

GEOC Meeting March 30, 2016

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

Mike Young – Chair, (Karen Piantek – Admin), Joseph Abramo, Pam Bedore (Sen C&C ex-officio), **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, Steve Zinn, Shabaz Khan (student rep)

Meeting was called to order at 10:34am.

1. The minutes from March 2, 2016 were accepted unanimously.

2. Announcements

A. None

3. Old Business

A. Gen Ed Task Force Update – Report draft available

- A draft of the task force's report is now available. K. Piantek will forward it to GEOC members. Feedback is welcome and should be directed to Jon Gajewski as soon as possible. The report will be presented at the next Senate meeting.

B. Digital Information and Literacy competency – Motion to delete Computer Competency

- S. Campbell felt that this discussion of the Information Literacy and Computer Technology competencies has been a good opportunity to revisit the guidelines of First Year Writing.
- M. Young asked the committee if they felt comfortable at this point in moving to delete the Computer Technology competency.
- D. Gross motioned to delete the Computer Competency; M. Wagner seconded. The floor was opened for discussion.
- B. Goffinet expressed concern that not all students are necessarily coming in with needed skills in computers, e.g. presentation software or spreadsheet applications.
- S. Campbell felt that applications like spreadsheets are not necessarily applicable to all students, nor can students be trained in all available apps and software. One would have to pick and choose select programs, which would not necessarily provide students with a valuable experience. Moreover, he felt that many of these skills could be rolled into a more general Information Literacy competency.

The Computer Technology Competency was deleted unanimously.

C. Next steps on the proposal regarding First Year Writing waivers – On hold until after Task Force review

D. GEOC Annual Report

- M. Young and K. Piantek are currently working on the report and will be sending it around shortly. Please review the report and provide feedback if possible.

4. Subcommittee Reports

A. CA2 Report

- No discussion.

CA2 Report accepted unanimously (revise SOCI 1251W, WGSS 1224)

5. Alignment Reports

A. CA1 Alignment Report

- The subcommittee reported that all four courses continue to meet requirements, although they had similar issues as the CA3 subcommittee with variations across sections and campuses. Still, all sections appear to meet the guidelines. The content is different, but skills assessed and pedagogy are the same.
- There was some discussion of how to ensure that instructors know they are teaching gen eds and understand the requirements. Subcommittees appear to be noticing some variance across courses. They can infer that the criteria are being met, but it is not clear that instructors are necessarily aware of all the criteria. G. Nanclares expressed concern regarding how much instructors teaching a course know about how the course was originally envisioned and proposed.
- M. Young noted that GEOC has tried to reinstitute an email that is supposed to go out to all instructors teaching gen ed courses to remind them to check the guidelines. K. Piantek said that the email went out last year, but she doesn't think it went out this year.
- O. Morand noted that he doesn't think variance is necessarily bad, and committee members generally agreed.
- D. Gross said that we can only report what we do know, not what we don't know.

CA1 Alignment Report accepted unanimously.

B. Q Alignment Report – Part 2

- D. Gross noted that there was some discussion within the subcommittee about whether all three Q criteria need to be satisfied and the different ways in which these criteria could be satisfied.
- The wording of the Q criteria suggests that all three criteria need to be satisfied; however, most courses already approved as Qs do not meet all three criteria. In fact, it would be difficult for most courses to meet all three criteria.
- It was suggested that the wording of the Q criteria probably needs to be updated to include phrasing such as "one or more" of the criteria.
- M. Young suggested that if the Q Committee can draft some language, he will include it in the GEOC annual report.

Q Alignment Report accepted unanimously.

C. W Alignment Updates

- M. Young has contacted proposers about their courses to explain the issues noted by the W subcommittee during the alignment.
- Some have responded, either by submitting revisions or by promising to make requested changes soon.
- M. Young expressed a desire to update the W Alignment report to reflect these responses. He told the committee to expect an eVote on these updates.

6. New Business

- A. Update on Honors MOU – Changes to Catalog Copy (Stephanie Milan/Olivier Morand)

- Staff from Honors and members from GEOC and Senate C&C met over Spring Break to discuss proposed changes to the MOU regarding Honors Core gen ed classes.
 - The Honors department wants instructors to be able to have leeway to give permission to students rather than simply reserving a certain percentage of seats for non-Honors students. GEOC and Senate C&C members felt as though this seemed like a reasonable request.
 - Honors will send a report for the next meeting reflecting updated language for review.
- B. Grace period for not having to submit full CAR after alignment
- M. Young gave a history of the issue. Departments were using revision of a course within the last five years to exempt courses from alignment, so the GEOC insisted that CARs be filled out completely in order to ensure that courses are being fully reviewed. After this most recent alignment, one department suggested that courses that have undergone alignment should have a grace period of five years in which they do not have to fully complete CARs.
 - M. Young asked the committee their thoughts on the matter, and there was some discussion of different theoretical scenarios.

Meeting adjourned at 11:45am.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Piantek
GEOC Program Assistant