General Education Administrative Structures

Prepared for University of Alaska Anchorage

In this report, Hanover Research profiles general education administrative structures at University of Alaska Anchorage peer institutions. Profiles focus on the structure of each general education administrative body; the charge of the group or individuals tasked with administering the general education program and their respective duties; and the groups or individuals responsible for evaluating student learning outcome assessment.
Executive Summary

In this report, Hanover Research profiles general education administrative structures at peer institutions of the University of Alaska (UA) Anchorage. The goal of our overview is to provide targeted information to inform the development of such a structure at UA. Institutional profiles provide information on the structure of each general education administrative body and the charge of the group or individuals tasked with administering the general education program, along with associated duties. Additionally, we identify the groups or individuals responsible for student learning outcomes assessment.

Profiles were included for University of Alaska Anchorage’s identified set of peer institutions (see appendix), with the exception of Western New Mexico University, for which sufficient information was not available. Note that while Hanover attempted to include all information relevant to UA’s research request, the volume and quality of available information varied somewhat by institution. In cases in which some information was lacking, we note the gap in the institutional profile. Finally, note additionally that profiles were compiled with the aim of providing a brief, targeted overview of pertinent information. Footnotes provided for each profile offer links to more detailed information on each institution, where available.

Key Findings

The following key findings emerged from our research:

- The majority of peer institutions reviewed for this report delegate oversight of general education to one administrative body or structure. Commonly, this body is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate (or similar organization). Armstrong Atlantic State University’s Curriculum Committee and Boise State University’s Core Curriculum Committee are both committees of the Faculty Senate.

- A smaller number of institutions have more decentralized administrative oversight. Ferris State University’s general education program, for instance, is administered through the University General Education Committee and Learning Outcomes Area Committees. Among peer institutions, it is also relatively common for one administrative body (e.g., a curriculum committee) to provide broad oversight of general education, while another handles learning outcomes assessments. Columbus State University, for instance, delegates general oversight to the University Curriculum Committee (under Academic Affairs), while assessment is overseen by a General Education Assessment Team, a 15-member body directly appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Indiana
University-Purdue University similarly concentrates general education administration within the Office of General Education, with assessment undertaken by general education area assessment subcommittees.

- The composition of general education administrative bodies varies by institution; however, some broad trends are evident among peer institutions. Commonly, general education administrative structures consist of at least one faculty member from each department or division, as well as staff members (e.g., representatives from the Office of the Registrar or library) and administrators. Several peer institutions include staff representatives as ex-officio members. The University of Texas-Brownsville, for instance, includes the Registrar and Senior Financial Aid Administrator as ex-officio members; Washburn University includes the Director of Assessment as such.

- Where one administrative body handles general oversight and assessment, it is common for a member of an assessment committee or institutional assessment division to be a part of that body. Arkansas Tech University includes a representative of the Assessment Committee on its General Education Committee. Washburn University has similarly announced plans to reconfigure its General Education Committee to include two members of the Assessment Committee, with the aim of facilitating student learning outcomes assessment related to general education.

- Common tasks associated with general education administrative structures include general education curriculum assessment, including the review of degree requirements and core courses; review of proposed general education courses, as well as any changes or developments relevant to existent courses; and, in some cases, review and/or revision of general education courses based on student outcomes assessment. In cases in which general education administrative structures facilitate assessment, courses are typically evaluated on a rotating basis. Some institutions—such as Indiana University-South Bend—evaluate the general education program annually.
Arkansas Tech University

At Arkansas Tech University, the **General Education Committee** is tasked with administering the General Education program. The Committee is comprised of the elected members listed below. Representatives are restricted to faculty with the exception of one student member.¹

- Seven representatives, with one elected from each of the following: the Business School, Community Education School, Education School, Liberal and Fine Arts School, Physical and Life Sciences School, and the Ozark Campus
- One representative, appointed by the Chair of the Faculty Senate, with approval from the Faculty Senate
- One representative, appointed by the Chair of the Assessment Committee, with approval from the Assessment Committee
- One student representative, selected by the Student Government Association

A visual representation of the functions of the Committee is provided below.²

---

2. Ibid.
With regard to assessment, the University notes the following:\(^3\)

The General Education Committee will assume responsibility for general education assessment from the Assessment Committee. In order for the General Education Committee to make informed decisions about general education goals, policy, and requirements, the General Education Committee must be directly involved in assessing general education outcomes. The General Education Committee should directly determine the types of information it needs to effectively and efficiently carry out its oversight role. The General Education Committee should consult with the relevant members of the campus community to improve the assessment and attainment of general education goals.

