

GEOC Meeting September 22, 2008

In Attendance: Tom Roby, Robert Cromley, Elizabeth Jockusch, Jane Goldman, Xae Alicia Reyes, Morty Ortega, John Troyer, William Lott, Cora Lynn Deibler, Michael Darre, Felicia Pratto, Katharina von Hammerstein, Kristen Mooney (GEOC Student Employee), Hedley Freaque (Chair, Senate Executive Committee), Anke Finger, Letitia Naigles. Not Present: Niloy Dutta, Peter Gogarten, Murphy Sewall, Tom Deans, Anabel Perez.

Meeting called to order at 12:05pm.

1. Minutes of the September 10, 2008 meeting. Felicia Pratto moved to approve the minutes. Xae Alicia Reyes seconded the motion.

Motion to approve the minutes passed with one abstention.

2. Announcements:

- *Cross-Content Area General Education Courses.* Katharina von Hammerstein will meet with the Senate C&CC on October 6, 2008 to discuss the Cross-Content Area General Education Courses proposal.
- *W Assessment Workshop.* Tom Deans and his collaborators from the Art History, Human Development and Family Studies, and Political Science departments will hold a W Assessment Workshop on October 9, 2008 at 12:00pm in CUE 318.
- *General Education at the Regional Campuses.* Katharina von Hammerstein will meet with Nancy Steenburg and Ernie Zirakzadeh on September 23, 2008 about the limited number of upper division General Education courses taught at regional campuses.

3. Subcommittee reports

Subcommittee Recruitment:

Katharina von Hammerstein addressed the expressed interest of professional staff members and faculty in joining GEOC subcommittees.

Felicia Pratto raised questions about University professional staff serving on GEOC subcommittees. Because only faculty can vote on GEOC matters, she was concerned that professional staff members would not be able to vote. Katharina von Hammerstein stated that professional staff members would be able to vote on subcommittees, as also undergraduate student representatives have done in the past.

Felicia Pratto also voiced concerns as to whether the professional staff members had the proper credentials to serve on GEOC subcommittees. She suggested that an advanced degree should be a requirement in order to serve on a GEOC subcommittee. Katharina von Hammerstein argued that the position a potential GEOC subcommittee member holds on campus should take precedence over an advanced degree. She stated that a person without an advanced degree could have much more experience in a particular area than one with an advanced degree. Having professional staff on the subcommittees would allow for a broader representation of the University.

Pending no GEOC regulations regarding professional staff subcommittee members, Tom Roby suggested that these issues and the recruiting of new members be discussed by each subcommittee.

Social Sciences

The CA2 subcommittee recommends **approval** of the following course:

SOCI 3823 The Sociology of Law: Global and Comparative Perspectives

Motion to approve the CA2 report as presented. Motion approved.

Diversity and Multiculturalism

The CA4 subcommittee recommends **approval** of the following course:

International

SOCI 3823

The Sociology of Law: Global and Comparative Perspectives

The CA4 subcommittee recommends **approval of the following course pending the change in title noted below:**

HIST/PRLS/LAMS 1570

Migrant Workers

(title should change to include the contemporary focus and ethnicities of the workers:
Latin American, Mexican, Caribbean)

Writing Competency

The W subcommittee recommends **revision** of the following course:

SOCI 3823W

The Sociology of Law: Global and Comparative Perspectives

The following items were identified as needing revision:

- GEOC Form
 - Catalog Copy needs to be written as it will appear in the catalog, with separate entries for the “W” and non-“W” sections.
 - Page 3 states, “This will be an upper division course open to sophomores.” However, no restrictions on registration are listed in the course description. Given the new numbering system, this allows freshmen to register for the course. Do you want to add the line “Open to sophomore and higher?”
 - The directions on the GEOC form read: “FOR ALL COURSES: describe how the proposed course meets the Specific Criteria for the particular content area and/or competency chosen.” However, the section for the form for “W” courses was not included. This section must be completed.
- Syllabus
 - The syllabus has to explicitly state that the student must pass the “W” component in order to pass the course.
 - The following is in the non-W syllabus. “PAPERS (5 pages each, typewritten plus a bibliography, 1” margins, font no smaller than 12 points)
Your papers will be evaluated based on both content and expression. Written work must be satisfactorily completed in order to pass the course. Your final versions of these papers must address the WRITTEN FEEDBACK that I give you on your first drafts in terms of both writing and organizational problems in order to receive a passing grade.”

