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

**ROOM 110 NOEL FINE ARTS CENTER – April 7, 2011; 9 a.m.**

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: R. Olson (attending Board of Regents)

1. G. Olsen called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

2. The minutes of March 31, 2011 were approved by general consent subject to a clarification made on page 1 regarding department resources.

3. Announcements.

Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) Update

J. Houghton reported that the AAC had begun discussion of the Step 5d proposal at its last meeting. He noted that there was substantial discussion regarding offering courses that satisfied multiple categories at the foundation and investigation levels (“silver bullets”). The question premising the discussion was: If a course could meet outcomes of multiple categories, and the instructor was aware of the assessment required, and the General Education Committee (GEC) approved, why couldn’t a course satisfying multiple categories in the investigation or foundation levels be an option. J. Houghton advised that reduction of breadth had been raised as a reason to preclude the option. He reported that an amendment had been moved to allow for the silver bullet options, but the motion was defeated by a slim margin. J. Houghton anticipates that this issue might be one raised at Faculty Senate. G. Olsen reported that there had also been discussion at the AAC of the quantitative literacy requirement related to Step 4. A brief discussion followed on suggestions of how the AAC could move forward with the Step 5d action; the governance timeframe for the remainder of the semester was also discussed. G. Summers reported that the AAC hadn’t discussed revised degree requirement proposals at the last AAC meeting. J. Schneider advised that the degree requirements work group hadn’t met since before the forums.

Math 100

J. Schneider reported that she had a conversation with Mathematical Sciences chair, Dale Rohm, who informed her that the Department of Mathematical Sciences was contemplating putting forth a proposal to make Math 100 a remedial course. A brief discussion followed; the committee noted that any change to the Math 100 offering would require faculty governance approval. G. Summers and D. Guay stated that Math 100 being a remedial course and requirement of a higher course offering was consistent with the Department of Mathematical Sciences original feedback related to the proposal.

4. New Business.

General Education implementation schedule

A revised General Education implementation schedule was distributed. G. Summers stated that Dan Kellogg had made many additions to the implementation schedule related to advising and registration timeframes. He advised that the schedule would need to be finalized for Provost Nook to share with the Executive Committee at its next meeting. Minor revisions were made to the schedule for helpful clarifications.

N. Fernando asked what the impact on students would be. G. Summers responded that he hadn’t considered at what point it might be more advantageous for a student to move from the general degree requirements (GDR) to the general education program (GEP). He advised that the GEC would begin approving GEP proposals in fall 2012; the GEC will also be responsible for mapping courses from the GDR to GEP designations, this mapping should begin fall 2011.

J. Schneider asked if advising presentations should include references to both the GDR and GEP. G. Summers advised that students should be aware that a new GEP will be put in place and directed to resources for guidance in making decisions regarding their general education. The resources will need to be in place by May 2012. J. Schneider inquired when the GDR would be done. J. Houghton stated that under the current policy, the catalog with the GEP would determine the end of the GDR; he added that students would always have the option of moving forward in regards to requirements. J. Houghton noted that there had been talk of moving to an annual catalog; he asked the status of that discussion. G. Summers informed the GEPRC that the 2011-2013 catalog was anticipated to be the last two-year catalog; subsequent catalogs were expected to be provided annually. J. Houghton stated that the 2013-2014 catalog would be the first to hold/publish the GEP. G. Summers advised that students entering in the 2013-2014 year would be under the new GEP; students re-entering would still have an option between the GDR and GEP. He stated that at some point the GDR might be an unrealistic option due to course offerings. J. Houghton stated that typically substitutions and/or waivers were used in those special instances. G. Summers asked that any additional feedback regarding the implementation schedule be forwarded to him.

N. Fernando inquired if the GEC would begin looking at courses this coming fall. G. Summers responded that the GEC would have authority to look at both GDR and GEP curricular proposals. He noted that depending on the course, the committee would be looking for outcomes appropriate with the GEP; during the transition the committee will try to balance both programs.

J. Sage asked if a new course proposal was put forth for the GEP, would the GEC grant GDR status. G. Olsen and J. Houghton advised that mapping was to work both ways, from the GDR to the GEP designations, and from the GEP to the GDR designations. J. Sage asked if the mapping could occur without being requested. G. Summers noted that mapping courses both ways was implicit in the recommendations passed by the Faculty Senate. J. Houghton suggested that GEC recommend GDR designation to departments if it wasn’t requested. N. Fernando stated that she could see where it might be possible that the Division of Interior Architecture might not want a GEP mapped to a GDR designation due to a clash with other GDR designations.

