

Grand Valley State University
General Education Committee Meeting

167 Lake Ontario Hall
 Minutes of 9/28/2015

PRESENT: Kirk Anderson, Chair; Hsiao-Ping Chen; Gabriele Gottlieb; Haiying Kong; Paola Leon; Melba Velez Ortiz; LeShell Palmer; Linda Pickett; Huihui Qi; Eric Ramsson; Susan Strouse; Patrick Thorpe; Jeremy Turnbull; David Vessey

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

NOT PRESENT: Emily Frigo; Kimberly McKee; Paul Sicilian*

*Participating via email despite conflict with meetings

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Approval of current Agenda	The chair asked to re-order agenda items to ensure discussion of “adding IL and/or OC as a 3 rd option” before the director needs to leave to attend a UAC meeting.	Approved per consensus
Approval of 9/21/2015 Minutes	Member asked if we need so much detail in minutes. Chair stated that more detail helps us to remember the discussion.	Approved per consensus
Assessment – discussion of adding IL and/or OC as a 3rd option for some categories	<p>Director discussed adding Information Literacy and Oral Communication as a third option for some categories.</p> <p>Chair stated that IL should be added to choice 1 and OC should be added to choice 2 for each category that doesn’t already have it as a choice. Director stated that the first choice is goals that most people already said they were teaching. The second choice is a goal that is more of a stretch. The goal should fit into the category and be manageable for class sizes. Art has Oral Communication and likely will not teach Information Literacy. In Historical Perspectives they will most likely not teach Oral Communication due to large class sizes but can add Information Literacy to the second choice. In Life Sciences the class sizes are so large it doesn’t make sense to add Oral Communication as a third option. Oral Communication does not need to be in Mathematical Sciences because no one will choose it. Philosophy and Literature already have both. Physical Sciences could add Information Literacy. US Diversity and World Perspectives already have both. Social and Behavioral Sciences have neither. They have Quantitative Literacy and only one course has chosen that goal. Member suggested we add Information Literacy to the first choice and Oral</p>	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p>Communication to the 2nd choice in Social and Behavioral Sciences. Member asked what percentage of GVSU students take WRT 150, director said roughly 50%. WRT 150 is one of the only courses to teach Information Literacy. Member stated you don't necessarily need to write a paper to demonstrate Information Literacy. Instructors could have students send them a list of sources used to research a topic and they could be graded on the quality of their sources. If we want to go with these we will need to email the Unit Heads and tell them if they want to change their goals they will need to revise their CAP. Then the committee will need to review and approve CAPs by January 1.</p> <p>Agreed upon changes: HP – Add OC has a 3rd option in choice 1 and IL as 3rd option in choice 2 PS – Add IL as 3rd choice in option 1 SBS –Add IL has a 3rd option in choice 1 and OC as 3rd option in choice 2</p> <p>Director will send this information out to unit heads with a deadline of November 13 to revise the CAP for any courses making a change.</p>	
<p>Curriculum items for consideration -Log 8746: New course – STA 341, Demographic Methods [new to GEC, submitted 9/10/2015] To count for Issues: Globalization.</p>	<p>STA 341 Chair reported that he talked with proposer about the prerequisites. He agreed to change the prerequisites to (STA 215 or STA 312) and junior standing. We will ask for this in the amendment.</p> <p>Member stated under Integration that it wasn't clear that more than one field of study would be integrated. There is mention of applying non-demographic information to non-demographic analysis, but this doesn't appear in the SoR. It should be explained in the SoR how they will look at non-demographic information in demographic analysis. Member stated that proposer does vaguely address the issue in SoR objective #5, but he uses the term discretionary. We would like to see "discretionary" deleted.</p> <p>An amendment will be requested: Change pre-reqs per discussion, revise SoR to better reflect the Integration objective regarding more than one field of study (including deleting "discretionary" from objective #5).</p>	<p>M. Velez Ortiz moved to ask for amendment. G. Gottlieb 2nd. Motion carries 13-0. Proposal to be returned to Chair.</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<p>-Log 9120: New Course – LAS 220, Introduction to Latino/a Studies [new to GEC, submitted 9/22/2015] Double-dipper! To count for Foundations: Social and Behavioral Sciences (with skills CCT and ER) and Cultures: US Diversity (with skills WC and OC).</p>	<p>LAS 220 Member asked if the course change for LAS 210 will come to us as well. Director stated that it will not come to us. The only thing that comes to us is something with a change to the General Education form. Members agree that the LAS 220 proposal was well written and should be approved.</p> <p>Chair stated that there were some SAIL issues. Under ASSESS, “Other” was checked, but nothing is indicated. Apparently Sail does not give proposers a field to enter text for an “other” assessment item. For the skills, the 4 objectives are not listed and definitions of the goals do not appear. Need to have the SAIL people fix these issues. Chair will contact SAIL to have these fixed.</p>	<p>S. Strouse moved to approve proposal. G. Gottlieb 2nd. Motion carries 13-0.</p>
<p>CAR Reviews</p>	<p>AHS 340</p>	<p>Discussion tabled.</p>
<p>Simplifying the skills rubrics</p>	<p>Rubrics have been highly criticized for being too complex and wordy. Chair would like the committee to revisit simplifying them. We discussed this last year and agreed to leave the left column (the objectives for each skill) untouched and to remove the distinguished column. Member stated that the rubrics are very subjective. Chair stated that is because courses are taught differently so many decisions have to be left up to the individual instructors. Member suggested that there needs to be a common understanding written in the rubrics. We need to define what “effective” means or give some examples of what is considered “effective.” Another member</p>	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p>stated that it has to be left open to the judgment of the instructor based on course content. Member said that the shortened rubric for Collaboration created in winter 2015 is much clearer and improved. Member suggested getting subcommittees to review the rubrics we revised last year. Member suggested sending a rubric to the assessment committee to get feedback. Most members think we should keep it internal. Member said it is hard to simplify the rubric and get more specific at the same time. Another member said that the rubric should be broad for faculty to adapt the rubric into their curriculum. Faculty should be able to assess their own courses based on the rubrics given. Faculty members use these as guidelines when developing their course. Chair will take inventory of work done last semester on simplifying the rubrics, and create subgroups to continue this task.</p>	
Chair's Report	None.	
Director's Report	None.	
Adjournment		4:30pm