

GECCo Meeting- Minutes

Venue: Virtual WEBEX meeting, 3.30-4.30 pm

Date: May 19, 2021

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

GECCO Manual Updates- contd...

1. Review of Syllabus and Audit Excel Sheet and checked access for all members to the sheet.

Link to Sheet:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1QPeYYR_biFKTEViOaH0H4MPIJT6vPO3PGzZho2SIVLk/edit?usp=sharing

- a. Listed by category and then find it under the actual list of syllabi
- b. Member wanted to know if it was okay to create folders- It was okay so members can create folder (sub-folders)
- c. There are lot of submissions (107-108), some may still have to submit (we will need to follow-up with the pending ones)
- d. Please note- some submitted syllabi which are not Gen Ed courses. We will need to be a lot more specific about the Course numbers. Will need to follow-up.
- e. Directors can review the syllabi (instead of reviewing with the CATS) on their own and confirm the assessment needs. (This was approved)

2. Meeting about a meeting with Dr. Jebb. where there will be a short introduction to GECCo by Chair. If there is any specific information that we need to add, members can contact the Chair to let her know.

- a. Stress that we have a robust Gen Ed program as a Liberal Arts College offering a range of interdisciplinary and specific courses from across the various Schools.
- b. It is also not what you just get done in your first year. They have topics which are relevant and modern, capturing what is required for the future of each student. (timely and varied course offerings). (Even the stand-alone courses (CRWT, SIAH, FYS) invite faculty from many disciplines.) Only reasons why it is not that inclusive is only because of the restrictions, like the double-counting and requirement to take at least one outside of the school. (Can check and follow-up again independently)
- c. GE reflects the mission (add one bullet point to show how it reflects the mission)
- d. If it is drafted and sent out- members can provide feedback.

3. Review of the manual and the check-list

(<https://docs.google.com/document/d/12QsyzyrUvIm0rg-mf0s1KyUzO7B7Wc29/edit>)

- a. The check-list is right there at the end of the manual starting from page 10.
- b. What reference if any do we make to the task-force report?- We will not refer to the task force report, instead mention that many revisions were made after the initial report was written-up. Just mention it reflects the GEN Ed program approved by the Faculty Assembly. We could consider just striking the statement completely. We may need to be careful to not let it slip out of the history in case someone wants to refer to the initial criteria and the revisions made. We may have a statement from the Middle-States report

that represents all those aspects as it is important to address the timeline of revisions or expected revisions. Note points related to recommendation versus requirement.

- c. Do we have a mission statement? Could we propose one and have FA vote on it and that could be what we could speak to (as to the spirit or the statement of what the mission is).
- d. There is still some confusion about what we are tasked with.
- e. Maybe we need to vote on each step. With the vote, we can have confirmation from the Faculty and whenever it comes up we can speak to it. One possible idea.
- f. In our old manual- <https://www.ramapo.edu/fa/files/2019/10/GECCo-Manual-2019.pdf> 5-6- requirements are available and the list of changes. Just change roman numeral to III. Just cut and paste the content about the requirements
- g. Members agreed to get rid of the entire bullet referring to the spirit.
- h. Reviewed for the appropriate sequential order of the check-list and appropriate changes were made. Let them not be phrased as questions. Let it just be a check-list. Revise how it is phrased.
- i. Note- language courses alone can be added at 300 or 400 level. This is an exception.
- j. Note- cannot have pre-requisite in the same category as the first will need to count.
- k. Would it make more sense to move the specific areas items under a separate subsection for the letter? Or should we have a broader criteria which you alter for each section? We need one checklist for everybody and then caveats for each category. It may be better to have a separate checklist. It is easier from a manual perspective to have a common one and to update it. We can just add the individual check-list in the appendix section. So definitely separate checklists with hyperlinks at the criteria section to add at the appendix section.
- l. Provide a static link to viewers (applicants) as view only that is downloadable which can be edited at our end.

Will be working on editing the criteria offline- members may be asked to review for phrasing and wordsmithing.

Next meeting is just office hours- if you have questions, concerns, please feel free to log in for the June meeting (or send an email).

Meeting Concluded.