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

**ROOM D281, Science – November 16, 2011, 9 a.m.**

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: M. Bixby, D. Guay (excused), R. Sirabian (excused)

1. G. Olsen called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

2. The minutes from November 9, 2011 will be reviewed at the next GEPRC meeting.

3. Announcements:

* J. Schneider announced that at its last meeting, the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) approved allowing two diplomas.
* J. Schneider and J. Sage reported that they had met with the professional advisors group to give an overview of the General Education Program (GEP) steps. They will meet again with the group in December for a continuation of the overview and to recruit members who might be interested in participating in the advising planning. J. Schneider stated that it would be good to have participating representation from each college.
* J. Sage reported that the initial meeting of the Convocation Committee had taken place. The Convocation Committee is part of the strategic plan and tied in with Vice Chancellor Thompson’s First Year Experience initiative. The committee will rethink orientation, move-in week, etc. and make recommendations. The group has been assured that recommendations will be acted upon. He noted that the last Convocation Committee in existence had been in September 2001. J. Houghton shared that past initiatives had only marginal success. A brief conversation followed of possible ideas, use of internal campus experts, and potential compensation for participating faculty. J. Sage noted that the target audience for initiatives is first year students and their family members.

The GEPRC discussed faculty governance process timeline issues related to the Step 6 proposal. Also discussed briefly were possible implications if the Step 6 portion of the GEP was not approved prior to the Higher Learning Commission focused visit. GEPRC members’ consensus was that it was essential that the Step 6 proposal be forwarded to the AAC prior to semester break. The goal date for completing revision of the Step 6 proposal and forwarding to the AAC is   
November 23.

4. Old business: Revision of the Step 6 proposal  
  
GEPRC members reviewed comment notes in the document and accepted changes to items that had been agreed upon previously. The committee discussed revisions needed on page 16, clause (b) regarding course-based measurements for the four general education (GE) program outcomes. Members discussed the benefit in leaving the clause more open-ended. J. Sage stated that assessment of the four broad GE program outcomes wasn’t really prompted elsewhere. G. Olson noted the exception being in the major components that would be assessed at the department level. He suggested that a statement be added of potential use of course portfolios and department assessment in assessment of the GE program. J. Sage added that the Assessment Coordinator (AC) could forward relevant information to departments and when feasible department information could be drawn upon as well. Discussion followed of GEP courses mapping to GE program outcomes. J. Sage suggested that the AC may be able to orchestrate selected faculty to assess GE program outcomes. He offered another option of the faculty learning communities having a rubric for the four GE program outcomes while reviewing course portfolios and determining what mapped appropriately to the GE program outcomes from the portfolios. Items (b) and (c) were exchanged in the item order with some revision.  
  
J. Schneider inquired if an explanation document would be provided to the AAC of revisions from the initial Step 6a proposal. R. Olson and G. Olsen recommended that due to the time constraints in the faculty governance process timeline, an explanation not be provided. The GEPRC could state that revisions took into account faculty responses to the initial proposal.  
  
Discussion followed of needed revision to items on page 17 under “2. Assessment Information.” Item (b) was amended to ask instructors to provide examples of student work that illustrated the range of student achievement rather than a specific number of examples. Item (a) was also revised so as not to be prescriptive in dictating that the “evaluation should be problem-based…” A brief conversation followed on use of “summary” rather than “evaluation” in item (a). G. Olsen and R. Olson stated that the terms differed in meaning and “evaluation” would be the more suitable term to use related to assessment. J. Sage questioned if additional detail should be provided regarding the faculty learning communities under item 1 of “The General Education Assessment Process.” A brief discussion followed; GEPRC revised item 1 to include explanation that a faculty learning community “might include the Assessment Coordinator and a member of the GEC representing a particular GEP category.”   
  
G. Olsen recommended that in the interest of brevity, the calendar listing, a duplication of information in a different format, be deleted (pages 47-49).  
  
J. Schneider asked who course portfolios would be submitted to. J. Houghton advised that it was concluded at the previous GEPRC meeting that the AC would receive the course portfolios and distribute them to the appropriate faculty learning community. Clarification was made that the faculty learning community would be considered an advisory group and consequently, course portfolios would not be considered public record and would remain private. G. Olsen and   
J. Houghton suggested that some explanation be included that all identifying information in the course portfolios would be removed prior to information being shared with the GEC.  
  
Discussion followed of possible confusion between the GEP application and the assessment course portfolio. J. Sage stated that the course portfolio would be comprehensive and include assessment. G. Olsen noted that the documents were at two different steps in the process.   
R. Olson stated the possibility of the GEP application differing from the course portfolio assessment information. The group continued discussion of the Assessment Coordinator and GEC representative’s place in the faculty learning community. Item 1 was edited to read that the faculty learning community “includes the Assessment Coordinator and a member of the GEC representing the particular GEP category.” Item 2 was revised to clarify that instructors teaching courses in areas under review “in the fall semester” would need to submit course portfolios to the Assessment Coordinator by “February 1.” GEPRC members edited items 3 and 4 to clarify the AC’s role in the assessment process. For consistency of reporting and in consideration of faculty workload, the GEPRC reaffirmed that the AC was the appropriate person to draft the faculty learning community assessment report. Discussion followed regarding feedback to individual faculty members. J. Sage noted the benefit in noting that individual faculty feedback would only be shared with the individual faculty member.  
  
J. Schneider inquired how Mary Bowman’s suggestion of faculty learning communities being subcommittees of the GEC should be addressed. GEPRC members noted that a subcommittee of the GEC would be under open records law which could allow for course portfolios to be public records. This was completely contradictory to the desire for complete confidentiality and privacy related to course portfolios. Additional revision was made to Item 4 to include “specific courses” as part of identifying information that would be excluded from the assessment report. Minor revisions were made in subsequent pages.  
  
J. Sage suggested that “Using Assessment Data to Improve Learning,” the procedure for collecting course-based evidence of student achievement within the GEP, item 4 (page 34) should better explain the two-step process of GEP course application and course portfolio. Items 3 and 5 were revised and item 4 deleted to provide a concise explanation of assessment and course portfolios, and address program learning outcomes as well.   
  
The committee will continue revision of the Step 6 proposal at the next GEPRC meeting. Members should continue to look at what additional revisions might be needed. Deletion of the calendar listing, pages 47-49, was noted.

5. The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 10:56 a.m.

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