



GEOC Meeting October 9, 2017

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

Eric Schultz – Chair, (Karen Piantek – Admin), Joseph Abramo, Lisa Blansett, Michael Bradford, Baki Cetegen, **James Cole**, Michael Darre (Ex-Officio), Ana Maria Diaz-Marcos, **Arthur Engler**, Beth Ginsberg, **Bernard Goffinet**, **David Gross**, Alvaro Lozano-Robledo, Thomas Meyer, **Michael Morrell**, Gustavo Nanclares, Anji Seth, **Kathleen Tonry (Ex-Officio)**, Eduardo Urios-Aparisi, **Manuela Wagner**

Regrets: Anji Seth, Michael Bradford, Beth Ginsberg

Meeting was called to order at 1:30pm.

1. Welcome

2. Minutes of September 27, 2017. Meeting were accepted as submitted.

3. Next Meeting: October 25, 2017 at 9:30am

4. Chair's Report

A. Report to the Senate on Gen Ed Progress

- E. Schultz briefly recapped the report to the Senate, specifically the goals based on the Task Force recommendations.
- The proposal to form a Δ GE group passed. There was a question as to why GEOC does not just do this work, but E. Schultz noted that he felt GEOC was already busy enough, and precedent has made these working groups separate from GEOC.
- There was also impatience with regard to adding Environmental Literacy to the Gen Ed curriculum. E. Schultz said he has given the same answer multiple times: This initiative will be rolled into a larger overhaul of Gen Ed, and this must be done thoughtfully, not just quickly.
- E. Schultz expects the working group to be fully formed very soon. In terms of a timeline, he is anticipating a proposal will be done by the end of the semester, and the Spring will be devoted to "taking this on the road."
- M. Wagner asked if the team talked with other people at the summer institute who tried to do something like this at their own institutions. She was concerned because she was talking with a colleague who reported that the language requirement was removed at his own institution when Gen Ed was revised. He felt that there was now a lack of breadth and depth. M. Wagner recommended talking to people at other institutions that have tried overhauling their Gen Ed requirements. There was some additional discussion of languages in relationship to "global citizenship" and how this could be made clearer in the new curriculum. E. Schultz asked M. Wagner to prepare a letter that he would pass on to the Δ GE group.
- M. Morrell asked for clarification on the charge to the Δ GE group. E. Schultz confirmed the charge and asked for recommendations on potential members. M. Morrell expressed concern about the cross-cutting themes initiative, especially civility and civics, and also noted that there was no guarantee this working group would have someone from the social sciences on the committee. He felt that the focus might have been driven more on the basis of particular people's priorities rather than the actual recommendations of the Gen Ed Task Force. E. Schultz disagreed that individual priorities were a driving force, and he gave some background on the push for civility as a theme.

- There was general discussion of anticipated effects of Gen Ed revision, specifically the hope that revisions would give students more flexibility. The revisions will have to be done carefully because students already feel that there are too many requirements.
- There was discussion of how the environmental component would be defined. E. Schultz did not think it would be a competency; it won't have entrance and exit requirements. It will be closer to a content area, but it is really more of a theme, which lends itself to the strands model.
- L. Blanchett asked about the guidance students would receive in selecting their Gen Eds more mindfully. E. Schultz noted that Learning Community resources might be helpful in this regard.

B. Community of Practice for Gen Ed faculty

- No updates.

C. Alignment letters have gone out to department heads

- K. Piantek showed the committee a chart of the courses identified for alignment, and E. Schultz gave a brief synopsis of the letter that was sent to department heads.
- M. Wagner requested that the chart be sent to GEOC members.

