

## ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

November 30, 2011

Wednesday, 3:00 p.m.

### MEMBERS PRESENT

David McLawhorn  
Crystal Ange  
Wesley Beddard  
Dixon Boyles  
Clay Carter  
Jo Linda Cooper  
Lisa Hill  
Chet Jarman  
Judy Jennette  
Kim Mullis  
Phillip Price  
Dorie Richter  
Morgan Roberson, SGA

### MEMBERS ABSENT

### OTHER STAFF PRESENT

The Administrative Council met at 3:00 p.m. on Wednesday, November 30, 2011, in the Conference Room of Bldg. 1. Dr. McLawhorn welcomed Morgan Roberson, SGA President and called the meeting to order and addressed the agenda items as follows:

#### **I. Approval of Administrative Council Meeting Minutes October 24, 2011**

The October 24, 2011 minutes were distributed to all Administrative Council members prior to the meeting. Dr. McLawhorn called for corrections or a motion to approve. Phillip Price made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. JoLinda Cooper seconded the motion. The motion was approved with an all ayes vote. (See regular session minutes on the Internet under the appropriate Committees and Minutes link.)

#### **II. Old Business**

Self-Study of General Education Competencies Assessment – Mr. Boyles stated that we are approaching the mid-point of our SACS reaffirmation and our 5-year interim report. Mr. Boyles shared a detailed report that is a self-study designed to evaluate BCCC's assessment plan to evaluate the extent to which graduates have demonstrated general education competencies in five areas: communication skills, critical thinking skills, computation skills, interpersonal skills, and technology skills. He noted that the report provides a brief history of the plan that was developed as a significant component of BCCC's reaffirmation of accreditation by SACS in 2009. Mr. Boyles stated that we still have some work to do with systematizing our assessment of Gen Ed Competencies. After reviewing the report, Mr. Boyles opened the floor for questions or comments. Hearing none, Dr. McLawhorn thanked Mr. Boyles for his work on the report and continued with the next item on the agenda. The complete report can be read below:

Self-Study of General Education Competencies Assessment  
at Beaufort County Community College

Dixon Boyles

November 29, 2011

**Executive Summary**

This report is a self-study designed to evaluate Beaufort County Community College's (BCCC) assessment plan to evaluate the extent to which graduates have demonstrated general education competencies in five areas: communication skills, critical thinking skills, computation skills, interpersonal skills, and technology skills. This report provides a brief history of the plan that was developed as a significant component of BCCC's reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) in 2009. The report also evaluates the current status of the plan and makes recommendations designed to increase its effectiveness in the future to both improve institutional effectiveness and also to satisfy SACS requirements. At this point, Beaufort County Community College has not yet identified benchmarks indicating proficiency in each general education competency. Further, BCCC should clarify the administrative responsibility for the coordination and reporting of the assessment process to document general education competencies of graduates. Finally, all existing timelines must be revised to accurately reflect the current status of the plan.

**Introduction**

The purpose of this report is to evaluate Beaufort County Community College's (BCCC) assessment of the five college-level general education competencies identified by the college: (1) communication skills, (2) computation skills, (3) critical thinking skills, (4) interpersonal skills, and (5) technology skills. Faculty and staff involved in ongoing general education assessment at BCCC are the intended audience. The current system to assess general education competencies at BCCC began during the 2007-2008 academic year in conjunction with the college's successful efforts to secure the reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) in June 2009. As the college passes the midpoint between reaffirmation and the subsequent Five-Year Interim report required by SACSCOC in 2014, this report provides a means to evaluate the progress and effectiveness of BCCC's assessment process and to revise the process as appropriate. It also confirms BCCC's ongoing commitment to continuous assessment and improvement.

**Background**

As part of the reaffirmation of accreditation process, SACS member institutions are required to demonstrate compliance with all SACS Core Requirements and Comprehensive Standards (also certain federal

requirements), including Comprehensive Standard 3.5.1 that states “The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which graduates have attained them” (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, *The Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement*, 2010, p.27). The SACS accreditation process also includes an Off-site Committee Report followed by a subsequent On-site Committee Report. In May 2008, the SACS Off-site Committee responsible for reviewing BCCC issued its report indicating that BCCC had not provided sufficient evidence that graduates have attained general education competencies. Further, the Off-site Committee instructed the On-site Committee to look for such evidence during its visit to the BCCC campus in November 2008.

During the on-site review, the On-site Review Committee reviewed the documentation regarding general education competencies provided by BCCC. This committee concluded that the college had failed to demonstrate compliance with CS 3.5.1. Subsequently, the On-site Committee issued a recommendation in its report: “The committee recommends the college assess general education competencies and the extent to which graduates achieve these competencies” (SACS On-site Committee Report). BCCC was required to submit a Focused Report to SACS in April 2009, to respond to each of the On-site Committee’s recommendations, including the one regarding CS 3.5.1.

In June 2009, SACS announced that BCCC’s accreditation had been reaffirmed but indicated its continued dissatisfaction with BCCC’s assessment plan for general education competencies as related to CS 3.5.1 and requested that BCCC submit a monitoring report in September 2009 to provide additional documentation of graduates’ attainment of general education competencies. In September 2009, BCCC submitted the monitoring report, including the revised assessment plan. In January 2010, BCCC received a letter from SACS President Belle Whelan stating that the SACS Commission on Colleges had reviewed the monitoring report and that no additional report was required at that time.

Since receiving notification from SACS that no additional reports are required, presumably until the Fifth-Year Interim Report is due in September 2014, BCCC has continued to implement and to revise its plan to assess general education competencies. This report evaluates that plan.

### **Details of the Plan**

In February 2008, following a recommendation from the Curriculum Committee, the Administrative Council at BCCC approved five college-level general education competencies, the attainment of which would be assessed for all graduates: (1) communication skills, (2) computation skills, (3) critical thinking skills, (4) interpersonal skills, and (5) technology skills. Additionally, during spring 2008, BCCC identified learning outcomes to demonstrate the attainment of each general education competency.

In similar fashion, college faculty identified student learning outcomes for each course taught at BCCC. Outcomes were listed on a common template with three categories: *Student Outcomes*, *Student Assessments*, and *Student Activities to Produce Outcomes*. Student learning outcomes for all courses were identified by the end of spring semester 2008.

The system Beaufort County Community College uses to assess the extent to which graduates attain general education competencies examines multiple measurements. First, student learning outcomes for all courses in each instructional division are assessed by a curriculum matrix that identifies general education competencies. This provides a measurement of the extent to which general education competencies, as demonstrated by student learning outcomes in each course, are integrated into each instructional division. Individual graduate proficiency in each general education competency is assessed with an algorithm that calculates GPA for only those courses that integrate a specific competency into its student learning outcomes. Graduate proficiency in general education competencies has been assessed using the method indicated above for the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 associate degree graduates. However, no assessment of this data has been completed.

Further, this GPA measurement was intended to provide baseline data to identify best instructional practices and course specific assessments to measure student achievement in spring 2009. As of November 2011, data regarding course specific outcomes assessments have not been completed. At this time, course specific assessments are not yet established, or at least published, as indicators of general education competencies. Thus, while BCCC's system for assessing graduate proficiency for each general education competency is designed to include data from both the program "down" and the course "up" to enhance the college's ability to plan improvements in curriculum, the college is not collecting this data through an ongoing, systematic process.

Although BCCC has not been able to meet the projected timelines submitted to SACS in September 2009, there have been mitigating factors that inhibited its ability to do so. Beaufort County Community College is a comparatively small institution within the North Carolina Community College System with annual FTE of less than 3000. Consequently, faculty and staff at smaller institutions are often required to perform a wider range of duties than at larger ones. For instance, at BCCC the chair of the Arts & Sciences division also serves as SACS Liaison, QEP Coordinator, and until recently as Lead Instructor of English. Because Arts & Sciences is primarily responsible for providing general education courses for all curriculums, the task to assess general education competencies is a significant responsibility for the division chair and other senior faculty within the division. Further, the algorithm used to measure the integration of general education competencies into student learning outcomes was designed by the lead instructor of mathematics. Although faculty within Arts & Sciences compiled the data in the Monitoring Report that was submitted to SAC in September 2009, they did so with the understanding that the system to assess graduate proficiency in general education competencies and to collect and report assessment data in the future would transfer to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (IE) henceforth. That transfer occurred during the 2009-2010 academic year.

