

## **GECCo Meeting- Minutes**

**Venue:** Virtual WEBEX meeting, 3.30-4.30 pm

**Date:** April 28, 2021

**Members Present:** Sarah Carberry (Chair), Chris Reali, Mike Unger, Amanda Beecher, Todd Barnes, Lisa Cassidy, Emily Leskinen, Desislava Budeva, Monika Giacompe, Christina Connor, Rebecca Leung, Ruma Sen, Yvette Kisor, Leah Warner, Roark Atkinson, Malavika Sundararajan

### **GECCO Manual**

#### **It needs some updates:**

1. Background-is historically accurate- no need to remove any of that.
2. Review role of GECCo directors and coordinators
  - a. Do we collaborate with administrators- That is Mike who represents the administrators. Else if the Vice-provost is sitting in on the meetings- it implies meeting with them.
3. Chair position minor changes.
4. Adding a minor position of a secretary -that someone volunteers to keep the minutes as the secretary to support the activities of the chair. Takes meeting's minutes and posts on the GECCo's website. (send it to Ann Marie and she will update it on the website).
5. Is the CAT- the same as subcommittees? Yes, comprising the faculty.
6. We need to continue to cite the aspects of the taskforce 2's work on it. (do we need to repeat it?)- we will remove the links and the wording related to it. It is already mentioned at the top. Plus it is out of date since a few aspects have changed. If we link back to the taskforce and they are not updated to reflect the changes then it will be an outdated document. So we need not have a link. Maybe we can just include either a paragraph or if there is a link-a note to refer back to the manual. Had to trace the document. We want to make it easy to access for applicants.
7. The checklist for keystone- have wording from the taskforce but not for the distribution categories.
8. Need to update the right map-check if there is an X which was missing..
9. Realigning and reformatting of the maps was completed.
10. Criteria- need to be updated or completely replaced by the checklists. The criteria has evolved.
  - a. Require sample assignments. Or, if your assignment is not described in your syllabus you will have to submit a copy (add this as a fifth bullet point). Fifth point was added to request sample assignments (instructions or descriptions of assignments and that it addresses all outcomes under that objective)
  - b. 4th point was revised to provide clarity and restated as "Include a syllabus showing the alignment of the course learning experiences and assessments with appropriate GE outcomes within the category"
  - c. This document does not have the category specific outcomes. We can attach it as a separate document. It would help smoothen the process. So here, put a link to the maps for each of the outcomes. Just say, refer to the checklist.
  - d. And on Historical Perspectives- there needs to be some reevaluation to help in closing the loop as well as for Global Awareness and other categories. One avenue is redoing the checklists, the category emails is another avenue that must be considered- wherein reminders are sent before June so they can ensure it is included in the course.

- e. Since we refer to the objectives- there must be an inclusion of the outcomes at least in an appendix section. Either link to it or put the appendix in the manual.
  - f. We are going to upload the manual on the website. It will be a static manual not a live, editable link.
  - g. Will be moving to fully online electronic submissions. Suggestions to use the same software being used for personnel binders. Not sure how far along we are. There was some funding approved for it. Not sure where it stands now.
  - h. We will revise the common changes today and revise the check-lists later.
  - i. Make a new bullet for assignments. This was added to the document under section IV.
  - j. Do we have an appeal process? Not really, they would have to reapply from scratch. Under rejected- revised phrasing of the process of resubmission or revisions? Is it then an appeal or a do over? We may have to leave it as rejected as it is usually not outcome related.
  - k. We may need to go back to minor revision and major revision then the rejection will be a hard no. Get rid of any language related to revisions under the rejected case.
  - l. It may help once the checklists are fully revised as it will offer clarity.
  - m. We can check the ARC's major and minor revision guidelines and align with it.
11. GECCo part of ARC manual- must be checked to see if it is updated.

**Review the checklists- before people start creating new classes and submit their applications.**

Meeting Concluded.