Grand Valley State University

*General Education Committee*

Minutes of 2-13-12

**PRESENT:** Kirk Anderson, Deb Bambini, Jim Bell, Susan Carson, Jason Crouthamel, Alisha Davis, Emily Frigo, Roger Gilles, Gabriele Gottlieb, Jagadeesh Nandigam, Keith Rhodes, Paul Sicilian, David Vessey, Judy Whipps

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

**ABSENT:** Penney Nichols-Whitehead, JJ ManserRuth Stevens

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda Items | Discussion | Action / Decisions |
| **Approval of**  **Feb 6 Minutes** |  | Approved as submitted. |
| **Agenda** |  | Approved. |
| **Chair’s Report** | *On Friday, February 10, Provost Davis presented the GE revision plan to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.*  The Board of Trustees, Provost Davis, and President Haas were very appreciative towards the work of Roger, Griff, and the GEC committee. President Haas talked about how important integrative learning is and connected the GE proposal to his vision for GVSU 2.0. |  |
| **Preparing for the Summer “Issues” Workshops** | *We will discuss the latest drafts of three documents:*   1. *The draft email to all deans and unit heads invited them to consider developing Issues courses this Spring/Summer* 2. *The draft document we plan to attach to the email, describing the Issues component and guiding faculty as they consider developing Issues courses* 3. *The draft spreadsheet, to be completed by unit heads, indicating what courses they might be able to develop as Issues courses, what faculty might be able to participate in the S/S process, and so on.* 4. Reviewed the Draft email text   What do we want to say to unit heads and what do we want unit heads to say to faculty.   * It was suggested to add information about the expedited proposal process. * The Director noted that it should be Fall 2014 (not 2013) for transfers and freshman. * UCC was added to the references. * The submission date for proposals should be Monday, August 5th as this is the reporting date for contracts. The unit approvals would happen after this (Sept date).  1. Reviewed the “Colleagues” draft and Judy’s draft for the problem solving goal  * The knowledge goal in 2nd paragraph was removed to get to Issues categories more quickly. * Drafted four bullets for each goal that were reviewed. * A committee member suggested striking “for now we propose”. There is possibility that once faculty start working on proposals we may gain more insight. It is always the case that these can change. The committee agreed to remove “For now”.   The Director asked if there was a need for the first bullet point “how course content related to issue and questions regarding…”. The Chair responded that there is a need to somehow demonstrate how the course content connects to the Issue. The Director suggested perhaps “relates to” instead of “connects to”. We want to make sure it makes sense to others and that we can answer questions that may arrive.  The Chair asked if only one content goal was needed. If we satisfy integration that maybe we only need one content goal. A committee member responded that the second bullet point is about different perspectives. Another committee member liked both bullet points and thought they should be kept. They were not convinced that integration alone will take care of. The content becomes important for integration. The integration piece is so important for us that the knowledge has to go along with skill. The Chair agreed that second bullet is needed in spirit, but how about language.  Complex was removed from bullet two  Conversation was changed to discussion in bullet two  The committee agreed on the following language. The Chair will work on an example for the Great Lakes ecology course.  For example:  Great Lakes ecology  All courses in the Sustainability Issue help students learn:   * How Great Lakes ecology (*the course*) relates to issues and questions regarding Sustainability (*the Issue*) * How complementary and competing perspectives covered in Great Lakes ecology (*the course*) contribute to the ongoing discussion about Sustainability (*the Issue*).   The Chair asked for suggestions on Page 2 of the document.   * A committee member requested to change cross-disciplinary. The committee agreed to change to inter-disciplinary. It was okay to leave multi- in the following paragraph. * The committee had no changes for the Collaboration goal * The committee agreed to change “Generally educated people” to “People who are generally educated….” This will be changed in each case in the document, as well as in the other six goals.   **Problem Solving**  The committee reviewed the Problem Solving goal and compared the two submissions.   * Bullet #1 use “construct clear and insightful problem statements that prioritize relevant contextual factors * Bullet #2, no change * Bullet #3, change to “Design and fully explain proposed solutions that demonstrate a deep comprehension of the problem” * Bullet #4 – should the “consider the need for further work” be taken out? The committee continued to discuss and it was noted that people can always do more, but this sets the minimum bar. It was decided that it was okay as is.   **Integration**  The committee reviewed the Integration goal.   * Bullet #1 – no change * Bullet #2 – the committee discussed “new situations” and what was meant by it. The Chair responded that it was meant to be inside the course material, but perhaps we could clarify. A committee member thought it should be removed. The committee agreed to change the bullet to “Adapt and apply skills, abilities, theories, or methods to explore complex issues in original ways.” * Bullet #3 – no change * Bullet #4 - Suggestion to remove parentheses.   The “self-assessment, reflective, or creative work” was originally added because it was in the AAC&U rubric. It added a reflective component to the course and saying that the student is changing self as continual learner.  