

General Education Review Committee Agenda

February 9, 2007
ADM 201
12:45 p.m. – 1:45 p.m.

I. Roll

() Doug Parry	CAS	Oral Communication
() Ben Curtis	Mat-Su/ UAB	Natural Sciences
() Caedmon Liburd	UAB	
() Patricia Fagan	CAS	Humanities
() Dan Schwartz	COE	
() Jack Pauli	CBPP/ UAB	
() Jeane Breinig	CAS	Written Communication
() Len Smiley	CAS/ UAB	Quantitative Skills
() Robin Wahto	CTC	
() Walter Olivares	CAS	Fine Arts
() Tom Miller	OAA	Guest
() Vacant	CHSW	
() Grant Baker	SOENGR/ UAB	
() Vacant	Student	

II. Approval of the Agenda (pg. 1)

III. Approval of Meeting Summary for January 26, 2007 (pg. 2-3)

IV. Chair's Report

V. Course Action Requests

Chg PSY A111 General Psychology (3 cr) (3+0) (pg. 4-9)

Chg PSY A150 Lifespan Development (3 cr) (3+0) (pg. 10-16)

VI. Old Business

A. GER CCG Updates (pg. 17-18)
Quantitative Skills GER review template
GER Template Memo

VII. New Business

A. GER Topic Paper: Annotated Executive Summary (pg. 19-32)

VIII. Informational Items and Adjournment

General Education Review Committee Summary

January 26, 2007
ADM 201
12:45 p.m. – 1:45 p.m.

I. Roll

() Doug Parry	CAS	Oral Communication
() Ben Curtis	Mat-Su/ UAB	Natural Sciences
() Caedmon Liburd	UAB	
() Patricia Fagan	CAS	Humanities
() Dan Schwartz	COE	
() Jack Pauli	CBPP/ UAB	
() Jeane Breinig	CAS	Written Communication
() Len Smiley	CAS/ UAB	Quantitative Skills
() Robin Wahto	CTC	
() Walter Olivares	CAS	Fine Arts
() Tom Miller	OAA	Guest
() Vacant	CHSW	
() Grant Baker	SOENGR/ UAB	
() Vacant	Student	

II. Approval of the Agenda (pg. 1)
Approved

III. Approval of Meeting Summary for January 19, 2007 (pg. 2-3)
Changed Tom to Tom Buller
Approved

IV. Chair's Report
Sent Patti Linton templates
Will talk about memo at GER
All templates are going to UAB
Talk about Tier 1 of Assessment Paper

V. Course Action Requests

Chg PSY A111 General Psychology (3 cr) (3+0)
No revisions received

Chg PSY A150 Lifespan Development (3 cr) (3+0)
No revisions received

Chg MUS A124 History of Jazz (3 cr) (3+0) (pg. 4-9)
Approved at last meeting, changes were made

Chg MUS A215 Music of Alaska Natives and Indigenous Peoples of Northern
Regions (3 cr) (3+0) (pg. 10-16)
Approved

Chg AKNS A215 Music of Alaska Natives and Indigenous Peoples of Northern
Regions (3 cr) (3+0) (pg. 17-23)
Approved

VI. Old Business

A. GER CCG Updates

1. Revised GER Review Templates (pg. 24-25)

2. DRAFT memo to announce the GER Templates (pg. 26)

Frequently asked questions have been answered in memo

Faculty, deans, everyone should be sent this memo

If UAB approves templates, they will be put online and memo will

be sent to everyone (Deans, Curriculum Committee Chairs, Faculty

Listserv)

VII. New Business

A. GER Topic Paper: Annotated Executive Summary (pg. 27-40)

Questions regarding capsized

Faculty teaching prep classes may not be same teaching in dept

Would be useful to have Gary come to the meeting

VIII. Informational Items and Adjournment

Meeting Adjourned



Curriculum Action Request

University of Alaska Anchorage

Proposal to Initiate, Add, Change, or Delete a Course or Program of Study

1a. School or College AS CAS		1b. Division ASSC Division of Social Science		1c. Department PSY	
2. Course Prefix PSY	3. Course Number A111	4. Previous Course Prefix & Number		5a. Credits/CEU 3.0	5b. Contact Hours (Lecture + Lab) (3.+0)
6. Complete Course/Program Title General Psychology <small>Abbreviated Title for Transcript (30 character)</small>					
7. Type of Course <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic <input type="checkbox"/> Non-credit <input type="checkbox"/> CEU <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Development					
8. Type of Action <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course <input type="checkbox"/> Program			9. Repeat Status No # of Repeats 0 Max Credits 3		
<input type="checkbox"/> Add <input type="checkbox"/> Prefix <input type="checkbox"/> Course Number <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> Credits <input type="checkbox"/> Contact Hours <small>(mark appropriate boxes)</small> <input type="checkbox"/> Title <input type="checkbox"/> Repeat Status <input type="checkbox"/> Delete <input type="checkbox"/> Grading Basis <input type="checkbox"/> Cross-Listed/Stacked <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Course Description <input type="checkbox"/> Course Prerequisites <input type="checkbox"/> Test Score Prerequisites <input type="checkbox"/> Co-requisites <input type="checkbox"/> Other Restrictions <input type="checkbox"/> Registration Restrictions <input type="checkbox"/> Class <input type="checkbox"/> Level <input type="checkbox"/> College <input type="checkbox"/> Major <input type="checkbox"/> Other			10. Grading Basis <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A-F <input type="checkbox"/> P/NP <input type="checkbox"/> NG		
			11. Implementation Date semester/year From: 8/2007 To: 12/9999		
			12. <input type="checkbox"/> Cross Listed with _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Stacked with _____ Cross-Listed Coordination Signature		
13. List any programs or college requirements that require this course BS/BA in Psychology					
14. Coordinate with Affected Units: UAA Deans; Directors of Mat-Su College, KPC, Kodiak College & PWSCC. Department, School, or College _____ Initiator Signature _____ Date _____					
15. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Education Requirement <input type="checkbox"/> Oral Communication <input type="checkbox"/> Written Communication <input type="checkbox"/> Quantitative Skills <input type="checkbox"/> Humanities <input type="checkbox"/> Fine Arts <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Social Sciences <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Sciences <input type="checkbox"/> Integrative Capstone					
16. Course Description Introduces methods, theories, and research in the psychological sciences. Core topics include psychological research methods, biopsychology, learning, cognition, lifespan development, personality, psychological disorders, and social psychology.					
17a. Course Prerequisite(s) (list prefix and number) None		17b. Test Score(s) N/A		17c. Co-requisite(s) (concurrent enrollment required) None	
17d. Other Restriction(s) <input type="checkbox"/> College <input type="checkbox"/> Major <input type="checkbox"/> Class <input type="checkbox"/> Level			17e. Registration Restriction(s) (non-codable) None		
18. <input type="checkbox"/> Mark if course has fees					
19. Justification for Action Updating the course description and course content guide to keep the course current.					

