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

**ROOM 110 NOEL FINE ARTS CENTER – June 28, 2011; 1 p.m.**

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

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

VISITOR: D. Rohm

1. G. Olsen called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

2. The minutes of June 21, 2011 were approved by general consent.

3. Announcements.

 G. Olsen announced that G. Summers had been named as interim provost for the 2011-2012 academic year. G. Summers informed the GEPRC that with his new position he would be unable to continue as a GEPRC member; dates were yet to be confirmed.

4. New Business:

Discussion of UW System Math Placement Exam (D. Rohm)

The group discussed whether the Quantitative Literacy (QL) was intended as a required course regardless of placement or if a test-out opportunity would be offered. D. Rohm clarified his understanding that for students transferring or obtaining credit-by-exam for courses satisfying the QL requirement, QL credit would be honored as other transfer or credit-by-exam credits are.

 There was discussion on whether adequate resources would be available to accommodate a QL requirement for all students. The GEPRC shared with D. Rohm their assumption that Math 100 would be put forth as a QL course. D. Rohm stated that presently approximately 80% of students test out of Math 100. He questioned if the intent was for 80% of the students to be able to test out of the QL requirement; if Math 100 was put forth as a QL course, this would likely be the result. D. Rohm informed the GEPRC that there was discussion across the UW System of the potential of changing the high school math requirement to a four-year requirement. He noted that this discussion had led to subsequent discussion of making Math 100 a remedial course. D. Rohm suggested that QL courses have a prerequisite of Math 100. Discussion followed of Math 100 as QL prerequisite and not a QL designated course. The group also discussed Math 100 possibly being renumbered to Math 95 and the budget implications of remedial courses.

 The group discussed the distinction between Math 100 and 105. D. Rohm explained that Math 105 is a math appreciation course which would satisfy the QL requirement. He noted that Math 105 hadn’t been fully utilized by students in the past. He suspected that low enrollment in Math 105 was largely due to a lack of understanding of the course offering. The GEPRC suggested highlighting Math 105 as a QL course. D. Rohm informed the GEPRC that generally Math 100 was a prerequisite for Math 105; this ensured that students had the necessary level of mathematical language to be fully engaged in the course. Additional discussion followed on the cost factor in requiring a QL course of all students. D. Rohm suggested that QL courses could be offered from various departments campus-wide for adequate course offerings. He noted that the Department of Mathematical Sciences didn’t feel strongly one way or another regarding a mandatory QL requirement as long as adequate QL courses were available.

 D. Rohm suggested a revision for the last two bullet points under the Mathematics placement text. He shared that there was an alternative math placement option. The alternative option was for the student to take the final exam of a prerequisite course; exam results would determine placement. The GEPRC revised the last two bullet points under the Mathematics placement test as D. Rohm suggested. The second bullet point regarding the Admissions Office was also revised. J. Schneider informed the GEPRC that the 30-credit and 60-credit rules discussed in the previous GEPRC meeting (per Libby Raymond, Catalog editor) had been moved in the catalog to the general degree requirements (GDR) section under each degree type. She informed the committee that there was another section in the catalog titled “remedial coursework” which spoke of the 30-credit rule. D. Rohm asked if the 30-credit rule was a UW System rule; G. Summers will determine where the 30-credit rule is initiated from. J. Schneider shared that the 32-credit rule applies only to advanced placement, credit-by-exam, and test-out. D. Rohm informed the GEPRC that there was a limited opportunity for retroactive credit available in mathematics. At the discretion of the department chair, a student who took calculus in high school but didn’t take the advanced placement exam could be placed directly into Math 121 and upon achieving a grade of B or better in Math 121, the student could receive retroactive credit for Math 120.

 Discussion ensued on whether a test-out opportunity should be made available for QL. D. Rohm voiced that philosophically having QL as a mandatory requirement was a good idea, but the question of whether a mandatory QL requirement could be supported by the university was a practical one. The group discussed what mathematics placement code level would make sense as an exemption for the QL requirement. D. Rohm suggested that code 7 or higher in mathematics placement be exempted from the QL requirement. He noted that most students placing at code 7 or higher generally take some mathematic intensive course. The mathematics placement text area was revised to incorporate a QL exemption. A brief discussion followed on whether common, every-day, practical QL instruction was needed. D. Rohm expressed his opinion that common, every-day QL information should be taught in the high school curriculum.

