

Grand Valley State University
General Education Committee Meeting
 303C DeVos Center
 Minutes of 4/13/2015

PRESENT: Kirk Anderson, Chair; Emily Frigo; Gabriele Gottlieb; Melba Hoffer; Jose Lara; Paola Leon; Josita Maouene; Paul Sicilian; Patrick Thorpe; David Vessey;
ALSO PRESENT: C. "Griff" Griffin, Director, General Education; Jennifer Cathey, General Education Office Coordinator
NOT PRESENT: Cheryl Kautz; Sarah King; Brian Kipp; Haiying Kong; Linda Pickett; Martina Reinhold; Susan Strouse; Lawrence Williams

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Approval of current Agenda	No concerns.	Approved per consensus
Approval of 4/6/2015 Minutes	No concerns.	Approved per consensus
Election of GEC chair for 2015-2016	K. Anderson offered to stay in the position for another year. He was uncontested.	K. Anderson was elected unanimously via applause☺
Curriculum items for consideration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised BIO 109 CAP 	The authors added additional information to make it more thorough. The chair pointed out that Biology faculty volunteered to submit an improved CAP to us; there was to requirement or request to do so. Considering that, should we be very critical? One member stated that we look at revised CAPs as if it were a curriculum proposal; in other words, hold it to the same high standard. Director stated that when skills goals were added to the CAPs the committee didn't look at the thoroughness as much as they should have, but there were too many to go through. Member stated that they seemed to have fixed the holes from their original CAP so we should thank them and accept it. There is always the assessment (CAR) to use where we can scrutinize the course more intensely. Member stated that the role of the student is not evident in the CAP. It mostly talks about the instructor perspectives. The only time a new CAP is required is if new goals are chosen for a course. A discussion should be had in the fall on whether or not to let courses choose new goals. This CAP is not very strong but it is better from what was originally submitted. Members agreed that we should accept it as is. The CAR for the course this year was pretty good; the scores were high but overall it was done well.	P. Thorpe moved to accept the BIO 109 CAP. M. Hoffer second, motion carries 9-0.

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Revised start-of-semester email attachment	Chair suggested that the first paragraph be taken out. It needs to be revised to show all skills goals with bullets. Integration should have 4 bullets. Change “a person with a general education will”...to “Students will...” All members agreed with the changes.	
W2015 CAR replies	The committee looked at 44 CARs this year. One was rejected to re-do assessment. One we asked for the CAR to be redone and the rest were accepted. Chair is working on the CAR replies as he wants them all to be in a similar format. Chair will post replies on Blackboard and allow committee to view them and ask questions or suggest changes.	Chair will finish and put on Blackboard for committee to view.
Condensing skills rubrics	<p>Director hopes that the committee can improve a few of the rubrics but not necessarily all nine. Chair thinks that this can be on the agenda for fall as to not rush through these important decisions. Member stated he’d like to discuss Quantitative Literacy because it has a lot of content and we don’t want to condense it down too much. Director stated that if the committee changes the objectives in the rubric then we will have to change all places those appear, such as the handbook. The rest of the grid can be changed as it doesn’t show up in nearly as many places. Director stated that we don’t want to change the objectives unless there is a compelling argument to change. It may be better to just change the rest by leaving off distinguished and simplifying the rest of the wording. Member stated that it was hard to pick out what the rubric was about. The goal should be big and bold, centered, and on a line by itself. Member suggested moving the name of the skill directly above the “Development Trajectory...” section. Director stated if the committee wants to change objectives they can do it and it will go live for the following school year that they are changed. Does the committee want to agree to drop the fourth level from the rubric? Can still give 4 scores in the assessment. There needs to be wording in the assessment instructions that states if a student does better than Proficient to assign a 4. Member stated we should wait and revise rubrics all together as there may be other components that the committee decides to change.</p> <p>Committee agreed to not have a Distinguished column on the rubric; instead we will add instructions on how to give a 4 (i.e. one level higher than Proficient). We will continue our work simplifying the rubrics in the fall. We won’t change any objectives unless we have a compelling reason. Revise the criteria under each category to be simplified and easily understood. Need to reassess if we want to give choices on skills goals and allow time to revise CAPs.</p>	No changes will be made to the rubrics yet. Work to simplify and improve the rubrics will restart immediately in the fall.
Chair’s Report	When course proposals go through the curriculum they go from the CCC of that particular college then to GEC. CCC chairs often ask for items under methods of evaluation to be vague, but we don’t want them too vague in some circumstances. For example, to meet the goal of collaboration, a substantial group project is necessary, so this should be clear in the SoR. Often, proposers are told by CCC to make it more flexible, resulting in phrases such as “at the instructor’s discretion, a group project may be assigned.” Need to talk to all CCCs about this issue. At this point in the semester, it	In fall, the GEC chair will send an email message to CCC chairs about this issue.

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p>doesn't make sense to contact CCC chairs, since many might not be in that position next year. In the fall, we will try to get the CCC chairs on board as to not make the proposals too vague.</p>	
Director's Report	<p>IDS 380 needs to be approved by Dean, if approved, it still wouldn't be through the curriculum process before Fall 2015.</p> <p>Member asked a question about Junior standing requirement for Issues courses for Speech Pathology majors where they are required to finish General Education requirement before their Sophomore year. Director stated that course instructor can override that to allow student to take it.</p> <p>If a student changes handbook years they can still have Themes courses taken count. However, they cannot take more Themes courses; they would have to take Issues courses. Also, Foundation courses will count retroactively but not Issues courses.</p>	
Adjournment		4:00pm