

Program	General Education
Division	
Contact Person	Melanie Jenkins

Criterion 1: History, Development, and Expectations of the Program/Unit — 5 points

1. Why was this program/unit developed, what is the mission of the program/unit, how has the program/unit adapted to change, how has it responded to changes in student/customer needs, and how has it improved?

AAC&U defines a general education as “that part of a liberal education curriculum that is shared by all students,” regardless of major. Receiving a general education assumes that all students can meet a common set of core competencies. Historically, a general education has been rooted in core academic areas: humanities, physical sciences, social sciences, biological sciences, and fine arts. The traditional model of general education in the American education system, and the model that Snow College still uses, is typically referred to as the distribution model or the Chinese menu.

Snow College has long used the distribution model, but that model has been modified several times throughout the institution’s history. Significant changes were implemented 20 years ago, after statewide focus meetings determined that all students should move through two English courses, a math course, a history course, and a minimum number of other GE courses as chosen by each state institution. This relatively standardized approach facilitated statewide articulation agreements, which were instituted in the 1990s. All state schools adopted the standardized approach by integrating it into existing distribution models.

In recent years, Snow College has addressed challenges to GE making several changes: the number of credits required by students has increased, courses approved for GE credit have been added, and student-learning outcomes (SLOS) have been revised downward from an initial 27 to ten and finally to seven for an AS degree and eight for an AA degree. This last change was mandated by the state adopting the initiative, Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP).

Finally, the GE committee has composed GE goals and outcomes for each of the knowledge areas that are included in the GE distribution requirements. These outcomes will be used by the committee to determine if a course fulfills GE expectations in a given area. This is an important improvement to the course development process. In the past, adding courses has created some fairly serious “turf wars” because academic divisions have felt the need to protect their disciplines and to assert their indispensability in GE. This makes the process more transparent, and it moves responsibility from divisions to the GE committee, a group that has representation from every division on campus.

These changes have resulted in several improvements to our distributive GE model: For instance, we have acquired stronger articulation agreements with other USHE institutions, we have modified GE requirements to include an Oral Communication component, and most recently we revised the GE outcomes to be in alignment with state and national standards.

Currently, the College is responding to a nationwide devaluation of GE (“I’m just getting my generals out of the way”) by exploring more innovative, integrative GE models. Because of discussions initiated by the Strategic Planning Committee, the General Education Task Force, and the GE committee, there is a productive and stimulating conversation going on campus wide about a new GE model that incorporates a more integrative base.

Criterion 2: Opportunity Analysis of the Program/Unit — 10 points

1. Please conduct an internal SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis. Based on the results, how could this program/unit be revised in order to enhance or strengthen it?

(Additional resources available at the Strategic Planning website: www.snow.edu/vision)

Strengths:

- Majority taught by full time instructors
- Small class size, generally
- Strong faculty and instruction
- Ability to explore
- Most teachers want to do well
- Value-added very high
- New descriptors define outcomes well
- GE is mission critical: core to the development of the whole student
- Nimble
- Small size allows for collegiality and cross-discipline dialogue

Weaknesses:

- Distribution model
- Hasn't been managed administratively
- Assessment
- No support to oversee program (workload release, administrator, etc.)
- Little time to communicate and innovate with other faculty
- Turf wars
- If you don't have a GE box, you feel like a second class citizen

Opportunities:

- Integrated model: acquire funding to enhance it and use as incentive to participate
- Strengthen new model by keeping full professors in the classroom
- Interdisciplinary opportunities (paired courses)
- Theme-based opportunities
- Potential for integration of more high impact practices
- AAC&U's assessment rubrics
- Hire GE director, who will oversee implementation and assessment of new model
- Meet employer needs

Threats:

- Institution has relied too much on GE to fill seats.
- Concurrent enrollment (Ednet, AP); reduces Snow's GE role and impacts quality
- Ability to maintain quality in alternative (Ednet) environments
- Need to move beyond GE if we are going to survive
- Attitude of public: get GE out of the way
- Low enrollment courses—faculty perception that they are risky
- Workload policy unfriendly to team teaching and interdisciplinary courses
- Online courses through competing institutions
- As programs grow, it may become difficult to maintain a presence in GE courses with full time faculty
- Traditional Chinese menu option and fear of change
- Faculty buy-in

There are several problems with the current distributive model. Students do not see the value of it; legislators clearly do not see value either, as they are providing opportunities for GE to be accomplished in high school; and the national evidence suggests that students do not retain information well because they do not see connections or relevance. There are a couple of options for revising our current distribution model to make it more innovative: an integrated model or a hybrid model. **Integrative** models typically feature a curriculum intentionally designed to help students make connections across courses, disciplines, and life experiences. The fully integrative model is championed by many private liberal arts colleges around the nation. Studying a single topic across multiple disciplines, students are asked to see and make connections in their education. Fully integrative models, however, do not always account for the transfer student. Furthermore, they require a considerable amount of faculty buy in and staff support. Because of transfer issues (both to and from the College), we are leaning toward a hybrid model

Hybrid models are currently used in the majority of institutions. According to the AAC&U, 64% of all higher education institutions use a hybrid model. Only 15% of institutions use the distribution model. Hybrid models fall between the distribution and the integrative models on the GE program continuum. These models maintain the distribution model but then modify it by adding integrative features. The most commonly used models require a common intellectual experience, or a core curriculum. That curriculum may include a thematic grouping of required courses, a freshman experience paired with a second year or senior year seminar, or the implementation of learning communities—students grouped together to study a “big question” across disciplines.

The General Education committee is applying to send a team to an AAC&U general education workshop this summer in order to development a hybrid program and an implementation strategy that will allow us to accomplish our mission goals, GE outcomes, and integrated learning expectations. We are looking at implementation as early as Fall 2015.

Criterion 3: External Program/Unit Demands — 15 points

1. Provide evidence of the national, state, and/or regional demands for your program/unit? This should be data intensive and may include relevance, transfer, trend lines, and/or job placement; current or proposed state mandates; or new policies or laws relating to student persistence, articulation, accreditation, accountability, sustainability, OSHA, other.

There are several External demands on the GE program.

The **Utah System of Higher Education** legislates much of what can be done with general education in the state of Utah in order to (among other things) “assure reciprocity and consistency in the structure and core requirements for General Education programs” (**R470**). General Education programs throughout the student must all be designed to “help students prepare for the 21st century by gaining knowledge and proficiency in 1) Intellectual and Practical Skills; 2) Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World; 3) Personal and Social Responsibility; and 4) Integrative Learning.”

These outcomes are taken directly from **Liberal Education and America’s Promise** (LEAP), which is a national advocacy group that promotes a 21st Liberal Education. Utah joined the LEAP States Initiative in 2011; consequently, LEAP outcomes and goals are written into the R470 document.

State requirements for General Education include a three-armed core: English 1010, English 2010; Mathematics 1030, 1040, or 1050; and American Institutions which includes Economics 1740, US Economic History 1740, Political Science 1100, or History 1700. In addition to the core, each institution is free to design a general education curriculum made up of knowledge area; the total GE credits shall range from at least 30 to

39 (which includes the core). While there are requirements that must be met, each institution is given quite a bit of freedom to design a curriculum that they feel best addresses the outcomes and goals of the R470 document, but allows for individualized mission-specific objectives.

Another Board of Regents policy, **R312**, outlines transfer preparation as the core mission and role of Snow College. The largest component of transfer preparation is general education. Therefore, GE transferability has to remain a focus of the College.

Furthermore, the **Northwest Accrediting Association** outlines specifications for course delivery, resources, and assessment, and Snow is obligated to verify it meets those guidelines. General education and assessment are both central to the accreditation process.

Finally, a **survey of national employers** suggests that a robust and integrative general education program is essential in providing the kind of skills employers need. Of those surveyed, 80% agree that a student, regardless of major, should acquire a broad base of knowledge in the liberal arts and the sciences. Students who meet the LEAP essential learning outcomes are better prepared to succeed in a world where critical thinking, clear communication, and complex problem-solving is vital.

2. Identify any existing and/or potential external partnerships unique to your program/unit.

Currently, we partner with every USHE higher education system in the state. Because the R470 document specifies a core, a GE credit hour expectation, and outcomes, reciprocity is guaranteed. Once a student completes General Education at Snow College, the two-year general education requirements are fulfilled at any other state institution.

We also partner with many high schools throughout the state by providing general education courses for high school juniors and seniors. General education opportunities are provided by individual departments who use the concurrent enrollment program to match high school teachers with college curriculum and deliver courses in the high schools. Other opportunities are provided through the Ednet system, where college professors broadcast courses to the high school classroom. We are currently working to expand these offerings through the Rural Superintendents' Initiative. If this passes, Snow College will offer a significantly larger number of courses (enough that students could actually complete their General Education requirements) through the Ednet program, but that is not all positive, especially given quality control issues we already face. Quality must be the over-riding concern when implementing and overseeing the Ednet curriculum.

Criterion 4: Internal Program/Unit Demands — 10 points

1. What are the internal demands for your program/unit and how do you assess that demand?

Internal demand is clearly evident for general education. A student cannot graduate from the institution without completing the general education curriculum. Of all courses offered in 2013, 35% were designated GE. Those courses are scheduled based on prior year enrollments, but we assess demand by being sensitive to enrollment demands. We try to add sections of courses only after other course sections fill.

More importantly, though, the College must continue to provide a general education core that is relevant to students, particularly given the changing nature of higher education and the demand for outcomes-based results. This core education has changed from traditional textbook, content-based classes to integrated and technology enhanced learning modules germane to today's socially networked students. To assess this demand, the General Education committee and several key faculty and staff members actively participate in state and regional conferences specific to general education. In addition, research is collected and shared regarding

different “best practices” at other institutions across the nation. Given this information, two years ago the College revised its general education core from ten content-based outcomes to eight outcomes more closely aligned with connectivist thinking and global perspectives. The development of two internal instruments (one for incoming freshman; the other for exiting students) intends to measure student progress on the new outcomes. The 2012-2013 academic year marks the implementation of this assessment. In addition, the GE Committee has developed “descriptors” by which faculty can revisit official syllabi in order to adopt the new GE outcomes at the course level.

2. Identify the internal programs/units you collaborate with effectively? What additional program/units could you collaborate with more effectively? What resources are and/or could be used in collaboration with other internal program/units? *(New programs may be proposed as appropriate to achieve strategic goals.)*

There is a lot of excitement on campus about a hybrid GE model because it provides opportunities for academic disciplines to collaborate. Right now, we are essentially isolated by the general education categories. With logistical and financial support, courses could be developed that bring teachers together from across disciplines, which would enable students to clearly see connections and comprehend relevance. We are hearing many collaborative ideas: For example, several disciplines have brought up the idea of combining one or more of their courses with a writing course. That way, they could study content within the context of writing within the discipline from at least two perspectives. Another idea that is generating discussion is the big question focus. We could ask a question like “what does it mean to live responsibly?” and courses from social science, communication, art, science, and English could focus on the question from angles within their discipline. Students, then, would be immersed in connections. The Honors program has been experimenting successfully with a model that pulls professors from multiple disciplines into one GE classroom. Students report that they love this integrated approach.

Criterion 5: Quality of the Program/Unit Resources (Inputs and Processes) — 10 points

List what your program/unit has for resources in support of program/job performance? Please include a listing of faculty qualifications and assignments. Think in terms of faculty, staff, licensing and degrees, technology, equipment, space, student/faculty ratio, etc. As you identify demand for services, please explain how they relate to the College’s strategic plan, mission and goals. *(Boxes will expand to accommodate responses)*

