Grand Valley State University

*General Education Subcommittee*

Minutes of 2/1/10

**PRESENT:** Deborah Bambini; James Bell; Susan Carson; Phyllis Curtiss; Roger Gilles; Hugh McGuire; Lauren Kaercher; Sheldon Kopperl; David Vessey; Kathryn Waggoner, Paul Sicilian, Judy Whipps

**ALSO PRESENT:** C. “Griff” Griffin, Director of General Education; Krista Rye, Office Coordinator

**ABSENT:** Dana Munk; Keith Rhodes; Kari Kensinger; Penney Nichols-Whitehead; Shelley Schuurman;

**GUESTS:** Roy Cole

| Agenda Items | Discussion | Action / Decisions |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Approval of January 25**  **Minutes** | Motion to approve; seconded. | Approved as corrected. |
| **Approval of Agenda** | Motion to approve; seconded. | Approved. |
| **GE Assessment:**  **Responding to CARs** | *Roy Cole will walk us through a couple of CAR responses and discuss the approach he plans to take with them. We will also look at a couple of fresh CARs and discuss possible responses. Finally, we will make a plan for sharing the review work with Roy.*  Roy presented two examples of both CARs and CAR Reviews. He wanted to be sure and show examples of model CARs and CAR Reviews, as well as those that need some work, especially for those on GES that have not seen either type of document in the past.  Roy noted that Maria did an exceptional job in the past with Review responses and a good job of encouraging faculty to continue to engage in assessment. It is in the best interest of the assessment process to give more concrete suggestions in certain instances.  The Director added that once the group reviews the CARs, they go back to the Unit Head and faculty member to allow them to share with their departments. Of the over 100 we’ve shared, we have not received any comments in return.  The second CAR example contrasted with the first example based on level of detail; it was very generic. The Director noted that in the CAP there doesn’t need to be as much detail in therms of objectives and measures, but in the CAR the faculty need to be more specific.  One thing to look for in the CAR reports is if the measures are exactly the same in the graphs. It’s important to note that we are not accessing student improvement; we are trying to access a specific time snapshot. Most faculty don’t understand the process and we (GE) need to clarify it better.  Roy added that in a perfect world we would have a pre and post test that we could refer to five years down the road. To see the process versus the results.  The Chair reminded everyone that we did change the CAR form to be more specific. The Director added that the flawed area is the need to aggregate the results; otherwise you can get one report that uses the same results five times. Sometimes a faculty member won’t see this unless the CAR Review specifically points it out.  The committee continued with suggestions for CAR Review language to be added or omitted.  The GE Director and Roy will meet outside of GES to discuss revisions to the Review form.  The Chair added that everyone can see why it is important for us to have a one-voice responder to the CAR’s. Roy had drafted three additional CAR Reviews that he can send to everyone. Today’s discussion will be the Foundation for a continued conversation at our February 15th GES meeting. | Griff and Roy will meet outside of GES to discuss revisions to the Review form.  We will continue to discuss the CAR Review process at the February 15th GES meeting. |
| **LEAP GOALS/ GE Structural Revisions** | *Organize the decisions we need to make prior to formulating a proposal (or range of proposals) for the wider university community. These decisions have to do with integrating (or removing) basic-skills courses; keeping, reducing, revising, or transforming the Themes; agreeing on which current GE goals and which LEAP goals to include in the program; and distributing those goals through the proposed GE curriculum.*  The Chair handed out a document that was based on last week’s discussion. The goal is to see if the committee can agree on the bullet points and decide how to move forward.  In regard to the first bullet point, it was noted that there are three ways for students to not take WRT 150; they can test out through AP test, by transfer, or by being in Honors (covered in their sequences). The Director noted that we would be moving from “basic skills” to a Foundation box called Written Communications.  Q. Would we have to create other skills and content goals for this category that would be different for 150? Would we have to create writing content goals? How are we going to codify? Does that mean that other categories don’t have to fulfill? Bullet point number five was referenced to answer how goals would be set. We are not saying, for example, that HST is no longer doing writing. They may or may not have responsibilities depending on how we distribute the goals. The Chair added that this would also be a shift in the assessment paradigm, and we would have to ask for new CAPs from everyone once the goals had been redistributed.  The Chair stated that rather than decide on the WRT 150 course goals ourselves, perhaps we should invite the Writing Department to decide.  A committee member said that she feels very strongly about not changing MTH 110 to an 0-level course. Students would no longer be able to get credit for it for graduation. The Chair added that when you do keep it at 110 it is taking up space for something else in the 120 credits towards graduation—especially if students are expected to have this knowledge when coming in to GVSU. A committee member added that we also need to consider the equivalency of students actually starting here versus those transferring in from GRCC, for example. The Chair noted that we obviously have to ask the Math Department for their opinion on this.  GES will continue to have discussions around these potential revisions. |  |
| **Director’s Report** | No Report. |  |
| **New** **Business** |  |  |
| **Adjournment** | Motion to adjourn; seconded. | Adjourned at 4:32p |