GECCo Meeting
Friday, October 28, 2016 @ 10:00 am-12:00 pm
Health Center Conference Room

Acting Chair: A. Hegde
Scribe: M. Silva

Agenda:

1. Assessment Coordinator application: recommendation decision sought [see CV and cover letter in Meeting Materials]
   a. Yes, meets minimum requirements.
   b. All in favor for Ault for the position.

2. Course review: SCI 3209
   a. No specific information on QR
   b. A lot of things implied, but not addressed.
   c. Guidelines aren't specified for writing assignments.
   d. Clarification on syllabus needed.
   e. Needing feedback on written communication and quantitative reasoning.
   f. Reconceptualize - GECCo Revision?

3. Course review: SOC 4988
   a. Does not review GE in assessment portion. More so, his major.
   b. OC is an issue. Needs to be more clear on what they are presenting/discussing.
      i. Not clear how much they are talking and what they are graded on. Needs to be explicitly clear
   c. Refer Doreen to Kelly
   d. Needs to be clear on life goals & reinforcement of oral communication
   e. Paul revision

4. Formal Approval sought: Instructor Qualifications Document from two weeks ago
   a. Agreed to change workshop participation wordage ‘participate in an appropriate learning community workshop’ (not in SELF)

5. Formal Approval sought: Compendium Edits from two weeks ago
   a. Suggest we rename it to AIMS compendium
   b. Compendium was approved pending changes to be made to the JYDR section by John Tarjan.

6. Review: Psych SELF pre-req revisions [See meeting materials folder. Two documents for Psych and SELF]
   a. Move to approve. All in favor

7. Block Scheduling answers – Vernon (multiple handouts with data)
   a. Great idea to put data & information in CSUB 1009 textbook & have it for Freshman orientation
   b. If they begin with an X amount of units (let’s say 15 units) they’ll be used to the 15 units so it’s better to start them off with a full load.
c. How does this get codified? Does it go to the senate?
   i. Bring it to senate executive, they take it to the senate, senate decides if they should take it to the senate floor for open discussion

d. Any proposal should be a pilot. Get faculty to study for a period of time then take it to senate. Follow modules.

e. Needs a committee, preferably not GECCo since we already have an ‘assertive’ reputation
   i. Beyond our scope

f. The intent of the committee would be to bring it up to the senate executive

g. All in favor of having a committee to observe block scheduling

Side notes:
- When submitting course reviews, have instructor provide documents that they were approved already by the school curriculum committee. GECCo needs to see documentation.
  - If we revise a course via GECCo, does it go back to the curriculum committee for a re-approval?
- Issues with A2 & A3 requirements. SD recommends we put on the agenda.