General Education Committee

March 16 2012

Minutes

Present: Abby Thomas, Amy Schutt, Brooke Burk, Bruce Mattingly, Carol Van Der Karr, Jim Hokanson, Larry Klotz, Linda Pickett, Merle Canfield, Sam Kelley, Alesia Forde (student member)

Excused: Annita Kuiken, Orvil White

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Comments** | **Action Item** |
| 1. Review/Approval of minutes from 2/24/12
2. Introductions
 | Review of minutes | Minutes approved.Happy to have Alesia Forde join us, and committee introduced members. |
| 1. Chair Report (Schutt on behalf of Kuiken)
	1. PHI 111 – revision review
	2. THT260 – revision review
	3. Spitzer email
	4. Subcommittees: review syllabi & submission 2
	5. GE Assessment Spring 2011 letter edit
 | A. Discussion of PHI 111. Discussion of response from K. Russell concerning PHI 111. L. Klotz suggests sending response to Quant skills ad hoc committee for their suggestions. L. Pickett and others liked detail of response and how to address SLO’s. Mattingly suggested that we need to a clear understanding of what is SUNY’s Quant Skills requirement. A. Schutt suggested looking at other SUNY’s and community colleges. B. THT 260 revision discussion. Does this meet the learning outcomes? C. Should new faculty be exempted from course GE assessment? L. Klotz & L. Pickett argued that all faculty should be involved. A. Thomas and B. Burk discussed how we inform faculty about GE assessment and should maybe be part of new faculty information sessions. This should not set a precedent for removal from GE assessment. L. Klotz, Our current GE assessment is not that involved and should not require that much work.S. Kelly reminds us how busy and possibly overwhelmed first year faculty are. And we expect recent hire adjuncts to complete this as well. A. Schutt suggested a brief talk with professor about the process and that it really does not take that much work. B. Mattingly talked about email and meaning of email. D. Subcommittees: review syllabi & submission 2. Amy Schutt reminds group about GE syllabus review and more time for a review of syllabus if needed. Form for syllabi review. Also assessment instrument.  | Group recommends to send response to Quant ad hoc committee for their suggestions.Carol Van De Karr will look at other schools. And how they define GE #1. Moved to approve A. Thomas, Second, L. Klotz, approved unanimously. Group recommends that Anita and/or L Pickett talk in person with professor. Group recommends that Anita (and maybe Bruce) talk with Chair about the process. April 10th date for re-write of GE syllabus if needed. GE sub committee leaders will help to make sure syllabi and assessment tool has been submitted. |
|  | E. GE Assessment Spring 2011 letter edit. What are the “benchmarks”? Why trends.  | Amy Schutt has changes to letter. Just started on revisions Amy will re-write changes and allow us to continue to review. |
| 1. A Director of Institutional Research and Assessment Report
 | Merle Canfield. Current list of what classes have turned in requirements for GE assessment.  |  |
| 1. Other

“What does GE mean to you?” Brainstorming session | So, what is our (SUNY Cortland) GE culture?EngagementOwnershipAnnual reports | The group will ruminate on how can GE be more meaningful.  |
|  |  |  |
| Meeting adjourned  | 12:35 pm |  |

Respectfully Submitted by Jim Hokanson, March 16th