Grand Valley State University

*NOTES: General Education Committee*

Minutes of 9/16/2013

**PRESENT**: Karen Burritt, Susan Carson, Emily Frigo, Roger Gilles, Melba Hoffer, Brian Kipp, Jagadeesh Nandigam, Alex Nikitin, Keith Rhodes, Chair, Paul Sicilian, David Vessey

**ALSO PRESENT:** Amy Kelly, General Education Office Coordinator

**NOT PRESENT:** C. “Griff” Griffin, Director, General Education, Paola Leon, Jose Lara, Martina Reinhold, Peter Anderson, Gary Greer

**ON SABBATICAL**: Kirk Anderson

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Member |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval of 9/09/2013** |  | Approved per consensus |
| **Approval of Agenda** |  | Approved per consensus |
| **Small Groups** | Meet in small groups to confirm decisions and clarify points. If it’s a 1, don’t worry about it. If it’s a 2, it’s ok for Keith to review without bringing it back to the committee. Give Keith more guidance on what is specifically being asked to change. If it’s a 3, it has to come back to the committee |  |
| **Reapproval of motions omitted from 9/09/2013** | **MUS 301, LOG# 8250**  **SOC 355, LOG# 8224**  We need the proposer to show engagement with the process and the Issues concept. Will be sent back with the comments. | **LOG# 8250**  M. Hoffer moved to send back for Amendments  A. Nikitin second  9 Approved  **LOG# 8224**  D. Vessey  J. Nandigam second  9 Approved |
| **New Issues** | **ANT 311, LOG# 8273**  A member feels there is a disconnect between the SOR and the topic list. Would like more explicit commentary about how the skills will be taught. It should include the Gen Ed Goals and make it clear the Issues project is a collaborative project and state that in the SOR.    **ECO 330, LOG# 8253**  Members want to see where the skills were going to be taught within the SOR. Should they be taught throughout the course or by specific weeks? Would we expect them to put the explanation of assignments under the topics? It’s better to see it in the SOR. We don’t have any models of how this is done. In models, there are specifics on how the skill is taught. Should have more explicit commentary about how the skills will be taught. Keith would like to send it back to the committee. If it comes back corrected, he will approve. | **LOG# 8273**  D. Vessey moved to amend, with amendment sent back to the committee  P. Sicilian second  9 Approved  **LOG# 8253**  S. Carson moved to amend, with amendment sent back to the committee unless Keith sees that all concerns met  D. Vessey second  9 Approved |
|  | **LIB 310, LOG# 8262**  Member thinks this is ready to sign off on. It doesn’t have the stock phrase in the SOR, but the objectives cover all of ours anyway. This course teaches the GE learning objectives that correspond to the name Issue. Their objectives say what they are going to do. Member thought this was very well done and could be a model. One member thought it would be a tough model in another discipline to follow.  **LIB 342, LOG# 8234**  Typo - 322 should be 342 in collaboration section.  Would like it tied more to the Health Issue. This is a potential model to send out once done. | **LOG# 8262**  P. Sicilian moved to approve  D. Vessey second  9 Approved  **LOG# 8234**  A. Nikitin moved to amend, to be approved by Keith without returning to the committee.  M. Hoffer second  9 Approved |
|  | **MLL 300, LOG# 8256**  The SOR is empty for primary sources of information. List examples.  **PA 332, LOG# 8268**  A few hesitations regarding the teaching of how the proposal is done. How are they going to teach the goals? A typo is also listed as 331. PA 300 is listed as a pre-req. Please specify other courses that might serve as substitutes. What are the appropriate pre-reqs? Members don’t think we should have PA 300 as a pre-req. since you have to be a PA Major in order to take the pre-req. Consider what other courses list as a pre-req. or configure the course so it’s available for multiple majors. | J. Nandigam and A. Nikitin moved to Approve  M. Hoffer second  9 Approved  M. Hoffer  moved to send back to the committee  K. Burritt second  9 Approved |
|  | **PSY 367, LOG# 8241**  Member stated this was exemplary and so pleasant to read.  Member stated it doesn’t have the standard language in the SOR. It lacks course description in the SOR. Suggest that folsk generally change the course description so it shows up in the SOR. The pre-req. 101 is in the Foundations and taken by a broad range of students, but would like to ask whether they can add other pre-reqs. to broaden the course - but we do not require any others. We just want to be sure we signal that we want multiple majors to be allowed to take this course. Propose to make this a model after changes are made. | B.Kipp moved to amend, to be approved by Keith without returning to the committee.  A. Nikitin second  9 Approved |
| **Chair’s Report** | The Chair wanted the committee’s sense of the answers to some questions that review has raised.  Do we have to ask the double dip courses to add objectives regarding the issues skills goals, but not necessarily the cultures skills goals? Members think we should standardize the approach, but we haven’t required the extra objectives language before. Stay with what we’ve done.  Teach the skills while teaching content. What are the component parts of each skill? We are giving them a set list of goals, each further defined by objectives. We want them to teach the goal and use objectives as a guide for what the objective is composed of.  It seems like a lot to people, is there something we can potentially do? The conflict could be they think of the courses as major courses. We have reduced the need for double-dipping.  Keith and Griff can go to the departments and reassure them the impressions of the overwhelming demand can be eased and the task managed.  Yes, we are asking for more explicit goals, but we are providing the tools and materials to assist in this. Give the impression this will be difficult at first, and there does need to be support. It doesn’t have to overwhelm the course. A member feels a specific course should focus on preparing students for oral presentations. A member feels some courses may choose to drop out of the GE program. A member thought the skills would be taught through the content, but we don’t have to resort to requiring that a certain chunk of hours would be dedicated to it.  Melba offered to attend the conference. |  |
| **Adjournment** |  | 4:15 p.m. |