Grand Valley State University

*General Education Committee*

Minutes of 4-9-12

**PRESENT:** Kirk Anderson, Deb Bambini, Jim Bell, Jason Crouthamel, Alisha Davis, Roger Gilles, Jagadeesh Nandigam, Keith Rhodes, Paul Sicilian, David Vessey

Judy Whipps

**ALSO PRESENT:** C. “Griff” Griffin, Krista McFarland

**ABSENT:** Susan Carson, Emily Frigo, Gabriele Gottlieb, Ruth Stevens, Penney Nichols-Whitehead, JJ Manser

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda Items | Discussion | Action / Decisions |
| **Approval of**  **April 2 Minutes** |  | Approved as submitted. |
| **Agenda** |  | Approved. |
| **Preparing for the Summer “Issues” Workshops** | *We have received the names of 65 faculty prepared to develop courses this spring/summer. We have funding for 50 faculty. Last week we developed criteria to use to make selections. We will look over the spreadsheet, review our criteria, and begin the process of deciding which faculty and courses to fund.*  We have received 65 faculty proposals. The Provost office will fund 50 and GE has money to fund 3 additional, so we can fund a total of 53 faculty.  The Chair and Director will be meeting on Tuesday to discuss the details of a fast-track. More details to comes, but we will probably want to limit ourselves to 53 courses for fast-tracking in order to be able to approve in the fall.  We can discuss what our position will be on multiple course proposals and how they will be handled. The Chair’s sense is that it is an open process if someone wants to propose beyond 53, it just goes through regular curricular process and will be approved as we get to them. The 53 courses will be what is approved for fast-track process.  The Director added that the flip side to this is if you want to teach an online course you have to go through training, no matter what. For the first two years nobody can propose a course unless they go through GE training and after two years something else can happen. The rationale is that you have to go through this experience because this is the one best shot we have that everyone knows the goals and has been trained. In theory, we want to train people for two years. Those are the two ends of the spectrum.  A committee member asked if we would be able to secure money for training if we considered the second model. The Director responded that hopefully there would be funding for 30 faculty again next summer and the option of another fast-track process that would be identical to what was created this year.  The committee member responded that this would mean a moratorium on approvals until next summer. The Director responded that there could be trainings during the year, but they wouldn’t be for additional pay. We do want to take advantage of everyone’s interests to submit courses, but we don’t need to have all Issues courses before 2016. A committee member added that the summer workshops are main training ground, but we could mount training courses during the year and have workshops each semester.  There are a series of decisions to be made in the meeting:   * How do we get the numbers down to 53 * What if you go to training and want to do 2 courses * What if someone proposes courses without training * What courses will be fast-tracked * What will we do next year.   A committee member asked if this will create pressure down the road to keep doing workshops. The Director responded that FTLC will do the workshops. The Chair added that it is feasible to do two workshops each semester.  The Chair thinks that we will have 53 “extra-informed” faculty from the summer workshops that other faculty can talk to. We will also post models online. A committee member thought that this could be closing a door rather than opening it for opportunities. Would it mean that the person that trained in the workshop become the faculty member that has to submit all the courses proposals. The Director added that one of her fears is that the committee has never said no to a course. The Chair was not convinced of the need for more fast-tracked. Our goal was to first get 30 courses up and running and then another 30 next year; with 53 we are already at that and maybe don’t need another round. It was noted that if faculty wait until the next round a year from August, the course actually won’t make it in for two years because of the cycle of the curricular process.  A committee member added that we want to maximize summer workshops and fast-tracking certainly helps. If proposals are wildly off base than we can encourage training. There is no need to shut the door on training or a fast-track process for next summer.  A committee member was opposed to required training. It is similar to getting a successful sabbatical proposal approved. He was unsure of the idea of training for a designation.    The Chair suggested that maybe the first basic decision is do we view as open process or do we want first two years set aside as training only to train and courage success. A committee member added that maybe the fast-track option is only for those faculty that go through training. The Director responded that there are several factors that will be dependent on the meeting about the fast-track process tomorrow.    Fast track requires at least two members of each committee – UCC, CCC, GEC to work outside of their committee. Not a small thing and it will require some work. There could certainly be a fast-track process each fall. The Director added that the disadvantage for a fast-track option is that we preference people that came in early. Advantage is we’ve trained these faculty so they chance for a successful proposal may be higher. It could be a little unfair.    The Chair added that the 53 we approve is because of capacity. We are encouraging some people, but we are not punishing others; they will still go through the normal curricular system. We do say in the proposal that an expedited curricular review will be possible.  The Chair asked if anyone was in favor of requiring training for first two years and not having an open process.  There was committee consensus to fast-track trained people this year and possibly next year. Any proposals that are submitted throughout the year will go through the regular curricular process. We will try to clarify the “one course” per faculty when we let them know about funding for summer.  A committee member asked if faculty that don’t care about funding course still participate in the training. The Director responded that, if so, we would probably need more workshops. We don’t have capacity. If we have six mentors that would be equal to about 10 faculty per mentor.  