Grand Valley State University

*General Education Committee*

Minutes of 3-19-12

**PRESENT:** Kirk Anderson, Deb Bambini, Jim Bell, Jason Crouthamel, Emily Frigo, Roger Gilles, Gabriele Gottlieb, Jagadeesh Nandigam, Keith Rhodes, Paul Sicilian, Ruth Stevens, David Vessey, Judy Whipps

**ALSO PRESENT:** C. “Griff” Griffin, Krista McFarland; Christine Rener, FTLC

**ABSENT:** Susan Carson, Alisha Davis, Penney Nichols-Whitehead, JJ Manser

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda Items | Discussion | Action / Decisions |
| **Approval of**  **Feb 20 Minutes** |  | Approved as submitted. |
| **Agenda** | The Director reported that GEC will no longer have to do a strategic plan, only an assessment plan and a report of the assessment results. | Approved. |
| **Preparing for the Summer “Issues” Workshops** | *Christine Rener, Director of the FTLC, will join us to talk about the summer workshops.*  Christine distributed a handout outlining the three components for the GE Issues workshops: online, in-seat and post-workshop.  The In-Seat workshops are scheduled for May 24th and May 30th.  FTLC would also like to be able to help fund some learning communities in order to share and give feedback in designing one of these courses. Learning communities model are semester and/or year long. FTLC provides money for supplies and a small stipend for professional development.  The Chair noted that some faculty might want to separate the goals and teach and/or assess them individually, not necessarily all three goals together.  Christine asked about the rubrics for collaboration, problem solving and integration for Model 3. The Chair confirmed that goals and objectives are ready to be moved into a rubric format. They are not quite finished, but the assessable objectives are written up for those three.  Christine asked if the Issues courses will have prerequisites. The Director responded that some courses may have prerequisites.  The Director suggested that one of the documents that we want to be sure the participants have read is the proposal. This will help them self-reflect on the Issues category and make sure their course fits. They should read our backgrounder before designing a course. The Chair agreed that this seemed like a good idea.  Christine added that she would welcome recommendations for the readings and for expert mentors for the summer workshops.  The GEC will review the readings during the next meeting and decide which are most germane.  Expert mentors could be members from the GEC. Christine added that there will also be a small stipend available for mentors. They will help design the sessions around the particular goal, sit in each session and lead the discussion. There may also be some follow-up on Blackboard. There will be 45 minute rotations for each skill during the May sessions. Participants will work with one or two mentors for each rotation.  A committee member asked if a mentor could also be submitting a proposal. It is possible, but a committee member suggested that it would be easiest if they mentor one session and attend one session.  Christine will handle coordinating mentors, but added that it would be helpful for GEC to send recommendations to her so that she can talk to the individuals more extensively about the specifics.  Christine asked about the timeline for deciding on participants for the Spring/Summer workshops. The Chair responded that we will have a fairly quick turnaround, after the April 2nd deadline, depending on how many we receive. We should know by April 9th or 16th at the latest. The Director added that if we requests for more than 30 participants we will beat the bushes for additional money, but we really won’t know until the end of the day April 2nd.  The committee had a brief discussion about the number of courses a faculty member might reasonable work on this summer. Can one person work on, for example 3 courses over the summer? It was noted that this discussion is just for summer funding, but faculty and departments can still submit as many courses as they want. The Chair added that the workshop is designed for a person working on a course. If they are working on others that is fine. It is not our business to say if or how many they should propose. The curricular process is open.  A committee member noted that one potential problem is if that person is going to become a resource to their department. This is something that can be looked at when choosing workshop participants. It is in the best interest of everyone to see about getting more money to fund everyone that wants to come. If we do need to make some decisions within departments for funding, we can make some decisions with that department as opposed to GEC solely making the decision. | The In-Seat workshops are scheduled for May 24th and May 30th.  Christine will handle coordinating mentors, but asked for GEC to send recommendations to her so that she can talk to the individuals more extensively about the specifics.  The summer workshops are designed for one person working on one course, but anyone can submit a course at any time.  Mentors can also submit proposals, but should mentor one session and attend the other for their course proposal.  The GEC will review the readings during the next meeting and decide which are most germane.  The GEC should be able to confirm participants for the workshop by April 9 or 16. |
