

Grand Valley State University
General Education Committee Meeting

167 Lake Ontario Hall
Minutes of 11/28/2016

PRESENT: Kirk Anderson, Chair; Hsiao-Ping Chen; Dori Danko; Dawn DeVries; Kimberly McKee; Linda Pickett; Eric Ramsson; Jeremy Robinson; Lindy Scripps-Hoekstra; Susan Strouse; Patrick Thorpe; Melba Velez Ortiz; David Vessey

ALSO PRESENT: Scott Berlin, Interim Director, General Education; Jennifer Cathey, General Education Office Coordinator

NOT PRESENT: Gabriele Gottlieb; Haiying Kong; Huihui Qi; Robin Smith-Colton; Jeremy Turnbull;

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Approval of current Agenda	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
Approval of 11/21/2016 Minutes	No discussion.	Approved per consensus
Approval of CAR Reply Letters	With a few noted exceptions, reply letters for all CARs for this semester have been edited by the chair. These reply letters were reviewed by GEC and approved. They will be sent out at the end of the semester.	Approved per consensus
Discussion of QI report/summary	<p>Member asked what the goal of the overall discussion section was. Was it proficient or above? We cannot use proficient or above in Foundations since those are mostly first year students. Member stated that even first year students should be proficient in content goals because that may be the only time they see this content. Member asked if there is a way to reinforce the goals they are learning in Gen Ed. Are we expecting students to get them in their major, SWS, etc. Member suggested that we look at everyone with Freshman standing in 2016 and then see them as Seniors in 2020. Members thought it wasn't much different than looking at Freshman and Seniors this year since they are different students. Member asked if we could we follow a cohort of students in the future? Can we require all students to take some sort of assessment through Blackboard? Most members thought that was too much to put on instructors in the future. Also, there is no way to guarantee students will complete these.</p> <p>Member commented on Ethical Reasoning, Quantitative Literacy, and Information Literacy and the fact that we are not showing an increase in proficiency through the four years. The Theory of Reflective Judgement states that the ability to think in this way is developmentally dependent and</p>	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	<p>may not be achieved by all students by the time they are a Senior. Member commented that the Library has data showing that GVSU students perform better in Information Literacy than most of the peer institutions. Member stated that it is easier to assess Ethical Reasoning than it is to teach it. We may not be teaching it properly. Member stated that there is a controversy in how ethical reasoning should be taught. Member stated that if there are deficits in our GE Program we can list the resources that we may provide to compensate. Members discussed the discrepancy in Quantitative Literacy. It could be that many students come in to GVSU and take their math course as a Freshman and those that wait will perform at a lower level. Member suggested that it may also be students who are retaking courses they failed as Freshmen. Chair suggested that we have the number of unique students assessed for Quantitative Literacy, Information Literacy, and Ethical Reasoning so we can make more sense of the numbers.</p> <p>Chair stated that Figure S.1, which gives percent proficient for <u>skills</u> by <u>content</u> category, is very confusing and believes it should be removed. Members agreed. Chair asked if we need to break out the skills goals by sub goals because not all assessors gave scores for sub goals; they only gave one overall score. Members agreed to get rid of them as the data is not adding anything of value to the report.</p> <p>Member suggested that we make GE Assessment appealing and a way to encourage teaching skills to students. Member suggested that we make a comment about how these skills are also employability skills as well as GE goals. Members talked about how to make GE courses more desirable for students and faculty. Faculty need to be excited about it to make students more excited. Member suggested having FTLC create an award for outstanding GE Faculty. This could motivate faculty teaching GE courses. Member stated that the GE program is already desirable but we need to market it better to faculty. Many faculty see GE as a series of boxes they need to check instead of seeing its true value for teaching important skills for employability and life. Member stated that faculty who don't teach in GE still need to know what the GE expectations are so they can reinforce them in the major courses. Chair mentioned that the UAC is encouraging departments to use the GE rubrics for their department assessments when applicable. Member suggested having a GE roundtable with those who enjoy teaching GE courses and those that need motivation. Getting others perspectives may help generate ideas and answer questions. Member suggested asking FTLC what concerns they see or suggestions they have.</p> <p>What should go in to the analysis/discussion section of the report? --Comparison between new and old rubrics. The report includes data captured with the old rubrics – we should discuss how the data may be improved in the next assessment cycle.</p>	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	--Discussion on the fact that writing scores are low but many students don't take WRT 150 due to AP courses they bring in. --Mention non-GE factors that affect our data	
Chair's Report	There is one more meeting for the semester. The midyear report will be written and will solicit committee feedback.	
Director's Report	None.	
Adjournment		4:01pm