Grand Valley State University

*NOTES: General Education Committee*

Minutes of 12/02/2013

**PRESENT**: Peter Anderson, Karen Burritt, Jonathan Cook, David Eick, Emily Frigo, Roger Gilles, Gary Greer, Melba Hoffer, Brian Kipp, Jagadeesh Nandigam, Alex Nikitin, Martina Reinhold, Keith Rhodes, Chair, Paul Sicilian, David Vessey, Yosay Wangdi

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

**NOT PRESENT:** Susan Carson, Maria Cimitile

**ON SABBATICAL**: Kirk Anderson

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Member |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval of Agenda** | Motion to move “Approval of internal GEC policy on eliminating courses that do not assess” to later in the meeting.  | M. Hoffer moved to amend agenda.J. Nandigam second. Agenda as amended approved per consensus |
| **Approval of 11/18/2013** |  | Approved per consensus |
| **Curriculum items for consideration** | Member states that it makes more sense to talk about the HNR courses in pairs or a set of four. The first two courses of a sequence satisfy two things, the next two cover another two. Specific items were brought up for each course but most of the discussion was about Honors courses in general. **HNR 256: East Asian Civilization I, LOG#8183**As of right now none of them have WRT 150 as an attribute, though the first pair of courses satisfies it. Records is working on hard-coding that in. The second courses satisfy SWS. WRT 150 used to be a campus requirement, it was an attribute outside Gen Ed. It will need to be hard-coded in the system. Amendments:Goals in SOR need to match the Gen Ed goals. Old Gen Ed goals listed in SOR. Do we want everyone to put their Gen Ed goals in their syllabus of record? Member states that it should be in there. What if we decide we want them to switch categories? Before the 1st day of class, we send out an email with the goals and say they should put them on their syllabus. Any time they decide to change their goals, at that point, they could switch their goals. They would switch them via CAP. It would seem that the standard that would be on your SOR would be "we will teach content goals". Member states we would need a more general statement that you will teach the content and skills goals on your syllabus. SOR should say, “you will meet the content and skills goals assigned to this category”. If you’ve added any skills goals that are not within your category, then you are doing it for your own good. Have a standard line that they copy and paste so it is consistent and not as messy. They should have the writing content goals in these CAPs if it is going to satisfy WRT 150. Work with IT to allow people to pick two foundations. The SOR should clarify that writing MUST be part of the course. Methods of evaluation: under measure they have a long list of things including participation but in the SOR it just has possible sources of participation. Are they obligated to measure 4 different ways if they say they’re going to assess 4 different ways? They really haven’t thought about the SOR and the CAP working together organically. We would like them to work together and list the problems that have come up. Member states that it looks to be a problem with all 8 HNR courses. Descriptions in the CAP: Can we ask them to remove this claim, “Students will learn to appreciate the internal logic and structure of both comprehensive and partial worldviews and to place these views in their contexts. Students will learn to evaluate these worldviews and to appreciate that such views must also be evaluated relative to their historical and cultural contexts and the information available to their originators at the time of their development. Most course content is completely new to students and so requires imagination and creativity simply for them to grasp. In addition, students will be presented with and required to formulate for themselves new possibilities or ways of thinking about issues.”? Ethical reasoning: why was the scientific component injected there and it didn’t show up anywhere else? This occurs every time they bring up ethics in all 8 Honors proposals. Member states that as they read through all new course proposals for this sequence, they noticed that it is interdisciplinary but it needs to be interregional. There are issues of trying to lump East Asia with Southeast Asia. There is overlap between East Asian Civilization III and IV. Will be discussed in further detail. Is this something the curriculum committee would be interested in? Certainly.