

Overview

This report is an update to [the report for November 8, 2016](#).

It has been eight months since the last formal update about GLOs. Given this, a [timeline](#) with short summary is provided to remind folks of the events that have taken place thus far. Next comes [a summary of the past year's experiences](#). Finally, an [anticipated list of what's coming up](#) in 2017-2018. This anticipated list needs to be presented and discussed with both Graduate Committee and administration before moving ahead.

Summary Timeline of Events:

June 2016:

Multiple graduate program coordinators attend a GLO workshop, learn about [Lumina Foundation DQPs](#), and informally agree with administration representatives that they are a good start for the project.

[\[http://www.wou.edu/facultysenate/files/2016/10/DQP-Definitions-by-Lumina.pdf\]](http://www.wou.edu/facultysenate/files/2016/10/DQP-Definitions-by-Lumina.pdf)

September 2016:

September 22nd, 2016:

Multiple graduate program coordinators participate in workshop around GLOs. Agree DQP/GLOs to emphasize for 2016-17 will be writing and analytic inquiry.

October 2016:

Graduate Studies Committee supports adopting DQPs as pilot GLOs. Emphasize two per year towards a total of 5-6 GLOs by 2019.

Graduate programs requested/required to write program outlines and identify which DQPs they are aligned to. Required/requested to submit by October 28, 2016 (date listed in my notes--I think this may have adjusted).

October 25th, 2016:

Senate Meeting. Lumina DQPs are presented to Faculty Senate as pilot framework for GLOs. Concerns expressed. Explicit emphasis placed on piloting, not permanent nature, of DQP model.

Faculty Senate Graduate Learning Outcomes Update for July 11, 2017

Faculty Senate approved framework.

December 5th, 2016:

Writing GLOs assessment meeting/workshop with multiple faculty held. Not all committee members were able to attend

May 2017:

Graduate programs required/requested to complete survey that shows how courses align with GLOs.

Concerns:

Multiple users had issues with organization, usability, structure, and purpose of survey. Survey instrument was partially revised in response to some concerns.

June 2017

June 14, 2017:

Writing Assessment workshop

- Meeting requested two weeks before; limited attendance possible.
- Revised initial request to have two samples per graduating student down to a total of 3 samples: one excellent, one moderate, and one poor.

Concerns:

1. Relatively short notice given; understanding about limited participation agreed to.
2. Initial request for 2 samples per student rejected by most faculty; negotiated new approach for 3 representative samples per program.

Outcomes:

Overall, faculty who were able to attend found [this is an informal assessment based on observing peers and their comments; it's not an official position]:

1. The rubric pretty useful and needing limited to no revision;
2. Helpful to review/read writing in other programs;
3. Important to have the context/type of writing explicitly identified (class paper, exit exam, weekly assignment, etc.).

June 15, 2017:

Analytic Inquiry workshop

- Meeting requested two weeks before; limited attendance possible. Only 2-3 people attended. Supposed to be rescheduled for summer.
- Revised initial request to have two samples per graduating student down to a total of 3 samples: one excellent, one moderate, and one poor.

Concerns:

1. Relatively short notice given; understanding about limited participation agreed to.
2. Initial request for 2 samples per student rejected by most faculty; negotiated new approach for 3 representative samples per program.
3. Given low rate of attendance, was anything achieved?

Outcomes:

1. I was not able to attend, so I cannot summarize any findings.
2. Workshop reslated for later in Summer 17.

Summary of 2016-17 Experience

1. Faculty are interested in working on this project, and the process has been useful.
2. The rubrics appear to be useful and in need of slight revisions.
3. Administration has been willing to work and revise parts of the process, so that's appreciated.
4. As of yet, no serious alternatives to DQP have been presented or proposed by faculty.

For greatest success and participation, what's clearly needed:

1. Schedule workshops on GLOs months, not weeks, in advance;
2. Establish a clear schedule and goals for the year;
3. Have focused communications about GLOs during Grad Cmte meetings; email and email threads are not followed by everyone immediately;
4. Have a consistent platform for documents, samples, work: Moodle.

What's Coming in 2017-18

A. Official adoption of DQP or new standards needed by October.

1. DQP was piloted. If we don't have alternative, then we need to work with DQP.
2. We can easily revise/adjust the DQP standards. That was a shared understanding when using or employing those rubrics.

B. Further workshops in 2017-2018 on two more DQP emphases since Writing and Analytic Inquiry (AI) were completed last year.

1. This continues the process started in 2016.
2. This works towards the goals of having five solid GLOs.
3. One in Fall, one in Spring--tentatively.

C. Revision of Writing and AI rubrics & feedback from programs

1. Revise the rubrics in grad committee (tentatively Fall).
2. Push out to programs & solicit feedback (tentatively Winter).
3. Review the revised rubrics (tentatively Spring).
4. Edit, revise, and hopefully approve (tentatively Spring).