

Grand Valley State University
General Education Committee Meeting

303C DeVos Center

Minutes of 2/16/2015

PRESENT: Kirk Anderson, Chair; Gabriele Gottlieb; Melba Hoffer; Cheryl Kautz; Sarah King; Haiying Kong ; Jose Lara; Paola Leon; Josita Maouene; Linda Pickett; Martina Reinhold; Paul Sicilian; Lawrence Williams

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

NOT PRESENT: Emily Frigo; Brian Kipp; Susan Strouse; Patrick Thorpe; David Vessey;

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Approval of current Agenda	Approved.	Approved per consensus
Approval of 1/26/2015 Minutes	Minutes were approved. On a side note, a member asked about a previous discussion about using assessments for evaluating faculty. Committee discussed that there should be guidelines for using these assessments if evaluating faculty with it. Some CARs show good student performance while others show poor performance and evaluators could use these for faculty evaluations. Chair stated that the GEC has no control over how departments might use the assessment reports, and that it sounds like an issue UAS might take up.	Minutes approved per consensus
Getting more courses with Oral Communication as a goal, revisited	There may or may not be a need to get more courses to add an Oral Communication goal. The director identified several courses to potentially switch to Oral Communication, with five courses identified as the most promising candidates to add this goal (these are colored green on the spreadsheet). Committee could invite all courses on the list to switch a goal to oral communication but that doesn't seem productive. Could ask the five green courses to add an Oral Communication goal. Within the green courses, EDF 315 (500 students), ENG 204 and HIS 206 have large numbers of students. MUS 129, PLS 103, and WRT 219 have roughly 300 students. There is a 100% chance that 8 out of the 9 goals will be encountered by students. The 9 th goal, Oral Communication, is only 80%. Member stated that most upper level major courses contain the Oral Communication piece they just aren't Gen Ed courses. Committee wants Oral Communication to be taught in Gen Ed so it doesn't need to be taught for the first time in upper level courses. Members discussed that it's very hard to incorporate Oral Communication in larger courses because it is so time intensive. The requirement could be downsized, such as a 3 minute presentation vs. a 20 min presentation.	Griff will gather information about what is being taught & assessed for the Oral Communication goal by courses and present to the committee

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p>Discussion among members about how it is hard to evaluate group presentations and that it takes time to teach them, have them present, and then evaluate and help the students improve. Griff is going to gather information from those that have the Oral Communications goal and see how it is met. Committee wants to see what exactly courses are teaching, whether formal presentation or other forms such as debate, etc. Members discussed that the Oral Communications General Education guidelines state that it is an oral presentation but there are other forms of oral communication with no public display. Seems like these guidelines require a public component. Other forms of personal communication are stated in the Collaboration goal. Introductory oral presentation activities should be built into courses that are small and they should ongoing vs. just one presentation. Effective communication is essential in all jobs but not necessarily a formal public presentation. Talking with clients, explaining points to colleagues, etc. Chair suggested forming a task force to reevaluate the Oral Communications goal.</p>	
<p>Content goals for Foundations courses</p>	<p>Eight years ago everyone had four content goals. Half of the foundation and cultures courses have two content goals and half have three. The content goals are written by faculty for faculty but should be written for students. Some faculty don't know what the goals mean or how the 2 or 3 are different. The goals should be written in standard English so everyone knows what content knowledge students should walk out of the class with. Content Goals should be broad and then be applied to classes in a more specific matter. Do all three content goals need to be there? Some faculty complain that it is too hard to distinguish between some of the content goals. Two questions Griff gets from faculty are 1. How do I translate this to my specific course? And 2. How do I parse out the difference between the 3 content goals? Member stated that they do make sense with Bloom's Taxonomy levels of thinking. Where should GE courses level of thinking be? Goal needs to be general. Rubric should contain the objective and level of thinking. New Handbook should have new wording for content goals. Member asked if committee can work with keywords for each content goal. Should the same goals be reworded to make more sense or do the goals need to be changed? Members agreed it would be easier if the committee revised goals and utilized keywords for all content goals across all foundations. Some departments may not want to lose a goal because they feel they are very distinct. What is the bare minimum a student leaving GVSU should know about each area? Treat the foundations as if they are the first and last course the student will ever have in that field.</p>	<p>Director will create a document with all of the handbook wording regarding content goals in one place, and the GEC will consider what needs to be changed.</p>
<p>CAR reviews, round 4 (for the '14-'15 academic year) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for groups to </p>	<p>Members broke into groups and discussed their assigned CARs, then shared their thoughts with the rest of the committee.</p>	<p>Groups reported that draft reply letters would be sent to the chair</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<p>discuss their assigned CARs among themselves</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports/committee discussion as necessary 		<p>soon. A few CARs were singled out for further discussion at the next meeting.</p>
Chair's Report		
Director's Report		
Adjournment		4:30 pm