Armstrong Atlantic State University

Armstrong Atlantic State University’s core curriculum is overseen by the **University Curriculum Committee**, a committee of the Faculty Senate. The charge to the committee is as follows:

*The University Curriculum Committee shall recommend to the Senate general curricular policies affecting the undergraduate academic programs offered by the university (e.g., core curriculum, university exit examinations, etc.).*

The Committee is comprised of 13 voting members from the faculty, distributed in the manner outlined below, as well as one non-voting ex-officio catalog editor.\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Members</th>
<th>• College of Liberal Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Members</td>
<td>• College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Members</td>
<td>• College of Health Professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Members</td>
<td>• College of Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among its other duties regarding the oversight of the University curriculum, the Committee is responsible for the administration of the core curriculum. The Committee makes recommendations to the Senate.\(^5\) Meeting minutes indicate that the Committee also undertakes student learning outcomes assessments at the departmental and faculty level.\(^6\) Presumably the results of these assessments are also reported to the Senate.

---

\(^3\) Ibid.

\(^4\) “University Curriculum Committee Bylaws.” Armstrong Atlantic State University. http://www.armstrong.edu/Departments/faculty_senate/senate_university_curriculum_committee_bylaws

\(^5\) Ibid.

Boise State University

The general education program at Boise State University is administrated by the Core Curriculum Committee, a committee of the Faculty Senate. The Committee is comprised of faculty members from the Senate, plus one faculty representative from each college or academic division (with the exception of the Graduate College and Honors College); a student representative; and three ex-officio officers representing the Vice President’s Office, the Registrar’s Office, and Institutional Assessment. The Committee works with the Provost and reports to the Faculty Senate.7

The Committee is charged with the following responsibilities:8

- Constantly examine Committee procedures and explore problems to be brought to the attention of the Faculty Senate. The Committee must notify the Senate of issues under consideration before trying to develop new policies.

- Work with the Provost to address the issue of developing objectives and outcomes for Core classes, including assessment methods that can be used to ensure all existing, as well as new, courses meet the intent of Core and can be proven through the use of hard evidence.

Assessment

As indicated above, the Committee’s duties include the assessment of existing general education courses and the general education program. Assessment runs on a Core Review Cycle, in which each general education area is scheduled for review roughly every five to seven years.9 The Committee also conducts student and faculty core learning outcomes surveys to assess the effectiveness of the program.10 Outcomes results are reported to the Faculty Senate.11

Boston University

In 2008 a Task Force, assembled by the Provost, was asked to consider and articulate the role of general education at Boston University.12 The Task Force was comprised of 18 faculty members and administrators from across the University and was chaired by the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education.13

---

8 Ibid. (Reproduced from source with slight alterations.)
9 “Core Review Cycle.” Boise State University.
10 “Student Core Learning Outcomes Survey.” Boise State University.
11 “Annual Report to the Faculty Senate from the Core Curriculum Committee, April 17, 2008.” Boise State University.
12 “One BU: Unlocking the Undergraduate Experience,” p. 3. Boston University.
The Task Force made a number of recommendations, including the suggestion that “each University school and department must be charged with and held accountable for meeting th[e] challenge” of addressing general education. The Task force also recommended that the University “Add capacity in institutional research to support learning outcomes assessment, especially for assessment across the curriculum.”

Clemson University

Clemson’s University Curriculum Committee was responsible for revising the General Education curriculum in 2003; the Committee defined six areas of competency, developed core requirements, and identified existing courses suitable to fulfill these requirements. Information on the composition of the University Curriculum Committee is not available. The Committee’s suggestions were approved by the Provost and President and accepted by a vote of all faculty members.

Today, new courses to fulfill a given General Education competency must be approved by a General Education Subcommittee. Hanover located one reference to the structure of the subcommittee, in a 2002 institutional effectiveness report, which noted:

The Clemson University General Education Subcommittee, composed of faculty from throughout the University, assesses the effectiveness of the General Education requirements in producing graduates who are competent in mathematics, speaking, writing, reading, and use of computers. Assessment plans have been developed for each General Education area by the faculty serving on each committee. Multiple strategies are used to assess general education competencies.

Assessment

Assessment of general education outcomes was examined in 2005 by the General Education Subcommittee, then chaired by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. The Committee charged the Office of Assessment to provide “suggested instruments and

15 Ibid., 32.
16 “Quality Curriculum: Raising the Bar.” Clemson University. http://media.clemson.edu/administration/ugs/provost_rationale.pdf
17 Ibid., 2.
18 Ibid., 5.
methods to collect data for assessing General Education.”

The General Assessment Subcommittee urged competency-area subcommittees to develop their own assessment plans to inform the administration of their respective general education competencies.

Columbus State University

Among numerous tasks relating to curriculum and requirements at the college and institutional levels, the University Curriculum Committee (a committee under Academic Affairs) is largely responsible for general education at CSU. It is not immediately clear who the Committee reports to. The Committee is currently comprised of the following members:

- Two representatives from the College of Letters and Sciences (Dean and Chair)
- Two representatives from the College of Arts (including Interim Dean)
- Two representatives from the College of Business and Computer Science (including Dean)
- Two representatives from the College of Education and Health Professions (including Dean)
- One representative from University College
- Seven ex-officio representatives (SACS Liaison, CSU Libraries, Registrar, Academic Affairs, Enrollment Services, Academic Affairs)

The University Curriculum Committee is responsible for the following tasks related to general education at Columbus State University:

- Recommend new policies and review current policies that control general University requirements; and
- Review proposals for core curriculum courses.

Assessment

Assessment of the general education program is the responsibility of the General Education Assessment Team, which consists of 15 members appointed by the

---


22 “Current Membership.” Columbus State University. http://aa.columbusstate.edu/elected_committees.php#University%20Curriculum%20Committee

23 “University Curriculum Committee.” Columbus State University. http://aa.columbusstate.edu/elected_committees/u_c_c.php
Vice President of Academic Affairs. The Team reviews general education outcomes as well as “institutional progress [toward] attaining those outcomes.”

CUNY College of Staten Island

The General Education Committee is responsible for administering the general education program at CUNY College of Staten Island. The General Education Committee is a division of the College Curriculum Office, along with the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Studies Committee. The College Curriculum Office is the “office of record” for the three above committees, as well as for the Undergraduate and Graduate catalogs.

The 2012 Committee is comprised of the following members:

- Provost and Senior Vice President
- Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences
- Dean of Science and Technology
- 17 faculty members from across the colleges and departments
- One student representative
- Six staff representatives (Institutional Research, Academic Advisements, Curriculum Coordinator, Registrar’s Office, Testing Office, Core 100)

The General Education Committee reviews and evaluates the general education structure, as well as any changes to general education courses. The process or ‘chain of command’ for changing or adding a new curricular item or course, or for

---

changing the general education program, is outlined graphically below.

**Figure 1.2: Process for Changes to General Education Program, CUNY**

A review of general education outcomes is conducted by the Assessment division of the Office of the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness.\(^\text{27}\)

**Ferris State University**

Several administrative bodies at Ferris State University govern the General Education program, including the following committees:\(^\text{28}\)

- University General Education Committee (UGEC)
- Learning Outcomes Areas Committees

**University General Education Committee (UGEC)**

Appointed by and reporting to the **Provost for Academic Affairs**, the University General Education Committee is chaired by a **general education coordinator** and includes representatives from the College of Allied Health Sciences, the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Business, the College of Education and Human Services, the College of Technology, the Library, and the Academic Counseling division. The Committee is currently comprised of **nine members**.\(^\text{29}\)

