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

**ROOM 110 NOEL FINE ARTS CENTER – May 31, 2011; 1 p.m.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: N. Fernando, J. Houghton, G. Olsen, R. Olson, G. Summers

MEMBERS EXCUSED: M. Bixby, D. Guay, R. Sirabian, J. Sage, J. Schneider

1. G. Olsen called the meeting to order at 1:08 p.m.

2. The minutes of May 12, 2011 were approved by general consent subject to one minor edit.

3. There were no announcements.

4. There was no old business.

5. New Business: Step 6 – Work Assignments

 G. Olsen reported that the general degree requirement (GDR) courses to general education program (GEP) designations document provided by the registrar’s office had been reformatted by unit. A database is available for any additional reformatting that might be desired.

 G. Olsen asked if there were any budget updates. G. Summers stated that there was no new information to report at this time; he would be meeting with the provost the following day. G. Summers informed GEPRC members that the First Year Seminar coordinator and Assessment coordinator positions had not been funded by the Growth Agenda grant. Potential budget implications related to UW-Madison remaining as part of the UW System were discussed briefly.

 G. Summers informed the GEPRC that each dean would be holding a college meeting to relay GEP transition information to faculty. He suggested that a step-by-step timeline be developed for presentation to the deans; the timeline could be included in the informational meetings. Two areas of transition would need to be addressed, degree requirements and general education. For degree requirements, departments would need to decide what degrees would be offered for majors and submit appropriate paperwork to the Curriculum Committee. A discussion followed on department and faculty understanding of the new degree requirements. The committee briefly discussed departments offering both a B.A. and B.S. track for a major.

 J. Houghton stated that two steps that would need to be included in the GEP timeline were how to address communication in the major and the capstone. G. Summers added that aligning courses to GEP learning outcomes would also be a required step. He noted that learning outcomes would need to be incorporated into course syllabi as part of the transition; he anticipated that this might be a big project. N. Fernando shared that the Division of Interior Architecture had recently had a learning outcomes workshop. She noted that in addition to focusing on objectives related to accreditation guidelines, I.A. worked on incorporating campus-wide assessment objectives into courses. She shared that the workshop was time well spent; she was satisfied that I.A. faculty had a good understanding of learning outcomes. G. Olsen suggested that the first decision departments should make related to mapping GDR courses to the GEP. Departments would need to determine what GDR courses they wanted to put forward into the GEP. This process would require departments to determine how courses might need to be edited to conform to the GEP learning outcomes. N. Fernando questioned whether new courses would also be addressed in the process. G. Olsen anticipated that new GEP courses would be a parallel process. He suggested that the next decision would be for departments to decide if there may be existing courses that weren’t GDR designated that would be appropriate to include in the GEP. G. Summers questioned whether these steps should be done by the General Education Committee (GEC) as part of the GDR/GEP mapping. R. Olson reported that James Sage had been elected chair of the 2011-2012 GEC.

 G. Olsen asked the status of forms. G. Summers responded that he hadn’t met with Scott Gile/IT regarding the GEP Course Application & Approval form. He questioned whether IT would be able to provide an electronic version of the form by fall 2011; he suggested that paper forms be used initially. He reported that the GEP Course Portfolio: Assessment form was at a standstill until the assessment plan was finalized. The HLC Assessment Academy team was in the process of revising the assessment plan.

G. Summers volunteered to work on a GEP transition process/timeline for GEPRC to review at the next meeting. G. Olsen stated that J. Schneider and R. Sirabian were working on placement. J. Houghton noted that placement included related test-out. G. Olsen shared that J. Schneider had intended on speaking with Mathematical Sciences department chair, Dale Rohm, but hadn’t had the opportunity to-date. Discussion followed on math placement and test-out policy, learning outcomes, and assessment of math skills. It was suggested that D. Rohm be invited to meet with the GEPRC. G. Olsen will contact J. Schneider for a math update. J. Houghton advised that D. Guay intended to have the transfer student information to the GEPRC for review prior to his leaving for Germany; D. Guay will be absent from the next two meetings. J. Houghton informed the GEPRC that he had spoken with Sue Kissinger regarding College of Natural Resources collaborative agreements. He advised that agreements varied and each agreement would need to be dealt with on an individual basis. S. Kissinger would be providing collaborating institutions with information regarding the new GEP.

G. Summers asked if GEPRC members had issue with the GEPRC SharePoint site being incorporated into the myFacultySenate SharePoint site. GEPRC members agreed to the site location change.

J. Houghton stated that the sequence of the previous GEP timeline appeared to make good sense. He questioned whether only a change in dates might be required for the creation of a new timeline. G. Summers inquired whether workshops should remain in the process/timeline. A brief discussion ensued on what was the purview of the GEPRC and the purview of the GEC. GEPRC members concluded that the GEPRC could make recommendations to the GEC regarding GDR/GEP transition, transition timeline and deadlines, etc., but the GEC would ultimately determine whether to proceed with the recommendations or not.

G. Olsen asked what documentation would be needed for existing GDR courses to be grandfathered into the GEP. G. Summers advised that part of the rationale for delaying implementation of the GEP was to allow for time to make sure that courses properly aligned with learning outcomes for less grandfathering of GDR courses. He stated that he was unsure what activity should take place to make sure that courses successfully align to the GEP. G. Olsen asked if in addition to incorporating learning outcomes into syllabi if departments would also be asked to provide a narrative. G. Summers noted that the workload for narratives could vary significantly by departments; narratives could create a substantial workload for some departments. G. Olsen suggested that each GEPRC member take one existing course from their respective units and do a trial transition to determine what questions might need to be answered. GEPRC members should complete the transition exercise for the next GEPRC meeting using the GEP Course Application & Approval form. G. Summers cautioned that using the GEP Course Application & Approval form for existing GDR courses could amount to an overwhelming amount of work for the GEC. He questioned whether another activity might better serve as a check for alignment; he suggested workshops as a potential activity. J. Houghton noted that workshops wouldn’t guarantee course alignment with learning outcomes. N. Fernando added that workshops wouldn’t be mandatory which would also be problematic. G. Summers advised that until the assessment stage it really wouldn’t be possible to guarantee course alignment to learning outcomes, but workshops would provide the information for successfully aligning courses to learning outcomes.

N. Fernando asked whether all GEP categories would have adequate courses for enrollment needs. G. Summers advised that the person in charge of enrollment management would be monitoring the adequacy of course offerings in relation to enrollment needs. Discussion followed on issues related to GDR registration and course offerings.

6. The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 2:15 p.m.

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