

GEOC Meeting February 11, 2008

In Attendance: Katharina von Hammerstein, Jane Goldman, Mike Darre, William Lott, Cora Lynn Deibler, Xae Alicia Reyes, Felicia Pratto, Niloy Dutta, Dean Hanink, Anke Finger, Hedley Freake, John Troyer, Peter Gogarten, John Bennett, Tom, Roby, Marie Cantino, Anabel Perez. Missing: Arnie Dashefsky, Murphy Sewall.

Meeting called to order at 11:05am.

1. Minutes from the January 31, 2008 meeting will be edited as follows:

- In addition to Arnie Dashefsky, the following GEOC members are ineligible to be renominated for GEOC membership:
 - John Bennett
 - Dean Hanink
 - Marie Cantino

Motion to approve the minutes with the edits noted above. Motion approved with two abstentions.

2. Announcements

- *Senate C&C Committee Representation.* Mike Darre will be unable to attend GEOC meetings on Thursdays. On those days, Janice Clark will be the Senate C&CC Representative to GEOC.
- *Current GEOC Priorities.* Interdisciplinary course review, Assessment of existing GEOC courses, W meeting.
- *GEOC Membership.* Dan Civco has agreed to join GEOC as a regular member and co-chair of the Information Literacy subcommittee.
- *GEOC Provost's Competition.* The GEOC office held an information workshop for faculty interested in submitting a proposal for the 2008 Provost's Office Gen Ed Competition. The session attracted approximately 15 interested faculty. The deadline for submission is February 29th.
- *AACU.* John Bennett presented a General Education paper at the most recent AACU meeting. The sessions focused on integrating general education into the regular academic curriculum. Basic concepts on how to integrate Gen Ed into the curriculum:
 - AACU website: white paper, College Learning for the New Global Century.
 - LEAP (Liberal Education and America's Promise) Initiative. They have identified essential learning outcomes:
 - Personal and Social Responsibility
 - Intellectual and Practical Skills
 - Integrative Learning
 - Knowledge of Human Culture and the Physical and Natural World.

3. Subcommittee Reports

Assessment Committee

The Assessment Subcommittee met last week and has hired a School of Education graduate student, Elizabeth Knoeblen, to work on CA3 assessment. The meeting was devoted to speaking with Ms. Knoeblen about the outlined CA3 assessment process.

CA3 Science and Technology. The outlined process is as follows:

First meeting with CA3 instructor: Knoeblen will collect information from the Instructors. She will take the CA3 Criteria Learning Outcomes and see how and where the outcomes and goals are covered in the course. This is a curriculum mapping exercise.

Second Meeting with CA3 instructor: Knoeblen will discuss assessment with the instructor. Have students learned what you want them to learn? How can you tell?

Third Meeting with CA3 instructor: Knoeblen will discuss with the instructor what is happening in other courses. How can what other instructors are doing positively affect the teaching and learning in this course?

In addition to the above meetings, an attitudinal survey will be developed and used to gauge student attitudes about science and technology.

Niloy Dutta suggests that the instructors of courses to be assessed in CA3 be given the CA3 Criteria and Learning Goals prior to the initial interview.

Writing Competency. The following departments have been identified for assessment in the coming year. The Writing Assessment Coordinator is identified in the list below, followed by the average number of annual graduates in the major.

ARTH- Art History Coordinator (38)

POLS- Virginia Hettinger (?)

HDFS- Lisa Kraimer-Rickaby (16)

Tom Deans is currently looking for a fourth department to assess, after EEB dropped out.

4. Reports and Discussion

4.a. Writing Courses meeting.

This meeting is geared toward department heads, undergraduate coordinators, and departmental C&C representatives. Katharina von Hammerstein has invited Veronica Makowsky to the W meeting in order to discuss the resources issue as GEOC has no control of this aspect of Gen Ed.

The breakdown of the meeting will be as follows:

- Katharina von Hammerstein- Discussion of Writing within the Gen Ed curriculum
- Tom Deans- Discussion of the different course options for Ws
- Veronica Makowsky- Discussion of funding for Gen Ed in academic departments.

