Grand Valley State University
General Education Committee Meeting
167 Lake Ontario Hall

Minutes of 9/14/2015

PRESENT: Kirk Anderson, Chair; Hsiao-Ping Chen; Emily Frigo; Gabriele Gottlieb; Haiying Kong; Paola Leon; Kimberly McKee; Melba Velez Ortiz; LeShell Palmer; Linda Pickett; Huihui Qi; Eric Ramsson; Susan Strouse; Patrick Thorpe; David Vessey
ALSO PRESENT: C. "Griff" Griffin, Director, General Education; Jennifer Cathey, General Education Office Coordinator
NOT PRESENT: Paul Sicilian*
*Participating via email despite conflict with meetings

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Approval of current Agenda	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
Approval of 8/31/2015 Minutes	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
• **UAS charges to GEC for 2015-2016 (updated from the draft charges we considered 8-31)**	The charges have been revised and now there are only five charges. The charge about advising administration about the MTA was dropped, since we accomplished that last year. The phrase "holistic assessment of the GE Program" was removed, replaced with "an analysis of the GEP report." Since we are in the final year of the 3-year cycle, it will be impossible for the GE Program to produce a full report. However, since we have been collecting based on GE categories, a partial/preliminary/status report can be produced. We have more than 10,000 data points for 8,000 students that can be released now. Director stated there is no harm to us by releasing the data. The people who assess want the information. Member stated to give a status report and then say the full report will be available next year when the three year cycle is over. Chair stated that this status report could serve as a rough draft for the final report. Director has created a document showing all the changes that have been made to the assessment process based on what we've learned going through the process several times, and this will be included in the report.	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	Goal #4 - Work with FSBC on exploring the feasibility of limiting enrollments for General Education courses, especially the Foundations courses, for pedagogical reasons.	
	This was supposed to be a joint charge with FSBC but it was not given to them. Director stated that we could ask the FSBC to run the costs of adding more sections of large courses so that we can have smaller class sizes for Gen Ed courses. FSBC could run the cost analysis for adding more sections staffed by faculty and/or adjuncts. Director stated that we have a small number of courses that are too large. We could solve the really large class size problem or the medium size class problem. Member asked what the large class sizes are; director stated that they are over 130 students. Chair asked if this is truly a problem or was it just the GEO 105 instructor who thought the large class size was a problem. Director stated that instructors might have to adjust their content and teaching methods to accommodate class size. Member wants to know why we have this charge; is it just from one faculty member's complaint. Director said we've had the complaint from GEO 105 and from BMS courses. The issue is that the experience for staff and students with large class sizes is not the same as the smaller classes. UAS wants us to explore the costs of making the large class sizes smaller. Member stated that this could be an opportunity to make a change in the university. Member stated that are we trying to make a change for such a small subgroup and isn't sure why this is a charge. Another member stated concern for the courses that have writing or oral communication as part of their goals and the class sizes are over 40 students. He suggested we focus on those courses versus just focusing on large class sizes regardless of goals. Director stated that we could also present this question to FSBC. Member asked if we could look at the data from the skills goals and pull data based on student performance for class size. Director stated we could, but the way that faculty assess is different so it is hard to compare one to another. Member stated that we could recommend to Deans/Unit Heads if a course chooses a certain goal, to limit class sizes. Director stated that doing so might deter people from ever choosing that goal. Director will gather data on goals and class sizes and pass it on to the committee. We can then pass the data on to FSBC to have them run the cost of decreasing class sizes. Member asked if we can look at other universities and see how they teach goals like Oral or Written Communication. Chair stated that FTLC will be able to provide us with that information. P&L and Math cap out at 30-32 students per class. Many of the classrooms just don't hold that many students. Member stated that our best bet is to emphasize the skills goals when trying to sell the smaller classes sizes. Director will gather data on all 9 skills goals. Member stated that it would be nice to know what class size would be an incentive to pick certain goals. If you had a large class you might be happy to not have Oral Communication as a goal. If you had a small class you might be more inclined to pick a different set of goals. Director stated that we can allow the GE courses to choose new goals. We need to make that decision before the end of the semester. The process is long and all courses that change goals need to rewrite their CAPs. Member asked if people just choose goals because they are easier to	Director will gather data on goals and class sizes and pass it on to the committee.

