General Education and Assessment 3.0: Next-Level Practices Now
Sponsored by Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U)
Chicago, IL   March 3 – 5, 2011
http://www.aacu.org/meetings/generaleducation/index.cfm

Summary by Marissa Cope

Executive Summary
My participation at this conference consisted of attending six concurrent sessions, a poster session, a plenary address, and a keynote address/panel. While the focus of the conference was on general education and assessment, many of the assessment components were not limited to the assessment of general education programs; they were about assessment of student learning as a whole. This is important to note because the assessment of learning in the general education program does not need to be a separate entity. Overall, there are several campuses doing unique and exciting things related to general education, but many campuses are in the same place that I perceive SUNY Fredonia to be in: looking for ways to more effectively provide a cohesive general education program while enhancing student learning and engagement (and collecting evidence of such through assessment). This assertion is supported by the fact that there were over 800 people in attendance at this conference.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment
There were primarily two sessions that I thought provided the most useful or unique information related to student learning outcomes assessment:
1. LEAPing Toward a Culture of Assessment and Alignment (page 5 in the detailed summary)
   Dickinson State University in North Dakota has chosen to highlight the importance of being intentional about student learning outcomes and assessment in a variety of ways using two approaches: vertical and horizontal:
   - The "vertical" approach involves faculty explicitly referencing applicable learning outcomes in their syllabi, directions for assignments, exams, and in-class activities. Faculty engage the students in meaningful discussions of learning outcomes as they relate to the course content as well as the results of the outcomes assessments.
   - The "horizontal" approach is undertaken across the campus, and again involves being very explicit to stakeholders about the importance of student learning outcomes assessment at Dickinson State. Information about how the campus undertakes this effort is included in the hiring process (e.g., faculty/staff position advertisements, interviews, follow-up communications), teaching evaluations, department/unit annual reports, and requests for faculty/staff development grants.
   Both of these approaches ensure that the importance of student learning outcomes assessment is understood by all stakeholders and they are very intentional about the integration of assessment into the teaching and learning process.

2. Using Peer Review to Evaluate Program Assessment Efforts: One Strategy, Multiple Gains (page 9 in the detailed summary)
   Marquette University utilizes a peer review process to increase knowledge, skills, and buy-in for student learning outcomes assessment on their campus. All units and departments on campus (including student development, administration, etc.) complete the same assessment report template. This report is turned in to the University Assessment Committee (UAC) every September. In November there is a one-day peer review seminar held to review and provide feedback to the departments/units regarding their assessment efforts. Each department/unit has a Program Assessment Leader (PAL) representing them; they are arranged at a table with 4 – 5 other PALs from a variety of departments/units. Each PAL receives the report for the other departments/units one week in advance so there is adequate time to review prior to the review seminar day. At the review seminar each PAL presents their report to their group, and the group provides feedback for that department/unit. The group completes a feedback form that is disseminated to the PAL for that department/unit, the UAC, and the appropriate administration leader. PALs take the feedback to

their department/unit and it is used to inform the next assessment cycle. Faculty feedback on the peer review process indicates it has been quite helpful to see how other departments/units define and assess student learning. Overall this process has strongly increased the institutional focus on assessment and helped faculty see how assessment fits into the teaching and learning cycle and how they can benefit.

General Education Program Revisions

There was one session that I thought was quite useful for general education program revisions:
Visioning General Education for the 21st Century: Examining the Questions and Answers (page 6 in the detailed summary)
This session was facilitated by a current Dean of Undergraduate Studies, whose responsibilities include the general education program. She has a wealth of experience in a variety of institutions related to general education reform, and provided a list of ten recommendations (see detailed summary) to guide reform on a campus. She presented each recommendation, provided some additional information, and then sought questions from the participants. Overall each of the recommendations is important to consider in the revision process and the issues that were brought up by other participants were beneficial to hear. The three main discussion points that really stood out to me were:

1. In order to have an effective general education program, we need to consider and define what it means to be a SUNY Fredonia graduate.
2. General education committees should be "stewards of institutional change" and shed their department or college representative hats when serving on the committee in order to serve the institution and students as a whole, not just their department or college.
3. All departments and faculty have a stake in general education, whether or not they teach any courses, as all students take general education courses. As such, perhaps consider reframing the concept of general education.