This suggests that the students will write more than one paper and will revise the papers. However, the grading criteria list one paper. Please edit syllabus to be consistent.

Motion to approve the W report as presented. Motion approved.

Arts and Humanities

The CA1 subcommittee recommends **approval of the following course pending the change in title noted above:**

HIST/LAMS/PRLS 1570

Migrant Workers

(pending adoption of a new title)

Motion to approve CA1 report as presented. Motion approved.

4. General Reports and Discussion

Voting for co-chairs and directors of Q or W Centers

If a Co-Chair is also a Director shall s/he vote, or shall the ex-officio members not vote?

A discussion ensued. Below are the key points:

- Felicia Pratto: Directors acting as Co-Chairs are temporarily given regular memberships and thus voting rights. If the individual remains a Director, but does not co-chair a subcommittee, then would not have voting rights.
- Bill Lott: if a non-faculty Director of the Q or W Centers remains on the GEOC, they should not vote and we should add this as a proviso to the bylaws
- Tom Roby: this would give GEOC a certain amount of flexibility if the Director is demoted from Co-Chair.
- Letitia Naigles recommended adding the following to the respective paragraph in the Gen Ed Guidelines: “Insofar as GEOC subcommittee Co-Chairs are faculty members and Q or W Center Directors are Co-Chairs, they should retain voting rights in the GEOC.”

Note: Currently, the respective paragraph in the Gen Ed Guidelines reads: “General Education Requirements will be overseen by a General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC), a faculty group appointed by the Senate and representative of the Schools and Colleges. The Committee also will have an undergraduate and graduate student representative. The GEOC shall be a subcommittee of the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee whose chair will serve as a non-voting member of GEOC. **The Directors of the University W and Q Centers will also be given non-voting appointments to GEOC.** The GEOC will monitor the General Education curriculum. The creation of a Senate-appointed committee recognizes the policy control of the Senate in matters relating to undergraduate education. This Committee will work in association with the Office of Undergraduate Education and Instruction because this office has University-wide responsibility for the health of undergraduate education and the fiscal resources to address emerging issues. Financial support for the activity of the GEOC will come from the Office of the Provost.”

Note: The Senate minutes of 04/05 read: “The University is appointing directors for the new W and Q Centers. Their work will be closely involved with the GEOC and so they should be given appointments to that body. The Senate C&C Chair should also serve on the GEOC to assure close coordination between the two committees. That appointment should be non-voting so that this individual only has a single vote on any particular issue. The Senate previously approved the inclusion of a graduate student representative on GEOC.”

GEOC intends to vote on the insertion above (possibly to be edited) at the next meeting, October 1, 2008.

Gen Ed W courses taught abroad, including those taught for 4 weeks or less

Currently, Gen Ed courses taught in periods of four weeks or less must get special permission from GEOC. Last summer, Study Abroad listed a 3 week course as a W course without the approval of the English Department or GEOC. That course was dropped. Jane Goldman asks a., who is teaching these courses and, b., who is monitoring them? There will be a meeting with CLAS Associate Dean Doug Hamilton, a representative from English (Hap Fairbanks), GEOC members (Tom Deans, Jane Goldman, Katharina von Hammerstein), and Study Abroad staff to iron out these issues.

In the following discussion, the following points were made:

- Katharina von Hammerstein: there must be some UConn oversight for the gen-ed requirements, even if the courses are taught abroad.
- Anke Finger: what was the justification for running the course?
- Morty Ortega: it is a bad idea to offer gen eds as Study Abroad courses as there is no supervision.
- Katharina von Hammerstein: there will be more such courses coming our way as more student participate in Study Abroad.
- Jane Goldman: a Study Abroad course comes in (to the transcript) as though it is a UConn class taken at UConn.
- Felicia Pratto: This is a serious procedural issue.
- Katharina von Hammerstein: This needs to be discussed as a larger issue; we must combine the value of Study Abroad with the value and standards of UConn’s Gen-Ed program.

