

Grand Valley State University
General Education Committee Meeting

303C DeVos
 Minutes of 3/27/2017

PRESENT: Kirk Anderson, Chair; Hsiao-Ping Chen Dori Danko;; Gabriele Gottlieb; Kimberly McKee; Linda Pickett; Eric Ramsson; Jeremy Robinson; Lindy Scripps-Hoekstra; Robin Smith-Colton; Susan Strouse; Patrick Thorpe; David Vessey

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

NOT PRESENT: Carly Aller; Dawn DeVries; Haiying Kong; Melba Velez Ortiz; Huihui Qi

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Approval of current Agenda	None.	Approved per consensus
Approval of 3/20/2017 Minutes	None.	Approved per consensus
Curriculum items for consideration --Log 9753 – Course Change – CIS 331 Data Analysis Tools and Techniques. To count for Issues-IIT	<p>Member stated that the listed objectives for the GE skills didn't seem to match the explanations. Chair believes it could be the changes in SAIL taking effect after they already started the proposal. Member stated that Junior standing prerequisite needs to be added. It does not appear that this course asks students to draw upon different fields of study, it is solely focused on CIS. The course seems to be aimed at CIS majors and not toward the general student population. Under collaboration it states that they will analyze data sets from different disciplines. There is nothing about how they will teach collaboration. Member feels that this could be a good course but it does not communicate how they will teach it for different disciplines. Member suggested they add something to the readings that incorporates some data analysis in different disciplines. Member would like more information on what the project is under collaboration. Member stated that group project is listed under collaboration and individual project is listed under integration and would like to know what the individual project is. Member suggested Chair make a note to the assessor that the objectives in SAIL have changed but they can continue to use the old ones.</p> <p>Amendment: Add Junior standing pre-requisite, make instructor role clear for Collaboration, and convince us that there is integration of different disciplines. Also, remind them that this course has to attract all students and not just majors.</p>	<p>S. Strouse moved to ask for amendment as discussed. P. Thorpe 2nd. Motion carries 11-0.</p> <p>Amendment to be returned to the committee.</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Revisions to recertification policy	Director believes we need to have a policy for 3 things: 1) not submitting the data on-time, 2) not submitting the CAR on-time, and 3) not submitting an adequate CAR. She presented an edited recertification policy for the committee to review. Member suggested we say, “effectively assess” instead of “show progress” because some of the inadequately assessed courses did not even address GE objectives. Members discussed the wording of the policy and made changes as necessary. Members suggested that the recertification policy state that if the data and CAR are not up to standards, then the unit must reassess the next time the course is offered. If the CAR is inadequate but the data is good the assessor must submit a revised CAR in 15 days of notification from GEC.	Director will revise the recertification policy per the discussion and present it again at an upcoming meeting.
Approval of agreement with Honors	Members reviewed the agreement with no further discussion.	P. Thorpe moved to approve. K. McKee 2 nd . Motion carries 12-0.
Possible new question on the CAR	ECS suggested GEC add a qualitative assessment of student learning. Director stated that we could add a question to the CAR asking the assessors how the data matched their holistic interpretation of students’ knowledge. Members suggested asking, “How well do you think the students met the SLOs for GE?” Member does not think that we need a question since it is not relevant to the data/information we are collecting.	Members agreed to not add this question.
(Start of) Discussion of interdisciplinary category (UAS charge to review foundations)	UAS charged GEC to review the Foundations category. Director stated that many colleges and universities have a component for Humanities in their GE program and we do not. Some courses that students are transferring in do not fit neatly into one of our categories. Director stated that we could change the categories around or add a credit neutral category. We must be careful about what we can do because staffing courses could be an issue. Member asked what the reasons for adding a new category would be. There are transfer students with courses that don’t fit neatly in our program and interdisciplinary courses that don’t properly fit into GE. Director stated we could add interdisciplinary courses into each category or create a whole new category strictly for interdisciplinary courses. Member stated it would be easier to create a new category that would be a substitute for some other GE requirement. Member asked if students are having a hard time graduating on time or if the interdisciplinary courses are helping the employer needs that Career Services discussed? No, students are not having a hard time getting through their programs in 4-5 years. All courses in GE are relevant to careers. Member asked if we take away our current requirement and add this interdisciplinary box, are we taking away something that students should be learning to help them in their major? Member asked how an interdisciplinary category would be assessed. Director said it would be similar to everything else but have its own set of interdisciplinary	Director will find a peer institution with IDS and share

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	content SLOs. Member believes that we need to loosen up what is needed to get into one of the Foundation categories.	
CAR Replies	Groups brought up areas of concern on their assigned CARs for committee discussion.	
Chair's Report	UAC Chair sent a letter to GEC stating we are going to be assessed every two years in a similar manner to how Units are assessed. Director provides an assessment report annually. They want GEC to provide a report every two years. Director stated we can ask to provide the report in an alternate format from Units. Members do not understand why a faculty governance committee has to do this considering we provide a report assessment on a regular basis. Members urge Chair to discuss this with UAC.	
Director's Report	None.	
Adjournment		4:35pm