As indicated earlier, the person primarily responsible for the development of general education competency assessments also serves as SACS Liaison and QEP Coordinator. Not surprisingly, there is a considerable overlap between the assessment practices regarding general education competencies and also

QEP outcomes. For this reason, it is necessary to examine some specifics of the QEP. The BCCC QEP “Write to Learn, Write to Earn” is designed to enhance the written communication skills of BCCC graduates (Appendix B). The QEP identifies a single learning outcome: “Students will write unified, organized, and developed documents and will apply conventional English grammar and usage.” BCCC has also identified this outcome as evidence of students’ proficiency in communication skills, one of the five general education competencies to be assessed by the college. Thus, QEP assessment is as a component of general education assessment, a component with some obvious advantages.

One potential drawback to such an integrated design is that any delay in the implementation of the QEP might well affect or delay general education assessment. There is evidence such a delay has already occurred. A key requirement of the QEP is the establishment of a campus writing center. In addition to physical space, a writing center requires a considerable institutional commitment in the form of equipment costs and salaries. The BCCC QEP originally called for the establishment of the writing center and employing a full-time director of faculty rank, in fall 2009. However, the worldwide financial crisis of 2008-2009 contributed to considerable budgetary uncertainty within the North Carolina Community College System. As a result, BCCC elected to postpone the establishment of the writing center until fall 2010.

As stated earlier, the QEP specifies that “Students will write unified, organized, and developed documents and will apply conventional English grammar and usage.” Further, it calls for students to demonstrate this outcome by completing a combination of “low-stakes” (formative) and “high-stakes” (summative) writing assignments in multiple courses throughout their designated curriculums. Mastery of the outcome will be assessed using rubrics. Once again, the results will be used to demonstrate proficiency in the general education competency, “communication skills.” Additionally, the QEP cites extensive writing across the curriculum research that indicates that the act of writing itself contributes to, as well as provides, evidence of the development of students’ critical thinking skills. Thus, data used to assess outcomes associated with the QEP can also assess at least two of the general education competencies identified by BCCC: communication skills and critical thinking skills. Finally, the QEP calls for student writing to be continually assessed by instructors using common rubrics and scoring guidelines. Instructors of QEP courses will participate in seminars to review pedagogical practices to enhance student learning outcomes in writing. Both the Director of the QEP and the Director of the Writing Center will direct these seminars to develop common rubrics and to enhance writing pedagogy.

The connection between these general education competencies and QEP assessment is significant in BCCC’s plan to evaluate general education programs. The development of assessment practices to measure writing outcomes will result in models than can be applied to the assessment of other general education competencies. And, despite the one-year postponement to establish the writing center until fall 2010, there is evidence that professional development is beginning to occur. During 2010-2011, the Director of the Writing Center worked with faculty from a number of disciplines to identify the types of writing occurring in those

classes and to design some common assessment models, including rubrics. Also, BCCC has established the Writing across the Curriculum Committee to emphasize the importance of the writing process in all BCCC classes but particularly those designated as a *writing intensive* course based on a defined criteria beginning in fall 2012. Further, while all English classes will meet the criteria for writing intensive courses, English faculty has also composed a common glossary of writing terms and definitions. Beginning in fall 2011, all sections of ENG 111 (Expository Writing) require a common writing terms exam as a component to assess general education competencies in communication and critical thinking skills at the course level. (Note: Other assessments of communication and critical thinking skills are currently being developed for use in English classes.)

