

General Education at Illinois State University

I. Mission:

Illinois State University's General Education Program prepares students to be globally engaged citizens who seek knowledge, appreciate diversity, think critically, communicate effectively, act responsibly and work collaboratively.

Illinois State University is committed to:

- A motivating and engaging faculty and staff who inspire curiosity and empower students;
- A seamless integration of curriculum and co-curriculum that engages students, extends beyond the classroom, and broadens their perspectives.

II. Learning Goals:

Upon the successful completion of the General Education Program, students will have gained

- I. **knowledge of diverse human cultures and the physical and natural world, allowing them to**
 - a. use theories and principal concepts, both contemporary and enduring, to understand technologies, diverse cultures, and the physical and natural world
 - b. explain how the combination of the humanities, fine arts, natural and social sciences, and technology contribute to the quality of life for individuals and communities
 - c. experience and reflect on global issues
- II. **intellectual and practical skills, allowing them to**
 - a. make informed judgments
 - b. analyze data to examine research questions and test hypotheses
 - c. report information effectively and responsibly
 - d. write in a variety of genres, contexts, and disciplines
 - e. deliver purposeful presentations that inform attitudes or behaviors
- III. **personal and social responsibility, allowing them to**
 - a. participate in activities that are both individually life-enriching and socially beneficial to a diverse community
 - b. interact competently in a variety of cultural contexts
 - c. demonstrate ethical decision making
 - d. demonstrate the ability to think reflectively
- IV. **integrative and applied learning, allowing them to**
 - a. identify and solve problems
 - b. transfer learning to novel situations
 - c. work effectively in teams

These goals have been adapted from the American Association of Colleges and Universities Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) goals.

III. Program Structure

One course required in each of the 13 course categories	
First Year – Core (Group 1 courses)	Additional Courses that may require prerequisite
English 101	Language in the Humanities
Communication 110	Humanities and Fine Arts (1)
Math	Quantitative Reasoning
Natural Science or NS Alternative	Science, Math and Technology
Natural Science or NS Alternative	Social Sciences
United State Traditions	
Individuals and Civic Life	
Humanities and Fine Arts (1)	

(1) students take one Humanities course and one Fine Arts course

(2) students may be exempted from one category based on expertise developed in their major

IV. Mapping of Goals to Course Categories:

Course	Learning Goal Mapping
Comp. as Cr. Inq.	II a, b, c, d; III (c), d; IV a, c
Com. as Cr. Inq.	II a, c, e; III (a), c; IV a, b, c
Math	I a; II a, b, (c); III d; IV a
Science	I a, b, (c); II a, b, c; III (c); IV a
Social Science	I b, c; II a, b, (c, d, e); III b, c, d; IV a, (b, c)
Humanities	I b, c; II a, c, (d, e); III b, c, d; IV a, b, (c)
Fine Arts*	I a, b; II a, e; III b, d; IV a, b, (c)
Quantitative Reasoning	I a, (b); II a, b, (c); III c, d; IV a, b, (c)
For BA only (1):	I b, c; II a, c, d, (e); III b, c, d; IV a, b, (c)
Global Studies requirement (2)	I b, c; II a, b, (c, d, e); III a, b, c, d; IV (a), b
Co-curriculum	I (c); II (a, b, c, d, e); III a, b, c, d; IV a, b, c

Goals in parentheses are secondary and may not be addressed in all courses.

(1) BA candidates take LAN 115 as a substitute for Quantitative Reasoning.

(2) Global Studies is a graduation requirement but is often fulfilled through General Education.

*revised per request of Fine Arts Advisory Panel 4-8-14

V. Overall General Education Program Administration

The Council on General Education (CGE), a standing external committee of the Academic Senate, has primary responsibility for the program in collaboration with the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education.

