

COLLABORATIVE WORK TEAM Members: Craig Caldwell, Maura H, Richard Scott, Jessica Curran, Roderic Land, James Singer, Marianne McKnight, Lynn Kilpatrick, Dennis Bromley, Lisa Fowler, Kim Cosby, Khaled Elzayyat, Erica Wight, David Hess, Jason Pickavance, Rachel Lewis, Ryan Farley, Mark Jarvis & David Hubert, Katerina Salini (co-chair), Kathryn Kay Coquemont (co-chair)

Executive Summary

This academic year, the Pathways Collaborative Work team set about responding to the charge provided by its Cabinet sponsors Provost Clifton Sanders and Vice President Chuck Lepper. We want to emphasize that good work is being done on behalf of SLCC students. Faculty and staff are dedicating themselves to the difficult task of reimagining and restructuring our work to meet the ambitious SLCC goals around student success. We are reminded of the line from the Roman stoic Marcus Aurelius: “what stands in the way becomes the way.” We ask that you interpret our sometimes struggles as signs of authentic engagement with the work.

Area of study course: While the group encountered some challenges when it came to creating an area of study course, the team quickly pivoted toward the elegant solution of embedding college success components into a gateway course. This approach addresses the substance of the first portion of the charge while holding students harmless when it comes to taking an extra course that may not count toward their program or transfer. All courses for fall 2020 are included at the end of this report.

Establish milestones for implementation through 2022: We have established milestones through Spring 2021. As we wrap up this academic year, the CWT co-leads along with Associate Provost Jason Pickavance are continuing to draft and refine milestones for implementation through 2022.

Ensure coordinated and consistent implementation of the engagement by design principles: Area of study design teams will hold themselves to the engagement by design principles as they restructure their gateway courses this summer and begin to build curricular maps and vertical communities next academic year. Teams will ensure that students are effectively brought into areas of study, are provided clear curricular maps, and are afforded engaging, inclusive teaching practices.

Design areas of study as vertical communities which integrate high-impact and inclusive teaching practices: We are now beginning to dedicate ourselves to the work of building vertical communities. Our efforts will progress into Summer 2020 and next academic year. That work will be led by Associate Vice President Kathryn Kay Coquemont with support from Associate Provost Jason Pickavance.

Recommendations going forward: Looking ahead, we recommend that next year the CWT be split into two parts, one dedicated to the work of building vertical communities and the other focused on the work that academic areas of study must accomplish.

Charge

Oversee and coordinate the design and creation of the areas of study and general education enhancements associated with SLCC Pathways. This includes the following:

1. Provide the guidelines and the essential components which must be included in an introduction to the area of study course to be used by the area of study design teams (Due Nov 30)
2. Establish milestones for implementation through 2022 (Due Nov 30);
3. Ensure coordinated and consistent implementation of the engagement by design principles across areas of study and general education (where appropriate utilize the how-to guide developed last year) (Progress Report Due March 15);
4. Design areas of study as vertical communities which integrate high-impact and inclusive teaching practices, program curriculum design, co-curricular opportunities, case management and intrusive advising milestones, and student development support to promote enhanced and equitable learning (Progress Report Due March 15);

Approach

The first step was to “Assemble the Team”, Step 1 of the SLCC developed “Engagement by Design: Implementation and Facilitation Guide” and an important milestone of its own. The “Team” is a set of intersecting groups designed to get the right people together from Academic Affairs, Faculty, and Student Affairs into working teams around designing areas of study. To launch this, Co-Sponsor Provost Sanders held an introduction and orientation to area of study design teams on the first Friday of Fall 2019.

The directing and coordinating CWT included: CWT co-leads from Academic Affairs and Student Affairs, administrators from Student Affairs and Academic Affairs with roles related to the work, the faculty Senate Curriculum Committee and General Education chairs, and the co-leads of each of the eight Areas of Study Design Teams. The Area of Study Design Teams were co-led by an academic administrator (Deans and two Associate Deans) and a member of the faculty elected by their peers in the Area of Study. The faculty co-lead election was valuable both in terms of the process and the results. The process created a learning opportunity where faculty learned more about the Area of Study structure itself and what Area of Study their program was in. The result was faculty selection of eight faculty members trusted to represent and co-lead faculty in Area of Study development along with Academic Administrators. The Area of Study Design Teams also include faculty members from programs within the specific Area of Study, career coaches, and academic advisors. This allows for Area of Study-specific design work that is coordinated with Curriculum and General Education while ensuring college-wide cohesion through the CWT.

While these teams were forming, the “Engagement by Design: Implementation and Facilitation Guide” was readied for CWT and Design Teams use. The CWT and the Design Teams began to meet in Fall 2019 to address the years’ charge. The CWT has met two times a month since its first meeting on August 29, 2019 and is scheduled to continue this through the end of the spring term. Our work has been an interleaving of development and decision-making around the year’s 4-part charge.

Response to the charge

Provide the guidelines and the essential components which must be included in an introduction to an area of study course to be used by the area of study design teams.

Fall Semester discussions unexpectedly revealed complications with immediately creating Introduction to area of study courses that could be rolled out for Fall 2020. Areas of study have different needs and strengths in their existing designs and transfer and industry relationships. And from a student-centric lens, and Engagement by Design Principle of “holding students harmless” it became increasingly apparent that an “Introduction to an Area of Study Design course would be problematic for students, at least at this point in our curricular development.

The CWT proposed embedding college success in existing gateway courses. This has the following advantages.

- It allows for implementation of intentional methods of developing student habits of mind essential for persistence and retention.
- We can start work toward the goals of building the overall learning climate of an area of study and adopting shared instructional practices, two of the four main goals in the “Implementation Guide”
- It is scalable. All students will experience college success outcomes if college success is included in an existing, required gateway course.
- It is portable and does not add to student credit burden. Placing college success in an existing gateway course does not require students to take an additional course that does not articulate to transfer institutions and addresses the credit load challenge faced by some Areas of Study.
- Latest research by CCRC suggests that putting college success in an academic context may be more effective than stand-alone college success courses.

An aggressive yet accomplishable January to August timeline for this was developed (Appendix A) and all points have been met to date. While the CWT has pivoted to embedding college success in existing gateway courses, we also drafted guidelines and essential components for this. A redesigned gateway course in an area of study should be:

- Student-centric. Meet students where they are and introduce concepts of student success strategies that will support program completion.
- Equity-minded. Address social inequities in the systems influencing higher education.
- Enhance learning. Use high-impact practices, such as case studies or wicked problems or FYE, to understand complex stories.
- Authoritative. Learn from a variety of authoritative, credible sources (textual and/or persons) from the fields in the Area of Study.
- Supportive. Understand and connect with the SLCC community and resources available to support their success.
- Retention-minded. Create a sense of connection between the students’ educational pursuits and their interests and goals (e.g. this course, next-course, program, life goals).
- Guiding. Identify and differentiate the programs within each area of study.

The faculty teaching the courses will be trained to facilitate these aspects via the updated course design, created by the Area of Study Design Teams and through the ACUE “Effective Teaching Practices” professional development.

Establish milestones for implementation through 2022.

Spring 2020

- Area of Study co-leads recruit faculty to revise curriculum and teach reconfigured course sections beginning Fall 2020. Faculty who have completed or will be taking ACUE, Faculty Guild or related Faculty Development training will be recruited for these classes. Provost's Office will provide reasonable incentives, if necessary, to faculty who revise and teach designated sections.
- Redesigned gateway course sections are available for students to register for, with seats reserved specifically for new, exploring students.
- Updated Pathways Orientation begin for summer/fall starting students, which will direct exploring students to register for redesigned gateway course sections. (Details provided in section 4.)

Summer 2020

- CWT breaks into two separate groups.
 - The first team will be led by Kathryn Kay Coquemont and Jason Pickavance to focus on the detailed design and implementation of vertical communities (part 4 of the CWT charge). The timeline will be that the design takes place in summer 2020 with first part of implementation being ready for fall 2020.
 - The second team will be led by Katerina Salini and Jason Pickavance to focus on the continued redesign and implementation of the gateway courses (part 1 of the CWT charge). This group will create a robust assessment plan in coordination with Data Science and Analytics to measure the success of the redesigned gateway courses.
 - Identify gateway course, sections, and faculty for spring 2021 implementation

Fall 2020

- Redesigned gateway courses are implemented with faculty support and training throughout the semester, dependent on IBP request funding.
- Assessment plan begins for the redesigned gateway courses.

Spring 2021 and beyond

- Continue to identify and implement expanded course offerings for Pathways gateway courses.
- Continue to train faculty.
- Continue to improve process and student experience, based on assessment gathered.

Ensure coordinated and consistent implementation of the engagement by design principles across areas of study and general education.

Areas of study will hold themselves to the engagement by design principles. Teams will ensure that students are effectively brought into areas of study, are provided clear curricular maps, and are afforded engaging, inclusive teaching practices. One challenge identified by the General Education Design team is the issue of General Education governance. We cannot expect to succeed when it comes to consistently implement the engagement by design principles when our General Education program is hindered from effectively regulating itself (the program through which the majority of our students must pass regardless the area of study). (see General Education Report, Appendix A).

Design areas of study as vertical communities . . .

Per the timeline listed in part 2, the new CWT group led by the Associate Vice President for Student Success and the Associate Provost for Academic Operations will create additional plans for vertical communities this summer; however, a summary of what is currently being worked upon is below:

- Orientation
 - Orientation & Student Success
 - Online Orientation/Pre-Orientation modules will include information regarding resources to select a program study, how to change a major from exploring into a program of study, and what courses exploring students should consider (redesigned gateway course sections and overall First 15).
 - When Orientation is again offered face-to-face, Orientation will have the opportunity for students to change from exploring to a program of study at an in-person orientation, rather than continue in the system as exploring when the student already has selected a program of study but not communicated it formally with the College.
 - Academic Advising and Career Services
 - Online Orientation
 - Career Services will send regular follow-up emails to exploring students who have not yet registered to encourage them to register for the redesigned gateway course(s) in their area of study.
 - The week before fall semester begins, Academic Advising will begin tracking the redesigned gateway courses to encourage exploring students without a seat in one of the courses to register for seats that become open as students drop/add.
 - Face-to-face Orientation
 - Exploring students attending an in-person orientation will meet with Advising and Career Services during a session built specifically to aid program of study selection. Included in this session is information about the First 15, with special emphasis placed on the redesigned gateway course sections.
 - After the session, exploring students will be taken to their own registration lab and given individualized attention to help ensure their registration into one of the redesigned gateway course sections. Despite these efforts, if a student chooses not to register for one of these courses, the staff member will record the reason why for tracking.
 - A New Student Kick-Off is being developed for fall 2021. (This was originally planned for fall 2020, but has been delayed to fall 2020, due to COVID-19 concerns. For fall 2020, an expanded offering of the current model's new student resource fair will be offered.) This high-energy event aims to include speakers such as President Huftalin and the SLCCSA President to encourage a sense of belonging, increased awareness of the support and resources available, and a formal welcome to the SLCC community. This event is intended to be an introduction to both the academic and student life aspects of college to help new students begin with an expectation of vertical communities and support.
- Academic year
 - Career Services

- After orientation, Career Services will follow up with exploring students to ensure the student continues to receive information and support in choosing a program of study before matriculation.
- Once the semester begins, Career Services will reach out to students who may still be exploring and offer individualized meetings and resources following the Design Your Life model to further aid in the selection of a program of study.
- SLSS 2900: Explorations of Areas of Study and College Success, is a 1 credit course that introduces student to life planning and education planning, in-depth exploration of college resources, and decision-making skills needed for college and beyond. We market this class through emailing exploring students, during career coaching and academic advising sessions, and support from academic partners.
- Academic Advising
 - For exploring students' first mandatory advising appointment, advisors will discuss the benefits of selecting a program of study, support the student regarding program of study exploration and selection, and remind the student of the formal process of declaring a program of study.
 - Students who wish to change areas of study but are not able to identify a program of study will be referred to an advisor in the new area of study and a Career Coach to identify a program prior to submitting a program of study change request. Students will not be able to change area of study to area of study and remain exploring.

