I. Rubrics
   a. 4 member team will review the 11 drafted rubrics then send back to the working groups

II. Oral Communication
   a. Two of the SLOs were struck through due to a discrepancy. In February, Council struck through
      the second part of the SLOs that were overly complex.
      i. Aaron reached out to Jessica McCall, David Carlone, and Kim Cuny to explain where we
         are with the SLOs. Jessica and David provided rationale for those SLOs so Aaron will
         share that with Council for final vote.
   b. Are the SLOs for Written Communication and Oral Communication SLOs too narrow? No, that
      did not come up in Council
   c. So far, only 2 people (both CST) have completed the GEC to MAC Express for Oral
      Communication. If the SLOs change, only 2 would need to re-submit the Qualtrics.

III. Faculty Senate MAC update
   a. Aaron will give an update on MAC at Faculty Senate on Wed. 9/9 at 4:40pm
      i. Direct them to the MAC website, Joi describe phased approach, Jodi can share pilot plan
      ii. Being the first meeting of the year, give broad overview

IV. MAC Website
   a. SLOs
      i. Oral Communication: Should we take the SLOs off website until Council votes? Yes.
      ii. CTI Natural Sciences: GEC wanted all the CTI SLOs to be consistent with 2 SLOs each
         but working group provided justification and GEC approved the 3rd CTI NS SLO.
      iii. Diversity & Equity: post both sets of SLOs since we’re piloting both sets? Yes. Jodi will
         draft language to explain and Tia will post on website. IC is trying to collect data from
         pilot to decide on the SLOs by testing out both sets of SLOs and surveying both the
         faculty and students.
   b. Integrating competencies in the major webpage – Andrew will draft verbiage for IC to review
      then Tia will get it up on website.
   c. News/Highlights webpage – Andrew and Joi will draft September update
   d. Data table/seat map – IC review and provide feedback and Tia will get it up on website.
      i. Keep GEC marker, subject code, course number, combo, course title, company, and seats

V. Counting seats in online courses
   a. Table until next data projection conversation.
   b. Dana has asked IR for the existing seat counts.
   c. UNCG Online is open to course development.

VI. Articulation plan (re: student-athlete recruitment)
   a. Andrew spoke with Kristin Rusboldt who asked about transfer articulation plan for general
      education in preparation for student-athlete recruitment.
VII. Communication plan for advising community
   a. We don’t have enough tangible information at this time to tell advisors, except for the crosswalk.

VIII. Petitioning for MAC courses
   a. Is the best thing for a student to initiate a review or to have the advisor do the review or should the advisors do the review?
      i. GEC has 3 appeals for Friday for students petitioning transfer courses for GEC credit.
      ii. Chris and Jodi’s offices are meeting on Monday to discuss this issue. The process is currently missing the DegreeWorks review and the advisor’s input.
         1. Should be a straight-forward, evaluative process that goes to GEC. This may increase workload of advisors. Dana has prepped Advising Council and recommends distributing the workload across specific people in the academic units.
         2. There will be peak times that these petitions come in and quick decisions must be made so students know what courses to enroll in for the next term.
      iii. Currently, the process is initiated by the student but the student needs guidance on when it is or isn’t an appropriate request. URO, GEC, the student, and their advisor is involved and Jodi’s office manages the flow of communications but it does need to start with student, last step is Council. The petition only goes to GEC when the determination isn’t clear. GEC had 2-3 last year, there aren’t many that go unresolved.
         1. Aaron is being told by advisors that the department has the right to determine if a course counts for GEP or not and that’s not true but the language around this is vague.
      iv. Should be student-driven, perhaps workflow includes some kind of approval from the advisor, but should not land on a single individual.
      v. Upper-division crosswalk to lower-division, primarily needed when students change their majors – different than the petition process.

Next meeting: Thursday September 3, 2020