Grand Valley State University

General Education Committee Meeting

167 Lake Ontario Hall Minutes of 11/9/2015

PRESENT: Kirk Anderson, Chair; Hsiao-Ping Chen; Emily Frigo; Paola Leon; Melba Velez Ortiz; LeShell Palmer; Huihui Qi; Eric Ramsson; Jeremy Robinson; Susan Strouse; Patrick Thorpe; Jeremy Turnbull; David Vessey

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

NOT PRESENT: Gabriele Gottlieb; Haiying Kong; Kimberly McKee; Linda Pickett; Paul Sicilian*

*Participating via email despite conflict with meetings

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Approval of	No discussion.	Approved per
current Agenda		consensus
Approval of	No discussion.	Approved per
11/2/2015		consensus
Minutes		
New CAP for WGS	The CAP follows the information literacy core competencies as given on the GVSU Library website,	P. Thorpe moved to
200: new goal is	which is very much in agreement with the Gen Ed rubric for information literacy. We can approve	approve the goal
Information	the CAP with a reminder to use the Gen Ed rubric for assessing.	change. M. Velez
Literacy		Ortiz 2 nd . Motion
		carries 11-0.
Curriculum items	PHI 343	D. Vessey moved to
for consideration	Did not address how he will teach complimentary and competing perspectives (content goal 2), but	approve
-Log 8956: Course	he addressed the rest of the concerns the committee had.	amendment to PHI
Change – PHI 343,		343. E. Frigo 2 nd .
Philosophy of		Motion carries 11-0.
Religion		
-Log 9190: Course	CPH 175	P. Thorpe moved to
Change – CPH	Member asked if the basis of Oral Communication is critiques. Chair stated that there is a formal	approve with
175,	oral presentation mentioned in the proposal. A typo ("photoghraphy") in the course title was	amendment to take

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Understanding	noted. Since the GEC was impressed with the proposal overall, the chair will ask the proposer via	out extra H in
Still Photography	email for permission to use it as a model.	Photography and to
		use as a model. M.
		Velez Ortiz 2 nd .
		Motion carries 12-0.
		Amendment to be
		returned to chair.
Items to be	 Do we continue to assess by course, or do we change to assessing by goal? 	Members all agree
considered before		to continue
next assessment	This could be a problem to consider for large course sizes. Committee started the	assessing by course.
cycle.	assessment process by assessing each Foundation in totality. Chair stated that it may be	
	less bother to ask for the entire assessment at once instead of certain goals every year.	
	Double-dip courses have more content and skills goals to be assessed. Should we come up	
	with an alternate strategy to assessing double-dippers? We want to make sure that a	
	faculty member assesses all goals for the same student. If there are large class sizes and we	
	only need 2 sections we could have four faculty assess so they each have fewer students to	
	assess. None of the large classes double dip. Director stated that we are only getting 1	
	section assessed for about 80% of the Gen Ed courses. We cap the number of students	
	assessed in large class sizes to 142 students. We could use another model if the assessment	
	burden is too high. Director stated we could ask for a minimum of 15 students per section	
	with a max of 50% of the course. Member asked if cutting down the number of students to	
	be assessed per section improves the data quality. If there are 3 sections and we only need	
	1 section the chances are we still may only get one section that can be assessed because it	
	is taught by tenured track faculty and not an adjunct or affiliate. Member suggested having	
	everyone assess 40 students since that is the cap for Issues courses. This way everyone	
	assesses the same number. Director stated that starting in Winter 2016 we will include the	
	graphs for all sections of a course being assessed. Member asked if there is consensus	
	among faculty that they do not want to assess every year. Member stated that she would	
	be open to looking at each goal separately so she can fine-tune each goal separately in	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	order to make her course better. Director stated that since there are 9 skills goals that	
	would take 9 years to go through. Committee could ask for 3 goals at a time but faculty	
	would most likely not enjoy assessing every year. Member suggested that we could cap	
	assessment numbers for courses with Oral and Written Communication goals. Member	
	questioned what the class sizes were for the double dippers. Director will gather the data to	
	provide to the committee. Chair stated that we can address the senate charge about large	
	class sizes by creating a cap for double-dippers and courses assessing OC and WC. Member	
	asked why math and writing courses are small and science classes are so large. He stated	
	that the grades in the courses are reflective of the size. Member stated that BIO has done	
	an experiment with BIO 120 and the class size does not make a difference in students'	
	grades. Christine from FTLC will be presenting information on how to teach goals in large	
	classes. She will have data on large class sizes. Chair would like to suspend the discussion	
	until we have the information from Christine.	
	 Do we ask for a subset of students for large sections? 	
	Director is flexible with data collection. If someone cannot provide all the data we need she	
	will allow them to submit what they can. Chair asked if the committee needs to put clear	
	policies in place or can we still handle this on a case by case basis. Director stated it is fine	
	to handle on a case by case basis for now. We should be getting more data than we have	
	now but we are trying to prevent overworking faculty. Member asked if there is	
	information in writing on these changes. Director stated yes, there is a document that has	
	all of the changes housed in the Gen Ed office.	
	 Wording for guidance to faculty on assigning scores for foundations, cultures and 	
	issues content goals	
	We did agree to keep the 4 as a score option. Member asked if the 4 explanation will be	
	gone. Director stated it will be at the bottom with 0. It will say 4-Above Proficient. Just like	
	0 is Below Baseline.	
	 	l

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	Content goal scores may be higher in Foundations since those goals are what you should	
	master as a Freshman. Member expects most students to master the content goals of a	
	Foundations course. Director stated that the goals are very broad and they may not meet	
	every area of the content goal. If we don't get them to level 3 proficiency then there may	
	be no other shot to do that as it may be their only course in that particular foundation area.	
	Members agreed that the wording for all Skills and Content goals should be similar.	
	Skills Goals:	
	4	
	3 – Level of Graduating Students	
	2	
	1 – Level of Entering Freshman	
	Content Issues:	
	4	
	3 - Level of Non-Major Graduating Students	
	2	
	1 – Level of non-majors	
	Content Cultures:	
	4	
	3 - Level of Non-Major Graduating Students	
	2	
	1 – Level of non-majors	
	Content Foundations:	
	4	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	3 – Level of non-major graduating students	
	2	
	1 – Level of entering Freshmen	
	Director encourages committee to come up with 1 generic content rubric that contains this information. Member suggested calling this an interpretation of numbers instead of a rubric.	
Chair's Report	None.	
Director's Report	None.	
Adjournment		4:30pm