By the end of 2011-2012, BCCC plans to identify course specific assessments to measure student proficiency in the five general education competencies. Benchmark data generated through these course specific assessments will be collected no later than fall 2012. The fall 2012 target date seems both reasonable and attainable. However, it should be noted that the original plan established a deadline of fall 2010 for completion of these tasks.

### **Evaluation of Proposed Activities**

This section of the report evaluates each of the seven “forward looking” goals of the assessment plan submitted to SACS in the 2009 Monitoring Report.

1. Data will inform procedures by Instructional Affairs to provide resources for faculty to identify best instructional practices for each general education competency. Proposed date of completion: Fall 2009. Evaluation: BCCC has not yet defined the mechanism for specifying which faculty and/or disciplines are linked to each competency. In any event, no documentation has been provided to verify the completion of this task in fall 2009 or afterward.

2. Instructional divisions will determine benchmarks of student proficiency for each general education competency in each degree program within the instructional division. Date of completion: Fall 2009. Evaluation: Benchmarks have not been established. However, graduate proficiency in each competency has been assessed by applying an algorithm calculating GPA for courses whose outcomes integrate specific competencies into their student learning outcomes.

3. Instructional divisions will determine course specific assessments. Date of completion: Spring 2009. Evaluation: Courses specific assessments have been identified in several disciplines for the assessment of both the QEP and the general education competencies. Assessments for all five general education competencies could be in place by fall 2012.

4. Instructional divisions will assess benchmark levels of student proficiency in each competency. Date of completion: Spring 2010.

Evaluation: Benchmark levels of student proficiency have not yet been identified. Once identified, assessment is possible using the GPA algorithm discussed earlier. However, this type of assessment would not provide direct evidence of the attainment of learning competencies/outcomes. Course specific assessment data for

select writing intensive courses and competencies related to the QEP should be available for assessment in spring 2012 and for all competencies by spring 2013.

5. Instructional Affairs will use benchmark assessment data to review and evaluate instructional practices for each instructional division and its degree programs. Date of completion: Fall 2010.

Evaluation: No data has been compiled for the completion of this task.

6. Instructional Affairs will use data from each instructional division to review curriculum and to evaluate common college-level instructional practices. Date of completion: Spring 2011.

Evaluation: The institution should establish and define the process for curriculum review. Also, BCCC should define what is meant by “common college-level instructional practices.”

7. Instructional Affairs and instructional divisions will review and evaluate college-level general education outcomes and course outcomes. Date of completion: Spring 2011

Evaluation: Although this task is yet to be completed, there is evidence that review of course outcomes linked to the QEP, including the general education competencies communication skills and critical thinking skills, is occurring. The specified type of review could be possible in spring 2013.

### **Strengths of Assessment Plan**

The BCCC plan to assess general education competencies for graduates has many strengths. First, the standardization of student learning outcomes for all courses using a common template simplifies the task of collecting and reporting data coherently. Because the academic freedom of faculty to design courses in the manner they deem appropriate is a major consideration, faculty are responsible for identifying the outcomes and assessments. To promote buy-in, senior faculty members provided professional development seminars for other faculty, emphasizing that the outcomes should reflect is already occurring in courses rather than a restructuring of curriculum. That these outcomes are now in place is a step forward to implement the complete assessment plan.

Second, the broader learning outcomes linked to general education competencies parallel the more specific outcomes of individual courses which means that assessment instruments can be embedded into courses with a minimum impact on instruction. For example, one learning outcome for English 111 states that “Students will identify and analyze rhetorical strategies.” The assessment instrument used by instructors to measure this specific course outcome will also provide a measurement of critical thinking skills as demonstrated by students’ ability to “identify and analyze rhetorical strategies.” The value of such a system cannot be overemphasized. Because the data for assessment of general education competencies is generated in the day to day activities of individual classes, the validity of the findings is inherently more reliable than through the use of external measures such as standardized test results to assess the general education competencies of graduates who lack motivation to succeed on a “test” not linked to a course grade. Additionally, the use of embedded course documents to assess broader general education competencies is consistent with faculty’s understanding of

valid and reliable assessment and may alleviate potential faculty fears that assessment results may be used against them.

