Grand Valley State University

*General Education Committee*

Minutes of 10-08-12

**PRESENT:** Roger Gilles, Chair, Kirk Anderson, Peter Anderson, Karen Burritt, Susan Carson, Alisha Davis, Emily Frigo, Gary Greer, Brian Kipp, Jagadeesh Nandigam, Keith Rhodes, and Paul Sicilian

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

**ABSENT:** Gabriele Gottlieb

| Agenda Items |  | Action / Decisions |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Approval of September 17 and October 1Minutes |  | Approved as submitted. |
| Approval of Agenda |  | Approved. |
| Chairs Report | 8 courses have now been approved and are moving forward in the process: AAA 337 (Log #7855), ANT 340 (Log #7865), BIO 338 (Log 37842), CIS 358 (Log #7717), ECO 343 (Log #7861), EGR 306 (Log #7860), HST 370 (Log #7820), and WGS 335 (Log #7843). |  |
| Directors Report | North Central accreditors visited and were looking for requirements that every student must do. There needed to be an assessment. Assessment started small, one section every three years. The accreditors said that this was acceptable. Vice President for Assessment and Strategic Planning stated that there now need to be far more students assessed, far more frequently. 30% of the sections should be assessed. In a perfect world all sections, every year, would be assessed. This is not feasible currently.Because of the lengthy process for assessing it is difficult to do the assessment and return to the faculty to revise how they teach in a timely manner. We will be collecting data every year, larger than 1 section a year. Departments will be responsible for collecting assessment data.For the initial assessment cycle, there will need to be a CAP on record by February 1. The memo will need to be clear for all departments. You can change the CAP at any time to change the goals. Member was concerned as to the clarity of the memo in regards to courses. We need the teach and measure for the content goals as well as the skills goals.Member was concerned as to the number of students that are in lab/lecture/discussion was such a high number. Director said she and others are trying to work out how to handle large sections; she will report back. |  |
|  |  |  |
| Discussion of Draft Rubrics | Discussion regarding the use of the verbiage proficient vs. competent (3 level). The feeling that proficient has more a positive connotation. Level 3 would be realistically attainable for 80% of our students by graduation.National standard that every student should be at 3.NCATE uses specific verbiage for the grading scales, across the board (distinguished, proficient, progressing, non-satisfactory).Due to NCATE accreditation, Chair wondered if the COE would have to alter their assessment to the chosen rubric for their issue courses(s).GE assessment is what is being asked for the Issues courses. Director is not certain that an absolute scale is needed. Member was concerned as to how the absolute scale would work for his courses due to the fact that there are freshman through seniors in his course. Chair reiterated that the students are being assessed on the GE goals, not as freshmen, sophomores, etc.. A standard scale for the four years a student is in college.Member mentioned the ‘bar’ being 3 for junior and 4 for senior. They would be expected to be at certain level based on the class standing. Discussion ensued regarding the expected level students should be at when entering into a course. If they come in at level 1 and they would be expected to be at a 200 level after completion of the course. Member did not feel that the “100, 200, 300, 400 levels” should be used. Baseline for 1, 2 progressing, 3 is proficient, 4 for even better.Member liked getting away from describing a 4. Another member stated that leaves only 2 levels of progress. Either student ‘gets it’ or doesn’t. Member felt that having 4 levels was helpful in adequately gauging where a student was.Members reviewed the Written Communication rubric. It was stated that 80 percent of students should be capable of reaching level 3. There are some students that should be able to reach a 4.Member suggested that level 4 should be listed as “better than 3”. Another member stated that the use of the word “attempts” sounds like the student could continue to fail and still succeed. Chair stated that levels 3 and 4 both are directed towards courses that would require more writing. Member is willing to change the document to fit what is desired. Chair stated possibly removing the detail of the level 4. Director stated that they have done more than anticipated but a GE course will not require multiple kinds of writing.Chair stated that we will stick to the four levels. Discussion continued in regards to what should be included in level 4. “Students with exceptional ability.” Another member also liked having 4 levels, providing the same kind of guidance to how to grade according to the rubric.Question in regards to how to assign a 0. The zero will be listed in the rubric, along with a descriptionQuestion as to should there be two rubrics for 100/200 and 300/400 level courses. Overall goal is that 80%-85 of GVSU students should reach level 3 by graduation.Chair summary. The plan is to stick with 4,3,2,1 and 0 as not satisfactory. Chair stated that when communicating with faculty, we should tell them that whenever they are doing their assessment of their students in GE courses, they should measure how they are doing based on “graduation proficiency.” All students, regardless of academic level, will be assessed based on this universal scale. Agreed to produce rubrics to describe what level a graduating senior would be at (level 3). Assessing our students and their steps along the way. Level 3 is where the vast majority of our graduating seniors should be. Level 2 and Level 1 would be the steps below that.The written communication rubric is pretty close to what we want. |  |
| Discussion of Collaboration Rubric | This can now be revised based on today’s discussion. | We will come back to the discussion of rubrics |
| Discussion of Draft Memo to Unit heads RE: New CAPs for F/C Courses | Memo will be going to unit heads. They may not be expecting it, so it needs to be very clear. Chair and committee felt that memos should be addressed personally to each unit head and include the GE categories and skills-goals options. Member was concerned about not mentioning the assessment plan.Director will find out about assessment and will email the committee.Chair will send around a final version via e-mail for GEC approval. |  |
| **Adjournment** |  | Meeting adjourned at 4:30pm |
|  |  |  |