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

**ROOM 110 NOEL FINE ARTS CENTER – May 12, 2011; 9 a.m.**

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: M. Bixby, R. Sirabian

VISITOR: K. Weis

1. G. Olsen called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m.

2. The minutes of May 5, 2011 were approved by general consent.

3. There were no announcements.

4. Old Business: Discussion of Associate Degree (A.D.) Learning Outcomes

 Kami Weis introduced herself as an academic advisor in the Student Academic Advising Center. She shared her background experience with the A.D. K. Weis informed the GEPRC that she had received information regarding the UW System (UWS) A.D. taskforce 3-5 months ago and was notified of an upcoming meeting a few weeks ago. The UWS A.D. taskforce will be meeting for the first time May 18. The goals for the meeting are to review the current standards for offering the A.D., examine the relationship between the breadth requirements and general education requirements, examine other institutions’ requirements for the A.D., assess the alignment of UWS shared learning outcomes with the current A.D. requirements, and assess the alignment of the UWS A.D. with the revised UWS transfer policy and current liberal arts transfer A.D. standards. If any revisions were necessary, the taskforce was to draft proposed revisions. K. Weis noted her understanding that the UWS A.D. policy was last updated around 1980. Her purpose in meeting with the GEPRC was to collect feedback.

 G. Summers expressed concern that the new UW-Stevens Point (UWSP) general education program (GEP) did not meet the standards of the UWS A.D. as presently defined. He noted that if the UWS A.D. policy wasn’t revised, then the UWSP A.D. would most likely need to be re-written. J. Sage stated that an A.D. incongruent with the GEP would not be in keeping with Provost Nook’s preference. D. Guay noted that the present UWS A.D. was a list of requirements with no measurable learning outcomes. He anticipated that the UWS A.D. would be revised to incorporate measureable learning outcomes.

 J. Schneider questioned the reference to the ”new UW transfer policy.” K. Weis shared that there were two documents proposed for revision that would be going before the BOR for approval, guidelines for articulation agreements between UWS and the technical system, and UWS undergraduate transfer policies. G. Summers shared information regarding the policy statements; he noted that these specific policy statements governed the transfer of credits between institutions. He advised that similar to the A.D. policy, these policies had been in place for some time and were in need of review for possible revision. G. Summers speculated, based upon differing opinions related to the transfer policy statements, that there may be different attitudes and approaches envisioned for revising the A.D. among the members of the taskforce.

 K. Weis questioned the reference of assessing the alignment of “UWS shared learning outcomes” with the current A.D. G. Summers shared that in 2007-08 UWS assembled a taskforce to look at a system-wide GEP. UW campuses were not in favor of a system-wide GEP; what results were the shared learning outcomes. Shared learning outcomes were general agreements that each of the campuses would try to comply with. G. Summers stated that with the UWSP A.D. learning outcomes being the GEP learning outcomes, he was fairly confident that if the goal was that the UWS A.D. aligns with the UWS shared learning outcomes, UWSP should be consistent with that. J. Sage noted that presently the UWS A.D. policy was not consistent with what was pledged by UWS in being a LEAP partner state. G. Olsen suggested that it would be helpful for K. Weis to review the GEP learning outcomes included in Step 4 documentation in preparation of the upcoming taskforce meeting. J. Schneider will provide additional information to help prepare K. Weis for the taskforce meeting.

K. Weis anticipated that the first meeting of the taskforce would set the stage of how the group would proceed with the A.D. review. The UWS A.D. taskforce was expected to meet 2-3 times. K. Weis expected that the taskforce would be working over the summer months as it was to provide a written summary of recommendation(s) to UWS in early fall. A discussion followed on taskforce representation

 The following talking points were suggested:

1. Alignment of the A.D. with shared learning outcomes consistent with LEAP.
2. The A.D. not referenced to credits.
3. The A.D. as close to synonymous with the GEP as possible.

J. Schneider inquired if the UWS A.D. taskforce would also be discussing transfer policy. G. Summers expects that transfer policy will be a topic of discussion for the taskforce due to the connected nature of the A.D. and transfer policy. G. Summers advised K. Weis that UWSP would accept an accredited institution’s A.D. as satisfying GEP requirements; the same respect was sought from other institutions.

K. Weis noted the suggested talking points; she will take copies of the LEAP shared learning outcomes, UWSP GEP learning outcomes, and approved degree definitions to the taskforce meeting. She will report back to the GEPRC on June 7.

5. New Business.

 Step 6-Draft course alignment

The GEPRC began committee review of the draft GEP/general degree requirements (GDR) alignment listing from Dan Kellogg/Registrar. D. Guay advised that Math 105 should be added to the Quantitative Literacy course listings. Discussion followed on whether courses under the Wellness listings included all or only some of the wellness learning outcomes. J. Sage suggested that courses listed could be temporarily grandfathered in to the GEP with the provision that departments would need to resubmit course information that showed that all designation learning outcomes were being addressed. D. Guay noted that Social Science 2 courses would also need the resubmit provision. The GEPRC discussed whether determinations in mapping the GDR to GEP designations were beyond the purview of the GEPRC. The committee questioned who had sufficient knowledge regarding courses and associated learning outcomes to make determinations. G. Olsen suggested that the listing be distributed to departments for input; G. Summers asked whether the GEPRC should circulate the draft listing to department chairs over the summer months to help the GEC with some initial feedback. G. Olsen advised that in many cases determinations regarding mapping would require a department meeting which may be difficult prior to fall semester.

