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

**ROOM D281, Science – September 21, 2011, 9 a.m.**

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED: M. Bixby

VISITOR: K. Stern

1. D. Guay called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

2. The minutes of September 7, 2011 and September 14, 2011 were approved by general consent.

3. Announcements.

* Student Government Association student representative to the GEPRC, Joseph Rohrer, and visitor, Katie Stern, were introduced.
* Protocol for organizing Communication in the Major certification workshop/sessions was discussed briefly. GEPRC will recommend to the Academic Affairs Committee that the writing emphasis coordinator contact the Division of Communication chair regarding certification workshop/sessions. R. Sirabian suggested adding a paragraph in the Step 6 proposal regarding the workshop/sessions. J. Sage recommended that it be included as a separate item to the proposal. Item 8, Communication in the Major Workshop(s), was added to the proposal. D. Guay noted that the General Education Committee (GEC) would be the committee working with the Communication and English areas and approving any certification workshop/sessions.
* J. Sage shared that he and R. Sirabian had given the GEC an overview of the General Education Program (GEP) curriculum at its first meeting. He would be discussing the assessment plan at the next GEC meeting, September 23.
* J. Schneider reported that the Wisconsin Academic Advising Association Conference would include a session on general education revision. UW System had requested the session be added the prior week. She stated that J. Sage and G. Olsen volunteered to participate in the session. R. Sirabian volunteered his participation too.
* J. Schneider informed GEPRC members that she had received a subsequent email with additional questions from Department of Mathematical Sciences chair, Cindy McCabe. She shared that the Department of Mathematical Sciences would be reviewing the draft math placement grid at its next department meeting for edits. Once approved by the department, the grid would be forwarded to faculty governance for action. J. Schneider advised that the timing of the proposed revision to the math placement grid and the Step 6 proposal may coincide, which might be beneficial.

4. Old Business: Revisions to the Step 6 proposal

 Advising

J. Schneider reported that the advising policy had been added to the Step 6 proposal.

Administrative Recommendations

R. Sirabian questioned if it might be appropriate for the GEPRC to recommend release time for recommended administrative positions. G. Olsen cautioned that “release time” implied that the position would be filled by someone from within the university. J. Sage informed committee members that the position description and funding for a .5 General Education Director position were being worked on by the Academic Affairs Office. He advised that the need would be communicated in the proposal, but the decisions would be made by those involved with the budgets. R. Olson clarified that Faculty Senate’s only involvement in budget/staffing issues was related to department review reports; the Faculty Senate reviewed the reports and determined whether to accept them. Staffing issues were addressed by administration.

Transitioning

J. Sage informed committee members that he had replaced the timeline in the proposal with the one that had been included in the college pre-class meeting packets. He added a bit of substance to the transitioning area as well, noting it had been more of an outline previously. Information added included: explanation of general degree requirements (GDR) grandfathering and the approval process, the procedures for GEP designation, and a statement regarding dual designation. J. Schneider questioned whether a transition timeframe of six years was necessary for dual designation. J. Sage advised that next year’s students would have the option to stay with the GDR program. Continuing the dual designations beyond 2018 would be a judgment call by the Registration & Records area.

Fall 2011 was added to the recommended timeline of changes. Other minor edits were also made. Discussion of faculty awareness of GEP learning outcomes was briefly discussed. G. Olsen advised that a steep learning curve would be involved; the current year transitions would make learning mandatory.

A short discussion followed regarding department recommendations for GEP designation in the GDR grandfathering. G. Olsen advised that individual units would need to make recommendations for GEP designation and GEC would make the final decision. He noted that the GDR grandfathering charts were for information purposes. J. Sage recommended that departments be encouraged to indicate GEP designation preference on the grandfathering chart; the GEC will follow up with any questions it may have. He noted his preference of getting courses on the books at the recommendation of the departments. K. Stern asked when the grandfathering charts were to be submitted to the GEC. J. Sage responded that they were to be to the GEC in mid-October.

J. Sage reported that he had met with Matt Gile August 10 regarding the status of the online forms. He had not had any communication from M. Gile in the meantime. J. Sage reported that the day prior he had requested an update from M. Gile. He noted that at present he was unable to access the forms page.

J. Schneider inquired if Communication in the Major workshop/sessions would be noted in the timeline. G. Olsen advised that departments would need training by next fall. A brief conversation of who would coordinate the training followed. D. Guay suggested that Communication in the Major workshop/sessions be added to fall 2012 items. It was noted that the timeline in the proposal would now differ from the timeline included in the information packet. N. Fernando suggested that a note regarding the revised timeline could be forwarded to department chairs. R. Sirabian stated that a note would also serve as a reminder which would be good. The committee discussed the number of Communication in the Major workshop/sessions that might be required. R. Sirabian advised that presently writing emphasis (WE) certification required a series of four meetings. R. Olson noted that oral communication was not currently specified in WE but would be a component of the Communication in the Major. J. Sage expressed his hope that for those with WE certification, there would be an abbreviated Communication in the Major certification process. J. Schneider inquired if there would be Experiential Learning (XL) workshops offered for mentors. She questioned how people would be made aware of XL information in the Step 5 appendix. J. Sage advised that it could be included in the GEC resource area; he will bring the issue to the GEC. J. Schneider noted the importance of students having access to the information and being aware of the process. R. Sirabian voiced support for an XL workshop noting that students would be going to departments and faculty for information. J. Schneider stated that advisors will need to direct students appropriately. She asked who would have the necessary forms. D. Guay suggested that GEP workshops be held that would include Communication in the Major and XL information. J. Schneider asked if the GEC would be the resource students would go to for questions regarding XL. J. Sage shared that it had been suggested that the Service Learning Steering Committee, presently a committee of the Center for Academic Excellence & Student Engagement, be shifted to an XL steering group that would serve as an advisory group to the GEC. AmeriCorps VISTA and the UW-Stevens Point VISTA position were discussed briefly. Spring 2013 and associated items were added to the timeline.

General Education Program Workshops

 The title of Section 8 was revised to GEP Workshops and incorporates both Communication in the Major and XL. The GEPRC will recommend that the Academic Affairs Office work in conjunction with the Department of English and Division of Communication to provide workshops for Communication in the Major. J. Sage and J. Schneider will work on a paragraph to be added to the section for the XL. It was questioned whether the Capstone Experience should also be addressed. J. Sage advised that the GEC would need to take questions related to the Capstone Experience on a case-by-case basis.

 The committee discussed what process remained prior to release of the Step 6 proposal to the campus for feedback. A discussion of proposal feedback and open forums followed.

 J. Schneider will contact the Department of Mathematical Sciences regarding possibly including math information in an appendix of the Step 6 proposal. R. Olson advised that the math placement grid would go through the Academic Affairs Committee as it was related to academic standards.

 The agenda for the September 28 GEPRC meeting will include a review of section 8, a final review of the Step 6 proposal, scheduling of Step 6 proposal release to campus, open forums, and the deadline for proposal feedback.

5. The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 10:32 a.m.

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