MCCCD General Education Statement of Purpose (31 Jan 2020)

District Curriculum Committee General Education Subcommittee Members:

- Helice Agria, Guided Pathway Mapping Project Manager and Department Chair of the Center for Teaching and Learning, Phoenix College
- Deborah Baker, Instructional Designer, Maricopa Center for Learning and Instruction
- Bill Guerriero, Vice President of Academic Affairs, Chandler-Gilbert Community College
- Julie Holston, SMCC Theatre Faculty and MCCCD General Studies Faculty Representative
- Kimberly Mauldin, SMCC English Faculty and Curriculum Development Facilitator, South Mountain Community College
- Julie Morrison, Psychology Chair & Faculty and Director of the College Assessment & Review Team, Glendale Community College
- David Rubí, Chair, Communication, Humanities and Languages Division, Paradise Valley Community College; Spanish Residential Faculty; Curriculum Development Facilitator

Rationale for the Development of Institutional District (Organizational) Learning Outcomes for MCCCD General Education:

General Education has always been central to the mission of the Maricopa Community Colleges. In 2016, a team convened to examine and update MCCCD's curriculum policies and procedures related to general education. The group noted that the establishment of common institutional learning outcomes would be beneficial; however, it was decided that Guided Pathways, which was just beginning, would likely impact the scope and direction of that process. The idea was tabled with the intention of revisiting after the impact of Guided Pathways could be more clearly ascertained. With the implementation of Guided Pathways, MCCCD colleges agreed to share all newly-developed transfer degrees emphases by default, and to consolidate occupational/technical degrees and certificates wherever possible to reduce duplication and to maximize student persistence and completion. This has resulted in a consortium approach to curriculum development with shared program outcomes for student career and transfer goals. To serve the best interest of students, a district-wide general education statement is needed to unify our philosophies and teach an aligned set of institutional-level learning outcomes.

At the request of the District Curriculum Committee, the General Education Subcommittee conducted a review of general education models and resources from higher education organizations and benchmark institutions. Additionally, the team conducted a crosswalk of the institutional learning outcomes at each of our colleges. As a result of this work, the sub-committee determined that the evidence-based and widely adopted learning outcome framework developed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) most closely aligns with our general education philosophy and current practices.

Each college is encouraged to (1) include the MCCCD general education philosophy and outcomes in its catalog, and (2) assure its own statement of general education philosophy or outcomes aligns with the MCCCD statement. (2) develop a statement about its general education philosophy and/or outcomes in alignment with the MCCCD general education statement.

A clear, consistent, shared, and transparent understanding of our General Education philosophy also presents many opportunities including:

- reaffirming our commitment to general education and providing a way for us to message to students and community stakeholders the value of the general education experience
- promoting more collaboration and sharing of recommended practices in assessing student attainment of institutional outcomes
- aligning our program, college, and district-wide learning outcomes to meet the expectations of accreditation and compliance partners

Philosophy of General Education:

General Education is present in every aspect of the collegiate experience, providing students with opportunities to explore broad areas of foundational knowledge and essential skills, and preparing them to contribute to society through personal, social, and professional interactions with others.

Institutional (District or Organizational) Learning Outcomes for General Education:

After completing a program of study at the Maricopa Community Colleges, students will demonstrate outcomes from these four categories:

1. Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World

Focused by engagement with big questions that deal with both contemporary and enduring topics.

Defined as:

• Study in the sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts.

2. Intellectual and Practical Skills

Practiced extensively, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance

Defined as:

- Inquiry and analysis
- Critical and creative thinking
- Written and oral communication
- Reading
- Quantitative literacy
- Information literacy
- Teamwork and problem solving

3. Personal and Social Responsibility

Anchored through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges

Defined as:

- Civic knowledge and engagement local and global
- Intercultural knowledge and competence
- Ethical reasoning and action
- Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
- Global learning

4. Integrative and Applied Learning

Demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems

Defined as:

 Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies

Next Steps:

- Originally presented Sub Committee recommendations to DCC meeting -February 3. April
- David Rubi moved, Shelley Dennis second for DCC to endorse this proposal. Approved by DCC 2.1.2021.
- Follow-up on the need to include this information in our common pages outside of 2.3.9 Julie Stiak with Teresa Toney.

Primary Stakeholders:

Group	Who, when, and how	Type of input
CAOC	DCC VPAA membership will bring forward to council and then the CAOC would communicate with their college teams.	What?
Assessment Coordinators	Julie Morrison on the original team could send to the coordinators and MCLI for feedback.	What?
Instructional Councils	Next meeting? How??? Perhaps Jacqui and Camille can share at the end of semester at onboarding sessions?	FYI only.
FEC	How????	What?