Concluding Thoughts

In addition to the items above, and through the combination of attending sessions, listening to the panel and plenary speaker, informal conversation with other conference attendees, and my own reflection, I have developed some concluding thoughts after attending this conference:

1. SUNY Fredonia needs to develop institution-level learning goals/outcome areas.
2. At many campuses, teaching general education courses is considered a privilege and something that faculty aspire to do. I do not believe this is the case at SUNY Fredonia, and I think more information from the faculty with regard to their attitudes and perceptions of general education on this campus would be helpful in order to move forward.
3. SUNY Fredonia is not alone when it comes to re-thinking the general education program. Many campuses have recently or are currently undergoing general education program revisions and the methods by which this occurs vary from campus to campus.
4. It is important to not only highlight how assessment of student learning is helpful for students, but also how it can benefit faculty. Faculty ownership of the process is important. In terms of the general education program it is helpful to think about assessment in the form of two questions: How do we know we are teaching what we say we are teaching? How do we know students are learning what we say they will learn?

More information about each of the items above can be found in the detailed summary.

Conference posters and presentations submitted by presenters are located at:
http://www.aacu.org/meetings/generaleducation/gened2011/Resources.cfm

The Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) framework and learning outcomes are described at:
http://www.aacu.org/leap/vision.cfm

Detailed Summary

Below are detailed summaries for each session that I attended as well as more information pertaining to my concluding thoughts.

Opening Keynote Panel: Reframing General Education (Thursday, March 3rd, 7:00-8:30pm)
Gail Mellow, President, City University of New York LaGuardia Community College
Ramón A. Gutiérrez, Preston and Sterling Morton Distinguished Service Professor in United States History and the College and Director, Center for the Study of Race, Politics, and Culture, the University of Chicago
Carol Geary Schneider, President, AAC&U

The panelists responded to four questions posed by AAC&U's Vice President for Office of Quality, Curriculum, and Assessment, Terrel Rhodes.

1. **What are the big issues facing general education and assessment?**
   Gail: At community colleges it is applying general education to professional/technical programs as well as being able to integrate with other campuses.
   Ramon: Current debate about the purpose of higher education being workforce development versus cultivation of the mind. Also, are general education courses meaningful for students, especially under-represented populations? Finally, faculty morale related to general education: what are the rewards for them?
   Carol: There are two bandwagons in higher education right now. The first is the efficiency/completion bandwagon, which thinks that students should get through college faster (e.g., 3-year degree programs), the curriculum should be shrunk (and this ends up applying mostly to general education courses), and there should be a national credit bank to allow for easier transition and completion of a final degree. The second is the redesign/quality bandwagon, which focuses on advancing and integrating learning (e.g., from "cornerstone to capstone"). The Lumina Foundation is focusing on this perspective of higher ed. Overall, it is important to remember that general education is the American signature on higher education.

2. **What are campuses doing/what positive practices are taking shape to address these issues?**
   Gail: 1. E-portfolios. LGCC is doing e-portfolios, where approximately 9,000 of their students have one. It is used as a place for students to reflect on their learning and what it is they are doing. It is often the one cohesive place where students can focus. The use of this tool also engages faculty in a different way than traditional classroom evaluation. 2. Assessment is embedded in faculty work.
   Ramon: U of C's general education requirements have been the same since 1931, and the focus is on using primary texts. Additionally, they surveyed students about their thoughts on general education and the results showed that they saw the value in general education. Their only complaint was that sometimes faculty were not as engaged as the students thought they should be.
   Carol: "Bringing back the homework." As NSSE shows, students are not spending enough time on their education. Student work needs to go beyond assigned reading. Faculty need to implement high-impact educational practices.

