

Grand Valley State University
General Education Committee Meeting

167 Lake Ontario Hall
 Minutes of 11/2/2015

PRESENT: Kirk Anderson, Chair; Haiying Kong; Paola Leon; Kimberly McKee; Melba Velez Ortiz; Linda Pickett; Huihui Qi; Eric Ramsson; Jeremy Robinson; Patrick Thorpe; Jeremy Turnbull; David Vessey

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

NOT PRESENT: Hsiao-Ping Chen; Emily Frigo; Gabriele Gottlieb; LeShell Palmer; Paul Sicilian*; Susan Strouse;

*Participating via email despite conflict with meetings

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Approval of current Agenda	No discussion	Approved per consensus
Approval of 10/26/2015 Minutes	No discussion	Approved per consensus
Curriculum items for consideration -Log 9183: New Course – EDF/IDS 325, Learning from Detroit: Education and Community Revitalization	Members liked the proposal and were glad to see the course is open to everyone. Self and peer evaluations and the group project should be in the SoR. They are mentioned in the proposal but they do not show up in the SoR. It also wasn't clear if the project mentioned was individual or group.	M. Velez Ortiz moved to approve with amendments to ask for clarification on the project and ask that self/peer evaluations and the group project be put in the SoR. E. Ramsson 2 nd . Motion carries 11-0. Amendment will come back to Chair only.

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
<p>CAR Reviews: Round 3</p>	<p>ANT 311 MGT 355 SCI 225 SW 322 SOC 205 STA 340 SOC 318 WGS 200</p> <p>Director asked why we don't post reply letters. Member stated that in previous discussions it was decided not to post replies because it is an evaluation of someone's work and they may not want that posted publicly. Member stated that every CAR has its strengths and weaknesses so we could take the really strong parts of CARs to post and share as a reference. Director asked committee to find parts of CARs that they found to be outstanding and send them to Gen Ed so we can put it together and provide it to those assessing this semester.</p> <p>Member asked if faculty associate the assessment scores they give students as a reflection of their teaching. Director said yes, that some do but she tells faculty in the assessment workshops that it is not.</p>	
<p>Items to be decided before next assessment cycle</p>	<p>Do we require a score for each objective, taking away the option of an overall score for skills goals? Members agree that we should take away the option for the overall score. It makes the assessors think more in-depth. Scores will be required for all 3 or 4 objectives within each skill in the next assessment cycle.</p> <p>Do we do away with 4's, so that the scale is 0-3? Member stated that we should leave it there because it makes the 3 score more meaningful. Member said that he believes that faculty inflate scores because there is a 4 option. Member stated that there is currently too many 4s given and we need to get rid of that because it gives a false picture of how students are performing. Member suggested we</p>	<p>E. Ramsson moved to do to do away with overall score. P. Thorpe 2nd. Motion carries 11-0.</p> <p>M. Velez Ortiz moved to keep the 4 as an option (note that definitions for</p>

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p>rebrand the 4. Give it a more clear definition and when it is to be used. Another member stated that faculty are still using the rubric as a grading rubric and comparing a 4 to an A. We need to work on changing that thought. Another member stated that if the 4 was dropped from the rubric that would prevent faculty from associating it with grades. Chair stated that having the 4 will make the rest of the data better and more valid. Member asked if we could change the coloring of the number definitions in the assessment site. Keep 1, 2, 3 in black and then 4 and 0 make red so they visually know these are not used often. Committee agreed to keep 4 as a scoring option and work on instructions so that faculty realize how rarely 4's should be awarded.</p> <p>Do we continue to assess by course, or do we change to assessing by goal? TABLED</p> <p>Do we ask for a subset of students for large sections? TABLED</p> <p>Wording for guidance to faculty on assigning scores for foundations, cultures and issues <i>content</i> goals. TABLED</p>	<p>this level will not appear on the rubric). P. Thorpe 2nd. Motion carries 11-0.</p>
Chair's Report	More curriculum is coming next week.	
Director's Report	None.	
Adjournment		4:29pm