The composition and responsibilities of the Faculty Senate General Education Committee (GEC) are as follows:

1. The General Education Committee shall consist of seven elected faculty members, the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Manager of General Studies, and a student representative. Each of the schools/divisions with elected senators, the Library and student government shall select its own representatives for the committee. These faculty representatives shall serve staggered two-year terms. The Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Manager of General Studies shall serve as ex-officio members of the committee.

2. This committee shall make recommendations to the Faculty Senate for the ongoing development and refinement of general education goals and student outcomes. All recommendations to the Faculty Senate for changes in general education goals and outcomes and for addition to the list of general education courses and experiences will come from this committee. This committee will ensure that general education is assessed, and that the data are used to improve general education. The committee will consult with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, providing faculty input to the ongoing strategic planning process.

Its membership in 2010-2011 was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts &amp; Letters</th>
<th>Rebekkah Meixner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Michael Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Melissa Sutherland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Melanie Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>Chris Lang (chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Janice McMahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Robin Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Gil Atnip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio, Manager of Continuing Studies</td>
<td>Saundra Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Jennifer Broadus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The GEC met in 2009-2011 on September 17, October 15, December 3, January 26, March 2, and April 5.

General Education Course List and Learning Outcomes

As indicated in its charge, a primary responsibility of the GEC is to recommend approval of changes to the list of approved courses for the general education requirements.
In its meeting of April 5, the GEC recommended the course MATH-M 114 for approval for the learning goal of Quantitative Reasoning.

In that meeting, the GEC also recommended the following courses for re-approval for the indicated learning goals:


Ethical Reasoning:  JOUR J-280, PHIL P-100, PHIL P-140, PHIL P-145, PHIL P-200, PHIL P-240.

Critical Thinking:  BIOL-L 101, BIOL-L 102, ENG-W 270, ENG-W 290, PHIL-P 150, PHYS-P 100, PHYS-P 105, PHYS-P 120, PHYS-P 201, PHYS-P 221, PLSC-B 101, PSY-P 101, PSY-P 102, SPCH-S 228.

These courses were expected to be considered by the Senate in its meeting of April 21, 2011.

Note, several Political Sciences courses were removed from the Critical Thinking list by request of the Political Science program: POLS-Y 103, POLS-Y 107, POLS-Y 109, POLS-Y 205. Also, there were a number of courses that had not submitted re-approval materials; it is expected that these courses will be recommended for re-approval at a later date. But materials were submitted for HIST-F 216 even though it was not scheduled for re-approval; the committee recommends that this course be given five years before its next re-approval.

As recommended by the previous year’s committee, the following courses were submitted to the Senate with the committee’s recommendation for re-approval for the indicated learning goals: Oral communication: SPCH-S 121; Quantitative Reasoning: MATH-M 110, 117, 118, 119, 122, 125, 215, and MATH-T 101; and Written Communication: ENG-W 131, 231, 234, 270, 290, 315, 350, and 420. These were approved by the Senate at its meeting of September 17, 2010.

Another primary responsibility of the GEC is to recommend changes in the learning outcomes for general education. No such recommendations were considered or made by the GEC in 2010-2011.

Assessment of Student Learning in General Education

As indicated in its charge, a primary responsibility of the GEC is to conduct assessment of student learning in the general education learning outcomes. The GEC has a three-year cycle for this assessment, as reflected by the last three years:

2008-09  CIIMI in Arts and Humanities  
          CIIMI in Natural and Physical Sciences  
          CIIMI in Social and Behavioral Sciences  
          Information Technology Fluency

2009-10  Quantitative Reasoning
Oral Communication
Written Communication

2010-11 Diversity
Ethical Reasoning
Information Literacy
Critical Thinking

To complete its assessment work for 2010-2011, the GEC formed four subcommittees:

Critical Thinking: Michael Harris and Robin Morgan
Diversity: Saundra Gordon and Rebekkah Meixner
Ethical Reasoning: Chris Lang and Janice McMahan
Information Literacy: Melanie Hughes

