Grand Valley State University

*General Education Committee*

Minutes of 4-2-12

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

**ALSO PRESENT:** C. “Griff” Griffin, Krista McFarland

**ABSENT:** Deb Bambini, Penney Nichols-Whitehead, JJ Manser, David Vessey

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Agenda Items | Discussion | Action / Decisions |
| **Approval of**  **Mar 19 Minutes** |  | Approved as submitted. |
| **Agenda** |  | Approved. |
| **Preparing for the Summer “Issues” Workshops** | *We have received the names of over 30 faculty prepared to develop courses this spring/summer. We will look over the proposals, review our funding, develop criteria for selecting faculty and courses, and begin the process of deciding which faculty and courses to fund.*  A spreadsheet containing all courses and faculty that have requested to participate in the summer Issues process was distributed for review.  GEC has been approved to fund additional faculty (over the original 30), but will not be able to cover everyone that has applied for participation.  **The committee agreed on the following criteria and order for selecting participants and courses:**  #1 Include as many units as possible  #2 Limit number of faculty per unit (could ask them to decide on top 3 or whatever)   * Scale to current offerings? And other factors such as underrepresentation (prof schools, sciences)? We should create a list of number of sections currently offered/# proposed   #3 Balance the categories  #4 Balance new/existing courses (generally within units )  #5 Faculty rank (prefer TT)  **Additional committee discussion regarding participant selection:**   * Faculty and units can submit as many courses as they want, but for the summer work GEC will only fund one person with one course. It is reasonable to say that if a unit has submitted multiple courses with one faculty name that we consider that one proposal for funding. * There is not necessarily preference given to a unit because they have submitted a large number of courses. * There is not enough information to pick one course over another based on title. * The committee discussed adjunct, visiting and affiliate faculty. The faculty handbook was reviewed and there is no policy regarding faculty rank and submit curricular proposals. Anyone can submit. The GEC could, however, cite faculty rank as a reason to fund some faculty over others because we want funded faculty to be around as leaders and trainers of others. * A committee member added that tenure track faculty can claim this as service as part of their work. This could be an additional burden to some affiliate faculty as they would not get compensated. A committee member added that they would get the $1,000 compensation for the summer. * There is difficulty for some units (LAS, for example) that utilize adjuncts or faculty from other departments. They eventually hire to teach those courses, but may not have someone when a course is submitted. AHS is another example because their Visiting faculty is who is available during the summer. Visitors have a three year contract. Unit heads have signed off on the submissions. * We have to be careful not to penalize units based on assumptions, as we have limited amount of information about the courses. We need to remain as objective as possible. * Should courses that have been a part of GE for a long time be given preference? The director responded that there are certain units and courses that have played a prominent role in specific Themes, but when the courses are released they may or may not be as prominent. It is hard to use the past information to compare. * Keep in mind that this is the first round of the first year. * To some extent we need to give consideration to Science and Professional schools; we may want to favor those that are typically underrepresented. * The Director will look at the numbers for sections in the Fall and the number of courses they are proposing. * Reminder that some faculty may not be able to or want to go through the summer workshops, so the current proposals are not an indicator of what unit’s will eventually offer.   The Chair suggested that a good outcome from today’s meeting may be to be able to go back to departments and say here are the number of spots you have and let them decide on the preference of which faculty/courses to send.  A committee member asked what will be done with exemplar courses and will they be featured on the website. The Chair responded that we haven’t decided on this yet.  We will keep the process as objective as possible. Right now we have 23 units responding. From there we can limit the number of faculty for remaining spots and balance the Issues categories. A list can be compiled to continue the discussion for next week’s meeting. We will fund as many as possible. We will also have April 9th and 16th to make final decisions on participants. | The GEC received approval to fund more than 30 participants.  The committee agreed on the criteria to use for selecting participants for the summer workshops (see full list).  A list will be compiled to continue the discussion for participant selection at next week’s meeting. |
| **Preparing for the 2012-13 CAP revisions for Foundation/Culture Courses** | *Volunteers have agreed to draft descriptions and objectives for written communication, oral communication, critical and creative thinking, information literacy, ethical reasoning, and quantitative literacy. Last week we finalized the ethical reasoning description. This week we’ll discuss critical and creative thinking, information literacy, and whatever other drafts are available.*  **Critical and creative thinking**  The committee reviewed changes made last week. There was committee consensus to approve the document as distributed.  **Information Literacy**  Hard copies of the long and short versions were distributed for review.  The core competencies went down to four (from 6 on website).The long version is a draft and the Library would welcome any feedback on it. GEC is interested in the short version for approving for the GE skill.  **The following changes were made:**   * Bullet #4 changed to: Communicate results ethically and appropriately. * “People who are generally educated...” was changed to “People with a general education work with many forms of information: text, data, images, and multimedia. Becoming information literate….” * A new tag line was added to the beginning “Information Literacy is the process of locating, evaluating, and using multiple forms of information.” * Changed “learned” to “acquired”. “Students who have acquired information literacy will be able to:” (followed by 4 bullets for objectives)   “People who are generally educated…” will be changed on ALL goals to “People with a general education…”  There was consensus from the committee to approve the changes to information literacy.  The committee should review all of the skills goals together to make sure there is consistency.  **Quantitative Literacy**  The goal review was moved to the meeting agenda.  **Oral Communication**  A committee member is working on the oral communication goal and has a question for the committee as he is developing the language. Some faculty consider oral communication competency when responding to questions in class, but others are when a presentation in class. There needs to be a distinction on whether it is formal or informal for this GE process and definition.  A committee member thought that it should be a formal presentation and not just class participation as that is difficult to set criteria for. If someone responds more in class it doesn’t make them more competent in oral communication. Informal can still be included in their grad. There is flexibility in what is required for class time for formalized presentations, but GE is saying that in order to assess for the GE program we are expect formal presentations. This is a change to what has been allowed in some past assessments. The Director added that courses will still have an option to choose that goal, or not.  There was committee consensus that the requirement for the oral communication goal is for a formal presentation. | The revised critical and creative thinking goal was approved.  Changes were made and approved for the information literacy goal (see minutes).  “People who are generally educated…” will be changed on ALL goals to “People with a general education…”  The committee will review all goals for language consistency.  Review of the quantitative literacy goal was moved to the next meeting agenda.  There was committee consensus that the requirement for the oral communication goal is a  formal presentation. |
| **Adjournment** | Motion to adjourn; seconded. | Meeting adjourned at  4:20pm |