Grand Valley State University

*NOTES: General Education Committee*

Minutes of 10/28/2013

**PRESENT**: Jonathan Cook, David Eick, Emily Frigo, Roger Gilles, Gary Greer, Melba Hoffer, Brian Kipp, Jagadeesh Nandigam, Alex Nikitin, Martina Reinhold, Keith Rhodes, Chair, Paul Sicilian, David Vessey

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

**NOT PRESENT:** Peter Anderson, Karen Burritt, Susan Carson, Maria Cimitile, Yosay Wangdi

**ON SABBATICAL**: Kirk Anderson

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Member |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval of Agenda** |  | Approved per consensus |
| **Approval of 10/14/2013 Minutes** |  | Approved per consensus |
| **Consideration of returning issues courses by whole committee** | **ENG 386, LOG# 8251**  There is some concern about the SOR regarding primary sources of information. There is minimal compliance with amendment requests. We have asked them not to be the same as other Death and Dying courses, and to focus on literature, which they have done. Now we see an opposing concern. Does this course bring in other diverse backgrounds? It’s talking about past experience, existing knowledge, not disciplinary background. There is inconsistency between the form and the rubric. We talked about integration being broad. Are we going to do anything about students in other disciplines taking the course? Will anyone other than a literature major sign up for the course? Member states the Theme structure is being abandoned, but the course seems still to be using that approach. Literature courses will have interdisciplinary knowledge and multiple disciplines. Member feels it is best to get a course that fits better with the need of the program. Point out that as to the integration point, we don’t see it. It doesn’t discuss multi-disciplinary. Perhaps the SOR should say a group project plus other options. This course does draw on multiple perspectives. We are glad they are drawing on disciplines outside of literature, but we would like to see that reflected in the SOR. Allow students to draw on disciplinary interests. We have Art, Myth, Music, and Film to draw upon, but what about other disciplines? It seems like something is missing. We should add in an apology why it wasn’t mentioned the first time. | **LOG# 8251**  P. Sicilian moved to send back for Amendment and send back to Keith.  R. Gilles Second  G. Greer Second  13 Agreed |
| **Procedures for**  **courses that do not turn in CARs/ re‑authorizing courses as GE courses on some regular cycle by some regular process** | People aren’t doing what we need them to do. Most likely, a negative sanction may be more effective and necessary. What can we really do? You do have the right to remove a course from Gen Ed. It makes sense to do the positive things before the negative.  In the Catalog, there is wording about “eight years”. It states if the program requirements change, we can hold students to the change. We put into My Path that a course is available in General Education.  Faculty needs some tutoring regarding the assessment process. Their ability to assess it is a different matter.  Member asks, for the Affiliate faculty, what should the reward be? We want to make sure this is something that is a normal part of teaching and not a rewarded extra.  In a couple of weeks, we will have 30 minute workshops to explain how to perform the assessments. It’s easier to get the point across by looking directly at the person than by email.  We should be focusing on ways to make the assessment easier for everyone to do. If not by a reward, how do we build better results?  Member still likes an idea of a certificate reward.  How did you teach, how did you measure it? We don’t assess every student. Member feels it is still a big task for courses with a large number of students.  A self-assessment can also be included, but we need direct results as well.  It wasn’t stated this is an easy process, but can be made a lot harder than it needs to be.  Figure out a way to simplify the process. For large section courses, you could split the content and skills goals by semester. You will need to assess in the Fall and Winter.  You can assess content goals via a final exam. The skills goals can assess them separately by semester.  A member says if the issue is a professor or course has too many students, that’s a problem we should highlight, not evade by backing off assessment. The large class may be the problem, not the assessment.  Faculty fears a poor assessment will be a negative reflection on them. We do not see it that way, but it’s hard to persuade faculty of that.  Member would like to propose why we need a 3-year assessment cycle for all skills. We should choose a limited range of things to assess in each cycle.  Maybe we should have one number for collaboration, problem solving, etc. instead of into 4 objectives.  This would reduce the data points for everyone. The rubrics and component parts are still valuable.  We will revise the Blank CARs.  Each faculty member can create their own CAR, or they can do it collaboratively. Their choice.  Member states a CAR for multiple sections should be filled out by tenure track professors and not affiliate or adjunct professors, as a matter of offering a chance of service credit to those who can use that credit. | G. Greer moved to approve revising the CAR by having teachers assign one rating to the entire skill rather than having to rate the four objectives for each skill separately.  M. Hoffer Second  13 Agreed |
| **Preliminary discussion of potential faculty forums on Gen Ed issues** | This item was postponed to accommodate the longer discussion of the earlier item. |  |
| **Chair’s Report** | There won’t be a committee meeting the week of Thanksgiving. |  |
| **Director’s Report** | Assessment workshops  The last day of the semester, we can have a social gathering to have discussions. Please share the important things you would tell someone else and what you would do differently. |  |
| **Adjournment** |  | 4:25 pm |