The responsibilities of the Council are:

- To coordinate the undergraduate curriculum for General Education and Interdisciplinary Studies (IDS), ensuring that the spirit of the philosophy of General Education is maintained by the program.
- To periodically review and analyze existing General Education and IDS courses and programs, based on program objectives and student outcomes.
- To report recommendations to the Academic Senate regarding program modifications.
- To provide consultation to departments, colleges, and other faculty groups planning new additions to the undergraduate curriculum for General Education and IDS.
- To review and approve or disapprove all proposals for new programs (majors, minors, and sequences), courses, and changes in existing programs/courses connected to General Education and IDS, in consultation with the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education.
- To provide the Academic Senate each year with a report of the Council on General Education's proceedings.

The committee is advisory to the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education and the Academic Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate on changes in the program itself and other recommendations such as amendments and bylaws. The Council forwards curriculum changes to the University Curriculum Committee.

Faculty Advisory Panels, established by category groups in fall 2013, will work in collaboration with the Council on General Education to promote the goals of the program as well as to conduct ongoing assessment.

The size and composition of advisory panels may differ by category but will normally include tenure-line and non-tenure line faculty as well as graduate teaching assistants where appropriate. Broad representation is encouraged from all colleges, departments and schools with significant teaching in the category. A member of CGE will serve as liaison to each advisory panel.

The categories for the advisory panels are:

Faculty Panel	Disciplinary Areas	Courses
Communication and Critical Inquiry - CAS	Communication English	COM 110 and ENG 101
United State Traditions - CAS, CAST	English Family and Consumer Sciences Geography History Sociology	ENG/HIS 131; FCS/HIS/SOC 112; GEO 140; HIS 135, 136; HIS/SOC 111; SOC 109;
Math & Quantitative Reasoning – CAS, CAST, COB	Math Economics Information Technology Management & Quantitative Methods Philosophy Physics Politics Psychology	ECO 138; GEO 138; IT 115; MAT 113, 120, 130, 145, 121, 131, 146, 150; MQM 100, PHI 112; PHY 117; POL 138; PSY 138
Sciences – CAS, CAST	Agriculture Anthropology Biological Sciences Chemistry Family and Consumer Sciences	AGR 203; ANT 102; BSC 101, 145, 160, 170, 196, 197, 202; CHE 102, 110/112, 140, 204; FCS/KNR/HSC 208; GEO 102, 202, 207, 211; HSC 156; IDS 265; IT 140,214; PHY 102, 105, 108, 110, 205, 206, 207; TEC 275

	Kinesiology and Recreation Health Sciences Information Technology Physics Technology	
Individuals and Civic Life – CAS, CAST	Criminal Justice Philosophy Politics	CJS 102, PHI 104, POL 101, POL 106
Social Sciences – CAS, CAST Including Individuals and Civic Life	Agriculture Anthropology English Languages Economics Family and Consumer Sciences Geography-Geology, Health Sciences Politics Psychology Sociology Social work Technology Women & Gender Studies	AGR 201; ANT 175; ANT/ENG/LAN 143; ANT 185, CJS 102, ECO 103, FCS 222, 224; GEO 135, 140, 235; HSC 170, 264; IDS 111; LAN 143; PHI 104, POL 101, 106, 140; PSY 110, 213, 223, 233; SOC 108, 220, 223, 240; SWK 126; TEC/SOC 175; WGS 120
Fine Arts - CFA	Art Music Theater and Dance	ART 176, 275, MUS 152, 153, 154, 176, 275, THD 152, 176., 275., or 3 hours of Ensemble course.
Humanities – CAS	English History Philosophy Languages, Literatures, & Cultures	COM/ENG/LAN 128; ENG 110, 124, 150, 250, 251, 229, 261, 206; ENG/LAN 125; HIS 101, 102,104, 107; IDS 121, 203, 207, 254; LAN 116.01, .12, .13.15, .18, .15; PHI 101, 150, 202, 224, 238, 251

Assessment Administration. Assessment of the learning goals will be led by the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education with support and consultation from University Assessment Services (UAS). Assessment will include direct and indirect measures. More details about these processes are included in Section VI, Program Assessment.

Direct Measures. The primary direct measure will be the assessment of student artifacts by faculty panels and other faculty in related disciplines. Faculty Panels will be responsible for reviewing artifacts using the LEAP rubric associated with their category or another assessment instrument as required. UAS will be responsible for analysis of the assessment results and communicating those results to the panels. The panels in conjunction with and the support of UAS will then write a report with analysis and recommendations to the CGE.

