Grand Valley State University

*NOTES: General Education Committee*

Minutes of 11/18/2013

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

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

**NOT PRESENT:** Karen Burritt, Maria Cimitile, Brian Kipp, David Vessey

**ON SABBATICAL**: Kirk Anderson

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Member |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval of Today’s Agenda** |  | Approved per consensus |
| **Approval of Minutes from 11-11-2013** |  | Approved per consensus |
| **Curriculum items for consideration** | **AAA 340 (Issues course—not “fast track”), LOG#8225**  Possibly needing amendment in collaboration. How are students going to learn to do collaboration better? 4th item has a description that can apply generically to the whole thing. We would typically ask for an amendment here and clarify that the teacher would start the learning. Ask for more detail.  This course is not a new course, just a change. It was already in General Education and he’s trying to put it under the identity issues. He writes the only change would be a required group assignment to satisfy the collaboration. It’s unusual that Themes courses need only that change, but it looks correct in this case.  Comment on CCC: evaluation might be changed to be more descriptive. I thought they were referring to the assessment section. They meant the methods of evaluation.  One of our issues is that none of these seem to assess collaboration. We could have an issue with that. Are we looking for more under the methods of evaluation? We don’t want people to think they don’t have to do a group project.  To me it is meeting our needs, not CCCs needs. CCC brings up specificity. To me it seems like we shouldn’t care, they’re being clear about the general education assessing goals.  Concerned about them relying too much on the assessment of collaboration? Yes, the project result itself doesn’t evaluate collaboration skills, just the results of using them.  Problem solving, number 2, it says teacher will help students analyze. It doesn’t seem like they explain that very well. The task asks students to identify and it doesn’t really explain how it will teach them to analyze. Analyze theories and apply theories to deal with the problems. What are you actually going to do, how are you going to help them? How is this going to help identify multiple approaches to solving the problem?  Seems there are possibilities in other assignments to assess collaboration, blog, etc. A really vigorous discussion or class participation is a good way to assess collaboration. Collaboration objective 2 most certainly is not a measure. What are the mechanics you are going to use? It could be binary, you did it or you didn’t. A rubric was attached as a supporting document.  Comments on integration? Member looks at #2 and wonders if that gets interdisciplinary enough. 2a seems quite disciplinary.  So do we send it back or explain that we can end up finding the information somewhere else? Can we refer them back to their current syllabus for the language to use? Ask them to bring it over from their syllabi. We would like the form to mention all of that so we don’t have to read between the lines. We think we have what we want but they need to solidify the language. It seems like it isn’t for just us but for future readers and teachers too, so it needs to be pretty obvious for future readers.  We will send back for amendment. | **LOG#8225**  G. Greer moved to approve.  P. Sicilian second  13 agree |
| **Review of revised internal GEC policy on eliminating courses that do not assess** | We need these procedures to communicate with people outside the committee but also for future members of the committee.  #3, before they do the report, they need to report their scores to us. I’m envisioning that’s just part of the CAR. Simplify #3 so it is more like #1 or #2? Could #3 be that department must submit and a complete CAR? We don’t want to give them an option to opt out. Delete “Unless other arrangements are made with the GEC.” Drafter is trying to say that they could make arrangements, but doesn’t want to give them an option to make arrangements. You could make it (a) so if #3 applies to them then they wouldn’t need to read the other part. Add “The GEC will set deadlines for entering assessment data and completing the CARs”  The assessment is done online and then they meet with their colleagues to do the CAR.  You need a new CAP whenever you feel like you need a new one or when you get an inadequate assessment. We are word-smithing, so is it a change or a new CAP. There will never be a brand new CAP unless they change goals. What if there is a new course? So if it is a brand new course, it will go through the online system. Our office goes through and back-fills. They will not produce a new CAP.  #3: Member likes the emphasis on the department to submit.  2 c ii: Does it make more sense to say “must submit a revised CAP”?  