

Meeting Notes

Item	Description
Name/Title	General Education Review Committee
Date	April 21, 2014
Time	2:00-3:00
Location	200 McKenny
Members Attending	Zenia Bahorski, Chris Foreman (co-chair), Christopher Gardiner, John Koolage (co-chair), Konnie Kustron, Peggy Liggitt, Gerald Newberry, Mary Rearick, Bob Winning
Absent	Daryl Barton (resigned), Michael Tew

Program Review Model:

John Koolage suggested that the committee treat General Education Review as a program review and that the CAS program review model be used as a template. The committee examined the five components of this model and considered if each is suitable for General Education review:

- Mission
- Integrity
- Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support
- Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement
- Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

The concept of SWOT Analysis was discussed in relation to General Education Review. While the ideas of strengths and weaknesses are clearly applicable, opportunities and threats are not as apparent. Threats can be considered as external (e.g., competition with community colleges, the questioning of liberal arts education from a national perspective), and also from within the University and the program itself (e.g., the proliferation of prefixes within certain departments threatening program integrity). Opportunities include the question as to whether there are things the program isn't currently serving which it should.

With regard to mission, the University mission and national perspective should be considered.

Integrity brings in the intentionality of the program in such areas as supporting a global view and diversity. It can also cover questions as to the fairness of the program's operations and processes to students, departments, and colleges.

The "Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support" criterion can cover such things as who is teaching what; do departments evaluate above and beyond the course evaluation process; and how do departments determine what courses are submitted for General Education.

The "Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement" criterion brings in assessment and can cover questions such as if students are sometimes stuck in General Education courses, what students are doing in regard to LBC requirements, and are transfer substitutions a danger to the integrity of the program.

"Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness" covers such things as program resources and budget.

It was agreed that, overall, the model can serve the General Education Review process.

Where do Faculty Questionnaire, Student Exit Questionnaires, and Quantitative Data from IRIM fit into this model?

The use of quantitative data in this model is clear from the above discussion of the model itself.

With regard to the Faculty Questionnaire, while the model does not specifically reference faculty input, it is spread throughout the entire process. Specific questions will apply to certain criterion. While faculty input is a natural part of a departmental program review process, General Education doesn't have that luxury and the questionnaire fills that gap.

Student input can be garnered from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). While it does not address General Education specifically, it does have a number of questions relevant to it. There are limitations to this data, but given that it is administered to freshmen with schedules consisting mostly of General Education courses it can be of use. The Senior Exit Survey contains questions specifically on General Education. It was agreed to start by examining existing student data.

The General Education office will continue its examination of programs at peer institutions as this data will be useful in a number of the criteria being considered.

It was agreed that administrators on the committee can work on collecting data over the summer. They will not analyze the data or meet as a group.

Next Steps:

A Doodle poll for a three hour committee retreat early in fall semester will be sent out during the last week of August.

Attachments:

Agenda

College of Arts & Sciences Program Review Plan (May 30, 2013)

Higher Learning Commission Accreditation Criteria