



GEOC Meeting September 27, 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: Tom Meyer, Gustavo Nanclares

Guests: Tom Deans, Richard Langlois, Pamela Bedore, and Heidi Dierssen

Meeting was called to order at 1:31pm.

1. **Welcome**
2. **Minutes of September 11, 2017 Meeting were accepted as submitted.**
3. **Next Meeting: October 9, 2017 at 1:30pm**
4. **Chair's Report**
 - A. Provost's Competition Announcement Released (see 'Competition Announcement F 2017-18_draft3')
 - The announcement has been posted on the Daily Digest. E. Schultz has received at least one inquiry.
 - B. SEC discussions of Metanoia plans
 - There is nothing to add at this time.
 - C. Community of Practice for Gen Ed faculty
 - E. Schultz has met with people at CETL, Neag, and with Kathleen Tonry to begin planning.
 - D. Senate C&CC approval of FYW ex-officio representation on GEOC
 - This action was finally approved at the last meeting.
 - E. Progress report to Senate on recommendations of the General Education Task Force; communications and high-impact practices working groups (see 'progress report to Senate')
 - E. Schultz will present to the Senate on the Task Force's recommendations for Gen Ed.
 - Working groups will be formed, one of which will tackle how to restructure Gen Ed at UConn, including, but not limited to, exploring the "strands" model. The Senate C&C will empanel this working group, which is expected to submit a specific proposal for change in the curriculum by the end of the Spring semester.
 - Additional working groups will be part of GEOC; one will be a group to oversee communication, such as the communication of Gen Ed goals to prospective students and the university at large. E. Schultz invited members to be in the group and invite their subcommittees.
 - Another working group will focus on high-impact practices, e.g. ePortfolios and/or learning communities.

- M. Wagner asked when the bulk of the work will be done. She wondered about conflicts with sabbaticals. E. Schultz felt that the first two groups would have plans by the Spring. The third will be ongoing. He also noted that he expects people might move in and out of the groups.
- M. Morrell asked for clarification on the structure of the working group(s). He was unclear about whether there would be one group or multiple groups and how big these groups would be. One of his concerns was adequate representation from stakeholder groups, e.g. types of departments within the schools and colleges. E. Schultz noted that he did not have an answer to those questions yet, but he would be sure to bring forth the concern when planning. He also noted that the steering committee has been named the “ΔGE” committee.

5. Subcommittee Reports

- A. CA1 Report (see ‘CA1 Report 9-27-2017’)
 - a. ENGL 2605/W Capitalism, Literature, and Culture, #163 (CA1, W) [Adding new course]
 - b. SPAN 1030 Religion in Latin America: A Historical View (CA1, CA4-Int) [Adding new course]
- The subcommittee noted that a letter grading scale is needed in both syllabi. E. Schultz promised that the Senate C&C will contact proposers about this.

The CA1 Report was accepted unanimously (add ENGL 2605/W and SPAN 1030)

- B. W Report (see ‘GEOC W Competency Subcommittee Report 9-27-17’)
 - a. ENGL 2605/W Capitalism, Literature, and Culture, #163 (CA1, W) [Adding new course]
 - b. POLS 3613W Congressional Elections (W) [Adding W section of an existing course]
- B. Ginsberg briefly explained the report as well as an internal subcommittee discussion about grading paper drafts. There are some issues with standardizing this practice, so this is not likely something that GEOC will act on in the near future.

The W Report was accepted unanimously (add ENGL 2605/W and POLS 3613W)

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

- A. GEOC Review of Second Language Courses
 - E. Schultz asked M. Wagner for a recommendation on how GEOC should move forward on this. She requested that the LCL department have some time to discuss this. E. Schultz offered to write a memo to help direct the discussion. M. Morrell suggested also including ASLN and maybe LING. The memo will go to department heads.

7. New Course Action Requests

- A. ARE 1150 Principles of Applied and Resource Economics, #321 (CA2) [revise title and description]
 - E. Schultz gave an overview of the proposal. He expressed concern that there might be significant overlap with courses in Economics. He did not see evidence in the CAR that there was consultation with that department.
 - E. Schultz observed that there tends to be less consultation when the overlap occurs across colleges. He explained an issue that occurred with a course in his department and one proposed by CAHNR, and expressed that he was unhappy with how the Senate C&C handled the case.

- E. Schultz said he has notified Dick Langlois in ECON and they will look into this course.
- M. Morrell indicated that he did not think the requested changes were substantive enough to warrant sending the course to CA2, but he felt that the consultation issue should be looked into.

M. Morrell motioned to table the course pending more information on how the course will affect ECON.

- M. Bradford felt that if the CA2 subcommittee's job was not to review consultations, but there is a clear issue with consultation, then the course should be sent back to the proposer.

M. Morrell withdrew his motion.

M. Bradford motioned to return the course to the proposer with a request to explore the impact on other departments, particularly ECON. D. Gross seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

8. New Business

A. Writing Center Presentation, Kathleen Tonry and Tom Deans (see 'Writing Center Overview')

- Tom Deans and Kathleen Tonry were introduced as Writing Center representatives. T. Deans brought up the Writing Center website on the screen and gave an overview of the center's work.
- T. Deans noted a number of partnerships the center has and their involvement with graduate students. D. Gross suggested reaching out to the McNair Scholarship program.
- T. Deans informed the committee of an Open House on October 5 in the morning.
- T. Deans noted that tutoring is the thing the center is most know for, and he said they conduct more than 4000 45-minute appointments a year. K. Tonry gave some more details about how the process works, and T. Deans demonstrated how the appointment and tutoring notes system works.
- T. Deans said that the Writing Center encourages students to read their work aloud, then there is a conversation and revision.
- Students have the option to send their professors tutoring notes.
- T. Deans also showed an example of a meeting with a grad student.
- K. Tonry noted that the Writing Center is research based, and they have produced published studies on their work. She specifically referenced "ugly writing," which includes papers in which racist, homophobic, etc. ideas are expressed.
- K. Tonry also noted that they work closely with regional campuses. She acknowledged their work with Pam Bedore at Avery Point.
- M. Bradford asked about how it's handled when a student comes in for one thing, but really needs help with something else. K. Tonry indicated that a diplomatic conversation takes place and the tutor steers the student toward what really needs work by asking strategic questions.
- B. Ginsberg asked if the 4000 appointments include regional campuses. It does not.
- A. Lozano-Robledo asked about how tutors walk the line between assisting students and doing homework their homework for them. T. Deans noted that the tutor will never take the keyboard; they ask good questions and try to lead the student toward the answer. Occasionally they will give the student a "gift" in terms of direct advice.
- M. Morrell asked if they had any feedback on W classes. T. Deans referred him to a report previously done by Tom Long.

B. Bachelor of Science in Economics, Dick Langlois and Heidi Dierssen (see 'BS in ECON_Memo to GEOC 2017 09 19', 'BS in ECON_Add Form', 'BS in ECON_Plan of Study')

- E. Schultz introduced representatives from CLAS and Economics. H. Dierssen explained the department's new BS proposal. The ECON curriculum committee felt that students would benefit

from taking Gen Ed courses on a track, meaning multiple courses in a single subject area, rather than taking courses in multiple subject areas as now required.

- E. Schultz asked what the process is at this point. D. Langlois explained that the BS subcommittee has passed the proposal, but it is stalled in the Council of Deans. He added some more information about the plan. It was an effort to include more econometrics and psychological sciences rather than the typical physical sciences.
- There was discussion about whether one major can be allowed to satisfy Gen Ed criteria differently than others; this may open up the option for other departments to attempt it, which is not advisable.
- H. Dierssen felt that ECON was satisfying the spirit of the science requirement, even though they are not sticking to traditional natural sciences.
- M. Morrell felt that CA2 is a science, a social science, and maybe we need to make distinctions between social sciences and natural sciences.
- The plan for the ECON B.S. is still being modified. If the version approved by the CLAS C&CC does not contain any deviations from current Gen Ed requirements, GEOC won't review it again.

Meeting adjourned at 11:08am

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Piantek
GEOC Program Assistant