

## **GECCo Meeting- Minutes**

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

**Date:** December 14, 2021

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

### **I. Review of Applications**

1. LITR200/SCIN263-Survey of Science Fiction under Systems, Sustainability and Society  
Issues: Course description does not sound like every version of this course would meet the criteria for this category. A concern- it is unclear if one of the learning outcomes related to qualitative and quantitative assessment would be measured. It does not appear to be present in the assignment. It could be modified. At this point it does not seem to be the case that it would be possible to meet the outcome. It seemed more appropriate for culture and creativity. There are some scientific intersections though. There are aspects of science but what kind of skills would students be bringing to carry out analysis. Here, there is no critical analysis of research. There is no critical thinking of the scientific method itself. That is the part that is missing from this course. Take it back to instructor, while it is related to Science, it is not designed to assess the outcomes it is supposed to assess. Could there be a reading list that could be incorporated into this as instructor would be open. Check what is it that the Race article is about and how it is being analyzed. We can provide this feedback and provide option for culture and creativity but over there as well, it may require a revision to meet criteria. Committee voted to ask the applicant to revise and resubmit.
2. SPAN 3XX\_Medical Interpreting. Under Values and Ethics. They will be hiring a specialist adjunct. There is a book on Ethics but it is a technical manual. May need a values and ethics statement and some readings and they can be handed to the person teaching it. It needs to be developed a little more. ARC may have more questions. Would need to revise the syllabus. Committee voted to accept (with minor feedback for improvement)
3. Psyc 101- Introduction to Psychology- (Here a working group may be charged by the provost with a review of the descriptions of the categories, who may inform GECCo about the changes needed) so the instructor will be informed that in its current form it does not meet the criteria. GECCo may be subordinate to ARC, we need to know who we are and how we can make the final decision. We report to FA via FAEC or Provost but a component of ARC. When we redid the GE program we did not create clear policies and procedures. So by default, if we are changing something, we decided we would not change it without a faculty vote. The Vice Provost is still basically the Dean of the GE program. We do not report to ARC.
4. PHIL 135\_Asian Philosophy: Requires further development at this point. Needs to be revised from ground up. The content has to be delivered and built in from ground up in order for it to be assessed. Committee voted- revise and resubmit with one abstention.
5. Still need to review the Italian Cinema- has to be postponed. Requires discussions of many aspects.

Meeting Concluded.