



May 15, 2008

PRESENT: J. Alas, D. Baxter, I. Benz, P. Bishop, T. Ciambor, B. Connell, M. DiSano, J. Downer, G. Dutter, M. Ernsthause, M. Fine, M. Fugate, E. Grissing, S. Haggren, R. Kennedy, A. Leopard, D. McConkey, M. Murphy, S. Murphy (Secretary), P. Ornt, H. Pierre-Philippe, E. Ripton, T. Schichler, D. Shaw, D. Smith, A. Striegel, J. Thompson, T. Tugel (President), J. Waasdorp, P. Wakem, S. Weider, C. Wendtland, S. Wexler, H. Wheeler (Vice-President), W. Willard, W. Yanklowski.

ABSENT: S. Batista-Provost, C. Boettrich, M. Ewanechko, S. Fess, S. Forsyth, K. Huggins, A. John, N. Karolinski, D. Leach, J. McKenna, J. Nelson, P. Peterson, J. Striebich, H. Wynn-Preische

GUESTS: S. Blacklaw, D. Cecero, K. Collins, C. Cooper, R. Degus, M. McDonough

STUDENTS: Jennifer Bickel

I. Meeting called to order: 3:35 p.m.

II. Guest: Michael Boester, Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Assessment and Program Review. The committee was charged with providing recommendations for a new timeline for the assessment cycle and to update the program review guidelines on the Faculty Senate resolutions. (See Attachments A and B for the full details.) The following people served on the committee: Lori Annesi, Susan Baker, Stuart Blacklaw, Rory Butler, Charlotte Downing, Regina Fabbro, Jason Mahar, Denee Martin, and Margaret Murphy.

A. Why Change the Program Review Assessment Cycle? This came from a Middle States suggestion for improvement related to Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning which suggests that the College examine the time frame of 7 years for the program assessment cycle citing that this length of time is long for a community college that must be responsive to community needs. SUNY Guidelines state that there should be one cycle every five to seven years. The committee recommends that there be one cycle every six years. This would provide more time to implement action plan and more time to evaluate its impacts on the program. It would decrease workload for faculty, departments, and curriculum and program Development. And it would reduce cost to the College for Program Assessment Liaisons (PALs).

B. Why change the Program Review Guidelines? The current guidelines are outdated and make references to committees that do not exist. Some areas are deficient in regards to SUNY guidelines. There is little guidance in the current resolutions on how to actually carryout the program review process and the resolutions were confusing. Another reason is that Dave Shaw's 2006 Program Review of Performing Arts: Music AS has been used just as much as the actual guidelines which points to the problem that the official guidelines are deficient.

- C. The committee recommends replacing the current resolutions in section 2.6 with the following seven step program review process guidelines:
1. Spring semester before program review-Step One-establish committees and collect guidelines. This step will determine the PAL, establish the Program faculty and staff committee and gather the external review committee.
 2. Fall semester of program review- Step Two-collect and analyze internal data. This step will review program mission, goals, objectives, outcomes, program design, analyze faculty/adjunct ratios, analyze how students are served, measure student learning outcomes assessment, and review support services and administrative support.
 3. Spring semester of program review-Step Three- meet with the external review committee to update them on the progress. Step Four-develop recommendations and create an action plan. Step Five-write the program review report. Step Six-submit the program review report.
 4. Fall semester after program review-Step Seven-establish a committee to carryout the action plan
- D. The committee asked for feedback from the following faculty: Tony Ciazza, Rick Costanza, David Shaw, and John Striebich,
- E. There will be an open hearing on these proposed changes on Thursday, June 5th at 2:00pm in room 8-300. The Senate will vote on this June 12th.

III. Announcements (T. Tugel):

- A. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be June 12th and is an All College meeting. President Flynn will be the guest speaker.
- B. This Saturday, May 17th, at 9:00am, the Board of Trustees meeting will take place and it is anticipated that they will announce their recommendation for president. The Senate has reserved a room immediately after the meeting if the College community would like to discuss the outcome of the announcement. On Tuesday, May 20 at 5:00pm in Monroe B there will be a joint meeting of the Faculty Senate, Faculty Association, CSEA and student government to discuss possible next steps.
- C. Barb Connolly DCC Dean of Academic Services, is retiring August 31. It is anticipated that there will be a search in the fall to fill her position at DCC and SCAA will be involved. It is also anticipated that Vice President Glocker will appoint an interim dean since the search cannot be completed by August 31. Vice-Appointments for interim positions do not require SCAA involvement.

