

# GEOC Meeting October 12, 2009

*In Attendance: Katharina von Hammerstein, Tom Deans, Jane Goldman, Niloy Dutta, Brenna Kelleher, Eric Schultz, Michael Young, Xae-Alicia Reyes, Bill Lott, Cora Lynn Deibler, and Rosa Chinchilla. Not Present: John Ayers, Robert Cromley, Anke Finger, Doug Kaufman, Tom Roby, Murphy Sewall, Sarah Winter, Kate Capshaw Smith, and Anabel Perez.*

Meeting called to order at 12:00pm.

**1. Minutes** of the October 2, 2009 meeting were presented.

Eric Schultz moved to approve minutes. Xae Alicia Reyes seconded the motion.

**The motion to approve the minutes carried.**

## 2. Announcements

- “six depts rule” = by-laws change (part of motion regarding 4-digits and Q Learning Center) We’d like to streamline the Gen-Ed guidelines and the catalog. Language proposed: The courses ~~in~~ *fulfilling the* Content Areas One, Two, and Three *requirements* must be ~~taken in~~ *drawn from at least* six different ~~academic units~~ *subjects as designated by the subject letter code (e.g., ANTH or PVS). The courses within each of these content areas must be from two different subjects.* Content Area courses may be counted toward the major. )  
**B. Keller moves to submit this language to the Senate C&CC/Senate. T. Deans seconds. All in favor. Motion carries.**
- WS inquiry about offering a GEOC-approved course online: GEOC is not a specialist in online offerings and will, for now, not request approval of online delivery (see Spring 2009 discussion). This has been relayed to Women’s Studies. Senate C&C has not yet discussed this issue. As far as Gen-Ed is concerned this course has been approved for that purpose. The Online Task Force provided a report dated June 16<sup>th</sup> regarding online courses. GEOC will consult the report for recommendations and discuss again GEOC’s stance on the matter.
- **DRAM 1110**, Introduction to Film- was approved for Intensive Session offering (by e-vote) in Dec. 2008. Must read into the minutes at this time. **B. Lott moves to approve. N. Dutta seconds. All approve. Motion carried.**

## 3. Subcommittee Reports

### CA1 Arts and Humanities

CA1 (C. L. Deibler) moved to approve **MAST 1200 Introduction to Maritime Culture** for inclusion in CA1 and noted that their revised syllabus is acceptable.

**Motion to approve MAST 1200 for CA1 inclusion carried.**

**GERM 1140W:** proposed for Intersession; needs more information. The committee feels this is hard to approve for such an abbreviated period. T. Deans: we have not approved W courses for Intersession in the past. If the writing action extended past the three weeks, approval of intersession W courses could be taken into consideration. The GERM 1140W proposal intends for a graduate student to teach it; it seems an unsustainable model in terms of writing and revising each day. CL Deibler: CA1 is responsible to approve CA1 Content, but the W Committee determines the W approvability. T. Deans: we may want to work cross-committee on this to

remain consistent, and to resist asking for more information, if the course is, ultimately, not approvable. J. Goldman: in the past it had been determined that it would only be possible to approve real exceptions among W courses. The concern regarding W courses in short intersessions is that stepping up the reading (to fulfill, e.g., the CA1 requirements) will create an impossible situation within which to fit the writing.

#### 4. Reports and Discussion

- **Multi-Content Area Gen Ed courses** cont.

K. von Hammerstein: University of Michigan, Duke, NC Chapel Hill have interdisciplinary elements woven into undergrad education and, in some cases, gen ed. The Association of Colleges and Universities also has material discussing this approach to curriculum structure. Thus, we have examples of cross-content area bridge building in Gen Ed.

Revisions- The revisions we have made to our motion from the last meeting are on the second page, bold face, starting from the current Gen-Ed Guidelines as we have changed them (approved in the last meeting, 10/2). It now includes the preamble. J. Goldman: for “F,” add “with the exception of one-credit courses as noted above?” Somehow incorporate them back in. K. von Hammerstein: also suggests something similar. J. Goldman: or “with the exception noted in part A.b” added just after “...each,”. E. Schultz: also, correct for document inconsistency regarding A.b vs. A.1.b (referred to elsewhere in the document).

J. Goldman: “B” addition for clarification. Suggests “A course that fulfills the specific individual criteria of 2 or 3 Content Areas, etc.”

B. Kelleher: new phrase, “If one of the three is CA4” added after “2 or 3.” Place this new phrase in parentheses.

R. Chinchilla: “... commitment to each Content Area must satisfy” is sufficient. Striking “be deep enough.”

J. Goldman: in “B”, regular print line, “CA3 or CA4, may be approved as a multiple content area...” In “e” add “may” rather than “can.”

