

## General Education Curriculum Committee

January 26, 2018

2-4 p.m.

Administration West 101

**Members:** P. Newberry, V. Harper, I. Sumaya, C. MacQuarrie, J. Moffit, B. Larson, C. Kloock, K. Flachmann, S. Saner, S. Daniels (No Quorum)

**Scribe:** M. Silva

### Meeting Minutes

1. PHIL 2129
  - a. Issues with course review coming up on Dropbox
  - b. CM review; concern whether testing a skill is the same as reinforcing the skill. Second, Area C; didn't have percentages laid out for Area C.
  - c. This is a co-req course. It doesn't need to have a percentage. We never discussed how to review these.
    - i. GECCo needs to come up with a process to review these courses.
    - ii. This will be the next step. Faculty Director will work with Fellows on process.

2. PSYC 2018
  - a. Lower cap from requested 35 to 30. Reason is because it takes up a lot of personal time with the students in the class.
  - b. If we cap at 30, there could be anywhere from 32-35, whereas, capping it at 35 it could be 37-40.

**ACTION:** Paul will conduct email vote for approval.

3. Learning Community attendance requirement
  - a. Participation each term you teach is expected.
  - b. We aren't getting that and may never get it.
  - c. If you are teaching the same course semester after semester, then why is there a need to keep going each semester you teach it?
  - d. Do people need to attend per semester or maybe once a year?
    - i. The intent is that you create a learning community.
  - e. Do we want to keep trying to change the culture? Yes, what is the best change though?
  - f. Should we use social media?
4. Pre-requisite change requested for ENGL 3119 (JYDR/GWAR)
  - a. Students over 45 units and A3 completion is okay for JYDR, however, GWAR MUST be 60+ units.
  - b. Will be okay this time for the students that went through. We are proposing changing requisites beginning next semester.

**ACTION:** Paul will conduct email vote for approval.

5. Course reviews and resubmission: Process. (worksheet)

- a. Conversation began in Nov 17, however, nothing was decided.
- b. MS is chair for subcommittee for course review
- c. What was said on the original document? Produce what we want to without being counterproductive.
- d. How are we going to figure out if they're doing the 30%?
  - i. First, start and make sure that they are using the correct template.
  - ii. Must check the description about the requirement, if there are SLO's
  - iii. Do not ask for assignments.
  - iv. First pilot, list the things that were looking for, turn into checklist and rubric. They'll be assessing themselves. 3-5 important items, then in our evaluation, we are suggestive rather than punishing. Send a self-assessment over spring.
  - v. Praise the ones that are doing the right thing, and send an example to someone that doesn't quite get it.
  - vi. Run a workshop to get self-evaluation ready.
    1. Might backfire. Fellows shouldn't be those to evaluate, that is GECCo's job.
  - vii. 8 GECCo members and split between each. Have the instructor self-evaluate first though.
  - viii. Should we look at every syllabi? If so, it has to be in a way we can manage it.
  - ix. There will not be a lot of change if we review and tell them what they're doing wrong. We need to teach them to do it right the first time.
    1. GECCo should be sending out the syllabi in the beginning of the semester rather than MAYBE getting them from their department chair.
  - x. External evaluator; can't work on outcomes because they're aren't any yet, however, he can evaluate what's being done.
  - xi. Who is using the syllabi, start there.
  - xii. Remediation in spring, self-checking and self-evaluation. Then get it to the department, then next year, we get to the syllabi.
  - xiii. This group thinks that this ought to be the plan;
    1. Fellows start offering workshops to prepare the syllabi
    2. Have all the syllabi then compare against the syllabi approved.
    3. FIRST we need a catalog of master syllabi.
    4. Checklist about the syllabi and LCF will be there to get feedback. A two-part meeting, first make sure it matches then one sample assignment from their class and compare it to syllabi