

## Procedure for new GEP course proposals

- 1) Faculty who wish to propose a GEP designation for a course are encouraged first to discuss the course with the GEC member(s) representing the relevant GEP category(ies), another GEC member with relevant expertise, or a member of the relevant Faculty Learning Community. This discussion would address the course's suitability for the GEP designation, and in particular how the course would address the category's learning outcomes.
  - a) Ideally, this procedure will allow for an "early intervention" to help faculty members understand the GEC's expectations for new course proposals.
  - b) Holding the discussion BEFORE drafting the proposal will hopefully avoid the problem of frustration/wasted effort in cases where the faculty member does not understand the need to address learning outcomes in the proposal, etc.
- 2) The GEC expects learning outcomes on the forms to be stated in a specific way. Faculty with questions regarding the writing and assessment of learning outcomes should contact the Assessment Coordinator.
- 3) After this initial (optional) consultation, the faculty member will complete the required proposal form and assemble all necessary paperwork.
- 4) The faculty member will submit the proposal to the department chair. Department chairs may review proposals and suggest revisions, if appropriate, before presenting them to the department for a vote.
- 5) After department approval, the dept. chair will submit the proposal to the GEC member(s) representing the relevant GEP category(ies) who will review the proposal and either forward it to the GEC chair or recommend revision.
  - a) The chief goal in requiring these multiple checkoffs is to ensure that proposals sent to GEC meet the basic requirements (i.e., addressing how students will come to achieve the LOs, and how they will be assessed). When course proposals clearly address the LOs and assessment, the checkoffs will require minimal time and effort. When course proposals do not address them, the checkoffs may enable the proposer to make necessary changes prior to the proposal going to committee, which will save everyone a good deal of time and frustration.
  - b) The use of other GEC members as liaisons between the GEC and faculty proposing courses will allow for more efficient and effective use of meeting time and committee members' expertise.
- 6) The GEC chair will circulate the proposal to the committee and put it on the agenda for a vote. If approved, it goes to Senate.

For 2012-2013, the elected representative and other GEC members with relevant expertise are as follows:

<b>GEP Category</b>	<b>Elected Representative</b>	<b>Other GEC members with interest in that area</b>
FYS	Rob Harper, History	David Hastings, Nancy LoPatin-Lummis
Oral and Written Communication	Cade Spaulding, Communication	Mary Bowman
Quantitative Literacy	Mike Simmers, Math	
Wellness	Jasia Steinmetz, HPHD	
Arts	David Hastings, Music	
Humanities	Mary Bowman, English	James Sage
Historical Perspectives	Nancy LoPatin-Lummis, History	Rob Harper, Valerie Barske
Social Sciences	Stephanie Alemán, Anthropology (Philosophy)	
Natural Sciences	Tony Timerman, Chemistry	
Global Awareness	Valerie Barske, History	Stephanie Alemán
U. S. Diversity	Rachael Barnett, English	Rob Harper
Environmental Responsibility	Mike Demchik, CNR	
Communication in the Major	N/A	Mary Bowman, Mike Simmers
Capstone in the Major	N/A	Valerie Barske, Tony Timerman
Interdisciplinary Studies	N/A	Stephanie Aleman, Mike Demchik, Axel Schmetzke
Experiential Learning	N/A	James Sage, Ron Strege
Assessment Coordinator	Paula DeHart	