

Grand Valley State University  
**General Education Committee Meeting**

303C DeVos  
 Minutes of 1/11/2016

**PRESENT:** Kirk Anderson, Chair; Hsiao-Ping Chen; Emily Frigo; Gabriele Gottlieb; Haiying Kong; Paola Leon; Kimberly McKee; Melba Velez Ortiz; LeShell Palmer; Linda Pickett; Huihui Qi; Eric Ramsson; Paul Sicilian; Susan Strouse; Patrick Thorpe; Jeremy Turnbull; David Vessey

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

**NOT PRESENT:** Jeremy Robinson\*

\*Participating via email despite conflict with meetings

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<b>Approval of current Agenda</b>	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
<b>Approval of 12/7/2015 Minutes</b>	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
<b>Curriculum items for consideration</b>  <b>--Log 9209: New Course – GSI/HST 202, History of Global Change and Social Transformation [returning proposal, resubmitted 12/9/2015]</b>	<p>GSI/HST 202--Double dipper: To count for Foundations - Historical Perspectives, and to count for Cultures - World Perspectives. Skills are WC, <del>ER</del> (changed to IL per our suggestion), CCT and OC.</p> <p>Member asked if for Oral Communication it is enough that they say “may include” oral presentation in the SoR. Chair responded that the proposer changed it from a “discretionary” method of evaluation per our request, so we will settle for that. We did not ask for the “may include” phrase to be changed (perhaps we should have). Member stated for Content Goal #1 on WP they do not mention anything about the environment. Chair stated that they do mention people outside of the United States in Content Goal #2, which was our request. We did not request changes to content goal #1. Member commended author for acknowledging the search plan for Information Literacy.</p>	<p>P. Thorpe moved to approve. J. Turnbull 2<sup>nd</sup>. Motion carries 15-0.</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<p data-bbox="96 131 359 974"><b>--Log 9282: New Course – CMB 321, Designing our future: Babies, Food, Medicine, and Biotechnology [new to GEC, submitted 12/9/2015] To count for Issues: Information, Innovation, and Technology.</b></p> <p data-bbox="96 974 359 1409"><b>--Log 9287: New Course – CMB 350, Foundations of Brewing [new to GEC, submitted 12/9/2015] To count for Issues: Health.</b></p>	<p data-bbox="359 131 1577 795"><b>CMB 321</b> Director questioned how the verbiage for the course catalog can be as long as it is. Member stated that it is catalog copy for the major. Director stated that we are happy to get some science courses in Gen Ed for non-majors as we struggle to get them in. Member stated that there isn't a lot of explanation in the SoR for Integration. Need amendment to include different disciplinary perspectives related to biotechnology. Member mentioned that Collaboration was well explained. Member stated that we should ask the author to add in differing perspectives. Member asked if you read just the SoR could you tell that this course was taught using different disciplinary perspectives. Members agreed that the SoR needs to be well explained as most people will read that and not the Gen Ed form. Member asked if there was a group project as he only saw "roundtable group written plan and discussion" under methods of evaluation in the SoR. Member stated that under Problem Solving the group project was further explained. Chair said we could ask them to state the group project more clearly under methods of evaluation. Under Problem Solving, they mention individual position papers but it is not listed as a measure. Member stated that under goal 1 they have individual critiques listed which could be the position paper. Chair stated that the first goal also mentions an individual project which is not explained. Member thought that maybe the individual projects are part of the group project. Members are confused on the Round tables. How many are there and is this group or individual work? Members think we need to ask for clarification.</p> <p data-bbox="359 795 1577 909">Ask for amendment to add to syllabus of record and gen ed form – more clarification on individual and group projects and add "disciplinary" in the SoR objective about different perspectives.</p> <p data-bbox="359 909 1577 1409">Member asked if the Collaboration project of brewing beer really requires collaboration as brewing beer could be done individually. Member stated that there really are no projects you cannot do alone. Collaboration is about learning to work on a project with other people. Member asked about the methods of evaluation. The proposal mentions presentations but it is unclear if those are individual or group. Also, the notebook listed in the SoR was not mentioned in the GE form. Member stated that it is a lab notebook where students are to take notes. The SoR also lists "collaborative skills." This needs to be explained further. Member asked how much of the course needs to be health related to count as a Health Issues course. Director stated there is no requirement and said the committee will need to decide if the course fits. Member stated that he believes it fits well in the Health topic based on the topics the course mentions in the SoR. Member questioned if there was a written project. Neither the SoR nor Gen Ed form explicitly mentions a paper. Chair asked if we believe this is a Health related Issues course. Member stated she would like to see more proof in the SoR. Member believes only one of the six topics listed in the SoR is Health related. Member stated it is clearly Health in the Gen Ed form but not in the SoR. Member stated</p>	<p data-bbox="1577 131 1841 617">P. Thorpe moved to ask for amendment M. Ortiz 2<sup>nd</sup>. Motion carries 15-0. Amendment to be returned to the committee.