Grand Valley State University

*General Education Committee*

Minutes of 10-31-11

**PRESENT:** Kirk Anderson, Deb Bambini, Susan Carson, Jason Crouthamel, Chris Dobson, Emily Frigo, Roger Gilles, Gabriele Gottlieb, Keith Rhodes,

Paul Sicilian, David Vessey, Judy Whipps

**ALSO PRESENT:** C. “Griff” Griffin, Director of General Education, Krista McFarland, General Education Office Coordinator

**ABSENT:** Jim Bell, Alisha Davis, Gary Greer, Paul Jorgensen, Penney Nichols-Whitehead, Ruth Stevens

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda Items | Discussion | Action / Decisions |
| **Approval of**  **Oct 17 and 24 Minutes** |  | Approved as submitted. |
| **Agenda** |  | Approved. |
| **Report on October 26 and 27 Campus Forums** |  |  |
| **Discussion of Final Draft of Revision Proposal** | ***Please come prepared with comments, suggestions, and corrections to the draft proposal. Most importantly, does the substance of the proposal match the will of the committee? Are the details in order? And do you have suggestions to aid the clarity and correctness of the proposal?***  ***Also, earlier we had decided to return to the question of whether to submit one full proposal or two separate proposals—one for the addition of goals and one for the creation of the Issues requirement.***  ***We will discuss our plan for distributing the draft proposal(s) and collecting feedback from faculty and students.***  The Chair wanted to make sure there was committee consensus on the draft proposal language that is moved forward for distribution by UAS. The committee reviewed the proposal and made changes to the hardcopy that the Chair will revise. Several comments and suggestions were made:   * A committee member thought the proposal was concise in a good way and was involved but readable. * The Chair recommended referring folks back to previous documents and the GE website for additional information on details and rationale. * The survey results about goals will be posted to the website. * Page 6 #3 -A committee member suggested adding a sentence to explain a little more about Themes. * Page 1 #3 Remove “remove and reduce 22 to 6”. It seems confusing and the point should be made later in the document * Page 1 - #1 and #4 seem redundant. The Chair explained that it is partially true; #1 is meant to be just about skills goals and #4 is about the new knowledge goal. A committee member suggested changing #1 to “transform” and #4 to “Add” new or “redefine”. * The current number of goals seems to be adding up weird. The language was adjusted to make it clearer. * #2 of Goal section. The Chair wanted to make sure this section was very clear about what we are asking formal government approval of, versus the details. We are asking for governance approval for change in the assessment plan, but not necessarily for the distribution plan. We don’t want to come back to faculty governance to change goals distributions down the road, so we need to make that clear in the proposal so that Senate knows exactly what they are approving and what GEC is approved to do. The Director recommended mentioning the table of goal distribution as the starting point, but acknowledging that revisions may happen in the future. * We have the assessment plan as another document. The Director recommends changing the language on Page 1 to “adopt a new goal distribution for our assessment plan”. * #2 Revise the Goal Distribution Method: * Change “each course” in the last sentence to “each category” * Change “actually” to “explicitly” * Page 5 – Delete “integrate the new goals into the program in a systematic way that is consistent with existing course pedagogies”. * Page 6, last paragraph - Delete “match unit and faculty expertise” * Section 3 – Add suggested opening (email from committee member) to the section….”Our research demonstrates that the values and int behind scences were laudable but cannont be…..Thus the GEC proposes to replace the Themes.” * Page 7 – Delete “future” * Add “Privacy” to the list under the Human Right section and “Health” to Globalization * Page 7 – spell out AAC&U. * Page 8 - suggest adding a title after the list for Issues vs. Themes. * Remove specific example of nursing papers as it added confusion. * Page 9 - Add “maximum” enrollment of 40 students per session. Also add that some units may choose lower enrollment caps. * Page 10 – change to Foundations “submit” new CAPS * Page 10 – add “Proposed” to Timetable title   A committee member noted that faculty wonder how they will grade the new goals. Are they just grading on the goal of integration even though content might be wrong. The Chair responded that as a teacher you have the ability to be able to evaluate student work. You are still responsible to know and/or go to colleagues that would know the perspective of the discipline. The primary goal is still for students to learn something. The Chair added that one objection during the campus Forum was about including life experience. Yes we want to encourage this in the course, but it still have to be relevant and appropriate.  The Chair noted that a faculty member at the Form asked why we are still allowing 1 course in Major for GE upper-level component. A committee member responded it may be good for students to take one course in the major first to get used to integration, etc.  The Director added that 2013-14 is what we are referring to, in the committee discussions, as the magic year. Students will be able to take courses from any Theme or Issues. In the Handbook the cool Issues classes will be highlighted and then there will be a long list of all Themes course (no categories). Students can get to the magic year in two ways: can choose catalog (don’t want because messes up programs like Nursing), or the Provost can approve GE and catalog to be separate those years.  A committee member was concerned about getting students to take Issues courses. Many students will complete their Theme automatically because they’ve already taken courses in other Themes. The Director added that we can also manage this administratively by the number of seats in Issues and Themes. This can force enrollment by limiting Theme availability.  A committee member asked if there is a way to address the Themes classes a year early and say that if the Themes courses don’t fill they are no longer a part of GE. The Director responded that this is already done anyway; courses need to have enrollment. A committee member asked about the flip side; will the Provost allow new Issues courses to run with low enrollment. This is something we’ll have to address.  A committee member asked if we can exclude the 100-200 level courses from the Issues sooner than 2013. The Director responded that we can’t; these courses will either drop out of the program, go up to a 300-400 level course for Issues, or become a Foundation only. Some of these courses we can already predict what will happen. It was suggested to add a bullet point on page 8/9 to spell out that the upper level will be 300-400 level courses only.  The Chair will send the UAS Chair the revised proposal, with updates discussed during today’s meeting, to the UAS Chair for distribution tomorrow. The GE office will also distribute the proposal by hardcopy to all faculty and staff. Faculty, staff, and students can comment via the GE discussion board and/or GE email. Feedback received will be used to determine changes to the proposal before it goes forward on November 28th. On December 2nd, UAS will also hold a forum to deliberate whether to support the document, or possibly to ask GEC to make changes. | The committee made revisions to the proposal that will be sent forward to UAS. |
| **The Role of Study Abroad in the Revised Proposal** | ***We will return to last week’s discussion and possibly agree on a basic plan for including Study Abroad as a substitute for the Issues requirement.***  Discussion moved to the next meeting. | Discussion moved to the next meeting. |
| **Moratorium on Course-Change and New-Course Proposals** | ***We will discuss putting a moratorium on course-change and new-course proposals while the full revision proposal is under consideration by faculty governance.***  Discussion moved to the next meeting.  The Director is currently saying no to requests for 380’s as Theme credit unless the faculty is willing to test the 3 new goals and the courses as an Issue because of the change in the program.    The Chair will draft a Memo in regard to this for review at the next meeting on November 14th. | Discussion moved to the next meeting. |
| **Assessment Cycle** | ***We will discuss the possibility of halting the current assessment cycle until the revision proposal is approved and new CAPs can be developed, possibly for a new assessment cycle to begin in Fall 2014.***  Discussion moved to the next meeting. | Discussion moved to the next meeting. |
| **Adjournment** |  | Meeting adjourned at 4:25 pm |