Grand Valley State University

*NOTES: General Education Committee*

Minutes of 1/28/13

**PRESENT:**, Kirk Anderson, Karen Burritt, Susan Carson, Alisha Davis, Emily Frigo, Gabriele Gottlieb, Melba Hoffner, Brian Kipp, Jagadeesh Nandigam, Keith Rhodes, Chair, Paul Sicilian

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

**NOT PRESENT:** Peter Anderson, Gary Greer\*

**ON SABBATICAL**: David Vessey

\* Participating in all work despite conflict with meetings

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Member |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval of** Month day  **Minutes** | Correction that Alisha was present | Motion approved |
| **Approval of Agenda** |  | All members approved the agenda |
| Review of the Issues Logs | **LOG #7851 SOC 382**- group felt that this was ready to go  **LOG #7854 LIB 314** group felt that this was ready to go  **LOG #7879** This one is ready to go  **LOG #7859 ART 391** All twelve of the objectives were not clear about how the teach and measure. There were multiple issues. Group will send their notes to the GEC Chair.  **LOG #7862 HST 322** This will need to be returned for more clarification, Problem solving 1 was left blank. Group felt that there were more revisions needed. Group member was willing to speak with the submitting faculty.  **LOG #7868 COM 438** Will need to be returned for amendments. Teaching section was not very clear how the teacher was planning to teach. GEC member was a submitting faculty. Discussion with faculty as to how to provide statement as to how to teach. Under collaboration, the impression was given that it was more individualized based as opposed to collaborative.  **LOG #7871 PLS 316** This will need to be returned due to the scope and focus in teaching. Group felt that objective three should be a model for the other objectives. Group will send the GEC Chair the notes from review.    **LOG #7853 ART 335** This course was lacking description in teaching throughout the goals. Not sure if this is a good fit for Issues  \*Note: the desire for these would be that faculty describe the “expert schema” to make it more clear for the reviewing committees. | Motion to approve log numbers 7851, 7854, and 7879 with no amendments needed. Moved by K. Anderson, 9 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.  Motion to send **7859** back with requests for amendments. Moved K. Anderson. 9 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.  Motion to return **#7862** for revisions by G. Gottlieb. 9 approved. O abstained.  Motion to return **#7868** for amendments by J. Nandigam. Seconded. 9 approved. 0 opposed, 0 abstained.  S. Carson moved that **LOG #7871** be returned for more expert focus on teaching. 9 approved. 0 opposed, 0 abstained. .  P. Sicilian moved to return **LOG 7853** for amendments. 9 approved. 0 opposed, 0 abstained. |
| Rubrics | The Information Literacy and Written Communication Rubrics  Collaboration Rubric  Problem Solving Rubric review  Changes seem to reflect the requested changes.  Integration Rubric  Notes for changes requested are missing with GEC as GEC member’s computer is missing.  Ethical Reasoning Rubric  Notes. The first row could incorporate the "s" as opposed to having it in parentheses. Changes were suggested regarding the first row  Being consistent with the verbiage throughout was suggested.  Many recommendations were made in regards to changes that could be made to this rubric. Changes were made and new version read for approval.  Critical and Creative Thinking Rubric  Questions arose as if this should be a 4 category rubric. Member felt that there so much was contained in the categories and wondered if they could be simplified. Discussion regarding the use of “consistently” in level three.  This rubric has posed as a challenge with regard to attempting to conquer creating a rubric that can evaluate both critical and creative thinking all in one.  GEC Chair is editing the rubric per GEC suggestions before forwarding | Motion to approve the beta version of the rubrics. Approved 9, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.  Motion to approve the Collaboration Rubric, approved 9, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.  Motion to approve S. Carson, 9 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.  S. Carson motioned that the Ethical Reasoning Rubric moves onto the testers (aka readers) upon changes. Motion approved by 9, 0 opposed, 0 abstained.  G. Gottlieb Motion to send C & CT rubric to readers. 9 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstained. |
| Note | Next week CAP review will start. Also discussion should be had for a call for new Issues course. |  |
| **Director’s Report** | Director will send the assessment plan to the GEC. And the call for proposals. Transition plan goes live. |  |
| **Adjournment** |  | 4:30 p.m. |