Undergraduate Curriculum Forum

AGENDA
Adanti Student Center 301
Thursday, April 27, 2017

I. Call to order

II. Announcements

III. Approval of UCF minutes of April 13, 2017

IV. Special order – Election of UCF Chairperson

V. Standing Committee Reports
   a. NMC – Notifications Management Committee
   b. WACC – Writing Across the Curriculum Committee
   c. UWIC – University Wide Impact Committee
   d. Ad hoc Assessment Committee
   e. LEPC – Liberal Education Program Committee
      • Motion for approval of Assessment Document
      • Motion for approval of Appendix A
   f. Ad hoc Transfer Committee
   g. Special Topics courses – none

VI. TAP Transfer Pathways under review – http://www.ct.edu/initiatives/tap#pathways
    none

VII. Updates from LEP co-directors

VIII. Unfinished business - none

IX. New Business – Presentation by Liz Kalbfleisch, Director of the Writing Center

X. Adjournment
I. Call to order

Called to order at 9:36 am. A quorum (50% + 1) was reached at 9:36 am

II. Announcements

a. Terry Bennett – When advising for new incoming Transfer students for fall of 2017, please have the students get their PINs from professional advisors.
b. Jen Ruggerio – Registrar office – reminder that students cannot change catalog year to 2017-2018 if graduating this spring or summer
c. Jeff Webb – thank you to Terry Bennett and Registrar’s Office for all their work
d. Ilene Crawford sent message to inform body that the proposals approved by UCF have made their way through Academic Council at system level and now will move on to Academic Council at BOR. Also first group of proposals that were at USDOE have been approved and now next group will be submitted.
e. Elections will be held next meeting for UCF Chair – Submit names to Deb Weiss. Representative or alternate can run for Chair.

III. Approval of UCF minutes of March 30, 2017

Minutes approved unanimously

IV. Standing Committee Reports

A. NMC – Notifications Management Committee

1. Motion to approve New Course Proposals

ENG 120- Writing Arguments for Bilingual Students (Tier 1)
2. **Motion to approve Revised Course Proposals**

   SOC 255 – Methods of Social Research

   IDS 110 – Experiencing the Arts → EDU 110 – Experiencing the Arts

   **Motion approved unanimously**

3. **Motion to Approve Revised Program Proposals**

   BS History

   **Motion approved unanimously**

4. **Departmental Minor**

   IDS Minor – Social Science & Medicine

   **Motion approved unanimously**

5. **EP for Minor Changes to Multiple Courses**

   BS Business_CONC_All

   **Motion approved unanimously**

Minutes of April 6, 2017 were received

**B. LEPC – LEP Committee**

1. Discussion with President about possible common curriculum if community colleges are consolidated.
2. Discussed David Pettigrew’s pilot critical thinking/writing linked classes instead of INQ/CT pairing – further discussion pending
3. Still need faculty to run for at-large LEPC vacancies

Minutes of April 6, 2017 were received

**C. UWIC – University Wide Impact Committee**

No meeting this month

**D. Ad Hoc Assessment Committee**

1. Discussion of detailed LEP Assessment Plan, specifically:
   a. Role of Affinity Groups
b. Effort to find some common question or metric that can be applied across all courses in each Area of Knowledge
c. Need for general guidelines for best practices regarding assessment tool to be composed by Ad Hoc Assessment Committee in the fall semester.

2. Motion to approve the LEP Assessment Plan will go to LEPC and come to UCF at the final meeting of the semester
3. Jessie Gleason will be the new chair of Ad Hoc Assessment committee
4. Committee expressed thanks to Rebecca Silady for serving as chair and work on PRAC

Minutes of April 6, 2017 were received

E. WACC – Writing Across the Curriculum Committee

Continued discussion of goals for students’ writing in program and discussions with Liz K. about writing proposal.

Minutes of April 6, 2017 and revised Minutes were received

F. Ad Hoc Transfer Committee

Motions under New Business

Minutes of April 6, 2017 were received

G. Special Topics Courses

ANT 398, Poulton Archaeology Field School, Kathleen Skoczen
ANT 398, Cultural Anthropology in NW Britain, Kathleen Skoczen

UCF Chair has logged these courses

V. TAP Faculty Implementation Review Committee

The most current versions of the Pathways can be found at: http://www.ct.edu/initiatives/tap#pathways.
None

VI. Updates from LEP co-directors

Deferred to next meeting

VII. Old Business
VIII. New Business

A. Motions from Ad Hoc Transfer Committee

**Motion 1:** Students with 60+ transfer credits and with at least 30 credits in General Education courses\(^1\) at time of transfer, may meet Tier 1 and Tier 2 requirements in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education Requirements</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics at the SCSU QR level</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English at the SCSU ENG 112 level</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>At least 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>At least 3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>At least 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional General Education credits(^1)</td>
<td>At least 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3 Capstone must be completed by course completion at SCSU</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42 - 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Any requirement not met at time of transfer must be met with equivalent SCSU LEP courses.
- Students must take LEP courses required for the major that are not yet completed.

---

\(^1\) General Education refers to courses in the arts and humanities, the sciences including mathematics, and the social sciences (NEASC CIHE Standards, 2016 - Sections 4.16-4.18). The table below associates SCSU’s discipline prefixes to the defined general education categories.
Discussion from Ad Hoc Committee Chair – many students with 60+ credits but no Associates Degree which is the impetus for this proposal. The intent is to also differentiate these students from those who are taking non-general education courses at the community college level.

Questions/Comments:
1. Students would only take the course(s) that they are missing - yes
2. Grouping in broader categories to ease transfer of courses
3. Who will do this work? Completed by transfer counselors and eventually it can be automated. What we use currently does not always have direct match with courses and therefore ends up being a manual process which is not compatible with automated implementation. This proposal would be implemented for 2018-2019.
4. Any discussion of EDU being included in the group of gen ed courses? Will not be included, but will still be addressed individually
5. How many students would be impacted? Currently about half of transfer students would probably be eligible for this change.

Motion approved unanimously

Motion 2: Transfer students with 30-59 transfer credits at time of transfer, 9 transfer credits of general education requirements, and a transfer GPA of 2.50 or above are waived from the Critical Thinking requirement without credit.

Questions:
1. How was 2.5 GPA determined and what if there is a pre-requisite for a course waived? – when courses are waived, the pre-req is automatically entered. Group felt 2.5 was a good number based on review of transfer transcripts.
2. This group of students is not waived from LEP. Given that CT is addressed in Tier 2 classes, it is likely that these students will have additional exposure to CT.

Motion approved unanimously

Deb Weiss acknowledged work of committee.

B. Visit from President Bertolino

President Joe shared his perspectives regarding the LEP, transfer students, and changes that are going on system-wide. He thanked the UCF for its hard work in reducing LEP credit load and the WLL Department for proposing recent changes for transfer students.

1. Comments related to LEP – number of overall credits
a. He fully supports LEP and strong GE curriculum, however worries about the size of the LEP and whether SCSU is competitive with private institutions.
b. Students look for the fastest way to get their degree. Whether this is good or bad, it is the reality, and SCSU has to respond to attract students.
c. Is LEP a core GE curriculum? His observation is that some majors build on the LEP curriculum and others do not (e.g., have required courses within the LEP). With many students undeclared, some students may need to re-take an LEP course(s) because of majors that require specific LEP courses, thus increasing the number of credits they need and increasing their time at SCSU.
d. Expressed concern that we are part of the system decisions, which means being aware of conversations at the system level and responding proactively. For example, might there end up being a common GE curriculum at the university level since it looks like it is going that way for community colleges?
e. Questions that he is hearing: should students transfer out and then transfer back in to take advantage of WLL change? We will need to address this moving forward.
f. Student government is planning a student survey on LEP which will also help inform decisions.
g. Thoughts on curriculum in general: largest discipline is IDS but students say it is not because they want to create their own program but rather because they could not navigate the curriculum both in the majors and in the LEP. Some students see it as best or only way to get a degree. That is a concern.
h. Another area is course scheduling – the right time, the right amount, and delivered in the right way? Curriculum is purview of faculty but his question is can we pay for it and deliver it – conversations need to happen with faculty, deans and provost.

2. Transfer Students
   a. Very pleased with creation of pathways as a step to help transfer students.
   b. What he hears from the community is it is difficult to transfer to SCSU – high schools and community colleges are not willing to recommend SCSU. Perceived as too complicated, will not graduate in four years and will not take transfer credits. Comments include “private schools will take credits but SCSU won’t.”

*Discussion from UCF body:*

Some history: SCSU was the lead on 30 credit TAP programs; has worked on meeting requirements for 120 credits and ease requirements for LEP. There is
also a new advising model and Degree Works to put four year plans in place. Finally, the new proposals passed today for transfer students. So how do we get the word out? What strategies do we need to implement? This should be our next set of questions?

Concerns that perceptions so deeply held. So despite SCSU 80% change, some will hold on to the 20% that may still be a barrier for students. How do we re-brand SCSU – so community hears “we can do this for you?”

Should LEP should be a stand-alone program – and not include LEP within majors?

Consider issues related to class scheduling – might require paradigm shifts for faculty, around classrooms and managing courses that are closed. Community needs to look at space, time, size, etc. We need to think in the aggregate.

Interesting perception with HS guidance counselors – believe that it is not necessarily accurate information about curriculum but has become the perception. Suggestion that SCSU needs to bring the guidance counselors in and make friends with them!

3. Other efforts by President Joe include regular Town Hall Meetings for Students; dinner in the dining hall regularly; teaching an undergraduate course in recreation department and connecting with students across the campus.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 am.

Respectfully Submitted:

Cheryl Resha
Present: Meredith Sinclair (Co-Chair); Braxton Carrigan (Co-Chair); Jamie Aschenbach, Jeremy Chandler, David Chevan, Russell Engel, Rich Glinka, Marty Hartog, Md Shafaeat Hossain, Sang Yoon, Sophia Myers (UCF secretary)

Absent: Meredith Sinclair, MaryJo Archambault, Cathy Berei, Steven Hoffler, Jen Ruggiero, Eboney Brown, Jessica Powell

Call to Order: 9:35am

Revised Course Proposals
SCE 494 – Student Teaching – Science
SCE 496 – Student Teaching Seminar –Science
  • language with pre-req. in 494 and 496 about completing program requirements needs to change, we suggest departmental permission or some other language co-req
Motion to approve pending clarification: (R. Engel, 2nd M. Fisher)
Vote: 10-0-0

Departmental Minor Proposal
CSC Minor
Motion to approve: (R. Engel, 2nd M. Fisher)
Vote: 10-0-0

The committee voted for Braxton Carrigan and Meredith Sinclair as Co-chairs for AY2017-2018

Meeting Adjourned
Discussion:

The body of UCF does not understand why changes to WAC need to be made. There is confusion about the ultimate goal to the program. Is it writing to learn or learning to write program? Liz can outline the difference between the two paradigms. Our current program is Writing to Learn (see the bylaws). Liz explained to the committee why learning to write is a better program for Southern as it focuses on teaching students how to write. We currently have a misalignment between our program’s goals and what our students can actually do (based largely on anecdotal data).

Liz will present the following to UCF on April 27, 2017:

- Our current bylaws
- National standards for writing
- Distinction between WTL and LTW, their pros and cons
- The disconnect on our campus
- Moving forward direction for WACC from WTL to LTW.

Liz will develop a PPP and submit it to UCF for dissemination.

Election of the chair of the committee will be done via email or an emergency meeting once the election results become available.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40.

Respectfully submitted by Elena Schmitt
I. Call to order ~9:40

II. New Business:

a. Discussion of committee to better address issues of accessibility for students with disabilities (learning, physical, etc). Barbara Cook outlined the expansion of the existing committee addressing accessibility for students with autism. Plan is to create a central information hub. The committee will be keeping the various university committees in the loop, and when completed, the relevant curricular recommendations/plans will be sent to UWIC for endorsement.

b. M Barboza nominated as co-chair for Fall 2017 (K Stiver remaining for fall). Savelli motion to approve, Knell second. Motion approved, 10-0-0.

III. Meeting adjourned 10:30

Minutes submitted by K Stiver
Ad Hoc Assessment Committee Minutes
April 20, 2017

Present: Costel Calin, Karen Cummings, Charlie Dillinger-Pate, Anthony Richardson, and Rebecca Silady (chair)

Guests: David Levine, Armen Marsoobian, Ken McGill, and Wes O’Brien

Absent: Marybeth Fede, Jesse Gleason, Tricia Lin, Yan Liu, and Jeff Webb

Meeting began at 9:40am

New Business
1. Discussion with Critical Thinking representatives regarding assessment
   a. Karen reviewed her plans for LEP Assessment
   b. Discussion of flexibility in assessment
      i. Different courses within Critical Thinking may assess different key elements using different assessment tools
         1. Embedded questions on exams
         2. Short pre/post assessment
         3. Rubrics
      ii. Instructors of a given course should agree upon and use the same assessment tool every semester
         1. Adjunct instructors will also need to assess their LEP courses and use the same rubric that is used for the other sections of the same course
   c. Discussion of best practices for development and use of rubrics
      i. Each course within Critical Thinking may use a separate rubric
      ii. Instructors of a given course should agree upon and use the same rubric
      iii. There should be training on the use of the rubric
      iv. Periodically a subset of artifacts should be scored by multiple instructors to test for inter rater reliability

Meeting adjourned 10:55am
Present: Helen Marx, Robert Page, Jim Tait, David Pettigrew, Mike Shea, Cindy Simoneau (chair), Mary Pat Lamberti, Polly Beals, Wendy Hardenberg (recording), Nicole Henderson; ex-officio: Terri Bennett, Karen Cummings; guest: Liz Keenan.

