Meeting was called to order at 1:31pm.

1. Welcome

2. Regrets: Bernard Goffinet, Gustavo Nanclares

3. The minutes from January 24, 2017 were accepted with minor edits.
   - K. Piantek said that she added a notation to the minutes to indicate that HEJS/CLCS 2301 was approved by evote.
   - M. Morrell clarified that the university as a whole views 2000-level courses as upper level, not just certain departments.

4. Announcements
   
   A. Alignment Project – Packets have been sent to subcommittee co-chairs for review. Please submit reports no later than the March 8 GEOC meeting.
      - K. Piantek clarified that the packets Co-Chairs received have already been completed by instructors. Co-Chairs should not need to contact departments unless something is missing or needs clarification.
      - E. Schultz asked the committee if there were any final clarifications on what needs to happen. After a brief discussion, members indicated that they understood the process.
   
   B. Assessment
      
      a. Quantitative (Q)
         - We are waiting for OIRE to return information to identify key Q courses.
      
      b. Writing (W)
         - E. Schultz talked to Tom Deans, and Deans talked him out of doing an assessment this year. However, E. Schultz told members to “watch this space for more information” in the future.
         - E. Schultz asked Co-Chairs to let him know if anyone feels it is a good opportunity to do assessment in their content area.
   
   C. Association of American Colleges and Universities Summer Institute on General Education and Assessment
      - E. Schultz will circulate the application that he sent in for this program since the committee indicated an interest in seeing it.
D. CETL Meeting (added item)
   • E. Schultz and K. Piantek met with CETL about website update/development ideas. They discovered that websites don’t just convey information; they now gather information about users and their habits in order to conduct online “campaigns.” GEOC will look into using this software to see how it can help us engage students and other stakeholders to communicate the value of general education.

5. Subcommittee Reports
   A. CA2 Report
      a. ARE 3235 Marine Economics and Policy [#514] (Add CA2; level change) - APPROVE
         • No discussion.
   D. Gross motioned to accept the report. The motion to approve the CA2 report passed unanimously. (Add ARE 3235).

   B. W Report
      a. CE 4900W Civil Engineering Projects I (Revise prereqs and enrollment restrictions) - RESUBMIT
      b. ECON 3438W Contemporary Problems in Economics [#584] (revise prereqs) - APPROVE
      c. ECON 4494W Seminar in Economics [#582] (Revise prereqs) - RESUBMIT
      d. ENGL/AFRA 3217/W Studies in African American Literature and Culture [#200] (New course requesting W) - APPROVE
      e. SOCI 3651/W Sociology of the Family (Revised – level change) - APPROVE
      f. SOCI 3841/W Public Opinion and Mass Communication (Revised – level change) - APPROVE
         • ENGL/AFRA 3213/W is missing from the report. K. Piantek will be sure to forward the most updated information.
         • CE 4900W is still waiting on the proposer.
         • A. Engler will communicate with the proposer about ECON 4494W.
   M. Morrell motioned to accept the report. The motion to approve the W report passed unanimously. (Revise ECON 3438W, SOCI 3651/W, and SOCI 3841/W; Add ENGL/AFRA 3217/W).

6. Old Curricular Action Requests
   A. ENGL 2413 [#318] The Graphic Novel (Add new CA1, W)
      • Course was originally a Special Topics and is also a Provost’s Competition winner.
         This course was referred out to subcommittee. (CA1, W)
   B. ENGL 2607 [#658] Literature and Science (Add new CA1)
      • E. Schultz reported on correspondence he had with the proposer about repeatability; the proposers decided against repeatability, but the CAR has not been updated.
• The syllabus is preliminary and needs more in the way of grading scales.
• M. Morrell asked if there are any gen ed courses that are repeatable for credit. Yes, but they would not count toward gen ed requirements a second time.

