

GEOC Meeting February 21, 2017

Members in **BOLD** were in attendance:

Eric Schultz – Chair, (Karen Piantek – Admin), Joseph Abramo, **Michael Bradford**, Scott Campbell, Baki Cetegen, Michael Darre (Ex-Officio), Ana Maria Diaz-Marcos, **Arthur Engler, Bernard Goffinet, David Gross, Thomas Meyer**, Olivier Morand, **Michael Morrell**, Gustavo Nanclares, **Fatma Selampinar**, Kathleen Tonry (Ex-Officio), **Eduardo Urios-Aparisi, Manuela Wagner**, Steve Zinn, Alvaro Lozano-Robledo, **Tyler DiBrino (student rep)**

Meeting was called to order at 12:31pm.

1. **Welcome**

2. **Regrets:** Alvaro Lozano-Robledo; Gustavo Nanclares

3. **The minutes from February 8, 2017 were accepted as submitted.**

4. **Announcements**

A. We will next meet March 8

B. Realignment – Reminder, please submit reports no later than the next meeting, March 8.

- E. Schultz asked that co-chairs please get their reports in by the Friday before the March 8 meeting. If anyone would like to see the original alignment materials, please contact E. Schultz and he will forward those on.
- D. Gross asked about whether he should forward on to K. Piantek any additional information that the subcommittee asks for from proposers. Yes.

C. Assessment

a. Quantitative (Q)

- E. Schultz checked in with Lloyd Blanchard about the OIRE requested data. The report is almost ready. If the Q subcommittee feels as though the report is adequate, it will be part of the next GEOC meeting packet.

D. Association of American Colleges and Universities Summer Institute on General Education and Assessment

- We should know by the next meeting whether our application has been accepted.

E. Communicating (aka “The GEOC Charm Offensive”)

a. Learning communities

- E. Schultz had a discussion with the Learning Community (LC) staff yesterday. He asked them if they thought that communicating some points of interest about gen ed to students would be valuable, and the staff thought it would be.
- LC staff noted that students would like assistance in identifying courses in the gen ed curriculum that would complement their particular interests. There was also a desire to map

out pathways. The goal is to establish more “intentionality” when students select their gen ed courses, rather than relying on courses that just fit into a schedule.

- M. Bradford asked if there was any discussion of advisors’ roles in finding these pathways for students. He noted that his only concern would be “too many fingers in the pot” in terms of students getting information and advice from multiple sources.
 - B. Goffinet mentioned that there is also the other side of the coin, where students in some departments are getting little advising and are having to make decisions by themselves.
 - D. Gross asked if E. Schultz planned to speak to faculty groups. E. Schultz indicated that this is his intention. There was some discussion of the best forum in which to do this. E. Schultz was open to suggestions from the co-chairs.
 - M. Wagner mentioned that we still don’t have a thorough and agreed-upon mission statement to convey. She suggested that working on this might be valuable. E. Schultz felt that this is probably something that would be started at the Summer Institute if we are selected. If not, then we would want to convene a separate group.
- b. Ecohusky and Sustainability student groups
- E. Schultz is meeting with two student groups about environmental and/or sustainability competencies.
- F. Digital Information Literacy competency
- This subcommittee has not met in a while, but E. Schultz has met with S. Campbell and new co-chair A. Seth to begin work on this again. The committee will meet for the first time on March 1st.

5. Subcommittee Reports

A. CA1 Report

- a. ENGL 2413W [#318] The Graphic Novel (Add new CA1, W)
 - b. ENGL 2607 [#658] Literature and Science (Add new CA1)
- M. Bradford briefly explained the report and noted that he will contact the proposer about getting a more thorough syllabus for ENGL 2607.
 - B. Goffinet asked whether syllabi should specifically note information about how courses fulfill gen ed criteria. E. Schultz noted that this is not directly specified in the guidelines from the Senate, but it is recommended as a best practice.

The CA1 report was passed unanimously. (Add ENGL 2413W).

B. CA4 Report

- a. MISI 92001 [#2023] Foreign Studies in Military Science (Add CA4-INT to transfer credit shell)
- E. Urios-Aparisi reported that J. Abramo met with the group and requested revisions, so there is no actionable report at this time.

