University of Connecticut
DigitalCommons@UConn

Minutes | University Senate

9-8-2008

Minutes September 8, 2008

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/senate_minutes

Recommended Citation
"Minutes September 8, 2008" (2008). *Minutes*. Paper 72.
http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/senate_minutes/72

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Senate at DigitalCommons@UConn. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UConn. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@uconn.edu.

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
September 8, 2008

1. The regular meeting of the University Senate for September 8, 2008 was called to order by President Michael Hogan at 4:06 PM.

2. Hedley Freake, Chair of the Senate Executive Committee, nominated Susan Spiggle as Moderator for the 2008/2009 academic year. The nomination was seconded by Senator Caira. Susan Spiggle was elected as Moderator of the Senate for 2008-2009 without dissent.

3. Senator Spiggle recognized Senator Freake who nominated Robert Miller as Secretary of the Senate for 2007-08. The nomination was seconded by Senator Hiskes. Robert Miller was elected as Secretary of the Senate for 2008-2009 without dissent.

4. Moderator Spiggle requested Senators introduce themselves and state their department affiliation.

5. Approval of the Minutes

   Moderator Spiggle presented the minutes from the regular meeting for April 28, 2008 for review.

   The minutes were approved without modification.

6. Report of the President

   President Hogan delivered his report to the Senate, bringing the Senate up-to-date on a number of important topics. Topics of discussion included: his strong belief that the Health Center and the remainder of the university should be unified; the recent response from four Connecticut hospitals to the University's Request For Proposals seeking to formalize new healthcare partnerships; the presentation of the Academic Plan to the Board of Trustees for approval at its September meeting; the Governor's budget rescission; the reorganization of the University's administrative structure; the review of the university by-laws with an eye towards revision; and the undertaking of a review of the committees that exist on all campuses with an eye towards reduction in the administrative burden on faculty.

   Lively discussion ensued regarding the budget rescission. President Hogan expressed his sympathy with all who have to undertake these reductions and pledged his support and leadership in minimizing the impact of these decisions. He emphasized that even with this we do enjoy a high level of support from the State, higher than most other state universities. Together with Provost Nicholls, he explained that the Governor's rescission was actually greater than the announced 3% due to an associated reduction in fringe benefits paid by the state and the likelihood that contractual increases would not be fully funded. The balance of the reduction to departments was attributed to a buffer designed to allow for expected additional cuts from the state together with a 0.5% reallocation to allow funding for priorities identified under the new academic plan.

7. Senator Freake presented the report of the Senate Executive Committee.

   (Attachment #1)

8. Senator von Munkwitz-Smith presented the report of the Nominating Committee.

   (Attachment #2)

a. We move the following faculty deletions to the named standing committee:

- Mohammed Hussein from the Curricula & Courses Committee
- Nancy Shoemaker from the Scholastic Standards Committee
- Robert Weiss from the Growth & Development Committee
- Richard Wilson from the Faculty Standards Committee

b. We move to change the Chair of the Faculty Standards Committee from Pamela Bramble to Mohammed Hussein.

c. We move to change the Chair of the Scholastic Standards Committee from Hedley Freake to Diane Lillo-Martin for fall 2008 and John Clausen for spring 2009.

d. We move the following faculty and staff additions to the named committees:

- Keith Barker to the Curricula & Courses Committee as an ex-officio, non-voting representative of the Provost's Office
- Rajeev Bansal to the Growth & Development Committee as representative of the University Budget Committee
- Karen Bresciano to the Growth & Development Committee as representative of the Student Welfare Committee
- Nancy Bull to the Faculty Standards Committee as an ex-officio, non-voting representative of the Provost's Office
- Janice Clark to the Growth & Development Committee as representative of the Curricula & Courses Committee
- Dolan Evanovich to the Enrollment Committee as an ex-officio, non-voting representative of the Provost's Office
- Eva Gorbants to the Growth & Development Committee as representative of the Enrollment Committee
- Lynne Goodstein to the Scholastic Standards Committee as an ex-officio, non-voting representative of the Provost's Office
- Katrina Higgins to the Growth & Development Committee as representative of the Scholastic Standards Committee
- Elizabeth Jockusch to the General Education Oversight Committee for a two year term, expiring June 30, 2010
- Margaret Lamb to the University Budget Committee
- Tessie Naranjo to the University Budget Committee
- John Silander to the Growth & Development Committee as representative of the Faculty Standards Committee
- Dana Wilder to the Growth & Development Committee as an ex-officio, non-voting representative of the Provost's Office
- Lee Williams to the Student Welfare Committee as an ex-officio, non-voting representative of the Provost's Office

e. We move the following undergraduate student additions to the named committees:

- Lia Albini to the Student Welfare Committee
- Kay Bloomberg to the Scholastic Standards Committee

- Seamus Keating to the Growth & Development Committee
- Shannon O'Reilly to the Student Welfare Committee

f. For the information of the Senate, the Undergraduate Student Government has named Lia Albini, Robert Ryan McHardy, Corey Schmitt, and Meredith Zaritheny to membership on the University Senate for a one-year term.

The series of nominations were presented as one motion.

The motion carried.

9. Senator Makowsky presented the annual report of the Work/Life Oversight Committee.
(Attachment #3)

10. Director Margaret Lamb presented the annual report on interdepartmental courses.
(Attachment #4)

11. Senator von Hammerstein presented the annual report of the General Education Oversight Committee.
(Attachment #5)

12. Senator Schaeffer moved that, **"The Senate's Budget Committee explain the University rescission numbers in FY '09 and FY '10 and as far as possible explain their consequences."** The motion was seconded by Senator Holsinger

The motion carried.

13. Senator Darre presented the report of the Senate Courses and Curricula Committee.
(Attachment #6)

I. The Curricula and Courses Committee recommends approval of the following courses for inclusion in the "W" Writing competency*:*

A. ENGL 3117W Romantic British Literature.
B. ENGL 3118W Victorian British Literature.
C. PSYC 3402W Child Development in Sociopolitical Context Content

II. The Curricula and Courses Committee recommends approval of the following course for inclusion in Content Area 4, International, Diversity and Multiculturalism

A. PSYC 3402W Child Development in Sociopolitical Context Content

III. The Curricula and Courses Committee recommends approval of the following course changes for courses included in the "Q" Quantitative Reasoning competency:

A. LING 3310Q Phonology. Change of prerequisites from LING 202 to LING 2010Q.
B. LING 3510Q Syntax and Semantics. Change the prerequisites from LING 101 or 202 to LING 2010Q.

IV. The Curricula and Courses Committee recommends approval of dropping the following course from the "W" Writing competency*:*

A. ENGL 223W Romantic and Victorian English Literature

V. The Curricula and Courses Committee recommends the approval of the revised University Policy on Academic Adjustments for General Education Competencies: Quantitative reasoning and/or second language.

A. Strike the language in the document referring to: University Program for College Students with Learning Disabilities (UPLD)

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
POLICY ON ACADEMIC ADJUSTMENTS FOR
GENERAL EDUCATION COMPETENCIES:
QUANTITATIVE REASONING And/Or SECOND LANGUAGE
December 11, 2006

Introduction

The University Senate enacted General Education requirements to ensure that all University of Connecticut undergraduate students become articulate and acquire intellectual breadth and versatility, critical judgment, moral sensitivity, awareness of their era and society, consciousness of the diversity of human culture and experience, and a working understanding of the processes by which they can continue to acquire and use knowledge. A critical element of General Education is demonstrated competency in five fundamental areas - computer technology, information literacy, **quantitative skills**, **second language proficiency,** and writing. The development of these competencies involves two thresholds: establishing entry-level expectations and meeting graduation expectations. In limited cases involving a significant disability, the graduation expectations for the **quantitative skills** and/or **second language proficiency** has been a barrier to degree completion. In an effort to respond to the extraordinary circumstances of students while maintaining the academic integrity of General Education and program requirements, the University has established a policy and procedures for considering **academic adjustments** to General Education requirements that would remove this barrier. It should be noted that the University provides a range of academic support for *all* students and provides appropriate support and reasonable accommodations for students with documented disabilities as defined by state and federal statute. Academic adjustments are only considered after a student has demonstrated that he or she is unable to complete the competency at the University. In these cases, this situation will involve a student with a significant disability whose documentation and educational history provide compelling evidence that an academic adjustment is reasonable.

Policy

Academic adjustments are granted only when it is clear that the completion of the requirement is impossible due to a disability. Waivers of General Education Competencies are never granted. Academic adjustments, which may include course substitutions, are granted on a case-by-case basis. The following rules will apply:

- If quantitative or second language competency is deemed as an essential element of a program or course of study, then a substitution is not permitted. The question of "essential element" will be decided by the Dean of each school or college or head of program, or enrollment unit.
- Academic adjustments will not reduce the number of courses/credits normally required to complete General Education requirements.
- If the student changes his or her school or college of enrollment, academic adjustments will be reviewed by the appropriate Dean's office in the new school or college of enrollment.
- Academic adjustments will be subject to the 8-year rule.

All decisions involving academic adjustments will be determined by a University committee and submitted to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction for final approval. The committee will include the individuals listed below.

1. Designee from the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction (Chair)
2. ~~University Program for College Students with Learning Disabilities Director or Designee~~
3. Center for Students with Disabilities Director or Designee
4. Designees from the Dean's office in the petitioning student's school or college or Academic Center for Exploratory Students (ACES) as appropriate
5. Designee from the Department of Mathematics or Department of Modern and Classical Languages
6. Designee from the General Education Oversight Committee

<u>Procedures</u>
Consideration for an academic adjustment is done on a case-by-case basis. Students are encouraged to initiate the process through the Dean's office of the school, college, or head of program or enrollment unit (ACES) in which they are enrolled. Students should initiate the process as soon as it is apparent that an academic adjustment should be considered and after a plan of study has been selected.

The academic adjustment request is initiated when the student, in conjunction with his or her school/college of enrollment, submits the following to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction:

- An Academic Adjustment Petition, which will include a personal statement outlining the reasons for the request, an explanation of the difficulties experienced in quantitative and/or language courses, and a complete listing of the quantitative and/or language courses attempted to date. This petition will be signed by the student's academic advisor to indicate his/her awareness of its submission.
- Unofficial transcripts from all colleges and high schools attended.
- Evidence that the student has actively pursued academic support which may include letters of support from professors, high school teachers, tutors, and/or academic advisors.
- If appropriate, student release of information forms provided by the ~~University Program for College Students with Learning Disabilities (UPLD) or~~ Center for Students with Disabilities (CSD).

- A letter from the ~~University Program for College Students with Learning Disabilities (UPLD) or~~ Center for Students with Disabilities (CSD) documenting the student's need for an academic adjustment.

Students should submit all materials to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction prior to the end of the 3rd week of the semester. Committee decisions will be made before the 5th week of the semester and communicated in writing to the student and his or her school/college of enrollment. In some cases students may be invited to speak with a member of the committee to provide more information. Requests are reviewed once per semester.

Guidelines for Academic Adjustments

The vast majority of students who experience difficulty in fulfilling the Quantitative Reasoning and/or Second Language Competency will experience success by employing any number of academic support and/or advising strategies. Academic adjustments may include an exception to an academic rule, such as allowing a student to complete a required course(s) on a pass/fail basis or substituting an alternative course(s) for a required course. Each academic adjustment should be based on the individual case and should not compromise the academic integrity of the requirements for a specific major or degree.

The entire report was presented as one motion.

The motion carried.

14. There was a motion to adjourn.

The motion was approved by a standing vote of the Senate.

The meeting adjourned at 5:47 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert F. Miller
Professor of Music
Secretary of the University Senate

The following members and alternates were absent from the September 8, 2008 meeting:

Bansal, Rajeev
Croteau, Maureen
Engel, Gerald
English, Gary
Franklin, Brinley
Gray, Richard
Guillard, Karl
Holzworth, R.J.
Hoskin, Robert
Kazerounian, Kazem
Kelly, Kristin
Lipsky, Sue
Mannheim, Philip
Paul, Jeremy
Pratto, Felicia
Silander, John
Sloan, Laurie
Taylor, Ronald
Thorpe, Judith
VanHeest, Jaci
Woods, David
Zaritheny, Meredith

Report of the Senate Executive Committee
to the University Senate
September 8, 2008

The Senate Executive Committee welcomes all Senators to the beginning of another academic year. We look forward to a year in which we will have vigorous discussion of issues that are before the Senate and in which we will continue our efforts to provide input to further improve the workings of the University.

The Senate Executive Committee has met six times since the April 28th meeting of the University Senate.

On May 23rd the Senate Executive Committee met alone to discuss the building program and to review Provost Nicholls' establishment of a task force to review the issue of charging graduate student tuition to grants. This task force resulted from a motion presented by the University Budget Committee and approved at the April 29, 2008 Senate meeting.

On May 29th the Senate Executive Committee met with Provost Nicholls, Barry Feldman, Jim Bradley, and Ross MacKinnon to discuss issues related to 21st Century UConn and the revisions that were being made to that plan.

Two meetings were held with Chief Financial Officer candidate finalists. (June 25 & July 1)

On August 29th the Senate Executive Committee met in closed session with President Hogan. Afterwards the SEC met with the Chairs of the Standing Committees to plan for the agenda of this meeting and to coordinate the activities between the committees. There are a wide variety of issues under consideration for discussion. These include the current budget rescissions, student evaluation of faculty, the building program and a simplified and efficient electronic system for the submission and tracking of curriculum action requests to the Senate C&C committee and to GEOC.

On September 5th, the Senate Executive Committee met in closed session with Provost Nicholls. Afterwards we met with President Hogan, Chief Operating Officer Feldman, Vice President for Student Affairs Saddlemire, Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Gray, and Suman Singha whose title s are too long to reiterate here. Dr. Singha attended in his capacity as Interim Vice President for Research and both he and Dolan Evanovich, Vice President for Enrollment Planning, Management and Institutional Research will now be attending these meetings. We were especially pleased to welcome new CFO Rich Grey.
Among the issues discussed were the size of the entering class, the budget cuts and their impact particularly within CLAS, various issues related to graduate students and ex officio appointments to the Senate.
We appreciate the continued dialog between the Senate and the Administrators and feel that this has provided many opportunities for shared governance.

The Senate Executive Committee is grateful to Senator Susan Spiggle for serving as moderator of the Senate this academic year and to Robert Miller for serving as secretary.

Respectfully submitted,
Hedley Freake
Chair, Senate Executive Committee
September 8, 2008

Report of the Nominating Committee

to the University Senate
September 8, 2008

1. We move the following faculty deletions to the named standing committee:

   Mohammed Hussein from the Curricula & Courses Committee
   Nancy Shoemaker from the Scholastic Standards Committee
   Robert Weiss from the Growth & Development Committee
   Richard Wilson from the Faculty Standards Committee

2. We move to change the Chair of the Faculty Standards Committee from Pamela Bramble to Mohammed Hussein.

3. We move to change the Chair of the Scholastic Standards Committee from Hedley Freake to Diane Lillo-Martin for fall 2008 and John Clausen for spring 2009.

