GE Board Minutes
October 2, 2015 in CSB 110 12:30-2:00

Minute taker – Millham; Attending; Collier, Deutsch, Hsu, Morrison, Nelson, Thomas, Tsai, Wawrzonek, Newcomb

1. Welcome. Approval of minutes from Sept. 23 meeting (10 minutes)
   Approved unanimously

2. Discussion of results of GE survey, with an eye towards developing/refining a summary to send to faculty (20 minutes)
   In what format: Discussion regarding format of survey results reflected by:
   School
   Or general

Feedback varies in that students need more choice vs. faculty need more
   • Does the data say 7 out of 10 or 10 out of 10 are more significant? Or want to keep what we have.

Credit distribution and categories: clear reduction vs. broad distribution of categories
   • Commonality
     o More effective choices
     o Just use all SUNY's BOT vs. 7 out of 10
     o How does the term “flexible” impact decisions on the GRE
   • Discontinuity
     o Considered and discussed
     o Single item suggestions

Other considerations:
   • Minimal vs. optimal
   • Flexibility vs. solid program
   • Thematic approach – an idea of a cohesive learning experience that is interrelated with majors
   • Quality and assessment are clear
   • Meaning, relevancy, integrity, inquiry, capstones, do no harm, critical thinking, full-time faculty, and social context with faculty
   • Should be identified on the common ground
   • Need for flexibility and coherency

First year seminar was a positive feedback; FIGs could be this

Discussion regarding whether we have 1, 2 or 3 proposals and whether we work on the proposals through the lens of commonalities.

If commonalities drive the proposals, what do they look like when they are completed?

Framing our GE proposals based on the outcomes rather than what we want
3. Discussion of Spring 2015 Assessment results and faculty comments (30 minutes).

Faculty found the process a bit easier after revisions of the last two years, though some problems in communication seem to still exist. Committee felt keeping the forms and communication methods the same for the coming year was the best course of action as we consider ways that assessment itself could be reformed.

Inconsistency in results in the two oral-focused categories were noted.

Discussion of faculty comments and problems of individual course assessment. Newcomb suggested a model based on testing. Also, based on faculty feedback, suggested:
- Do selection of sections earlier—perhaps at the end of finals week for fall semester. Instructors can build it into syllabi over break.
- Avoid selecting first-term TAs. Avoid selecting unstaffed sections if the selection is moved earlier. Ideally avoid selecting first-term adjunct instructors. (Yes, this hurts validity, but the statistical validity is quite questionable already. Associate Provost Garrick Duhaney has already said she'll try to keep first-term TAs out of the sample.)
- First-timer guide to assessment. Provide a tip sheet. (May already exist.)
- Keep the deadline for turning in final assessments later than the final grades due deadline in spring.
- Request that department chairs send out sample teaching and assessment materials in early spring to all selected instructors (whenever material is available).
- Require that assessment learning outcomes appear separately on syllabi for courses meeting those GE requirements. This may already be the case, but it is not clear to many, and those outcomes seem separate from the list of learning outcomes for a course that are often there.

Consideration of Models of assessment and ways of addressing assessment:
- Competency tests for some GEs are not always critical thinking focus
- Rather than wait on GE reform, could add material NOW into syllabi
- What other variables can be used
- If we overhaul GE do we overhaul assessment?
- Do we work backward from assessment outcomes to the goal of GE?

4. Discussion of plan for constructing proposal/proposals
- What is the meaning behind GE? Committee decided answering this would be the first stage of proposal drafting for next week.
- How does the meaning drive our GE programming
- What does SUNY require in assessment
- What do the Middle States require?

Find the SUNY and MS requirements first and allow the assessment requirements to drive GE proposals as a possible approach to determine feasible proposals based on assessment and the survey

Meeting adjourned at 2:02 pm.
Respectfully submitted by Rosemary Millham