 G. Summers informed the GEPRC that Dean Loy had organized an advising workshop for the College of Professional Studies. N. Fernando stated that the advising workshop was to take place in conjunction with the all college meeting at the beginning of the fall semester; the workshop would relate to transitioning. J. Houghton shared that he was scheduled to speak to the College of Natural Resources (CNR) in the fall at the college meeting regarding transition; he intended to speak in more general terms. He anticipated that each college would be holding similar transition meetings. G. Summers suggested that specific information, such as department timelines, might be more beneficial. J. Sage noted that the prior fall, the provost had asked department chairs to provide a semester-by-semester action plan for transitioning. He advised that taskforces were to be assembled in the spring to start anticipating work required in transitioning to the new GEP. G. Summers noted that the request had been premised on the degree requirements approval and subsequent approvals happening in fall 2010; those approvals hadn’t occurred. He advised that the process would need to begin again. The timeline will need to be adjusted and determinations will need to be made regarding implementation. He stated that he liked the college-by-college strategy; it had the potential for a greater number of people being involved.

 Discussion continued on how to proceed with the draft GEP/GDR alignment listing. GEPRC members suggested forwarding the draft listing to the GEC with a recommended process with the GEC being responsible for mapping GEP/GDR designations. G. Olsen suggested that the GEPRC recommend to GEC that departments review the draft listing. J. Houghton advised that departments could suggest what courses might currently meet designated learning outcomes. G. Summers recommended that the GEPRC determine a longer-term process connected to the assessment plan. He advised that there would be approximately a year to work on alignment; the plan could be a structured process to get UWSP ready by fall 2013. G. Summers volunteered to begin work on a draft plan for discussion at the May 31 GEPRC meeting. J. Houghton recommended that the longer-term plan be presented to colleges at their fall college meetings. G. Summers will speak with the provost and deans regarding the GEPRC suggestions. N. Fernando questioned if to get started, it might be beneficial to inform departments informally; she shared her plans for the Interior Architecture department. J. Sage responded that for most departments it would be difficult to hold a meeting prior to fall semester.

 Degree requirements were briefly discussed. D. Guay questioned if a major wanting to offer a degree not presently being offered, would need Board of Regents approval. G. Summers advised that it would be dependent upon the initial request. Unless a specialty major, usually majors were approved as bachelor degrees, without specificity, but he noted that that wasn’t always the case.

 J. Schneider questioned whether advising workshop efforts would be better spent gearing up for the new GEP. G. Summers responded that until there were courses in the GEP curriculum, it would be difficult to train advisors in the GEP. He noted that there were other issues related to advising that were important to address. G. Olsen suggested that an early workshop on assessment of advising and the criteria for successful advising would be helpful; it would get people in the right mindset prior to new rules being implemented.

 J. Schneider asked when UW Colleges and technical colleges would be informed of the new GEP for transfer and articulation agreement purposes. G. Summers stated that those institutions would need to be informed this summer. J. Houghton advised that the articulation group included institutions in other states as well as Wisconsin.

Work assignments for May 31

The GEPRC reviewed the Step 6 outline for work assignments.

D. Guay will work on drafts related to transfer students. Transfer and articulation agreements will need to take place department-by-department. J. Houghton will speak with Sue Kissinger/CNR regarding CNR articulation agreements and needed summer notifications.

G. Olsen questioned if the GEP/GDR alignment listing might be more useful sorted by department. He will provide an additional version of the GEP/GDR alignment listing by department.

G. Summers will work on a draft process plan for GEP and degree requirements transition.

D. Guay questioned if something more should be done with administration. G. Summers noted that there wasn’t much more that could be done until more was known regarding the budget. He shared that growth agenda grant recipients should be announced the following week; proposals had been submitted for a First Year Seminar coordinator and an assessment coordinator.

J. Schneider stated that information had been added to the work space for test-out, credit-by-exam, prior learning assessment. She asked if a recommendation should be formulated. J. Sage stated that the GEPRC had discussed the use of a simple statement such as, test-out opportunities would be handled by individual departments. The GEPRC discussed how UWS placement results were used by departments; math placement/test-out and quantitative literacy were specifically discussed. A brief discussion followed regarding raw scores of placement tests. J. Schneider inquired if the present test-out policy should be maintained. G. Olsen expressed his support of maintaining the present test-out policy. J. Schneider noted additional questions related to advanced placement and college level examination program (CLEP). G. Summers informed GEPRC members that there was a UWS taskforce on prior learning assessment that would be coming out with recommendations in the near future. J. Schneider and R. Sirabian will work on placement.

G. Summers and J. Sage will continue work on forms.

A brief discussion ensued regarding English 101/102 being implied in the B.A. degree requirements but not specifically noted.

The next meeting of the GEPRC will take place Tuesday, May 31, 1-3 p.m. J. Schneider and J. Sage will be unable to attend May 31; J. Sage will also be absent from the June 7 meeting.

6. The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 10:57 a.m.

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