Grand Valley State University

*NOTES: General Education Committee*

Minutes of 10/14/2013

**PRESENT**: Peter Anderson, Jonathan Cook, David Eick, Emily Frigo, Gary Greer, Melba Hoffer, Brian Kipp, Alex Nikitin, Martina Reinhold, Keith Rhodes, Chair, Paul Sicilian, Yosay Wangdi

**ALSO PRESENT:** C. “Griff” Griffin, Director, General Education, Amy Kelly, General Education Office Coordinator

**NOT PRESENT:** Karen Burritt, Susan Carson, Maria Cimitile, Roger Gilles, Jagadeesh Nandigam, David Vessey,

**ON SABBATICAL**: Kirk Anderson

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Member |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval of Agenda** |  | Approved per consensus |
| **Conversation with Jonathan Hodge about CAP Responses** | Wants to share perceptions of his colleagues in reading comments from the committee. Math CAPs – the “Teach” descriptions didn’t say much of what the instructor would be doing. The comments were about substantial problems, “student activities” vs. “instructor activities”. It was interpreted that the Instructor wasn’t doing anything.  When we are asked, “how will we teach,” we think initially about what our students will be doing. Several of the Instructor activities can also be geared toward the student activities.  Were others similarly confused regarding the CAPs? Some yes, others no.  Member stated for skills such as collaboration students were put into groups and the better ways to collaborate weren’t explained in great detail. Our concern: How will we plan the experience so we know students are gaining actual skills?  If the committee wants to see an explicit description of Instructor activities, it would be worth pointing out this includes student-centered learning, but more information should be provided for Instructors.  Jon understands the tension of looking through so many CAPs, but some of the phrases in the response language were a bit strong. It could be phrased more neutrally.  We would like sample language for the “teach” section that you feel would be helpful. |  |
| **Approval of 10/07/13 Minutes** |  | Approved per consensus |
| **Consideration of Returning Issues Courses** | **ANT 311, LOG# 8273**  We need them to meet our concerns.  Integration Objectives – different objectives, but the “teach” description is exactly the same.  Subset of Identity - how does this fit into the category?  They could provide examples and sources.  Why do multiple perspectives keep coming up? It doesn’t mean it belongs with each objective.  Need further explanations for problem solving and integration objectives…..Encourage to check models!  **SOC 355, LOG# 8224**  The content goals still seem the same. How does it relate to the issues category? Can we determine from what they’ve said that it really does fit?  Problem solving and Integrations portions are much better. | **LOG# 8273**  P. Anderson moved to request amendments.  A. Nikitin Second  12 Agreed    **LOG# 8224**  M. Hoffer moved to Approve  A. Nikitin Second  12 Agreed |
| **Creating procedures for dealing with courses that do not turn in CARs** | 3 year assessment cycle. We don’t receive all the reports. We bother departments multiple times to get the data, but we still don’t receive them all.  We receive less than 50%. We need a better system to receive 75 – 100% of reports.  The ones we don’t receive this Fall, we will re-assess for Winter.  Member suggested we include the UH on all email reminders and not just instructors.  Member would like to see encouragement to collect data?  We need to be stronger with the process by including the UH and Dean.  There is a narrow window since we need the data before Christmas.  Do departments have assessment committees? How do we get around the departments not caring?  What’s the next step if the Instructor doesn’t collect the data? How many strikes do you want? There is a memo from UCC that states the GEC has the choice to remove courses for failing to do assessment.  Send a message about this. There could be a probation period added for those that don’t collect data two terms in a row.  Kicking courses out of Gen Ed will hurt students and departments. It would lead to a lot of confusion for students.  Member would like an incentive included such as an ipad or money reward. Reward the good behavior for having a raffle for all those who get their reports turned in on time.  Further discussion will be needed. | Bring this back as an Agenda Item |
| **Skills-based courses in Art and Music in the Arts Foundation Category** | Under MACRAO from a 2 year school, skills-based arts courses will transfer over. Should we accept them otherwise? In our Gen Ed program, we don’t have skills based courses, photography, acting, art of dancing, piano, drawing, etc. Other colleges have those courses.  The School of Communications offers photography and theater, but for Communications credit.  Bring any such courses in Gen Ed to Gen Ed’s attention and they will get approved in the Transfer Equivalencies.  Art is planning to propose such courses. We do not have any particular problem with that, as long as they meet normal Gen Ed requirements for their category. Members pointed out that WRT 219 and MUS 129 can be seen as skills-based arts courses, and they are designed to meet all Gen Ed requirements for their categories as well.  Content is taught, but the main focus of the course is focused on doing what they are teaching.  It gives students more choices, but doesn’t impact us. |  |
| **Adding any “Brainstorm” Agenda Items** | Nothing new added |  |
| **Chair’s Report** | We have finished our obligation before the Oct. 18 deadline. There won’t be a meeting next week. |  |
| **Director’s Report** | Nothing added |  |
| **Adjournment** |  | 4: 18 p.m. |