**General Education Policy Review Committee**

**Minutes of the June 1, 2010 Meeting**

Present: Don Guay, Gary Olsen, Nisha Fernando, Greg Summers, John Houghton, Randy Olson, Julie Schneider

The meeting was called to order at 1:00pm.

The minutes of May 13, 2010 were approved as amended.

Announcements:

Outside of GEPRC members, no one attended the May 19 open forum.

There were 30 well-written proposals for the FYS pilot. It was difficult choosing 12.

Greg Summers will incorporate the Step 5a May 4, 2010 document into the April 30th version currently posted as the GEPRC’s working document.

James Sage would like to present to the GEPRC what the Assessment Academy Team has been working on. The committee decided on June 29.

There has been an Open Forum scheduled for Sept. 1 from 10-noon in CPS 116. It’s listed in the Pre-Class Schedule.

Old Business: Discussion of Step 5 – Investigation and Integration levels

 Greg Summers asked committee members to look at the definition of Interdisciplinary Learning. Is it clear what constitutes interdisciplinary? For ex., Biochemistry would not be. The committee agreed we need more specific criteria to guide the Gen Ed committee. Don Guay raised the question whether the Paper Science major would be considered interdisciplinary, since it has courses in chemistry, physics and economics. John Houghton and Nisha Fernando discussed the interdisciplinary nature of their majors. The dept will be responsible for assessing an interdisciplinary major or minor. However, majors and minors that do not have any programmatic connection, e.g. an English major with a Chem. minor, wouldn’t be considered interdisciplinary because there is no way to assess the Interdisciplinary learning outcomes.

New Business

1. Review Feedback: Committee members reviewed the History Dept. comments posted on the GRC website. Discussion followed as to what the “course criteria” are intended to address: instructor qualifications, course qualifications or both? The current forms used by the GDR Subcommittee do not mention instructor qualifications and learning outcomes are only very loosely addressed. The current Writing Emphasis form is the closest to what we’re trying to create with the new GEP in that instructor qualifications (WE training) is required and the learning outcomes are very specific.

The Committee discussed the idea of” waiving” the instructor qualifications for those instructors teaching a course in their field, i.e. a History instructor who teaches a course in Historical Perspectives, an English professor who teaches a course in literature (Humanities). Instructors from outside the discipline who want to teach a course within that discipline would have to get approval. Perhaps when a dept. puts forward a course for approval, they could list all the instructors that are expected to teach that course for “blanket approval”. If there’s a new hire, that instructor would have to get approved separately.

The Committee continued to discuss the History Dept. comments. They want to be listed as a consulting dept. to Social Science courses, since they coordinate the Broadfield Social Science major. It was pointed out, however, that the History Dept. does not teach any social science courses. It was also noted that a number of dept. are missing from the “consulting dept.” list, e.g. all CNR areas.

The Committee agreed that the purpose of the “consulting dept.” was to separate a legitimate question of whether an instructor is qualified to teach a course from departmental turf protection. Does the campus trust the General Education committee to make these decisions or is it necessary to draft a number of rules for them to follow? Based on this discussion, the following changes were made to p.3 of Step 5: the GEP Category/Consulting Dept. box was removed and the sentence above it amended to: “Note: If there is a question about instructor qualifications, the General Education Committee will seek advice from any appropriate department.”

The Committee discussed the comments posted on the GEPRC website that are against allowing non-teaching academic staff to teach a FYS. The committee agreed they need to emphasize that the FYS is not a content course and that academic staff A are quite qualified to teach such a course.

Committee members discussed the Math Dept. comments. Dale Rohm reiterated that they want Math 100 to be the prerequisite to the Quantitative Literacy requirement. John Houghton said that most CNR faculty agree. However, this would greatly affect B.M., B.F.A. and B.A. non-science majors. They could have to take up to 3 math courses, depending on their placement (90, 100, QL), in addition to the 2 courses of foreign language that was approved by Faculty Senate for those degree types. The committee agreed that this could impact UWSP professional programs, preventing students from being able to graduate in 4 years. Julie Schneider asked whether, because of accreditation requirements, these programs are inflexible with regard to course and credit number changes or if these majors could be revised to accommodate the new degree type and gen ed requirements. Gary Olsen and John Houghton replied that they could be revised.

The Committee discussed the current math placement policy. Different members have different interpretations as to how that policy applies to the new GEP. It is currently used as a test-out tool. Will we continue that policy or is the placement test simply that, a placement recommendation? If the latter, a student who, for example, places into or above Math 100 would still have to take a QL course. It wouldn’t necessarily have to be a math course; it could be one of the other types of courses that were proposed, e.g. statistics, personal finance, business math, probability theory, consumer economics, etc. Greg Summers noted that each dept. sets their own GDR test out policy, which is then approved by Academic Affairs. Julie Schneider mentioned that currently only Math and Foreign Language use the UWS placement test as a test out tool. All other dept. have their own procedures. Randy Olson commented that the test-out policy was originally created to try and streamline time to degree because of UWSP’s large number of GDR requirements. Is it necessary now with a trimmed down GEP?

The Committee discussed Mary Bowman’s suggestion that the Communication in the Major program also be phased in like the FYS. Greg Summers mentioned that UW LaCrosse has taken years to phase theirs in. Re: the English 101-201 numbering, Robert Sirabian should follow up on that.

Regarding Robin Tanke’s comments on Comm. 101, it appears she is referring to the way the current course is taught and has questions about the old learning outcomes, not the new proposed ones.

1. Discuss summer goals and assignments:

Greg will work on strengthening the argument for allowing academic staff A to teach the FYS and the clarifying the definition of Interdisciplinary.

Don will look into the Math requirement at other UWS institutions.

Gary will combine the bulleted lists for the “sidebar” categories under one heading: Cultural and Global Awareness.

Julie will start working on an Experiential Learning Manual.

Adjourned at 3:13pm.

Respectfully submitted by Julie Schneider