

University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point

# Step 5d

---

## Course Criteria

**General Education Policy Review Committee  
March 7, 2011**

**Revised – Academic Affairs Committee  
April 11, 2011**

**Approved by Faculty Senate: April 20, 2011**

A proposal for approval through faculty governance.

## Index

Proposal	3
Explanation of Proposal	9
Summary of Changes	9
Resources	11
General Criteria	12
Foundation	14
Investigation	17
Cultural & Environmental Awareness	18
Integration	18
Center for Academic Excellence and Student Engagement	23
Appendix I: Experiential Learning Activity Guide	25

## Proposal

### GENERAL CRITERIA

1. These criteria apply to the Foundation, Investigation, and Integration levels of the General Education Program (GEP).
2. All courses to be considered for the GEP must be proposed by an academic department or functional equivalent.
3. All courses to be considered for the GEP must be approved by the General Education Committee through the submission of a course proposal. The proposal will typically include:
  - a. Basic course information, including course number, title, credits, and catalog description.
  - b. A representative course syllabus, including learning outcomes aligned with those of the General Education program.
  - c. A narrative describing how student learning will be assessed.
4. All courses must address the approved learning outcomes in the category in which they are taught.
5. All courses should be taught by an instructor with teaching, research, or professional expertise in an appropriate area of study in order to satisfy the relevant learning outcomes in each category. Typically, instructors should possess at least a Master's degree appropriate to the area or category of the proposed course..
  - a. Note: If there is a question about instructor qualifications, the General Education Committee must seek advice from the appropriate department(s) and may request a brief curriculum vitae describing the instructor's qualifications.
6. No course in the Foundation or Investigation Levels may satisfy more than one general education requirement, unless it is paired with one of the following categories: Global Awareness, U.S. Diversity, Environmental Responsibility, or Experiential Learning.
7. Courses that exceed the GEP credit requirements satisfy the requirement.

### FOUNDATION

1. All requirements in the Foundation Level must be completed before students reach 60 credits. If not, students will be restricted to enrolling for a maximum of 12 credits each semester until the Foundation Level is complete.

### First Year Seminar

1. All First Year Seminars must be numbered according to the following scheme, with appropriate subtitle:
  - a. FYS 101: Foundations of Critical Inquiry (GEP: FYS)

- b. FYS 102: Foundations of Critical Inquiry (GEP: FYS and Global Awareness)
  - c. FYS 103: Foundations of Critical Inquiry (GEP: FYS and U.S. Diversity)
  - d. FYS 104: Foundations of Critical Inquiry (GEP: FYS and Environmental Responsibility)
  - e. FYS 105: Foundations of Critical Inquiry (GEP: FYS and Experiential Learning)
2. All First Year Seminars should focus on topics about which instructors have both expertise and interest, and which are engaging to a general audience of first-year students.
  - a. The primary function of the First Year Seminar should NOT be to serve as an introduction to a major.
  - b. Ordinarily, no First Year Seminar may be required for a major.
3. Current non-instructional staff are invited to seek adjunct teaching appointments with academic departments in order to teach first-year seminars.
4. All First Year Seminar instructors must attend a workshop coordinated by the Center for Academic Excellence and Student Engagement.
5. FYS courses should have sufficiently small enrollments so that students will receive appropriate individual feedback.

### **Written Communication**

1. The Written Communication outcomes will be satisfied by English 101: Freshman English and English 202: Sophomore English.
2. English 150: Advanced Freshman English may be substituted for English 101/202, with the appropriate placement.
3. English 101 should be taken during the student's freshman year.
4. English 202 should be taken during the student's sophomore year and will have a prerequisite of English 101.
5. Written Communication courses should have sufficiently small enrollments so that students will receive appropriate individual feedback.

### **Oral Communication**

1. The Oral Communication outcomes will be satisfied by Communication 101: Fundamentals of Oral Communication.
2. Oral Communication courses should have sufficiently small enrollments so that students will receive appropriate individual feedback.

### **Quantitative Literacy**

1. All Quantitative Literacy courses will have a prerequisite of Math 90 or higher.

## **Wellness**

1. Wellness is a one-credit requirement that may be satisfied by a one-, two-, or three-credit course.

## **INVESTIGATION**

1. All courses at the Investigation Level should be designed to serve one of two student populations:
  - a. Survey courses designed to serve all students regardless of major; such courses do not presume academic or disciplinary preparation beyond the Foundation Level;
  - b. Courses designed to serve students in specific majors; such courses presume more advanced background preparation appropriate to the discipline.
2. Ordinarily, courses in the Investigation Level will not have prerequisites beyond the Foundation Level. Departments must provide a rationale when proposing General Education courses with prerequisites.
3. A single course may not be designated for more than one Investigation Level category.

## **CULTURAL & ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS**

1. The instructor and course criteria for the categories of Global Awareness, U.S. Diversity, and Environmental Responsibility are driven exclusively by the approved learning outcomes. A combination of education, research, and professional development related to these categories that allow the learning outcomes to be met is considered qualifying.
2. Ordinarily, courses offered in this area will fulfill one other requirement in the General Education curriculum at the same time, either at the Foundation, Investigation, or Integration Levels.
3. A single course may not be designated for more than one Cultural and Environmental Awareness category.

## **INTEGRATION**

### **Interdisciplinary Studies**

1. Students will complete either: a single Interdisciplinary Studies course or an approved Interdisciplinary Major, Minor, or Certificate.
2. "Interdisciplinary" shall be defined as "integrating content, data, methods, tools, concepts, and theories from two or more disciplines or bodies of specialized knowledge in order to advance fundamental understanding, answer questions, address complex issues and broad themes, and solve problems" (from Julie

Thompson Klein, *Creating Interdisciplinary Campus Cultures: A Model for Strength and Sustainability*, 2010).

3. The course content, methods and related learning outcomes must be closely related to two distinct categories in the Investigation Level, namely Arts, Humanities, Historical Perspectives, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences.

For single Interdisciplinary Studies courses:

4. Students shall have a minimum of sophomore standing before enrolling in any Interdisciplinary Studies course.
5. If the course is co-taught by two instructors:
  - a. The instructors should represent two distinct disciplines, as defined above.
  - b. The instructors should provide a written explanation regarding the division of work.
6. If the course is proposed by a single instructor:
  - a. In some cases, a single instructor may have at least a Master's Degree in two distinct disciplinary fields that will be used in the course.
  - b. In other cases, in addition to at least a Master's Degree in one discipline, a single instructor should possess adequate teaching or research experience in another discipline to allow students to satisfy the approved learning outcomes for Interdisciplinary Studies. The instructor should provide a written explanation of how their teaching experience, research, or other academic training has prepared them to teach an Interdisciplinary Studies course.

