1. Approval of 7 March 2012 Minutes
2. Academic Staff Committee Reports
   a. Awards [Weber]
   b. Economic Issues [Ehlen]
   c. Elections/Balloting [Clokey]
   d. Government [Kriska/Flanagan]
   e. Organization [Fragola]
   f. Professional Development [Ehlen]
   g. Instructional Promotions [Farmer]
   h. Review [Ogunsola]
   i. Title Appeals [Ehlen]
   j. Titling [Naff]
   k. Rewards and Recognition [Simes]
3. Review of ELARC Recommendations and Development of Assembly Feedback [Ehlen]
4. Updates/Announcements
   a. Assembly Priorities [Ehlen]
   c. UW System Benefits Working Group [Naff]
5. Other Business
   a. Campus Kudos [Assembly Staff]
   b. Miscellaneous/Round Robin [Assembly Staff]

\textit{Italicized items include attachments for review/discussion.}
PRESENT: George Clokey, Denise Ehlen [Chair], Mike Flanagan, Patty Fragola [Vice Chair], Nadine Kriska, Giuliana Miolo, Kyle Naff, David Reinhart, Kim Simes, and Curt Weber
ABSENT: Freda Briscoe, Nancy Farmer, and Elizabeth Ogunsola

1. Approval of 8 February and 22 February 2012 Minutes: Simes/Naff moved to approve the minutes. The Assembly discussed/reviewed the minutes. Approved by unanimous vote.

2. Academic Staff Committee Reports
   a. Awards [Weber]: Weber announced that the Committee made recommendations for two Academic Staff Excellence Award nominees; one from the instructional ranks and one from the non-instructional ranks. Weber called for a vote to ratify the recommendations of the Committee. Simes/Fragola moved approval of the recommendations. Approved by unanimous vote.
   b. Economic Issues [Ehlen]: No report
   c. Elections/Balloting [Clokey]: Clokey reported that the notice of election went out to all academic staff on 5 March 2012. Clokey reported that he, Farmer, Naff, Briscoe, and Fragola are up for re-election. Clokey called for a vote to elect Ehlen as Chair of the Assembly. Simes/Reinhart moved to elect Ehlen as Chair of the Assembly. Approved by unanimous vote.
   d. Government [Kriska/Flanagan]: No report
   e. Organization [Fragola]: No report
   f. Professional Development [Ehlen]: Ehlen reported that one application was received for the March round. The Committee will be making recommendations next week and those recommendations will be brought to the Assembly for ratification at the next meeting.
   g. Instructional Promotions [Farmer]: Deferred until the next meeting.
   h. Review [Ogunsola]: Deferred until the next meeting.
   i. Title Appeals [Ehlen]: Ehlen announced that there has been a titling appeal and she will be convening the Committee to review the appeal.
   j. Titling [Naff]: No updates
   k. Rewards and Recognition [Simes]: Simes reported that three nominations were received on 1 March 2012. The Committee will be making recommendations and will bring those recommendations to the next meeting.

3. Updates/Announcements
   a. Assembly Priorities [Ehlen]: Ehlen reported that she will be finalizing the priorities document and will bring it to an upcoming meeting.
b. University Handbook Working Group [Weber]: Ehlen will add a handbook disclaimer to the Assembly website (i.e. “Currently being revised by the University Handbook Committee”).

c. UW System Benefits Working Group [Naff]: Naff reported that meetings will be held in the University Center on 20 March 2012 and 26 March 2012 regarding the new personnel systems. Naff will contact Judi Trampf, Director of Human Resources, to see if there will be a summary of the meetings available to those who cannot attend.

4. Other Business

a. ELARC [Ehlen]; Ehlen reviewed the ELARC documents with the Assembly. The Assembly provided feedback on the ELARC recommendations. Ehlen will bring the feedback of the Assembly to a future ELARC meeting.

b. UW System New Personnel Systems [Ehlen]: This was discussed as part of the benefits work group discussion.

Consensus to adjourn at 1:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Casey Pellien, Governance Associate
Essential Learning & Assessment Review Committee
Conclusions and Recommendations, 2012

The Essential Learning & Assessment Review Committee (ELARC) reviews assessment data from across campus and uses the data to make recommendations to improve teaching, learning, and assessment at UW-Whitewater. The committee focuses on data related to student achievement of the UWW baccalaureate learning goals, currently defined as the LEAP essential learning outcomes (available at http://www.uww.edu/acadaff/assessment/academic/wofiassess.html) from the Association of American Colleges & Universities. The committee receives assessment summaries from the Colleges and other constituencies on campus and integrates the findings using the baccalaureate learning outcomes as the organizing framework. The ELARC recommendations presented here reflect attention to blending the curricular, co-curricular and extra-curricular student experiences.

In the Fall of 2011, ELARC received and reviewed assessment summaries from the following:
- College of Arts & Communication
- College of Business & Economics
- College of Education & Professional Studies
- College of Letters & Sciences
- Office of Multicultural Affairs & Student Success
- Audit & Review
- Institutional Planning
- Writing Still Matters 2011 campus assessment project
- General Education Assessment Summit 2011

Conclusions:

In Spring 2010, UW-Whitewater adopted the LEAP essential learning outcomes as the campus’ definition of learning expected for all bachelors degree recipients. Departments, programs, colleges, and other units are in the early stages of integrating these learning outcomes into their systems for assessing student learning. At this point, our most informative areas of direct and indirect assessment relate to writing and critical thinking. An Open Pathways Project for the Higher Learning Commission will extend our data collection to additional learning outcomes.

Writing
Evaluations of samples of student writing from the Writing Still Matters assessment project (2011) indicate that the quality and effectiveness of writing improves significantly from freshman to senior year. By senior year, however, only 50% of student writing meets the standards expected for graduating students. At the senior level, writing is stronger in the areas of focus, thesis, use of evidence, and documentation, and writing is relatively weaker in analysis, interpretation, language use, and conventional grammar. Writing essay scores from the Collegiate
Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP, administered 2009-2010) show that UWW seniors scored significantly higher in writing than did freshmen, and both freshmen and seniors scored higher than the national average. UWW students come to college better prepared in writing than their national peers, and their writing skills improve significantly while they are here.

In 2010, UW-Whitewater participated in the Consortium for the Study of Writing in College (CSWC) as part of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Compared to CSWC peers, students at UWW reported that faculty engaged in significantly fewer best practices in teaching and writing including pre-writing activities, concept mapping and outlining, giving feedback on multiple drafts, and structuring peer review options. In addition, students believe that UWW faculty assigned more summary and description writing projects but fewer analytical writing or expository prose that integrates and synthesizes ideas and concepts; similarly, they paid less attention to teaching about the differences among discipline-specific discourses and audience awareness. Other practices students reported that UWW faculty engaged in less frequently include giving clear instructions concerning writing assignments, articulating learning objectives for these assignments, clarifying grading criteria and providing samples of successful writing (see the report of the General Education Assessment Summit, Team 2). This feedback from students suggests several ways that writing instruction can be improved at UW-Whitewater.

Critical Thinking
Several measures of critical thinking show that juniors and seniors at UW-Whitewater score significantly higher than freshmen (for a review of data, see the report of the General Education Assessment Summit 2011, Team 1). By most measures, UWW students are similar to or above national norms or averages in critical thinking. Based on scores from the Critical-thinking Assessment Test (CAT), UWW students showed growth in the specific CT skills of evaluating information and providing alternative explanations, and applying information to real-world problems. Areas in most need of improvement included summarizing patterns of results, evaluating and interpreting correlations, and separating relevant from irrelevant information. Results from the CAAP (administered 2009-2010) show that UWW freshmen scored at the 44th percentile nationally in critical thinking and seniors scored at the 66th percentile—a substantial gain. On the NSSE, seniors at UWW report an overall higher degree of engagement in critical thinking in their courses than first year students report.

These data on writing and critical thinking are encouraging, and it would be important to explore the degree to which gains in these areas occur in individual programs across campus.

