

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

167 Lake Ontario Hall

Minutes of 9/18/2017

**PRESENT:** Brian Bowdle; Hsiao-Ping Chen; Dori Danko; Dawn DeVries; Brian Drake; Gabriele Gottlieb, Chair; Kimberly McKee; Linda Pickett; Huihui Qi; Peter Riemersma; Lindy Scripps-Hoekstra; Susan Strouse; Patrick Thorpe; David Vessey

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

**NOT PRESENT:** Robin Smith-Colton

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<b>Approval of current Agenda</b>	One change to the agenda is to add a live discussion on SLOs after the review of the content rubric.	Approved per consensus
<b>Approval of 9/11/2017 Minutes</b>	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
<b>Review of the Content Rubric</b>	<p>Director sent an email to all members regarding the definitions for 1, 2, and 3 on the content rubric. Members discussed the suggestions via an email conversation. At the meeting members discussed the proposed revisions which are:</p> <p>3 = Proficient: the level of a non-major who understands the content of the Foundation, Cultures, or Issues category</p> <p>2 = Progressing: in between baseline and proficient</p> <p>1 = Baseline: the level we can reasonably expect for adequately prepared entering students</p> <p>Director explained that GE and instructors have a different expectation for what students should know, therefore, we must be clear on what we want. Members made edits to the rubric. The final content rubric as approved by the committee:</p> <p>3 = Proficient: Demonstrates a competent understanding by a nonmajor (not an advanced understanding as would be expected of a student majoring in the discipline) of the Content outcomes described in each of the Foundation, Cultures, or Issues categories;</p> <p>2 = Progressing: between baseline and proficient</p>	S. Strouse moved to accept the version created by the committee. P. Thorpe 2 <sup>nd</sup> . Motion carries 12-0.

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	1 = Baseline: Knowledge of a non-major entering the course	
<b>Live Discussion of SLOs</b>	<p>We need to have a target and some thresholds for student achievement in GE courses. Director proposed a Target of 70% of seniors would be proficient in the nine skills. The thresholds will be 90% of seniors will be at progressing or higher and 70% of the sophomores will be at progressing or higher. Members agree that we cannot have 100% of students at proficient because it is not realistic only aspirational. Member asked what happens when we do not meet the thresholds. Director stated that we would have to act. The purpose of the fora is to get faculty talking about how we will implement action to improve student learning and assessment.</p> <p>In the information we communicate on GE assessment data, there will be written information on each overall skill and each skill objective. Each graph will have an N that represents the number of data points we have for each learning outcome. Members worked to create a template for communicating the SLO assessment results.</p> <p>Member suggested having all four skills objectives on one graph and only graphing sophomore and seniors.</p> <p>Member suggested sending faculty an email with the dates for the fora. We can also record one of the fora presentations if there is interest.</p>	D. Vessey moved to approve the target and thresholds discussed. B. Bowdle 2 <sup>nd</sup> . Motion carries 12-0.
<b>Review of World Perspective description and SLOs</b>	Director asked committee to look at the handbook to be sure that using Global Perspectives in place of World Perspectives will work for all of the SLOs. Members agreed that this would work.	P. Thorpe moved to accept Global Perspectives in place of World Perspectives. P. Riemersma 2 <sup>nd</sup> . Motion carries 12-0.
<b>Discussion of the Interdisciplinary Category</b>	Member would like to see a curricular justification for the interdisciplinary category. Many of the interdisciplinary courses are already in the GE program. Director stated that many of the interdisciplinary courses do not fit nicely into a GE category. Member stated that most interdisciplinary courses started in a traditional field of study, however, it is hard to take a course that cover so many areas to fit it in one specific area. The breadth of the course is limited if it has to fit into one foundational art. Chair stated that this potential new category cannot be treated as a dumping ground for courses that do not fit nicely into a GE category. Director stated that we can	Tabled the topic for a future meeting.

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p>create an interdisciplinary box that would allow students to take a class and apply it to an existing foundation, thus keeping it credit neutral. Member believes that if students have the option to choose an interdisciplinary course then they are not getting the full foundational knowledge the GE program is built on. Member asked how we are going to assess this. Director stated that the committee would need to write content SLOs. Member stated that an interdisciplinary course could draw on a different area of a discipline that is not commonly shown. Member asked if one subject area wanted to teach an IDS course that was getting foundation credit in a different subject area if they would have to get permission from that department. Director said that GE would own the interdisciplinary box and only GE would have to sign off on what foundational category students would receive credit.</p>	
<p><b>Curriculum items for consideration</b>  <b>-Curriculum Item – SW 322 (9796)</b></p>	<p>This course is already a GE course for this category. They are changing the course to meet accreditation standards for Social Work. They mention that nothing in GE will be changing; however, the proposal is not the same and would not be accepted as is. Member suggested having the chair talk to the proposer in regards to the changes. Member stated that SW 150 is not coming to us but does not have the GE statement in the SoR.</p>	<p>P. Thorpe moved to table the topic until Chair talks to proposer. K. McKee 2<sup>nd</sup>. Motion carries 13-0.</p>
<p><b>Chair's Report</b></p>	<p>Next week we will start with CAR Reviews.</p>	
<p><b>Director's Report</b></p>	<p>Will not be at the next meeting. Thank you for all the editing and responses via email. A draft of the assessment report will be emailed out soon.</p>	
<p><b>Adjournment</b></p>		<p>4:26pm</p>