Indirect Measures. Indirect measures include a periodic syllabus audit (CGE responsibility), survey data from the Alumni and NSSE surveys (UAS responsibility), and a senior exit survey (Colleges and Office of the Provost responsibility).

VI. Program Assessment

Responsibility for the assessment of General Education lies primarily with the Council on General Education in consultation with University Assessment Services and faculty advisory groups associated with specific General Education categories.

Program Assessment Objectives: General Education Assessment has as its primary objectives to ensure that 1) students are attaining the learning goals established for the program and that 2) faculty receive appropriate feedback to improve the curriculum and pedagogies.

Methods: Program Assessment will employ direct and indirect measures.

Direct Method: Institutional Artifact Portfolio (IAP)

The IAP is the primary method of assessing General Education. Student work is systematically collected from General Education courses by category according to a revolving schedule. It is reviewed by faculty panels and other faculty in related disciplines according to rubrics established by faculty advisory panels and reviewed for consistency by CGE. UAS will be responsible for analysis of the assessment results and communicating those results to the panels. The panels with the support of UAS will then draft a report with analysis and recommendations to the CGE.

The collection and compilation of artifacts will be organized and managed by UAS. Each fall and spring semester, faculty teaching courses in the scheduled General Education category will be invited by the Council on General Education to submit student artifacts to their respective panel that address the assessment items as outlined by a rubric which has been designed for each category. This is a voluntary system with no penalty for not participating; faculty retain the autonomy to select the assignment for review. Faculty submitting artifacts will include the assignment and the specific learning outcomes the assignment was designed to address.

IAP Process:

1. Invitation to participate: During the first week of the fall and spring semesters faculty teaching General Education courses in a targeted category will receive a letter from the Associate Provost of Undergraduate Education inviting them to participate in the semester's General Education assessment. Chairs in the respective disciplinary areas will be notified prior to the invitation.

UAS will prepare a letter to invited instructors explaining the IAP process. Attached to that letter will be the rubric(s) appropriate to the category and an "intent to participate" form. Specific instructions will be provided regarding how the faculty should proceed if they elect to participate. The faculty member has ten business days to respond to the invitation. A follow-up e-mail reminder will be sent five business days following the initial invitation. The list of identified faculty and participants will be kept in UAS.

2. Faculty elect to participate and submit required information: After reviewing the rubric, faculty may elect to participate in the assessment process by identifying one activity [discovery activity, paper, speech, exam, etc.] that addresses the majority of the criteria outlined. The list of faculty who communicated intent to participate will be confidential and housed in UAS.

3. Artifact preparation by faculty/students: Students will submit the designated assignment to faculty as usual. Faculty will collect the assignment to be submitted and bundle it for pick-up by UAS staff. Faculty will be provided an e-mail reminder from UAS regarding their participation in the Gen Ed assessment process.

4. Artifact pick-up and return: Faculty and UAS staff will designate a preferred date, time, and location for artifact pick-up two weeks prior to pick-up. The faculty member will also receive an e-mail reminder of the scheduled pick-up date/time/location two days prior to its occurrence. Faculty may request a change in artifact pick-up at any time by contacting UAS staff. A final date/time/location will always be confirmed with an e-mail message.

A member of the UAS staff will collect all artifacts on the confirmed date/time/location. The artifacts will be taken directly to the UAS office where they will be duplicated and returned to the faculty within one (1) business day. All artifacts will be returned to the Department/School Office in a secured envelope which is labeled for the faculty member. To insure receipt of the returned artifacts a two-part signed receipt form will be used.

A note about embedded assessments: In some categories, embedded assessments may be used in addition to the IAP. For example, Communication 110 uses well-established, rubric-based assessments aligned to the goals of General Education. Faculty Panels will work with appropriate departments and UAS in the collection and use of embedded assessments to supplement their analyses.

