

General Education Oversight Committee

Report of Activities July 2006- June 2007

Introduction

The past year represents the second of operation of the “new” general education program and the fifth for the GEOC committee. The program appears to be functioning well although there is now a clear need to collect direct evidence that students are learning what we intend. The committee is also functioning well, giving faculty direct control of this critical part of undergraduate education. This report summarizes both operation of the program and activities of the committee.

Course Approvals

The GEOC continued the process of reviewing proposals for adding courses to the general education curriculum. Forty-seven such proposals were reviewed, resulting in the addition of 44 courses to the curriculum. The program now contains 261 content area courses and 460 skill code courses. The breakdown of these total figures is given in Table 1. Since some courses are included in more than one category, the totals are less than the sum of the individual categories.

Table 1. Numbers of courses now approved for the general education curriculum

Content Area/Competency	100 level courses	200 level courses	Total number of courses
Arts and Humanities	75	42	117
Social Sciences	36	5	41
Science and Technology	46	3	49
Diversity and Multiculturalism	61	67	128
Total content area courses	154	97	261
Quantitative	45	33	78
Writing	28	354	382
Total skill courses	73	387	460

In addition to these new course reviews, the GEOC reviewed two proposals to offer existing general education courses in intensive sessions. The total numbers of courses approved for these offerings is given in Table 2. Courses are approved either fully or provisionally, depending on the measure of assurance GEOC has that the GenEd objectives of the courses can be maintained in the shortened format. GEOC also reviewed faculty reports on the offering of these courses in the intersessions. These subjective reports were favorable but difficult to evaluate. Proper assessment of the effectiveness of intersession courses must await the development of measures of course effectiveness as a whole.

Table 2. Outcome of review of general education courses for intensive session teaching 2005-07.

Course disposition	
Approved	25
Provisionally approved	14
Rejected	4

Program operation

Between nine hundred and one thousand separate sections of general education courses were offered each semester of the second year of operation of the new program. Breakdown of those courses for each semester by general education category and campus is shown in tables 3 and 4. In common with last year, many more seats were filled in aggregate in CA 1 and 2 courses than in CA 3 and 4. The capacity of all the content areas remains adequate to meet the needs of the undergraduate student population (approximately 5000 students per class). The enrollment capacity within 100 level W courses increased 10% in comparison to last year (1987 vs. 1805) but still appear insufficient. The extent of this shortfall is difficult to gauge, since it is not clear how many of the 200-level W courses are generally available and also how many programs offer two W courses for their students. A survey of departments was conducted to gather some of this information (see Oversight below).

Table 3. General education courses offered (C) and enrollment (E) by campus and category. Fall 2006

Campus	Avery Point		Hartford		Stamford		Storrs		Torrington		Waterbury		All campuses	
	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E
GenEd category	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E
Arts and Hum	16	390	26	679	22	573	133	8194	7	136	21	515	225	10487
Social Sciences	13	343	23	727	24	687	101	8014	5	130	15	522	181	10423
Sci and Tech	5	131	6	203	5	180	17	2041	1	51	3	151	37	2757
Sci and Tech Lab	9	223	9	350	10	182	36	4183	4	49	5	217	73	5204
Div and Multi	5	92	9	167	9	193	57	1893	1	26	6	95	87	2466
Div and Multi Int	7	205	16	389	7	204	57	4814	2	69	6	178	95	5859
Total Cont Area	39	1233	72	2157	65	1699	314	23358	18	392	48	1433	601	30262
Quantitative	20	373	25	675	26	481	189	8668	6	107	21	520	287	10824
Writing 100 level	4	61	9	138	5	87	22	552	0	0	2	32	42	870
Writing 200 level	8	77	6	80	15	215	178	3326	4	52	11	148	222	3898
Total Writing	12	138	15	218	20	302	200	3878	4	52	13	180	264	4768
Total GenEd	69	1520	97	2700	99	2272	567	32047	28	551	72	1925	981	41015

Table 4. General education courses offered (C) and enrollment (E) by campus and category. Spring 2007

