

2008-2009 Faculty Senate Team Annual Reports

Graduate Affairs Team	Page 2
Grants and Research Team	Page 3
Student Affairs Team	Page 4
Program Review	Page 12
Student Learning Goals and Outcomes (SLOG) Task Force...	Page 13
General Education Council	Page 16

Graduate Affairs Team

GAT Goals AY 2008-2009

1. Graduate Academic Policy- Continued Development
2. Review of College Level Graduate Faculty Appointment and Review Policies/Process
3. Graduate Admission Criteria (including Transfer Credit)
4. Clarification of Scholarly Capstones required for program completion (including development of any associated policy)
5. Process for handling Graduate Affairs Appeals including petitions

Membership 2008-2009

R. Boggs (COB), P. Allman (CAS), L. Downe (CHP), M. Hartung (Lib), T. Valesky (COE), H. Walsh-Haney (CPS), A. Nolan (Facilitator & Provost Appointee)

Ex-Officio: M. Savarese (Director, Graduate Studies), L. Benefield (Student Government), C. Duff (AA)

Goal 1 Graduate Academic Policy- Continued Development

The GAT amended policy related to Transfer Credit for the Ed. S. degree as well as establishing credit hour requirements for doctoral level study as required by SACS. Revised Graduate Academic policy document was approved by Faculty senate 1-16-09.

Goal 2 Review of College Level Graduate Faculty Appointment and Review Policies/Process

The GAT committee reviewed each College's Graduate Faculty Appointment and Review Process process in comparison with the Faculty Senate's approved Graduate Faculty Appointment and Review Policy. As per the required process, the results of the review were given to the Director of Graduate Studies & Provost and revision/development recommendations went back to the Colleges through the Director of Graduate Studies.

Goal 3 Graduate Admission Criteria (including Transfer Credit)

Because the Board of Governors devolved control of graduate admissions to universities, the GAT has been reviewing the process of using test scores in admissions. Of interest were use of set scores to determine admission, discipline-based differences in use of test scores, and misuse of test scores. The GAT engaged in data mining from FGCU and national universities in order to review admission test practices/requirements. This work is ongoing as the GAT now plans on engaging FGCU colleges to ascertain views on use of graduate admission tests.

Goal 4 Clarification of Scholarly Capstones required for program completion

The GAT has been engaged in data mining as a precursor to developing policy related to scholarly capstones. The data mining questions included:

- a) What types of capstones are required such as theses, dissertations, portfolios, and other?
- b) What is the level of demand/rigor of different capstone projects (size and scope)?
- c) Do policies exist that govern the review of capstone projects by committees?
- d) What policies or practices exist for appealing unsatisfactory capstone outcomes?
- e) What policies exist for graduate appeals of grades?
- f) What policies exist for faculty workload compensation that may be related to the size and scope of different capstone projects?

Data has now been collected and is under review. This work is ongoing.

Goal 5 Process for handling Graduate Affairs Appeals including petitions

The GAT has been exploring the issue of graduate appeals. There is a question as to whether the GAT should be the hearing body for graduate appeals. The GAT is working to verify if all colleges have appeals procedures in place and what the chain of appeals should be. In addition to academic appeal there should be due process related to graduate assistantships, tuition waivers and thesis committees. This work is ongoing.

Grants & Research Team

Submitted by: Diane Schmidt (Education), Team Leader

Team Members: Catherine Gardner (Library), Ai Ning Loh (Arts & Sciences), Melih Madanoglu (Professional Studies), Ann Nolan (Health Professions), Hulya Yazici (Business)

The work of the G & R Team was highly productive during the 2008-2009 academic year. In addition to conducting the normal business specified in the bylaws, the Team also responded to requests from the Senate and worked to revise G & R documents and protocols. This additional work helped refine and clarify the procedures for the team and all university personnel conducting business with the G & R Team.