Assessment reports from each subcommittee are appended to this report. However, as an initiative of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment and the Institute of Learning and Teaching Excellence along with this committee, a major revision was introduced in the process of assessment of student learning in general education learning goals. The new model for assessment would resemble the existing process for assessment of student learning in academic programs: Data would be collected every year, and on a three-year cycle, assessment results would be evaluated and analyzed by the program, OIRA and the committee. Details of the new process, as designed by OIRA, are appended to this report. These were communicated to faculty and deans involved with general education courses in meetings held on February 15 and 16.

Recommendations for the 2010-2011 Committee

The 2010-2011 committee makes the following recommendation to the 2011-2012 committee:

- Implementation should continue of the new model of assessment of student learning in general education learning goals.
- Certain courses were scheduled for re-approval for certain general education learning goals, as listed below, but application materials were not submitted, or submitted too late for the 2010-2011 committee to consider. The 2010-2011 committee recommends to the 2011-2012 committee to follow up on these courses and as appropriate recommend their re-approval to the Senate.

Critical thinking: CHEM-C 100, CHEM-C 104, CHEM-C 105, CHEM-C 125, CHEM-C 126, CSCI-A 201, ENG-W 420, GEOL-G 100, GEOL-G 180, HIST-F 100, HIST-G 100
Diversity: AFRO-A 169, FINA-A 150, GEOG-G 201, HIST-G 100, HIST-H 207
Report of the General Education Critical Thinking Assessment Subcommittee (Michael Harris and Robin Morgan):

At the beginning of the assessment process, 40 courses were listed as fulfilling the general education critical thinking requirement. Of these 40, the General Education committee decided to remove seven as each of these seven were for advanced students, not an introductory level student. Program coordinators in the disciplines represented by each of the remaining 33 courses were contacted and requested to provide their assessment data from the past three years. Of the 33 courses, 19 or 58% submitted a response. Of these 19 submissions, 15 or 79% submitted assessment information on critical thinking; the program coordinator for four courses requested that these courses be removed from general education, critical thinking.

Of the 15 courses that submitted assessment information 7, or 47%, submitted no data. Approximately half indicated that they were in the development stage of assessing critical thinking, approximately one-fourth indicated that students scored above average, and approximately one fourth reported that critical thinking was being assessed but provided no data.

Of the 8 courses that submitted data, all used self-created assessment procedures that were difficult to summarize across courses. For two courses, the data submitted were not interpretable as presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>% of students achieving critical thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOL L101</td>
<td>90 – 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL L102</td>
<td>90 – 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG W290</td>
<td>70 – 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL P150</td>
<td>68 – 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLSC B101</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCH S228</td>
<td>71 – 93.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the lack of data for all courses, a new procedure involving course-embedded assessment that is automatically sent to the OIRA for analysis, developed by the entire General Education committee, will be used for assessment of critical thinking in the future.
Report of the General Education Ethical Reasoning Assessment Subcommittee (Chris Lang and Janice McMahan):

The following courses are included in the general education course list for the learning goal of ethical reasoning: JOUR-J 280, PHIL-P 100, PHIL-P 140, PHIL-P 145, PHIL-P 200 and PHIL-P 240. The assessment results below are based on materials submitted by Jim St. Clair (Journalism) and George Harvey (Philosophy) as part of the re-approval process for these courses for this learning goal.

The learning goal of ethical reasoning includes the following learning outcomes:

1. Explain and evaluate several key moral principles and ethical theories.
2. With respect to a particular moral issue, evaluate alternative positions using appropriate principles or theories and articulate the ramifications and consequences both of alternative courses of action and of the acceptance of different moral principles and ethical theories.
3. Engage in moral discussions constructively and effectively.

