General Education Committee Meeting Minutes

September 23, 2021

Members Present: Nancy Diller, Carol Van Der Karr, Dan Radus, Garrett Otto, Lauren Delaubell, Eunyoung Jung, Gregory Ketcham, Stephen Cunningham, Bruce Mattingly, Justin Bucciferro, Doug Armstead

Members Absent : Jenn McNamara

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Comments** | **Action** |
| **Meeting started 8:32am** |  | **Minutes passed** |
| **Course proposals** | INT300 and INT301 up for deactivation  SCI325 and SCI360 up for GE 12 removal | **All 4 courses proposals passed by unanimous vote** |
| **Stakeholder chair message** | Letters to send to department chairs are in the works. Letters will focus less on revisiting rubric.  For presentation skills and Prejudice and discrimination:   * Recommendation that letters urge use of target, acceptable, unacceptable for rubrics. * Set expectation that their rubrics will be hashed out in 1 constrained meeting (to keep work load of ad hoc committee manageable). * Have GE committee liaison share needed files. |  |
| **Discussion of SUNY GE Framework** | Questions about   * Campus autonomy to set requirements above and beyond minimums (see bullet #15 of document) * Impact on writing and presentation skills (will they be forced into a single course) * SUNY central’s break on extra GE requirements:   + For curricula that exceed 126 Credit hours 1st recommendation is to cut extra GE requirements   + Requirement to show that a transfer student can satisfy the GEs in a timely manner (at least on paper). See section C.V of Implementation guidance. * Who makes the decision on campus?   + Change in GE program is shepherded by GE committee through the Faculty Senate   + Clarity is needed about what will go forward * Are models where students select among categories possible? Ans.: yes framework allows campuses this option.   Key question that shifts the tenor of the discussion:  “If we make no changes to existing Cortland GE requirements at Cortland would we be in compliance?”  From here forward the discussion is about identifying the minimum change possible to keep compliance.  Delaubell shares effort to create a crosswalk/crosstalk document toward this end. This part of the discussion identifies the following issues   * Guidance seems to push 1 course to satisfy both writing and presentation skills. Will we break compliance keeping these separate? This is seen as a problem to push back against. * GE4: having a civics requirement in this GE is new * GE6: Can we retain the additional SLOs in our local category? * In the bigger picture how much flexibility will we have in setting local SLOs?   Campus response must be turned in by 10/8. | **Expect draft of campus response to be shared at 10/7 meeting.** |
| Meeting ended 9:31am |  |  |

Submitted by Doug Armstead