The Open Pathways Project for the Higher Learning Commission
During 2012-2013, UW-Whitewater will participate in Cohort 3 of the Pathways Demonstration Project for the Higher Learning Commission. As part of our campus
In the reaccreditation process, we will engage in an assessment project exploring writing, critical thinking, quantitative literacy, information literacy, broad/integrative knowledge, and specialized and applied learning outcomes in one academic department in each UWW college: Arts & Communication, Business & Economics, Education & Professional Studies, and Letters & Sciences. Direct assessment of these learning outcomes will occur at the associates, bachelors, and masters levels. Data collection will occur primarily during the Fall 2012 semester. Data will be analyzed and reported during spring and summer of 2013. Some outcomes will be measured using a campus-central “assessment center” model, while others will be measured locally in academic departments. This project should provide a good test of our assessment capabilities and help our campus enhance and better coordinate assessment efforts.

**Recommendations:**

1. Assessment work is vital to our understanding of the strengths and areas for improvement in student learning. To be most meaningful, assessment work needs to occur as an integral part of teaching, learning, and curriculum development, and this requires active engagement of faculty, staff, and students. To **enhance a positive culture of assessment** that facilitates engagement, we recommend that:
   a. The Faculty Senate, Academic Staff Assembly, and other appropriate governing bodies and administrators review and revise personnel policies (e.g., job descriptions and reward structures) to support faculty and staff engagement in academic assessment.
   b. Administrators support the positive culture of assessment in their various addresses and interactions on campus.
   c. The campus establishes an annual “Assessment Day” to showcase work and recognize and share best practices and innovation.
   d. Colleges, departments, and other units create ways to acknowledge and reward faculty, staff, and students for their work on assessment.

2. **Resources** are important for enhancing and sustaining our assessment capacity on campus. The Provost's Office should collect feedback and suggestions about resource allocation for assessment, and work with colleges and other units to establish or revise budget lines and allocations for assessment work. We recommend that colleges, departments, and other units evaluate the resources they allocate or have available for assessment and work to determine the types and levels of resources they need to enhance their work.

3. We agree with the recommendation of the General Education Assessment Summit 2011 that campus should develop rubrics that **define learning** and the progression of learning (e.g., from freshman to senior levels) for the essential learning outcomes of critical thinking, intercultural knowledge and awareness, and quantitative literacy. The AAC&U VALUE rubrics can be used
as guides or starting points. Using Writing Matters as a model, these new rubrics can define our campus consensus about learning, can be used to communicate our expectations to students across disciplines and across the curriculum and co-curriculum, and can be used to collect and coordinate direct assessment data.

4. Based on our review of data, and to improve student writing, the ELARC concurs with the recommendations from the Writing Still Matters 2011 assessment project to:
   a. Define “writing intensive” courses at the college and university level.
   b. Enhance department-level writing instruction and assessment projects.
   c. Annotate the Writing Matters document to provide models of effective components of writing and to foster cross-disciplinary discussion.
   d. Facilitate faculty and staff professional development to enhance writing instruction.
   e. Appoint and support faculty representatives for Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) and Writing in the Disciplines (WID).
   f. Explore ways that Student Affairs units may contribute to Writing Still Matters recommendations, particularly in relation to student employment, student organization participation, and unit-driven initiatives.

5. Based on our review of data, and to improve critical thinking in students, we recommend faculty and staff development sessions aimed at improving the instruction and assessment of critical thinking. Where appropriate, the focus should be on improving students’ skills in summarizing patterns of results, evaluating and interpreting correlations, and separating relevant from irrelevant information. This effort should take into consideration student curricular, co-curricular and extra-curricular experiences.

The diagram below represents our recommendations in the form of a strategic assessment plan for 2012-2014.

It is our hope that all units on campus will participate and engage with this plan in ways that are meaningful to them.
UW-Whitewater Strategic Assessment Plan, 2012-2014
ELARC Members (2011-2012):

Greg Cook (Chair)
John Stone
Brent Bilodeau
Liz Hachten
Sally Vogl-Bauer
Melanie Agnew
Lois Smith
Julie Letellier
Barbara Bren
Rowand Robinson
Paul Ambrose
Denise Ehlen

February 21, 2012
ANNUAL CYCLE OF CAMPUS ASSESSMENT

The purpose of this system is to ensure the regular and timely consideration of data from assessments of student learning and use of these data in setting goals and making recommendations that affect student learning and the University's curriculum.

Assessment data (related to student learning and LEAP) flow up from courses, departments, colleges, and other units. The Essential Learning & Assessment Review Committee (ELARC) reviews assessment data, integrates findings from across campus, and uses LEAP as the central organizing framework. The ELARC distills findings into an annual report of 6-8 highlights and recommended actions. This report is discussed by the VC for Academic Affairs (Provost), VC for Student Affairs, Deans, SPBC, Faculty Senate, Academic Staff Assembly, and WSG, and their feedback and recommendations are sent back to the ELARC. The ELARC then provides an annual campus report back to colleges, departments, units, those responsible for core courses, and other constituents to complete the annual cycle.

Colleges:

Each college has an assessment committee or other body that reviews and acts on assessment data.

Annual Report. Each college submits an annual report summarizing assessment of student learning, due November 1, to the ELARC. Reports should address the following items and relate to LEAP as much as possible:

1. Summarize the most important assessment results that were collected within or related to your college during the past year. Examples could include results of systematic assessments of student writing, critical thinking, multicultural knowledge, or other essential learning outcomes.
2. Describe the most important actions that you recommend or plan to take that use these assessment results for the improvement of student learning within your college.
3. From year two and beyond, describe the progress made in implementing your recommendations and plans from last year and the progress made in implementing other recommendations from last year’s campus report from the ELARC.
4. Describe recommendations you have for further data collection, analysis, or other assessment work within your college or elsewhere on campus that would lead to important improvements in student learning.

Institutional Research (IR):

IR administers the NSSE, FSSE, CAAP, MAPP, Senior Exit Survey and other assessments and also manages the collection and analysis of data related to student enrollment, applications,
retention, graduation rates, and other measures. Survey results and other data are hosted on a centralized website for convenient access by all campus stakeholders. Summary reports (brief highlights) are sent to the ELARC as soon as practical upon completion of each survey (e.g., NSSE) or major data query (e.g., statistics on graduation, retention).

Annual Report. In addition to sending reports of individual surveys and analyses to ELARC, the Director of IR submits an annual report summarizing assessment of student learning, due October 1, to the ELARC. Reports should address the following items and relate to LEAP as much as possible:

1. Summarize the most important assessment results that were collected by IR for campus during the past year.
2. Describe the most important actions that you recommend for IR or other units to take that use these assessment results for the improvement of student learning.
3. From year two and beyond, describe the progress made in implementing your recommendations and plans from last year (if applicable to IR) and the progress made in implementing other recommendations from last year’s campus report from the ELARC (if applicable to IR).
4. Describe recommendations you have for further data collection, analysis, or other assessment work that would lead to important improvements in student learning.

Student Affairs:

Assessment data are collected in Student Affairs units, including Residence Life, UHCS, CSD, UC, Career & Leadership Development, Recreation Sports, and Financial Aid.

Annual Report. Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs should review data that are related to student learning with relevant staff and produce an annual assessment report, due November 1, to the ELARC. Reports should address the following items and relate to LEAP as much as possible:

1. Summarize the most important assessment results that were collected within or related to your units during the past year.
2. Describe the most important actions that you recommend or plan to take that use these assessment results for the improvement of student learning (as applicable to your units).
3. From year two and beyond, describe the progress you made in implementing your recommendations and plans from last year and the progress made in implementing other recommendations from last year’s campus report from the ELARC (as applicable to your units).
4. Describe recommendations you have for further data collection, analysis, or other assessment work within your units or elsewhere on campus that would lead to important improvements in student learning.
**Other Academic Units:**

Assessment data are collected for Learning Communities, First-Year Experiences, Academic Support Services, Trio Programs, Pre-College Programs, and other campus programs/units.

**Annual Reports.** Each director should review data related to student learning with relevant staff and submit an annual assessment report, due November 1, to the ELARC. Where appropriate, reports from individual units can be combined and submitted from, e.g., Graduate Studies and Continuing Education, Student Affairs, or Academic Departments. Reports should address the following items and relate to LEAP as much as possible:

1. Summarize the most important assessment results that were collected within or related to your unit during the past year.
2. Describe the most important actions that you recommend or plan to take that use these assessment results for the improvement of student learning (as applicable to your unit).
3. From year two and beyond, describe the progress made in implementing your recommendations and plans from last year and the progress made in implementing other recommendations from last year’s campus report from the ELARC (as applicable to your unit).
4. Describe recommendations you have for further data collection, analysis, or other assessment work within your unit or elsewhere on campus that would lead to important improvements in student learning.

