SLAAG/GLAAG Report
2022

SLAAG Membership
Sara-Beth Bittinger, Ed.D, Interim Asst. VP Provost's Office, Chair, SLAAG
Dr. Keith Terry, Assistant Dean, CLAS
Dr. Janet Mattern, Assessment Coordinator, CoE
Dr. Assyad Al-Wreikat, Assessment Coordinator, CoB
Dr. Michael Mathias, Interim Provost
Dr. Jill Morris, Chair, CLAS Assessment Council; Chair, GEPRC
Dr. Ben Norris, GEPRC, Interim Associate Provost

GLAAG Membership
Sara-Beth Bittinger, Ed.D, Interim Asst. VP Provost's Office, Chair, GLAAG
Dr. Keith Terry, Assistant Dean, CLAS
Dr. Kim Rotruck, Associate Dean, CoE
Dr. Sudhir Singh, Dean, CoB

College of Business

1. Impact on assessment from COVID -19 (Optional)

Assessment results in Fall 2021 were different from those in previous years. For example, in oral presentation, scores were lower. Some of this was expected since the oral presentation assessment occurred after two years of Covid-related restrictions on face-to-face classes. Students' oral presentation skills declined because they did not have face-to-face communication as in the past. It would be expected that in the future, as classes return to the normal, in-person, modality again, scores on oral communication will improve. On the positive side, scores in ethical reasoning were high because the assessment was made at the end of a business ethics course. After studying business ethics for an entire semester, students were asked to describe a personal ethical experience and relate it to a set of principles-based concepts covered in class. Since the students had adequate instruction in ethical reasoning in the semester in which the assessment was made, the ethical reasoning scores were high, consistent with our expectations. Based on these results, one can reasonably conclude that students learn about ethical theories in the course and can apply those to their personal experiences.

2. Undergraduate Assessment Summary: 2021-2022 Academic Year

Using the same testing protocol for measuring general business knowledge in previous years. undergraduate students answered 75 questions; questions were analyzed both individually and as pairs. Student scoring on the IDI was slightly higher than on the ETS-B (72.83% correct on average versus 69.71%). Although the mean difference in student performance on the two sets of questions does not seem that large (in practical terms), results of two measures of similarity (Phi Coefficient and McNemar's Test) failed to indicate statistical similarity for the two sets of questions (meaning the sets of questions differ in sensitivity and/or specificity). Overall, students were more likely to get an IDI question correct and the paired ETS-B question incorrect than to get an ETS-B question correct and its paired IDI question incorrect, and this drove the dis-similarity in the question sets. It is important to note that AACSB standards and guidelines do not require a member institution's IDI to equate to or correspond with the ETS-B or, for that matter, any minimum expected level of overlap in the curriculum of a given member institution and the universe of topics spanning the ETS-B.

FSU undergraduate institutional learning goals influence the choice of learning goals for the CoB, the mission statement for the CoB, and learning goal expectations for a bachelor's degree program stated in Standard 9 of AACSB, the accrediting body for the CoB. The first goal is assessed through a stand-alone, multiple-choice exam, administered online during the

capstone course. The other eight goals are assessed using rubrics based on course-embedded assignments completed by individual students. All CoB rubrics have multiple dimensions and five scaled levels of achievement, with each group described by the text. For the first goal, desired student performance correctly answers 70% of questions. In Spring of 2022, only about 62.5% of students were above this level of achievement (which shows improvement from last year results by 2.5%), likely due to questions tapping instruction encountered 4 to 5 semesters prior to examination. For the rubric-based goals, the college raises the desired level from 3 previous years to 4. Almost all students were at the desired level of 4 (Above expectation) on a 1 to 5 scale on all dimensions.

3. Graduate Assessment Summary: 2020-2021 Academic Year

The CoB presently has five graduate learning goals: general business knowledge, critical thinking, ethical reasoning, written communication, and global perspective on business. The process of assessment is similar to that for undergraduates. The first goal was assessed through a stand-alone, online, multiple-choice exam administered during the capstone course in the MBA program. The remaining goals are assessed using rubrics, based on course-embedded assignments completed individually by students. Similar to undergraduate rubrics, graduate rubrics have five levels of achievement with textual descriptors for incremental levels. For the first goal, the desired level of achievement is correctly answering 70% of questions. In Spring of 2021, about two-third (67%) of students were above this level. Again, this is likely due to questions tapping material covered several semesters in the past. For the rubric-based goals, the only problematic goal was critical thinking, where fewer than 74% of the students were above the desired level of 3 (meets expectations) on a scale of 1 to 5 for each of the 4 dimensions.

