Grand Valley State University

General Education Committee Meeting

303C DeVos

Minutes of 2/29/2016

PRESENT: Kirk Anderson, Chair; Emily Frigo; Gabriele Gottlieb; Haiying Kong; Paola Leon; Kimberly McKee; Melba Velez Ortiz; LeShell Palmer; Linda Pickett; Huihui Qi; Eric Ramsson; Paul Sicilian; Susan Strouse; Patrick Thorpe; David Vessey

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

NOT PRESENT: Hsiao-Ping Chen; Jeremy Robinson*; Jeremy Turnbull

*Participating via email despite conflict with meetings

Agenda Items | Discussion | Action Taken
--- | --- | ---
Approval of current Agenda | No discussion. | Approved per consensus
Approval of 2/22/2016 Minutes | No discussion. | Approved per consensus

Curriculum items for consideration


SOC 287

Member wants to see something in the SoR bibliography that addresses religion and race. Since it is a US Diversity course it needs to include something regarding race. Member stated that content goal 2 under US Diversity did address the diversity aspect. Member stated that the methods of evaluation did not match the GE form to the SoR. Member stated that we don’t always require the methods of evaluation to match. Chair stated that we can request explanation on how the GE form matches SoR. Critique, performance, and field observation are missing from the SoR. Member stated if this is not a deal breaker, we should just let it slide as it is not one of the required methods for a GE goal. Member stated that one of the sources on the bibliography is about Muslim Americans in the US so we can forgo asking for more resources listed on the bibliography.

G. Gottlieb moved to approve course.
S. Strouse 2nd.
Motion carries 13-0.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Member stated that they don’t have a group collaboration project in the SoR. Member asked if giving the students discussion prompts has anything to do with Collaboration as stated in the GE form. Member stated that this is probably related to getting the students to collaborate online. Member stated that there is very little on the instructor’s role under Problem Solving and Integration. Members feel that the instructor needs to actively teach Collaboration before just allowing the students to blindly engage in it. Member stated that self-reflection and peer evaluation are missing under collaboration.  
Amendment – Explain if the methods of evaluations in the SoR are individual or group and in the GE form make a more explicit explanation on what the instructor role will be in teaching the three skills goals. Include self/peer evaluation in the collaboration measures. | M. Velez Ortiz moved to ask for amendment. P. Thorpe 2nd. Motion carries 13-0. Amendment to be returned to committee. |
Member stated that the explanation of Integration and Problem Solving are better now. Member stated that it is hard for a history course to address Problem Solving. Chair stated that the goal was left pretty open to include a lot of different courses and is not necessarily asking to solve the problem but could discuss how problems were already solved. | P. Thorpe moved to approve. E. Ramsson 2nd. Motion carries 14-0. |
| Rubric revisions – Integration and Problem Solving | Members looked at the Integration rubric. Group removed communication section as it was not relevant to Integration. Members questioned removing “most freshmen will...” from Baseline of the Integration rubric since this skill won’t be assessed on freshmen. Director stated that we really need to maintain continuity between all rubrics. Changed the Integration definition.  
Members decided to keep the Collaboration definition as is.  
Members looked at the Problem Solving rubric. Made some minor wording changes. Also changed the definition. | Send both rubrics to Writing Center for review. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closing the assessment loop – changes to the CAR</td>
<td>Need one question at the end of the CAR in order to ask assessors how they have changed their course from the previous assessment cycle to make improvements. We need to ask how they used their previous CAR and feedback to make changes to the course whether it was their assessment or not. Explain how the information in the previous CAR – and the GEC’s feedback - help you improve your teaching and/or assessing of the course this time.</td>
<td>P. Thorpe moved to add question as the first question in the CAR. S. Strouse 2nd. Motion carries 14-0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair’s Report</td>
<td>Making good progress on curriculum and rubrics. Next will be CAR reviews.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director’s Report</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjournment</td>
<td></td>
<td>4:23pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>