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	assess, even though they teach most or all of the skills goals. Director stated it is unique to the discipline and course.	
Curriculum items for consideration Log 9048: Course change – MGT 303, Introduction to International Business (title will change to "International Business and Culture") [new to GEC, submitted 4/15/2015] Note: to count for Issues: Globalization.	A member pointed out that MGT 303 is currently in World Perspectives, and the Course Change proposal is to add it to Issues. However, the SoR (or any of the forms for this proposal) does not mention World Perspectives. Director stated that SAIL should automatically include the existing GE attribute of World Perspectives and we need to contact IT to have the issue fixed. The chair stated that the proposer contacted him about changing the course title to better reflect the emphasis on business culture. This change is supported by the dean, but the system is locked unless and until we ask for an amendment (see below). Chair will ask IT to fix SAIL to try to get the World Perspectives information in the current proposal. Chair will also ask IT to display the four sub-objectives for the skills goals, which do not currently appear in the GE form. Member stated that they mention papers in the proposal as a way to evaluate the goals but it is not indicated in the SoR. Regarding Collaboration they list peer evaluation and nothing else. Chair thinks that they just didn't add in the group project mentioned in the teaching methods. Also, "paper" was the only assessment method chosen for problem solving and integration. They should make it clear what will be used for assessment for problem solving and if it is group and/or individual work (it shouldn't be entirely group work). For integration, the teach entry mentions a final project, self-refection via the GLOBE leadership survey and a reflective paper, so the assessment choices should reflect this. Member was concerned about their explanation of teaching Integration. She stated that students are supposed to use their knowledge gained in the major in the Integration process. Another member stated that the Collaboration and Integration seem to go together and it sounds like it is the same or similar project that will be used for both goals. The chair will ask for an amendment that aligns the assessment items chosen in the GE form with the narrative given in the Teach field. These assessment methods also need to align with the SoR.	P. Thorpe moved to ask for amendment. S. Strouse 2nd. Motion carries 14-0.

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	This proposal sparked a general discussion. A member asked if there could be another drop down list to ask for individual or group work. For example, when they choose paper they would have to pick individual or group. Or have choices that say, "Paper-Individual" or "Paper-Group." Items that can be chosen for assessment in SAIL: *Case Report *Critique Discussion *Exam *Group Project (Change to Project and choose group or individual) *Journal *Lab Report *Observation *Oral Presentation *Other *Paper Peer Evaluation *Performance *Poster *Quiz Self-Reflection *Change to ask whether it is group or individual.	The chair will ask for three changes to be made to Sail (existing GE attributes, skills goals objectives, and assessment drop-down menu options).
CAR Reviews	AAA 200 – Understanding Africa AHS 340 – Tabled until next meeting.	
Questions about the next assessment cycle: o Do we want to continue a 3 year cycle?	Chair stated that the current 3 year cycle seems to be working. Director agrees. Members agree. GEC assesses courses every 3 years. We assess anywhere from 1-5 sections. Professors can only assess one course/one section per semester. Some faculty are asked to assess each semester if they are the only person teaching a course, or if there are adjuncts teaching. Director stated that	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
▪ Do we want to change the goals that courses can choose? ▪ Do we want to give courses an option to pick new goals? o Do we want to allow double dippers to split the goals?	some departments complain because so many of their courses are up for assessment in the same year. This is because we assess by category. All the languages will assess in the same year because WP is done at the same time. Should we keep doing them by category, or should we split them up in a different way? Committee agreed to keep it by category as it is easier to track. Do we want to rearrange the goals in the boxes for choosing skills goals by category? Director is discouraging doing this. However, she stated that she thinks they could change the goals they chose from those boxes. We would email everyone and offer them time to change their goals, they would have to rewrite the CAP and then turn it in by a set deadline this winter. Member stated that last year the committee discussed that Oral Communication was offered as an option in categories that were not likely to choose it as an option. This meant that students may never see Oral Communication in their General Education program. Director stated that, in the grid, the first column is goals likely to be seen in that category and the second column would be more challenging. Director stated that we can ask people, when we invite them to change their goals, what their interpretation of the goals are. Do they think that Oral Communication is a 15 minute presentation or could they have a 5 minute presentation instead? Member asked if we could add a third option for Oral Communication in order to get more courses that have that as a goal. Member stated that a 5 minute presentation probably doesn't convey enough information. Another member stated that a 5 minute debate can be effective because they have to be prepared to debate their points. Director stated that we could add Oral Communication as a third choice in boxes where it would fit, like P&L where class sizes are small. Also, Collaboration and Problem Solving are goals chosen by lots of courses. Historical Perspective courses have Problem Solving or Ethical Reasoning and those are hard to teach in the curriculum. Moving forward the committee would like to continue the 3 year cycle, give courses an option to pick new goals, leave the goal choices the same but add Oral Communication and Information Literacy as a 3rd choice for some categories. Chair asked committee to look at good places we can add Oral Communication and Information Literacy before the next meeting. Also, committee wants to avoid taking away someone's goal forcing them to rewrite their curriculum. Finally, the committee agreed that we will not allow double-dip courses to split goals for assessment.	
Chair's Report	More CARs and more curriculum proposals are coming.	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Director's Report	None	
Adjournment		4:28pm