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**0.0 Summary**

In response to NWWCU accreditation criteria and a decade-long effort at UAA to make student learning the hallmark of UAA-wide assessment practices, this document summarizes the first phase of a new iteration of GER assessment undertaken at the University of Alaska Anchorage during AY16 that builds upon the three-year effort of the faculty-led GER Assessment (GERA) Committee (attachment 1) and extends the faculty-led AA Assessment Committee’s multi-year work with the AA assessment as a proxy for the GER (attachment 2). In addition, the AY16 GER process incorporates the recommendations of the 2014 GERA Task Force Survey (attachment 3). Based upon the GER Assessment committee’s recommendation and with the Faculty Senate’s recommendation (attachment 4), UAA appointed its first Director of General Education in July 2015 who was charged specifically with coordinating a three-year GER assessment process.

**1.0 Background & Context**

The AY16 GER assessment process builds upon UAA’s decade-long successes in program, departmental, and course-level assessment and carries forward the work of the faculty-led committees overseeing GER and AA assessment. In addition, OAA has sent faculty teams to the Association of American Colleges & Universities General Education Assessment conferences since AY12 to ensure that UAA faculty are in touch with national trends and best practices (the LEAP Outcomes and VALUE rubrics, attachments 5 and 6). During AY16, the GER assessment process focused upon the first three (of nine) GER outcomes: Written Communication, Oral Communication, and Information Literacy (attachment 7).

**1.1 Process & Schedule**

Consistent with the institutional strategy initiated in AY12, Fall 2016 began with an assessment seminar sponsored by the Academic Assessment Committee and the Office of Academic Affairs focused upon curriculum mapping and led by Dr. Janice Denton (attachment 8), who challenged the faculty (1) to see General Education as part of the larger curriculum and a shared institutional effort centered upon student success; (2) to define the skills, knowledge, and habits of mind that define general and liberal education; and (3) to convey these to students in the form of an ‘elevator pitch’ that students could communicate to others. In effect, this shifted the conversation of Gen Ed assessment from *compliance* (checking off courses on a list) to *continual improvement* (a shared faculty effort across all curriculum).

Building upon the momentum initiated with the September 2016 curriculum mapping and assessment seminar, the Director of General Education scheduled a series of workshops designed (1) to introduce curriculum mapping to interested departments and programs; (2) to develop a shared rubric for written, oral, and information literacy outcomes (built upon a rubric devised by the GER Assessment committee in AY14); and (3) to gather a cohort of faculty (including community campuses) who would be willing to commit to GER assessment in Su16.

**1.2 Principles & Values**

What became clear in our discussions throughout the year is that the goals of General Education(the SLOs), especially UAA’s Tier 1 GERs (written, oral, and quantitative outcomes), are not simply the province of Gen Ed courses but are in fact and in practice also the concerns of every course, program, major, and discipline. As a result of this yearlong discussion, the following principles for Gen Ed assessment at UAA were identified:

* **Simple:** We are building upon departmental and program assessment processes already in place so as to minimize duplicating our efforts.
* **Shared:** We are adapting the GER process to complement other assessment efforts ongoing across the campus (and campuses) to increase collaboration across the GER and majors, programs, and disciplines.
* **Sampled:** We are drawing upon faculty expertise and student artifacts in a wide variety of courses in multiple disciplines to get different snapshots of student achievement across the institution and to evaluate student achievement in the GER outcomes across the curriculum.
* **Seeded:** We are spreading GER assessment from defined GER courses across the programs, disciplines, majors, as well as two-year and four-year degrees so that general education becomes a focus of all curriculum and faculty rather than being the concern of only a few specified courses.
* **Staggered:** We are assessing three GER outcomes per year over the next three years in conjunction with our reaffirmation of accreditation self-study and with a view toward re-evaluating our GER Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).
* **Systematic:** We are moving through three outcomes per year and will reconsider each recursively as we move forward.
* **Sustainable:** We are creating a shared GER assessment plan that works collaboratively with our current institutional assessment processes as part of developing UAA’s culture of learning and student success.

Additionally, we found that perhaps as important as the actual assessment results were the cross- and interdisciplinary faculty conversations enabled by Gen Ed assessment. Getting faculty together to talk about facilitating student learning and success has led to a number of productive collaborations across campus and a renewed focus upon student success and the pedagogical strategies that lead to greater success as integral to the teaching and learning process.