Normally, an exit survey is administered online in Spring to CoB students in the capstone courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The survey captures student perceptions of the educational process, demographic information, and current career plans. However, administration of the exit survey for Spring of 2021 was complicated by an unforeseen event. The exit survey is hosted by the survey platform SurveyGizmo. A URL to the survey page is e-mailed to students with a request to enter the site and respond. Unfortunately, in April of 2021, the AoL Program Coordinator was telephoned by the FSU cybersecurity officer and informed that the SurveyGizmo domain name had been co-opted by hackers, and SurveyGizmo URLs being sent out through FSU e-mail had been flagged as malicious by two security monitoring sites. The end result is that the e-mailed URLs were being dis-enabled by the e-mail system. An alternative survey platform could not be enlisted within the needed time frame, and, so, the exit survey was greatly truncated and added into the online 50-question exam of general business knowledge administered through Canvas to students enrolled in the capstone courses. The quality of information obtained from this process was significantly diminished from prior years.

College of Education

Undergraduate Overview:
Undergraduate (UG) students in the College of Education demonstrated strengths in UG Learning Goals with only specific indicators demonstrating the need for continuous improvement. Education Professions shared highly effective scores in connecting to INTASC Standards 1: *Learner Development* (97% of students scoring Highly Effective or Effective), InTASC 3: *Learning Environments* (100% of students scoring Effective), InTASC 5: *Application of Content* (91% of students scoring Highly Effective or Effective) , and InTASC 7: *Planning for Instruction* (80% of students at Effective or Highly Effective), which were linked to **Undergraduate Institutional Learning (UGIL) goals, 3 and 4**. Kinesiology and Recreation provided overall averages for **each of the 5 UGIL goals** with 86% or above of all students meeting or exceeding expectations.

Undergraduate students in Educational Professions and Exercise Sport Science demonstrated indicators for continuous improvement in **UGIL Goal 3- Acquisition and Application of Specialized Knowledge.** Educational Professions determined students needed to improve in portions of INTASC 4: *Content Knowledge*, InTASC 6: *Assessment*, and InTASC 8: *Instructional Strategies*. Assessments tied to this goal asked candidates to use resources effectively in content instruction, improve instructional strategies with English Language Learners and gifted students, develop instructional decisions based upon assessment results. Ed Professions invited expert presenters to share strategies that will be incorporated into methods courses. Students in Kinesiology (Exercise Sport Science) scored at the 68% range for "**demonstrating technical and analytic skills to their field of study and applicable to future careers**," and

"**demonstrating competencies and achievement appropriate to their field of study**." Exercise Sport Science is working on curricular changes. Recreation did not see an area for improvement within this goal.

Within **UGIL Goal 5- Appreciation of Cultural Identities**, Educational Professions identified InTASC 2: *Learning Differences* within differentiating instruction as an area for growth. Overall mean scores for UGIL Goal 5 were high but there were many students (30 - 41%) who were only at the Developing level on this assessment. Kinesiology identified "**understand the cultural and social exercise of power**" as their weak area with only 66% scoring at meeting expectations. Recreation students scored higher but still only 76% met the criteria for this indicator.

Exercise Sport Science had a few indicators that demonstrated a need for continuous improvement in goals 1 and 2. In **UGIL Goal 1**, "Liberal Knowledge and Skills of Inquiry, critical thinking, and synthesis", they scored lower 66% for the indicator, "**Use problem – defining and problem-solving skills by synthesizing ideas within and across disciplines**." **In UGLG 2** – "Core Skills", students in Kinesiology and Recreation scored 60% for "**comprehend and critically interpret information in written and oral forms**." Overall, for goals UGLG 1 and 2, the department or Kinesiology and Recreation scored in the effective range with 89% and 87% respectively meeting the expectations of the goals.

Scores within Exercise Sport Science were overall lower than Recreation or Educational Professions. The Exercise and Sport Science program is planning a comprehensive review of the curriculum and work on curriculum revisions to better address accreditation learning outcomes and the undergraduate institutional learning goals.

