

Grand Valley State University
General Education Committee Meeting

303C DeVos
Minutes of 3/20/2017

PRESENT: Carly Aller; Kirk Anderson, Chair; Hsiao-Ping Chen; Dori Danko; Dawn DeVries; Haiying Kong; Kimberly McKee; Melba Velez Ortiz; Linda Pickett; Huihui Qi; Eric Ramsson; Lindy Scripps-Hoekstra; Susan Strouse; Patrick Thorpe; David Vessey

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

NOT PRESENT: Gabriele Gottlieb; Jeremy Robinson; Robin Smith-Colton;

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Approval of current Agenda	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
Approval of 2/27/2017 Minutes	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
Curriculum items for consideration --Log 9571: New Course – SOC 306, The Sociology of Human Rights [returning proposal] To count for Issues-Human Rights.	<p>Instructor added a nine-week long project for collaboration. Member asked what rubrics the instructor is referring to because it was unclear if they were his own or the GE rubrics. Group project was not listed as an assessment measure on the Gen Ed form under collaboration. Under Methods of Evaluation in the SoR group project – 9 weeks/discussions is listed. It should be just a group project with discussions listed as a separate method of evaluation. Member believes that the course will be structured the same as in the previous proposal but will include a group project. Member suggested stating that we look forward to approving the course.</p> <p>Amendment – Add group project and group presentation to the methods of evaluation for Collaboration. Add Junior standing pre-requisite under the course explanation instead of stating that there are no prerequisites.</p>	<p>M. Velez Ortiz moved to ask for an amendment per the group discussion. D. DeVries 2nd. Motion carries 13-0.</p> <p>Amendment to be returned to Chair.</p>
Agreement with Honors	Chair and Director met with the Honors Curriculum Committee to discuss the GE requirements for Honors sequences. The two sequences that have seven GE requirements will stay with seven as Honors wants them and they do teach all of skills. Since those were already approved, they do not have to change. Going forward the agreement is that all Honors sequences will count for 6 GE categories including Issues and Writing. The key skills will be written communication, information literacy, collaboration, integration, and problem solving. For GE assessment, Honors agreed that they should have combined CARs for their sequences each semester.	Director will put together a policy document for Honors for the committee to vote on next week.

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
A possible change to how we ask units to assess	<p>Currently we have instructors assess 2-3 content and 2-5 skills SLOs. Since we now ask for all objectives to be assessed we have people assessing 10+ pieces of data each cycle. We can help alleviate the work load and get better quality data by only collecting some of the data one year and the rest the following year. Director asked some instructors who all agreed they would rather do it all in one year. They did suggest allowing them to collect the data on 20-30 students as opposed to a full class of 40+. We could allow this if we had multiple sections being taught. Member feels like faculty may choose to assess their brightest students to inflate the results or because it is just easier to assess those students. Some members do not believe this would actually save time since they still have to assess the skills in 20-30 students so they might as well teach and assess them for all students. The QI states that we will think about a new way to assess large class sizes. We can survey faculty to get their feedback. Member believes that we need to fine-tune the assessment itself before trying to fix the frequency of data collection. Director stated that some instructors mentioned that we should walk away from reporting assessment ratings and just report how student performance changed over the duration of the course. We cannot walk away from the rating scores; however, we could add a question on the CAR asking instructors if they feel the assessment numbers are reflective of their opinion on how students learned the GE content and skills. Member stated that not all courses are offered every year, which could make it hard to gather data over two years. It would also increase the GEC workload by having to read more CARs.</p>	<p>Committee agreed to split large class sizes but to leave the rest as is.</p>
Student survey on skills SLOs	<p>In Fall 2014, we sent a survey to 1000 students who had courses with Collaboration, Integration or Problem Solving and had a 20% return rate. Students could only be in one course. The survey only asked two questions, how would you rate yourself on these skills before you took the course and how would you rate your skills after the course. Director would like to do this survey again before the end of the semester but include all nine goals. We would like a higher return rate. We could ask Student Senate to help promote it. Member is concerned that the information we will get will not be very accurate. Director stated that we could do a focus group but it is hard to know if the data is meaningful. Member believes that the student opinions would be meaningful if the focus group is done correctly. Member suggested using the NSSE survey for Information Literacy. Chair asked what the motivation for the survey is. Director stated that best practices state that we should be involving students and this survey is one of the ways to involve them by asking their opinions. Member feels that a survey does not allow for follow-up questions the way a focus group does. Director stated that there are people in the university who are trained to do focus groups and we could ask them to help conduct ours. Do we want to do the nine skills SLOs, just GE in general, or other areas of GE? Member thought having some data will be better than no data. The Student Senate Rep believes that it is hard for students to judge where they are since they do not have a clear definition of the rating scale.</p>	<p>Committee decided not to do the survey.</p>
CAR Replies	<p>Groups discussed their assigned CARs and brought up any issues with the committee.</p>	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Chair's Report	None.	
Director's Report	None.	
Adjournment		4:31pm