**General Education Policy Review Committee**

**Minutes of the November 30, 2010 Meeting.**

Present: Don Guay, Gary Olsen, Michael Bixby, Nisha Fernando, John Houghton, Randy Olson, James Sage, Julie Schneider, Robert Sirabian, Greg Summers, Mary Holland.

Called to order at 3:05pm.

Announcements:

1. Don Guay will set up a Doodle calendar for when we want to meet next spring, and discuss when to meet during the Winterim break.
2. This week Friday, the Assessment Subcommittee is working on Curriculum Mapping.

Old Business. Update Step 5 draft:

1. Written and Oral Communication.

The committee discussed updating the wording of the bullet to “will have enrollment *in the range of 20-24* students.” The committee discussed if research has been found to support this; it is recommended that a citation be added to the Explanation.

The committee discussed if an instructor wanted a lower or higher number of students in the class they could appeal this number with the Chair/Dean and then the Provost for an exception.

The committee further discussed the wording, suggesting, “typically this would be the max.” The committee then discussed if the number is flexible why have it at all? Why not get rid of enrollment caps on Communication and recommend caps only for the First Year Experience.

The committee discussed how Quantitative Literacy uses on-line resources that affect the number of students that can easily be dealt within an individual class. The committee discussed that the Provost is against rigid caps in policy, and he’d want to see an assessment-based argument for this.

The committee discussed how other departments and courses might want class size caps too. The history of the Writing Emphasis caps was that governance approved them, but we are unable to locate this in the minutes. The committee discussed that when a single class has the ability to create an additional seat for a WE course only at the request of the Dean.

The committee discussed using the words “adequate supervision” instead of a cap because issuing of caps is beyond the committee’s purview. The committee discussed how some members would have trouble supporting a cap when the program has not needed one for at least 30 years. The committee discussed how some like the flexibility to allow a professor to chose how many students he or she could teach.

The committee discussed for First Year Seminar what the words “sufficiently small” means; this is a discussion between a professor, the Dean and the Department Chair. If caps are there it’s harder to argue; it’s harder to be flexible.

The committee discussed whether it is the role of the committee to deal with resource and administrative issues. The committee discussed we may state strong opinions but its arguably not our purview to deal with caps. The committee changed the bullet wording to “sufficiently small caps” and then in the Explanation a good range will be suggested for a trial run with assessment; and request a statement from Mark Nook.

1. Interdisciplinary Studies.

The committee changed the wording on a bullet point from “have a minimum of 24 credits” and replaced with the more conventional catalog wording of “sophomore standing.”

1. Capstone Experience in the Major.

The committee discussed whether to have the bullet “all capstone courses/experiences must be completed in the senior year of the respective major.” The committee agreed it’s superfluous and should be deleted.

The committee changed the wording “area of concentration” to “major.”

The committee added “knowledge which will demonstrate continuity between the GE program outcomes and the Major.”

1. Experiential Learning.

The committee discussed that Experiential Learning can be satisfied by more than one course, and suggested change of wording to “credit-bearing course.”

The committee discussed that for Service Learning course the 24-hour requirement might be too high; 15 hours might be more reasonable. Debbie Palmer could report a definition that would be included in the Explanation, of what Service Learning means (so the GEP has criteria).

The committee discussed when there should be a 24-hour requirement and when that is not necessary. The committee discussed the difference would be between a credit bearing practicum course versus a non-credit bearing ELA course. A one-credit course is 16 hours work. The ELA is just one option among a broad number of options; and it’s the one that caused the most confusion. The committee discussed if all the details will allow this new course to mature in response to needs.

The committee changed wording from “90-credits” to more conventional catalog wording of “junior-standing”.

Homework.

Julie Schneider will work on sidebar.

Julie Schneider and James Sage will work on ELA.

Gary Olsen will work on General Criteria.

Adjourned at 4:53 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Mary Holland.