Grand Valley State University

*NOTES: General Education Committee*

Minutes of 2/25/13

**PRESENT:** Kirk Anderson, Peter Anderson, Karen Burritt, Susan Carson, Alisha Davis, Emily Frigo, Gabriele Gottlieb, Melba Hoffner, Brian Kipp, Jagadeesh Nandigam, Keith Rhodes, Chair, Paul Sicilian

**ALSO PRESENT:** C. “Griff” Griffin, Director, General Education, Sarah Kozminski, General Education Office Coordinator

**NOT PRESENT:** Gary Greer\*

**ON SABBATICAL**: Roger Gilles, David Vessey

\* Participating in all work despite conflict with meetings

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Member |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval of** 2-18-13 **Minutes** |  | Motion approved with minor edit |
| **Approval of Agenda** |  | Agenda approved |
| **Assessment plan** | The assessment plan has been revised and will be sent to the unit heads.  GEC member felt that there should be more clarity in regards to the scale on the first page. Noted to remove the word “least” with the desire for the minimum of a level 3.  GEC member was concerned that the scale was related to the grade the student has earned. This is not the case. For example, a student could earn an A but not reach the level of exceptional on the generic rubric.  Minor edits to the document were suggested and completed. | S. Carson motioned G. Gottlieb second. 11 approved. 0 opposed. |
| **Generic content rubric** | The generic content rubric will be sent to the unit heads to disperse to their faculty to guide in creating a rubric for their course to use for assessment.  GEC members felt that there should be edits to the rubric.  GEC member felt that there were already rubrics existing where the language was agreed upon which would help with clarity and consistency.  Discussion ensued as to the struggle with a rubric being generic yet needed to guide faculty to create a rubric for their course.  GEC Director advised that there needs to be a decision, in regards to establishing a rubric, this semester. The main focus should be what the GEC’s definition of proficient is. Once that is established then the other levels can be developed.  The paragraph in the assessment letter provides guidance to the faculty teaching the course. This could be provided for the time being. |  |
| **Review of CAPs** | Many of the CAPs received scores of 2s and 3s. Many were very vague and did not provide enough information as to how they would be taught.  Difference b/w 2 and 3 clarification:  Score of 2 – CAP provided some information as to the student would do but not what the teacher would do. There was not a clear understanding as to how assessment would be done. If it was unclear as to if there were multiple instructor teaching the course or if it was only one instructor teaching multiple sections.  Score of 3 – CAP did not have any connection to the skills that and there was quite a bit of copy and pasting.  GEC Chair said that there could be 1s with comments which would not need to be reviewed.  1s will not need to be reviewed.  Multiple courses from the same departments had quite a bit of duplication.  The CAPs will be dispersed for second reads if the CAP rec’d a 2 or 3. If the second reader gives a 1 then it is clear to go.  If a CAP rec’d a 2 and a 3 then it would be reviewed by a 3rd reader.  There will need to be feedback and a paper trail that will notify the faculty how they did and if they did poorly there will need to be changes because they will struggle with assessment. |  |
| **Chair’s Report** | No meeting for the next 2 weeks. The next meeting will be the 18th of March. At this point there will be a discussion regarding CAPs so that reviews will need to be done by this date. |  |
| **Director’s Report** | As issues courses are approved they will be updated on Banner but the remaining courses are waiting on amendments.  The final version of the quick guide will be on the GE site on March 1st |  |
| **Adjournment** |  | 4:27pm |