

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

167 Lake Ontario Hall  
 Minutes of 10/19/2015

**PRESENT:** Kirk Anderson, Chair; Hsiao-Ping Chen; Emily Frigo; Haiying Kong; Kimberly McKee; Melba Velez Ortiz; LeShell Palmer; Linda Pickett; Huihui Qi; 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:** Gabriele Gottlieb; Paola Leon; Eric Ramsson; Paul Sicilian\*

\*Participating via email despite conflict with meetings

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<b>Approval of current Agenda</b>	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
<b>Approval of 10/12/2015 Minutes</b>	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
<b>Simplifying the skills rubrics – establishing ground rules for continuing revisions</b>	<p>Chair asked if the committee agrees to keep the grids and simplify the wording. Director stated that the University Assessment Committee asked for the rubrics to be simplified as they are too wordy and complex. Chair stated that we do not want to oversimplify them. Committee needs to decide on a common format for the rubrics. Is there interest in combining the proficient column and the objective column? Member asked if we could pilot new rubrics. Give a handful of faculty members the old rubric and the new rubric we create and ask which one is easier to interpret. Director stated that the committee could do it. Member stated that we are too close to these rubrics, we need to get an outsiders opinion. Would someone who is not familiar with it know how to use it effectively? Director said we could make easy changes to the rubric such as not keeping the distinguished column. We could ask colleagues what their thoughts on proposed changes would be before we make them. Member asked if people use the rubrics in their assessments. She stated that is not clear in the CAR instructions that it needs to be used. Director said she could survey the faculty who assessed courses the past 2 years and asked them if they used the rubrics and if not, why. Chair stated we shouldn’t survey people as the GEC requires them use the rubric. We probably would not get a good return from these surveys. Most faculty that assess give one overall score for the goal instead of a score for each sub objective. Member stated that the sub objectives may go into the planning of the course and it may be easy for faculty to say someone is progressing if they are</p>	<p>Committee agreed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stick with the grid format</li> <li>• Ensure the skill definition is in the objectives</li> <li>• Decide if 4 sub objectives are needed or could they be simplified to 3</li> <li>• Delete skill definitions</li> </ul>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p>proficient in 2 areas and progressing in the other 2. Chair stated that maybe for the next assessment cycle we need to take away the overall skill scoring option and make everyone give scores for all sub objectives. Member stated if we want to have assessors give a score for all the sub objectives then we need to make it simple for them. Director stated that originally we had everyone assess all the sub objectives. Then later the committee changed it to allow them to give only one score. We need to decide if we want to gather all the goal data from faculty every 3 years or just skills goals and then just content goals in different years. Member stated that combining proficient and objective columns might dissuade faculty from using grades as scores. Director said the committee needs to decide how many bits of data to collect. Do we give faculty a choice of giving an overall score for skills goals or do we require everyone to give data for all sub objectives. Member asked if the value of the data is greater than the amount of time we are asking faculty to put into this. Director stated we should look for ways to ask for all sub objectives but make them assess fewer goals at one time. We could have faculty assess one goal one year and another goal the following year. That way it is more manageable to design assessments around those goals and sub objectives. How do we keep the faculty workload down? Member asked if Director is suggesting we assess twice as often. Member said if we ask for too much assessment data from faculty they are going to get burned out and either going to return poor quality information or none at all. Director asked if better data is asking for the 4 sub objectives or asking for less data at one time. Member asked what the goal is for the rubrics. We have all agreed we need to keep them but we need to make them concise and easy to use. Member stated that the GE rubrics seem more confusing than the original AAC&amp;U wording. Director stated that we need to make big assessment changes at the end of this school year because this year is the end of the 3-year assessment cycle. Member stated that we should throw out the definitions so that faculty focus on the objectives. All groups should delete the definition.</p> <p>Ensure the skill definition is in the objectives before deleting the definition. Do we keep level 4? Member stated no. The goal of Ged Ed is to get them to a level 3 so giving a 4 is not necessary. Chair stated that there are some students who will be above proficient and thinks we should keep it. Director stated when she reports data she lumps 3 and 4s together and says proficient or higher.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to try to simplify/clarify wording</li> </ul> <p>Future agenda items, to be decided before the next assessment cycle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do we require a score for each objective, taking away the option of an overall score for skills goals?</li> <li>• Do we do away with 4's, so that the scale is 0-3?</li> <li>• Do we continue to assess by course, or do we change to assessing by goal?</li> <li>• Do we ask for a subset of students for large sections?</li> </ul>
<p><b>CAR Reviews</b>  <b>-Time for groups to discuss their assigned CARs</b>  <b>-Reports/ committee</b></p>	<p>BIO 120  BMS 202 – Tabled until next meeting  GEO 103  GEO 111  GPY 235 – Tabled until next meeting  GPY 353 – Tabled until next meeting  ITC 100</p>	<p>Future agenda item to be discussed:  The role of adjuncts in assessment.</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<b>discussion as necessary</b>	LAS 210 ECO 330 HST 206	
<b>Chair's Report</b>	None.	
<b>Director's Report</b>	None.	
<b>Adjournment</b>		4:31pm