Among its duties, the Committee votes to approve or reject courses requesting General Education status, and assesses the suitability of existing General Education courses.\(^\text{30}\)

---


\(^{29}\) “University General Education Committee,” Ferris State University. http://www.ferris.edu/htmls/academics/gened/ugenedcomm.html

Learning Outcomes and Area Committees

The Learning Outcomes Area Committees are integral to the process for approving courses as General Education status (see subsection below); Area Committees are also tasked with conducting assessments of student learning for individual courses, based on specified General Education outcome area.\footnote{“General Education Learning Outcomes Area Committees.” Ferris State University. \url{http://www.ferris.edu/htmls/academics/gened/outcomescomm.html}} There are currently eight distinct Learning Outcomes Area Committees. Area Outcome Committee titles and administrative compositions are described below. \footnote{Ibid.}

Figure 1.3: Area Outcomes Committee Titles and Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Title</th>
<th>Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Competence: Writing</td>
<td>• Three faculty from Languages and Literature and two faculty from colleges other than Arts and Sciences (subcommittees may be formed in Languages and Literature for specific areas of assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Competence: Speech</td>
<td>• Three faculty from the speech communication area and two faculty from colleges other than Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Skills</td>
<td>• Three faculty from Math and two faculty from colleges other than Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Understanding</td>
<td>• Two faculty from the physical sciences, two faculty from the biological sciences, and two faculty from colleges other than Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Awareness</td>
<td>• Four faculty from Social Sciences, one faculty from Accountancy, Economics and Applied Stats in the College of Business, and two faculty from colleges other than Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Enrichment</td>
<td>• Two faculty from Languages and Literature, three faculty from Humanities, and two faculty from colleges other than Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Consciousness</td>
<td>• One faculty from Social Science, one faculty from Languages and Literature, and one faculty member from Humanities and three faculty from colleges other than Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity/Gender</td>
<td>• Two faculty from Social Sciences, one from humanities, one faculty from Languages and Literature, and two faculty from other departments and/or colleges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Courses Seeking General Education Status

Courses seeking approval for General Education status, originated by individual academic departments, are forwarded to the appropriate Learning Area Outcomes Committee by the Provost for Academic Affairs. The Learning Area Outcomes Committee then has 30 days to review the course and determine whether it is approved for General Education status. If the course is not approved by the given Learning Area Outcomes Committee, it is returned with an explanation to the appropriate department. If approved, the course is forwarded to the UGEC. If the UGEC considers the course inappropriate, the course is returned to the Outcomes Committee with an explanation. If the UGEC approves the course's General Education status, the proposal is forwarded to the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) for review. If the UCC approves the proposal, it is forwarded to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. This chain is shown below.

Figure 1.4: Approval Chain for New Courses Seeking GE Status, Ferris State

Changes in General Education

Improvements to General Education at Ferris State University that may change the general education categories (or the distribution of credits among categories) may be recommended by any member of the University community. These improvements are sent directly to the General Education Coordinator and the UGEC, who, in turn, confer with the Provost on the proposed change. Should the Provost decide to consider the suggestion, the Provost, along with the Senate, will appoint and convene a committee to review the proposal. The committee then shares its recommendation with the Senate, which may also offer feedback. The recommendations of the committee and the Senate are submitted to the Provost. If the Provost approves, major changes to General Education must be submitted for final approval to the Ferris State University Board of Trustees.