Third, the QEP should prove an asset as the institution continues to develop its ability to assess general education competencies. The establishment of the Writing Center represents a substantial institutional commitment to the enhancement of student writing. Assessment of the QEP will provide direct evidence of two or more of the five general education competencies. It will also provide assessment models and professional development activities that should enhance all general education competency assessment.

Finally, the extent to which faculty have been involved in the development of general education competency assessment is to be commended. The research literature associated with student learning outcomes assessment emphasizes the necessity of faculty participation to achieve valid and reliable results. BCCC faculty have been intensely involved in the design of the system to assess general education competencies, and that involvement should contribute to ongoing success.

### **Weaknesses**

Despite the apparent strengths of the BCCC plan to assess general education competencies, weaknesses do exist. First, BCCC has not clearly identified benchmark indicators of proficiency. The reasons for this omission are not entirely clear. One possible explanation is that the college has not designated the responsibility of managing general education assessment to any specific office. Assessment activities seem to be split between Instructional Affairs and Institutional Effectiveness. While faculty have largely been responsible for identifying outcomes and assessments, there is no clear mechanism to collect and the report data.

This apparent structural weaknesses has serious implications for the ultimate outcome of the assessment plan. Much of the college's assessment effort related to learning outcomes was in response to the pressures of an accreditation agency (SACS) which is not atypical. The necessity to respond to accreditation agencies is arguably the primary motivation for most colleges to implement outcomes assessment. However, as those assessment practices are implemented, colleges must seek to integrate them fully into the institutional culture so that assessment reports are viewed not as an end to satisfy accreditors and other stakeholders but as a means for ongoing institutional improvement. BCCC is struggling with that transition, and the lack of organizational coherence contributes to that struggle.

### **Recommendations**

While BCCC is conducting extensive general education assessment activities in a number of instructional areas, there exists no single authority responsible for coordinating, or at least reporting, these efforts. Perhaps the most difficult challenge in designing and implementing effective assessment methods is that too many accreditors and administrators largely see faculty as responsible beyond their specific courses for assessment activities related to student learning. Similarly, too many faculty see assessment only linked to accreditation/administrative requirements and not student learning. For general education assessment to succeed, senior administration needs to communicate to faculty what the institution needs to know about

student learning and why. The first task then is to designate the administrative area responsible for the process to assess student learning. In my opinion, this responsibility for collecting and reporting assessment data regarding general education competencies at the institutional level should reside in IE. IE is in the best position to coordinate these assessment activities to parallel other assessment measures within the college. Professional development opportunities (including regularly attending SACS meetings) to emphasize current “best practices” in reporting and assessing student learning outcomes should be provided to IE to implement the assessment of general education competencies. As IE positions are added or replaced, qualifications of applicants should include expertise in the use of statistical methodology in educational research as well as previous IE experience, preferably at an institution of higher education.

Second, the college should identify benchmarks that measure graduate proficiency in each college-level general education competency. BCCC is currently assessing graduates at the macro-level using an algorithm that calculates GPA in courses that are linked to general education competencies through specific learning outcomes within individual courses. Once again, benchmarks indicating proficiency should be determined in order to assess this data to improve instruction. BCCC should also determine the office responsible for identifying these benchmarks.

In addition to the macro-analysis on graduates, the college is working to identify course-specific assessment linked directly to each of the five general education competencies. There is evidence that such assessments are being developed, particularly in conjunction with the QEP, and that course specific assessment data will be collected for all five general education competencies by fall 2012. It is highly recommended that the college complete this task in a timely manner. At the annual SACS-COC conference in December 2011, SACS-COC member institutions will vote on, among other items, proposed revisions to CS 3.5.1. The specific changes to CS 3.5.1 would require colleges to evaluate the general education competencies of *students* rather than *graduates*. If this change is approved, BCCC’s current system of evaluating graduates will remain useful but obviously not sufficient. The recommendation is that BCCC ensure that course specific assessments that can be linked to college-level general education competencies for all students be in place no later than fall 2012 and available for assessment at the institutional level in spring 2013.