4. We move the following faculty and staff additions to the named committees:

   Keith Barker to the Curricula & Courses Committee
   as an ex-officio, non-voting representative of the Provost's Office.
   Rajeev Bansal to the Growth & Development Committee
   as representative of the University Budget Committee.
   Karen Bresciano to the Growth & Development Committee
   as representative of the Student Welfare Committee.
   Nancy Bull to the Faculty Standards Committee
   as an ex-officio, non-voting representative of the Provost's Office.
   Janice Clark to the Growth & Development Committee
   as representative of the Curricula & Courses Committee.
   Dolan Evanovich to the Enrollment Committee
   as an ex-officio, non-voting representative of the Provost's Office.
   Eva Gorbants to the Growth & Development Committee
   as representative of the Enrollment Committee.
   Lynne Goodstein to the Scholastic Standards Committee
   as an ex-officio, non-voting representative of the Provost's Office.
   Katrina Higgins to the Growth & Development Committee
   as representative of the Scholastic Standards Committee.
   Elizabeth Jockusch to the General Education Oversight Committee
   for a two year term, expiring June 30, 2010.
   Margaret Lamb to the University Budget Committee.
   Tessie Naranjo to the University Budget Committee.
   John Silander to the Growth & Development Committee
   as representative of the Faculty Standards Committee.
   Dana Wilder to the Growth & Development Committee
   as an ex-officio, non-voting representative of the Provost's Office.
   Lee Williams to the Student Welfare Committee
   as an ex-officio, non-voting representative of the Provost's Office.

5. We move the following undergraduate student additions to the named committees:

   Lia Albini to the Student Welfare Committee.
   Kay Bloomberg to the Scholastic Standards Committee
   Seamus Keating to the Growth & Development Committee
   Shannon O'Reilly to the Student Welfare Committee.

6. For the information of the Senate, the Undergraduate Student Government has named Lia Albini, Robert Ryan McHardy, Corey Schmitt, and Meredith Zaritheny to membership on the University Senate for a one-year term.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey von Munkwitz-Smith, Chair
Anne Hiskes
Karla Fox
Harry Frank
Debra Kendall
Susan Spiggle

Report to the Senate
Provost's/COO's
Work/Life Oversight Committee
September 2008

I. OVER-ARCHING GOAL

To recruit and retain the best faculty, staff, and students through a supportive environment that allows each individual to attain her or his best potential. This Committee participates in the goals of the Provost's Academic Plan by promoting Workforce Development here at UConn.

II. Mission, Charge, and Members

The **Work/Life Oversight Committee (WLOC)** reports to the Provost, Peter J. Nicholls, and to the Chief Operating Officer, Barry Feldman, and meets twice a semester. Its mission is to promote a culture of balanced work and life for the University of Connecticut faculty, staff, and students, through the review, development, and implementation of policies and programs. It is charged with monitoring childcare and other work/life needs, exploring joint projects with the Town of Mansfield, directing concerns and problems about work/life issues to the correct recipient, and taking other actions or making recommendations at its discretion.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Veronica Makowsky (co-chair), Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Regional Campus Administration

Terri Dominguez (co-chair), Manager, Department of Environmental Health & Safety

Karen Bresciano, Assistant Dean of Students

Jane Goldman, Associate Professor, Department of Human Development and Family Studies

Artie Maharaj, Graduate Student

Carol Millette, Administrative Assistant, Women's Center

Kathy Sanner, Nurse Coordinator, Student Health Services

Lori Vivian, Manager of Human Resources Benefits Administration

III. 2007-2008 Activities and Accomplishments

A. Among many disappointments we have all faced with the recent budget rescissions, we also lost the Work/Life Coordinator position, while a search was in progress, when Human Resources cut the position in order to meet their budget rescission without displacing persons already hired in HR. Human Resources wishes to seek refunding for the position. This year the Work/Life Oversight Committee will meet to talk about ways we can get some of the Coordinator's functions accomplished and take a fresh look at the position and

its placement in the university. This position is important to the recruitment and retention of excellent faculty, staff, and graduate students that will move UConn in to the top twenty of public institutions.

B. The Work/Life Connections website (www.worklife.uconn.edu) was updated to include a notice of available Lactation Rooms on campus; Work and Breastfeeding online resources, including the CT Law on *Breastfeeding in the Workplace*; and a posting of the Work/Life Specialist position.

C. The Committee met with the Family Roles Subcommittee of the Provost's Commission on the Status of Women to review common goals and discuss strategies for collaboration. The committees agreed to establish regular joint meetings—at its second meeting of each semester, the Committee will meet jointly with the Family Roles Subcommittee.

D. Personal service agreements with Mansfield Discovery Depot, Willow House, and Community Children's Center for 2007 were finalized; we are working on PSAs for 2008. These subsidies ensure that the centers reserve a majority of their spaces, particularly infant/toddler slots, to children of UConn-affiliates. They also help the centers to maintain and enhance NAEYC accreditation and recruit and retain quality staff, while minimizing fees. The goal is to sustain and, insofar as possible, improve the availability, affordability and quality of local childcare services for the benefit of the University community.

E. Town of Mansfield's Mansfield Advocates for Children (MAC)

1. Members of the Work/Life Oversight Committee and MAC, Veronica Makowsky, Terri Dominguez, Anne Bladen, and Jane Goldman met with Tom Callahan to discuss the possibility for joint University /Town efforts to expand the availability of high-quality, affordable spaces for infants and toddlers who are the children of UConn employees and/or town residents. The decision of the group was to investigate the possibility of conducting a feasibility study. In early September, members of MAC will meet with Tom Callahan and Matt Hart, Mansfield Town Manager, to further explore this possibility. Some technical support may be available through the Graustein Foundation.

2. For the last year Mansfield has engaged in a community-based strategic planning effort. Dr. Jane Goldman of HDFS served as the MAC representative on the steering committee. The plan will be presented to the Town Council on September 8. The plan includes an action item "Provide affordable early care and education for children from birth to kindergarten." This is under the priority vision point "Education and Early Childhood Development."

3. MAC has received a Local Capacity Building Grant from the William Casper Graustein Memorial Foundation that will support the development of a comprehensive plan that will identify the needs of young children (birth to 8 years) in Mansfield and their families. The plan, "A Blueprint for Mansfield's Children," will assess needs across a wide range of domains: education, health care, housing, transportation, etc.

F. The Committee participated in a panel discussion entitled "Work & Life: UConn, Legislation and Women," sponsored by UCPEA's Women's Issues Committee.

G. The University continues to be an institutional member of the **College and University Work/Family Association (CUWFA)**, through the efforts of the Committee.

H. The CT Legislation on Breastfeeding in the Workplace was sent to Buildings and Grounds with a recommendation by the Committee to provide lactation rooms in new or renovated buildings to facilitate compliance with the law.

IV. Goals for 2008/2009

A. Hiring Work/Life Coordinator (title and placement to be determined).

B. Restructuring the Committee into an institutional Work/Life Advisory Board, reporting to the upper administration and consisting of members across the University Community, including individuals in leadership positions who can effect change and promote awareness of work/life issues and the implementation of work/life policies. The formation of the Board is recommended to occur six months after hiring the Work/Life Coordinator (title and location to be determined).

C. The Committee and/or Advisory Board, working in collaboration with the Work/Life Coordinator (title and located to be determined), will promote work/life programs and initiatives and an environment of work/life balance by:

1. Developing education and training programs, particularly of supervisory faculty and staff, about implementing work/life policies in the spirit of the Work/Life Flexibility Statement.

2. Recommending work/life policies and guidelines after researching best practices at peer, aspirant, and other CT institutions of higher learning.

3. Exploring pilot programs that promote Work/Life flexibility along with productivity (e.g. floater workforce to facilitate flextime or extended leaves).

4. Enhancing the visibility of the UConn Work/Life Connections website and updating resources.

5. Monitoring changing area childcare opportunities and making recommendations to ensure and enhance the availability, affordability, and quality of childcare (particularly infant and toddler).

6. Pursuing further opportunities with the Town of Mansfield: Mansfield Advocates for Children.

7. Working to identify the needs of graduate students, especially international students, regarding information about the education system in Connecticut, child care, and parenting issues.

V. NEEDS

A. Hiring Work/Life Specialist (title and location to be determined).

B. Leadership and support from the upper administration for a Work/Life Advisory Board having institutional influence and authority on work/life issues.

C. Education and training, particularly of supervisory faculty and staff, about implementing work/life policies in the spirit of the Work/Life Flexibility Statement.

D. Support and funding to increase the availability of infant/toddler childcare to meet the needs of the University Community.

Report to Senate: Interdepartmental (INTD) Courses

Margaret Lamb
Director, Individualized & Interdisciplinary Studies Program
Administrator, INTD Courses
September 4, 2008

The INTD Designation

"The Interdepartmental designation is used for courses that are truly interdisciplinary or interdepartmental; courses under the sponsorship or scope of a single department are given the departmental designation (e.g., History 195)."

Senate "Guidelines for Submitting Course Proposals (Nov. 1995, updated 2002)"
(http://www.senate.uconn.edu/GUIDE1.html as retrieved on Jul 15, 2007)

Some interdisciplinary teaching initiatives of faculty falls entirely within the scope of their department's courses; others are appropriate for cross-listing (*e.g.* when two departments agree that the particular course fits equally comfortably within both departments' disciplinary course offerings). The interdepartmental (INTD) designation is another option for interdisciplinary teaching initiatives and may be adopted when at least two departments share "ownership" of a course. Seven of the current INTD courses with catalog listings can be classed as collaborations of this type.

The INTD course designation is currently home for courses associated with a wide range of programs designed for University of Connecticut undergraduates, whatever their major and school or college affiliation. Such significant undergraduate programs include the University of Connecticut Honors Program, First Year Experience, and Senior Year Experience. Some other programs have important constituent courses among INTD offerings: Study Abroad, Urban Semester, the Individualized Major Program, the Diversity minor, and Linkage through Language.

Oversight of INTD Courses

Responsibility for INTD courses rests with the Provost, who has delegated course oversight arrangements to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. Dr. Makowsky has three goals for INTD courses:

- that INTD should represent a course category available for the promotion of interdisciplinary collaboration across schools and colleges;
- that faculty review of INTD course proposals should ensure that INTD courses achieve the quality expected of other courses across the University; and
- that a process of INTD course approval should be agreed across the University as the acceptable means to provide oversight for INTD courses.

Administration of INTD Courses

Since 2004 the Individualized & Interdisciplinary Studies Program (IISP) has administered INTD courses. IISP is part of Undergraduate Education & Instruction, overseen by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. Administration of INTD courses by IISP involves working with a faculty committee to approve new courses, as well as the Office of the Registrar and INTD-teaching programs to ensure that course descriptions and relevant information are up-to-date. In 2005 a process of consultation and reform was initiated to enhance faculty review arrangements for INTD course proposals so that they would be more consistent with the Vice Provost's goals for INTD courses.