3. **How are faculty and student affairs staff assessing student learning outcomes?**
   Gail: Assessment is a high impact practice and should be integrative. The bottom line with assessment is to articulate what you want students to be able to do and what that looks like; how will you know when it has happened? One thing to remember is that the "what you want students to learn" is the same at most campuses, i.e., most general education programs look very similar (e.g., SUNY's GER LOs), but the "what it looks like" is differently depending on your campus, your students, your faculty, etc. It is also important to think differently about how you assess.

Ramon: At U of C students see grades as the way in which they are/should be assessed. However, the use of rubrics provides more information than just grades. Also consider what knowledge or skills should be expected after 1 course in a discipline, after 2 courses in the disciplines, after 3 courses, etc.
Carol: Curriculum-embedded assessment. High-impact practices give products that can be used to assess if learning is happening; the VALUE rubrics are a great tool for that. She also mentioned a publication entitled "Our Students Best Work" and the link to that is:
http://www.aacu.org/publications/pdfs/studentsbestreport.pdf

4. **What are your key concerns and worries?**
    Gail: How to ensure we are educating diverse and poor students. They are often at community colleges that have very little funding. Mentioned the "College, Inc." episode of Frontline. There is pressure to make education a commodity, homogenization.
    Ramon: Education of under-represented populations does not appear to be a concern anymore. Commitments to social justice have been forgotten.
    Carol: The business that we are in is course delivery due to set lists of courses developed decades ago with no discussion as to why. Mantra of "going to college to get a job" has hurt the concept of general education and the civic role that higher education has traditionally played.

Other notes based on questions posed to the panelists:
- Get creative with course pairings, e.g., a history course taught by music, or a nursing and philosophy course.
- Put behind the notion that only Arts & Sciences can provide or are responsible for general education courses, as any department with students is a stakeholder in general education, whether or not they have any courses designated as general education courses.
- "Economic Case for Liberal Education" is about the effect of a liberal education on employees' earnings. The link to this is: http://www.aacu.org/leap/presidentstrust/talkingpoints.cfm

Poster Session (Thursday, March 3rd, 8:30-9:30pm)
Abstracts of notable posters:
Imagining the "Ideal Student": Helping Faculty Focus on What's Really Important to Assess
By asking faculty members to write, and then analyze, a letter of reference for an "ideal student" the presenters helped faculty members: (a) move beyond a long list of outcomes to a few integrative phrases that capture central program goals; (b) articulate how institutional general education outcomes relate to student work in disciplinary courses; (c) articulate what these institutional outcomes look like in specific disciplines; and (d) recognize that student attitudes and behaviors (e.g., the LEAP personal and social responsibility outcomes) constitute important student learning outcomes. Students benefit when faculty members can more clearly articulate these relationships—they not only acquire a compass (in LEAP terms), but also learn that they share a culture of shared purpose with faculty. This poster will show how this exercise has been used in a variety of settings and include responses from those who have completed the exercise.
Mary Savina, Charles L. Denison Professor of Geology and Cherry Danielson, Associate Director of Institutional Research and Assessment—both of Carleton College

Closing the Loop on Course and Program Level Assessment through a Streamlined Submission and Review Process
Creating and organizing an assessment process that provides useable data for program-level analysis and meets the needs of individual course instructors is challenging. Instilling faculty buy-in to a new assessment process can also be a struggle. The University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (UW-L) developed an online submission and review process along with a training program to help faculty refine the use of assessment within all general education courses. In the first year of implementation, 91% of course instructors submitted assessment plans with nearly 75% submitting completed projects. This poster will share information on UW-L's new process of submission and

review along with examples of the results obtained from the system, including the course-level and program-level reporting options.