Additionally, all timelines in the plan should be revised to accurately reflect the actual progress of the plan.

Finally, that faculty are heavily involved in general education assessment at BCCC is apparent. In particular, the faculty member upon whom the majority of this responsibility rests is the Division Chair of Arts & Sciences and Nursing who also serves as SACS Liaison and QEP Coordinator in addition to his regularly assigned duties. It is recommended that he and other faculty most heavily involved in general education assessment be considered for overload pay or a reduction in teaching load to better facilitate the development and implementation of course specific assessment instruments in all program areas. Disclaimer: the author of this report is that division chair. While this report was compiled with input from the President, the Dean of

Instruction, and the Director of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, all opinions expressed in this report are his own.

## References

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. *Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement*. Decatur GA, 2010.

## Recommended

Kuh, G.D. and Ewell, P.T. (2010). The state of learning outcomes assessment in the United States. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 22(1), 1-20.

**III. New Business** – Mrs. Dorie Richter requested to add an item to the agenda under other items. Mrs. Richter stated that the Planning Council Minutes for the November 9 meeting were emailed prior to today’s meeting. This will become item 4 under New Business.

1. Faculty Senate Minutes for the October 11, 2011 and October 18, 2011 meetings had been distributed electronically prior to the meeting for information only. (See minutes on the Internet under the appropriate Committees and Minutes link.)
2. Information Technology Minutes for the April 12, 2011 meeting had been distributed electronically prior to the meeting for information only. (See minutes on the Internet under the appropriate Committees and Minutes link.)
3. Marketing Committee Minutes for the July 26, 2011 meeting had been distributed electronically prior to the meeting for information only. (See minutes on the Internet under the appropriate Committees and Minutes link.)
4. Planning Council Minutes for the November 9, 2011 meeting had been distributed electronically to members of the planning council for approval prior to today’s meeting. Mrs. Richter stated that currently she has received approval from thirteen of the eighteen members that attended the meeting. After a vote of approval by Mrs. Lisa Hill and Dr. Phillip Price (planning council members), Mrs. Richter noted that with the two additional votes, the minutes have received a majority vote from the planning council. McLawhorn called for approval of the minutes by Administrative Council. Dr. Price made the motion with a second by Mrs. JoLinda Cooper to approve the Planning Council minutes as presented. (See minutes on the Internet under the appropriate Committees and Minutes link.)

## IV. Progress Reports - Updates

Dorie Richter

- Planning Update
  - In the process of updating IE website
  - Working on the introduction to next year’s plan
- Evaluation Update
  - Graduate Follow-up Survey – received 8% back (14 out of 181)
  - Non-Returning Students Survey – received 3% back (5 out of 176)
  - Employer Survey – received 19 % back (37 out of 192)
  - Instructor & Course Evaluation by Students
    - Almost completed the Business Division and then will start on Arts & Sciences, IT and NCIH

- Distributed the November 2011 Grant Activity Report
- The Information Technology Plan has been approved
- Institutional Review Board (IRB) website– All institutions that apply for or receive federal funds must have an IRB on their campus. This is basically a protection for human rights. The IRB Committee reviews all research and research activities to be sure that BCCC is compliant with the Federal Regulation 45CRFCFR part 690. This committee makes sure that the information collected is confidential and not harmful. This information can be accessed off the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) website.

#### Clay Carter

- The CRC class in Plymouth has finished
- Working to fill 2 Medical Office Technology classes in Roper
  - Continue looking for a teacher

#### Lisa Hill

- The state will require all 10<sup>th</sup> graders to participate in a test titled “The Plan”
  - Similar to the PSAT
  - Pretest for the ACT
  - Will affect all three Early High Schools – all ECHS Liaisons have contacted the instructors, so students will not be in class that day
- Preparing for exams