2 c iii: Do you need the revised CAP at that point? The distinction we’re looking at is that we have accepted revisions. Now we’re saying we don’t want to accept them. Get rid of the 1st three words, “To be accepted”. Second to last line, “GEC may extend the deadline.” It doesn’t say “we will extend”. Drafter wants that? Yes.  #3 we’re going to get caught. If they don’t do it in the fall, they can still do it in the winter before we say they don’t have any more warnings. Is that extension done by the office or the committee? The GE director. If you want to make those things a GEC decision, Director can present problems to the committee each semester to decide.  So if professors don’t collect this term, and Director goes to him the next term and says they need to collect data again, we’re wondering how many strikes a person gets before something happens. You’re not going to kick them out the first time. If the students enroll in the course then the university it not going to take that away. But how many shots does the professor get at not responding? How much time is their between shots? You’ll do it by the next time the course is taught. So if it’s taught in the fall, you need to do it by the winter. 2 shots and you’re out so1 warning.  Director won’t make the call on whether or not the CAR meets the minimums, GEC will. I will just do the part of following up on who did and did not do things.  2a: extending deadline will go to GE director.  2b: specifying the time the department needs to make the request. It needs to be before the GE director says “you’re in trouble”. By the end of the semester. Do we even need b? You still want the language there, especially in the future when they need a revision. Remove 2b.  2c: covers the language when someone doesn’t have a CAP.  3 and 2 could be swapped. In the current program they’re doing the CAR first as the CAP already exists.  Are you saying a department can’t revise their CAP before their assessment? They can change it whenever they want but we don’t know what would make them change it. They’re making a procedure, they’re going to implement a plan, they’re going to collect the data, and in some circumstances you ARE going to revise the plan. You’re not going to force them to revise unless there is a lousy CAP. We said we might throw people out for lousy CAPS; but we can tell them it is lousy and go on and do the CAR. We’ll keep telling you the CAP are lousy even if you do the CAR. What we need from them is the CAR since that makes the assessment data.  Do you have anything in their about the committee responding to their CAR. You could put in that they’re going to review CARs, or not. It is in here. It doesn’t really tell them they’ll get a response but that’s fine.  If I did the CAP for the course and I’m gone, and a new person is in, shouldn’t the new person read the CAR and work on the problems? I would bring the new person in to look at the CAP.  So our basic intent of this policy is to remove from the program a course that does not complete a CAR one term after it is due. Ultimately, it’s about paying attention and being productive.  This can’t wait until next semester to look over again. We can finish it over email. |  |
| **Considering the role of the GEC and others in teaching how to teach and assess GEC Goals** | We’ve been talking about the idea that one of the places we can feel contrite about is that we haven’t done enough to teach people how to teach and assess these goals. We were approved by the university and the university needs to make sure it works. We could help and push this harder.  Isn’t that what the FTLC is for? Yes. We could go to the department that is more involved in the different goals. Like COM might have resources for oral communication that they think are better than what we have pulled together. We could go to different people. We can work with FTLC to help facilitate the workshops. You’re talking about us being in better contact with FTLC and we offer names of people who might be really good in doing those workshops. If we were going to do that, Chair would want to make assignments and asking people about their interests in that area.  Begin this process not by troubleshooting but by looking at what is being done well. Next term we will have more time to dedicate for this. We’ll help make it easier for FTLC.  People seem to be having the most trouble with the collaboration section. The other one is ethical reasoning and how to assess it. FTLC might help faculty to make goals that are easier to assess.  Making sure the resources are also available online due to time constraints. We would need to discuss with people who are not happy about the online resources.  Member would worry about too much closeness between the committee and the workshop so it doesn’t look like it’s the committee’s way of doing things. Possibly having 5 different people to present instead of just one. We could never do “Here are the GEC workshops on the goals.” We don’t want “teach to the test” mentality. |  |
| **Chair’s Report** | No meeting next week (11/25). Honors courses will be discussed at the next meeting (12/2). |  |
| **Director’s Report** |  |  |
| **Adjournment** |  | 4:27 pm |