

GECC Meeting Minutes
Jan. 28, 2022
2:00-3:30pm

Present:

Voting members:

Jonathan Moore, Julianne Guillard, Angela Reynolds, Gregory Triplett, Rohan Kalyan, Dan Salandro, Adam Ewing, James Keck, Carly Phinizy, Ross Collin, Alena Hampton, Ann Marie Gardinier Halstead, Allison Ryals, Vicki Pallo

Non-voting members:

Whitney Lovelady, Constance Relihan, Roxanne Spindle, Emma King, Madeline Goldman, LaToya Robinson

Guests: Dr. Fotis Sotiropoulos, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Dr. Deborah Noble-Triplett, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

Absent/vacant:

Student rep from SGA [vacant]
UUCS rep [vacant]
Life Sciences rep [vacant]
Ryan Cales [faculty senate rep]

Meeting notes

Note: Minutes for last meeting (12/10/21) approved by a vote of 10-0.

- Chair opened the meeting at 2pm
- **New business:** Transfer & Substitutions Subcommittee updates & decisions needed
 - Subcommittee Chair shared updates on the subcommittee transition to GECC and asked for input from GECC on the decision & approval process going forward. Committee recommendations:
 - Subcommittee should have autonomy to make decisions about petitions using the input and expertise of its members.
 - Situations that require additional input from the GECC can be brought forward to full committee meetings.
 - Once a year, the subcommittee will provide a summary of all petition decisions made to the GECC for transparency and review.
 - To aid in the decision making process, syllabi should now be required when petitions are submitted.
 - Subcommittee requested input on a petition for a student where the AOI application was not clear. GECC recommendation: revise the AOI attribution for the substitution and reconsider the petition.
 - Note: one additional faculty at large subcommittee member still needed.

- **New business:** Racial Literacy submission and timeline
 - Chair updated the committee on the racial literacy process and timeline:
 - In order for degree programs to get started on updating their degree pages, we need to begin accepting submissions this spring.
 - A new course proposal form needs to be developed and approved specific to racial literacy courses. A draft will be ready for the next GECC meeting.
 - Discussion about what supplementary documents would be required to demonstrate commitment to all of the racial literacy course requirements. Committee recommendation:
 - A syllabus with a list of readings
 - An additional 1-2 pp. document discussing how the course will address all of the listed criteria.
 - Discussion followed about whether to ask for a commitment to course level assessment.
 - Point raised that some other Foundations courses are required to conduct this type of assessment; perhaps this should be the case for all Foundations courses.
 - Response: This is complicated by the fact that unless it is in a unit's major the courses might not be assessed regularly.
 - Recommendation: The GECC will need to consider how to review all courses in the GenEd curriculum, not just those currently being submitted. The GECC may decide at a later time that departments need to commit to doing their own course level assessment.
- **New business:** Provost Sotiropoulos & Dr. Noble-Triplett joined the meeting at 3pm. Purpose of visit: to answer committee questions regarding additional "literacies" (computational and entrepreneurial) & faculty work groups.
 - Provost first provided an update that his office is moving forward with a search for a Director of Assessment position.
 - Opened for questions from committee (summary of discussion below):
 - Q: Which economic theories/economists form the basis of these new literacies? Also a request for clarity on the definition of entrepreneurship being used. Concern raised that for some units this sounds more like "job training" as opposed to an institute of higher learning, and would not be well received.
 - A: His focus is on the "future of work"; not just about "job training;" he wants students to be able to succeed once they graduate. They will have to interface with technology no matter what career/future they plan for themselves, and higher level skill sets will be required.
 - Q: Is racial literacy being presented as equivalent to computational and entrepreneurial literacies? Or do these new literacies fit more as AOI?
 - A: The goal is to introduce every student, regardless of degree, to all three. In his view they are interconnected (bias in algorithms, need for success/justice for all students, etc.) Our university claims to provide access to a wide-range of individuals, including

marginalized/at risk; in his view this is also an issue of “financial justice” as a part of social justice.

- Q: Can work groups on this topic consider multiple options for how to incorporate these literacies, as there is not a lot of room (credit hours) in our current GenEd curriculum? Also a request that representation from GECC be permitted in the work groups.
 - A: work groups will be under GECC, and report back to this committee. The charge for the work groups will include consideration of multiple options for addressing this.
 - Q: What is the current timeline for this idea?
 - A: They would like to see steady progress. A decision isn’t needed by May, but they would like to see progress on thinking through the ideas by then.
 - A: This idea has also been presented to the Board of Visitors, and they are very excited about it. The hope is that we can find a way to make it happen. At the same time, the Provost will not circumvent faculty input. If the committee concludes that it can’t be done, he’ll report back to the BOV with this news. However, he’d like to find ways to keep our university competitive, and even ahead of the curve. We need to be attractive/relevant to future students to have a sustainable future.
 - Additional requests from members: this needs to be part of a larger conversation with faculty. It also should include discussions with all the majors. This can’t only happen in the GECC, as it means either increasing the total number of GenEd hours, or decreasing numbers in the majors. Faculty, deans need to be on board with this as well.
 - A: They would like input from our committee about how this could work, and hope that the work groups will help with this. They would also like to get to the point where we can have the flexibility in our general education to do things like this going forward. The goal is to think as creatively as possible about how to do this.
- Meeting concluded at 3:43 pm.