For Interdisciplinary Majors, Minors, and Certificates:

7. Interdisciplinarity, as defined above, should be the organizing principle of the coursework involved. An interdisciplinary program is an intentional integration of multiple disciplines. In other words, it is not meant to focus largely on a single discipline or methodology with one or two extra courses added to the requirements.
8. The program must include a plan from the department or coordinator for how student achievement of the approved interdisciplinary learning outcomes will be assessed.

### **Experiential Learning**

1. Experiential Learning will provide students with meaningful learning experiences and activities that go beyond traditional classroom settings.
2. The Experiential Learning requirement may be completed through one of two different options: (a) structured, recurring credit-bearing course(s) or learning experience(s), or (b) a student-initiated learning experience that could be either credit-bearing or non-credit-bearing. Each option must meet the approved learning outcomes.

- a. The first option, as proposed by an academic department and approved by the General Education Committee, includes (but is not limited to) the following possibilities: service-learning courses, internships, externships, practicum experiences, field experiences, student teaching, or credit-bearing study-abroad experiences. Students transferring to UWSP can request to have a previous experiential learning course satisfy the requirement.
  - b. The second option, as proposed by an individual student, is an “Experiential Learning Activity” (ELA), and includes (but is not limited to) any of the following possibilities: credit-bearing independent studies, undergraduate research opportunities, or creative performances; community service projects; student leadership experiences; professional development through paid or unpaid work experiences or internships. Students must complete the ELA while enrolled at UWSP.
3. All ELAs (option 2b above) must meet the following criteria:
- a. All ELAs must be coordinated with an ELA Mentor. Any UWSP faculty or academic staff (instructional or non-instructional) member may serve as a Mentor for an ELA.
  - b. Students must meet with their ELA Mentor and complete an ELA Plan form before beginning the activity.
  - c. The ELA Plan must be approved by the Mentor before the student begins the activity.
  - d. An ELA must consist of a minimum of 16 hours of service and/or experience.
  - e. Students must reflect on their activity through oral and/or written communication with their Mentor.
  - f. The Mentor will evaluate the ELA.
  - g. The Mentor will record when the ELA has been completed.

### **Communication in the Major**

1. The Communication in the Major requirement addresses discipline-specific communication that builds on the Written and Oral Communication learning outcomes of the Foundation level.
2. Departments or units will designate a minimum of six credits at the 200-level or above within each major to meet the Communication in the Major requirement. Departments may distribute this requirement over any number of courses. These courses may, when appropriate, come from other departments but must be included as part of the major.
3. These courses must include a plan for how student achievement of the approved Communication in the Major learning outcomes will be assessed.

4. All instructors teaching Communication in the Major courses must complete a workshop coordinated by the Center for Academic Excellence and Student Engagement.
5. Communication in the Major courses should have sufficiently small enrollments so that students will receive adequate personal feedback, from both instructors and their peers, on their communication skills.
6. Assignments should be based on the kinds of communication typical of the relevant discipline or profession.
7. Both writing and speaking instruction should be integrated into course discussions and activities and include grading criteria, revision experiences, and opportunities for student peer review. Writing and speaking instruction can be taught together in a single course or divided among courses.

**Capstone Experience in the Major**

1. Departments will designate a Capstone course(s) or experience for each of its majors.
2. The Capstone course(s) or experience should require the use of skills, methodology, and knowledge which demonstrate continuity between the General Education Program Outcomes and the major.
3. Capstone courses or experiences should have sufficiently small enrollment caps to allow for active participation by each student and feedback by the instructor.



## Explanation of Proposal

The General Education Policy Review Committee is extremely thankful to those who commented on the Step 5b proposal released to campus for review last semester. The committee has made several changes to the criteria and the explanation of the criteria as a result of these comments. GEPRC has always been and still is committed to partnering with the campus as a whole to implement a very strong General Education program worthy of the educational reputation of UWSP.

After reviewing the campus feedback regarding the Step 5b proposal sent out for review last semester, the GEPRC has made significant revisions in Step 5c accordingly. Many of the revisions were for clarity, organization, or grammar. However, several revisions were also made to the criteria themselves. All of the proposed revisions to the criteria are discussed in detail in the explanation section of this document. Here is a brief summary of the changes made to the criteria.

### Summary of Changes

#### General Criteria

- Clarified the limits of courses that may satisfy more than one GE requirement.
- Added a requirement that all courses must be proposed by an Academic Department or a functional equivalent.
- Strengthened the requirement for the General Education Committee to seek advice from appropriate departments when instructor qualifications are in question.
- Added a statement that courses that exceed the GEP credit requirement may satisfy the requirement.

#### First Year Seminar

- Since all courses must be proposed by an Academic Department or functional equivalent, an invitation was added for non-instructional academic staff to seek adjunct teaching appointments with the appropriate academic unit on campus in order to teach FYS courses.
- The enrollment cap of 20 students was removed.

#### Oral and Written Communication

- Enrollment caps of 24 students for Oral Communication and 23 students for Written Communication courses were removed.

### Quantitative Literacy

- Revised the prerequisite to be Math 90 *or higher*.

### Investigation

- Revised the statement to say that GEP courses should serve either general students or targeted students as introductory courses for specific majors.

### Cultural & Environmental Awareness

- Added a statement that a single course cannot satisfy more than one requirement in the C&EA category.

### Interdisciplinary Studies

- The definition of disciplines was clarified to reflect course content, methods, and learning outcomes of the General Education Program at the Investigation Level, rather than discipline labels.
- The prerequisite for all Interdisciplinary Studies courses was revised to be sophomore standing for all students. In step 5b, all IS courses had to be numbered at the 300-level or above.

### Experiential Learning

- The criteria were reorganized into two options: a) recurring credit-bearing courses, or b) student-initiated experiences.
- The minimum time required to satisfy the requirement for an ELA was lowered from 24 to 16 hours.
- The requirement for students to identify their ELA prior to completing 90 credits was removed.
- The degree requirement for UWSP faculty/staff to serve as an ELA mentor was removed.

### Communication in the Major

- The requirement was changed from a minimum of 6 credits at the 300 level or above to a minimum of 6 credits at the 200 level or above.
- The writing and speaking requirements for a specific number of pages of writing and specific time for presentations were removed.

### Capstone Experience in the Major

- The requirement to complete the capstone experience during the student's senior year was removed.