Assessment of ethical reasoning in Philosophy courses used the following specific learning outcomes:

1A. Students will describe the distinguishing features of a range of ethical principles and theories.
1B. Students will identify the strengths and weaknesses of different principles and theories.
2A. Students will describe a moral problem, identifying features of the problem that are of moral relevance.
2B. Students will show how different theories or principles would apply to the problem.
2C. Students will provide a sound justification for preferring one theory or principle over the alternatives.
3A. Students will demonstrate full understanding of the implications of a position they take on an ethical issue.
3B. Students will acknowledge the merits of positions opposed to their own.
3C. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the basics of sound philosophical argumentation.

Assessment of ethical reasoning in Philosophy courses was based on a variety of measures (instructors in a sample of sections of each course were asked to use their own measures appropriate to their section). Assessment results are available for several courses: PHIL-P 100, PHIL-P 140 and PHIL-P 145 (results for the latter two courses were combined into one data set). (There were no assessment results for PHIL-P 200 or PHIL-P 240; these courses were not offered in this assessment cycle.)

The results are as follows:
PHIL-P 100:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHIL-P 140 and 145:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the course JOUR-J 280, the following learning outcomes and measures were used:

Learning objective 1A: Students will demonstrate their knowledge of a variety of ethical principles and theories. Student learning in this outcome was measured using written assignments where students described and applied the different philosophies of great thinkers such as Aristotle, Kant, or Mill to a contemporary ethical issue in journalism.

Learning objective 1B: Students will evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of different ethical principles and theories. Student learning in this outcome was measured using written assignments in which students determined which ethical/moral philosophy works the best in a given ethical situation in journalism.

Learning Objective 2A: Students will examine case studies that present journalist with a moral problem, identifying the main feature of the problem and the dilemma faced. Student learning in this outcome was measured using written assignments.
Learning Objective 2B: Students will describe what ethical theory or principle would best apply to addressing the problem. Student learning in this outcome was measured using written assignments in which students decide on the best course of action to deal with the problem.

Learning Objective 3A: Students will engage in discussions that explore a full range of ethical problems that confront today’s journalist and acknowledge that the issues in this field are not black and white and perhaps never will be. Student learning in this outcome was measured using written assignments in which students examine common ethical/moral problems of contemporary journalism.

For each outcome, student written assignments were assessed against the following point scale: 3 (excellent), 2 (good), 1 (satisfactory) and 0 (poor). The following results were obtained. (The sample size was 10.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning objective</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>2A</th>
<th>2B</th>
<th>3A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Journalism Program reported one change to assessment based on these results: the development of a rubric for a self-reflexive essay that asks students to draw upon readings from the textbook and other material to express their views of the current state of journalism ethics. This rubric is intended to better measure student learning on Objective 3A.

It is expected that assessment of student learning in ethical reasoning (in Journalism and in Philosophy) will be substantially revised as the new model for assessment of student learning in general education is implemented in the next several years.
Report of the General Education Diversity Assessment Subcommittee (Rebekkah J. Meixner and Saundra Gordon):

Program coordinators in the disciplines which represent the General Education Diversity courses were contacted and requested to provide their assessment data from the past three years.

The learning goal of Diversity includes the following learning outcomes:

1. Explain how a person’s social status (e.g., race, gender, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, age origin, and disability) shapes his/her perspective.
2. Identify significant variations and commonalities among peoples of different cultural groups.
3. Evaluate how a person’s own cultural context influences how he or she perceives people of a different cultural context.
4. Recognize how personal and systemic discrimination, prejudice and stereotypes impact lives and relationships.

Currently there are 20 courses which are listed as meeting the criteria for the Diversity which span over 11 departments. Of these 20 courses, the following 10 courses submitted a response.

- POLS Y – 109: Introduction to International Politics
- POLS Y – 107: Introduction to Comparative Politics
- HIST F – 232: Upheaval in Twentieth – Century Latin America
- HIST F – 216: History of Slavery in the Americas
- HIST H – 231: Women, Men and Family in History: Latin America
- HIST E – 100: Introduction to African History
- SOC S – 163: Social Problems
- PHIL P – 170: Introduction to Asian Philosophy
- HIST F – 100: Introduction to Latin American History: The Encounter of the Three Races
- EDUC – M 300: Teaching in a Pluralistic Society

100% of the responding courses indicated that they were still meeting the requirement that 50% of the course content and 50% of the possible grade points address the Goal.

Of the 10 courses that submitted assessment information:

- 6 courses submitted no assessment data but did include a written summary of the course and how it goes about meeting the Diversity criteria.
- 1 course submitted no assessment data and no written summary (Professor of record was on sabbatical).
- 3 courses submitted assessment data.

Of the 3 courses that submitted data, all used self-created assessment procedures that were difficult to summarize across all the courses. For one of the courses, the data submitted was not
numerical in nature and was instead student comments about the course and the material that they learned. The two remaining courses provided numerical data which is presented below.

For the course PHIL P – 170: Introduction to Asian Philosophy, the following learning outcomes and measures were used:

Spring 2010:

Outcome:
Identify significant variations and commonalities among peoples of different cultural groups.

Measure:
Three multi-part essay exams which require student to “articulate the principles of one or more of the Asian philosophical systems, and to critique, and/or compare it Western philosophical/cultural values.

Data:
52% (14/27) Met Expectations
30% (8/27) Partially Met Expectations
18% (5/27) Failed to Meet Expectations

For the course SOC S – 163: Social Problems, the following learning outcomes and measures were used:

Measure:
Each Goal had a corresponding multiple choice question on an exam.

Outcomes and Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity Goal</th>
<th>% of students achieving goal Fall 2009</th>
<th>% of students achieving goal Spring 2010</th>
<th>% of students achieving goal Summer 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain how a person’s social status (e.g., race, gender, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, age origin, and disability) shapes his/her perspective.</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify significant variations and commonalities among peoples of different cultural groups.</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate how a person’s own cultural context influences how he or she perceives people of a different cultural context.</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize how personal and systemic discrimination, prejudice and stereotypes impact lives and relationships.</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given the lack of data for all courses, a new procedure involving course-embedded assessment that is automatically sent to the OIRA for analysis, developed by the entire General Education committee, will be used for assessment of Diversity in the future.
Report of the General Education Information Literacy Assessment Subcommittee (Melanie Hughes):

Student Learning Outcomes for Information Literacy:
- Use appropriate tools and technologies to identify, access, and evaluate, and use information effectively.
- Use information responsibly, in accordance with legal and ethical principles.

Information literacy is a General Education requirement that is implemented across the curriculum, whenever students are required to utilize information to complete course assignments. Information Literacy, as defined by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) is “the set of skills needed to find, retrieve, analyze and use information.”

At Indiana University Southeast information literacy is assessed at different points in a student’s academic career, in the Library we refer to this as a three-tiered system of information literacy instruction. Students are introduced to information literacy in the Library Instruction session of the First Year Seminar (FYS), or Tier 1 course.

The Library assesses FYS students by having them complete a post-instruction assessment survey, similar to a one-minute paper, in that it asks for free-responses to the following questions:

- What aspects of the library instruction session were most helpful to you?
- What aspects of the library instruction session were least helpful to you?
- Based on what you learned in your library instruction session, what will you do differently when searching for information?
- Did you learn anything new in the library instruction session? Y/N
- If so, what did you learn?

The answers to these qualitative questions are compiled and analyzed each semester by the Library’s Coordinator of Instruction, Maria Accardi, Assistant Librarian. Findings show that 87% of the students stated that they learned something new in the FYS library session (n=675), and that in the future, 30.94% of students said that they will apply this knowledge and conduct better searches in the future (n=242). In addition, 17.51% of students (n=137) stated that learning about periodical article databases was the most helpful thing they learned in the library session, and 13.55% of students (n=106) indicated that they will use library resources instead of Google when searching for information.

The Library also is starting to assess information literacy at the Tier 2 Entering the Major (ETM) course-level for those programs that utilize Library Instruction to introduce their students to resources and research strategies appropriate to their discipline. This semester a survey was introduced for students at the end of these sessions that repeats the first three questions of the FYS survey, plus asks the students for suggestions for future library instruction sessions. Ms. Accardi also compiles this assessment data for the campus. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) is also working on qualitative analysis software that could be utilized to help analyze the surveys at the FYS and ETM levels.
The Library also offers instruction in specific majors at the Tier 3 Capstone Level. These courses, often called Senior Seminars, require students to perform a significant research paper in their discipline. The Library is working on developing assessment for these courses, but anticipates that it will be similar to a rubric used by the Honors Program to analyze and assess the information resources selected and how they were used by students.

When our committee met with Ron Severtis, of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA), in December, we discussed the need for a protocol for collecting sample papers from the capstone courses for assessment. We know that papers have been collected for other assessment work, for example, on the Faculty Senate Improvement of Writing Committee.

Because Information Literacy is integrated into the curriculum, it is assumed that faculty members are evaluating the effective use of quality information in their students’ submitted assignments, as they also evaluate the subject content of the assignments. The Library is available to support students on any research assignment and is available to offer Library Instruction specifically tailored to each course.

Respectfully Submitted by Maria Accardi and Melanie Hughes.

REFERENCES

General Education Assessment: A Model for Assistance and Collaboration

General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC)
- Report to Faculty Senate each year
- Responsible for assessment of all General Education Goals on a 3-year rotation schedule.
- Provides guidance to faculty teaching courses through the course proposal process.
- Provides guidance to subcommittees during review of goals.

GEAC Subcommittees (by goal)
- Report to GEAC at the end of the evaluation year.
- Evaluates progress on a specific general education goal based on data collected by OIRA.
- Recommends improvements based on data.
- Provide guidance to next review committee.

ILTE/OIRA
- Assist subcommittees with review/revision of outcomes associated with each goal.
- Assist with the identification and development of a menu of measures for each outcome, from which faculty can choose the best option for the proposed course.
- Assist faculty in the customization of general assessment measures to meet the specific needs of a particular course. (See Diversity Example Next Page)
- Create and distribute forms for ongoing data collection.
- Summarize data on an annual basis.
- Provide data and summaries to subcommittees at time of review.

Faculty Teaching General Education Courses
- Agree to participate in General Education Assessment.
- Include student learning outcomes associated with the relevant General Education goal on the syllabus. (Consider implementing a syllabus template.)
- Choose, customize, and implement assessment measures with guidance from OIRA/ILTE (See Diversity Example Next Page).
- Collect data using forms provided and return data to OIRA.
- Collaborate with sub-committee members during review of the relevant General Education goal.
General Education Assessment:
Roles & Responsibilities

Program Coordinators:

• Keep track of courses in the program that meet general education goals.
• Provide faculty with guidance on meeting the requirements for general education assessment.
• Direct faculty to OIRA and ILTE for assistance with assessment.
• Collaborate with OIRA to collect and submit data by:
  ✓ reminding faculty to collect data
  ✓ reminding faculty to return data to OIRA
  ✓ informing new faculty of the process of collecting and submitting data

Faculty Members:

• Identify objectives to be met in specific course.
• Identify/develop measures for the objectives (OIRA & ILTE are resources).
• Develop data collection tool with OIRA.
• Collect data each semester the course is offered.
• Submit data to OIRA for summary and reporting.
• Review reports from OIRA.
• Make adjustments based on assessment and report those changes to the Gen Ed Committee.

