processes about the natural world.

	State No. System	USF Course	USFSP Course
AST X002 Descriptive Astronomy	Yes	No	No and we will not teach
BSC X005 General Biology	Yes	BSC 1005	yes ! X
BSC X010 General Biology 1	Yes	BSC 2010	yes GE
BSC 2085 Anatomy and Physiology I	Yes	BSC 2085	No
CHM X020 Chemistry for Liberal Studies	Yes	No	No
CHM X045 General Chemistry I	Yes	CHM 2045	Yes GE

ESC X000 Intro. Earth Science	Yes	No	No	
EVR X001 Intro to Environmental Science	Yes	EVR 2001	Yes	GE
PHY X020 Fundamentals of Physics	Yes	PHY 2020	No	
PHY X048 General Physics w/Calculus	Yes	PHY 2048	Yes	X
PHY X053 General Physics 1	Yes	PHY 2053	Yes	GE

Any student who successfully completes a natural science course for which one of the general education core course options in natural science is an immediate prerequisite shall be considered to have completed the natural science ce.

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Students will demonstrate the ability to examine behavioral, social, and cultural issues from a variety of points of view. Students will demonstrate an understanding of basic social and behavioral science concepts and principles used in the analysis of behavioral, social, and cultural issues, past and present, local and global.

	State No. System	USF Course	USFSP Course	
AMH X020 Intro. Survey Since 1877	Yes	AMH 2020	yes	GE
ANT X000 Intro. Anthropology	Yes	ANT 2000	yes!	GE
ECO X013 Prin. Of Macroeconomics	Yes	ECO 2013	yes	GE
POS X041 American Government	Yes	POS 2041	yes!	X
PSY X012 Intro. to Psychology	Yes	PSY 2012	yes!	GE
SYG X000 Principles of Sociology	Yes	SGY 2000	yes	GE

General Education Committee Philosophy

Applicable Fall 2015

Approved by the USFSP General Education Committee April 5, 2013

Approved by the USFSP Voting Faculty December 6, 2013

General education is the cornerstone of academic life at the University of South Florida St. Petersburg. It is shaped and inspired by the faculty's commitment to give our students the broad liberal arts education they need and deserve.

A liberal arts education provides students with broad knowledge of major areas of human learning, it instills and refines quantitative literacy and reading, understanding, reasoning, and communication skills, and it develops and strengthens essential intellectual virtues: curiosity, a healthy skepticism, intellectual honesty, the imagination to understand and fairly consider the perspectives of others, and the willingness and ability to constructively evaluate their own ideas and arguments. Such an education allows students to appreciate the cultural and biological diversity of an increasingly interconnected world, provides them with critical thinking skills to engage issues shaping our global economy, environment, and lives. It thereby prepares them to continue their intellectual, cultural, and personal development long after college.

General Education courses in mathematics, social sciences, humanities, communication, and the natural sciences lay the groundwork for a quality liberal education. All require students to write clearly and think critically. We further encourage faculty to incorporate, where appropriate, discussion of diverse cultural perspectives and significant ethical debates into their respective discipline's general education courses.

Students explore a range of subjects, many outside their anticipated field or major. These courses encourage the development of a habit of inquiry that is flexible, disciplined, and able to grasp multiple perspectives; it is scholarly while understanding that the force of ideas extends beyond the classroom. A sound General Education curriculum empowers students to pursue a liberal arts education by giving them the academic tools required for success in their respective majors and minors.

**UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA SAINT PETERSBURG
GENERAL EDUCATION STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**

Approved by the USFSP General Education Committee Oct. 25, 2013

Approved by the USFSP Voting Faculty Dec. 6, 2013

COMMUNICATIONS

State mandated Student Learning Outcomes (SLO):

C1. Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively.

C2. Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze communication critically.

In pursuit and amplification of State SLO, it is expected that in USFSP courses:

C3. Students will demonstrate fluency in grammar, spelling and mechanics; they will communicate with accuracy, clarity and style, using numerical computations and interpreting statistical data where appropriate.

HUMANITIES

State mandated Student Learning Outcomes:

H1. Students will confirm the ability to think critically through demonstrating interpretive ability and cultural literacy.

H2. Students will acquire competence in reflecting critically upon the human condition

In pursuit and amplification of State SLO, it is expected that in USFSP courses:

H3. Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze texts, express ideas clearly, and present written analyses in discipline appropriate vocabularies and using discipline appropriate techniques, including the relevant use of quantitative methods.

MATHEMATICS

State mandated Student Learning Outcomes:

M1. Students will determine appropriate mathematical and computational models and methods in problem solving, and demonstrate an understanding of mathematical concepts.

M2. Students will apply appropriate mathematical and computational models and methods in problem solving

In pursuit and amplification of State SLO, it is expected that in USFSP courses:

M3. Students will demonstrate the ability to accurately calculate and solve arithmetic, algebra, geometry and statistics problems;

M4. Students will demonstrate the ability to represent, comprehend, and evaluate quantitative problems numerically, graphically, symbolically, in a tabular way and/or in a written argument.

