

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

303C DeVos  
 Minutes of 2/20/2017

**PRESENT:** Carly Aller, Kirk Anderson, Chair; Dawn DeVries; Gabriele Gottlieb; Haiying Kong; Kimberly McKee; Melba Velez Ortiz; Linda Pickett; Huihui Qi; Eric Ramsson; Jeremy Robinson; Lindy Scripps-Hoekstra; Robin Smith-Colton; Susan Strouse; Patrick Thorpe; David Vessey

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

**NOT PRESENT:** Hsiao-Ping Chen; Dori Danko

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<b>Approval of current Agenda</b>	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
<b>Approval of 2/13/2017 Minutes</b>	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
<b>Curriculum items for consideration --Log 9614: Course change – AHS 330, Health Care: A Global Perspective [new to GEC as of 2/13/2017] To count for Issues: Globalization. Note that this is a Themes conversion.</b>	<p>AHS 330            Add Junior standing pre-requisite. Only has one book listed in the SoR. Member stated that the textbook is very comprehensive and covers many diverse topics.</p> <p>Amendment – Add Junior standing pre-requisite. Be sure the group project mentioned in the SoR and the group paper in the GE form are the same. Mention that they may want to add more books in the SoR.</p>	<p>M. Velez Ortiz moved to ask for amendment as discussed. S. Strouse 2<sup>nd</sup>. Motion carries 15-0.</p> <p>Amendment to be returned to chair.</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<b>HLC QI Report</b>	<p>We are obliged to tell the campus what we learned from the assessment data we collect. We also must have a report for the Quality Initiative, which has 10 items that we were supposed to achieve. The compliance rate for data collection went from 71% in the first assessment cycle to 99% in the second. This is attributed to constant reminders and communication with faculty. The compliance rate for CARs went from 64% to 97%. This is also attributed to constant reminders and communication with faculty. We will never get 100% of CARs due to people leaving the university and not being obligated to finish their CAR.</p> <p>Director asked for any recommendations the group had after reading the first report. The following changes were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>--Data mining project is unclear. The GE Office takes all the answers from completed CARs and copies into a spreadsheet so we know how everyone is teaching and assessing all of the goals. Director will take this data and filter out the good answers and put with teaching resources.</li> <li>--Member asked when all of the reports are to be published. We can shift the dates around as to when and how we disseminate the data. The tense of the report is unclear. Will certain tasks be done when this report is submitted? That will depend on the tense of some of the statements.</li> <li>--Director will send the committee the surveys that were used in the past to determine if we want to administer them again. Chair said that asking if instructors discussed the objectives for each SLO with their students is more important than asking if they distributed the rubrics.</li> <li>--Simplifying rubrics – 4.A.6—the report mentions modifying the rubrics a second time. Someone may read that has negative, like we are constantly changing them. Say “clarified” instead of “modified” in the second mention of changing the rubrics.</li> <li>--4.A.4—Give a justification for why we changed the assessment to asking for a score on all objectives instead of an overall score. Point out that in the past we eased faculty in to assessment by allowing them to give an overall score. Now that they are familiar with it, we want a deeper understanding of student learning in each of the objectives.</li> <li>--4.A.1—Say that the rubrics in 2012 were inspired by AAC&amp;U. It also shows that we were consistent using those rubrics as a guide through our revisions.</li> <li>--6.C.2—We had 3 CARs rejected in 2015-2016.</li> </ul>	<p>Director will make the changes to this section and send GEC the next section.</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p>--8.A.—It would be great to tell students how they are doing but we are not measuring each individual students progress. We are merely taking a sample of students to see if the overall student body is progressing toward proficiency in the student learning outcomes through 4 years.</p> <p>--Section C--Take out “at the end of the course scores will be posted...”</p> <p>--Section F—The objectives do not start until 2017-2018.</p> <p>--Delete 8.G.3.—faculty do not need to tell students that they are assessing the course for GE. They should distribute and talk about the rubrics to talk about the components of the goals they are learning.</p> <p>--9.B.2.—Mention the faculty resources that are provided.</p> <p>The next section asks about the stakeholders that are part of this process. Director sent information out to all of these people asking what they did with the GE Assessment process. Another section was on the challenges faced in this process. There some opportunities we had to make changes to accommodate faculty. It will also include what we will change going forward.</p> <p>The university has to have graduate and undergraduate student learning outcomes. They will use the GE Student Learning Outcomes as the undergraduate ones. However, Chris Plouff, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, would like to split Critical and Creative Thinking. They are not the same thing so we cannot treat them as such. We hardwired written communication and information literacy into Writing so they do not get a choice. We can hardwire creative thinking into Arts so they only have one choice. Either we can write the definition or we can let senate do it. Members believe we should do this. Member asked about the handbook deadline. We will not implement this for next year. We can start developing this for implementation in 2018-2019. Member suggested just dropping creative from the current SLO and just call it Critical Thinking.</p>	
<b>CAR Replies</b>	Members discussed more CARs and drafted reply letters.	
<b>Chair’s Report</b>	None.	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<b>Director's Report</b>	None.	
<b>Adjournment</b>		4:30pm