The committee consensus was that the timeline would raise awareness of the coming general education transition.

Revision of UWSP Self-Study for Higher Learning Commission (HLC) visit

D. Guay noted that GEPRC summer work included review and revision of the UWSP Self-Study for the HLC. He asked who was working on the revision. G. Summers responded that he was writing a draft that would be reviewed by the GEPRC, Assessment Subcommittee, and HLC Assessment Academy team. He anticipated that the draft would be completed by early summer, noting the importance of including important events in the report that were happening presently. G. Summers reported that the self study deadline was October 2011. J. Sage confirmed that part of the self study was documenting the work of the various pertinent committees. He suggested that G. Summers meet with the HLC Assessment Academy team and co-chairs of the GEPRC and Assessment Subcommittee prior to beginning the draft.

Advising Academy team

J. Schneider shared her concerns regarding the Advising Academy team related to the advising workshops and training. She noted that the Student Academic Advising Center didn’t have a Council of Advisors to help in putting together advising training. G. Summers assured J. Schneider that she would be given assistance with the Advising Academy workshops.

Step 6

* Associate Degree (AD)

J. Schneider reported that presently UW College students were not required to take a Speech course to fulfill the AD; the requirement for UW College students was an Application and Performance requirement. She noted that with that exception, the AD mapped fairly well to UWSP courses. Discussion followed on revision of the AD at the UW System level. G. Summers advised that UWSP would have a representative on the AD Revision Committee. The GEPRC discussed whether the UW College/System level requirements applied to the UWSP GEP. J. Schneider advised the importance of the UWSP GEP dovetailing the AD as much as possible. She stated that in that the AD in the University of Wisconsin document, it defined the list of AD requirements as the “Minimum General Education Breadth Requirements.” She informed the GEPRC that the present AD learning outcomes were not assessable. A brief discussion followed on the structure of the UWSP AD related to the UW College AD. The committee discussed the potential for a UWSP AD policy that would require completion of the UWSP GEP and additional credits to reach a minimum of 60 credits, all with an acceptable GPA.

R. Sirabian inquired if UWSP would have multiple AD transfer policy documents, one for AD transfer students from the UW Colleges and universities, and another AD policy for students transferring in from other institutions. G. Olsen voiced Provost Nook’s desire for one standard AD transfer policy; if a student earned an AD at an accredited institution, the AD would be treated consistently regardless of the accredited institution awarding the AD. The committee discussed the benefits and possible drawbacks to this approach.

J. Schneider stated that she had questions from Dan Kellogg related to AD transfers. D. Kellogg questioned how it could be ensured courses transferred to UWSP wouldn’t be given credit for Capstone or Communication in the Major. Some committee members responded that departments could determine whether a course transferred in might be awarded credit for Communication in the Major. Regarding the Capstone courses, course numbers should be in a higher course number range so that it shouldn’t pose a problem.

* Administration

G. Olsen asked what additional work might be needed regarding administration of the GEP. The committee briefly discussed priority of the GEP positions. G. Summers suggested that the committee delay continued work on descriptions and recommendations to see if the growth agenda grant request was funded. The committee will re-visit administration issues in the fall.

The committee discussed the GEC task of mapping the GDR courses to the GEP. The grid of possible designations provided by the Registrar’s office is included in materials on the step 6 worksite. It was noted that the GEC would need to come up with some mechanism for checking with departments regarding mapping of GDR courses. A brief discussion followed on what role the GEPRC might have in encouraging quantitative literacy courses.

* Test-out, credit-by-exam, prior learning assessment

The committee discussed test-out, credit-by-exam, and prior learning assessment briefly. It was noted that Provost Nook had mentioned in the prior meeting that opportunities to earn credit for prior learning would need to be in place for students. G. Summers advised that present policy was if a department offered GDR courses, the department must provide a test-out opportunity.

* Advising

J. Schneider will work on a draft advising plan. Once the draft plan is completed it will be provided to the GEPRC for its review.

* Assessment Plan

G. Summers suggested that the GEPRC review the assessment plan since the plan would be included as part of the GEPRC step 6 proposal. G. Olsen directed committee members to review the Assessment plan in preparation for discussion at the next meeting.

5. The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 10:44 a.m.

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