## Resources

The committee received many comments that raised questions about the resource implications of the new General Education Program (GEP). Although the committee has discussed these issues in its deliberations—including asking questions of the Provost—we wish to emphasize again that resources per se are not part of our purview. Certainly, we are not pretending that the new curriculum has no resource implications. It does, and they are numerous and complex. Nevertheless, the committee was not formally charged to make resource decisions. Rather, our task is merely to assist the campus in creating the new curriculum. As the Faculty Senate approves various parts of this curriculum, it then falls to the Provost working with Deans, department chairs, and the faculty to allocate the resources necessary to implement these decisions.

Given the scope and complexity of the new GEP, the resulting resource implications are sure to take time to understand and address. For example, the great majority of “resource” comments received by the committee thus far have raised questions concerning the First Year Seminar (FYS). This is not surprising. To implement a required FYS on a campus the size of UWSP is a major undertaking, and there are many resource implications. At present, however, it remains difficult to say precisely how much money or additional positions will be required to implement the FYS, because the new GEP and the related degree requirements have yet to be finalized. (In theory, if the GEP reflects an overall reduction in the number of required credits as compared to the current General Degree Requirements, this might free some resources for new elements of the program, including the FYS. But again, this is difficult to predict at the moment.) In the meantime, given the Faculty Senate’s approval of the FYS, the Provost’s office has already begun to work with Deans, departments, and faculty members to assist the campus in putting this program in place, investing significantly in the necessary professional and instructional development.

The fact that resource issues are outside the committee’s purview also led us to remove any reference to enrollment caps from the Step 5 proposal. In the Step 5b version, the committee had included specific enrollment caps related to the First Year Seminar and the Written and Oral Communication categories. These caps were based on current practices in the existing Communication 101 and English 101/102/150 courses, as well as on a review of the literature related to First Year Seminars. In the revised Step 5c proposal, by contrast, enrollment caps are not specifically noted in the proposed criteria. Although enrollment in a course clearly affects the instructor’s ability to teach the course successfully, it remains fundamentally a resource question to be determined in conversations among the Provost, Deans, department chairs, and the faculty. Even more important, establishing enrollment “caps” can often have the

unintended consequence of creating enrollment “minimums,” especially in difficult budgetary circumstances. Finally, rigid enrollment caps can also unnecessarily restrict the flexibility that department chairs and faculty members ought rightfully to have in deciding how best to deliver a particular course. Although the committee remains convinced that enrollments in these Foundation-level courses need to be small, we have decided that it is best to leave the question of how small to those with the authority to make these resource decisions.

### General Criteria

#### *Instructor Qualifications*

As noted in our previous proposal, under the present General Degree Requirements (GDRs), UWSP has been governed by relatively inflexible rules regarding which instructors are permitted to teach in each GDR category. Many of the GDRs themselves are labeled using department names, including Freshman English, Mathematics, Communication, History, and Foreign Language. (The GDRs are described in Chapter 7, Section 6: <http://www.uwsp.edu/admin/handbook/handbook09-10/CH7-8%2009-10.pdf>.) Beyond this implicit restriction, the only instance in which instructor qualifications are explicitly stated in the Handbook is in the Social Science area, which specifies that “Category 1 courses must be offered from the departments of Business/Economics (Economics only), Geography/Geology (Cultural Geography only), Philosophy/Anthropology (Anthropology only), Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology.” Other faculty are permitted to teach Social Science classes, but only under the “Category 2” label.

The solution proposed by the committee is to vest “ownership” of the curriculum in a new General Education Committee (GEC) as a standing committee of the Faculty Senate. This idea was initially proposed by the HLC Assessment Academy Team and approved in principle by the Senate’s Executive Committee. It has been referred to the Constitution and Handbook Review Subcommittee for development as a formal proposal for consideration by the Senate. According to the criteria proposed by GEPRC, the new GEC would be charged with ensuring that instructors in each category of the curriculum demonstrate “teaching, research, or professional expertise in an appropriate area of study in order to satisfy the relevant learning outcomes.” If members of the GEC are uncertain for any reason, the proposed criteria require them to seek advice from appropriate departments.

The committee received a great deal of feedback from campus concerning instructor qualifications. As has become typical of this issue, opinion was split between two opposing views: some faculty/staff wanted more specific and stricter criteria regarding the degrees and department memberships that qualify someone to teach in a given category while others

argued that the criteria as proposed in Step 5b were sufficient, or perhaps even overly restrictive.

In response, the committee has maintained its current proposal largely unchanged, except for two significant revisions. First, as noted above, we have strengthened the language under General Criteria to require the new General Education Committee to consult the appropriate academic departments in the event of uncertainties regarding instructor qualifications. Second, we have made clear that departments (or their functional equivalents) are responsible for proposing all General Education courses, and as a result, that these departments are ultimately responsible for selecting, identifying, and assuring the qualifications of the instructors teaching their GE courses, including the First Year Seminars. Given these slight but significant clarifications, we continue to believe that these criteria are sufficient to ensure that instructors in each area of the GE curriculum are qualified without unnecessarily or arbitrarily restricting people's ability to teach.

The most pointed conversation concerning instructor qualifications concerned the Investigation Level, and specifically the Historical Perspectives category. Unlike the current History General Degree Requirement, which is taught only by members of the History Department, the new Historical Perspectives requirement can theoretically be offered by qualified faculty in other departments. Critics of this proposal have argued that History is a discipline, and that this disciplinary training is an essential qualification for offering Historical Perspectives courses. Certainly, the committee is aware that History is a discipline. But History, in fact, is not the only discipline that engages the world historically. Just as there are numerous disciplines which lay some claim to contributing to the Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences, there are also numerous disciplines in which historical engagement is a core part of their methodology. This includes historical geography, art history, and theater history, among others. As a result, in proposing that the Historical Perspectives category remain open to faculty outside the History Department, we are not suggesting that these faculty be allowed to teach the discipline of History. Rather, the committee proposes that they be allowed to teach *their own disciplines*, provided that these disciplines are themselves historical in their methodology and that the instructor is qualified to offer courses that meet the learning outcomes of Historical Perspectives.

#### *Instructors in the First Year Seminar*

The proposal outlined above also applies to the First Year Seminar. In the Step 5b proposal, the committee had suggested that non-instructional academic staff with at least a Master's degree should be allowed to serve as qualified instructors. The campus responded to this suggestion with two opposing sentiments: some people thought that FYS instructors should be full-time,

tenure-track professors, while other people agreed that non-instructional academic staff might be well qualified to serve as FYS instructors, especially with respect to addressing the learning outcomes involving study skills, information literacy, and co-curricular involvement.

