

GEOC Meeting March 24, 2015

In attendance:

Mike Young – Chair, (Karen Piantek – Admin), David Gross, Tom Abbott, Scott Campbell, Arthur Engler, Eric Schultz, Stephanie Milan, Michael Bradford, Fatma Selampinar

Regrets:

Gustavo Nanclares, Manuela Wagner, Ana Maria Diaz-Marcos

Meeting called to order at 12:03pm.

1. Minutes of February 24, 2015 meeting – Minutes were approved unanimously.

2. Guest Speaker (via Conference Call)

- A. Ellen Carillo's year -1 update on her course development of ENGL 2049W through the Provost's Competition Grant
 - Ellen Carillo gave an overview of how and why she developed her proposal. She discussed the idea "transferring" writing skill across disciplines.
 - The course focuses on reading and research, especially how proposals are written and the elements that are similar across disciplines.
 - One of the focuses is also on how students can find topics they are really interested in and move towards developing a real project.
 - D. Gross asked how the course was different from the original version; E. Carillo noted that she was really trying to make the transfer element visible.
 - M. Young asked how the transfer element will be assessed. E. Carillo noted that the final paper is really where the elements come together and where this should be demonstrated. Students also reflect on their own progress in the final survey.
 - S. Campbell asked E. Carillo to comment on the claim that this is the only course at the university that "promises to introduce all students to research methods within their chosen fields." E. Carillo noted that perhaps that was overstated, but she did confirm that her goal is really to give students the tools for them to facilitate their own development.
 - S. Campbell also asked what the students were writing about this semester. E. Carillo explained that students haven't chosen topics just yet, but that she will actually receive those proposals this week.
 - T. Abbott asked if there is a post-course assessment to measure the skills in other classes and contexts beyond academia so as to connect this class to other courses or more longitudinal outcomes. E. Carillo noted that she would love to do that, but that she doesn't necessarily have resources just yet. She did share some anecdotal examples of how students have used skills learned in the course in other contexts.
 - T. Abbott asked about the difference between the transferal versus the translation of skills. E. Carillo noted that she hadn't really seen the term translation used before, but she has heard these skills described as "generalizable."
 - The GEOC thanked E. Carillo for her report and wished her good luck in her second year.
 - After the conference call ended, the GEOC had a short debate about the difference between "transfer" and "translate."

3. Old Business

- A. Revision of a "Digital Information Literacy" competency; deletion of Computer Technology competency; Assessment Project: Info Lit Survey and Interviews

- The committee has done more research on which courses are on departments' Info Lit plans.
 - The project is not necessarily an assessment of Information Literacy, but a survey of what the current situation is.
 - They conducted a sample interview with the School of Business; the protocol seemed to work.
 - To summarize the Business interview, they seem to take a very traditional approach with regards to going to library and doing research. The other potential part of Information Literacy relates to sending information back out onto the internet as an exchange.
 - The committee is expecting to find resistance or deferral from departments as they proceed.
- B. 2014-15 Course Re-alignment – Due this meeting
- CA1 Report - M. Bradford reviewed the subcommittee's report. M. Young noted that it was positive to hear the diversity of courses that still meet CA1 criteria.
 - CA2 Report - S. Milan expressed approval of the clarity of the new forms and reviewed the subcommittee's report. The SLHS course was noted to be taught primarily by GAs. GEOC suggested follow-up to see what kind of support is given to the grad instructors given the course's Gen Ed status. The committee noted that some of the W content seemed lacking but recognized that this was not their area to review. They also noted a lack of generalizability in the CAR form responses for CA2 content across sections of some courses. Responses often noted, "In my class...I'm not sure about in other sections."
 - CA3 Report – Nothing to report. M. Young reminded the committee that the report is past due.
 - CA4 Report – Nothing to report. M. Young reminded the committee that the report is past due.
 - Q Report – The committee has not finished the report from last meeting. D. Gross needs to request more info. M. Young asked the subcommittee to please get the report completed.
 - W Report - M. Young asked A. Engler to send him the information request history for the outstanding course on the report so that he can perhaps persuade the proposer to respond.
- C. Next steps on the proposal regarding First Year Writing waivers – OIRE has suggested contacting the Registrar to obtain the data requested.
- The GEOC was reminded that university has an additional 250+ students next year; there is urgency to explore this matter since exemptions will be urged in order to accommodate this influx of students.
 - Data is needed to see if these exemptions are detrimental. The university must assess if there is the need for additional sections of FYW.
 - It was suggested by several committee members that perhaps Sally Reis needs to be brought in to this discussion, especially since there needs to be a long-term plan. M. Young noted that he will try to discuss the issue with S. Reis.
- D. Modification of the Implementation section of the Gen Ed Guidelines – E. Schultz will provide the revised document for the next meeting.

3. Subcommittee Reports

A. CA1 Report – The report does not yet approve EVST 1000; G. Nanclares been in touch with the proposer

The report was accepted as submitted with the approval of AFRA/DRAM 3132 and HIST 3619.

B. CA2 Report – The committee also felt that more information about EVST 1000 was needed and has declined to approve at this time.

The report was accepted as submitted.

C. CA3 Report – Nothing to report.

D. CA4 Report - No discussion.

The report was accepted as submitted with the approval of AFRA/DRAM 3132.

E. W Report - A. Engler explained the subcommittee's report.

The report was accepted as submitted with the approval of PHIL/HRTS 3220W, ARTH 3630W and the ENGL 4000 sequence.

Meeting adjourned at 1:45pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Piantek
GEOC Administrator