____ Approved
____ Disapproved: _____
Initiator (faculty only) Date

____ Approved
____ Disapproved: _____
Department Chairperson Date

____ Approved
____ Disapproved: _____
Curriculum Committee Chairperson Date

____ Approved
____ Disapproved: _____
Dean/Director of School/College Date

____ Approved
____ Disapproved: _____
Undergraduate or Graduate
Academic Board Chairperson Date

____ Approved
____ Disapproved: _____
Provost or Designee Date

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE
COURSE CONTENT GUIDE

I. Initiation Date: January 2007

II. Course Information:

- A. College: College of Arts and Sciences
- B. Course Title: General Psychology
- C. Course Subject/Number: PSY A111
- D. Credit Hours: 3.0 credits
- E. Contact Time: 3 + 0 hours per week
- F. Grading Information: A-F
- G. Course Description: Introduces methods, theories, and research in the psychological sciences. Core topics include psychological research methods, biopsychology, learning, cognition, lifespan development, personality, psychological disorders, and social psychology.
- H. Status of course relative to degree or certificate programs: Required for B.A. or B.S. degree in psychology; applies toward Social Science requirement of GER.
- I. Course Attributes: Applies toward UAA GER Social Science requirement.
- J. Lab Fees: None
- K. Coordination: Extended campuses
- L. Course Prerequisite: None
- M. Registration Restriction: None

III. Course Activities:

This class is delivered in a traditional-lecture format or a distance-delivery format. In either case, it is principally instructor-driven and lecture-oriented. On occasion, lecture can be supplemented with other activities.

IV. Evaluation:

At least 95% of a student's grade will be based on individual performance on quizzes, exams and written assignments. Other criteria (e.g., classroom participation, group activities) can account for up to 5% of the grade, with extra-credit activities accounting for no more than 3%.

V. Course-level Justification:

This class is appropriate at the 100-level because it (a) has no prerequisites, and (b) presents a broad survey of several different areas of psychology.

VI. Outline

A. Core Topics

(Instructors must devote at least 1/15th of lectures and exams to each of the following 8 topics, and all of the subtopics.)

- 1) Introduction to the scope and methods of psychology:
 - a) Roots and scope of modern psychology
 - b) Major perspectives in psychology (e.g., Biophysical)
 - c) Major themes in psychology (e.g., Nature and Nurture)
 - d) Research design: Descriptive, correlational and experimental
 - e) Research analysis: Basic statistical methods
- 2) Biological psychology
 - a) Neural transmission
 - b) Neurotransmitters
 - c) Nervous systems
 - d) Brain structures and functions
- 3) Cognition
 - a) Memory
 - b) Decision-making
 - c) Language development
 - d) Intelligence
- 4) Learning
 - a) Classical conditioning
 - b) Operant conditioning
 - c) Social learning
- 5) Developmental Psychology:
 - a) Physiological development:
 - b) Psychosocial development
 - c) Cognitive development
- 6) Personality Psychology
 - a) Trait theories
 - b) Psychoanalytic theories
 - c) Humanistic theories
 - d) Behavioral theories
- 7) Psychopathology and Psychological well-being
 - a) Anxiety disorders
 - b) Affective disorders
 - c) Schizophrenic disorders
 - d) Personality disorders
- 8) Social Psychology
 - a) Social thinking (e.g., attitudes and attributions)
 - b) Social influence (e.g., conformity and compliance)
 - c) Social relations (e.g., attraction and altruism)

B. Optional Topics:

(Instructors can devote no more than 2/15th of the semester to any of the following topics.)

- 1) Sensation & Perception
- 2) Consciousness
- 3) Motivation and Emotion
- 4) Stress and Health
- 5) Positive psychology and psychological well-being
- 6) Therapeutic assessment and interventions
- 7) Nature-Nurture
- 8) Evolutionary psychology

VII. Instructional Goals and Defined Outcomes

A. Instructional Goals: The instructor will:

- 1) Orient students toward the historical roots, dominant perspectives, major issues and key sub-disciplines of the modern psychological sciences.
- 2) Describe the differences among (a) subjective, non-scientific ideas about behavior and mental processes, (b) scientifically-derived hypotheses, and (c) empirically-supported conclusions.
- 3) Describe how the scientific method is applied to the psychological sciences, introducing the advantages and limitations of different types of research designs (i.e., case studies, surveys, correlational studies, and experiments), and different approaches to data collection (i.e., naturalistic observation and obtrusive observation).
- 4) Provide examples of theories, methods, and empirically-supported conclusions about the core topics in the psychological sciences (i.e., biological bases, learning, cognition, lifespan development, personality, psychological well-being, and social influences).
- 5) Show the application of the material to the lives of students and the diversity among people in the world around them.

B. Defined Outcomes: Students should be able to:

- 1) Describe the historical roots, dominant perspectives, major issues, and key sub-disciplines of the modern psychological sciences.
- 2) Demonstrate an understanding of (a) the problems of human subjectivity and biases in non-scientific impressions about human behavior and mental processes, and (b) the value of formal hypotheses that can be tested and either verified or rejected with systematic/objective observations of behaviors/processes.
- 3) Describe the differences between (a) non-empirical truth claims (e.g., subjective opinions, anecdotal observations, commonsense) and (b) empirical truth claims that are based on application of the scientific methods of survey research, correlational approaches and experimental designs.
- 4) Demonstrate an introductory knowledge of social science methods, including systematic observation of behavior and mental processes; empirical data analysis and quantitative reasoning using central

tendency, variability and correlation; theoretical models about core topics in the psychological sciences (i.e., biological bases, learning, cognition, lifespan development, personality, psychological well-being, and social influences).

- 5) Demonstrate sufficient understanding of empirical findings about both normal and abnormal behaviors/processes in the core topics of the psychological sciences, and how that knowledge applies to the diversity of people in the world around them.

