November 7, 2013

To: Dean Van Galen, Chancellor
    116 North Hall
    University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: David P. Rainville, Chair
       Faculty Senate
       University of Wisconsin-River Falls

Re: UWRF Faculty Senate Motion 2013-14/25

At the November 6, 2013 meeting of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls Faculty Senate, motion 2013-14/25 was passed and is effective immediately. The motion is forwarded to you for your action.

The General Education and University Requirements Committee (Donavon Taylor – Chair) recommends that the UWRF Faculty Senate adopt the following documents as the policy regarding GE and UR programming on campus and that they be posted on the UWRF General Education Committee Website (http://www.uwrf.edu/FacultySenate/Committees/StandingCommittees/GeneralEducationandUniversityRequirements.cfm).

1. Steps for Adding, Changing or Removing General Education Requirements and University Requirements.
3. Steps for Evaluating Existing GE and UR Course Assessment Reports.
4. Steps for Removing Courses from the GE and UR Listings.
5. General Education Periodic (7-Year) Review Timeline.
7. Rubric for Reviewing GE Assessment Reports.
Approved ✓

Disapproved

Dean Van Galen, Chancellor

[Signature]

Date: 11/22/13
Appendix D1
Steps for Adding, Changing, or Removing General Education Requirements and University Requirements

1. An addition, revision, or removal narrative proposal related to one or more General Education and University Requirements and the related relevant GE and/or UR appendix is submitted to the General Education and University Requirements committee chair.

2. The proposal is placed on an upcoming GEURC (General Education and University Requirements Committee) meeting agenda and the proposer is notified of the date, time, and location of the meeting. Communication with the proposer indicates the person is expected to be able to provide a quick overview of and answer questions about the proposal, especially the relevant GE and/or UR appendix.

3. The proposal and relevant GE and/or UR appendix are distributed to the GEURC members along with the agenda or at about the same time.

4. At the meeting, GEURC committee members evaluate whether
   a. the proposal and appendix are meaningful and significant improvements to the current requirements. Additions and revisions should address unique learning outcomes that are not addressed by current requirements.

   b. the learning outcomes involved are crucial to the future of all students.

   c. the proposal should be considered as an independent item or in combination with other related changes.

   d. the proposal will increase or decrease time to degree for all or some students.

5. The GEURC votes to approve or disapprove the proposal.

6. If the proposal is disapproved, the Faculty Senate Chair and Secretary are notified of the reasons for the disapproval. If the proposal is approved, the chair notifies the Faculty Senate Chair and Secretary and forwards the proposal and the relevant GE and/or UR appendix. The proposal is placed in motion format on an upcoming Faculty Senate meeting agenda and the proposer is notified of the date, time, and location of the meeting. Communication with the proposer indicates the person is expected to be able to provide a quick overview of and answer questions about the proposal, especially the relevant GE and/or UR appendix. The Faculty Senate votes to approve or disapprove the new requirement motion.

7. The Chancellor either signs or does not sign the new requirement motion.
8. If the Chancellor signs the motion, a staff person in the Registrar’s Office ensures the new requirement is coded appropriately in eSIS, and the appropriate GE and/or UR web page is updated to include the new requirement and related objectives.

Appendix D2
Steps for Approving New General Education and University Requirement Courses

1. The course proposal and relevant GE and/or UR appendix are received from the University Curriculum committee.

2. The course is placed on an upcoming GEURC (General Education and University Requirements Committee) meeting agenda and the course proposer is notified of the date, time, and location of the meeting. Communication with the course proposer indicates the person is expected to be able to provide a quick overview of the course and answer questions about the course, especially the relevant GE and/or UR appendix.

3. The course proposal and relevant GE and/or UR appendix are distributed to the GEURC members along with the agenda or at about the same time.

4. At the meeting, GEUR committee members evaluate whether
   
a. the course as a whole meets overall General Education criteria and specific GE Goal criteria.

b. the assignments described in the appendix are relevant to the appendix learning outcomes that must be assessed.

c. the appendix rubric used to assess the assignment measures the appendix learning outcomes and does not include other factors, for example, grammar and spelling, that are not related to the appendix learning outcomes. If necessary, remind the course proposer that the full assignment rubric used to grade the assignment is not relevant to the GEURC and that only appendix learning outcomes data will be needed in the course assessment report in the future.

Since each appendix represents a significant amount of assessment and documentation work for the course proposer, the GEURC strongly suggests that courses focus on one GE or UR goal, understanding that in some circumstances two GE and/or UR goals may be warranted. Attempting to meet three or more GE and UR goals in one course is almost always dilutive to the goals and unmanageable for assessment measurement and documentation. Multiple goal requests are still considered one goal at a time by the committee.
5. If the course meets the criteria in #4 and no revisions are necessary, then the GEURC votes to approve the course for GE and/or UR listing.

6. If the course does not yet meet the criteria in #4, but the course proposer has been given advice on how to change the appendix to meet the criteria, has agreed to make the changes, and the committee believes the revisions will be consistent with the criteria in #4, the GEURC may vote to approve the course for GE and/or UR listing pending review of the updated documents by either the chair or the committee via email.

7. If the course does not yet meet the criteria in #4, and the committee believes that significant appendix revisions are necessary to meet the criteria in #4, the GEURC may vote to postpone the consideration of the course for GE and/or UR listing until the significant revision is received and considered at a future meeting. The GEURC may also vote to disapprove the course if the criteria in #4 are not met after a formative request.

1. If the course is approved for GE and/or UR listing, the chair notifies the Registrar’s Office using the official course proposal form with attached appendix. A staff person in the Registrar’s Office ensures the course is coded appropriately in eSIS, and the appropriate GE and/or UR web page is updated to include the new or revised course.
Appendix D3
Steps for Evaluating Existing GE And UR Course Assessment Reports

1. At the beginning of the academic year, the GEURC chair updates the “Report Format for Gen Ed” document with the correct chair email address and due date updated to November 1 of the current year.

2. The GEURC chair then consults the “GE Courses & Assessment Dates” file that had been updated at the end of the previous academic year. On or before the second Tuesday in September, the GEURC chair notifies the department chairs of all courses that are due for review in the current academic year. The email notification includes:
   a) a list of all department courses that are up for review.
   b) the updated “Report Format for Gen Ed” document is indicated as being attached to the email. Remember to attach the document!
   c) either a link to the model report(s) for each category the department will review that year or the model report itself is attached. Remember to include the link or attach the document!

3. Submitted reports are posted to the appropriate folder (either category and then academic year or academic year and then category, depending on what is determined to be most efficient) on T:/Collaborations/General Education folder.

4. The GEURC sends reminders to department chairs that still have reports outstanding on the second Tuesday in October.

5. On the first Tuesday after November 1, the GEURC sends reminders to department chairs that still have reports outstanding and requests an estimated date of completion. Reminders are then sent the first Tuesday of the month until the report is submitted.

6. If the report is not submitted by December 1, the College Dean of the delinquent department is notified and cc:ed on every first Tuesday reminder until the report is submitted. One possible consequence would be to not permit any new courses in the general education or university requirement category from a department which currently has delinquent reports.

7. At the beginning of the fall semester, the GEURC divides the committee into subcommittees of two, or at most three, and assigns GEUR categories to each subcommittee, ensuring that approximately the same number of reports will be read by each subcommittee.

8. The subcommittee assignments and location of the course assessment reports are shared with the committee on or before the second Tuesday in November. The following instructions are also shared:
Procedures for the teams to evaluate course assessment reports.

a. The reports are scanned by the teams by the end of the Fall semester to ensure essential components are included. The checklist on the GEUR Assessment Report Format will facilitate this process.

b. The reports should be viewed with an eye toward: collected data, data analysis, and changes in the course considered upon reflecting on the data. These criteria and the related checklist are found in the document “Report Format for Gen Ed” titled General Education and University Requirements Assessment Report Format that all course reports should be following. The rubric for evaluating assessment reports developed in 2008 should be used only as an aid.

c. Per the instructions in the “Report Format for Gen Ed” document, the complete report should have 2-3 page narrative which describes: the assessments, how well students achieved the outcomes, summary of data, data analysis, course response to assessment, and how consistency in assessment was assured for multi-section courses. Attached to the narrative should be: approved GE appendix with rubrics and an assignment description for each outcome.

d. If the assessment report is missing information, the team will report back to the report writer and, if necessary, the GEURC chair.

e. Each team will be responsible for writing an evaluation paragraph summarizing the team’s findings for each course assessment report and recommending a committee action. The location of past evaluation paragraphs should be shared. Common recommendations include:
   i. The recommendation is to re-approve the course for 5 years.
   ii. Due to the deficiencies described previously, the recommendation is to re-approve the course for 2 years.
   iii. Due to the ongoing deficiencies described previously, stretching over several years, the team recommends the course be removed from GEUR.

f. At this stage in the new general education program, the evaluation paragraphs should have a formative tone, seeking to improve on the quality of the assessment instrument or report.

g. Evaluation paragraphs for all submitted course assessment reports are due by the Tuesday following Spring Break.

9. Submitted evaluation paragraphs are posted to the appropriate folder (either category and then academic year or academic year and then category, depending on what is determined to be most efficient) on the T:/Collaborations/General Education folder.
10. The GEURC sends reminders to subcommittees that still have paragraphs outstanding on all following second Tuesdays in February and March.

11. If the subcommittee paragraphs are not submitted by the Tuesday after Spring Break, a reminder is sent to the subcommittee every first Tuesday until the paragraphs are submitted.

12. By the beginning of February, the GEURC chair starts scheduling individual course evaluation paragraph discussions, followed by committee action to re-approve the course for five years, to re-approve the course for two-to-four years, or to disapprove and remove the course from the GE and/or UR listing. All committee action must be completed by the end of the last week of class.

