

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

Awareness of conversation
Knowledge basis

Synthesis
Summary - abstract
Exec summary of project

Clear organization

Critical thinking
Evaluate
Analysis
Reflection on process/conclusion
Rationales offered for decisions

Mechanics of cite
Correctness

Design/presentation
Aesthetic

“Professional”

Audience accommodation
Signposts
Fluidity
Effective execution of genre
Lining up

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*******