Grand Valley State University

General Education Committee Meeting

167 Lake Ontario Hall

Minutes of 9/11/2017

PRESENT: Hsiao-Ping Chen; Dori Danko; Brian Drake; Gabriele Gottlieb, Chair; Kimberly McKee; Peter Riemersma; Lindy Scripps-Hoekstra; Susan Strouse; Patrick Thorpe; David Vessey
ALSO PRESENT: C. "Griff" Griffin, Director, General Education; Jennifer Cathey, General Education Office Coordinator
NOT PRESENT: Brian Bowdle; Dawn DeVries; Linda Pickett; Huihui Qi; Robin Smith-Colton;

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Approval of current Agenda		Approved per consensus
Approval of 4/18/17& 8/28/2017 Minutes	Both sets are good.	Approved per consensus
Ellen Schendel, Assistant Vice President Academic Affairs – Provosts Office	Introduced herself. She is an ex-officio member of the committee. Members can let her know if they need anything or if they feel she should be at a meeting.	
Report from ECS Meeting	Chair went to the ECS meeting last Friday to discuss the charges the committee was given. Changing the Foundations category will be our priority for the Fall semester. ECS removed the charges related Design Thinking and the development of more Issues courses. The report for assessment is something we put in our End of Year Report so it is already done and does not need its own charge. Chair and Director will meet with UAC to discuss the 2-year vs. 3-year cycle for reporting on assessment. Member stated that the professional schools continue to ask for online Issues courses. Director stated that FTLC has offered $500 to instructors to design online courses and many people have inquired about the opportunity this fall. Simone Jonaitis from the Office of Adult and Continuing Studies stated that online Foundation courses are also needed at the satellite campuses. Member asked how many online courses there are currently. There are roughly 30 sections across campus but less in Gen Ed and most of the GE ones are in Liberal Studies. Member stated that we	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
	should teach online workshops and ask FTLC if they could fund them. Also, allow faculty to be compensated for the time they spend making screen casts for online courses. The final charges are as follows: 1. Review GE Foundations categories, and make recommendations for changes if/as warranted. Include thorough justifications for any proposed changes (Fall 2017 priority). 2. Suggest Professional Development workshops and other resources for teaching online courses that FTLC or others might host for teaching General Education Skills. 3. Continue to monitor and improve the General Education assessment process by in part, including an analysis of the GEP Report in the GEC's EOY report. 4. Provide a report on the assessment of the general education outcomes (identified as institution-level undergraduate outcomes) to UAC for review according to the assessment process outlined on the UAC website (gvsu.edu/uac). 5. In an effort to engage more faculty in our shared governance system, prepare a mid-year progress report at the end of the Fall semester to be posted on the GEC website and disseminated to ECS/UAS and College Deans (a full report is expected as usual at the end of the year).	
Curriculum items for consideration **--HNR 250 (Log 9074) – new course (HP, W with Goals W, IL)** **--HNR 251 (Log 9073) – new course (WP with Goal CT)** **--HNR 283 (Log 9076) – new course (PL with Goal O, E)**	Member is concerned that the proposal will have 7-8 goals and Oral Communication is not a part of this. Oral Communication should be in HNR 283 and the information from the previous proposal was sent to the members. HNR 250/251 - Members feel like there is not enough information given on how the goals will be taught and assessed. There is no mention of the website project that is mentioned in the explanation of Information Literacy. Member feels there should be a library component for Information Literacy. The sources of information in the SoR need to have specific primary sources that could be used. Member feels that the SoRs should slightly different for the courses in the same semester as 250 and 251 are identical. The SoRs for HNR 250 and 251 should remove the objectives for OC and add it to the SoR for 283 since that is where the goal is to be taught. Member stated that Collaboration is a goal but the course information specifically says that collaboration will not be taught. They need to remove it from the SoR if it will not be taught. Amendment – More information on how the goals will be taught and assessed. Explain the website project in more detail and what it is being used to assess. Add to 283/284 as it fits with Collaboration. Add some primary sources to the SoR. Reinforce that primary sources should be from	S. Strouse moved to return HNR 250/251/283/284 to author for revisions and clarifications on how the course will be taught and assessed. P. Thorpe 2nd. Motion carries 9-0. Amendment to be returned to committee.

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
--HNR 284 (Log 9075) – new course (Arts, Issues with Goals C, IN, P)	varying content areas that match the Gen Ed content goals. Written Communication – Teaching citations need more variety. HNR 283/284 Member stated that in the course description for 283 it states that it fulfills Issues. HNR 284 fulfills Issues so the statements needs to be moved to 284. In HNR 284, it states that it is the 3rd part of the course, but it should be changed to say the 4th part. Member stated that there is nothing about Latin American philosophy in the SoR but the author states the course will teach both philosophy and literature. It should only say literature, as there is no mention of philosophy topics. Member stated that there needs to be a better explanation for ethical reasoning. Member is confused about the simulation that is mentioned under Collaboration in 284. There is no reference to it in the SoR. Content goals are being assessed through discussion and self-reflection and there are no exams explained but they are mentioned in the SoR. There is a mandatory group project and member thinks that would be a better assessment method for collaboration. Member is worried about integration. The topics of the course in the SoR are all Arts but the integration project has nothing to do with Arts. The Chair would like to meet with the instructors and explain what the committee is looking for in the proposal. Member asked if we could create a model Honors proposal to allow other Honors faculty to use when writing proposals. Director said that we could ask a proposer once we identify a good example. Amendment – Remove philosophy from the course description that states the course will teach philosophy and literature. Change the East Asian reference to Latin America. Need to offer better explanation on how they will teach and assess the skills SLOs. Explain the simulation being used in HNR 284. Chair will add a note about meeting with the instructors to explain the amendment further.	
Chair's Report	No report.	

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Taken
Director's Report	Director will provide members with a report on interdisciplinary courses at our peer institutions. Our peer institutions do not say World Perspectives. They use Global Perspectives. The student learning outcomes we use are fine the way they are. However, the word should be global instead of world to be more current with trends. The Chair will send email communication to Robert Adams that we are making the change and find out if we need to do anything else. We assess students on a 4-point scale. Our goal is to have all seniors achieve a 3 in all GE SLOs. That is an unattainable goal. We will never get 100% of seniors to level 3 for all SLOs. We need to establish a threshold. What is the minimum level that units will expect their students to achieve? If we say 70% of students should be at level 3 then we fail in 8 SLOs and pass in 2. Since we are failing, we could lower the standard, teach better, or assess better. We cannot lower the standard but we can help faculty to teach and/or assess better. The threshold would be the minimally acceptable level. We could say we want 90% of the seniors at level 2. Three of our SLOs would fail but 7 would pass. We could have a second threshold of 70% of Sophomores at level 2. We would pass all our SLOs at that threshold. For the content goals, we get 90% of students to proficient in Issues but only 30% in Foundations. That indicates problems in the way that faculty are assessing students in the content goals. Most students will only take 1 Math course or 1 Life Science course so we need to get them to level 3 in that one course. The Higher Learning Commission will want to know how we will improve student learning for the GE outcomes. Director will send out the numbers to the committee. The GE Assessment fora will consider these targets and thresholds to see what people have to say. The data that will be sent out to committee members will have an N= which is not the number of students but rather the number of data points we have gathered.	P. Thorpe moved to change World Perspectives to Global Perspectives. D. Vessey 2nd. Motion carries 9-0.
Adjournment		4:25pm