General Education Committee

April 28, 2011

Draft of Minutes

Present: Klotz, Thomas, Canfield, Trunfio, Kelley, Hokanson, White, Van Der Karr, Latimer

Absent: Mattingly, Schutt,

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Comments** | **Action Item** |
| Minutes from 4/21/11 | Consideration of minutes from 4/21; minor edits were noted and minutes were approved. | Minutes approved. Thomas will make changes and clarification. |
| New Course Proposal  COM 100 for GE 7 Humanities | Comments: Grade scale in syllabus is greater than 100%. WOW!  The stated learning outcomes via GE7 are somewhat vague.  Nice proposal and well organized. Does it meet the learning outcomes?  Discussion of how course learning outcomes specifically meet the stated GE learning outcomes. Need to meet all learning outcomes. More discussion of how these may line up. | Motion to pass, unanimously passed. Forward on to Associate Provost. |
| MUS 105 | A. Thomas reports no updates on this class. Discussion of can a course for GE be for majors only (e,g, MUS 105 is a 600 section). Maybe not the best model. Discussion of section vs. course description. | A. Thomas will follow up. Including with B. Mattingly. |
| Assessment Plan. Move Forward with our plan! | Canfield submitted data. His presentation of validity of grades. His conclusion of data set is that course grades are indeed a valid measure of GE outcomes in specific major/discipline classes (e.g. art). OK, WOW. discussion continues with some fun statistical technique discussions and various assumptions. CLA, SOS, other general learning outcome tools for general education work.  L. Klotz begins discussion of course grade and a grade on a specific ‘test’ or embedded assessment. Should the course grade vs. an embedded test be suitable for GE assessment?  Could we, should we, add course grades as an additional tool for GE assessment. A. Thomas points out that this could lead to more, maybe better discussion with faculty that teach in that GE area. C. Van Der Karr suggests this is probably longer-term project using course grades. | Ok, next meeting should we use these grades as part of our outline for our new assessment plan? |
| Outline or our assessment plan for GE | What would this look like for the next couple of years. Currently 3-year plan, we suggested 6-year plan, now need to re-evaluate. | Again, need outline for our new assessment plan or outline. Sub-group of M. Canfield, A Thomas, C. Van Der Karr, J. Hokanson, White will work on plan. A. Thomas will schedule meeting to see what members are free and can join in with meeting. |
| C. Van Der Karr and 29 ‘special topics’ number classes as GE credit | GE seminars in different categories. A seminar series that could be ‘approved’ yet course content could change. More flexibility in the course content yet still assured it meets the GE outcomes. Acceptable by SUNY? Committee was supportive. | Discussion for next year. C. Van Der Karr will continue with research and report next year.  Meeting adjourned 12:32 pm |

Respectfully Submitted by Jim Hokanson, April 28, 2011