



**ARMSTRONG ATLANTIC
STATE UNIVERSITY**

University Hall 282
Minutes August 18, 2010

PRESENT: Lee Braswell, James Brawner, José da Cruz, Catherine Gilbert, Leon Jaynes, David Lake, Rick McGrath, Glenda Ogletree, Randall Reese, Jonathan Roberts, Jennifer Zettler, Phyllis Panhorst (Catalog Editor)

ABSENT: Michael Mahan, Teresa Winterhalter

GUESTS: Mark Finlay, John Kraft

CALL TO ORDER. The meeting was called to order at 3:00 by immediate past chair, Dr. Glenda Ogletree.

I. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Dr. Glenda Ogletree was elected Chair. Dr. Rick McGrath was elected Vice Chair.

II Core Curriculum/Learning Outcomes

Dr. John Kraft gave a historical perspective on the USG and the core (see attachment 1, slide 3). In March 2010, an ad hoc committee to facilitate the core implementation process on this campus. This committee consists of Dr. Mark Finlay, Dr. Teresa Winterhalter, Dr. Stephen Jodis, Dr. Steve Primatic, Dr. Tim McMillan, and Ms. Suzanne Carpenter.

The USG has mandated that institutions must assess their current core curriculum, define student learning outcomes (SLOs), and define how these student learning outcomes will be measured. SLOs must be provided to BOR in November. The deadline for submission of the assessment piece is in the spring. It is important, when developing the SLOs, to keep in mind that these must be measurable. However, the means of measurement do not need to be decided at this time and should not bog down the process of developing the SLOs.

Two institutions have submitted their SLOs to date. Georgia State University's SLOs were approved (see Attachment 2). Georgia Southern University's SLOs were not all approved (see Attachment 3).

Question: Page 69 of the undergraduate catalog lists general student outcomes. Do these not already count?

Answer: There are nine areas that need to be covered. The seven listed on page 69 do not correspond with those nine.

Question: How will new SLOs be incorporated into the catalog?

Answer: This is not clear at the moment. It will be studied in the spring when catalog revisions are done.

Question: Did Georgia Southern receive feedback from the BOR on why some of their SLOs were not approved?

Answer: Unknown. This information was just made available in the last 24 hours, and Attachment 3 was all that was provided.

Question: Will the BOR accept our covering ethics in Area B instead of Area C, since that is what we've been doing that for the last 13 years?

Answer: Unknown. Dr. Finlay said he would check on that issue. [Note: Following the meeting, Dr. Finlay confirmed that AASU may keep Areas B and C as they are now. Ethics may be covered in Area C, but it does not have to be.]

Question: Are we going to change the core classes?

Answer: Not unless we need or want to.

Beginning in April, the ad hoc committee worked with the deans and assistant deans of the College of Science and Technology (CST) and the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) to develop a draft of proposed SLOs for the nine required areas. Over the summer, the committee worked with USG officials involved with the core implementation process, sought feedback from all CST and CLA departments heads, and also invited input from the deans and assistant deans of the College of Education and the College of Health Professions. This input helped shaped the forum held on August 12 where Drs. Finlay and Winterhalter presented the issues that have come up thus far (see Attachment 1) and the current draft SLOs (See Attachment 4). The USG is holding a workshop at Savannah State University on September 10 to help with development of SLOs.

There was discussion of what role the UCC should have/would like to have in this process. Several possibilities were discussed. The consensus of the UCC was that the ad hoc committee should continue the work they have begun, and that the UCC's role should be to review and give feedback, helping in that way to create a document that the UCC could ultimately approve.

It was decided that Dr. Rick McGrath would work with the ad hoc committee as a representative of the UCC. Dr. Teresa Winterhalter, who is already a member of the ad hoc committee, is also a UCC member. The ad hoc committee will continue to work with the departments for feedback and input as they refine the draft SLOs. Ms. Phyllis

Panhorst will set up a listserv for the UCC and ad hoc committee members to distribute and discuss drafts and other information as the process proceeds.

The next regular meeting of the UCC is September 15, which is too close to the workshop date to expect information/results to be distributed for discussion. There will also likely be curriculum items on the table at the September 15 meeting, although it is uncertain how many at this time. It was proposed that a special meeting of the UCC be planned for September 22, where the ad hoc committee's results could be presented. The agenda must be posted a week in advance, so if the ad hoc committee cannot provide materials for posting to Ms. Panhorst by September 15, the special meeting will be held on September 29. This should give the UCC members sufficient time to discuss and consider what the ad hoc committee proposes prior to the next scheduled meeting, October 20, at which time they would vote on whether or not to approve the final draft.

ADJOURNMENT. The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Phyllis L. Panhorst
Catalog Editor and Secretary to the Committee

An Introduction to the Core Implementation Process

Mark Finlay

Assistant Dean of Liberal Arts

and

Teresa Winterhalter

Interim Director of Faculty Development

Welcome

- Goals today
 - Review the forthcoming (rather minor) changes in the USG and AASU Core Curriculum
 - Review the concept of student learning outcomes (SLOs) and assessment
 - Create and evaluate drafts of possible SLOs
 - Describe various options for assessment of these SLOs
 - Open the floor for discussion
 - Seek feedback on progress thus far

Timeline

- Fall 1998—Current 42-hour, Areas A-E core created
- Fall 2007—Call to reexamine the core
- Spring 2008—Super Bowl Sunday, large committee, post-it notes, numerous drafts, on-line comments, counterproposals and petitions, then tabled
- 2008-2009—New committee formed, less controversy evident
- October 2009—New USG core approved and posted, see <http://core.usg.edu/uploads/CorePolicy2009-09-23.pdf>
- Fall 2010—SLOs due to USG's Committee of General Education before its December meeting
- Fall 2011--New core to go into effect for all four-year institutions (and by Fall 2012 for all two-year institutions)

Who's Involved

- Ad Hoc Committee—Mark Finlay, Teresa Winterhalter, Steve Jodis, Suzy Carpenter, Steve Primatic, Tim McMillan,
- Department Heads and Deans
- Andy Clark-Institutional Research, Assessment, SACS
- Faculty Senate and UCC
- VPAA Thompson
- USG Committee on General Education
- Proposed AASU Committee on General Education
- SACS

The New Core

The areas A-F will remain but the USG will not specify a precise number of hours. Instead it will specify minima as follows:

- Area A1*: Communication Skills: At least 6 hours
- Area A2*: Quantitative Skills: At least 3 hours
- Area B: Institutional Options: At least 3 hours
- Area C: Humanities, Fine Arts, and Ethics: At least 6 hours
- Area D: Natural Sciences, Math, and Technology: At least 7 hours
 - At least 4 of these hours must be in a lab science course.
- Area E: Social Sciences: At least 6 hours
- Area F: Lower-Division Major Requirements: 18 hours

*Effective Fall 2012, Areas A1 and A2 must be completed by 30 hours

Side by Side Comparison

Current Core

Area A1: Communication Skills
6 hours

Area A2: Quantitative Skills
3 hours

Area B: Institutional Options
4-5 hours

Area C: Humanities/Fine Arts
6 hours

Area D: Science, Math, Tech
10-11 hours

Area E: Social Sciences
12 hours

New Core

Area A1: Communication Outcomes
At least 6 hours

Area A2: Quantitative Outcomes
At least 3 hours

Area B: Institutional Options
At least 3 hours

Area C: Humanities/Fine Arts/Ethics
At least 6 hours

Area D: Natural Sciences, Math, and Technology
At least 7 hours*

Area E: Social Sciences
At least 6 hours

US, GL, and CT Overlays
SLOs to be demonstrated and approved

Overlay requirements

- In addition to the rules regarding the six basic areas (A1, A2, B, C, D, and E), three new learning goals, US Perspectives (US), Global Perspectives (GL), and Critical Thinking (CT), are added to the core.
- The US and GL are incorporated as overlay requirements. Each institution would designate some courses in Areas A-E as US courses and some courses in Areas A-E as GL courses.
- In fulfilling the Area A-E requirements, every student must take at least one US course and at least one GL course.
- CT is added by requiring each institution to develop a plan to insure that students who complete Areas A-E acquire foundational critical thinking skills.

Other changes

- Institutions may apply for up to 9 hours of Area A-E credit that is specified for certain degree programs, and a prerequisite for certain Area F courses, so long as such courses count for all students regardless of final degree
- Approved 3000- and 4000-level courses may be included in the core, so long as a pathway of exclusively 1000- and 2000-level courses remains
- Orientation classes may not count in Areas A-F, but may be required and added outside the maximum number of hours
- Institutions may add additional “reasonable” requirements, such as the grade of C in all or part of the core, so long as native and transfer students are treated the same way
- Students in the health professions must fulfill the Area D science requirement with a two-semester sequence in either physics, chemistry, or biology

“Ease of Transfer” (or transfer headaches)

- Students successfully completing a course in one institution’s Areas A-E will receive full credit in Areas A-E for the course upon transfer to another System institution (even if the Area has not been completed) as long as (a) the course is within the Area hours limitations of either the sending institution **OR** the receiving institution and (b) the student does not change from a non-science major to a science major.

- **Example to Illustrate Cross-Area Transfer Credit**

	Decatur State	Winder State	Moultrie State
• Area A1	6 hours	6 hours	6 hours
• Area A2	3 hours	3 hours	3 hours
• Area B	3 hours	3 hours	3 hours
• Area C	12 hours	9 hours	9 hours
• Area D	9 hours	12 hours	9 hours
• Area E	9 hours	9 hours	12 hours
• Total	42 hours	42 hours	42 hours

FAQs

<http://core.usg.edu/faq/>

- **Why didn't the Committee decrease the size of the core? There are majors that are having a hard time meeting their accreditation rules within the 120 limit.**

While a minority of faculty expressed a desire for a smaller core, a large majority expressed a desire to keep the size of the core as it is. The Committee considered the idea of having a smaller core for certain disciplines (e.g., a “teacher’s core” for those in education programs), but this idea was rejected because it might stigmatize certain programs as weaker than others and because students frequently change majors

FAQs

<http://core.usg.edu/faq/>

- **Why did the Committee add the US, GL, and CT requirements?**

Critical thinking was added because it received the highest score on the faculty survey. The other two are common requirements across the country and also did well on the faculty survey.