Faculty Review of INTD Courses

An INTD C&CC was created in Fall 2006 as part of arrangements, initiated by the Vice Provost and developed in consultation with Senate, to provide better, appropriate oversight of interdepartmental courses and other university-wide courses taught under the designation "interdepartmental." Faculty appointments to the Committee from each undergraduate school and college were made. In academic years 2006/07 and 2007/08, INTD C&CC functioned as the inaugural or transitional cross-college oversight committee for INTD course approvals. In January 2007, Senate Scholastic Standards Committee was asked by the Vice Provost to recommend a revised INTD course approval process. Such review took into account the work done by INTD C&CC and considered reservations expressed about the 2006/07 INTD course approval arrangements. In Fall 2007 Senate Scholastic Standards Committee proposed recommendations to the Provost.

In January 2008 Senate approved the recommendations for a revised undergraduate interdepartmental (INTD) course approval process, creation of a new University Interdisciplinary Courses Committee (UICC), and eventual

recategorization of some existing INTD courses as University (UNIV) courses. The proposed new designation, UNIV, would emphasize that some courses serve important functions in university-wide academic and academic-related programs. A new UICC would serve to clarify and advise faculty members and staff who propose interdisciplinary and/or program-based, non-departmental courses on the approvals required. The committee would carry out advisory vetting and provide oversight of INTD and UNIV courses. While the UICC would act as a "gatekeeper" for the INTD and UNIV designations, UICC would not accredit new courses; schools and colleges, as well as Senate for particular types of courses, are the course accrediting bodies.

INTD Activities (2007/08)

In recognition of the transition to new INTD course approval arrangement, a policy to keep INTD courses running in 2007-08 at "steady state" was implemented: only those new INTD course proposals already in the pipeline at the start of Fall 2007 semester were considered by the INTD C&CC; experimental courses previously reviewed and approved by the INTD C&CC were permitted to continue to be offered after administrative review. INTD C&CC did not meet in Spring 2008. In recognition of the transition period, consideration of new INTD proposals that would represent changes to the catalog were deferred until the time the new University Interdisciplinary Courses Committee would be ready to act as the reviewing body.

INTD C&CC met twice in Fall 2007. The Committee considered and approved three INTD course proposals. Two were INTD course proposals to introduce satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading options for experimental courses: INTD 194 (1998) *Variable Topics Seminar* and INTD 290 (3985) *Special Topics*. The new courses were required to implement decisions made in the previous year for several experimental INTD courses with satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading. These catalog changes were approved by Senate. The third proposal approved was an experimental INTD 290 section for a Stamford Interdisciplinary Internship course. INTD C&CC also approved the delisting of one INTD course.

In Fall 2007 INTD course renumbering was implemented and all existing INTD catalog descriptions were reviewed and agreed as up-to-date with course instructors, INTD C&CC, and the Registrar's Office.

The INTD administrator worked with the Chairs of Senate Scholastic Standards Committee and Curricula & Courses Committee concerning the recommendations to the Provost for the formation of a University Interdisciplinary Courses Committee, the revised process of INTD course approval and oversight, and the conceptualization of a new course category: UNIV. In Summer 2008, the INTD administrator worked with the Provost's Office to obtain nominations of faculty members from each undergraduate school and college to the University Interdisciplinary Courses Committee.

INTD Course Statistics (2007-08, with *comparatives for 2006-07*)

Of the 31 INTD courses approved for regular listing in the course catalog, 25 were taught in 2007-08 (*06-07: 29 and 24 respectively*). One INTD course was dropped from the INTD designation in Spring 2008.

Nine INTD courses were designated general education courses (as either Ws and/or content area courses). With the one course dropped from the INTD curriculum, there are currently a total of eight general education INTD courses.

PeopleSoft listings of INTD course sections (based on data supplied by OIR)

	2007-08		2006-07	
	Sections	**Seats**	Sections	Seats
First Year Experience Program (INTD 180, 182 – each 1 cr.)	**249**	**4,113**	266	4,308
Honors Program courses (INTD 170, 198, 291 – 3 cr., 1 cr., and 3 cr. respectively)	**22**	**366**	29	425
Linkage through Language course (INTD 222 – 1 cr.)	**39**	**255**	35	223
Senior Year Experience course [lecture sections] (INTD 283 – 1 cr.)	**2**	**331**	1*	176
Departmental- and Program-based courses with individual catalog listings	**34**	**234**	41	253
Other INTD courses (including experimental, special topics, independent study courses)	**81**	**579**	114	971
Total	**427**	**5,878**	486*	6,356*

Every one of UConn's six campuses used at least two INTD courses to offer sections to its students.

2007-08 instructors of INTD course sections were 40% faculty (tenured, untenured, adjunct), 13% graduate students, and 47% other professionals (*06-07 based on Spring and Fall data only: 30%, 10%, 60% respectively*).