Regular business conducted during the 2008-2009 academic year included:

- Reviewed annual reports for Centers and Institutes, providing feedback to directors and submitting appraisals to Provost Toll
- Reviewed proposals for two new university Centers and sent recommendations to Provost Toll and President Bradshaw
- Reviewed proposals for ORSP Internal Grants and recommended funding of nine proposals
- Reviewed proposals for Graduate Research Assistant grants and recommended approval of two awards
- Reviewed and advised on new policy for Centers and Institutes
- Reviewed and advised on a new program to provide funding for student research needs
- Reviewed and advised on suggestions to ORSP from a Whitaker Center meeting on ways in which ORSP might help centralize information in support of collaborative grant writing

- Advised and assisted in Research Day events, including promotion, reviewing submissions, and judging competitive entries

Additional business conducted during the 2008-2009 academic year included:

- Revision of the Senate Bylaws for the G & R Team
- Development of a first draft of Policies and Procedures for the G & R Team
- Revision of the guidelines and creation of a template for submitting new proposals for Centers and Institutes
- Revision of guidelines and creation of a template for Center and Institute Annual Report Supplements
- Revision of guidelines and scoring criteria for the ORSP Internal Grant program

Student Affairs Team

2008-2009 Annual Report

SAT Goals and Other Ad-Hoc Issues for AY 2008-2009

1. Revision of FGCU Student of the Year (SOTY) Awards document.
2. Selection of SOTY.
3. Revision of By-Law.
4. Assisting Student Affairs to conduct Academic Honesty Survey.
5. Review of Enforcement of Student Code of Conduct.

Membership of AY 2008-2009

- Barb McAloose (CHP)
- Tony Mercurio (student member representing the SG)
- Kazuo Nakatani (COB)
- James Rollo (*ex officio* member appointed by the Vice President of Student Affairs)
- Dayle Upham (COE)
- Andrew Wilkinson (CAS)

Progress and Achievements

1: Revision of FGCU Student of the Year (SOTY) Awards document: SAT revised and the revision was approved by the Faculty Senate. See the document in the Faculty_Governance\SOTY folder. There are a few issues SAT may need to discuss for further revision of the SOTY document. See Meeting Minutes of April 6, 2009 for details.

2: Selection of SOTY: Jenna E. Martin, Whitaker School of Engineering was selected as The Undergraduate Student of the Year for 2009 and Luke Benfield, College of Education was selected as The Graduate Student of the Year for 2009.

3: Revision of By-Law: SAT revised and the revision was approved by the Faculty Senate.

#4: Assisting Student Affairs to Academic Honesty Survey: SAT helped Student Affairs to create survey questions. Student Affairs completed the survey and they are writing the report.

#5: Review of Enforcement of Student Code of Conduct: SAT reviewed the part of the Student Code of Conduct that is related to the code enforcement by comparing it with those published by other FL state universities. The question raised by the Senate Leadership Team was whether the code was properly enforced when faculty members are harassed by students. SAT concluded that the current version and other non-documented procedures sufficiently address the enforcement of the code. See the Meeting Minutes of October 17, 2008 and November 21, 2008 for details.

There are no outstanding issues that need immediate attention.

-- Meeting Minutes are included in this document, starting from the page 2--

Meeting on April 6, 2009, 2:00-3:00p at SU104 (Approved)

Attendees: Barb McAloose; Dayle Upham; Tony Mercurio; Andrew Wilkinson, James Rollo; and Kazuo Nakatani (Michelle Yovanovich left her assessment of SOTY nominees with Dr. Rollo)

Issues Discussed

1. SOTY award
 - SAT (or say SOTY selection committee) selected:
 - Jenna E. Martin as this year's undergraduate SOTY winner, and
 - Luke Benefield as this year's graduate SOTY winner.
 - Discussed the following two issues
 - SAT agreed to change the minimum requirement for undergraduate student nominees should be increased to '12' credit hours [KN1]per semester for the academic year the award will be given.
 - SAT discussed about possible change of weights of the three categories but did not agree on any change suggested (change weights or no weights). SAT decided to keep the current weight at this point and may discuss this issue next year.

Meeting on March 20, 2009, 2:00-3:00p at SU104 (Approved)

Attendees: Dayle Upham; Tony Mercurio; Andrew Wilkinson, James Rollo; and Kazuo Nakatani

Issues Discussed

1. The minutes of Feb 20, 2009 was approved.
2. Updates of Honest Survey (if any)
 - Data was collected and Dr. Rollo will email us the summarized data.
3. Re-scheduling the April 3 meeting.
 - We re-scheduled it to April 6 (M) at 2:00p because two members cannot make on April 3.
 - Kazuo sent out a message about the change in the date and time and asked to send a representative from each unit if the member cannot make the meeting on April 6 (M) at 2:00p.
4. Review of SOTY nominees' portfolio.