5. Next Steps in Monitoring and Assessment

CA3 Science and Technology Assessment

Hedley Freake, CA3 Assessment Coordinator for 2007-2008.

A graduate student was hired to work with Hedley Freake throughout the Spring 08 semester to conduct interviews of faculty teaching CA3 courses. 9-10 “gateway courses”- those not intended for majors- were identified. Faculty teaching these courses were eager to participate and met twice with the graduate student and once in a meeting to share what went well in their courses.

Meeting 1: Faculty were asked to identify how/where in the course s/he taught toward student learning objectives identified for CA3. Almost all courses addressed all learning objectives in the estimation of the faculty (table 2 of the CA3 Assessment Report 2008). Objectives that were not taught need to be investigated as to “why not?”

Meeting 2: Faculty were asked to show assessment items that proved effective handling of CA3 objectives. The graduate student also scored these examples. The instructor’s evaluation compared to the graduate student’s evaluation of the effectiveness of these examples is shown in table 3. All around- the eight CA3 learning objectives are reasonably well assessed, however, with some gaps.

Meeting 3: Faculty were brought in for an opportunity to talk about what worked well in their classes. This was a fruitful format and instructors responded well. Several suggestions came from these sessions that will help instruction of CA3 non-gateway courses.

Next Steps: More direct assessments of student learning rather than indirect assessments. Also, the goal is to make students more interested in science who are not science majors. Q courses were not discounted deliberately but gateway science courses were (there is some overlap).

The following points were made during the ensuing discussion:

- Peter Gogarten: This procedure does not assess what the students are doing. This falls short of what assessment is to be about.
 - H. Freake: This is indirect assessment and is prerequisite to going on to more in-depth assessment of areas (which includes more student assessment).
- Anke Finger: This is the first year report. The continuation in the second year is to come?
- Katharina von Hammerstein: This is the first year any assessment was conducted for Content Area 3. As GE at UConn is a huge program with 5,000 courses a year and an enrollment of 111,000, assessment must take small steps and gather small samples. Those samples are interpreted and used to make recommendations for improved teaching. It is an ongoing process with each content area and competency starting in a different year and then continuing.
- Mike Darre: GEOC includes “oversight”- what we’ve seen with this committee’s activity is a good model in terms of oversight.

CA3 Assessment Coordinator

Several names were offered for possible CA3 Assessment Coordinator. Katharina von Hammerstein suggests ranking them. This position includes \$5000 summer salary.

The group discussion led to a list of potential candidates. Hedley Freake will contact these first candidates and then bring in Katharina von Hammerstein.

W Assessment

Brief Report on W Assessment- tabled until Tom Deans can join us next time.

CA4 Assessment

Discussion regarding CA4 Assessment Coordination:

- Possible CA4 Assessment Coordinator- Alexinia Baldwin, Clare Eby, Blanca Silvestrini, Arnie Dashefsky are all nominated. Alexinia declined assuming that the list of recommendations for CA4 in the 2008-09 Assessment Proposal was a “must-do” list. Arnie Dashefsky is unlikely to take this on.
- Katharina von Hammerstein: we will need a pseudo-Hedley to take on this responsibility.
- Anke Finger: the subcommittee is greatly concerned with the enormous workload being foisted upon a single person with just one TA. CA4 is a complex content area.
 - Katharina von Hammerstein: How can we make this work manageable for someone? We must discuss strategies. Alexinia Baldwin’s background in assessment activities makes her a valuable possible contributor.

It was agreed that the CA4 and Assessment subcommittees will meet. Anabel Perez will set up a meeting time.

Meeting Adjourned at 1:55 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

C. L. Deibler
Kristen Mooney