GENERAL EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (GEOC) REPORT OF ACTIVITIES, JULY 2007- JUNE 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction …… 2

General Education Course Approvals ...…….. 2

General Education Program Operation ...……..... 3

Substitutions …… 6

Provost's General Education Course Development Grant Competition …….. 8

Oversight, Innovations, and Revisions ……. 9
- **Assessment** …… 9
  - **Assessment of Writing** …….. 9
  - **Assessment of Information Literacy** ……. 10
  - **Assessment of Content Area 3 (Science and Technology)** …….. 10
  - **Plans for Further Assessment, Evaluations, and Recommendations for Improvements** ……. 11
  - **Recertification of General Education Courses** …… 12
- **Proposed Cross-Content Area General Education Courses** …… 12
- **Intersession Course Action Request (CAR) and Report Forms** …….. 14
- **Second Languages and Quantitative Competencies** ……. 14
- **Revision of the *Senate Course Proposal Guidelines*** …… 14

One CAR Form …… 14

General-Education Related Cross-Campus Initiatives …… 15
- **Global Learning** ……. 15
- **Second Languages and Cultures Learning Commons** …… 15
- **FYE Teaching Module on General Education** …… 15

General Education Workshops on Campus …….……. 16

National Conferences …….. 16

Staffing …….. 17

GEOC Committee Members AY 2007-2008 …….. 18

GEOC Subcommittee Chairs and Members AY 2007-2008 ……. 19

Appendices …… 20

INTRODUCTION

The Academic Year 2007-2008 is the third of operation of UConn's "new" General Education program which is now well established. The General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC), now in its sixth year, represents a hard working group of faculty from across the UConn campuses. Their variety of opinions leads to lively discussions and productive work. GEOC includes chairs and co-chairs of each of the ten GEOC Subcommittees (Content Areas 1, 2, 3, 4; Competencies: W, Q, Second Language, Information Literacy, Computer Technology; and Assessment) and several ex-officio members (the directors of the W and Q Centers, a representative of the Senate CC&C). The committee is functioning well and represents faculty governance of this critical part of undergraduate education. In order to find out, how well the program is working, GEOC has started program assessment this past year in the areas of Writing, Information Literacy, and Content Area 4 (Science and Technology). This report summarizes both operation of the program and activities of the committee.

GENERAL EDUCATION COURSE APPROVALS

The GEOC has continued reviewing proposals to add courses to and revise existing courses within the General Education curriculum. In the AY 2007-2008, 73 proposals were reviewed, resulting in the addition of 37 new courses to the curriculum; 10 existing courses were revised. Some of the 73 proposals are still in the review process and some GEOC-approved courses have not yet reached review by the Senate. The program, as approved by the Senate, now contains 275 Content Area courses and 474 Competency (skill code) courses. The breakdown of these total figures is given in Table 1. Since some courses are included in more than one category, the totals are less than the sum of the individual categories.

*Table 1. Numbers of **courses now approved** for the General Education curriculum*

Content Area/Competency	100 level courses	200 level courses	Total number of courses
CA1 Arts and Humanities	77	45	120
CA2 Social Sciences	37	7	44
CA3 Science and Technology	51	3	54
CA4 Diversity & Multiculturalism	59	69	128
Total content area courses	**224**	**124**	**275**
Quantitative	45	33	78
Writing	29	367	395
Total skill courses	**74**	**400**	**474**

In addition to these new course reviews, the GEOC reviewed three proposals to offer existing General Education courses in intensive sessions (4 weeks or less). The breakdown of these reviews since 2005 is given in Table 2. Courses are approved either fully or provisionally, depending on the measure of assurance GEOC has that the Gen Ed objectives of a given course can be maintained in the shortened format. GEOC has collected faculty reports on provisionally approved intersession courses but proper assessment of the effectiveness of these courses must await the development of measures of course effectiveness as a whole. Future assessment of intersession courses will have to include intensive study abroad courses of four weeks or less.

Table 2. Total General Education courses reviewed ***for intensive session teaching 2005-08****.*

Course disposition	
Approved	27
Provisionally approved	15
Rejected	4

GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM OPERATION

The General Education course offerings and enrollments at all campuses have increased by 96 courses (5%) from 1906 (981+925) in Fall and Spring 2006-07 to 2002 (1020+982) in Fall and Spring 2007-08 (see low right numbers in Tables 6a and 6b). Tables 3 (F 2007) and 4 (S 2008) show the breakdown of courses and enrollments by General Education category and campus. Tables 3 / 4 and 6a / b result from numbers provided by different sources on campus and reflect different counting systems. Unlike Tables 6a and 6b, Tables 3 and 4 count individual sections of Gen Ed courses as separate courses which explains the higher numbers of 2611 courses for Fall 2007 and 2416 courses for Spring 2008. Furthermore, since some Gen Ed courses are included in more than one Content Area, the total of Content Area courses is actually fewer than the number shown in Tables 3 and 4. The same goes for the total of Gen Ed courses since some Content Area courses are also listed as W or Q courses.

Like last year, the offerings and enrollments in CA 1 and 2 exceed the ones in CA 3 and 4. However, the increase of courses and enrollments in CA 3 and 4 exceeds, in ratio, the increase in CA 1 and 2. The capacity of offerings in all Content Areas seems adequate to meet the needs of our undergraduate population (approximately 4000-5000 per class).

Since most W courses or sections fill up to a maximum of 19 students, we can assume that the W enrollment numbers equals the total number of seats available in W-courses. The availability of 100-level W seats has dramatically increased by approx. 25% (from 1987 seats last year to 2472 seats this year). Enrollment in 200-level W courses (writing in the major) has increased by approx. 20% from 8473 last year to 10187 this year. While there is still a shortage of 100-level W courses, the overall number of seats in W-courses has increased by approx. 19.4%. A meeting with department heads about the W question has been scheduled for Fall ‘08.