Under the current Step 5c proposal, staff members currently in non-instructional positions can still become instructors for a First Year Seminar. But to do so, they will need to be formally hired and supervised in an instructional academic staff position by an academic department or unit. (This is essentially in keeping with current practice.) In this way, academic departments will be responsible for overseeing instructor selection for the FYS. Staff members in this situation would still need to be granted release time or additional compensation for their efforts, and we urge the administration to establish policies to govern this scenario. The committee remains convinced that allowing traditionally non-instructional staff to participate in the FYS program will enhance the curriculum and benefit students. We hope that clarifying the role of academic departments in providing oversight and ensuring instructor qualifications will ease the concerns of those who raised questions about the previous proposal.

## Foundation

### *First Year Seminar*

The course numbers proposed for the First Year Seminar are determined by the additional General Education requirements they are intended to fulfill. Given that each FYS course might also fulfill the requirements for Global Awareness, U.S. Diversity, Environmental Responsibility, or Experiential Learning, we need to have a unique number for each of these possibilities, including an FYS course that does not carry any additional General Education credit.

Please note that the committee has also proposed a title for the course beyond simply calling it the First Year Seminar. “Foundations of Critical Inquiry” appears to reflect the approved learning outcomes relatively well, but we would welcome other suggestions from the campus.

### *Written and Oral Communication*

Written and Oral Communication is the only area in which the committee has singled out particular classes to satisfy the learning outcomes. We did so for several reasons:

- English 101 and 202 (or English 150) and Communication 101 give all students a common starting point in developing effective communication skills that can be built upon in all general education and major courses and particularly in Communication in the Major courses.
- In the Department of English, Foundation-level composition instruction is coordinated by the Freshman English Program, ensuring programmatic

coherence, consistency, and quality. In the Division of Communication, Foundation-level oral communication instruction is coordinated by a director, ensuring programmatic coherence, consistency, and quality.

- UWSP has a history of relying on faculty within the Department of English and the Division of Communication to teach foundational-level communication courses. Faculty in the Department of English as well as faculty in the Division of Communication have the expertise as well as the extensive training and experience needed to teach the fundamentals of written and oral communication, which all undergraduates take and which pose unique, time-consuming instructional demands. Graduate assistants for the Division of Communication who teach discussion sections undergo training before and throughout the semester.

We received a number of comments regarding the three-credit requirement for Oral Communication. After thoughtful consideration during Step 4, the Committee designated a three-credit requirement for Oral Communication. For Step 5, the Committee proposes that Communication 101 will meet this three-credit requirement. Under this proposal, the Division of Communication will need to revise the current Communication 101 to be a three-credit course that meets the learning outcomes for Oral Communication that were approved in Step 4.

Since many colleges and universities require three credits of basic communications, UWSP students who transfer to other schools have to retake the course. And the current practice of allowing students to add an extra credit by completing an extra assignment is not the best pedagogical practice.

Moreover, just like all other courses in the new General Education Program, Communication 101 will be assessed and revised in content and structure to meet the learning outcomes for a three-credit Communication course. Communication 101 relies on graduate assistants to teach discussion sections; however, the course structure and content is designed and monitored by a faculty director who delivers the weekly lecture. After being vetted for their qualifications and potential for successful teaching, graduate assistants undergo a week-long mentoring orientation, attend the weekly lecture, and attend weekly meetings to discuss pedagogical issues. They also participate in end-of-the-semester evaluations. As part of course review for the new GEP, the Division of Communication will consider several course revisions, including incorporating additional assignments, using technology, and focusing on small group oral communication. Finally, the Division of Communication is interested in collaborating with other departments to possibly offer a greater variety of class options under Communication 101. For

example, some sections of Communication 101 could be geared specifically to students in particular majors.

Another issue concerning Oral and Written Communication is enrollment caps or ranges. We removed the enrollment caps or ranges in the proposal (above) because it is an administrative/resource issue outside the committee's purview. Still, the committee suggests that enrollments in these courses remain as small as possible. In line with current practice, an enrollment range of 20-23 students for English 101, 202, and 150 and Communication 101 is a pedagogically sound goal. This is not to say that all courses in the General Education Program would not benefit from smaller enrollments. The instructional demands of written and oral communication courses, however, are especially labor intensive because all students take these courses and because of the demands of teaching the fundamentals of writing and speech as the primary focus of these courses. Giving students timely and detailed oral and written feedback on a regular basis throughout a semester, addressing students' needs in class when preparing presentations or essay drafts, and working with students individually during conferences requires small class sizes. Various organizations dedicated to composition issues along with research on the size of writing courses suggest that the size of writing classes should be in the range of 17-20 students [for example, see Horning, Alice. "The Definitive Article on Class Size." *WPA: Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators* 31 (2007): 11-34]. It is also the consensus of communication faculty at UWSP as well as faculty at other institutions that larger class sizes limit the amount speaking and targeted feedback that can occur in an oral communication class.

The idea of moving the current English 101/102 sequence to a new English 101/202 format comes from the English Department itself. Research shows that that a sophomore writing experience can be more beneficial for the retention of writing knowledge and skills than a two-course requirement entirely in the freshman year. In addition, students will have more educational experience on which to base their writing assignments and should have a better understanding of the importance of developing and practicing their writing knowledge and skills.

### *Quantitative Literacy*

Campus feedback correctly noted that many courses that might satisfy the Quantitative Literacy requirement will have a prerequisite higher than Math 90. Therefore, the Course Criteria were revised to indicate that all Quantitative Literacy courses will have a prerequisite of Math 90 **or higher**. In addition, as revised in the General Criteria section, Quantitative Literacy courses must be a minimum of 3 credits. Courses that exceed the 3 credit minimum are acceptable.



GEPRC received a few comments regarding the amount of Quantitative Literacy required in General Education. The Quantitative Literacy requirement passed by Faculty Senate in Step 4, in conjunction with the latest draft of the Degree Requirements proposal circulated by the Academic Affairs Committee, requires students to meet essentially the same level of quantitative literacy as our current General Degree Requirements.

### *Wellness*

For Step 5c, there are no changes to the Wellness criteria (we did not receive any feedback regarding the Step 5 Wellness criteria). The feedback we received about Wellness referred to Step 4 issues, which passed Faculty Senate in February 2010.

### Investigation

In the Investigation Level, the committee made only one modest addition to the criteria suggested in the Step 5b proposal; namely, to define more precisely the intended audience for the courses offered in this area. The committee's previous proposal suggested that "all courses in the Investigation Level must be sufficiently broad to serve an audience of general education students." Several comments from the campus feedback noted the vagueness of the term "sufficiently broad" and requested something more precise. In response, the committee's current proposal defines two distinct groups of students to which these courses may be aimed:

- a. Students with little academic or disciplinary background in the subject area, beyond what they will be expected to have achieved from General Education courses at the Foundation Level;
- b. Students within particular majors or related fields for which more advanced preparation in the discipline can be expected.

This two-tiered structure is intended to provide departments with the flexibility required to serve both the broad audience of students looking simply to fulfill the General Education requirement as well those students within their own majors and related fields who require more content-specific preparation. In the Natural Science area, for example, the Biology Department might choose to continue offering Biology 100: Biological Principles and the Human Environment as a General Education course for students with little background in the discipline. (See "a" above.) At the same time, the department could also continue to offer Biology 101: General Biology, Biology 130: Introduction to Plant Biology, and Biology 160: Introduction to Animal Biology as General Education courses for those students in majors that require this more advanced content (as described in "b" above). The same may well be true for other Investigation Level courses (Social Sciences, Historical Perspectives, Humanities, Arts).

## Cultural and Environmental Awareness

As with the Investigation Level, courses in this area require few criteria beyond the approved learning outcomes. The only criteria we have proposed involve the breadth of topics, which should be broad enough to be of interest to general education students and which should generally not require pre-requisites.

Since courses addressing these learning outcomes could originate in a wide array of disciplines, it is anticipated that such courses will be used to satisfy another requirement in the General Education curriculum at the same time. Thus, a course that is satisfying a Cultural and Environmental Awareness requirement could also be satisfying requirements in the Foundation, Investigation, or Integration levels. An individual course, however, may only satisfy one requirement within the Cultural and Environmental Awareness category.

In keeping with current practice (with respect to Non-Western Culture, Minority Studies, and Environmental Literacy), it is also likely that instructors offering courses in Cultural and Environmental Awareness (Global Awareness, U. S. Diversity, and Environmental Responsibility) may come from a diverse set of disciplinary backgrounds. For that reason, it is recommended that instructor qualifications be based on a combination of education, research, and professional development adequate to address the approved learning outcomes.

## Integration

### *Interdisciplinary Studies*

There have only been two changes from Step 5b to Step 5c. First, the definition of disciplines was clarified to reflect course content, methods, and learning outcomes of the General Education Program at the Investigation Level, rather than disciplinary labels. Second, the prerequisite for all Interdisciplinary Studies courses was revised to be sophomore standing for all students. Interdisciplinarity can be defined in a great variety of ways. As a result, in establishing criteria for the Interdisciplinary Studies category in the new General Education Program, the committee sought to adopt standards that fulfilled the learning outcomes and at the same time remained internally consistent with the rest of the GEP curriculum. In particular, given its location in the Integration Level, the Interdisciplinary Studies requirement is intended to build on the knowledge and methodologies that students will learn from previous courses in the General Education Program.

The committee recognizes that these criteria will exclude some courses and programs from fulfilling the Interdisciplinary Studies requirement. For example, a Biochemistry major may well

integrate distinct methodologies employed in Biology and Chemistry. However, both Biology and Chemistry are categorized as Natural Sciences within the GEP. Given the structure of the approved General Education Program and its intent to provide as broad an education as possible, it seems prudent to focus on programs that integrate the disciplinary areas defined at the Investigation Level.

Not every course or program precisely fits within the GEP categories at the Investigation Level. As a result, we sought to provide enough flexibility in the proposed criteria to include exceptions where they are warranted. For example, the College of Natural Resources currently joins with the History Department to teach Forestry/History 392: Native American Forestry. Although Forestry may not elect to propose courses that count specifically for Natural Sciences credit in the new General Education Program, the Forestry/History 392 course nonetheless integrates two disciplines that clearly represent the Natural Sciences and Historical Perspectives areas of the Investigation Level. The same may well be true for other courses that align with the Foundation and Cultural and Environmental Awareness learning outcomes.

The proposed criteria also leave broad discretion to the General Education Committee to determine which majors, minors, and certificates should fulfill the Interdisciplinary Studies requirement. These programs, just like individual courses, must submit a plan for how student achievement of the approved learning outcomes will be assessed.

### *Experiential Learning*

Some people expressed concern that the Experiential Learning requirement will place an undue burden on faculty. Although the committee understands this concern, we believe strongly that this requirement will enhance the educational experience of UWSP students. In many cases, UWSP students already engage in experiential learning, but we, as a campus, haven't coordinated our efforts to recognize it. The committee also hopes that the Experiential Learning requirement will help to motivate departments and faculty to offer additional opportunities for experiential learning.

In fact, many departments already offer, or might even require their majors to participate in, some type of "learn-by-doing" experience: for example, service-learning courses, internships, field experiences, student teaching, or a music, dance or theater performance. In these cases, departments can propose to have these existing courses or experiences designated as fulfilling the learning outcomes for Experiential Learning. Obviously, these recurring, credit-bearing courses or experiences are not restricted to only majors, but can be offered to non-majors as well. As long as these courses or experiences are approved by the General Education Committee (GEC) as satisfying the Experiential Learning requirement, ELA Mentors are not required.

In some cases, however, students may elect to satisfy the Experiential Learning requirement by engaging in a non-credit-bearing experience, or what is called an “Experiential Learning Activity” (ELA). These ELAs will be approved by individual faculty or staff members who agree to serve as an “ELA Mentor” for the student. In other words, for ELA experiences that are student-initiated (community service projects, student leadership positions, undergraduate research, paid summer work, etc.), an ELA Mentor is required.

When it comes to serving as ELA Mentors, the committee hopes that since all faculty and academic staff (instructional and non-instructional) can serve as ELA Mentors, the service to the students will be shared by many. In addition to this, the ELA option should not be much of an extra burden for those experiential learning activities where students already collaborate with faculty or academic staff members (i.e., research supervisor, student organization advisor, academic advisor, or any other “general educational service” capacity, as noted in the University Handbook). Obviously, if the student’s ELA is a credit-bearing course (e.g., an independent study or practicum), the ELA Mentor will have to be a faculty member or hold a teaching appointment in a department. But for ELAs that are non-credit-bearing (student leadership, community service, etc.), the ELA Mentor can be an academic staff member.

Based on feedback we received, for the Experiential Learning requirement that is satisfied by option (a), a structured, recurring credit-bearing course or learning experience, the committee decided not to identify specific criteria beyond meeting the learning outcomes. We expect that the department proposing the credit-bearing course or experience will use their best judgment when determining the number of hours required, as well as the type of reflection required of students.