</p> <p data-bbox="1577 617 1841 1409">S. Strouse moved to ask for an amendment. G. Gottlieb 2<sup>nd</sup>. Motion carries 15-0. Proposal to be returned to the committee.</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p>that we should ask for them to say the presentations are health related. Another member stated that it is too restricting for someone who may teach this course down the road. Member stated the proposal said that the presentations would be health related so the two should match. Member stated that the weeks listed next to the topics need to be removed from the SoR so a future instructor won't be bound to those. Member asked about the SoR prereqs. It is stated Junior Standing and completion of Foundations. Members think it is supposed to be Foundation-Life Sciences. Need to ask for this to be specific.</p> <p>Amendment to ask for more clarification of the health relation in SoR and remove the weeks that are listed next to the topics. Needs to further explain the methods of evaluation in SoR and the measures in the Gen Ed form. Also, must specify that the pre-req is Foundation-Life Sciences and not just Foundations.</p>	
<p><b>Rewording of CAR question 6</b></p>	<p>"One of the expectations for GE courses is that faculty distribute and explain the rubric to students."</p> <p>--Members agreed to strike this as it is now present in the first day letter that goes out to all faculty teaching GE courses.</p> <p>"Did you distribute all of the GE skills rubrics that are associated with the class? If so, was it helpful? If you did not distribute the rubrics, please briefly explain why you chose not to do so."</p> <p>Member stated that we should only ask how they distributed the rubrics because they are required to. We can also ask if they found the distribution method effective. Member stated that as a student, he has never seen a Gen Ed rubric and he doesn't really want to because it would distract from the course material and how he is graded in the course. Director stated that we want the students to know they are being assessed in the Gen Ed Program and what the Gen Ed Program is in the larger sense of their learning.</p> <p>Director stated that if we want more details about the rubrics and the distribution we can do a separate survey for it. Member stated it is a program question and not really an assessment question so it doesn't really fit in the CAR. Member stated that we should ask if faculty used the rubric in designing assessments for the course. Director stated that is a question that should go in a program survey that is sent to all faculty.</p>	<p>P. Sicilian moved to strike out question 6 from the CAR. P. Thorpe 2<sup>nd</sup>. Motion carries 14-0.</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p>Members agree to throw the question out completely. We are not gaining any purposeful data from it.</p> <p>CAR will no longer have the question. We will design a survey that asks if they used the rubrics when designing the course and if they distributed them to students.</p>	
<p><b>Creating a new Interdisciplinary Foundation category</b></p>	<p>Many colleges and universities have added this category to their Gen Ed program to incorporate more disciplines. Director stated that if someone wants to create a course in an Interdisciplinary category they would have to cross list the course with another category. The main category it is coming from must be met with a majority of the course. An example, ENS 100 could be offered as an SBS course for SBS credit but also cover other categories. Member asked if an IDS course belongs in the Foundation categories. Member stated that we have interdisciplinary courses in our Cultures and Issues categories and that maybe we don't need it in the Foundations. Member asked if the point of Foundations is to learn different topics from different perspectives then maybe we should be adding courses that teach trans-disciplinary or multidisciplinary perspectives. Member said that this is what the Issues category does.</p> <p>Chair stated we should look at peer institutions and what they're doing. Committee should review spreadsheet sent out by the Director and be prepared to discuss at the next meeting.</p>	
<p><b>Rubric revisions</b></p>	<p>Tabled to next meeting.</p>	
<p><b>Chair's Report</b></p>	<p>No meeting on MLK Day. Next meeting is in two weeks.</p>	
<p><b>Director's Report</b></p>	<p>No report.</p>	
<p><b>Adjournment</b></p>		<p>4:31pm</p>