13. Following the final meeting, the GEURC chair updates “GE Courses & Assessment Dates” file for all committee actions in the current year and to indicate when the courses will next be reviewed.
Appendix D4
Steps for Removing Courses from the GE and UR Listings

1. Departments that wish to remove a course from the GE and/or UR listings without making any other significant changes to the course file an updated first page of the course proposal form with the General Education and University Requirements Committee (GEURC) chair along with an undergraduate curriculum/course transmittal form signed by the department chair. If significant changes are made to the course, the usual course change procedures apply.

2. The removal of the course from the GE and/or UR listings is placed as a consent agenda item on an upcoming GEURC agenda. Unless a committee member requests that the item be removed from the consent agenda for discussion, the item is passed as the consent agenda is passed. The related documents are signed by the GEURC chair and transmitted to the Registrar’s Office.

3. The GEURC chair works with the Registrar’s Office to ensure the GE and/or UR indicators are removed from the eSIS course description and the course is removed from the GE and/or UR listings webpage.
Appendix D5
General Education Periodic (7-Year) Review Timeline

Action Steps

1. An outside evaluator is identified by the joint work of the Gen. Ed. Committee and the Assessment Committee, assisted perhaps by the provost's office, by October 30, and invited to campus for a visit in February.

2. General Education surveys are sent by the end of September.

3. General Education survey responses are summarized by the Survey Research Center by October 30, and provided to the General Education chair in time to incorporate the results into the December 1 Report for the outside evaluator.

4. The Assessment Committee Chair, prior to or concurrent with Step 2 immediately above, communicates any process improvement ideas to the GEURC chair/subcommittee.

5. The GEURC chair/subcommittee completes a draft written report for the external evaluator by December 1.

6. A program review report is approved by the Gen. Ed. Committee no later than January 23. This report is forwarded simultaneously to the outside evaluator, APP, and to the Assessment Committee.

7. Within two weeks of receipt of the Gen. Ed. Report, the Assessment Committee forwards comments to AP&P. (See the Handbook as to the duties of the Assessment Committee.)

8. February: visit and report by the outside evaluator.

9. Gen. Ed. makes recommendations to the Faculty Senate concerning the structure of Gen. Ed. if any are warranted as a result of the review (including both the Gen. Ed. Committee's findings and the outside evaluator's report as well as any comments by the Assessment Committee and APP) by March 21.
Appendix D6
General Education and University Requirements Assessment Report Format

1) Describe the assessments (assignments) used to evaluate how well students achieved the outcomes for the GE designator. Append sample assignments and/or test questions (not student work). If this is a multiple section course, explain how consistency in assessment was insured across the sections.

2) Provide a summary and analysis of the data collected as part of the assessment process.

3) Discuss how the assessment information has been used for course improvement. If it has not been used, explain why not.

Special Instructions:

☒ The report title should include the name(s) of those writing the report.

☒ The narrative described above should be no longer than 2-3 pages, not including appendices.

☒ Approved General Education (CW, CS, CA, SB, HF, M, SL, S, MD, HW, EC) or University Requirements (ACD, GP) appendix with rubrics.

☒ The report should be submitted electronically in one file to the GEURC chair by November 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report item</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Meets/exceeds expectations</th>
<th>Needs improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Goals of course relate to designator goals</td>
<td>Course goals clearly related to designator goals</td>
<td>Some or all course goals described not sufficiently related to designator goals</td>
<td>Not addressed in report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assignments described for each outcome</td>
<td>Assignment described that addressed each outcome</td>
<td>Assignment description insufficient to evaluate effectiveness</td>
<td>No assignment described for one or more outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Clearly addresses how consistency was assured across multiple sections/semesters</td>
<td>Potential for inconsistency</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubrics appended</td>
<td>Appended for all assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric missing for one or more assignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3          | Data summary                         | -Data clearly presented  
-Summarized to addressed consistency issue (if necessary)  
-Representative data collected | -Data not presented clearly  
-Consistency not adequately addressed  
-Sufficient data not collected, per approved plan | No data presented for one or more outcome |
|            | Data analysis                        | -Interpretation based on student achievement of outcome  
-Addresses whether standard for course | Interpretation not directly related to achievement of outcome | No data analysis                             |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Course improvement based on data</th>
<th>-Clear discussion of how results are being used for course improvement, or justification for making no changes -Specific modifications described that directly relate to assessment</th>
<th>-Not sufficiently addressed even though data suggest changes are needed -modifications described not directly related to assessment</th>
<th>No discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised appendix (if necessary)</td>
<td>-Appropriate revisions made</td>
<td>-Revisions made, but not clear or not directly related to new outcomes</td>
<td>-No revised appendix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Any score of unacceptable will require department to submit missing information or result in conditional re-approval for 1 or 2 years.*

Review result:  
- _____ Re-approved for 5 years  
- _____ Conditional re-approval for: 1 year or 2 years  
- _____ Not re-approved

Comments and suggestions: