

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

303C DeVos  
 Minutes of 3/14/2016

**PRESENT:** Kirk Anderson, Chair; Hsiao-Ping Chen; Emily Frigo; Gabriele Gottlieb; Paola Leon; Kimberly McKee; Melba Velez Ortiz; Eric Ramsson; Paul Sicilian; Susan Strouse; Patrick Thorpe; David Vessey

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

**NOT PRESENT:** Haiying Kong; LeShell Palmer; Linda Pickett; Huihui Qi; Jeremy Robinson\*; Jeremy Turnbull;

\*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 2/29/2016 Minutes</b>	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
<b>-Log 9268: New course – CIS 320, Visualization of Data and Information [returning proposal, resubmitted 2/23/2016] To count for Issues: Information, Innovation, and Technology.</b>	<b>CIS 320</b> Members agreed that the amendments were satisfactory.	S. Strouse moved to approve. G. Gottlieb 2 <sup>nd</sup> . Motion carries 9-0.

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<p data-bbox="96 131 359 456"><b>-Log 9379: Course change – LIB 330, The Idea of Nature [new to GEC, submitted 3/1/2016] To count for Issues: Sustainability.</b></p> <p data-bbox="96 667 359 1198"><b>-Log 9343: Course change – ANT 207, Language and Culture [new to GEC, submitted 2/29/2016] Double dipper: to count for Foundations: SBS, and to count for Cultures: US Diversity. Skills are CCT, OC, and WC.</b></p>	<p data-bbox="359 131 1577 618"><b>LIB 330</b> Member noted that all methods of evaluation in the SoR are listed as “discretionary,” which is a bad idea, especially for certain measures like the group project. Another member pointed out the sentence “Evaluation methods must include a group assignment so that students may demonstrate collaboration and problem solving, and an integrative assignment; each of these will be carried out in a format appropriate to the learning context” which seems to over-ride that concern. Member noted that authors last name is missing in one of the texts listed. Member felt that under methods of evaluation the “for example” portion of the first sentence regarding delivery method of the course is not needed. Members think it is ok to leave it in.</p> <p data-bbox="359 667 1577 943"><b>ANT 207</b> Member stated that it is not clear how oral communication skills will be taught. The SoR is missing an oral presentation in the methods of evaluation. Member asked if there was a letter of support from English as was mentioned in the form. It does not appear that it has been received. The course is an elective in the English department and should have the letter of support from them. Member suggested we remind them of the rubric and that they need to address all the sub-objectives in their explanation of oral communication.</p> <p data-bbox="359 943 1577 1198">Amendment – Need to better explain how oral communication will be taught, add formal oral presentation to the SoR, and upload the letter of support from English.</p>	<p data-bbox="1577 131 1841 618">M. Velez Ortiz moved to approve. S. Strouse 2<sup>nd</sup>. Motion carries 11-0.</p> <p data-bbox="1577 667 1841 1198">P. Thorpe moved to ask for amendment. E. Ramsson 2<sup>nd</sup>. Motion carries 11-0. Amendment to be returned to the committee.</p>
<p data-bbox="96 1198 359 1408"><b>Request to FSBC regarding the feasibility of capping enrollments</b></p>	<p data-bbox="359 1198 1577 1408">The chair consulted with a member of FSBC with many years’ experience on the committee, and now has a good idea of how to put a “price tag” on capping Gen Ed course enrollments. Chair went through the enrollments for all Cultures and Foundations and found that 96 sections would need to be added in order to cap courses at 40. The cost will be high, and will likely not be seen as feasible to university administration. On one hand, we can stress the point that Christine Rener of FTLC made during her visit to GEC: methods exist to successfully teach and assess skills in large classes.</p>	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	Regarding Gen Ed assessment, the program has and will continue to be flexible with units assessing large classes. On the other hand, we can certainly advocate for smaller class sizes. The committee also discussed the apparent trade-off between having a greater number of adjuncts teach (smaller) classes, and a greater number of tenure-track faculty teaching (larger) classes.	
<b>Rubric revisions – CCT and OC</b>	Oral Communication Members made changes to the rubric. Will move Preparation section above Presentation Skills section. After many edits, members agreed to send it to the Associate Director of the Speech Lab. After that, it will go to the Director of the Writing Center, then to UAC.	
<b>Chair's Report</b>	We have 49 CARs to review. Each group will review 9-10 CARs. Groups need to go through them and write a draft reply letter. The committee does not need to see them unless groups need feedback. All groups have 2 weeks to review the CARs and we will not meet next week. We have two more rubrics left to revamp, CCT and QL.	Meeting on 3/21 cancelled. All groups need to review their assigned CARs
<b>Director's Report</b>	Handbook goes to press on March 25.	
<b>Adjournment</b>		4:32pm