

**SUNY Broome Community College
General Education Committee Minutes
12/10/20**

College Vision: **Learning today, transforming tomorrow.**

SUNY Broome Mission: SUNY Broome Community College supports all members of the learning community by creating access to inclusive, diverse educational experiences. Success is achieved through the provision of innovative academics, transformative student support, and meaningful civic and community engagement.

Institutional Values: **INQUIRY, RESPECT, INTEGRITY, TRUST, EQUITY**
Thursday, Dec. 10, 2020 3-4:30 pm
Via Zoom

Vision: LEARNING TODAY, TRANSFORMING TOMORROW

Voting members present: H. Bartlett, C. Church, B. Dawe, K. Moyer, S. Ohl, C. Tokos

Non-voting members present: D. Berchtold, S. Gible, R. Lofthouse, K. McLain, C. Ryan, S. Wright

I. Call to order: 3:04pm

II. Minutes from 11/19/20

Motion to approve: H. Bartlett, 2nd C. Tokos, Vote: 6, 0, 0

III. Vote on Course Deactivation:

a. MUS185

Motion to vote approve the deactivation: H. Bartlett, 2nd C. Tokos. Vote: 6, 0, 0

IV. New Business

a. Dr. Kim McLain, update from Institutional Effectiveness & Enrollment Planning

Today was the first of the forums on the draft for Middle States (the Broome Zoom today). The committee will be presenting at the Shared Governance meetings next week. Standards 3 and parts of Standard 5 probably of most interest for the Gen Ed committee to look over in the draft.

Program Maps: 4 programs in the LA Division are having difficulty meeting ILO 5. For now it is highlighted and has a note that it is being worked on. A Work Group is being formed to develop a module to meet ILO 5 and then infuse that into a course or courses that all students in the program will take. The concern is that there isn't necessarily a single course that all students take.

It was suggested that perhaps this committee could come up with a description that better defines what ILO 5 is in order to help programs better figure out how to map to ILO 5.

Need to make sure that students are "performing" something based on the language of the measurable statement.

Maybe develop a rubric that could be used in courses in LA that do extensive research papers and those courses could assess that aspect to capture the ILO.

There are also other courses across LA that all majors have to take at least one of that capture some form of technical competency (music, art, theater, etc.)

History courses that are required by LA degree—Working Group could survey the professors teaching these courses to see who requires a research paper. If they all do, then a common rubric to assess papers could solve the problem. There is a possibility that a professor may choose to not require a paper and that would cause issues.

Faculty buy-in is needed, but we need to better define and explain what can meet the ILO...which may increase buy-in.

The issues with getting the buy-in was discussed, especially for adjuncts (and those who are losing those positions next semester)—how can we ensure that there is full buy-in to truly assess everyone?

b. Racial Justice ILO

Given the issues discussed about ILO 5, we want to make sure that we don't run into the same type of issues with the new ILO measurable statement.

Needs to be something that can be accomplished. Should also match what we have for the other ILOs

Suggestion from the committee to start with:

Students will identify the consequences of racism at the individual, group, and systemic levels in the United States.

Updated suggestions:

Students will identify the consequences of racism at the individual, group, and systemic levels in the United States within the context of a given course of study.

Including the last phrase may make it seem more doable for different programs

Within the context of a given course of study, students will identify the consequences of racism at the individual, group, and systemic levels in the United States.

Within the context of a given field, discipline, or profession, students will identify the consequences of racism at the individual, group, and systemic levels in the United States.

There was a discussion about whether there needs to be a specific part that clarifies “apply that knowledge to their own area of study”

There was a discussion about the “United States” part—what happens if that is taken out. The rationale from the PTODI specifies that the discussion is focused on what happens/happened within the United States (distinguishes from the Global Awareness ILO)

There was a discussion about needing training, although there is the issue that training cannot be mandated.

There was a discussion about the portion “and evaluate the impact of policy in promoting a more just democracy” that the PTODI deems “desirable but may not be feasible at this time in all programs.” It very way may be addressed in courses, but assessing it could be

extremely difficult. It may make sense in certain classes that specifically deal with policy, but across the board this may be hard.

The point was brought up that students don't necessarily take programs—they take courses within any program. So these elements need to be addressed in the course level, not program.

The point was brought up that it is difficult to have the large ILOs and then have to narrow them down to one assessment within one course. K. McLain clarified that it is not limited to just one course to meet an ILO. As many courses as necessary can be used to meet an ILO—using just one keeps in simple.

We will send our final suggested statement back to the PTODI for their thoughts and we will go from there at our next meeting. Once they agree on the wording, the Gen Ed committee, along with representation from PTODI will take it to the divisions to get their feedback and approval.

V. Call for New Business

VI. Adjournment 4:35 pm

Respectfully submitted by Karyn Moyer