Recommendations and Looking Ahead

- We recommend the the CWT form two sub-groups. One group led by Kathryn Kay Coquemont and Jason Pickavance to work on vertical communities, including:
 - Co-curricular pieces in each area of study.
 - Links between advising, career services, and student success efforts outside of the classroom and academic areas. Increase case management ability through increased communication (e.g. MySuccess)
 - Building a virtual space (perhaps a Canvas landing page) for students in each area of study where Student Affairs and Academic Affairs collaborate to provide students appropriate resources, support, and community building.

And one group led by Jason Pickavance and Katerina Salini to continue the planning and implementation of:

- College success in each area of study.
- Design of assessment for Fall 2020 redesigned gateway courses.
- The development of faculty around The Effective College Teaching framework (ACUE), and how that framework can form the basis of shared pedagogy within areas of study.
- The drafting of first year and program maps within areas of study.
- The effective organization and integration of general education as a program into SLCC pathways (in collaboration with the General Education Design team).

- The First Five courses should have expanded offerings, as suggested by the Deans, Associate Deans, and faculty of programs and areas of study.
- We should diversify communication to faculty and staff regarding Pathways as a whole, what is happening next that will impact their roles, and how changes build a better student experience.

APPENDIX A

The General Education Design Team Report and Proposal to Provost and CWT leads

April 24, 2020

Design Team Members: Zack Allred, Corinne Anderson, Angela Belnap, Cynthia Bonsall, Ella Butler, Emily Dibble, Joseph Gallegos, Ashley Givens, David Hubert, Mark Jarvis, Kati Lewis, Rachel Lewis, Rob Marlette, Jon McGowan, Daniel Poole, Michael Young.

Executive Summary

Excellence in General Education is critical. While General Education is not an Area of Study that students choose at entrance to Salt Lake Community College (SLCC), it is a program that is foundational to all eight of SLCC's Areas of Study. Success in General Education leads to success in other academic programs, to career flexibility, and to empowered citizenship. Moreover, SLCC's General Education program offers a Certificate of Completion that is recognized across the Utah System of Higher Education, is essential to SLCC's accreditation with the Northwest Commission of Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) and is integral to SLCC's vision to be a model for inclusive and transformative education.

This report addresses long-standing issues with the governance structure of General Education at SLCC, situates those issues in the context of NWCCU standards and expectations, and describes the consequences for the program of its governance deficiencies. It offers our consensus vision for a new way to govern General Education. While not a specific proposal, the consensus views of the Design Team members illuminate a way forward toward a governance structure that better serves the General Education program and SLCC's move to Pathways.

After treating governance, the report goes on to address the topics described in the *Engagement by Design* white paper: shared instructional practices, assessment, positive learning climate, and curriculum. It does so with the twin underlying assumptions that General Education is foundational to a successful Pathways initiative at SLCC and that students benefit from an integrated General Education program that is grounded in effective teaching practices, rigorous assessment, and a common pedagogical approach that mixes signature assignments with deep reflection.

Sections

1. Governance
2. Shared Instructional Practices

- 3. Assessment
- 4. Positive Learning Climate
- 5. Curriculum

Section 1: Governance

Section 1.1: NWCCU Standards Pertaining to Governance and General Education

1.C.1 The institution offers programs with appropriate content and rigor that are consistent with its mission, culminate in achievement of clearly identified student learning outcomes that lead to collegiate-level degrees, certificates, or credentials and include designators consistent with program content in recognized fields of study.

1.C.2 The institution awards credit, degrees, certificates, or credentials for programs that are based upon student learning and learning outcomes that offer an appropriate breadth, depth, sequencing, and synthesis of learning.

1.C.5 The institution engages in an effective system of assessment to evaluate the quality of learning in its programs. The institution recognizes the central role of faculty to establish curricula, assess student learning, and improve instructional programs.

1.C.6 Consistent with its mission, the institution establishes and assesses, across all associate and bachelor level programs or within a General Education curriculum, institutional learning outcomes and/or core competencies. Examples of such learning outcomes and competencies include, but are not limited to, effective communication skills, global awareness, cultural sensitivity, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and logical thinking, problem solving, and/or information literacy.

1.C.7 The institution uses the results of its assessment efforts to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices to continuously improve student learning outcomes.

2.A.1 The institution demonstrates an effective governance structure, with a board(s) or other governing body(ies) composed predominantly of members with no contractual, employment relationship, or personal financial interest with the institution. Such members shall also possess clearly defined authority, roles, and responsibilities. Institutions that are part of a complex system with multiple boards, a centralized board, or related entities shall have, with respect to such boards, written and clearly defined contractual authority, roles, and responsibilities for all entities. In addition, authority and responsibility between the system and the institution is clearly delineated in a written contract, described on its website and in its public documents, and provides the NWCCU accredited institution with sufficient autonomy to fulfill its mission.

2.A.2 The institution has an effective system of leadership, staffed by qualified administrators, with appropriate levels of authority, responsibility, and accountability who are charged with planning, organizing, and managing the institution and assessing its achievements and effectiveness.