**Core Course Committee:**

Core Course Coordinators work with instructors for GENED Core Courses (110, 120, 130, 140, 390) to gather assessment data from student portfolios, samples of student work, core-course surveys and/or other assessment activities.

**Annual Progress Reports to GERC.** Core course coordinators guide the development of a self-study for each course to be submitted to the GERC on a regular schedule (e.g., every 5 years). Progress reports for each course are submitted to the GERC annually and in time for GERC to meet its October 1 deadline for submitting an annual report to the ELARC.

**General Education Review Committee (GERC):**

The GERC approves new general education courses, monitors gened courses for LEAP alignment, and reviews assessment data/reports from core courses and from gened courses in departments undergoing Audit & Review.
**Annual Report.** The GERC submits an annual report summarizing assessment of student learning, due October 1, to the ELARC. Reports should address the following items and relate to LEAP as much as possible:

1. Summarize the most important assessment results that were collected within or related to general education courses (including core and proficiency courses, general electives, and diversity courses) during the past year.
2. Describe the most important actions that you recommend or plan to take that use these assessment results for the improvement of student learning in general education.
3. From year two and beyond, describe the progress made in implementing your recommendations and plans from last year and the progress made in implementing other recommendations from last year’s campus report from the ELARC (as applicable to general education and the work of the GERC).
4. Describe recommendations you have for further data collection, analysis, or other assessment work within or related to general education that would lead to important improvements in student learning.

**Academic Departments:**

Departments collect assessment data related to student learning in majors, minors, and general education courses (including proficiency, general education electives, diversity courses, and other such courses that count for general education credits).

All majors, minors, and programs undergo Audit & Review on a 5-year cycle. Assessment of student learning is a focus of A&R. One component of the A&R will emphasize general education courses offered from the department or program. Every 5 years, each major, minor, or program submits a self-study report to their Dean for review. The Dean should make suggestions for revision, request additional information, etc., and then the Department forwards the revised self-study to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for the Audit & Review process. The Assoc. VC forwards the general education portion of the self-study to the GERC.

**Audit & Review:**

Assessment data are reviewed for each program that undergoes Audit & Review. Review includes assessment of student learning in majors, minors, and general education courses. The GERC simultaneously reviews assessment data for the general education courses and provides feedback and recommended actions to the A&R committee to be considered for their report sent back to the Department.

**Annual Report.** Each year, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (or designee) should work with the Audit & Review Committee to consider all of the programs and assessment information reviewed that year and submit an annual assessment report, due
October 1, to the ELARC. Reports should address the following items and relate to LEAP as much as possible:

1. Summarize the most important themes in assessment results that were noticed in the assessment data reported by each department during the past year.
2. Describe the most important actions that you recommend that use these assessment themes for the improvement of student learning and/or improvement of programs across the campus.
3. Describe recommendations you have for further data collection, analysis, or other assessment work on campus that would lead to important improvements in student learning and/or program improvement.
4. Describe recommendations you have for the improvement of the audit and review process.
5. From year two and beyond, describe progress made in implementing last year’s recommendations for improving the audit and review process.

**Essential Learning & Assessment Review Committee:**

Meets on a regular schedule to consider annual reports from each constituency (Colleges, IR, Student Affairs, GERC, A&R, etc.). Provides feedback and short-term recommendations to each constituency in a timely manner.

**Annual Campus Report.** Once each year, the ELARC produces an annual campus report that synthesizes assessment information and recommendations across all other constituencies and recommends actions that can be taken to improve student learning that are practical and sustainable. A draft of the annual campus report is due February 1 and is submitted to the Vice Chancellors for Academic and Student Affairs, Deans, SPBC, Faculty Senate, ASA, and WSG for their feedback and recommendations. The report should address the following items and relate to LEAP as much as possible:

1. Summarize the most important themes in assessment results that were noticed in the annual reports from constituencies received during the past year.
2. Describe the most important actions that would use these assessment themes for the improvement of student learning across the campus.
3. Describe recommendations for further data collection, analysis, or other assessment work on campus that would lead to important improvements in student learning.
4. Describe recommendations for the improvement of the annual cycle of assessment review on campus, including the function of the ELARC.
5. From year two and beyond, describe progress made in implementing last year’s recommendations for improving the annual cycle of assessment review on campus, including the function of the ELARC.
6. From year two and beyond, describe the progress reported by other constituencies in meeting the recommendations made in last year’s campus report.

