

# GEOC Meeting March 26, 2013

*In attendance: Murphy Sewall, Karen Piantek, Stephanie Milan, Eric Schultz, Xae Alicia Reyes, Thomas Abbott, Thomas Meyer, Thomas Deans, Nicholas Leadbeater, Françoise Dussart, Sarah Winter, Michael Young, Rosa Helena Chinchilla, Wally Madych, Peter Kaminsky*

*Not present: Thomas Long, Linda Neelly, Kailee Himes, Richard Jones, Noah Sharpsteen, Gustavo Nanclares, Laurent Michel, Olivier Morand*

Meeting called to order at 9:04am.

## 1. Minutes of the March 6, 2013 meeting

The minutes of the March 6, 2013 meeting were accepted as submitted.

## 2. Announcements

- None at this time

## 3. Subcommittee Reports

### CA1

The committee recommends approval of the following new course proposal:

- SPAN 3267W The Spanish American Short Story

#### *Overview:*

- In consultation with and approval from the teacher, Prof. Miguel Gomes, the committee offers one important revision to the CAR: line 29 should be corrected to say that the course is NOT repeatable for credit, instead of that it is repeatable for up to 9 credits. (Revision made 3/12/13 by KCP)
- Still awaiting W subcommittee review

The committee recommends approval of the following new course proposal for the Stamford campus:

- DRAM 1811 Dance Appreciation

#### *Overview:*

- Can only be taught in Stamford at this time due to “limited resources”

#### *Discussion:*

- There was discussion as to whether the campus restriction was something that needed to be noted or even addressed as the course moves through its approval process. E. Schultz didn't believe the restriction would be an issue for the Senate C&C

**The motion to approve carried unanimously.**

### Q

The committee recommends approval of the following new course proposals:

- LING 3410Q Semantics
- LING 3511Q Syntax

#### *Discussion:*

- E. Schultz asked a question about how the pre-requisites for the two courses would be effected by the split of the original course but noted that the Senate C&C would follow up if there was an issue.

**The motion to approve carried unanimously.**

### W

- The W committee did not have a chance to meet. No report available at this time.

## 4. Reports and Discussion

### *Discussion of proposed edits to CA1 criteria*

- E. Schultz questioned the word “assessment” in the first paragraph of the submitted revision; the word is indicative of the path the document took since the proposed revision came out of the CA1 course assessment project; subcommittee co-chair F. Dussart indicated that this would be edited
- The committee inquired about what the shortcomings of the previous language were that prompted the proposed change; F. Dussart stated that the original was found to be too limiting

- T. Deans wanted to be sure the revisions addressed the inclusiveness of “digital humanities” and suggested adding “multi-modal” to the 4<sup>th</sup> criteria
- There was concern that the term “modes of symbolic representation” in the 3<sup>rd</sup> criteria was too broad or vague and might encourage taking undue advantage of the CA1 designation. There was discussion of how math, engineering, and language courses might fit into this criteria language; one committee member suggested that GEOC should “let the challenge stand”; it was decided that there was at least a need to lay the groundwork for this criteria earlier in the document

#### *Discussion of DFW Assessments*

- In reviewing the lists of DFW courses provided for the GEOC, there was concern expressed over exactly what the GEOC’s responsibility regarding these courses would be; in general, the GEOC felt that they did not have enough information about why certain courses had high DFW rates, and many members expressed a desire to steer clear of having anything to do with a project of this nature.
- M. Sewall reminded the GEOC that the topic came up in the context of the Provost’s Competition and that the only task the GEOC had been asked to undertake was the drafting of an RFP that would encourage instructors of DFW courses to apply for funds that might improve the courses
- Many GEOC members still found this problematic on the grounds that:
  - There only appears to be one semester of data provided; a true determination of chronic DFW courses would require a look at an in-depth history of the courses rather than just one semester
  - It’s possible that instructors who teach so-called DFW course are really “holding the line on academic standards”; it was noted that here are a lot of Q and W courses as well as math and science courses on the list and that perhaps the courses are just difficult by design, that they are “gatekeeper” courses
  - Similar scrutiny should be directed at courses where high percentages of students get As
- Overall, the GEOC requested more information and declined to act on the request at this time

#### *Addendum: Alignment project*

- E. Schultz asked about the status of the course alignment process
- It was indicated that a process has been put in place; it’s just not in effect yet
- It is believed A. Perez had been working on having departments assign a contact person
- The GEOC will look to roll out this process by Fall 2013
- M. Sewall indicated that while we do have a process for assessing the alignment of course, the GEOC has not yet determined a process to realign courses that have “drifted”
- It was indicated that the GEOC should be sure to look at alignment on the regional campuses as well

#### *Discussion of GEOC guide book*

- Due to time restrictions, the guidebook was not discussed in-depth, but the following points were made:
- T. Abbott felt that it was not appropriate to go back to instructor directly to make changes to the course, especially the syllabus, if there are problems; he suggested sending the syllabus back to the back to the departmental C&C committee.
- M. Young suggested a compromise: if the course does not meet GenEd standards, it should go back to instructor; if the issues with the course are general or related to the syllabus, it should go back to the departmental C&C
- P. Kaminisky pointed out that any issues generally become the responsibility of both instructor and chair of departmental C&C anyway
- The addition of an org chart was suggested; K. Piantek will revise and resubmit

#### *Other*

- It was suggested that next year GEOC meetings be limited to 90 minutes and that they should fall during the hours of class periods
- The Doodle poll for Fall will also indicate that members should still answer “yes” to periods where they have at least partial availability

Meeting adjourned at 10:59am.

Respectfully submitted,  
Karen Piantek  
GEOC Program Assistant