- Some of us stayed and reviewed portfolios.
- We also decided the selection committee will verify GPA and check history of any serious conduct problems at FGCU of top 3 nominees.

Meeting on February 20, 2009, 2:00-3:00p at SU104 (Approved)

Attendees: Barb McAloose; Dayle Upham; Andrew Wilkinson, James Rollo; and Kazuo Nakatani
 Issues Discussed

5. The minutes of Jan 16, 2009 was approved
6. SAT Bylaw change recommendation: We will discuss a suggestion from Dr. Isaacs (see Comment [KN1]) in this document.

(c) Student Affairs Team (from Faculty Senate By-Laws)

(i) Composition

The Student Affairs Team consists of one faculty member representing each unit/college, one voting student member representing the SG, one *ex officio* member appointed by the Vice President of Student Affairs, and one *ex officio* member appointed by Vice President of Academic Affairs.

(ii) Responsibilities and Duties

The Student Affairs Team collaborates with Student Affairs on behalf of the faculty to develop policies affecting the quality of educational programs. The team will review and recommend policies concerning matters relating to student affairs. These include, but are not limited to, admission and readmission of students to the University, academic suspension of students, withdrawal from courses and from the university, academic status, award of credit, award of academic honors, award of SOTY, academic grievances, educational equity, rights and responsibilities ([including code of student conduct](#)^[KN2]), and maintenance of academic integrity. The team will work with Student Affairs to assure appropriate faculty representation on Student Services Committees.

7. Updates of SOTY nomination
 - 27 (5 graduate students) were nominated as of Feb 20.
 - Assure everyone understand the next steps:
 - Mar 13 (Portfolio due)
 - Dr. Rollo will set up days, times, and room for SAT members to review the portfolio and let us know.
 - Apr 3 (F) 2:00-3:00p, SAT will meet to make selections of students for 2009 SOTY awards.
 - We will ask Michele Yovanovich, to attend the meeting for additional information about the nominees.
 - **Note:** Apr 17 (F) meeting will be held ONLY IF we have issues to discuss.
8. Updates of Honest Survey (if any)
 - IRB approved the survey.
 - The survey is planned to be sent to students next week (Feb 23-27).
9. Standard Operating Procedure of SAT
 - Regular events of SAT are:

- SOTY: The procedures are documented (in the Faculty_Governance\SOTY folder).
 - Year end summary for the team leader.
- 10. Kazuo shared an issue discussed in Feb 13 Senate Leadership Team that may be a concern of SAT
 - How to handle students who dropped by the university after the first week due to not-paying the full tuition.
 - How to make up missed attendance/assignments/labs after reinstated (especially after the absence of 3 weeks)
 1. Certain learning activities are impossible to make up
 2. Increases faculty workload
 - Faculty liability/responsibility in case faculty let the students stay in the class
 - The leadership team decided that this is an administrative problem and thus the team does not handle this issue. The Faculty Senate President will inform the leadership team after she contacted with the university administrators who are responsible for this policy.

Meeting on January 16, 2009, 2:00-3:15p at SU104 (Approved)

Attendees: Andrew Wilkinson, James Rollo; Tony Mercurio, Michele Yovanovich and Kazuo Nakatani

Issues Discussed

1. The minutes of the minutes of Nov 21, 2008 was approved.
2. Bylaw changes
 - We discussed several change suggestions made by the Senate Leadership team and finalized our recommendation as shown below.

(c) Student Affairs Team (from Faculty Senate By-Laws)

(i) Composition

The Student Affairs Team consists of one faculty member representing each unit/college^[KN3], one voting student member representing the SG, one *ex officio* member appointed by the Vice President of Student Affairs, and one *ex officio* member appointed by Vice President of Academic Affairs.^[KN4]

(ii) Responsibilities and Duties

The Student Affairs Team collaborates with Student Affairs on behalf of the faculty to develop policies affecting the quality of educational programs. The team will review and recommend policies concerning matters relating to student affairs. These include, but are not limited to, admission and readmission of students to the University, academic suspension of students, withdrawal from courses and from the university, academic status, award of credit, award of academic honors, award of SOTY, academic grievances, educational equity, rights and responsibilities, and maintenance of academic integrity.^[KN5] The team will work with Student Affairs to assure appropriate faculty representation on Student Services Committees.
3. Confirmation of meeting schedule for Spring 2009