	We have currently	We need to meet demands of the program/unit goals	We have but is not critical to the future of the program/unit
Faculty (degrees/certifications/responsibilities)	The majority of our faculty are involved in teaching GE courses as at least part (if not all) of their teaching load. Full time faculty teach 73% of GE courses; whereas only 57% of non-GE courses are taught by full-time faculty.	We would need more faculty members qualified and trained to teach in an Ednet environment if the Rural Superintendent's Initiative passes.	
Adjunct & Overload commitments	Some bottleneck courses (English, Math, Biology) and other programs that currently do not have enough staff to cover both major courses and GE courses (Art, Music) rely on adjunct instructors. 27% of GE courses are taught by adjuncts.		
Staff (degrees/certifications/responsibilities)	Susan Larsen currently works with each state institution ensuring articulation.	In order to successfully implement and manage a truly integrative GE program, a new position, GE Director, is essential. Although GE revision needs to be faculty driven, changes of this magnitude cannot occur or be managed by an individual or committee trying to juggle GE administration with a full teaching load.	
Part-Time Employees with Responsibilities		A part time employee to manage and track assessment data. We also need someone to take notes and manage the GE syllabus database.	
Institutional Service Commitments	Currently, the GE Committee is made up of 8 faculty members, the CAO, and a representative from Academic Advising		

	and Institutional Research.		
Technology		A program (or training on an existing program) and a place (website) to house and manage assessment.	
Training Opportunities/Needs		AAC&U workshop on GE redesign. June 2014.	
Equipment		Data.	
Space			
Cross Training			
Workload Releases/CHE (by employee & purpose)		We need workload release or monetary stipends to facilitate the creation of new courses and interdisciplinary work.	

1. Based on the information provided in the table above what are your program/unit strengths and weaknesses in relation to current resources?

The strength of the GE program, as it currently stands, is that highly qualified teachers are, almost without exception, in the GE classroom. We have not turned GE over to graduate students and adjuncts like many of our counterparts. In 2013, 73% of GE courses were taught by full-time faculty members. Furthermore, GE class sizes are small. The average GE class size ranges from 16 in foreign language to 32 in social science. This is unique to Snow College in the state system, as most schools offer large-sized GE classes in an effort to reduce instructional costs. At those schools, small major courses are often funded at the expense of GE courses. We have not caved to this trend; instead, we have retained a commitment to small class size in the GE classroom. Any changes to the GE model cannot interfere with these strengths. We have established a tradition of excellence that is recognized throughout the state; it is essential that quality be at the forefront of all GE discussions.

Weaknesses based on current resources are tied to lack of a director: because we don't have a director, it is very difficult to get GE work accomplished. Any work that has been done has been done by concerned/invested faculty who don't have the time or capital to make sweeping changes. Furthermore, the GE committee does not have the ability to enforce expectations for assessment. For most GE outcomes, very little authentic assessment is being reported to the GE committee, even though there is a schedule and an explicit expectation.

2. Identify innovative strategies you have employed to enhance the quality or effectiveness of your program/unit or to help your unit perform its job better?

Along with learning outcomes, LEAP outlines **High Impact Practices** that include proven pedagogical methods that increase student learning, information retention, and engagement. Some high impact practices have been implemented into individual GE courses. For instance, some courses have included **Undergraduate Research** into the curriculum. Students are presenting at conferences, they are involved in the labs, they TA in courses, and some write honors theses for their final projects. **Collaborative Assignments and Projects** are

also making an appearance at Snow College. At the fall workshop 2013, we spent an afternoon working on collaborative courses and assignments. Some of those assignments have been integrated into GE courses, where a paper for one course is integrated into the English 2010 assignment so that students see relationships between courses and so that they get multiple responses to their work. Similar things are happening in the Communication department. Last fall semester, the OLE program instituted a **Learning Community**, where students worked together in a variety of disciplines to understand the concepts of Outdoor Leadership. We also had a workshop last fall on including **Global Learning** opportunities into any classroom. Some teachers have implemented those ideas into the GE curriculum. **Service Learning** is another area of strength at the college. Many GE courses have been identified as service learning courses, and students in those courses have an occasion for experiential learning.

There is a great opportunity with the revision of GE to increase and improve the quality of opportunities already underway and to add other innovative high impact practices into the GE curriculum: First Year Seminars (small group of students meet regularly with faculty and staff—can be discipline specific), Common Intellectual Experiences (required common courses combined around broad themes), Learning Communities (organized around a theme, students take two or more linked courses), and Writing-Intensive Courses (emphasizes writing instruction across the curriculum).

