Grand Valley State University

*General Education Committee*

Minutes of 1-16-12

**PRESENT:**, Deb Bambini, Jim Bell, Susan Carson, Jason Crouthamel, Alisha Davis, Emily Frigo, Roger Gilles, Gabriele Gottlieb, Jagadeesh Nandigam Keith Rhodes, Paul Sicilian, Ruth Stevens, David Vessey , Judy Whipps

**ALSO PRESENT:** C. “Griff” Griffin, Krista McFarland, General Education Office Coordinator

**ABSENT:** Kirk Anderson, JJ Manser, Penney Nichols-Whitehead

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda Items | Discussion | Action / Decisions |
| **Approval of** **Nov 21 Minutes** |  | Approved as amended. |
| **Agenda** | Jagadeesh Nandigan was introduced as Hugh McGuire’s committee replacement from CIS for Winter 2012 semester. | Approved. |
| **Update on GE Revision Proposal** | *On December 9, the ECS voted to forward the proposal to the UAS for initial discussion on Friday, January 27.*The GEC Chair and GE Director attended the ECS meeting on December 9.There were a few questions that came up during the meeting:* What is an “Issue”? We welcome faculty proposals to teach through posing problems or questions that reach beyond our fields.
* Questions about courses that may not fit into one of the proposed categories. GEC response was that we would like to hear about that course and see if it is true.
* Will you have enough Issues courses to offer? GEC response was there will be enough sections. This doesn’t mean that departments get more money to add to tenure lines in their department.
* How many courses will switch from Themes to Issues? GEC can’t guess; we don’t know.
* What is the reason behind the cap of 40 per class? It is pedagogical and based on students working in groups of up to 6.

UAS will have an initial discussion about the proposal on January 27th. The proposal will probably not go up for a vote that day, but rather will probably be an initial discussion and then up for vote during the UAS February meeting. They can vote yes, no, or ask for amendments on the proposal. The GEC Chair and Director will attend the January meeting. The meetings are open and GEC members are encouraged to attend. A report on the financial implications of Issues will also be discussed. GEC has said that we don’t foresee any financial implications because there are no changes (from 2 Theme courses to 2 Issues courses). The only cost is for faculty training that the Provost will be covering. The FSBC committee will still review to see how much money it will cost to run the program.We do have to account for classes above the 40 student cap. This is about 15% of courses, but the number of sections will not change. If departments add sections it would be to accommodate majors, not to change for GE.The Chair added that it was encouraging to see the President of Student Senate at the meeting saying that Student Senate supported the proposal and asked for a speedy approval.  | UAS will have an initial discussion of the GE proposal on January 27th. The meetings are open and GEC members are encouraged to attend. |
| **Update on GE Assessment** | *Joan Borst, School of Social Work and former GEC member, will help us this semester as we return our attention to the ongoing assessment. Griff will update us on where we are and what we need to accomplish this semester.*AAC&U will be hosting a free webinar. The Director will forward information if you would like to participate.Feb 29 1:30-3:30 Employers speak on a Liberal EducationThe next six weeks we will start to work on the GE Handbook changes. In becomes critical to approve curricular items in order to make sure they are included/updated in the Handbook. The process for assessment is that faculty write a CAP, the unit determines which section of the course will assess, they faculty collects data for that one section, the date is returned to GE, uploaded into the assessment system, we send back to faculty member with charts and tables for them to finish their CAR. A few years ago we decided that we also need to have a review process.The first year reviews were completed by Maria Cimitile, then Roy Cole, then Shelley Schuurman. Joan Borst will be doing the reviews this semester. Her job will be to look at previous work, write a response, and then 3 GEC members will review Joan’s work before we send the report back to the faculty member. Joan will be on faculty overload and review approximately 40 assessment reports. The Director will be meeting with Joan to discuss the process. Joan will come to a GEC meeting in early February to discuss the approach she is taking in the reviews on behalf of GEC.If the GE proposal gets approved, we will step out of doing assessment for entire next year. The only way switch to new goals is to train faculty on them, which also means rewriting course assessment plans (CAP’s). Training would start this summer and start all of next year. Procedure for CAP in that they must be completed by a certain date or the courses drops out of GE. The fall assessment would start again in 2013. 2012-13 will be to train faculty on the new goals and assessment plans. We will have to strategize this term on how to organize training and work by goals. There will be different categories with the goal. One of the biggest challenges will be to get people to the training. | Joan Borst will be doing the CAR reviews for GEC this semester. The Director will invite Joan to a GEC meeting in early February. |
| **Update on Curricular Proposals** | *At this point, we have just two active curricular proposals, which we will consider at our next meeting. Because they involve the cross-listing of current Theme courses, we need first to consider a general policy on how cross-listed courses should be handled in the upper-level component. The basic question: If a student takes a course in that is cross-listed with another discipline, can the student go on to take a second upper-level GE course in the second discipline and still satisfy our two-prefix requirement?* We have two proposals for review. They are both GPY courses that want to be cross-listed with ENS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MODEL 1 (CURRENT MODEL IN THEMES)**For example: Gender Theme has the most cross-listings.The first course listed owns the pedagogy. AAA/WGS 333 (student takes) AAA 386 (student CANNOT take as 2nd course because same discipline)WGS 325 (student CAN take as 2nd course) | **MODEL 2:**AAA/WGS 333 (student takes course)Student can’t then take AAA OR WGS as second discipline for course. |

