Undergraduate Curriculum Forum
AGENDA
Adanti Student Center, Room 301A
Thursday, November 7, 2013

I. Call to order

II. Announcements

IV. Approval of UCF minutes of October 10, 2013

V. Standing Committee Reports
   a. NMC – Notifications Management Committee
   b. WACC – Writing Across the Curriculum Committee
   c. UWIC – University Wide Impact Committee
   d. NPIC – New Programs and Innovations Committee
   e. LEPC – Liberal Education Committee

   Motion to approve TAP/LEP 30 credit packages with other ConnSCU schools
   TAP powerpoint presentation is available here:
   http://southerncnt.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-senate/ucf/

   Resolution re: course caps for LEP Tier 2 courses (see LEPC minutes for language)

VI. New Business

VII. Adjournment
Undergraduate Curriculum Forum
MINUTES
Adanti Student Center, Room 301A
Thursday, October 24, 2013


Absent: S. Grace, L. Bower-Phipps, C. Meyerhoffer, S. Graves, R. Silady, S. Clerc, J. Alexander, D. Bentley-Drobish, C. Petto

I. The meeting was called to order at 9:36.
   1. A quorum (50% + 1) was reached at 9:36.

II. Liz Keenan welcomed Casey Senny, a graduate student writing a doctoral dissertation on the Transfer Articulation Policy.

III. Announcements:
   a. Tricia Lin announced an event that will take place tonight from 5:00-7:00, entitled Peace Talks. It will be a discussion featuring activists from the Flying Eagle Woman Fund, Movement for Justice in El Barrio and North End Action Team. The talk is associated with the Women’s Studies capstone course, and a light dinner will be served.
   b. Kathleen Skoczen announced the upcoming lecture about the León Sister City program that will take place next Thursday at 12:30 in the Adanti Student Center theater. This lecture is part of the Social Justice in the Academy Series.
   c. Polly Beals informed the body that the Office of Assessment has been collecting and analyzing data about the LEP. Michael Ben-Avie has been instrumental writing up this data, and the report is forthcoming.
   d. Liz Keenan announced that at out next meeting Barbara Aronson, and perhaps other members of the Online Policy Committee, will present a draft of a policy for online and hybrid learning. The UCF body has been asked to consider and vote on the policy.

IV. Approval of the UCF minutes of October 10, 2013
   1. The minutes were approved.
V. Standing committee reports:

1. NMC
   a. Discussion of the 10/17/13 meeting
   b. **Motion** to approve the following revised program proposal:
      i. BS Athletic Training
      **Motion** was approved unanimously.
   c. **Motion** to approve the following new course proposals:
      i. BIO 396—Synthetic Biology: Engineering Life
      ii. MUS 230—Introduction of Musical Improvisation
      **Motion** was approved unanimously.
   d. **Motion** to approve the following revised course proposals:
      i. ANT 321—Indians of North America
      ii. CHI 210—Chinese IV
      iii. ENV 491—Seminar in Environmental and Marine Studies
      iv. HIS 162—Connecticut
      v. MAR 150—Costal Marine Studies
      vi. MAT 103—Mathematics for the Liberal Arts
      vii. MAT 103—Mathematics for the Liberal Arts
      viii. PHY 200—General Physics I
      ix. PHY 210—College Physics
      x. PHY 230—Physics for Scientists and Engineers I
      **Motion** was approved unanimously.
   e. **Motion** to approve the following Departmental Minor Revision Proposal
      i. Science Education and Environmental Studies—Marine Studies
      **Motion** was approved unanimously.
   f. The minutes from the meeting on 10/17/13 were received.

2. WACC
   a. Discussion of the 10/17/13 meeting
      i. Marie McDaniel reported that the committee is engaged in discussion about caps on W courses; the committee will eventually present external and internal data they have collected to the UCF body.
      ii. She also reported that the committee is interested in hosting a year-end gathering to recognize faculty who teach W courses and to provide an opportunity for them to share pedagogical strategies.
      iii. Finally, she reported that the committee would like to explore proposing that students divide W-courses in different areas of their courses of study: students would taking one W course in the LEP, one in their major, and would have one free option. She asked members of the body to share their opinions about the idea, and the floor opened for discussion.
      1. Members of the body expressed concern about: the practical implementation of such a division; having
an adequate number of W-courses in departments in which high levels of adjuncts work; the need to streamline our processes and simplify our requirements; the difficulty of requiring departments to write W-course proposals; adding a student requirement when faculty should assume the burden of the additional requirements, and the strategic difficulty of making additional curricular changes as we transition into the LEP.

2. Liz Keenan asked the members of the body to start a dialogue within our Departments about how the LEP has shifted our curriculum, particularly within our own majors. She asked us to explore with our colleagues how we help students continue to develop their writing competency, not just in the Tier 2, but also within the major.

3. Liz Keenan reminded us that we approved a motion last year about reducing the cap on W courses to 20 students over three semesters. Since the reduction of the cap size was supposed to begin this spring, she followed up with Provost Kennedy; however, the Provost said it wasn’t the time to begin reducing class sizes due to budget constraints. This is why, Keenan informed the body, WACC is discussing and gathering data on class size.

b. The minutes from the 10/17/13 meeting were received.

3. UWIC

a. Discussion of the 10/17/13 meeting

b. **Motion** to approve the following revised course proposals:

i. HIS 228—Modern Latin America (Tier 2; Global Awareness)

ii. GEO 100—People, Places and Environments (Tier 2; Time and Place)

iii. MUS 110—Music History of the Western World (Tier 2; Cultural Expression)

iv. ART 104—History of Western Art 1 (Tier 2; Cultural Expression)

v. ART 105—History of Western Art 2 (Tier 2; Cultural Expression)

vi. HIS 104—Islamic Civilization (Tier 2; Global Awareness)

c. The **motion** was approved unanimously.

d. Klay Kruczek read a statement by the committee expressing concern about whether or not “mega sections” (particularly, several courses scheduled for the spring capped at 200 students) can fulfill the pedagogical goals of the LEP (see UWIC minutes for statement). He opened the floor for discussion.
i. Members of the body expressed concern about whether the committee has any control over caps (responding to that, Liz Keenan reminded us that LEPC is the body that makes policy about the LEP, and that they are working on a policy regarding course caps). Kathleen Skoczen expressed concern that sound pedagogy is not the primary preoccupation of the administration; rather, it is the fiscal bottom line. She urged the body to let the administration know that this bottom line is impoverishing the educational mission of SCSU, and that it is our job to defend the integrity of our classes. It was brought up that the Dean has responded this semester with additional allocations to make sure the mega sections are effective. Patricia Kahlbaugh expressed concern that the mega sections will suck up the diversity of course offerings within Tier 2, which would undermine our work creating courses which may not be taught if mega sections become the norm; Yilma Gebremariam expressed concern about assigning mega sections to adjuncts with heavy accents because the students have difficulty understanding them.

ii. Liz Keenan reminded us that a motion about cap sizes will come forward at the next meeting; consequently, we should discuss the issue within our departments.

e. The minutes from the 10/17/13 meeting were received.

4. NPIC
   a. Discussion of the 10/17/13 meeting
   b. The following courses were logged and accepted as Special Topics courses:
      i. NUR 498—Global Healthcare
   c. **Motion** to approve the minor: Social Science and Medicine
   d. The **motion** was approved unanimously.
   e. Minutes from the meetings on 10/17/13 were received.

5. LEPC
   a. Deb Weiss presented the UCF body with the following **motion**, prepared by the LEPC:

**Any LEP credits a student earns beyond the program’s required 48 credits will be credited towards a student’s free electives.**

   i. After significant discussion, the question was called.
   ii. The **motion** passed unanimously.
   b. Deb Weiss finished her presentation about the TAP she began at the last UCF meeting. Upon finishing, she fielded questions and comments from members of the body. There was not enough time to vote on the TAP.
   c. The minutes of the meeting on 10/16/13 were received.

VI. There was no new business
VII. Meeting adjourned at 10:52.

These minutes are respectfully submitted by Resha Cardone
Notifications Management Committee  
October 31, 2013  
MINUTES

Present: Corey Hannah (Co-Chair); Helen Marx (Co-Chair); John Critzer; Jeremy Chandler; Jodie Gil; Mary Kiarie; Kim Laing; Sobeira Latorre; Cheryl Resha; Gregory Robbins; Jennifer Ruggiero; Sophia Myers (UCF secretary)

Absent: Marty Hartog; Sean Grace; Erin Larkin; Cindy Simoneau;

Call to Order: 9:35

I. Old Business

Revised Course Proposals
** PHY 100 – Physics for the Liberal Arts  
Motion to APPROVE; (H. Marx, 2nd J. Gil)  
Vote: 10-0-1

** GEO 201 – Physical Geography  
Motion to APPROVE; (J. Chandler, S. Latorre 2nd)  
Vote: 11-0-0

WMS 356 – Maternal and Child Health  
Motion to APPROVE with minor revision; (H. Marx, G. Robbins 2nd)  
Vote: 11-0-0

III. New Business

New Course Proposals
ESC 111 – Life Through Time  
Motion to APPROVE; (J. Gil, J. Ruggiero 2nd)  
Vote: 11-0-0

MUS 251 – Music and Movement in Early Childhood  
Motion to APPROVE; (G. Robbins, S. Latorre 2nd)  
Vote: 11-0-0

MGT 425 – Managing for People, Planet, and Profit  
Motion to APPROVE with minor revision; (J. Gil, J. Critzer 2nd)  
Vote: 11-0-0

Revised Course Proposals
IDS 401 – Capstone Seminar in Interdisciplinary Studies  
Motion to APPROVE with minor revision; (J. Gil, C. Resha 2nd)  
Vote: 11-0-0
MUS 300 – Beethoven

** CHE 103 – Crime Scene Chemistry

Motion to APPROVE; (J. Chandler, S. Latorre 2nd)
Vote: 11-0-0

Revised Program Proposal
BS Communication: Concentration – Film, Television, & Digital Production
Motion to APPROVE; (J. Critzer, C. Resha 2nd)
Vote: 10-0-0

COM Courses Related to BS Comm.- Conc. Film, TV, and Dig. Prod.
RCP’s
COM 274 – Experimental Media Production
COM 360 – Video Field Production
COM 372 – Electronic Filmmaking
COM 385 – Documentary Production
COM 492 – Practicum in Video Production

