

From: [Pollock, Elizabeth](#)
To: [Madan, Manish](#)
Subject: ELOs and APP
Date: Friday, January 21, 2022 3:51:43 PM

Manish,

APP discussed the provost's request to review the currency of our ELOs. We are agreed in thinking that our committee is not the best group to handle such a review, for two reasons:

1. We lack the appropriate expertise
2. The current ELOs are not degree requirements and as such never came before APP when first adopted. Changes would not need to be reviewed by our committee unless those changes include the adoption of explicit degree requirements

We instead recommend that a task force be assembled for this review, with at least one member of APP being a member of such a task force. While not discussed within the committee, I also suggest that there be representation from the General Studies committee. We encourage Senate to reach out to several faculty who have published in the area of ELOs as possible chairs for such a task force. Specific names mentioned were Susan Cydis, Shelly Meyers (though I believe she is getting ready to retire so may not be interested), and possibly Carra Hood now that she has returned to faculty.

Regards,
Elizabeth



October 7, 2021

Provost's Response to Senate "REQUEST FOR ESSENTIAL LEARNING OUTCOME (ELO) REVIEW"

Thank you for the thoughtful review and opportunity to clarify the request to review the Essential Learning Outcomes (ELO). The ELO's are ten-years-old and should be reviewed to ascertain relevancy with cultural and educational changes that occurred over the last decade.

To place in context the response, the ELO's serve as set values for student success and thus a guide for undergraduate degree requirements and attributes and the overall educational foundation of our students. Thus, to clarify both items below, the intent of the charge was to ensure that the undergraduate degree requirements and attributes were considered in developing the ELO's. A strategy for reviewing our undergraduate and degree attributes, in order to best align, remodel, or create additional ELO's was the intent of the charge. As such, some questions the committee should consider:

- Would the Faculty Senate consider reaffirming the value of the ELO's?
- Do the current ELO's continue to meet the needs of our academic programs, our students, and the communities we serve?

The committee is not expected to assess the need for, and efficacy of, undergraduate degree requirements, although a revision of ELOs may indicate the need for such an assessment in the future. Likewise, the committee is not expected to assess attributes by program but review for awareness of required attributes in the development of the ELOs.

Lastly, completion of the ELO review and/or revision to institute for FY2024 is requested.

The faculty senate's ELO review in the context of our standing undergraduate requirements and attributes to drive our academic direction, is greatly appreciated.

Response to Provost's REQUEST FOR ESSENTIAL LEARNING OUTCOME (ELO) REVIEW

The Faculty Senate Executive would like to thank the Provost for her Request for Essential Learning Outcome (ELO) Review (*Appendix A*) discussed on Tuesday, September 7, 2021, and delivered in writing on Thursday, September 9, 2021.

The Executive committee is responding to the memo to ask for clarification of the charge of the committee, noting the charge discussed on September 7 was related to the APP committee reviewing the ELOs.

However, the charge in writing requests the APP, in addition reviewing ELOs, to

2. Develop a strategy to assess the need for, and efficacy of, undergraduate degree requirements, including:

- General Education Goals Requirement: Attributes – A, I, H, V
- Suggested Credits per G Category
- Writing Requirement
- Quantitative Reasoning Requirement
- Race and Racism Education Requirement
- First-Year Studies (FRST) Requirement
- First-Year Seminar Requirement

1. Our first clarification involves the necessity and desirability of “develop[ing] a strategy to determine the need for, and efficacy of, undergraduate degree requirements.” Some of these requirements are unique, and all touch upon the university’s mission, organizational structure, and culture in different ways. This would mean a comprehensive examination and potential restructuring of a long-standing Stockton’s curriculum. If such a project were to be undertaken, we believe it should be done after a broader discussion with various stakeholders and the Senate at large. This would allow for faculty, professional staff and interested parties to understand the motivation for this endeavor as well as what the potential outcomes may be.

2. Following from the first point, we note that, with attributes and subscripts listed alongside core curricular requirements and the competency requirement, it would be difficult for a single committee such as APP to gather the comprehensive insights needed into the various programs. If the senate were to agree to an all-encompassing project, we believe it would call for the construction of a carefully chosen task force with wide representation including representatives from SFT 2275 as such a project would potentially impact terms and conditions of employment.

3. Our third point relates to the timeline established for the review (Dec. 2021). General education reform is typically a multi-year process. A strategy to determine the need and efficacy of the ELOs, for example, might be achieved in a short time frame, but it is not enough for a large-scale review of the G-categories, the W1/W2/Q1/Q2/R1/R2 attributes, the HIVA subscripts, and the FYS and competency requirements together. As we note above the potential impact of the work of such a committee could alter the identity of Stockton as it has developed in its 50 year history.

We request

- a. a clarification and rationale of the near-term and longer-term goals of the general education requirements review; and if this were agreed to proceed in some form then
- b. a comprehensive and carefully appointed task force; with
- c. an expanded timeline for wider general education review and reform, with more inclusive opportunities for participation in this important aspect of our mission, structure, and culture.

Sincerely,
Stockton University Senate Executive Committee

Office of the Provost

P: 609.652.4514 • F: 609.626.5509



101 Vera King Farris Drive
Galloway NJ 08205

stockton.edu

REQUEST FOR ESSENTIAL LEARNING OUTCOME (ELO) REVIEW

Suggested Members

Faculty Senate Academic Programs and Planning

Framing Ideas and Assignments for the Committee Consider providing this charge to the Faculty Senate Academic Programs and Planning (APP) The APP recommends a long-range plan for undergraduate and graduate education and reviews and approves new degree-granting programs at both undergraduate and graduate levels. We respectfully request that the Committee to respond to inquiries about the impact of increasing the number of undergraduate [graduation requirements](#) and reviewing Stockton's Essential Learning Outcomes (ELOs). The ELOs turn ten years old this year, a fitting milestone for the campus to reflect on their contributions to institutional accomplishments and current goals.

In its work, the task force will address the following topics:

1. Provide feedback on the following based on assessment data and benchmarking with like institutions:
 - a. Should we collapse, simplify or refine the 10 ELOs?
 - b. Should we include RISE Initiative (High Impact Practices)?
 - Can ELOs be collapsed under a RISE ELO?
2. Develop a strategy to assess the need for, and efficacy of, undergraduate degree requirements, including:
 - General Education Goals Requirement: Attributes – A, I, H, V
 - Suggested Credits per G Category
 - Writing Requirement
 - Quantitative Reasoning Requirement
 - Race and Racism Education Requirement
 - First-Year Studies (FRST) Requirement
 - First-Year Seminar Requirement
3. Outline how the above requirements are documented, promoted, and assessed.
4. Consider how these requirements optimize student persistence, retention, and graduation rates.

Timeframe for Outcomes

This information is needed by the first week of December so that schools have time to adjust fall 2022 course schedule prior to becoming viewable to students in January 2022.

Existing information

[Graduation Procedure 2050](#) was updated during the Spring 2021 term. Recent edits include adding the one Race and Racism Education course (R1 or R2).

[Essential Learning Outcomes \(ELOs\) Background](#): During the spring and summer of 2011, Dr. Harvey Kesselman (as Provost) challenged the faculty and staff to engage in a collaborative effort of defining ten (10) essential learning outcomes that each Stockton college graduate should achieve during the course of their Stockton experience. He wrote, “We will focus on ensuring that all graduates acquire a set of essential learning outcomes critical for 21st century success. These outcomes will combine a robust and flexible liberal arts education with adaptive