Grand Valley State University

*General Education Committee*

Minutes of 2-6-12

**PRESENT:** Kirk Anderson, Jim Bell, Susan Carson, Jason Crouthamel, Alisha Davis, Emily Frigo, Roger Gilles, Gabriele Gottlieb, Jagadeesh Nandigam, Penney Nichols-Whitehead, Keith Rhodes, David Vessey Judy Whipps

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

**ABSENT:** Deb Bambini, C. “Griff” Griffin, JJ Manser, Paul Sicilian, Ruth Stevens

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda Items | Discussion | Action / Decisions |
| **Approval of** **Jan 30 Minutes** |  | Approved as submitted. |
| **Agenda** |  | Approved. |
| **Preparing for the Summer “Issues” Workshops** | *In the next week or two, we will send out to deans and unit heads a call for proposals asking for very basic and preliminary information: existing and new courses they are considering proposing as Issue courses, the Issues category they see as the best match for each prospective course, and the number of sections of each course they’d anticipate offering per year. These preliminary proposals will require the unit head’s signature.**To help prepare faculty for the summer workshops, we need to develop at least two sets of material:*1. *An overview of the Issues component and the knowledge/content goals associated with it. We worked on this last week. Let’s look at a revised draft of this document (attached).*
2. *An overview of the three upper-level skills goals, including the exact “objectives” that will form the basis of the assessment rubric associated with each goal. Let’s talk more about the objectives and the assessment rubrics.*

The committee discussed the summer work group logistics, documentation, and what should be sent out to campus.Two dates are tentatively scheduled at the end of May for the workshops.  The Director and Christine from FTLC are working on a spreadsheet to send out to units. Christine from FTLC will come to GEC to talk about how she plans to transfer this into a workshop and online module.  A committee member suggested offering additional trainings for faculty that may not be going through the summer sessions, but may be teaching the course. The Chair thought this was a good idea and something to discuss further. He noted that they didn’t necessarily need to happen this summer since we have 2012-13 to work on.A committee member asked if faculty that don’t necessarily want the money could still participate in the workshops. The Chair responded that he can’t imagine we would turn anyone away. If someone was interested they could contact GE.The committee reviewed two documents that were distributed with the Agenda (one rough draft letter to “Colleagues” and the other the 3 goals of collaboration, problems solving, and integration).A committee member asked, from a curriculum standpoint, how to come up with a 300-400 level course and how to justify with little pre-requisites.  A committee member responded that much will come from integration.  The disciplinary work doesn’t have to be as high-level, but rather applying the ideas and concepts. A committee member added that we are also asking students to take the discipline along with other knowledge to find solutions. Generally, 1st and 2nd year students aren’t great with that, so justifies 300 level. A committee member asked what UCC will want to see as justification for 300 level. The Chair responded that we already have precedence with Themes.A committee member added that some of these questions might add confusion throughout a unit. Where will faculty go for questions they have. There was a suggestion for an FAQ or Blackboard site for people to find answers to questions they have about the proposal process. It was mentioned that an FAQ draft was in process for the GE website. We can also post information to encourage faculty to invite GEC to their unit meeting to discuss questions to might have.A committee member suggested including more examples to show what an Issue course will look like before and after.  The Chair added that it will be helpful to have some examples that we agree on, but that we want the 30 courses form the summer work to become the examples.The committee reviewed the “Colleagues” letter that was distributed. It was noted that the “Colleagues” letter is not complete, just a starting point.  It includes content, but need to also add skills info.  Discussed language to tweak and add. The first step is to address how the new course will be an Issue course.A committee member through that the letter, from the outside, seems a little confusing. Perhaps there should be language to show the levels of the GE program to make it clearer. The Chair added that while it is a lot of text to talk about something that isn’t new, but colleagues would benefit from the context. Many people would prefer the shorter version, but inclination is to try and couch it a little more clearly. It was decided to leave as is for now.The Chair asked if the committee was okay with the second portion of the draft document. The committee was in agreement and liked the language. The committee distributed and reviewed the handout on the skills goals (collaboration, problem solving, and integration).The Chair wanted to make sure everyone was in agreement in how we intend rubrics to be use when talking about how faculty will use them.Example Rubric on board:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Interdependent |  |  |  |  |
| Interactive |  |  |  |  |
| Accountable |  |  |  |  |
| Reflective |  |  |  |  |