Motion to APPROVE as a block; (J. Chandler, C. Hannah 2nd)
Vote: 10-0-0

Revised Program Proposal
BS Communication
Motion to APPROVE; (J. Critzer, G. Robbins 2nd)
Vote: 10-0-0

COM Courses related to BS Communication
RCP’s
COM 201 – Applied Communication Design
COM 205 – Fundamentals of Professional Presentations
COM 233 – Communication in Relational Development
COM 234 – Fundamentals of Copyrighting
COM 236 – Copyrighting for Electronic Media
COM 250 – Business and Professional Communication
COM 257 – Audio Production
COM 258 – Cinematic Technique
COM 259 – Studio Production
COM 265 – Video Technology
COM 275 – Persuasion
COM 287 – Introduction to Communication Research
COM 300 – Organizational Communication
COM 312 – Communication and Gender
COM 322 – Communication Training and Development
COM 332 – Interviewing
COM 335 – Advertising and Promotional Design
COM 340 – Communication and Product Information
COM 360 – Video Field Production
COM 365 – Advanced Postproduction Techniques
COM 370 – Interpersonal Conflict and Communication
COM 372 – Electronic Filmmaking
COM 375 – Family Communication
COM 377 – Video Directing
COM 385 – Documentary Production
COM 387 – Communication Theory
COM 407 – Advertising for Promotions for the Internet
COM 410 – Crisis and Communication
COM 430 – Communication Strategies in the Corporation
COM 440 – Cultural Influences on Communication
COM 468 – Special Effects in Video
COM 472 – Advertising and Promotional Campaigns
COM 481 – Applied Perspectives in Interpersonal Communication
COM 487 – Advanced Organizational Communication Theory
COM 490 – Practicum in Organizational Communication
COM 492 – Practicum in Video Production
COM 493 – Practicum in Advertising and Promotions
COM 497 – Field Experience

Motion to APPROVE as a block; (C. Hannah, H. Marx 2nd)
Vote: 10-0-0

**Departmental Minor Revision Proposal**
Theatre
Motion to APPROVE; (J. Critzer, J. Gil 2nd)
Vote: 11-0-0

Adjournment 10:50

** Classified as LEP courses**
Southern Connecticut State University  
Writing Across the Curriculum Committee  

Meeting Minutes  
October 31, 2013  

NOTE: The WACC met virtually for this meeting.  

Participants: G. McVerry, M. McDaniel, E. Schmitt, K. Lacey, D. Flynn, K. Burke, T. Ferrucci, W. Hochman  
Absent: P. McBrine  

1. Announcements  
   Patrick McBrine welcomed a baby boy, William, born this week!  

2. Proposal Review  
   a. ART 401W History of Art since 1945- Joseph J. Inguanti, approved pending clarifications 6-1-0  

Next meeting: Thursday November 14, 2013 ASC 308  

Respectfully Submitted,  
M. McDaniel/Chair
University-Wide Impact Committee Minutes 10/31/13

Present: K. Kruczek (Chair), S. Graves (co-Chair), L. Bower-Phipps, L. Kwak, J. Mielczarski, B. Rowe, D. Risisky, A. Reynaga, D. Chevan, D. Petroski, H. Lockwood, J. Dodson, K. Stiver, M. Shea
Absent: P. Beals, A. Marsoobian, T. Rega, J. Alexander

I. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 09:41 am (quorum reached) – a few members arrived after the MAR 210 review.

Marine Studies 210, Coastal Marine Studies – LEP Tier 2 Natural World II
Motion: L.B.P. moves to approve with clarifications, D.C. seconded
Vote: unanimous

II. Old Business: Revisiting Previous proposals.

History 106, East Asia to 1850 – LEP Tier 2 Global Awareness
Motion: DC moves to approve with minor revision, HL seconded
Vote: unanimous

Italian 380, Contemporary Italian Culture – LEP Tier 3
Motion: MS moves to approve, DP seconded
Vote: unanimous

French 410, French and Francophone Studies – LEP Tier 3
Motion: DP moves to approve, MS seconded
Vote: unanimous

Music 102 & 103, University Choir – LEP Tier 2 Creative Drive
Motion: DP moves to approve, DR seconded
Vote: unanimous

Music 104 & 105, University Band – LEP Tier 2 Creative Drive
Motion: LBP moves to approve, DC seconded
Vote: unanimous

II. New Business:

Political Science 240, Introduction to Political Thought – LEP Tier 2 Cultural Expression
Motion: MS moves to approve with minor revision, DP seconded
Vote: unanimous

Chemistry 103, Crime Scene Chemistry – LEP Tier 2 Natural World I
Motion: HL moves to approve, DC seconded
Vote: unanimous

Music 230, Introduction to Musical Improvisation – LEP Tier 2 Creative Drive
Motion: DP moves to approve, MS seconded
Vote: unanimous
Chinese 210, A Taste of China: Culture through Food – LEP Tier 2 Cultural Expression
Motion: KK moves to revise and resubmit, DP seconded
Vote: unanimous

Following proposals were tabled.

Environmental Studies 491, Seminar in Environmental and Marine Studies – LEP Tier 3
Natural World II

Mathematics 103, Mathematics for Liberal Arts – LEP Tier 1 Quantitative Reasoning

III. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 10:50am.
Graves
New Programs and Innovations Committee
Minutes
October 17, 2013

Present: Sara Johnson, Stanley Bernard, Lee deLisle, Yilma Gebremariam, Mike Skinner, Hillary Harper, Yunseon Choi, Ho Young Ahn Guest: Kathleen Skoczen

1. Call to Order: Meeting was called to order by Lee deLisle at 9:40 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes: As minutes were sent to all NPIC committee members electronically, the minutes were approved unanimously without corrections via an electronic format.

3. Old Business:

   Updates were provided on all outstanding proposals:
   a. LIT 398 – Israeli Short Story – approved and logged with UCF
   b. ART 398 01 – Photobook: History & Practice – approved
   c. ART 398 02 – Art of Revolution – corrected approved and logged with UCF
   d. ECO 398 – Behavioral Economics – approved and logged with UCF
   e. NUR 498 Global Health Care – approved corrections, logged with UCF
   f. HON 298 – Applied Mathematics and Environmental Problems – approved and logged with UCF
   g. New Minor in Social Science and Medicine – Dr. Kathleen Skoczen spoke with NPIC about the new minor proposal. Approved with revisions, logged with UCF
   h. ITA 398 – Italian American Literature – approved, logged with UCF

4. New Business

      i. Type error in Course Title – “Cutlure” should be “Culture”
      ii. Type error in Course Description – “culture” should be “culture”
   b. NUR 498 – Emergency Nursing – motion to “approve” by Skinner, second by Bernard and Gebremariam. Approved by 1; abstention by 1
5. **Closing:** The motion was made by Lee deLisle to end the meeting. The motion was seconded by Hillary Harper. Motion was approved unanimously. The meeting ended at 10:29 a.m.

*Minutes respectfully submitted by Hillary Harper.*
Meeting Minutes

Present: Dave Petroski, Wendy Hardenberg (recording), Polly Beals, Beena Achhpal, Deb Weiss (Chair), Elliott Horch, Scott Graves, Joe Fields, Mike Shea, Chris Barrett

- Call to Order: 3:34 p.m.
- Committee and Ad Hoc reports
  - Affinity groups – update, Polly Beals
    - Met today with Tier 3 AG (4 attendees)
    - Office of Assessment has requested an LEP assessment steering board comprised of all the coordinators of all the AGs
      1. Dave reported that the TF AG has been talking about creating an action plan with regard to their own assessment, so the board might be helpful for that
      2. Committee agreed this seems like a good direction to go in
  - WAC - The WAC committee met this week and talked about assessment plans for the year. They will reach out to all faculty teaching W sections and collect data on ‘contact hours' with students and writing assignments. They are preparing a report on the impact of class size on writing instruction, which they hope to present to UCF and the Dean’s council in the Spring semester. They also discussed future plans for the WAC program which include proposing that the structure of the program be revised to include requiring:1 W in the LEP program,1W in the major and 1W in any dept.

- Old Business
  - Continued discussion on LEP course caps and completion of referendum
    - Do we have time to do further research, or do circumstances suggest we need to make this motion now?
    - Perhaps better to have this before the appropriate bodies prior to final schedules for spring
• We’re only one avenue for this sentiment (also coming from Council of Chairs, etc.)
• A number of changes were made to the proposal and are reflected in the document itself.
• Motion: To approve resolution as attached for vote by UCF and Faculty Senate – approved unanimously

  o New Business

  • Presentation of Version 3 LEP Document incorporating changes from 2012-2013
    • Would encompass any motions that we’ve passed
    • Deb will work on document and Polly will chair next meeting in Deb’s absence
    • It was decided that the LEPC will address the issue of including a statement(s) regarding class size in Tier 2; this appears to have been inadvertently omitted from the original LEP document

Adjournment: 4:45 p.m.
Whereas the primary goal of SCSU is academic excellence;

And whereas, class caps are maximum student enrollment limits specified for each class;

And whereas, the administration is raising class caps primarily to mitigate funding shortfalls;

And whereas, scholarly studies report that non-pedagogically based class caps may have a serious impact on effective instructional delivery and student success, and raising class caps in many cases impacts effective instruction (for instance see Cuseo, 2007⁴; Horning, 2007²; Kokkelenberg, Dillon, & Christy, 2005³);

And whereas, a number of professional organizations, including National Education Association (NEA), National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), Associated Writing Programs (AWP), National Communication Association (NCA), American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), Association of Departments of Foreign Languages (ADFL) and Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABED) have guidelines for establishing class caps and/or faculty/student ratio based on pedagogical concerns;

And whereas, large class sizes are likely to be detrimental to the recruiting and retention of students;

And whereas, the Liberal Education Program document approved via faculty referendum and signed by the SCSU President affirms both the importance of small class size and a dedication to provide resources to ensure successful implementation of the LEP⁴;

And whereas the LEP requires development and reinforcement of competencies throughout the program, and the teaching of competencies is a labor-intensive endeavor;

Therefore, to fulfill the University mission of academic excellence, be it resolved that class caps in LEP courses should be determined on the basis of sound educational principles such as, but not limited to, the instruction methods, course modality, course objectives and outcomes, and assessment methodology.