5. Artifact review: Review of artifacts will be conducted by the faculty panels and faculty in related disciplines using modified LEAP or other rubrics. Training in use of rubrics will be conducted by UAS and CTLT staff. Rubrics will be scored and delivered to UAS for analysis.

6. Data analysis and report: Scored rubrics along with comments or other forms of feedback from the panels will be delivered to UAS for analysis. The analysis will include descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, and a brief narrative in the form of a Draft Report. UAS will include results from indirect measures and any embedded assessments (if any) in the Draft Report. UAS will deliver the Draft Report to the Faculty Panel, and will work on writing a Final Report for the respective category.

7. The Final Report will be delivered and presented to the CGE on or before September 30th. The CGE will then evaluate the Final Report to make informed decisions about the General Education Program.

8. Communication of Results: Results from the assessment will be communicated via the following methods:

- An abridged version of the Final Report, written by UAS staff and representatives of the Faculty Panel, will be published in the spring edition of *Progressive Measures*.
- As needed, the CGE chair and Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education will write a second article in *Progressive Measures* highlighting their responses, thoughts, analyses, and decisions about future actions.
- If possible and as appropriate, a summary of the Final Report will be presented at the annual *Teaching and Learning Forum*, administered by CTLT. The presenters will include the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, UAS staff, Faculty Panel members, and CGE representatives as appropriate.
- General Education Assessment website: <http://assessment.illinoisstate.edu/program/gened/>

Indirect Methods

Syllabus Review: The Council on General Education will undertake in collaboration with faculty advisory panels a periodic review of syllabi by category. The goal of this review is to ensure that the syllabus contains a prescribed section in which students are informed of the specific General Education goals addressed by the course. Viewing these goals repeatedly across all required courses will reinforce the consistency of the curriculum as a whole for the student and serve as a reminder for faculty of the overall curricular outcomes in each category. Specific text to be included is posted by category on the General Education website.

Alumni Survey: Currently, one- and five-year ISU graduates are invited to complete an Alumni Survey. UAS will work with Faculty Panels in identifying relevant questions and including them in the Initial Report. Faculty Panels are also invited to include additional questions on the Alumni Survey.

Exit Surveys (in development): The Council of Deans approved in concept an exit survey to be administered to seniors as close to graduation as possible. The survey will contain questions on how General Education prepared students for their majors and prospective careers.

Surveys of Student Engagement: Illinois State participates in a three-year cycle of assessment of student engagement using the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the Before College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE), and the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE). These data will be used to supplement our understanding of perceptions of current students' engagement in our General Education program. Results from relevant questions will be included in the Initial Report from UAS to the Panels. UAS will also develop a mapping of NSSE questions to relevant General Education learning goal areas.

The Review of the General Education Assessment program is the joint responsibility of the Council on General Education and University Assessment Services. The Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education and UAS will develop a methodology that will evaluate the assessment program and present findings to the CGE. This will include dimensions such as goals, planning, or alignment and will be rooted in the WASC Program Learning Outcomes rubric (http://www.academicprograms.calpoly.edu/pdfs/assess/wasc_acadprog_lo.pdf) or similar model for programmatic assessment.

IAP Timeline

Academic Year	Categories Sampled for IAP (direct measure)	Syllabus Review (indirect measure)
2013-2014	Communication and Critical Inquiry	Communication and Critical Inquiry
2014-2015	United States Traditions; Individuals and Civic Life	United States Traditions; Individuals and Civic Life
2015-2016	Mathematics and Quantitative Reasoning	Math and Quantitative Reasoning; Sciences

2016-2017	Social Sciences	Social Sciences; Humanities; Fine Arts
2017-2018	Sciences	Communication and Critical Inquiry; United States Traditions; Individuals and Civic Life
2018-2019	Humanities	Math and Quantitative Reasoning; Sciences
2020-2021	Fine Arts	Social Sciences; Humanities; Fine Arts

VII. Transition to the Assessment of the Revised General Education Program

Based on the recommendations of the General Education Task Force as approved by the Academic Senate in April 2013, the revised General Education Program will be implemented with the 2014-2016 *Undergraduate Catalog*.