Campus	Avery Point		Hartford		Stamford		Storrs		Torrington		Waterbury		All campuses	
	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E
GenEd category	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E
Arts and Hum	12	327	22	609	22	549	113	7585	8	130	25	616	202	9816
Social Sciences	14	418	27	809	18	545	103	8154	5	129	16	482	183	10507
Sci and Tech	5	107	6	216	3	393	19	1728	5	29	2	54	36	2527
Sci and Tech Lab	8	184	8	253	9	183	31	3471	1	60	7	181	67	4332
Div and Multi	4	75	8	170	4	85	56	1857	3	34	6	111	81	2332
Div and Multi Int	6	158	9	304	7	199	46	3166	3	50	10	246	81	4123
Total Cont Area	43	1089	67	1963	53	1357	292	21893	20	370	53	1376	528	28048
Quantitative	20	345	25	595	21	409	150	7069	8	121	19	374	243	8913
Writing 100 level	4	71	10	178	8	138	25	585	1	20	7	125	55	1117
Writing 200 level	8	73	14	193	16	250	196	3874	5	65	9	120	248	4575
Total Writing	12	144	24	371	24	388	221	4459	6	85	16	245	303	5692
Total GenEd	65	1393	98	3543	83	1906	575	30015	29	506	75	1768	925	39131

These enrollment data allow the calculation of average numbers of students in general education classes in each category of the system. Not surprisingly, class sizes are uniformly smaller at the regional campuses in comparison to Storrs, with an average 3-fold difference in content area classes. However, some interesting differences emerge between the content area courses at Storrs. Science and Technology classes are larger than any other category, averaging more than 100 students. Laboratory classes are the largest, though the effects of this may be partially offset by their division into smaller lab sections. Within the Diversity and Multiculturalism content area, international classes are more than twice as large as non-international. The reasons for this are not apparent. While it may appear that 100 level W classes are over enrolled on the Storrs campus, this is not the case since the average size for both 100 and 200 level W classes reflects the practice of some departments to list multiple sections of a class, taught by different individuals, under one instructor of record.

Table 5. Average class size for general education classes, 2006-2007

Campus	Storrs	All Regionals	All Campuses
GenEd category			
Arts and Hum	64	25	48
Social Sciences	79	30	58
Sci and Tech	105	41	72
Sci and Tech Lab	114	26	68
Div and Multi	33	19	29
Div and Multi Int	77	27	57
Total Cont Area	75	27	53
Quantitative	46	21	37
Writing 100 level	24	17	20
Writing 200 level	19	13	18
Total Writing	20	15	18
Total GenEd	52	25	42

The Senate General Education Guidelines encourage the teaching of courses by regular faculty. Table 6 shows that tenure track faculty teach a little more than 40% of all general education classes. Adjunct instructors (primarily at the regional campuses) and GAs (primarily at Storrs) combine to teach 52% of classes. Non-tenure track faculty ranks and other professionals teach the balance. While adjunct instructors and GAs may be extremely competent teachers, they are likely to be less integrated into the teaching mission of the institution and require and deserve support and supervision to ensure maintenance of teaching standards and fulfillment of courses goals.

Since class sizes and credit loads vary, it was also of interest to compare these teaching contributions on the basis of student credit hour production (Table 7). While this does not influence the data much at the regional campuses, the number of students taught by faculty at the Storrs campus rises significantly, because faculty tend to teach the larger classes. When all faculty ranks are considered, faculty teach almost two thirds of students' general education programs at Storrs.