Call to Order: 9:40 a.m.

Announcements
- Only one person self-nominated for LEPC for next year, which leaves two open positions. We need to recruit candidates.

Old Business
- David Pettigrew’s proposal for a Pilot Writing Program
  - Motion: Implement a pilot program for a select group of students, replacing INQ 101 with a second Critical Thinking course focusing on writing argumentative essays.
    - 1 in favor, 6 opposed, 2 abstentions
  - Nicole Henderson suggested she would be willing to pair D. Pettigrew teaching CT with an INQ instructor willing to teach writing.

New Business
- Updated Appendix A: Transfer Students for LEP Document. Guest: Liz Keenan, Ad hoc Transfer Committee Chair
  - Year-long process of thinking through what would be helpful and make sense for our transfer students
  - Decided to make proposals based on numbers of credits students transfer in with
  - Goal of having policy that could be programmed in Banner so transfer students could know right away how things would transfer
  - Implementation plan will be constructed during 2017-18 for a Fall 2018 implementation
  - Perhaps examples would help make the appendix clearer for students?
  - Appendix is at the policy level, so the implementation plan language would likely have to be different in order to be more comprehensible for students and advisors
  - Motion: Include revised Appendix A and supporting document in LEP Document.
    - Approved unanimously

- LEP Assessment Plan
- Karen Cummings said she has been meeting with departmental reps for various affinity groups, but it's been hard to get people together and engaged
- Still a very collegial process
- Plan includes both direct and indirect measures of student learning
- A single assessment (such as a rubric) used across an entire Area of Knowledge turns out to be unreasonable
- Course-level assessment aimed at improving the course plus a pre/post test for overarching concerns
- Mike suggested having Tier 2 courses also choose a Tier 1 skill to assess (in addition to Tier 2 key elements)
  - That may only make sense in terms of a longitudinal study of students (rather than courses)
  - Good to do an assessment in the middle as well as beginning and end
  - The plan can be relooked at and voted on again
- David suggested looking at doing some assessment based on class observations
- Motion: Accept LEP Assessment Plan as currently drafted.
  - 8 in favor, 1 abstention

Adjournment: 10:51 a.m.
Ad Hoc Assessment Committee Minutes

April 20, 2017

Committee did not meet
Do we need to revise the WAC program?

Presentation to UCF by WAC committee and Director Liz Kalbfleisch, April 27, 2017
Rationale for revision

There is little, incomplete assessment data describing student writing, but what data we have says:

• 256 seniors graduating from SCSU in 2016 had their writing rated as ranging from *below expectations* to *met expectations* (see fuller explanation in appendix)

• 41 juniors (not a large enough sample size) had an overall score average of 2.65 on a 4 point rubric
Rationale for revision

Additionally, for some time, those involved with writing on SCSU’s campus—

- WACC committee
- Former WACC directors Karen Burke and Debby Carroll
- Current WAC director Liz Kalbfleisch
- Faculty teaching W courses
- ENG 110 and 112 coordinator

--Have felt that the WAC program is in need of revision for a variety of reasons.
Limits of program design--bureaucratic

- Uncertainty about how the W is “certified”: course or teacher?
- Paperwork required is onerous
- No on-going “quality control” or assessment of program by SCSU faculty
- May not have the Ws in the “right” place—i.e. not enough tier 2 courses are W. Especially a problem for transfer students
Limits of program design-curricular

Put simply, there seems to be a misalignment between the theoretical design of the WAC program and faculty’s expectations for the outcomes of the program.
Limits of program design-curricular

More specifically, we have a “writing-to-learn” program, but faculty may want a program that teaches students to “learn to write”

“Writing-to-learn” and “learning to write” are different, not necessarily incompatible, designs for a writing program.
“writing to learn”

From the WACC documents: “The purpose of WAC is to create a curricular structure and educational environment in which writing can be encountered as a tool of discovery across the curriculum for both faculty and students who participate in writing-intensive courses.”
A program that has a “writing to learn” design uses writing as a “tool” to learn course content. In this sense, writing (papers, exams, etc.) is one of a variety of pedagogical strategies faculty may use to teach—or assess the learning of—course content. Other “tools” might be multiple choice tests, class presentations or demonstrations, etc. Of these various tools, writing can be one of the most powerful and effective, which is why the “write to learn” paradigm was developed.
“writing to learn”

Further, though students are using writing and doing writing, they may not be learning to write. The instructional emphasis in a “writing to learn” curriculum may not involve much instruction in how to write.
“learning to write”

Additionally: when we talk about student writing, faculty are commenting on deficiencies they encounter in the following areas of their students’ writing:

- Reading comprehension
- Cognitive operations like synthesis, analysis, abstract reasoning
- Producing grammatically and syntactically correct writing
- Organization
- Use of sources/citation of sources
- Knowledge of genre features
“learning to write”

- Reading comprehension
- Cognitive operations like synthesis, analysis, abstract reasoning
- Producing grammatically and syntactically correct writing
- Organization
- Use of sources/citation of sources
- Knowledge of genre features

These are the skills of academic literacy. Facility with these aspects of academic literacy marks a “good writer”. “Writing to learn” programs work best at schools populated by “good writers” but these programs may not produce good writers.
Many people believe that a list of skills like the one above is the domain of first year composition (FYC). They think that students should acquire these skills in FYC and then be ready to write successfully everywhere else in the university.
Acquiring academic literacy

Unfortunately, this is not how the acquisition of academic literacy works for a variety of reasons. I’ll describe two:

1) reading comprehension, producing grammatically and syntactically correct prose, and facility with cognitive skills like synthesis, analysis, and abstract reasoning are not static skills that can be acquired at the beginning of an education and applied smoothly throughout a degree program. Rather, these are dynamic skills that build up and break down and build up and break down as students learn increasingly complex material and intellectual operations.
2) Organization, the use of sources, and features of particular genres are varying aspects of disciplinary writing. How a written work is organized, how its sources are cited, and the features of its genre (i.e. do you have to discuss the method by which you arrived at your argument?) are quite different for different disciplines.
WACC will propose a new program

So:

in order to align our program design with faculty’s goals, we may want to redesign our program to have more “learning to write” features.
WACC will propose a new program

The WAC committee is working on a proposal for a writing program that will have more “learning to write” features and will address our stated concerns about our students’ writing more directly and effectively. We hope to have the proposal ready for presentation to you in mid-fall 2017.
Join us!

Want to join us? Know a faculty member you think would be helpful in this program re-design? There are open seats for FA 2017-2018 on WAC, so please persuade yourself or a colleague to get involved.
Through participating in the Multi-State Collaborate to Advance Quality Student Learning (MSC), Southern is influencing the national conversation about the “yardstick” by which the effectiveness of higher education should be measured. MSC builds on assessments directly linked to faculty instruction, actual curricula, and real student work (instead of standardized testing). The metrics are directly related to teaching and learning in contrast to such proposed metrics as alumni default on student loans and wages earned in first job. The metrics--the VALUE rubrics for critical thinking, quantitative literacy, and written communication--were developed by faculty working with the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U).

**Seniors who received PELL grants had scores that did not differ from the scores of their peers. Also, non-traditional seniors (aged 25-39) had scores that did not differ from those of their peers. Male and female seniors had scores that were more similar than different. The scores of the seniors from African-American and Hispanic/Latino backgrounds did not differ from those of White seniors.**

During the 2015-2016 academic year, Southern collected 279 papers from students nearing graduation. Students from 26 different courses submitted their de-identified final papers. The papers were scored by faculty in other states. The most important finding was that there was a wide range of scores. Student performance ranged from below expectations to exemplary.

*Scoring: Benchmark=1, Milestones=2 & 3, Capstone=4*

Once again, Southern met expectations (most of the scores were between 2 and 3), but did not exceed expectations (scores of 4).

**Critical Thinking:** Average Score Range: 1.44-3.25

**Written Communication:** Average Score Range: 1.7-3.4

**Quantitative Reasoning:** Average Score Range: .64-3.33

This academic year, Southern will collect de-identified papers from first-year students and seniors. In this way, we will be able to measure growth over time.
APPENDIX A: TRANSFER STUDENTS

Draft Revisions 4-17-17

The following policies shall be used to determine how transfer credits are applied to LEP requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer credits (at time of transfer)</th>
<th>SCSU Transfer Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15+ credits</td>
<td>• INQ waived without credit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1-29 credits                           | • Transfer credit is determined with course-by-course analysis.  
                                           • Remaining LEP courses must be completed by waiver exam or course completion. |
| 30-59 credits                          | • Waived from the Multilingual Communication T1 requirement with completion of Level 3 high school or Level 2 college foreign language. Students who do not qualify for the waiver are required to complete the 101 level at Southern (not the 200 level). [Approved by UCF 2-23-17]  
                                           • Students with at least 9 General Education transfer credits\(^1\) and a transfer GPA of 2.50 or above are waived from the Critical Thinking requirement without credit. [Approved by UCF 4-13-17\(^2\)]  
                                           • Transfer credit for remaining requirements is determined with course-by-course analysis.  
                                           • If student has the 30-credit TAP package: accept the 30-credit TAP package according to the TAP Framework\(^3\). [Approved by UCF 2-23-17\(^2\)]  
                                           • Remaining LEP courses must be completed by waiver exam or course completion. |
| 60+ credits                            | • Waived from the Multilingual Communication T1 requirement. [Approved by UCF 2-23-17]  
                                           • Students with at least 30 credits in General Education courses\(^1\) at time of transfer may meet Tier 1 and Tier 2 requirements in the following manner: |
|                                        | **General Education Requirements** | **Credits** |
|                                        | Mathematics at the SCSU QR level | 3 |
|                                        | English at the SCSU ENG 112 level | 3 |
|                                        | Arts and Humanities | At least 3 |
|                                        | Sciences | At least 3-4 |
|                                        | Social Sciences | At least 3 |
|                                        | Additional General Education credits\(^1\) | At least 24 |
|                                        | Tier 3 Capstone must be completed by course completion at SCSU | 3 |
|                                        | **Total** | 42 - 43 |

- Any requirement not met at time of transfer must be met with equivalent SCSU LEP courses.  
- Students must take LEP courses required for the major that are not yet completed. [Approved by UCF 4-13-17\(^2\)]

\(^1\) See definition of General Education Transfer Credits on next page.  
\(^2\) Implementation plan to be constructed in AY 2017-2018 with implementation targeted for Fall, 2018.  
\(^3\) See TAP Framework description on next page.
# TAP Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAP Competency Areas</th>
<th>TAP Credits</th>
<th>SCSU Liberal Education Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>INQ 101, Written Comm. (W&amp;R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative reasoning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific reasoning, knowledge,</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Natural World I-Physical Realm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural World II-Life &amp; Environ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical knowledge &amp;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Time and Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Phenomena</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Social Structure, Conflict, Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Dimensions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cultural Expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B Course I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Critical Thinking (CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B Course II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Technological Fluency (TF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note 1:** Students who earn a TAP Transfer Degree follow TAP pathway/articulation agreements. *WLL requirement waiver needs to be inserted in all approved TAP pathway/articulation agreements.*

**Note 2:** The course mapping shown in this table is not necessarily a course-by-course transfer equivalency. Rather the ENTIRE 30 credits shown in Column 1 must be transferred in order for the student to receive the equivalencies shown in Column 2.

---

## Defining General Education Transfer Credits

General Education requirements, as defined by NEASC, traditionally refer to courses in the arts and humanities, the sciences including mathematics, and the social sciences ([NEASC CIHE Standards, 2016](#) – Sections 4.16-4.18). The table below associates SCSU’s discipline prefixes to the defined general education categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education Categories</th>
<th>Discipline Prefixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>ART, ENG, HIS, JST, LIT, MDS, MUS, PHI, THR, WLL, WMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>BIO, CHE, ESC, ENV, MAR, PHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>ANT, COM, ECO, GEO, JRN, PSC, SOC, PSY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional discipline prefixes to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be included in the 30 credits of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general education at time of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPA, ITA, GER, FRE, LAT, CHI, JPN above the 101 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAT at the 103 level or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENG at the 112 level or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEP Assessment Plan

Goal
Collect the appropriate type and amount of high-quality, actionable data for use in informing improvement of individual Liberal Education Program courses and the Liberal Education Program (LEP) as a whole.

Key Aspects of the Assessment Plan
1. Assess current implementations via a faculty survey: Faculty self-report alignment between learning objectives stated in the LEP document and what is actually being done in their course. We will also probe what aspects of the LEP course faculty currently consider most/least important and most/least difficulty to implement. We will solicit information regarding what aspects of Tier-1 courses are most important to Tier-2 instructors. Feedback goes to the LEP Committee and informs assessment plans.

2. Assess learning outcomes in individual courses: Initial focus will be on 1-3 key elements in every LEP course. Course level assessments in Tier-Tier-1 should include some direct measure of skill or competency development. Tier-Tier-2 course assessments should focus on direct measures of LEP-related learning goals. Ideally, Tier-Tier-2 course assessments should also include at least one element that is common to all courses within the Area of Knowledge. Tier-Tier-3 course assessments should include a values/ethics-based dimension.