IV. Approval of Minutes: Minutes of April 24, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting approved as written.

V. Action items:

- A. Curriculum action item:
Program deactivation:
PD2S Radiologic Technology-Alternative for Radiographers, AAS, **motion passed.**
- B. Academic Policies action item-Resolution 1.8.2 Disciplinary Action
W. Willard clarified a few points regarding this policy. This policy does not require a faculty member to give a grade of F in cases of academic dishonesty. It does not require faculty to change the student initiated W to an F. This policy gives faculty the right to do so if they choose to exercise that right. It is recommended that this policy be included along with the required statement on academic dishonesty in the course information sheet.
Current Policy
All students who are involved in any form of academic dishonesty shall be considered equally guilty of the transgression and shall be subject to the same penalties.

A faculty member who has evidence that a student is guilty of academic dishonesty shall initiate the appropriate disciplinary action. However, no penalty shall be imposed until after the student has been informed of the charge and of the evidence upon which it is based, and been given opportunity to present whatever statement or evidence the student desires in his/her defense.

Thereafter if the student is found guilty, the faculty member shall assess a penalty within the course, consistent with the magnitude of the transgression. Such penalty may consist of a warning, reduction in passing grade for the course, or a grade of "F" for the course.

Every case of academic dishonesty which affects a student's grade shall be promptly reported in writing to the appropriate department chairperson and the Vice President of Student Services. The Vice President of Student Services may initiate further disciplinary action in any case of repeated infractions, or in cases of complicity on a large scale. Such further disciplinary action shall be the discretion of the Vice President of Student Services and may result in probation, suspension or expulsion from the College. A record of the offense and the disciplinary action taken shall remain in the student's file.

Proposed Policy

(Insert the following paragraph between paragraphs 3 and 4 above)

If a student who commits an act of academic dishonesty withdraws from the course and would have earned a grade of "F" due to the academic dishonesty, the instructor has the right to change the grade from "W" to "F." Such grade changes will be made by submitting an Academic Record Change Form to Registration and Records indicating the reason for the grade change as academic dishonesty. The student will be notified in writing by Registration and Records that the "W" grade has been changed to a grade of "F" due to academic dishonesty.

Rationale

A number of faculty members have expressed concern that when they have notified a student guilty of academic dishonesty that his/her penalty will be a grade of "F" in the course, the student then withdraws from the course, thus avoiding the penalty for the transgression. After discussion over the last year between Academic Policies and Student Services concerning how to best resolve this issue, we have reached consensus to support the right of faculty to change the student-initiated W to a grade of F in instances of academic dishonesty. This policy change further reinforces to students the serious consequences that can result from academic dishonesty. Students shall retain the right to appeal or grieve the grade change by following the normal procedure for appeal or academic grievance procedure outlined in sections 1.8.3 and 1.9.4 of the Senate Resolutions.

Motion passed.

VI. Standing Committee Reports

Academic Policies Committee – W. Willard

- A. Revisions to the Incoming Transfer Credits policy (1.2.1) have been reviewed and finalized by Academic Policies, Senate Executive Committee, Betsy Ripton (Registrar), Andy Freeman (Director of Admissions) and Bill Sigismund (Director of Adult and Experiential Learning). The revisions are being presented to senators for dissemination to constituents and will be voted on at the June Senate meeting. The revisions were necessitated by the need to include sources for advanced standing credit that are offered at MCC but were not part of the original policy such as portfolio credit for prior experiential learning. Students with extensive experience that is equivalent to content learned in a MCC course may, through documentation of the learning, earn credit for the course. Students receive credit for documented course-equivalent learning, not for the portfolio itself. The Office of Adult and Experiential Learning has student guidelines for the development of portfolios and Bill Sigismund is very willing to meet with individual departments to talk further about experiential learning and portfolio credit. W. Willard encouraged departments to invite him to a department meeting to learn more about portfolio credit.
- B. A concern has come to the attention of the Committee regarding the College's new 15-credit DART (Dental Assistant Rapid Track) program that was recently approved by the State Education Department. The program, as approved by the State, permits students to test out of 9 of the 15 program credits. However, this violates MCC's residency requirement for certificate programs, as stated in the college