---

² Horning, A. (2007), The Definitive Article on Class Size, WPA 31(1), 11-34.
⁴ “In the first tier, small classes help students develop foundational Competencies essential to academic discourse;” (page 8) (italics added)
“the second tier brings the Areas of Knowledge and Experience more to the forefront, while students continue both engaging in Discussions of Values and further developing the Competencies necessary for comprehending, analyzing, and communicating.” (page 8)
“In the third tier, students’ general education culminates with a limited-enrollment capstone seminar focusing on...” (page 8) (italics added)
“In order to focus effectively on providing students with fundamental academic Competencies, Tier 1 courses are generally capped at 20 students.” (page9) (italics added)
“In every [Tier 2] course, students continue developing critical thinking and writing skills, as well as at least one other Competency.” (page10) (italics added)
“The administration has committed to providing the resources necessary for the implementation and support of the Liberal Education Program at Southern.” (page 15)
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An extensive review of literature on research in higher education demonstrated that universities have not developed evaluation strategies for determining the effectiveness of their general education programs in their entirety. Instead, universities tend to evaluate the effectiveness of individual programs, initiatives, or competencies and extrapolate the findings to make claims about the general education offered to the students. The aim of this report is to draw upon these diverse sources of evidence and others in order to articulate a coherent and comprehensive assessment of SCSU undergraduate student learning and development. The intent is to convey that the whole general education program is considered, and not to repeat mistakes made in the past which looked at individual departments and programs in isolation from one another. The report contains baseline information that will be useful in the future when the Liberal Education Program (LEP) is evaluated in its entirety.

There are standardized tests and other performance-based assessments that purport to directly measure embedded competencies within general education. One example is the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) which measures such skills as critical thinking and writing ability, analysis and problem solving, writing effectiveness, scientific and quantitative reasoning, and critical reading. SCSU administers CLA to 100 first-year students and 100 seniors. Another example is the Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes (AHELO).

Another popular approach is to rely on such indirect measures as surveys. This past year, SCSU administered the National Assessment of Service and Community Engagement (all undergraduates), and the Student Strengths Inventory Continuing Student Survey (sophomores and juniors). SCSU also piloted iSkills, which is a measure of information literacy, communication technology skills, and time management. SCSU also re-administered the National Survey of Student Engagement (freshmen and seniors). While this report briefly discusses the findings from these indirect measures, the core of this report is comprised of findings from the direct measures that the LEP affinity groups developed to measure student competencies.

Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes (AHELO)

SCSU was one of only 10 U.S. universities to participate in a feasibility study for an international assessment test of “core” or “workplace” skills conducted by the 34-nation Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). AHELO measures critical thinking, analytic reasoning, problem solving, and written communication. SCSU’s overall mean score was slightly higher than the mean score of all 250 institutions of higher education around the world that participated in AHELO. Some SCSU students had scores that were comparable to those of the top 15% around the world. Out of the other U.S. private and public universities, only 13 students had higher scores.

Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)

The Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) evaluates students’ competency in such skill areas as analytic reasoning and evaluation; writing effectiveness; writing mechanics; and problem solving. In fall 2010, 121 SCSU freshmen completed the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), and 98 seniors completed it in the spring. Southern seniors greatly exceeded expectations in how well they performed on the exam compared with projections. The projections were based
on the CLA test scores of the freshmen and their SAT scores. When all factors were weighed, SCSU seniors reached the 91st percentile nationally in terms of exceeding expectations in the educational gains by its students between their freshman and senior years.

Assessing the Liberal Education Program

LEP was designed as a framework for the structure of learning and experiences at the undergraduate level (SCSU NEASC Self-Study Report, 2011, p. 21). This structured form of general education has been employed by the university in order to provide students with a broad base of knowledge and to encourage a progressive transition from introductory college competencies (Tier 1) through areas of knowledge (Tier 2) and into more advanced ideations and discussions of values (Tier 3). Furthermore, the LEP was designed to promote specific learning outcomes and to allow for the concrete and consistent measurement of these goals. The following outcome statements emerged from the operationalization of the Guiding Principles for the Liberal Education Program that appear in the Undergraduate Catalog (pp. 48-49). Upon completion of the LEP, undergraduate students will be able to:

- Analyze and solve complex problems.
- Cogently and articulately express ideas in speaking and in writing.
- Demonstrate academic habits of mind (e.g. time management, future orientation, study skills).
- Think independently from an informed understanding.
- Research and apply new information to make thoughtful choices.
- Engage in creative and innovative thinking.
- Integrate learning throughout the LEP curriculum, and between liberal education and the major.
- Converse in the language and methodologies of their academic discipline and/or chosen major.
- Apply the standards and ethics required to enter into the professional world.
- Collaborate effectively in teams.
- Articulate/evaluate multiple perspectives on an issue, acknowledging the potential for complexity and ambiguity.

Another central aim of LEP is to provide students with the competency to engage in the integration of information resources and information technology, which is deemed essential for personal and professional success.

As an integral part of LEP implementation, the interdisciplinary affinity groups are developing their own direct measures of student learning. Each affinity group aligns its rubric with the LEP Document (2009) by reviewing the specific key elements of the competency or area of knowledge that the group represents. In general, the affinity groups are developing common shared rubrics, and faculty teaching courses within the competency/area of knowledge use the rubrics for assessing student work.

The following sections briefly describe the results from the assessments that the affinity groups administered to their students.
**Critical Thinking**
Ratings of sample work showed that students were able to provide an adequate central claim in making their argument, but that this area is in need of improvement. It is possible that these claims were too broad or that they were not presented clearly enough and appeared too general. The lowest ratings were assigned to the students’ quality of support for claims, and quality of writing, which also produced the most inconsistent scores among raters. On average, students offered examples or evidence to support their points but their evidence or support were often not effective. Students may not have developed their ideas fully, or they may have used opinions rather than solid support for their claims. It is also possible that their general theses led to a lack of direction and resulted in unclear support.

**Cultural Expressions**
Overall, students’ demonstrations of cultural expressions appear to be developing at best. Professors rated students highest in terms of information literacy, interpretation of content, and application of knowledge and skill set from the course. For most competencies (e.g., interpretive and creative thought, insight, and relation to other works in the discipline), a majority of students were rated at a developing level or below. They received the highest mean score in their ability to interpret content, indicating they offer simple explanations of how the medium creates meaning.

Based on the professors’ ratings, it appears that students understood the task, and were able to apply some of the skills they learned in class. They were able to analyze the work and defend their position to a certain degree, but not with the needed depth. In some cases, students were able to show creative, independent thought. They were able to relate other cultural works in support of their positions.

**Quantitative Reasoning**
Students (n=1,473) in 2012 were rated by math professors for each outcome. Ratings ranged from 1 (student did not meet the outcome) to 3 (student fully met the outcome). Based on these ratings, students demonstrated the highest degree of competency in their ability to understand and apply the formulas they were taught, with 79% partially or fully meeting the outcome. In terms of inductive and deductive reasoning, 70% of students partially or fully met the outcome. In communicating mathematically in writing and problem solving ability, about 67% of the students partially or fully met the outcome goals. While a majority of SCSU students in math courses were able to partially or fully meet the learning goals, around 30% of students failed to meet learning expectations in each of the four key outcomes.

**Written Communication**
In regard to students’ quality of writing on their Critical Thinking papers, their work contained errors, which did not hinder comprehension but might have distracted the raters as they read the papers. On the Cultural Expressions assessment, student writing tended to be rated as “competent” or above less than 25% of the time.

Over three semesters (2009-2010), writing samples were collected from 927 students in ENG 112 (approximately 25% of the total number of students, representing 51 sections taught by 26 instructors). Faculty assessed students’ Self-Evaluation Essays (SEE), which was required as the final writing project for ENG 112. The SEEs were graded by four readers, all of whom taught ENG 112, on a common rubric that measured students’ abilities to create and support an
argumentative claim, integrate and document outside sources into their writing, and edit their writing for standard English. The grades and percentages in each category were High Pass (16.4%), Pass (52.9%), Low Pass (25.1%), and Fail (5.6%).

**Oral Communication**

The Communication Department assessed students’ final oral presentations, which were videotaped. In total, 30 videos were scored. The one area that met or exceeded the standard of 75% was “Clarity and enthusiasm of the speaker’s vocal delivery.” Other areas of moderate strength were the appropriateness of the speaker’s wording; professionalism and appropriate appearance; and preparedness and awareness of the audience.

**Information Literacy**

While students tend to think they are quite competent in this domain, pilot iSkills results would suggest that SCSU is behind in regards to information literacy. iSkills measures information literacy and communication technology skills. iSkills was piloted with 15 students during 2012-2013. These students achieved a mean score of 230 (out of 500). The minimum score achieved was 110 and the maximum was 390. Six students reached the recommended minimum score for certification, which was set at 260.

In 2013, SCSU was a pilot site for a new module on information literacy offered by the *National Survey of Student Engagement* team (n=545). The students were asked to respond to the following item: “How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in using information effectively?” On a scale of 1 to 4, the mean score was 2.96. The students were also asked to indicate how often they “decided not to use an information source in a course assignment due to its questionable quality.” Of the students, 11% indicated very often, 22% often, 38% sometimes, and 28% never.

Students most often completed an assignment that used an information source (book article, website, etc.) other than required course readings. Least often, they looked for a reference that was cited in something they read. They felt that their professors emphasized the most “appropriately citing the sources used in a paper or project.” Professors emphasized the least “questioning the quality of information sources.” In terms of impact on students’ learning and development, the following had an impact (from most to least): Information resources (books, electronic articles, databases, etc.); Library staff (in-person or online consultation); Library guides and tutorials (in print or online).

**Technological Fluency**

The Technological Fluency courses all included such technology-based educational activities as technology-enhanced presentations, blogs, and e-documents. Students were most frequently rated by their instructors as “exemplary” in their ability to use software to create technology-enhanced presentations. Students were most frequently rated as “needing improvement” in the degree to which they were able to use electronic tools to navigate, to compare or contrast, to research, and to know enough to evaluate the technology as a tool.

**Multilingual Communication Competency**

While more than half of SCSU students met or exceeded the national standard in the reading and speaking domains, almost all students performed at the national standard in writing. In terms of reading and speaking, however, World Language professors tended to feel that students
performed better in class than indicated by the STAMP test. After 180 hours of foreign language instruction, it seems that SCSU students are proficient in at least one of the various modes of multilingual communication.

**What is Next?**

LEP is ready for continued growth and improvement in the courses available to students. The Creative Drive affinity group has developed a preliminary outline of a rubric and work will continue in the fall. The addition of the remaining Tier 2 areas of knowledge in global awareness, mind and body, social structure, conflict, and consensus, and time and place will continue. The development of Tier 3 capstone experience courses will enhance the LEP as they specifically emphasize discussions of values such as social justice in America and global environmental sustainability.

The Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) team has worked closely with the First-Year Experience office to promote the use of e-portfolios to assess student writing across the tiers. Currently, the peer mentors in the Inquiry courses are learning how to develop their own e-portfolios with the expectation that they would then show the first-year students how to do so.

Measurement and analysis of LEP learning outcomes will also continue, and as students that have been exposed to the full LEP graduate from SCSU, their progress (e.g., time to completion, employment rates, graduate school enrollment rates) will provide valuable insight into the effectiveness of the LEP as a cohesive whole.

**Summary**

Do students at SCSU engage in the practical use of critical and reflective thinking, rational and effective reasoning, and creative thought? Are they developing the competencies that are embedded within LEP? Students appear to engage in critical and reflective thinking to a certain degree, but not with the proper depth, or understanding that is expected at the college level. One strength uncovered through analysis is that a majority of students across several different major programs reported being required to think critically or analyze evidence in their classes some of the time, a lot of the time, or all of the time. It is important to note, however, that professor ratings of student work, AHELO results, and student self-reports regarding critical thinking, quantitative reasoning and written communication all point to a “developing” level of competency in these areas.

In particular, the quality of student writing emerged as a concern, with ratings of the students’ “mechanics and usage” being particularly poor. The papers demonstrated that students rarely or never provide linguistic control, do not proofread, or polish their work. For example, the Cultural Expressions affinity group tended to rate student writing as “competent” or above less than 25% of the time. A similar finding was observed in the Critical Thinking papers. Students’ work contained errors, which did not hinder comprehension but might have distracted the raters as they read the papers. It is possible that improvement in mechanics, usage, and organization in writing may result in a greater ability to express evidence and support for one’s argument, describe the process of critical and creative thought, and exhibit rational and effective reasoning through writing.
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Towards a Holistic Evaluation of Undergraduate Student Learning

An extensive review of literature on research in higher education demonstrated that universities have not developed evaluation strategies for determining the effectiveness of their general education programs in their entirety. Instead, universities tend to evaluate the effectiveness of individual programs, initiatives, or competencies and extrapolate the findings to make claims about the general education offered to the students. There are standardized tests and other performance-based assessments that purport to measure embedded competencies within general education. One example is the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) which measures such skills as critical thinking and writing ability, analysis and problem solving, writing effectiveness, scientific and quantitative reasoning, and critical reading. SCSU administers CLA to 100 first-year students and 100 seniors. Another popular approach is to rely on such indirect measures as surveys. This past year, SCSU administered the National Assessment of Service and Community Engagement (all undergraduates), and the Student Strengths Inventory Continuing Student Survey (sophomores and juniors). SCSU also piloted iSkills, which is a measure of information literacy, communication technology skills, and time management. SCSU re-administered the National Survey of Student Engagement (freshmen and seniors). The key question is how can we combine the information from these different pieces in order to form a coherent whole?

The intent is to consider the whole general education program, and not to repeat mistakes made in the past which looked at individual departments and programs in isolation from one another.

This evaluation report integrates findings from assessments of students’ learning and development. The different assessments are listed in Table 1. Longitudinal cohort datasets maintained by the Office of Assessment and Planning provide insight into the progress of the students. For each incoming class of first-year students since 2005, the office has built a cohort dataset that contains the students’ scores on the New Student Orientation Survey, Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement, the First-Year Experience Self-Assessments, and the National Survey of Student Engagement among others. Banner supplied such demographic information as high school rank, SAT scores, gender, ethnicity, residential status, academic status, registration with the Disability Resource Center, English placement, Math placement, and retention. Students’ ID numbers are used to link the scores from these assessments to create comprehensive cohort datasets. Moreover, new data points are added each semester. These include academic status, GPA, credits earned, retention, and the subsequent enrollment in other institutions for students who withdrew from the university. The data are analyzed to observe trends, patterns, and anomalies related to undergraduates’ learning and development.
Table 1: The assessments used in this report in addition to the specific assessments developed or being developed for LEP areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Name of Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHELO</td>
<td>Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCSSE</td>
<td>Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Collegiate Learning Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>Student Strengths Inventory Continuing Student Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYE 1</td>
<td>First-Year Experience Self-Assessment: Academic Habits of Mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYE 2</td>
<td>First-Year Experience Self-Assessment: College Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iSkills</td>
<td>ETS iSkills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASCE</td>
<td>National Assessment of Service and Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSO</td>
<td>New Student Orientation Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td>National Survey of Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAMP</td>
<td>Standards-Based Assessment &amp; Measurement of Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Program Review] Student Survey</td>
<td>Academic program review Current Student Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information gleaned from the assessments provides a glimpse of the characteristics of SCSU students. Some of the most informative data regarding undergraduate learning at Southern may come from students’ own accounts. One such indirect assessment of student learning and development is the Student Strengths Inventory Continuing Student Survey (CSS), which is administered to students to measure their college success, involvement in campus activities, planning ability, and perceived future success. For the purpose of this analysis, 779 students from the incoming classes of 2010 and 2011 were evaluated (when they were in their junior or sophomore years). SCSU students were close to the national college average in many aspects of their experiences at Southern (e.g., study habits, perceptions of future success, organization and time management).

Several questions on CSS pertain to the classroom and learning experiences of students at the university. Compared to the national CSS average, students at SCSU tended to be more worried about their ability to succeed academically and their ability to ultimately graduate from college. SCSU students were also more likely to report finding most of their classes irrelevant [to their desired major or profession]. Compared to students across the country, SCSU students were less likely to have formally declared a major, and to have felt that they were on track in achieving their career goals. Students at SCSU were less likely to report that their classes were interesting and less likely to report knowing where to seek help when they struggle with class concepts. Perhaps most relevant to the LEP, SCSU students were less likely than the national average to feel confident in their ability to complete college general education courses with a “B” or better.

The Continuing Student Survey also inquires about the students’ overall college experience. Compared to the national average, students at SCSU report being more likely to cite work as a priority, and report more that they worry about how they will pay for college. SCSU students are also less likely than the national average to have participated in a club, organization, or co-curricular activity. Our students are more likely to report that their college experience has been disappointing and they are less likely than the average college student to report being satisfied...
with their experience at the university, and to feel as though they belong on this campus. However, compared to the national college average, students at SCSU tended to report a greater sense of feeling more motivated to succeed this year than last.

International and national assessments provide a sense of how SCSU students compare with other students. Consider, for example, the Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes (AHELO), a direct assessment of student learning that SCSU administered in spring 2012. Southern was one of only 11 schools in the United States to participate in a feasibility study for an international assessment test of “core” or “workplace” skills conducted by the 34-nation Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). AHELO was intended to compare college students in the areas of critical thinking, analytic reasoning, problem solving and written communication. These skills are desired of any graduate, regardless of discipline, and are considered amenable to change. Eighty-seven randomly-selected seniors completed this assessment.

Southern’s overall mean score was slightly higher than the mean score of all 250 institutions around the world that participated in AHELO. Around 70% of students taking the test had overall scores between 400 and 600. Southern’s mean score was 533. Some Southern students had scores that were comparable to those of the top 15% around the world. The highest score achieved by a Southern student was 818. Out of the other 10 private and public U.S. universities, only 13 students had higher scores.

Southern’s highest subtest scores were on the scales that measure (1) conceptual thinking about the interpersonal and political aspects of the commercial world; and (2) conceptual interpretation of a scenario in the domain of the social sciences.

The weakest subtest score was Analytic Problem Solving. This subtest can be interpreted as students’ ability to interpret graphs and tables, and set up and solve quantitative problems. The second weakest score was Analytic Reasoning: students’ critical thinking ability on an “authentic” task, including students’ ability to interpret information correctly, recognize logical fallacies, and draw appropriate conclusions.

For the purpose of this report, the AHELO results are considered “baseline” data. Also, this year’s NSSE data from the seniors are considered baseline data. Prior to implementation of the Liberal Education Program (LEP), the Office of Assessment and Planning collected “baseline” data on general education outcomes. In this way, the university is able to see student learning outcomes prior to LEP and afterwards. The primary assessment of general education outcomes was the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The data in the following section reflect the state of general education outcomes among seniors under the previous All-University Requirements (AUR) system. In the future, the scores of LEP students will be compared to those of AUR students.
In spring 2009, SCSU’s faculty approved a new Liberal Education Program (LEP) that was initially implemented in 2010-2011. As SCSU gears up to implement the new program, a trend analysis was conducted of relevant indicators that will serve as baseline data (that is, in years to come NSSE data will be compared with the data from today’s pre-implementation stage). This trend analysis currently covers eight years (2005-2011, 2013). NSSE is an example of an indirect measure of student learning.

In comparison with universities in our Carnegie Class, ConnSCU peers, and overall NSSE score, SCSU scored the highest in terms of the first-year students’ interactions with faculty. In comparison with our peers, the SCSU average was significantly higher. So, too, SCSU first-year students’ average score was significantly higher than those of the other ConnSCU 4-year public state universities. A similar pattern was observed with the scores of the seniors. Both the first-year students and the seniors scored lower than Carnegie Class peers and the overall NSSE scores in terms of campus environment (quality of interactions and supportive environment, including academic advisors, faculty, student services staff, and other administrative staff and offices). Seniors also scored lower in terms of quantitative reasoning.

The table below summarizes the responses of the seniors from 2005-2013 to the NSSE item “How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?” A score of “substantial impact” was computed by combining the responses of “quite a bit” and “very much.”
Table 2: Percent senior rating SCSU impact as substantial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome Area</th>
<th>% Senior Rating SCSU Impact as Substantial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Thinking critically and analytically</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Writing clearly and effectively</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Speaking clearly and effectively</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Working effectively with others</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Acquiring job or work related knowledge and skills</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Analyzing numerical and statistical information</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Solving complex real-world problems</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engagement Indicators: Overview

Engagement Indicators are summary measures based on sets of NSSE questions examining key dimensions of student engagement. The ten indicators are organized within four themes: Academic Challenge, Learning with Peers, Experiences with Faculty, and Campus Environment. The tables below compare 2013 average scores for SCSU students with those in comparison groups.