**1.3 From General Education *Requirements* to a General Education *Program***

Furthermore, while faculty across campus are aware that the Gen Ed is central to our institutional mission and to student success, faculty are equally aware that we can improve the GER. As a result of developing a cooperative and coordinated assessment effort across the GER and multiple disciplines, UAA will be well-placed to reassess the GERs (and GER outcomes) systematically and to revise them strategically as we move

* from *General Education Requirements* (a loosely related 37-credit series of course-based requirements tied to a compliance model and nine outcomes) based upon BOR policy
* to a *General Education Program* (a pedagogically-integrated program based upon high-impact teaching practices, coordinated assessment, and distributed-outcomes model across multiple campuses, the curriculum, and the student experience).

This year’s initial GER assessment process has motivated faculty to think together about the necessity of the GER being not simply as a collection of courses that students check-off a list of requirements but as an integrated program central to all students and the concern of all faculty. In addition, resulting from this year’s conversations about what makes a UAA graduate distinctive, we are challenging ourselves to think about how we know that each and every student benefits from these campus-wide efforts.

**2.0 Synopsis of GER Assessment Activities and Participants**

The AY16 GER assessment process involved a wide variety of activities, a broad cross-section of faculty from many disciplines, programs, and community campuses, as well as the Anchorage campus. The following chart summarizes the efforts.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Topic** | **Attendees** |
| **11 Sep 15** | Academic Assessment Workshop: Curriculum Mapping | 127 |
| **23 Sep 15** | Curriculum Mapping I & Student Learning Outcomes | 32 |
| **23 Oct 15** | Curriculum Mapping II & Rubrics and Assignments | 42 |
| **30 Oct 15** | Curriculum Mapping III & Shared Assessment | 33 |
| **17 Jan 15** | CAFÉ GER Assessment Kick Off | 36 |
| **25 Mar 16** | CAFÉ GER Assessment Workshop I: Using the Shared Rubric & Designing Assignments | 10 |
| **15 Apr 16** | CAFÉ GER Assessment Workshop II: Gathering and Selecting Student Artifacts | 25 |
| **15 Apr 16** | CAFÉ Academic Assessment Workshop: Closing the Loop & Telling the Story | 21 |
| **6 May 16** | CAFÉ GER Assessment Workshop III: Planning the Summer 2016 GER Assessment Pilot | 13 |
|  | **Total Attendees** | **339** |
|  |  |  |
| **Units Represented in GER Assessment in AY16**   * **Academic Innovations & eLearning; Admissions** * **CAFÉ – Center for Advancing Faculty Excellence** * **College of Arts & Sciences** (Anthropology, Biological Sciences, Communication, Chemistry, Creative Writing and Literary Arts, English, History, Journalism, Languages, Math, Music, Philosophy, Psychology, Sociology, Theater & Dance) * **College of Business & Public Policy** (Accounting & Finance, Economics, Information Systems & Decision Sciences, Management & Marketing, Public Administration) * **College of Education** (Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Special Education) * **College of Engineering** (Computer Sciences & Computer Systems Engineering; Engineering, Science, & Project Management; Geomatics; Mechanical Engineering; Professional & Continuing Education) * **College of Health** (Alaska Center for Rural Health & Health Workforce, Center for Community Engagement & Learning, Center for Human Development, Dental Hygiene, Dietetics & Nutrition, Fire & Emergency Services and Paramedic Technology, Human Services, Justice Center, Nursing, Social Work) * **Community & Technical College** (Automotive & Diesel Technology; Bachelor of Science – Technology; College Preparatory & Developmental Studies, Construction Management; Construction Design & Safety; Culinary Arts & Hospitality; Health, Physical Science & Education; Multicultural Center; Occupational Safety & Health) * **Consortium Library** * **Educational Opportunity Center – TRIO** * **Electronic Student Services** * **Housing, Dining, and Conference Services** * **Institutional Effectiveness** * **Institutional Research** * **Kenai Peninsula College** (English, Library & Information Science) * **Kodiak College** (English, Social Sciences) * **Matanuska-Susitna College** (Business Administration, English, Humanities, Math, Student Services) * **New Student Orientation** * **Office of Academic Affairs** * **Office of International and Intercultural Affairs** * **Prince William Sound College** (Academic Advising) * **Student Access, Advising, and Transition** * **Student Affairs** * **University Honors College** | | |

**Table 1: GER Assessment Activities and Participants**

Of the 339 total attendees, 127 faculty and staff across UAA attended one or more sessions in AY16.

**2.1 The Development and Goals of the Discussion** The AY16 GER assessment process had four overlapping goals in mind:

1. to extend upon the September Academic Assessment Seminar’s emphasis on curriculum mapping to identify formative and summative assessment milestones within the academic programs,
2. to cultivate a shared assessment model in which GER SLOs are considered throughout the curriculum rather than simply in GER courses,
3. to develop a simple but effective assessment rubric in which both GER SLOs and program SLOs could be examined in relationship to one another, and
4. to recruit a multi-disciplinary group of faculty to undertake the GER assessment in Su16.

The effort was successful.

**2.2 The GER SLOs and Assessment Sequence**  
 UAA faculty developed the nine GER SLOs after extensive discussion from 1999-2003 in concert with the three-tied structure of the UAA GER (attachment 9). In 2015, the GER Assessment committee determined that three GER SLOs should be evaluated each over the next three years in the seven disciplinary categories (plus the integrative capstone):

* Year 1 (AY16): Written Communication, Oral Communication, Information Literacy
* Year 2 (AY17): Social Sciences, Humanities, Arts
* Year 3 (AY18): Quantitative Skills, Natural Sciences, Integrative Capstone

The AY16 assessment established a shared process to be followed in subsequent years. At the same time, subsequent years will recursively (re)examine student artifacts for additional SLOs. In other words, because written, oral, and information literacy skills are Tier 1 (or Basic Skills), faculty can continue to assess student achievement in these basic skills whenever the student artifacts allow.

**2.3 The Shared Rubric**

Drawing upon the GER Assessment committee’s earlier faculty efforts, faculty in the GER Assessment workshops worked toward a shared understanding not only of the GER SLOs in written, oral, and information literacy but also defined more specific criteria for each SLO (attachment 10).

**3.0 Summer GER Assessment Group**A summer working group was established based upon faculty willingness and availability, and the group met over 16 hours in May and June 2016 to gather student materials, adjust the rubric, norm the scoring, and evaluate the results while also working independently with selected student materials. The summer pilot group consisted of following:

* Jennifer Brock, Associate Professor of Engineering, Anchorage
* Sheri Denison, Associate Professor of English, Mat-Su College
* Rachel Graham, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, Mat-Su College
* Trish Jenkins, Associate Professor of English, Anchorage
* Dan Kline, Professor of English and Gen Ed Director, Anchorage
* Shawnalee Whitney, Associate Professor of Communication and Director of CAFE, Anchorage

The participation of community college faculty was integral to the success of the effort.

**3.1 Rubric Development**

In our development of the shared rubric throughout the academic year, we reached a consensus that, with some fine tuning, the rubric could be brought in line with the AAC&U’s VALUE rubrics. As a result, the summer group adjusted the shared assessment rubric, adopted language from the VALUE rubrics, and extended the supporting criteria *from* three to four and moved from a four-point Likert scale to a five-point (*4 = Mastery*, *3 = Proficient*, *2 = Developing*, *1 = Beginning*, *0 = Absent*), reflecting the language of the VALUE rubrics. This is the rubric we then normed together (attachment 11).

**3.2 Rubric Norming**

Over the course of two four-hour meetings, the summer group read two sample essays from five different assignments, scored the essays in written communication and information literacy, discussed their rationale for the scores, and then adjusted the scores according to shared feedback. A subgroup of three faculty did the same thing with the archived student speeches, assessing them for oral communication and information literacy. These were added to the independent GER assessment that faculty members from different disciplines did at the end of the academic year.

**3.3 Faculty Collaboration**

The group’s clear consensus was that the faculty discussions and collaboration was likely as important as the actual assessment results. There was a strong desire to expand the interdisciplinary nature of the shared assessment process and to extend the conversation into other areas of the curriculum and pedagogy, with a consensus that we should move toward a two-day GER assessment project at the end of the AY16 contract period.

**4.0 Findings**

Because our aim was (1) to draw upon already-existing assessment efforts and (2) to broaden GER assessment throughout the entire curriculum, we depended upon faculty volunteers to make their materials available, independent of whether they would be involved in the actual assessment.

**4.1 Student Artifacts and Sample Size**

For each group of student artifacts, after norming each of the assessment criteria as described above, faculty evaluators assessed 5 assignments in common (chosen randomly) and then each also chose 3 additional assignments from each class, to ascertain different “snapshots” of student achievement. Out of the 8 sampled artifacts in each class, any assessment result that was more than 2 levels away from any others was refigured.

Out of the x-number of faculty who participated in GER assessment activities in AY16, 11 faculty members from across campus submitted student materials for the GER summer pilot group:

|  |
| --- |
| ../../../Desktop/Screen%20Shot%202016-08-14%20at%205.44.58%20PM.p |

**Table 2: Student Artifacts for GER Assessment**

As the GER assessment process develops over the next two years, we will be able to draw more systematically from a greater variety of representative courses via hardcopy and digital copies of student artifacts.

**4.2 Written Communication**

The UAA Written Communication SLO (“*Communicate effectively in a variety of contexts and formats*”) was broken down into the following descriptors aligned with language in the AAC&U’s VALUE rubric:

* Responds effectively to the assignment
* Demonstrates effective organization
* Develops content adequately
* Controls syntax and mechanics

As part of the movement toward a shared GER assessment process, we assessed written student work in non-GER courses that involved writing and in GER composition courses, for a total of 10 courses (as represented in Table 2).

The results are summarized as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ../../Desktop/Screen%20Shot%202016-07-30%20at%205.03.43%20PM.png | ../../Desktop/Screen%20Shot%202016-07-30%20at%205.07.02%20PM.png |
|  |  |
| **Table 3: Summary of Written Communication SLO Assessment Results** | |

Overall, as students progress through their written work, they begin fairly successfully (in the beginning range, but nearing about 2.5), decline slightly at the 200 level (to about 2.1), then end near proficiency in the 400-level courses (nearing 3.0). The slight dip seen in 200 courses may be because students are encountering concepts they had never heard of, such as theory and more complicated readings. As they try to deal with more difficult concepts, their writing may simply suffer from it. However, as they begin their 400-level courses, they seem to have overcome the hurdle experienced in their earlier work, reaching near proficiency. This suggests that students at the 400 level have more fully learned the strategies needed for successful writing in their specific disciplines. Furthermore, 400-level students have almost equal amounts of success on all of the different descriptors, something quite different from writing seen in 100- and 200-level courses.

***100-level writing*** At the 100-level, students are strongest in responding to the assignment and content development. This may be because the instructions for assignments are easier for students to understand—there may even be some similarity to their work from high school—and, thus, easier for students to meet. The assignments may also be pre-structured by instructors, which would help with both responding to the assignment and developing the content. On the other hand, students struggled most in organizing their work and controlling language and syntax. Organization often means understanding things at a larger scale, and students at the 100 level may still be learning this skill. Language and syntax may be explained by the differences between writing for high school versus college. Many students come to college with no understanding of academic voice or the rules applied to it; similarly, they frequently have not focused on such things as syntax and style. Student scores in this area may indicate that they are adapting a new set of academic writing skills.

***200-level writing***

Intriguingly, 200-level students suffer a dip from performance at the 100 level. This is probably accounted for by the fact that they are encountering more difficult assignments and content. At the 200 level, students often have their first exposure to theory; they also may be tasked with working with academic journals or even field research, which makes their learning tasks even more difficult. Because of this possible shift in complexity, students do seem to struggle more in their 200-level writing. The strengths and weaknesses follow the same trends as at the 100 level—strongest areas are responding to the assignment and content development while organization and syntax control are weakest—but a measurable drop occurs in the proficiency of their work. This suggests the writing behaviors are similar, but either the content has changed or that they are adapting to higher academic expectations.

***400-level writing***

Senior writers demonstrate a clear trend towards proficiency of their writing—and many actually were edging into mastery. They also showed almost equal levels of success in all four written descriptors. This proficiency in all areas suggests that students have emerged from their 400-level work as solid writers in their specific disciplines, learning the techniques that their fields require for success. That their scores were lower in meeting the assignment requirements simply suggests that they may have been struggling with a more difficult assignment and more complex writing tasks. Even so, they met the challenge. It is an encouraging difference to see for the end of their college experience.

**4.3 Oral Communication**

The UAA Oral Communication SLO (“*Communicate effectively in a variety of contexts and formats*”) was broken down into the following descriptors aligned with language in the AAC&U’s VALUE rubric:

* Demonstrates clear and appropriate organization
* Uses clear and suitable language
* Incorporates appropriate verbal and nonverbal cues
* Develops relevant and adequate content

The results are summarized as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| ../../../Desktop/Screen%20Shot%202016-08-17%20at%2011.56.37%20AM.p |
| **Table 4: Summary of Oral Communication SLO Assessment Results** |

***COMM A1XX***

COMM A1XX Fundamentals of Oral Communication is one of four courses that satisfies three credits of the General Education Requirement in Oral Communication Skills. Other courses that fulfill this requirement for all baccalaureate degrees are: COMM A235 Small Group Communication, COMM A237 Interpersonal Communication, and COMM A241 Public Speaking.