A committee member thought that this would be a difficult thing to assess. It may be something that comes after the courses and not necessarily something you see already at the end of a semester. A committee member added that this is something we’ve addressed and taken out of most other goals. We are saying that students as citizens of the world have a connection to that issue; it’s not just academic study, but rather helping them recognize their role as active citizen. It requires students to integrate deliberately.  The Director added that if we want the students to be reflective than we should use the word reflection. We can also send this document to the Assessment Committee for review.  A committee member thought that the self- learner should remain part of the goal. Another committee member responded that they were concerned how you would measure it and how do you know if a student achieved self-reflection or not.  A committee member added that we are trying to get at is that students the value of their role and know how to work with other disciplines, while still understanding their own place in the big picture.  The Chair gave the example of the Great Lakes Ecology course. Where is self in this? Don’t know how personal it is. A committee member responded that the personal part is really important. Even in Great Lakes ecology one person can make a difference – zebra mussels, carp. The idea is not to push social responsibility, but to acknowledge that it is important.  A committee member asked if it really fits in integration. It is important, but again how do you assess it. The example of a Human trafficking course was given as an example. Can you assess how well do you reflect versus how good is your reflection. A committee member responded that you can easily do one reflective exercise.    The Chair suggested coming back to the conversation at the next meeting. He asked the committee to review the integration goal again and asked what we want. The committee should make notes about what they think and send to the Chair or bring to the next meeting.  **Spreadsheet for unit heads**  The purpose of the spreadsheet it to ask the minimum number of questions to get the unit to say thumbs or down on submitting a proposal, versus saying why do you want to become an Issues course.  The Director asked the committee to think about how much preliminary information they would need to make decisions if we end up having more proposals that you have money for the summer workshops.  The Chair asked if we are imagining to have one spreadsheet per department, or per person. The Director responded that everything will be sent to the unit head so that they are aware of the process and they would submit one spreadsheet back to GE.  The Chair asked if faculty names should form the columns. A committee member responded that multiple people may be teaching a course, so it has to remain the unit. So we are interested in courses and not as much as who is submitting. After we receive the spreadsheet we go back to the unit to ask who would like to come to the workshop? The spreadsheet was seen as a little confusing – should it be by course or by faculty involved.  The Director added that GEC has funding for 30 faculty versus courses. We presume that those 30 people will share their knowledge with other sections, or share how to do paperwork for future courses. If we have more than 30 proposals then we will have to make decisions on who will be selected to participate in the summer. The Director added that if we get additional proposals we will see what we can do to get more funding.  There were suggestions to indicate if a course already has a faculty person attached to it, or could leave blank. It is okay to leave blank so that we are not putting more pressure on a Chair to ask for both a course and a person in the first round.  A committee member asked if we want to know how many faculty are teaching. A unit could potential proposed one course, but have six different faculty teaching it. This could become an issue.  It was agreed that the Excel form should only be submitted from a unit head – we don’t want individual faculty forms submitted to GE. The Chair added that the form need to be very about the summer 2012 workshops and whether departments have faculty that they want to participate this summer.  A committee member understood the benefit in knowing the number of sections to consider, but wondering if there would be an issue with privilege for commitment to number of sections offered by department. The Chair responded that it would not be a primary factor, but could be one thing to look at. We don’t want it to be seen as a disadvantage by certain departments.  The Chair said that we would try to be fair and would look for a range of departments, a range of Issues categories, and the number of sections. A committee member added that it would be great if it actually comes down to needing to look at all of these additional factors to decide, but they may not even be needed.    Next week Julie Guevara about Strategic Planning. Whatever time left can return to discussions. | The drafts of the unit head email, Issues component, and proposal spreadsheet were all revised.  The committee will revisit bullet #4 in the integration goal at the next meeting.  Next week Julie Guevara will attend GEC to about Strategic Planning. |
| **Curricular Proposals** | *There are four related curricular proposals (Log #7602, #7603, #7604, and #7605) waiting for our approval, all from the BIO department and all involving the same change—to allow BIO majors to take existing BIO Theme courses. (They are currently unable to do so.) We will discuss how we want to handle these proposals.*  There was committee consensus to approve all four proposals; the changes don’t affect GE. The Chair will approve the proposals in the curriculum system. | Consensus to approve Log #7602, #7603, #7604, and #7605 |
| **Adjournment** | Motion to adjourn; seconded. | Meeting adjourned at  4:30 pm |