

GEOC Meeting September 16, 2015

In attendance:

Mike Young – Chair, (Karen Piantek – Admin), Tom Meyer, Arthur Engler, Scott Campbell, Gustavo Nanclares, David Gross, Ana Maria Diaz-Marcos, Fatma Selampinar, Joseph Abramo, Manuela Wagner, Pamela Bedore (Sen C&C), Eduardo Urios-Aparisi

Regrets:

Michael Bradford

Meeting called to order at 11:05pm.

1. Minutes of April 28, 2015 meeting – Minutes were accepted as submitted.

1. Announcements

- A. The Senate will be conducting a comprehensive Gen Ed Assessment as part of its NEASC accreditation this year.
 - P. Bedore gave an overview of the charge to the committee that will be conducting the Gen Ed assessment. The committee reports directly to the Senate, and will generally not incorporate GEOC or Senate C&C members.
 - The assessment is anticipated to be a 1-year project, after which time it will be determined if a second year is needed to effect revisions.
 - Initial findings will be presented as a report to the Senate in April.
 - S. Campbell asked if the committee will be looking at actual student work. P. Bedore said that the assessment strategy was uncertain at this point, and someone from Neag will be recruited to help.
 - M. Young noted that he has heard a potential environmental component might come out of this, and that anything from financial literacy to physical education could be on the table.
- B. The Provost's Competition is on hold, pending the results of the Gen Ed Assessment (The work of previous winners will continue.)
 - The competition will not run this year. Pending the assessment of new Gen Ed priorities, it may be continued next year. The GEOC will fund the second year activities from the last round of winners, but there will be no new round this year.
- C. Senate Executive Meeting Updates
 - There was discussion of the denial of right to a seat for nonattendance after 10 days, but the add-drop period is over, too. For W courses, it doesn't work, particularly when teaching occurs during the first 2 weeks. Pedagogically it makes the first 2 weeks of classes a bit dicey.
 - There was discussion of the 45-credit limit for courses at the 2000 level. It may need to be adjusted. The graduation requirement doesn't say anything about 3000 or 4000-level courses.
- D. Work on the Course Alignment project will begin shortly.

2. Old Business

- A. Revision of a "Digital Information Literacy" competency; Assessment Project update

- A formal report will be forthcoming soon. The survey taken by faculty was completed very late in the Spring semester. Seventy-four faculty members who teach info lit courses responded, representing 34 departments.
 - The survey found a lot of diversity and a lot of activity. It was decided that departmental plans do not adequately cover what is actually happening with information and digital literacy. One recommendation will be to have departments revisit and revise their plans.
 - P. Bedore noted that the Gen Ed assessment committee will want to review this report.
- B. Next steps on the proposal regarding First Year Writing waivers
- S. Campbell informed the GEOC that there may be problems with FYW offerings in the Spring. There was a very large group of incoming students and not enough funding for the ENGL department to run enough FYW courses to accommodate these students.
 - D. Gross noted that math will increase and offer more sections on the fly if they are needed. S. Campbell said that the English department has been told they can't do that.
 - There was a general question as to whether FYW is part of Gen Ed. The answer is thought to be yes, absolutely.
- C. Adding generic transfer courses to the list of GEOC-approved transfer course substitutions (per 4/28/15 meeting, CA1, CA3, and CA4 subcommittees are asked to review the new courses requesting Gen Ed substitution status.)
- D. Gross raised a concern about how courses are reviewed.
 - There was discussion of the difference between study abroad accreditations and transfer credit courses.
 - M. Young felt that there were enough questions to warrant inviting Katrina Higgins back to clarify some issues. He will contact her about attending the next meeting.

3. Subcommittee Reports

A. CA1 Report

- No discussion.

Report was approved unanimously. (SPAN 1020 approved for intensive.)

B. CA2 Report

- No report was submitted.

C. CA4 Report

- The subcommittee felt that GEOG 2400 needs some revision and clarification of the CA4 criteria. The subcommittee will contact the proposer.
- No discussion.

Report was approved unanimously. (EDCI 2100 approved as new CA4; SPAN 1020 approved for intensive.)

D. W Report

- A. Engler reported that there is still no response from the proposer of BADM 4075W to his requests for revision. K. Piantek will try to follow up with the proposer.
- No discussion.

Report was approved unanimously. (SOCI 2275W approved as new W; BADM 4070W, CHEG 4030W, MARN 4030W, and PSYC 3300W approved for revision)

4. New Business

- A. Proposed Policy Revision: Passing the Lab Component of a CA3 course
 - There was a suggestion last year that students must pass the lab portion of a course in order to pass the class. K. Piantek will follow up to try and get more information on this potential initiative.
- B. Transfer of credits from Community colleges and CSU – the “TAP” program
 - M. Young and Katrina Higgins met with admissions over the summer to discuss this.
- C. International Baccalaureate program, accepting IB diploma similarly to AP exams and courses.
 - The IB is a high school curriculum adopted from a European model that is more rigorous. Earning the IB is like students getting AP credit. From the Admissions perspective, they would like to get more people coming into UConn with this.
 - D. Gross noted that on the math end, the program is very opaque and won’t disclose exams or other materials, so it can’t be determined just what the program entails.
 - UConn reps who witnessed the program in action were pleased by what they saw, but there is a question as to whether they were shown the whole picture.
 - M. Young noted that at the minimum, UConn would need some sort of alignment process.
 - P. Bedore asked who would be part of this decision-making process. There was no clear answer.
- D. New CAR Form (Agenda addition)
 - M. Young gave an update of the process, saying that the form is still very complex and unreliable.
 - P. Bedore noted that she had a more optimistic view of the progress on the form. She noted that testing was promising but confirmed that the form was not ready to go anytime soon.

Meeting adjourned at 11:58am.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Piantek

GEOC Program Assistant