

Grand Valley State University
General Education Committee Meeting

167 Lake Ontario Hall

Minutes of 11/6/2017

PRESENT: Hsiao-Ping Chen; Dori Danko; Dawn DeVries; Brian Drake; Gabriele Gottlieb, Chair; Kimberly Lohr; Kimberly McKee; Keith Oliver; Linda Pickett; Huihui Qi; 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: Brian Bowdle; Mark Gleason

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Approval of current Agenda	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
Approval of 10/23 and 10/30/2017 Minutes	No discussion on 10/30 minutes. Postpone minutes from 10/23.	Approved per consensus
Assessment – Discussion of Data for Workshops	<p>The assessment conference will be Friday, January 5, 2018. The speaker from the fall conference will be the speaker for this assessment conference. We will not be doing our mini assessment workshops. FTLC would like to have exemplar educators in different assessment areas (GE is one) to participate in a panel discussion. If members know of any good CARs they read let the Director know so she can contact them. We will have to get through all the assessment workshops by the end of Winter. Due to this, we will add one more workshop this semester. Kim McKee volunteered to host US Diversity on November 29 from 12:30-2 p.m. in Kirkhof 2270.</p> <p>The Methods and Instructions report was modified slightly to be past tense. Member mentioned that we use scores vs. ratings. We will make sure we use ratings throughout. Member stated that we have too many spaces between periods in some spots as well as different dashes. Those issues will be fixed before the report is finalized. Member questioned why we have a target for seniors in Foundations courses. He believes that it would not be representative of the traditional students, since most students will take Foundations as a freshman or sophomore. Member stated that since students only have one shot at the Foundations categories, they all should have the same expectations. Member stated that seniors should do better in a Foundations course because more life and college experience helps them acquire more knowledge. Member thinks it is out of reach to</p>	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p>say we will get 90% of seniors to proficient. Member suggested having another chart that shows all students together for proficiency instead of breaking it down by class standing.</p> <p>Members had the following choices for reporting data for content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Just seniors B. All students C. Sum of freshman and sophomores D. All students broken down by class standing <p>Members agreed they would like to see the graphs for content outcomes to show all students clumped together instead of breaking down by class standing. The target will be 70% of students at the proficient or higher level and the threshold will be 90% of students at progressing or higher. We will remove the class level for content.</p> <p>The assessment workshop enrollment is still low. We are going to send out an email to all faculty once the reports are up on the website to remind them to enroll. We will record the data presentation portion of the workshop to put on our website. We will also document the Q&A for faculty to read if they are interested.</p>	
<p>Curriculum items for consideration --Revised Proposal for EGR 406 (Log# 9968) --New Course – CJ/DS 335 (Log# 9589) Issues- Globalization</p>	<p>EGR 406 Members were happy with the changes that were made based upon the amendment request.</p> <p>CJ/DS 335 Member was surprised by the rationale for Junior standing pre-req. They cannot expect a student to have had any CJ or DS courses. Small group discussion was the only project listed for collaboration. Member stated that it is unclear how they are teaching the skills. Member feels the project listed under integration should also be under collaboration. Member is curious as to how they will assess the presentations. Member stated that the weeks assigned to each topic exceed the weeks in the semester.</p> <p>Amendment – Remove prerequisite rationale. Add more to the collaboration project than just small group discussion – could have the groups construct discussion. Be more explicit for how the skills will be taught. The semester this course will be offered needs to be consistent on the forms. Methods of evaluation needs to say group project. Need to know more about the group project.</p>	<p>B. Drake moved to approve the course. K. McKee 2nd. Motion carries 13-0.</p> <p>P. Thorpe moved to ask for amendment as discussed. L. Pickett 2nd. Motion carries 13-0.</p> <p>Amendment to be returned to committee.</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Chair's Report	None.	
Director's Report	<p>Director presented the outline from FTLC for the assessment conference and the GE breakout sessions. The exemplar panels will address three questions. Member suggested Geology as a department that has had good CARs in the past. PHI 101 this semester was also good. Peter Riemersma stated he would participate on the panel.</p> <p>An existing course wants to cross-list with IDS 380 and have IDS 380 offered as issues. We cannot do that. The original course will need to change to an Issues course.</p>	
Adjournment		3:33pm