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

**ROOM 110 NOEL FINE ARTS CENTER – April 21, 2011; 9 a.m.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: M. Bixby, N. Fernando, J. Houghton, G. Olsen, R. Olson, J. Sage, J. Schneider, R. Sirabian, G. Summers

MEMBERS ABSENT: D. Guay (excused)

1. G. Olsen called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

2. Announcements.

 G. Olsen announced that the Step 5d Course Criteria proposal had been passed at Faculty Senate.

3. New Business.

 Discussion and Update of Course Forms

 G. Summers reported that Scott Gile/IT was prepared to work on the GEPRC forms.

 Degree Requirements update

 J. Schneider reported that the degree definitions for the B.F.A. and B.M. had been passed by the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC). She noted that the definitions were passed without the foreign language requirement. G. Olsen asked if there had been any discussion regarding the incorporation of a minor into the B.A. G. Summers advised that he and J. Schneider would be meeting with Mary Bowman and R. Sirabian to discuss combining both group’s proposals into one. J. Houghton expected that degree definitions would be approved at the next AAC meeting; the big issue related to the B.F.A. and B.M. had been dealt with. G. Olsen shared that he supported a minor requirement in the B.A.; he thought it an effective way for providing breadth. J. Schneider added that the minor would be an enhancement more so than additional general education coursework.

J. Schneider shared some concerns of the Student Academic Advising Center (SAAC) related to the minor requirement; the minor requirement might limit some students. G. Summers noted that a minor could be problematic for students who had completed 60 credits without a focus, but stated that a student completing 60 credits without a focus was problematic as well. J. Schneider stated that students transitioning from one major to another or transitioning from undeclared to a declared major might find the addition of a minor problematic. Depending on the number of credits a student has taken, it may be difficult to complete both a major and a minor within 120 credits. N. Fernando inquired how long a student could claim undeclared status. J. Schneider responded that there was no restriction on how long a student could be undeclared. She shared that when students begin taking upper level courses they should have some focus; SAAC advisors encourage students to determine a focus by that time. N. Fernando questioned if there wasn’t a credit number at which a student must have a declared major. J. Schneider stated that there doesn’t appear to be a rule in place at UWSP. J. Houghton stated that there was “a 165 credit rule;” when students reached 165 credits, the student would be required to pay the full cost per credit; the cost per credit would substantially increase at that time. J. Schneider noted that there was also a rule related to satisfactory academic progress (SAP) through financial aid; if a student wasn’t making satisfactory academic progress at a certain number of credits there were financial aid implications. She noted that it would be nice to have a general SAP rule. J. Schneider shared that typically students in these circumstances elect for a lower credit B.A. major.

Continued Discussion and Updating of Course Forms

 The GEPRC reviewed the GEP Course Application & Approval coversheet and form. G. Olsen noted that the form should reference departments rather than individuals. “Proposing/Sponsoring department or academic unit” was added to the coversheet under “Materials needed to have prepared for Application and Approval.” A brief discussion followed regarding department voting; the committee agreed that the department vote should be noted on the course application. The committee discussed whether a listing of all potential instructors should be requested on the coversheet listing; the committee agreed that a list would be preferable to “basic instructor information.” “List of potential instructors” was added to “Materials needed …” items. Discussion followed on Curriculum Vitaes (CV); the committee discussed at what point CVs should be requested and who should make the request. The committee discussed whether instructors’ CVs were typically kept up-to-date; it was noted that this differed among the colleges. The committee agreed that CVs should be requested by the General Education Committee (GEC) in the event that there were questions regarding instructor qualifications, rather than CV(s) accompanying the course application. The following statement was added under “List of potential instructors”: Note: “If there is a question about instructor qualifications, the General Education Committee must seek advice from the appropriate department(s) and may request a brief curriculum vitae describing the instructor’s qualifications.”

 G. Olsen inquired if one form could be used for course proposals for the GEC and Curriculum Committee. G. Summers advised that two forms would still be needed; one form to create the course and a second for general education program designation.

 “A plan for how student learning will be documented, …” under basic information on the coversheet was discussed. N. Fernando noted that some instructors were confused regarding student learning assessment. She shared that some instructors thought that student learning was assessed by student evaluations. She suggested that clarification be made that this was not the type of assessment that was being specifically sought. J. Sage stated that student evaluations would fall under indirect assessment measures; he questioned if direct student measures were required in department assessment reports. A brief discussion followed on the frequency of assessment and assessment measures. The GEPRC revised the item to read:

* a plan for how student achievement of learning outcomes will be assessed
	+ include direct assessment measures (i.e., direct measures of student work)
	+ might also include indirect assessment measures (i.e., student surveys, reflections, or feedback).

J. Sage asked if S. Gile thought the form could be electronic. G. Summers confirmed that S. Gile deemed an electronic form possible.

Discussion of application revisions followed. J. Sage questioned if an enrollment target should be included on the application. G. Summers asked what the relevance was of the enrollment target on the application; he noted that the GEC wouldn’t have policing authority over the enrollment. J. Sage stated that anticipated enrollment would be helpful to the GEC in understanding course design. He suggested that clarification be made why the enrollment question was being asked in a mouse over.

Formatting issues were discussed. G. Summers noted that the “existing GDR” area would be removed from the form once the general degree requirement program was done. G. Olsen suggested that a note be added regarding the GDR section only being applicable during the transition time. The GEPRC agreed to the addition of the following notation under the “existing GDR” area of the application: (Note: this section is only applicable during the GDR-GEP transition).

N. Fernando suggested that a note be included regarding “double dipping” to clarify that a course could satisfy only one category in the sidebar and one level category. G. Summer suggested letting the GEC interpret what might be allowed. J. Sage noted that the electronic form could be set up such that would limit how many boxes could be checked. J. Sage advised that the form would automatically populate the GEP Learning Outcomes area with the appropriate learning outcomes based upon what GEP Category was checked. Applicants would be able to modify the Course Learning Outcomes but would not have access to the GEP Learning Outcomes. Discussion followed on the potential for a variety of application documents being submitted. G. Olsen suggested that text boxes adjusting according to the amount of text would be helpful in alleviating “see attached” notations in the boxes and many attachments.

J. Sage asked who would speak to the proposal at the GEC meeting, the department chair or the instructor. J. Houghton stated that presently instructors spoke to GDR proposals. R. Olson added that should there be issues with the proposal that would be when a department chair and other personnel would typically become involved in speaking to a proposal.

J. Sage questioned if a save and come back later option should be incorporated into the form. G. Olsen asked if department review of the application would be facilitated through saving the application as a PDF file. Discussion followed on what options should be put in place to allow for department review, application revision, and GEC submission. G. Summers will discuss these questions and issues with S. Gile.

J. Sage shared that D. Kellogg was excited about the electronic workflow process and potential for wide distribution. G. Summers advised that the Constitution and Handbook Review Subcommittee was working on a workflow for faculty governance through SharePoint. He questioned how easily these forms could be integrated into SharePoint. G. Olsen asked what the status was of the catalog. G. Summers responded that the 2011-2013 online catalog would be a PDF version; he is hopeful that subsequent catalogs will be through a catalog management system. He estimated that UWSP was about two-years from implementing a new catalog system. A brief discussion followed on workflow process and department awareness of curricular proposals.

G. Olsen inquired if the form was far enough to share with S. Gile. G. Summers shared his contemplation that it may be better to use hard copy forms for the first few years. R. Sirabian supported delaying an electronic process to allow for more careful planning. G. Olsen suggested that the process could remain paperless through electronic files. J. Schneider shared that the electronic form being proposed was very similar to forms used for academic staff supplemental review. G. Summers will discuss possible options with S. Gile.

The committee will continue discussion of forms at the next meeting.

5. The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 10:40 a.m.

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