

GEOC Meeting September 27, 2016

Members in **BOLD** were in attendance:

Eric Schultz – Chair, (Karen Piantek – Admin), Joseph Abramo, Michael Bradford, Michael Darre (Ex-Officio), Ana Maria Diaz-Marcos, Arthur Engler, Bernard Goffinet, David Gross, Thomas Meyer, Olivier Morand, Michael Morrell, Gustavo Nanclares, Fatma Selampinar, Kathleen Tonry (Ex-Officio), Eduardo Urios-Aparisi, Manuela Wagner, Michael Young, Steve Zinn; Baki Cetegen (prospective new member)

Meeting was called to order at 12:32pm.

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. The minutes from September 13, 2016 were accepted unanimously with minor typographical edits.

3. Announcements

A. Provost's Course Development Competition announcement has been posted

- E. Schultz announced that after consultation with CETL and Sally Reis, the award amount has been increased from \$10,000 to \$15,000 over two years.
- E. Schultz asked the committee about ideas for distribution of the announcement. Members suggested asking the Provost's office to distribute it. They also noted that college deans have ListServes that they can utilize, so we should reach out to them.
- E. Schultz asked the committee to be sure that they tell their colleagues about the competition.

B. Senate Executive Committee – Should we permit W transfers?

- E. Schultz reported that the Senate Executive Committee questioned why writing courses cannot transfer into UConn as Ws.
- M. Morrell asked how permitting transfer Ws might affect regular Ws versus Ws in the major. E. Schultz said that could be up for discussion, but it would more likely be a decision that was made at the department level as to whether or not to accept a transfer W for the major.
- B. Goffinet asked about what kind of pressure there is in Admissions to accept transfer Ws. E. Schultz wasn't sure, and he did not know if there was any practical way to find out.
- A. M. Marco-Diaz raised concerns about Ws in the language majors, which require writing in that specific foreign language.
- E. Schultz requested that the W subcommittee discuss this option and make a recommendation.

C. Gen Ed Task Force – Senate C&C accepted the Task Force's report

- The report will be reviewed by the Senate Executive Committee next.

D. GEOC Listserve

- E. Schultz asked the GEOC if they liked the idea of creating a GEOC ListServe so that members could easily communicate with one another. If so, he asked who should be on it.
 - The committee had no objections to the idea but thought that GEOC subcommittee members didn't need to be on it.
- E. Other
- E. Schultz asked members to submit subcommittee reports at the very least the day before a meeting.
 - Members expressed some feedback and concerns about the newly proposed committee workflow. In general, they wondered about the necessity of full committee review versus specific subcommittee review, citing the amount of time required to review all the proposals as one concern.
 - One member also noted that if all proposals were to be reviewed, he would need to receive the meeting packet sooner than the Friday before a meeting.
 - E. Schultz acknowledged the concerns and said that he at least wanted to try out this format for a little while as a way to help members more fully engage with General Education at UConn. He noted, however, that if it was apparent after a while that the process was becoming too onerous, the committee could revisit it. He also agreed that an effort would be made to get the meeting packet out to members sooner.

4. Subcommittee Reports

- A. CA2 Report (No report)
 - a. ARE 1110 Population, Food, and the Environment (Revision; description change; currently CA2)
- B. CA4 Report (No report)
 - a. MAST 1300 (New course; requested updates received)
- C. W Report (No report for CE 4900W)
 - a. CE 4900W (Revision; awaiting requested updates)
 - b. FINA 3710W (New) – Report mistake; was approved by W subcommittee Spring 2016)
 - FINA 3710W was approved with one abstention.

5. Old Business

- A. Digital Information Literacy competency
 - Nothing new to report.
- B. Next steps on the proposal regarding First Year Writing waivers
 - Nothing new to report.
- C. Alignment (AH, BME, COGS, COMM, CSE, EKIN (KINS), ENVE, EPYS, HDFS, MCL/CLCS*, MSE, STAT)
 - K. Piantek briefly explained the alignment course selection process.
 - B. Goffinet noted that he would like a little more direction on what goes on in the alignment, especially as he was new last year.
 - G. Nanclares asked if the full GEOC will review all alignment submissions the way they are currently reviewing all proposals. E. Schultz did not think that would be necessary.
- D. 2016-17 Assessment

- E. Schultz noted that, other than the W Competency, most other Gen Ed areas have not performed assessments since 2010.
- E. Schultz asked the members to review their guidelines on the GEOC website to determine the potential need for updates or assessment areas.

6. Old Curricular Actions Requests

- A. BADM 4070W Effective Business Writing (Revision) – (Revision of existing W; Change in designation, number, and restrictions)
- Members felt that the form adequately supported the course’s inclusion in General Education, and they referred it to subcommittee for further review.
- B. BADM 4075W Business Communication (Revision) – (Revision of existing W; Change in designation, number, and restrictions)
- B. Goffinet asked why this course is three credits while the other is one. E. Schultz was unsure but asked the W subcommittee to look into this.
 - T. Meyer noted that there was a good link on writing in the syllabus.
 - Members felt that the form adequately supported the course’s inclusion in General Education, and they referred it to subcommittee for further review.
- C. BME 4910W Senior Design II (New W)
- E. Schultz noted that the syllabus for this course says attendance is required, but UConn does not allow this. Students can be graded on participation, but not attendance. E. Schultz asked the W subcommittee to convey this to the proposers.
 - D. Gross thought this had changed, but the committee generally thought it had not.
 - Members felt that the form adequately supported the course’s inclusion in General Education, and they referred it to subcommittee for further review.
- D. ENGL 2201/W American Literature to 1880 (Revision of existing W; Adding CA1; description change)
- E. Schultz felt that the information in box 41 on the course’s appropriateness as a Gen Ed was not well-represented in the syllabus. E. Schultz asked the subcommittees to convey this to the proposers.
 - Members felt that the form adequately supported the course’s inclusion in General Education, and they referred it to subcommittee for further review.
- E. ENGL 2203/W American Literature since 1880 (Revision of existing W; Adding CA1; description change)
- E. Schultz asked the committee their feelings about sending the requested changes that are relevant to the non-W section of the course along to Senate C&C while the subcommittees reviewed Gen Ed related changes. Members agreed that this was appropriate.
 - Members felt that the form adequately supported the course’s inclusion in General Education, and they referred it to subcommittee for further review.
- F. ENGL 2301/W World Literature in English (Revision of existing CA4-INT, W; title change)
- G. Nanclare felt that the subjects referenced in the two title versions were completely different, so he thought the change was appropriate to make it more accurate.
 - E. Schultz again felt that the Gen Ed outcomes needed to be reflected in the syllabus.

- M. Morrell noted that the syllabus does not appear to indicate that all 15 pages of required writing should be revised. The committee discussed the specifics of the W requirement, e.g. Can a course with three 5-page papers only require revision of one of them? Or do all 15 pages of writing need to be revised? The committee felt that it was the latter, 15 pages of revised writing.
- E. Urios-Aparisi felt the CA4-INT justification was inadequate. He felt the course should be sent back to the proposer for more information.

The committee voted unanimously to return the proposal for revisions.

- G. ENGL 3215/W Twentieth- and Twenty-First Century African American Literature (New CA4-INT & W course)
- It was noted that the “INT” is missing from the CA4 in the course description.
 - The syllabus again has no reference to any Gen Ed objectives.
 - D. Gross questioned whether the committee should be dictating what goes into the syllabus. E. Schultz admitted that it is only his belief that Gen Ed courses have extra properties that need to be conveyed through the syllabus and that this is not expressed in any Senate policy. E. Schultz made the case that any recommendation that GEOC would make would be in terms of best practices, not dictating.
 - D. Gross said that he didn’t mind recommending, just not requiring. E. Schultz noted that GEOC can’t set requirements because it has no way to police those requirements.
 - E. Urios-Aparisi noted there is no international content in the CA4 box. K. Piantek suggested that, given the missing “INT” in the course description, the proposer may have accidentally clicked the wrong CA4 button on the form. E. Schultz felt the course could be referred out to subcommittee and asked the CA4 co-chairs to look into this as a possible mistake.
 - Members felt that the form adequately supported the course’s inclusion in General Education, and they referred it to subcommittee for further review.
- H. HEJS 2203 Holocaust in Theater and Film (New course; requesting CA2 and CA4-INT)
- Members felt that the form adequately supported the course’s inclusion in General Education, and they referred it to subcommittee for further review.
- I. HEJS 3201 Selected Books of the Hebrew Bible (Revision; existing course adding CA1)
- M. Morrell said the course didn’t strike him as Gen Ed. It was his belief that Gen Ed is more broad and this course seems more focused, which he associates with major-related content. The course has a lot of prereqs, some of which may already be Gen Ed. He wondered how narrow a course could get before it was no longer broad enough to be Gen Ed.
 - M. Bradford suggested that studying one book of the Bible does not necessarily mean that the course is narrow. He felt that the conversation or perspective taken on the subject can be broad instead.
 - T. Meyer felt that the information in box 40 was unsatisfactory. It appears to be just cut and pasted from the guidelines.
 - Members felt that the form adequately supported the course’s inclusion in General Education, and they referred it to subcommittee for further review.
- J. LING 3000Q Introduction to Computational Linguistics (New Q course)
- D. Gross indicated that he was not familiar with the terminology used in the description, so he would have to ask the proposer for more info about the content of this course.
 - Members felt that the form adequately supported the course’s inclusion in General Education, and they referred it to subcommittee for further review.

Meeting adjourned at 1:55pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Piantek
GEOC Program Assistant