Vice Chancellors, Deans, SPBC, Faculty Senate, Academic Staff Assembly, & WSG:

The Vice Chancellors for Academic and Student Affairs jointly review the annual campus report from the ELARC with the Deans, SPBC, Faculty Senate, ASA, and WSG or their designated representatives. Vice Chancellors then (jointly) provide feedback and recommendations related to items in the report back to the ELARC by March 1. Feedback can include other assessment results that should be considered by the ELARC. Deans, SPBC, Faculty Senate, ASA, and WSG are also encouraged to provide individual feedback to the ELARC (due March 1) reflecting their unique recommendations, concerns, or guidance.

Essential Learning & Assessment Review Committee:

The ELARC discusses feedback and recommendations from the Vice Chancellors, Deans, SPBC, Faculty Senate, ASA, and WSG, revises the annual campus report as needed, and submits the annual campus report, due April 1, to all constituencies.

This completes an annual cycle of data collection, review, campus recommendations for action, and progress checking for previous recommended actions.

Relationship to Curriculum:

The ELARC copies its annual campus report to the UCC, GERC, and College curriculum committees. Curricular actions should be informed by assessment data and campus recommendations and action plans that are based on assessment. Curricular committees should send reports of their issues, concerns, and questions about the improvement of student learning and the curriculum to the ELARC for consideration during the annual cycle of assessment review.
### Essential Learning & Assessment Review Committee
#### Annual Schedule of Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mtg</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Main Agenda Item</th>
<th>To/From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>Organizational meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Annual assessment reports due from: Audit &amp; Review, GERC, IR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Discuss annual reports from: Audit &amp; Review, GERC, IR</td>
<td>Colleges, Student Affairs, other units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Discuss campus assessment data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Sketch/distill salient items for action &amp; draft annual campus assessment report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Discuss &amp; revise campus report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Campus assessment report sent to: Vice Chancellor level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>Feedback/recommendations due from: Vice Chancellor level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Review, plan, &amp; wrap up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other agenda items appear as available:

- To/From UCC: course actions, questions, suggestions (LEAP, etc.)
- From IR: results from individual campus surveys (e.g., NSSE, Senior Exit)
- Reports, recommendations, requests from Deans, SPBC, Faculty Senate, ASA, etc.
ELARC, begins Fall 2011

VC for Academic Affairs & VC for Student Affairs
Mar. 1

Deans   SPBC   Faculty Senate   Acad Staff Assembly   WSG

Essential Learning & Assessment Review Committee (ELARC)
Reviews, integrates campus data on assessment of student learning
Reviews, makes recommendations regarding essential learning (LEAP) on campus
Provides guidance to curriculum committees on issues related to LEAP

Assoc. VC Academic Affairs, Assist. VC Student Affairs, Assessment Dir., GenEd Coord.
1 representative from each college, including Grad. Studies (appointed by Deans)
Faculty/Staff: rep or chair from GERC, Audit & Review Cmt., Assess. Cmt., Acad. Dev. Cmt., ASA
2 students selected by WSG  (16 total members)
draft to Vice Chancellors Feb. 1; final report to campus constituents Apr. 1

Audit & Review
Oct. 1

GERC
Oct. 1

Academic Departments
5 years

GenEd Proficiency & Elective Courses
Data gathered by instructors from portfolios or samples of student work

Core Course Committee
Course self-studies include data gathered by instructors from portfolios or samples of student work

From Units
LCs, 1st Yr. Exp., acad. support services . . .
Nov. 1

Student Affairs
Student surveys, unit data . . .
Nov. 1

Institutional Research
NSSE, CAAP, Senior Exit Survey . . .
Oct. 1

Colleges
summary reports from L&S, CoBE, CoE, A&C, GS&CE
Nov. 1

Univ. Curric. Cmt.
College curric. cmts
UWW Foundation

Data Collection