Grand Valley State University

*General Education Committee*

Minutes of 11-21-11 DRAFT

**PRESENT:** Kirk Anderson, Jim Bell, Susan Carson, Jason Crouthamel, Alisha Davis, Emily Frigo, Roger Gilles, Gabriele Gottlieb, Gary Greer, Paul Sicilian,

Ruth Stevens, Judy Whipps

**ALSO PRESENT:** Krista McFarland, General Education Office Coordinator

**ABSENT:** Deb Bambini, C. “Griff” Griffin, Paul Jorgensen, JJ Manser, Penney Nichols-Whitehead, Keith Rhodes, David Vessey

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda Items | Discussion | Action / Decisions |
| **Approval of** **Nov 14 Minutes** |  | Approved as submitted. |
| **Agenda** |  | Approved. |
| **Final Revisions to the GE Proposal** | *Based on last week’s discussion, we have a revised draft proposal dated November 21, 2011. We will discuss that draft, as well as any new faculty/student feedback we’ve received, and make suggestions for the final version of the proposal to be submitted to Figen Mekik by Monday, November 28.**In addition to the revisions already made, we should discuss in particular how we can sharpen or improve our presentation of the upper-level component, including the “integration” goal and the multi-disciplinary aspects of the courses.*A hardcopy of the proposal was distributed for final review. The committee walked through proposed changes that had been submitted by committee members and highlighted on the proposal.There are three levels of discussion: 1) What do you think of proposed changes(new updates in yellow) 2) Are there other suggestion to clarify 3) Is there confusion over what we mean by upper-level, or why we are asking for 2 and not 1 course.**Page 1** – Everything looks fine; no changes.**Page 2 –** A committee member asked if the new goals should be paralleled in how they are listed in 1-9 (eg. Oral vs. engage in articulate expression through effective speaking.) The committee decided it was okay to leave the same, as the goals are addressed in length after that area.**Page 3 -*** Suggestion to change “undergird” to “inform”
* Discussion of removing “habit of mind”. The Committee decided to leave as is.
* The Chair asked if the new paragraph (added on top of page 3) does anything. It is helpful? The committee agreed that it was helpful in answering questions.
* Removed “like our existing GE skills and change to “All these skills…”
* A committee member noted that a lot of questions can be answered by the GE website. Should we attach an appendices to proposal? Should we trust that colleagues will look at the website? Should we embed in the proposal or encourage people to look at the website.
* There was agreement to submit the proposal without an appendix. The proposal encourages them to go there in several spots. It was noted that if people don’t read the website, they are probably not likely to read and appendix.

 **Page 4** – Everything looks fine; no changes.**Page 5 -*** The Chair asked if there was any reason to revisit the distribution. The Committee responded no. The Chair added for clarification that the departments will be choosing between the goals from the choices provided.

**Page 6 -****Section 3:*** The Chair noted that one of the threads in the discussion board was if we have good courses then why are we making changes. The first line was added to show that we do have full confidence in the courses and that the faculty are doing a good job. The courses are good, but Themes failed.

**Integration Definition*** The Chair wanted to be certain that the committee was good with official definition of integration. There was some confusion with faculty that they need to integrate other coursework. We intend to say that the faculty will provide the setting and the students are the ones integrating their own coursework into the course.
* Clarification - GE is assessing what students are doing, we are not assessing the faculty.
* The integration definition should be updated to imply that we are requiring students to “synthesize and apply knowledge…”
* Should “campus” be changed to “various settings”? It was agreed to leave “campus” for now.

**Multidisciplinarity** * If integration is an issue, we need to draw people’s attention to the fact that as educators, integration is second nature to many of us. We should try to make people see the way we are doing this.
* We should add that most of our disciplinary work already draws from multidisciplinary. Page 7 seems like a natural place to add.
* One reason that we want integration as goal is that we are already doing in our disciplinary work, so it is good to ask our students to also do and enrich our courses.
* Integration is also a broad definition of liberal education.
* Perhaps add a paragraph and information about NSSE and AAC&U
* Will students have to be junior or seniors? Yes.

**Faculty expectations*** The Chair asked if there is a place for us to say here is what we expect from faculty member?
* Committee members were concerned that this would seem like we are dictating pedagogy and we are not. Perhaps it should be noted that we are expecting certain outcomes, but the methodology will vary by discipline. We are calling upon people for the outcomes.

**Categories*** There were many questions about why we have categories. We need to add language that shows we are just trying to draw focus and organization to help both faculty and students.
* Can a course show up in more than one category? It doesn’t matter that much because students can still take in any category.
* On Page 7, it was decided to remove, for clarity, part of the paragraph “However, the current Themes…..”
* Will categories show up on transcript? No, they will just be listed.

**Issues Vs. Themes Section*** We received one comment saying that Issues versus Themes section was confusing.
* Perhaps spell out the section title to “How are Issues different than Themes?”
* Should the Biology course be kept as example?
* It was agreed to delete “the biology students and the non-biology” and leave as “students” and not distinguish between the two.
* There was agreement that the Study Abroad paragraph was fine. The Chair will ask the Director to review this section again.
* It was suggested to remove” does not connect to any particular component”.
 | Final changes were discussed and made to the draft proposal for submission to Figen Mekik in ECS. |
| **Remaining Timetable** | A committee member asked what ECS will do after receiving the proposal. The Chair responded that they can either send it back to GEC and ask for an amendment or they can forward to UAS for consideration. ECS can’t make amendments to the proposal.Roger will make changes and send around mid-day or later tomorrow for review.No meeting on November 28th; we will meet again on December 5th.  The ECS Forum is scheduled for December 2. | There will not be a meeting on November 28th. The next meeting is scheduled for December 5th. |
| **Adjournment** |  | Meeting adjourned at 4:13 pm |