VIII. Suggested Texts:

- A. Coon, D. & Mitterer, J. O. (2007). *Introduction to psychology: Gateways to mind and behavior* (11th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Wadsworth.
- B. Coon, D. (2007). *Psychology: A modular approach to mind and behavior* (10th ed). Pacific Grove, CA: Wadsworth.
- C. Kalat, J. W. (2005). *Introduction to Psychology* (7th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Wadsworth.
- D. Myers, D. G. (2007). *Psychology* (8th ed.). New York: Worth Publishers.
- E. Myers, D. G. (2007). *Psychology in modules* (8th ed.). New York: Worth Publishers.

IX. Bibliography and Resources

- A. *PsychInfo* (Consortium Library online database of psychological articles)
- B. Gelfand, H. & Walker, C. J. (eds). (2001). *Mastering APA style: Student's workbook and training guide*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Curriculum Coordination Form

Notification Date: October 26, 2006

Initiating unit: PSY

Affected unit(s): UAA Deans; Directors of Mat-Su College, KPC, Kodiak College & PWSCC

Course Prefix and Number: PSY A111

Previous Prefix and Number:

Complete Course/Program Title: General Psychology

Previous Course/Program Title: same

Description of Action: Updating the course description and course content guide to keep the course current.

Supporting documentation of the proposal is attached.

Initiating faculty are also REQUIRED to send an email to uaa-faculty@uaa.alaska.edu describing the proposal, including the proposed action and the course prefix, number, course description, prerequisite, and any other relevant information.

Any questions concerning the proposed changes may be addressed to the appropriate department chair, or the chair of the appropriate curriculum committee. Written comments may also be sent to the UAB or GAB, in care of the Governance Office, at the following address:

University of Alaska Anchorage
Governance Office, ADM 213
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508

If no written comments are received by the UAB or GAB within ten (10) days of notification date shown above, it is assumed that there are no objections to the proposal.

Note: Acknowledgement of coordination does not mean approval, it is only meant to verify that coordination has occurred.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE
COURSE CONTENT GUIDE

- I. Initiation Date: January 2007
- II. Course Information:
- A. College: College of Arts and Sciences
 - B. Course Title: Lifespan Development
 - C. Course Subject/Number: PSY A150
 - D. Credit Hours: 3.0 credits
 - E. Contact Time: 3 + 0 hours per week
 - F. Grading Information: A-F
 - G. Course Description: Reviews physical, cognitive, and socioemotional aspects of human growth, maturation, and development across the life span. Special attention is given to the effects of broader sociocultural influences on development. Classical and contemporary theories relating to development across the lifespan are considered.
 - H. Status of course relative to degree or certificate programs: Required for BA & BS in Psychology; AAS & BS Nursing; AAS & BA Early Childhood Development; BA Elementary Education; AAS & BS Human Services
 - I. Course Attributes: Applies toward UAA GER Social Sciences Requirement.
 - J. Lab Fees: None
 - K. Coordination: Extended campuses
 - L. Course Prerequisite: None
 - M. Registration Restriction: None

III. Course Activities:

This class is primarily delivered in a traditional-lecture format or a distance-delivery format. In either case, it is principally instructor-driven and lecture-oriented. On occasion, lecture can be supplemented with other activities.

IV. Evaluation:

This course will provide basic knowledge regarding psychological research findings and theories of human development and assess this knowledge and reading comprehension through exams. Written and oral communication skills will be assessed through papers and other written assignments, group or class discussions, and/or student presentations. Attendance is essential due to the broad range of material covered in this foundational course, the applicability of this material to everyday life, and the opportunity the course content and targeted skills provide for personal growth.

V. Course-level Justification:

This class is appropriate at the 100-level because it presents a broad survey of several different areas of psychology.

VI. Outline: Core Topics

A. Overview of the study and psychological research findings relevant to lifespan development.

B. Classical and contemporary theories of lifespan development and the role of the scientific method.

C. Prenatal period:

1. Physical, cognitive, and socioemotional beginnings of development: Role of nature/nurture, genetics, brain growth and development, stages of prenatal growth.

2. Common difficulties/dysfunctions.

D. Infancy and toddler years:

1. Physical, cognitive, and socioemotional domains of development: Neonatal development, reflex behaviors, development of knowing and perceiving, role of temperament, attachment, early child care, pre-linguistics, and sensorimotor skills.

2. Common difficulties/dysfunctions.

E. Early childhood:

1. Physical, cognitive, and socioemotional domains of development: Accidental injuries, nutrition, cognitive neuroscience, preoperations, theory of mind, information-processing, language development, preschool, self-concept, and gender.

2. Common difficulties/dysfunctions.

F. Middle childhood:

1. Physical, cognitive, and socioemotional domains of development: Concrete operations, moral reasoning, literacy, elementary school, self-esteem, and multiple intelligences.

2. Common difficulties/dysfunctions.

G. Adolescence:

1. Physical, cognitive, and socioemotional domains of development: Puberty, interaction between the strands of development, neuron-cognition, formal operations, middle and high school, identity, sexual orientation, peer influences.
2. Common difficulties/dysfunctions.

H. Young adulthood:

1. Physical, cognitive, and socioemotional domains of development: Post-formal operations, intimate attachments with responsibility, reproduction, emotional intelligence, college, work.
2. Common difficulties/dysfunctions.

I. Middle adulthood:

1. Physical, cognitive, and socioemotional domains of development: Optimization of development, menopause, middle-life aging and crisis, role of expertise, mature learning, work, retirement, kinship ties, stability and change in personality.
2. Common difficulties/dysfunctions.

J. Later adulthood:

1. Physical, cognitive, and socioemotional domains of development: Presbyopia, aging brain, wisdom, life narratives, decline in physical functioning, social support, living arrangements
2. Common difficulties/dysfunctions.

K. Death and dying:

1. Physical, cognitive, and socioemotional domains of development: Cessation of bodily functions, spiritual and religious practices, grief, bereavement, care for the dead and dying, attention to legal, medical and ethical concerns
2. Common difficulties/dysfunctions.

VII. Instructional Goals and Defined Outcomes:

A. Instructional Goal: The instructor will:

1. Orient students toward the historical roots, dominant perspectives, and major issues in the scientific study of lifespan development.
2. Introduce the advantages of, and limitations of various scientific methods to derive empirically-supported conclusions that describe, predict, and explain changes and consistencies across the lifespan.
3. Provide examples of theories and empirically-supported conclusions about core topics in lifespan development (i.e., physical, cognitive and socioemotional issues as it relates to change and stability across each stage of the lifespan).
4. Show the application of the material to the personal development of students and the diversity of lifespan development among people in the world around them.

