GEOC Meeting October 21, 2011

In Attendance: John Ayers, Mike Young, Alex Shvartsman, Elizabeth Jockusch, Murphy Sewall, Xae Alicia Reyes, Erin Eighan, Robert Cromley, Rosa Helena Chinchilla, Eric Schultz, Anabel Perez, Suresh Nair, Richard Jones, Peter Kaminsky.
Not Present: Olivier Morand, Francoise Dussart, Wally Madych, Sarah Winter, Tom Roby, Tom Deans.

Meeting called to order at 11:05am.

1. **Minutes** of the October 7, 2011 meeting

Motion to approve the minutes as presented. Motion seconded.

Motion carried with one abstention.

2. **Announcements**
   - *Council of C&CC Chairs.* There will be an inaugural meeting of C&C Committee chairs on October 26, 2011.
   - *GEOC Approval of Editorial Changes to Catalog Copy. GEOC* Chair is going to take actions on editorial changes, which will then be forwarded to Senate C&CC for their review and approval.
   - ENGL 2011: At the 10/10/11 Senate meeting, ENGL 2011 was approved with catalog copy that reads: "May be used to satisfy the English 1010 or 1011 requirement."

     Note:
     ENGL 2011 Honors I: Literary Study through Reading and Research will eventually replace ENGL 3800 Honors I: Approaches to Literature. ENGL 3800 will be gradually discontinued.

     CAR Rationale:
     "The revised course title reflects the emphasis on writing and research in the course; the 2000-level designation accurately reflects the course's relationship to first-year writing courses ENGL1010 and 1011, since ENGL 2011 is a more rigorous version of them. The level at which the course has been taught in recent years is more consistent with 2011 numbering than with the 3000-level designation; the proposed change to 2011 corrects this disparity. The course may be used to satisfy the composition requirement; it may also be taken after the requirement has been met and so serve as a gateway to honors for students who might otherwise not have considered honors. The change in credit hours also reflects the course's relation to 1010 and 1011, which, a number of years ago, also moved from three to four credits. As it does for 1010 and 1011, the additional credit hour for ENGL 2011 will entail an extra 50-minute class in writing instruction per week and increased writing expectations."
       - ENGL wishes to obtain blanket approval to revise the current prerequisites of all W courses from "Prerequisite: ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 3800" to "Prerequisite: ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 2011 or 3800."
       - ENGL wishes to obtain blanket approval revise any course with the following prerequisite, "ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 3800" to ENGL 1010 or 1011

GEOC approved this change.

3. **Subcommittee Reports**

Writing Competency
ARE 3440W Writing in Environmental Policy was **provisionally approved** pending revisions in the proposal at the 10/7/11 GEOC meeting. The revisions were made and the course has been reported as provisionally approved to the Registrar's Office.

CA3 Science & Technology
CA3 recommends **the approval of the revision** to the following course, as noted:

Current Title and Catalog Copy:
GSCI 1052. Laboratory Earth and Life through Time
(107) (Formerly offered as GEOL 1052.) Both semesters. One credit. Not open to students enrolled in or having passed GSCI 1050. Students who complete both GSCI 1051 and 1052 may request GSCI 1051 be converted from a CA 3 Non-laboratory to a CA 3 Laboratory course.
Laboratory complement to GSCI 1051. Provides an opportunity to work with specimens (minerals, fossils, rocks), terrain images, maps, physical models, and simulation experiments. Includes two local field trips.

Revised Title and Catalog Copy:
GSCI 1052. Laboratory Earth and Life through Time
(107) (Formerly offered as GEOL 1052.) Both semesters. One credit. Not open to students enrolled in or having passed GSCI 1050. *Prerequisite: GSCI 1051.* Students who complete both GSCI 1051 and 1052 may request GSCI 1051 be converted from a CA 3 Non-laboratory to a CA 3 Laboratory course.
Laboratory complement to GSCI 1051. Provides an opportunity to work with specimens (minerals, fossils, rocks), terrain images, maps, physical models, and simulation experiments. Includes two local field trips.

