

Grand Valley State University
General Education Committee Meeting

303C DeVos
 Minutes of 1/29/2018

PRESENT: Hsiao-Ping Chen; Dori Danko; Brian Drake; Mark Gleason; Gabriele Gottlieb, Chair; Kimberly Lohr; Dennis Malaret; Linda Pickett; Peter Riemersma; Lindy Scripps-Hoekstra; David Vessey

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

NOT PRESENT: Brian Bowdle; Dawn DeVries; Kimberly McKee; Keith Oliver; Huihui Qi; Patrick Thorpe

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Approval of current Agenda	None.	Approved per consensus
Approval of 1/22/2018 Minutes	None.	Approved per consensus
Finalizing Handbook Changes	Members looked at the proposed Faculty Handbook changes about the GEC charge and discussed each of them. Member asked about the assessment reporting piece and how often it has to be done. Director said annually and every three years. Director said that we have to mention both knowledge and skills so it is clear that we are reporting on both. Member asked if we can make changes about the assessment process as well as the GE Program without having language in the handbook. Director said yes. Members changed the wording to make sure that we can propose changes to the GE Program but make changes on our own to the assessment process. Chair will ask UCC and UAC for a letter of support of our changes. Member asked if we should mention that we maintain the recertification policy on our website. Director we have internal procedures that are publicly accessible - like UAC and UCC – on our website, which should be sufficient.	M. Gleason moved to approve the changes to the faculty handbook as discussed. L. Pickett 2 nd . Motion carries 9-0.

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<p>Curriculum items for consideration: --New Course: CTH 325 (Log# 9785) I-IIT</p> <p>--New Course: CMB 155 (Log# 9945) F-LS w/outcomes Q and P</p> <p>--Change Course: WGS 450 (Log# 10091) Double-Dip I-HR and C-WP w/outcomes IL, C, IN, P</p>	<p>CTH 325 Member does not understand why this is in the Information, Innovation, and Technology category. It seems to be a better fit for Identity or Human Rights. Director said it does not have to cover every topic in the category but rather one of the three topics in Information, Innovation, and Technology. Member said the proposal talks a lot about Identity and that seems like a more natural fit. There is not enough information on Collaboration as most of the assessments are individual but the content is being assessed on a group level. Neither of the group projects mentioned are being used to assess collaboration. Member said that the assessment measures need to show up in the SOR. The proposal mentions working in groups of 2 or more and that concerns members. It should be more than 2 people. Member does not feel that there is enough integration of different areas of study. Member said they should specify certain areas of study that will be integrated. Member is surprised that the description of the class does not mention any performances but the class is all about performing.</p> <p>Amendments – Add assessments to the SoR. State groups are more than 2 people. Be more explicit of what fields of study will be integrated. Content skills should be assessed individually and not in groups.</p> <p>CMB 155 Member is concerned that this is required for majors and it will take all the seats away from non-major students who want to take it. Director stated that there could be Foundation courses that are required for the major. We do not know if they can staff it but that is the department’s concern. They cannot restrict the course to only their majors or it cannot be in GE.</p> <p>Amendments – Concerned that this is required in the major and it cannot be restricted to majors.</p> <p>WGS 450 Member said they need to get rid of the WGS 200 prerequisite in the description. They also need to delete, “offered Fall only” as they mention it will be offered every semester. They need to make self and peer evaluations required in the methods of evaluation. They need to make it specific that the project for World Perspectives will a country other than the US. Member would like to see examples of the countries they will discuss. Member is concerned that all four skills outcomes are being assessed by group projects, rather than individual student effort. Committee would like to have</p>	<p>D. Vessey moved to ask for amendments as discussed. B. Drake 2nd. Motion carries 9-0.</p> <p>Amendment to be returned to committee.</p> <p>D. Vessey moved to approve with note of concern. L. Scripps-Hoekstra 2nd. Motion carries 10-0.</p> <p>L. Pickett moved to ask for amendments as discussed. D. Danko 2nd. Motion carriers 10-0.</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p>specific examples of how they will assess. Integration and problem solving cannot be assessed by a group project. Member mentioned that they discuss the individual paper for problem solving but they do not list it as an assessment.</p> <p>Amendments – Take out prerequisite from the description, add mandatory to group presentation, add self and peer evaluation to collaboration assessment, different assessment for integration and problem solving, and specify non-US countries under World Perspectives</p>	Amendment to be returned to committee.
MGT 355 Missing Assessment Data	MGT 355 assessor responded to the question about why Oral Communication was not assessed. He said he did not do a formal presentation. Director said, if we accept it we must be very clear that formal presentations must be taught and assessed. If the committee feels this is not acceptable, we can accept this provisionally and collect the additional data the next semester. Director will ask the MGT chair when the assessor is next teaching and then we can decide what to do. Member stated that many of his comments seem like it is not very heavy on U.S. Diversity. Chair said that the guest speakers and some of the readings do discuss U.S. Diversity.	Table until we get more information.
Chair’s Report	We will do more CAR Reviews next week. The Collaboration rubric is causing some confusion for faculty.	
Director’s Report	We have a special topics course to review next week. We have some other curriculum issues. The GE student worker is reviewing all of the SoRs to be sure they have the correct GE category. We will be changing all “goals” to “outcomes” and World Perspectives to Global Perspectives.	
Collaboration Rubric	<p>Members reviewed the fourth objective under collaboration.</p> <p>Old: assess their contribution and the contribution of others New Assess contributions of self and others to the group dynamics. Members chose to make the change.</p> <p>Collaboration cells changed because the description of the levels are not reflective of the objective. The objective is about the process critique not about the communication process in the group.</p> <p>Old: Accurately assess contributions and promote effective communication within the group. Provide some assessment of contributions and participate in communication. Avoid assessing contributions and does not promote effective communication</p> <p>New Thoroughly assess contributions of self and others to the group dynamics.</p>	P. Riemersma moved to accept the changes discussed. L. Pickett 2 nd . Motion carries 9-0-1.

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	Partially assess contributions of self and others to the group dynamics. Minimally assess contributions of self and others to the group dynamics	
Adjournment		4:21pm