Use the following key:

▲ Your students’ average was significantly higher (p<.05) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude.

△ Your students’ average was significantly higher (p<.05) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.

-- No significant difference.

▽ Your students’ average was significantly lower (p<.05) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.

▼ Your students’ average was significantly lower (p<.05) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude.
## First-Year (FY) Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Engagement Indicator</th>
<th>Conn State System</th>
<th>Carnegie Class</th>
<th>NSSE 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Order Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective and Integrative Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning with Peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with Diverse Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences with Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Teaching Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>▽</td>
<td>▽</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>▽</td>
<td>▽</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Engagement Indicator</th>
<th>Conn State System</th>
<th>Carnegie Class</th>
<th>NSSE 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Order Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>▽</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective and Integrative Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td>▽</td>
<td>▽</td>
<td>▽</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is worth noting that Campus Environment includes the quality of interactions with academic advisors, faculty, student services staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.), other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.), and other students.

The following chart displays the NSSE 2013 engagement indicators (benchmarks) for both first-year students and seniors. These benchmarks were converted to a 0 to 100 point scale where the higher the score indicates a more desirable score.

**Table 3: NSSE 2013 engagement indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Order Learning</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>64.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective and Integrative Learning</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>60.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Strategies</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>67.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>44.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>51.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with Diverse Others</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>67.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>39.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Teaching Practices</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>65.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Interactions</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>64.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>58.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COLLEGIATE LEARNING ASSESSMENT

The Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) evaluates students’ competency in such skill areas as analytic reasoning and evaluation; writing effectiveness; writing mechanics; and problem solving. In fall 2010, 121 SCSU freshmen completed the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), and 98 seniors completed it in the spring. Southern seniors greatly exceeded expectations in how well they performed on the exam compared with projections. The projections were based on the CLA test scores of the freshmen and their SAT scores. When all factors were weighed, SCSU seniors reached the 91st percentile nationally in terms of exceeding expectations in the educational gains by its students between their freshman and senior years.

Currently, first-year students are completing CLA+ and seniors are scheduled to complete the test in the spring. CLA+ is the new version of the test.

ACADEMIC PREPAREDNESS FOR COLLEGE

As a second source of information in considering our students’ academic needs, the attitudes and perceptions of students who have enrolled at SCSU and will enter this fall (2013) were evaluated. New Student Orientation (NSO) surveys were developed and administered to all NSO participants. Between 28% and 34% of incoming students reported perceived each of the seven academic domains as a “past barrier to their academic success”.

Students were asked to rate the following questions using a 6-point scale from “Not at all” to “Very much.” Specifically, the applicable section of this survey inquired about the extent to which incoming students felt the following areas have been barriers to their academic success thus far: (1) attention to academic tasks, (2) spelling/punctuation/sentence construction, (3) organizing thoughts in writing, (4) handwriting, (5) note taking, (6) reading class-related materials, and (7) really comprehending class-related materials. Students reported being the most worried about attention to academic tasks and organizing thoughts in writing, and reported the least worry regarding their handwriting.

Furthermore, the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE) includes a similar question set, which asks incoming freshmen to rate how prepared they feel to do various academic tasks during the coming year. Ratings on these items ranged from 1 (not at all prepared) to 6 (very prepared). Students from the incoming class of 2013 reported feeling the most unprepared in their ability to analyze math or quantitative problems. These students reported the highest degree of confidence in their ability to work effectively with others.
The Liberal Education Program

LEP was designed as a framework for the structure of learning and experiences at the undergraduate level (SCSU NEASC Self-Study Report, 2011, p. 21). This structured form of general education has been employed by the university in order to provide students with a broad base of knowledge and to encourage a progressive transition from introductory college competencies (Tier 1) through areas of knowledge (Tier 2) and into more advanced ideations and discussions of values (Tier 3). Furthermore, the LEP was designed to promote specific learning outcomes and to allow for the concrete and consistent measurement of these goals. The following outcome statements emerged from the operationalization of the Guiding Principles for the Liberal Education Program that appear in the Undergraduate Catalog (pp. 48-49). Upon completion of the LEP, undergraduate students will be able to:

- Analyze and solve complex problems.
- Cogently and articulately express ideas in speaking and in writing.
- Demonstrate academic habits of mind (e.g. time management, future orientation, study skills).
- Think independently from an informed understanding.
- Research and apply new information to make thoughtful choices.
- Engage in creative and innovative thinking.
- Integrate learning throughout the LEP curriculum, and between liberal education and the major.
- Converse in the language and methodologies of their academic discipline and/or chosen major.
- Apply the standards and ethics required to enter into the professional world.
- Collaborate effectively in teams.
- Articulate/evaluate multiple perspectives on an issue, acknowledging the potential for complexity and ambiguity.

### Table 4: How prepared are you to do the following in your academic work at this institution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Write clearly and effectively</th>
<th>Speak clearly and effectively</th>
<th>Think critically and analytically</th>
<th>Analyze math or quantitative problems</th>
<th>Use computing and information technology</th>
<th>Work effectively with others</th>
<th>Learn effectively on your own</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BCSSE; N=1,300
Another central aim of LEP is to provide students with the competency to engage in the integration of information resources and information technology, which is deemed essential for personal and professional success.

Table 5: Timeline of the Liberal Education Program (LEP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>LEP Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>The Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF) commissions the University-Wide Impact Committee (UWIC) to study general education reform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>UWIC presents the “General Education Review Report,” and their recommendations are approved by UCF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2004</td>
<td>The General Education Task Force (GETF) is formed and faculty and student open discussions on general education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>GETF is reconfigured and meetings take place with faculty to define their goals. The program structure is developed and presented to faculty and administrators for refinement. The goals for LEP were approved by the faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Pilot of First-Year Experience (FYE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Meetings take place with individual departments, programs and administrators and the LEP is submitted to UCF and Senate. New Task Force members are elected and take part in orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>The LEP is approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Initial investigation of LEP components (New Student Orientation, First-Year Experience). LEP was implemented in the fall 2011 semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Tier 1 LEP component affinity groups start to develop assessment strategies or enhance previous strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Several Tier 2 LEP component affinity groups develop assessment strategies; the use of e-portfolios is explored.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Affinity group” is the term used on campus to describe the departments that worked collectively on a specific competency. In general, the interdisciplinary affinity groups are developing common shared rubrics, and faculty teaching courses within the competency/area of knowledge use these direct measures of student learning. Each affinity group aligns its rubric with the LEP document by reviewing the specific key elements of the competency or area of knowledge the group represents.

Affinity groups developed assessment teams and at many of the first meetings of these teams, faculty members were presented with the LEP Affinity Group Rubric (the “rubric of rubrics,” which was based on the 2013 USAFA Departmental Needs Assessment, and adapted from the Program Needs Assessment at the University of Northern Colorado). This rubric appears in this report, and is called “LEP Affinity Group Self-Assessment.” This rubric describes the process through which common shared assessments are developed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Question(s) To Think About</th>
<th>Level 0: No Progress Yet</th>
<th>Level 1: Beginning</th>
<th>Level 2: Satisfactory</th>
<th>Level 3: Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Competencies</td>
<td>Has my affinity group written student learning outcomes that allows for meaningful assessment (that is, to answer questions that we do not know already)?</td>
<td>Student learning outcomes have not been written for this affinity group.</td>
<td>Student learning outcomes have been written for this affinity group. However, they are not written in terms of what students will be able to do (“competencies”) as a result of taking a course(s) in the affinity group.</td>
<td>Student learning outcomes have been written in terms of what students will be able to do as a result of taking a course(s) in the affinity group. However, modest improvements are needed because one of the following is true: 1. Outcomes are not actionable (i.e., they don’t include an action verb). 2. Outcomes are not clear and understandable to faculty and students.</td>
<td>Student learning outcomes have been written for this affinity group in a way that allows for meaningful assessment. 1. Outcomes are written in terms of what students will be able to do as a result of taking a course(s) in the affinity group. 2. Outcomes are actionable (i.e., they include action verbs). 3. Outcomes are clear and understandable to both faculty and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Methods</td>
<td>Is my affinity group making efforts to assess each of the elements in the LEP document? To what extent are we relying on direct vs. indirect measures?</td>
<td>No efforts are being made to assess student learning outcomes.</td>
<td>The affinity group is beginning to assess at least some student learning outcomes. However, assessment efforts rely completely on indirect measures of learning (e.g., student feedback, surveys, focus groups, etc.).</td>
<td>Assessment of student learning outcomes is underway but not fully implemented. At least some of the outcomes incorporate the use of direct measures of learning (e.g., exams, research papers, portfolios, etc.) are used for each outcome and are supplemented by indirect measures (e.g., student feedback, surveys, focus groups, etc.), as appropriate.</td>
<td>The affinity group is fully engaged in assessing each of the student learning outcomes. Direct measures of learning (e.g., exams, papers, projects, portfolios, etc.) are used for each outcome and are supplemented by indirect measures (e.g., student feedback, surveys, focus groups, etc.), as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Has my affinity group established processes for sharing assessment results? To what extent do faculty members discuss those results with one another?</td>
<td>Assessment results are not shared with faculty in my affinity group.</td>
<td>Assessment results are shared, but only with affinity group leadership. Other faculty members are not included.</td>
<td>Assessment results are shared with all faculty in my affinity group. However, there is not a forum in which faculty members discuss those results with one another.</td>
<td>Assessment results are shared with all faculty members. Workshops and other forums exist such that faculty members openly discuss assessment results with one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to the Affinity Group</td>
<td>Does my affinity group regularly use assessment results for the purposes of improving the courses in the affinity group? Is the affinity group in the habit of conducting follow-up assessments to ensure that the improvements worked?</td>
<td>Assessment results have not been used for the purposes of improving the courses in the affinity group.</td>
<td>There is at least one documented example in which assessment results have been used for the purposes of improving the courses in the affinity group.</td>
<td>Assessment results are regularly used for the purposes of improving the courses in the affinity group. However, the affinity group is not in the habit of performing follow-up assessments to ensure that the improvements actually worked.</td>
<td>Assessment results are regularly used for the purposes of improving the courses in the affinity group. The affinity group is also in the habit of performing follow-up assessments to ensure that the improvements actually worked.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Based on USAFA Departmental Needs Assessment. (2013). Adapted from Program Needs Assessment at University of Northern Colorado.
LEP assessments have been developed for New Student Orientation, First-Year Experience, Critical Thinking, Quantitative Reasoning, Technological Fluency, Cultural Expressions, American Experience, and Natural World. The development of a common shared rubric for Creative Drive is in process. Multilingual Communication has a standardized exit assessment in place (see Appendix B). Information Literacy has been measured through the iSkills pilot and a new module on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) that focuses on information literacy. In collaboration with the Writing Across the Curriculum team, the use of e-portfolios is being explored. The remaining competencies will be evaluated in the future. These are primarily Tier 2 and 3 competencies. The affinity groups focused their attention on measuring competencies or areas of knowledge. The related LEP values were not explicitly discussed. It is expected that as the design of the Tier 3 courses continues, values will be more clearly articulated and measured.