Motion carried.

Information Literacy
The IL subcommittee met and discussed the possible combination of the Information Literacy and Computer Technology competencies into one competency. A merged competency, such as "Critical Literacies," would better fit the need to satisfy the requirements of both competencies and make for a more simple system.

Discussion:
- Would some departments have problems with merging the two competencies?
- Mike Young clarified that the IL subcommittee is not presenting a motion for this change; rather, they want to put the idea out for GEOC's consideration.
- The "Critical Literacies" title can be misleading, though this is the title currently used by librarians.
- The exercise in merging the two might be useful to get the GEOC and Senate to discuss oversight of the competencies.
- Another option would be to get rid of the CT competency altogether and reconstitute IL.
- Many students have very basic problems with using computers in an *academic* way, some of which are discipline-specific.
- Murphy Sewall asked: Where does the problem of computer technology competency lie? Is it that the competency is no longer relevant, or is it that the GEOC has no real oversight authority to make this competency effective?
- GEOC should try to get feedback from the departments to see if the Computer Technology Competency plans they submitted to GEOC are useful. If they are not, then cancelling this competency may not hurt students in any way and could be considered.
- A driver for this discussion is that GEOC has no authority to manage IL and CT plans.
- The GEOC should review the specific entry expectations for computer technology competency to be clear about what facility with technology faculty expect students to have.
- At the very least, GEOC needs to think about redefining its role with respect to CT and IL and whether these need to be two separate entities or merged.
- The CT and IL subcommittees should go through the CT and IL plans to see how many (which) go beyond entrance expectations.
- The problem with using the plans developed in 2004 may be that knowledge within the departments has changed since their last use.

How should GEOC proceed?
- One thing GEOC is unclear about is its role in managing this portion of its charge in a way that is effective. Is the role trying to promote best practices? GEOC needs to decide if its role is in approving courses or in promoting best practices.
- The GEOC should try to get a summit of departments together, or survey departments, to ask them to think about their CTC plans and let us know about their individual needs. Is there a common problem among departments that GEOC needs to try to solve from a general education point of view? (vs. discipline specific gaps in computer education)
- Some of the gaps in computer education cannot be taught in isolation, and, for many disciplines, it is important that students understand how the need for computer competency applies to their discipline.
- It is not formally out of bounds for the GEOC to review those courses identified as CTC courses on departmental plans. But this may be more difficult to pin down than W courses in general.
- It is important to remember that numerous upper division courses are gen eds; gen ed courses are not limited to lower division.
- IL and CT are very dynamic, more so than technical writing skills and, as such, the needs of each are constantly changing.
- Primary question for GEOC to ask is whether departments want more oversight of CT. Perhaps, "GEOC is considering getting rid of the Computer Technology Competency; we want your feelings on this."
- Should GEOC handle a review of CT like it will do for IL (in course alignment)? Even if it take five years?
- Perhaps the Library would have an interest in holding a forum on this issue with a local speaker and build the question about the importance of CTC to those who attend.
- Can the Senate be a representative body to give GEOC a sense of faculty feeling on this? A GEOC proposal to eliminate the CTC will get the discussion going but any proposal would need very clear justification.
- A suggestion was proposed that the two subcommittee chairs get together to discuss the IL subcommittee's suggestion to merge the two competencies and then submit a proposal for moving forward. In particular, if the argument is that CTC does not have a role in gen ed, we need to have a clear justification for why it has outlived its usefulness.

Murph Sewall asked the CTC subcommittee to report back to us at the December 5, 2011 meeting.

4. Reports and Discussion
AY 11-12 Assessment
- Murphy Sewall is currently in the process of reconvening the Assessment subcommittee to see what it wants to do this year. He will report back to the GEOC.

Meeting adjourned at 12:40pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Anabel Perez
GEOC Administrator