Criterion 6: Quality of Program/Unit Outcomes and Assessment — 15 points

1. What is the program/unit mission and what are your outcomes? How do those outcomes advance the mission, core themes, and strategic plan of the College?

The mission of general education at Snow College is to stretch students' minds and enlarge the foundation of their intellectual and practical skills in order to create in them a lifelong love of learning.

The general education curriculum is designed to accomplish several goals: to provide students with a broad exposure to different academic disciplines in order to assist them in selecting their course of study; to introduce a variety of ways of making knowledge so that students understand the complexity of information and knowledge; to facilitate the development of a passion for a specific area of study and a love of learning in general; to provide connections between disciplines by providing interdisciplinary, integrated learning opportunities; to prepare students to participate fully in human culture, ask probing and thoughtful questions, and engage as responsible citizens.

As many of the world's great thinkers have observed before, a general education is more than a bunch of facts and numbers: it is that part of the self that remains when the details have been forgotten. At Snow College, first and foremost, general education is who we are.

A student who graduates from Snow College or completes the General Education curriculum

1. Has a fundamental knowledge of human cultures and the natural world, with particular emphasis on:

- American institutions;
- the social and behavioral sciences;
- the physical and life sciences;
- the humanities;
- the fine arts;
- and personal wellness;

2. Can read, retrieve, evaluate, interpret, and deliver information using a variety of traditional and electronic

media;

3. Can speak and write effectively and respectfully as a member of the global community, and work effectively as a member of a team;
4. Can reason quantitatively in a variety of contexts;
5. Can respond with informed sensitivity to an artistic work or experience;
6. Can reason analytically, critically, and creatively about nature, culture, facts, values, ethics, and civic policy;
7. Can address complex problems by integrating the knowledge and methodologies of multiple disciplines.

A student who graduates from Snow College with an AA degree:

8. Can speak, read, and write a foreign language with basic proficiency.

The general education program is integral to the mission of the college, by continuing the tradition of “providing a vibrant learning environment that empowers students to achieve their educational goals, [and by] encouraging and supporting innovative initiatives that create dynamic learning experiences.” Furthermore, the General Education program is essential to the strategic plan: one white paper focuses on general education specifically, and quality is the overriding concern when developing, approaching, and teaching GE courses. General Education courses are also a major component of workforce preparation programs in that GE courses develop the skills that employers claim they are currently seeking, and we are working to add more GE courses for workforce development curriculums.

2. How are the outcomes assessed for relevance and quality? How has this data been used to improve the program/unit?

General education has been assessed using a variety of instruments. Typically, the College would administer ACT’s Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) in the areas of Reading, Science, and Mathematics and the Community College of Student Experiences Questionnaire (CCSEQ) on alternating years. Individual administration and trend data were collected but never associated to general education instruction until 2010 when specific questions on the CCSEQ were linked to the College’s general education outcomes. CCSEQ data was collected in 2012 and 2013 and analyzed according to revised GE outcomes. Reports for the 2012 and 2013 CCSEQ administrations are published on the Snow College website respectfully located at <http://www.snow.edu/ir/assessment.html> and (http://public.tableausoftware.com/views/CCSEQ_GEOutcomes/StandardQuestions?:embed=y&:display_count=no#1).

Currently, the College will administer the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). A previous administration of this instrument occurred in 2012 by which the College ranked higher than national peer institutions in term of active and collaborative learning (a new GE outcome and Core Theme) specific to student teamwork, student tutoring, and community-based learning assignments. For the 2014 administration, additional “local” questions will assess student experiences as related to other GE outcomes such as writing clearly and effectively, the cohesion of ideas from different courses/subjects, the development of global views/ethics/values, relevant career skills, thinking critically and analytically, the establishment of a lifelong

learning attitude, and the importance of a broad general education.

The goal of the 2014 CCSSE administration is (1) to provide the College with comparative information regarding active and collaborative learning either to confirm or show improvement against prior results and (2) provide benchmark data against national norms regarding specific GE areas such as writing, thinking, idea cohesion, and lifelong learning.

