

## GECCo Meeting- Minutes

**Venue:** Virtual WEBEX meeting, 1-3 pm

**Date:** November 10, 2021

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

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

1. Psych 101- continuing with the review- is applying to get into scientific reasoning (applied twice before, 5 years and 2 years ago- both times they were denied). First, wording related to the introductory course in TAS requirement in addition to other items. Second time, in case some of the criteria had changed for GECCo, but that was not of any consequence to the wording used to them- so it was denied.). This time, the class has changed, according to the cover letter, the entire idea of intro to Psychology has changed and that it has gone more towards natural science. Discussion: Question 1: Is the TAS language still what we are going with. If not, we will have to change the GECCo program's core, which was voted on by the Faculty, which is not possible. Open for discussion to all committee members: Nothing about the TAS footnote has not gone away, but since they are not moving the class to TAS, the criteria is still the same. So, nothing against the course but that was the expectation. GECCo need not be responsible for this decision, let it go back to faculty for a vote. That is what we are leaning towards as a committee. Would the sentence then have to be removed? Or would it be GECCo asking to change the GEnEd. If the deputy people can talk about it then we can see the objections raised by TAS. It is not just the technicality, there may be additional issues, which must be heard. (So, the Chair may recuse self during the process as chair). A couple of other issues- being in Gen Ed, Scientific Reasoning. It is transferring in for Socio 110. Social Science Inquiry. Psych 101 is not a course that is used in Scientific Reasoning in any other college, it is typically a social science category. The varieties of ways in which the course can be taught, and although there are 5-6 weeks seems dedicated to natural science, it may not be the way it is taught in all the sections. Keeping in mind, what GECCo can do: approve and send to ARC, ask for revisions, reject. If we reject, then what next? We must be cautious about setting precedence about people going to FA for a vote, which may undermine what GECCo does, leading to a bit of uncertainty in the decision-making process. It may help to alleviate any anger or misunderstanding with an emphasis on collegiality. Would FAEC be a good place or FA? Does GECCo want to initiate the change? We also said that we would write out a category description for each of the categories. We will do that, although that may not directly help with this case. Obstacle for them seems to be the TAS footnote. We are saying no, because of the footnote, so it may be worth going to FA for. We could suggest other categories for them in terms of fit. There may be two different issues in that case. However, if the sentence is changed, it may change the category. When this work was done years ago and this issue was not anticipated, as a process, if we can solve the problem and then take it to FA to let them see what the problem is and how we may want to solve it. We could remove the TAS note and then ask if they want to submit a class in neuropsych instead? If we are making a change to Gen Ed wouldn't it be better to change the social science inquiry and open it to include social science courses rather than just have one option? Intro to Neuroscience would be a more appropriate course or they could design a course specifically designed for this category.

Removing the TAS footnote may not solve this problem for this specific course (Physical or Natural Science may be a better inclusion). Voting: Course Rejected: 12 Yes, 1 Abstained.

The second item. We do not have any procedure with respect to who can change it but a few items were changed by FA votes for two items and for the senior presentation, it was agreed by Deans to move it to a different place. Those were substantial changes which impacted all the students. Is this substantial enough for a vote? Maybe we can write the language for the new descriptions for the different categories and then take it to FA. Let us do it for all the categories. We are happy to work with people who are interested in coming into any of the categories.

2. Values and Ethics course: SPAN 3XX- Medical Interpreting. By Natalia Santamaria. Some issues: No cover letter. Final project seems to tick all boxes. Prereq is a SPAN course which is in Global Awareness. Suggestions can be included in the letter to the applicant to strengthen the values and ethics course. Requires more information. Postponed decision.
3. Global Awareness: INTL 318\_Italian Cinema. By Rosina D'Angelo. Earlier it was rejected due to it being a 300 level course. Concerns: Being in any other language cannot qualify for Global awareness if it is not measuring those objectives and its concern is about it being a higher level course. ARC form is not completed (typos, missing information). A letter will be sent to the applicant requesting for more information.  
Note: To have an opportunity to discuss Global Awareness Criteria.
4. Global Awareness: COMM 2XX: Media Culture in South Korea. By David Oh. Well designed. Content is good. Grid assesses correctly. Course Approved. 11 votes: Yes
5. HIST 1XXX: History Matters (based on email explanations and clarifications). Course Approved. 12 Votes: Yes
6. HIST 211: The Barbarous Years: Colonial America to 1750. By Roark Atkinson. Name Change if it will benefit. Course Approved: 12 votes: Yes
7. HIST 212: Empires Fall: America's Revolutions to 1830. By Roark Atkinson. Name change and minor changes with some new content and material. Course Approved: 12 votes: Yes
8. PHIL 235: Asian Philosophy. By Lisa Cassidy. Concerns: May not have enough historical content to fit into the historical perspectives category. May fit another category. Either consider Global Awareness or revise and resubmit. (May need to talk about what it means to be historical perspectives versus not having enough historical content). May not also be complete in its presentation of historical perspective. Here it is just the traditional historiography. An issue is, historiography is one out of four SLOs so it may be a disconnect. Another is about how we are assessing this. It could go into Values and Ethics or Creativity and Culture. Important to understand who decides what gets approved for a category. Here, it is not as clear as it needs to be. So we will email requesting more information for now.

Additional Notes: Courses are running as Global Awareness, which are not meeting the criteria and teaching what they are supposed to. Same with Scientific Reasoning- in terms of assessments/assignments that do not assess accurately.

We need to review Science Fiction at the next meeting.

Meeting Concluded.