FAQs

<http://core.usg.edu/faq/>

- **Who came up with the learning outcomes used as examples?**

The Committee decided not to specify learning outcomes for the entire state but instead to merely provide examples. The examples are merely illustrative. Institutions need not use any of the examples.

The Assessment Debates

- SACS: The goal of assessment according to the SACS Commission on Colleges: “Measuring student learning by a focus on outcomes.”
- Universities are being held accountable for their performance in terms of student learning.
- Assessment directives such as this are being mandated by administrators nationwide, especially in state-supported universities where accountability to the legislature and taxpayers is a huge issue. Most acknowledge, however, that the assessment process *is* in the hands of the faculty. Faculty set the standards of what a graduate of program X should know, be able to do, and value. Faculty measure how well students are performing. Faculty decide what curricular or program changes are indicated in order to improve students' knowledge of their major.

“The trouble with learning outcomes’ active learning in HE, 3, 3, 220-233, Hussey, T. & Smith, P., 2002

- Learning outcomes, and the ideas related to them, are in danger of becoming little more than spurious devices to facilitate auditing at the expense of the educational process. (p 222)
- ... (they) are damaging to education if seen as precise prescriptions that must be spelled out in detail before teaching can begin and which are objective and measurable devices suitable for monitoring educational practices. (p222)
- ... while some academics have embraced learning outcomes, many design their courses or modules by considering the content of the syllabus, the contact time allotted, the level or year, the appropriate texts to be used and the best mode of assessment. They may state their expected learning outcomes if obliged to do so, but this is seen as a chore, rather than a useful exercise. (p224)

How can we know what students are learning?

- Consider the missions of our programs. How often do we have conversations that focus on definitions of our purposes and philosophies in constructing our curricula? Can we answer these questions:
 - What is the overall unique purpose of this program?
 - What knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values do we expect in graduates from the program?
 - Can we shape clear, concise statements that describe how students demonstrate their mastery of program learning goals (what does the student do, know, or value); in other words, what are our SLOS?

Why aren't classroom grades enough?

- Of course we are all perfect teachers; none of us is biased...
- Do we see the limitations in our own behaviors and expectations?
- Do we see evidence of student performance that goes beyond our own beliefs?
- Do we consciously set out to find ways to improve our classroom performance?
- In what ways do our blinders keep us from seeing what students are really learning?
- Perhaps attempting to find objective measures isn't all bad (read: extra work, directives from "The Man," etc.)

Is assessment a bad thing?

- Before you answer that question, think about the education a doctor or lawyer or other professional gets at a university. We all want competent graduates. Assessment helps us know how well we are doing in our principal task: educating students.

SLOs for the New Core

- By November 2010, each USG institution must present proposed SLOs for each of the nine different aspects of the core: (A1, A2, B, C, D, E, CT, GL, and US)
- Must also show which courses address the US and GL overlay requirements, and how students will meet the CT requirement, thus demonstrating that all students who complete the core will encounter each
- Each outcome **must be collegiate level, broadly focused and consistent with the mission** of the USG.
- Outcomes should not be skills- or content based
- Each outcome **must be measurable.**

SLOs so far

- April 2010 draft—Dr Winterhalter met with deans and assistant deans
- Summer 2010 meetings with Dept heads from COLA and COST
- Georgia State posted its SLOs
 - George Rainbolt of GSU the main dude
- September 2010 workshops
- December 2010 deadline

Possible Assessment Instruments

- MAPP-Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress
- CAAP-Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency
- Individual course
- Core capstone course

- VPAA's Ideal: A meaningful assessment measurement that coalesces with SLOs and adds value to teaching and learning

MAPP

What we do now

- Required for all graduating seniors
 - **Measures critical thinking, reading, writing, and mathematics, often in the context of questions about the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences**
 - **Costs \$\$\$**
 - **PROS**
 - **Years of past data could be compared with future**
 - **Focus is on academic skills, not subject knowledge**
 - **Norm comparison readily available**
 - **CONS**
 - **Majority of AASU's graduating seniors did not take AASU core**
 - **AASU does not use the data collected**
 - **No incentive to do well**
 - **No penalty if skipped**
 - **Seems deficient in the following areas that must be assessed: Ethics, Global Perspective, Humanities, Lab Science**

MAPP Variations

- Could be given earlier in career, after 45 or 60 hours
- Could be given twice to compare progress, the “value added” of core curriculum
- Could add additional questions tailored to assess the AASU Core/to fill in areas not well covered by the current MAPP
- Could be given to a subset of all students
- Could calculate data only for those students who took the AASU core; through “if-then” statements

Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP)

- Standardized test designed by ACT specifically for postsecondary institutions to assess, evaluate, and enhance the outcomes of their general education programs. It is comprised of a series of multiple choice tests and an essay version for measuring writing.
- Cost: Claims to be less expensive than MAPP
- Pros
 - Measures students' achievement levels on a group or individual basis; can be used to compare students' achievement to national user norms
 - Structured with a variety of subtests (each takes 40 minutes and can be administered individually: reading, writing skills [multiple choice], writing essay, mathematics, science, critical thinking); allows academic units to tailor the test to outcomes desired from specific courses or areas
 - Can provide department level data; can link CAAP scores to ACT scores for “value added” measures (though not SAT); can be linked to individual course approach

Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP)

- Cons

- only essay portion has established rubrics
- relies upon various academic units for administration of test (this could also be a pro)
- no data archived on student performance in previous years
- requires additional design work from departments and academic units (in collaboration with test writers at ACT)

Individual Course Approach

- Defined: embed something into an element of the course (e.g., questions on a final exam or written work that can be assessed outside of the grading process) that can assess student success in meeting the desired outcome
- PROS:
 - Instructors “own” it
 - Does not requires fees
 - Does not involve assessment of students who did not take the AASU core
- CONS
 - Instructors responsible for collecting and analyzing data
 - Possible to not take it very seriously
 - Additional burden for faculty, including part-timers

Possible Assessment Tools

Implement e-Folio archival system

- PROS

- based on actual work, not standardized tests
- real, task-driven outcomes

- CONS

- cost
- administrative challenges

Capstone Course Model

- Defined: Large capstone class, perhaps included in Area B, for students near the end of the core course
- PROS
 - would permit a broad-based interdisciplinary test
 - Would allow for creative interdisciplinary teaching
- CONS
 - would impact Area B, which currently (seems to) serve both GL and CT requirements
 - logistical complications

For example: USG Critical Thinking Overlay Requirements

- **Suggested skills and abilities for Critical Thinking Learning Goal:** Students will demonstrate the abilities to interpret, analyze, evaluate, make inferences, or explain information, arguments, or observations presented to them.
-
- **Rubric for approval:** Generally, CT Course outcomes should include four of the five abilities cited above, as should the Critical Thinking Plan for an institutions opting not to identify particular course(s).
-
- **Acceptable additional abilities may include but are not limited to:** Demonstration of self-regulation of thought, demonstration of inductive/deductive reasoning, complex problem-solving ability, etc.
-
- **Definitions:**
- Interpretation: Ability to categorize, decode, clarify meaning
- Analysis: Ability to examine ideas, identifying arguments
- Evaluation: Ability to assess claims made, assess argumentative perspectives
- Inference: Ability to query evidence, conjecture alternatives, draw conclusions (through inductive or deductive reasoning)
- Explanation: Ability to clearly state results, justify procedures used, present arguments

Area A1

Communication Skills

AASU Draft

- Students will be able to assimilate and analyze a body of information, meeting conventional standards of composition.

GSU Approved

- Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, demonstrates appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation

Other Options: Students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions

-Students demonstrate an understanding of what constitutes plagiarism and acknowledge the use of information sources

Area A2

Quantitative Skills

AASU Draft

- Students will be able to employ the skills of quantitative and qualitative problem solving.

GSU Approved

- Students understand and apply mathematical information, concepts, and verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.

Other Options: Student have the ability to model situations from a variety of settings in generalized mathematical forms

- Students have the ability to solve multi-step problems through different (inductive, deductive, and symbolic) modes of reasoning**

Area B

Institutional Options

AASU Draft

Students will be able to analyze the ways that culture shapes ethical views and critically evaluate those views.

Students will be able to analyze multicultural issues in the diverse realm of societies across the globe. (See also GL Overlay)

GSU Approved

- Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate**

Other Options: Students recognize that an ethical issue is present and can distinguish among ethical choices

Area C

Humanities and Fine Arts

AASU Draft

A) Students will be able to recognize themselves as participants in a particular culture and see how this affects their experiences and values.

B) Students will apply knowledge of historical, social, and cultural influences to understanding a work of art

GSU Approved

- **Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them**

Other Options: Students have the ability to make informed judgments about art forms from various cultures, including their own

Area D

Natural Sciences, Math, & Technology

AASU Draft

- A) Students will demonstrate understanding of the method by which scientific study is conducted.**
- B) Students will appropriately evaluate data in scientific reasoning problems**

GSU Approved

- Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the changing nature of science, and the scientific method, or mathematical information, concepts, and verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.**

Other Options: Students have the ability to understand the physical universe and science's relationship to it

- Students have the ability to understand the changing nature of science**

Area E

Social Sciences

AASU Draft

- **Students will analyze the complexity of human behavior as a function of the commonality and diversity within groups.**