In addition, the first annual Student Learning Outcomes Assessment was administered to incoming freshman at the start of fall semester 2013. Results from this administration will be compared with the first annual Student Learning Outcomes Assessment administered to the 2014 graduating class to (hopefully) indicate growth specific to each new general education outcome. This internal assessment will become a standard part of each new student's application/registration to the College as well as each tenured student's graduation application.

General education outcomes particular to GE English, communication, and foreign language courses have tailored questions specific to their GE outcome of individual course evaluations administered at the end of each semester.

The GE Committee has designed an assessment cycle that combines internal and external assessment measures on alternating years that are more specific to GE outcomes. Past assessment information has assisted the revision of Snow College's traditional GE core. It has also brought attention to the fact that a general education remains a mystery to students who are either unfamiliar with the outcomes or view the list of classes as a cantankerous check list.

Current assessment information is being used to establish student growth patterns (success or failure) specific to general education categories and associated courses. In addition, this information is being used to establish a hybrid model of General Education at Snow College as well as support the establishment of a GE director—someone who holds ultimate accountability for GE.

Criterion 7: Size, Scope, and Productivity of the Program/Unit (Academic programs/units should deal with enrollment at both the program/unit and course level) — 10 points

1. Has productivity of the program/unit been growing, declining, or remaining stable over the last five years? What factors have contributed to this? (*Additional data available through the IR dashboard at: http://public.tableausoftware.com/views/StrategicPlanning/TrendData?:embed=y&:display_count=no*)

Simply put, enrollment patterns in the General Education curriculum reflect institutional enrollment patterns. As student numbers increase or decrease campus wide, General Education is similarly impacted. Likewise, the kind of student recruited (in terms of college readiness) also impacts GE enrollments. For example, students who come with several college credits usually need fewer GE credits for graduation.

According to the dashboard created by Institutional Research, there has been an increase in demand for general education courses over the last 5 years. In 2009, 28% of courses taught on campus were general education courses. That number increased to 35% in 2013. It was at 37% in 2012, but with the missionary age change scare, some general education courses were deleted—hence a small decline. The biggest change occurred in the Oral Communication requirement, which is our most recent GE category. Between 2009 and 2013, it has more than doubled the number of sections it offered throughout the year.

Enrollment in the General Education program mirrors the enrollment of the college at large in terms of raw numbers. Without a significant change in GE requirements, there should be very little variance in terms of GE enrollments. Students must complete 36 hours of general education in order to graduate. While that is half of their graduation requirements, students are obviously taking more than the 63 credits needed for graduation if only 35% of the courses they take fulfill GE credit. That means that students are getting much more out of their education at Snow College than just the 63 credits needed for graduation. The following table illustrates how many hours students graduate with and the number of credits they transfer to Snow College from other institutions.

Graduation Hours

	Required Hours	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	5-year Average	Average Hours Exceeding Graduation Requirements (based on 5-year average)	Courses over Required Credits (based on 3 credits/course)
AA	63	79.5	76.1	79.5	77.5	80.2	78.6	15.6	5
AAS	69	87.6	89.9	84.9	82.9	78.5	84.7	15.7	5
APE	64	102.0	94.5	114.4	103.0	105.3	103.8	39.8	13
AS	63	75.4	74.9	77.0	76.3	75.4	75.8	12.8	4
ASB	63	90.9	92.7	85.3	90.0	93.6	90.5	27.5	9
Grand Average	63	87.1	85.6	88.2	85.9	86.6	86.7	23.7	8

Transfer Hours

	Required Hours	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	5-year Average	% of Required Hours (based on 5-year average)
AA	63	18.4	15.0	15.4	13.7	17.4	16.0	25%
AAS	69	11.2	12.9	4.8	7.6	2.3	7.8	11%
APE	64	8.3	5.5	12.3	21.4	7.0	10.9	17%
AS	63	14.2	11.8	13.3	11.0	10.3	12.1	19%
ASB	63	15.6	14.8	10.3	14.1	15.4	14.0	22%
Grand Average	63	13.5	12.0	11.2	13.6	10.5	12.2	19%

2. What is the capacity of the program/unit to maintain and/or increase productivity? (For academic programs please utilize the data provided by IR dashboard regarding course/section details and explain any restrictions on your course offerings (i.e. enrollment caps, small class sizes, time restrictions, etc.). Staff offices should identify similar efforts though the IR dashboard does not apply. An example includes hiring student workers in the Controller's Office rather than a full-time employee to provide more than eight hours of labor daily).

