

Draft

G.E. Committee

Meeting Minutes

October 21, 2008

Present: David Miller (Chair), Anita Chiodo, Merle Canfield, Bruce Mattingly, Claus Schubert, Valerie Jones, Joy Hendrick, Joseph Rayle, Donna West, Mark Worrell

Absent: Susan Davidenko, Nancy Aumann, John Hartsock, Amber Murphy

Agenda for Meeting:

- 1) Next meeting-Please mark your calendar for the following meeting to be held on 11/4 (Election Day) from 1:10-2:30 in Old Main 110.
- 2) Final Draft of "You may be in the assessment pool" letter (henceforth YMBAP). Please print and bring to the meeting with your final improvements.
- 3) The following student has been added as the student rep to the GE Committee:
Amber Murphy - amber.murphy@cortland.edu . Welcome Amber!
- 4) Discussion item: Should the G.E. Committee establish April 1 as the last day to consider courses for the G.E. Program?
- 5) Should we postpone the assessment of GE 1-Quantitative skills?
- 6) Request for PHI 201 and PHI 202 to be considered as a GE 5-Western Civilizations.

Agenda item #6

The committee did not feel comfortable making a decision without proper time to evaluate the request. Dave will send out an electronic copy of this request. The committee requested a "General Education Course Proposal Form" attached which includes a copy of course syllabi. The committee also requested a breakdown in which each learning outcome is specifically addressed. This course was originally submitted in the previous semester and turned down. The committee has requested the minutes for the meeting to investigate the reasons for the failure the previous semester.

A question was raised as to whether or not the department requesting a course, to be considered a GE, needed to provide a method of assessment. Currently the departments are asked to think about it. Concern was voiced that to ask the departments to provide a method of assessment proves difficult because many lack the knowledge necessary for such a task.

Agenda item #2

Committee made final adjustments to the YMBAP letter. Suggestions included a date to be added in paragraph two, letting teachers know when they will be receiving notification if they were to be selected for assessment. Discussion on what names should be included on the bottom of the letter. Catalog states that the director of OIRA (Merle) is a member of the GE Committee; thus, his name should be included. Amber Murphy's name should also be included. Bruce Mattingly and Nancy Aumann's names should also be noted on the letter but with a connotation that they are ex-officio.

Question was raised about the membership on the proposal to the faculty senate and the restructuring committee.

Dave will send a finalized letter to Merle Thursday morning. Merle hopes to distribute this letter by the end of the week.

Agenda Item #3

Welcome Amber

Agenda Item #4

Discussion was opened about the possibility of making April 1st the last day to submit proposals to the GE committee. Date seemed reasonable. Discussion centered on time needed to obtain course approval to still be included in the college catalog. The provost needs recommendation by May 15th and because the Provost is the last one to purview request after the GE committee April 1st seemed too soon. The committee agreed April 15th is the last date the GE committee can process courses requesting to be included in any GE categories.

Agenda Item #5

Should we postpone the assessment of GE 1?

Per David Miller's e-mail prior to GE meeting the following information was discussed:

In essence, the GEAR group has not been able to locate or develop an acceptable exam ("After two thorough reviews, the GEAR group found that no existing exam assessed all five of the University's student learning outcomes in mathematics, and its work with University faculty to design items for a new exam ended when the vendor went out of business"). Our options include:

- *Postponing your assessment of mathematics for another year;*

- Using the SUNY rubric, available at <http://www.cortland.edu/gear/mathrubric.pdf>, for assessing student work in mathematics in 2008-2009; and
- Using a local rubric approved by GEAR as being comparable to the SUNY rubric for assessing student work in mathematics in 2008-2009.

We will discuss this at our meeting. We recently received the following communication about Category 1 assessment from the new GE Czar Willie-Schiff:

" Our records indicate that Cortland was not scheduled to use the math test in 2009, so I did not contact you on October 3 when I sent an email (below) to the 14 campuses that our records showed were scheduled to use the math test this year. I can't explain why our records didn't match your plans. Fortunately, you contacted me before it's too late. You can select an option presented in the email below and let me know what you plan to do by October 20. If you anticipate needing more time, please send me a preliminary plan and sample size by October 20 if at all possible so that I can be sure our budget includes your plans in this year before budget cutting worsens."

Dean Mattingly responds that

" Given that the next GE committee meeting is scheduled for October 21 and that Nancy is looking for a response a day earlier, how shall we go about choosing from among our options for the GE Math assessment?"

My personal opinion is this: I think that using the SUNY rubrics would be very labor-intensive, and I think that developing a local rubric at this late date is out of the question. I'm therefore very much in favor of postponing the assessment for another year. If a standardized test is not developed, then we may be faced with using the rubrics next year. But I would strongly prefer that the GE and QS committees have the opportunity to look at them closely and make a commitment for next year, instead of rushing to a decision to use them for this year."

Joy Hendrick (member of our GE committee and a representative on the GEAR group) suggests that

"I concur that the recommendation be made by the QS committee and sent to the GE committee for official approval. This type of decision was what the QS committee is in place to make. In terms of the outcome, my suggestion is to start with circulation of the rubric used before that was in the original GE assessment plan and ask the QS committee to discuss questions and/or assignments. In my opinion it will most likely be that faculty would like to submit some of their current course-imbedded assignments/tests to be used for the assessment. At least we are not starting from zero – we have the original rubrics developed by GEAR and may just need to work on test questions and/or assignments to assess using the rubrics. These rubrics are available from this page of the GEAR website (<http://www.cortland.edu/gear/mathpanel.html>)

The committee then discussed that the SUNY Learning outcomes for the Math are not easily assessed. Currently there is no standardized test for SUNY to assess Math. The other option is for a panel of SUNY Faculty to develop rubrics. The committee favored postponing the assessment so that Faculty on campus can develop and/or modify rubrics. Question was raised as to what will happen with a postponement. Bruce Mattingly will email Nancy Wille-Schiff letting her know that we will postpone the assessment of GE1. Dave will send an email to the Quantitative Skills Committee requesting that the committee take a look at the SUNY Rubrics and/or come up with a proposal on how to assess GE1. Dave would like the proposal by March 1st.

Minutes from the meeting on 9/23 were approved

Additional Business

Merle has the completed feedback on GE outcomes and he would like to have a meeting or forum on results. Merle will send the "outcomes reports" to committee members and we will review and discuss plans for distribution at next committee meeting. Merle will also send the "closing the loop report" to all committee members.

Question was raised whether the committee should develop a plan to review the courses that will be assessed in 2010. GE 4, 7, 10 and 12 are scheduled for assessment in 2010. GE1 was originally scheduled to be reviewed but it was reviewed two years ago so it will not be reviewed this year. It was suggested that sub committees be formed to review information and report back to the GE committee. Ideally, Dave would like each of the GE committee members to serve on a subcommittee. The committee decided to discuss plans for review at the next meeting.

Meeting Adjourned

Next Meeting November 4, 1:10-2:30 in Old Main 110