K. von Hammerstein: in “g” is the highlighted area redundant? Yes- strike this sentence. It also contradicts “e” as written. “A. a.” was just approved today and so it is highlighted.

In the Justification we will use “bridge-building” and delete “while addressing content in more than one domain.”

C.L. Deibler: Add, “from both scientific and philosophical perspectives.”

Voting on the revisions: J. Goldman will vote against this in light of her prior reservations. E. Schultz: suggestion: the official vote date shall be today, October 12, 2009. **M. Young moves that all changes discussed today be approved. Most in favor, one opposed. Motion carries.**

#### 5. Monitoring and Assessment

- **Recertification** discussion cont.

K. von Hammerstein: the goal is to have our concept and the recertification form ready this semester. This may or may not be possible and there is also a technical issue (support or not from

UITS). Being ready with the concept and form will put us in a good position for spring and the possibility of moving forward with departments. Focus on concept. Homework- Content Areas and W and Q put together their part of the form.

GEOC, last spring, decided on small scale recertification -- large scale is not something departments can handle at this time. As Bill Lott suggest, we may want to consider coordinating the timing of recertification with the required departmental reviews, if a department so chooses. Some departments are too large and all their Gen Ed courses would overwhelm the respective subcommittees responsible for reviewing the recertification proposals. So:

**Option 1:** small scale, department chooses the courses

**Option 2:** perhaps larger one year ahead of deptl review, if a department wants to integrate Gen Ed review into their departmental review.

We have about 55 departments, but not all departments have gen-ed courses, W, Q, etc. Courses up approved until 2004 (year/date yet to be decided) will be eligible for recertification (no point in asking newer courses to recertify). The form should be as simple as possible. Recertification is one of GEOC's charges from the Senate. Assessment comes from the Provost's Office and needs support. There may be some crossover/overlap between recertification and assessment. B. Lott: there is an 11-page metric coming from the Provost's Office to departments regarding review. Is there an element of Gen-Ed review on that? K von Hammerstein will ask V. Makowsky. N. Dutta: previously, in 2001, Physics called their Gen-Ed courses "Service Courses." R. Chinchilla: Recertification needs to be serious and meaningful or it is merely busy work for departments. Departments will choose their best courses. T. Deans: perhaps the department and GEOC both choose some courses (like in any other peer review process, in the spirit of scholarship). Robust discussion is invisible and absent in my own (ENGL) department, but we should also avoid being too prescriptive.

K. von Hammerstein: this process may lead to discussions within departments about Gen-Eds. We should make this process as simple as possible. M. Young: is the GEOC's task to recertify once or to set up a process for ongoing recertification? If the latter, perhaps we need to do the initial recertification in one way and then get courses on an every third or fourth year rotational basis. T. Deans: if there is a strict 4-year cycle the process will remain large-small-large-small with the waves of "fat years." M. Young: a pool of possible reviewed courses can be arranged to avoid this. R. Chinchilla: the problem with the old system is that there was no oversight and bad courses remained unchecked for years. T. Deans: that is where having the departments provide a course and having GEOC choose one is a benefit. K. von Hammerstein: a high enrollment course would be a good one to add to the mix. B. Lott: using a percentage sample would keep the quantities fair. If there is a 7-year cycle for departmental review, this also helps to even out the load. M. Young: the burden depends upon what is required- a one page form and a syllabus makes 30 courses not sound as onerous for the committees that must review the courses.

K. von Hammerstein: there are three threads to this discussion:

- What is recertification supposed to do (the concept)? What do we want to find out?
- Mechanics and logistics of how to get this done.
- The form itself - linked to concept.

E. Schultz: what is the Senate's original task for us? K. von Hammerstein: to monitor the Gen Ed program including the courses. M. Young: does sound as though the Senate wants us to review all the courses. K. von Hammerstein: The total review approach is undoable at this point. A sample approach, as agreed upon by GEOC in Spring 2009, is more realistic and okay with the Vice Provost. M. Young: until this is done, though, we have no data or feedback on any of the Gen Ed courses to date.

M. Young: we could get a syllabus from all courses and choose from amongst those. T. Deans: from the semester being reviewed. K von Hammerstein: there are sometimes multiple syllabi from each course per semester. M. Young: seeing all versions would give us the idea of whether or not quality is being sustained across the entire course. This would be a sample. R. Chinchilla: the form needs to reflect the justification; as courses are inherited they change. N. Dutta: what you've suggested thus far for the form makes sense. K. von Hammerstein: CA1 and CA4 will have a lot of work to do, so we must come up with a way to structure the recertification process or those sub-committees will be overwhelmed. K. von Hammerstein: UConn's Gen Ed system prior to the reform had about 100 courses, the current system has about 400 in about 600-700 Content Areas and W and Q. Also, we did not have a recertification process under the old system.

The meeting adjourned at 2 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cora Lynn Deibler