

Reviewer's Companion to the CGEIP Tool for Evaluating General Education Courses

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMISSION:

Download form, complete and submit electronically to your subcommittee chair or to Sandra Arthur (SArthur@missouristate.edu). Add lines as needed in the table for more authors.

CGEIP reviewers: Chair John Downing, Ed Chang, Diana Piccolo

Course REL 100

Review Date: Semester SPRING Year 2012

Department Head and/or other authors: Kathy Pulley and Jack Llewellyn

Please complete the table below for all course instructors, including lab instructors, adjuncts, etc. for all sections for the current and most recent fall or spring semester. (Add lines as needed.)

Sect.#	Names of instructors/person(s) responsible for course	Year Taught	Title/Rank	√ if Syllabus attached.
1-3, 5	Micki Pulleyking	FA2011	Senior Instructor	√
4, 999	Kathy Pulley	FA2011	Professor	√
5, 10	David Embree	FA2011	Per Course	√
6, 7	Austra Reinis	FA2011	Associate Professor	√
8, 9, 899, 900	Lora Hobbs	FA2011	Senior Instructor	√
1-3, 5	Micki Pulleyking	SP2012	Senior Instructor	√
4	Kathy Pulley	SP2012	Professor	√
7, 11	David Embree	SP2012	Per Course	√
8, 9	Austra Reinis	SP2012	Associate Professor	√
10, 898	Lora Hobbs	SP2012	Senior Instructor	√

A. Has the requested material been provided to determine whether or not this course is attempting to meet the aims and goals of General Education?

1. Reviewer comments: REL 100 faculty have submitted the required information for CGEIP review. It is suggested that under the current format of the syllabi, course and general education goals be merged in the same section, *e.g.*, course goals what is the nature of human beings and why is there suffering? Immediately followed by ...reflects ... understanding the nature of our humanness and how human beings are like and different from the other beings with which they share the planet.... rather than present course and general education goals in different parts of the syllabus. This will allow students to make an immediate connection between the two sets of goals.

The committee also questions the use of the 4 item assessment tool in its current format as it is essentially a reiteration of general education goals without connection to the course objectives. Using information in **1d of the evaluation form** should easily help in reconstructing a more effective assessment tool.

B. Is this course attempting to meet the aims and goals of General Education?

Reviewer comments: Religion 100 appears to meet the goals of general education. However the assessment tool in its current format is weak as it fails to present specific questionnaire items that integrate the course goals into the general education goals.

C. Rating scale for final recommendation:

 1 OK; no changes required – continue in the General Education Program

 2 OK; continue in the General Education Program. Address committee concerns before the next review.

 3 Resubmit portfolio since it is either incomplete, or it is inadequate to determine whether or not the course should be continued in the General Education Program. Re-submit no later than _____.

 4 Fail: Remove from the General Education Program.

Reviewer's final comments: I believe that in general REL 100 is attempting to meet the goals of general education. However, the assessment tool included is at best a poor representation of how general education goals are reflected in the course goals. Consider the student perspective. The syllabus includes course and general education goals in separate sections of the document. The assessment tool asks the student to equate disparate information, *e.g.*, *knowledge of individual, physical, emotional, intellectual, social etc. matrices*, in questions 2, 3 and 4 into the actual course objectives under the assumption that they can equate and integrate all of this information into a meaningful whole. It would seem to me, however, that the faculty already has the bases of a bona fide assessment tool with some of the information included in the four goals mentioned in **1d of their course evaluation tool**. I would suggest that the instructors use this information to construct a better assessment tool, and have it consist of approximately 20-30 items that are interrelated with the course goals. This should allow the student to analyze/synthesize the information more easily when completing it, and also lend the tool to a more efficient statistical analysis.

Rating 2

Subcommittee Chair's Summary and Final Recommendation: The committee feels that the REL 100 syllabi and review document do a good job articulating general education goals, especially if they modify the syllabi to interrelate the course and general education goals into one section of the syllabus. The assessment tool, however, needs revision. In its current format it is difficult to connect both general education and course goals in any meaningful sense. From the perspective of a student this would seem especially difficult. The committee suggests that the instructors construct a more valid and reliable assessment tool, consisting of approximately 20-30 items that are interrelated/interconnected with the course goals. The framework for this reconstruction has already been completed **in the bulleted items in 1d – goals 1-4 of the evaluation tool presented** in the review package. Expanding on these items should expedite the reconstruction.

Final Rating 2

Update and Response to “Reviewer’s Companion to the CGEIP Tool for Evaluating General Education Courses” (Fall, 2012)

Our complete CGEIP Report (Spring, 2012), indicated that we do two types of assessment in the class. The first was discussed in the narrative of that report (See page 3, which discussed the focus groups with students and their written responses to questions that tied our course objectives to the Gen Ed goals.). The second type of assessment was the self-report survey (attached at the end of our report), which is intended to provide quantitative data. Last spring we administered both types of assessment and I am pleased to report that both the qualitative information and the survey results confirmed that Rel 100 is meeting Gen Ed goals. The objective student assessment at the end of spring semester, 2012, gave all sections a composite 1.5 score (on a scale of 1-4, with 1 as best), demonstrating that students largely agree that the class is achieving its stated goals.