C. W Report

- a. CE 4900W Civil Engineering Projects I (Revise prereqs and enrollment restrictions)
 - b. ECON 4494W Seminar in Economics [#582] (Revise prereqs)
 - c. ENGL 2413W The Graphic Novel [#318] (Add new W)
 - d. ENGL/AFRA 3213/W Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century African American Literature [#198] (New course requesting W)
 - e. PLSC 2110W [#361] Sustainable Plant Pest Management Communication (Add new W)
- A. Engler briefly explained the report. After some discussion, A. Engler indicated that he would contact the proposer about including guidelines for revision on ENGL 2413W, and this item was moved up to the approved items list.

The W report was passed unanimously. (Revise ECON 4494W; add ENGL 2413W, ENGL/AFRA 3213/W, and PLSC 2110W).

6. Alignment Reports

- A. CA3 Alignment Report
- B. Goffinet briefly explained the report. E. Schultz asked if there was anything else he and T. Meyer wanted to note about the alignment process. They felt as though things went smoothly and the courses were straight-forward.

The CA3 Alignment Report was passed unanimously. (COGS 2201 and AH/NUSC 1030 aligned).

- M. Morrell asked if the process is called “Alignment” or “Re-Alignment.” E. Schultz noted that he prefers Re-alignment, but K. Piantek felt that Alignment was simple and accurate. E. Schultz deferred to K. Piantek since she administrates the committee across chairs.
- M. Morrell asked for clarification on whether the course needs to align with all seven general education criteria as well as the content area criteria. There was some disagreement in his committee on this. It was clarified that the course needs to meet some of the gen ed criteria but not all. Individual content areas vary in terms of their requirements.

7. Old Business

A. Revision of By-laws related to General Education

- E. Schultz noted that he communicated with the Registrar’s Office about the question brought up last meeting regarding the waiver of lab requirements for certain CA3 courses. The office spoke to degree audit and confirmed that two CA3 courses are still required, and that this does not really occur very often as an issue.
- M. Wagner wanted to revisit a question about where language being omitted from the document will end up. E. Schultz noted that he will ultimately discuss this with the SEC. As far as the approval pathway, the document will also be sent to the SEC, Scholastic Standards, and the Senate C&C.

- The discovery of another use of the word “requirement” rather than “curriculum” led the committee to consider what a particular paragraph was actually saying. There was discussion and disagreement over university gen ed requirements versus college/program requirements. M. Morrell suggested some wordsmithing changes to this sentence, and the language was changed. E. Schultz noted some concerns he had about how schools and colleges handle university-wide approved gen ed courses toward their own requirements. There was additional discussion, with the input of student rep T. DiBrino, about the complexity of gen ed requirements and where exactly students’ frustrations are coming from.

8. New Curricular Action Requests

A. DRAM 1101 Introduction to Theatre (Requesting intensive session as a CA1)

- D. Gross asked what the criteria are for considering intensive session requests. E. Schultz noted that our purview is whether or not the course still fulfills gen ed criteria in its condensed format, not necessarily whether the course covers the same ground as the original.
- There was brief discussion about whether the course could proceed directly to the Senate C&C or if it should be referred out to subcommittee. Members generally felt that it should go to the subcommittee first.

This course was referred out to subcommittee. (CA1)

B. HRTS 3571 Sociological Perspectives on Asian-American Women [#2597] (Delete a cross-listing, CA4-INT)

- No discussion.

M. Morrell motioned to send the course to Senate C&C. E. Urios-Aparisi seconded. The course was approved to move to Senate C&C.

C. INDS 4296 (W) Senior Thesis [#2973] (Changing a non-W to a W)

- No discussion.

This course was referred out to subcommittee. (W)

9. New Business

A. Planning for March and April

- E. Schultz gave the committee an overview of business for the second half of the semester. He asked members to think about projects that would be a constructive use of the committee’s time. For instance, he asked the committee to consider if they wanted to meet with Peter Diplock from CETL to see what recourses are available.

10. Business On Hold

B. Next steps on the proposal regarding First Year Writing waivers

Meeting adjourned at 3:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Piantek
GEOC Program Assistant