GSU Approved

- **Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, or spatial relationships develop, persist, or change**

Other Options: Students have the ability to describe how historical, social, and spatial relationships develop, persist, and change

Overlay Requirement-GL

Global Perspectives

AASU Draft

- See also Area B: Students will be able to analyze multicultural issues in the diverse realm of societies across the globe

GSU Approved

- Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, or institutional developments across the globe

Other Options: Students recognize individual and cultural differences across the globe

- Students are engaged and informed global citizens aware of multicultural issues**

Overlay Requirement-US

US perspectives

AASU Draft

- **Students will identify the constitutional principles and related political, social, and institutional developments and governmental processes fundamental to an understanding of American democracy and political participation, from colonial times to the present.**
- (E1, perhaps?)

GSU Approved

- **Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, or institutional developments.**

Other Options: Students understand the history of the United States and can see the effect of this history on contemporary culture

- Students understand the constitutional principles and the related political, social, and institutional developments**

Overlay Requirement CT

Critical Thinking

AASU Draft

- Students will effectively identify, analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions

GSU Approved

- Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate

Other Options: Students have the ability to recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and effectively use the needed information

- Students are active, independent, and self-directed learners who apply their thinking skills and innovation to solve problems**

**Georgia State University
Cover Letter for**

Application for Approval of General Education Learning Outcomes

and

Overlay Approval Form

Attached you will find Georgia State University's "Application for Approval of General Education Learning Outcomes" and "Overlay Approval Form."

Georgia State has had a comprehensive process in place for the evaluation of learning outcomes in all core courses for several years. All core courses must have clearly delineated general education learning outcomes and must assess the attainment of these outcomes annually. Assessment reports from all core courses are reviewed by the Assessment subcommittee of the University Senate, with feedback provided to the departments offering core courses. By means of this system, the core curriculum offerings at GSU have been continually refined and enhanced, and the entire University community gains buy-in to the content and goals of the specific core courses.

As a result of this on-going process, Georgia State's faculty-lead review of the core curriculum resulted in strong support for the current structure of the core. Georgia State proposes no changes in the size of any of the core areas and only one modest change to an existing core course (in Psychology 1100).

Georgia State supports the move to introduce overlay requirements in the areas of Critical Thinking, US Issues, and Global Learning. Because these areas represent existing strengths in the University's current core curriculum and because the University has traced the complexity of its current graduation requirements as one barrier to the progression and timely graduation of our students, GSU has approached the overlay requirements in a potentially novel fashion. For each of the three requirements--CT, US and GL--the faculty has designated all courses within one specific sub-heading of the core curriculum as satisfying the requirement. All Area B courses will be designated CT, all Area E1 courses will be designated US, and all Area E2 courses will be designated GL. Since all students must take at least two courses from Area B and at least one from Areas E1 and E2, students will necessarily satisfy all three overlay requirements as they progress through the core. The faculty hopes that this system will minimize student confusion about the overlay requirements, especially in light of the campus-wide Critical Thinking Through Writing initiative, described below.

The faculty also hopes this system will underline the importance of critical thinking to the Georgia State undergraduate curriculum. As a result of the SACS accreditation process completed in 2008, critical thinking emerged as the centerpiece of the University's Quality Enhancement Plan. Starting Fall 2009, all entering GSU students must take two upper-level critical thinking and writing intensive courses (CTW) within their majors in order to graduate; all

of these sections are capped at a 25-1 student-faculty ratio. In keeping with this upper-level requirement, the faculty, with the current core proposal, has designated all courses within Area B of the core as having to satisfy a key critical-thinking learning outcome. It is hoped that this strong emphasis on critical thinking in the core will prepare students for the new upper-level CTW requirement at Georgia State and help to constitute a signature academic program for the University.

Note: This material is being submitting in advance of final approval by the Georgia State University Senate. The Senate meeting is March 25, after the March 19 deadline for submission of these forms but before the April 5 meeting of the Council on General Education. Should the Senate decline to approve these changes, these documents will be withdrawn.

**Application for Approval of General Education Learning Outcomes
Submitted to the USG Council on General Education**

Name of Institution: Georgia State University

The newly adopted USG Core Curriculum Policy must be implemented by Fall 2011 by all four-year institutions and by Fall 2012 by all two-year institutions. The first step in implementation is approval of at least one learning outcome for each goal. Please complete this template and submit to the Council on General Education as a request for approval of your learning outcomes for Goals A-E and I-III. See:

http://www.usg.edu/academic_programs/cpr/implementing_the_new_core_curriculum/

Please consider:

- ❖ Each outcome **must be collegiate level, not skilled based, broadly focused and consistent with the mission** of the USG.
- ❖ Each outcome **must be measurable**.

Once approved initially, any revised outcomes must be approved by the Council on General Education.

This is (please check one):

- Initial submission of learning outcomes for approval
 Request for approval of revised outcomes

Learning Goal A1 (Communications)

Proposed Gen Ed Outcome(s) for this Goal.
Students produce well-organized communication that exhibits logical thinking, demonstrates appropriate style for circumstance and audience, meets conventional standards of usage, and acknowledges the use of information sources when necessary. Students demonstrate comprehension of written material: purpose, message, and rhetorical situation.

Learning Goal A2 (Quantitative)

Proposed Gen Ed Outcome(s) for this Goal.
Students understand and apply mathematical information, concepts, and verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.

Learning Goal B (Institutional Options)**Proposed Gen Ed Outcome(s) for this Goal.**

Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

(See note re Learning Goal III)

Learning Goal C (Humanities/Fine Arts/Ethics)**Proposed Gen Ed Outcome(s) for this Goal.**

Students effectively analyze the meanings of texts or works of art or music, express ways that culture shapes values, and critically evaluate them.

Learning Goal D (Natural Sciences)**Proposed Gen Ed Outcome(s) for this Goal.**

Students demonstrate understanding of the physical universe, the changing nature of science, and the scientific method, or mathematical information, concepts, and verbal, numeric, graphical or symbolic forms.

Learning Goal E (Social Sciences)**Proposed Gen Ed Outcome(s) for this Goal.**

Students effectively analyze the complexity of human behavior, and how historical, economic, political, social, or spatial relationships develop, persist, or change.

Learning Goal I (US Perspectives)

Proposed Gen Ed Outcome(s) for this Goal.
Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, or institutional developments.

Learning Goal II (Global Perspectives)

Proposed Gen Ed Outcome(s) for this Goal.
Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, or institutional developments across the globe.

Learning Goal III (Critical Thinking)

Proposed Gen Ed Outcome(s) for this Goal.
Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate. (This learning goal is the same as the learning goal for Area B. GSU proposes to focus Area B on critical thinking. Please see the cover letter for details.)

Overlay Approval Form
Submitted to the USG Council on General Education

Name of Institution: Georgia State University

The newly adopted USG Core Curriculum Policy must be implemented by Fall 2011 by all four-year institutions and by Fall 2012 by all two-year institutions. In addition to approval of at least one learning outcome for each goal by the Council on General Education, each institution must by that date meet the “overlay requirements” for US Perspectives, Global Perspectives and Critical Thinking by designating one or more courses in Areas A-E as US courses; designating one or more course in Areas A-E as GL courses; and designating one of more courses in Areas A-E as CT courses (or, alternatively, by adopting a CT plan). See:

http://www.usg.edu/academic_programs/cpr/implementing_the_new_core_curriculum/

Learning Goal I US Perspectives

Which of your approved Area A-E courses are proposed for designation as US perspectives courses?	In which area (A-E) is that course already approved?	How will completion of that course support your approved outcome(s) for US Perspectives?
Hist 2110 Survey of United States History	E	These two courses are focused on GSU’s proposed US learning goal: Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, or institutional developments.
PolS 1101 American Government	E	These two courses are focused on GSU’s proposed US learning goal: Students demonstrate understanding of the United States and its related political, social, or institutional developments.

Learning Goal II Global Perspectives

Which of your approved Area A-E courses are proposed for designation as Global perspectives courses?	In which area (A-E) is that course already approved?	How will completion of that course support your approved outcome(s) for Global Perspectives?
Econ 2100 The Global Economy (3)	E	These four courses are focused on GSU's proposed GL learning goal: Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, or institutional developments across the globe.
Hist 1111 Survey of World History to 1500	E	These four courses are focused on GSU's proposed GL learning goal: Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, or institutional developments across the globe.
Hist 1112 Survey of World History since 1500	E	These four courses are focused on GSU's proposed GL learning goal: Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, or institutional developments across the globe.
PolS 2401 Global Issues	E	These four courses are focused on GSU's proposed GL learning goal: Students demonstrate understanding of political, social, economic, or institutional developments across the globe.

Learning Goal II Critical Thinking

Which of your approved Area A-E courses are proposed for designation as Critical Thinking courses?	In which area (A-E) is that course already approved?	How will completion of that course support your approved outcome(s) for Critical Thinking?
Phil 1010 Critical Thinking	B	These four courses are focused on GSU's proposed CT learning goal: Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
Spch 1000 Human Communication	B	These four courses are focused on GSU's proposed CT learning goal: Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
Pers 2001 Perspectives on Comparative Culture	B	These four courses are focused on GSU's proposed CT learning goal: Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.
Pers 2002 Scientific Perspectives on Global Problems	B	These four courses are focused on GSU's proposed CT learning goal: Students effectively analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions, considering opposing points of view when appropriate.

Recommended Student Learning Outcomes for the Core Curriculum

The Core Curriculum Task Force's charge is, in part, (1) to work with the university community to identify at least one student learning outcome for each area of the revised core curriculum (Areas A-E) as well as identify at least one student learning outcome for U.S. Perspectives, Global Perspectives, and Critical Thinking. After seeking broad input from the university community, the Task Force puts forward the following student learning outcomes for the Undergraduate Committee's consideration and approval.

