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

**ROOM 164, NOEL FINE ARTS CENTER – August 9, 2011, 1 p.m.**

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED: M. Bixby

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

2. The minutes of August 2, 2011, were approved by general consent subject to a minor edit on page 2.

3. Announcements.

 R. Sirabian requested that College of Letters and Science (COLS) GEPRC members discuss what points related to the general education transition will be presented at the upcoming COLS pre-class college meeting. G. Olsen suggested that the GEPRC as a whole discuss general points that would be applicable for all college meetings. He suggested that the general points could be obtained from the general education implementation timeline.

4. Old Business:

 Assessment plan

 J. Sage reported that the HLC Academy team had completed editing of the draft assessment plan. The draft plan had been forwarded to GEPRC members via e-mail and inserted into the Step 6 proposal draft. The assessment plan proposal consisted of the first five pages of the document. J. Schneider questioned if it would be acknowledged that the assessment plan came from the HLC Academy team. It was noted that the HLC Academy team was not an official faculty governance group; therefore the proposal would process officially through the GEPRC and the Academic Affairs Committee to Faculty Senate.

 The committee discussed course portfolios required for assessment; specifically what would be required for courses offering multiple sections. Committee consensus was to include the following note under the course-based measurements section of the proposal:

Note: the GEC will consult with departments offering multiple sections of the same GEP course to establish a plan for assessment; such a plan will specify a subset of instructors/sections who will submit course portfolios.

 J. Sage reported that the HLC Academy team had incorporated in the updated draft the suggestion to collect assessment information only in the fall, had revised the required contents of the portfolio, and kept basic deadlines but removed detailed information related to fall/spring semesters. He shared that the draft assessment plan had been shared last summer with a few key persons for feedback. He informed the GEPRC that the HLC Academy team had been working on the assessment plan for the past 18-months. He advised that the assessment plan should appear familiar but more refined.

J. Sage informed the GEPRC that assessment of the four broad general education program (GEP) learning outcomes had not been included in the prior version and had been added in this updated draft. The addition had not required any additional changes to the document. Discussion followed on whether the GEP learning outcomes should appear on the GEP forms. N. Fernando stated that part of the General Education Committee’s (GEC) responsibilities was to determine whether course learning outcomes fit into at least one of the GEP learning outcomes; this would be done prior to the assessment stage. J. Sage suggested that the GEC could mention broad program learning outcomes assessment needed to faculty providing assessment portfolios. If a portfolio applied specifically to a program learning outcome, the faculty member could make the GEC aware of this. In this manner, the program learning outcomes assessment could include course-based assessment as well as institutional level.

Discussion followed on the possibility of courses satisfying dual requirements having consecutive year assessment required. GEPRC agreed that assessment portfolios would need to be submitted regardless of consecutive year assessment requirements. It was noted that the multiple portfolios would allow the GEC to determine if all learning outcomes were being addressed.

J. Schneider asked how non-course Experiential Learning (EL) would be assessed. She noted that Step 5 stated that EL mentors should save assessment rubric information. J. Sage suggested that EL mentors could be asked to submit the assessment rubric in year four of the proposed assessment cycle. J. Schneider questioned if rubric training would be provided for EL mentors. A brief discussion followed on current zero-credit service projects. J. Houghton shared that there were many summer job experiences for College of Natural Resources majors. D. Guay added that Paper Science & Engineering majors had summer placements at paper mills.

Forms status

The committee reviewed a draft of the electronic GEP application and approval form. J. Sage advised that it didn’t appear that revisions requested in June had been incorporated into the current draft. Discussion of form format followed. J. Sage noted that eventually what could be automated in the form would be automated, such as the course description being automatically loaded into the form based upon input of the course number. The following additional edits were requested by the GEPRC:

* Add “representative” to syllabus to note that a “representative syllabus” was what was being requested.
* Re-format the foundation and investigation selection boxes making the default “none.”
* “None” should be located in the upper right corner of all applicable boxes.

 J. Sage advised that presently the form didn’t automatically populate the GEP learning outcomes based upon category selections made. It was voiced that regardless of how many GEP categories were selected, all learning outcomes should be included in the GEP learning outcomes box.

 R. Sirabian inquired if there would be a character limit imposed on the boxes; he voiced his support of an imposed limit. Discussion followed whether a limit was appropriate. It was determined that a 400-word limit would be imposed and that it be noted on the form that the limit was applicable to attachments as well.

 The committee discussed the format for the GEP learning outcomes, course learning outcomes, and statement of alignment. Committee members agreed that having the GEP and course learning outcomes, and statement of alignment all on one page would be most efficient for the person completing the form. It was suggested that the signature assignment and how student learning will be assessed also be combined on to one page and that mechanics for an attachment be included for each information area.

A brief discussion followed on what information should be requested related to the department vote. It was decided that it would be beneficial to report the actual vote (i.e., in favor, opposed, abstain) on the form in addition to the department meeting date. G. Olsen recommended that an additional notation be added to the “submit to GEC button”; the qualifier “only after department approval” should be added. R. Olson suggested that there could be two “submit” buttons. The first submit would share the form with department members, the second would submit the form to the GEC after the department vote and meeting date were documented. Different options for sharing the form with department members and who should have form editing privileges were discussed.

 J. Sage will be meeting with Matt Gile/I.T. later in the week. He will relay all requested revisions and reformatting requests.

5. New Business:

 College Information Packet

 J. Sage distributed to GEPRC members the draft information packet regarding changes to general education curriculum, assessment, and degree requirements, to be shared with the interim provost and deans for use at pre-class college meetings. He advised that this was not an “official” document and would serve only as a guide. Discussion of the packet followed; the committee praised J. Sage for the work he had done in compiling the necessary information in a concise yet thorough manner. J. Houghton and R. Olson suggested the addition of the implementation timeline. GEPRC members also requested that Step 5 be referenced and highlights be provided, specifically the policy on the potential for dual requirements being satisfied with individual courses (double-dipping).

 J. Sage shared that it was hoped that by spring 2012 some courses would be integrating GEP learning outcomes. By spring 2013 GEP learning outcomes would need to be explicitly stated on course syllabi. This would require that syllabi be modified but would not necessarily require modification of courses or course titles. It was noted that both the Higher Learning Commission and Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology required learning outcomes to be specified on syllabi.

 Agenda items for the August 16 meeting will include:

* Review of the information packet
* Update of the Step 6 working draft proposal

 J. Schneider asked what entity was responsible for notification of the GEP change to the two-year colleges and similar institutions. A brief discussion followed whether notification was the responsibility of the Admissions office or the Registration & Records office. J. Schneider suggested a reminder to the appropriate office.

 6. The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 3:08 p.m.

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