Bergen Community College
Committee on General Education
Meeting of March 5, 2013
Minutes

Members present: Benicia D’Sa, Gary Correa, Andrew Krikun, Tracy Saltwick, Michael Redmond, Joshua Guttman, Ash Melicka, Harriett Terodemos, Denise Budd, Danielle Coppola, Bridget Connolly, Margaret McLaughlin, Beth Pincus, George Cronk, Barbara Walcott, and Judi Davis

Guests: None

A. Last Meeting: The minutes of 1-29-2013 meeting were approved as written (13-0-1).

B. Chairperson’s report: Judi Davis reported:

C. After presenting the GE assessment plan to the GE committee on Jan 29, 2013, I met with VP for Institutional Effectiveness, Dr. Yun Kim, who had reservations about the plan. Her objections were mainly in four areas:
   1. The plan should NOT state that it will require no further work from faculty.
   2. There is not enough money in budget to support a GEAC as described in the plan.
   3. There are too many different assessment groups already (LAC, Assessment Liaisons, Assessment Fellows), so we do not need a new one.
   4. The plan itself is not situated in research data supporting this kind of plan.

D. Yun Kim and I also met with Acting VP of Academic Services, Tom Jewell and Andrew Tomko to further discuss the plan. The outcome of that meeting was the suggestion that a team of faculty and administrators apply to participate in a week-long workshop sponsored by the AAC&U on “General Education and Assessment.” This workshop will provide expert assistance to the team to help it develop a plan for assessment of GE that is suited for our GE program. We had to write an essay explaining our needs and should learn if we are accepted or not by March 8, 2013.

E. The GE assessment plan was sent to the officers of the BCC Faculty Senate, but I withdrew my request to be on the March Faculty Senate agenda, waiting to learn of the AACU workshop. The problem with slowing down our progress to get a GE Assessment Plan approved is that it does not move forward on the recommendation from Middle States to incorporate centralized assessment into general education.

F. Related to the Information Literacy Project: I prepared a statement articulating confusion we have about the way the state is looking at what it calls “Integrated Course Goals.” The state is acting on a presumption that for a course to be considered as “integrating” IL, it must address all five major goals on the IL Progression Standards (developed by librarians and endorsed by the NJCCC). The issue is that the IL Standards itself suggest assignments that address only one or two of the goals—not all five. We have been working under the assumption that all five goals need not be addressed to consider that a course is integrating information literacy.

G. I attended the NJCCC Summit on Core Learning Outcomes at Middlesex Community College. This conference was attended by Seamus Gibbons and Adam Goodell (Composition 101); Lou
Ethel Roliston and Daniel Salerno (Composition 2); Elin Schikler and Kathleen Williams (Speech); Anne Maganzini and Mi Ahn (Psychology 101); Maureen Ellis-Davis and Manuela Lataianu (Sociology 101), Thomas Jewell and Judith Davis (Staff). The purpose of the conference was to gather faculty from all over the state to develop three common student learning outcomes for five of the most highly enrolled GE courses in the state. There are plans to do this for five more courses next fall.

3. New Business – No new Business

4. Old Business
   Discussion and vote on GE Proposal to the Senate on “BCC Policy on Student Selection of General Education Courses” (George Cronk). Proposal passed by a vote of 16-0-0.

   The Proposal is intended to document that the college must coordinate the IT, Student Services, and GE Program in determining what courses are considered “General Education” for students’ transcripts and degree requirements. In brief, there is no tie between the matriculation catalog year and the GE List, since the list is updated three times per year. The current GE list should apply—even for returning students; if courses are no longer considered GE courses, but were when the students took the courses, the college should adjust the degree requirements.

4. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 1:15 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Judi Davis, Chair