NATURAL SCIENCES

State mandated Student Learning Outcomes:

NS1. Students will demonstrate the ability to critically examine and evaluate scientific observation, hypothesis, or model construction, and the use of scientific method to explain the natural world.

NS2. Students will successfully recognize and comprehend fundamental concepts, principles, and processes about the natural world.

In pursuit and amplification of State SLO, it is expected that in USFSP courses:

NS3. Students will communicate in writing the examination of scientific observations, hypotheses or models, to include quantitative analyses and relevance to societal issues.

SOCIAL SCIENCES

State mandated Student Learning Outcomes:

SS1. Students will demonstrate the ability to examine behavioral, social, and cultural issues from a variety of points of view.

SS2. Students will demonstrate an understanding of basic social and behavioral science concepts and principles used in the analysis of behavioral, social, and cultural issues, past and present, local and global.

In pursuit and amplification of State SLO, it is expected that in USFSP courses:

SS3. Students will demonstrate through written analysis the capacity to identify and critically evaluate social factors that contribute to shaping diverse human behaviors, experiences, and interactions, past or present.

SS4. Students will demonstrate knowledge of the quantitative and qualitative methods in the social sciences as they formulate and seek to answer questions about the nature of social organizations and institutions.

GE STATE CORE COURSES CURRICULUM MAP

SUBJECT COURSE GE OUTCOMES

		C1	C2	C3	H1	H2	H3	M1	M2	M3	M4	NS1	NS2	NS3	SS1	SS2	SS3	SS4
Com	ENC1101	X	X	X														
Hum	ARH2000				X	X	X											
Hum	HUM2020				X	X	X											
Hum	LIT 2000				X	X	X											
Hum	MUL1010				X	X	X											
Hum	THE2000				X	X	X											
Hum	PHI2010				X	X	X											
Math	MAC1105							X	X	X	X							
Math	MAC2311							x	X	X	X							
Math	MGF1106							X	X	X	X							
Math	MGF1107							X	X	X	X							
Math	STA2023							X	X	X	X							
NScience	BSC1005											X	X	X				
NScience	BSC2010											X	X	X				
NScience	BSC2085											X	X	X				
NScience	CHM2020											X	X	X				
NScience	CHM2045											X	X	X				
NScience	ESC2000											X	X	X				
NScience	EVR2001											X	X	X				
NScience	PHY2020											X	X	X				
NScience	PHY2048											X	X	X				
NScience	PHY 2053											X	X	X				
SScience	AMH2020														X	X	X	X
SScience	ANT2000														X	X	X	X
SScience	ECO2013														X	X	X	X
SScience	POS 2041														X	X	X	X
SScience	PSY 2012														X	X	X	X
SScience	SGY 2000														X	X	X	X

Current General Education Assessment Plan for SLO through Critical Assignments

This document was written on Dec. 9, 2013 by Dr. Kathy Arthur, GE Chair in absence of a known written document available to faculty outlining a detailed current (2010 to present) USFSP GE assessment plan.

A Critical Assignments text is available in the USFSP SACs Reaffirmation Comprehensive Standard GE3.5.1 pp. 299-300.

Critical Assignments

Faculty members have developed critical assignments that address student learning outcomes in General Education which include papers, e-portfolios, individual or group projects and/or presentations, as well as embedded items on examinations. Faculty members establish performance criteria and use scoring rubrics to assess student work. An analytical tool is used by the institution to compile and report General Education assessment findings. The Planning, Effectiveness and Budget Committee (formerly, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee) which was established in 2009-10, supports the institutional effectiveness function of the university and the General Education Committee (GEC) supports the university's assessment function. The GEC is a committee of the Faculty Senate, and the Planning, Effectiveness and Budgeting Committee (PEBC) is a faculty led committee that was established by the Regional Chancellor and that is staffed by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness (IRPE). IRPE attends GEC meetings on an *ad hoc* basis and supports their assessment efforts as well. In 2008-09, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) developed the assessment data collection and reporting tool for General Education that was previously mentioned, IRPE compiled assessment materials, and the IEC and GEC co-sponsored University Assessment Day. In this section of the response, findings from several reports prepared by IRPE will be presented including a matrix of course offerings by General Education area which includes the number of sections and total enrollment by semester [6], and output from the General Education Assessment analytical tool [7].

In 2008-09, University Assessment Day took the form of concurrent meetings of Task Force groups that reviewed and discussed assessment material. The concurrent Task Force meetings were co-chaired by GE Committee members and academic program/department chairs and included participation by faculty members that taught General Education courses. The GE Committee issued a Task Force Report and both the GE committee and IEC together convened a joint meeting in order to review all materials relating to General Education assessment. In 2009-10, the Planning, Effectiveness and Budget Committee (PEBC) was established and together with the GEC co-sponsored University Assessment Day. Like in the previous year, the focus of the meeting was to bring together faculty to review and discuss assessment data. In 2009-10, the General Education Assessment Report was compiled by a faculty member and presented to the PEBC. The PEBC review of the GE Assessment Report includes recommendations for actions to be taken by the GE Committee.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Planning, Effectiveness and Budget and General Education Committees, 2009-2010