Critical Thinking—Critical thinking functions as the umbrella learning goal over the core curriculum; therefore, each area of the core must also address critical thinking.

Students will appraise diverse contexts using a logical and ethical framework.

Comment [AU1]: Not approved by USG

Area A1—Communication Skills (at least 6 hours)

Students will demonstrate written competence in adapting communication to specific purposes and audiences.

Area A2—Quantitative Skills (at least 3 hours)

Students will represent, manipulate, and apply mathematical knowledge using analytical, graphical, and numerical approaches.

Area B—Institutional Options (at least 3 hours) & Global Perspectives—Global Engagement

Students will identify major themes across diverse societies in their historical *and cultural* contexts and will apply this knowledge through engagement in local and global communities.

Area C—Humanities, Fine Arts, and Ethics (at least 6 hours) & Global Perspectives

Students will critically appreciate the historical and contemporary fine arts, as well as other cultural products, relate them to individual and social values, and make informed and ethical judgments about them from the standpoint of various cultures, including their own.

Comment [AU2]: Not approved by USG

Area D—Natural Sciences, Math, and Technology (at least 7 hours and at least 4 of these hours must be in a lab science course) & US Perspectives & Global Perspectives

Students will use scientific inquiry to apply and analyze the basic principles of science, math, and technology.

Comment [AU3]: Not approved by USG

Area E—Social Sciences & US Perspectives & Global Perspectives

Students will apply constitutional, cultural, economic, and geographic concepts within the historical context of an evolving and diverse human experience.

Students will demonstrate knowledge of major financial, social, and political institutions fundamental to citizenship in state, nation, and an interdependent global community.

Comment [AU4]: Not approved by USG

Assessment Program for Armstrong Atlantic State University's Core Curriculum 2010

Statement of Purpose: The mission of the Core Curriculum at AASU is: 1) to provide students a course of intellectual study that focuses on effective communication; 2) to offer these students opportunities to expand their skills in quantitative and scientific reasoning; 3) to promote their familiarity with the diversity, global contexts, and interrelatedness of disciplines in a Liberal Arts degree.

The Student Learning Outcomes for our Core Curriculum align with the learning goals outlined by USG Core Curriculum Committee, which are to be implemented by Fall 2011. We have identified one/two SLOs for each of the areas that will comprise our core at that time and are making recommendations for how to best assess our success in reaching those objectives.

<p>Student Learning Outcomes for the students completing the Core Curriculum at AASU are:</p> <p>Outcome #1- (aligning with Area A1—Communication Skills) Students will be able to assimilate and analyze a body of information, meeting conventional standards of composition.</p> <p>Expected Results- The student will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop arguments clearly in written form. 2. Demonstrate knowledge of appropriate uses of style, standards of correctness, and documentation. 	<p>Assessment Methods and Descriptions Use rubric to assess random sampling of final writing projects in ENGL 1102 (roughly 10% of the students completing ENGL 1102 in any given year; at our current enrollment rates [61 sections of this offered in 2009 @ 25 students per class] this would mean approximately 152 students/year).</p> <p>Recommendations: We recommend that the university purchase “EFOLIO” software to ease the administrative burden that collection of these papers would create. Estimated cost for this software is \$5,000.00 for a university-wide site license. This software would have applications for departments and programs beyond these immediate assessment measures, and cost for it could be absorbed by money saved if we eliminate the current Regents’ Exam on our campus. Reading/review of these writing samples and development of the evaluation rubric is work for which faculty would need to be compensated. This compensation (borrowing upon the rates currently offered from grading Regents’ exams, which is</p>
--	--

	<p>\$1.25/exam) could also be garnered from money saved through the elimination of the Regents' Exam. In order to insure that students actually submit their work to the EFOLIO file an advisement hold could be placed on their accounts.</p> <p>Note: We may want to raise the remuneration amount for reading these essays, given that an ENGL 1102 essay will be considerably longer than a Regents' Exam. We also may want to use two essays in the efolio.</p>
<p>Outcome # 2- (aligning with Area A2— Quantitative Skills) Students will be able to employ the skills of quantitative and qualitative problem solving.</p> <p>Expected Results- The student will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apply basic mathematical and statistical methods to formulate answers to problems. 2. Have the ability to use data presented in graphical form to solve problems. 	<p>Assessment Methods and Descriptions Use rubric to assess responses to specific questions on the MAPP exam (required of all students graduating from Armstrong).</p> <p>Note: At least 20 questions on MAPP involve these skills.</p> <p>Recommendations: Communicate these expected results to the faculty of the Math Department to ensure that the described skill are taught and evaluated in the Core Area A2 courses.</p>
<p>Outcome # 3- (aligning with Area B— Institutional Options. Please note: because our institutional options include an Ethics and a Global Perspectives focus, both of which have now been mandated by the USG committee, we have not added anything new here. Instead we have moved Ethics from Area C, where the system includes it, and taken Global Perspectives out of the Overlay Requirements, which is where the system identifies it as an additional requirement.)</p>	<p>Assessment Methods and Descriptions Use rubric to assess responses to specific questions on the MAPP exam (required of all students graduating from Armstrong).</p> <p>Recommendations: If questions can be added onto the MAPP exam to focus on these particular issues, and if students' answers to these questions can be measured in such a way that their responses do not work against them in tabulations of their overall scores on the standardized</p>

<p>A. Students will be able to analyze the ways that culture shapes ethical views and critically evaluate those views.</p> <p>B. Students will be able to analyze multicultural issues in the diverse realm of societies across the globe.</p> <p>Expected results- The student will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify themes and events relevant to the construction of ethical reasoning. 2. Situate these understandings in global contexts. 	<p>components of the exam, then we would be willing to support this as a useful and valid method of assessment.</p>
<p>Outcome #4- (aligning with Area C— Humanities and Fine Arts)</p> <p>A. Students will be able to recognize themselves as participants in a particular culture and see how this affects their experiences and values.</p> <p>B. Students will apply knowledge of historical, social, and cultural influences to understanding a work of art.</p>	<p>Assessment Methods and Descriptions Use rubric to assess responses to specific questions on the MAPP exam (required of all students graduating from Armstrong).</p> <p>Recommendations: If questions can be added onto the MAPP exam to focus on these particular issues, and if students' answers to these questions can be measured in such a way that their responses do not work against them in tabulations of their overall scores on the standardized components of the exam, then we would be willing to support this as a useful and valid method of assessment.</p>
<p>Outcome #5- (aligning with Area D— Natural Sciences, Math, & Technology)</p> <p>A. Students will demonstrate understanding of the method by which scientific study is conducted.</p> <p>B. Students will appropriately evaluate data in scientific reasoning problems.</p>	<p>Assessment Methods and Descriptions Use rubric to assess responses to institution-generated questions added to the MAPP exam.</p> <p>Recommendations: Several questions addressing this outcome must be developed by the CST faculty and added to the MAPP exam because none of the existing questions address this area. Also, because students have several course options in Area D, the developed questions must address topics common to all such courses. Examples may include questions regarding the scientific method and the appropriate</p>

	use of data in formulating conclusions.
<p>Outcome #6- (aligning with Area E— Social Sciences) Students will analyze the complexity of human behavior as a function of the commonality and diversity within groups.</p>	<p>Assessment Methods and Descriptions Use rubric to assess responses to specific questions on the MAPP exam (required of all students graduating from Armstrong).</p> <p>Recommendations: If questions can be added onto the MAPP exam to focus on these particular issues, and if students’ answers to these questions can be measured in such a way that their responses do not work against them in tabulations of their overall scores on the standardized components of the exam, then we would be willing to support this as a useful and valid method of assessment.</p>
<p>Outcome #7- (aligning with Area F— Lower-Division Major Requirements)</p> <p>Because these requirements vary from major to major, each department will be required to submit its own SLO for this area.</p>	
<p>Outcome #8- (aligning with Overlay Requirement—US perspectives) Students will identify the constitutional principles and related political, social, and institutional developments and governmental processes fundamental to an understanding of American democracy and political participation, from colonial times to the present.</p>	<p>Assessment Methods and Descriptions Use rubric to assess responses to specific questions on the MAPP exam (required of all students graduating from Armstrong).</p> <p>Recommendations: If questions can be added onto the MAPP exam to focus on these particular issues, and if students’ answers to these questions can be measured in such a way that their responses do not work against them in tabulations of their overall scores on the standardized components of the exam, then we would be willing to support this as a useful and valid method of assessment.</p>
<p>Outcome #9- (aligning with Institutional Plan Outcome—Critical Thinking) Students will effectively identify, analyze, evaluate, and provide convincing reasons in support of conclusions.</p>	<p>Assessment Methods and Descriptions Use rubric to assess random sampling of students’ final writing projects in HIST 1111 and 1112 (roughly 10% of the students completing HIST 1111 and 1112; at our current enrollment rates [48 sections</p>

	<p>of this offered in 2009 @ 40 students per class] this would mean 192 students/year.</p> <p>Recommendations: We recommend that the university purchase “EFOLIO” software to ease the administrative burden that collection of these papers would create. Estimated cost for this software is \$5,000.00 for a university-wide site license. This software would have applications for departments and programs beyond these immediate assessment measures, and cost for it could be absorbed by money saved if we eliminate the current Regents’ Exam on our campus. Reading/review of these writing samples and development of the evaluation rubric is work for which faculty would need to be compensated. This compensation (borrowing upon the rates currently offered from grading Regents’ exams, which is \$1.25/exam) could also be garnered from money saved through the elimination of the Regents’ Exam. In order to insure that students actually submit their work to the EFOLIO file an advisement hold could be placed on their accounts.</p> <p>Another option might be identifying a standardized test in critical thinking itself and administering it along with the MAPP exam.</p>
--	--