**GEACC Meeting Notes**

February 23, 2017

 Chairperson: Jason Seabury

 Vice Chairperson: Burton Tedesco

 Secretary:

Committee Attendance:

Burton Tedesco- Aesthetic Dimension

Beth-Ann Scott- Written Communication

Lisa Anderson- Ethics

Jaime Hammond- Continuing Learning/Information Literacy

Sandra Eddy- Critical Analysis/ Logical Thinking

Karla Ekquist-Lechner- Historical Knowledge

Jason Seabury- Quantitative Reasoning

Alexander Zozulin- Scientific Knowledge

Peter Benzi - Scientific Reasoning

~~Lawrence Venuk- Social Phenomena- Sabbatical~~

Amy Lenoce - Oral Communication

~~Ed Clancy- Advisory -Registrar’s Office- Away from Campus~~

Guest- Jane Wampler

Guest- Ron Picard

Guest- Chris Tuccio

Meeting called to order at 2:35 by Jason Seabury

1. Vote to approve minutes from Dec. 8, 2016 meeting.

 Motion to approve: Amy Lenoce

 Second to motion: Karla Ekquist-Lechner

 Abstained: Jaime Hammond and Lisa Anderson

 Motion carried.

1. GEACC mission / name / future

Jason raised some questions about GEACC’s mission and name. Some options included removing the “Curriculum Design” component (GEAC) or removing both that and the “Assessment” component (Gen Ed) with the assumption that those words are implied under the umbrella of General Education.

Ron raised the point during discussion included the fact that the college will likely create an Assessment committee in the future, but that may not grow out of this committee. GEACC’s mission includes assessment, and the practices and policies that we create and implement may help the assessments that programs and disciplines do as part of their reports in the future: this is an argument against removing “Assessment”

Jane raised the point that while GEACC no longer votes on every course proposal involving gen ed during our meetings, the competency experts and chair of our committee are still called upon to help map outcomes to gen ed outcomes, and therefore curriculum design is still a part of our duties.

* + 1. Proposal to change the name of GEACC to General Education Committee.
			1. Motion to approve: Peter Benzi
			2. Second to motion: Sandra Eddy
			3. After discussion, there was a proposal to table the motion.
				1. Motion to table: Burton Tedesco
				2. Second to motion: Beth-Ann Scott
				3. Motion carried unanimously.
			4. Motion was **tabled.**
1. Discussion about types of data we feel necessary to evaluate competencies being met. The point that we should be collecting data constantly and uploading it to an online program was raised. Artifacts should be collected by all instructors teaching Gen Ed courses, and when that competency is assessed, the competency experts should put together teams of assessors (who should be granted ARs) to assess the already-collected artifacts. This will help streamline our system and put less of a sudden burden on experts and department chairs and program coordinators. This is not a policy set in stone yet: it is reliant on our obtaining the appropriate software. Ron told us that there is a consortium of colleges in the system that are bargaining together to use Taskstream. We will get updates on this as they become available: there is a meeting March 10 in Hartford with I.T. and assessment people from many colleges that may provide further information on this.
2. Discussion on exemption policy. There is a state policy that associate’s degree programs should not require more than a certain number of credits: this is usually 62 credits for programs without outside accreditation, and a few more credits granted for programs with stringent outside accreditation requirements. To meet these outside requirements and still fit under the credit cap, some programs require exemptions. We are asking that they demonstrate 2 things: 1) How it is impossible to fit that gen ed course, and 2) How those outcomes are either generally met through other courses, or how those outcomes are unnecessary for student success in that program and beyond. We will also keep close records about which programs have exemptions, and the rationale.
	1. Horticulture NALP Program – Exemption Request from Historical Knowledge– Chris Tuccio demonstrated the preceding criteria.
		1. Motion to approve request: Peter Benzi
		2. Second to motion: Karla Ekquist-Lechner
		3. Motion **carried** unanimously.
3. HRT 224 – Exclusion from Scientific Reasoning – Chris Tuccio also pointed out that students in the Horticulture program taking HRT 224 were already fulfilling their Scientific Reasoning requirement through a BIO course. It made sense to the committee to remove HRT from Scientific Reasoning on those grounds.
	* 1. Motion to approve request: Amy Lenoce
		2. Second to motion: Peter Benzi
		3. Motion **carried** unanimously.
4. Lastly, Burton Tedesco reported from the system-wide FRC committee (faculty-based TAP facilitation advisory committee) that two new Gen Ed competencies have been suggested in order to help guarantee that more of students’ General Electives will transfer: Global Knowledge and Creativity. He passed out forms that included 3 outcomes for each of those two areas. He and Ron Picard stressed that NOT all programs need to fit courses into these competencies: they are purely to REPLACE up to two “General Electives” in order to help make sure those general electives will transfer easily and help those students finish requirements at the four-year schools. Competency experts on GEACC and department chairs and program coordinators are asked to determine which (if any) of the courses offered in their areas might fit the three outcomes in these two new Competency areas. More information will be forthcoming soon.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 pm.

Minutes submitted by:

Jason Seabury