- Feb 20 (F), Mar 20 (F), and Apr 17 (F) at 2:00p – 3:00p at Dr. Rollo’s office.
- 4. Updates of STYO nomination
 - 15 nominations were received.
- 5. Review of Undergraduate Admission Regulation proposed by UAAC (Undergraduate Admissions and Advisory Committee)

The team reviewed the document and recommends the following changes:

 - In (1), it may need to clarify “admission process” and “enrollment process”.
 - “Official transcripts” need clear definition and acceptable mode of submission for people who are not familiar with the American system.
 - In the first line of (7) (b) “must” may be conflicting with (7) (a).
 - (15) needs clarification about what the Dean of Students does.
- 6. Assisting Student Affairs to create Honest Survey
 - Upon the request of Vice President of Student Affairs, SAT reviewed the survey questions and provided possible questions that could be included in the survey and wording of questions.

Meeting on November 21, 2008, 2:00-3:00p at SU104 (Approved)

Attendees: Barb McAloose; Dayle Upham; James Rollo; Tony Mercurio, Michele Yovanovich and Kazuo Nakatani

Issues Discussed

1. The minutes of October 17 meeting was approved.
2. An approval of the SOTY documents
 - Approved by the SAT.
 - SAT wants an approval from Senate on Dec 5 to advertise before the winter break so students can prepare their portfolios during the break.
3. Scheduling meeting for Spring 2009
 - Temporarily agreed on the third Friday of a month, 2-3 at SU 104.
 - The next meeting is January 16, 2009, 2-3 at SU104.
 - Kazuo will email the members their availability in early January 2009.
4. Report of UAAC (Undergraduate Admissions and Advisory Committee) Meeting on Oct 31.
 - Reported statistics of admissions and strategic planning.
 - Reported and discussed a proposed out-of-state waiver and there was no objection.
5. Requests to Faculty Senate Leadership Team for Bylaw change

(c) Student Affairs Team (from Faculty Senate By-Laws)

(i) Composition

The Student Affairs Team consists of one faculty member representing each academic unit college (and/or library?) unit [MR6], [KzN7] one voting student member representing the SGA, one *ex officio* member appointed by the Dean Vice President of Student Affairs, and one *ex officio* member appointed by the Dean of Enrollment Management Provost [KzN8].

(ii) Responsibilities and Duties

The Student Affairs Team collaborates with Student [Services Affairs and Enrollment Management](#) on behalf of the faculty to develop policies affecting the quality of educational programs. The team will review and recommend policies concerning ~~all~~ matters relating to student affairs. These include, but are not limited to, ~~recruitment~~, admission and readmission of students to the University, ~~academic~~ suspension of students, withdrawal from courses and from the university, academic status, award of credit, award of academic honors, ~~award of SOTY~~, ~~student academic~~ grievances, educational equity, rights and responsibilities, and maintenance of academic integrity. ~~The team will members will serve on work with Student Affairs to assure appropriate faculty representation on Student Services Committees requiring faculty membership as decided by the team or will name representatives whose appointment is subject to the consent of the Faculty Senate.~~

6. Student Code of Conduct

- Faculty Senate Leadership Team wants the procedure to reflect the faculty perspective when a faculty member is an alleged victim.
 - Is this a valid request?
 - Does the current procedure already reflect the faculty perspective?
 - Is there any “non-documented” procedure to solve this issue?
 - Is there any change we can suggest to Faculty Senate Leadership team, which sends a request to Vice President for Student Affairs for consideration?
 - Kazuo and Dr. Rollo exchanged email messages and met on Nov 17.
 - SAT discussed the above issues and reviewed FGCU student code of conduct, as well as those of other universities (UF, USF, FAU, and UCF) and agreed on:
 1. The current procedure documented in FGCU Student Code of Conduct is fairly typical and nothing is unusual thus we don’t see any critical flaw and necessity of changes.
 2. Faculty members who do not agree with all of “case dismissal” decisions made by three different people (appropriate staff of Judicial Office, Dean of Student Affairs, and Vice President for Student Affairs) (Note: the three decisions are made as separate, independent decisions at three different times) can go to the University Ombudsman office (or President/Provost through proper supervisory chain) to complain. We believe that documenting this process is not necessary, especially NOT as part of Student Code of Conducts.

