

Grand Valley State University
General Education Committee Meeting

303C DeVos
 Minutes of 4/3/2017

PRESENT: Carly Aller; Kirk Anderson, Chair; Dawn DeVries; Gabriele Gottlieb; Kimberly McKee; Melba Velez Ortiz; Eric Ramsson; Jeremy Robinson; Lindy Scripps-Hoekstra; Robin Smith-Colton; Susan Strouse; Patrick Thorpe; David Vessey

ALSO PRESENT: Jennifer Cathey, General Education Office Coordinator

NOT PRESENT: Hsiao-Ping Chen; Dori Danko; C. "Griff" Griffin, Director, General Education; Haiying Kong; Linda Pickett; Huihui Qi

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Approval of current Agenda	No discussion	Approved per consensus
Approval of 3/27/2017 Minutes	No discussion	Approved per consensus
Curriculum items for consideration --Log 9764: New course – GSI/PLS 207, Global Migration. Double dipper: to count for Foundations – SBS and Cultures – WP. Skills are CCT, ER, and Collab. --Log 9559: New course – HNR 269, Art and Money. To count for	<p>GSI/PLS 207 Member stated that the group project under collaboration was very specific, possibly too specific for another instructor to teach it. Proposer did not explain how collaboration would be taught. Member said the GE form can be specific and does not mean another instructor has to teach it that way. Member said they did discuss how they would teach ethical reasoning and creative thinking. Member stated that peer evaluation and self-reflections needs to be added to the methods of evaluation for collaboration on the Gen Ed form.</p> <p>Amendment – Add peer evaluation and self-reflection in the GE form and group project to the methods of evaluation. Give more detail on how you will teach collaboration.</p> <p>HNR 269 This is a standalone Arts course for students who do not get Arts in their sequence. The instructor role for critical thinking and oral communication was lacking. Member stated that the group oral presentation listed as an assessment measure for oral communication needs further explanation.</p>	<p>S. Strouse moved to request amendment per discussion. G. Gottlieb 2nd. Motion carries 11-0.</p> <p>Amendment to be returned to chair.</p> <p>G. Gottlieb moved to request amendment per discussion. K. McKee</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<p data-bbox="109 139 323 248">Foundations – Arts. Skills are CT and OC.</p> <p data-bbox="109 672 333 946">Log 9729: Course change – SOC 377, Globalization: Structures and Movements. To count for Issues – Globalization.</p>	<p data-bbox="369 139 1545 347">Committee wants to know if everyone is presenting orally and if the students are getting feedback on the oral updates. Member thinks that the updates are done for content learning and not for assessing oral communication. Member feels the course has real strengths in terms of using Art Prize in the curriculum. Member stated that under critical thinking they did not address all the objectives. Members are concerned that individual critiques as an assessment method for critical thinking can be difficult to assess.</p> <p data-bbox="369 388 1545 558">Amendment – Explain how you will teach critical thinking and address all of the objectives. Explain the critique as an assessment method. Explain how you will teach oral communication. An optional encouragement to visit the speech lab is not adequate, there needs to be more. Provide further explanation on the group oral presentation and oral updates as each student needs to be assessed orally. Change the first semester offered to Fall 2017 instead of 2016.</p> <p data-bbox="369 672 474 699">SOC 377</p> <p data-bbox="369 711 1556 1162">Member feels that the way integration is explained is not adequate. Member is confused by the group project, as it does not reflect group work. A group is not necessary to complete an annotated bibliography as students will just divide the work and not necessarily engage in group work to complete the task. Problem solving seems more like written communication rather than working to solve a problem. Members do not feel that writing a paper teaches problem solving. Members feel that this course has good content but needs more work to fit into GE. This is going to be an online course, which could be why it relies heavily on writing for projects. Member believes we should ask FTLC to teach workshops on how to incorporate collaboration in an on-line course. Member stated there needs to be checks in place to be sure that collaboration is occurring in the annotated bibliography instead of everyone just doing part of the work. Member is confused by the assessment of integration. Members would like clarification on the different fields of study that will be discussed in the course. Member wants to know how the proposer will teach students to integrate.</p> <p data-bbox="369 1208 1556 1308">Amendment – Under collaboration, give more information on how the students will work together and touch on all the objectives. Specify which fields of study will be discussed in the course. Further information is needed on all goals.</p>	<p data-bbox="1587 139 1814 204">2nd. Motion carries 11-0.</p> <p data-bbox="1587 261 1814 371">Amendment to be returned to committee.</p> <p data-bbox="1587 711 1835 902">S. Strouse moved to ask for amendment per discussion. J. Robinson 2nd. Motion carries 12-0.</p> <p data-bbox="1587 959 1814 1070">Amendment to be returned to committee.</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<p>Revision to recertification policy.</p>	<p>6a – change the word data to CAR 6d – change the word data to CAR 7a – delete “or the course will be removed...”</p> <p>Add between 7 and 8...you only get three chances (data, report, good report)</p> <p>Member suggested that we combine 5 and 6 since they go together as compliance. Member asked for a process flowchart.</p> <p>Data collection is about compliance. If you don’t submit anything once you get another chance. If you don’t collect again then you’re out. If they get purged then they have to go back through the SAIL process to get the course approved again.</p> <p>Take out 5e...no meeting if they don’t comply with submitting data 2 times.</p> <p>#1 – Member thinks it should be broken out into 2 steps or the explanation of more frequently needs to be deleted. Committee agreed that item #1 could be omitted.</p> <p>Prior to the meeting, the chair felt that the committee’s revisions might be minor. Since the discussed changes are major, we will send it back to the director. The GEC will discuss the policy further at the next meeting.</p>	<p>Chair will send the ideas for changes to the director.</p>
<p>CAR Reply Discussion.</p>	<p>None.</p>	
<p>Chair’s Report</p>	<p>There are still more CARs to review. Each group has one except for one group that has two. There is one curriculum item for review so far. It is the resubmission of an Art course from 2 years ago.</p>	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Director's Report	None.	
Adjournment		4:29pm