Grand Valley State University

*General Education Committee*

Minutes of 10-1-12

**PRESENT:** Roger Gilles, Chair, Kirk Anderson, Peter Anderson, Karen Burritt, Susan Carson, Alisha Davis, Emily Frigo, Gabriele Gottlieb, Gary Greer, Brian Kipp, Jagadeesh Nandigam, Keith Rhodes, Paul Sicilian,

**ALSO PRESENT:** C. “Griff” Griffin, Director, General Education, Sarah Kozminski, General Education Office Coordinator

**ABSENT:**

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Member |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval of** Month day  **Minutes** | Minutes approved for Sept 17 | approved |
| **Approval of Agenda** | Approved |  |
| Review of the remaining Issues course proposals | GPY 364 – After discussion, motion to approve pending amendments. Approved unanimously. Does not need to come to full committee.  MTH 312 - After discussion, motion to approve pending amendments. Approved unanimously. Does not need to come to full committee  STA 340 - After discussion, motion to approve pending amendments. Approved unanimously. Does not need to come to full committee.  SOC 346 – After discussion, motion to amend and return to the committee. Approved unanimously. | Three courses were approved pending quick amendments.  One course was returned with a request for amendments. |
| Discuss Draft Rubrics | Collaboration (drafted by Peter Anderson) and Written Communication (drafted by Keith Rhodes)  Discussed terms “absolute” vs. “relative” scale, “competency” vs. “mastery.” Final consensus is that we are creating “competency” rubrics on an “absolute” scale (within the context of an undergraduate education). Level 4 is where we want students to be: they are decidedly competent. Anything lower than 4 would be “progressing” toward full competency.  Discussed whether to begin the scale with “unacceptable” or “baseline.” Committee agreed that Level 1 is baseline (a typical entering freshman, not in need of remediation). Work or performance that is unacceptable at the college level is a zero, off the chart—the absence of baseline competence. Level 4 we imagine to be a senior we are pleased to graduate. The middle two levels indicate that the students are “progressing” from baseline to full competence.  For revision, Peter will remove his level 1 column and separate his level 3 into the two “progressing” levels. Keith will change his column labels (to Level One, etc.) and tone down his Level 4 to reflect “full competence” rather than “a vision of mastery.”  Griff will ask Julie Guevara about typical or recommended rubric language from an accreditation or assessment perspective. | We will develop “competency” rubrics with “absolute” scales.  Our scales will begin with “baseline” and progress toward “full competency.”  Peter and Keith will revise their rubric drafts for discussion next week. |
| Discuss Plans for Implementing New Goals in the foundations/cultures courses | All Foundations and Courses need new Course Assessment Plan (CAPs) by March 15 at the latest, in order for us to approve them prior to the 2013-14 academic year. Recall that courses will be able to choose two goals from four possible goals. Faculty will be given the goal definitions and objectives along with the assessment rubric—and then they will just have to indicate how they will teach and assess each objective.  The chair wondered if we should send out a memo soon—perhaps even ASAP--to unit heads reminding them of this work that needs to be done and explaining the basic process. Everyone agreed that we should, so the chair will draft a memo summarizing the process and giving the basic timeline (December 1 as the first possible due date, etc.). The draft will be discussed next week.  The chair also wondered if most faculty would want guidance or will the paperwork and rubric be sufficient for them to prepare their CAPs. The director suggested offering workshop sessions that are available to faculty for Q&A to discuss the form and ways to respond to it. We might want to prepare a list of possible ways to teach the various goals, for example. After discussion, it was generally agreed that we’ll want to offer a small number (perhaps 5 per term) of “general” sessions (i.e., not tied to particular goals).  Regarding the Issues course proposals, the chair proposed that we might want to require all faculty teaching the courses to submit their syllabi for a quick review by GEC to ensure that the GE goals are indeed making their way into the actual courses. The director noted that we’ll likely move, in our new assessment plan, from assessing only one section of each course every three years to assessing multiple sections—so this might take care of or at least minimize this concern. We’ll come back to this issue as we get into our assessment plan. | The chair will draft a memo for unit heads regarding the development of new CAPs for all Foundations and Cultures courses. For discussion next week. |
|  |  |  |
| **Director’s Report** |  |  |
| **Adjournment** |  | 4:30 pm |