#### Wesley Beddard

- Winding down the semester – less than 2 weeks before exams start

#### Kim Mullis

- Faculty Senate presented a resolution to Admin Council back in April 2011 regarding a campus calendar
  - Admin Council referred to the Information Technology Committee
    - Information Technology Committee met in October and the calendar was not discussed
    - Information Technology Committee meets again in February – hopefully the calendar will be addressed at this meeting
- The Department of Labor Grant calls for intelligent classrooms – faculty requested input into what should be included as part of smart classrooms
  - In the process of identifying items that will enhance instruction for students
    - Due to Wesley Beddard by December 9

#### Crystal Ange

- Financial Aid Office has received the last set of verification attendance reports from our instructors
  - In the process of sending out notices to students who have stopped coming to school
  - Students must come to school at least 60% of the semester or they have to pay money back – this is a federal regulation
- Counseling Department
  - Gearing up our retention efforts
    - Finding out why students have stopped coming to class
- Career & College Promise Update
  - To date only 21 students have met all of the criteria

- 13 are from our local high schools
  - 8 are from private or home schools
- SGA is participating in the Washington Christmas Parade on Saturday and the Bath Parade on Sunday
- Next Tuesday, Christmas Social in the Student Lounge from 11:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

#### Morgan Roberson

- SGA Parades
  - Washington - Saturday at 11:00 a.m.
  - Bath – Sunday at 2:00 p.m.
- BCCC was invited to attend the American Red Cross Recognition Ceremony
  - BCCC was awarded for their participation with blood drives
  - BCCC was the most consistent in obtaining the largest amount of blood at each event
  - BCCC maintained a steady average – beating out Pitt Community College and ECU

#### Judy Jennette

- Faculty Staff Christmas Luncheon scheduled for December 20
  - Vel & Mel's will be catering
  - The Brotherhood of Harmony will be performing
- James Casey's covers have been framed and will be submitted to Raleigh for BCCC's entry into the art exhibition
- Spring scholarships were awarded on the 19<sup>th</sup>
  - 50 applications and awarded 28
- Emergency Grant process has been slightly modified
- Rembrandt Rockets trip turned out nicely – did not make money on it
  - Tickets not sold were given to student services to distribute to 4 students
- Holiday edition of Campus Connections will go out tomorrow
- Please let Judy or Betty Gray know if anyone has anything that needs to run in the newspaper over the holidays

#### Jo Linda Cooper

- The Staff Association continues to work on the canned food drive

#### Phillip Price

- Anticipate receiving budget reversion request sometime in December – we have not been told exactly when or how much the reversion will be
  - The state has several outstanding issues that may impact our funding
    - Funding provided by the General Assembly for Medicaid and funding for the More at Four program.
    - The NC Community College System is also not meeting anticipated tuition receipts
- Construction on the new Allied Health & Nursing building is going very well
  - In the process or rescheduling when paving will take place on the roadways – need to schedule when students will not be impacted
- State auditors are on our campus auditing our financial statements for last year

- Staff Changes
  - Anthony Moore started Monday as the PT Server Operations Specialist in network services
  - Ernie Coleman started as PT Campus Police Officer
  - Today is Keith White and Brian Bridgers last day with BCCC

David McLawhorn

- Distributed information on the new US Dept of Labor Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training Consortium with Robeson Community College grant
  - Total request of \$18.8 million focusing on emerging technologies impacting teaching and learning in advanced manufacturing and industrial technology programs
  - BCCC awarded approximately \$2.2 million
  - The \$2.2 million jobs grant will pay for technology upgrades and new equipment for industry –related programs at BCCC
  - The alliance has targeted to help those workers who have been affected by jobs lost in recent years as North Carolina based industries have moved their operations to other countries
  - The grant includes - \$771,319 to improve technology at BCCC, including improvements in the campus wireless network; \$564,192 to create intelligent classrooms; \$370,000 for a robotic welder and other equipment for the electrical, electronics and welding programs, and \$65,708 for an emergent technology laboratory.
  - Dr. McLawhorn noted that Almeta Woolard has brought in \$12 million to our campus

The next regular meeting date is scheduled for January 31 at 3:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

---

David McLawhorn, Chair