**MINUTES – GENERAL EDUCATION POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**ROOM 110 NOEL FINE ARTS CENTER – January 18, 2010; 1 p.m.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: N. Fernando, D. Guay, J. Houghton, G. Olsen, R. Olson, J. Sage, J. Schneider, G. Summers

MEMBERS ABSENT: M. Bixby, R. Sirabian

1. D. Guay called the meeting to order at 1:04 p.m.

2. The minutes from the January 11, 2010 meeting were not available; the January 11, 2010 minutes will be reviewed for approval at the next meeting.

3. There were no announcements.

4. Old Business: Update Step 5 Draft

The committee continued discussion of the Step 5c draft. D. Guay noted that the criteria had been reviewed and revision completed at the last meeting; other than a few formatting adjustments, there hadn’t been any additional changes made subsequent.

D. Guay stated that he had added a paragraph in the Explanation of Proposal section thanking the campus for their feedback of the Step 5b proposal; he also had done some reformatting. He explained that he opted for use of a list format rather than table sensing that it provided for better explanation. G. Summers suggested that the resources section be moved to after the summary of changes; the committee agreed.

J. Schneider questioned if information regarding quantitative literacy should be included in the summary of changes list. She noted that although the rewording was only a minor change it still might be good to note the change. D. Guay concurred that quantitative literacy should be added to the summary of changes list to read “revised the prerequisite to Math 90 or higher.” Discussion followed on how the C&EA summary point might be revised for greater clarity; the summary point was revised to “a single course cannot satisfy more than one requirement in the C&EA category.” J. Sage inquired if there should be mention of courses satisfying dual requirements, “double dipping.” In an effort to maintain brevity of the summary listing, it was generally agreed to not mention the potential for “double dipping”; it was noted that explanation was given in the C&EA explanation portion of the draft.

Discussion of the draft continued with the resource area. G. Summers informed committee members that he had added a paragraph regarding enrollment caps; the committee reviewed and accepted the proposed revisions. N. Fernando asked if faculty governance action would be required for action related to enrollment caps. G. Summers responded that enrollment caps were ultimately an administrative decision, but added that faculty were welcome to discuss enrollment cap requests with department chairs, deans, and the Provost. G. Summers questioned whether an enrollment limit had been voted on by Faculty Senate for writing emphasis courses. Other than possibly the writing emphasis courses, G. Summers could not recall any specific enrollment caps that had been defined. Discussion followed on the search-ability ease of historical governance information. It was suggested that information might be obtained through the Registrar’s office. G. Summers advised that committee members would need to be prepared to explain decision-making related to enrollment caps. D. Guay and J. Houghton noted that enrollment caps were an administrative decision and not a committee decision.

The committee discussed if there should be a listing of areas that were not changed in the updated proposal. The committee decided against creating a list to highlight areas unchanged.

The committee briefly re-reviewed revisions to the instructor qualifications section. G. Summers informed the committee that he had made revisions to the instructor qualifications in the First Year Seminar (FYS) area. D. Guay inquired if adjunct status was considered hired. G. Olsen, J. Houghton, and G. Summers responded that adjunct status was considered hired; adjunct faculty would be eligible for selection to teach a course from the pool of available faculty. G. Olsen questioned whether the GEPRC had made a resource decision in that someone who was not a faculty member in a department and got accepted into an adjunct pool and assigned a FYS section could get overload pay. G. Summers responded that decisions regarding resources and overload pay were something that needed to be discussed and decided upon by the Provost and the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs. Discussion followed on how resources and overload were handled presently. G. Summers stated that presently supervisors, on an individual basis, have the ability to give permission but with it potentially being on a larger scale it would be best to have a policy in place. N. Fernando asked which department would be compensated in cases of multiple departments. G. Summers responded that the department hiring the faculty to teach the FYS would receive the compensation. Suggested revisions for the instructors in the FYS area were discussed. J. Sage noted the importance of emphasizing that additional training could be provided to potential instructors to equip them to teach the non-discipline specifics of a FYS. The committee revised the instructors in FYS area; the last sentence of the first paragraph was revised to, “…well qualified to serve as FYS instructors, especially with respect to study skills, information literacy, and co-curricular involvement.” G. Summers advised that he had not completely finished revision of the area and would continue working on revising the area. He suggested that it might be an opportune place to call attention to the course name and encourage feedback of possible names.

J. Sage asked if the Constitution and Handbook Review Subcommittee (CHRS) updated General Education Committee (GEC) proposal would be appendix 1 in the Step 5c proposal. Discussion followed on what future plans CHRS had related to the GEC proposal and committee decided against the GEC proposal being appendix 1 in the updated proposal. N. Fernando inquired if the CHRS had an area for interested persons to review an updated version of the GEC proposal and related information. G. Summers responded that the GEC proposal had been revised based upon feedback received. He was unsure whether a decision had been made by CHRS to solicit additional feedback on the revised GEC proposal or forward the proposal to the Academic Affairs Committee.

G. Summers will work on revision of the Foundation area. The committee briefly reviewed the written and oral communication area. D. Guay shared that R. Sirabian was still in the process of revision. A brief discussion clarifying points discussed with Chris Sadler to be included in the written and oral communication area followed. D. Guay suggested that the committee revisit the communication area after R. Sirabian had the opportunity to complete revision. The committee moved on to quantitative literacy.

D. Guay questioned whether the updated proposal should mention degree requirements. J. Schneider asked who would be responsible for determining test-out and placement for Foreign Language, Mathematics, and English. D. Guay responded that question would be addressed in step 6 of the general education policy (GEP). G. Olsen advised that placement differed from “test-out.” G. Summers concurred stating that under the current system they were synonymous but under the new GEP they may not be the same. G. Summers stated that the Academic Affairs Committee would be the governance committee responsible for determining responsibility; he envisioned that degree requirements would need to be in place before decisions could be made. D. Guay advised that ultimately the same proficiencies would be maintained when GEP and degree requirements were combined related to the Bachelor of Science degree. A brief discussion followed on the math and equivalencies requirement. D. Guay asked whether the proposal should note that degree requirements were forthcoming. J. Sage suggested adding “in conjunction with degree requirements.” The committee revised the last sentence of the second paragraph under quantitative literacy to read, “… the Academic Affairs Committee, requires students to meet essentially the same level of quantitative literacy as our current General Degree Requirements.” G. Summers reminded the committee that courses falling under quantitative literacy in the new GEP could potentially be offered from an area other than mathematics. J. Schneider added that in the present GDR program, the requirement is not termed “quantitative literacy” as it is in the new GEP.

J. Schneider stated that there had been no comments received regarding Wellness in feedback related to the Step 5 proposal. The Wellness area was revised to note that there had been no revisions to the area and that no feedback had been received related to Step 5 Wellness criteria.

The committee reviewed the investigation area. The “and” between the course types listed under points “a” and “b” was removed. The semicolon was left to emphasize the distinction of each group. J. Schneider asked what might happen to the five-credit 101 natural science courses. G. Summers noted that if the courses were required for majors that they would fall under category “b.” J. Schneider questioned how departments requiring another department’s courses might be affected. A brief discussion followed on the benefits to departments in continuing to offer courses required by other departments. J. Schneider requested that “Biology 101: General Biology” be added to the listing of examples. The committee made additional revision to the final sentence of the last paragraph; the sentence was revised to read, “The same may well be true for other investigation level courses (Social Sciences, Historical Perspectives, Humanities, Arts).”

J. Houghton distributed a handout of a revised C&EA area; the committee reviewed proposed revisions. J. Houghton questioned whether the parenthesis containing the three categories of Global Awareness, U.S. Diversity, and Environmental Responsibility was necessary. G. Olsen voiced his support of leaving it in. J. Schneider asked whether the parenthesis should be moved to the first C&EA reference. There was a brief discussion related to revision of the final sentence. The revised C&EA area was accepted by the committee with minor revisions to the final sentence. J. Sage stated that in regard to talking points related to the sidebar categories, the committee needed to consider varying audiences differing by course levels; he noted the benefit of the committee striving to be as accommodating as possible. G. Summers suggested referencing current practice. J. Schneider suggested the following revision to the first sentence in the last C&EA paragraph, “In keeping with current practice (with respect to non-western culture, minority studies, and environmental literacy), it is also likely …” The proposed revision was accepted by the committee.

The committee began review of the integration areas. R. Olson noted that under interdisciplinary studies, the first bullet point stated “the 300 level”; he advised that this had been revised to sophomore standing. The committee noted that revision was needed of the interdisciplinary studies area. R. Olson will work on revising the interdisciplinary studies area and summarize changes from the Step 5b to 5c proposal. D. Guay suggested that the committee review the interdisciplinary studies area at the next meeting after revisions were completed.

The committee reviewed the experiential learning area; some minor revisions were discussed and accepted by the committee. J. Houghton suggested that in the final sentence of the fourth paragraph, the additional related to student affairs after “academic staff member” be left out. J. Schneider explained that the inclusion of the student affairs component was to provide additional considerations in spreading out the mentoring responsibility for the experiential learning requirement. J. Schneider questioned if the removal of degree requirements for mentors needed to be mentioned. G. Olsen noted that it was included in the bulleted summary listing. J. Schneider advised that there were no specified criteria for option “A” other than satisfying established learning outcomes. She suggested the addition of a statement stating that departments were responsible for determining hours and reflection. The final sentence in the fifth paragraph was revised to, “We expect that the department proposing the credit-bearing course … use their best judgment when determining the number of hours required, as well as the type of reflection.” She inquired whether there should be explanation of the reduction to 16 credits. The committee briefly discussed that the reduction was related to the contact hours for a one-credit course and the reduction was fairly self-explanatory.

D. Guay advised that revision was still underway for communication in the major. He anticipated that R. Sirabian would complete revisions by the next meeting and the area could be reviewed at that time.

5. New Business: Planning for campus release of draft 5c and forums

D. Guay asked committee members’ views on when the Step 5c proposal should be released to campus for feedback. He noted that revision and subsequent review were still needed for some areas of the proposal. Discussion followed on potential release dates and the amount of time that should be given for campus feedback. The committee agreed on a month’s time for feedback to allow discussion of the proposal at department meetings; it was noted that some departments meet only once per month. A tentative release date of February 4, 2011 was selected. Discussion followed on the number of forums to be held and times that might be best for greatest possible participation. The committee agreed on two open forums. J. Sage suggested coordinating one of the forums with a Thursday afternoon College of Letters and Science department chairs’ meeting; Thursday, March 5, 2011, 3-5 p.m. was tentatively selected. A second forum was tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, February 23, 2011, 3-5 p.m.

D. Guay will email committee members the tentative forum dates/times to confirm agreement and “homework” assignments for the following week. He noted that if forum dates were confirmed he and G. Olsen would determine locations. D. Guay will also contact Academic Affairs Committee chair, Mick Veum, to advise him of GEPRC release and feedback plans for the Step 5c proposal.

6. The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 3 p.m.

Minutes Recorded by:

Nanci Simon, Secretary to the Faculty Senate