---

Indiana University- Purdue University, Fort Wayne

Currently, the Office of General Education is tasked with the bulk of the administrative duties relating to the General Education program at Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne. The Office consists of two administrative officers: the Director of General Education and the General Education Coordinator. The Office of General Education falls under the purview of the Office of Academic Affairs. Its members provide support for the following activities:

- **General Education Proposal Development**: Assistance in creating a new or recertified proposals
- **Assessment**: Assistance in developing methods to assess General Education outcomes
- **Grants**: Assistance in writing proposals to improve General Education assessment
- **Curriculum Mapping**: Assistance in mapping the Baccalaureate Framework to General Education course outcomes

**Assessment**

Assessment of the General Education program is conducted by **area assessment committees**, which examine samples of student work and student surveys to evaluate the efficacy of the program. General Education area assessment subcommittees are appointed by the **Assessment Task Force** in each of the institution’s six General Education areas. The Assessment Task Force is appointed by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Education Policy Committee, and the General Education Subcommittee, and is comprised of three faculty members from across the institution, as well as the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

---

35 “Contact/ Services.” Indiana University- Purdue University, Fort Wayne. http://new.ipfw.edu/offices/oaa/programs/GenEdProgram.html
36 Ibid. Reproduced from source.
37 “Academic Programs- Gen Ed.” Indiana University- Purdue University, Fort Wayne. https://webcms.ipfw.edu/offices/oaa/programs/genedqa.html?host_id=1#HowisGEProgAssessed
Indiana University-Northwest

The General Education Assessment Committee is responsible for the Indiana University-Northwest general education program. The Committee reviewed and revised the general education program from 2005-2009 and developed five general education principles, as well as required courses and corresponding learning outcomes.40

Assessment

Today, the Committee assesses the appropriateness of the general education program and the efficacy of student learning outcomes. The Committee submits annual reports to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Faculty Organization; however, the most recent report listed on the website dates from 2010.41 The most recent listing of members is from 2008-2009, and lists 15 faculty members from across the University’s colleges and departments.42

Indiana University-South Bend

The General Education Committee at Indiana University-South Bend is responsible for overseeing the University’s general education curriculum. The General Education Committee is tasked with the following responsibilities:43

- Approve all courses proposed to satisfy the general education curriculum and forward general education proposals for new courses to the Curriculum Committee.
- Review the list of approved courses and the general education program annually.
- Conduct annual assessment of the general education program, and report regularly to the Academic Senate Assessment Committee.
- Review and revise course characteristics documents on the basis of annual program assessment findings.

The program is comprised of the members listed on the following page. Faculty members are appointed from the full-time faculty, in consultation with the Director of General Education. A chair is elected from among faculty members. All members

have voting privileges. Membership is as follows:

- Three faculty from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Two faculty from the College of Arts
- One faculty member from the College of Business
- One faculty member from the College of Education
- One faculty member from the College of Nursing and Health Professions
- One faculty member from the Library
- One student representative
- Director of General Education (ex-officio)

**Assessment**

Periodic reviews of the general education curriculum are conducted by the Assessment Committee, which is responsible for conducting assessment for programs and units across the University, and for advising the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, who has primary administrative authority over assessment at Illinois University-South Bend.

The Assessment Committee is comprised of nine members, who each hold three-year appointments. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate appoints five members and the Office of Academic Affairs appoints four members. The Vice-Chancellor for Academic affairs appoints a Committee chairperson from among the nine voting members.

**Metropolitan State University**

General Education requirements at Metropolitan State University were initially determined by the General Education Committee, which selected courses to satisfy the designated General Education outcomes. Information on the structure and composition of the Committee is not available. Ongoing evaluation and revision of student learning outcomes are conducted through various independent processes as part of the University’s “continuing improvement framework,” which includes revision by the General Education Committee on a rotating basis.

**Assessment**

Assessment of student learning outcomes related to the general education program is currently being discussed and expanded by the Assessment Committee and the

---

44 Ibid.
46 Ibid., 17-18.
47 “Core Student Outcomes Study: Metropolitan State University.” Minnesota State Colleges and Universities. http://coreoutcomes.project.mnscu.edu/index.asp?Type=B_BASIC&SEC=%7BDC9F3824-934F-4CCA-BAD1-FAFD1307DB8C%7D&DE=%7BE2854543-8DB3-435A-8139-D8B48B0EA535%7D
48 Ibid.
General Education Committee. Relevant documents indicate that assessment is particularly difficult to accurately conduct at Metropolitan State University, as “the majority of students transfer to the University with varying numbers of general education courses.”