3. Assess the overall, cumulative impact of the LEP on student learning: This will involve
   i) A small number of representative student portfolios (approximately 3 per year) which can be used as deep, qualitative case studies of student work. Artifacts will be scored by trained evaluators who are external to the courses and using agreed upon rubrics.
   ii) Larger scale pre/post testing of students in regard to critical thinking, writing, and quantitative reasoning within the context of the Tier-Tier-2 courses.

4. Survey of alumni and current students completing the program. This will allow us to gain insight into students’ short- and longer-term views of the LEP’s value of the LEP, how well it serves their goals and needs, and -perceived as well as potential areas of strengths and weaknesses.

Connection to Other Assessment Efforts
Assessment of the LEP as discussed in this document should be integrated with assessment efforts associated with departmental program reviews, system-wide transfer agreements, and external accreditations. LEP assessment work should either leverage or facilitate these other assessment efforts. For example, a course that is both required as part of a major/program and offered as part of the LEP should be assessed with a single assessment tool that focuses on areas of overlap between program goals and LEP goals. LEP-assessment data should feed into, or draw on, data required for various accreditations.

Appropriate Types and Amounts of Data
We should be thoughtful and flexible about the types of assessments we employ, acknowledging that pre-test/post-test methodologies, embedded assessment, rubric based
scoring of student work, portfolios, and indirect measures of student learning will all contribute
to our goal of improving the LEP. In addition, we must take care to collect as much data as
needed to accomplish our goal, but no more than this. See below for a discussion of when data
collection is required. When choosing an assessment approach, we should consider what
method of assessing a key element is most valid, actionable, reliable, efficient and cost-
effective. Rubrics will not be the best choice in all cases.

Implementation Survey

The purpose of this survey is to periodically remind full- and part-time faculty of the key learning
outcomes expected of their LEP courses, provide feedback to the LEPC that can inform
discussions of an evolving program, and give insight into the most fertile key elements for
assessment development. The Director of LEP Planning and Assessment will develop this survey
with help from the Office of Assessment and Planning. The survey will be given in the Fall 2017
semester, Spring 2019 semester, and every fourth semester thereafter. This is an approximately
every 18-months cycle and ensures that data will periodically be collected in both spring and fall
semesters.

Course-Level Assessment

It is primarily the instructors of a given course who will decide how to assess learning is to be
assessed in that course. However, assessment decisions should be made in consultation with
the Affinity Group and the Director of LEP Planning and Assessment to ensure that program-
level needs are being met.

In Tier-1 courses, reliable and direct measures of core competencies should be a part of the
assessment. In Tier-2 courses, some Areas of Knowledge may use a single rubric to assess
all courses. In other Areas of Knowledge, much of the assessment may be course-specific.
However, we will strive to find some common questions or metrics that can be applied
across all courses in each Area of Knowledge.

All sections of a particular LEP course, including those taught by different instructors and part-
time faculty, must use the same baseline assessments. All instructors for a given course are
expected to engage in assessment based on the timeline discussed in the Additional
Portfolios

Our goal is to complete approximately 3 portfolios per year that each span a particular student’s entire LEP experience and include artifacts for each LEP course taken by that student. In order to accomplish this, we will start the process with 6 incoming freshmen each year. These 6 students will be chosen as follows: All incoming freshmen will be asked if they are willing to have artifacts of their LEP coursework archived and evaluated for LEP assessment purposes. From the group of students who agree to this, we will choose a random but representative group of 6 students. Given current attrition rates, this should provide us with an average of about 3 complete portfolios per year.

At the start of every semester, the Director of LEP Planning and Assessment will contact the instructor in every LEP course taken by students in the portfolio cohorts. The instructors will be asked to archive and submit at least one notable example of the student’s work. Archiving can be done by scanning, photographing, or otherwise digitizing the work. The instructors will then send the archived work to the LEP Director who will manage the digital portfolio and subsequent rubric-based evaluation of student work.

Pre/Post Testing of Critical Thinking, Quantitative Reasoning, and Written Communication

The overall effectiveness of the LEP will be evaluated through large-scale pre- and post-instruction testing of students in regard to critical thinking, quantitative reasoning and written communication skills within the context of the Tier-Tier 2 courses. Pre-testing will be done in the first semester with incoming freshmen in Tier-Tier 1 courses. Post-testing will be done when students are enrolled in their Tier-Tier 3 courses. (However, this is not an assessment of the Tier-Tier 3 course.) The goal is to have a summative measure of learning outcomes in the LEP.