Patrick J. Barlow, University Assessment Coordinator and Kenny Hunt, Associate Professor of Computer Science—both of University of Wisconsin-La Crosse

Refocusing Program Outcomes and Assessment for Clarity and Alignment
This poster will demonstrate a process used to refocus academic programs with an emphasis on program outcomes and alignment to general education program outcomes. The presenter will share how the program refinement was implemented, from mapping the program outcomes to courses to initiating key assessments. Benefits of the process include a more relevant and aligned curriculum, improved student and faculty support resources, and the development of a culture of assessment within the university.

Anna Van Wie, Assistant Director for Learning Outcomes Assessment—University of Maryland University College

<u>**LEAPing Toward a Culture of Assessment and Alignment**</u> (Friday, March 4th, 8:00-9:00am)
Alan Church, Associate Professor of English, Chair of the Department of Language and Literature, Dickinson State University; Carol Griffin, Director of General Education, Professor Natural Resources Management and Roger Gilles, Chair General Education Committee, Professor of Writing—both of Grand Valley State University
This session provided examples from two universities related to the use of the LEAP framework with general education for fostering a culture of assessment and improving student learning.
<u>Dickinson State University (North Dakota):</u>
- Intentionality is very important – "If we do not emphasize our outcomes to students and our colleagues, then they won't acquire a common language of assessment or understand what Essential Learning Outcomes mean."
- Two questions guide efforts:
    1. Are we teaching what we say we are teaching?
    2. Are students learning what we say they will learn?
- Vertical approach: faculty create student awareness of LEAP, institutional, and other ELOs in their classes. Happens through very specific and direct connections between the ELOs and the information in syllabi, in-class/out-of-class activities and assignments, student and instructor self-assessments, and exams.
- Horizontal approach: how administrators can produce direct and indirect evidence of a common culture of assessment. Happens through a variety of mechanisms, including during the hiring process, classroom teaching observations, annual performance reviews, faculty development requests (for funding), special projects/recognition. This approach infuses the learning outcomes into the life of the institution.

<u>Grand Valley State University (Michigan):</u>
- Moved from a "faith-based" program of assessment (i.e., we "trust" that you are doing it, wink, wink) to a more systematic approach to gather a baseline of information. Faculty collected evidence of student learning in their courses through assignments and essentially reported the frequency of each grade on the related assignments. For example, across all courses that were associated with the effective writing outcome, the breakdown of grades was: 29% A, 35% B, 32% C, 3% D or F. There was no norming across faculty and no discussion of what an A means, what a B means, etc. as they believe all faculty are pretty similar when it comes to knowing the value of each letter grade. It was also noted if the learning outcome associated with a course was not covered in the course, and therefore not assessed.
- Using this information, in 2008-2009 they undertook an effort to align their general education goals with LEAP outcomes. They held a 2-day forum where faculty and staff reviewed the LEAP framework and identified outcomes they didn't think applied to Grand Valley State, or outcomes they thought applied, but were missing from the LEAP list. They ended up with a set of outcomes that were mostly LEAP-based, but customized to fit GVS.

- In fall 2010 they set out to see the extent to which current general education courses were or could, with minor adjustment, cover the learning outcomes. They administered a survey asking departments "Please consider each learning outcome (e.g., critical thinking) in relation to each of your GE courses tell us which sentence best describes your unit's perspective." The answer set was:
    o Our faculty could teach and assess this outcome with no adjustments.
    o Our faculty could teach and assess this outcome without too much adjustment.
    o Our faculty could teach and assess this outcome with considerable adjustment.
    o Our faculty could teach and assess this outcome only with major adjustments.
  The results of the survey let the GE committee know which outcomes had plenty of coverage, and where there were gaps in coverage. They then worked with departments to see about adjusting courses as needed to cover the gaps and have an even distribution plan.
- They learned they were too ambitious with their first attempt at the distribution plan and have simplified it, with the hope of accomplishing the original plan in the coming years.

