

General Comments

John Houghton's notes from October 19, 2012 Step 6 open forum

-Comment regarding Wellness and Comm requirements as not being "satisfied" in old GDR system when transferring with completed bachelor or approved associate – will now be.

-Anticipate a "Period" of "co-offering" GDR and GEP. Intuition is that this will be a relatively long (4 – 5) period of years.

-In the process of assessment with Dept. or Univ. assessment requirements take "precedence"? How will this impact individual faculty members?

-Could assessment result in a course being removed from Gen Ed category?

-What are the open record(s) implication(s) of the assessment process?

-Could Departments have individuals provide examples for their peers? Get examples out there?

*-Make new GEP approvals available as soon as possible for planning purposes

-Four Year Plans, Advising, Enrollment

Posted: 10/23/2011 10:21 AM by Sage, James View Properties Reply

Links to the Open Forum videos:

Oct. 19:

<http://www4.uwsp.edu/media/admin/ACAAFF/GenEdReview2011/gened101911.aspx>

Oct. 20:

<http://www4.uwsp.edu/media/admin/ACAAFF/GenEdReview2011/gened102011.aspx>

Posted: 10/31/2011 2:24 PM by Olsen, Gary View Properties Reply

Hello GERPCs,

I know the deadline for comments on Step 6 was last week, but I thought I'd share these just in case they're still useful.

One follow-up to the forum:

I ended up less than clear on the role of the Assessment Coordinator. I was under the impression (based on p. 43 and previous discussions elsewhere) that this person would have a particular expertise in assessment and could be a resource for the GEC and the Assessment Subcommittee. At the forum it sounded more like this was just someone to do the heavy lifting for the GEC (recruiting and coordinating Assessment Teams, compiling data, etc.). If the latter is the case, then I would support having this person be an elected position, perhaps a GEC co-chair. In the former case, however, an administrative appointment makes more sense. One way to make sure power stays in faculty hands would be to make the Assessment Teams formally constituted subcommittees of the GEC who must vote to approve the report that goes forward to the full GEC.

A one editorial suggestions:

In the Handbook proposal on p. 15, the sentences at the beginning of the first two paragraphs are nearly identical. That seems repetitious unless there's some meaningful distinction between "assessment" and "evaluation" that isn't being made clear. It would make sense to me to cut the one in the first paragraph.

(Also, the note numbers in the chart on p. 53 are messed up.)

Thanks!

Mary Bowman

English Dept.

x4338

Assessment Plan

Posted: 10/27/2011 6:57 AM by Sage, James View Properties Reply

From: Wendorf, Craig

James, Don, and Other Members of the GEP Committee –

While I find Step 6 to be a very logical (albeit ambitious) assessment plan, it does represent a fairly significant increase in workload for faculty. I wanted to outline the major concerns that I have heard in discussions with other faculty.

First, although a single course may only be assessed via portfolio every five years, the reality is that many faculty teach multiple courses that fall under this proposal. As a result, they might be doing a course portfolio every other year or worse yet multiple portfolios in a given year. How can we possibly ask faculty to do this much more without some reduction in workload elsewhere?

Second, the amount of work involved is not just a function of the creation of the course portfolio. The faculty learning communities represent a big unknown at this point. What will the actual time commitment look like? I am leery about asking faculty to serve on even more committees.

Third, the proposal states that Communication in the Major and Capstone Experiences must all be assessed as well. While I don't disagree that they should be assessed, I question if it should be a requirement from a GEP perspective. Certainly the Communication and the Capstone elements are departmental, and perhaps assessment of them should fall under the governance of the departments. Combined with my first concern, now faculty may be doing multiple course portfolios most years. Yikes.

Fourth, Experiential Learning is going to be more difficult to utilize a course portfolio model. In some cases, there is no clear written product. What then would be submitted into the portfolio? And given that it's not a credit bearing element to begin with, I wonder how appropriate the assessment model is here.

I hope the committee can provide clarity and guidance in simplifying the assessment plan and process. Though student learning is always primary, high workload of faculty is one of the major obstacles to effective teaching and learning.

Sincerely,

Craig A. Wendorf, Ph.D.

Professor and Chair of Psychology

University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point

Transferring Credit to UWSP

Posted: 10/11/2011 11:54 AM by Glennon, Catherine View Properties Reply

Due to a recent change in the UW System Transfer Policy, the Admissions Office would like the second bullet in this section changed to the following (or similar wording). If you have questions, please contact Cathy Glennon, Director of Admissions. Thanks!

Credit is generally awarded for college-level courses completed with grades of D or higher at institutions accredited by a regional or national accrediting organization recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). Courses must be similar in nature, level and content to course work in our undergraduate curriculum. Continuing education courses and courses that are remedial, technical, vocational or doctrinal in nature are not transferable.

Posted: 10/22/2011 9:03 AM by Veum, Mick View Properties Reply

I have some questions about using the math placement exam as a means of testing out of the quantitative literacy requirement. If placing in level 7 demonstrates sufficient quantitative literacy to satisfy the GEP requirement, then it seems logical to infer that the math placement exam adequately assesses the learning outcomes associated with the quant. lit. requirement. Is that a correct inference? If this inference is correct, then can a student request to take the math placement exam as a means of testing out?

Also, do the prerequisite math courses associated with level 7 then, by default, satisfy the quantitative literacy requirement? It also seems logical to infer that if placing into level 7 demonstrates a student has achieved the learning outcomes of the QL requirement, then passing the prerequisites for level 7 should also demonstrate that those learning outcomes have been met. I reserve the right to incorrect about this, but I am picturing that it would be entirely conceivable for a student to place below level 7, go on to major in a quantitative natural science like physics (or even double-major in physics and math for that matter), and still not have satisfied the quantitative literacy requirement. It would really depend on whether or not the math courses are designate as QL. The GEP physics courses taken by a mjaor will be designated as NS and won't apply to QL. If I am thinking about this correctly, then either the palcement exam itself is a loophole, or there is a doughnut hole in the QL requirement.

Edited: 10/26/2011 9:41 AM by Guay, Don View Properties Reply

A score of 7 indicates that a student has demonstrated that he or she would be able to meet the learning outcomes if he or she would enroll in a QL course. A placement score of 7 indicates that a student has tested beyond Math 109 which has been submitted to the General Education Committee as a QL course in the new GEP.

All students take the math placement exam which means that every student on campus is in essence taking a test-out exam for QL since the Mathematical Sciences Department has chosen to use the UW System math placement exam as their test-out instrument.

Individual departments are responsible for bringing courses to the General Education Committee for approval to meet QL learning outcomes as appropriate. The list of courses brought to the General Education Committee for approval as QL by the Mathematical Sciences Department is sufficient to meet the needs of the diverse science majors on campus.