New Mexico Highlands University

The Academic Affairs Committee is responsible for the NMHU core curriculum. The Committee is comprised of a Committee Chair and Secretary elected from the faculty; one faculty representative from the School of Business, the School of Social Work, and each departmental unit; one librarian; the Vice President for Academic Affairs (non-voting); the Director of Admissions (non-voting); and one student representative (non-voting).

Among its charges pertaining to academics at the University, the Committee is responsible for reviewing and recommending approval (or rejection) in the formulation of the core curriculum. The Committee reports directly to the Faculty Senate.

Assessment

The Outcomes Assessment division of the Institutional Research Office assesses outcomes related to curricular core competencies. The division offers recommendations to the Faculty Senate for improving core curriculum outcomes. Additionally, core curriculum outcomes are assessed by the independent organization The Academy for Assessment of Student Learning, which offers assessment services to all Higher Learning Commission member institutions.

Northern Michigan University

General education at Northern Michigan University is known as “Liberal Studies.” The Liberal Studies Committee, a standing sub-committee of the Academic Senate, is tasked with overseeing the Liberal Studies program. The Committee is comprised of 11 voting members in total, including nine faculty members, the Registrar or

---

49 Ibid.
51 Ibid. (Reproduced from source with slight alterations.)
52 Ibid.
53 “Core Competency.” New Mexico Highlands University.
54 “Faculty Handbook,” Op cit., 34.
55 “Academy for Assessment for Student Learning.” New Mexico Highlands University.
designate, and the Associate Provost.\textsuperscript{58} The Chair of the Committee is responsible for convening meetings and, along with the assistance of the Secretary, submitting periodic reports to the Academic Senate. The Secretary must also maintain a record of Committee meetings.\textsuperscript{59}

The Committee reports directly and makes recommendations to the Academic Senate. The Committee is tasked with the following duties:\textsuperscript{60}

- Oversee the liberal studies component of the undergraduate curriculum, reviewing and recommending criteria concerning Liberal Studies to the Academic Senate.
- Review and evaluate proposed Liberal Studies courses and submit recommendations of approval or disapproval to the Academic Senate.
- Review and evaluate existing Liberal Studies courses and submit recommendations to the Academic Senate.
- Establish and conduct outcomes assessment of the Liberal Studies program and make recommendations concerning Liberal Studies outcomes assessment to the Academic Senate.

Northwestern State University

The \textbf{Curriculum Review Council} oversees general education at Northwestern State University.\textsuperscript{61} The Council is chaired by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and contains the following additional members:\textsuperscript{62}

- Fourteen faculty members, with representatives from each of the colleges (appointed by deans)
- One additional faculty member (appointed by the Faculty Senate)
- President of the Student Government Association
- Executive Director of Fort Polk Center

\begin{itemize}
\item “Liberal Studies Committee Operating Procedures,” Northern Michigan University. http://www.nmu.edu/lsc/node/1
\item Ibid.
\item Ibid. (Reproduced from source with slight alterations.)
\item “Comprehensive Standard 3.5.3.” Northwestern State University. http://sacs.nsula.edu/shell/response-3.5.3.asp
\end{itemize}
University Registrar
- Director of University Libraries

The Council reviews all proposals relating to curricula and course offerings at the University and makes recommendations to the President accordingly. The Council is additionally tasked with designating and maintaining a core curriculum of general education requirements.

Assessment

The University conducts a regular assessment of the general education program though self-study, with participation from external peer reviewers.

Purdue University-Calumet

The Curriculum and Educational Policy Committee is tasked with the oversight of the general education program at Purdue University-Calumet. The Committee is composed of “at least six faculty Senators” (though only five are currently listed)—one from each of the University’s schools. Among its duties pertaining to curricular matters, the Committee is responsible for reviewing and approving “the general requirements for the curricula for undergraduate degrees.”

Assessment

Assessment of the general education program is conducted by the Committee on General Education Assessment. Information on the composition of the Committee is not available.