The committee decided to reduce the number of hours required for option (b), the student-initiated Experiential Learning Activity, from 24 to 16 (or what is the equivalent of the contact hours for a 1-credit course).

Although some people commented that the number of hours for the Experiential Learning requirement were too many, others expressed the concern that the criteria for Experiential Learning were too minimal. As a compromise, the committee decided on the current proposal as a starting place. In the future, after seeing how this works, we certainly hope that the Experiential Learning requirements will be modified to better serve UWSP students and the UWSP campus community.

Finally, there were also concerns regarding the requirement to identify the ELA before reaching 90 credits. In particular, it was thought that this would create an undue procedural burden and might create delays for students. The committee decided to remove this requirement. Instead, we recognize that it is the responsibility of the student and his/her academic advisor to include discussions of Experiential Learning options throughout the advising and degree-planning process, and to ensure timely completion of the Experiential Learning requirement (either course-based or through an ELA).

See Appendix I, “Experiential Learning Activity Guide,” for more details and examples of ELAs.

### *Communication in the Major*

The Communication in the Major (CM) requirement (non-GEP credit) addresses the continued need for students to improve their writing and speaking knowledge and skills. During their freshman and sophomore years, undergraduates will take English 101 and 202 and Communication 101, courses which address communication fundamentals using various types of subjects and assignments not necessarily related to a student’s major. Taken mainly during the junior and senior years (some CM courses can be sophomore level), CM courses allow students to build on their foundational communication skills and, more specifically, give students experience with discipline-specific writing and speaking tasks. Although CM courses focus on content as well as writing and speaking, writing and speaking are an integral component of these courses. Perhaps most importantly, CM courses allow all faculty members to use their knowledge of discipline-specific communication to help students improve their communication awareness and skills, a need almost universally acknowledged by faculty. This CM requirement is one important example of how general education goals can be integrated with courses in the major, hopefully dispelling the notion that general education program is an obstacle to overcome or a perfunctory checklist of courses.

The CM requirement retains some of the characteristics of the former Writing Emphasis (WE) requirement while addressing some of the problems with WE courses identified by faculty. It will be possible to adapt WE courses to meet the learning outcomes for CM courses. The CM requirement can be satisfied with two or more classes (e.g., two three-credit courses or three two-credit courses). Of course, a department or unit can require their students to take additional CM courses (beyond what is needed to satisfy the requirement) if they wish to make the requirement more rigorous. Class size might be a factor in how departments devise the requirement structure since larger classes will limit the amount of writing and speaking that can be assigned as well as the ability of the instructor to provide timely and specific feedback. Most departments will offer the CM courses that their students need to fulfill the requirement, but in some cases students may take CM courses offered by other departments when appropriate

(e.g., science majors might take an advanced scientific and technical writing CM course offered by the English Department). In such cases, departments would need to collaborate as they design CM courses.

Class sizes have been left to the judgment of each department or unit. Class sizes should, however, be as small as possible to ensure that CM courses meet the designated learning outcomes. Research clearly shows that small classes enable more effective writing and speaking practice. There will be more opportunities for students to work closely with faculty and their peers as well as for faculty to provide students with detailed oral and written feedback without becoming overwhelmed. In addition, departments have flexibility in determining the amount of writing and speaking that is appropriate for meeting the CM requirement. As discussed in the explanation section of Step 4 of the GEP, general guidelines for the CM requirement will help ensure that it is addressed credibly and consistently across the university. As a general guideline for two or more courses (six credits), writing should total a minimum of 12 pages, but each department or unit determines what constitutes a “page,” based on writing common in a discipline (e.g., a research essay, a literature review, or a concept explanation with graphics). Following these same general guidelines (e.g., two or more courses), speaking should include at least two presentations so that students have the opportunity to build upon an initial speaking experience, but, again, departments or units have flexibility in determining the length of presentations. For example, students might give three five-to-ten-minute presentations or two ten-to-fifteen minute presentations. At least one presentation should incorporate a visual and/or multi-media component. In addition, writing and speaking assignments can be individual and/or group assignments.

Finally, instructors teaching CM courses will participate in a workshop in order to share strategies for teaching written and oral communication. The goal of the workshop is not to turn all faculty into writing or speaking teachers. Instead, the workshop should serve as a forum for faculty to discuss how they can use their communication expertise to teach CM courses effectively.

#### *Capstone Experience in the Major*

The Capstone experience is designed to bring reflection and focus to the whole of the college experience. It should encourage students to integrate facets of their major with important concepts from the General Educational Program.

Examples of possible capstone experiences include (but are not limited to) the following:

- A senior seminar that requires a major project.
- An undergraduate thesis.
- A semester project that culminates in a paper, essay, presentation, or similar product.

- An internship to investigate a problem in the workplace and a paper/presentation that asks students to analyze and evaluate the experience.
- A performance, show, or recital appropriate to the discipline, together with relevant supporting assignments.

### Center for Academic Excellence and Student Engagement

A number of comments received by the Committee raised concerns about the role of the Center for Academic Excellence and Student Engagement (CAESE) in the new General Education curriculum. Specifically, some worried that CAESE will be granted too much authority to “certify” instructors in the new curriculum through the training workshops that are suggested in the Step 5b proposal. However, it was not the Committee’s intention to grant CAESE any additional role beyond what is already supported in the Center’s mission statement. Last year, the Faculty Senate approved the following revised mission statement for CAESE:

*The Center for Academic Excellence and Student Engagement seeks to foster a learning-centered culture of teaching at UWSP by engaging faculty and staff in an ongoing, collaborative process of instructional development. In particular, the Center is dedicated to pursuing the following goals:*

- 1. Assist faculty and staff with pedagogical innovation, especially by encouraging the adoption of engaging teaching methodologies and instructional technologies.*
- 2. Provide pedagogical development opportunities in support of the General Education Program.*
- 3. Coordinate faculty development opportunities in support of meaningful academic program assessment, including both departmental programs and the General Education Program.*
- 4. Seek ideas to improve student engagement, paying special attention to students in the first year and to connecting curricular and co-curricular learning environments, and share these possibilities with faculty and staff.*

Note that in each of the prescribed roles listed above, the Center’s function is to support, assist, and provide opportunities, not to exercise authority of any kind. The current Step 5c proposal is very much in keeping with this supportive, facilitating role. Authority over the General Education curriculum, including any required professional development, is intended to be exercised by faculty governance, specifically the new General Education Committee. CAESE would merely be asked to implement any professional development required by governance. In the case of the First Year Seminar, for example, faculty teaching in the program would be asked to attend brief CAESE-sponsored workshops designed to assist them in developing their

syllabi. Two such workshops have already taken place to support the current pilot First Year Seminars. Although these initial workshops were led by facilitators from other campuses, the intention is eventually to run these workshops internally once UWSP develops the necessary experience and expertise in this area. Similarly, in the case of Communication in the Major, CAESE would likely work with members of the English Department and the Division of Communication in order to provide the professional development suggested in the committee's proposal, much as now takes place with the Writing Emphasis training currently required to teach WE courses in the GDR program.