OIRA:

• Act as first point of contact for program coordinators and faculty members. OIRA will provide assistance or direct coordinators and faculty members to appropriate resources.
• Work with faculty members to identify/develop measures for gen ed objectives.
• Work with faculty to develop data collection tools.
• Provide tools to faculty every semester.
• Collect, scan, summarize, and report data back to faculty members each semester.
• Provide yearly data summaries to the GEC (at 3-year intervals).

ILTE:

• Work with faculty to identify objectives that are appropriate for the specific course.
• Work with faculty to develop measures and rubrics for objectives.
• Work with faculty and OIRA to develop appropriate data collection tools.
General Education Criteria and Process

Process of Approval:
1. Form submitted (form is on General Education website)
   a. Form must be approved by your dean
   b. Form is submitted to Academic Affairs

2. Must submit the following documents along with the form:
   a. Assessment plan for the course
   b. Representative course syllabus
   c. Assignment schedule
   d. Sample of assignments or student work

3. Course must be an approved 100 or 200 level course meant for students with no prerequisites, unless an exception is granted by the committee.

4. Identify the general education outcomes that will be met in the courses. All of the outcomes listed on the following pages must be addressed for any particular Goal. Generally, 50% of the course content or 50% of the possible grade points should address the Goal.

5. Courses that have been approved to meet General Education Goals are re-evaluated approximately every 5 years in order to remain on the approved course list.

General Education Outcomes

Written Communication

A. As a Writer
- Adapt and structure messages and their presentation to the audience, situation, purpose and occasion.
- Include, either explicitly or implicitly, a central idea, focus or thesis throughout the text as appropriate to the audience, situation, purpose, and occasion.
- Use a variety of credible sources, as appropriate to the genre, to support contentions with relevant and adequate evidence.
- Use and cite the work of others appropriately, avoiding plagiarism, misquoting, and misreading.
- Use a variety of academic and professional documentation formats appropriately.
- Follow standard practices in sentence structure usage, vocabulary, and word choice as appropriate to the genre.
- Effectively use and offer peer critique and other feedback in revision and/or future work.
- Demonstrate an understanding of the multiple uses of writing, such as improving learning and critical thinking and enhancing self-expression and reflection.
- Use writing technologies such as word processing and writing for the Web effectively and appropriately.
B. As a Reader
- Identify a writer's central purpose, ideas, and goals.
- Apply critical thinking strategies to analyze the validity of arguments and assumptions in texts.
- Analyze critically coherence, structure, clarity and style in a written or oral text.

**Oral Communication**

A. As a Speaker
- Choose, adapt, and restrict the focus of a topic to clarify it according to its purpose and goals.
- Formulate a central idea statement appropriate for the purpose and goals of the speech or text.
- Cite a variety of credible sources, when appropriate, in the speech or text to support one's contentions with relevant and adequate evidence.
- Adapt and structure messages and their delivery or presentation to the audience, situation, purpose, and occasion.
- Use principles designed to influence attitudes, beliefs, and actions.
- Explain what constitutes plagiarism and use the work of others appropriately.
- Structure messages for effectiveness utilizing an introduction, thesis, main points, connectives, and a conclusion.
- Introduce the speech by gaining attention, previewing main points, stating a thesis, establishing goodwill and establishing credibility.
- Conclude the speech by signaling an end of the presentation, summarizing the main points, and providing a memorable/vivid ending.
- Create a complete and accurate preparation outline and a speaking outline.
- Deliver messages extemporaneously using effective eye contact, body movements, and vocal qualities.
- Feel comfortable when delivering speeches.
- Use appropriate pronunciation, grammar, articulation, and word choices to express ideas.

B. As a Listener
- Discriminate between statements of fact and opinion.
- Discriminate between statements of fact and opinion.
- Discriminate between emotional and logical arguments.
- Analyze information and arguments in order to draw conclusions.
- Analyze critical coherence, structure, voice, and style in a written or oral text.
- Employ the active response strategies of questioning and paraphrasing in response to a message.
- Identify persuasive strategies.
- Meaningful critique the written or oral work of peers.