For the LEP evaluation, direct and indirect measures were used in order to assess the level of competency exhibited by SCSU students, and the ability of the LEP to support these developing competencies. A direct measure assesses student performance based on identified learning outcomes. Examples of direct measures include iSkills, AHELO, the STAMP, and rubric-based ratings. An indirect measure is based on opinion or thought about student performance. Examples of indirect measures include the FYE Self-Assessments, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and the Student Strengths Inventory Continuing Student Survey (CSS). NSSE was used for the Civic Engagement area because it is the only assessment measuring this area that is repeatedly administered at the university.

On the following page appears a table, which describes the direct and indirect assessments. For the purpose of this report, competencies and related LEP goals were aligned with the LEP and General Education areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEP and General Education Areas</th>
<th>Tier Level</th>
<th>Developed Locally (L) or Externally (E)?</th>
<th>Type of instrument</th>
<th>Indirect (I) or Direct (D) Outcome Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Student Orientation</td>
<td>Pre-Tier 1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Experience (INQ)</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological Fluency</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Expressions</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Experience</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural World</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Drive</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingual Communication</td>
<td>Tier 1/Tier 2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Across the Curriculum</td>
<td>All Tiers</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>e-portfolio (in design stage)</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Complexity</td>
<td>Tier 1, Tier 3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Collegiate Learning Assessment (every other year)</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Foundational Competencies</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>iSkills (every other year); Special module of the National Survey of Student Engagement</td>
<td>D/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Tier 1, Tier 3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>National Survey of Student Engagement</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL THINKING

“To prepare students to identify problems and to think effectively about their solutions, both of which require making good arguments and critically assessing information. These skills are necessary for active learning and independent thinking; they are also essential for academic success and good decision-making in students’ personal, professional, and public lives” (LEP Document, 2009).

The interdisciplinary “affinity group” for Critical Thinking is comprised of faculty members from Anthropology, Art, Environmental Studies, Geography, History, Judaic Studies, Media Studies, Philosophy, Physics, Political Science, and Sociology.

According to the key elements of the Critical Thinking competency, courses aim to use real-world problems in order to provide instruction in four key areas. Students should be able to produce logical arguments, evaluate the quality of their arguments, identify various types of arguments, and place a significant focus on inductive reasoning. Critical thinking courses also aim to provide practice with evaluation, such as assessing the quality and reliability of sources and forms of evidence. These courses should also guide students in analysis, helping them to break down concepts and assertions in order to identify relationships and ascertain defining features. Finally, critical thinking courses aim to give ample practice in synthesis and to instruct students on the ability to integrate many claims into a coherent whole. Can SCSU students examine an argument from all sides and form a well-reasoned position on it?

Critical Thinking Courses
In 2012-2013, 374 student papers were assessed by professors using the Critical Thinking rubric, which was developed by the affinity group. This rubric is comprised of five main content areas: 1) quality of argument’s central claim, 2) quality of reasoning, 3) quality of support for claims, 4) quality of writing, and 5) development of content and concepts. Content area 2 (quality of reasoning) was further broken down into two criteria: organization and quality of argument. Other than that the papers were all essays, there was not a common assignment.
In the following table, please note that the higher the mean score, the more desirable the result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Critical Thinking results</th>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of argument's central claim</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of reasoning: Organization</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of reasoning: Quality of Argument</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of support for Claims</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of writing</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of context and concepts</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings of sample work showed that students were able to provide an adequate central claim in making their argument, but that this area is in need of improvement. It is possible that these claims were too broad or that they were not presented clearly enough and appeared too general. The lowest ratings were assigned to the students’ quality of support for claims, and quality of writing, which also produced the most inconsistent scores among raters. On average, students offered examples or evidence to support their points but their evidence or support were often not effective. Students may not have developed their ideas fully, or they may have used opinions rather than solid support for their claims. It is also possible that their general theses led to a lack of direction and resulted in unclear support. In regard to students’ quality of writing, their work
contained errors, which did not hinder comprehension but might have made reading more awkward for raters.

**Student Evaluations of Critical Thinking at SCSU**

Another measure of critical thinking comes from the academic program review *Current Student Surveys*, which were administered to 4,371 students over the last 5 years across 11 departments. These surveys inquire about students’ experiences in their classes at SCSU, and provide baseline data that will be used for evaluating the progress of LEP in the future. In order to assess critical thinking, 5 items were examined as a single variable whereby an average score for each student was calculated. Scores ranged from 1 (not at all) to 5 (totally), with higher scores being indicative of reporting more critical thinking experiences in the classroom. The average score was 3.55, or between “some” and “a lot” perceived critical thinking within courses.

**Table 7: Overall, in the courses that I’ve taken in this department, I am or have been . . .**

| Required to analyze topics in-depth | 60% |
| Expected to reason from evidence | 58% |
| Expected to provide rich, thoughtful answers to questions asked in class | 57% |
| Taught how to appraise the quality of my work | 54% |
| Expected to rethink notions that I have | 53% |
| Provided with opportunities to use reasoning abilities to solve problems | 52% |
| Required to gain insight into the thinking of other people | 52% |
| Taught ideas, concepts, and knowledge that help me in other courses | 52% |
| Required to analyze and evaluate evidence | 50% |
| Challenged to defend my position on a topic | 42% |

To evaluate the new Critical Thinking course from the students’ perspective, several items were added to the *FYE Self-Assessments*:

**Table 8: Critical Thinking Course Student Appraisal**

| As a result of my critical thinking course, I am able to distinguish between the premises and the conclusion of an argument in a complex piece of writing. | 65% |
| As a result of my critical thinking course, I can identify and explain specific types of fallacies (common errors in reasoning). | 63% |

Students’ scores on these items will also be tracked over time to discern change, if it should occur.
CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS

“To develop the students’ understanding of and aesthetic appreciation for influential cultural objects and traditions. This understanding will enable students to expand their own aesthetic sensibilities and to enhance their encounters with cultural works” (LEP Document, 2009).

The interdisciplinary “affinity group” for Cultural Expressions is comprised of faculty members from Art History, English, Theatre, Music, and Geography.

According to the key elements of the Cultural Expressions competency, courses aim to promote students’ aesthetic evaluation (encountering historical and/or contemporary genres of cultural expression); encounter with works of cultural significance (examining social, historical, and aesthetic contexts of cultural expression); and analytic skills (thinking critically and analytically about cultural expression).

One way to assess students’ ability to engage in more complex critical thought is to ask them to apply their analytic skills to an unfamiliar and novel object. Students were presented with a novel cultural artifact and were required to describe, and analyze the object, as well as to provide adequate evidence and support for their given analyses.

In order to assess students’ ability to think complexly about an unfamiliar aspect of another culture, three raters in spring 2013 scored 20 student writing samples based on the Cultural Expressions Rubric, which was developed by the affinity group. (To test the rubric, a pilot was conducted in 2012). The rubric included two main categories: (1) core criteria, and (2) universal competencies in writing. Within each category, there were several criteria. Within the core criteria category, raters assessed in terms of the student’s interpretation, relation to other works of art, broader context, description of structure and formal elements, application of principle features to the unknown and the students’ insight. Raters assessed students’ interpretative and creative thought, how criteria was formed and defended, and information literacy. Finally, raters assessed students’ thesis or central claim, organization and mechanics. For each of these criteria, student work was rated as “unacceptable” (minimal or developing), “acceptable” (competent or effective), or “exemplary” (mastering).

The goal of asking students to interpret and analyze culturally-bound art, music, theatre, and writing is to expose them to novelty. Writing about the familiar allows students to rely upon common ideas and everyday knowledge. Discussing “the strange” requires creative thought and an analytical skill set, as students must apply what they have learned in class to something new. Are students able to accomplish this task?

The following is a table of each criterion evaluated by raters and a description of what is deemed to be “Acceptable” for each item.
Table 9: Core Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation</strong></td>
<td>Student’s presentation offers <strong>simple</strong> explanations of how the medium creates meanings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relation to other works of art</strong></td>
<td>Student <strong>sometimes or often</strong> establishes meaningful and accurate connections among works of art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broader Context</strong></td>
<td>Student demonstrates a command of the circumstances of artistic production and <strong>some</strong> of its dimensions (e.g., historical, cultural, regional, and chronological).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of structure and formal elements</strong></td>
<td>Student considers <strong>a few</strong> formal elements of a work of art or similar (e.g., composition, light and shade, pictorial space, technique, tonality).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application of principal features to the unknown</strong></td>
<td>Student <strong>demonstrates understanding of</strong> the formal, stylistic, and contextual relationships between the unknown and the known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insight</strong></td>
<td>Student <strong>tentatively</strong> demonstrates creative autonomy in the analysis of the known and the unknown.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Raters assessed student performance on each of these criteria by assigning a score of 1 to 6, where 1=minimal, 2=emerging, 3=developing, 4=competent, 5=effective, and 6= mastering. Minimal and emerging are considered to be “unacceptable,” while developing and competent are considered “acceptable” and effective and mastering are considered “exemplary.”

Overall, students’ demonstrations of cultural expressions appear to be developing at best. Professors rated students highest in terms of information literacy, interpretation of content, and application of knowledge and skill set from the course. For most competencies (e.g., interpretive and creative thought, insight, and relation to other works in the discipline), a majority of students were rated at a developing level or below. They received the highest mean score in their ability to interpret content, indicating they offer simple explanations of how the medium creates meaning.