B. Defined Outcomes: Students should be able to:

1. Describe the historical roots, dominant perspectives, and major issues in the scientific study of lifespan development.
2. Demonstrate an understanding of the advantages and limitations of various scientific methods that are used to derive empirically-supported conclusions about changes and consistencies across the lifespan.
3. Demonstrate an introductory knowledge of theories and empirically-supported conclusions about core topics in lifespan development (i.e., physical, cognitive and socioemotional issues as it relates to change and stability across each stage of the lifespan).
4. Describe applications of the material to personal development and the diversity of lifespan development among people in the world around them.

VIII. Suggested Texts:

- A. Berk, L. E. (2004). *Development through the life span*. (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- B. Boyd, D., & Bee, H. L. (2005). *Lifespan development*. (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- C. Kail, R. V., & Cavanaugh, J. C. (2007). *Human development: A lifespan view*. (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- D. Papalia, D. E., Olds, S. W., & Feldman, R. D. (2007). *Human development*. (10th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

IX. Bibliography:

- A. Damon, W. & Lerner, R. M. (2006) *Handbook of child psychology* (Eds.) Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons.
- B. *Developmental Psychology Journal* (1969). Arlington, VA: American Psychological Association
- C. Gardiner, H.W. & Kosmitzki, C. (2005). *Lives across cultures: Cross cultural human development*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon
- D. Lerner, R. M. (2002). *Concepts and theories of human development*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- E. Cavanaugh, J. C. & Blanchard-Fields (2006). *Adult development and aging* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth and Thomson

Curriculum Coordination Form

Notification Date: October 26, 2006

Initiating unit: PSY

Affected unit(s): UAA Deans; Directors of Mat-Su College, KPC, Kodiak College & PWSCC

Course Prefix and Number: PSY A150

Previous Prefix and Number: `

Complete Course/Program Title: Lifespan Development

Previous Course/Program Title: Life Span Development

Description of Action: Updating the course description and course content guide to keep the course current.

Supporting documentation of the proposal is attached.

Initiating faculty are also REQUIRED to send an email to uaa-faculty@uaa.alaska.edu describing the proposal, including the proposed action and the course prefix, number, course description, prerequisite, and any other relevant information.

Any questions concerning the proposed changes may be addressed to the appropriate department chair, or the chair of the appropriate curriculum committee. Written comments may also be sent to the UAB or GAB, in care of the Governance Office, at the following address:

University of Alaska Anchorage
Governance Office, ADM 213
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508

If no written comments are received by the UAB or GAB within ten (10) days of notification date shown above, it is assumed that there are no objections to the proposal.

Note: Acknowledgement of coordination does not mean approval, it is only meant to verify that coordination has occurred.

Template for Review of Tier 1: Quantitative Skills GER Courses

Course:	Crs. #	Date of Review:							
For each of the boxes below, check those components that have been reviewed and found to be acceptable on the submitted CAR/CCG.									
CAR	CCG date within 10 years	Course Description	Course Outline	Text & Bibliography Current					
CCG has instructional goals and assessable student outcomes consistent with GER category descriptor and appropriate preamble student outcomes.									
Student Outcomes At the completion of the course the student will be able to:			Outcome Included in Course		Outcome Assessed with Appropriate Tools		Evidence for Achievement of Outcome*		
Category Descriptor Outcomes			Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	In Development	No
1. Develop their algebraic, analytic and numeric skills; use them to solve applied problems; and correctly explain their mathematical reasoning.									
Appropriate numbered GER preamble Student Outcomes									
Must Include: 2. Reason mathematically, and analyze quantitative and qualitative data competently to reach sound conclusions.									

*For institutional GER review

Date: February 7, 2007

To: Deans, Patty Linton, Curriculum Committee Chairs, Faculty ListServe

From: Ben Curtis, Chair GERC

Subject: Availability of GER Course Review Templates

The General Education Review Committee (GERC) and the Undergraduate Academic Board (UAB) approved GER review templates for each of the GER categories which incorporate input received from faculty. The templates will ONLY be used by the GERC for the actual GER course review process. The templates are now available on the GER website (<http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/governance/ger/index.cfm>), and the GERC encourages faculty preparing GER courses for submission to UAB to examine the templates as a guide to the criteria in the current UAA Catalog's category descriptor that the GERC will use to review GER courses.

GER course review by the GERC is a deliberative process based on active discussion among its members and the course initiator(s). The GERC will utilize the templates as a tool to assist with arriving at a consensus that there is sufficient alignment of a specific course's outcomes with its requested GER category descriptor to justify inclusion of the course in that category.

The Curriculum Handbook now contains the following statement approved by the faculty senate on November 3, 2006. **"The Committee shall: (with respect to course actions and reviews) 1) apply the current UAA catalog's GER category descriptors and GER Student Outcomes as primary criteria for evaluating all GER courses for inclusion in specific categories of the General Education curriculum. Tier 3: Integrative Capstone courses have additional criteria."** Other than this requirement that a GER course's outcomes are consistent with the current Catalog's category descriptor, there are no "new" criteria for the approval of GER courses. On the templates, the GERC will note if the course outcomes are assessed with appropriate tools based on the statement in the Curriculum Handbook that "Student outcomes must be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timely. Student evaluation methods must assess the accomplishment of the students in each outcome." The GERC will also record the "Evidence for Achievement of Outcome*" on the templates; however, as stated on the template, this is "*For institutional GER review" only, as part of ongoing institutional assessment of the GER.

As they are used for course review, the GERC will continue to evaluate the need for any further revisions to the review templates based on faculty input.

SUPPORTING UAA'S INSTRUCTIONAL MISSION

**GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENT
COURSES**

(A FIVE-YEAR CONTEXT PROFILE)

Topic Paper 2006-04

Prepared for :

UAA Provost Dr. Mike Driscoll

by:

Office of Institutional Planning, Research & Assessment

Dr. Gary Rice, Director
Yuan Fang Dong
Hongmei Zhu

In Collaboration with:

General Education Review Committee
Dr. Benson Curtis, Chairman

November 2006

REPORT CONTENTS

Executive Summary

Introduction

Definitions, Methodology, Assumptions

Curriculum Primary Functions Overview

Summary of Findings—GER Courses

What is the Category/Course(s) Primary Purpose

Tier I—Basic College-Level Skills

Who Offers the Course(s)?

How Full is the Course(s)?

When is Course(s) taken in Student's Goal Path?

Who takes the Course(s)?

How Well are Students Prepared/Performing in this Course(s)?

What is Relationship between Course(s) Attributes and Attrition?