The committee discussed advantages and disadvantages to cross-listing courses. A committee member noted that there were several reasons including marketing to raise awareness of the courses for students, accreditation, and also as a side benefit for fulfilling minors.If we want students to have multiple perspectives than we would want them to take a second courses that is not within either of the cross-listed disciplines. This seems reasonable since we are now only asking students to take two courses in the upper-level component. Courses can still be cross-listed and beneficial for major/minor; students just won’t be able to take another course in either discipline.The Director noted that we still have Themes for another year. We don’t want to change rules Themes now because we want students to get through Theme, so we might want to make the change with Issues if the proposal passes. It was agreed that the rule would change with Issues. If Theme courses come through now with a request for cross-listing we can tell them that it will change when they reapply as an Issues course.Motion to approve that a cross-listed course excludes both disciplines (Model 2) from being taken as a second course to fulfill Issues (pending approval of proposal) requirement; seconded. One abstain. Motion passes.The GPY curricular proposals we be reviewed at the next meeting.The Director will advance warn the Gender Theme about the cross-listing change if the proposal passes. | Motion to approve that a cross-listed course excludes both disciplines (Model 2) from being taken as a second course to fulfill Issues requirement; seconded. One abstain. Motion passes.The GPY curricular proposals will be reviewed at the next meeting.The Director will advance warn the Gender Theme about the cross-listing change if the proposal passes. |
| **Update on Strategic Plan** | *Our strategic plan is due May 1, 2012, so we need to discuss what that will entail and how we should go about completing it.*The Strategic Plan from 2006 is available on the GE website. The strategic plan is what we want our program to do. GE is different because we are a committee and not a unit. No one else as committee does it, just GEC. It really does drive the process of doing GE revision because we said we will periodically look at assessment.Assessment plan links back to strategic plan and we will have to line up with the university’s strategic plan. Julie Guevara will attend a GEC meeting whenever we want her to. The Director originally asked for a delay to completing the plan because of the current proposal.Our current due date is May 1 for our strategic plan for the next 5 years. It should include the goal of the GEC committee and how it furthers GVSU’s mission.For example:* Should do something about Honors?
* What happens when people don’t do assessment? Is there a recertification process?
* Do we want to ever consider moving to a one-course, team-taught, upper-division course?

would add to strategic plan if want that, whether do or not.  The 2006 document was written by an outside consultant after they brainstormed the goals and how we wanted to achieve them. The Director wrote the assessment plan, worked on it with the consultant and then GEC approved the entire plan.The timeline will be to have Julie Guevara attend a GEC meeting in January, work on it in February and March and then write it in April. It will be much easier to modify the original document and not have to create an entirely new document this time.The Director will check with Julie Guevara on availability and the Chair will also touch base with her. A committee member asked if it would be efficient for a small group to work on the plan and bring it back to the committee. It was decided that GEC should have an initial discussion with Julie and then make a decision on how to work on the plan after that. The Director is mindful of how much time is spent by the committee to work on this and she can work on portions with Julie and bring them back to the committee.  | The GE strategic plan will be due on May 1, 2012.The Director will check with Julie Guevara on availability and the Chair will also touch base with her.The timeline will be to haveJulie Guevara attend a GEC meeting in January, work on it in February and March and then write it in April.  |
| **Plans for the Summer “Issues” Workshops** | *Our revision proposal calls for two rounds of summer workshops focusing on faculty development of Issues courses. We need to discuss the details of those workshops and how we plan to recruit faculty to participate in them.*The Chair referenced the last page of our GE proposal that stated GEC will, before the end of Winter 2012 semester, invite units and faculty to propose new or existing courses for inclusion in the Issues component. In preparation, the committee needs to:1. Create an invitation for an Initial call to start working on proposals.
2. GEC and FTLC will need to collaborate on the details of the workshops.

