

**DRAFT General Education Program Assessment Plan**

**Introduction/Background**

The 2008-09  [General Education (GE) APR](https://www.csustan.edu/GE/Pages/documents/GE_APR_Final0708_000.pdf) included a [Draft GE Assessment Plan and Preliminary Report](https://www.csustan.edu/GE/Pages/documents/AppendixGupdate.pdf) based on the then-current goals. The Draft Assessment Plan was refined over the following year, and featured goals assessment embedded at the individual course level, supplemented by other direct measures (CLA+, e.g.), and indirect measures (NSSE, FSSE, e.g.) of student and faculty perceptions. The Plan was put on hold as the seven goals were reviewed and revised in an effort to align with system-wide requirements. Segments of the 2008-09 Assessment Plan remain in place, however, and have guided action as this new plan was developed and refined under the revised GE goals and outcomes by the General Education Assessment Council (GEAC), as charged by the Provost and Senate Executive Committee.

The former seven- goals system required each GE course to demonstrate how it met Goals 1-5 and either Goal 6, Goal 7, or both Goals 6 and 7. Ultimately, the seven goals were replaced by [three goals and 16 outcomes](https://www.csustan.edu/general-education/general-education-goals) largely aligned with LEAP (Liberal Education and America’s Promise) outcomes (2015) as suggested in Executive Order 1100 (previously 1033 and 1065). Through the shared-governance process, the campus agreed that GE courses should select 2-4 of the “most essential outcomes” and demonstrate where practice/achievement of those outcomes would take place in the course (i.e., a specific assignment identified on the syllabus, etc.)

The following Mission Statement and General Education Learning Goals and Outcomes were approved in 2015.

General Education Mission Statement

General Education is fundamental to a university education. General Education develops foundational communicative, quantitative and critical thinking skills. General Education promotes an understanding of history and culture, fosters appreciation for the arts and humanities, and encourages a broad knowledge of social issues and scientific inquiry. Attaining a general education means that students understand that all learning is connected and enriches all aspects of life: personal, civic, and professional. (11/AS/14/UEPC).

General Education Learning Goals

|  |
| --- |
| **Goal 1: Develop the intellectual skills and competencies necessary to participate effectively in society and the world.**Students attaining the first learning goal will be able to:1. Demonstrate effective oral communication.
2. Demonstrate effective written communication.
3. Demonstrate the ability to think critically and creatively.
4. Apply quantitative reasoning concepts and skills to solve problems.
5. Find, understand, examine critically, and use information from various sources.
6. Comprehend and use appropriate technological resources effectively.

**Goal 2: Develop broad knowledge of biological and physical sciences, humanities and creative arts, and social sciences.**Students attaining the second learning goal will be able to:1. Explain and apply basic scientific methods.
2. Demonstrate an understanding of the living and non-living physical world.
3. Recognize the structures and institutions that frame human interactions.
4. Express appreciation of cultural, intellectual, and artistic ideas and works.
5. Demonstrate effective creative expression and understanding through artistic means.
6. Identify life-skills and behaviors needed to flourish as a mature person.

**Goal 3: Develop abilities to integrate knowledge, make informed ethical decisions, and accept civic responsibility.**Students attaining the third learning goal will be able to:1. Integrate and combine knowledge and abilities developed in several fields to analyze and critically evaluate specific problems, issues, or topics.
2. Illustrate the ability to self-reflect and assess relevant ethical values.
3. Identify and analyze problems within local, regional, national, and/or global contexts.
4. Demonstrate enhanced awareness of multicultural, community, and/or technological perspectives.

GE courses will address two to four of the most essential learning outcomes.17/AS/14/UEPC Resolution to Adopt General Education Goals and OutcomesApproved by the Academic Senate on February 10, 2015Approved by President Joseph F. Sheley on March 26, 2015**Source URL:** <https://www.csustan.edu/general-education/general-education-goals> |

**GE Assessment Plan**

The following GE Assessment Plan

* Outlines goals of GE Assessment Plan;
* Displays curricular alignment between General Education areas, learning goals, and outcomes;
* Explains the Outcome Assessment Process and Methods;
* Includes a description and timeline for assessment activities; and
* Provides a plan/timeline for future assessment activities (see 6.2.5 in revised EO 1100).

