

Grand Valley State University
General Education Committee Meeting

303C DeVos
 Minutes of 2/12/2018

PRESENT: Dori Danko; Brian Drake; Mark Gleason; Gabriele Gottlieb, Chair; Kimberly Lohr; Linda Pickett; Huihui Qi; Peter Riemersma; Patrick Thorpe; David Vessey

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

NOT PRESENT: Brian Bowdle; Hsiao-Ping Chen; Dawn DeVries; Dennis Malaret; Kimberly McKee; Keith Oliver; Lindy Scripps-Hoekstra

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Approval of current Agenda	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
Approval of 2/5/2018 Minutes	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
Stock Language for CAR Replies	GE Director came up with categories of topics (good and bad) that we encounter with CARs then created a list of stock language that can be used by GE members in the CAR replies. The committee reviewed the topics and stock language provided and discussed what we can use going forward so we are consistent in replies to all CARs. Director will give each category area a name to easily find it in the spreadsheet and provide it to all members once we have compiled all the CAR Replies.	
Ethical Reasoning Rubric	During the Ethical Reasoning workshop, it was noted that for one of the objectives, many more students were receiving a proficient rating for participating in activities that engage them in ethical reasoning. The problem is likely to be the descriptor for the objective; the languages in the cells describing the various levels is good. This was confirmed by several faculty in their CARs. GEC Member proposed that Applications section of the rubric, “APPLICATION—participate in activities that engage them in ethical reasoning” be changed to “APPLICATION--Accurately apply ethical theories and terms to situations.”	P. Thorpe moved to accept the change as proposed. K. Lohr 2 nd . Motion carries 8-0.
Curriculum items for consideration --New Course: CTH 325 (Log# 9785) Issues-IIT	CTH 325 Member is still concerned about the content area and the issues category chosen. They need to explain how it fits in this category. Amendment: Describe why the course fits into the Issues category chosen and teaching is missing from Problem Solving.	P. Thorpe moved to ask for amendment as discussed. L. Pickett 2 nd . Motion carries 8-0

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<p>--Preliminary Proposal: PHY 280</p> <p>Reviewed by groups:</p> <p>--Course Change: HST/LAS 372 (Log# 9846) – Themes Conversion—add to I-HR</p> <p>--Course Change: WGS 200 (Log# 10100) Add to US—IL, O</p>	<p>PHY 280 – Special Topics Course to count to Foundations-Physical Science. Members agree that the proposal looks good.</p> <p>HST/LAS 372 No issues with the course and the group moved to approve.</p> <p>WGS 200 The course currently counts for Social and Behavioral Sciences and they are proposing to add US Diversity. There needs to be individual assessments for oral communication. It is not clear that race is part of the course. Member suggested they change content outcome 2 to reflect the teaching and assessing of race and ethnicity. Director stated that the oral communication rubric does not indicate that individual presentations need to occur for assessment. Members would like to revise the rubric to reflect the need for individual presentations by adding the following line: {Students must give individual formal presentations; group presentations are acceptable if every student presents}.</p> <p>LIB 331</p>	<p>Amendment to be returned to committee</p> <p>P. Thorpe moved to approve. B. Drake 2nd. Motion carries 8-0.</p> <p>P. Thorpe moved to approve. K. Lohr 2nd. Motion carries 9-0.</p> <p>K. Lohr moved to ask for amendment as discussed. P. Thorpe 2nd. Motion carries 9-0. Amendment to be returned to committee.</p> <p>P. Thorpe moved to add line of text to Oral Communication rubric. P. Riemersma 2nd. Motion carries 9-0.</p> <p>K. Lohr moved to approve. P. Thorpe</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<p>--Course Change: LIB 331 (Log# 10093) Add to I-G</p> <p>--Course Change: WGS 224 (Log# 10090) Add to HP—CT, P</p> <p>--Course Change: HST 211 (Log# 10014) Existing WP course; Add to HP—W, IL</p>	<p>Members thought the proposal was good as is.</p> <p>WGS 224 Member thought that more information was needed on the role of the student for content outcome 2. In content outcome 3, it references a project but does not state whether it is group or individual. The instructor role is not clear for teaching critical thinking. Amendment – clarify the project assessment, make the instructor role more clear for content outcome 2, problem solving, and critical thinking.</p> <p>HST 211 Member said the assessment of content outcome number 2 is not listed in the SoR and the Written Communication instructional methods were vague. It does not clearly explain the instructor’s role. Member said the essay question examples that were provided do not add value to how the course will be taught.</p>	<p>2nd. Motion carries 9-0.</p> <p>P. Thorpe moved to ask for amendment. P. Riemersma 2nd. Motion carries 9-0. Amendment to be returned to chair.</p> <p>D. Vessey moved to ask for amendment. P. Thorpe 2nd. Motion carries 9-0.</p>
<p>Recertification Policy</p>	<p>Some areas of the Recertification Policy need clarification. We ask the unit to submit data and a completed CAR but the faculty member who assessed has to do it. Member suggested saying “The faculty member on behalf of the unit.”</p> <p>When a faculty member has missing data we ask them to complete it. If they do not have the missing data, we need a policy on what to do. Members asked how often data is missing and if it is possible to correct it before it comes to GE. When the GE Office notices data is missing, they contact the faculty member, and most times they submit the missing data. The policy was modified to say – “If data appears to not meet the GE data completeness standards, the GE Director will notify the unit and the faculty assessing, that they can submit missing data before the next semester starts.”</p> <p>Sometimes faculty submit what appears to be data that was collected incorrectly (where they give all the same scores across skills and knowledge). The policy was modified to say – “If data appears to not meet the GE data accuracy standard, the GE Director will notify the unit and faculty assessing the course that they should submit a detailed explanation of how the data was collected when they submit the CAR.”</p>	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p>If a course does not collect data they are placed on probation. If a course does not submit a completed CAR they are placed on probation. If the CAR doesn't meet the GE completeness and accuracy standard, it is placed on probation. The unit then must collect data the next semester the course is offered. If that is still inadequate it should be that they are removed from GE. The Unit and the Dean should be notified after the first failed attempt. Members agree that there should not be a third attempt given. Members revised the policy to reflect the changes. Members will revisit the policy next week.</p>	
Chair's Report	None.	
Director's Report	None.	
Adjournment		4:24pm