5. Subcommittee Reports

A. None

6. Old Business (likely to be taken up after New Course Action Requests)

A. GEOC Review of Second Language Courses

- E. Schultz gave some background on the suggestion that GEOC should review courses that fulfill the second language requirement. He previously asked M. Wagner to explore this more, and she now has some feedback.
- M. Wagner noted that students do not always know why they are taking languages, so objectives need to be clarified, and competency assessment should be revisited. Moving forward, performance assessment is favored over paper assessment. M. Wagner would like to pull together a working group that would include representatives from LING, PYSC, and EPSY.
- E. Schultz noted that we have second language as a competency, but the exit requirement is basically completing courses. He thinks this could be re-envisioned.
- There was discussion of placement exams related to students bringing in language transfer credit.
- There was also discussion of the total number of Gen Ed credits required and how students fulfill them, especially related to language requirements.

7. New Course Action Requests

A. ARTH/AMST 3440/W 19th Century American Art, #3523 (W) [Create AMST section and cross-list with ARTH]

- A W syllabus had not been provided, but we requested and received one. It seemed to have all the required elements.

M. Wagner motioned to send the course on to the Senate C&C. The motion was seconded by M. Morrell. The motion was approved unanimously.

B. DRAM/AFRA 3132 African American Women Playwrights (CA1, CA4) [Intensive session offering]

- D. Gross noted that he has reservations about offering courses in such a condensed format. M. Wagner suggested that immersion might be good for a course like this.
- L. Blanchett asked about if the minimum credit hours are fulfilled. E. Schultz said that the 42 hours per week that is listed is in the neighborhood.
- J. Abramo felt that the CA4 content was maintained. We do not have CA1 co-chairs in attendance, but E. Schultz suggested that by nature the CA1 content is there.
- D. Gross asked why GEOC sees these courses. E. Schultz noted that it gives us an opportunity to be sure that the Gen Ed content is being maintained in the condensed format.

M. Morrell motioned to send the course on to the Senate C&C. The motion was seconded by D. Gross. The motion was approved unanimously.

C. EEB 3244W Writing in Ecology, #3265 (W) [New W, no non-W]

- E. Schultz gave some background on the motivation for the course.
- D. Gross gave some friendly feedback about the requirement that students pass both papers. He envisioned as case where a student might fail the first paper, but by working hard and incorporating feedback on the second paper, the student might be able to pass. This feedback will be sent to W subcommittee.

The proposal was referred to subcommittee.

D. HDFS 3261 Men and Masculinity, #4364 (CA4) [Revise Title]

- No discussion.

M. Morrell motioned to send the course on to the Senate C&C. The motion was seconded by J. Abramo. The motion was approved unanimously.

E. PNB 3264W Molecular Principles of Physiology, #3681 (W) [Revise Pre-reqs]

- There was discussion of who should tell the proposer they need an F clause: GEOC, the W subcommittee, or Senate C&C.

This course was put on hold pending contact with the proposer about the need for a W statement/F clause in the syllabus.

F. POLS/AMST 3822/W Law and Popular Culture, #3721 (W) [Create AMST section and cross-list with POLS]

- The course appears to have all the required W elements.

M. Morrell motioned to move the course on to the Senate C&C. The motion was Seconded by J. Abramo. The motion was approved unanimously.

G. SPSS 3660/W Nursery Production, #3802 (W) [New W with a non-W]

- Student feedback indicated that they would prefer W courses that were more focused versus more broad, and this course is the result of that feedback.

The proposal was referred to the W subcommittee.

8. New Business

A. GEOC Representation from other Departments, e.g. Honors

- This question is part of a larger discussion about which departments or units need to have a voice on GEOC. It is important for regional campuses to have representation, for instance.
- M. Morrell was concerned about adding more work to instructors' plates. He suggested we should just make sure one co-chair is from one of the regional campuses.
- E. Schultz suggested that GEOC ask Honors to come make a presentation. The committee agreed with this idea.

9. Coming Up this Year

A. Study Abroad and CA4 Gen Ed

B. Presentation from First-Year Writing

C. Q Assessment

Meeting adjourned at 2:50pm

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Piantek
GEOC Program Assistant