Who Teaches the Course(s)?

What does it Cost to Offer the Course(s)?

How Effectively does Course(s) Accomplish its Primary Purpose?

How Successful are Students meeting their Academic Expectations?

How do Findings Compare with UAA Comparative Peers?

Tier I Data Tables

Tier II—Disciplinary Areas

Who Offers the Course(s)?

How Full is the Course(s)?

When is Course(s) taken in Student's Goal Path?

Who takes the Course(s)?

How Well are Students Prepared/Performing in this Course(s)?

What is Relationship between Course(s) Attributes and Attrition?

Who Teaches the Course(s)?

What does it Cost to Offer the Course(s)?

How Effectively does Course(s) Accomplish its Primary Purpose?

How Successful are Students meeting their Academic Expectations?

How do Findings Compare with UAA Comparative Peers?

Tier II Data Tables

Tier III—Integrative Capstone

How Full is the Course(s)?

When is Course(s) taken in Student's Goal Path?
Who takes the Course(s)/
How Well are Students Prepared/Performing in this Course(s)?
Who Teaches the Course(s)?
What does it Cost to Offer the Course(s)?

Tier III Data Tables

Appendix

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: *Italics by B. Curtis from full report*
Data sets from Summer 2000 to Spring 2006

This Topic Paper is one of eight in a series to examine the impact of eight curriculum components in support of UAA's instructional mission. Its two-fold purpose is to (1) provide a comprehensive 5-year retrospective look at the component to construct context and trends, and (2) provide some insight into the fundamental mission-related question: **“To what extent does completing a course(s) make the difference intended by the university and/or expected by the student?”**

The paper is organized around three tiers that currently comprise the GER program: Tier I—Basic College Level Skills, Tier II—Disciplinary Areas, and Tier III—Integrative Capstone. Tier I is broken into Oral Communication, Quantitative Skills, and Written Communication categories. Tier II is broken into Fine Arts, Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences categories. Tier II is reported by individual courses. Within each tier, it seeks to answer some common straight-forward who, what, when, where, why and how queries one would ask about any course in the UAA curriculum

The project begins with an overview of the entire UAA curriculum relative to the eight primary course functions during the past five years. It also presents the relative contribution of each campus to each primary function. They serve as a stable reference frame to assess the contribution of each component over time. During those five years UAA experienced a 6% increase in sections offered, 10% enrollment increase, 14% SCH increase, and 9% increase in instructional FTEF=Faculty to serve these students.

Tier I curriculum constitutes 6% of total sections offered(4% *Anchorage*), 8% of UAA total academic year enrollment(6% *Anchorage*), 10% of total SCH generated(8% *Anchorage*), and about 8% of total instructional FTEF effort(6% *Anchorage*). It represents about 8% of the total Anchorage enrollment, 10% at KPC, 6% at Kodiak, 9% at Mat-Su, and 3% at PWSCC.

01-02 to 05-06 Anchorage 16% enrollment growth: Honors +46%, Student readiness -3%, GER Tier I +23%, GER Tier II +22%, Major core +47%, electives -15%, graduate +5%, prof. development +15%, Non-credit -64%

All campuses: GER Tier I enrollment up 15% faculty up 8%(Anchorage enrollment up 23%, sections up 21%, faculty up 19%), GER Tier II enrollment up 18% faculty up 8%, major core enrollment up 47.1%

05-06 Anchorage %enrollment: 4.2 % Student Readiness, 8% GER Tier I, 27% GER Tier II, 50.5% Major core, 19.3% electives, 5.2% prof.develop, 4.9% graduate

Written Communication had the largest growth in the Tier I curriculum *from 02-06 (+25% enrollment, +15% sections, +15% faculty)*. Oral Communication experienced growth but was the least productive of the three areas when comparing enrollment increase to proportion of instructional faculty effort growth to serve them (+5% enrollment, +8% sections, +8% faculty). Quantitative Skills courses were the most

economically productive (+11% enrollment, -2% sections, -1% faculty). Note: These statements do not in any way imply or equate instructional quality with economic productivity. (UAA entire curriculum +10% enrollment, +6% sections, +9% faculty)

In Fall 2005 Tier I courses had a combined total of 5,204 initial registrants but 703 (13.6%) dropped leaving 4,501 enrollees (46% Written, 23% Oral, 31% Quantitative). The entire tier had 87% of its total available capped seats occupied and average section size was nearly 21. By contrast UAA had an overall fill rate of 69% capacity, about 8% drop rate, and 15 average section size. 6,507 of 65,974 initial UAA registrants (10%) have their classes cancelled and/or change their mind and leave before classes start. *Tier I courses are 69% full by 1st day of instruction and 87% full by end of registration compared to 50% and 69% full across the curriculum. Fill rates Oral Communication(1st day 78%-90% final) 20.7 section size, Written Communication(1st day 73%-92% final) 18.9 section size, Quantitative Skills (1st day 57%-80% final) 24.6 section size.*

During 02-06, Oral 244 sections with 89 over enrollment cap(37%), Quantitative 6,751 sections with 8% overloaded, and Written 21% overloaded. All Tier I, 21% of sections overloaded.

About 26% of the (headcount) and 18% of Tier I enrollment takes place during first year of college. By second year the percentages are 42% and 37% respectively. That means 58% of the headcount and 63% of the Tier I enrollment occurs AFTER the student has reached upper-division status base on cumulative credit hours already earned.

Enrollment(headcount)

Oral Communication: 1st year 19%(28%), 2nd year 19%(15%), 3rd year 21%(22%), 4th year 21%(18%), 5th year 20%(17%).

Written Communication: 1st year 17%(27%), 2nd year 19%(15%), 3rd year 21%(19%), 4th year 22%(19%), 5th year 21%(20%).

Quantitative Skills: 1st year 20%(21%), 2nd year 20%(20%), 3rd year 20%(18%), 4th year 20%(20%), 5th year 20%(21%)

The project examines the GER hours students took with them when they transferred out of UAA to another college or university. It also looks at selected student characteristics and their GER attrition rates.

Attrition: any grade symbol that hinders student from making progress toward his/her educational goal: F, W(withdrawal), NP(not pass), Audit. Success Grades facilitate progress: A, B, C, D, and P, while Stasis grades are neutral (Audit Deferred Incomplete)

A larger proportion of a greater number of students are successfully completing their Tier I coursework in AY06 (76%) than in AY02 (73%). Oral: 06(85%) 02(84%),

Quantitative: 06(65%) 02(59%), Written: 06(78%) 02(75%).