***Goals of the GE Assessment Plan***

 As established in the 2008-09 GE Academic Program Review:

1. The plan shall assess the General Education program as a whole and, in particular, its success in addressing the goals and outcomes of the GE program.
2. The plan shall be as minimally intrusive to ensure instructor control and decision‐making in his/her class(es).
3. No part of this assessment process shall form part of the RPT or post tenure review of any faculty member, unless requested by that faculty member.
4. The assessment plan shall include a mechanism (Outcomes Assessment Process 2e & f) by which weaknesses in the GE program can be overcome by the development of new courses, or the modification of existing courses.
5. GE program assessment will work in concert with the Stanislaus State [*Principles for Assessment of Student Learning*.](https://www.csustan.edu/office-assessment/principles-assessment-student-learning)

***Curricular alignment between General Education areas, learning goals, and outcomes***

*Alignment*

Each GE Area has anchor outcomes (in **bold** below) that must be included among the learning outcomes identified for each course in a particular Area. Only anchor outcomes will be used as the basis for GE Program assessment. At least one anchor outcome must be selected for each Area course. After the anchor outcome(s) are selected, the department may select 1-3 additional outcomes from the suggested outcomes list (total 2-4 outcomes). Suggestions for further outcomes for courses in an Area are indicated in a separate column, reflecting outcomes commonly found in courses in that area. For example, acknowledging that all A1 courses must address 1.1 as the anchor outcome, the department/program would also need to select at least one additional outcome to meet the 2-4 outcome requirement. Whereas, for Area C1, the department/program with courses in this Area may choose to select the two stated anchor outcomes, and also may also wish to select up to two additional outcomes. Anchor outcomes will form the foundation of GE Program assessment. Selected outcomes will need to be addressed in the departmental program review process and will also be used to identify courses to request artifacts for outcomes assessment.

**Table 1: General Education Area and Outcome Alignment**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GE Area** | **GE Goal(s)** | **GE Anchor Outcome (*Choose at least one, if multiple appear*)** | **GE Suggested Outcomes\* (*Choose 0-3 depending on the number of anchor outcomes chosen. Total chosen is 2-4*)** |
| A1 | 1, 3 | **1.1,** | 1.3, 1.5, 2.3, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 |
| A2 | 1, 3 | **1.2, 1.5** | 1.3, 1.6, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 |
| A3 | 1, 3 | **1.3, 1.5** |  2.3, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 |
| B1 | 2 | **2.1, 2.2** | 1.4 |
| B2 | 2 | **2.1, 2.2** | 1.4 |
| B3 | 1, 2 | **1.4** | 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.6 |
| B Lab | 1, 2 | **1.6** | 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 3.3 |
| C1 | 1, 2 | **2.4, 2.5** | 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 2.3, 2.6 |
| C2 | 1, 2 | **2.4, 2.5** | 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 2.3, 2.6 |
| C3 | 1, 2 | **2.4, 2.5** | 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 2.3, 2.6 |
| D1a | 1 | **1.3** | 1.1, 1.2 |
| D1b | 2 | **2.3** | 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 |
| D2a | 2, 3 | **2.3, 2.4** | 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4 |
| D2b  | 2, 3 | **2.3, 2.4** | 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.3, 3.4 |
| E1 | 1, 2, 3 | **1.6, 2.6** | Any additional Outcomes |
| E2 | -- | **2.6** | 1.6, or any other one outcome |
| F1 | 3 | **3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4** | 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 |
| F2 | 3 | **3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4** | 1.1, 1.2, 2.4, 2.5, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 |
| F3 | 3 | **3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4** | 1.3, 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 |
| G | 3 | **3.4** | Acknowledge any cross-listing |

\* The outcomes suggested in each *row* of this column are based on consultation with academic departments; however, departments may select *any* outcome listed in this *column*.

*History of the alignment process*

The General Education Assessment Council (GEAC) was formed based on the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee on General Education in 2015. GEAC was charged, primarily, with developing an assessment plan for General Education and assisting with the GE Academic Program Review (Provost Memo, Jan.25, 2016). GEAC will disband after completion of these charges, and responsibilities for GE Assessment will follow the processes indicated in the approved assessment plan.

To accomplish their charge, the GE Assessment Council completed an initial review of all GE Course Learning Outcomes as listed in the approved course proposals archived in the Office of Academic Programs. They also reviewed an initial mapping of courses to draft outcomes, completed by department chairs/program coordinators in 2011. Based on this information and discussion regarding the CSU defined Area definitions (EO 1100 February 2015 draft), GEAC developed a provisional document aligning GE Areas with Outcomes both found to be in common across the Area(s) and aligned with Area definitions described in EO 1100.

