UNDERGRADUATE OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (UOAC)
Worcester Polytechnic Institute
Minutes of meeting #7 of the 2017-18 academic year
November 10, 2017

Present: L. Mathews (chair), D. Samson (secretary), J. deWinter, R. Mallick, C. Demetry, A. Donta-Venman, G. Cataldo '20 (SGA), A. Heinricher (Provost's Office), O. Pavlov (CAP), P. St. Louis (guest, Office of the Dean of Engineering), J. Rudolph (invited guest, GMCLOT), A. Sakulich (invited guest, GMCLOT)

The meeting began at 2:07 PM.

Consideration of the minutes of meeting #6 was postponed until the next meeting.

L. Mathews welcomed J. Rudolph and A. Sakulich to the meeting and thanked them for their willingness to help UOAC by answering three questions about the task force's work and recommendations:

1. How would a course (or other credit-bearing activity) get a designation of "GIC," or demonstrating the satisfaction of global competency requirements?
2. Did GMCLOT discuss in detail how a new learning outcome would be assessed (beyond or in addition to ePortfolios)?
3. Did GMCLOT discuss how the learning outcome would apply to international students?

J. Rudolph explained that her task force did not discuss how GIC designations might be made. She answered the question on international students by explaining that the requirement for global and intercultural competence should apply to all WPI undergraduates.

Committee members and guests discussed issues of assessment at length. Discussion included the pros and cons of taking the Writing Across the Curriculum program (WIC) as a model for G.I.C. course content and designation; distinctions between qualitatively-oriented assessment and the more clearly definable goals of quantifying assessment; the goal of meeting a checklist of graduation requirements versus that of less measurable achievements of lifelong learning; and what kind of undergraduate course experience or production might be used as a "gateway" or beginning measure for the required competencies. A. Heinricher and J. deWinter observed that if off-campus (i.e. "global") IQPs became the norm, a student's application essay would serve this function well. All participants agreed that assessment will require provision for well-trained and perhaps exclusively assigned evaluators, such as WIC was intended to have but never obtained. J. Rudolph pointed out that pages 16-20 of the GMCLOT report suggested various strategies of assessment, such as those used by the Programme (sic) for International Student Assessment, AAC&U, and the Intercultural Development Inventory.

UOAC members also asked about GMCLOT's language concerning student "engagement." The invited guests clarified that this did not explicitly mean "engagement with persons who

represent a global or intercultural identity." A student's global/intercultural mastery could also come about by engaging with books or ideas in a classroom context, for example.

UOAC and its guests discussed whether the GMCLOT report's language defining "global competency" and "intercultural competency" ought to be more explicit when the task force presents in a faculty meeting, or perhaps less explicit. G. Rudolph, J. deWinter and C. Demetry said that the report's current wording was crafted explicitly with faculty understanding and acceptance as goals, although whichever GMCLOT members presented to faculty might usefully come prepared with a "glossary" of the report's language in case of faculty questions. The GMCLOT members repeated its belief that assessment of "global" competence should remained firmly attached to "intercultural" goals in all presentations and motions.

The meeting adjourned at 2:57.

Respectfully submitted,

David Samson, sec'y