Grand Valley State University

*General Education Subcommittee*

Minutes of 4/5/10

**PRESENT:** Deborah Bambini; James Bell; Susan Carson; Phyllis Curtiss; Roger Gilles; Kari Kensinger; Heather Harvey (for Lauren Kaercher); Sheldon Kopperl; Hugh McGuire; Penney Nichols-Whitehead; Keith Rhodes; David Vessey; Paul Sicilian; Kathryn Waggoner; Judy Whipps

**ALSO PRESENT:** C. “Griff” Griffin, Director of General Education; Krista Rye, Office Coordinator

**ABSENT:** Dana Munk; Shelley Schuurman;

**GUESTS:** Maria Cimitile, Provost Office; Monica Harris, COE

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Action / Decisions |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval of March 29 Minutes** | Motion to approve; seconded. | Approved. |
| **Approval of Agenda** | Motion to approve; seconded. | Approved. |
| **Director’s Report** | *Guidelines needed for departmental transfer-equivalency reviews.*  This topic deals with the reorganization of ARC/ARSP. Historically, things were handled a particular way and we are looking at which competencies need to be reviewed by faculty versus staff. Currently ARC responds to equivalencies for Foundations and Cultures and the GE Director handles Themes.  The question to the group is who should be involved? Should it be the GE Director, the GE committee, or a mix of both?  A committee member asked what the quantity of these requests is. The Director stated that about fifty-plus come in a week.  The Director added that there has not been a systematic review for a long time and everyone would really like to see a systematic update to the process. The departments are reviewing many of the transfers, so the fifty a week are what remains. These courses refer to the individual requests and not the “en mass” GRCC courses.  A committee member said that if the Director is willing to be the one to take a look at the courses that she would trust her judgment, but wondered if the work load be possible? The Director responded that she could look further into the workload and then see if GEC wants to do.  The guest from the Provost’s Office noted that the Dean’s from GRCC and GVSU met to discuss issues and to take a closer look at what courses transfer in. When appropriate they would like to give more credit, but they are probably a year out from this happening. The GVSU Dean’s will also be meeting with other community colleges in the area. She also added that one reason they are looking at this is because of the ARSP reshuffle their number of staff decreased. Additionally, these are really academic issues so it makes sense to not have Advisors making decisions about GE.  A committee member suggested that for consistency and efficiency sake that it may make sense to have a GE committee to investigate and make recommendations to give to the Director.  The Director will report back as more unfolds. |  |
| **LEAP GOALS/ GE Structural Revisions** | *Based on the March 29 discussion and the revised chart, we will try to reach consensus about the rough contours of the upper-level GE component we’d like to see.*  Revised tables from 3/29/10 and 4/3/10 were distributed for reference.  A committee member asked for clarification on the course content goals. A committee member responded that his understating is that if the Themes courses are adapted to Global Issues courses that we would request to have skills added.  The Chair responded that Models 1 and 2 would allow the current Themes courses to be adapted and that the content goals would be changed to the Global Issues content goals if they fit. Model 3 would be developing entirely new courses.  A committee member gave an example of a course. If the Global Issue were Sustainability, the class could be on water. The student would work in inter-disciplinary teams and have to choose a question or problem to work on. Students could investigate and propose a solution to the problem and would involve integration, teamwork and problem-solving. She also mentioned sponsored courses. Nonprofits or local organizations bring problems they are working to the class. They would come back and the end of the course to hear solutions from the class.  Discussion continued in regard to Model 3 and what the course would look like. The Chair mentioned that these courses may be adapted, along with their materials, from previous courses, but not sure that we would say the course itself would spring out of the previous course. The material and expertise, yes, but they would be using a generic template. Model 1 would still have the disciplinary title, but Model 3 courses would all have a GE prefix.  A committee member asked about Models 1 and 2 goals. His understanding is that the courses in these models would still have a disciplinary name, but have more focus on goals achieved. The Chair responded that it is a change in pedagogy; not only are we shifting, but we could go farther into one column of goals.  A guest asked if the committee had discussed how course would choose which category of LEAP goals their course would fall into. As an aside, the Director commented that it could be a big deal with scheduling issues if we have two categories. It would be much easier to say we are doing all goals in courses. Two separate categories would start us off with more issues with scheduling for students.  A committee member thought that it would be interesting to see LEAP goals integrated into the departments and not have the major and GE thinking about separate from each other.  A committee member said if we were to included all four LEAP goals – integration, civic engagement, problem solving, and team-work, then what could be the pedagogy of GE 4XX?  The committee discussed how to work civic engagement into every course. How much would it require? A committee member responded that it could be looking at civic problems and wouldn’t mean that students necessary have to be out in the community.  The Director added that in addition to civic engagement the description includes civic knowledge. The Chair added that we could be adjusting assignments to the genre in the community, rather than just academic.  A committee member asked what the difference would be then between problem solving and civic engagement? The Director responded that problem-solving in the process, so civic engagement and problem-solving could work together. The committee member responded that if we do all four goals it doesn’t mean that we are doing all four well.  The Chair commented that perhaps civic engagement could be elsewhere in GE and the other three goals could be the focus for the upper-level component.  A committee member asked if we are doing all four anyways, then why do we need a new GE4xx course. In response, a committee member said that part of this process was to dream and think of a cutting-edge was to move GE forward and she was still in favor of LIB 100 plus the GE4XX model. An additional committee member stated her strong favor for Model 3. If we can help students get set up for GE with liberal education they will come in thinking about these issues and doing things to help them to integrate the GE program and the capstone.  The discussion turned to how each of the three Models could be transitioned from the current Themes model. The Chair commented that if we decided on either Models 1 or 2 we will probably stop there.  A committee member asked if we would really be reducing overall courses with Model 3. If keeping the SWS requirement and if these courses don’t also count for some in their major, than we may actually be increasing the number of courses required overall.  The Chair responded that for some students it would reduce overall, at least on page it would reduce by once course, but did agree that practically speaking in would not reduce number of courses for some students. A committee member responded that she was not sure that is a goof reason for us to no do for overall GE. Maybe double-dipping is not a fair practice.  The Director said that she was fine with any models, but she was not sure that if we adopted Models 1 or 2 if there would be enough incentive for faculty members to choose to teach in GE because their incentive is to teach within their discipline and department.  A committee member stated that he was supportive of going for a GE4XX, but hates to vote for it if, in light of university budget situation, that we were not able to get the resources need to commit for faculty training. The guest responded that the Provost really does want to commit to training for a model similar to Model 3.  A committee member asked for clarification as to whether the committee is committed to 9-credits versus 6-credits? Is our mandate to shrink the program? The Chair responded that our charge is to look at time to graduation and not necessarily the number of credits, but rather the availability in scheduling. For example, if SWS becomes integrated into GE than students make get the writing proficiency without an additional course.  A committee member stated that she would like to see Model 1 and change to 3 Global Issues courses OR 1 Global Issue course + GE4XX. The guest noted that whatever model we choose it must be feasible.  A committee member asked about how many faculty currently teach LIB 100? Phillip from Institutional Analysis is currently looking in to it. The Chair added that in terms of FTE’s we are actually creating space.  The Chair would like to have the committee come up with a proposal. If we just give out the discussion table it will cause confusion. |  |
| **Chair’s Report** | *Plan for the April 19 year-end report and April 23 report to UAS.*  Update moved to the next GEC meeting. |  |
| **New Business** |  |  |
| **Adjournment** | Motion to adjourn; seconded. | Adjourned at 4:30p |