GEAC members reached out to all departments and met with 23 academic departments over the spring 2017 semester to discuss a process for developing the draft alignment of GE course learning outcomes and to receive feedback on the preliminary alignment. Based on department feedback and discussion over spring 2017, each GE Area has been aligned with core “anchor” outcome(s) found in common across Area courses. The General Education (GE) Area and Outcome Alignment was approved in November, 2017 (See Appendix X: 17/AS/17/UEPC – *General Education (GE) Area and Outcome Alignment*)

Moving forward with this alignment, through the process of GE course recertification and future certification, departments will identify 2-4 Outcomes (*Resolution to Adopt General Education Goals and Outcomes* 17/AS/14/UEPC) for each GE course, acknowledging the anchor outcome(s), and supplementing with any others, as they see fit and as GE Subcommittee allows (based on review criteria). Outcomes should be selected with the understanding that all outcomes selected will need to be identified on all GE syllabi and will need to be assessed and reported on as part of the departmental annual report and the Academic Program Review process.

***Outcomes Assessment Process***

|  |
| --- |
| 1. At the beginning of each semester the FDGE and GE subcommittee will notify program chairs and instructors teaching sections of the GE Area course to be assessed that year.[[1]](#footnote-1) Sections for sampling student work in the GE area will be identified at random with a goal of assessing 20% of course sections in each sub area.[[2]](#footnote-2)
2. Individual faculty identify on course syllabi an assignment/activity that best assesses student achievement on anchor GE outcome(s) linked to the course.
3. FDGE selects five students at random from each selected section and the instructor submits work artifacts from those students and the assignment prompt by the end of the semester. The student work artifacts should be chosen from the assignment instructors have identified on the syllabus.[[3]](#footnote-3)
4. The FDGE will invite all part-time, full-time, and tenure track faculty who teach GE courses to participate in compensated Outcomes Review Panels (ORPs) of 5-7 faculty to assess student artifacts. Development or modification of a selection process occurs in consultation with the SEC.
5. ORPs will use Core Competency FLC criteria/methods for evaluating Outcomes 1.1-1.4 and 3.4. ORPs’ work should include a norming activity using the criteria as applied to student artifacts, an assessment of artifacts, and a period of reflection that culminates in a report. A typical two-day assessment schedule could be:
	1. Morning Day 1: Norming
	2. Afternoon Day 1: Assessment
	3. Morning Day 2: Assessment
	4. Afternoon Day 2: Reflection and development of ORP Reports for integration into the seven-year GE APR.
6. The FDGE and GE subcommittee review ORP Reports and send a summary to the UEPC in fall term for review and approval.
7. The FDGE will post the approved summary report to the GE Assessment website and disseminate to campus. These reports will be integrated into the GE Annual reports and in the GE APR process.
8. The UEPC will determine campus processes for developing rubrics/criteria for outcomes outside of the Core Competencies. ORP will use these criteria to evaluate the remaining GE outcomes.
 |

***Timeline for Assessment Activities***

Table 2 displays a draft timeline for General Education outcomes assessment to begin (fall 2018) following approval of the GE Assessment Plan. This timeline and activities will continue to be refined as discussions continue amongst the Faculty Director of General Education, the Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning, and faculty teaching General Education courses. This timeline includes activities that will occur in addition to systematic annual processes such as the review of university‐wide assessment data.

**Table 2: Draft General Education Timeline for APR cycle**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cycle Year** | **GE Area** | **GE Goal** | **GE Core Outcomes** |
| **Year 1** | **Area A** | **1** | **1.1, 1.2, 1.3** |
| **Year 2** | **Area B** | **1,2** | **1.4., 1.6, 2.1, 2.2** |
| **Year 3** | **Area C** | **2** | **2.4, 2.5** |
| **Year 4** | **Area D** | **1, 2** | **1.5, 2.3, 2.4** |
| **Year 5** | **Area E** | **1,2** | **1.6, 2.6** |
| **Year 6** | **Area F and G** | **3** | **3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4** |
| **Year 7** | **Holistic Review** |  |  |

**Leadership and Governance**

The General Faculty Constitution reserves oversight and evaluation of the GE program for the University Educational Policies Committee (UEPC), an elected body, which assigns a highly defined and limited role to GE Subcommittee, whose membership is by appointment by the Committee on Committees (COC). The Faculty Director of GE (FDGE), appointed by, and reporting to, the AVP for Academic Affairs, assumes leadership for the program, again in highly defined areas.

