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

**ROOM 164, NOEL FINE ARTS CENTER – August 2, 2011, 1 p.m.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: N. Fernando, D. Guay, J. Houghton, G. Olsen, R. Olson, J. Sage,

MEMBERS EXCUSED: M. Bixby, J. Schneider, R. Sirabian

1. D. Guay called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m.

2. The minutes of July 26, 2011, were approved by general consent.

3. There were no announcements.

4. Old Business:

HLC Academy Assessment plan

J. Sage reported that the draft assessment plan was still undergoing editing by the HLC Academy Assessment team. The draft plan should be ready for GEPRC review at the next meeting.

Director of General Education (GE) position description

J. Sage advised GEPRC members on the status of the Director of GE and Assessment Coordinator positions. He shared that Interim Provost Summers welcomed input from the GEPRC regarding the Director of GE position description. J. Sage noted that position recommendations had been made by the GEPRC to the Academic Affairs office in the recent past; the GEPRC could affirm its continuing support of the positions rather than putting forth a subsequent duplicate recommendation. Committee members reviewed the draft Director of GE position description. General consensus was that the responsibilities listing appeared to be fairly comprehensive and could be forwarded to the interim provost. A brief discussion of the First Year Experience (FYE) coordinator and the CAESE director positions followed. N. Fernando inquired if the First Year Seminar (FYS) advisory group would continue to be active in FYE planning. J. Sage anticipated that the FYS advisory group would remain active and would likely evolve into an advisory group to the General Education Committee (GEC).

GE Forms status

J. Sage reported that he was in the process of gaining access to the GE forms test site. The Application and Approval form was largely developed with components and subcomponents. N. Fernando, J. Houghton, and R. Sirabian were providing examples that would be incorporated into the form. J. Sage will continue to work with Matt Giles/I.T. on electronic form development of the GE forms.

5. New Business:

Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Annual Conference

J. Sage advised GEPRC members that the deadline for submitting proposals for the annual HLC conference was September 27. He shared that Provost Nook had expressed interest in presenting the UWSP GE review process at the conference. One or two volunteers from the GEPRC would be needed to help in writing up the proposal as well as potentially participating in the conference. Committee members briefly discussed the proposal requirements and individuals’ interest in participating in the conference. J. Sage shared that there would be three distinct proposals submitted for HLC consideration, one of which was to be the GE review process. N. Fernando, D. Guay, and G. Olsen expressed interest in helping prepare the proposal and potentially participating in the conference presentation.

Step 6 draft proposal

The committee reviewed the format of the proposal draft. It was discussed to have action items located in the beginning of the proposal and items for informational purposes following. Items for information would be forwarded to other entities and process through faculty governance appropriately via those entities, if necessary; the GEPRC would not have involvement in those subsequent processes. Placement/test-out/credit-by-exam policies, transfer policy, and the assessment plan were items that would require action and would be addressed in the beginning of the proposal. Administration, transition, forms, and advising would follow as information items. It would be noted in the proposal what items were forwarded to other entities that would be responsible for bringing the items forth for action or other necessary dispositions. The committee discussed how much information and detail should be included in the proposal and what would be better placed as appendices. R. Olson will reformat the proposal as discussed.

Catalog year requirements were briefly discussed. It was noted that the GEPRC was not proposing any changes to catalog year requirements.

A brief discussion followed on the governance process for course proposals. R. Olson explained that all new undergraduate courses and changes to majors would require Curriculum Committee approval; the GEC would have authority over GE course designation. He advised that in areas of overlap, standing committee chairs generally conferred with each other.

J. Sage shared that Dan Kellogg had expressed a desire for use of a template that would provide standard headings and greater uniformity in the catalog. GEPRC members agreed that the upcoming transition time would be an optimal time for use of a template, but noted that this was an issue for the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) and not the GEPRC.

Committee members conversed on how best to specify what courses in the major satisfied degree, Communication in the Major, and the Capstone Experience requirements. G. Olsen supported having an initial statement specifying if multiple degree tracks existed. He suggested having a parenthesis after courses designating what the course satisfied. Discussion followed on how writing emphasis (WE) differed from other general degree requirement emphases in that the WE designation was only included in the time table and not in the catalog.

N. Fernando inquired if training and/or workshops would be offered for the GEC members to familiarize them with the general education program and specific responsibilities of the committee. R. Olson advised that decisions relating to training and/or workshops would be decisions to be made by the GEC membership. He suggested that photo prints of the proposed GE forms be forwarded to the GEC as soon as possible as a starting point for the committee. He noted that the Application and Approval form would need to process through faculty governance and should be one of the first orders of business for the GEC.

D. Guay asked if edits needed to revise references of general degree requirements (GDR) to general education program (GEP) would require Faculty Senate approval. R. Olson responded that faculty governance action would be required for the needed revisions. He anticipated that a general replacement would be proposed with the catalog editor making needed revisions. J. Sage questioned whether the catalog editor would have liberty to make the changes; D. Guay suggested revisions be a joint effort of the catalog editor and Director of GE. R. Olson stated that this was under the authority of the AAC; the AAC would propose how the revision should take place. D. Guay asked whether a recommendation regarding the needed revision should be stated in the Step 6 proposal. Committee general consensus was to add the following notation at the beginning of the Step 6 proposal:

*GEPRC recommends: various committees and units on campus should examine the course catalog for references to GDR language and replace with GEP language.*

August 9 Agenda items

Agenda items for the August 9 meeting will include the HLC Assessment Academy draft assessment plan, GE forms, and explanations and edits/revisions to the draft Step 6 proposal.

Needed explanation, and possible edit/revision was divided among members as follows:

* Placement, test-out, credit-by-exam, prior learning assessment – G. Olsen
* Transfer students – D. Guay
* Administration – N. Fernando
* Forms, Curriculum Conversion – J. Sage

6. The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 3:06 p.m.

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