Graduate Overview:

Graduate students in the Recreation, Parks, and Sports Management demonstrated proficiency in (1) Breadth and depth of knowledge in the field; (2) Communication of knowledge in the field of study, (3) analytical thinking in the field of study; (4) practices, values, and ethics of the profession, and (5) applied knowledge and skills of the discipline. Students scored either competent or exemplary. (See data table) Athletic Training master's program data were not available because the program just commenced during the previous summer. A rubric developed to collect data was added to the report.

Educational Professions tied CAEP Advanced Proficiencies data from Common Assessments to **Graduate Student Learning Goal 1, 2, 4 and 5.** Scores were effective to highly effective. However, Educational Professions identified areas for continuous improvement within GIL Goal 3 in the M.Ed. program, ***Synthesis of Research*** (Proficiencies A.1.1.a, A.1.1.b -**GIL Goal 3 Analytic thinking in the field of study**.) and ***Research Problem Significance*** (Proficiency A.1.1.c.- **GIL Goal 3 Analytic thinking in the field of study**).As a result, Educational Professions performed inter rater reliability and validity exercises for the Capstone Research Project Academic Writing Rubric.

Recreation, Parks, and Sport Management related the institutional learning goals to the research and practicum. Goal 5 was 100% competent but did not have any exemplary scores within this goal, unlike the others. The specific program goal tied to the graduate learning goal 5 was, ***"To utilize recreation and sports in the delivery of a human service, which enhances the quality of life in the public***". The department is focusing on updating their assessment plan to not just the capstone experience but integrating course specific assessments as well as engaging students in the assessment process and activities. The program faculty plan to do a curriculum analysis to assess where key content is being covered and what projects are completed in each course that benefit student's capstone experiences.

College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

1. **Undergraduate Assessment Summary: 2020-2021 Academic Year**

Undergraduate assessment was completed by most units within the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences by December 2020, and 34 of the 36 were finished by January 24, 2021. Life-Cycle Facilities Management is a new program and has not collected data yet but has a plan in place. International Studies had a change in leadership and no data were collected, were not submitted or were lost.

Members of the college assessment committee were asked for recommendations of names of programs that were engaged in exemplary assessment activities during 2020- 2021. Of those offered, History, Health Science and Earth Science in

Geography are featured in this year's report. Just as last year, these are highlighted because faculty in the programs have: implemented their assessment plans; utilized assessment as part of informed decision making; changed curriculum, courses, and/or assessment plans; and made continuous improvement to "close the loop."

The faculty members in the Department of History had four assessment goals which also serve as program goals - (1) Demonstrate knowledge of a historical topic in research, writing and speaking, (2) Complete a highly readable research paper using proper English and conforming to Chicago style, (3) Locate and substantively evaluate information from a variety of historical sources and (4) Complete a research paper using appropriate word-processing format and tools. The assessors presented detailed rubrics used to measure each of these, aggregate data and benchmarks used to determine if the objectives were achieved. Although not all of their thresholds were reached, the faculty members in the unit were presented the results in a fall 2021 faculty meeting where they discussed the results, the students and multiple ways to improve the teaching and learning. Overall, the members of the Department of History methodically measured, analyzed, interpreted and adjusted their instructional plans to strive to achieve their program goals.

In Health Science, assessment activities are conducted in the program's capstone course using case studies from the field and a current research article. Students are evaluated on three separate goals – (1) Communication: Graduating Health Science Majors will be able to communicate effectively in writing, orally, and using appropriate technology, (2) Scientific Knowledge/Reasoning: Graduating Health Science Majors demonstrate their scientific knowledge and skills in scientific reasoning and (3) Literature Resources: Graduating Health Science Majors will be able to effectively find and use/interpret resources from the literature. Students in the course were assigned case studies and related scholarly articles, and from these, they developed oral presentations. Further, when not presenting, students were to engage in discussions about the same. Rubrics used to evaluate presenters and discussants were provided along with the threshold and the assessment data. All three of the goals were achieved. This program is highlighted due to the very strategic methods of measurement used to evaluate classroom activities that relate to program goals.

In the Earth Science capstone course, students developed a portfolio containing narratives related to each of the program's five learning goals. They also included two examples of their work for each goal. Once submitted, the portfolios were reviewed by three faculty raters who independently evaluated the materials using a detailed rubric. In the assessment report, data were presented for each unidentified student showing their scores, as well as the scale and minimum threshold for success. Due to assessment deficiencies in 2019 – 2020, adjustments were made in classes in 2020 – 2021 which yielded improvements in the current report. The results of the assessment were shared with all faculty in the Department of Geography for review and discussion. The clearly communicated report and methodical nature of the measurement plan is the reason it is featured here.

One problem that happened in more than one document was not approaching the report writing from the perspective of what was more than likely a new assessment committee evaluator. In some cases, important information was left out such as rubrics and procedures used to measure teaching and learning assuming that the reader would know it from past years. Another was specifying how "the loop was closed." There seemed little doubt that it was happening but there was no statement specifically mentioning how and when the results were shared with relevant publics. Other problems that occurred less often but did happen included mislabeled/missing/incorrect assessment data files, not stating n-sizes, not stating the assessment venue, not articulating the minimum level of achievement expected and not specifying goals assessed.

2. **Graduate Assessment Summary: 2020 – 2021**

Master of Science in Applied Computer Science

In fall 2019, the Department of Computer Science and Information Technologies' graduate committee began discussing and developing a new course to enable the department to collect assessment data. Unfortunately, the pandemic shut down the institution spring 2020 and the department's faculty had to focus on pivoting to online instruction and the mental stress associated with the situation. During the 2021 school year, the department's faculty could not implement a solution as there was discussion regarding whether or not this was the appropriate path for assessment. The unit's faculty members feel that the virus continues to challenge forward momentum for the assessment.

Similar to last year's report, the faculty will seek approval for a new capstone course and change the wording to require all students graduating from the program to take COSC 700 *or* the capstone course. Each of these will ensure every student is assessed according to the Graduate Institutional Learning Goals rubric. The faculty will initiate this plan during the 2022-2023 academic year to be implemented fall 2023. Funding the new capstone is also a budgetary concern for the department that will need to be explored with the new dean of the college.

Master of Science in Counseling Psychology

The program assesses students on five learning goals that cover (1) breadth and depth of knowledge in the field; (2) communication of knowledge in the field; (3) analytical thinking in the field of study; (4) practices, values, and ethics of the profession; and (5) applied knowledge and skills in the discipline. These learning goals are evaluated through a combination of internship supervisor evaluations, written papers, responses to case studies, oral presentations, and research. Of the seven students evaluated, all achieved the highest score of 5 or "Exemplary" on Learning Goals 4 and 5. All but one was Exemplary on Learning Goal 2, with one scoring a 4 or "Competent." Five reached the highest level for Learning Goal 1 and two earned ratings of 4. Similarly, four were rated as Exemplary and three were Competent regarding Learning Goal 3. The faculty in the MS program in Counseling Psychology met the assessment objectives. While successful, the director of the program aspires for further improvement. There has been continued use of case conceptualizations in the child and adult psychopathology class. The Psychology graduate students were also able to take a counseling theory class which was taught for the first time fall 2021and there, they completed a case conceptualization assignment. It is hoped that exposure to such educational experiences will continue to improve the students' analytical thinking abilities – Learning Goal 3.

Master of Science in Nursing – Leadership and Management Track, Education Track

The MSN assessment plan measures student learning outcomes based on the nine American Association of Colleges of Nursing Master's Essentials. Data were collected from the students' capstone assignments for summer and fall 2020 and spring 2021. Data are collected in NURS 700 Capstone Project (Leadership & Management and Nursing Education Concentrations) and in NURS 701 Transition to Practice (Family Nurse Practitioner and Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner Concertation). The program is assessed by other metrics in addition to the Capstone course to demonstrate student success and closing of the loop via graduate exit surveys, alumni surveys, employer surveys, preceptor evaluations of students in the practicum experience, student evaluations of preceptors and sites in the practicum experiences, employment rates, and graduation rates.

All of the students enrolled in the courses were assessed (n = 20). The Department of Nursing Assessment Committee employed a rubric which assessed the students' achievements in meeting each of the nine AACN Master's Essentials. The benchmark set by the faculty for the assessment plan is that all students achieve a three (3) on a 1 - 4 Likert scale where 1=unsatisfactory, 2= below satisfactory, 3=satisfactory and 4=excellent performance. Results were reported in aggregate and on each of the nine AACN Essentials. The average score was 3.6 or higher demonstrating mastery; the targets were met.