Again, the Committee's proposals regarding CAESE are not intended to grant the Center authority over instructors. Rather, they are simply meant to define specific instances in which CAESE should be asked to fulfill its intended mission of supporting the new General Education curriculum.



## **Appendix I:**

### **UWSP General Education Program Experiential Learning Activity Guide**

#### *Introduction*

Students benefit from opportunities to learn by reflecting on experiences beyond their typical classroom activities and by applying the knowledge and skills they gain from traditional courses in new settings. To this end, students are required to complete an Experiential Learning requirement as part of the General Education Program (GEP). To fulfill this requirement, students will:

- Complete an approved experiential learning project.
- Reflect on the experiential learning activity in order to gain further understanding of their university education, and an enhanced sense of one's personal responsibility as a member of a larger community. (Note: "Community" in this context is defined as any of the various on- or off-campus departments, units, or organizations with whom students might work to complete their Experiential Learning requirement.)

Experiential learning is a broad concept, including many types of active, hands-on learning opportunities. It is an example of a "high-impact teaching practice" that has been shown to enhance a student's comprehension of course material, to enable students to see connections between theory and practice, to aid in student retention, and to develop a student's sense of responsibility for their education. Moreover, experiential learning provides students with an experience that aids in the development of leadership skills and responsible citizenship.

Experiential learning is the synthesis of a hands-on experience with some relevant aspect of a student's university education. This synthesis of experience with learning takes place in the context of a structured reflection activity. An appropriate reflection activity will vary depending on the experiential learning activity.

In some cases, students can satisfy this requirement by completing a structured, credit-bearing course that has been proposed by an academic department and approved by the General Education Committee. Departments proposing the credit-bearing course or experience will use their best judgment when determining the number of hours required, as well as the type of reflection required of students.

In other cases, however, students may elect to satisfy this requirement by completing an Experiential Learning Activity (ELA). What follows are some guidelines for students and ELA Mentors regarding the Experiential Learning Activity.

#### **Guidelines for an Experiential Learning Activity**

Students may elect to satisfy the Experiential Learning requirement by engaging in an "Experiential Learning Activity" (ELA). These ELAs are approved by individual faculty or academic staff members who agree to serve as an "ELA Mentor" for the student. Depending on

the type of ELA, examples of appropriate Mentors could be a faculty member with whom a student arranges an independent study or collaborates on undergraduate research or a creative performance, a student organization advisor, a residence hall director, an academic advisor, a Student Affairs academic staff member who supervises one of the activities listed in the following examples of ELAs. Students will complete a reflection activity that synthesizes the student's experience with an enhanced understanding of responsible citizenship, leadership, and/or the scholarly aims of a discipline. Students can complete this experiential learning requirement by engaging in at least one of the following types of experiential learning activities:

### **1. Independent Studies, Undergraduate Research, and Creative Performances:**

Students can complete an ELA by engaging in an appropriate discipline-specific, credit-bearing independent study, research project, or creative performance in conjunction with a faculty supervisor or academic advisor.

See the following for examples:

- <http://www.uwsp.edu/cnr/research/symposium/>
- <http://www.uwsp.edu/cls/subpages/ResearchSymposium/index.aspx>
- Participation in one of the many art, dance, music or theater opportunities offered in the College of Fine Arts and Communication or the Stevens Point area community.

### **2. Community Service Projects:**

Students can complete an ELA by engaging in a community service project.

Examples include:

- A Foreign Language major volunteers to tutor for a local literacy council.
- A Women's Studies minor volunteers for Sexual Assault Victim Services.
- An English or Communication major volunteers to put together a newsletter for a local community group.

### **3. Student Leadership Experiences:**

Students can complete an ELA by participating as leaders in Student Government, holding officer positions in student organizations recognized by the Student Involvement and Employment Office (SIEO) , or participating in Residence Hall activities. Students must do more than just attend meetings as an organization member or hall resident, however. Students must hold an officer position or some other position that has significant responsibilities.

See the following for examples:

- <http://www.uwsp.edu/stuorg/sga/>
- <https://mypoint.uwsp.edu/SIEO/SIEO004/SIEO004.aspx>
- <http://www.uwsp.edu/centers/sieo/index.asp>
- <http://www.uwsp.edu/stuorg/rha/>

#### **4. Professional Development through Paid or Unpaid Work Experiences or Internships:**

Students can complete an ELA in paid or unpaid work experiences and summer internships.

Examples include:

- A student (in any major) who plans to work in human resources sets up a job shadow with a retail store manager where she/he has a part-time job.
- A student completes a non-course-based internship.
- A History major or Anthropology minor works as a guide in a museum during the summer.

## UWSP General Education Program Experiential Learning Activity (ELA) Checklist

### For Students:

1. Check to make sure that your major has not already designated an experience or activity required for your major that satisfies the Experiential Learning Requirement.
2. If not, discuss ELA options with your academic advisor.
3. Ask an appropriate UWSP faculty or academic staff member to serve as your ELA mentor.
4. Complete I- IV of the ELA Plan form.
5. Meet with your ELA mentor to discuss your ELA Plan form.
  - a. Determine whether the activity is appropriate to achieve the learning outcomes for Experiential Learning.
  - b. If not, work with your ELA mentor to modify activity or choose a different one.
  - c. Agree on an appropriate reflection type (section V).
  - d. Agree on scheduled meeting dates and times as well as the reflection due date (section VI).
  - e. Sign and date the ELA Plan form.
6. Meet with your ELA mentor as agreed upon in section VI of the ELA Plan form to discuss how the ELA is going. Use the questions in the ELA Reflection Guide to guide your discussion(s).
7. Request that your ELA mentor assess your progress.
  - a. If you successfully complete the ELA, your mentor will indicate completion of the ELA requirement to the Records & Registration office for entry in to your record.
  - b. If not, at your ELA mentor's discretion, you may reapply to use the same ELA with the same mentor with the suggested modifications, or your ELA mentor can request that you choose a new ELA activity and mentor.

