

Grand Valley State University
General Education Committee Meeting

167 Lake Ontario Hall
 Minutes of 10/12/2015

PRESENT: Kirk Anderson, Chair; Hsiao-Ping Chen; Haiying Kong; Paola Leon; Melba Velez Ortiz; LeShell Palmer; Huihui Qi; Eric Ramsson; Jeremy Robinson; Susan Strouse; Patrick Thorpe; Jeremy Turnbull; David Vessey

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

NOT PRESENT: Emily Frigo; Gabriele Gottlieb; Kimberly McKee; Linda Pickett; 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 10/5/2015 Minutes	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
CAR Reply Letters -BIO 311 -CJ 101	<p>Chair created a template for CAR replies. Asked committee to leave stock language as is and not to worry about professor's name(s), Gen Ed office will take care of that. Members should give comments and helpful suggestions regarding CARs but are discouraged from asking questions since we don't usually expect a response back.</p> <p>Member asked how the rubrics differentiate between the levels on the skills rubric. In a 100 level course we would expect students to achieve 1s and 2s but many times instructors give 3s or 4s because they think they are the top in the class and should get a 4. Other instructors understand that 4 is the level of an exceptional graduating senior. The committee tries to stress that the scores on the skills goals are not tied to grades. Director stated that it is a difference between an absolute and relative scale. The bar is higher here than in high school. It is higher in a senior level course than a freshman level course.</p> <p>Member asked how the data from these assessments is used. Chair stated that we don't assess every student each year for every goal. It is much more scattered to get a small picture of how students are performing. Director stated that we need to make instructors and students aware of the goals and remind them that these need to be integrated into the curriculum of Gen Ed courses.</p>	Chair will email template to committee and get subgroups assigned to more CARs soon.

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p>The reply letters are meant to inform the instructor who assessed that their data is being looked at and we are trying to help them teach the Gen Ed goals effectively. Also, we may need to start telling instructors how to assess certain goals, such as Collaboration. That way we know they are teaching the goals and assessing against a similar activity. Faculty struggle with teaching and assessing Collaboration. Member stated that if instructors understand and explain how to create groups then they may have an easier time assessing it. Member suggested creating a packet of best practices for teaching collaboration.</p>	
<p>CMB 380 – Special Topics course to be considered for Issues Credit</p>	<p>Last year the committee decided to entertain 380 courses from departments. Director stated that 380s give instructors the chance to try out a course by creating it for a semester to see how it works. These courses will be given issues credit for the 1 semester they are approved for. IDS 380 is an interdisciplinary special topics course through Brooks College and there is no single department in charge. It could be a course that does not fit neatly into 1 department but could be an interdisciplinary course. Often times 380s don't count for anything, but with Gen Ed credit it could help boost enrollment. Member asked what needs to be done to propose a 380 course. Director stated that instructors need to email Gen Ed with enough information to prove that it fits into Issues categories. Member said the instructors should have to prove that their Unit Head and department is on board with this before we review it.</p> <p>CMB 380 – First 380 course the committee will review.</p> <p>Member asked if this could be controversial with the topic of brewing beer. Member said there is already a brewing club on campus. Another member stated that the only concern is usually if the students are drinking the beer. Members agreed that this was well written and should be an issues course. Need to remind the author that it should have Junior standing pre-requisite.</p>	<p>J. Robinson moved to approve Issues credit for CMB 380. J. Turnbull second. Motions carries 11-0</p>
<p>Simplifying the skills rubrics</p>	<p>Group examined the simplified Integration rubric. The group made changes as a whole.</p> <p>Member asked if we can explain Baseline, Progressing, and Proficient in a deeper way. Then we could find verbiage to define all 9 rubrics in a similar way. Member asked if we need the descriptors to get the most accurate scores from faculty. Member stated the complexity in the current language is more desirable than oversimplifying it. Member asked if we could come up with generic language for Baseline, Progressing, and Proficient and then see if it fits with each rubric. Chair stated that the committee needs to decide if we want to simplify the rubrics or completely revamp them. Member suggested we just continue with simplifying.</p>	<p>Will continue discussion next week.</p>
<p>Chair's Report</p>	<p>None.</p>	
<p>Director's Report</p>	<p>None.</p>	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Adjournment	NOTE ADJOURNMENT TIME!!	4:31pm