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

Minutes of 11/14/2016

PRESENT: Kirk Anderson, Chair; Hsiao-Ping Chen; Dori Danko; Gabriele Gottlieb; Haiying Kong; Kimberly McKee; Linda Pickett; Huihui Qi; Jeremy Robinson; Lindy Scripps-Hoekstra; Susan Strouse; Patrick Thorpe; Melba Velez Ortiz
ALSO PRESENT: Scott Berlin, Interim Director, General Education; Jennifer Cathey, General Education Office Coordinator
NOT PRESENT: Dawn DeVries; Eric Ramsson; Robin Smith-Colton; Jeremy Turnbull; David Vessey

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Approval of current Agenda	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
Approval of 10/24/2016 Minutes	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
Curriculum **--Log 9595: New Course – DS 201, Digital Identities and Communities. To count for Foundations-Social and Behavioral Sciences. Skills are CCT and ER.**	DS 201 Member is concerned that it may not be enough of a Social and Behavioral course to give the students a true Social and Behavioral Science experience. Member believes that the course should be taught by someone with formal training in Social and Behavioral Sciences. Member stated that we need to trust that the department will have the proper faculty teaching the course. There is a lot of diversity in the reading materials.	P. Thorpe moved to approve. G. Gottlieb 2nd. Motion carries 10-0.
--Log 9600: New Course – DS 350, Social Media in Culture. To count for Issues-	DS 350 Member stated that there is no group project mentioned in the SoR. Under Collaboration measures they don't have self-reflection or peer evaluation in the Gen Ed form. Amendment - Change SoR to add group project, and change the "may include" wording above the	P. Thorpe moved to ask for amendment. G. Gottlieb 2nd. Motion carries 10-0.

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Information, Innovation, and Technology.	methods of evaluation, since some items need to be required. Add peer evaluation and self-reflection to the methods of evaluation for Collaboration in the Gen Ed form.	Amendment to be returned to chair.
--Log 9599: New Course – DS 340, Identity and Representation in Digital Culture. To count for Issues-Identity.	DS 340 Member said this has the same issues as DS 350 with no group project mentioned in the SoR. Under Collaboration measures they don't have self-reflection or peer evaluation in the Gen Ed form. Amendment - Change SoR to add group project, change the "may include" wording above the methods of evaluation, since some items need to be required. Add peer evaluation and self-reflection to the methods of evaluation for Collaboration in the Gen Ed form.	P. Thorpe moved to ask for amendment. G. Gottlieb 2nd. Motion Carries 10-0-1. Amendment to be returned to chair.
--Log 9571: New Course – SOC 306, The Sociology of Human Rights [new to GEC as of 11/1/2016] To count for Issues-Human Rights.	SOC 306 Member stated that group discussion should not be a measure. Members think there needs to be a project involved as the discussion does not necessarily mean the students have to work together. Member asked what the group critique is. There are a lot of assessment measures listed. Member questioned how students are learning any skills by just having group discussions. Does the group have a shared goal they are working toward? The proposal is unclear. Members believe there should be something they are working toward. Member stated that having everyone take a leadership role in the group is not recommended. Some students don't want to be in a leadership role. Member stated that none of the assessment measures from the GE form for the content goals are listed on the SoR. Member stated that it is unclear how the students are solving a problem. Member stated that there is little evidence of how the instructor will teach Problem Solving or Integration. Amendment – We want to see an explicit explanation of an end product for Collaboration. It should also be included as a method of evaluation on the SoR. Provide a stronger argument for how they will teach Problem Solving and Integration.	S. Strouse moved to ask for an amendment. G. Gottlieb 2nd. Motion carries 11-0. Amendment to be returned to committee.

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
--Log 9593: Course Change – PLS 339, Comparative Democratization [new to GEC as of 11/1/2016] To count for Issues-Human Rights.	PLS 339 Member asked about the pre-requisites of Junior Standing <u>or</u> PLS 103. It either needs to be "and" or have PLS 103 dropped since all issues require Junior Standing. Member stated that the Collaboration project is good but it is unclear how the instructor will teach Collaboration. It does state that the students will read an article on Collaboration and discuss it. Member asked if the peer evaluations were about the collaboration or about the annotated bibliography. Member stated that for Integration they are not asking the students to draw from their own field of study but rather from others fields. Amendment – Change pre-requisites to Junior Standing "and" PLS 103 or drop PLS 103 completely. Make sure that peer evaluation is about the collaboration process and not about the project itself. Add self-reflection as an assessment measure.	M. Velez Ortiz moved to ask for amendment. G. Gottlieb 2nd. Motion carries 11-0. Amendment to be returned to Chair.
Quality Initiative	Member stated that she was looking to see what the proficiency expectation was but it was not there. Interim Director stated that the point was to establish baselines for the first 3 years. In the next 3 years we can then establish our benchmark goals. Member suggested adding something to the recertification process that states that the CAR is tied to all courses being recertified. Member stated that we should take these purposes in the QI proposal and lay out the QI Report in the same order and discuss how we achieved them. Analysis part of QI should be the purposes (A-I) and develop a response to each one. Can we boil down the baseline student proficiency rates for each SLO? Member stated that we need to do the meta-analysis of all the QI graphs. Purpose H is to increase student involvement in the assessment process and that is something we need to work on. Member stated that we ask the faculty to distribute the GE SLO rubrics to all students. Interim Director stated that he tells faculty in the assessment training to discuss rubrics and results with students. Members agreed that we need to involve student senate to get their input. Member suggested surveying the students asking how they thought they performed in each of the SLOs vs. how their instructor thought they did. Member suggested we could frame it as skills employers are looking for and then ask students if they think they have those skills and why.	
Themes Courses	We have data on what courses are large and could become Issues. The GE Director has already visited departments to try to get them to convert their Theme courses but many of them just don't want to convert. We have provided workshops and offered a fast-track process to encourage the switch. The GE Office has reached out to departments and offered suggestions for which GE Issues category the courses would fit in to. It is now up to the departments to take ownership of their Theme courses. Members believe that once enrollments dwindle we may see more departments try to convert.	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Revised QI Report	Members reviewed the updated QI report and made some suggestions. Member asked if we can take out the information about 138 students and replace with how we determine how many sections of a course we need. Members believe the 138 number will raise too many unanswered questions. Chair suggested adding info on how the number of sections is determined, and explain how the number 138 was arrived at, pointing out that it mainly applies to courses with very large enrollments. Under the rubrics sections it sounds like we did away with the possibility of a 4 but we did not. We just omitted the description on the rubric but faculty are still able to assign 4s. Chair suggested moving information about the new rubrics to the analysis section we plan to add at the end. O.2a graph is missing. O.1b graph appears to have incorrect information. Committee would like all graphs to have the same look. Tyler should run the Excel graphs in SAS to give a uniform look. Can we break down the sample sizes by class standing, especially for Integration? It is hard to explain that 65% of Freshman are proficient when Freshman shouldn't be encountering Integration at all.	
Chair's Report	More curriculum to come. Troy Farley will be here next week.	
Director's Report	None.	
Adjournment		4:32pm