Kazuo contacted Dr. Isaacs if the faculty union has any procedure to handle this issue. => **Response from Dr. Isaac on Nov 21:**
“Without knowing the specifics of the case I cannot determine what an appropriate role for UFF might be. However, I do know that any action that might require a grievance would require that

the faculty member be an active member of the union when bringing a grievance and when the event that is triggering the grievance occurs. Beyond grievance, UFF has always provided counsel and guidance to any faculty member who brings a concern ranging from active assistance to referral to more appropriate offices on campus. We do not have policies and procedures per se (other than the one noted above about membership and grievance) that might pertain to this.” => In short, it seems that those faculty members who are not satisfied with the “dismissal” decision can file a grievance if they are UFF members and can get some assistance from UFF even when they are not UFF members.

3. SAT also discussed the sufficiency of the current procedure from the following two perspectives:
 - If the university does not have sufficient procedure, faculty members must rely on laws outside the university, media or others. => SAT believes that we have enough official and unofficial policies and procedures.
 - Junior faculty members should be allowed to make mistakes without being harassed by students or jeopardizing his/her career. => SAT believes that the current student code of conduct, with proper evidence, makes students who harass/come after faculty members responsible for their violations of code.

Note: The current student code of conduct was approved by a committee which had two faculty member representatives.

7. Honest Survey

- Dr. Rollo will continue to draft the survey questions.

Meeting on October 17, 2008, 2:00-3:00p at SU104 (Approved)

Attendees: Barb McAloose; Dayle Upham; James Rollo; Tony Mercurio, and Kazuo Nakatani

Issues Discussed:

1. The minutes of September 23 meeting was approved.
2. Revision of FGCU Students of the Year Awards document for 2008-2009
 - a. Waiting for a corrected version from Andrew.
 - b. Need to advertise it in December.
 - c. Agreed to distribute the documents for reviewing in e-mail. (Sent out on 10/23 and requested to review by Nov 7).
3. Enforcement of Student Code of Conduct (This issue was raised in Senate Team Leadership meeting on Nov 3)
 - a. KN explained the issue discussed in Senate Team Leadership meeting on Nov 3.

- b. The current Student Code of Conduct may not apply the issue of students lying about teachers.
 - c. Violations of Student Code of Conducts are currently enforce as documented in Student Code of Conduct 2008-2009.
 - d. In conclusion, it needs to modify Student Code of Conduct to accommodate such an issue (if a majority of faculty requests...)
4. SAT's Goals for 2008-2009
- a. 2008-2009 FGCU Students of the Year Awards.
 - b. Develop Academic Honesty Survey.
5. Academic Honesty Survey
- a. Dr. Rollo explained a rough draft of the survey.
 - b. The SAT agreed that The survey should focus on:
 - i. What is considered as cheating by students and by faculty
 - ii. How often students/faculty see cheating at FGCU, comparing with other places
 - iii. Different levels of "seriousness" (different types of cheating, in different types of courses, by different levels of student status (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, graduate), etc.
 - c. Dr. Rollo revised the current draft and the electronic version will be distributed to obtain feedback from the team members.

Meeting on September 23, 2008, 1:00-2:00p at SU104 (Approved)

Attendees: Andrew Wilkinson; Barb McAloose; Dayle Upham; James Rollo; and Kazuo Nakatani

Issues Discussed:

- 1. Selection of the team leader
 - a. Kazuo Nakatani will be the team leader of the team
- 2. Revision of FGCU Student of the Year Awards document for 2008-2009
 - a. Went through the most of the document
 - b. The electronic versions will be distributed to members to finalize the document
 - c. (In the next meeting), the team finalize the document
- 3. Academic Honesty Survey
 - a. Dr. Rollo presented a rough draft of the survey.
 - b. The electronic version will be distributed to obtain feedback from the team members
- 4. Scheduling meetings
 - a. With Andrew Wilkinson, James Rollo and Kazuo Nakatani discussed about limiting the frequency of physical meeting once a month using a shared folder, Sharepoint server [KzN9] (to be implemented by Admin Computing soon), or

Google Docs, where reviewing of documents can be done electronically and individually.

- b. Scheduling meetings for Fall 2008 (Done electronically with help of Eileen Whitt)
 - i. Oct 17 (Friday) 2-3p Dr. Rollo's Office
 - ii. Nov 21 (Friday) 2-3p Dr. Rollo's Office

Outstanding Issues (responding the email from Halcyon St. Hill on 9/17/2008)

1. Goals and other items the team need to address
 - a. Revision of FGCU Student of the Year Awards document
 - b. Academic Honesty Survey
 - c. Any other?
2. Any issues or concerns (from 2007-2008 SAT report)

Responsibilities of SAT Leader include:

- Attending the leadership meetings. You do not need attend Senate meetings unless you chose to do so or when you are bringing a document from your team to the senate for approval. In the latter case, you may chose to come to address questions or clarify items as needed. (E-mail from Dr. St. Hill on Oct 1, 2008)
- Attending Undergraduate Admissions Advisory Committee meetings (Email from Mr. Laviolette on Sep 30, 2008)

Program Review Team

List of Team Members AY 08-09:

Thomas Bevins (CHP) – Facilitator
Lee Duffus (COB)
Madelyn Isaacs (COE)
Johnny McGaha (CPS)
Morgan Paine (CAS)

Summary of Goals/Charges

The Program Review Team (PRT) met roughly every other week this year. We re-drafted/revised a document to serve as a guideline for development by undergraduate programs of a Student Assessment and Program Evaluation Plan for the Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs). We got feedback from the Assessment Liaisons on this document. The document is attached for your consideration. We plan to work with the Assessment Liaisons next year in reviewing and giving feedback to each college on one or two of their ALC Student Assessment and Program Evaluation Plans. We hope that the colleges can then use that feedback to revise other Plans. ALCs are managed administratively through the Office of Curriculum and Instruction (OCI), and the PRT will continue to work with OCI in a review and consulting manner on the development and revision of ALCs.

We have been developing a procedures document to outline how the PRT will interface with the Office of Planning and Institutional Performance (PIP). PRT has been getting much more

involved with the Program Review (PR) process this year, and that activity is set to increase as we look forward at the programs scheduled for PR in the upcoming years (on the 7-year cycle). The PRT is trying to establish procedures that provide faculty review of the process without getting too involved in the administrative aspects of the process.

This year we reviewed the one-year follow-up reports of PR for:

Biology
Occupational Therapy
Environmental Studies

(still waiting for Communication to submit)

We reviewed the PR reports for:

Physical Therapy
Resort & Hospitality Management
Social Work (MSW)

We consulted in the process of selection of the external reviewer for:

Marine Science
General Education
English

(Social Work (BSW) had a visit from their outside accrediting agency)

Items that are ongoing for the 2009-2010 Team to assume/complete: Nearly all activities of the PRT are ongoing. The programs that we review change from year to year, but the PR process is cyclical, and ongoing.

Programs up for review next year are:

Psychology
Political Science
Human Performance
Community Health
Forensic Studies

Student Learning Goals and Outcomes (SLOG)

Task Force

Introduction

The members of the Task Force met weekly to address its charge from the Faculty Senate:

1. To define the collaborative process between the FGCU faculty and administration for reconsidering undergraduate and graduate students' learning outcomes and goals.
2. Proceed with the review of the existing university graduate and undergraduate students' outcomes/goals within an acceptable time frame.

Membership agreed that the statements labeled “Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes” and “Graduate Student Learning Outcomes” in the 2008-2009 FGCU catalog may need to be renamed and, in some cases, changed. Since the University opened in 1997, the undergraduate statements have been presented in various ways. In the 1996-1997 FGCU catalog, the statements were labeled “University Learning Outcomes” and the wording of the statements was different from wording that appeared in the 2008-2009 catalog. In the 1998-1999 FGCU catalog, the statements were labeled “Student Learning Goals and Outcomes.”

The meaning and understanding of the terms *goals* and *outcomes* have changed over time. In the science of educational assessment, particularly relevant for the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the current understanding of the term *outcomes* implies frequent, systematized assessment on periodic basis (e.g., 1-3 years). Adopting a structure, to be determined by faculty and administrative stakeholders, with both general statements (e.g., values, goals) and more specific statements (e.g., outcomes) relating to student learning will enable the University to have statements common for all students as well as statements specific to a program.

In determining a review process, the membership examined existing student learning outcomes for undergraduate and graduate students and determined the time allotted to this task force was insufficient for a comprehensive and meaningful review to occur. This review process has great importance and implications for the University students, faculty, and community stakeholders. For a valuable and comprehensive review, resulting in significant and meaningful information, a new task force will require a greater the amount of time, such as that devoted to developing the University Mission or the Quality Enhancement Plan. The review must include students, faculty, and community stakeholders (e.g., businesses, employers) with ample input from all parties.

The Task Force agreed that the General Education competencies are a core unit of the University, yet do not completely reflect the University’s uniqueness. There was no additional review of the General Education competencies. Membership did not consider this a part of its charge.

As charged, the task force, with full consensus, approved the following collaborative review process.

Collaborative Review Process of Student Learning Outcomes

- A. Compose and disseminate the historical, institutional contexts that necessitate revised Student Learning Outcomes and a revised Student Learning Outcome assessment process.
- B. Identify assessment expectations from internal and external bodies (state regulations, accreditation institutions and programs, etc.).
- C. Gather information about how FGCU Undergraduate and Graduate colleges/programs use and assess the institution’s current Student Learning Outcomes.
- D. Gather information about how other institutions’ Undergraduate and Graduate colleges/programs use and assess their respective Student Learning Outcomes.

- E. Gather information on trends and models in use at state, regional, and national levels. These would include the essential learning outcomes entitled LEAP (Liberal Education for America's Promise), promulgated by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) and any others found as part of this research process.
- F. Align data from C, D, and E to identify best-case Student Learning Outcomes and Student Learning Outcomes assessment strategies for fulfilling the assessment expectations identified in B.
- G. Analyze best-case Student Learning Outcomes and Student Learning Outcomes assessment strategies against current FGCU Student Learning Outcomes and Student Learning Outcomes assessment strategies.
 - a. Generate comparative analysis.
 - b. Disseminate report to stakeholders (faculty, student government, administration, etc.).
 - c. Invite stakeholder feedback on this report to generate ideas for aligning FGCU's current Student Learning Outcomes (which reflect its institutional history and values) with best-case Student Learning Outcomes and Student Learning Outcomes assessment strategies (which determine the University's accreditation status and viability).
 - d. Determine resources needed, including technology, to support efforts.
- H. Collate feedback to develop revised Student Learning Outcomes and Student Learning Outcomes assessment strategies.

Lastly, with full consensus, the task force recommends the collaborative review process of student learning outcomes be directed and frequency of review be determined by a new committee. The new committee should be comprised of individuals who have an institutional history, as well as knowledge of and experience with student assessment requirements, and accreditation process.

Thank you for this opportunity to assist the University in this matter.

Respectfully,

Patricia Coccoma Ed.D., LCSW

Task Force Facilitator and Graduate Curriculum Committee representative

Taskforce Members

Eric Otto, Ph.D.

General Education Council

Mary Hart, Ph.D.

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Thomas Bevins M.S.

Program Review Team

Cathy Duff, Ed.D

Office of Curriculum and Instruction

George Alexander Ph.D.

Planning and Institutional Performance

Debra Hess Ph.D.

Provost and VPAA appointee

Alice Brunner, Ph.D.	Student Affairs
Megan Mcshane, Ph.D.	College of Arts and Sciences
Julie Hulya Yazici Ph.D.	College of Business
Judy Wilkerson, Ph.D.	College of Education
Deborah Chapa Ph.D.	College of Health Professions
Mary Ann Zager Ph.D.	College of Professional Studies
Anna Carlin M.S.	Library

Submitted 3/8/09 to Dr. St. Hill, Faculty Senate President

GENERAL EDUCATION COUNCIL

PREPARED BY DOUGLAS HARRISON, CHAIR

The members of the General Education Council in 2008-09 were:

Douglas Harrison, Chair, Arts & Sciences
 Scott Anstadt, Professional Studies
 Margaret Cavin, Arts & Sciences
 Eric Otto, Arts & Sciences
 Danielle Rosenthal, Library
 Halcyon St. Hill, Health Professions
 Dean Stansel, Business
 Dayle Upham, Education
 Scott Karakas, Director of General Education (*ex-officio*)
 Peter Lechler, Student Government (*ex-officio*)
 Marisa Ouverson, Academic Advising Council (*ex-officio*)

Accomplishments and Completed Actions:

1. *Approved revised and updated criteria for General Education Courses:* By developing [more robust and specific criteria](#) for what constitutes a General Education Course, the Council completed work held over from the last major General Education program review. These criteria reflect the ongoing effort on the Council's part to provide faculty with more direction in developing Gen Ed curriculum and create a more coherent Gen Ed program. The new criteria will also provide better guidance to the Council in assessing the effectiveness of courses within the program.
2. *Worked with faculty and administration to approve the framework for a three-credit Diversity requirement:* This action reflected the Council's strong support for a formal commitment to Diversity education in the curriculum. It also addressed relevant aspects of the [University Conversation on General Education](#) regarding Diversity and Gen Ed.
3. *Innovation in General Education Grant Competition:* In fall 2008, the General Education Council approved a proposal originally submitted by the General Education program Director, for an annual grant competition designed to support faculty initiatives to enhance student learning and achievement within the FGCU General Education program. The grants aim to foster creativity and innovation in general education course design, with project proposals focusing on interdisciplinary content or teaching across

disciplines being particularly encouraged. [Four proposals](#) from a total of twelve faculty members were chosen in spring 2009 for support from the grant fund.

4. *Completed external program review:* The Council collaborated with the Director of General Education to develop a program [self-study](#) as part of the second seven-year review. Dr. Claudia Stanny of the University of North Florida was recommended by the Council and selected as the external reviewer. Her report will be forthcoming early in 2009-10.
5. *Revised Faculty Senate bylaws governing the Council:* The bylaws outlining the scope and charge of the Council's work had not been revised since the inception of the Council. In [revising the bylaws](#), the Council worked closely with the Faculty Senate Leadership team. The goal of the revisions was to create bylaws that more closely reflect the function that the Council has come to perform in the university and to allow for that function to continue to evolve over time without requiring regular bylaws revision.
6. *Provided feedback on new General Education program website:* In fall 2007, the Office of Curriculum and Instruction sponsored the creation of a university-wide General Education program web site, to inform and serve FGCU students, faculty, staff and administration, as well as the general public. The site is maintained and updated by the General Education program Director, and may be accessed here: http://www.fgcu.edu/general_education/.

Continuing items

1. *Report outcome of External Review:* The announcement of the results of the External Review will be the starting point for conversations related to General Education that will be the focus of the Council's work in the coming year. These include the place of Diversity in the FGCU curriculum, internal review of courses, and a Gen Ed Advisory Group.
2. *Continue the conversation on Diversity and General Education:* Between November 17, 2008, and February 1, 2009, the Council solicited proposals from faculty for new or existing General Education courses that would also satisfy the Diversity requirement approved in early November 2009. Upon reviewing the submitted proposals, the Council determined that while each course thoughtfully, organically, and effectively addressed one or more aspects central to meaningful Diversity education, the courses collectively did not represent a sufficiently diverse range of coursework to satisfy the philosophical and practical demands of such a requirement. Subsequently, the Council wrote and submitted to the Faculty Senate a [report on the state of Diversity and general education at FGCU](#). This report has been forwarded to the Faculty Senate Leadership and to the administration. In 2009-10, the Council will work closely with the Senate and administration to formalize Diversity as a component of curriculum at the university.
3. *Continue dialog between Gen Ed Faculty and Gen Ed Council:* In 2008-09, the Council began inviting department chairs, program directors, and course leaders affiliated with the Gen Ed program for conversations about the new criteria and any other issues or questions related to the program. The Council will continue these conversations in early

2009-10 and will continue to include outreach to deans and other administrative partners.

4. *Initiate internal review of General Education coursework:* This activity follows the approval of new criteria and will involve a close inspection of coursework currently constituting the General Education program to determine the degree to which Gen Ed coursework aligns with the approved criteria for Gen Ed program courses. The Council will continue discussing this review with faculty leaders of Gen Ed courses in the conversations outlined above. A report on the findings of this review will be a key goal of the Council's work for the coming year.
5. *Explore creation of General Education Advisory Group:* The Council has become increasingly convinced that the vast expansion of the size and scope of the Gen Ed program in recent years creates an opportunity for greater collaboration and conversation among Gen Ed faculty. In exploring the creation of a Gen Ed Advisory group in the coming year, the Council will be attempting to envision a way for Gen Ed faculty to come together separate from the Council's work of curriculum oversight and work toward a more coherent General Education program unified across departments, programs, and colleges. In the coming year, the Council will work with Faculty Senate and administrative partners to determine the effectiveness of such an Advisory group.