Southern Utah University

Southern Utah University’s Academic Planning Steering Committee lists “assessing and implementing changes to improve the General Education curriculum” as one of its charges in the “SUU Academic Roadmap 2010-13” plan.

The Committee is comprised of 12 voting members from across the University and two non-voting members representing the Academic Budget and Institutional Research Office and the Administrative Support Office. The Committee is

---

63 Ibid.
65 Ibid.
66 “Curriculum and Educational Policy.” Purdue University, Calumet. http://www.purduecal.edu/facultysenate/CEP.html
67 Ibid.
sponsored by the Provost of the University and makes recommendations to the
Provost, Associate Provost, and deans. 

Assessment

Assessment of general education student learning outcomes is provided by the
University’s ad hoc Committee on Assessment, which examines “cognitive
learning in general education and academic majors as well as student perceptions of
institutional effectiveness.” The Committee on Assessment circulates its finding in
reports distributed throughout the campus.

SUNY Empire State College

SUNY Empire State College adheres to the general education program common to
campanes in the SUNY system. General education learning outcomes for all
SUNY campuses were set forth in a document issued by a special Task Force; these
outcomes consider the recommendations of the Provost’s Advisory Committee on
General Education. Hanover was unable to locate information on the composition
of the Task Force and the Provost’s Advisory Committee on General Education.
Learning outcomes provide clear expectations for courses seeking approval to meet
the general education requirement.

Assessment

The SUNY General Education Assessment Review (GEAR) played “an
important role in the State University of New York’s assessment initiatives for eight
years, as it guided the development, implementation and use of local general
education assessment plans on campuses.” GEAR was comprised of “faculty and
assessment leaders from across the University.” Though GEAR disbanded at the
conclusion of the 2010 academic year, the group’s criteria continue to serve as self-
assessment tools for SUNY campuses. GEAR rubrics are currently used by the
SUNY Empire State College Center for Planning and Institutional
Effectiveness, which presumably conducts general education assessment at the
campus level.

71 Ibid.
72 “Southern Utah University Assessment Outline,” p. 10. Southern Utah University.
   http://www.suu.edu/general/ir/pdf/assessoutline.pdf
73 Ibid., 5.
74 “Guidelines for the Approval of State University General Requirement Courses.” SUNY.
76 Ibid.
77 Ibid.
78 “Rubrics Developed at Empire State College and Other SUNY Institutions.” SUNY Empire State College.
   http://www8.csc.edu/ESConline/Across_ESC/InstResearch.nsf/allbysubject/Rubrics+Developed+at+Empire+State+College+and+other+SUNY+institutions?opendocument
University of Central Oklahoma

The existing general education program at the University of Central Oklahoma was designed by the University Core Committee, which held meetings in 2006-2007. The Committee was comprised of 16 faculty voting members and five ad hoc members. Representatives were distributed in the following manner:

- **Faculty Members**
  - Two from the College of Arts, Media, and Design
  - Two from the College of Business Administration
  - Three from the College of Education
  - Six from the College of Liberal Arts
  - Three from the College of Mathematics and Science

- **Staff Ad Hoc Members**
  - One from Assessment
  - One from First Year Experience
  - One from Freshman Academic Advisement
  - One from the Library
  - One Retention Coordinator

The University Core Committee was tasked with the following duties:

- Develop cohesiveness of the curriculum as a whole.
- Approve changes in and additions to the University core curriculum.
- Determine program improvement based on assessment of the University core curriculum.

**Assessment**

Assessment of general education or “core” courses is conducted by the Office of Assessment. Assessment focuses on “course-embedded methods in core curriculum courses.”

University of Texas at Brownsville

Among their various objectives, the UT-Brownsville Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is tasked with reviewing “matters related to the general education

---

80 Ibid., 32.
81 Ibid. (Reproduced from source with slight alterations.)
program and other University-wide programs.”83 In addition to this responsibility, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee also reviews:84

- All new course and academic program proposals;
- Revisions to existing programs; and
- Matters related to the improvement of all academic programs.