**HNR 257: East Asian Civilization II, LOG#8184**Every place they have a collaboration goal, they cut and pasted, it doesn’t seem like it is written for this section. **HNR 276: East Asian Civilization III, LOG#8185**Same problems with East Asia and Southeast Asia as East Asian Civilization I. The focus is on art, music, and culture and states students will be tested on the artwork. How will they be tested? Member states that they think the students will have to know the artist and what is important in the era. Collaboration is not focused on the arts but more on political negotiations. Wouldn’t it make more sense to have collaboration focused on art? What sort of work are they doing in the arts that these count for the arts? Are they using the same collaboration project in 3 and 4? Yes. One is WP and one is ARTS. Their model is a little different but do we ask them to explain a little more? Be careful with what you accept now because we are having difficulty with how they will assess these courses. Because the courses are hard-wired in as fulfilling a category then they need to be assessed. They don’t necessarily have to do GE assessment, they could do Honors assessment. They can have their own system to assess and you could manage them differently, and collaborate with them on a new way to assess, but it’s unclear what that might be. We’re forcing them to do these forms that don’t fit for them. How do we get to a point where they’ve done an assessment where student’s know art and get those skills goals? But the students can leave honors in the middle of the semester so something needs to be figured out. The sequences are the ones we’re not sure how to assess. Member states that the students are getting the skills they need. But we’re here struggling on how to assess these and they have the resources to assess themselves. We still have the problem of giving students credit that don’t complete courses in honors or drop out half way through the semester. How would we explain to a faculty member that is assessing in their “normal” courses and then not in their honors courses? Member suggests that we do assessment in looser terms. The idea that they’re going to assess at the end of all 4 courses does seem difficult. We’ll get their assessments in, look at the data, have an easier hand but we will ask them to do some things differently. It just won’t be as neat. We could also ask them to design their own assessment and report back to us. Of course that’s asking them to do a lot more work that they might not want to do. As an academic unit, they have an assessment plan. They are going to assess, with or without us, it just won’t look as neat and tidy. Talk with them and see what we can come up with and come back to talk further. Discuss the larger picture. That means everything would be on hold until they’re ready to do that. They will be happy to talk. It won’t look like our assessment plan but that doesn’t mean it’s a bad plan.**HNR 277: East Asian Civilization IV, LOG#8186****HNR 278: History of Science II, LOG#8187**Counts as an art but what if a student drops out before taking this part of the sequence? How can you tell if they have enough art credit? Is there enough art in the course to satisfy the Arts? We are happy the students are over there taking these courses. If they’re not worried about doing our assessment then they’re not worried about lining up with our courses. We need to discuss what students will get credit for if they drop out. You need to have a course count for something at each spot. The proposal does state that there is overlap so if they make a case for overlap we can give credit for those courses. **HNR 258: History of Science I, LOG#8188**Does not state what type of faculty will teach this course. **HNR 279: History of Science II, LOG#8189****HNR 259: History of Science I, LOG#8190**Contact proposers about larger issues and then try to shape, with them, how the amendment will go. Work with them to figure out something that will work for them. Need to work out which courses will fulfill categories. How do we get useful information from them? Compare the honors assessment with the general education assessment. They would need to use the same thing. They have to have something where they’re going to assess art. Seems clear we should be looking at their assessment with our goals in mind. Member states we need to be concerned about how courses would transfer over if the student doesn’t complete the Honors program. Our assessment is set up for our curriculum whereas their program was not designed to match our goals. It was designed to meet our goals but it’s a matter of having the assessment work for them. Member states it should be easier once we see their plan. Not going to ask for a motion but plan on having a talk with course proposers and work on amendments.  | **LOG#8183****LOG#8184****LOG#8185****LOG#8186****LOG#8187****LOG#8188****LOG#8189****LOG#8190** |
| **Approval of internal GEC policy on eliminating courses that do not assess.** | No comments or any changes.  | R. Gilles moved to approve.M. Hoffer second.14 agreed |
| **Chair’s Report** | We’ve had classes to discuss the skills. Nothing else to report on that.  |  |
| **Director’s Report** | Dec. 6th Issues celebration. Those that want to share can share, pretty informal. Another assessment meeting. We will need to be clearer on which goals are being taught for each course. We need a way to make sure people know which goals they’re teaching. Wouldn’t it make sense to have your category and the goals on the syllabus?  |  |
| **Adjournment** |  | 4:17 pm |
|  |  |  |