

GEOC Meeting November 7, 2013

In attendance:

Mike Young – Chair, (Karen Piantek – Admin), Olivier Morand, Eric Schultz – Ex-Officio, Ana Maria Marcos-Diaz, Tom Abbott, Tom Long, Tom Meyer, Laurent Michele, Kathleen Tonry, Wally Madych, Peter Kaminsky, Scott Campbell, Eduardo Urios-Aparisi, Michelle San Pedro, Stephanie Milan

Not present:

Francoise Dussart, Nicholas Leadbeater, Gustavo Nanclares (sabbatical), Richard Jones, Charles Mahoney, Linda Neelly,

Meeting called to order at 12:33 pm.

1. Minutes of the October 17, 2013 meeting

The minutes of the October 17, 2013 meeting were accepted.

2. Announcements

- SEC highlights (CA1 re-wording, re-enrollment pilot, syllabus requirement)
 - There will soon be an initiative to put limits on students who take courses multiple times to get better grades; they are filling seats needed by students who have yet to take the course
 - Scholastic Standards is considering a motion on standard syllabus content; T. Long reported that AAUP feels that content on syllabi should be left up to individual departments; M. Young says the main reason for the proposal is to mitigate lawsuits; M. Young noted that CAR form requires a syllabus to be uploaded; E. Schultz asked T. Long if we will get an official statement from AAUP; T. Abbott suggested that it may be better not to require a syllabus because then instructor is held to that content
 - In the CA1 criteria revisions, the word “literature” was re-inserted
- Course Realignment update – 6 alignment forms have been received to date (Deadline – Nov 20); there was an issues with GEOC links because the new site recently went live and broke the old links, but provisions are being made.
- The new GEOC website has gone live
- PHAR 1005 concerns addressed with new syllabus – T. Abbott met with instructors of PHAR 1005 to express his concerns about the course and found that they were very receptive to his suggestions. A new syllabus has been provided that addresses these concerns.

3. Subcommittee Reports

CA1

Discussion

- P. Kaminisky was concerned about a “reach-in foul” but made some syllabus recommendations to the proposer
- Motion to approve the course pending syllabus revisions

CA1 Report accepted as submitted.

CA2

Discussion

- None

CA2 Report accepted as submitted.

CA3

Discussion

- E. Schultz had concerns regarding BIOL 1110 in relationship to the BIOL 1102 proposal
- In light of the concerns, CA3 Committee withdrew the BIOL 1102 motion pending further review
- MCB 3602W was not submitted for approval by the committee and has since been withdrawn

CA3 Report was accepted with the withdrawal of BIOL 1102

CA4

Discussion

- The committee had mistakenly submitted the course for Intersession rather than International approval, but the appropriate designation was confirmed by K. Piantek via email with L. Neelly
- T. Meyer indicated that the report was rather limited; he would have liked more information about why the course was approved, especially in the absence of committee members from the GEOC meeting

CA4 Report accepted as submitted with three abstentions

W

- A W subcommittee report was not available by the time of the meeting, so this agenda item was removed.

4. Reports and Discussion

- A.** Course Provost Competition – E. Schultz questioned the phrase “21st Century work” in the draft provided; the word “skills” was added to the phrase “work *skills* and learning skills” as a friendly amendment; K. Tonry asked about the first site, and M. Young indicated that he found this site provided the best summary of the relevant topic; K. Tonry suggested adding an emphasis on Sophomore-level courses as a #4 to the suggested topics/criteria; the committee assented to this addition
- B.** Content Area/ GEOC Guidelines update – M. Young asked if any other committees were considering a guideline update; he requested that subcommittees put a discussion of their current guidelines on their next meeting agendas. If revisions are to be made, it would be best to send them all together rather than piecemeal.
- C.** Capacity and Enrollments – In response to grading data from the Spring 2013 semester provided, there was a discussion of L/D sections versus main course section; T. Abbott and E. Schultz expressed their thoughts on expectations of W courses regarding A/A-s graded and the idea of “mastery” of the skills through revision; T. Long mentioned the topical content of W courses as a possible reason for grade disparities; S. Campbell mentioned that the Regional campuses predominantly use adjuncts, and he would like to see a breakout of instructor status; S. Milan made the point that Grad Students sometimes give high grades for discussion sections; L. Michele noted that he advises some students to retake classes they got an A in because they may have taken course at branch campuses; M. Young noted that this discussion was originally spurred by a concern about DFW courses as gatekeeper courses, and asked the committee if they felt that the issues has really shifted to a concern about courses with high numbers of A-grades; T. Abbott expressed concerns about how higher achieving students can distinguish themselves given the abundance of A grades; T. Meyer reminded the committee that statistics can lie and suggested that the GEOC seek professional assistance if they decide to pursue this issue; M. Young asked the GEOC if they really wanted to get into the muddy waters of the grading issue; the GEOC decided to draft a statement

which notes that it has looked at the issue and expresses concern on both sides of the grading scale, but believed the issue to be broader than simply Gen Ed responsibility