Recommended Actions for DCC:

What's the most logical place to dovetail this work with the Curriculum Redesign Task Force's work?

Communication/feedback from college Guided Pathway and Assessment teams. This team needs to discuss modified communication plan: the April meeting is not the ideal time for the first presentation.

KC: Does this apply to certificates, Associates, and transfer pathways? We did have a conversation about this applying to everything because everything we do at MCCCD is a part of General Education, but do they need to in the smaller programs? They certainly won't hit comprehensively.

Does every college have Gen. Ed. in their mission? KM will check and confirm.

Context

As you may be aware MCCCD has had a long standing <u>General Education Statement</u> that highlights specific elements, similar to outcomes, that we expect students to experience/attain through our general education curriculum.

Last year, the District Curriculum Committee (DCC) convened a General Education Sub-committee with five Faculty representatives, one MCLI Instructional Designer, and one VPAA to review the current general education learning outcomes within the Guided Pathways framework and evolving national context of institutional assessment. The team also reviewed all of the college institutional outcomes to help ensure any revision to the MCCCD General Statement would be in alignment with what the colleges were assessing at the college level.

"As a result of this work, the sub-committee determined that the evidence-based and widely adopted learning outcome framework developed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) most closely aligns with our general education philosophy and current practices." From Stephnie Hopple (compliance) - These are widely accepted and used throughout the educational systems, so there won't be an issue with using these as a foundation.

The research and recommendations of the Sub-committee are found in this document: <u>Proposed - General Education Learning Outcomes</u>. *Please note that we are currently receiving feedback on the document so there are comments and odd notes.*

DCC voted to endorse the recommendations of the General Education Sub-committee at the February 3 meeting to be vetted by stakeholder groups.

What are the specific concerns for compliance?

Given that MCCCD already had a statement and outcome-like elements we were:

unsure if changing the statement and formalizing outcomes to the AAC&U model needed to be communicated/approved by the HLC by the District and/or colleges From Stephnie Hopple (compliance) - As long as the mission has not changed and the program (thinking of General Education as a program) curriculum has not changed more than 25%, we should not have to submit this to HLC. We would want to make sure the colleges are all in agreement with these, including faculty. During the modification/adoption/approval process with college and District stakeholders- it will be important to maintain detailed documentation (like you have been), and would be useful to have a "crosswalk" to show what is currently in place and the proposed updated/formalized outcomes. I also added the HLC verbiage to the proposed statement of purpose

- if changing the statement and formalizing the outcomes to the AAC&U model changes a dynamic of assessment requirements between ILOs at the college and District, i.e. if there was/and should continue to be an obligation for colleges to demonstrate/assess how their ILOs met the DO General Education to the HLC From Stephnie Hopple (compliance) - Assessment will continue to be important for all programs, at all colleges, and continues to be a focus of HLC.
- Any assistance you could provide in helping us work through the HLC considerations would be much appreciated. If you are unable to attend on March 12, if you could respond via email with your thoughts on the questions/concerns and provide any other thoughts/concerns you might have as well it would be much appreciated. I am also happy to find another time for a smaller subset of us to meet in advance if it is easier for us to talk in person. It is really hard to negotiate all of the calendars.:) From Stephnie Hopple (compliance) I understand the calendar situation and will see if I can change my conflicting meeting for that day.

Outcome Assessment Discussion 3.12.2021

Attendance: Bill Guerriero, Stephnie Hopple, Helice Agria, Debbie Baker, <u>Julie Stiak</u>, David Rubi, Annapurna Ganesh

General conversation -

Because we now share programs by default, we are obligated to a common set of gen ed outcomes at least at the college-level. These outcomes are about what every college educated student should know, regardless of program of study. The colleges should be assessing this through their assessment measures to meet HLC requirements. Assessment requirements are interpreted differently by HLC teams.

There was no concern about the use of AAC&U or their rubrics, the question is how do we demonstrate the alignment and measurement? Is there an additional reporting requirement needed or do we just need to show the alignment from course > program > ILO > DO outcomes?

Outcome assessment would be done by the colleges.
The evidence would be done by the colleges
Consistent section that is measured across - because that would help

We need a policy and the business process in place. Practicality and support conversations - a plan for documentation for the HLC on how we are going to get to the shared vision for example timelines, how the college ILOS align to the GEs, evaluation of the GEs.

There is anxiety around assessment - what are the expectations around assessing shared pathways - what common measures and tools are needed as a district - what data can be

leveraged to help colleges with the assessment - people needs and resources and technologies - the colleges feel alone in this and adding the DO outcomes puts more pressure on the system

What are general education outcomes vs what are institutional outcomes vs. what is program and course outcomes