

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

303C DeVos Center

Minutes of 3/9/2015

**PRESENT:** Kirk Anderson, Chair; Emily Frigo; Gabriele Gottlieb; Melba Hoffer; Cheryl Kautz; Sarah King; Haiying Kong ; Jose Lara; Paola Leon; Josita Maouene; Linda Pickett; Martina Reinhold; Paul Sicilian; Susan Strouse; Patrick Thorpe; David Vessey; Lawrence Williams

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

**NOT PRESENT:** Brian Kipp

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<b>Approval of current Agenda</b>	No discussion	Approved per consensus
<b>Approval of /2015 Minutes</b>	No discussion	Approved per consensus
<b>Curriculum items for consideration</b>  <b>-Log 8819: Course change – MGT 340, Business, Social Change and Ethics [this proposal is new to GEC]</b> <i>Note: to count for Issues: Sustainability.</i>	<p>Member stated that it needs to have a pre-req of Junior Standing because it is an Issues course. Also need to add GE statement to SoR. A final presentation is mentioned in the GE goals form, but it isn't clear if there is an associated group project.</p> <p>Amendments will be requested regarding the junior standing prereq, GE statement, and clarification of group project along with alignment with the SoR. To be returned to chair.</p>	<p>P. Sicilian moved to ask for amendment for MGT 340 course proposal. S. Strouse second, motion carried 13-0.</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<p><b>--CAR reviews, round 5 (for the '14-'15 academic year)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Time for groups to discuss their assigned CARs among themselves</b></li> <li>• <b>Reports/committee discussion as necessary</b></li> </ul>	<p>Groups had time to review CARs. Most groups did not have issues.</p> <p>BIO 104 F14 BIO 105 F14</p> <p>PLS 102 F14 PLS 103 F14</p> <p>MOV 350 F14 MUS 300 F14</p> <p>PLS/ENS 303 F14 SPA 313 F14</p> <p>CLA 201 F14 CMB 150 F14</p> <p>In a general discussion, the director brought up the content goals. General Education needs to have goals that are generic enough to know that students are walking out of one course with proficient knowledge in that area as it may be the only course of that subject they take.</p>	
<p><b>--Discussion items brought up during round 4 of CAR reviews:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>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</b></li> </ul>	<p>Director stated that faculty can't realistically give GE assessment results back to students since it is close to the end of the semester. Does there need to be another way to give them results? Or should that question be taken off the CAR. Gen Ed Office could take responsibility for providing students with results. A member stated that there are issues with the way the assessments are done and how they are interpreted by faculty. Some faculty don't understand the assessment which could make the student performance data inaccurate or different compared to another section. Chair stated that there is nothing in place stopping instructors from sharing scores with students now. Members responded by stating that few, if any, instructors, do this. Director asked if the question should be taken out of the CAR. Members agreed it should be taken out. Student Senate Member stated that students should have access to that information if they want it, but that few probably would. Committee is not yet happy enough with the reliability of scores to agree to have the GE program share them with students directly. Member stated that we need to communicate better with faculty prior to assessing the course so they understand the process and</p>	<p>Director will revise the CAR and create a report so that the GEC can see how much variability in scores exists for an individual student</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A response to the concern that level 2 (progressing) is too wide compared to the other levels</b></li> <li>• <b>Teaching GE goals to large classes</b></li> </ul>	<p>scoring. Director stated that question 13 (“How did you inform each student about how they performed on each of the General Education goals?”) will be removed from the CAR.</p> <p>One assessor felt that too many students were falling in the progressing (2) category, and suggested expanding it to two categories. GEC agreed that we do not want to make the rubrics more complex, and agreed with the chair’s statement that it is acceptable if more students fall in the progressing category – the scores aren’t meant to necessarily be uniform.</p> <p>One assessor was concerned about assessing a large class. Director stated that we can encourage Unit Heads to split up assessment across multiple large sections and/or simplify the rubric to only have 2 objectives. Director stated that Senate should be made aware of large classes in the annual report.</p>	<p>for the same skill for different courses.</p>
<b>Chair’s Report</b>	We will keep up with CAR Reviews and look at David’s condensed ethical reasoning rubric.	
<b>Director’s Report</b>	Currently hiring a new GA.	
<b>Adjournment</b>		4:12 pm