Table 6a. General education classes by instructor rank at each campus Fall 2006 (% of total)

Campus	Asst Prof	Assoc Prof	Prof	Instructor /Lecturer	Total faculty	Adjunct	GA	Other	Total non-fac.	Total Courses
Avery Point	13.0	11.6	5.8	0	30.4	49.3	11.6	8.7	69.6	69
Hartford	8.2	11.3	17.5	0	37.1	52.6	10.3	0	62.9	97
Stamford	8.1	26.3	5.1	0	39.4	54.5	5.1	1	60.6	99
Torrington	7.1	3.6	0	3.6	14.3	85.7	0	0	85.7	28
Waterbury	18.1	18.1	1.4	2.8	40.3	45.8	13.9	0	59.7	72
All regionals (avrg)	10.9	16.2	7.4	0.8	35.3	53.7	9.1	1.9	64.7	365
Storrs	14.1	12.5	20.3	4	51.0	13.1	31.8	4.1	49.0	616
All campuses	12.9	13.9	15.5	2.8	45.2	28.2	23.3	3.3	54.8	981

Table 6b. General education classes by instructor rank at each campus Spring 2007 (% of total)

Campus	Asst Prof	Assoc Prof	Prof	Instructor /Lecturer	Total faculty	Adjunct	GA	Other	Total non-fac.	Total Courses
Avery Point	4.6	16.9	7.7	0	29.2	55.4	7.7	7.7	70.8	65
Hartford	11.2	10.2	11.2	0	32.7	56.1	11.2	0	67.3	98
Stamford	4.8	25.3	7.2	0	37.3	59.0	2.4	1.2	62.7	83
Torrington	10.3	0	0	6.9	17.2	79.3	3.4	0	82.8	29
Waterbury	16.0	21.3	1.3	6.7	45.3	42.7	12.0	0	54.7	75
All regionals (avrg)	9.4	16.6	6.6	2.0	34.6	55.7	8.0	1.7	65.4	350
Storrs	12.5	13.4	19.7	4.0	49.6	13.7	32.0	4.7	50.4	575
All campuses	11.4	14.6	14.7	3.2	43.9	29.6	22.9	3.6	56.1	925

Table 7a. General education credit hour production by instructor rank at each campus Fall 2006 (% of total)

Campus	Asst Prof	Assoc Prof	Prof	Instructor /Lecturer	Total faculty	Adjunct	GA	Other	Total non-fac.	Total Courses
Avery Point	14.6	10.2	3.1	0	27.9	48.0	16.1	8.0	72.1	5225
Hartford	8.9	13.0	16.2	0	38.2	51.2	10.6	0	61.8	9834
Stamford	8.3	23.3	4.8	0	36.3	56.5	5.9	1.3	63.7	7702
Torrington	7.0	4.1	0	8.5	19.5	80.5	0	0	80.5	1909
Waterbury	21.3	24.0	0.8	4.0	50.1	37.4	12.6	0	49.9	6760
All regionals (avrg)	12.3	16.9	6.9	1.4	37.5	50.8	10.1	1.6	61.5	31430
Storrs	19.1	14.0	23.1	7.6	63.8	11.2	22.3	2.7	36.2	113030
All campuses	17.6	14.6	19.6	5.2	58.1	19.9	19.6	2.5	41.9	144460

Table 7b. General education credit hour production by instructor rank at each campus Spring 2007 (% of total)

Campus	Asst Prof	Assoc Prof	Prof	Instructor /Lecturer	Total faculty	Adjunct	GA	Other	Total non-fac.	Total Courses
Avery Point	2.6	14.7	8.5	0	25.8	58.6	8.5	7.2	74.2	4788
Hartford	15.2	8.7	10.4	0	34.3	55.6	10.1	0	65.7	8975
Stamford	7.2	22.4	6.8	0	36.4	60.5	1.8	1.4	63.6	6488
Torrington	9.1	0	0	9.5	18.6	77.0	4.4	0	81.4	1718
Waterbury	17.0	21.5	1.5	6.4	46.4	41.7	11.9	0	53.6	5934
All regionals (avrg)	11.2	15.1	6.7	1.9	34.9	55.6	7.9	1.6	65.1	27903
Storrs	19.5	15.9	23.6	7.3	66.3	11.4	18.6	3.8	36.2	103361
All campuses	17.7	15.7	20.0	6.2	59.6	20.8	16.3	3.3	40.4	131264

