Grand Valley State University

***General Education Committee Meeting***

3015 James H. Zumberge Hall

Minutes of 9/15/2014

**PRESENT**: Kirk Anderson, Chair; Emily Frigo; Ella Fritzmeier; Gabriele Gottlieb; Melba Hoffer; Andrew Kalafut; Sarah King; Brian Kipp; Haiying Kong; Jose Lara; Paola Leon; Linda Pickett; Martina Reinhold; David Vessey

**ALSO PRESENT:** C. “Griff” Griffin, Director, General Education; Jeanne Whitsel, General Education Office Coordinator

**NOT PRESENT:** Karen Burritt, Paul Sicilian\*

**ON SABBATICAL**: Alex Nikitin

\*Participating in all work despite conflict with meetings

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Member |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval of current Agenda** |  | Approved per consensus |
| **Approval of 9/8/2014 Minutes** |  | Approved per consensus |
| **Curriculum items for consideration** | * Log 8610: Course change – ART 270, Introduction to Sculpture [new to GEC]   + Note: The change is to add the course to Gen Ed Foundations: Arts category   The responses to the first and third content goals were reversed, as with the previous ART proposals. It must be a SAIL transfer issue. Otherwise the content goals look good.  Under Critical and Creative Thinking, “evaluation of student participation in class discussion” seems rather vague and general.  The Teaching responses are good, and are clearer on this proposal than on the other recent ART proposals. However, it is implied but not clear that specified criteria are being evaluated. We would like to know how the critiques are weighted, and more about how are they are going to be measured. We would also like to see attendance and participation listed separately from the critique. It should be clear that the critique itself is being evaluated.  The director will provide the chair with a general statement about the course teaching GE goals to send to proposers when requesting amendment.  The chair will ask that it be added to the Syllabus of Record (SoR).  Motion was made to request minor amendments, to be returned to the chair only, and approve upon receipt of requested amendments.   * Log 8414: New course – HNR 201, Live. Learn. Lead.: An Introduction to Life in Honors [returning proposal – GEC requested amendments 2/12/14]   + Note: GEC (full committee) reviewed this on 2/10/2014   Responses to content goals are clearly mixed up – again, it must be a SAIL issue.  The projected maximum section size says 240, but we believe that was meant to be 24 instead.  Certain parts of the proposal were worded very generally. We would have liked to see some examples. We wonder if this was intentional, to give some leeway to the different instructors teaching the course.  For the Information Literacy section, there was some discussion on the meaning of “having students read good books”. We assume it refers to books that demonstrate good ethical reasoning. We wondered how students will be taught to communicate effectively. Are they being given guidance beyond reading the books? Does analysis happen with the teacher? Is this sufficiently covered in the Information Literacy portion as a whole?  These questions notwithstanding, this proposal is greatly improved, and members were happy with it overall. | M. Hoffer moved to approve upon receipt of amendments. G. Gottlieb second. Motion carried 14-0.  G. Gottlieb moved to approve, J. Lara second. Motion carried 14 – 0. |
| **Consider the wording of question #12 on the current CAR. Are we asking for advice, or reflection? Let’s compare questions #7 and 8 on the old CAR with #11 and 12 on the current one.** | Effective immediately, questions 11 and 12 will be replaced with:  11.  Based on the results, describe any changes you anticipate making in teaching the course.  12.  Based on the results, describe any changes you anticipate making in assessing the course.  13.  What else can the GE Program do to help you meaningfully assess student learning? | M. Hoffer moved to approve the change, G. Gottlieb second. Motion carried 14-0. |
| **Consider the Internationalization Task Force (IZN TF) recommendation to conduct a comprehensive review of the “World Perspectives” portion of the General Education requirements.** | Members discussed the general evolution in terminology, and the possible implications in this case of changing our wording from “world” to “global”. Is there a significant difference between the two? There seems to be a slightly different context, with “world” being more of a geographical term and “global” suggesting interaction among members of the global community and the global dynamics of power structures.  Changes in wording would take place in titles, descriptive texts, and student learning objectives.  If we do not have a compelling reason to refuse, and it helps the Task Force achieve their goals, we would be inclined to update our terminology. However, it is not clear whether they perceive a problem with our current knowledge goals or are just asking us to think ahead. The chair will invite cochairs Mark Schaub and Carol Sanchez to speak to the committee to clarify what they are asking of us. |  |
| **Chair’s Report** | The chair welcomed student senate representative Ella Fritzmeier. The committee appreciates having a student perspective.  So far there are no new nominations for GEC membership. The chair has emailed department chairs, receiving various responses. Meeting time conflicts are a common problem. Paul Sicilian is unable to attend meetings due to a schedule conflict, but has offered to contribute via email. |  |
| **Director’s Report** | Business departments have not been bringing over Issues courses. The director has met with the new Seidman dean to see what can be done to encourage more participation by the college.  One instructor is interested in adding a Marketing Ethics course but was not sure it would fit. The director showed them where and how it would apply and encouraged them to make the proposal.  The director and chair gave a PowerPoint presentation to CLAS. One of their departments prefers to have 1/3 of their courses assessed each year, as opposed to the current policy of assessing 1/3 of each category (eg Arts) every year.  The committee can allow faculty to choose new skills goals for their courses if they wish. In that case, they would need time to produce a new CAP, and they would be given a deadline by which to do so.  Student proficiency in goals is reached more often with Issues goals, probably because Issues courses are taken by upper level students. We want to see 100% of students at 3 or higher by graduation. We won’t likely achieve that goal, but that is our aim. There is still some confusion about the A vs 4 rating; it will take an entire 3-year cycle to have everyone use the system. When we see a problem in the results, we can point out to assessors that it seems they are using a relative scale (A=4) rather than an absolute scale (4 is a proficiency level). |  |
| **Adjournment** |  | 4:19 pm |