Grand Valley State University

*General Education Committee*

Minutes of 3-26-12

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

**ALSO PRESENT:** C. “Griff” Griffin, Krista McFarland

**ABSENT:** Jim Bell, Emily Frigo, Ruth Stevens, Penney Nichols-Whitehead, JJ Manser

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda Items | Discussion | Action / Decisions |
| **Approval of** **Mar 19 Minutes** |  | Approved as submitted. |
| **Agenda** |  | Approved. |
| **Preparing for the Summer “Issues” Workshops** | *Last week Christine Rener, Director of the FTLC, requested two things of us:*1. *Volunteers and/or names of colleagues who might be willing and able to serve as expert/mentors for the summer process. This would require attendance at least one of the two workshops: 1-4 p.m. Thursday, 5/24, and 9 a.m.-noon Wednesday, 5/30, as well as some online activity before and after those dates.*
2. *Suggestions for readings, AAC&U and otherwise, for Module 1 (background on the revision, new ways of looking at liberal education, engaging big questions, etc.) and Module 3 (readings specifically on collaboration, problem solving, and integration).*

*We’ll discuss these and prepare a follow-up message to Christine.*We think there is a need for a total of six mentors; three for each workshop to talk about each of the three goals. Our sense is that, on average, we will have 15 faculty in each workshop. Christine will also be contacting other faculty as potential mentors.The Chair asked if there were any volunteers from GEC that were willing to be mentors for May 24 or May 30. The role would be to facilitate group discussion around one of the three goals. There may also be some online follow-up with faculty participants.A committee member asked if there were GEC members that are also proposing Issues course. The Chair responded that if so, it would be ideal that they attend both workshops; one as a participant and one as a mentor.The Chair asked if there was any reason to discourage or encourage GEC members not to. He thought it would be a good thing. The only consideration is if there are more than 30 proposals, but that bridge can be crossed when we get to it. Judy volunteered to be a mentor for the Integration goal.The committee suggested the following names to pass along to Christine as possible mentors to contact:Gretchen Gailbraith Peter Anderson Ellen Schendel Shaily Menon Paul WittenbrakerAaron LowenChris Drewel Julia Mason Clark WellsKathleen UnderwoodTim PenningJudy WhippsThe committee discussed readings to share with Christine. A committee member suggested the reading that Peter Anderson shared during last year’s summer work. Judy has two articles on integration that she will forward.The Chair asked if the full proposal and backgrounder should be required reading for the workshops. A committee member thought that both documents would be helpful for the participants to read. The Chair and Director will compile a comprehensive list of suggested mentors and readings to Christine and then GEC can continue conversations after that. | The committee agreed that the proposal and backgrounder should be required reading for the workshopsThe Chair and Director will compile a comprehensive list of suggested mentors and readings to Christine and then GEC can continue conversations after that. |
| **Curricular Proposals** | *Log #7680, a course-change proposal from Geography & Planning for GPY 356, Geography of Europe, proposed for the World Perspectives category. The course is currently in Theme #11, Earth and Environment.**Log #7685, a course-change proposal from Geography & Planning for GPY 352, Geography of Latin America, proposed for the World Perspectives category. The course is currently not a part of GE.*Log #7680 GPY 356 – already in Theme, adding to WPA committee member referenced the Syllabus of Record for the method of evaluation. He wished that it included oral presentation as a part of the grade. In the actual syllabus the note that the last three weeks are for presentations. The CCC told them to take it out and just put content. He can understand why, but there should still be some sort of written or oral included as part of a grade in SOR. Actual syllabus have to do research and presentation, but nothing with oral and written in SOR Motion to approve Log #7680 with a friendly amendment change to the Syllabus of Record; seconded. Motion Passed. Log #7685 GPY 352 adding to WPThe committee discussed the percent of methods and that it didn’t allow much leeway. It was suggested to ask for an adjustment.The Director noted that with both logs if you want the department to change the SOR, you need to ask for an amendment so that they system will allow them back in to make changes.Motion to supersede previous vote; seconded. Motion Passed.Motion to request Amendments to Syllabus of Record for Log #7680 and #7685 (GPY 356 making written and oral a part of the final grade; GPY 352 making the percent of methods allow leeway for teachers); seconded. Motion for Amendment Passed. | Motion to request Amendments to Log #7680 and #7685; seconded. Motion for Amendment Passed. |
| **Preparing for the 2012-13 CAP revisions for Foundation/Culture Courses** | *Last week, volunteers agreed to draft descriptions and objectives for written communication, oral communication, critical and creative thinking, information literacy, ethical reasoning, and quantitative literacy. We’ll discuss whatever drafts are available—or whatever questions or concerns have come up during the drafting process. Next week, we will need to look at all of the drafts.* **Ethical Reasoning**Removed one line and switched the order. The paragraph was not changed.Consensus by GEC that this goal is complete and the changes were approved.**Critical/Creative Thinking**The group that worked on the goal started out with using the paragraph to create the objective bullets. As theylooked at the list it just seemed like critical thinking, and it was unclear where the creative thinking comes in. The dilemma is that they are not sure how much to change it. A committee member suggested that the easiest thing to do is to operationalize the current description. A committee member made two suggestions. One to change the language for “generally educated people” and two to adjust the second bullet. It is about evaluating evidence and something should be added about evaluating the satisfactoriness of the conclusion.A committee member suggested combining 1st and 2nd bullet and add a new bullet:Formulate and evaluate creative processes or solutions.The committee changed the objectives to the following:* ~~Identify and~~ Assess differing perspectives and assumptions
* Evaluate evidence and the logic of arguments
* Formulate novel approaches or create alternative interpretation
* ~~Reason systematically in support of arguments~~

The Chair will work on the first paragraph of the critical and creative thinking goal and GEC can revisit next week. Next week we will also:Review the information literacy documents that Emily put together. Discuss the expedited process for curricular proposals. | Consensus that the ethical reasoning goal is complete and the changes were approved.The Chair will work on the first paragraph of the critical and creative thinking goal for GEC to revisit next week. The committee will review the information literacy documents and discuss the expedited process for curricular proposals next week. |
| **Adjournment** | Motion to adjourn; seconded. | Meeting adjourned at 4:10 pm |