02-06 Tier I: 19% increase in "Failure" grades and 17% increase in Withdrawals.

During that time attrition rates remained constant (22%) and proportion of stasis grades dropped to 1.7%. Within that, however, course attrition overall was 11-14% in Oral Communication courses, 29-33% in Quantitative Skills, and 19% in Written Communications. In 06 Tier I 22% attrition: 13% Oral, 20% English(ENGL 111 23% & other ENGL 17%), 33% Quantitative.

Who takes Course?

Attrition in Tier I higher for: males, minority students(especially Alaska Natives and American Indian), freshman, 25-39 yr olds, high school GPA \leq 2.4, bottom half of high school class, living off-campus, not UA scholar, non-degree seeker, part-time student, attending Anchorage or Mat-Su campus.

Assumption: Students have met course prerequisite qualifications if they are officially enrolled in the course. The final course grade is a proxy outcome assessment for student performance against course standards/instructor expectations, and individual instructor grading philosophies becomes normalized in aggregate statistics

A separate small side research project(*first time freshman Fall 00-06*) set up to control variables as much as possible and examine the effect of GER prerequisite course performance compared with GER criterion course performance. A comparison of criterion performance was made by those who Met the prerequisite(*successful grade in all required prerequisite courses*), vs *Not Met(not taken or not passed)* those who did not but enrolled anyway, and *for Met vs* those who did not take the prerequisite but were admitted via faculty waiver. There were both expected and unexpected but important statistically significant findings.

Quantitative Skills:

23.4% MET: mean GPA 1.81

67% successful grade, 1% stasis, 31% attrition grade

4.9% Not Met: mean GPA 1.57 (P =0.02)

57% successful grade, 3% stasis, 40% attrition grade

71.7% Faculty Waiver: mean GPA 1.83

66% successful grade, 2% stasis, 32% attrition grade

Written Communication:

31.8% MET: mean GPA 2.74

83% successful grade, 2% stasis, 14% attrition grade

0.9% Not Met: mean GPA 2.22 (P=0.002)

71% successful grade, 4% stasis, 24% attrition grade

67.3% Faculty Waiver: mean GPA 2.44 (P<.0001)

77% successful grade, 2% stasis, 21% attrition grade

A second larger, but less controlled, analysis prepared a correlation between the actual grade performance of all students in each stated GER prerequisite course and their grade performance in the GER criterion course. How students were placed in each course was not important; they were there and their performance was compared. An examination of the common (what the two courses had in common) and unique variance between each prerequisite and criterion course revealed findings subject to two possible interpretations. One, the small common variance indicates the two courses were not presenting the same thing which one would hope for since duplication was minimal. Two, prerequisites were not performing their intended function because there is so little carryover from prerequisite to criterion course that is assumed to facilitate learning and success in the latter.

Correlation in grade in GER Tier I prerequisite and grade in subsequent criterion course

The smaller the correlation in the prerequisites grade and the subsequent criterion course grade the smaller the common variance. For Quantitative Skills common variance was 13-20%, while for Written Comm. 4-11%.

There were 444 repeaters (10%) among 4,501 Tier I enrollees during Fall 2005. Based on the average section size of each category compared with the courses repeated, they would represent the equivalent of 1.1 additional Oral Communication classes, 9.3 additional Quantitative Skills, classes and 10.2 additional Written Communication classes in one semester. Further, this just represents the tip of the iceberg because 57-65% of Tier I attriting students elected not to repeat their course. Doing the math and adding this to the number who actually did repeat one sees the impact. *Oral 5% of repeaters, Written 43% of repeaters, and Quantitative 52% of repeaters. Highest Courses for Tier I repeaters: ENGL 111 28% and MATH A107 21% of all repeaters.*

15-20% of Oral Comm. elected to repeat the same course

45% of Quantitative Skills elected to repeat and took more tries to complete successfully

32-40% of Written Comm. elected to repeat

Majority of Tier I students successfully repeated on the first attempt

The project determined whether significant attrition differences existed in GER courses taught weekday vs. weekend, morning, afternoon and evening, class size, taught by different instructional modalities, and taught via. distance delivery. There were some statistically significant differences between them.

Oral and Written Comm. Attrition: no significant difference morn., aft., eve.

Quantitative attrition: morning highest(36.2%) afternoon(32.0%), evening lowest(29.1%)

Oral and Quantitative Attrition: no signif. Difference weekday vs weekend

Written Comm. Attrition: Higher weekend(26.2%) than weekday(17.8%)

Small (1-19), medium (20-49), large (50+) class size

Oral class Size: no difference small vs medium, no large

Written class size: no difference small vs medium, no large

Quantitative class size: attrition rate in medium size(35.4%) higher than small size(20.5%) $P < 0.0001$

Distance Delivery

Only Written Comm. offered Distance courses. Attrition Rate higher in Distance courses each year offered 02-03(29% vs 21%), 03-04(32% vs 20%), 04-05(28% vs 21%), 05-06 (35% vs 19%)

It also determined the proportion of students who started with a full-time course load and ended up with a part-time load based on attrition rate in GER courses. *63% were part time and 37% were full time. Of all these 74% were able to complete entire load and 26% had attrition.*

The project looked for different performance in GER courses taught by regular vs. adjunct faculty and also difference by academic rank along with bipartite-tripartite status. There were some statistically significant differences between them.

All UAA courses attrition 15-16%. Ranked faculty had higher attrition rates (17-18%) vs adjuncts (14%). For GER Tier I Ranked faculty attrition 22-25% vs adjuncts 20% attrition rate for GER Tier I

Oral: Prof(12.1%), Assoc.(17.1%), Asst.(20.4%), Instruc.(8.9%), Adjunct(14.1%)

Quant: Prof(37.0%), Assoc.(39.8%), Asst.(34.2%), Adjunct(30.3%)

Written: Prof(15.0%), Assoc.(18.7%), Asst.(20.5%), Instruc.(18.4%), Adjunct(20.6%)

Attrition rate all courses Bipartite from 19% in 01-02 to 17% and Tripartite stable at 15-16%

GER Tier I mostly taught by Bipartite(96%) attrition 24% & tripartite(4%) attrition 32%

The project established total and unit direct instructional, instructional plus indirect support, and full cost to teach GER courses. There are important comparisons but unit cost increases were discovered to be more the result of increases in full operating costs than salaries although benefits are playing an ever-increasing role in bringing direct instruction and full-costs closer together.

How effectively does course accomplish purpose?

*Correlation in grade in GER Tier I prerequisite and grade in subsequent criterion course
The smaller the correlation in the prerequisites grade and the subsequent criterion course grade the smaller the common variance. For Quantitative Skills common variance was 13-20%, while for Written Comm. 4-11%.*

The project analyzed student evaluation of instructional effectiveness in GER courses over the five years. Students rated their instructional experience in such classes very high (almost too high given the proportion of attrition grades awarded over the years. Students reported spending 2-4 hours per week outside class and the GER course workload requirements were typically perceived to be about the same as other comparable credit-hour course, except for Quantitative Skills, *rated as heavier workload, and also were more likely to spend more hours per week outside class working on course material.*

The GER Tier II curriculum was analyzed in the same way and there is a wealth of findings for the interested reader.

Tier II 14% of all UAA sections, 25-26% of enrollment, 29-30% of all SCH, taught by 18% of Faculty.

02-06 Tier II +9% total sections, +20% SCH, +9% FTEF faculty

CAS +10% sections, +21% enrollment, +8% FTEF

CTC +14% sections, +29% enrollment, +14% FTEF

06 Tier II 14% sections, 25% enrollment, 17% FTEF faculty

06 Anchorage 27% enrollment, 17% FTEF faculty

Tier II

Fine Arts: 8% enrollment, 8% SCH, 6% of Tier II faculty

02-06: +18% in sections, enrollment +31%, +18% faculty

Humanities: 31% enrollment, 39% of Tier II faculty

02-06: -6% in sections, enrollment +5%, -7% faculty(FTEF)

Natural Sciences: 29% enrollment, 25% of Tier II faculty

02-06: +22% sections, enrollment +26%, +27% faculty

Social Sciences: 32% enrollment 30% Tier II faculty

02-06: +16% sections, enrollment +23%, +16% faculty

ALL UAA fill rates: 1st day(50.0%) end 76.5%, drop(7.5%) final(68.9%)

Tier II GER Course Fill Rates: Fall 2005

ALL Tier II: 1st day(67.5%) end(92.6%), drop(8.3%) final(84.3%)

Fine Arts: 1st day(75%) end(97.2%), drop(7%),final (90%) section size 36.3

Humanities: 1st day(66%) end(92.3%), drop(8.8%) final (83.5%) section size 24.3

Natural Sciences: 1st day(65.5%)end(92.5%), drop(8.9%) final(83.6%) section size 27.9

Social Sciences: 1st day(69.1%) end(92.0%), drop(7.5%) final (84.5%) section size 32.4

Tier II drops represent 24% of drops from all courses in the entire UAA curriculum

% Capacity Sections Over Capacity Caps:

Fine Arts: 21% over capacity

Humanities: 21% over capacity

Natural Sciences: 11% over capacity

Social Sciences: 17% over capacity

When are Tier II courses Taken?

Enrollment (headcount)

Fine Arts: 1st yr 16.6%(8.1%), 2nd yr 18.5%(21.4%), 3rd yr 20.9%(21.4%), 4th yr

22.2%(20.1%), 5th yr 21.8%(29%)

Humanities: 1st yr 18.7%(22.0%), 2nd yr 20.5%(17.9%), 3rd yr 20.7%(19.2%), 4th yr

20.6%(20.6%), 5th yr 19.5%(20.3%)

Natural Sciences: 1st yr 16.1%(11.7%), 2nd yr 18.7%(22%), 3rd yr 20.8%(19.8%), 4th yr

22.4%(30.4%), 5th yr 22%(16.1%)

Social Sciences: 1st yr 17.2%(12.5%), 2nd yr 19.5%(20.5%), 3rd yr 21%(23%), 4th yr

21.2%(20.2%), 5th yr 21.1%(23.8%)

Who takes course?

Tier II course attrition higher for: males, minority students(especially Alaska Natives and American Indian), freshman, 18-24 yr olds, high school GPA ≤ 2.4 , bottom half high school class, living off campus, not UA scholar, non-degree seeker, part-time student

How well are students prepared? grades and attrition rates

144,547 grades Fine Arts(8%), Humanities(29%), Natural Sciences(16.6%), Social Sciences (27.7%)

Successful grades(A,B,C,D): Fine Arts 83%, Humanities(78%), Natural Sciences(76%), Social Sciences(76-78%)

2% of Tier II grades incompletes

Attrition Rates: 02-06

Natural Sciences(22-24%), Social Sciences(18-21%), Humanities(19-20%), Fine Arts(16-17%)

06 Attrition Tier II 22%

06 Attrition: Natural Sciences(23%) from 7% in environmental sci. to 27% in biology, Social Sciences(21%)from 13% in HUMS to 34% in paralegal, Humanities(20%) from 10% in linguistics to 47% in Latin, Fine Arts(16%) from 7% in dance to 18% in music

Prerequisites and attrition

Students that Met prerequisite vs Not Met and Met vs Faculty Waiver

Fine Arts:

Met(51.5%) GPA 2.88

91% Success, 0% Stasis, 9% attrition

Not Met(3.5%) GPA 2.08 P=0.04

60% Success, 4% Stasis, 36% attrition

Faculty Waiver(45%) GPA 2.66 P=0.03

82.9% success, 0.9% stasis, 16.2% attrition

Humanities:

Met(54.2%) GPA 2.63

94.5% Success, 0.7% Stasis, 14.7% attrition

Not Met(2.1%) GPA 2.08 P=0.009

55.8% Success, 7.8% Stasis, 26% attrition

Faculty Waiver(43.8%) GPA 2.67

82.6% Success, 0.7% Stasis, 15.9% attrition

Prerequisites and attrition

Students that Met prerequisite vs Not Met and Met vs Faculty Waiver

Natural Sciences:

Met(41.5%) GPA 2.64

89.8% Success, 0.7% Stasis, 9.3% attrition

Not Met(21.5%) GPA 1.73 P= <0.0001

63.7% Success, 1% Stasis, 34.9% attrition

Faculty Waiver(37%) GPA 1.89 P=<0.0001

82.6% Success, 0.7% Stasis, 15.9% attrition

Social Sciences:

Met(41.9%) GPA 2.47

83.5% Success, 0.8% Stasis, 15.7% attrition

Not Met(6.9%) GPA 1.67 P= <0.0001

64.2% Success, 1.2% Stasis, 34.5% attrition

Faculty Waiver(51.2%) GPA 2.07 P=<0.0001

72.9% Success, 1.8% Stasis, 25.3% attrition

There was a significant difference in mean GPA between MET prerequisite and other students for all 4 Tier II categories. In 3 of 4 (not humanities) there was a significant difference between the Met prerequisite and faculty waiver students.