2.A.4 The institution's decision-making structures and processes, which are documented and publicly available, must include provisions for the consideration of the views of faculty, staff, administrators, and students on matters in which each has a direct and reasonable interest.

2.F.3 Consistent with its mission, programs, and services, the institution employs faculty, staff, and administrators sufficient in role, number, and qualifications to achieve its organizational responsibilities, educational objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic programs.

Section 1.2: Differences Between the Governance of General Education and All Other Programs

Who Has a Voice and a Vote?

For all academic programs except General Education, the Dean, Associate Dean, and faculty who teach in the program have voices and votes. For General Education, faculty who teach Gen Ed courses, faculty who do not teach Gen Ed courses, Student Affairs personnel, and the ePortfolio coordinator have voices and votes.

What is the Primary Venue for Governing the Program?

For all academic programs except General Education, the primary venue for program governance is the School Curriculum Committee. For General Education, the primary venue for program governance is the General Education Committee, but its decisions about the program are often subject to review and contradiction by the Senate Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate, which rarely happens for other academic programs.

What is the Governing Ethos?

For all academic programs except General Education, the governing ethos centers around maintaining the quality, integrity, and coherence of the program, in addition to achieving or maintaining healthy program enrollment. Faculty, Associate Deans, and the Dean are all invested in that ethos. In General Education, the ethos is departmental representation in the commons that is the General Education program. Issues of program quality, integrity, and coherence take a back seat to ensuring that departments get what they want out of General Education, which is primarily extra enrollment when a course receives General Education designation.

What is the Governance Hierarchy and Timing?

General Education is a sub-committee of a committee of the Faculty Senate, and its very weighty deliberations come early in the curricular process. Time for deliberation is often short because it is sandwiched between school curriculum committees and the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee. School curriculum committees stand outside of the college-wide curricular process and can operate on their own timeline.

Section 1.3: Consequences of the General Education Governance Structure

The nature of General Education governance at SLCC has resulted in the following:

1. Sometimes superficial deliberation over General Education curriculum in the General Education Committee.
2. Second-guessing of fundamental components of the General Education program—e.g., the current prospect of the Faculty Senate dictating to the General Education program a learning outcome that the program does not want and cannot assess. Has that ever happened to any other academic program?
3. If a department puts forward a course as belonging in a General Education designation, the General Education Committee will nearly always approve it.
4. The General Education Committee has passed courses and placed them in designations that don't match our USHE counterparts. This can cause potential confusion and transfer problems for students.
5. The General Education Committee has passed courses that were later determined to be majors courses.
6. The General Education Committee spent considerable time writing designation criteria, and its members often don't refer to the actual words of the designation criteria when deliberating over course proposals. Instead, extraneous arguments are offered: the course is popular with students; the department worked hard on the course; it is "important" for all students to know the content in the course.
7. Faculty exclusion of administration has prevented administrators from doing what they routinely do in all other programs: take stands on curricular issues.
8. The General Education Committee has skipped procedural requirements in its own Handbook— e.g., passing courses without all the required documentation and passing courses that didn't go to all the appropriate school curriculum committees.
9. The membership of the General Education Committee ranges from tenured to first-year faculty, from those who know a great deal about the national general education conversation to those who know little.
10. There is considerable turnover in the General Education Committee's membership, despite terms and rotation schedule.
11. The General Education Committee is staffed in mysterious ways. How exactly are members chosen? For what reasons?
12. General Education Committee members receive very little professional development specific to general education.
13. General Education Committee members usually act as political representatives of their department—ensuring that General Education becomes the amalgamation of departmental interests rather than a program in and of itself.
14. The mentor process and the five-year course review timeline are ineffective. Mentors are often not connected to courses in a timely fashion. Departments often flout the five-year course review schedule with no repercussions.
15. Following the 2004 NWCCU recommendation on General Education—i.e., Gen Ed wasn't integrated, didn't have learning outcomes, and didn't directly assess the program using

student work—SLCC experienced some finger pointing. Faculty said it was administration’s fault; administration pointed to the Gen Ed Committee on which they had no votes. This would likely occur again were SLCC ever to run into accreditation issues related to General Education.

16. Following the 2004 NWCCU recommendation on General Education, SLCC administration didn’t trust the General Education committee to write learning outcomes. Those learning outcomes were written by an ad hoc committee appointed by the Academic Vice President and chaired by the Director of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center.

Section 1.4: Consensus of the General Education Design Team on Governance

1. The current way we govern General Education is suboptimal in that it:

1. Does not have the right mix of stakeholders with voice and vote expected of a shared governance body as that term is commonly understood, practiced in other programs, and outlined in NWCCU language.
2. Creates difficulty in building a college-wide definition of General Education as a program.
3. Causes confusion among members of the General Education Committee as to whether they are on the committee to serve the interests of the General Education program or to represent the interests of the department that asked them to hold a seat on the committee.
4. Does not produce the kind of calm, deliberative, and collaborative new course and 5-year reviews that the General Education program deserves.
5. Does not give General Education Committee members the reassigned time and professional development that the General Education program deserves.

2. Governance of the General Education program would benefit if it had the following characteristics:

1. The General Education Committee should be understood to be more like a school curriculum committee in that it is responsible for the integrity, coherence, and quality of the General Education program. The cross-school nature of the General Education program plus its centrality to institutional accreditation suggest that the Provost’s Office should sponsor the Committee as happens at other institutions such as the U of U and SUU, and it should not be a sub-committee of a committee of Faculty Senate.
2. The Provost should charge all General Education Committee members with maintaining and promoting the quality, coherence, and integrity of the General Education program.
3. In accordance with NWCCU standards 1.C.5 and 2.A.4, teaching faculty should hold the majority of voting seats on the General Education Committee, and some voting seats should be held by administrators responsible for the integrity and assessment of the

General Education program, and staff who have a particular interest in General Education's common pedagogy (e.g., ePortfolio) and learning outcomes (e.g., information literacy).

4. When possible, non-faculty voting seats should be held by people who teach at least one General Education course per year.
5. The General Education Committee should be smaller than it is currently, and members should have reassigned time, summer stipends for mentor work, and professional development designed to help them become campus experts on the national general education conversation.
6. The General Education Committee should send course proposals out to groups of faculty who teach specific designations in order to get feedback from them. This process would operate much like anonymous peer review does in journal submissions. Faculty on the review groups should receive service credit in the rank and tenure process.
7. Faculty on the General Education Committee should have considerable experience at SLCC—although the Design Team did not reach consensus on whether or not tenure should be a requirement. Because of its cross-college importance, service on the General Education Committee should be a career milestone for those on track to become full professors or who have attained that rank. Faculty with limited experience at SLCC but who have an interest in General Education should be allowed to serve as non-voting members of the General Education Committee and/or as faculty to whom courses would be sent for anonymous review. Such non-voting member status would be recognized as service or professional development in their rank/tenure portfolios and would increase their chances of being selected to serve as voting members later in their careers.
8. No General Education Committee member (faculty or staff or administrator) should suffer adverse consequences for any vote taken on the committee, nor should they be directed to vote in particular ways.
9. The curricular process for General Education should be extended to better allow for collaborative course development/review.
10. The curricular process should be redesigned in a way that makes the following clear: school curriculum committees, the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, and the Faculty Senate are responsible for recommending that courses enter SLCC's course bank, but the General Education Committee is responsible for recommending whether a particular course belongs in the General Education program and whether the General Education component of other degrees and certificates is properly structured.
11. The order of the curricular process for General Education courses should not squeeze the General Education Committee's deliberations between those of school curriculum committees and the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee. General Education as a program would benefit if the General Education Committee's place in the sequence of the curriculum process were changed to allow for more deliberation.

12. The General Education program should be responsible for its own internal processes, rubrics, and learning outcomes, subject to the same kind of limited review by the Faculty Senate afforded to other academic programs.

Section 2: Shared Instructional Practices

Section 2.1: High Impact Practices (HIPs)

In its handbook, the General Education Committee already encourages General Education faculty to use HIPs. Specifically, it states the following in section 6.3:

We affirm that General Education courses should connect learning outcomes to teaching methods and follow best practices in teaching. In particular, the literature highlights the use of high impact practices and active learning methods such as:

- *Case studies*

- *Group problem solving*
- *Peer teaching*
- *Role-plays*
- *Multi-step group projects* • *Service learning*

- *Hands-on experimentation* • *Inquiry based learning*
- *Simulations*
- *Argumentation/debate*

- *Individual/group presentations* • *Interactive lecture*
- *Class discussion*
- *Student response systems*

In 2010 the General Education program adopted ePortfolio pedagogy in all of its courses. In 2016 the Association of American Colleges & Universities added ePortfolio pedagogy to its official list of HIPs. In our program, all General Education courses must identify at least one signature assignment that students need to put in their ePortfolio along with at least one reflection. Signature assignments must address two or more General Education learning outcomes, and the ePortfolio component of the course must count toward the student's grade.

As long as they do not jeopardize the required ePortfolio, Areas of Study Design Teams are better positioned to define the specific HIPs used in General Education courses that serve double-duty as program on-ramps. For its part, the General Education Design Team recommends that the General Education Committee undertake the following:

1. Require that new course proposals and 5-year review course materials contain assignment descriptions so that the committee members can make judgments about

whether the course is meeting pedagogical expectations outlined in the General Education Handbook. The Committee may determine that this requirement apply to signature assignments, all assignments that address the primary course learning outcomes, or some mix thereof. The Committee may also decide that faculty who are bringing courses forward for review can best share assignment specifics via the syllabus, the Canvas site for the course, or via a summary/overview of assignments and potential assignments for the course that help students achieve course and GE learning outcomes.

2. Ensure that assignments in Diversity (DV) courses address both the General Education designation as well as diversity issues and concepts.
3. Promote interdisciplinarity in General Education courses by asking that they examine the history of the discipline, stories the discipline tells about itself, and/or stories told about the discipline from other perspectives.
4. Consider whether the Goals and Outcomes page of the ePortfolio could align better with advice Career Services gives to students.
5. Ensure that students receive an explanation of General Education, that the course they are taking is a General Education course, where it fits in the program, and how that course's discipline knowledge connects with other aspects of the General Education program.

Section 2.2: Inclusive Teaching Practices

Currently the General Education Handbook does not address inclusivity. The General Education Design Team recommends that the General Education Committee undertake the following:

1. Add an inclusivity section to the General Education Handbook.
2. Consider adding an inclusivity section to the General Education Rationale document.
3. Require all committee members to take the Equity Minded Practitioner (EMP) course and encourage all faculty who teach in the General Education program to do so as well.
4. Ensure when feasible that a member of the EMP Committee sits on the General Education Committee.
5. Ensure that General Education courses embrace a diversity of relevant, real-world examples without resulting in "check-box inclusivity."
6. Add an inclusivity section to the General Education course development workbook.
7. Consider jumpstarting the process of improving inclusive teaching practices in General Education through the following:
 - a. Have the EMP, SLOA, and the General Education Committee work together.
 - b. Target high-enrollment General Education courses.
 - c. Workshop them so that they are exemplars of inclusive content and teaching practices.
 - d. Use the newly revised courses to help other courses meet the expectations of the General Education Committee.
8. Recognize faculty and courses that exemplify inclusive teaching.

