



**Monday, February 13, 2012**

TIME	Location	Unit	People
8–9:15 a.m.	DUC 378	HLC Assessment Academy Team	Koch, Sorrells, & Tschetter
9:30–10:45 a.m.	DUC 378	General Education Policy Review Committee	Koch, Sorrells, & Tschetter
11–11:50 a.m.	DUC 378	Assessment Subcommittee	Koch, Sorrells, & Tschetter
Noon–1:30 p.m.	CPS Café (109)	Lunch	Koch, Sorrells, & Tschetter
1:30–2:30 p.m.	DUC 376	CAESE Advisory Board Interim Assessment Coordinator	Koch
	DUC 223	Department Review Subcommittee	Sorrells
	DUC 378	First Year Seminar Planning Committee / Faculty	Tschetter
2:30–3 p.m.	DUC 378	Site Visit Team Discussion	Koch, Sorrells, & Tschetter
3–4 p.m.	DUC 374	Open Forum	Koch, Sorrells, & Tschetter
4–5 p.m.	DUC 378	Academic Affairs Committee	Sorrells & Tschetter
	213 Main	Chancellor	Koch

**Tuesday, February 14, 2012**

TIME	Location	Unit	People
8–8:50 a.m.	DUC 376	Faculty Senate Executive Committee	Koch
	DUC 378	General Education Committee	Sorrells
	DUC 211	Cross-Division Assessment Team	Tschetter
9–9:50 a.m.	DUC 374	Deans/Department Chairs/Directors	Koch, Sorrells, & Tschetter
10–10:50 a.m.	DUC 378	Chancellor, Interim Provost, and Faculty Governance Leaders	Koch, Sorrells, & Tschetter
11 a.m.	HLC Site Team Departure		

## Institution's Response to the Concerns Raised by the Commission

(Included in the Introduction of the HLC Self-Study Report, p. 5)

In the abbreviated self-study report that follows, we have addressed the various concerns raised in the 2008 HLC Report (Appendix A3: HLC Report 2008). In the table below, we present an overview of the key changes implemented in response to HLC's concerns.

HLC's Concern	UWSP's Response
<p>(1) Program Assessment efforts were "uneven" and campus culture did not embrace assessment as an important campus-wide initiative.</p>	<p>(1) Initiated a fundamental revision of program assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• visited each department, identified needs, made recommendations;</li> <li>• designed a series of workshops responding to identified needs and to support a comprehensive revision to program assessment (Assessment Academy);</li> <li>• required all departments to submit Program Learning Outcomes, Curriculum Maps, and Assessment Plans;</li> <li>• revised UWSP Handbook to reflect new approach to assessment.</li> </ul>
<p>(2) The General Degree Requirements were found to be credit-intensive, not well understood nor valued, and not based on learning outcomes.</p>	<p>(2) Carried out a six-step process to create a new General Education Program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Step 1: Mission Statement (May 2008)</li> <li>• Step 2: Goals &amp; Program Outcomes (February 2009)</li> <li>• Step 3: Model &amp; Degree Types (April 2009)</li> <li>• Step 4: Structural Components &amp; Measurable Learning Outcomes (April 2010)</li> <li>• Step 5: Course &amp; Instructor Criteria (April 2011)</li> <li>• Step 6: Administration, Implementation, &amp; Assessment (February 2012)</li> </ul>
<p>(3) Assessment of general education was lacking.</p>	<p>(3) Proposed assessment plan for general education based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a continuous improvement model</li> <li>• course portfolios</li> <li>• faculty learning communities that engage faculty from across campus to share best practices.</li> </ul>
<p>(4) Faculty governance structures impeded effective assessment and management of general education.</p>	<p>(4) Revised Faculty Governance structure and processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Merged responsibilities for curriculum and assessment in a new General Education Committee;</li> <li>• Revised assessment report and department review self-study formats</li> <li>• Synchronized reporting schedules for the Assessment Subcommittee and the Department Review Subcommittee based on a 5-year and 10-year cycle, respectively;</li> <li>• Proposed new positions: Director of General Education and Assessment Coordinator</li> </ul>