There is currently room in the GE offerings for growth, particularly in some areas. Courses generally have lower actual enrollment than their caps suggest. American Institutions averages 32 students per course, and most courses are capped at 35. English 1010 averages 21 students per course and most courses are capped at 25. Fine Arts courses average 15 and most are capped at 20. Foreign Language averages 16 and most are capped at 25; Humanities averages 22 and most are capped at 25; Life Science averages 27 and most are capped at 30; Math averages 21 and most are capped at 25. Oral Communication averages 18 and most are capped at 20. Physical Education averages 24 and is generally capped at 25; Social Science averages 32 students and is generally capped at 35. These numbers are not intended to explain exactly where there is room for growth, just to illustrate that in each GE area, there are probably open seats. However, that is not true of every course in the

GE category; with each of these averages, there are courses in the system that are set lower than the cap suggests. Numbers reflect averages, not actual enrollments. Likewise, these numbers do not account for attrition, which means courses could have been full at the beginning of the semester.

Despite what appear to be open seats, the Advising Office claims that there is additional demand for more of the following courses: English 1010, English 2010, Human Biology, Interpersonal Communication, and Ethics and Values. They consistently turn students away from those courses.

Caps are generally determined by quality and pedagogy issues, but sometimes by classroom size. In those cases, scheduling courses in larger capacity rooms represent a possibility for future growth.

In sum, it appears based on class averages that there is a bit of room for growth in GE courses. However, any significant growth in terms of student population would need to be accompanied by a parallel growth in faculty numbers if students are to complete GE in a reasonable time frame. It is essential students not get overly frustrated with GE options and enrollments.

3. What thing(s) do you wish you could do differently to improve the effectiveness, reach, or scope of the program but have not had the opportunity, time, or resources to do?

The GE Committee and the GE Task Force have been exploring the idea of revising General Education at Snow College into an integrative model for more than a year. Research suggests that for general education to be relevant in the 21st Century, it must focus not only on knowledge but also on the development of skills that are practical, useful, and in demand. A hybrid model facilitates this kind of learning and there is excitement on campus for this change. Many, though, are getting frustrated with the reality that we are talking, but that we can't seem to move beyond that. In order for GE revision to really happen, an individual needs to take on this assignment and there has to be funding to support it. We also need to work on faculty buy-in, educating students about the value of a liberal education, providing workload support for integrative models, and assessment. Advising and other student support offices would also need to be heavily involved in the conversation, so that logistical problems could be solved.

Criterion 8: Revenue Sources (Grants, Awards, Donors, etc.) and Non-Revenue Sources (Relationships, Partnerships, Endorsements, etc.) — 5 points

1. What are current and potential revenue sources for the program/unit (i.e., grants, awards, donors, endorsements, relationships, partnerships, etc.)?

GE has not typically generated any resources; however, we are in the process of looking at grant opportunities for GE redesign. We have three grants that we are actively seeking:

- 1) National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) has a grant program that supports faculty members in the teaching and development of a new course that will foster intellectual community through the study of an enduring question.
- 2) AAC&U has a grant for bringing theory to practice. Program development grants (up to \$10,000) are awarded and are designed to help institutions implement changes that will improve student learning.
- 3) National Science Foundation has a grant for improving undergraduate STEM education. This grant could be used to help GE courses in math and science increase student retention in STEM, improve learning outcomes, and broaden participation in STEM GE courses.

Committees have been created in order to develop grant proposals.

Criterion 9: Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program/Unit? — 10 points

1. Review the attached Budget related documents for your department/program financial analysis. A three year detailed listing of actual expenditures for your program/unit is provided by object code for current expense and travel. The fourth column is an average of the three years. As a result of the prioritization review, the task force proposes using the “Average” column as your new program/unit base budget in future years. If you choose to justify a higher or lower amount by object code or in total please outline the reasons below. Justification for additional budget authorization to expand or enhance the program should be detailed as well.