2013-2014 was a transition and planning year for assessment efforts, including review and possible adaptation of LEAP rubrics as appropriate for Illinois State's program goals.

Transition Process:

Advisory panels are established in fall 2013 with the following goals for the year:

1. Discuss the broad applicability of LEAP outcomes (as adapted to ISU by the GETF) to the category. Review and approve the curricular mapping of outcomes to the category as proposed by the General Education Task Force.
2. Review VALUE rubrics and assess their usability for Illinois State's program goals.
3. Informed by broad LEAP outcomes and VALUE rubrics, discuss what we want our students to know and do after they have completed courses in this category.
4. Identify key performance indicators that might be measured according to a rubric that will provide evidence that students are meeting the learning outcomes assigned to the category.
5. Determine if the VALUE rubrics are sufficient to adequately assess student performance. If not, design alternatives.
6. Establish recommendations for specific assessments if different from the IAP process. For example, a panel might propose a common assignment across multiple courses for review or embedded assessments within courses in a category.
7. Circling back: based on conversations about 1-6, are current Gen Ed courses in the category likely to lead to the desired outcomes. Consider content and pedagogies.

VIII. General Education Assessment Resources

Evaluation of Process Frameworks (Meta Assessment)

- Meacham, J. (n.d.). *Assessing General Education: A Questionnaire to Initiate Campus Conversations*. Washington, DC: AACU.

- Western Association of Schools and Colleges. (n.d.). *Assessment Rubrics*. Online: http://www.academicprograms.calpoly.edu/pdfs/assess/wasc_acadprog_lo.pdf. Includes rubrics for:
 - Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes
 - Assessing the Use of Portfolios for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes
 - Assessing the Use of Capstone Experiences for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes
 - Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews

Reliability, Validity, & Calibration

- Finley, A.P. (2011/2012). How Reliable Are the VALUE Rubrics? *Peer Review, Fall/Winter*, pp. 31-33.
- Greenhoot, A., & Bernstein, D. (2011/2012). Using VALUE Rubrics to Evaluate Collaborative Course Design. *Peer Review, Fall/Winter*, pp. 22-26.
- Pusecker, K.L., et al. (2011/2012). Increasing the Validity of Outcomes Assessment. *Peer Review, Fall/Winter*, pp. 27-30.
- Rhodes, T.L., & Finley, A. (2013). *Using the VALUE Rubrics for Improvement of Learning and Authentic Assessment*. Washington, DC: AACU. See Ch. 3: Validity and Reliability (pp. 15-16), Ch. 5: Rubric Calibration (pp. 23-25), and Ch. 4: Rubric Modification (pp. 17-21).

General Frameworks, Mapping & Alignment

- Allen, M.J. (2006). *Assessing General Education Programs*. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass.
- AACU. (2004). *Taking Responsibility for the Quality of the Baccalaureate Degree*. Washington, DC: AACU. Shows how program accreditation liberal education outcomes align with General Education outcomes, see specifically pp. 12-13 for an outcomes map. Also section on how learning outcomes align with accreditation standards.
- Finley, A. (2012). *Making Progress: What We Know about the Achievement of Liberal Education Outcomes*. Washington, DC: AACU. General overview of current status of learning outcomes, including references to testing.
- Gaston, P.L., & Gaff, J.G. (2009). *Revising General Education and Avoiding the Potholes*. Washington, DC: AACU.
- Leskes, A., & Wright, B.D. (2005). *The Art and Science of General Education Assessment*. Washington, DC: AACU. See specifically Ch. 6: Assessment Methods (pp. 29-44).
- Maki, P. (2010). Assessment. In P.L. Gaston (Ed.). *General Education and Liberal Learning: Principles of Effective Practice* (pp. 45-50). Washington, DC: AACU.
- Miller, R., & Leskes, A. (2005). *Levels of Assessment: From the Student to the Institution*. Washington, DC: AACU.
- Rhodes, T.L., & Finley, A. (2013). *Using the VALUE Rubrics for Improvement of Learning and Authentic Assessment*. Washington, DC: AACU. See Ch. 6: Assignments, specifically mapping and aligning assignments with outcomes (pp. 27-31).
- Sternberg, R.J., Penn, J., & Hawkins, C. (2011). *Assessing College Learning: Evaluating Alternative Models, Using Multiple Methods*. Washington, DC: AACU.