**Public Speaking Skills**  
 For purposes of the GER Assessment Pilot, we focused on the *public speaking skills* that comprise a portion of what is learned in COMM A1XX. The COMM A1XXassignment assessed in this GER Assessment Pilot called for students to develop a 5-7 minute, research-based, extemporaneous presentation designed to familiarize the audience (i.e. an audience of college students) with the efforts of a particular non-profit organization. In this portion or unit of the course, students learn to identify and develop a thesis (i.e. craft a message that serves a particular goal) that is designed to reach an audience. They work to delineate key main points or arguments in support of said thesis, and build a body of evidence supporting their main points or key arguments. Throughout this process, they develop a full-sentence outline or keyword outline that includes references that are to be cited orally within the presentation as well as on written documents (the outline) in one of the major styles (usually APA). The culmination of the public speaking unit includes the delivery of a well-organized presentation that incorporates evidence (i.e. has oral source citations) and demonstrates appropriate verbal and nonverbal communication behaviors. COMM A1XX students gain experience using the extemporaneous style of delivery, the most common and flexible style of the four major forms of delivery.

**Summary of Findings**

Oral communication artifacts were sampled and rated on Oral Communication Outcome and Information Literacy using the UAA GER Program Rubrics.

* On **Oral Communication Outcome**, students scored highest on *demonstrates clear and appropriate organization* (2.83). Scores for *develops relevant and adequate content* (2.66) and *incorporates appropriate verbal and nonverbal cues* (2.58) followed. The lowest score was in *uses clear and suitable language* (2.33).
* On **Information Literacy**, student scored highest in *demonstrates relevant use of supporting evidence* and *evaluates information sources critically* (2.16 for both). Scores on *determines information needs* and *follows appropriate documentation conventions* (2.08 for both) were slightly lower. The findings suggest that students are gaining confidence and developing strength in the ability to delineate and structure their ideas in support of a particular thesis. In addition, they are developing the ability to locate and incorporate evidence.

***COMM A3XX***

COMM A3XX is an upper division, three credit Communication course. It may be taken for upper division elective credits toward a baccalaureate degree and counts toward the minor in Communication.

**Public Speaking Skills & Assignment Design**

Students develop skill with citing sources (APA format) both in their speeches (i.e. oral citations) and on supporting “documents” such as in outlines and on visual aids. The presentation that was assessed was a 6-8 minute, research-based, manuscript presentation that included a brief question-and-answer session with their audience. The goal of the presentation was to familiarize the audience (i.e. an audience of upper division college students) with a particular problem, and then advocate for the audience to adopt a particular attitude/belief or course of action related to the topic.

**Summary of Findings**

* On the **Oral Communication Outcome**, students scored highest on *uses clear and suitable language* (2.58) and *develops relevant and adequate content* (2.58). Scores in *demonstrates clear and appropriate organization* (2.5) and *incorporates appropriate verbal and nonverbal cues* (2.41) were slightly lower, but not markedly so.
* On **Information Literacy**, students scored highest in *follows appropriate documentation conventions* (2.41) followed by *determines information needs* (2.33). *Demonstrates relevant use of supporting evidence* and *evaluates information sources critically* (2.25 for both) had the lowest rating.

Students scored in the “developing” category on all dimensions. Though the number in the sample is insufficient to generalize more broadly, in this particular group it looks like the students are gaining confidence and developing strength in their ability to express themselves clearly, to delineate and structure their ideas in support of a particular thesis, and to follow conventions for documenting sources.

**4.4 Information Literacy**

The UAA Information Literacy SLO (“*Locate and use relevant information to make appropriate personal and personal decisions*”) was broken down into the following descriptors aligned with language in the AAC&U’s VALUE rubric:

* Determines information needs
* Demonstrates relevant use of evidence
* Uses information sources critically
* Follows appropriate documentation conventions

The results are summarized as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ../../Desktop/Screen%20Shot%202016-07-30%20at%205.03.58%20PM.png | ../../Desktop/Screen%20Shot%202016-07-30%20at%205.14.00%20PM.png |
|  |  |
| **Table 5: Summary of Written Information Literacy SLO Assessment Results** | |

Overall, a similar pattern emerges between written communication and information literacy: students start fairly well at the 100 level, dip at the 200 level, then swing back up at the 400 level. Their strongest area at the 100 and 200 level is meeting information needs, which suggests they already have some fairly solid research strategies that meet assignment needs, but they have difficulty with other areas of information literacy. Students who persist at the 400 level are more likely to succeed in relevant use of sources and appropriate use of conventions, two areas their 100- and 200-level counterparts struggle with the most.