| **Curricular Proposals** | *Log #7676, a* ***revised*** *new course proposal from Women and Gender Studies for WGS 255, Gender and Popular Culture, proposed for the US Diversity category. We requested amendments on February 20.*  *Log #7510, a course-change proposal from Biomedical Sciences for BMS 105, Basic Nutrition, proposed for the Life Sciences category.*  Log #7676 We asked for amendments after the last meeting and have received a revised proposal.  A committee member commented that objective #3 fits the GE content goal is covered more now in SOR; the method shows up more.  The one assignment used for the popular culture project is the only evidence of oral communication. Is a 4-5 minute presentation enough? A committee member added that it is a bit lacking for information literacy with the annotated bibliography. They didn’t add much detail.  The Chair asked if we are comfortable with the revisions or if there is a need for more clarification. A committee member asked if they answered the issue of race. The Chair responded that we did not ask them for it in our amendment, but rather asked about covering a lot of information in a 2-3 week period. They responded that they are covering more through the semester. Popular culture informs other dimensions, so it is pretty varied. They had more in the proposal last time showing how much they are covering, but they removed in the revised version.  A committee member wished that they had more than one 4-5 minute presentation, but the difficulty with oral communication is that it takes up class time.  Motion to approve Log #7676; seconded.  Discussion of concern about lack of information literacy. It’s a well done assignment, but the way it is written is doing a bit of disservice to the course as it is actually taught.  A committee member added that we want to make more explicit skills goals, but we can’t expect to ask for standard that we haven’t defined. The Chair added that we have to be satisfied that these things will be addressed and assessed. The Director added that this course will have to be revised again during the 2013 goals change, so some of these concerns will probably be addressed at that time.  A committee member asked how this course is different from SOC 381 in the same category. A committee member responded that it is UCC’s purview to decide if a course overlaps. The Director added that even if a topic and title are identical (could happen with Issues) they are taught from different perspectives. The committee discussed whether to include a note to UCC. A committee member added that it doesn’t really matter because students will only take one course in US Diversity, so there is not a chance that they would take both courses. It would matter more if it were and Issues course. The committee member did not want to add informing UCC to the motion.  MOTION passes for Log #7676.  LOG #7510 for BMS 105.  A committee member thought that it was a very short explanation and that it didn’t address the goals. Other GE programs allow nutrition courses.  The Chair suggested asking them to enumerate the skills and content goals and add more explanation.  Motion to request Amendment to explain the three existing skills goals in more detail; seconded. Motion for Amendment Passed. | Motion Passed to Approve Log#7676 for WGS 255.  Motion Passed to request Amendment to explain the three existing skills in more detail for Log #7510 for BMS 105. |
| **Preparing for the 2012-13 CAP revisions for Foundation/Culture Courses** | *We’ll discuss the nature of the necessary CAP revisions and determine what documents we need to develop for each of the new and existing skills goals. We’ll need volunteers to work up descriptions and objectives for each goal, along the lines of the materials we prepared for collaboration, problem solving, and integration.*  We have already reviewed and revised the integration, collaboration, and problem solving goals and reduced the number of objectives. Now we need to go through the remaining goals and do the same. There are two news goals of ethical reasoning (5 obj) and quantitative literacy (7 obj) in addition to the previous goals.    The Chair asked for volunteers to draft revised descriptions and objectives that we could discuss either next week or April 2 meeting. He suggested staying close to the spirit of what we did in last workshops and they should include a descriptive paragraph and four objectives.  Volunteers were confirmed:  Emily – information literacy  David - ethical reasoning  Kirk – quantitative literacy  Keith - written communication  Jim – oral Communication  Roger - critical and creative thinking  The committee briefly discussed the level that the value rubric should be created. Integration is only at the upper-level, but problem solving and collaboration will span all categories. A committee member asked if we want the Foundations and Issues to be at the same level. The Chair encouraged everyone to think of it as a relative scale for general education. | GEC Volunteers were confirmed to draft revised descriptions and objectives for the remaining goals (see specific list in body of Minutes). |
| **Adjournment** | Motion to adjourn; seconded.  Next week will talk about readings for the May workshops and names to recommend to Christine for expert mentors.  We can also look at any proposals received from unit heads for Issues courses. On April 2 GEC will look at drafts and review unit proposals for summer. | Meeting adjourned at  4:20 pm |