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

**ROOM 110 NOEL FINE ARTS CENTER – July 5, 2011; 1 p.m.**

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

MEMBERS EXCUSED: M. Bixby, G. Summers

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

2. The minutes of June 28, 2011 were approved by general consent.

3. Announcements.

 G. Olsen asked if the committee wanted to discuss recommendations for potential replacements for G. Summers. General consensus of the group was that if a replacement was named for G. Summers, it would be necessary for the replacement to have good familiarity with the general education process thus far. No specific recommendations were made by the committee as a whole; individual committee members noted that they had forwarded replacement recommendations to G. Summers prior to the meeting.

4. New Business:

 Associate Degree/Transfer documents

 D. Guay reported that the transfer with an Associate Degree (A.D.) document was essentially completed. The transfer without an A.D. document was still underway; information had been taken from the catalog and put into document form but additional work on the document was needed.

 The committee reviewed the “transferring credit to UWSP” area of the catalog and discussed suggested revisions and rearrangement of the bullet points.

 The committee briefly discussed how the step 6 proposal should be formatted. It was determined that due to the multiple components in step 6, the proposal would likely be a compilation of various items and appear somewhat “piecemeal”. J. Schneider noted that information regarding the new general education program (GEP) should be circulated yet this summer to the two-year colleges and other institutions that had articulation agreements with UWSP. It was noted that the GEP Requirements document would be an informative document but shouldn’t be circulated until approved by faculty governance; step 4 GEP information should provide adequate initial information to the institutions.

 “Completion of UWSP GEP requirements by an A.D.” document was reviewed and revised.

 Discussion of revisions to the “transferring credit to UWSP” area continued. The committee discussed whether the “A.D. from an accredited institution” reference was too broad. The committee also discussed what Provost Nook’s intention was in an A.D. from an accredited institution satisfying the UWSP GEP. Committee members noted differences in A.D. requirements among colleges, universities, and technical colleges. The present Admissions Office process to determine transfer credits for non-UW A.D. was discussed. Cathy Glennon from the Admissions Office was consulted regarding transfer credits for A.D. and policy. J. Schneider questioned whether it was in the purview of the GEPRC to revise admissions policies. J. Sage suggested that the policy could remain that the Admissions Office evaluate what A.D. transfers are acceptable; if the Admissions Office approves the A.D. then the A.D. satisfies the GEP. GEPRC members agreed with the suggestion. It was noted that an A.D. from a UW institution would automatically satisfy the GEP, per the UW System transfer policy. Discussion followed on what number of credits should be specified as necessary for an A.D. from an accredited institution. The committee reviewed the UW-Whitewater transfer policy and incorporated a few points from the policy into the UWSP policy. The “transferring credit to UWSP” area was preliminarily revised to differentiate between transferring to UWSP with an A.D. from an accredited institution, from the two-year UW colleges, and Wisconsin technical colleges. D. Guay will continue revision to incorporate the various discussion points; the revised draft will be reviewed at the next GEPRC meeting.

 GEP Placement, Test-out, and Credit-by-exam policies

 J. Schneider requested that the GEP placement and test-out document be reviewed. She noted that language had been changed in the foreign language area to reflect majors rather than degree; she questioned if similar revisions should be made in the English and mathematics area. The committee deleted “for all degree types” at the end of the first paragraph for both English and mathematics. The committee briefly discussed whether specifying specific UW System placement tests in the first paragraph was necessary; general consensus was to generalize the sentence and not include specific test areas.

 Step 6 progress

 The committee reviewed the step 6 outline.

* Assessment Plan

J. Sage reported that the HLC Assessment Academy was scheduled to meet July 7 and would be going over the assessment plan and proposed GEPRC revisions. He anticipated that the GEPRC should have a revised draft for review in the near future.

* Administration

G. Olsen noted that decisions regarding administration were not faculty governance decisions and recommendations had been forwarded appropriately to the Academic Affairs Office. The committee agreed that it would be noted in the step 6 proposal that recommendations regarding administration had been forwarded to the Academic Affairs Office.

* Forms

Proposed examples for the General Education (GE) Application and Approval form will be reviewed at the next GEPRC meeting. It was noted that Information Technology was presently working on the electronic version of the GE Application and Approval form.

J. Schneider advised that “transition to new GEP” included advising and forms. She asked how much information regarding advising should be included in the step 6 proposal. It was noted that the information related to advising didn’t require faculty governance approval. Including general statements of what was intended regarding advising seemed most appropriate by committee members.

 A brief discussion of the step 6 proposal followed. G. Olsen suggested that the step 6 proposal identify what areas require faculty governance approval and what areas don’t. For those areas not requiring approval, it could be noted who the item was referred to and would ultimately be responsible. The committee noted that the assessment plan, transfer information, placement, test-out, and credit-by-exam were all areas that would require faculty governance approval. R. Olson advised that the forms would also need to process through faculty governance as an informational item.

 G. Olsen questioned if the committee would seek campus comment on the step 6 proposal or if the proposal would be forwarded directly to the Academic Affairs Committee. D. Guay noted that previous practice had been to seek campus comment; he expected that step 6 would follow that precedent. R. Sirabian suggested that when campus comment is solicited, it be made clear what entity should receive comments on the various items; comments should be forwarded to the relevant entity.

 Catalog transition from the general degree requirements to GEP was briefly discussed. It was expected that GEP transitional information, such as advising information, would be incorporated into the online catalog as the 2013 catalog would be the first print catalog to incorporate the GEP.

 D. Guay inquired if any GEPRC members were willing to begin drafting the introduction and explanations of the step 6 proposal. J. Schneider volunteered to work on explanations for advising, placement, and test-out. She will also inform C. Glennon of the admission policy discussion, and discuss with C. Glennon how best to provide notification of the new GEP to the UW colleges and other institutions.

 July 12 GEPRC meeting

 Agenda items for the July 12 GEPRC meeting include:

* An update on the HLC Assessment Academy team revised assessment plan draft
* Review of the revised transfer information draft
* Review of proposed examples for the GE application and approval form

G. Olsen informed the committee that he would be absent from the July 12 and 26 GEPRC meetings and possibly the July 19 meeting as well. J. Sage may also be absent from the July 12 meeting.

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

Minutes Recorded by:

Nanci Simon, Secretary to the Faculty Senate