Grand Valley State University

***General Education Committee Meeting***

3015 James H. Zumberge Hall

 Minutes of 9/8/2014

**PRESENT**: Kirk Anderson, Chair; Karen Burritt; Emily Frigo; Andrew Kalafut; Sarah King; Brian Kipp; Jose Lara; Paola Leon; Linda Pickett; Martina Reinhold

**ALSO PRESENT:** C. “Griff” Griffin, Director, General Education; Jeanne Whitsel, General Education Office Coordinator

**NOT PRESENT:**  Melba Hoffer; Haiying Kong; Paul Sicilian; David Vessey

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Member |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval of Agenda** |  | Approved per consensus |
| **Approval of 8/25/2014 minutes** |  | Approved per consensus  |
| **Curriculum items for consideration** | Performance classes haven’t traditionally been a part of General Education because GE goals can be difficult to teach in these courses. Professors need to convince us it can be done and tell us how they will do it. Performance classes are welcome if this assurance can be provided. As a member pointed out, Arts courses fit into the GE philosophy statement, which states “a sound general education helps one ‘make a life’ as well as ‘make a living’ ” and that it helps students acquire “the broad knowledge and life skills that will allow them to be informed and thoughtful people”.* Log 8604: New course – ART 159, Drawing Fundamentals
	+ Note: this was a special topics course (ART 280); the new course is to be in the Gen Ed Foundations: Arts category (proposal was approved by CCC 8/12/2014)

Members were happy with the content goals in this proposal. However, it appears that the responses to the first and third items were reversed in the move to SAIL. The chair will ask the proposers to restore them to their proper places.The Syllabus of Record (SoR) says student contact hours will include both studio and lecture time, but the Proposal shows only 5 hours in the studio. We need the proposers to be more specific about how the skills are being taught.“Formulate novel approaches or create alternative interpretation” seems vague. This may be perfectly clear to an artist, but we need to have these things spelled out for non-artists.The specific pieces we are looking for in response to the skills goals questions get lost in the paragraph. The answers are not tailored to the skill being taught and measured. The proposer could highlight the pertinent points in each case so they stand our more clearly. This is done in the SoR, but in the GE portion it isn’t clear.Critiques can be done throughout the course, they don’t need to be limited to one final presentation. This is articulated more clearly in the SoR; we will ask them to do the same in the GE portion. Summary: This proposal has good information, but hasn’t reached its full potential. We need them to highlight what they’re doing instead of hiding it. Some things are probably implied, we want to see them spelled out.We will request amendment, with the response to be returned to the committee.* Log 8607: Course change – ART 260, Introduction to Painting
	+ Note: The change is to drop all pre-reqs and add the course to Gen Ed Foundations: Arts category (proposal was approved by CCC 8/27/2014)

The committee had two problems with the SoR:1) It indicates the course will meet for 16 weeks2) It is too vague- what is meant by “course work”? Members had questions about what should be included on SoR regarding Foundations and Cultures courses. There is a blurb for Issues courses, but not the others. What is the best way to handle this going forward? Also, it is not clear how to assess whether objectives are being met.The formal presentation of the final painting addresses the oral communication goal. This is what we need to see in other places, brought forward and made clear.“Rehearsal of critique” – does this mean rehearsal of communicating, learning format and vocabulary of critique, as opposed to repeatedly practicing the same critique? This seems to be the case. We would like to see a little more information on how the critiques work and consistent expression of how they’re being measured, entered in the appropriate places.This proposal is better at tailoring answers to questions than ART 159. However, the measures are nearly all the same. Proposers are clear about what they will assess but not how they will do so. What tools, what approaches will be used? We need a little more information here. The paper mentioned in the beginning isn’t mentioned later in the measure, and it isn’t connected to critique. The necessary elements are there, they just need to make them more explicit.Members wondered if there was a critique form or rubric, and what that looks like. Griff will ask Maria Cimitile about the purpose of the long list of Activities on the new course form. Does is matter whether they check studio, lecture or discussion? Is it about calculating faculty load?As opposed to the ART 159 proposal, the information provided (such as the formal final paper presentation) is mentioned in the GE section but not in the SoR. We would like to see the proposal match the SoR.The chair will request an amendment to be returned to the committee.* Log 8608: Course change – ART 275, Introduction to Ceramics
	+ Note: The change is to add the course to Gen Ed Foundations: Arts category (proposal was approved by CCC 4/22/2014)

This proposal also addresses the oral communication goal by mentioning weekly critiques. However, it doesn’t describe the projects or critiques.The chair will request three minor amendments: 1) Switch the first and third answers under content goals, which were apparently reversed in the move to SAIL.2) Demonstrate evidence of rehearsal – does their comment go far enough? We would like the role of the instructor to be clarified. The measure is good, but the teaching part could be strengthened, and there seems to be a disconnect between teaching and measuring. We would like to see a clearer match between the two.3) The chair will ask that the proposers make sure the measures on the SoR clearly match the GE goals form.Motion was made to approve pending requested minor amendments, to be returned to the chair.* Log 8610: Course change – ART 270, Introduction to Sculpture
	+ Note: The change is to add the course to Gen Ed Foundations: Arts category (proposal was approved by CCC 4/22/2014)

This item was tabled until the next meeting. | G. Gottlieb moved to request amendment, E. Frigo second. Motion carried 10-0.G. Gottlieb moved to request amendment, A. Kalafut second. Motion carried 10-0.G. Gottlieb moved to approve pending minor amendment, E. Frigo second. Motion carried 10-0. |
| * Consider the Internationalization Task Force (IZN TF) recommendation to conduct a comprehensive review of the “World Perspectives” portion of the General Education requirements.
 | This item was tabled until the next meeting. |  |
| **Chair’s Report** | The chair recognized Andrew Kalafut. Andrew will be filling in for Jagadeesh, who is unable to serve this term.The committee still needs two more members from CLAS. There are no nominations yet. We will approach English and Art, and former GE members will be asked to recruit on our behalf, or to serve again if they wish. Members were asked to email the chair with ideas.We do not have a student senate member yet. Scott St. Louis is unavailable, but said he will try to get someone to take his place. |  |
| **Director’s Report** | A large number of GE handbooks were sent to the wrong people. We are having them redistributed to faculty members. Unit heads have been emailed regarding assessment assignments, and we are waiting for their responses. Once we have those, faculty will receive assessment instructions. We hope to get this information out this week. The director will meet with CLAS unit heads to recruit for the GEC. |  |
| **Adjournment** |  | 3:42pm |