

Grand Valley State University
General Education Committee Meeting

303C DeVos Center
 Minutes of 2/23/2015

PRESENT: Kirk Anderson, Chair; Emily Frigo; Gabriele Gottlieb; Melba Hoffer; Sarah King; Brian Kipp; Haiying Kong; Paola Leon; Paul Sicilian; Susan Strouse; Pat Thorpe; David Vessey; Lawrence Williams

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

NOT PRESENT: Cheryl Kautz; Jose Lara; Josita Maouene; Linda Pickett; Martina Reinhold

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Action Taken |
|---|---|---|
| Approval of current Agenda | No discussion | Approved per consensus |
| Approval of /2015 Minutes | No discussion | Approved per consensus |
| WRT 150 CAP (note: we need only consider the information literacy section) | The committee was happy with the CAP, and agreed to "hard-wire" the skills written communication and information literacy for Writing. This will be the only category without choices for skills goals. Currently WRT 150 is the sole course in the category, but if any other courses come along they will also have to teach/assess these two skills goals. The handbook will be changed to reflect this. | P. Sicilian moved to approve the CAP. M. Hoffer second, motion carried 13-0. P. Thorpe moved to hardwire Written Communication and Information Literacy. G. Gottlieb second, motion carries 13-0 |
| Curriculum items for consideration -Log 8673: New | | |

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Action Taken |
|--|---|---|
| <p>course – HNR 260, Alliance and Conflict: World Construction in Religion and Society [this proposal is new to GEC]</p> <p>Note: to count for Foundation: Historical Perspectives (with skills CCT and PS) and Cultures: World Perspectives (with skills CCT and Collaboration).</p> <p>-Log 8675: New course – HNR 261, Alliance and Conflict: World Construction in Religion and Society [this proposal is new to GEC]</p> <p>Note: to count for Foundation: Arts (with skills CCT and Collaboration) and Cultures: World Perspectives (with skills CCT and Collaboration).</p> | <p>HNR 260 – A member noted that for Problem Solving, it appeared that group work was being exclusively relied upon. For assessment, (some) individual work should be used.</p> <p>It was noted that the peer evaluation was not worth much in the final grade, but a member felt that Honors students don't need motivation through scores to complete it.</p> <p>A member stated that compared to the other goals, collaboration was under-explained. A member asked how class discussion could be used effectively as an assessment.</p> <p>Amendments will be requested to clarify that individual work will be used to assess problem solving, and more details given under collaboration.</p> <p>HNR 261 – Members indicated concerns about the group project, since it is not clear if it will take place over a significant portion of the semester. The SoR says that the group project is worth 15-30% of the course grade, but this must be connected to the GE goals form. Also in collaboration, no self/peer evaluation is mentioned under objective #4. A member wasn't convinced that the professors team-teaching the course will effectively model collaboration.</p> <p>An amendment will be requested to clarify the collaboration section.</p> <p>HNR 262 – Same issue as with HNR 260: for Problem Solving, it appears that group work is being exclusively relied upon. For assessment, (some) individual work should be used.</p> <p>HNR 261 should be a co-requisite for 262 not a pre-requisite.</p> <p>Amendments will be requested to clarify that individual work will be used to assess problem solving and to change HNR 261 from a pre-req to a co-req.</p> | <p>G. Gottlieb moved to ask for amendments specified for all 3 courses and bring back to the committee. M. Hoffer second, motion carries 13-0</p> |

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Action Taken |
|--|---|---|
| <p>-Log 8674: New course – HNR 262, Alliance and Conflict: World Construction in Religion and Society [this proposal is new to GEC]</p> <p>Note: to count for Foundation: Social and Behavioral Sciences (with skills CCT and PS).</p> | | |
| <p>Content goals for Foundations and Cultures courses</p> | <p>Content goals were recently rewritten by the director to read easier but none of the content was changed.</p> <p>Committee could ask the departments to re-look at the content goals and see if they want to write new goals. Now is the time because we are on the 3rd year of the 3 year rotation.</p> <p>To make changes in content goals the committee could rewrite the goals and then distribute to Unit Heads for approval.</p> <p>Member stated all goals should be in a similar structure. Goal 1—Method and Goal 2—Content/Findings. This could alleviate goals within a category being too similar.</p> <p>Director stated that all Content Goals for all Foundations should share a similar structure. Content Goals need to be written for non-majors to understand.</p> <p>Members discussed how to write general goals that cover a variety of disciplines. Can faculty from a certain discipline write a general enough goal to transcend all disciplines?</p> <p>Director said the next step could be to email unit head and have them designate someone to come</p> | <p>Chair and Director will work on sending an e-mail requesting feedback on the content goals from all faculty who have assessed courses.</p> |

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Action Taken |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>to a meeting to work on writing goals or email all the people who did the assessments and ask them for their input on content goals. Ask them if they understood the goals or think they need changes.</p> <p>Members feel it is best to ask those that have assessed for feedback on content goals.</p> | |
| <p>Discussion items brought up during round 4 of CAR reviews:</p> <p>- Instructors creating their own rubrics and the need to separate grading for course from scoring for GE assessment</p> <p>-A response/solution to the concern that students can't be notified about how they did on GE skills goals because it's too late by then</p> <p>-A response to the concern that level 2 (progressing) is too wide compared to the other levels</p> | <p>Instructors who have assessed recently complained that the CAR rubric is hard to grade Sophomore level classes. That is why they had so many 3 and 4s. The rubrics asked them to grade skills that are not necessarily assessed in a Sophomore class. They asked about using separate rubrics—one for Issues one for Foundations. Member brought up that there is a choice to fill in overall score or broken down score. Director stated that if the committee wants to rewrite the rubric they would have to sit down and try to simplify it and decide what goals to assess and what areas are needed. One member stated that simplifying the rubric will bring more clarity to the assessor and the committee needs to decide what data is necessary. Also, students have had criticism of the rubrics. If the intent is to share them with students they need to be clear. Many faculty members still associate the four levels of scoring with grades. D. Vessey volunteered to collapse the Philosophy/Literature rubric from 4 rows to 1 to have an example. One member suggested renaming the rubrics to Trackers so as to not associate grades with the assessment data.</p> <p>Tabled the rest of the agenda until the next meeting.</p> | <p>D. Vessey will develop an example of a collapsed rubric for the committee to consider.</p> |

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Action Taken |
|--|--|--------------|
| -Teaching GE goals to large classes | | |
| Chair's Report | Congratulations to David Vessey and Gabriele Gottlieb for staying on the committee for another term. | |
| Director's Report | None | |
| Adjournment | | 4:26 pm |