2015-2016 General Education Committee Minutes

Wednesday, Nov. 18, 2015
2-4 p.m.
Room 314, South Engineering

Members present: Mike Christoffers, Rosalinda Connelley, Marie Bosley Gordon, Robert Gordon, Kay Hopkins, Joe Mike Jones, Larry Peterson, Dale Sullivan, Amy Rupiper Taggart, Beth Twomey, and Charlene Wolf-Hall

Unable to attend: RaNelle Ingalls, Chengwen Sun, Aaron Vipond, David Wells, and Justin Wageman

Recorder: Kelly Hoyt

1. Amy went over a short summary of what Dynamic Criteria Mapping is.

2. Amy encouraged the committee to discuss with their partners the written assignments they were appointed to review and consider if there are any agreements or criteria that emerge. After some time for discussion in pairs, then the large group will point to anything they made notice of and Amy will write things on the white boards to see if we can come up with important guidelines to use for assessment.

3. **Values**
   - Claims supported by evidence
   - Accurate references
   - Variety
   - Synthesis
   - Summary - abstract
   - Exec summary of project
   - Awareness of conversation
   - Knowledge basis
   - Clear organization
   - Critical thinking
   - Evaluate
   - Analysis
   - Reflection on process/conclusion
   - Rationales offered for decisions

   **Mechanics of cite**
   - Correctness
   - Audience accommodation
   - Signposts
   - Fluidity
   - Effective execution of genre
   - Lining up
   - Design/presentation
   - Aesthetic
   - “Professional”
   - Providing context for presenting knowledge
   - Narrative structure vs.
   - Collection of facts
   - Disciplinary – tech
   - Knowledge
   - Application of theory
   - Technical language
   - Team vs. individual
**Process**
Disc experts can read sensitivity
How often?
GE is shared goals/outcomes
Capstone vs. external site for assessment – separate from major
Generic rubric
1 credit upper division – external or cross disc. Course/task (Portland State)
Report to Faculty Senate
FLCs around outcomes – or capstones
Present on capstone models

**Don’t Value**
Emotional/feeling language as evidence/argument
Design (no white space) -
References not credible – scholarly
“Thin gruel” – not enough information or analysis
Lack of granularity – specifics – evidence - synthesis
Lack of nuance – Critical thinking

Mechanics/Style
Casual colloquial
Inconsistency

**Missing**
Application or implications
Connection between the application and research

4. Amy asked the committee to think what the committee’s next role is. Do we come up with a rubric, do we come up with capstone outcomes. We will share the discussion with Senate

*****Next Meeting is Wednesday, December 2nd at 2 pm in Peace Garden*****