In the following tables, please note that the higher the mean score, the more desirable the result.
### Table 10: Cultural Expressions spring 2013 results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Item</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of content</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of knowledge, ideas, and skill set from the course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the work (of art, literature, music, theater)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification and linguistic description of content (structure and formal elements)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to other works in the discipline, if applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria formed and defended</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretative and creative thought</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis/Central claim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader context, if applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics and usage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: Cultural Expressions spring 2012 results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.35383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to Other Works of Art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.35793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader Context</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.19001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Structure and Formal Elements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.33907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of Principle Features to the Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.27673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.31573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive and Creative Thought</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.34234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Formed and Defended</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.22877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.17796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis/Central Claim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.22190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.19271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics and Usage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.24101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of papers = 59
In general, students struggled with the demands of this task. There were many clear areas in
which their analysis and writing could be improved. Even ratings of the strongest areas showed students’ skills to be developing, and student writing tended to be rated as “competent” or above less than 25% of the time. Based on the professors’ ratings, it appears that students understood the task, and were able to apply some of skills they learned in class. They were able to analyze the work and defend their position to a certain degree, but not with the needed depth. In some cases, students were able to show creative, independent thought. They were able to relate other cultural works in support of their positions.

In general, students performed at a developing to competent level. Students seemed to establish and defend their points fairly well, though more students were rated as developing rather than competent. Raters assigned the lowest scores to the students’ use of proper materials in completing the assignment.

QUANTITATIVE REASONING

Quantitative Reasoning Competency

“To enable students to recognize, understand, and use the quantitative elements they may encounter in various aspects of their lives, to foster abstract quantitative thought, to build self-confidence, and to appreciate the beauty and power of quantitative reasoning. Increasingly, success in modern life, academic disciplines, and career paths depends upon quantitative reasoning” (LEP Document, 2009).

According to the key elements of the Quantitative Reasoning competency, courses aim to develop five key areas among students. Students should be exposed to quantitative situations, in which they must identify essential quantitative elements and understand the relationship between these elements. Students will also be instructed on the processes of quantitative data, and the representation and interpretation of information in technical and common language. Further, this competency aims to develop students’ understanding of methods and their ability to acquire the tools necessary in order to resolve routine and novel quantitative questions. Students will gain practice in assessing the reliability of data and solutions including the correctness and accuracy of the analysis used. Finally, students are expected to master mathematical processes using discovery, pattern-recognition, and testing to develop mathematical formulas and theorems, and to give persuasive mathematical arguments in order to establish their validity. Can our students engage in meaningful and accurate mathematical reasoning and logic?

The courses that are included in the Quantitative Reasoning assessment are MAT 103, MAT 106, MAT 107, MAT 108, MAT 120, MAT 122, MAT 128, MAT 139, and MAT 150. Students in these mathematics courses were assessed by faculty members based on the following desired four learning outcomes:

- Outcome 1: evaluated mechanical processes such as the students’ ability to understand and apply the theorems and/or formulas being taught.
- Outcome 2: looked at both inductive and deductive reasoning to solve a problem.
- Outcome 3: assessed the students’ ability to communicate mathematics effectively in writing regardless if the statement was correct.

- Outcome 4: considered the students’ modeling and problem solving ability.

Students \((n=1,473)\) in 2012 were rated by math professors for each outcome. Ratings ranged from 1 (student did not meet the outcome) to 3 (student fully met the outcome). Based on these ratings, students demonstrated the highest degree of competency in their ability to understand and apply the formulas they were taught, with 79% partially or fully meeting the outcome. In terms of inductive and deductive reasoning, 70% of students partially or fully met the outcome. In communicating mathematically in writing and problem solving ability, about 67% of the students partially or fully met the outcome goals. While a majority of SCSU students in math courses were able to partially or fully meet the learning goals, around 30% of students failed to meet learning expectations in each of the key outcomes.

Student performance on each outcome was predictive of their overall course grade, with outcome 1 (mechanical processes) being the largest contributing factor to final grades.
Information Literacy Competency

“To provide students with the ability to recognize when information is needed and to locate, evaluate, and use information effectively. In their academic, professional, personal and civic endeavors, students face an expanding quantity of information from sources whose quality is often uncertain, and have an increasing number of tools available to them for information retrieval and evaluation” (LEP Document, 2009).

According to the key elements of the Information Literacy competency, courses aim to develop five key abilities. The first is determination of needs, whereby students should gain the capability of defining and articulating the information needed, as well as the ability to identify potential information sources. Furthermore, students should become efficient retrievers of this information. A third component of this competency is critical evaluation of the quality and reliability of accessed sources. Information literacy courses also aim to convey knowledge of ethical and legal issues and to promote the appropriate use of processes of acquiring, questioning, analyzing and synthesizing information. Do SCSU students possess the awareness and skills to acquire valid and useful information for their given assignments and tasks?

iSkills

*iSkills* is a measure of information literacy and communication technology skills. The *iSkills* assessment consists of 50 items resulting from the performance on 14 interactive tasks. Resulting scores on this assessment range from 0 to 500. Educational Testing Service recommends a minimum score of 260 to receive the certification in this area that is provided by ETS. At SCSU, *iSkills* was piloted with 15 students in the May of 2013. All the students in a computer science course participated in the pilot. These students achieved a mean score of 230. The minimum score achieved was 110 and the maximum was 390. Six students reached the recommended minimum score for certification set at 260. For the LEP evaluation, these scores are considered baseline data and future *iSkills* results will be compared to them.

**New NSSE module on information literacy**

In 2013, SCSU was a pilot site for a new module on information literacy offered by the *National Survey of Student Engagement* team. The students were asked to respond to the following item: “How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in using information effectively?” On a scale of 1 to 4, the mean score was 2.96. The students were also asked to indicate how often they “decided not to use an information source in a course assignment due to its questionable quality.” Of the students, 11% indicated very often, 22% often, 38% sometimes, and 28% never.

Students most often completed an assignment that used an information source (book article, website, etc.) other than required course readings. Least often, they looked for a reference that was cited in something they read. They felt that their professors emphasized the most “appropriately citing the sources used in a paper or project.” Professors emphasized the least “questioning the quality of information sources.” In terms of impact on students’ learning and development, the following had an impact (from most to least): Information resources (books, electronic articles, databases, etc.); Library staff (in-person or online consultation); Library guides and tutorials (in print or online).
In the following tables, please note that the higher the mean score, the more desirable the result.

**Table 12: During the current school year, how often have you done the following?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed an assignment that used an information source (book, article, web site, etc.) other than required course readings</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked on a paper or project that had multiple smaller assignments such as an outline, annotated bibliography, rough draft, etc.</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received feedback from instructors that improved your use of information resources (source selection, proper citation, etc.)</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed an assignment that used the library’s electronic collection of articles, books, and journals (JSTOR, EBSCO, LexisNexis, ProQuest, etc.)</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used the library’s physical resources (study space, computers, meeting rooms, etc.)</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified how an author’s findings or conclusions contributed to the existing knowledge of a topic</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed the focus of a paper or project based on information you found while researching the topic</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked for a reference that was cited in something you read</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 13: During the current school year, how much have your instructors emphasized the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriately citing the sources used in a paper or project</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not plagiarizing another author’s work</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using scholarly or peer-reviewed sources in your course</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using practices (terminology, methods, writing style, etc.) of</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a specific major or field of study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning the quality of information sources</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 14: How important have the following been to your learning and development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information resources (books, electronic articles, databases,</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library staff (in-person or online consultation)</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library guides and tutorials (in print or online)</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technological Fluency Competency

“To provide students’ fluency in contemporary and emerging technologies that transform the way we work, and to prepare them to respond to future technological changes. In today’s highly technological society, comfort with and fluency in rapidly evolving technology provide students with a competitive edge professionally and with important tools for social interaction and collaboration” (LEP Document, 2009).

The interdisciplinary “affinity group” for Technological Fluency is comprised of faculty members from Communication, Computer Science, Education, Geography, Journalism, Physics and Women’s Studies.

According to the key elements of the Technological Fluency competency, courses aim to develop four key elements: (1) “common tasks” such as solving problems, accessing information, and communicating information and ideas using appropriate technologies; (2) “focus” which involves using emergent or recently developed technologies to address specialized tasks; (3) “future technological change” which evaluates a student’s ability to navigate and adapt to future technological developments; and (4) “broader implications” which refers to a student’s level of cognizance regarding the ethical and social implications of revolutionary technologies.

Students should complete such common tasks as solving problems, accessing information, and communicating information and ideas using the appropriate technologies. This competency also places an emphasis on the ability to use emergent or recently developed technologies in order to address specialized tasks. Further, students should be instructed on future technological change and understand how to adapt to future developments. Finally, students will be made cognizant of ethical and social implications of new technologies including their impact on security, privacy, censorship, intellectual property, and the reliability of information. Are SCSU students able to use technology effectively and to their advantage as well as demonstrating experience with the appropriate technological tools?

Using the rubric developed by the afore-mentioned affinity group, faculty members evaluated their students’ ability to carry out several technology-based tasks as part of their Technological Fluency courses. The evaluated LEP courses all included technology-based educational activities such as technology-enhanced presentations, blogs and e-documents. For this assessment, 622 students were evaluated from three different disciplines: Computer Science (n=295); Communication (n=241); and Physics (n=86). Students were evaluated on nine performance criteria related to four key elements associated with technological fluency within the classroom.

Students were most frequently rated by their instructors as “exemplary” in their ability to use software to create technology-enhanced presentations. Students were most frequently rated as “needing improvement” in the degree to which they were able to use electronic tools to navigate, to compare or contrast, to research and to know enough to evaluate the technology as a tool.
Most recently, 133 students were assessed on technological fluency in the spring 2013 semester using a slightly revised rubric. The rubric had been revised based on previous results. Scores for this evaluation ranged from 1 (skill not evident) to 4 (exemplary). Students were most frequently
rated as “exemplary” in terms of their ability to create technology-enhanced presentations, and to present their findings with good organization, clarity and with good delivery. Students’ skills were most frequently rated as “not evident” in this same domain. For most performance criteria, students seem to be performing at a satisfactory level, with many students in need of progress and improvement in this area. Overall, student performance was rated similarly to those previously assessed.

**ORAL COMMUNICATION**

“To provide students with the tools to express themselves coherently and cogently in face-to-face interactions. In the twenty-first century, students must be able to interact effectively in the community and in the workplace to succeed in their professional, personal, and community roles” (LEP Document, 2009).

According to the key elements of the Oral Communication competency, courses aim to develop students’ oral interactions (engaging in oral interactions to accurately convey or obtain information, to express feelings in an appropriate manner, and to exchange ideas); effective listening (understanding and interpreting language concerning a wide variety of subjects in an accurate and meaningful fashion); and presentation and audience (effectively presenting information and ideas to diverse audiences using appropriate technology).

Oral Communication is an embedded competency. The only data so far on students’ competency in this area comes from the Communication Department’s COM 205. Students’ final presentations, which are videotaped, are assessed with a rubric that measures their competency in oral communication. In 2012-2013, the rubric used to assess student presentations evaluated the following eight criteria:

- How appropriate and how much research was involved in developing the content of the presentation.
- The effectiveness of the presentation’s organization.
- How appropriate the speaker’s wording was for the audience and occasion.
- The clarity and enthusiasm of the speaker’s vocal delivery.
- The confidence and audience connection evident in the speaker’s nonverbal delivery.
- The effectiveness of the presenter’s design and use of technology.
- How well the presenter demonstrated professionalism and appropriate appearance.
- How well the presentation demonstrated the presenter’s preparedness and awareness of the audience.

Each category was scored on a 3-point scale: below expectations, meets expectations, exceeds expectations. In total, 30 videos were scored (these were all the videotaped presentations that year). The following chart graphically-depicts the results. The delivery criterion was the only one in which the assessment met or exceeded the standard of 75%. Other areas of strength were the appropriateness of the speaker’s wording; professionalism and appropriate appearance; and preparedness and awareness of the audience.
As a result of the assessment process and findings, changes were made to the course (Department of Communication, *Program Review and Assessment Report*, 2013, p. 33). Changes include:

- A new volunteer coordinator was named to help oversee the direction and cohesion of the course.
- The COM 205 Steering Committee has been created to rebuild COM 205 from the ground up. Already the new goals and objectives of the course have been identified.
- All COM 205 faculty members were required to include a statement in their syllabi indicating that student presentations will be videotaped throughout the semester.
- All faculty will be required to videotape the final presentation and turn in the assignment description, grading rubric, and actual grades given to each presenter. These tapes will help us to continue to evaluate the effectiveness of COM 205 courses, as well as provide subjects for future workshops on creating and using grading rubrics.

One future strategy to measure students’ proficiency in oral communication is to adopt the TAP rubric that specifically deals with this competency.
Multilingual Communication Competency

“To develop students’ proficiency in a language and create awareness of cultures other than their own. These capacities enhance the students’ ability to think critically about themselves in relation to others, to appreciate the complexity of language and the richness of cultures, and to live as informed and responsible citizens in an increasingly interdependent world” (LEP Document, 2009).

The “affinity group” for Multilingual Communication is comprised of faculty members from Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, Latin, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish.

According to the key elements of the Multilingual Communication competency, courses aim to develop 5 key areas. These courses focus on language proficiency for participation in interpersonal, presentational and interpretive modes of communication. Students will gain cultural and linguistic awareness which may assist in the ability to make informed comparisons of one’s own culture to other cultures around the world. This competency aims to develop students’ ability to use the target language in environments beyond the classroom setting and to connect cultural understanding to other fields of study and aspects of one’s life. Finally, these courses aim to provide instruction on critical analysis of various cultures’ customs, arts, everyday practices, attitudes, transportation and media. Does our program allow for a student to becoming proficient in foreign language?

In order to assess multilingual communication, STAMP test results from 2010 through 2012 were used. The STAMP test is a standardized measure of student competency across three domains: reading, writing, and speaking. The STAMP test affords universities the opportunity to compare the competencies of its students with national standards and with the students of other comparable institutions. Currently, SCSU uses the STAMP test in two ways: (1) as a general progress report of students after their 2nd or 3rd semester of a world language, and (2) as an option for students to fulfill their multilingual communication competency in place of traditional classroom courses. The STAMP proficiency level of “low intermediate” is used as the set standard.

At SCSU, students who have had 180 hours of instruction in Spanish, French, or Italian were administered the STAMP test. In terms of reading, the percentage of students who met the national standard was 55%. For the writing competency, 90% of students met the national standard, and 69% of students met the nationally set standard for speaking.

The following charts graphically depict selected results. Starting in fall 2011, about 500 students are tested each semester.
Spanish STAMP Test Results for the Period from 2010-2012

Percent of SCSU students who meet national proficiency expectation
WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

“To provide students with the tools to comprehend what they read, to discover new ideas, to refine their thinking, and to express their thoughts cogently in writing. In our contemporary society, the capacity to grapple with complex thoughts and to communicate effectively in written form is of ever-increasing importance to students’ personal, professional, academic, and public lives.” (LEP Document, 2009)

According to the key elements of the Written Communication competency, courses aim to promote students’ argument comprehension (summarizing, analyzing, and challenging sophisticated texts by evaluating evidence and the validity of an author’s claims); argument construction (making a coherent written argument that gives background information, presents a reasonable claim, and uses a range of evidence to support the claim); academic honesty (avoiding plagiarism by properly using primary and secondary sources); audience awareness (using the conventions of multiple genres to communicate effectively with particular audiences); and correctness (demonstrating control over standard English language usage).

Overview
The English Department’s Composition Program was significantly revised in 2009 in order to be integrated into the Liberal Education Program. Before that time, students were placed into one of three courses: ENG 110 (into which approximately 15% of students were placed), 111 (80% of students), and 112 (about 5% of students).

With the creation of the LEP, INQ 101 took on many of the objectives that had been stressed in ENG 111 and writing was now required in all courses that compose the LEP’s 48 credits. As a result, ENG 111 was dropped from the curriculum. Students are now placed into 110 (if their SAT Verbal score is below 480) or 112 (above 480).

In addition, ENG 110 and 112 were also reconceived to better match the LEP’s Tier 1 requirements. With the increase in the number of students taking 110, the course focuses more on academic writing, and less on sentence- and paragraph-level concerns. Similarly, 112 has shifted focus to academic argument. As discussed below, the department plans to eventually further revise, and renumber, these two courses.

Assessment Results
In anticipation of the change to the LEP, and the elimination of the 111 course, the Composition Program undertook an assessment of the 112 class from spring 2009 to spring 2010.

Over three semesters, writing samples were collected from 927 students in ENG 112, approximately 25% of the total number of students, representing 51 sections taught by 26 instructors. The samples collected were the Self-Evaluation Essay (SEE) required as the final writing project for all 112 students. The SEE asks students to evaluate themselves by reflecting on their abilities and skills and by constructing an argument about their own writing abilities. The SEE thus measures both the student’s self-reflection and competency in constructing an argument.
The SEEs were graded by four readers, all of whom taught 112, according to a common rubric that measured students’ abilities to create and support an argumentative claim, integrate and document outside sources into their writing, and edit their writing for standard English. The rubric allowed students grades of High Pass, Pass, Low Pass, or Fail. Of the 927 student samples, 152 (16.4%) were rated as High Pass; 491 (52.9%) were rated as Pass; 232 (25.1%) were rated Low Pass; and 52 (5.6%) were rated Fail.

One future strategy to measure students’ proficiency in written communication is to adopt the TAP rubric that specifically deals with this competency.

**WHAT’S NEXT?**

LEP is ready for continued growth and improvement in the courses available to students. The Creative Drive affinity group has developed a preliminary outline of a rubric and work will continue in the fall. The addition of the remaining Tier 2 areas of knowledge in global awareness, mind and body, social structure, conflict, and consensus, and time and place will continue. The development of Tier 3 capstone experience courses will enhance the LEP as they specifically emphasize discussions of values such as social justice in America and global environmental sustainability. Also, the use of e-portfolios to assess student writing across the curriculum is being explored.

Measurement and analysis of LEP learning outcomes will also continue, and as students that have been exposed to the full LEP graduate from SCSU, their progress (e.g., time to completion, employment rates, graduate school enrollment rates) will provide valuable insight into the effectiveness of the LEP as a cohesive whole.

**SUMMARY**

Do students at SCSU engage in the practical use of critical and reflective thinking, rational and effective reasoning, and creative thought? Are they developing the competencies that are embedded within LEP?

Students appear to engage in critical and reflective thinking to a certain degree, but not with the proper depth, or understanding that is expected at the college level. One strength uncovered through analysis is that a majority of students across several different major programs reported being required to think critically or analyze evidence in their classes some of the time, a lot of the time, or all of the time. It is important to note, however, that professor ratings of student work, AHELO results, and student self-reports regarding critical thinking, quantitative reasoning and written communication all point to a “developing” level of competency in these areas.

In particular, the quality of student writing emerged as a concern, with ratings of the students’ “mechanics and usage” being particularly poor. Consistent with this, SCSU students tend to report less confidence in their ability to write a term paper than the average college student. It is
possible that improvement in mechanics, usage, and organization in writing may result in a greater ability to express evidence and support for one’s argument, describe critical and creative thought, and exhibit rational and effective reasoning through writing.
Online Committee Recommendations

The Online committee was commissioned by Dr. Kennedy in January of 2013 to submit recommendations for the approval and re-approval of online and hybrid courses at SCSU. We met regularly throughout the spring semester of 2013 and submitted preliminary recommendations to Dr. Kennedy in June of 2013.

The Online Committee reviewed the following materials:
WCSU and ECSU policies related to online/hybrid/distance education courses
Writing Across the Curriculum Policies (WAC) of the UCF

The Online Committee made the following recommendations:
Committee Recommendations

Key findings:

- Begins to address some of the requirements outlined in the NEASC Guidelines for the Evaluation of Distance Education (2009)
- Outlines the unique process for on-line and hybrid course approval and re-approval at SCSU, processes are currently in place at our sister institutions (WCSU, CCSU, and ECSU)
- Standardizes terminology for online, hybrid, web-enhanced courses, and eLearning programs
- Begins the dialogue related to the support structure needed for the expansion of on-line learning at SCSU
- Identifies a seamless structure for undergraduate and graduate online and hybrid course approval at the undergraduate and graduate level that preserves the process for initial course approval in place at the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF)
- Mirrors the process for course approval that is in place for Writing Intensive courses (WAC) in the UCF
- Provides an on-line training course for faculty within the Learning Management System which includes resources and information on best practices with technology and pedagogy
- Provides an on-line training course for students within the Learning Management System which will contain necessary technical skills and factors that contribute to student success in on-line courses
- Has the potential to increase the quality of on-line course delivery at SCSU which may increase student enrollment especially at the Graduate level and encourage the development of new programs and new initiatives (both credit bearing and continuing education programs)
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