 The GEPRC thanked D. Rohm for attending the meeting to discuss the mathematics placement and QL information.

 General Education Program Placement, Test-out, and Credit-by-Exam Policies

 J. Schneider reported that Richard Ruppel and Michael Williams had reviewed their respective placement test texts; both R. Ruppel and M. Williams were agreeable to their respective texts. The GEPRC discussed proposed revisions to the foreign language placement test text. The foreign language placement test text was revised to specify English 101 and 201, or English 150 as a means of fulfilling the foreign language requirement for students whose native language was not English and could document formal study of their native language, as well as other minor editorial revisions.

 General Education Implementation Timeline for Academic Departments

 G. Summers asked for feedback on the revised General Education Implementation Timeline for Academic Departments. He noted that the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) focused visit and self-study due date had not been included on the timeline; the two HLC landmark dates didn’t require departmental action. The timeline was revised to highlight the February 2012 column and a note was added that the HLC focused visit was scheduled for February 13-14. Committee members noted that the timeline should be helpful to departments; fall 2011 college meetings should be an optimal time for distributing the timeline. Discussion followed of when a general education program (GEP) advising resource would be needed. UW colleges and other similar entities will need to be informed of the new GEP yet this summer despite only limited detail being available at present. Implications of the new GEP for transfer students was briefly discussed; transfer students as well as students under the general degree requirements (GDR) program will need to determine which program is more advantageous for them. Advising for both the GDR and GEP will begin the summer of 2012; an advising resource will be needed by May 2012.

 General Education Transfer without an Associate Degree and UW Colleges Transfer Proposal

 The GEPRC reviewed the General Education Transfer without an Associate Degree document. R. Olson informed committee members that the new UW System transfer policy had been approved by the Board of Regents at the June meeting. The maximum of 72 credits accepted from two-year colleges, noted under item 5 of the document, was no longer applicable with the new policy. References to the GDR in the document were revised to GEP. G. Summers noted that the transfer proposal would be a good means of communicating information regarding the GEP to the two-year colleges. There was some uncertainty of the present revision status of the documents; the GEPRC will discuss the documents at the next meeting when D. Guay is in attendance.

 Assessment Plan

 G. Olsen asked the status of the assessment plan. G. Summers informed the GEPRC that the HLC Assessment Academy team would be going over the changes at a meeting the following week. He anticipated that a draft would be forthcoming to the GEPRC shortly thereafter.

 Learning Community Expectations

 G. Summers asked committee members’ input on the possibility of formally communicating to students expectations of UW-Stevens Point as a learning community. He questioned if the initiative should be incorporated into the GEP possibly through Step 6. He offered the University of Iowa’s “Iowa Challenge”, a set of expectations noted by five one word challenges, as an example of a similar initiative. G. Summers stated that assessable institution-level outcomes could be established; the outcomes would be assessed to determine if the UW-Stevens Point learning community goals established were being achieved. He noted that the initiative was partially in response to faculty concerns voiced regarding some sense that students lacked awareness of standards of excellence expectations. In additional to clearly communicating expectations, this initiative would also provide a framework for putting problems related to academic misconduct and misconduct in general in context. Discussion followed. The committee raised questions of what would be measured for assessment purposes, the ambitiousness of taking on additional assessment and another program, and how Academic Affairs and Student Affairs could be aligned in the effort. There was general consensus among committee members that the initiative should be looked into further. G. Summers will prepare a draft document for the GEPRC to review.

 July 5 GEPRC meeting

 The GEPRC discussed briefly items for the next meeting agenda. July 5 agenda items will include a discussion of the Associate Degree and transfer documents, as well as a review of the Step 6 outline to determine Step 6 progress.

5. The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 3:15 p.m.

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