Also to be discussed at this meeting:

- The course proposal approval process.
- What is not being taught in order to teach the necessary Ws?
- Who is teaching Ws? What is the role of teaching assistants?
- In what ways have you created processes that have reaped positive benefits for your undergraduate majors? What are the negative effects?
- The importance of one-on-one meetings with students as an effective tool in teaching students about writing.

Felicia Pratto notes that one reason GEOC has not been hearing complaints about the lack of Ws is the seemingly permanent CLAS W moratorium on the third W for their majors.

4.b. Failure vs. non-Failure of the 1-credit linked W courses.

If students fail the 1-credit W courses, they currently fail the 3-credit linked course. The W subcommittee has recommended that if a student fails the 1-credit W, the student should NOT also fail the 3-credit non-W course. *GEOC can “recommend,” though not require, the above practice.

The W subcommittee recommends that if the student is taking a 1-credit W, they MUST take the 3-credit linked course simultaneously. If the student failed a 1-credit W, the student cannot retake that same W course during another semester without retaking the 3-credit linked course.

This recommendation raised the following questions and concerns:

- Hedley Freake states that it IS possible for a student to master the content of a course while still failing the W portion.
 - How often has a student failed the W portion of the course and passed the non-W portion?

- The recommendation is inconsistent with the 3-credit W course wherein a student MUST pass the W portion of the course in order to pass the 3-credit course.
- Mike Darre points out that the 1-credit co-failure clause is not written in policy, though it has been practice in Senate C&CC.
- How much should GEOC be managing how departments wish to teach their W courses?

Motion made to abandon the current co-failure practice for 3-credit courses linked to 1 credit W courses. That is, if a student fails the 1-credit W course, they should not also fail the 3-credit linked course, and vice versa. It is up to the department to decide to adopt this recommendation.

Motion approve the above recommendation passed with 1 abstention and 1 GEOC member opposed. The above recommendation will eventually go onto the W portion of the web guidelines.

As far as requiring a student to retake the 3-credit co-requisite course if a student fails the linked 1-credit W course, it should be up to the department, though GEOC recommends that it should be clearly stated in the catalog and in department policy so that students are made aware of the policy.

William Lott recommends that Senate C&C Committee revisit the F-clause portion of the W requirement. Peter Gogarten recommends that GEOC recommend to departments that they rethink the idea of 4-credit W courses and change them to a 3-credit course with a 1-credit add-on.

4.c. Interdisciplinary Courses.

What kind of a ratio do we want to recommend for interdisciplinary courses? Should students be allowed to decide what CA the course fulfills if the course is split 80/80 or 100/100?

William Lott suggests that a 50/50 course may be possible in CA3 courses in order to get students more involved in the science portion of the course. Jane Goldman and Xae Alicia Reyes would like discussions about this issue to get away from the percentage language.

Jane Goldman recommends meeting with proposers of interdisciplinary courses in order to guide them through the process. However, Marie Cantino suggests that a policy be in place to guide the subcommittees in their review of courses.

Hedley Freake notes that changing the central guideline of CA1, CA2, CA3 exclusivity is very complicated and a clear departure from how the general education curriculum is currently set up. Mike Darre points out that he does not believe that the Senate would be receptive to a change in the GEOC guidelines about this issue.

Would the exclusivity in CAs1-3 discourage work among faculty across disciplines? Several GEOC members believe that not being able to count a course in a particular CA will discourage the instructor from that discipline to work with instructors from other disciplines. Others believe that instructors would be very excited about teaching courses “interdisciplinarily” even without their students being able to count this course as fulfilling the GE requirement in the CA represented by the instructor. Anke Finger suggests at some point in the future to make co-taught interdisciplinary courses a goal of the Provost’s Competition.

Tom Roby questions if a decision about this issue is necessary. Katharina von Hammerstein notes that having a policy in place is necessary so that GEOC does not have to discuss each interdisciplinary course proposal at length as was done in the previous semester.

Respectfully submitted,

Anabel Perez
GEOC Administrator