GEACC Meeting Notes
3/10/2014

Chairperson: Ron Picard
Vice Chairperson: Richard Gard
Secretary: Amy Lenoce


Agenda for General Education Meeting 3-6-14
1. Vote on Minutes from 2-20-14
2. Vote on BIO 110 removed from Scientific Reasoning
3. Vote on Social Phenomena Applications presented by Joe Ward
4. Discussion on Science meeting, CEAC, and other matters
5. Adjourn

1. Vote on Minutes from 2-20-14
Presenter: Ron Picard

Motion to Approval meeting minutes from 2-20-14
First Jim Pronovost
Second Alex Zozulin
Vote- Unanimous

2. Vote removing BIO 110 from Scientific Reasoning
Presenter: Ron Picard

Science department has requested BIO 110 be removed from Scientific Reasoning
Discussion- course should be evaluated on outcomes and not on pedagogy

Science has the right to remove the course application if they so choose
Motion: To remove BIO 110 from Scientific Reasoning as requested
First Alex Zozulin
Second Katie Lozo
Vote- Unanimous

3. Vote on Social Phenomena Applications presented by Joe Ward
Presenter: Joe Ward
PSY 245- Abnormal Psychology
Suggested- Remove 1st outcome on objective #3, & #4, & #5
Motion: accept PSY 245 with minor changes for Social Phenomena
1st Jim Pronovost
2nd Katie Lozo
Vote- Unanimous
4. Discussion on Science meeting, CEAC, and other matters
Presenter: Ron Picard

1. Ron- Attended science department meeting. Shared with us concerns that were discussed.
If we are accepting courses that are not typical of the category, will transfer institutions accept the course? Technically, under TAP, yes.
Currently programs can specify courses that students have to take. Programs will limit the course options students may take to complete and transfer their degree.
Our committee is dedicated to cause as little disruption to programs as possible. If the new competency-based Gen Ed can fit into programs as they stand now, then transfer will stay as status quo for graduation. This whole point will be moot when all 17 schools have one common Gen Ed.

The Science Department is concerned about approval of Psychology courses as science courses as they are not lab courses. Ron pointed out that many programs may need the psychology course as a science in their curriculum because, unlike the TAP Gen Ed, they currently do not require two natural science courses.

If Gen Ed is to have 2 science courses, then STEM will need to provide more courses, lab space, and faculty. There currently is not enough physical space on campus for additional labs. Concern about the quality control over teaching psychology outcomes was discussed. That is a current issue that we are dealing with in all academic programs.

Terry reported that the psychology faculty will meet at the end of March to address the specific concern raised by GEACC regarding the PSY 111 application.

2. Should we have a FAQ on the website and feedback? Yes. Should we include the FAQ in the weekly bulletin. Yes. Jaime volunteered to write the FAQ.

3. Coordination with CEAC
Jim Brancifort, chair of CEAC, is concerned that courses are changing their outcomes without the course going through CEAC with a course modification.
Ron expressed concern that CEAC may not be equipped to handle the volume of course changes (150-160 course changes). The faculty on this committee have 2+ years of experience, some many more, in writing and revising course outcomes. Also, many of the changes were to verbs, not to the course materials. Furthermore, most of these changes were additions, not subtractions.

We need to have the course outcomes in final version. We need to create a repository of course outcomes. Ron asks that we send him the application and the final approved outcomes as a .pdf to store on our website. Amy suggested that we link the approved course outcomes to the course as listed in the Access database.

Jim pointed out that many courses that went through CEAC never went through with outcomes. It was only in the last 5 years CEAC started to review outcomes with course applications.

Katie raised the concern that when a course applied for multiple competencies we must be sure the same outcomes are being used in each application.

Jim and Ron pointed out that we are establishing and maintaining ethics standards by having consistent
It would be a good idea to have a representative from GEACC to attend CEAC meetings on a regular basis. Currently Jaime is on both committees, but Ron and Jaime agree that a faculty member should fill this role.

Jamie said that CEAC wanted to look at the process, but it would be labor intensive to review all the courses. They want to do “due diligence” but not be overly labor intensive. CEAC meets Mondays at 2:30pm, once a month. If anyone wants to volunteer to be the liaison please let Ron know.

Katie- questions on assessment raised by the Math Department
1. GEACC talked about planning assessment in the fall and assessing in the spring. Math Department feels that a spring only assessment does not provide enough data. They want to plan now and assess in fall and spring. Ron said that is fine to do.

2. Should we really begin assessing before the Planning and Implementation Team decides which courses will fall under each competency? We may end up assessing courses that will not fall under Quantitative Reasoning and may miss assessing others. Will the Planning and Implementation Team create the assessment measure?
Ron said that the Planning Committee said assessment was to be done locally. You can use the assessment rubric created by the planning committee or with your own tool. Assessment is on student learning- how well do the students learn the stated outcomes. The assessment report is to identify weaknesses and how they will be addressed.

3. The Math Department has several classes in the catalog that are not taught at NVCC, but are used for transferring in of courses to award students credits in math. Should these courses go through the application and assessment process? Ron said it was not necessary since we are not teaching them.

5. Adjourn
Meeting adjourned 2:05pm