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

**ROOM D281, Science – November 23, 2011, 9 a.m.**

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: M. Bixby, J. Houghton (excused), J. Rohrer (excused), J. Schneider (excused), R. Sirabian (excused)

1. D. Guay called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

2. The minutes from November 9, 2011 and November 16, 2011 were approved by general consent.

3. There were no announcements.

4. Old business: Revision of the Step 6 proposal  
  
GEPRC members reviewed the Step 6 proposal page-by-page to accept changes that had been approved previously and for any other needed edits or revisions. J. Sage explained that the word “facilitates” was substituted for “organizes” to better express how the expertise of the Assessment Coordinator would be used (Item 6, page 34, under the procedure for collecting course-based evidence of student achievement section). Item 3 under the evaluation and reporting of General Education Program assessment was revised to remove the word “formal” from “formal recommendations for changes … to the Faculty Senate for discussion and approval.” The first paragraph on page 35 under “The Assessment Cycle” was reviewed and revised. J. Sage noted the dilemma regarding information for assessment of the four broad program learning outcomes when instructors would be focused on category learning outcomes. He suggested that an option might be to recruit instructors to either add a program learning outcome in addition to their category learning outcome or possibly have some instructors focus only on a program learning outcomes in their assessment. He noted that some information would be available from assessment reports. He suggested that this information could be gathered by the Assessment Subcommittee (AS) forwarding copies of the assessment reports to the General Education Committee (GEC). The GEC could gather relevant assessment information from the reports. A brief conversation followed regarding the importance in including both the Capstone Experience and Communication in the Major when discussing portions of the General Education Program (GEP) that will be embedded in the major. GEPRC members’ consensus was to have the AS and the GEC collaborate in gathering of program learning assessment information.  
  
The GEPRC completed revision of “The Assessment Cycle” paragraph on page 35 and the page-by-page review continued. The committee also checked that page numbers in the Table of Contents corresponded properly to referenced areas.  
  
J. Sage inquired if sample application and portfolios should be included in the proposal or provided separately. He suggested that a website be set up that contained samples rather than including the samples in the Step 6 proposal. He noted the benefit of samples being continually added to the website. Discussion followed regarding the website suggestion and whether this may be more in the purview of the GEC. J. Sage advised that an independent website could likely be coordinated with the GEC that would provide samples and examples for instructors and/or departments that might have questions.  
  
J. Sage informed GEPRC members that the Academic Affairs Committee had requested an overview of revisions that had been made from the initial Step 6 proposal to the Step 6b proposal. The GEPRC discussed what revisions had been made and conversed briefly of when to forward the proposal to the Academic Affairs Committee for action.  
  
GEPRC members did a final review of the Step 6b proposal. G. Olson noted that pages 47-49 were not a repeat of information as was previously thought and should remain. The GEPRC brainstormed key changes that had been made. Key changes from the initial proposal included:

* Clarification of the role of the Assessment Coordinator and the faculty learning communities for GEP assessment.
* Clarification of the language regarding the course portfolios within the assessment process.
* Recommendation of collaboration between the AS and GEC to use in the major GEP requirements to help assess GEP Program outcomes.
* “Assessment teams” references were replaced with “faculty learning communities.”
* Specific references to the Center for Academic Excellence and Student Engagement were replaced with more general language to allow for broader opportunities for professional development and instructional support.
* Catalog language regarding transferring credit to UWSP was updated to conform with UW System standards.

N. Fernando suggested mention of sample/example documents. The GEPRC added a note that the GEPRC would be providing example GEP course applications on the GEPRC webpage.

D. Guay will forward the overview of revisions, all comments received regarding Step 6, and the Step 6b proposal to Academic Affairs Committee chair, Todd Huspeni, for Academic Affairs Committee review and action.

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

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