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

**ROOM D281, Science – September 28, 2011, 9 a.m.**

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED: N. Fernando

1. D. Guay called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m.

2. Announcements.

* J. Schneider reported that information she had received from the Department of Mathematical Sciences had been forwarded to GEPRC members earlier that morning.
* GEPRC members briefly discussed archiving of general education proposal feedback comments.

3. Old Business: Revisions to the Step 6 proposal

 Section 8, General Education Program Workshops
J. Schneider reported that she and J. Sage had inserted Experiential Learning information in Section 8 of the proposal. Minor edits were made and typos corrected to Section 8. J. Schneider questioned whether an introduction was needed. Committee members agreed that a few sentences of introduction would be appropriate and crafted an introductory paragraph. The question of whether to provide Interdisciplinary Studies (IS) workshops was raised. GEPRC consensus was to not include IS workshops in the GEP workshops recommendation. The introductory paragraph was further revised and a statement regarding the First Year Seminar pilot program was added.

 Section 9, Student Expectations and Responsibilities
There was brief committee discussion of the mixture of grammatical person in the Section 9 text. G. Olsen noted that the grammatical person used would be dependent upon where the text was designed to go. An introductory paragraph was added to designate what was draft language of student expectations and responsibilities and to suggest potential placement in student publications. Specific examples of publications and means for communicating the expectations and responsibilities to students were provided. Committee members suggested revising the draft text so that it was suitable catalog language. J. Sage recommended that it not be revised for catalog language; the draft was included in the proposal as information and recommendation to colleagues.

 R. Sirabian asked if “shared learning community” was a term understood by students. Alternate terminology was suggested and discussed. The GEPRC revised “shared learning community” to “broad, shared learning community” to be inclusive of the variety of learning communities students are engaged in.

 R. Sirabian suggested that the second bulleted item be revised to specify students’ responsibility of being informed of the GEP and major requirements. The second bullet point was revised to:

Choose a path by assuming responsibility for their educations, making deliberate choices, and crafting realistic plans for achieving their goals by analyzing the specific structure and requirements of the GEP and their majors/minors.

Additional edits and revisions were made to:

* Page 3, additional explanation was added regarding the two sections that comprise the Step 6 proposal, proposals and recommendations,
* Page 4, minor revision and correction of typos,
* Page 6, revision was made to the foreign language text for consistency with the approved degree requirements text.

J. Schneider shared that Mathematical Sciences department chair, C. McCabe, was confident that the revised math placement grid would be approved by the department. J. Schneider inquired whether the math placement grid should be included in the Step 6 proposal as an appendix. A sentence referencing the math placement grid as appendix 1 was added under “Placement” on page 4.

* Page 9, the “except for Writing Emphasis courses” was replaced by “except for Communication in the Major and Capstone Experience in the Major,” in the test-out and credit-by-exam area.
* Page 13, explanation was given for removing the “Note” at the bottom of the advising responsibility section of the *University Handbook* information that had been included in the proposal. For increased clarity, revisions were also made to the first sentence to remove “old” and “new” and replace them with “pre-2013” and “post-2013” respectively.

GEPRC members discussed the various combinations of general education (GDR or GEP) and pre- and post-2013 majors. J. Sage advised that the only problem that arose was the combination of the GEP and a pre-2013 major. He noted that the combination would be structurally impossible with the transition to new majors in fall 2013. J. Sage informed committee members that requests related to catalog year would go initially to the Registration & Records Office. He suggested that the Registration & Records Office could be responsible for policing requests. He advised that students could request a prior catalog year, but that it was not a given that the request would be granted. GEPRC members anticipated that the number of students desiring a combination of GEP and old major would be small and could likely be handled via deans’ substitutions or waivers. R. Sirabian stated that it would be helpful for faculty to have catalog year/GDR/GEP/pre-2013/post-2013 explanation; it would be helpful in their advising. J. Schneider questioned whether it should be included in the catalog year section of the proposal. Committee consensus was that the revision of the first sentence provided enough clarity at this time and additional written explanation wasn’t necessary. The catalog year information will be highlighted at the open forums.

* Page 20, a sentence was added to acknowledge that the HLC Assessment Academy Team, in coordination with the Assessment Subcommittee and GEPRC, was responsible for the assessment proposal and explanation. R. Olson recommended clarification be added that the HLCAAT is a UWSP entity.

J. Schneider asked about assessment of Experiential Learning Activities (ELA). J. Sage advised that assessment of ELA would be determined by the GEC.

J. Sage informed GEPRC members that he had modified some of the graphs in the Step 6 proposal.

J. Schneider inquired if there would be anything additional added in regard to a timeline for a manual for GEP advising; she would like to see some guidance given the committee involved in this initiative. J. Sage informed committee members that he and Kathy Davis would be heading up the advising initiative and additional information would not need to be added.

Providing Comments

GEPRC members reviewed the providing comments area and discussed the appropriate amount of time for feedback. Open forums were discussed. Committee members will do a final review of the proposal by early Friday morning. Release of the proposal via a special Message of the Day is planned for Friday, September 30. The deadline for submitting feedback to the GEPRC on the proposal will be Monday, October 24. Two open forums will be held.

5. The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 10:58 a.m.

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