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

**ROOM 110 NOEL FINE ARTS CENTER – July 19, 2011; 1 p.m.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: N. Fernando, J. Houghton, R. Olson, J. Sage, J. Schneider

MEMBERS EXCUSED: M. Bixby, D. Guay, G. Olsen, R. Sirabian

1. J. Sage called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m.

2. The minutes of July 12, 2011 were approved by general consent.

3. Announcements.

 J. Sage announced that he would be serving as interim Associate Vice Chancellor of Teaching, Learning, and Academic Programs beginning August 1, 2011 and through the 2011-2012 academic year.

4. Old Business:

 Transferring credit to UWSP

 J. Schneider advised committee members that C. Glennon had expressed concern regarding both of the Associate Degree (A.D.) transfer credit options proposed. C. Glennon questioned what criteria the Admissions Office would use in determining A.D. transfer credits; she viewed criteria for transfer credit as an academic decision. C. Glennon also expressed concern that “two-year or four-year colleges” could be misperceived in a broader sense than what was intended. R. Olson suggested that the GEPRC determine which option it thought most appropriate and allow the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) to discuss the proposal and make any changes viewed necessary. He added that if needed, the AAC would be the suitable committee to provide criteria for A.D. transfer credit decision-making. Committee members discussed which transfer credit option best served the interests of transfer students and UWSP. It was noted that it made sense to put language in that was consistent with the UW System (UWS) A.D. since UWSP would need to be in compliance with the UWS A.D.

 Discussion followed on Provost Nook’s position regarding an A.D. earned from an accredited institution being accepted as an A.D. Committee members discussed differing academic rigor required by various accrediting bodies. N. Fernando suggested defining what was considered a transferrable A.D. at UWSP. Presently an A.D. earned at UW institutions was to satisfy general education requirements at the receiving UW university. For other institutions, the transcript would be reviewed course-by-course by the Admissions Office to determine transfer credits. A brief discussion followed regarding “other institutions.” J. Houghton suggested stipulating that of the 40 transferrable credits required, a minimum of 30 credits must be in the General Education Program (GEP) foundation and investigation levels (the sidebar would not be included as required categories). For an A.D. to transfer as such, 30 credits would need to be evident in the foundation and investigation level categories.

Three transfer credit situations were defined: 1. case-by-case basis, 2. A.D. from UW Colleges or Wisconsin Technical College (WTC) parallel programs, and 3. all others. J. Sage questioned if “all others” would fall under the “case-by-case basis” and only two transfer credit situations needed to be addressed. J. Houghton advised that there are “feeder” programs in surrounding states that provide transfer students as well. His expectation would be that as UWSP works with an institution, if a pattern exists, the pattern would be discovered and could be noted for future reference. J. Sage suggested that an additional transfer credit policy could incorporate specific approved institutions and articulation agreements. It was again noted that perhaps the most efficient means of designating the transfer credit policy was to stipulate UWS guidelines. R. Olson shared key points from the recently approved Regent Policy Document (RPD) 7.1, UWS Undergraduate Transfer Policy. J. Schneider voiced her concern that the UWS undergraduate transfer policy didn’t give guidance on A.D. from outside of Wisconsin. J. Houghton agreed that the UWS undergraduate transfer policy didn’t appear to give guidelines for out-of-state credit transfers. He noted that it would be advantageous for non-UW or non-WTC parallel program institutions to be included on an approved institutions listing for credit transfer to UWSP. It could serve as a selling point for their programs and he anticipated that the listing would grow over time. J. Schneider informed the group that three WTC parallel programs were listed in the UWS undergraduate transfer policy; the UWSP catalog listed five. She will check whether the additional institutions listed in the UWSP catalog are a result of articulation agreements. J. Schneider advised that the UWS undergraduate transfer policy allowed for differing policies among the UW universities. R. Olson advised that the flexibility was due to varying competencies required at the various institutions as well as program requirements.