***100-level information literacy*** Freshman students seem very strong at finding their sources and using them in relevant ways; they struggle with critical use of sources and appropriate conventions. Several possibilities emerge for this. One way of looking at the difference is that students may have already had some practice in search strategies, perhaps from high school; thus, they may have the skills needed for 100-level work. They can find their sources and use them relevantly—but they do not have the background in research to be critical of their sources or to understand proper documentation strategies. Critical understanding of sources is often something that takes time for students to understand and practice in their work, especially in an age where Google is so prevalent. Careful use of documentation is also a skill that students learn gradually; they may learn the rules in a 100-level writing course, for example, but it may take them continual practice to truly be proficient.

***200-level information literacy***

The 200-level work demonstrates a similar pattern to that seen in written communication: there is a measurable drop in proficiency. It is possible that students are dealing with the same issues that caused a drop in written communication: they face more difficult and challenging materials and assignments, and, thus, their proficiency declines. Even more interestingly, they may also be starting to understand the complexity of research behaviors: academic journals, relevance to their work, and strength of sources. For example, students encountering professional writing in a field for the first time may feel overwhelmed and uncertain how to use a source. They may even be uncertain how to cite material they have never seen. Because of this, the fact that their scores go lower at the 200 level may actually be encouraging, suggesting that complex learning is beginning.

***400-level information literacy***

As with written communication, 400-level information literacy shows students who are, overall, proficient—and many who are treading towards mastery. Even more interestingly, it shows the same inversion of strengths/weaknesses between 100/200-level courses and 400-level courses: students are now struggling more with those areas they performed strongest in at earlier levels. That they are so proficient across the board (with only relevant use of sources truly emerging as notably stronger) suggests that the previous three years of coursework have strengthened their information literacy skills. When they have difficulty, it is in finding appropriate sources and using them critically, which may be because the assignments and expectations for 400-level work are more complex and much closer to actual work performed in the discipline. Building these information literacy skills across the curriculum will be an important conversation for next year’s assessment.

**5.0 Conclusions**

* Successful Phase One Pilot
* Positive Process
* Valuable Conversations
* Trans-disciplinary & -programmatic Collaboration
* Important Data

**6.0 Key Findings:** We have established a successful process for assessing student learning in the GER SLOs but we need to:

1. **Broaden** faculty (and programmatic) involvement in the process,
2. Use our assessment findings to **strengthen** teaching and student learning (‘close the loop’),
3. **Link** GER assessment with related assessment efforts across UAA, and
4. **Communicate** the purpose and function of the GER more clearly to students (and faculty).

**6.0 Recommendations**

1. Broaden Involvement
   * Continue Shared Assessment Process
   * Build Faculty Capacity
   * Increase Programmatic Participation
2. Strengthen Teaching and Learning & Close the Loop

* Expand Range of Student Artifacts
* Develop Digital Resources
* Partner with CAFÉ
* Continue Curriculum Mapping Workshops
* Circle Back to Tier 1 Outcomes
* Develop Teaching ‘Hot Sheets’: One-page teaching tips from GER faculty for faculty across the curriculum to facilitate assignment design and assessment guidelines in the Tier 1: Basic Skills SLOs (Written Communication, For Oral Communication, For Information Literacy)

1. Link GER Assessment to Other Efforts
   * Coordinate with Shared AA Assessment
   * Align with AAS and Related Instruction
2. Communicate with Faculty and Students
   * Foster regular email updates from GER Director to faculty and students
   * Incorporate GER materials into faculty orientation and development activities
   * Facilitate GER conversations as part of reaffirmation of accreditation efforts

**7.0 Supporting Material**

* Attachment 1: General Education Requirements Assessment Report
* Attachment 2: Associate of Arts Assessment Report
* Attachment 3: GERA Task Force Survey & Results
* Attachment 4: GERA Report & Recommendations to Faculty Senate
* Attachment 5: Curriculum Mapping Materials g(Dr. Janice Denton)
* Attachment 6: AAC&U LEAP Outcomes
* Attachment 7: AAC&U VALUE Rubrics
* Attachment 8: UAA GER Outcomes
* Attachment 9: UAA Three-Tiered GER Structure
* Attachment 10: AY16 GER Assessment Rubric
* Attachment 11: Su16 GER Assessment Final Rubric
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