Plenary Address: Investing in Quality: Aligning Resources with Learning Outcomes (Friday, March 4th, 9:15-10:15am)
Ann Ferran, Senior Fellow, AAC&U and former Provost, American University in Bulgaria
**Powerpoint slides and podcast available on the AAC&U website.
Effective general education program characteristics:
1. Course redesign to increase learning
2. Curricular delivery of learning outcomes
3. Integrating curricular and co-curricular experiences
4. Using evidence to improve results: input, process, outcome measures

Assessment 3.0 (Assessment as an Adverb): Shifting the Assessment Paradigm to Facilitate Decentralized Engagement (Friday, March 4th, 10:45-12:00)
James M. Sloat, Associate Dean for Assessment and New Initiatives—Washington and Jefferson College
Kathleen E. Harring, Associate Dean for Institutional Assessment—Muhlenberg College
Robert Rand Davidson, Professor of Exercise and Sport Science—Ursinus College
Take-away messages:
- We need to frame assessment in the context and language of the discipline; too much time is spent talking about assessment terminology and not enough talking about how it is done within the discipline.
- Faculty need to own the assessment process.
- Goal is not the assessment itself, but what change is coming about; change from a "culture of assessment" to a "culture of evidence."
- "If you love what you teach you likely want your students to love it, too, and assessment helps make sure you are teaching and they are learning in the most effective way possible."
- Ursinus developed a portfolio for outcomes assessment for the campus. They also developed value statements from the mission, and these form the basis of their outcomes assessment; one area is assessed each year.

Visioning General Education for the 21st Century: Examining the Questions and Answers (Friday, March 4th, 2:15-3:30)
Gail G. Evans, Dean of Undergraduate Studies—San Francisco State University
10 Steps to General Education Revision:
1. Get campus involvement from all constituents
    - Common language
    - Use technology to assist
2. Link your proposed change to other campus initiatives
    - Mission and/or strategic plan revisions, accreditation reviews
3. Ensure the support of your administration

4. Recognize faculty ownership of the curriculum and support and engage faculty leadership
    - Consider different departments covering content. For example, a music course about history could be taught by music, but relate to a history general education requirement.
5. Develop a "road map" or timeline for implementation
    - Who, what, when, how, milestones
6. Determine the impact of existing policies and procedures
7. Commit resources
    - Align with T&P process and rewards
8. Develop and assessment plan for your work
    - Approval for general education courses should include mandating an assessment plan
9. Recognize that the work in which you are engaged is inherently political
10. Don't assume that a negative vote is the end.
    - Present for approval in parts, not all at one time/in one package

Other notes:
- When revising the general education program, really think about and answer the question "What should a Fredonia graduate be?"
- 10-80-10 rule: You are always going to have 10% in complete agreement with you and 10% in complete disagreement with you. Focus on the 80% in the middle in order to try to get anything accomplished.
- Consider an external reviewer for your general education program.
- General education committee members should be "stewards of institutional change", not representatives of departments with the main goal of doing what's best for their individual department.
- Reframe how general education is perceived, some campuses call it "campus-wide outcomes" or "baccalaureate goals" or "institutional learning goals." The bottom line is that all departments and faculty have a stake in general education, whether or not they teach any courses, as all students take general education courses.

Recommended reading: Gaston and Gaff's *Revising General Education – and Avoiding the Potholes*.

Assessing Institutional Assessment Integration Efforts: Where is Your Campus? (Friday, March 4th, 4:00-5:15pm) Catherine Wehlburg, Assistant Provost; Blaise Ferrandino, Associate Professor and Faculty Senate Academic Excellence Chair; Edward McNertney, Director of the Core Curriculum—all of Texas Christian University
- Mission statements typically are composed of three types of words or phrases: 1) philosophical, 2) aspirational, and 3) operational. Break the mission statement down to see which characteristics apply to each word or phrase (e.g., "student-centered" is philosophical). Must have alignment across institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; start with the mission and derive the learning goals and outcomes from there.
- Levels of Assessment (from Miller & Leakes, 2005)
    - Assessing individual student learning within courses
    - Assessing individual student learning across courses
    - Assessing courses (noted that faculty have the hardest time with this one because they see it as an evaluation of them)
    - Assessing programs
    - Assessing the institution
        - What do the institution's programs add up to in terms of learning?
        - How well are the institution's goals and outcomes for student learning being achieved?
        - How much have students learned over their college years?
        - Does the institution educate students for the workforce? Future?
- Levels of Implementation (Lopez, 2002) *Items in blue describe Fredonia, in my opinion.*
    - Level 1 – Beginning Implementation of Assessment Programs