GER Tier II Repeating Students:

There were 1,131 repeaters (7%) in the 15,811 Tier II students in Fall 2005. Based on class size, repeaters represent 1 additional Fine Arts, 10.4 additional Humanities, 17.5 additional Natural Sciences, and 10.9 additional Social Sciences classes in one semester. If the 1,131 were spread across the average 15 student Tier II class size it would represent 75.4 additional Tier II sections in Fall 2005.

Fall 2003

Fine Arts: 80.4% no repeat, 19.6% repeat, 11.6% successful

Humanities: 78.3% no repeat, 21.7% repeat, 12.8% successful

Natural Sciences: 64.4% no repeat, 35.6% repeat, 21.9% successful

Social Sciences: 70.6% no repeat, 29.4% repeat, 17.3% successful

Social Sciences courses repeats took more times to be successful and tried more times unsuccessfully than other Tier II. The majority of students who repeated Tier II successfully did so on their first attempt.

Course Attributes and Attrition: Tier II 24% of total UAA enrollment

**Significant differences 05-06 in attrition*

Time of Day: highest in morning, less in afternoon, and lowest in evening classes

Fine Arts: Morn(17.5%), aft(12.6%), evening(15%), missing(24%)*

Humanities: Morn(21.6%), aft(18.2%), evening(18.5%*), missing(20.7%)*

Natural Sciences: Morn(23.4%), aft(24.1%), evening(19.9%), missing(22%)*

Social Sciences: Morn(21.4%), aft(20.4%), evening(17.9%), missing(27.6%)*

Attrition Weekend vs Weekday

Only Social Sciences has a significant difference. Weekend(12.1%) has lower attrition than weekday(20.3%).

Attrition vs Class Size: Small (1-19), medium (20-49), large (50+) class size

With the exception of medium vs large fine arts and small vs medium Natural Sciences, a statistically significant($P < 0.0001$) relationship between the larger the class size and the higher the attrition for all Tier II.

Attrition vs Modality for Tier II categories with different modalities

Tier II Humanities courses taught by lecture(20.6%) and lecture-lab (15.7%)

Natural Sciences lecture(28.3%), lab only(21.3%), lecture-lab(24.6%) .

Attrition Tier II distance delivery vs non-distance delivery 01-06

No significant difference in Fine Arts. Humanities and Natural Sciences had significantly higher attrition in early years but not in 04-06. Only Social Sciences had significantly higher attrition in distance delivery courses from 01-06.

Who Teaches the course? Attrition Rate

All UAA courses attrition 15-16%. Ranked faculty had higher attrition rates (17-18%) vs adjuncts (14%). For GER Tier II Ranked faculty attrition 20-22% vs adjuncts 18-20%.

attrition rate for GER Tier II 05-06

Fine Arts: Prof(21.7%), Assoc.(30.4%), Asst.(14.9%), Instruc.(7.1%), Adjunct(15.2%)

Humanities: Prof(22.1%), Assoc.(25.2%), Asst.(22.8%), Inst.(16,8%),Adjunct(19.7%)

Nat.Sci.:Prof(28.6%), Assoc.(17.8%), Asst.(16.2%), Instruc.(26.7%), Adjunct(24.1%)

Social Sci.:Prof(26.3%), Assoc.(20.9%), Asst.(23.6%),Instruc.(18.4%),Adjunct(18.8%)

General hierarchy in last two years has shifted to Assoc>Prof>Asst>Instructor

Attrition rate all courses Bipartite from 19% in 01-02 to 17% and Tripartite stable at 15-16%

GER Tier II (05-06) taught by Bipartite(52%) attrition 21% & tripartite(47%) attrition 25%

How effectively does course accomplish primary purpose?

Correlation in grade in GER Tier II prerequisite and grade in subsequent criterion course

The smaller the correlation in the prerequisites grade and the subsequent criterion course grade the smaller the common variance. Natural Sciences had the highest proportion of common variance(5%-46%) for all courses in a category, as expected given discipline carryover and 2 semester sequences. Social Sciences had the next highest common variance(5%-33%) for its courses with prerequisites. Humanities was third in the proportion of common variance(0.4%-46.2%) for its courses with prerequisites which include 2 semester sequences. Fine Arts has the lowest aggregate common variance(1%-27%) for courses with prerequisites.

The project analyzed student evaluation of instructional effectiveness in GER courses over the five years. Students rated their instructional experience in such classes very high (almost too high given the proportion of attrition grades awarded over the years. Students reported spending 2-4 hours per week outside class. The GER course workload requirements was rated slightly lighter for Fine Arts courses, and Natural Sciences were rated as a heavier workload than other equal credit classes. They were slightly more likely to recommend Humanities and Social Sciences courses to another student.

The Tier III capstone courses were briefly examined because there was insufficient data to conduct a detailed analysis.

*Tier III Course Fill Rates: 2 sec. Sum 05(61 enroll.), 8 sec. Fall 05(200 enroll.), 9 sec. Spr 06(234 enroll.)
Fall 05- Capacity*

8 Sections of Tier III (232 seats): 1st Day(78%), end(88.8%), 2.6% drop, Final(86.2%)

Spring 06: 9 Sections of Tier III Final (79.3%).

Tier III course attrition by 06, 495 students had taken Tier III and 36 (7.3%)attrition. Substantially lower attrition than the other GER Tiers.

Tier III Course Prerequisites and Attrition:

Met GPA 2.81, Not Met GPA 2.71, Faculty Waiver GPA 3.09 no significant differences, so prerequisite or faculty waiver had no significant effect on grade or attrition. 91% successful (A,D,C,D) grades were obtained in Tier III, higher than other Tiers.

Attrition and repeats: Fall 2003, 12 attrition grades in Tier III, 8 chose not to repeat, the 4 who did repeat were successful on first attempt, similar success in other years.

Who Teaches the Tier III Course?

Proportion of bipartite to tripartite faculty instructing Tier III has fluctuated over the years. Bipartite faculty have slightly higher attrition rates than tripartite faculty.

UAA lacks important information to assess the fundamental mission question cited earlier about both outcome differences the course(s) makes as intended by the university and/or expected by the student. Outcome criteria consensus needs to be reached and strategies/resources developed to gather information that will inform UAA regarding this question. Once that is determined and UAA information gathered, efforts can be made to obtain comparator peer information as well.