This course was referred out to subcommittee. (CA1)

C. MISI 92001 [#2023] Foreign Studies in Military Science (Add CA4-INT to transfer credit shell)
• E. Schultz recapped some committee actions from the Fall in which GEOC approved transfer courses for CA4 credit for the first time.
• J. Abramo said that the subcommittee looked at this in a preliminary way and had concerns about the lack of structure and how outcomes would be met, particularly because any interaction with societies abroad might be adversarial.
• D. Gross felt that an adversarial interaction could still be a learning experience.
• J. Abramo said that at bare-minimum the subcommittee would want to see the rubric for the required paper, and that rubric would need to align with CA4 criteria.
• T. Meyer noted that his concern would be ensuring that meaningful interaction did actually take place while on deployment.
• M. Wagner noted that oftentimes military experience is actually a great source of cultural experience, but there does need to be more information to ensure that this occurs.
• K. Piantek gave background on why the course is being proposed as a transfer course rather than under a regular UConn designation. Transfer Admissions was consulted, and they pointed out that with a UConn designation students would have to pay for the credit they earned. Given that many-to-most student deployments take place before students come to UConn, it was felt that this was unfair.
• K. Tonry asked if maybe W credit might be more appropriate than CA4. E. Schultz noted that the program director is probably not necessarily trained to manage a W course.
• A. Lozano-Robledo asked if the rubric would be related to whether the course meets CA4 criteria or if the paper would be evaluated for quality. E. Schultz felt that the grade would more likely focus on the CA4-related experience.
• S. Campbell and A. Lozano-Robledo both expressed concern about the idea of giving credit simply for having the experience of being abroad since we don’t automatically give credit to other students for going abroad.
• M. Morrell argued that we give internship credit for students having an experience and writing about it.
• D. Gross told of a student of his who has had lots of diverse experience, but can’t get credit for most of it. E. Schultz asked if this was an objection to the course or a suggestion that we should look at options for other students to do the same. It was not necessarily one or the other, just an observation.
• The will of the GEOC and CA4 Co-chair J. Abramo was that the subcommittee should engage with the proposer to get more information on how the paper will meet CA4 requirements.
This course was referred out to subcommittee. (CA4-INT)

D. PLSC 2110W [#361] Sustainable Plant Pest Management Communication (Add new W)
   • E. Schultz approved a slightly revised catalog copy description with the proposer.
   • E. Schultz flagged some CAR language that suggested the instructor will be revising parts of the students’ work.

This course was referred out to subcommittee. (W)

7. Old Business
   A. Revision of By-laws related to General Education
      • E. Schultz reminded the committee about the purpose of the by-laws and assured them that the sections being removed would be put into a separate policy document.
      • D. Gross pointed out some typos. He was also confused about language regarding lab and non-lab courses. There was discussion and disagreement about whether students still needed to take two CA3 courses in this case. It was generally interpreted that they did, but E. Schultz said that he would check on this to be sure.
      • D. Gross was also unsure about a sentence indicating that 1000-level courses could not have multiple competencies, but it was realized that this did not refer to content areas, which are different than competencies.
      • M. Morrell questioned certain language in the document, but E. Schultz said that he pulled this language from somewhere specific, and he would check where.
      • Edits were made to language about fulfilling the gen ed requirements of the academic year in which students enter their school or college.
      • S. Campbell questioned changes to language about competencies, especially with regard to information literacy. E. Schultz added a comment to the document about this being a “discussable point.”
      • M. Morrell pointed out the use of the word “requirement” when E. Schultz had indicated the desire to use “curriculum” and had used the latter almost exclusively elsewhere. M. Wagner said this should be consistent, so revisions were made to satisfy consistency.
      • D. Gross questioned if the charge to GEOC should be in the by-laws or if maybe it should be a footnote.
      • S. Campbell discussed concerns about resources and labor when looking at the by-laws. E. Schultz said that he would put a note in about this.
      • K. Piantek suggested drafting language to give the GEOC authority to remove gen ed designations through the course alignment process. E. Schultz made a note about this.
      • M. Morrell questioned the phrase “setting criteria for Content Areas and Competencies.” Since the Senate must approved GEOC actions, he felt that this wording was inaccurate. E. Schultz made a note.
E. Schultz asked about adding language to revise, delete, and approve for intensive session. The committee agreed this should be added.

8. New Curricular Action Requests
   A. COMM 4220W Small Group Communication [#2756] (Revise prereqs)
      The committee felt the course could be moved directly to C&C.
      M. Morrell motioned. J. Abramo seconded. The course was approved to move to Senate C&C.

9. New Business
   A. None.

10. Business On Hold
    A. Digital Information Literacy competency
    B. Next steps on the proposal regarding First Year Writing waivers

Meeting adjourned at 3:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Piantek
GEOC Program Assistant