Section 3: Assessment

Section 3.1: Existing Assessment Practices

SLCC has a robust and informative assessment process for its General Education learning outcomes. Our process was commended by NWCCU after its 2014 visit and has been a source of interest in SLCC on the part of other colleges and universities. Our existing assessment practices include the following elements:

1. All students in General Education have an ePortfolio which has a page for each General Education requirement.
2. At a minimum, all General Education course must identify at least one signature assignment that results in an artifact that students upload to their ePortfolio along with one reflection.
3. Signature assignments must touch on two or more General Education learning outcomes.
4. Each May, Data Science and Analytics pulls a random sample of students who are graduating with an AA or AS degree and who took all of their General Education courses from SLCC.
5. The ePortfolio Office and the AD of General Education collaborate to conduct the assessment of the sampled ePortfolios.
6. Teams of faculty go through a brief orientation and norming session and assess student attainment of General Education learning outcomes by applying VALUE and in-house rubrics to the sampled ePortfolios.
7. The ePortfolio Coordinator and the AD of General Education collaborate to analyze the data and write an assessment report that is shared with the campus community.

Section 3.2: Consensus Recommendations for Assessment

The General Education Design Team recommends the following steps to improve assessment in the General Education program.

1. Develop a process to disaggregate assessment data. We piloted an approach to disaggregation in 2019, but we may need to tweak our approach.
2. Combine the assessment process with experimentation—e.g., comparing outcomes of students who did/did not receive information literacy instruction.
3. Follow through on the AAC&U Pathways grant project to do the following:
 - a. Revise the General Education learning outcomes to make them more assessable.
 - b. Map signature assignments to General Education designations.
 - c. Conduct signature assignment design charrettes.
 - d. Create a rubric that establishes for students and faculty what constitutes a truly high impact General Education ePortfolio.
 - e. Create and maintain an online repository of model signature assignments.

4. Rethink the assessment schedule. We can't do everything every year, so we need a schedule of what we are going to focus on each year. The schedule should be published so faculty and academic administrators know what will be assessed each year.

Section 4: Positive Learning Climate

Section 4.1: Existing Practices in General Education for Developing a Positive Learning Climate.

With respect to General Education, SLCC is committed to—in the words of the *Engagement by Design* white paper—“design[ing] the student experience to cultivate a positive learning environment which transforms fear into confidence and anxiety into anticipation.” We have already taken the following steps to ensure a positive learning climate.

1. The Explaining General Education initiative helps students orient themselves to the General Education program and understand why the college asks them to build a broad general education foundation for civic engagement, an enriched life, career advancement, and further educational success. This gives students a positive introduction to the General Education program and confidence that they can navigate it successfully. To that end, and to maintain consistency of the student experience, we have made the Explaining Gen Ed materials available in Canvas modules that faculty can choose to use if they would like.
2. The collaborative and interdisciplinary nature of our Gen Ed program promotes a positive learning environment as students realize that each component of the program does not sit in isolation. Courses are designed so that students can easily make connections between them, even though each student pursues an idiosyncratic path through General Education.
3. Our planned assignment design charrettes will incorporate the imperative to develop a positive learning climate, one aspect of which is transparency in assignment construction. Students benefit when they understand the purpose of the assignment, what role it fulfills in the course, and exactly how to complete the assignment.
4. The General Education Committee promotes teaching methods that create student-to-student and faculty-to-student interaction.

Section 4.2 Consensus Recommendations for Developing a Positive Learning Climate

The General Education Design Team recommends the following steps to improve the learning climate in the General Education program.

1. The General Education Committee and the Equity Minded Practitioners group shall collaborate to ensure that General Education courses use content, examples, and assignments that reflect the diversity inherent in academic fields, their histories, and their relevance to students' daily lives.

2. The General Education Committee shall highlight in the Handbook and the Gen Ed Rationale document its desire for courses that promote a positive learning climate. This shall include promotion of college success skills (growth mindset, grit, etc.) and shall be accompanied by Faculty Development workshops to help faculty in this regard.
3. The Associate Dean of General Education shall periodically study D, W, E rates in General Education courses. When concerns arise from those studies, the Associate Dean of General Education shall raise them with the Associate Dean or Chair who is responsible for the course. They shall discuss the high D, W, E rate of the course, reasons that might explain that rate, and possible changes to the course that the department faculty might consider.
4. The Associate Dean of General Education shall work periodically with Data Science and Analytics to convene student focus groups to ask about learning climate and other General Education experiences. He shall give this information to the General Education Committee and the Associate Provost for Learning Advancement.
5. 5. The General Education Committee shall recognize faculty and courses that build a positive learning environment.

Section 5 Curriculum

Section 5.1 Existing General Education Curriculum

As with other public colleges and universities in Utah, SLCC's General Education Curriculum is a blend of Utah system requirements and institutional requirements. Our General Education program also differs depending on the degree or certificate students are seeking.

Existing General Education requirements for SLCC degrees and certificates

1. AS/AA Degrees: Core consisting of Composition (6 credits), Quantitative Literacy (3-4 credits), and American Institutions (3 credits); Distribution Requirements consisting of Fine Arts (3 credits), Humanities (3 credits), Life Sciences (3 credits), Physical Sciences (3 credits), and Social Sciences (3 credits); Institutional Requirements consisting of Lifelong Wellness (1 credit), Communication (3 credits), International and Global (3 credits), and Diversity (co-designated with a course carrying one of the other designations).
2. AAS Degrees: Core consisting of Communication (3 credits), Quantitative Studies (3 credits), and Human Relations (3 credits). Distribution Requirements for AAS degrees are 1 or 2 courses (3-6 credits). There are no Institutional Requirements for AAS degrees. (Add embedded option.)
3. Certificates of Completion: contain clearly identifiable instructional components in communication, computation, and human relations. These are delivered in either stand-alone general education courses or embedded within other program courses.

Recent

1. In 2005 the General Education program added a Diversity (DV) course requirement. Diversity is a co-designated requirement. Students must take a course with a primary designation that also has the DV designation.
2. In 2010 the General Education program added its ePortfolio requirement.
3. In 2012 the General Education program discontinued its Computer Literacy (CL) requirement.
4. In 2018 the General Education program replaced two requirements—Student Choice (Depth or Intensive) and Interdisciplinary (ID)—with a Communication (CM) requirement and an International/Global (IG) requirement.
5. In the past three years the General Education Committee has been updating and standardizing its designation criteria.

Size of the General Education course pool.

1. In the 2004/05 catalog SLCC had a total of 180 courses in its General Education course bank.
2. In the 2019/20 catalog SLCC had a total of 289 courses in its General Education course bank.
3. With respect to lower-division General Education courses in just the five USHE-mandated distribution areas, a study conducted by the Associate Provost in 2018 found the following number of such courses around the state of Utah:

- University of Utah—198
- Utah Valley University—127
- Salt Lake Community College—124 ○ Utah State University—117

changes to the General Education curriculum.

- Weber State University—112 ○ Snow College—90
- Dixie State University—80
- Southern Utah University—74

Section 5.2 Consensus Recommendations for General Education Curriculum

The General Education Design Team recommends the following steps with respect to the General Education curriculum.

1. The General Education Committee shall study the size of the General Education course bank and make decisions with respect to its optimum size. This study should incorporate student input via focus groups and/or surveys, input from Orientation & Student Success and Advising, and work the General Education Committee has already done on this issue.
2. The General Education Committee shall be consulted in Pathways course recommendations.
3. The General Education Committee shall enforce its Handbook requirements for 5-year course reviews in such a way that keeps them on schedule while limiting any damage to

students that might be caused by de-listing General Education courses. The Committee can draw upon work that it has already done on this issue.

4. The General Education Committee shall conduct a study of courses that either haven't been offered frequently or that have often not carried in the past few years. This study shall exclude courses that were only recently added to the General Education course bank.
5. Preparation for new course proposals or 5-year course reviews in General Education shall be recognized as either professional development or service in faculty professional ePortfolios.
6. The Associate Dean of General Education shall put together a proposal that the University of Utah accept SLCC's International and Global (IG) courses as satisfying its International (IR) graduation requirement. The Associate Provost for Learning Advancement will submit the proposal to the Provost and President and request their advice and support in pursuing it with the University of Utah.
7. The Assistant Provost for Curriculum and Academic Systems and the Associate Dean of General Education shall develop an improved system for handling General Education curricular documents, with an eye toward making it easier for faculty and curriculum techs. They shall also develop training on the system for faculty and curriculum techs.

Pathway Design Teams responses – April 27, 2020

Area of Study	Fall Courses	First Five Changes
<p>Arts, Communication, and Digital Media (Richard Scott & Jessica Curran)</p> <p>On-track for Fall 2020</p>	<p>For FALL, these two unique sections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 41006 COMM 1010-360 SCC 8:30-9:50 a.m. MON & WED 2. 45350 COMM 1010-412 T-Red 4:00-6:50 p.m. MON <p>Put an approval code on these courses. AOS advisor directs exploratory students to these sections and grants a special permission code.</p>	<p>We want to overhaul the first 5 classes and as part of that overhaul include a variable option we are calling a specialization exploration class. Advisors will work with students to establish they are interested in our area of study and then ask additional questions to see which specialization within the area of study they are most interested in. The fifth recommended classes will be chosen off a list. Our goal is to keep that list to 4 or 5 choices: Communication, Visual Arts, Performing Arts, Architecture/Interior Design, Fashion (Fashion may be grouped with visual arts).</p> <p>For example, any student who is undecided, but most interested in any Visual Art & Design area (painting, drawing, animation, web design, photography, printing, etc...) will be recommended to take ART 1120 Design as their specialization exploration course.</p> <p>We would like to make this change in an attempt to make pathways work for our students. Approval of this flexibility will allow our CC, AAS, and AS programs to better align to pathways. We're taking the goal of not negatively affecting students very seriously. We want all classes in the first five to work for both AS and AAS students.</p> <p>The basic philosophy behind our request is that given the expansiveness of the offerings in our school and the varied yet connected intricacies of the creative economy , if a student is interested in the area of study but not necessarily a specific program there must be some underlying interest they have. So in discussions with faculty and academic advising it is believed that an exploratory course on how students perceive the arts would be helpful in determining their ultimate program. If they have an interest in area bit not willing to commit to a specific program this will allow them to explore more specific interest and without being</p>

Area of Study	Fall Courses	First Five Changes										
		<p>harm down the road. Each program has designated an exploratory course based on the interaction with advising which we believe will create a meaningful pathway in shorter period of time. In addition, all of these courses are part of our AS and AAS programs. These specific exploratory courses were /are supported by faculty and academic advising.</p> <p>FIRST 5 CLASSES</p> <p>AREA EXPLORATION</p> <p>COMM 1010 (CM)*</p> <p>MATH (QL)</p> <p>ENGLISH (EN)</p> <p>FINE ART (FA)</p> <p>AREA EXPLORATION COURSES</p> <table data-bbox="1255 1019 1713 1279"> <tr> <td>Visual Arts</td> <td>ART 1120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Communication</td> <td>COMM 1500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Performing Arts</td> <td>FA 1025</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fashion</td> <td>FASH 1010</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Architecture / Interior Design</td> <td>ARCH 1010</td> </tr> </table>	Visual Arts	ART 1120	Communication	COMM 1500	Performing Arts	FA 1025	Fashion	FASH 1010	Architecture / Interior Design	ARCH 1010
Visual Arts	ART 1120											
Communication	COMM 1500											
Performing Arts	FA 1025											
Fashion	FASH 1010											
Architecture / Interior Design	ARCH 1010											

