

GEOC Meeting March 6, 2013

In attendance:

Mike Young – Chair, (Karen Piantek – Admin), Eric Schultz – Ex-Officio, Tom Abbott, Scott Campbell, Eduardo Urios-Aparisi, Gustavo Nanclares, Fatma Selampinar, Tom Long, Mary Ellen Junda, Stephanie Milan

Not present:

Richard Jones, Olivier Morand, Charles Mahoney, Kathleen Tonry, Laurent Michel, Ana Maria Diaz-Marcos, Tom Meyer, Peter Kaminsky, Wally Madych, Michelle San Pedro

Meeting called to order at 12:32pm.

1. Minutes of the February 20, 2014 meeting

The minutes of the February 20, 2014 meeting were accepted as submitted.

2. Announcements

A. 2014 Institute on General Ed Conference – University of Vermont – June 3-7

- T. Long has agreed to attend.
- Please let K. Piantek and M. Young know if you will attend before next meeting.
- Sally Reis will likely designate Katrina Higgins to go.

B. Content Area/Competency Guideline Revision

- The committees will not act on the project this semester.

C. Update on revision of the Info Literacy and Computer Literacy Competencies

- The committee had another meeting and discussed the idea of one group that wanted to build on the Computer Competency with regards to computational thinking. There was concern that deleting the Computer competency would affect these plans, but this was found not to be the case, so the synthesis of the two competencies can move forward.
- On a related issue, S. Campbell noted that he met with Kathy Labadorf about the issue of ensuring library resources for courses and programs.

D. GEOC Member Reappointments – Tom Abbott, Stephanie Milan, Wally Madych, and Laurent Michel

- Members above will be reminded until the end of the semester to let K. Piantek and M. Young know if they will re-enlist for another term; members should consider themselves “bugged.”

4. Subcommittee Reports

W Report

- There have been no meetings on Freshman English since the last one; M. Young encouraged discussion of the issue to take place so that something can be included in the upcoming Annual Report.
- The only course recommended for approval by the committee is COMM 4200W.
- The W subcommittee is having significant issues getting completed and adequate forms and syllabi for review. It was suggested that this is because faculty do not read instructions and do not turn things in on time.
- There was discussion about the possibility of providing good sample syllabi with the new CAR form when the system goes live.

W Report passed unanimously as submitted.

4. Reports and Discussion

A. Course Realignment – Deadline for reviews: 3/27/14

- Please have assessment reports in by 3/26/14 to give time for review.

B. Provost's Competition – 3 proposals funded (ENGL 2049W, PHAR 1005, SPAN 1XXX)

- S. Campbell noted that he had won a grant to revise ENGL 2049W a few years ago and was wondering what made the course proposal distinct this time around. It was pointed out that the department head must sign off on the grant application, so there seems to be a communication problem.
- The primary concern was whether changes to existing courses are binding on all instructors and whether the instructor receiving the grant has an obligation to provide materials to all other instructors. It was noted that instructors must satisfy course objectives, but each has some flexibility in content. It was questioned whether this proposal included a change to outcomes or just materials. It appears that it is just materials.
- T. Long noted that this occurrence is not unique. He received a grant to revise NURS 1175W in 2010 after the course had previously won the Provost's Competition under different proposers in 2005.
- Now that issue has been highlighted, the proposer must be informed, and it was suggested that the course might need a new number if it will include significant changes. M. Young noted that he will contact the proposer and convey these concerns as well as encourage her to collaborate with other instructors and share materials developed.
- The GEOC considered whether a second level of checks should be in place for courses that are already in existence, especially those that may have been funded in the past. This led to a discussion of whether a course can be revised to change what someone else created. It was asked if GEOC should add questions to the proposal template to mitigate this issue, or provide guidance in the instructions for seeking department approval. This was thought by some to be a department issue.
- It was asked if the full GEOC should have final approval over the competition committee's selections. This was largely rejected.
- One member suggested that the word "enhancement" implied deficiency in other versions of courses.
- There were different feelings amongst committee members as to how much of an issue this situation creates.
- Another issue raised was a question of instructors' professional development versus course enhancement.

Meeting adjourned at 2:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Piantek
GEOC Administrator

Appendixes:

W Report

GEOC W Subcommittee Report: 2014 March 6

Continuing Business

- First-year Writing. No further conversation among Kathleen Tonry, Scott Campbell, and Tom Long since our last report.

- W Course Realignment Review. As reported at the last meeting, a HuskyCT group has been created for the W review with relevant files uploaded into a discussion board for committee review. This review has begun but is not completed. In addition to an online form, we find two documents for each course, but both documents appear to be the same (i.e., a syllabus). Is the second document supposed to be different?

- The following courses have been pending:

Reviewed and Approval Recommended

- COMM 4220W Small Group Communication. Submitters have made requested revisions, supplying detailed information in the CAR form and on the sample syllabus. **Recommend approval.**

Reviewed but Revisions Needed Before Committee Approval

- EDLR 3300W Sport in Society. The CAR submission does not include details requested concerning items #41 and #42. The syllabus does not make clear when draft review will be conducted. We have requested revisions. **We do not recommend approval until these changes have been made.**
- URBN 2000W Introduction to Urban Studies. The CAR submission does not include details requested concerning items #41 and #42. We have requested revisions. **We do not recommend approval until these changes have been made.**
- URBN 4000W Understanding Your Community. The CAR submission does not include details requested concerning items #41 and #42. In addition the syllabus has the following deficiencies:
 - It specifies only 10 pages of graded writing (not the required minimum of 15 pages of graded writing). We are unclear how a PowerPoint presentation can be the equivalent of 15 pages of revised, graded writing. Toward the end, the syllabus also mentions poster presentations, but there is no description of that writing assignment.
 - It does not indicate when or how draft review and revision will occur.
 - It does not specify that students must pass the graded writing portion of the course in order to pass the course.
 We have requested revisions. **We do not recommend approval until these changes have been made.**

The following courses are new.

Not Ready for Committee Review

- MATH 2710W Transition to Advanced Mathematics. While the CAR seems complete (if perfunctory), the syllabus needs revision: The required statement that students cannot pass the course without passing the writing portion of it; a more detailed description of the writing assignments and draft review/revision. **We have requested revisions before full committee review.**
- MATH 2794W Mathematics Writing Seminar. Submitters were informed of gaps in the CAR form and syllabus. In item #41 submitters indicate that the course is not a gen-ed course, but it does come under GEOC's purview in that it fulfills a gen-ed competency (writing), so the information requested in that form field does need to be supplied. Similarly item #42f needed to be completed before our review. These revisions have been made within the past 48 hours. The syllabus is not acceptable in its current form. Our understanding from the rationale for this change is that the department is combining a two-course sequence (with 7.5 pages of writing each) into one course (with 15 pages of writing). The syllabus provided is for one course in the sequence. We have asked that the department prepare a mockup for the course they are proposing. It should include:
 - Page-length requirements for the assignment(s) (a minimum of 15 pages of revised, graded writing).
 - Some indication of how draft review, revision, and explicit writing instruction will occur.
 - A statement that students must pass the written work in order to pass the course.**We have requested revisions before full committee review.**

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Long & Kathleen Tonry, co-chairs