The "loop was closed" when the results were reported to the Department of Nursing. Because of the addition of the new concentrations, a change was made to the assessment process to assess student learning outcomes common to all four concentrations via a cumulative paper in the final course (NURS 700 and NURS 701). A portfolio demonstrating the students' work throughout the program accompanies this cumulative paper. The students are required to gather an artifact from each course, upload it to the new e-portfolio application, and write one paper in the final course that combines all of the essentials and how they met each collectively.

Master of Medical Science in Physician Assistant Studies

This report for 2020 – 2021 constitutes the second assessment of graduate students in the Physician Assistant program. Overall, 25 students were assessed on the five program goals using the rubric developed in 2018 – 2019. The measuring instrument employed a four-point scale ranging from 1 – Unsatisfactory to 4 – Exemplary. The standard of achievement for the students was a 3 – Competent.

All 25 students were judged to be Exemplary on Goals 3 and 5 – "Analytical thinking in the field of study" and "Applied knowledge and skills in the discipline." Twenty-four students scored at the competent level or higher on Goal 2 and 4 – "Communication of knowledge in the field of study" and "Practices, values, and ethics of the profession." However, on Goal 1, "Breadth and depth of knowledge in the field of study," seven students scored lower than Competent. This last item marks an improvement over 2019 – 2022 when 11 students scored at a level lower than Competent. Faculty report that they will use the data and review the methods of assessment and instruction to attempt to improve the results relating to Goal 1 in 2021 – 2022.

Master of Science in Wildlife/Fisheries Biology & Applied Ecology and Conservation Biology

For the 2020 – 2021 graduate assessment in the Department of Biology, eight students were involved in the review. Seven of them were in Applied Ecology & Conservation Biology and one was in Wildlife & Fisheries. In order to measure the objectives for the programs, each student was required to write a research-based thesis, publicly present their results, host a Q & A afterward, and undergo an oral defense of it, as well. They were evaluated using a five-point scale ranging from Unsatisfactory (1-2) to Exemplary (5). The threshold for a minimum level of achievement was a 3.5. For Goals 2 and 5 – "Communication of knowledge derived through research" and "Applicability of thesis research on contributing knowledge for solving conservation challenges," the average rating was a 4.3. For Goals 1 and 4 – "Breadth and depth of knowledge in the field of study" and "Quality of thesis research," the average rating for the graduate students was 4.1. On the final goal, number three, the overall rating was 3.8. Overall, the results were very positive. For this assessment, each student's advisor alone assigned ratings in the five measurement areas but future evaluations will include input from the candidate's entire graduate committee.

General Education Program Assessment Summary

1. **Impact on assessment from COVID-19**

The global COVID-19 pandemic impacted the assessment process. The changes to the assessment schedule, approved in 2019, were timely to reduce the burden on academic departments in the face of the pandemic's impact on other faculty work. The pandemic also caused alteration of instructional and assessment methodologies in the fall of 2020. In some cases, like the assessment of Quantitative Reasoning in CHEM 201, there is a clear impact from the pandemic on assessment outcomes. In other cases, the impact is not clear. Regardless, 2020 should be considered an anomaly due to the pandemic; few decisions should be based on the change in results from 2019 to 2020. The pandemic also disrupted the ability of the GEPRC to implement improvements to the assessment system based on recommendations from Cycle 1.

2. **Summary of GEP Assessment**

Calendar Year 2020 marked the final year of Cycle 2. Table 1 indicates the learning objectives being assessed and the academic departments conducting the assessments.

Table 1. GEP learning objectives and associated academic departments.

GEP Learning Objective	**Cycle 1 (2016-18) Department**	**Cycle 2 (2018-20) Department**
Written Communication	English and Foreign Languages	English and Foreign Languages
Oral Communication	Theatre	Communication
Mathematical and Quantitative Reasoning	Math	Chemistry
Critical Thinking	Philosophy	Psychology
Appreciation of Cultural Identities	History	Geography
Values, Social Responsibility, and Civic Engagement	Sociology	Political Science

In addition to the challenges from the pandemic, fewer resources were available to support GEP assessment during cycle 2. The rubric feature in Campus Labs was discontinued and has not been replaced. Additionally, the staff member in Assessment and Institutional Research who assisted with analysis left the institution and was not replaced. This reduction in resources to support GEP assessment has meant more burden on the academic departments to conduct the data analysis. Correspondingly, we simplified the analysis and reporting of GEP assessment to better align with available resources. We also shifted from assessing every semester to a new schedule:

Fall, year one	Assessment data are collected
Spring, year one	Data analysis and closing the loop
Fall, year two	Implement change and collect data
Spring, year two	Final assessment and analysis of the cycle

Despite these challenges, GEP assessment remains a sustainable process at FSU. The following table summarizes results from 2016 – 2020. Since Cycle 2 changed the data collection to fall only, only the fall terms of Cycle 1 are being compared. Despite the change in data analysis methodology in Cycle 2, and the typical term-to-term variance in ratings, results from Cycle 2 are consistent with those from Cycle 1. Overall ratings remain at or above the 3.0 benchmark for three objectives: Written Communication, Oral Communication, and Appreciation of Cultural Identities. Three objectives failed to meet benchmarks at least once during Cycle 2: Quantitative Reasoning, Critical Thinking, and Values / Social Responsibility / Civic Engagement. These three objectives were also below benchmark at least once in Cycle 1. Two of these three objectives lack a clearly identifiable course or category in FSU's current GEP.

Four objectives saw improvements between 2019 and 2020 due to departmental improvements to curriculum: Written Communication, Oral Communication, Critical Thinking, and Values, Social Responsibility, and Civic Engagement. Quantitative Reasoning exhibited a serious decrease in measured student learning. The Chemistry Department attributes this decrease to the pandemic. All introductory chemistry course sections were offered online in the fall of 2020, and the assessment was conducted through an auto-graded Canvas assignment. In 2019, the assessment instrument was given in person and evaluated by the faculty.

Table 12. Summary of GEP Assessment – Overall mean or median rubric ratings by term

	Median Rating*			***Mean Rating****	
Objective	**Fall 2016**	**Fall 2017**	**Fall 2018**	**Fall 2019**	**Fall 2020**
Written Communication	**3.0**	**3.4**	**4.2**	**3.3**	**3.7**
Oral Communication	**3.0**	**3.6**	**4.4**	**4.0**	**4.3**
Quantitative Reasoning	**2.4**	**3.0**	**3.5**	**3.4**	**2.4**
Critical Thinking	**2.3**	**3.5**	**2.3**	**1.6**	**3.1**
Appreciation of Cultural Identities	**3.0**	**3.1**	**3.0**	**3.3**	**3.1**
Values, Social Resp., Civic Engagement	**2.3**	**3.0**	**3.3**	**2.7**	**3.3**

* Due to the change in data analysis support, the mean rating was calculated in 2019 and 2020 as part of a simpler data analysis procedure.

SLAAG and GLAAG Recommendations to AIEC and UAC (for early June synthesis meeting)

Based on its review of university-wide student learning outcomes assessment activities this past year, SLAAG/GLAGG makes the following recommendations to AIEC and UAC:

- Assure continuing opportunities for professional development and training related to student learning outcomes assessment, specifically:
    - Conduct focused PD. Group review and feedback of a difficult assessment.
    - Methods of sustainability of the assessment system.
- There were not clear themes across learning goals as there was in the past (e.g., critical thinking).

- Dean's offices should review current promotion of student learning outcome assessment by program that is currently on the website and look for opportunities to improve transparency of learning results to multiple stakeholders including prospective students.
- Ensure that staffing and technology resources for the University are aligned with FSU's commitment to high-quality student learning outcomes assessment.
- Continue to investigate and potential implement the integration of FSU's learning management system (Canvas) and an assessment management system such as Portfolium.
- Urge academic departments, colleges, and faculty governance to examine existing reward structures for faculty work related to student learning outcomes assessment and to engage external stakeholder groups to provide feedback to inform assessment plans.
- Encourage and support the development of student learning outcomes assessment in cocurricular activities.
- AIEC requests a response from the UAC/AIEC related to how recommendations were received and resource allocations made to advance the SLAAG/GLAAG recommendations.
- Work to ensure that all faculty understand the diagnostic value of assessment and how learning outcomes can help faculty target topics or skills for improvements in instruction.
- GEPRC recommendations:
    - RECOMMENDATION 1. As the GEPRC works on its re-envisioning, it must investigate and promote curriculum models with stronger connectivity between the learning goals, objectives, and outcomes and curricular structure of the GEP.
    - RECOMMENDATION 2. Based on feedback from participating departments, the GEPRC should develop and promote standard GEP assessment procedures to improve consistency and sustainability.