catalog, that students must complete at least 50% of the credit hours required by the program at MCC. Concerns were raised as to how the College's residency requirements for degree and certificate programs were determined and the rationale behind them. As a result, other concerns developed as to why the Senate resolutions contain no information or policies concerning graduation requirements for certificate or degree programs. As stated in the Senate bylaws, academic standards and educational policies of the College are under the purview of the Senate through Academic Policies. If graduation requirements represent part of the College's academic standards, then the Academic Policies Committee and Executive Committee believe they should be included in the Senate resolutions. Since a number of important concerns developed as a result of the DART issue, these concerns need time to be resolved and will be a focus for the Executive Committee and Academic Policies in the next academic year. In order to resolve the immediate issue as to how to fairly handle the three students scheduled to receive DART certificates this May who do not meet residency requirements, Vice President Glocker waived the 50% residency requirement for those three students. Academic Policies and the Senate Executive Committee concur with the decision made by Vice President Glocker.

- C. W. Willard has received and replied to a number of questions from different senators concerning the W to F proposal that was voted on as an Action Item at this meeting. As a result of suggestions from faculty, portions of the Disciplinary Action policy (1.8.2) that were not part of the action item put to vote at this meeting are being modified. Those changes will be presented at the June Senate meeting. W. Willard encouraged senators to send her any suggested changes to 1.8.2 by May 30 in order for them to be presented with the other changes at the June 12 Senate meeting.

Curriculum – A. Leopard

- A. The Curriculum Committee has given final approval to:

Six New Courses:

NC3S PPE 185 Sports Performance Coaching

NC5S CHI 103 Intermediate Chinese I

NC6S JPN 103 Intermediate Japanese I

NC7S FSA 110 Principles of Baking-Bread Products and Cookie Doughs

NC8S FSA 111 Principles of Baking-Pastries and Confections Products

NC4S HIS 275 History and Cultural Analysis of the Holocaust, Genocide, and Human Rights

Eight Course Revisions:

CR65S EDU 208 Guided Observation in Education

CR17S BUS 250 International Management and Marketing

CR18S GEO 105 Astronomy

CR14S EDU 200 Foundations in Education

CR20S SOC 209 Environmental Sociology

CR21S ENG 201 Early British Literature

CR25S ENG 202 Modern British Literature

CR26S MTH 210 Calculus I

One Course Deactivation:

CD3S NUR 100 Nursing Orientation Seminar

The Curriculum Committee has posted:

Three Course Deactivations:

CD4S CE 220 Cooperative Education – Communication

CD5S BUS 182 Business Research Methods

CD6S HEC 215 Human Ecology Practicum

Four Course Revisions:

CR6S MET 201 Drafting/Design III

CR7S MET 101 Technical Graphics

CR8S MET 122 Computer Aided Drafting/Design II

CR9S MET 202 Drafting Design IV

One New Course:

NC32S OFT 175 Microsoft Outlook

Two Program Revisions:

PR5S Teaching Assistant – Technology, Certificate

PR6S Teaching Assistant Early Childhood/Childhood, Certificate

- B. The Curriculum Committee received the report from the ad hoc committee on Assessment and Program Review and forwarded their recommendations to the Executive Committee.
- C. The Middle States Follow-up Committee recommendations have been sent to the Curriculum Office. (See Attachment C.)

NEG – H.Pierre-Philippe

Thank you to all who helped with the various elections this semester. All departments and areas have a senator except for one of the English/Philosophy seats which the Committee is currently trying to fill.

SCAA – D. Shaw

An ad hoc committee of SCAA has been created to run a parallel search for the new position of Assistant Vice-President Academic Services. The ad hoc committee members are: Kim Martell, Chair, Cheryl Mahoney, Kate Smith, James Murphy, Carmen Powers, Angel Andreu, Christine Schwartzott, Stasia Callan, George Fazekas, and two current SCAA members, Jeff Thompson and Ted Ciambor. The ad hoc committee plans to interview candidates starting on May 19 and will hold open hearings on May 23.

Planning – E. Grissing

No report.

Professional Development – B. Connell

The Professional Development workshop, “Initiating Undergraduate Research” is scheduled for June 12 and 13th. This event is being co-hosted by the Professional Development Committee of the Faculty Senate, the Dean of Liberal Arts and the Dean of Science, Health and Business. Representatives from CUR (Council on Undergraduate Research) will be at the workshop.

VII. Student Announcements

J. Bickel read a message from Dan Elliott, President of the Brighton Student Government. The message said: “Dear Faculty and Staff, you have been a true ally to the students through the presidential search process. Your guidance, vision, and clear knowledge of the workings of this college have been vital to myself, and other student government members. Thank you for all of your effort in this vital situation, I appreciate everything you do for the students. On a different note, I see a resolution up for vote for Academic Policies related to the academic dishonesty cases. I assure you that I agree with this resolution, but would welcome the opportunity for another change in this section of our policies manual. The current appeal process for academic dishonesty only includes one student, where all others include two students. I would like to see this change where there would be two students on this appeal’s hearing. Thank you again for all of your hard work, and for considering that appeals change. Dan Elliott”.

T. Tugel-The Faculty Senate would also like to thank the student government. The students really stepped up to the plate and have been assertive in what they feel is important to this college. And MCC couldn’t have asked for a better student trustee, David Ladwig. Jennifer, please convey our thanks.

VIII. Old Business

None.

IX. New Business

None.

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Terri Tugel
President

Susan Murphy
Secretary

Minutes approved at the June 12, 2008 All College Faculty Senate meeting.

Attachment A

Memorandum

To: Annette Leopard, Chair, Senate Curriculum Committee
From: Michael Boester, Chemistry & Geosciences
Chair, Assessment Committee
Date: April 7, 2008
Re: Rationale for Program Review Assessment Cycle

The Ad Hoc Committee on Assessment and Program Review would like to share the rationale for the selection of a six year assessment cycle. At the recommendation of Middle States and the charge given by the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, this committee looked at both a five year cycle and six year cycle of assessment and reviewed the pros and cons of both.

Five Year Cycle

- The five year time frame would include two complete program review cycles per Middle States visit.
- There is an opportunity for greater oversight of the program.
- However, this time frame will increase workload for the faculty, departments and Curriculum and Program Development.
- There would be less time to implement the program action plan from the previous review.
- There could be less tangible evidence of actions which would allow for reliable evaluation of modifications.
- Only one cycle of General Education course assessment would occur.
- There would be increased costs to the college for PALs.

Six Year Cycle

The six year time frame would decrease the workload for the faculty, departments, and Curriculum and Program Development.

- It would allow for two cycles of General Education course assessment.
- There would be more time to implement the program action plan from the previous review.
- There could be more tangible evidence of actions which would allow for reliable evaluation of modifications.
- There would be reduced costs to the college for PALs.
- There would be less opportunity for oversight of the programs.
- It would allow for only one cycle of complete Program Review per Middle States visit.

Recommendation

Based upon this reasoning, we would like to recommend the six year cycle as it would be to the overall benefit of the College, Programs, and it would meet the SUNY Guidelines.

Committee Members

Lori Annesi, faculty, ETS: Library
Susan Baker, Assistant Vice President, Student Services Office
Michael Boester, faculty, Chemistry and Geosciences

Stuart Blacklaw, Dean, Curriculum & Program Development
Rory Butler, faculty, Office & Computer Programs
Charlotte Downing, Director, Curriculum & Program Development
Regina Fabbro, faculty, English-Philosophy
Jason Mahar, faculty, Mathematics
Denee Martin, faculty, Visual & Performing Arts
Margaret Murphy, Coordinator of Assessment

Attachment B

**All New Program Review Requirements
Highlighted (mostly Middle States/SUNY recommended)
Monroe Community College
PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS GUIDELINES**

It is important to note that the comprehensive program review process of academic programs should provide the information necessary to stay current and provide the best possible education to students in the program. The process is guided by the shared governance policies of Monroe Community College Administration and Faculty. As part of the State University of New York system, the process also adheres to the recommendations for assessment by SUNY:

Each campus is responsible for overseeing the process through which the assessment of academic major programs takes place, following existing curriculum and governance procedures. Campuses and programs have maximum autonomy in the development of assessment plans for academic majors, and should include the input of faculty, professional staff, and students. (From *SUNY Guidelines for the Implementation of Campus-based Assessment of the Major* Revision: August 12, 2003)

Overview of Requirements

All programs should meet the following requirements in carrying out their assessment plan.

- Programs should complete one cycle of assessment every six years.
- Programs should include measures of student learning outcomes in their plans
- Programs should seek review of their final Program Review Report by an External Review Committee, including a campus visit and written report
- Programs should include in their plans some strategy for measuring change in students' knowledge and skills over time, specific to designated learning outcomes. (From *SUNY Guidelines for the Implementation of Campus-based Assessment of the Major* Revision: August 12, 2003)

Overview of Process

The following information is meant to assist in your process and the reporting of your Program Review. Basically there are seven steps in completing your review:

1. Obtain Program Review and PAL guidelines and establish committees
2. Collect and analyze internal data

3. Analyze written report from External Review Committee
4. Meet with Program members for discussion and recommendations
5. Write Program Review Report
6. Submit Program Review Report
7. Establish a committee to carry out Action Plan

Step One: Establish Committees and Collect Guidelines (Spring semester before Program Review)

This step provides the necessary foundation to build the Program Review. Knowing what needs to be accomplished and having all necessary resources in place will make the process run smoothly. It is particularly important to include the selection of the External Review Committee to avoid delays later in the review process.

A. Program Assessment Liaison (PAL)

Meet with Coordinator of Assessment to obtain guidelines, examples, and for information on overall process. (Contact Coordinator of Assessment for forms.)

B. Program Faculty and Staff Committee

PAL will establish a committee to

- Collect and analyze internal and external data
- Present results of analysis to Program members for discussion and recommendations for the Action Plan
- Evaluate the Program Review Report
- Submit Program Review Report to the Program Chair, and then to Program Dean for approval and signature
- Submit Program Review Report to Coordinator of Assessment

C. External Review Committee

The purpose of the External Review Committee is to provide programs and academic leadership with an at-arm's length, objective critique of the strengths and challenges of programs, so as to provide the basis for assessment.

Outside Accredited Program

For programs that are accredited by an external agency (e.g. Nursing) and are reviewed regularly for reaccreditation purposes by an External Review Committee whose membership is determined by a professional accrediting body, this agency may be considered to be the External Review Committee. If the accreditation review has occurred prior to the last SUNY Program Review, it may fulfill this requirement. A description of the agency, its review team, and a copy of the accreditation report and recommendations are necessary.

Non- Outside Accredited Program

The membership of External Review Committee for programs that do not require outside accreditation should be discussed between the Program/Department being reviewed, the dean (where applicable) and the campus chief academic officer or his/her delegate.

The ideal committee for

- A transfer program would include two members from institutions with high MCC transfer rates
- A career program would include two representative employers and two experts in the field

In general, External Review Committees should consist of not less than two (2) persons who have no academic, professional or other significant relationship to full-time faculty in the Program/Department, no previous significant or formal affiliation with the institution, and who come from academic or professional institutions belonging to a peer group (equivalent to being in the same class and having similar program size, scope and statistical, or perceived reputational, ranking).

Responsibilities of External Review Committee

1. Review internal data and data analysis report supplied by the PAL
2. Make a campus visit to
 - Tour of Program facilities
 - Discuss Program Review Report with PAL and Program Review Faculty/Staff committee
 - Make recommendations for Program
3. Write a report to the Program Review Faculty/Staff committee to include at a minimum
 - List of names of the external reviewers and organizations they represent
 - Date of the campus visit
 - Assessment of the Program, including major strengths and weaknesses
 - Recommendations for the Program
4. Hold a follow-up meeting if necessary

Step Two: Collect and Analyze Internal Data (Fall semester of Program Review)

This step provides the broad view of the Program foundations, the components that provide the theoretical and practical structures of the Program.

A. Program Mission, Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes (Contact Coordinator of Assessment for forms.)

The mission, goals, outcomes and objectives form the basis for all decision making and general action in a program. As such it is important to be sure that each of these represent what is desired in relation to academic culture, process and product.

1. Review the Program's mission statement and describe its relationship to the institutional mission.
2. Appraise the Program's goals and objectives.
3. Explain the Program's learning outcomes and trace their relationship to course learning outcomes.

B. Program Design

The Program design provides the foundation for student success in the Program.

1. Review the program's catalog description
2. Describe the unique/innovative aspects of this Program
3. Evaluate the program's admission requirements
4. Analyze the program's degree distribution requirements
5. Validate any prerequisites and/or co-requisites in the degree distribution requirements
6. Describe how the Program satisfies the MCC and SUNY General Education requirements including specifics for the infused competencies (Contact Coordinator of Assessment for forms.)
7. Assure that required courses and electives are offered on a schedule to meet the needs of various student constituencies
8. If the Program is accredited, describe the program's accreditation status and identify the accrediting agency
9. If the Program has applied for accreditation or the department plans to apply for accreditation, describe the program's accreditation status and identify the accrediting agency
10. Describe how Program related co-curricular activities advance the Program's mission and goals
11. Provide an organizational chart that shows the relationship of the Program to the rest of the institution

C. Faculty

The quality of the faculty is critical to the quality of an undergraduate academic program. The qualifications of the faculty are useful to show the extent to which the faculty is prepared to fulfill the mission of the Program.

1. Provide a listing of full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty assigned to the Program for the last academic year including: names, ranks, credentials, years of teaching experience, courses taught, release time, and overload
2. Describe the demographics of full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty assigned to the Program for the last academic year
3. Analyze the percentage of courses taught by full-time, part-time, and adjunct, faculty assigned to the Program for the last academic year and compare to College averages
4. Explain how faculty professional development activities support the Program's mission and goals

D. Students

In the evaluation of the effectiveness of an undergraduate academic program, it is essential to consider the students it serves and those it might serve in the future. Student needs influence the design of the curriculum, the faculty to implement it, and the services to support it. The quality and success of a program depends upon the extent to which it meets the needs of its students.

1. Provide a student summary for the last six years including annual and aggregate numbers of: full-time students, part-time students, graduates, student demographics, and student/faculty ratios

2. Analyze demographics of students in the Program with that of the College geographical area of service- with the assistance of Coordinator of Assessment and Institutional Research
3. Describe the strategies for addressing the diverse learning styles of the students in the Program
4. Analyze the Program's enrollment patterns for the last six years
5. Evaluate any recruitment activities designed to bring students into the Program
6. Evaluate any orientation activities designed to introduce students to the Program
7. Analyze the Program's attrition patterns for the last six years
8. Describe and analyze any strategies used to address retention - if needed
9. Analyze the time students take to complete the Program
10. Analyze follow-up data on student transfer/placement for the last six years. Indicate year(s) data was collected and total number of student responses: percentage employed in the field, employed elsewhere, seeking employment, and continuing education

E. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Assessment of student learning upon the completion of courses allows the Program to gain information needed to determine strengths and challenges in curriculum. Over time these periodic assessments provide an institutional memory used in Program and course planning for maximum student success. (Contact Coordinator of Assessment for forms.)

1. Review the previous assessment of Program
2. Review any previous assessment of SUNY General Education and two Infused Competencies Outcomes
3. Describe any modifications made to the student learning outcomes in the Program since the last Program assessment
4. Describe the process the department uses to assess student learning
5. Describe how this process measures student achievement of Program learning outcomes
6. List major findings of this assessment of student learning outcomes done as part of the Program assessment
7. Identify what has been learned in methods of assessment that can be helpful to others as they conduct assessment of their program learning outcomes

F. Support Services

The academic and student services of the campus provide important support to the instructional efforts of the faculty. Furthermore, support services should contribute directly to the richness of students' academic lives.

1. Describe the academic advisement procedures and the way the department assesses advisement effectiveness
2. Describe supporting resources and facilities that are made available specifically for the students in this Program and the way the department assesses supporting resources and facilities

3. Describe services for job placement and/or college transfer
4. Describe student and faculty satisfaction with services that support the Program and the way the department assesses satisfaction

Attachment C

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Recommendations to the Curriculum Office

Reported to Faculty Senate May 15, 2008

In their 2006 Middle States report the evaluation team made the following suggestion: “MCC should develop an accountability system to make sure that information literacy; critical analysis and reasoning; and the study of values, ethics, and diverse perspectives are incorporated into each student’s general education program.”

In Fall of 2006 the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee charged an ad hoc committee with developing an accountability system. The ad hoc committee made an interim report in May of 2007 and reformed to continue working in Fall of 2007. They made their final report to the Curriculum Committee in January 2008. The Curriculum Committee reviewed their report and forwarded recommendations to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in April, 2008. Based on the recommendations of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee after reviewing the report from the Ad Hoc Middle States Recommendations Follow Up Committee II (Renee Rigoni (Chair), Professor, Business Administration and Economics; Stuart Blacklaw (ex officio), Dean of Curriculum; Robert DeFelice, Associate Professor, English and Philosophy; Alice Harrington, Assistant Professor, Library; Elizabeth Laidlaw, Associate Professor, English and Philosophy; Holly Wheeler, Assistant Professor, English and Philosophy), the Executive Committee is forwarding the following five recommendations to the Curriculum Office:

- 1) **Revise the MCC – GER titles and descriptions (p. 64 of catalog) to more closely reflect the items Middle States wants included in General Education, thereby providing greater transparency that these competencies are included in all MCC programs.**

Infused competencies – Revise the language to include Middle States requirements in addition to the SUNY-GER learning outcomes.

MCC General Education Requirement/Infused Competency

Current Title: Critical Thinking (Reasoning)

Proposed Title: Critical Analysis and Reasoning

Current Description:

Students will identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments as they occur in their own or others’ work and develop well-reasoned arguments. Additionally, students will demonstrate the ability to define, interpret, and solve problems using such methods as creative thinking, comparative reasoning, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.

No specific course requirement. Critical Thinking is an infused competency, which students will learn throughout their college experiences.

Proposed Description:

Students will identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments as they occur in their own or others’ work and develop well-reasoned arguments. Additionally, students will demonstrate the ability to define, interpret, and solve problems using a variety of methods.

No specific course requirement as Critical Analysis and Reasoning is an infused competency. Students will develop skills of critical analysis and reasoning throughout their college experiences, particularly in 200 level courses.

MCC General Education Requirement/Infused Competency

Current Title: Information Management

Proposed Title: Information Literacy

Current Description:

Students will perform the basic operations of personal computer use and understand and use basic research techniques. In addition, students will locate, evaluate and synthesize information from a variety of sources.

Proposed Description:

Students will perform the skills of Information Management including basic operations of personal computer use and the use of basic research techniques. In addition, students will locate, evaluate and synthesize information from a variety of sources. Students will demonstrate an understanding of issues affecting the use of information by observing laws, regulations, and institutional policies.

No specific course requirement. Information literacy is an infused competency which students will learn throughout their college experiences.

Rationale:

These new descriptions add the language of Middle States while not changing the language meeting SUNY general education requirements. These changes will help demonstrate that our general education requirements in critical analysis and reasoning, and information literacy meet the expectations of Middle States. Additionally, program development, course development, compliance and assessment are clarified by making these requirements clear.

2) Create a structure for a review of General Education as part of Program Review, particularly for the infused general education competencies.

The ad hoc committee proposed a tool (form) to be used to assess General Education as part of Program Review. That form will be forwarded to the Coordinator of Academic Assessment and Program Review Assessment as an example of a tool to use for the purpose of assessing General Education requirements as part of Program Review.

3) Account for the study of values, ethics, and diverse perspectives as an infused competency in the MCC General Education Requirements through Program Review.

Although the ad hoc committee suggested incorporating these knowledge areas into the Social Studies definition, the Curriculum Committee was not ready to do so in light of their work in progress defining all of the local general education areas. The Executive Committee recommends that the study of values, ethics, and diverse perspectives be accounted for as a part of program review in the same fashion as recommended for the infused competencies. The Curriculum Committee should propose a definition of this infused competency as part of their work to define MCC's local general education requirements.

4) Add a field to the Curriculum database for new programs and program revisions to indicate where critical analysis and reasoning; information literacy; and the study of values, ethics, and diverse perspectives will occur.

5) Increase awareness among faculty of the status of Information Literacy as an infused competency.

- a. Encourage faculty to tailor courses to include information literacy skills.
- b. Increase awareness among faculty of the tools and support services available to them on campus, especially MCC Libraries and the Writing Center.
- c. Provide professional development for faculty to develop ways to best incorporate information literacy skills into their courses, perhaps in conjunction with the Faculty Senate Professional Development Committee.

- d. Increase awareness among faculty of external resources and publications regarding the design and development of comprehensive information literacy programs. Publicize the availability of such materials as

i) Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education. May 21, 2007. Association of College and Research Libraries. December 7, 2007. <http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlstandards/informationliteracycompetency.cfm#iltech>

ii) Middle States Commission on Higher Education. Developing Research & Communication Skills: Guidelines for Information Literacy in the Curriculum. Philadelphia: Middle States Commission on Higher Education, 2003.

The former forms the basis for information literacy programs at academic institutions across the country and is referenced in the latter publication. It is produced by a library-affiliated organization but it is not “library-centric”; the standards are meant to be applied to nearly any discipline (i.e. science, business, etc). The Middle States book is especially good because it shows how information literacy can be incorporated into a course.