Currently, the Office of Assessment and Planning is engaging in two closely related projects: the Multi-State Collaborative and exploratory use of the College Learning Assessment Plus (CLA+). Both of these projects make pre/post measures of the three key outcomes noted. The data from these projects has been significant in mid-cycle assessment-data reporting to NEASC.

In order to accomplish our goal of assessment of the LEP, we will leverage our participation in these projects while developing in-house tests and perhaps expanding our use of the CLA+ and Multi-State collaborative
**Additional Information**

**Role of the Affinity Groups**

It is expected that the Affinity Group for each Area of Knowledge meet at least once per semester. If the Coordinator for the Affinity Group does not call a meeting of the group by mid-term each semester, or if a Coordinator for the Affinity Group is not identified, the Director of LEP Planning and Assessment will organize the meeting. All instructors of LEP courses are expected to attend these meetings.

For purposes of planning and assessment, the Affinity Groups are charged with two primary tasks:

1. The first task is to provide current recommendations regarding common assignment types, experiences, expectations, etc. for courses within the Area of Knowledge. For example, the Critical Thinking affinity group might decide to recommend that all students taking a critical thinking course write a three-page argumentative essay with supporting evidence. This type of guidance regarding what is typical or recommended for courses within an Area of Knowledge will aid new instructors and will make assessment discussions and LEP planning more effective.

2. The second task required of the Affinity Groups is to discuss assessment and assessment outcomes within the context of the Area of Knowledge. These discussions should pertain to current assessment practices, difficulties associated with assessment, and evaluation of how assessment data is being used to improve instruction. The discussions should also be a part of ongoing efforts to find one or more common assessment element(s) that can be used across all courses in the Area of Knowledge.

**Which LEP courses will be assessed and when?**

All LEP courses will be assessed within the next 3 years.

**How often must assessment data be collected in an LEP course?**

Data may need to be collected every semester if assessment tools are under development and/or being validated. Data will be collected according to the schedule below once the instructor(s) teaching an LEP course and the Director of LEP Planning and Assessment agree that a stable, valid assessment tool is available.

An instructor teaching an LEP course must collect assessment data if

- S/he is teaching the LEP course for the first time.
  OR
- S/he did not collect data that last time s/he was required to do so.
  OR
- S/he has taught the LEP course before and more than two academic semesters have passed since s/he last collected data.
  OR
- Department-level assessment or accreditation require assessment data.
For example, if I am teaching PHY230 for the first time in fall 2018, I need to collect assessment data that semester. I am not required to collect assessment data in PHY230 again until spring 2020. In spring 2020, I am required to collect assessment data even if the last time that I taught the course was fall 2018. If I don’t teach PHY230 in spring 2020, I am required to collect data the next time I teach that course.

**Developing/Adopting Assessment Tools**

In many cases we will find existing tools are available for use in assessing our LEP courses. In some cases, we are already using tools developed elsewhere (e.g. Multistate Collaborative, AAC&U rubrics). Where there is no appropriate tool already available, or in cases where using an externally developed tool is expensive, we will develop tools and rubrics “in-house”.

Because the instructor(s) of a given LEP course are in the best position to determine how student learning should be assessed, they are charged with adopting, developing, or adapting an assessment tool for use in their course. The Director of LEP Planning and Assessment will provide guidance to ensure that the chosen tool and/or approach will provide data that contribute to meeting the stated goal for assessment within the LEP. (See first page of this document). Tools and approaches should be shared within the Affinity Group for the Area of Knowledge. In addition, the affinity groups for each Area of Knowledge will work to develop or adopt the portion of the assessment that will be used across all courses within the Area. Assessment tools and procedures will be shared with the Deans and Provost.

All instructors who are teaching, have taught, or intend to teach a given LEP course will be encouraged to participate in deciding how learning will be assessed within the course and in developing tools when needed.

**Evolution of Assessment Tools and Procedures:**

Once an assessment tool and procedure have been agreed upon by the instructors and Director of LEP Planning and Assessment, that assessment tool and procedure will remain in use for no less than 4 years before it is modified or replaced. This will allow consistency in data collected which is important in evaluating the evolution of courses and the LEP program. It will also allow the University to report consistent data to external accreditors.

**Who will score the assessments?**

This will be determined on a case-by-case basis by the instructors involved and the Director of LEP Planning and Assessing, in consultation with the administration. For example, a multiple-choice assessment given pre/post instruction may be machine-graded through the Office of Institutional Advancement. As another example, an assessment involving multiple-choice and short-answer questions that can be evaluated with a very direct rubric and that might be included as part of a final exam would be graded by the instructor with periodic checks for inter-rater reliability.