- - - Shared understanding of purposes has not evolved or is just beginning to evolve
      - No institutional-wide understanding of assessment strategies
      - Few or no departments have outcomes stated
      - Unclear or no institutional level outcomes stated
      - Little or no faculty buy-in
    - Level 2 – Making Progress in Implementing Assessment Programs
      - Student learning and assessment are somewhat valued
      - Some departments have listed outcomes
      - Assessment of general education is not widespread
      - Some faculty are taking responsibility for assessing learning
    - Level 3 – Maturing Stages of Continuous Improvements
      - Assessment is a priority – a "way of life"
      - Students, faculty, and staff see assessment as part of the institutional culture
      - All academic unites create and use the results of the assessment plans
      - Departmental and institutional decision-making is tied to assessment results
- Stages of Assessment: The Mobius Strip
  - Stage 1 – Assessment is a separated and "added on" responsibility (This is the way of thinking for many faculty.)
  - Stage 2 – Assessment becomes part of teaching and learning, but is separated from teaching and learning
  - Stage 3 – Teaching and learning is the center and assessment surrounds it
  - Stage 4 – Integration of teaching, learning, and assessment
    - Often departments are doing this, but do not know it. For example, TCU's Economics department was making curricular revisions based on data/evidence (student capstone projects) and just considering it as part of the teaching and learning process. The assessment office needed to directly point out that they were using assessment to make decisions. This is often the case with curriculum revisions, and this is good because it is seamless and integrated, not viewed as something separate.
    - TCU uses WEAVE to organize their information.

Assessing Student Affairs' Contributions of General Education Learning Outcomes (Saturday, March 5th, 8:00-9:00am)
Mike Cairns, Associate Vice President, Student Affairs; Kristen Salomonson, Dean of Enrollment Services; Fred Heck, Professor of Geology and General Education Coordinator—all of Ferris State University
- General education revisions: start with defining what general education is on your campus
- Newly proposed student learning outcomes: Campus-Wide Learning Outcomes
  - Use the term "campus-wide" outcomes versus "general education" outcomes, as this recognizes that learning happens across the full curriculum and co-curriculum.
  - Helps faculty and staff remember that it's not just about what happens in the Arts & Sciences.
  - Provides the foundation for finding, developing, and assessing the links between general education and co-curricular experiences in Student Affairs.
- The LEAP model provided the organizing framework:
  - Knowledge: Graduates of Ferris State should know. . .
  - Skills: Graduates of Ferris State should be able to. . .
  - Responsibilities: Graduates of Ferris State should understand the value of. . .
  - Integration: Graduates of Ferris State should be able to integrate what they have learned inside and outside of the classroom.
- Administered a learning outcomes assessment via survey to student employees; this was self-report *(MC note: use a rubric as part of performance evaluations to <u>directly</u> measure learning)*

Using Peer Review to Evaluate Program Assessment Efforts: One Strategy, Multiple Gains (Sat., March 5th, 9:15-10:15am)

Margaret L. Bloom, Professor of Education and Counseling Psychology; Jon Dooley, Senior Associate Dean for Student Development; Christine Krueger, Associate Professor of English—all of Marquette University

- Marquette has institutional learning outcomes and three levels of assessment: course, program, institution
- They have a Framework for Undergraduate Learning Assessment; it's governing principles are
    - Having common definition and assessment process across the campus
    - Incorporating program/unit flexibility and decision-making
- Their (assessment) cycle is: Define → Measure → Reflect → Improve
- All programs and units use the same template to submit their assessment report.
- Reports are due in September to allow for the summer to be used to develop the report.
- In November the "Peer Review Seminar" is held. There are two sessions, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. Every program and unit on campus designates a Program Assessment Leader (PAL) and this is the individual that attends the review day.
- The set-up for the review is that there are 4-5 people at a round table; each person has received the reports of the other units in their group a week in advance. The PAL for each group presents their program/unit's report and then the other PALs (these can be from other academic departments, student development, etc.) provide feedback. Which PALs are together at a table is intentionally determined by the committee.
- Participants have noted that it is extremely helpful to hear from other programs/units about how they are assessing student learning.
- Each group completes a peer review feedback form for each program/unit based on their assessment report. This form is given to the program/unit, the assessment committee, and the provost.
- The institution also has access to a Marquette-specific rubric for evaluating their assessment systems.

My concluding thoughts:
1. SUNY Fredonia needs to develop institution-level learning goals/outcome areas. (I thought this before I started my position, have continued to think this as I get to know the campus culture, and this conference confirmed it.)
    - Consider calling them "campus-wide" outcomes, and then each division, department/unit, and general education/CCC can determine their own outcomes from there. This contributes to systematic assessment and is the typical way in which guiding framework components are developed.
    - Middle States repeatedly mentions alignment as an issue at Fredonia, and without institution-level learning goals/outcome areas, this is simply not possible, and will be an area in which we continue to be deficient.
    - The LEAP framework is a great starting point, not only for general education, but for the institution as a whole.
    - We need to ask the question "What should a Fredonia graduate look like?" and have a common understanding of the answer to that question across campus.
    - The strategic planning process is a great time to start discussing this set of goals/outcomes.

2. At many campuses, teaching general education courses is considered a privilege and something that faculty aspire to do. I do not believe this is the case at Fredonia, and I am curious as to why that is. My guess is that it is because many aspects of the CCC were imposed by SUNY so there is little buy-in from the faculty. This is another reason why campus-wide learning goals/outcome areas could be beneficial, as those are developed here, with much input from faculty. However, I think it would be beneficial to get a better understanding of the faculty's attitudes toward general education here; perhaps a faculty-wide survey with follow-up focus groups would be beneficial for ascertaining this information.

3. Many campuses have recently or are currently under-going general education program revisions. Some institutions have literally wiped the slate clean and every single course needs to re-apply to be part of the general education curriculum; assessment plans are an important component of the re-application process. Other campuses are taking less drastic measures and making modifications to the current program through course distribution and delivery as well as curriculum re-design. In most cases, clearly identifying the learning outcomes for general education is the starting point for revision. Most campuses are moving away from the structure that Fredonia currently has, which appears to be a list of courses for each outcome area and little cohesiveness to the program as a whole. Regardless of the direction that SUNY Fredonia moves in related to the CCC, it is important that there are clearly outlined assessment plans and reporting processes, and I am happy to assist with those in any way possible.

4. We need to find ways to highlight how assessment can benefit both the faculty and students (aside from any external requirements by SUNY or Middle States) and be a natural part of the teaching and learning process. Faculty ownership of the process is important. In terms of the general education program it can be helpful to think about assessment in the form of two questions: How do we know we are teaching what we say we are teaching? How do we know students are learning what we say they will learn? The answers to both of these questions are beneficial to both faculty and students. Additionally, a peer review process (such as Marquette's above, page 5) and Dickinson State's vertical and horizontal approaches to learning outcomes assessment (page 3) are all excellent ways of getting all departments/units involved, but I think more education and an increased culture of assessment/evidence/learning needs to develop at SUNY Fredonia before these ideas would be embraced. I am excited to be able to contribute to this evolving culture through educating and providing feedback and resources to a variety of campus constituents on an on-going basis.