Grand Valley State University

*General Education Committee*

Minutes of 08.27.12

**PRESENT:** Kirk Anderson, Peter Anderson, Karen Burritt, Susan Carson, Alisha Davis, Emily Frigo, Roger Gilles (chair), Gary Greer, Brian Kipp, Jagadeesh Nandigam, Keith Rhodes, Paul Sicilian

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

**ABSENT:** Gabriele Gottlieb, Student Senate representative (TBA), CCPS representative (TBA)

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Action / Decisions |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval of** April 16th **Minutes** |  | Approved as submitted. |
| **Approval of Agenda** |  | Approved. |
| **New General Education Program** | **Review of the “new” General Education program**The focus for the next several years will be implementing the new GE program. This year’s focus will be on soliciting new CAPs from all Foundations and Cultures courses and approving the first batch of Issues courses. The chair reviewed the details of the new program and asked for questions or clarifications.**Discussion regarding new program**:* A committee member asked if a goal is to have students choose from prefixes outside their major. The answer is yes, Issues courses should be open to all majors.
* A committee member asked if goals like collaboration and problem solving will be defined and assessed differently at different levels. The answer is that faculty will use the same assessment rubric for each goal, regardless of the level of the course. (see below)
* A committee member asked about the rubrics. Are they proficiency-based or competency-based? Per the director, the university is moving towards proficiency-based assessment. Students completing a program should demonstrate XX level of proficiency.
* The chair referenced the draft rubric from library and asked if they were focusing on student proficiency – through the lens of “general education” as a whole as opposed to a specific course. Saved bulk of this discussion for later in the agenda.

**Preparing for the Fall 2012 Review of Initial Proposals:*** Proposals for 54 courses from faculty will be submitted with expectations of feedback by the committee.
* Issues course development should be ongoing collaboration, not just a one-time “event”.
* The chair asked for input on the ANT 345 course proposal, just as an example. A committee member felt that the course was being “sold” to those reviewing. This is likely due to the detail we’ve requested in the form itself. The chair commented that the collaboration piece was done well—specifically, the surveying the students’ “assets” at the beginning of the course and using that information to form groups.
* The director explained that, starting next week, the specific “Issue” will be listed at the top of each GE course form, and that will make our reading a bit easier.
* The proposals are due Saturday, September 1. They need to be approved by unit heads by Monday, September 10. The GEC will review the proposals September 10, September 17, and September 24. UCC and the appropriate college curriculum committees will review the proposals simultaneously to expedite the process.
* There will be about 54 proposals to review, 18 per week. The chair proposed dividing the proposals and having them reviewed by sub-committees, or review groups. The chair asked about the best way for the group to review the proposals.
* A committee member suggested that proposals not in proper, easy-to-read formats should be “kicked-back” to the submitting party for amendments for resubmission.
* It was agreed to discuss the proposals in review groups via e-mail—and then meet briefly at the start of each GEC meeting to prepare for the general discussion.
* The director asked if it was acceptable to review courses that are submitted by one’s own department. The consensus was to avoid that for the review groups. It is, of course, unavoidable for full committee discussions.
* The chair asked for feedback on the LIB 322 proposal, also just as an example. A committee member felt that it was more repetitive than the other proposal, but clearly written.
* General conversation: confusion about the term “wicked.” Consensus that major terms should not require searching for definition. We need guidance from the proposers.
* Conversation regarding the level of detail we need about a proposed method of assessment, for example. The director said if there is a rubric and they have a way to assess each goal – she’s satisfied. A solid plan and a way to implement the objectives = success.
* The review groups (subcommittees) should make notes of what they want to pass on.
 | Small groups will not be assigned proposals submitted by their own department. |
| **Foundations and Cultures Revisions** | **Foundations and Cultures Revisions**General discussion:* The director discussed the “absolute scale” as opposed to the “relative scale.” Students will be trained to be at XX level by the time they graduate from GVSU. They all should be performing at a competitive level. There needs be to an acceptable level of performance.
* The chair stated his one misgiving about an absolute scale: faculty may see these rubrics as even more “external” to their courses than ever. Our “relative” scales could be used for grading purposes, etc., as well.
* A committee member indicated that faculty could use the absolute scales as the basis for more detailed “relative” scales to be used in their individual courses.
* The chair proposed a simple scale of 1 – 4 for now. “Benchmark” should be the starting point, equivalent to what we might expect from an entering freshman.
* It was agreed that positive statements of proficiency would be needed for all levels on the scale.
* The chair requested volunteers to draft rubrics for four of the nine skills goals. Emily will continue to draft the information literacy rubric. Kirk agreed to draft quantitative literacy. Peter agreed to draft collaboration. Keith agreed to draft written communication. The chair asked for the drafts prior to the September 17 meeting.
 | Emily will continue to draft the information literacy rubric. Kirk agreed to draft quantitative literacy. Peter agreed to draft collaboration. Keith agreed to draft written communication. The chair asked for the drafts prior to the September 17 meeting. |
| **Director’s Report** | None given |  |
| **Adjournment** |  | Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm |

The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, September 10, 2012.