Acceptance of an A.D. from any accredited institution to satisfy UWSP general education requirements was discussed. It was noted that it could be a disservice to students to treat all A.D. as equivalent regardless of academic rigor. The committee again discussed the benefit of stipulating UWS undergraduate transfer policy as UWSP undergraduate transfer policy. It was noted that if the UWS undergraduate transfer policy allowed for flexibility, UWSP could still identify additional institutions approved for transfer credits. J. Schneider expressed her concern that if the revised UWS A.D. was defined by learning outcomes, the evaluation of learning outcomes related to transfer credit could be difficult. J. Sage shared information regarding an academic integrity program that is being required of all higher education institutions providing federal financial aid; the program’s primary objective is to provide for greater accountability in higher education. He suggested that the program may be a help with the A.D. concerns. Committee members noted the vast amount of time spent in discussing the transfer credit issue and the need for the committee to come to a decision.

J. Schneider requested that the bullet point stating that “The UWSP Admissions Office will review your …” be returned to the original text of a 72-credit maximum or that language from the new transfer policy document be used. R. Olson gave a brief explanation of the Academic Information Series (ACIS), noting that ACIS 6.0 and 6.2 related to undergraduate transfer, and the RPD 7.1, which was revised based upon the revision of ACIS 6.0 and 6.2. He noted that ACIS 6.0 and 6.2 would be the appropriate UWS undergraduate transfer policy to reference.

N. Fernando suggested separating transfer credits from A.D. transfer for clarity. The following possible new catalog text structure was discussed: 1. transfer with A.D. or bachelor’s degree from UWS two or four-year institution, 2. Transfer with A.D. from WTC parallel program, 3. Transfer with accredited A.D. from specific list of institutions (based upon articulation agreements, including other WTC), 4. all others, 5. transfer credits on a case-by-case basis. R. Olson noted that the structure similarly paralleled the UWS policy. J. Schneider will continue work on the draft transfer credit catalog text.

Catalog year requirements

J. Schneider noted that in Dan Kellogg’s email regarding catalog year requirements, he stated that a student under the new GEP could not complete old major requirements. Degree requirements will be embedded into majors beginning concurrently with the new GEP. The committee discussed D. Kellogg’s proposed drafts; minor revisions were suggested. J. Schneider will make revisions and incorporate the statement that beginning fall 2013, all re-entering students will be unable to revert back to a previous catalog year to complete requirements for a major.

Earning a second bachelor’s degree

D. Kellogg also forwarded to J. Schneider information regarding UW-Green Bay’s policy for students earning a second bachelor’s degree. It was noted that this issue would be taken up by the AAC in the fall.

5. New Business:

Advising training

J. Schneider noted that on the Step 6 outline she was listed as the person/entity responsible for GEP advising information (manual/reference guide and workshops). She expressed her concern with there being no administrative structure for advising and questioned how all the necessary GEP advising tasks would be completed. She stated that the Student Academic Advising Center (SAAC) served students in transition and those with undeclared majors; the SAAC didn’t have the resources to take on the GEP advising tasks. She also advised committee members that P. Ploetz had informed her that the Center for Academic Excellence and Student Engagement CAESE) would require 6-months lead time for facilitating training workshops. R. Olson and J. Sage stated that advising fell under the Academic Affairs Office; it was noted that the Director of General Education position description included the responsibility of GEP advising. J. Schneider reiterated that UWSP needed a formal entity on campus to address advising.

Discussion of the Council of Advisors initiatives followed. J. Houghton and J. Schneider provided information regarding the initial convening of the council and the subsequent reconvening in 2008, reports written, and actions (or lack thereof) taken.

Discussion of GEP advising and the proposed GEP timeline continued. J. Houghton noted that advisors who could advise students appropriately regarding the GEP would be needed in spring 2012; a GEP advising guide/resource would be needed for those advisors. Additionally, the GEP categories would need to be populated with courses so advisors would be able to advise to students courses that satisfy GEP requirements. N. Fernando noted that General Education Committee (GEC) members will also need training; GEC members will need to be familiar with the GEP to carry out GEC work. J. Sage shared his expectation that the September GEC meetings will be informational/training meetings for members. R. Olson stated the necessity of GEP categories being populated in the 2011-2012 academic year; populating the GEP categories with adequate courses will be crucial for the GEP as well as for departments in revising majors. GEP advising training may need to be delayed until the end of the 2011-2012 academic year to focus efforts on populating the GEP categories.

Committee members present generally agreed that GEP advising was ultimately the responsibility of the Academic Affairs Office and would need to be addressed by that office. It was suggested that possibly the CAESE and SAAC could provide some input and help in the effort.

6. The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes Recorded by:

Nanci Simon, Secretary to the Faculty Senate