Grand Valley State University

*NOTES: General Education Committee*

Minutes of 1-7-13

**PRESENT:**, Kirk Anderson, Peter Anderson, Karen Burritt, Susan Carson, Emily Frigo, Melba Hoffner, Brian Kipp, Jagadeesh Nandigam, Keith Rhodes, Chair, and Paul Sicilian

**ALSO PRESENT:** C. “Griff” Griffin, Director, General Education, Sarah Kozminski, General Education Office Coordinator

**ABSENT:**

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Member |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval of** Dec. 3, 2012 **Minutes** |  | Approved |
| **Approval of Agenda** |  | Motioned to approve agenda in favor 6, 0 apposed |
| CAP Review Method | The review process for CAPs will be set forth with a goal to “help” people.  A vote of a 1 means the CAP passes with one reading; the reader cannot imagine anyone rejecting it. We will send a congratulations and possible comments (if necessary).  A vote of 2 means the CAP gets a second reading and a third if needed. Two votes of 2 or better means it passes. We will send suggestions for improvement.  A vote of 3 means the CAP gets a second reading, but needs a vote of 1 or 2 to get a third reading. Two votes of 3 means it passes provisionally. The “provisional” pass would mean the CAP will not be good enough for the next round (in 2 years, most likely). They can revise now, if they wish, or they can use the assessment process as a means to refine the CAP for next time. We will send suggestions for improvement. For all cateories, we will offer to review revisions. We will also post models and suggestions on our website when we begin to return CAPs with comments. | Motion to approve review process. 10 approved/0 opposed. |
| Norming for the CAP Review | GEC discussed rubrics, as many departments have their own rubrics already created. GEC members wondered if faculty teaching a GE course is expected to use their own rubrics or use the GEC rubrics, as this is what was approved for the assessment piece. GEC member wondered how is the value, per the rubric, assessed for multiple choice tests? GEC Director said that there needs to be given some direction for the fall semester to help faculty understand the whole assessment process.  GEC member had a question regarding the rubrics and the CAPs addressing how the assessment piece for the GEC will be addressed. GEC Chair felt that the GEC rubrics could be reconciled with rubrics that met the desired goals of the specific department.  Director mentioned that faculty could create questions on the exams to be crafted to address the desired goal of the GEC rubrics.  GEC member in the College of Education has a database where assessment rubrics have been implemented for their courses. She will send an email with this information to the committee.  GEC reviewed a few samples of CAPs already submitted  The first CAP was very thorough and would be given a score of a 1  Upon review there is much lacking in the second CAP. It is very vague and needs more information. GEC member suggested providing a model for reference. This would be given a score of a 3  GEC Chair stated that at this point we will take whatever CAP is submitted with a request to make acceptable changes in the future so that there can be successful assessment.  Courses that are currently in the GE program were just asked to submit the CAP by the deadline. They were not given specific consequences for doing well or poorly.  GEC member suggested to put ‘model’ CAP on the GE website so that faculty could review the models for revisions to their submitted CAPs.  The third CAP needed clarity regarding assessing what is already taught as opposed to assessing as the means of instruction. This would be an example of a score of a 2.  Going forward most likely everything cannot be done best based on just one measuring opportunity or perhaps even just one type of assessment. This will need to be communicated in the future.  General Education Office Coordinator will send out the CAPs to GEC members, once we have received them by February 1st. Members will review and communicate the score and comments. This will be communicated with the GEC Chair and Director. |  |
| Discuss Rubrics | GEC Chair would like the remaining rubrics to be reviewed by those who have adopted them or anyone that is able to review them.  Critical and Creative thinking will be worked on by Gary Greer as is not able to attend the meetings  Ethical Reasoning will be worked on by Melba Hoffner  Those who have worked on a rubric and submitted it could they please review for any additional changes that may be needed.  For the next meeting’s agenda the following rubrics will be reviewed:  Problem Solving and Integration for forwarding to the Provost’s office for advice, and Quantitative Literacy, Written and Oral communication for final approval. |  |
| **Chair’s Report** | Chair was able to get released time while working as the interim chair. He will have the time needed to work on additional items for the GEC.  Chair likes running meetings as a conversation and is welcome to any suggestions GEC members may have regarding this. |  |
| **Director’s Report** | If you have a gmail account please email it to the GE email.  New GE video will have the GEC Chair featured in it and it should be finished and ready for viewing in the fall 2013 semester.  We are looking to clear the drop/add date before informing students about the magic year. Taking one theme and one issue or 2 themes or 2 issues (jn different disciplines)  The registrar’s office will send a letter via email and USPS mail to inform students if they may have completed the GE requirements for themes. Records will also run a report to find students that have registered for courses that they do not need.  A new version of assessing less than 1/3 of the sections. More information will be provided soon. |  |
| **Adjournment** |  | Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm |