**MINUTES – GENERAL EDUCATION POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE** (GEPRC)

**ROOM D281, Science – October 12, 2011, 9 a.m.**

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: M. Bixby

1. D. Guay called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

2. The minutes of October 5, 2011 were approved by general consent.

3. Announcements.

* J. Sage recommended that a reminder be forwarded to campus regarding the Step 6 proposal open forums and the site address for providing feedback. He informed GEPRC members that he had arranged for videotaping of the forums.
* J. Sage announced that the Center for Academic Excellence & Student Engagement would be hosting a brown bag event to present information on service learning and Experiential Learning in the new General Education Program (GEP). Debbie Palmer and he would be presenters at the event. A Message of the Day will be forthcoming to inform faculty and staff of the opportunity.
* J. Sage informed GEPRC members that a special invitation to the open forums had been extended to the chairs of Academic Affairs, Curriculum, and General Education Committees. The chairs of these committees will be attending at least one of the forums. He informed members that Interim Provost Summers would be attending both forums.
* J. Houghton updated the GEPRC on Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) discussion of multiple degree policy. He shared that the 30-credit rule had been discussed at length. He anticipates that there will be a resolution put forth at the next meeting. J. Sage advised that the AAC appeared to be leaning towards removing the additional 30 credits required in obtaining a second degree. D. Guay questioned what the present practice was for multiple degrees. J. Houghton explained that presently one degree was awarded based upon the student’s choice of a primary major. All majors earned were transcripted under that degree. J. Houghton added that also discussed were questions related to reporting of multiple degrees versus reporting of student numbers. N. Fernando inquired if other comprehensive universities’ policies had been investigated.   
  J. Houghton advised that D. Kellogg had shared with the AAC that UW-Whitewater was the only UW awarding multiple degrees and most UW institutions used the 30-credit rule for second degrees. J. Sage noted the additional question of whether two majors of the same degree type with distinctive coursework would be deemed as one or two degrees.

4. Old business: Open forum planning  
  
The GEPRC began review and editing of the draft PowerPoint overview for use at the upcoming open forums. G. Olsen noted that the PowerPoint provided good information but perhaps the assessment information might be a bit too detailed for the forums. Committee members reviewed the assessment slides and decided which should remain in the overview. J. Sage will move the unused assessment slides to the end of the overview in the event that the detailed information might be useful at the forums. He will provide one or two slides that summarize the core information.  
  
D. Guay informed GEPRC members that Mathematical Sciences department chair, Cindy McCabe, forwarded him differentiating information between code 4 and 7 of the math placement scale. He will add this information to the notes area of the PowerPoint overview.   
  
R. Sirabian anticipated that resource questions were likely regarding the administrative recommendations as well as questions of how the positions were envisioned. G. Olsen stated that the GEPRC had not recommended FTE related to the positions; the GEPRC had recommended responsibilities that needed to be met. He noted that decisions regarding the recommended positions would be made by Academic Affairs. R. Sirabian advised that recommendations could be made by forum attendees.  
  
G. Olsen stated that all of the Recommendations for Transitioning to the new GEP were efforts underway. He asked the status of departments submitting grandfathering forms to the General Education Committee (GEC). J. Sage informed the GEPRC that the GEC would be addressing approximately 13 grandfathering forms at its next meeting.   
N. Fernando inquired whether it might be beneficial to provide a sample grandfathering form at the forums. After a brief conversation, GEPRC members agreed that it would not be necessary to include a grandfathering sample form at the open forums. Grandfathering forms had been distributed to all department chairs earlier in the year. The notation “in progress” was added to the Recommendations for Transitioning to the new GEP section. J. Sage noted that with his being elected GEC chair last spring, he had begun some work on behalf of the GEC prior to his appointment to interim associate vice chancellor. The Advising Recommendations slide was edited. A minor revision was made to the GEP Workshops slide.   
  
R. Sirabian inquired what difference was trying to be articulated in the two bullet points on the Student Expectations and Responsibilities slide. J. Houghton advised that the first bullet point was geared toward education broadly; the second focused on general education. Discussion followed on how best to revise the slide to incorporate the fundamental ideas. The GEPRC settled on providing two key bullet points from the proposal.  
  
The GEPRC reviewed the revised PowerPoint slides and discussed additional needed edits, revisions, and reformatting. D. Guay questioned if the topic of “silver bullets” related to assessment should be discussed. J. Sage will create a slide that explains double and triple dipping and the implications related to assessment. Committee members reviewed the five-year assessment cycle at UWSP slide. G. Olsen asked about talking points for foundation level courses and program outcome one. He questioned what should be communicated to forum attendees in how assessment works with that array of courses and specific program outcome. J. Sage responded that the foundation level courses would be based upon course embedded assessment measures and program outcome one would be mapped to institutional level measures. G. Olsen inquired how an instructor teaching a foundation level course should provide assessment for the course. J. Sage responded that submission of a portfolio would satisfy what was required. A brief discussion followed on program learning outcomes. The five-year assessment cycle slide was edited further. R. Sirabian noted the importance of sharing the intent for assessment to be manageable. G. Olson stated that the five-year process seemed to be an increase in manageability. He asked how years one through four tied into year five assessment. J. Sage explained that the fifth year would be a comprehensive review of the prior four years. Overall, the GEC would be responsible for the comprehensive review. The GEC will look at changes, deem if present assessment was appropriate, and make any necessary amendments. He noted that it was considered common and good practice to review the program as a whole as the fifth year of assessment would do. J. Houghton confirmed with J. Sage that if changes were seen as necessary in the first year, those changes would not wait until the fifth year. J. Sage confirmed that needed changes could be recommended immediately; amendments would not need to wait for the comprehensive review year. He noted the possibility of having optional off-cycle assessment to determine if changes were rendering desired results. J. Sage informed GEPRC members that he would be attending both open forums.  
  
Editing was done to the Administrative Recommendations slide relating to replacing general degree requirements language with GEP language wherever necessary (e.g., *University Handbook*, *UWSP Catalog*, websites, brochures, etc.).  
  
J. Sage asked if explanation would be provided for GEP courses in the major not being designated as such. It was noted that by designating in the major courses, a student transferring majors might be under the incorrect impression that the requirement was satisfied by having been completed in the previous major. A change in major would require the student to complete the in the major requirement for the new major regardless of completion in the previous major. It was suggested that course notations could be added in the catalog of courses satisfying the Capstone Experience or Communication in the Major requirements. The notations would be for informational purposes. J. Houghton voiced the importance in students being aware of this circumstance.  
  
D. Guay announced that there would be a pre-forum workgroup gathering next Wednesday at 9 a.m.; an official GEPRC meeting would not take place.

5. New Business:  
  
Advising Reference Guide  
  
R. Sirabian informed GEPRC members that he had added some rough draft ideas to the advising reference listing. D. Guay and G. Olsen directed members to continue adding draft ideas to the listing. The GEPRC will review the draft advising reference guide listing in a couple weeks.

6. The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 10:33 a.m.

Minutes Recorded by: Nanci Simon, Secretary to the Faculty Senate