

## **GECCo Meeting- Minutes**

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

**Date:** September 30, 2020

**Members Present:** Sarah Carberry (Chair), Sam Mustafa, Chris Reali, Mike Unger, Amanda Beecher, Desislava Budeva, Todd Barnes, Yvette Kisor, Christina Connor, Rebecca Leung, Lisa Cassidy, Leah Warner, Malavika Sundararajan

### **3-3:30: Pre-meeting session**

Chairperson was logged in to answer questions, discuss plans and reports, or address other issues details.

I. With respect to assessment related issues.

Try to assess something. Let instructors know we are doing some sort of assessment. If encountering difficulties, alter assessment schedules by swapping the timings and objectives. Get through them frequently enough so that you can compare them overtime. It was mentioned that measuring technology assessment-without scientific calculators, so either simple calculators, paper pencil, but cheating was rampant, so still exploring, may have a take home assignment in the works. May have to discuss a different way of assessing it. Can have a separate meeting to discuss strategy. As a member, oversee the assessment for your category and the other half of the work is if the courses can be included in Gen Ed or not.

II. Historical perspectives category is doing direct assessment of one objective.

General rule is two- either direct or indirect, at least a direct and then another direct or an indirect. (indirect sample- like a survey). Can sample from overall data. All outcomes are assessed indirectly in a survey every year. Maybe we needed to edit it a little. May have been disconnected between the assignment and the objective. So it was about collecting more data. For Math, we can have questions like, did we agree we did this?, are we going too slowly?, and so on.

III. Where will all GECCo docs be housed? It will be transferred to google drives. Some may be in email inboxes right now following the mini meetings.

### **3:30-4: Official Meeting Started**

#### **1. Welcome New Members**

Amanda Beecher is the representative for Quantitative Reasoning- Welcome!

Lisa Cassidy and Sarah Carberry are continuing in their respective positions.

Ruma Sen will be representing Global Awareness- Welcome!

#### **2. Academic Honesty in GE**

Academic honesty issues need to be addressed to consider if the mode of delivery has resulted in modifications of assignments, and if students are not doing their own assignments, will this affect the way we are going to assess the Gen Ed program and is the data even reliable? Is it affecting the way we can assess the students in the right way? Committee members stated that some assessments were working in spite of virtual delivery modes but others like interpersonal

skills or experiential activities would have to be delayed. The Chair agreed to postpone all experiential activity based assessments and shared the timeline. Committee members further explained that we are early enough in the assessment cycle to revisit what categories we are assessing, in which years, and flip them around, as long as we do not say we cannot assess anything this year. Critical Reading is in the second cycle, and therefore comparison of data can commence. It was suggested that all should do whatever they could this semester and try their best. While we do not need to create extra work and stress, the work must also not come to a halt resulting in not having anything to show in a couple of years.

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022
FYS	8, 12, 13	7 & 9 (12)		
CRWT	6, 11	6, 8		
SIAH		8,12	1,6	10
HP	pilot	*		
GA		1	13	16
SSI		2, 4	14, 15	12
SR		3	10	5
QR		4	5, 9	10
CC		1, 2	5, 15	
VE	pilot	5,14	11,15	
SSS		14	3	5

\*HP will be determined by the incoming Coordinator.

▶ Current Timeline.

### 3. Compliance - sample size

Several compliance related issues had been observed in Scientific Reasoning, Historical Perspectives and other categories. Committee members expressed concern about adjuncts not being compliant. Suggestions to inform the Deans about this were made as well as choosing to make a mental note and not rehire such adjuncts was mentioned. Another suggestion was to have something in the contract for adjuncts about assessments and the need to comply.

- The Chair may decide to speak at the Dean's council about this matter.

In the Historical Perspectives category, it was noted by a committee member that there were barely enough submissions. Two of the five courses did not have an instrument at all that was linked to multiple outcomes. There was no "now what".

For scientific reasoning, previously, assessments did not even make sense so now all will be assessed together (although data will be categorized separately)

### 4. CATs

The Curriculum Assessment Teams CATs- were encouraged by the chair to do what is best for individual courses but work on the courses in the categories, before the next meeting. CATs will be asked to provide their lists, to enable planning ahead and emailing thank you notes. If anyone from CAT needed a letter for anything, they should let the chair know.

Regarding the pool of money available for adjuncts if they served on CAT, the following points were made. 1. To check with Provost if funds would be available this year. 2. The stipend for adjuncts on CATs was only \$150-200, so for 15 hours of work it did not seem enough. 3. It may be better to ask full time faculty to be on CAT this year and take adjuncts only when the amount is confirmed. 4. There is a short list of adjuncts who have volunteered and if someone wants members they can contact the chair. 5. It would be advisable to get an adjunct and loop them into the program so that it is not just one person in charge of an entire category.

Committee members were reminded that faculty cannot approve GE substitutions on their own. It still has to be approved by the Vice-Provost. (Susan Gauldon is still both VP and Provost).

**4-4:30:**

**5. SPAN 305**

Request to consider 300/400 level Spanish classes in GE Keystone categories beyond Global Awareness:

The document was emailed to the committee. A request from Spanish language convenor, about having 300/400 level classes being included in GE keystone categories.

- a. The chair explained that the reason the applicants were writing this early was, if the committee was not going to be in favor, they did not want to submit it in October. At this point we are not approving or disapproving of the course but are just determining if we should stick with the rules or allow this. The course they want to include into Historical Perspectives is SPAN 305- called Spanish Civilization. According to rules, the courses in this category have to be 100-200 level only, with prereqs excluded. This is a 300 level course with a pre-req. Language courses are allowed into keystone Global Awareness at 300 level. That is one issue. The letter explains it.
- b. Committee members explained that language course levels are different from other 300 levels, since 100-200 level courses in language are only for basic literacy.
- c. The letter says. "The 100 and 200-level Spanish (and other language) courses can be compared to CRWT and SIAH". But, unsure it was clear.
- d. Committee members explained that in language classes at 300 level and above they are taught Culture in that language. But a 300-level elective is still a significant difference from a 100/200 level introductory course, and therefore he mentioned that he does not approve of it, especially since in addition to being at the 300 level it also has a pre-req. But the additional issue is, it is taught in Spanish, which means 90% of our student population cannot take this course and it is targeted to a narrow student population.
- e. With Pre-reqs, there is a parallel to Math courses. You can test into a few courses. Here, however, the prereq you will test out of is in a different category, which is in Global Awareness and CRWT. So taking two other keystone courses to take this keystone course sounds like too roundabout a way to have to take this course. Also, if we make this exception once, we will have to make it again. We have denied several 300 level courses, this is not the first time.

- f. Committee members shared that we have allowed 300 level courses earlier though it was only in the distribution categories and in Global Awareness and that they were only language courses that you can test into. It has never come up for Historical Perspectives but the rules say it has to be 100-200 level. The other civilization courses (at least Italian civilization) is in Global Awareness. Committee members asked if it has something to do with what is provided to bilingual students. Since the majority are not bilingual, we are saying no to this, but, we may be sidelining them. It was explained that bilinguals have access to all Gen Ed courses, and this would be only offered to bilinguals and not the rest. Although this was a way to understand Latin American or Spanish culture and we may be narrowing the cultural groups we are including. However, if that were the case then it should be offered in English so all can take it. It was mentioned that it appears it has value as it is taught in Spanish. If it were at 100 level, we may not have this issue and that there are opportunities for other language courses in other categories but you cannot double count more than two in a category. We may have made an exception with the Italian language course inclusion so we could advise them to put their course in Global Awareness. The same applicants were going to submit several courses, which are spread out across different Gen Ed categories and that they already have global awareness courses.
- g. Committee members stated that it is an art history course. If lower level and taught in English without prerequisites it could have been considered. Taught in Spanish, requiring prereqs and at 300 level are the stumbling blocks.
- h. The question was do we allow a 300 level course in? Do we make an exception? Then talk about prereqs a bit. Are we going to make an exception? With respect to Historical Perspectives the preference was not to make an exception. Committee members discussed that if the case is that a 300 level course should not be included because it presupposes disciplinary knowledge, with SPAN- it is only language proficiency and not disciplinary knowledge although it still did not mean the course needed to be included. A question was raised-Wasn't language the disciplinary knowledge for languages? In response to which it was explained that in this case, the disciplinary knowledge may be History. However, the original concerns remained and the chair put forth a motion to vote on the item. A WEBx poll was sent out to all committee members (with the chair's vote mentioned manually as the poll did not allow her to vote)

The item for the vote was "Will we allow this exception to the 300-level restriction in keystone categories?"

**Results of the vote:** Yes- 0/12; No-11/12; Abstain- 1/12. No answer- 0/12.

With a clear majority, the committee voted to not allow this exception to the 300-level restriction in keystone categories.

A response letter will be prepared by the chair and sent to the applicants.

End of Meeting.