

Grand Valley State University
General Education Committee Meeting

167 Lake Ontario Hall

Minutes of 12/4/2017

PRESENT: Brian Bowdle; Hsiao-Ping Chen; Dori Danko; Brian Drake; Mark Gleason; Gabriele Gottlieb, Chair; Kimberly Lohr; Kimberly McKee; Linda Pickett; Peter Riemersma; Lindy Scripps-Hoekstra; Patrick Thorpe; David Vessey

ALSO PRESENT: C. "Griff" Griffin, Director, General Education; Jennifer Cathey, General Education Office Coordinator

NOT PRESENT: Dawn DeVries; Keith Oliver; Huihui Qi

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Approval of current Agenda	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
Approval of 11/13/2017 Minutes	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
Mid-Year Report	Member suggested we include more detail in the mid-year report about adding an interdisciplinary category since we spent so much time discussing it. Another member suggested we keep it simple and if anyone wants more detail we can provide it.	K. McKee moved to approve the edits to the mid-year report. L. Scripps-Hoekstra 2 nd . Motion carries 10-0.
Review of Content SLO for Historical Perspectives	Faculty members who attended the GE Assessment workshop for Historical Perspectives stated that the second content SLO was too similar to an SLO associated with U.S. Diversity courses. Additionally, it isn't self-evident that it was related to Historical Perspectives. Member asked what the intent of SLO #2 was. Member said that it was put there to teach students how historical events help students learn about others. Member asked if we remove #2, will #1 and #3 be differentiated enough.	P. Thorpe moved to delete the 2 nd SLO and leave everything else the same. P. Riemersma 2 nd . GE Director will contact Unit Heads for their approval before submitting it to UCC. Motion carries 10-0.

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<p>Assessment (removing labels from ratings and changing definitions)</p>	<p>Faculty members who attended the assessment workshops came up with different rating definitions for the content rubric. 4=Exceeds level 3 3=Demonstrates a basic understanding of the SLO by a non-major 2=Progressing toward a basic understanding of the SLO by a non-major 1=Lacks basic understanding of the SLO.</p> <p>Member thinks that using the number without the label forces faculty to read the definition instead of just assuming they know what proficient, progressing, etc. are. Member suggested using, “1=does not possess a basic understanding of the content SLOs.” Member thinks that is still confusing for faculty. Member chose to change 1 to “1=Possesses a very limited understanding of the content SLO.” Members also revised level 4=Demonstrates an advanced understanding of the SLO. Member discussed how to make each rating definition clear and different from one another. After much discussion about the definitions member decided on the following:</p> <p>A student – regardless of major – demonstrates: 4=an advanced understanding 3=a basic understanding 2=substantial progress toward a basic understanding 1=a very limited understanding 0=Demonstrates no understanding</p>	<p>P. Thorpe moved to approve the changes for the Content rubric effective in January 2018 as discussed. D. Vessey 2nd. Motion carries 12-0.</p>
<p>Critical Thinking Rubric</p>	<p>The Reasoning and Evaluate portions of the Critical Thinking rubric confused two faculty members who are assessing this semester. Members do not think we should change it as it is a process of thinking, you must reason through and then evaluate the idea. Member thinks we need to change “idea” in Evaluate to “conclusion”. Member thinks if faculty are confused then changes are needed. Member stated that thinking critically does not mean you are going to solve problems with it. You can, but you do not have to. Director stated that we could add creative thinking back into GE and then hard-wire it into Foundation-Arts, similar to hardwiring Writing and Information Literacy into the Foundation-Writing. If we did that, would we want to change rows 3-4 on the Critical Thinking rubric? Members decided to table this issue until the Winter semester.</p>	<p>Tabled until Winter semester.</p>
<p>Curriculum items for consideration -SW 322 (revised Log #9796)</p>	<p>SW 322 The changes made were not adequate. They need to delete everything in the GE form and just put “See Log #8232 (the previously approved log#).</p>	<p>P. Thorpe moved to ask for amendment as discussed. B. Drake 2nd. Motion carries 11-0.</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<p>-HST 371 (Log #9940)</p>	<p>HST 371 The course is an Issues course that is being cross-listed with WGS. Member said that the type of work they will be doing will be great for collaboration. Member was concerned by the proposer's response to objective 1 under integration. GE expects that the students are taught how to share their experiences, but not actually be forced to share them. In the SoR, the collaboration project needs to be required. Member asked if WGS 371 will be changing its name, as it does not match HST 371. It was History of American Masculinities in Fall 2016. Both HST 371 and WGS 371 have title changes each semester based on what is being taught. The courses need to match each semester. Peer and self-evaluation needs to be listed as an method of evaluation under collaboration. Member asked how students learn the skills that they apply to the collaborative project.</p> <p>Amendments – Peer and self-evaluation needs to be listed under collaboration. Require the collaboration project in the SoR. Explain how students learn the skills they apply to the collaborative project. Explain what is needed for objective 1 under integration and have them rewrite.</p>	<p>Amendment to be returned to Chair.</p> <p>P. Thorpe moved to ask for the amendment as discussed. L. Pickett 2nd. Motion carries 11-0.</p> <p>Amendment to be returned to chair.</p>
<p>Chair's Report</p>	<p>We will be removing MGT 340 from GE. They do not want to remove the prerequisite they placed on the course. Email your finished CAR reply letters to Chair.</p>	
<p>Director's Report</p>	<p>GV Assess – ECS charged us with putting our information into GV Assess. GE does not fit nicely into the GV Assess, which makes the task more difficult. We will put our information in and upload our reports from 2013-2016 assessment. We need to say what we are going to do if we do not meet the targets we set. We have learned a lot from our assessment and we have and continue to change our assessment process. Additionally, we are sharing the results with stakeholders. Director will generate some language that we will use for reporting the results and closing the loop. The committee can review it in Winter term.</p> <p>We need all members to help with the remaining GE workshops for the Winter semester. We only need to have 1 GEC member present at each one.</p> <p>How do we distribute the information to students? Are they even interested? We need to get Student Senate involved.</p>	
<p>Adjournment</p>		<p>4:13pm</p>