A committee member asked if mentors will need to be available all summer. She thought it was limited to just the workshop time. The Chair clarified that they would be available through email or blackboard discussion after the workshops. The Director added that mentors will not be on the hook for a large number of hours to do consulting. Faculty will be asking the mentors questions, but they are not running their entire proposal through the mentor. FTLC’s intent is also to help people function collectively on a discussion board.  The Chair proposed 51 faculty to fund for summer participating and discussed how he came to this number.  A committee member asked if we know the current percentage of units in the GE program. The Chair responded that tried to scale to current participation.  The Chair shared his proposal to decide on summer participants.   * We fund all units that proposed 1, 2, or 3 faculty members * That leaves six units that proposed more than 3 faculty. We will decide on a number for those units and write to them to ask who they will send. * Visitors were excluded, but unit will have the option to send someone else instead.   A committee member asked if there was consideration between new versus existing courses. The Chair responded that this was not considered in the decision. Should we? The Director responded that it doesn’t matter as much and the department’s decisions on courses will be fine. It may even change during their summer work.  There was consensus to go with the Chair’s proposal for faculty selection. The Chair will work on the email language and GE will send out confirmation to selected faculty. Separate emails will also be sent to those unit’s that require a response on their faculty participation. | There was committee consensus to fast-track 53 courses for faculty trained this year and possibly next year.  Any proposals that are submitted throughout the year will go through the regular curricular process.  There was consensus to go with the Chair’s proposal for faculty selection for summer workshop participation. Confirmation emails will be sent to faculty. |
| **Preparing for the 2012-13 CAP revisions for Foundation/Culture Courses** | *We have finished drafts of the ethical reasoning, critical and creative thinking, and information literacy descriptions. This week we’ll discuss quantitative literacy, written communication, and oral communication. We will finalize the entire batch of drafts on April 16.*  **Quantitative Literacy**  All objectives seem to be singular activities, so good on that area.  A committee member edited the definition included in the proposal. He dug into AAC&U and Math Association descriptions. How do we address using their language? The Director responded that any language that comes from the AAC&U value rubrics can be used; that it what it is intended for. AAC&U acknowledges this broadly on their website.    The following changes were made to the Quantitate Literacy goal bullets:  #3 CHANGE TO: solve problems using appropriate arithmetical, algebraic, geometrical, or statistical techniques  #4CHANGE TO: draw valid conclusions based on data analysis or critically evaluate conclusions made by others    There was consensus on the draft language and it will be reviewed again next week with all of the goals.  **Written Communication**  The messages seem deliberately broad. It is good to be inclusive because there are so many different forms of media that it can fall under.  The following changes were made to Written Communication:  CHANGE IN PARAGRAPH: added “by” …enter large discussion “by” learning formats and conventions….  CHANGED TO: People with a general education use thoughtful writing processes to develop effective written materials for a variety of audiences and purposes, entering larger discussions by using formats and conventions that are important to their readers.  The committee discussed using “developing” and “crafting” instead.  CHANGE FIRST LINE TO: Written communication is the practice of creating and refining messages that educated readers will value.  A committee member asked if anything should be included about ethics.  A committee member noted that is nothing included about evaluating writing. A committee member responded that there is an implied sense of the collective; it is a pedagogical move.  There was committee consensus on the changes and they will review again next week.  **Oral Communication**  The following was updated and there was committee consensus on the changes.  **Oral communication** skills enable students to be effective when communicating verbally with a public audience across a variety of contexts.  People with a general education are able to synthesize their knowledge of a subject with their speaking and listening skills to effectively craft a verbal presentation appropriate for a specific situation, purpose, and audience. They understand that effective verbal communication involves a dialogues between speaker and audience and use this knowledge for decision-making about the organization, development, and presentation of appropriate material. They understand that oral communication skills are essential for a knowledgeable speaker to inform, persuade, and inspire audiences.  Students who have developed oral communication competency are able to:   * Develop content appropriate to the presentation goals * Organize the content in a logical manner appropriate for the intended audience * Demonstrate a range of effective formal and informal presentation skills * Demonstrate evidence of preparation through the verbal presentation   The committee agreed to look at the “tag lines” for all nine goals next week and decide if they are uniform. Some goals have more definition included than others. | Changes were made to the Quantitative Literacy goal. There was committee consensus on the new draft language.  Changes were made to the Written Communication goal. There was committee consensus on the new draft language.  Changes were made to the Oral Communication goal. There was committee consensus on the new draft language.  The committee agreed to look at the “tag lines” for all nine goals next week and decide if they are uniform. |
| **Adjournment** | **Next week:**   * We’ll finalize the entire batch of skills-goals descriptions. * We’ll review a draft of our year-end report to ECS/UAS * We’ll discuss and vote on next year’s committee chair. * We’ll thank departing members and welcome new ones.   The Chair will send a draft on Friday for our GEC year-end report; we can review together at the next meeting.  We will be contacting members in regards to terms that are up and new representation. We will have some new members next year and we will invite them to Monday’s meeting.  Next week we will discuss and vote on a committee Chair for next year. The current Chair will be on sabbatical in winter.    Motion to adjourn; seconded. | The Chair will send a draft on Friday for our GEC year-end report to be reviewed at the next meeting.  Next week we will discuss and vote on a committee Chair for next year.  Meeting adjourned at  4:27 pm |