Substitutions

Under the General Education Guidelines, schools and colleges are given the explicit authority to make substitutions to the requirements for individual students. They are also required to make an annual report to the GEOC on the substitutions made, to ensure uniform interpretation of the guidelines across different academic units. The registrar's office now supplies GEOC with a list of all substitutions made on an annual basis and then follow-up meetings are scheduled with the responsible individuals at the school/college level. A total of 778 substitutions were made in the second year of operation of the new general education requirements (Table 8), a number similar to the first year. Relative to student numbers, these substitutions were made disproportionately by the former College of Continuing Studies (CTED) for BGS students and, to a lesser extent, by the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (CANR) and the Neag School of Education (EDUC). This partly reflects the transfer student populations served by these units. Procedures for making substitutions by the BGS program have been tightened considerably over the past year. The CTED numbers also include many courses pre-approved for substitution by the GEOC. It is anticipated that next year there will be a substantial drop in the number of substitutions given by the BGS program.

Table 8. Substitutions to the General Education Requirements by School or College

	# subs	# grads	subs/grad
ACES	8		
AGNR	81	276	0.29
BUSN	51	580	0.09
CLAS	170	2126	0.08
CTED	336	356	0.94
EDUC	55	194	0.28
ENGR	32	255	0.13
FNAR	13	114	0.11
NURS	19	97	0.20
PHAR	13	104	0.13
Total	778	4102	0.19

Forty percent of all substitutions were made to the CA4 Diversity and Multiculturalism requirement (Table 9), similar to last year. This may not be unexpected, given the newness of this category, but will be of concern if it continues to persist. It partially reflects the fact that, unlike other content areas, no automatic substitutions are given for Diversity and Multiculturalism courses taken at other institutions unless they transfer in as the equivalent to a specific UConn CA4 course. Substitutions for this content area are always considered on a case-by-case basis by the school or college, and therefore included in these numbers.

It is interesting to note that the fewest substitutions were made for the Q and Second Language requirements. This continues a trend from the previous academic year. A policy to govern substitutions in these areas, developed by a committee chaired by the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education and then refined by GEOC, was brought to the Senate and approved. An Academic Adjustments committee is now meeting to consider petitions from students requesting alternate ways of meeting the second language or Q requirements, on the basis of learning disabilities.

GEOC is currently developing a substitutions form that will be recommended for use by students wishing to substitute any of their general education requirements. This form will ask the student to explain how the proposed substitution meets the particular requirement, thus giving some assurance that the student is familiar with the requirement and understands what is supposed to have been learned.

Table 9. Substitutions to the General Education Requirements by Category

Category	Substitutions granted
CA1	67
CA2	51
CA3	161
CA4	311
Q	26
W	135
Second language	27
Total	778

Regional campus issues

Discussions have been ongoing to try and allow for more 200-level GenEd courses to be offered at the regional campuses. When the general education curriculum was being developed, departments were encouraged to submit 100-level courses that would be accessible to first and second year students. BGS students enter with at least 60 credits and wish to take as many courses as possible, including any remaining general education requirements, at the 200 level. There are a number of upper level courses offered at the regional campuses that would be appropriate for general education. However, in many cases departments are unwilling to propose them for the GenEd curriculum because that would exacerbate existing enrollment pressures within those courses at the Storrs campus. There are courses for which this concern does not arise and so departments are being encouraged to submit those for GenEd consideration. In addition, regional campus faculty can develop new 200 level courses that are both appropriate for general education and aligned with their campus mission. The Provost's competition, see below, is a vehicle for developing such courses.

All of the completed curriculum action request forms that contain the information used to justify courses for inclusion in the GenEd curriculum are now all available on the GEOC website. This means that all instructors, including adjuncts at the regional campuses, have access to this information as they prepare to teach their courses.

Provost's competition

This spring saw the fourth offering of the Provost's General Education Course Development Grant Competition. This program has proved popular among faculty and successful at introducing new and interesting courses to the curriculum. Thirteen proposals were received for the latest round and 9 were funded, at least in part. Like last year, rather than fund all approved proposals at the set rate of \$8,000 over two years, faculty were asked to provide a budget laying out the amount that was needed, up to a maximum of \$10,000. This allowed for smaller proposals, perhaps for revision of existing general education courses, and also dealt with this issue of unbudgeted fringe benefit costs that was encountered in previous iterations of the program.

Evaluations are in progress for the previous iterations of the competition. Final evaluations from 2004 competition winners rated several aspects of the competition structure and project design highly. These included: the built-in evaluation in all aspects of the project and course design; the two-year structure of the competition to support work in year two of the grant period; and the opportunity for faculty to integrate innovations in pedagogy with new areas of study in their discipline. As one winner noted: "[h]ad it not been for the program, the course development might have remained a paper concept." Year one evaluations from 2005 competition winners followed in this same vein, with heavy emphasis on developing evaluation priorities for courses and students and adapting information to make even technical material accessible to a general audience. One clear benefit from the program is that

participating faculty are further developing their skills in the area of course design and evaluation, through interaction with the instructional design staff from ITL.

Table 10. Courses developed through the support of the Provost's competition by general education category

Category	Courses approved 2004-2006	2007 Proposal Winners
CA1	11	3
CA2	5	5
CA3	5	1
CA4	18	5
Q	3	0
W	12	5
Total	35	9

Oversight

W courses

Survey requests went out in October 2006 to all academic units offering majors to ask about their "Writing in the Major" programs. Of the 16 that were returned, most were consistently positive about the W requirement in the major and did not express concerns about the availability of seats. Only one department expressed clear dissatisfaction with the requirement. The Writing Competency subcommittee has been at work reviewing the list of majors that have submitted W surveys and identifying the non-responders that they would most like to hear from. Further, they are discussing ways in which the GEOC can follow up on these surveys in the coming academic year.

On-line courses

Earlier this year, it became apparent that approximately 20 general education courses were being offered regularly in a completely on-line format, without undergoing any process of review by either GEOC or school/college C&C committees. These courses had been developed by individual instructors, with the assistance of the previous College of Continuing Studies, to meet a demand for courses in this format. While GEOC's position is that on-line teaching may well be effective, it had no information about whether this was so in these particular cases. It also was of the opinion that justification for on-line teaching should be included in the curriculum action request form. A CLAS C&C subcommittee has now reported on appropriate processes for approval of on-line courses and the Provost has appointed a task force to consider University policies and procedures in this area. GEOC decided that the general question of mode of delivery of courses will be included in the process it develops for course recertification.

Recertification of courses

Discussions have been ongoing through the course of the year about the purpose of and process for course recertification for continued inclusion in the general education curriculum. Overall, the GEOC intent is to use this process both to check that those offering the course still think it is appropriate for the curriculum and that, as currently taught, it meets the relevant requirements. In addition, the recertification forms are being designed to assist faculty in making the transition from thinking about what they do as teachers to what students actually learn in the classroom. They will therefore be asked about how their courses align with the learning objectives that have been outlined for the various categories of general education courses and how they routinely determine whether these objectives are being met. A cycle for recertification will be developed across the content areas and competencies that will allow for regular review and renewal of the curriculum, without overwhelming the GEOC subcommittees that will be responsible for evaluating the materials.

Assessment

Determination of how to evaluate the success of the general education program continued to occupy a significant portion of the GEOC's attention. Discussions around moving from a context in which the system is described largely in terms of what courses should teach to one described in terms of what students should learn were completed for the Social Sciences and Science and Technology content areas. Significant progress was also made with Diversity and Multiculturalism. That subcommittee hosted a well-attended open meeting for faculty to discuss draft learning outcomes and is now working on their revision. The Q subcommittee has also prepared a draft assessment document and will be ready to discuss it with faculty in the fall. A curriculum map was completed to determine how well the five objectives for Arts and Humanities were being covered by courses in that content area. The curriculum action request forms, completed when the courses were proposed for inclusion in this content area, were reviewed to see which criteria were claimed. While most of the goals of this content area were well-addressed, one of them, the creation or recreation of artistic works, culminating in publication or performance was only claimed by two of the more than 100 Arts and Humanities courses.

A similar curriculum map was prepared to determine how well the seven overall goals of the GenEd program were addressed. While content areas vary in the goals they address, coverage overall was found to be good, with each of the goals being covered by more than half of the courses (Table 11). Given that students take 7 or 8 content area courses, it appears likely they will be well exposed to all of the GenEd goals.

Table 11 Percentage of courses in each content area that address the University of Connecticut goals of general education

GenEd goal	CA1	CA2	CA3	CA4	All CA
Articulate	72	48	23	66	58
Intellectual breadth	61	75	90	62	67
Critical judgment	80	90	83	69	77
Moral sensitivity	67	58	18	62	54
Awareness of era and society	63	78	40	60	57
Consciousness of diversity	68	75	18	87	63
Lifelong learning	48	51	91	44	53

The GEOC Assessment subcommittee drafted a proposal that was approved by GEOC that describes concrete steps to begin the assessment of the general education program at the university. The proposal, which is fully outlined in a separate document, focuses on assessment of three areas of the program, writing, information literacy and the science and technology content area. These were selected because of their importance and also because they represent targets of opportunity where significant progress appears possible. GEOC elected to recommend a focused approach that concentrates on limited numbers of students in restricted areas of the curriculum, with the belief that the quality of the resulting data will allow meaningful recommendations for improvement and strengthening of the program. It is worth noting that despite many reservations about assessment, the final proposal was very well received by GEOC and this reflects well on the job done by the assessment subcommittee.

Global learning

The work of the Provost's Task Force on Developing Global Citizens has been largely parallel to that of GEOC. However, as the curriculum subcommittee of that task force has moved forward with the task of defining global learning outcomes for UConn undergraduate students, overlaps and interactions have increased. The GEOC chair has also led the global curriculum subcommittee and discussions on defining GenEd Diversity and Multiculturalism learning outcomes have involved many of the same

people as those trying to define outcomes for global learning. Perhaps all of the courses satisfying the international CA4 requirement also will help develop global learning, as do a reasonable number of courses from the other content areas. Discussions are under way to determine how GenEd courses that promote global learning might be identified, to allow their selection by students interested in this area.

Inclusive Science Project

With the financial support of the Dean of CLAS and the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education, GEOC organized a learning community for instructors of CA3 Science and Technology courses designed to assist them in finding way to make their courses more inclusive. Cathy Love (associate vice provost, OMIA) facilitated the group with the assistance of John Settlage (Neag School of Education and Keith Barker (ITL) and the GEOC chair. Ten faculty met for 3 hours each month over both semesters to examine this issue from the perspectives of course content, pedagogical approaches and interactions with students. The project had dual goals of both improving performance of underrepresented students in these classes and also developing cultural competence in majority students. The latter is one of the overall goals of the GenEd program, but is not well addressed by the science and technology content area. Attendance was good and faculty reported that the discussions were beneficial. Additional evaluations will determine what changes were made to the courses as a consequence of the learning community.

One form initiative

Discussions have been ongoing over recent months directed towards improving the course approval process. The GEOC form itself is based on outmoded software and is cumbersome for faculty to use. In addition it requires much of the same information as other forms used by other C&C committees for course approval. In addition, the multilayered process for course approval is not well understood by faculty resulting in the failure of a course to move expeditiously through the system. The preferred solution is to develop a single form for approval of new or revision of existing course at the university. This would require faculty to fill out a single form that would then be routed automatically through the levels of approval required for that action. The relevant copy would then be available to the registrar's office staff for inclusion in the catalog and course schedule. GEOC has taken the lead in discussions with the schools and colleges and the Senate C&C committee for this system and has requested that the BEST initiative team take on this project as a means for improving efficiency at the university.

