**MINUTES – GENERAL EDUCATION POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**ROOM 110 NOEL FINE ARTS CENTER – February 17, 2011; 9 a.m.**

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: J. Sage

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

2. The minutes from the February 3, 2011 meeting were approved.

3. Announcements.

* G. Summers announced that the General Education Committee (GEC) constitutional amendment proposal had its first reading at Faculty Senate February 16. Discussion and action on the proposal will take place at the next Faculty Senate. A brief discussion followed on anticipated University Library discussion related to the proposal.
* G. Olsen reported that there had been limited feedback of the Step 5c proposal posted to the SharePoint website. To date, with one exception, all feedback had either been supportive or minor editorial changes.

4. There was no old business.

5. New Business.

Open Forum preparation

The committee discussed the format of the forums and what technology would be needed. It was agreed that overhead projection of the proposal would be beneficial for discussion; the bulleted list of changes would be projected initially to serve as talking points. A poll was taken of what committee members would be attending the forums. The committee determined that the agenda for the forums would be a welcome to attendees, reference to the bulleted list of changes, and a request for feedback. It was noted that the objective of the forums was to obtain attendee feedback and input. J. Schneider asked if M. Bixby had much input from students. He responded that he had been reporting information regarding the general education process and proposals to the student government association, but hadn’t received much response from students.

D. Guay will prepare reminder Message of the Days of the open forums for Monday and Wednesday. Room set-ups and microphone needs for the forums were briefly discussed. N. Fernando will supply the laptop computer for Wednesday’s open forum and D. Guay will supply the laptop computer for Thursday’s.

Step 6 Discussion

The GEPRC began discussion of what issues Step 6 might involve. G. Summers advised that Step 6 would encompass many things including assessment. He informed the GEPRC that the Assessment Academy team would soon be circulating a second draft of a proposed general education assessment plan. Feedback will be solicited from a limited audience including the GEPRC, Peggy Maki, and a few other assessment people. He anticipated that the general education assessment plan would be ready to incorporate as part of the Step 6 proposal this spring. In addition to assessment, there are a number of other administrative issues that will need to be addressed in Step 6 such as the General Education Director, Assessment Coordinator, and other supporting positions. G. Summers informed the GEPRC that there had been a call for proposals from UW System for Growth Agenda grant monies. A proposal, approved by the University Officers, was put forth; notification of grant monies is expected in mid-May/early-June. G. Summers explained that initially the proposal was related to the FYS but had been expanded to be more about general education assessment. Funding requested in the proposal was for a FYS coordinator and an Assessment Coordinator. The funding would be for one year for half-time positions. He explained that the idea was that after the initial start-up funding, the university would fund the positions. He noted the importance of staffing the general education curriculum appropriately. He anticipated a great deal of work involved in getting the general education curriculum up and running as well as that of management and maintaining the curriculum. G. Summers stated that the Deans recognized the need for someone to be in charge of the general education program and for position funding in that respect to be an institutional priority.

G. Summers suggested the GEPRC consider grandfathering the general degree requirements (GDR) into the general education program (GEP). He advised that it was anticipated that it would take 1-2 years before the assessment program would be functioning really well. The first assessment exercise would need to be an alignment exercise to ensure that courses were properly aligned with established learning outcomes. G. Summers suggested that the GEPRC put forth a proposal to Faculty Senate regarding grandfathering GDRs. He noted that although this is a Step 6 issue there is time sensitivity involved. He advised that the first issue the GEC will need to address will be the transition from the GDR to the GEP; the GEC would benefit by having a curriculum to inherit. Discussion followed on what designations would be more easily grandfathered and others that would require special attention. It was noted that the Experiential Learning, Capstone, and Communication in the Major would require special attention.

D. Guay questioned if transfer and test-out were other issues for Step 6. G. Summers confirmed that they would need to be addressed in Step 6.

The committee discussed the formation of the GEC next fall and the elimination of the GDR Subcommittee. It was noted that the GDR Subcommittee had been getting a large number of proposals for GDR designation; it was suspected that this was largely a result of the upcoming print catalog deadline. Suggestion was made to have a cut-off date for GDR proposals. Discussion followed on the possibility of the GEC addressing GDR course proposals during the interim time between the GDR ending and the GEP beginning. Concern was raised that there was the potential for the GEC dealing with GDR proposals and not having adequate time to work on the new GEP curriculum. Recommendation was made that a date be established where GDR proposals would no longer be accepted. Proposals after that established date would need to be GEC proposals; some GEC designations would automatically map to the GEC course to a GDR designation. It was recognized that there would be difficulty with some categories. A brief discussion ensued about the proper timing for the proposal since it technically was a Step 6 issue. It was noted that although the GEC proposal was a Step 6 issue, the timing of the proposal was premised on the time sensitivity involved.

J. Schneider inquired how the general education transition might affect part-time students. It was agreed that part-time students might have problems. It was noted that Deans had the authority to grant waivers and that waivers might be necessary in some cases.

R. Sirabian confirmed that what was being recommended by the GEPRC was that next year the GEC would approve GEP courses, and those GEP courses would map to GDR requirements. The GEPRC members anticipated that this process might need to in place for the next two years. It was noted that there may be an issue related to certification of instructors for teaching Communication in the major; the committee agreed that there would need to be some flexibility in the transition. Discussion followed on the need for new forms and the GEPRC’s purview related to new GEP forms. It was noted that new forms would be the responsibility of the GEC but that a draft template for the committee to start with might be beneficial.

J. Schneider requested that advising be added to the list of Step 6 issues addressed by the GEPRC. G. Summers shared that the Compass Team was working on plans for advising workshops for faculty development opportunities for advising the new GEP and through the transition. J. Schneider noted the importance of summer advisors being properly prepared.

R. Sirabian asked what effect degree requirements would have on majors. G. Summers explained that if the proposed degree requirements were approved, majors would need to incorporate those requirements. He added that he expected the Curriculum Committee to be quite busy next year with revisions to majors related to degree requirements. He advised that all major revisions would need to be put forth through the Curriculum Committee. He noted the additional benefit to departments in grandfathering the GDR into the GEP.

D. Guay listed the following items that would need to be addressed in Step 6:

1. Assessment Plan
2. Administration
3. Transition to GEP (Committee structure and mapping)
4. Transfer
5. Test-out
6. Placement
7. Advising
8. Forms

G. Summers advised that a proposal could be put forth that directed the GEC to take up the issue of grandfathering GDR courses into the GEP as its first item of business. GEPRC could make a recommendation, but the actual mapping of individual courses would be done by the GEC. He shared that D. Kellogg had prepared a spreadsheet of courses and where they might potentially be designated in the GEP. Problematic mapping issues were briefly discussed. Consensus was reached that mapping decisions would be the responsibility of the GEC. D. Guay questioned if departments would need to address learning outcomes related to the corresponding designations. G. Summers responded that departments would need to address learning outcomes. He advised that the first year of general education assessment would be devoted to alignment. R. Olson noted that the Higher Learning Commission will want to see assessment results by 2017. G. Summers will prepare a proposal for review at the next GEPRC meeting. Once approved, the proposal will be forwarded to AAC for action.

D. Guay will put together an outline of the Step 6 items to be addressed. J. Houghton noted that he was still getting questions regarding the lack of a diagram in the present proposal. G. Summers responded that the diagram was an Academic Affairs tool that was useful in the Step 4 general education proposal but wasn’t necessary to include in subsequent proposals. He advised that when the new Academic Affairs website is launched, the diagram would be included on the website.

A brief discussion of when the work of the GEPRC would be completed followed. Members anticipated that Step 6 would extend into the next academic year. The question of whether the committee desired to work over the summer was raised. The GEPRC members asked G. Summers to work on funding for the summer months in the event that it might be necessary for the GEPRC to work over the summer months.

6. The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 10:17 a.m.

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