**General Education Policy Review Committee**

**Minutes of the June 29 Meeting**

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

Called to order at 1:00pm.

The minutes of June 22 were amended.

Old Business: Discussion and revision of Step proposal.

1. Communication in the Major. Robert Sirabian submitted some updates.
2. Experiential Learning. Julie Schneider is working on a draft version of the packet with the understanding that the new Gen Ed Committee will have to create the approval process for the department designated EL experience.
3. Interdisciplinary Studies. Greg submitted some updates and is working on more.

New Business: HLC Assessment Team Presentation – James Sage.

James Sage presented the 16-page draft of the Gen Ed Program proposal by the HLC Assessment Academy Team to the Gen Ed committee. Due to pending Higher Learning Commission accreditation UWSP must set up measures for either accountability or compliance to HLC requirements.

The HLC Assessment Team proposal suggests we focus on accountability for continuous improvement of student learning (not assessment of instructors). Grades are not the best measure for assessing student learning because many aspects of one student’s performance determine grades, whereas assessment is one dimension of all students collectively. A meaningful way to assess student learning is needed.

There are proposals for a full-time director of a new Gen Ed program. It would also be nice to have a full-time Assessment Coordinator for GEP course proposals and advisor to departments.

The recommended way of doing assessment is to have a short course portfolio assembled by the course instructor on a 5-year rotating basis. The portfolio would include the course syllabus and learning outcomes with a narrative describing the link between the two, two examples of student work including one high and one low achievement example, and an instructor report on student learning and how assessment will be use to improve student learning outcomes.

One alternative to assessment would be a voluntary system where the Gen Ed Committee would give feedback on the course portfolio proposal for course approval, and then there would be a Faculty Learning Committee where faculty in each department would meet every year or so to help with assessment (if this would not be a daunting workload).

Feedback included:

The five-year cycle seems a little long. But any less is not enough time to show a response to assessment. HLC Accreditation happens every 10 years so this would mean we would have 2 assessment cycles within that time. Who does the comprehensive review? Perhaps each Faculty Learning committee might have a leader to work with Policy Analysis and planning with an (CAESE) Assessment Coordinator. Would any of this process be required? Not sure, we’re looking at that. We could have this mandatory or voluntary system. The College of William and Mary have a completely voluntary system with 75-90% participation.

The Gen Ed committee discussed how it must be made in crystal clear language that this assessment procedure would be in no way connected to retention, promotion, and tenure status of instructors. The committee discussed how campus might react to this proposal due to the Student Evaluation feedback was told that it would not be used for assessment but within 2 years it became used for assessment here at UWSP.

If not in compliance with HLC, UWSP faces the penalty of being put on probation by HLC.

The HLC Assessment Committee would like feedback from the Gen Ed committee. We can begin giving feedback on the proposal. Please comment on this as part of Step 6.

Homework: Take a look at Step 5 for next week. Have feedback ready for the HLC Assessment Committee for next week.

Adjourned at 3:04pm.

Respectfully submitted by Mary Holland.