Grand Valley State University

*NOTES: General Education Committee*

Minutes of 11/04/2013

**PRESENT**: Peter Anderson, Karen Burritt, Susan Carson, Jonathan Cook, Emily Frigo, Roger Gilles, Gary Greer, Melba Hoffer, Jagadeesh Nandigam, Alex Nikitin, Keith Rhodes, Chair, Paul Sicilian, David Vessey, Yosay Wangdi

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

**NOT PRESENT:** Maria Cimitile, David Eick, Brian Kipp, Martina Reinhold

**ON SABBATICAL**: Kirk Anderson

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Member |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval of Agenda** |  | Approved per consensus |
| **Approval of 10/28/2013 Minutes** |  | Approved per consensus |
| **Consideration of returning issues course by whole committee** | **ENG 384, LOG# 8254**  How does it connect to human rights in the SOR? What comes across is it’s about war, violence, and the literature connected to it. There isn’t a sense that it is going to discuss human rights. Human rights are discussed only one time.  If the problem solving objective brought up Human Rights, it would solve the issue. Member feels there aren’t enough specific human rights concerns brought up, but it should be more explicit. Regarding the violence and artful expression, there should be clarity on this as well. Give us examples.  Express gratitude for their revisions. Integration objective – students will be invited to gain experience, but I don’t get the sense the instructor will encourage the students to draw on their expertise based on multiple disciplines. | **LOG# 8254**  K. Burritt moved to ask for Amendment and send back to the committee  M. Hoffer Second  12 Agreed |
| **Consideration of new issues courses (normal track, not fast) by whole committee** | **SOC 317 / WGS 317, LOG# 8369 Sociology of Gender**  Member feels the proposals were thoroughly done.  Member states Integration talks about readings and students own understanding, but I don’t see the cross referencing multi disciplines.  **SOC 318 / WGS 318, LOG# 8370 Sociology of Sexuality** | **LOG# 8369**  R. Gilles moved to Approve both courses  S. Carson Second  13 Agreed |
| **Reviewing blank CAR and any other action needed to switch from assessing all skill goal objectives to assessing skill goals as a whole** | No further action seems to be needed. |  |
| **Procedures for courses that do not turn in CARs and for re‑authorizing GE courses** | Should we do anything to accommodate those with large classes?  Member struggled with having large classes and it would be difficult to assess. We could potentially break the 100 student courses down into two sections.  Member states the problem is the sections are too large to obtain Gen Ed goals. Either sections should be smaller, or the course shouldn’t be in Gen Ed.  Large courses may just need to find more efficient ways to assess.  Member says the assessment burden is too large, but it doesn’t mean the course shouldn’t be in Gen Ed.  Member says it sounds like an equity issue. There are over 1,000 students a year who are required to take a BIO 120 course, and it needs to be in Gen Ed.  Member feels class size is the main issue. We can say there shouldn’t be a class with more than 20 students, but that’s not practical. We should look for ways to maximize the likelihood of compliance. The professor probably won’t do the assessment in the most accurate or efficient manner.  What are the contextual factors? Did you pick the wrong goal? In this first round of assessment we are finding out what we can do better. We should not change ahead of time.  The Gen Ed department has to persuade departments to follow the assessment process accurately. Member feels the Assessment Committee and others should be made aware that class sizes are making it difficult to assess.  Member says there could be higher quality data in smaller samples.  Would like a mechanism in place to make the assessment easier to accomplish.  It isn’t extra work and seems it is being setup incorrectly. It’s a GVSU/Gen Ed requirement. It is each professor’s job to teach and assess.  What should we as a Gen Ed Committee do to help find a resolution? We can’t look only at the Gen Ed Committee.  The problem is the class size has to change. Some of these restraints should be recognized.  We should address why we need certain numbers. Why would smaller numbers be more helpful, or assessing a portion of the class would be a significant help? We need some help deciding what are the best methods.  Our goal is to get 100% of the data…..we may fail. We won’t receive them all. We can come up with an alternate model. We should design the system for what most people have. If we need to modify the system for the large areas, we can do that.  We need to go forward and see where we get. We will learn from the process.  See how the process works before fixing it? Success will be just getting more courses doing assessments than the previous year.  Maybe we should get approval of the whole plan. Tell them they have to complete the assessment in order to stay in Gen Ed. What would that look like? What cycle?  The plan should be structured around getting a commitment from each department on how they plan to complete their assessment.  It could be a simple process by copying the Chair or Dean in order to receive the data. This often helps us receive the missing information.  Develop a procedure now if they don’t comply. If they didn’t assess, give them one warning.  More will comply with assessment over time. Try to assume we will continue to get better at it and make it as efficient as we can.  Compliance and Quality are two separate things. Which do we want first? We aren’t increasing the burden on class size any differently than before. We are establishing a benchmark for the next three years. Make it easier, do what you can do given the restraints you have.  Compliance with a reasonable amount of quality is what we are wanting.  **Re‑authorizing GE courses??** We may not need anything new by way of external procedure, but we should set up internal procedure. Chair will draft and bring it back for a future meeting. |  |
| **Chair’s Report** | Some of the proposals have come back after amendment, others haven’t. It has worked fairly well to consult with proposers about how to get the proposal into final form. |  |
| **Director’s Report** | 16 faculty members have accepted the informal gathering at the end of the semester. Is that enough? Members agree that it is.  We need a response from the committee if they will attend. Respond via doodle board. |  |
| **Adjournment** |  | 4:26 pm |