**Quantitative Reasoning**
- Interpret mathematical models such as formulas, graphs, tables and schematics and draw inferences from them.
- Represent mathematical information symbolically, visually, numerically and verbally.
- Use a variety of mathematical methods (algebraic, geometric, and/or statistical methods) to solve problems.
Reasoning About Ethical Questions
- Explain and evaluate several key moral principles and ethical theories.
- With respect to a particular moral issue, evaluate alternative positions using appropriate principles or theories and articulate the ramifications and consequences both of alternative courses of action and of the acceptance of different moral principles and ethical theories.
- Engage in moral discussions constructively and effectively.

Critical Thinking
- Evaluate the quality of arguments and evidence, and the accuracy of claims.
- Evaluate the quality of statistical evidence.
- Identify logical errors and fallacies.
- Distinguish between facts, inferences, and opinions and value assertions.
- Recognize alternative approaches and conflicting viewpoints.

Diversity
- Explain how a person’s social status (e.g., race, gender, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, age, origin, and disability) shapes his/her perspective.
- Identify significant variations and commonalities among peoples of different cultural groups.
- Evaluate how a person’s own cultural context influences how he or she perceives people of a different cultural context.
- Recognize how personal and systemic discrimination, prejudice and stereotypes impact lives and relationships.

Central Issues, Ideas, and Methods of Inquiry - Arts/Humanities
(A) Student learning outcomes in the Arts
- Students will define the following: the arts, aesthetic principles, form, style, genre (medium)
- Students will explain and provide three specific examples of the ways in which the arts impact society.
- Students will define the concept of style and provide three examples of how it is expressed in works of art.
- Making reference to a specific work of art, students will describe the work as an expression of the personal experience of the artist and as a reflection of the specific social context and the cultural context in which the work was produced.
- Students will accurately place a work of art within an historical context and justify such placement using three specific characteristics of the work.
- Students will analyze a work of art using form, subject, the elements of design, and instrumentation/tools of production.
(B) Student learning outcomes in the Humanities

- Students will define the humanities.
- Students will explain three ways in which the context that led to its creation influenced an important contribution to the humanities.
- Students will describe three characteristics of a text which explain why it is considered an important contribution to the humanities.
- Students will describe the impact of an important contribution to the humanities using three specific examples.
- Students will identify two similarities and two differences between their perspective and that of an important contribution to the humanities.

Central Issues, Ideas, and Methods of Inquiry - Natural/Physical Sciences

- Understand the role of empirical data in establishing scientific knowledge.
- Understand that, in addition to empirical evidence, science involves skepticism and rational arguments; that it is not opinion but is rather a reasoned consensus among informed experts which improves over time.
- Understand several paradigm examples of the fundamental conceptual models in at least two separate disciplines of the natural sciences (Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Geoscience) which underlie our current understanding of the physical world. Examples include (but are not limited to): conservation of energy, evolution, plate tectonics, oxidation, etc.

Central Issues, Ideas, and Methods of Inquiry - Social/Behavioral Sciences

- Students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of two important theories and/or interpretations in one or more disciplines in the social sciences (for the purposes of general education, the social sciences include history, political science, psychology, sociology, journalism, criminal justice, economics and human geography.)
- Students will be able to explain three specific ways in which the social sciences have contributed to our understanding of society in the contemporary or historical context.
- Students will be able to evaluate and reach a conclusion about an argument or an explanation based on factual information provided in an assigned reading.
## General Education Assessment Cycle Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIMI: Arts/Humanities</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIMI: Nat/Phys Sci</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMI: Soc/Behav Sci</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Reasoning</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CODE Responsibilities

- **D**: Design Assessment Programs & OIRA
- **I**: Implement Assessment Programs
- **A**: Analyze Results OIRA
- **R**: Report and Review Programs, OIRA & GE Cmte
- **P**: Plan for Next Term Programs & OIRA
- **S**: System Analysis- Does this process work for this category? GE Cmte