### For Faculty and Academic Staff ELA Mentors:

1. Meet with student and discuss her/his ELA Plan form.
  - a. Determine whether the activity is appropriate to achieve the learning outcomes for Experiential Learning.
  - b. If not, work with student to modify activity or choose a different one.
  - c. Agree on an appropriate reflection type (section V).
  - d. Agree on scheduled meeting dates and times as well as the reflection due date (section VI).
  - e. Sign and date the ELA Plan form.
2. Meet with student as agreed upon in section VI of the ELA Plan form to discuss how the ELA is going. Use the questions in the ELA Reflection Guide to guide your discussion(s).
3. Using the ELA assessment rubric, determine whether student has completed the Experiential Learning requirement.
  - a. If yes, indicate completion of the ELA requirement to the Records & Registration office for entry in to the student's record.
  - b. If not, at your discretion, student may reapply to use the same ELA with suggested modifications, or you can request that the student choose a new ELA activity and mentor.

# UWSP General Education Program Experiential Learning Activity (ELA) Plan Form

Students: You must submit your completed ELA Plan Form to your ELA Mentor BEFORE you begin your ELA.

## I. Student Information

Name \_\_\_\_\_ ID# \_\_\_\_\_

Major(s)/Minor(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Cumulative GPA \_\_\_\_\_ Major GPA \_\_\_\_\_

## II. Mentor Information

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Faculty/Academic Staff (circle one)

Department/Unit \_\_\_\_\_

## III. Experiential Learning Activity Information (check one and fill out corresponding information)

**Independent Study, Undergraduate Research, and Creative Performance**

Type of activity: \_\_\_\_\_

Supervisor, if not ELA mentor \_\_\_\_\_

**Community Service Project**

Type of activity: \_\_\_\_\_

Supervisor, if not ELA mentor \_\_\_\_\_

**Student Leadership Experience**

Type of activity: \_\_\_\_\_

Supervisor, if not ELA mentor \_\_\_\_\_

**Professional Development through Paid or Unpaid Work Experiences or Internships**

Type of activity: \_\_\_\_\_

Supervisor, if not ELA mentor \_\_\_\_\_

## IV. ELA Planning

Describe your Experiential Learning Activity.

Describe your position and responsibilities.

How many hours do you expect to spend on this activity (minimum 16 hours total)?

Describe the orientation and supervision you will receive for this activity.

What do you expect to learn from the proposed activity?

How does this activity either relate to the subject matter of a course, to your major or minor, or to the 4<sup>th</sup> program outcome of the GEP: “Students will apply their knowledge and skills, working in interdisciplinary ways to solve problems”?

How will this activity help you develop or enhance your sense of personal responsibility as a member of the larger community you are working with?

**V. Reflection Information** (check one)

- written reflection (1 page minimum)
- one-on-one interview (15 minutes minimum)
- small group discussion (30 minutes minimum)
- oral presentation (15 minutes minimum)
- media presentation (15 minutes minimum)
- journal (5 pages minimum)
- other ELA mentor-approved reflection (describe here)

**VI. Student/Mentor Meeting and Activity Completion Information**

Scheduled meeting date(s) and time(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Reflection due date: \_\_\_\_\_

**VII. Approval Signatures:**

The following signatures of agreement and approval must be secured **BEFORE** the student begins the Experiential Learning Activity.

I have reviewed this student's proposed Experiential Learning Activity and approve it as meeting the UWSP General Education Program Experiential Learning requirement.

I agree to work in collaboration with the student, to monitor the student for the duration of the ELA, and to assess the chosen reflection activity from section V. I agree to provide notification of successful completion of the ELA to the UWSP Records and Registration office.

**Faculty/Staff EL Mentor** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**Print Name** \_\_\_\_\_

I agree to complete this activity by the date agreed in section VI and to work in collaboration with my ELA Mentor. If not, I may reapply for the ELA at the discretion of the ELA Mentor.

**Student Signature** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**Print Name** \_\_\_\_\_

## UWSP General Education Program Experiential Learning Activity (ELA) Reflection Guide

Experiential learning is the synthesis of a hands-on experience with some relevant aspect of your university education. This synthesis of experience with learning takes place in the context of a structured reflection activity. The learning outcome for the UWSP General Education Program Experiential Learning requirement is to “reflect on the Experiential Learning Activity in order to gain further understanding of one’s university education, and an enhanced sense of one’s personal responsibility as a member of a larger community.”

“Community” in this context is defined as any of the various on- or off-campus departments, units, or organizations with whom students might work to complete their ELA.

Regardless of which type of reflection you choose: written reflection, one-on-one interview, small group discussion, oral presentation, media presentation, journal, or some other method of reflection decided upon by you and your ELA mentor, the questions below are to help guide you in your reflection.

- What did you learn about the people in the community you worked with and their similarities or differences to you?
- How were you able to contribute to the goals of the community you worked with?
- What do you feel was your main contribution to the community you worked with?
- What did you learn during your ELA that enhanced your learning gained in the classroom?
- As a result of your ELA, describe how you practiced and improved on one or more of the following:

### skills

oral and/or written communication  
listening  
critical thinking  
problem-solving  
organizational/interpersonal  
leadership  
teamwork  
computer literacy

### characteristics

work ethic  
attention to detail  
initiative/motivation  
honesty/integrity  
flexibility/adaptability  
self-confidence

- What impact did your ELA have on your everyday life?
- What insights did you gain through your ELA that might assist you in your future career or in selecting a career?
- What did your activity teach you about community involvement, citizenship and civic responsibility?
- What is the relationship of your ELA to the “real world”?
- What was the most difficult part of your experience?
- If you were to start at the beginning of this ELA again, what would you do differently the second time around?



## UWSP General Education Program Experiential Learning Activity (ELA) Assessment Rubric

**Student Name** \_\_\_\_\_ **ID #** \_\_\_\_\_

ELA Requirements	Yes + comments	No + comments
The ELA was completed while student was enrolled at UWSP.		
The student submitted an approved ELA Plan form before beginning the activity.		
The ELA meets the 16 hour minimum.		
The reflection meets minimum requirements as stated in section V of the ELA Plan form.		
The student demonstrates in the reflection piece that she/he has an enhanced sense of her/his personal responsibility as a member of a larger community.		

The above student has successfully completed the Experiential Learning Requirement of the UWSP General Education Program.

**Faculty/Staff ELA Mentor Signature** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

Mentors must retain a copy of the ELA rubric for their own records and future General Education Program assessment purposes and give a copy of the completed ELA Rubric to the student. Mentors must report the completion of the ELA to Registration and Records.