

Grand Valley State University  
**General Education Committee Meeting**

303C DeVos  
 Minutes of 1/8/2018

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

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<b>Approval of current Agenda</b>	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
<b>Approval of 12/4/2017 Minutes</b>	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
<b>Assessment – further discussion of labels, wording etc.</b>	<p>Should we change CONTENT outcomes to KNOWLEDGE outcomes to align with AAC&amp;U?</p> <p>In the handbook we say “Graduates will know:” and “Graduates are proficient in:” Should we change this to:</p> <p>Option A:            Graduates will know:            Graduates will be proficient in:</p> <p>Option B:            Graduates know:            Graduates are proficient in:</p>	<p>D. Vessey moved to change content outcomes to knowledge outcomes. P. Thorpe 2<sup>nd</sup>. Motion carries 9-0.</p> <p>P. Thorpe moved to choose option B. D. Vessey 2<sup>nd</sup>. Motion carries 10-0.</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p>Labeling the assessment ratings 1-3. We do not want to continue to call them Levels since most people associate “level” with grades. Jon from UAC worked with the Director and Chair to come up with descriptive labels for assessment ratings 1-3. Member asked why not proficient? This is mostly because the assessment mini-workshops have convinced us that Faculty are interpreting proficient incorrectly. They believe proficient is the level of a student graduating in their major as opposed to the expectations of the GE program. Options for labeling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- Beginning or Baseline</li> <li>2- Emerging or Progressing or Approaching</li> <li>3- Effective or Meets or Satisfies or Skilled or Acquired or Achieved</li> </ul> <p>Members thought content and skills labels should be the same. Member said that content is about the course itself but the skills are throughout their education at GVSU. We should have gradation of terminology that differentiates skills and content. Members like 1-Baseline, 2-Progressing, and 3-Achieved. Member likes Achieved or Satisfies for level 3. Member said that achieved means that there is not a level higher than 3. Director said the heading would say 3-Achieved Objective. Members are worried that the labels may be interpreted for the descriptions in the boxes instead of for the objectives. Add Objectives above “students will:” on all rubrics. Member suggested calling level 3 Target instead of achieved. Member suggested Completed as another option for level 3.</p> <p>Members are going to ask their colleagues what they think about the proposed new labels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1-Baseline</li> <li>2-Progressing</li> <li>3-Satisfies</li> <li>4-Exceeds</li> </ul> <p>The GE Office will provide the changes written out to all committee members so they can discuss with colleagues.</p>	
<b>Review of Collaboration</b>	<p>Member mentioned that the graphs are mis-numbered for the objectives. The GEC office will not report results for any category with less than 10 students. Member asked if we have any information on how faculty assessed the objectives so we know how they determine that their students are proficient in the skill. Director told committee that we do pull all information from the CARs about how faculty taught and assessed the SLOs. Some faculty provide detailed information but many only give a few words to answer. Member said that there are no clear ways to assess</p>	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	collaboration and get quality data. Member stated that if we have some ways faculty are doing it well, we should put it together and share with others who are assessing.	
<b>Curriculum items for consideration --ART 380</b>	Art course being proposed for the Issues-Health category. Member wishes there was more in the description of the course that talks about the topics listed in the bibliography. Director talked to proposer about how they will collaborate in a group over a significant period of time. That issue will have to be worked out before the course is actually proposed as a standing Issues course. This proposal does not mention how the course will teach the skills of the Issues course. Member asked Director to provide the proposer with a reminder about teaching the skills.	P. Thorpe moved to approve. K. McKee 2 <sup>nd</sup> . Motion carries 11-0.
<b>Review of Critical Thinking Rubric</b>	Faculty from Art were concerned about the lack of creative thinking. However, the creative piece is still listed in Critical Thinking. We could implement creative thinking and tie it to Foundations-Art. AAC&U has both Critical Thinking and Creative Thinking as separate skills. Member thinks that having creativity in critical thinking is an issues since it does not flow naturally. Director said that creativity is not part of the critical thinking value rubric from AAC&U. Members discussed the reasoning for having creative thinking in GE for the Foundations-Arts. Chair said that some faculty had trouble distinguishing between the reasoning objective and the evaluate objective. There was never a question about the creativity objective. Chair stated that the last column, EVALUATE should say evaluate the novel approaches or innovative interpretations. Member asked how the Evaluate objective change will affect the knowledge descriptions for that objective. Chair said that the descriptions will also have to change. Change the first column "thoroughly analyze the limitations and implications of novel approaches or creative interpretations." The second column "Account for the limitations and implications of novel approaches or creative interpretations." The third column should be "Not account for the limitations and implications of novel approaches or creative interpretations." GE Office will notify those teaching Critical Thinking this semester about the change.	P. Thorpe moved to accept changes to the Critical Thinking rubric. P. Riemersma 2 <sup>nd</sup> . Motion carries 11-0.
<b>Chair's Report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Honors has proposed to separate from GE and operate as an alternative GE program. According to the Faculty Handbook, Honors is under the purview of UCC. GE will put a hold on any further assessment with Honors pending their proposal. The UAC will be responsible for assessing Honors. The committee supported the idea.</li> <li>• We are going to have a lot of course proposals to review before the Handbook deadline. We also have CARs from Fall that will need to be reviewed.</li> </ul>	
<b>Director's Report</b>	We still need a person to do the Written Communication assessment workshop on January 23 from 2-3.	
<b>Adjournment</b>		4:25pm