VALUE Rubrics: General Information

- AACU. (n.d.). *An Introduction to LEAP*. Washington, DC: AACU. Online: http://www.aacu.org/leap/documents/Introduction_to_LEAP.pdf
- AACU. (n.d.). *The LEAP Vision for Learning: Outcomes, Practices, Impact, and Employers' Views*. Washington, DC: AACU. Online: http://www.aacu.org/leap/documents/leap_vision_summary.pdf
- AACU. (2007). *College Learning for the New Global Century*. Washington, DC: AACU.
- Finley, A. (2012). *Making Progress: What We Know about the Achievement of Liberal Education Outcomes*. Washington, DC: AACU.
- Miller, R. (2007). *Assessment in Cycles of Improvement: Faculty Designs for Essential Learning Outcomes*. Washington, DC: AACU. Provides specific and practical examples of faculty assessment projects designed around the LEAP VALUE rubric categories.
- Peer Review Journal (from AACU), general issue on assessment using VALUE rubrics, including information literacy, Integrative Knowledge, Lifelong Learning, and collaborative course design.
- Rhodes, T.L., & Finley, A. (2013). *Using the VALUE Rubrics for Improvement of Learning and Authentic Assessment*. Washington, DC: AACU. See specifically Ch.1: FAQs about the VALUE Rubrics (pp. 5-7).

VALUE Rubrics and VSA/Testing

- Kinzie, J. (n.d.). *Assessing General Education Outcomes: NSSE Benchmarks and Institutional Practice*. Online: http://nsse.iub.edu/institute/documents/General_Ed_examples_for_Web.pdf
- Kuh, G.D. (2008). *High-Impact Educational Practices*. Washington, DC: AACU. Overview of using NSSE learning scales and value rubrics.
- University of South Florida. (2009). *Comparison of NSSE Items Relating to General Education*. St. Petersburg, FL: Institutional Research Office.

IX. Professional Development for General Education Faculty

The ultimate goals for professional development in General Education assessment are for faculty to be able to explain the General Education assessment process and commit to becoming active participants in that process.

Transformational Goal

Faculty who have participated in professional development for General Education will identify, not only as scholars of their individual disciplines, but also as members of the General Education program, sharing a broad general understanding of the program and a sense of investment in its success.

Outcomes

As the result of their participation in CTLT-General Education professional development programming, GE faculty will ...

- meet other General Education faculty, participate in important conversations about teaching in the General Education program
- be able to explain the General Education program and the roles their courses play in that program, in part by

- creating syllabi that help their students gain a better understanding of the mission and outcomes of GE and the ways in which these specific courses contribute to that mission and outcomes
- be able to identify the specific GE outcomes their courses are expected to address, in part so that they can also
 - identify the ways in which these outcomes can be seamlessly integrated in to their courses, supporting rather than disrupting or displacing the disciplinary outcomes already attached to the courses
 - ensure that their courses include learning activities and assessments related to the General Education goals mapped on to their courses
 - design specific assignments that address the General Education goals that are mapped on to their courses and understand how to submit those assignments for review as part of the Institutional Artifact Portfolio
- be able to explain the General Education program assessment process and commit to becoming active participants in that process, including, but not limited to
 - active participation in the Institutional Artifact Portfolio process
 - becoming familiar with the rubrics used to assess the Institutional Artifact Portfolio and
 - considering the ways they might integrate versions of those into their own in-course assessment processes (that is, assessment of student work), as appropriate
- understand the special needs of First Year students (freshmen and transfers) and identify ways to meet those needs in their General Education courses
- understand how the General Education program promotes the integration of the curriculum and the co-curriculum, in part so that they can
 - identify specific ways that they can promote/support the integration of the curriculum and co-curriculum in their courses and identify specific ways that they can promote/support the integration of General Education courses within and across departments