

# GEOC Meeting October 28, 2015

*Members in **BOLD** were in attendance:*

**Mike Young – Chair, (Karen Piantek – Admin), Joseph Abramo, Pamela Bedore (Sen C&C), Michael Bradford, Scott Campbell, Ana Maria Diaz-Marcos, Arthur Engler, Bernard Goffinet, David Gross, Thomas Meyer, Stephanie Milan, Olivier Morand, Gustavo Nanclares, Fatma Selampinar, Eduardo Urios-Aparisi, Manuela Wagner, Bing Wang, Shabaz Khan (student rep)**

Meeting called to order at 11:12pm.

## 1. Minutes of October 15, 2015 meeting

The minutes were accepted as submitted.

## 2. Announcements

- A. M. Young noted that he received an email from Oskar Harmon asking about online enrollment limits with regard to an ECON intensive session course. O. Harmon would like to set the enrollment cap at 25 while his department chair is worried about allowing enrollment that is less than what is normal for a regular version of the course. O. Harmon was inquiring about possible GEOC policies regarding enrollment caps for intensive session course. M. Young noted that there are no such caps currently and he asked the committee if they felt this was an issue that the GEOC should take up.
- M. Wagner supported the instructor's desire for 25 students if the pedagogy and assessments supported the need for fewer students.
  - P. Bedore asked if SETL had any guidelines. M. Young noted that they use Quality Matters as a basis for recommendations, but they have no official guidelines on this.
  - T. Meyer felt that enrollment caps were a matter of "state's right," and that the issue should be dealt with by departments on an individual basis. He did not feel as though GEOC should get involved, and the committee generally agreed.

## 3. Old Business

- A. Gen Ed Review ad hoc committee
- P. Bedore reported on the Task Force progress. The committee has been constituted and met for the first time. Jon Gajewski will chair. The main question the committee will address is if Gen Ed meets the needs of students. There are three potential answers: Yes; Yes, but adjustments could be made; or No, revisions are needed. This committee will not present suggested revisions; they represent year one of a two-year project, and recommendations will be the task of a committee convened in year two.
- B. Course Realignment
- Materials will go out this week. The number of courses up for review appears manageable given the departments and courses eligible for alignment.
- C. Digital Information Literacy competency; Assessment Project Report update.
- The subcommittee has met and is deciding on what information should be conveyed to Gen Ed Assessment Task Force. S. Campbell wants to put together a more constructed statement about their findings before releasing this information.
- D. Official deletion of the Computer Competency
- M. Young had K. Piantek check to see if this competency was officially deleted. No, it was not. M. Young asked if the committee wanted to take action on this.

- S. Campbell felt that this action was tied to the reimagining of the Digital/Information Literacy Competency, so this is likely why action was not taken previously. He suggested that the Information Literacy committee should finish its assessment work and make recommendations to the Gen Ed Task Force before action is taken.
- E. Next steps on the proposal regarding First Year Writing waivers
- This issue has largely stalled. There were supposed to be town hall meetings, and those never happened. More data was requested, but it was not the kind of data that was really needed. This may again be an issue for GEOC to hand off to the Gen Ed Task Force for now.

#### 4. Subcommittee Reports

A. CA1 Report (attachment)

- The proposer has been contacted for more information on the one course up for CA1 review. The subcommittee does not recommend approval at this time.

B. CA2 Report (attachment)

- The subcommittee reported that three courses needed more information. One other was recommended for approval.

**Report approved unanimously (GEOG 2000 approved for intensive session)**

C. CA4 Report (attachment)

- HIST/AFRA 3619 does not have information about the International part of CA4. The proposer has been contacted for more information.
- The subcommittee noted that the justification for CHIN 3270 was sparse, but they felt it met the guidelines for CA4. P. Bedore asked if approving this course for a content area with sparse explanation but not approving it for other content areas might send a mixed message.
- There was some discussion of whether the justification for CHIN was adequate.
- It was decided to sever CHIN 3270 from the report and ask the proposer for more information.

**Report approved unanimously after the severance of CHIN 3270 (GEOG 2000 approved for intensive session, WGSS 3718/W added)**

#### 5. New Business

A. Wording of emails from GEOC regarding action recommendations to Senate C&CC (Pam Bedore)

- P. Bedore asked that GEOC subcommittees be careful about the wording of any emails they send to proposers indicating that a course has been approved. There have been cases where a proposer has misunderstood and thought that their course was done with the process when in fact it had more levels of review.
- K. Piantek told subcommittee chairs that, in general, they should only contact proposers about problematic courses. If proposers have further questions about where their courses are in the review process, they can be referred to K. Piantek who keeps a comprehensive log.

Meeting adjourned at 11:55am.

Respectfully submitted,  
 Karen Piantek  
 GEOC Program Assistant