Meetings

Hedley Freake and Katharina von Hammerstein from GEOC attended the AACU *General Education and Assessment: Engaging Critical Questions, Fostering Critical Learning* conference in Miami, FL in March. This meeting represents a useful opportunity for solidifying and extending thinking about general education assessment and for examining approaches other institutions are taking to evaluation issues. This annual meeting will next be held in Boston, MA and will present a useful opportunity to the university to highlight its programs and achievements.

Staffing

Anabel Perez is about to complete her second year as the first permanent staff person for GEOC. She splits her time 50:50 between GEOC and the Individualized Major/Interdisciplinary Studies program and her performance this year has been highly meritorious. Hedley Freake is in process of stepping down as the first GEOC chair to serve a full three-year term. He will be replaced by Katharina von Hammerstein and a priority for the summer is to ensure that there are good, well organized records of GEOC policies and procedures in place to ease the transition.

GEOC Committee Members 2006-2007 Academic Year

Hedley Freake, Chair ('07)	NUSC
John Bennett ('08)	ME
Marie Cantino ('08)	PNB
Cora Lynn Deibler ('08) to finish Anne D'Alleva's term	ART
Michael Darre ('07)	ANSC
Arnold Dashefsky ('08)	SOCI
Thomas Deans (Writing Center Director)	ENGL
Niloy Dutta ('08)	PHYS
Clare Eby ('08)	ENGL
Peter Gogarten ('08)	MCB
Dean Hanink ('08)	GEOG
Robert Jeffers (Senate Curricula and Courses Committee)	ME
William Lott ('07)	ECON
Deborah McDonald ('07)	NURS
Felicia Pratto (07)	PSYC
Thomas Recchio ('07)	ENGL
Thomas Roby (Q Center Director)	MATH
Lisa Sanchez ('08)	ENGL
John Troyer ('08)	PHIL
Manuela Wagner ('08)	MCL
Michael Brezak (Undergraduate Student Rep)	
Brooke Morrill (Graduate Student Rep)	

Anabel Perez (Administrative support)

Two members of the committee who were present at its inception, Deborah MacDonald and Tom Recchio are now rotating off. Particular thanks are due to them for their work in the areas of the information literacy and writing competencies. In addition Bob Jeffers who has also served on GEOC from the beginning, principally in his role as chair of the Senate C&C committee, is stepping down. He has performed a critical role in bringing GEOC business to Senate C&C and then to the Senate, all with great efficiency and his inimitable sense of humor.

GEOC Subcommittee Members 2006-2007 Academic Year

Arts and Humanities

Anne D'Alleva/Cora Lynn
Deibler
John Troyer
Ed Benson
Katherine Capshaw Smith
Gustavo Nanclares

Social Sciences

Dean Hanink
Felicia Pratto
Linda Lee
Jeremy Pressman
Ronald Sabatelli
Gaye Tuchman
Susi Wurmbrand

Science and Technology

Marie Cantino
Niloy Durtta
John Ayers
Elizabeth Hart
Tom Meyer
Tyson Miller

Diversity and Multiculturalism

Clare Eby
Arnold Dashefsky
Morty Ortega
Alexinia Baldwin
Benjamin Liu
Robert Stephens
Elizabeth Ciurylo (Student)

Computer Technology

William Lott
Michael Darre
Kim Chambers
Murphy Sewall

Information Literacy

Deborah McDonald
John Bennett
Francine DeFranco
David Lavoie
Carolyn Lin
Brooke Morrill
Letitia Naigles

Second Language

Manuela Wagner
Lisa Sanchez
Rajeev Bansal
Kenneth Fuchsman
Catherine Jarvis-Ross
Barbara Lindsey

Quantitative

Peter Gogarten
Thomas Roby
Philip Best
James Cole
David Gross
Sarah Frey
Tyson Miller

Writing

Thomas Recchio
Thomas Deans
Janice Clark
John DeWolf
Jane Goldman
Steve Zinn
Vanessa DiPilato (Student)

Assessment

Hedley Freake
Scott Brown
Tom Deans
Daniel Mercier
Felicia Pratto
Eric Soulsby
David Yalof