

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

303C DeVos  
Minutes of 2/26/2018

**PRESENT:** Hsiao-Ping Chen; Dori Danko; Brian Drake; Gabriele Gottlieb, Chair; Kimberly Lohr; John Lurie; Dennis Malaret; Kimberly McKee; Huihui Qi; Peter Riemersma; Lindy Scripps-Hoekstra; Patrick Thorpe; David Vessey

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

**NOT PRESENT:** Brian Bowdle; Dawn DeVries; Mark Gleason; Keith Oliver; Linda Pickett

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<b>Approval of current Agenda</b>	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
<b>Approval of 2/19/2018 Minutes</b>	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
<b>Curriculum items for consideration --New Course (Log# 10108): GSI 280/290: Changemakers; To count for SBS w/SLOs CT, P</b>	<p>GSI 280 The course is being proposed as a 280 for Fall until the actual proposal for GSI 290 goes through. The committee is reviewing the course first as a special topics and then as an actual course. Members agree that this course is sufficient as GSI 280 as a special topics for SBS credit.</p> <p>GSI 290 Member would like clarification on the critique assessment method as that is only used in Art courses. Member asked that we get clarification on whether there are individual assessments. There are no individual projects in the SoR. Member also mentioned that the exams and quizzes mentioned in content goal one are not listed in the methods of evaluation. Member said the proposal references participation in a field trip for knowledge goal 3 but is not clear if that is part of the methods of evaluation. Member would like to know if the papers listed under Problem Solving are attached to the group project.</p> <p>Amendments: Clarify the assessment for all SLOs and match them to the SoR, take out the critique, and clarify group project versus the individual assessments.</p>	<p>P. Thorpe moved to approve. K. McKee 2<sup>nd</sup>. Motion carries 8-0-1.</p> <p>P. Thorpe moved to ask for amendments as discussed. K. Lohr 2<sup>nd</sup>. Motion carries 9-0-1.</p> <p>Amendment to be returned to Chair.</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<p><b>Discussion of Assessment Scale for Skills</b></p>	<p>Director proposed the following targets and thresholds by differentiating expectations between Knowledge and Skills.</p> <p>Knowledge – 1 exposure model 70% at level 3, 90% at level 2. Data are reported for ALL students</p> <p>Skills – Tree-ring model 70% of Seniors at level 3 60% of Juniors at level3</p> <p>90% of Seniors, 80% of Juniors, 70% of Sophomores, and 60% of Freshmen to be at level 2 or higher.</p> <p>The GE Office will change all the reports that have been done. We do show progression from Freshmen to Seniors for most of the outcomes.</p> <p>Member asked if the skill reporting was getting too complex with all of the different target and threshold levels. Director said we can drop the thresholds for Juniors and Seniors since we have targets for them. --70% of Sophomores, and 60% of Freshmen to be at level 2 or higher</p> <p>Member asked if we can change the CAR graphs to reflect the targets and thresholds.</p> <p>OLD CARs There should be an explanation on the old CARs telling people who read them that we have made changes to the assessment process. This will prevent the same mistakes from being made again. GE Director proposed the following explanation: “Assessment rubrics and directions for filling out CARs have changed since the 2013-16 assessment cycle. GEC holds current CARs to a higher standard of accuracy and completeness than those from the 2013-2016 cycle because assessment rubrics and directions for filling out CARs have improved and faculty have become more experienced with GE assessment.”</p> <p>Members revised the statement to the following: “GEC hold current CARs to a higher standard of accuracy and completeness than those from the 2013-16 cycle because rubrics and directions for completing CARs have improved and faculty have become more experienced with GE Assessment.”</p>	<p>GE Director will make a sample skills report with the graphs. Will also do CAR graphs with the targets.</p> <p>P. Thorpe moved to accept the assessment scale and all wording as discussed. K. McKee 2<sup>nd</sup>. Motion carries 10-0-1.</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p><b>CAR REPLIES</b>  Director proposed changing CAR Replies to CAR Feedback. Members approved the change.</p> <p><b>CAR REPLY STATEMENT</b>  Director proposed the following statement to be added to the top of all old GEC CAR replies to inform faculty that GEC’s expectations for student learning have changed:</p> <p>“Assessment rubrics, directions for filling out CARs, and the expectation level for student performance for the Knowledge outcomes have changed since 2013-16 assessment cycle. While student develop their skills outcomes over four years, they have only one exposure to most Knowledge outcomes. As such, the new expectation is that students achieve level 3 for Knowledge outcomes in a single course.”</p> <p>Members revised the proposed statement as follows:</p> <p>“Based on the results from the 2013-16 assessment cycle, GEC adjusted the expectations regarding Knowledge outcomes. Students usually have only one exposure to these outcomes. The new expectation for Knowledge outcomes is for students to achieve level 3 in a single course. In contrast, students develop their Skills outcomes over four years. “</p> <p>Director told members that we need to open up the assessment cycle results available to all students. We will do that once we modify the skills reports.</p> <p><b>ADDITION TO KNOWLEDGE POWERPOINTS</b>  We need to add an explanation of why we changed the expectations for Knowledge outcomes. Director proposed the following wording on the PowerPoint.</p> <p>When GEC explained the expectation for the Knowledge outcomes it became clear there was confusion or misalignment with our expectations:  --We did not clearly distinguish between how to assess Knowledge and Skills outcomes  --The wording of level 3 – proficient: the level we expect for all graduating seniors  Faculty indicated that the student performance for the Knowledge outcomes reported in the assessment reports are not representative of student learning. The figures underreport student learning.</p>	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	Members approved this wording.	
<b>CAR reviews</b>	Members spent time reviewing CARs in small groups and discussed any problems with the whole committee.	
<b>Chair's Report</b>	No meeting next week. If courses come through they will be sent to the committee to review ahead of time.	
<b>Director's Report</b>	None.	
<b>Adjournment</b>		4:24pm