Would say, for exampleKnowledge goal #31) content goal2) content goal3 skills goalsCOLLABORATION – would have 4 bullet points1)2)3)4)We would be asking faculty to come up with measures to assess students in each of these 4 areas. We could give the faculty the rubric to use; this would simplify the process for faculty. They could also do the same for Foundations and Cultures. If we are asking too much of our colleagues we should figure that out right now. A committee member thought that we should continue with what we are doing and see what it looks like after we are finished. If it turns out after summer workshops that we need to take a look at it again then we can decide if we need to make changes. Right now it helps to clarify the process. The committee reviewed and combined the bullet points for the problem solving goal. Judy Whipps will continue to draft the bullet points.The committee worked on the description and bullet points for the integration goal. The committee discussed bullet point #3 and whether or not we are talking about outside experience.A committee member responded that it wouldn’t be one of the objectives, but good luck trying to do without it. AAC&U rubric talks about connecting to your life. We have fields, experience, perspective and we are asking students to pull from this range of possibilities. Or, are we asking them to separate out singularly. If it’s the later, than it might be implicit in the 2nd bullet. The Chair suggested broadening to include the experience from more than one field of study perspective, experience, etc….A committee member added that it doesn’t have to be life experience. She thought it would be difficult to think about assessing things that come out in class discussions. There should be some flexibility so that they are as inclusive as possible.A committee member thought that even one assignment to have students reflect on the topic will allow them to bridge to the larger issue. A committee member responded that this could be difficult for students that are young and may not have a lot of world experience. A committee member responded that their engagement in the world is part of their world experience – it doesn’t have to be their own personal experience – more of an intellectual engagement. It was suggested to add “experience” into 3rd bullet, between abilities and theories.It was agreed to remove bullet point #1 as it was very broad. It would be worked into the description. A committee member asked for clarification – is it experience, or is it that you and adapt and apply experience. They are slightly different. Bullet point #2 was changed to “and apply skills, abilities, theories, methodologies, or insights from experience to new situations ….” Also removed “gained in one situation”The Chair will work on combined both documents into a single document for review again at next week’s meeting.Changed Integration paragraph – removed first “and” and added “and develop a sense of self as a learner” at the end.The committee discussed what the communication to campus should be and who to send the first communication to. It was decided that a single communications to unit head’s with a cc to Dean’s.  Unit head’s would be encouraged to pass on to faculty. It would include invitation and a spreadsheet.  The Chair will draft the text for the email for review and distribute to everyone on Friday for discussion at next Monday meeting. | Two dates are tentatively scheduled at the end of May for the workshops. GEC will consider offering additional trainings for faculty that may not be going through the summer sessions.The committee was in agreement with how rubrics will be intended to be used. Updates were made to the problem solving and integration descriptions and bullet points. It was suggested to added examples and FAQ to website or Blackboard site.A single communication will be sent to unit head’s with a cc to Dean’s on the proposal process.  Unit head’s would be encouraged to pass on to faculty.The Chair will draft the text for the email for review and distribute to everyone on Friday for discussion at next Monday meeting. |
| **Other Business** | No other business.We will meet with Julie Guevara on February 20th. Tentatively, GEC will not meet on February 27th. There are no curricular proposals currently for review.  | We will meet with Julie Guevara on February 20th. Tentatively, GEC will not meet on February 27th.  |
| **Adjournment** | Motion to adjourn; seconded. | Meeting adjourned at 4:10 pm |