Following the review process, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee makes recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.85 The Vice President must offer a rationale to the Committee in cases where he or she denies recommendations.86

The Committee is comprised of the following members:87

- **Chair** – Voting member of the committee (assistant professor)
- **Vice-Chair** – Voting member of the committee (associate professor)
- **Four Faculty Members** – Voting members of the committee (assistant professors and instructors from across the disciplines)
- **Three Administrative Members** – Non-voting members of the committee (Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs; Dean, College of Science, Mathematics, and Technology; Dean, College of the Liberal Arts)
- **Five Ex-Officio Members** (Course Inventory Coordinator; two Academic Advisors; Registrar; Senior Financial Aid Officer)

The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee holds regular monthly meetings. These meetings comprise an ongoing assessment procedure. Committee meetings are called to order, adjourned, and conducted by the Chair; in the absence of the Chair, the Vice-Chair conducts the meetings.88

**Washburn University**

Currently, Washburn University has a General Education Committee (a committee of the Faculty Senate), which appears to convene once or twice annually.89 A review of meeting minutes indicates that duties include reviewing course proposals for General Education status, assessing existing General Education courses, reviewing procedures such as the General Education transfer process, and meeting with

---

83 “University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee,” University of Texas at Brownsville. http://www.utb.edu/vpaa/AAC/UUCC/Pages/default.aspx
84 Ibid. (Reproduced from source with slight alterations.)
85 Ibid.
86 “Curriculum Changes.” University of Texas at Brownsville. http://www.utb.edu/ba/hoop/Policy/7-6-3.pdf
87 “Members.” University of Texas at Brownsville. http://www.utb.edu/vpaa/AAC/UUCC/Pages/members.aspx
88 “Minutes.” University of Texas at Brownsville. http://www.utb.edu/vpaa/AAC/UUCC/Pages/minutes.aspx
departments to develop student learning outcomes. The General Education Committee is comprised of 12 members, listed below. Specific duties relevant to each position are not provided.

- **Chair** (Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs)
- **Nine faculty members** from across the colleges and departments
- **Library member**
- **Ex-Officio member** (Director of Assessment)

Recent documents indicate that a shift will take place in the committee’s composition as of fall 2013. A central objective of the reorganization is to expand the committee’s duties to include SLO assessment. Membership composition will be the same, though two representatives from the University Assessment Committee will be added “for assistance with SLO assessment review and approval.” The name of the committee will also be changed, to the General Education/Student Learning Outcome Course Review Committee. The reconstituted committee is responsible for course reviews (with results submitted to the Vice President of Academic Affairs). Following initial approval, general distribution and core classes “will be re-evaluated every 5 years on a schedule created by the GE/SLO Course Review Committee.”

The reconfigured committee is “Phase I” of a University-wide initiative related to general education. Phases II and III are shown below:

- **Phase II:** In addition to the assessment process taking place at the General Distribution level… an overarching assessment process will be presented by December 2012, relating to proposed entry and/or exit capabilities of Washburn students on the SLOs.

- **Phase III:** Based on data from both the overarching assessment process and the course-based process, recommendations will be made by September 2015 as to specific potential General Education course requirements (e.g., Should each student take at least one course in each SLO area as part of the General Distribution requirement, … etc.). The General Education “Core” … will be reviewed.

---

89 “General Education Committee.” Washburn University.  
http://www.washburn.edu/main/vpaa/facultysenate/CommitteeWebpages/GenEd.html

90 “General Education Course Review.” Washburn University.  


92 “Faculty Agenda Item – March 26, 2012.” Washburn University.  
http://www.washburn.edu/main/vpaa/facultysenate/11-12FSActionItems/12-05%20FSAgendaItem-GenEdPhase1.pdf

http://www.washburn.edu/main/vpaa/facultysenate/11-12FSActionItems/ImplementationPhase1GenEd.pdf

94 Ibid.

95 “Faculty Agenda Item – March 26, 2012,” Op. cit., 2 (Bullet points reproduced from source.)
Appendix: University of Alaska Anchorage Peer Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full List of Peer Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Tech University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Atlantic State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNY College of Staten Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University-Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University-Purdue University-Fort Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University-South Bend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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