

Grand Valley State University  
**General Education Committee Meeting**  
 303C DeVos Center  
 Minutes of 3/23/2015

**PRESENT:** Kirk Anderson, Chair; Emily Frigo; Gabriele Gottlieb; Melba Hoffer; Cheryl Kautz; Sarah King; Brian Kipp; Haiying Kong; 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:** Jose Lara

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<b>Approval of current Agenda</b>	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
<b>Approval of 3/16/2015 Minutes</b>	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
<b>CAR reviews, round 6</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Time for groups to discuss their assigned CARs among themselves</li> <li>○ Reports/committee discussion as necessary</li> </ul>	HST 205 SOC 382 CHM 111 CLA 101 HNR 241	
<b>Condensing skills rubrics</b>	<p>The committee considered the draft condensed rubrics for ethical reasoning and written communication that were provided by D. Vessey, who described the process: start by simplifying the objectives (1<sup>st</sup> column), then simplify each cell, trying to make a simple and clear distinction between categories. The draft rubrics omitted the Distinguished column. There was discussion about whether or not a column was needed for Distinguished, or if it could be treated like a "Zero" currently is (less than Baseline). Members agreed that it could be left off, which simplifies the rubric and might also differentiate the scores from course grades in instructors' minds. Instructions would simply say that any student clearly scoring better than Proficient would earn a 4.</p> <p>Groups of at least two members will work on writing condensed rubrics for the nine skills goals.</p>	GE Office will provide templates to groups, who will create condensed versions of their assigned skills goals.

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p>General Education Office will provide templates to the groups.</p> <p>Cheryl Kautz, Paola Leon, Paul Sicilian, David Vessey – ER and WC  Melba Hoffer, Brian Kipp, Josita Maouene – Integration and CCT  Jose Lara, Martina Reinhold, Susan Strouse – PS and OC  Gabriele Gottlieb, Linda Pickett, Pat Thorpe, Lawrence Williams – Collab and QL  Emily Frigo, Sarah King, Haiying Kong - IL</p>	
<b>Feedback on the content goals</b>	<p>Authors of CARs for the last 3 semesters were surveyed and asked if they were happy with the content goals for Foundations, Cultures and/or Issues. Almost all of the feedback was very positive, even making statements like “please keep them as is.” Twenty-two responses were received.</p> <p>The director provided the committee with graphs comparing scores on content goal 1 vs. content goal 2 for each of the GE categories. Many, but not all, of the courses showed a preponderance of the same score (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) for both content goal, which might mean that assessors aren’t distinguishing between them. In other words, they might be giving each student the same score for the two content goals simply because they are lumping them together in their minds. This is important for GEC to know – we want instructors to assess each goal individually. Ideas were suggested for improving the graphs to get a better sense of the problem, if one exists. The director stated she will have Grad Assistant pull more data, create new graphs, and report back.</p>	<p>Director will have Grad Assistant pull more data, create new graphs, and report back.</p>
<b>Methods used to teach and measure oral communication</b>	<p>A report was created by the GE Office to show how instructors are teaching and assessing oral communication (OC). Responses from CARs over the last 3 semesters were collated for the report. Since this is the only goal that we can’t guarantee all students will see in the general education program, we need to be aware of effective approaches that are being used. We might then be able to add to and improve the packet of OC materials.</p>	
<b>Chair’s Report</b>	<p>Talked with Matt Boelkins, Director of Freshman Orientation. He gave a rundown of how Freshman orientation works. Many entities on campus (such as marching band, study abroad, Gen Ed) have an interest in their information being told to students, but the orientation is designed in a way that tries not to overload them. They are shown a presentation on how college is different than high school, they show the “snappy” GE video, and broadly stress how GVSU is a liberal education school. The 3 components of their liberal education are given as 1) choosing a major, 2) gen ed, and 3) becoming a life-long learner. Then they spend 20-30 minutes with a professor talking on-on-one. The professor tries to get to know the student in order to give targeted information. They discuss curriculum including GE, WRT 150 and math placement. They give them the Gen Ed Quick Guide, and go through the choices that students have within that. Since these are first-year students, they</p>	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p>do not spend time talking about Issues courses or other upper level requirements like SWS.</p> <p>Test site for SAIL – worked well except for the typos. GEC members were encouraged to play around with more mock proposals, since there are likely more typos and perhaps even some bugs.</p> <p>At the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting the committee discussed having a workshop for faculty on converting courses from Themes to Issues. Since then, the director has held brown bag lunch events for interested faculty. Regarding a need for a workshop, the director stated that we still need more Issues seats, but it doesn't matter if they are from converted Themes courses, new courses, or expanded sections of current Issues courses. Members stated that as enrollment for themes courses goes down, faculty will be motivated to convert their courses.</p>	
<b>Director's Report</b>	None.	
<b>Adjournment</b>		4:32pm