General Education Oversight Committee  
Wednesday, October 27, 2021 at 10:00am-11:30am 
Via WebEx 
Meeting Minutes 

*Members in BOLD were in attendance:*

Called to order at 10:02 am.

1. Welcome and Regrets

2. Past and Future
   A. Minutes of October 11, 2021 meeting.
   L. Halgunseth motioned to approve. R. Dunn seconded. The minutes were accepted as submitted unanimously.

   B. Future Meetings:
   Mon. November 8, 1:00pm-2:30pm
   Wed. December 1, 10:00am-11:30am

3. Upcoming Deadlines
   A. Catalog Deadline (February 5) – The absolute final GEOC meeting to approve courses is December 1.

4. Chair’s Report
   A. 2021-2022 GEOC Business
      a. Provost’s Competition:
         i. The CFP has been released. Please share with colleagues.
         ii. Information Sessions: Tuesday, November 2 – 10:00am-11:30am
            Thursday, November 4 – 2:30pm-4:00pm
      b. Delta2GE
         • M. Wagner provided a brief update on Senate C&C discussions.
         • One member asked if undergrad students were involved in the development and discussion regarding the new Gen Eds. Yes, Delta2GE had very active student members.
         • S. Wilson provided an additional update on the process that the SEC approved for review. The discussion and voting will be broken into three parts and taken in turn. Senate will start by looking at the “Guiding Principles,” then the “Implementation Plan,” and finally the motion for the By-laws change.
         • The Senate may try to get at least to the guiding principles document by December.
      c. Alignment Workshop
         • There will be an information session on November 10, 2021 for anyone interested.
            o Meeting Link: https://uconn-cmr.webex.com/uconn-cmr/j.php?MTID=m93d6e31a091fc04d36176e35c21f0169
5. Subcommittee Dockets

A. CA1 Docket
   a. CLCS 2010 Media Literacy and Data Ethics [CA1, CA4-Int] (#6015) [Returned by Senate C&C for consultation with proposer]

B. CA2 Docket
   a. NURS 1500 Introduction to Correctional Healthcare (#8584) [Add CA2]
   b. SOCI 1701(W) Society in Global Perspective [CA2, CA4-INT, W] (#7864) [Add W]
   c. SOCI 2701E Sustainable Societies [CA2, EL] (#7603) [Revise prerequisites]
   d. SOCI 2705E Sociology of Food [CA2, EL] (#7604) [Revise prerequisites]
   e. SOCI 2709E Society and Climate Change [CA2, EL] (#7744) [Add non-W version]
   f. SOCI 2709WE Society and Climate Change [CA2, W, EL] (#7565) [Revise prerequisites]
   g. SOCI 3823(W) The Sociology of Law: Global and Comparative Perspectives [CA2, CA4-Int, W] (#7623) [Revise prereqs, add W]

Discussion
   • L. Halgunseth presented the report. There was no discussion.

The CA2 Report was accepted as submitted (Approval of all courses).

C. CA3 Docket
   a. ENGL 2614 Writing in Algorithms [CA3] (#4375) [New course]
   b. Transfer Credit Request for PHYS 91500 to carry CA3-Lab Designation

Discussion
   • A. Gokirmak presented the report.
   • It was clarified that GEOC is only voting on the PHYS 91500; ENGL 2614 is still being considered.

The CA3 Report was accepted as submitted (Approval of PHYS 91500).

D. CA4 Docket (N/A)

E. Q Docket
   a. COMM 2010Q Applied Communication Research Methods [Q] (#5137) [Add Course]
   b. MARN 3003Q Environmental Reaction and Transport [Q] (#7019) [Revise number, title, and description]
   c. SOCI 3211Q Quantitative Methods in Social Research [Q] (#7641) [Revise prerequisites]

Discussion
   • K. Conrad presented the report. The committee is moving MARN 3003Q and SOCI 3211Q, and they provided an update on COMM 2010Q. They recently received updates and will report again at the next meeting.

The Q Report was accepted as submitted (Approval of MARN 3003Q, SOCI 3211Q).

F. W Docket
   a. AFRA 4997W Senior Thesis in Africana Studies [W] (#6837) [New course]
   b. ENGL 3509W Studies in Individual Writers [W] (#7964) [Add W Version]
   c. ENGL 4613W Advanced Study: LGBTQIA+ Literature [W] (#6020) [Revise title and description]
   d. SOCI 1701(W) Society in Global Perspective [CA2, CA4-INT, W] (#7864) [Add W]
The W Report was accepted as submitted (Approval of all but AFRA 4997W).

- There was a question about the 15-page minimum and group work. Can students satisfy the W requirement with a group project? Oftentimes, one member noted, one or two students do all the work and the others reap the rewards. This would not seem to satisfy the W requirement.
- K. McDermott noted that W has had discussions before about whether or not a group project satisfies the 15-page requirement. At the time, they did not feel it satisfied the requirement if the group turned in one 15-page paper as a whole.
• It was noted in the chat, “I think if students each individually wrote and revised 15 pages, but also created some sort of group project from that (e.g. a group poster board about a salient issue in the 15 pages), that would be a way to do it.”
• It was noted in the chat, “I think this question is related to a similar question in our last meeting about checking whether courses are doing what they're supposed to.”
• There was some mention that students generally hate group work. It was clarified that the students in the group who do all the work hate group work.
• It was noted in chat, “Google docs and Wikipedia record every edit which is easily visible, this is one way to measure individual contributions to a group project.”

G. EL Docket (N/A)

H. Information Literacy Docket

I. Second Language Docket

6. Writing (W) Competency Motion

• O. Hiob-Bansal noted that W wanted to have a different measurement of length since we are moving away from an essay-centric model and into more multi-modal work, so they are suggesting the option for pages or words.
• There was some discussion of what the “or” meant in ‘pages OR words.’
• There was discussion of page maximums. This is up to the instructor; the important part is the minimum.
• It was noted in the chat, “Very, very few students will write anything like a 30-page paper when 15 pages is the requirement. I've had students in a W course write a little more than 15 pages, but not excessively more. I remember one case of a student with a massive figure on one page, so I required extra paper length (coming out to over 15 pages) to make sure the big figure didn’t count towards the 15-page requirement.”
• There was discussion of whether 15 pages vs. 4500 words was really a choice, or if it was a clarification as to whether 4500 words was defining what the 15 pages was. O. Hiob-Bansal compared it to Fahrenheit vs Celsius. They are essentially equivalent, but they represent two different ways of measuring the same outcome.
• It was noted in the chat, “Celsius: you write 4500 words....Fahrenheit: you write 12030 words and start counting at 3200.” Members laughed a lot.
• There was some concern about counting figures in the page number. It was noted in the chat, “To me "15 pages OF WRITING" implies that figures are not included in that count.”
• It was noted in the chat, “My students do a running online project that they not only post the URL in submission, but a word doc with the actual text posted so I can run Safe Assign plagiarism checker and check for length.”
• It was noted in the chat, “Can comment as: 15 pages is expected to be correspond to 4500 words.”
• One member noted some confusion/frustration with information that must be in the CAR versus the syllabus. There was discussion of whether CARs are turned back for not having the 19-student cap mentioned in the syllabus. W subcommittee members noted that they do not turn back courses for not mentioning the cap in the syllabus, but another member noted that they have had several colleagues complain about this.
• There was support for removing the parentheses from around the word count. It was felt that this suggested the word count was secondary to the page count.
• Faculty members can pick their standard (words or pages), and that if they change, this is not something that needs to be reviewed again by GEOC.
• There was a suggestion to include words-per-page in the doc.
• There was discussion of how to proceed, whether or not to table consideration, or whether to wordsmith now or later.
• One member thought this was a minor change that was being blown out of proportion. They felt we should vote on it now. Another member disagreed and felt that GEOC should table consideration, wordsmith the proposal to be sure we have what we want, and then bring it back for a vote.

R. Dunn motioned to table consideration of the proposal. K. Conrad seconded. The motion to table failed with 5 against and 4 in favor of tabling.
B. Brueggemann motioned to removed the parentheses. O. Hiob-Bansal seconded. The motion was accepted as a friendly amendment.
O. Hiob-Bansal motioned to approve the proposal. L. Halgunseth seconded. The motion to accept the proposal with the removal of the parentheses was approved unanimously.

7. Second Language Motion

8. New Business
   A. Discussion of Intensive Session Courses
      a. Enrollment caps

9. Old Business (on hold)
   A. Aligning the Alignment Process
      a. Requiring Regional Campus Syllabi
   B. PR and Mentoring Campaign for Gen Ed in the Spring:
      a. Awareness of importance of Gen Ed (students, staff, faculty: presentations of Gen Ed courses, videos about what Gen Ed did for..., student focus groups on specific topics,...)
      b. Mentoring: Lack of knowledge about EL
      c. Outreach to Student Organizations
      d. Suggestions for student initiatives
      e. Number of EL Seats
      f. Gen Ed Goals and Syllabi
      g. Study Abroad and CA4 Gen Ed

10. Course Action Requests in the Queue

   Full-Committee Review
      A. N/A

   Requests on Hold
      A. N/A

   Requests Awaiting Chair Review
      A. N/A

Meeting adjourned at 2:31pm.