- D. Computer & Info Lit Competency (Digital Information Literacy?) – The committees are trying to find a date to meet
- E. W and Q Assessments- (1-credit Ws) – T. Long is meeting with T. Deans today to discuss the 1-credit W project
- F. Tom Meyer’s suggested wording changes to GEOC Guidelines:
 - Current wording: “Setting the criteria for courses that may satisfy content area and competency requirements for General Education”; Suggested wording: “Setting the criteria for content area and competency requirements that General Education courses must satisfy”
 - Current wording: “Monitoring periodically courses that satisfy General Education Requirements to ensure that they continue to meet the criteria adopted by the Senate”; Suggested wording: “Reviewing General Education courses to ensure that they continue to meet the criteria adopted by the Senate”
 - *Discussion:* Official revision of this wording would require submission to the Senate; M. Young noted that the GEOC could adopt the revisions as a paraphrase on website or go through the process of official change that could be bundled with other revisions; T. Meyer said he would be fine with the former and the GEOC concurred.

Meeting adjourned at 1:54pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Piantek
GEOC Administrator

Appendixes:

1. CA1 report on English 3320, Literature and Culture of India

This Revise course request comes from the English Department, to request this course to fulfill CA1 in addition to CA4-International—which it already does.

The rationale for doing so is reproduced below (Item 38, CAR):

The course currently counts toward CA 4 only, but India Studies has requested us to seek CA 1 certification because their minors face the problem that this is the case with all the courses counting toward the minor. The consequence is that their minor have [has] no courses counting toward the minor that also count toward CA 1, even though this course meets the criteria for CA 1. English normally avoids double-dipping in gen ed content areas because we do not want students taking our courses merely to satisfy requirements. In this case, however, we feel that India Studies makes a compelling case for the double certification, and we are happy to oblige. No other units are affected apart from India Studies.

The CA1 subcommittee agrees with the rationale for doing this, and the course content and organization appear to support fulfilling criteria for CA1.

However, in looking at the CAR, there is a gap between what it says about fulfilling CA1 criteria, and the syllabus, in particular the emphasis on film study and analysis in the CAR and its non-appearance in the syllabus.

Item 42 of the CAR reads as follows:

a. Arts and Humanities

The extensive attention to Vedantist metaphysics, ethical theory, and aesthetic theory should qualify the course under the "Inquiries into philosophical . . . theory" section. We consider each of these aspects of Indian tradition in some detail. More obviously, the attention of the course to literature and film, with extensive (philosophical and ethical) exploration of each would seem to qualify under the fourth category, "Comprehension and appreciation of written, graphic and/or performance art forms." Indeed, the attention to art and/or music, though more limited, fits here as well.

The syllabus shows a lot of emphasis on literature, and an introduction to Indian classical music at the end, but not any film or its analysis.

Recommendation to GEOC:

To revise the syllabus to include more detail supporting fulfillment of CA1 criteria, in particular the ethical and philosophical analysis of film. Because this represents be a small-scale and quick fix, we recommend an E-vote to approve, subsequent to receiving a revised syllabus for the course.

Respectfully submitted,

Françoise Dussart
Peter Kaminsky
Co-chairs CA1 subcommittee

2. CA2 Subcommittee Report | November 7, 2013

The CA2 Subcommittee recommends approving the following course proposal as a Content Area 2 course:

ANTH 1500 Great Discoveries in Archaeology (INTERSESSION)

Revision Note: This proposal is a request to offer a previously approved CA2 course during the intersession. The instructor has modified the syllabus in a way that retains sufficient CA2 content. Only two lecture topics have been eliminated, and more hands-on activities have been added to enhance learning in the abbreviated version. The instructor has modified instructional time (3.5 hours a day) to combine lecture, discussion and activities in a way that should maintain high student engagement and meet learning objectives.

3. CA3 Subcommittee Report | November 5, 2013

I. The CA3 Subcommittee recommends approving a revision, as stated below to the Content Area 3 – Science and Technology course Biology 1102, *Foundations of Biology*.

- Biology 1102 Foundations of Biology

Suggested revision as directly copied from the GEOC Revised Course Request Form

- According to the Registrar's Office, they are not enforcing the statement that BIOL 1102 is "not open for credit to students who have completed a year of advanced biology in high school". We would like to remove this statement so it does not cause confusion to students, parents, staff, or faculty.

Additionally, we would like to add the statement "\\\"Not open to students who passed BIOL 1107 or

1108” due to the large amount of overlap between BIOL 1102 and BIOL 1107/1108, and also because BIOL 1107/1108 are more extensive courses, intended for science majors.

II. The CA3 Subcommittee recommends a stay on approving a new Content Area 3 – Science and Technology course request, MCB 3602W, *Introduction to Bioinformatic Tools for Microbial Genome Annotation*. The Subcommittee feels that the proposal as originally submitted did not thoroughly address CA3 tenants. The instructor has been contacted and has agreed to resubmit based on concerns.

4. CA4 Diversity and Multiculturalism Report | November 7, 2013 GEOC Meeting

The CA4 Subcommittee recommends approval of the following course revision under Diversity and Multiculturalism (International):

SOCI 1701 Society in Global Perspective

Note: The course currently has no content area designation and is applying for CA4-INT.