As previously discussed, the Provost will approve $1,000 for faculty that complete an online module, (to make sure they are familiar with process and intent), then attend a 3-hour workshop, meet for an online peer consultation from those familiar with proposal, and submit an online curricular proposal by August 1.Anyone can submit an online proposal before or after August 1, but to get $1,000 have to go through our process.In the month of August there will be a streamlined process with a “super-committee” of members from UCC, CCC, GEC Chair and Director to meet and consider these proposals. The goal will be to have an answer on each of the proposals by the time school starts.The Director added that we are working toward and October 1 deadline for curriculum for units so that it doesn’t take months to get through process.There will be spots for 30 faculty in Summer 2012 with the intention of resulting in 30+ courses. If more than 30 people apply we can discuss the possibility of increasing to 60 spots; it will be partially contingent on FY budgets. It will be to our advantage to have more than 30 participants, so we will review if more apply.A committee member commented on the timeline for approvals and was not comfortable with approvals happening prior to the school year as this would not give departments time to review. The Director agreed that perhaps mid-September would be a better time for the super-committee to meet to review proposals. We want to make sure everything is reviewed by the departments first. The timeline can be adjusted for faculty to submit proposals by August 15 instead of August 1. We still want faculty to have an earlier deadline to submit before they are back for the semester. The next step for GEC is to outline the process for online module. Christine Rener from FTLC envisioned that once approved she can take on the process to start design and instructional system for training. It was suggested to invite Christine to a GEC meeting to talk about what is envisioned for the online modules and training.The first step in the process will be to evaluate proposals received and decide which ones we want to fund. If we get more than 30 we might need to make decisions on the best ones to fund. For example, one faculty member might be teaching three courses in GE. If we get less than 30 proposals we may decide to fund all of them.To reiterate the process for faculty 1. They attend a brief online module (through FTLC)
2. They attend a 3-hour training (created by GEC and FTLC)
3. They complete and online peer consultation session (through FTLC)

Discussion notes from the white board:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Recruitment (RFP)

HowSelection Process  Diversity of Issues # of SectionsWhen  Probably March a-Spring b-Summer | 1. Forms/Criteria

Course Proposal = CAP | 1. Training

Online In person in May Teach skills, content Teach how to fill in our forms. |

Committee members suggested that it would be helpful to have the RFP forms drafted and the departments aware of the process early on so they know what to expect if the proposal passes. Faculty are beginning to talk about courses they would like to propose, but we really need the units to look at what the overall proposals are for the unit. A committee member suggested sending an email to units to let them know UAS is reviewing in January. If the proposal is approved this will be the RFP process and we want you to start thinking about what your unit would like to propose. The Chair suggested contacting the Dean’s and asking them to pass along to unit head’s. The email will not include the RFP, but rather mention that an RFP will be a part of the process. It will be important to include in the correspondence that each unit will have to schedule a meeting in September to review department course proposals.The Chair will draft a letter to send to the Dean’s about the RFP process. The Director will send to the Dean’s by February 1st. The Director will contact Christine in FTLC about coming to the GEC meeting in February.The Director distributed an article from Chronicle of Higher Ed. We will add the article to the GE website. | The suggested timeline for submitting proposals is Aug 15 for faculty; Sept 15 departments to review, the supercommittee will meet in mid-September, followed by an Oct 1 deadline for curriculum.The Chair will draft a letter to send to the Dean’s – it will be important to include that each unit will have to schedule a meeting in September to review department course proposals. The Director will send to the Dean’s by February 1st.The Director will contact Christine in FTLC about coming to the GEC meeting in February. |
| **Adjournment** |  | Meeting adjourned at 4:12 pm |