

# GEOC Meeting November 7, 2011

*In Attendance: John Ayers, Mike Young, Alex Shvartsman, Elizabeth Jockusch, Murphy Sewall, Xae Alicia Reyes, Erin Eighan, Robert Cromley, Rosa Helena Chinchilla, Eric Schultz, Anabel Perez, Peter Kaminsky, Tom Deans Françoise Dussart, Wally Madych, Sarah Winter.  
Not Present: Olivier Morand, Tom Roby, Suresh Nair, Richard Jones.*

Meeting called to order at 11:07 am.

**1. Minutes** of the October 21, 2011 meeting.

**Motion to approve the minutes as presented.**

**Motion carried with one abstention.**

## **2. Announcements**

- *Meeting of the C&C Committee Chairs.* The University Curriculum Advisory Council is comprised of the Chairs of C&C committees from all schools and colleges plus Senate C&C and GEOC. It is a self-appointed body; to take action, the Council will approach the Provost and/or Senate to be given formal standing.

The first item to be addressed by the Council is a unified CAR form to be used by all schools and colleges for course approval purposes. An initial meeting was held with UITS and Nancy Bull on October 26<sup>th</sup> to lay out the current situation. (At present, only GEOC and Senate C&C have a CAR that employs an electronic workflow.) A second meeting will be held with UITS and Nancy Bull to develop the workflow that will be required. This will be an opportunity to review whether the current course approval process is the one that the university wishes to continue.

- *Question about the scope of GEOC jurisdiction.* Often, when a course is being prepared for offering in the intensive session, or moving a course from small to large enrollment, there are changes in the method of course instruction. For intensive session courses, a 16 week version of a course cannot be the same as a 3 week version. If the course does not offer the full course content in the condensed session, but it does not change the gen ed aspects of the course, can it be still be approved by GEOC? The key in this review needs to be how any changes to the course affects the gen ed content. If a subcommittee has this concern about a particular proposal, they could report it to GEOC and the proposal can be discussed by the larger group.

Discussion:

- This method of review would need to apply to online courses.
  - Should the GEOC send dept heads a description of the sorts of changes that necessitate GEOC re-approval?
  - How do you deal with syllabi that vary from instructor to instructor? It's possible that a syllabus different from the one included in the proposal is being used.
    - The GEOC assumption is that all courses approved for gen ed are bound by the approved course description and criteria.
  - The GEOC might wish to consider whether it should request template syllabi instead of actual syllabi.
- *W Enrollment Report received from OIR.* A report of W enrollment in W courses for Fall 2011 was shared with Tom Deans. This semester, there are 396 W sections across 5 campuses; 26 sections are above the 19 student cap; 25 were in the 20-23 range; there was one outlier at 27 students. Tom Deans requested that a short email be sent from Murph Sewall to the departments reminding them that the cap for W sections is 19. If the issue of overenrollment persists, the GEOC can report this to Senate CC&C with a summary of the problem and those departments or courses where the overenrollment problem recurs.
  - *Status of other request made to OIR and potential for graduate student assistance.* OIR is checking on whether having a GA work on the GEOC information requests would violate FERPA rules. The second piece would be what sort of technological skill requirements are needed for a GA to complete this work.

### 3. Subcommittee Reports

#### CA2 Social Science

The CA2 subcommittee recommends **approval of the following course for offering in the intensive session:**

PP 1001 Introduction to Public Policy

**Motion approved with one abstention.**

#### Information Literacy Competency

IL recommends the **acceptance of the update to the ENGL information literacy plan.**

#### Writing Competency

The W Subcommittee recommends the **approval of the revision** in title and catalog copy to the following courses:

##### *Current Title and Catalog Copy:*

WS 4994W Senior Seminar in Women's Studies

(289W) Second semester. Three credits. Prerequisite: ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 3800. Recommended preparation: WS 3265W and PHIL 3218 or instructor consent. For WS majors only. McComiskey Capstone course integrating and analyzing Women's Studies theory and substance through research on a common topic and discussion of advanced texts.

##### *Revised Title and Catalog Copy:*

WS 4994W Senior Seminar

(289W) Second semester. Three credits. Prerequisite: ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 3800. Recommended preparation: WS 3265W and PHIL 3218 or instructor consent. For majors only. Capstone course integrating and analyzing Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies theory and substance through research on a common topic and discussion of advanced texts.

##### *Current Title and Catalog Copy:*

WS 3265W Women's Studies Research Methodology

(265W) First semester. Three credits. Prerequisite: WS 1103 or WS 1104 or WS 1124 or HIST1203; ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 3800; Open only to WS majors. Women's Studies majors are strongly urged to take this course as early as possible and before PHIL 3218.

Analyses of gender bias in research design and practice, problems of androcentric values, and overgeneralization in research. Varieties of feminist research methods and their implications for the traditional disciplines. Student projects using different methodologies.

##### *Revised Title and Catalog Copy:*

WS 3265W Research Methodology

(265W) First semester. Three credits. Prerequisite: WS 1103 or WS 1104 or WS 1124 or HIST 1203; ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 3800; Open only to majors. Majors are strongly urged to take this course as early as possible and before PHIL 3218.

Analyses of gender bias in research design and practice, problems of androcentric values, and over-generalization in research. Varieties of feminist research methods and their implications for the traditional disciplines. Student projects using different methodologies.

Rationale, from CAR:

"The Women's Studies Program's proposal to change its name to Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies was approved by the CLAS C&C on 16 November 2010. The title and copy of these required, core courses should accordingly reflect this change. Women's Studies is only looking to 1) change the name of the courses by removing "Women's Studies" from the titles, and 2) change the copy for these classes to reflect the change to Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies as approved by the CLAS C&C."

**Motion carried.**

W Course Alignment Form Review

The W subcommittee reviewed the two CAFs submitted by ARTH and NURS. Compared to original course proposals, the information provided on the CAFs looked good, perhaps even better than the original.

Tom Deans reports that ARTH and NURS were involved in the Assessment project in 2008 and 2009, respectively, so he is familiar with the writing programs in these departments. This raised questions about how to move forward with those departments that have not participated in a W Assessment project and for whom we have a lot more information. Because we won't have the benefit of the information obtained via the Assessment project, it becomes even more important that unique syllabi for EACH section of a course be submitted. The W subcommittee also wants to see aggregate data of student teacher evaluations for the W courses.

Discussion:

- Some departments set up their W courses with different lecture and W section instructors. This makes the evaluations meaningless.
- The GEOC will ask OIR if they can produce the aggregate data W wishes to see.

Assessment

The Assessment subcommittee has reconvened and met recently to discuss the CA1 Assessment document.

The wishes to either move CA1 and CA4 along to the next step of the Assessment cycle (the next step for each would be to identify a coordinator; they in turn would seek out GA support), or do another round of W Assessment.

Discussion:

- It was noted that although the W Assessment would be valuable to those departments participating, the exercise would not give GEOC any new information.

It was decided that the GEOC will move forward on CA1 and CA4. Ideas for faculty coordinators should be sent to Murph Sewall. The GEOC will review the list of instructors for CA1/CA4 courses this year to identify potential faculty.

**4. Reports and Discussion**

Course Alignment Form

It was reiterated that the course of Course Alignment is to identify best practices. The GEOC Chair will communicate with those departments that participated in the Course Alignment pilot round to give them the results of the GEOC review.

Meeting adjourned at 12:20pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Anabel Perez  
GEOC Administrator