**GE Subcommittee (see GE Subcommittee Charge and APR Procedures: General Education)**

* Reviews GE course proposals from departments/programs for courses to be included in the General Education Program and makes decisions for continuance/discontinuance of GE course designations.
* Reviews department/program’s GE courses on a seven-year cycle and reports annually on University-wide GE Assessment.
* Reviews the General Education Goals and Outcomes on a seven-year cycle and recommends action (retain/revise).
* Submits an annual year-end report to UEPC, including recommendations for next steps.
* Responsible for the completion of the GE APR with the FDGE.

**Faculty Director of General Education**

* Facilitates the development and revision of GE program assessment with the GE Assessment Council (GEAC) and the review and implementation of GE assessment by GE and ASL subcommittees.
* Liaises with faculty governance, administration, college-level committees, and departments to communicate and support the GE assessment process.
* With the General Education subcommittee, responsible for the completion of the General Education annual assessment report and the seven-year Academic Program Review.

**Faculty Fellow for Assessment**

* Liaises with the FDGE and ASL Subcommittee of UEPC to evaluate GE assessment
* Works with the different Colleges and Departments/Programs, and work within the faculty governance framework to unify GE assessment across academic units.
* Works with the Office of Assessment to facilitate, review, and improve GE assessment processes.

**University Educational Policies Committee (see** [**APR Procedures**](https://www.csustan.edu/AcademicPrograms/Data/documents/AcademicProgramReviewPROCEDURES2012-13_092612.pdf)**: General Education)**

* Reviews the GE Academic Program Review.
* Reviews the GE Assessment Plan and/or delegate to ASL subcommittee.
* Develops or delegate (ASL subcommittee) the development of an assessment process for GE outcomes outside of the Core Competencies.

**Department Chairs and Directors/Coordinators**

* Facilitate the completion of the program APRs, which includes a General Education Assessment component.

**College Assessment Faculty Learning Communities**

* Review college program APRs and annual assessment reports.
* Report on college-level GE assessment trends and discusses with the FDGE.
* Submit findings to GE subcommittee to be integrated into annual reporting.

**Deans**

* Support university-wide assessment as it relates to academic disciplines, General Education, and Graduate Education outcomes.
* Facilitate the batch certification and GE course certification process.

**AVP/ALO**

* Supports the work of the Faculty Director of General Education.
* Ensures GE APR information is integrated into the University’s reaccreditation self-study report.

**Provost**

* Supports the development of the implementation plan(s) as part of the GE APR process.

**Framework for the Assessment of General Education**

**STRUCTURE**

The three levels of student learning assessment at Stanislaus State are institutional-level, program-level, and course-level (Fig 1). Assessment of student achievement in GE occurs first at the course-level; course-level findings are reviewed and summarized via the departmental Academic Program Review. Assessment of GE goals and outcomes occurs at an institutional level via the General Education Program Academic Program Review. As part of the established Academic Program Review process, the FDGE and GE subcommittee review student learning achievement data annually, as well as institutional data related to General Education including enrollment trends, faculty demographics and DFW rates. A review of standardized testing data (e.g., CLA+) and student perceptions of achievement (e.g., NSSE, Graduating Senior Survey, Alumni surveys) are also reviewed to triangulate findings. These levels of review are not new, and continue on-going processes established on campus for many years.



*Fig. 1*. Campus Assessment Structure

**University‐Wide Assessment**

Assessment at the GE program level (i.e., across departments/programs and colleges) is overseen in tandem by the Faculty Director of General Education, the General Education Subcommittee, and ASL subcommittee. While academic program reviews, outcome assessment data, course embedded assessment, and curricular development are completed directly by departmental and college faculty, many of the other assessment activities described below (Table 3) are conducted by the University's various administrative support offices and resulting reports are distributed to the Faculty Director of General Education and General Education subcommittee for review and posted on University websites (Institutional Dashboards, Office of Institutional Research, Office of Assessment, General Education).

These assessment methods, measures and data sources are reviewed by GE subcommittee annually as part of the seven-year Academic Program Review process. The College Assessment FLCs will also review program APRs to identify college-level trends regarding GE and report to FDGE/GE Subcommittee.

*Assessment Methods, Measures, and Data Sources Used at the University‐Wide, Area, and Program Levels*

For each of the following assessment methods, measures, and data sources, a brief statement of purpose and methodology follows, accompanied by the office or persons responsible for gathering, analyzing, summarizing, and presenting information (Table 3).

