Grand Valley State University

*NOTES: General Education Committee*

Minutes of 1/13/2014

**PRESENT**: Kirk Anderson, Karen Burritt, Jonathan Cook, José Lara, Emily Frigo, Roger Gilles, Melba Hoffer, Brian Kipp, Paola Leon, Jagadeesh Nandigam, Alex Nikitin, Laudo Ogura, Martina Reinhold, Keith Rhodes, Chair, David Vessey,

**ALSO PRESENT:** C. “Griff” Griffin, Director, General Education, Ryan VanVolkinburg, General Education Office Coordinator

**NOT PRESENT:** Susan Carson, Gary Greer\*

**ON SABBATICAL**: Paul Sicilian

\* Participating in all work despite conflict with meetings

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Member |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval of 12/02/2013** |  | Approved per consensus |
| **Approval of Agenda** |  | Approved per consensus |
| **Curriculum items for consideration** | Foundations and Cultures (reviewed by all)  **MES 202: LOG 7357** – US Diversity  Member states the teaching portion is not clear and it should be a plan, not a pledge. The oral communication portion may need clarification. How could you actually teach and asses all of the oral communication? It certainly needs more explanation. There needs to be more explanation of how the skills and oral communication will be taught in class presentation. The old skills goals may need to be removed.  **REL 100: LOG 8416** – SBS & World Perspectives  This could be used as a model for double dipping. Member stated the evaluation may need to be made clearer. Collectively agreed to recommend using as a model. | **LOG #7357**  Motion made, seconded, and passed to seek amendments, returned to Chair  **LOG #8416**  Motion made, seconded, and passed to approve |
|  | Returning “Fast Track” Issues proposals (reviewed by earlier review groups, as expanded)  Member states the issues have a strong role to play and their goals may need clarification and emphasizing.  Groups gather to discuss their thoughts regarding the following course proposals.  **PA 372: LOG 8235** – Globalization (Burritt, Frigo, Leon, Nandigam, Nikitin)  Group recommends aligning their current syllabus of record with the proposal. In the absence of the syllabus, it is hard to see how they will teach the course according to the course description. The goal descriptions are not clear or specific enough to explain how the content and skills goals will be taught.  **ECO 330: LOG 8253** – Information, Innovation, & Technology (Greer, Carson, Eick, Sicilian, Vessey)  Group is unsure how the course is a good fit for this category. The naming is very similar. The course description is unclear how it relates to Information, Innovation, and Technology. The group is also unsure what group it would actually fit well with.  Should all theme courses be transitioned to issues courses? Probably not. This course is seen more as a theme course being adjusted as little as possible to become an issues course.  The course could be more focused on globalization, but it would then become a different course. This course is basically combined between sports marketing and economics. The issue is not focused upon and therefore the integration portion is missed. The problems are presented, but are not brought into one clear issue.  The course is integrating sports marketing and economics, but the group is speculating whether it will fit as an issues course. The course may need to be aligned with a different category. If the committee is unsure how it fits into the category, how will students?  The course issue needs to be focused on. Many of the students are sports management students. The course is also highly focused on statistics. There are many related topics, but it could be better explained. There needs to be a clear reason available to students for why this course fits in this issue category. The description should be refocused on Information, Innovation, and Technology, particularly innovation and information.  Send it back and ask for greater explanation of how it is an Information, Innovation, and Technology course. Explain how sports economics makes students think about Information, Innovation, and Technology.  New Issues proposals (with reviewers as assigned below)  **GPY 410: LOG 8248** – Sustainability (K. Anderson, Gilles, Hoffer, Kipp, Reinhold)  Member states the group would like to recommend the course to be sent back for revision. Skills goals do not explain teaching part. It does not discuss how the teacher will explain to students how the skills goals will be measured. How will the students learn the different components of collaboration and how will you asses them on their learning?  Content goal number two provides many perspectives, but in what way does this show how it contributes to the ongoing discussion about sustainability? How do all of these different areas compete for power, attention, and authority in landscape analysis and the ongoing discussion to achieve sustainability?  The syllabus of record does not mention the assignment listed in other areas.  The proposal will be reviewed and considered whether it will be brought back to committee. It needs to be made clearer what they are planning on doing. All in favor.  Member mentions the past proposal may have been passed too quickly without a chance to address some concerns.  **NUR 354: LOG 8442** – Health (all)  Well done, potential model. Approved by consensus.  **LIB 373: LOG 827** – Information, Innovation, and Technology (all)  New issues proposal  Member says it needs amended. Broad language is used including the word “this”. The assignment discussed needs to be clarified, despite being mentioned seven times. There may have originally been details regarding the assignment and it was taken out by the UCC. GEC wants the details brought back.  If the assignment details are given, the course will be more apt to be approved. For content goal number two, the description listed may be a description of the aforementioned assignment.  There appears to be a problem with the proposal, not the course. The proposal appears to alter SOC 366 and cross list it? It is implied LIB 373 will go away, but it won’t. SOC 366 will be changing its name and becoming an issues course. LIB 373 will be made LIB 366? Members state concern that SOC 366 will continue to go on as normal without the format being changed to be an issues course. With such concern, should it be passed on to UCC for further evaluation and confirmation?  Approval is given subject to finding out the removal of LIB 373, replacing it with LIB 366, and altering SOC 366. | **LOG #8235**  Motion made, seconded, and passed to seek amendments, returned to Chair  **LOG #8253**  Motion made, seconded, and passed to seek amendments, returned to Chair  **LOG #8248**  Motion made, seconded, and passed to seek amendments, returned to GEC  **LOG #8442**  Motion made, seconded, and passed to approve  **LOG #827**  Motion made, seconded, and passed to approve, subject to furher inquiry by Chair |
| Chair’s Report | There will be no meeting next week. One more meeting before the approval date in February. Numbers may be sent out ahead of time for review. The chair states that he will not be the chair next year and members need to consider their interests in serving as future chair.  A meeting was held with honors to design a whole package to interchange courses for the honors program. The match between the designations of the course may not perfectly match up with the skills goals in the typical program; therefore, one standard package should be created. The skills goals can be re-balanced to fit the needs of the overall program. The chair states this appears to be a better approach.  The history of science course had a greater focus on the arts than originally recognized. The first course proposal is expected to be a smooth process and will hopefully serve as a model. |  |
| Director’s Report | Next year, the Gen Ed themes courses will not appear in the quick guide or handbook. Themes will no longer apply to new students, only existing students. Two quick guides will be produced, one handbook, and one PDF form. The theme page will be adjusted as needed as courses transfer to issue courses.  Changes to the quick guide were discussed. Potential changes include listing descriptions to the six issues categories or listing the actual course names rather than just the course number. All agreed to take out title description and put in the course titles.  A new, general issues description will be added as a header under each category throughout the handbook until better explanation is written in the future.  Assessment Issues:  The rubric should be clarified to how it is to be or not to be used to assign grades. Faculty will wrongly use 1-4 system listed in the rubric to report grades. Committee agreed to leave it on the rubric for now.  Eighty-nine percent of those who were supposed to do the assessment are actively participating. Some of those submitted will forget skills goals or delay until next semester, but they are participating.  The issues event in December proved to be useful. Different faculty members stated they made changes to allow for the issues goals and it bettered their class as a result. |  |
| **Adjournment** |  | 4:23pm |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |