

General Education Committee Meeting Minutes

December 3, 2015

Members Present: B. Mattingly, L. Czirr., M. Nagel, S. Chemsak, J. McNamara, S. Stratton, A. Thomas, C. Van Der Karr, A. Young.
Members Absent: K. Stone, B. Smith,
Guests: I. Jubran, T. Pasquarello

Topic	Comments	Action
Approval of 11/15/15 minutes	M. Nagel should be noted as absent on 11/15/15	Minutes approved as corrected
Spring 2016 assessments	Instructors have been identified and are being or will be contacted about the Spring 2016 assessment.	
Discussion of 11/20/15/ GE 1 subcommittee meeting (I. Jubran & T. Pasquarello)	<p>Subcommittee on GE 1 and other interested parties had differing views about GE 1 outcomes and how to assess them. I. Jubran and T. Pasquarello provided documents representing divergent viewpoints to the committee before the meeting and represented those viewpoints during the meeting.</p> <p>One view is that the SUNY imposed outcomes are problematical to meet and assess in most math courses, but those outcomes could be easily and effectively assessed in any introductory statistics course. Hence, we should consider listing only statistics courses as meeting GE 1 requirement. (Majority of the subcommittee.)</p> <p>Other view is that that most other colleges do as we do, listing a wide variety of math courses that meet the requirement. Some of these institutions have different language to describe the GE 1 outcomes, but these were presumably approved by SUNY as being compatible with the intent of SUNY outcomes. Further, a GE program should allow for diversity rather than suppressing it. We have assessed this category before and can do so again.</p> <p>A lengthy discussion followed that included many comments and opinions:</p> <p>Outcome 4 (reasonableness of results) and 5 (limits of math and stat methods) are most difficult to assess in non-stat math courses.</p> <p>Reasonableness and limits are not that difficult to assess. One can learn to discern if a result makes sense.</p> <p>Philosophy department can help with the question of reasonableness. Meta perspectives needed to do assessment.</p> <p>Replacing our outcomes with those of Geneseo or Binghamton would help.</p> <p>Many people have never seen the results of the 2011 assessment, especially</p>	No action was taken, which would seem to mean we're going forward with the assessment this spring using a variety of approaches (e.g., embedded assessments or those 2011 tools that are still applicable).

those on the current sub-committee. This made the subcommittee work difficult and raises the question of why we do assessment. It also leaves teachers of these courses without feedback.

The results of the 2011 assessment are available. Instructors do know the results of their assessment at the time they submit them.

While hampered by not having the 2011 GE 1 assessment report at the time of their meeting, the committee can still get the report and use it going forward.

We don't have to use a single assessment for all GE 1 courses. In 2011, there were several, each tailored to the nature of various courses. The current approach is to have embedded assessments, which are likely to be unique to each course.

Changing to a stats-only approach to GE 1 would have significant staffing implications. The stat courses close early in registration already.

A stats-only approach would be burdensome to students who complete GE 1 courses repeatedly (but not a stats course) as part of their major.

Students in other majors are in the same situation with respect to other GE courses. A stats course would be of great value to all students in their professional and personal lives

If we're dissatisfied with the outcomes, which are nearly identical to SUNY wording, why not rework the outcomes (which would still require SUNY approval) rather than restrict our offerings to one type of course?

Instructors of stats courses could develop a common assessment tool.

If we change the category, we need to remember that we admit 800 transfer students who are likely to have met the GE 1 requirement with something other than stats. So an understanding of statistics could never become a mark of a SUNY Cortland graduate.

We should delay the assessment until this question is settled.

Changing the outcomes or the approved courses will require a lengthy process. We can go ahead using the 2011 tools and/or embedded assessments created by individual instructors.

Discussion of Subcommittee
Reports
GE 4
GE 11
Curriculum Discussions
HLH 369 – GE 11
REC 310 – GE 7

Meeting adjourned at 9:40
with remaining agenda
items (left) postponed
to a later date.