Planning, Effectiveness and Budget Committee General Education Committee

Prof. Gary Patterson, COB, PEBC Chair Prof. Morgan Gresham*, CAS, GEC Chair

Prof. Frank Biafora, Dean CAS Prof. Tiffany Chenneville, CAS

Prof. Alison Watkins, COB Prof. John Arthur, CAS

Prof. Zafer Unal, COE Prof. Tom Carter, COB

Ms. Tina Neville, Faculty, Library Prof. Olivia Hodges, COE

Ms. Cynthia Collins, Faculty, Advising Center Ms. Tina Neville, Faculty Library

Ms. Julie Jakway, Budget Director

Ms. Holly Kickliter, Enrollment Services

Dr. Ruby Qin, Student Success Center

Mr. John Dickson, Operation and Maintenance

Dr. J. E. Gonzalez, Director, IRPE

Notes:

In 2010-11, Dr. Gresham who chairs the GE Committee, will also serve on the PEBC.

Also in 2010-11, PEBC members will begin to roll off in staggered terms.

The work of assessment of the General Education core and Liberal Arts Requirements is a faculty-led exercise and the annual review and discussion of findings by their peers increases accountability and viability of this essential university function,

This plan was presented by GE Chair to the General Education Committee on Dec. 13, 2013 and approved on _____ for their review and approval concerning the accuracy of the current assessment plan and history of action concerning assessment. Although the above document is in place, this more detailed plan and history was written so that we may evaluate and review our assessment procedures at USFSP.

All General Education Courses regardless of teaching format (DL, face to face, etc.) are assessed in the same manner.

Currently, courses fall under 1 or more of the USFSP subject areas: English Composition, Quantitative Methods, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Historical Perspectives, Fine Arts, and African, Latin American, Middle Eastern or Asian Perspectives (ALAMEA).

Faculty teaching General Education courses are allowed to select one, all, or several of the Student Learning Outcomes listed for each subject area for assessment in their course.

Each Fall and Spring semester, all the Faculty teaching GE courses are expected to submit their course assessment of Student Learning Outcomes to the IR Officer, the Q drive, the College of Arts and Sciences Assistant Dean (beginning Fall 2011), or the USFSP Chair (began Fall 2013). The faculty members all submit their assessment on a standardized GE Assessment Form. The form is emailed to the faculty by the IR

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Officer and in 2012 the email was co-authored by the GE Chair (General Education Committee, a faculty committee of the USFSP Faculty Senate). The email with the attached assessment template is sent out at the end of each Fall and Spring semester. The form also is available on the IR and General Education websites. A list of the GE courses and their corresponding Subject Areas and Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) also are available on the websites. The IR officer is responsible for amassing the data in a database and creating summary tables to be available to the faculty.

The GE Assessment Form was created by the IR Officer and requires faculty to indicate the SLOs covered in their courses, the critical assignments addressing the SLO, rubric, criteria for success, and the number and percent of students who meet or do not meet each SLO.

The summary tables are presented to the GE teaching faculty organized by IR at a GE day meeting. The faculty discuss 2-3 years of data and provide a use of results to improve student learning to close the loop.

In the **Fall of 2011**, the GE committee began to request from the IR officer a list of faculty compliance per each semester and tables summarizing the data, which is documented in their GE minutes. This would allow the committee to request missing data from the faculty and to arrange a GE day for faculty discussion of the assessment. However, this data was not presented to the committee in full until October 2013. At that point it appeared that compliance was 60-70% and the GE chair undertook contacting faculty to collect the missing GE data, which resulted in 80-90% compliance per semester. The GE Committee then arranged a GE Day meeting in the spring 2014 for faculty to review, discuss, and provide a use of the results for the data from Fall 2010 to Fall 2013.

General Education Assessment Plan for 2015

Outline for what we need!

1. Creation and Approval of GE Philosophy Completed
2. Creation and Approval of GE SLOS Completed
3. GE Course Certification Process
4. Gathering Assessment Data Criteria
 - a. Where does the data go?
 - b. When do faculty submit the data and how often?
 - c. Which faculty submit data and when?
 - d. Criteria for Assessment –Rubrics-- for each SLO, i.e., what does each SLOs mean to the faculty who are teaching/assessing. Rubrics or criteria also provide information for how we or where we need to make changes. Right now all our assessment is closed our answers are yes/no or met/not met and we need a more open system to evaluate our courses and our GE program.
 - Number and percentage of students that met and did not meet
 - What was the criteria for success
 - What will the results be used for in the future?
 - Will the instructor change textbook, assignments, lecture material in response to the assessment?
 - Qualitative comment area?
 - Indirect student evaluation?
 - Course grade is not appropriate
 - Embedded assignments are the best
 - e. What are we going to collect—the Artifacts! ? We need 80-100 for a statistically viable group—critical/snapshot/signature assignment samples
5. Reporting- Closing the Loop!
 - a. Data analysis and summary tables—what type of summary tables do we want?
 - b. Closing loops- pulling together GE teaching faculty for discussion about status and future change what are we going to do with our results now that we have them? In some institutions a second round of assessing the artifacts? How often will this group meet and when?
 - c. Compliance assist