Area of Study	Fall Courses	First Five Changes																														
		<p>*COMM 1010 is our Pathways CWT gateway course for Fall 2020</p> <p>Also, I think we need to show him this is a highly refined list. It filters many programs into one exploration course.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AREA EXPLORATION COURSES</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;">Visual Arts</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Take ART 1120</td> <td style="width: 33%;">Animation AS</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Game Development CP</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Graphic Communications AS</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Graphic Communications CC</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Graphic Technician CP</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Motion Graphics CP</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Animation Emphasis AAS</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Graphic Design Emphasis AAS</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Illustration Emphasis AAS</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Multimedia Emphasis AAS</td> </tr> </table>	Visual Arts	Take ART 1120	Animation AS			Game Development CP			Graphic Communications AS			Graphic Communications CC			Graphic Technician CP			Motion Graphics CP			Animation Emphasis AAS			Graphic Design Emphasis AAS			Illustration Emphasis AAS			Multimedia Emphasis AAS
Visual Arts	Take ART 1120	Animation AS																														
		Game Development CP																														
		Graphic Communications AS																														
		Graphic Communications CC																														
		Graphic Technician CP																														
		Motion Graphics CP																														
		Animation Emphasis AAS																														
		Graphic Design Emphasis AAS																														
		Illustration Emphasis AAS																														
		Multimedia Emphasis AAS																														

Area of Study	Fall Courses	First Five Changes	
			Photography Emphasis AAS Web Design Emphasis AAS Web Graphic Design CP Web Programmer CP Web Site Designer CP Communication Take COMM ???? Journalism & Digital Media AS Video or Radio Production AAS Performing Arts FA 1025 Film Production Technician AAS Media Music AAS MIDI CP Music AS Music Recording Technology CP Music Technology CP Theatre Arts AS Fashion Take FASH 1010 Fashion Design Emphasis AAS

Area of Study	Fall Courses	First Five Changes									
		<p style="text-align: right;">Merchandising Emphasis AAS</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Technical Apparel Emphasis AAS</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Architecture AS</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Interior Design AAS</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Interior Design CP</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Interior Design / Architecture Take ARCH 1010</p> <p style="color: red;">Provost Sanders approved 4/24/2020</p>									
<p>Business (Dennis Bromley & Lisa Fowler)</p> <p style="color: red;">On-track for Fall 2020</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From a purely gateway standpoint, the course is BUS 1010, as every undecided student coming into business will take that course. The course will include elements that lay a foundation for student success as well as help students make an informed decision when selecting a specific program of study. For students with a specific program of study in mind, either or both BUS 1050 and MKT 1030 are required in every program of study. These courses will also be modified to include student success elements. <p style="color: blue;">1. Put an approval code on the business sections.</p> <p style="color: blue;">2. Or build a cross list code for these sections. Dept. determines how many seats we hold.</p> <p style="color: blue;">3. Or just keep them open.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="573 1182 1205 1349"> <tr> <td>BUS 1010</td> <td>409, 410</td> <td>Phil Nelsen</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>402, 405, 513</td> <td>Tyson Riskas</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>403, 512</td> <td>Pook Carson</td> </tr> </table>	BUS 1010	409, 410	Phil Nelsen		402, 405, 513	Tyson Riskas		403, 512	Pook Carson	<p>The Business Area of Study Design Team requests revising the first 5 courses for business students who are undecided about a specific program of study. Here is the revised list:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">BUS 1010 ENGL 1010 (or placement) MATH 1010 (or placement) ECON 1740 (AI) COMM 1080: Conflict Management & Diversity (SS, DV)</p> <p style="color: red;">Provost Sanders approved 4/23/2020</p>
BUS 1010	409, 410	Phil Nelsen									
	402, 405, 513	Tyson Riskas									
	403, 512	Pook Carson									

Area of Study	Fall Courses				First Five Changes
			406, 412	Daysi Hernandez	
			408, 505, 508	Don Gren	
	BUS 1050		403, 501, 506	Daysi Hernandez	
			402, 406	Lon Schiffbauer	
			404, 408	Lisa Fowler	
			505	Tyson Riskas	
	MKTG 1030		404, 501, 503, 504	Ahmad Kareh	
Computer Science and Information Technology (Khaled El-Zayyat & Kim Cosby) On-track for Fall 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CSIS 1030, all sections 12 sections, does not satisfy gen ed. CSIS first programming course. This one takes care of itself. 				No changes
Health Sciences (Erica Wight & David Hess) On-track for Fall 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HS 2050, all sections 3 sections, 2 are open and one on reserve 				No changes
Humanities (Marianne McKnight & Lynn Kilpatrick) On-track for Fall 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English 1010-433 crn 41767 TR 10-11:20 AAB 117 Hum 1100-409 crn 41092 TR 11:30-12:50 AAB 220 This is a learning community; the Humanities advisor should just know.				No changes
Manufacturing, Construction, and Applied	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction to Robotics, all sections Assembly and Soldering, all sections 				No changes

Area of Study	Fall Courses	First Five Changes
Technologies (Gary Cox & Diego Pardo) On-track for Fall 2020	Keep these open and don't worry about reserving.	
Science, Engineering, and Mathematics (Craig Caldwell & Maura Hahnenberger) On-track for Fall 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CHEM 1010, sections 501, 502, and 405 BIOL 1010, sections 402 and 405 Approval code for these.	No changes
Social & Behavioral Sciences, Education, and Human Services (Roderic Land & James Singer) Waiting to hear back	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possibly CJ 1010, PSY 1010, SOC 1010, ECON 1010, EDU 1000, SW 1010, LS 1020, ETHS 2400, and ANTH 1010, waiting to hear back with confirmation 	Waiting to hear back