The GE committee has not had a dedicated budget; all expenses associated with GE have been covered by the Vice President for Academics. Those expenses include: travel to statewide GE Task Force meetings; annual participation for a team of Snow College personnel in “What is an Educated Person’s” Conference; annual membership in AAC&U; annual participation in AAC&U conferences.

If we are going to redesign GE, it is time for the GE committee to have a dedicated budget to cover those annual expenditures, to fund the GE Director position, to facilitate quality initiatives in curriculum design, and to fund ongoing assessment practices.

The school requested mission-based funding from the legislature in the amount of \$135,000 to be used for this purpose. That total includes salary and benefits for an administrator, operating expenses, and money for quality initiatives (course development).

2. What have you already done, or could you do, to reduce costs associated with your program/unit? (Address: streamlining, consolidation, technological enhancements, or improving processes to improve service delivery.)

In maintaining Snow’s long tradition of excellence, we have kept GE classes fairly small. This does add to the cost of delivering GE. We have in very specific cases, where we have been assured that quality will not suffer, increased the size of some GE courses (Psychology, Biology, Theater). Recently, several Ednet GE courses have been quite large (Music 1010, English 2230, Art 1010, Sociology 1010, Political Science 1100). There have been mixed reviews in terms of quality in these larger sized GE course offerings.

3. Reviewing the list of faculty/employees for your program/unit included in Criterion #5 please outline anticipated changes in personnel in the next five years and how those changes will be addressed. (i.e., possible early retirements, retirements, turnover, growth, etc.) What is your program/unit strategic plan for replacement, recruitment, and retention of qualified personnel?

N/A

Criterion 10: Impact, Justification, and Overall Necessity/Value of the Program/Unit — 10 points

1. What are the benefits to the College of offering this program or maintaining this unit, short-term and long-term?

General Education has been referred to as the “bread and butter” of Snow College, and in fact for many years that has been true. Because R312 identifies our primary mission as transfer-specific, GE is in fact the fundamental fulfillment of that mission.

However, the benefits to the college of maintaining a high quality general education move beyond our Regent-defined mission: Our accrediting body (Northwest) requires that we fulfill our mission and that we effectively manage and deliver GE. Articulation agreements and Board of Regents policy also require that our General Education curriculum transfer smoothly and meet similar outcomes of other USHE institutions. Additionally, future enrollments depend on the continuation and perhaps strengthening of General Education. All other institutions in the state are working toward a hybrid GE model, which is a more exciting model for students. In order to compete, we need to continue to offer high quality general education courses, but also need to offer general education courses that are exciting, integrated, full of high impact practices, and meaningful.

As we consider revising general education, though, we need to be aware of issues with majors, transfer, prerequisites, and courses that fulfill two roles (i.e. GE and major).

2. What could the program/unit do more efficiently in order to free up funds to facilitate strategic planning priorities? (Consider outsourcing, resource collaboration, etc.)

Enrollment management is one area where we could probably do a better job. The following suggestions could be used to better facilitate scheduling, particularly General Education courses.

- Ensure courses are full before adding additional sections
- Schedule courses at times that accommodate student needs when possible, considering issues of space and faculty load
- Make sure the courses are spread out so that students can fulfill several GE options each semester
- Insist on common start/stop times on the MWF, TTH schedules
- Limit course offerings that take up more than the average 50 minutes on MWF or 75 on T/TH
- Effectively correlate course enrollments and classroom size (seats available)

3. What additional information should the review committee know about your program/unit?

General Education has been a solid program for many years. However, the idea to revise General Education at Snow College has really taken on momentum and many people are excited about the possibility of creating a premiere General Education program, a program by which the school can be known. There are strong GE leaders on campus, a solid vision for a future program that will be a benefit to students, excitement about integrated courses, and administrative support. The future of GE, with adequate support, is innovative, quality-centered, and provides a better model to fulfill the GE LEAP outcomes.

The General Education committee believes that in order to continue a tradition of excellence, general education must be infused with innovative and engaging opportunities that better help students prepare for the 21st Century.

Once completed, please submit your questionnaire via email to: vision@snow.edu on or before 2/28/14