**Table 3: Methods, Measures and Data Sources Used at the University‐Wide, Area, and Program Levels (5/AS/04/UEPC & 11/AS/09/UEPC)**

| **METHODS, MEASURES, and DATA SOURCES** | **FREQUENCY** | **RESPONSIBILITY** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Academic Program Review***[Revised language from the APR on GE - include language] | Program APRs and GeneralEducation APR– maximum every seven years | Department Chair/Delegate; College Assessment FLCs; FDGE review applicable APR information. |
| ***Collegiate Learning Assessment***\*The performance‐based test is designed to assess critical thinking, analytical reasoning, problem solving, and written communication. The results are normalized using SAT or ACT scores of the participants. We have administered since 2006/07 and 2007/08 to first-year and seniors. The Office of Institutional Research has posted summaries on the website. Stanislaus State uses benchmark data provided by CLA to compare student ratings of achievement to peer group rankings. | Annually (or as administered) | Office of Assessment; Office of Institutional Research  |
| ***Area Assessment***Each year, the General Education subcommittee will review the outcomes assessment data provided by the ORPs as part of the annual assessment process (4e). Using these data the committee will evaluate the effectiveness of courses in these areas for meeting the General Education learning outcomes. Findings and recommendations for action will be distributed to the University Educational Policies Committee, the Assessment of Student Learning subcommittee, and the academic administration for review and recommendations. Findings and recommendations/actions will be sent to the Office of Assessment for tracking and archiving purposes. | One or two areas assessed annually | GE Area Faculty, FDGE, GESubcommittee |
| ***Course Approval Processes*** Courses in the General Education Program are approved by review of the General Education Subcommittee in the course of the regular curricular review process. The subcommittee reviews course materials, including a statement of how the course meets defined Area outcomes (see Table 1) and a description of assessment methods..  | Varies | Department CurriculumCommittee, Department Chair, College Curriculum Committee, College Dean, GE subcommittee, University Educational Policies Committee, Academic Affairs |
| ***Class Size***Data on headcount and average class size for the sub‐areas are tabulated by semester. | Annually | Office of InstitutionalResearch; FDGE |
| ***GPA and DFW Rates*** | Annually | Office of Institutional Research; FDGE |
| ***Frequency of Courses Offered by GE Area*** | Annually | Office of Institutional Research; FDGE |
| ***Faculty Demographics***Analysis of faculty by rank and demographic variables | Annually | Office of InstitutionalResearch; FDGE |
| ***Graduating Senior Survey***The Graduating Senior Survey measures baccalaureate students’ perception of various aspects of their overall education at Stanislaus State, including a section on General Education experiences. Utilizing a 5‐point scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree), students are asked to rate their achievement of General Education goals. The Office of Institutional Research annually disseminates aggregate reports to campus committees and units for review. Data are also disaggregated by program and disseminated to college deans and department chairs for review within their areas. | As administered | Office of InstitutionalResearch |
| **National Survey of Student Engagement and Faculty Survey of Student****Engagement** CSU Stanislaus has aligned its General Education learning goals with NSSE Survey items. Similarly, the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement parallels the NSSE and results allow for a comparison of student and faculty perceptions of achievement. CSU Stanislaus uses benchmark data provided by NSSE to compare student ratings of achievement on GE skills with ratings from peer institutions. | Every three years (or asadministered) | Office of InstitutionalResearch |
| **Writing Proficiency Screening Test**  The reliability of the WPST will be reviewed during this period.  | As part of the Seven-Year APR | WPST Office, Office ofInstitutional Research, |

\*Direct Assessment Method

**REPORTING**

**Reviewing and Reporting on General Education Assessment Results**

1. Summary information will be sent out to campus listservs and posted on the GE website.
2. Summary information will be shared with faculty governance and key administrative units.
3. Annual GE Assessment reports will become part of the seven-year APR.
4. Provost will meet, as part of the seven-year APR process, to discuss the GE implementation plan -- inviting all GE faculty to a GE open forum.

Approved by the University Educational Policies Committee on December 7, 2017

1. See the area assessment timeline in Table 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For example, for area A2, 25 sections of English 1007 and five sections of English 1001 will be offered in spring 2018. Sampling 20% means that six sections will be identified for student work (artifact) collection for a total of 30 artifacts (5 from each section) that are aligned with the core outcome 1.2. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The materials will be anonymized so as to not identify specific instructors or students and will follow the *Principles of Assessment*. After the report is submitted to and approved by the UEPC, the artifacts will be destroyed. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)