Table 3. General Education ***courses offered (C) and enrollment (E)*** *by campus and category. Fall 2007 (Individual sections of courses are counted as separate courses.)*

Campus	Avery Point		Hartford		Stamford		Storrs		Torrington		Waterbury		All campuses	
GenEd category	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E
Arts and Hum	11	356	27	772	21	633	273	8385	7	157	24	679	363	10982
Social Sciences	18	550	29	957	25	676	226	7797	7	174	16	550	321	10704
Sci and Tech	4	156	6	246	6	210	94	2655	1	41	4	186	115	3494
Sci and Tech Lab	17	290	36	381	11	225	269	4518	6	78	11	245	350	5737
Div and Multi	6	100	9	205	4	103	86	2210	3	67	5	93	113	2778
Div and Multi Int	8	253	11	397	10	293	123	4871	3	71	6	203	161	6088
Total Cont Area	**64**	**1705**	**118**	**2958**	**77**	**2140**	**1071**	**30436**	**27**	**588**	**66**	**1786**	**1423**	**39613**
Quantitative	**23**	**249**	**50**	**855**	**26**	**588**	**449**	**9401**	**10**	**183**	**22**	**570**	**580**	**11846**
Writing 100 level	4	77	6	112	4	71	41	766	0	0	3	53	58	1079
Writing 200 level	7	100	12	145	15	246	501	4749	5	58	10	129	550	5427
Total Writing	**11**	**177**	**18**	**257**	**19**	**317**	**542**	**5515**	**5**	**58**	**13**	**182**	**608**	**6506**
Total GenEd	**98**	**2311**	**186**	**4070**	**122**	**3045**	**2062**	**45352**	**42**	**829**	**101**	**2538**	**2611**	**57965**

Table 4. General Education ***courses offered (C) and enrollment (E)*** *by campus and category. Spring 2008 (Individual sections of courses are counted as separate courses)*

Campus	Avery Point		Hartford		Stamford		Storrs		Torrington		Waterbury		All campuses	
GenEd category	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E
Arts and Hum	18	505	25	713	20	503	253	8358	10	161	25	626	351	10866
Social Sciences	17	537	24	845	20	566	239	7758	7	133	18	568	325	10407
Sci and Tech	3	72	6	224	3	117	48	2105	1	50	3	72	64	2640
Sci and Tech Lab	13	183	20	310	13	236	216	3707	4	65	13	234	279	4735
Div and Multi	5	115	7	178	14	222	75	2013	4	45	8	154	113	2727
Div and Multi Int	9	263	11	379	8	225	127	4767	3	42	12	327	170	6003
Total Cont Area	**60**	**1675**	**93**	**2649**	**78**	**1869**	**958**	**28708**	**29**	**496**	**79**	**1981**	**1302**	**37378**
Quantitative	**24**	**425**	**35**	**715**	**22**	**487**	**367**	**7695**	**7**	**105**	**22**	**491**	**477**	**9918**
Writing 100 level	7	128	7	131	6	113	46	877	4	41	6	103	76	1393
Writing 200 level	12	98	12	176	16	231	507	4071	4	44	10	140	561	4760
Total Writing	**19**	**226**	**19**	**307**	**22**	**344**	**553**	**4948**	**8**	**85**	**16**	**243**	**637**	**6153**
Total GenEd	**103**	**2326**	**147**	**3671**	**122**	**2700**	**1878**	**41351**	**44**	**686**	**117**	**2715**	**2416**	**53449**

The enrollment data allow the calculation of average enrollment in General Education courses in each category of the system. However, the numbers shown in Table 5 are somewhat misleading since individual sections of a course are counted as separate classes. Moreover, some departments create sections of W courses for use by their faculty and don't delete sections with zero enrollment once registration is complete. Thus, actual enrollment numbers for Gen Ed courses are higher than the ones listed in Table 5. Traditionally, larger lectures are more likely to be found in Storrs than at the regional campuses. Courses in CA 3 (Science and Technology) and especially CA3 lab courses tend to show high enrollment. They are, however, divided into smaller lab sections. Among the CA 4 (Diversity and Multiculturalism) courses the ones in the international category are usually larger. Enrollment statistics for each semester furthermore indicate that W-sections tend to fill up to but rarely exceed the cap of 19 students. Instructors who significantly overenrolled students in W-courses have been contacted.

Table 5. ***Average class size*** *for General Education classes, 2007-2008*
(Note: Individual sections of courses are counted as separate classes. Practice in some departments is to create many sections of W courses for use by their faculty. However, sections with zero enrollment are usually not deleted from the official schedule once registration is complete. This complicates 200-level W average class size and impacts total W and total Gen Ed average class size. This problem is limited to the Storrs campus.)

Campus	Storrs	All Regionals	All Campuses
GenEd category			
Arts and Hum	32	27	31
Social Sciences	34	31	32
Sci and Tech	34	37	34
Sci and Tech Lab	17	16	17
Div and Multi	26	20	24
Div and Multi Intl	39	30	37
Total Cont Area	**29**	**26**	**28**

Quantitative	**21**	**19**	**21**
Writing 100 level	19	18	18
Writing 200 level	9	13	9
Total Writing	**10**	**15**	**10**
Total GenEd	**22**	**23**	**22**

The Senate *General Education Guidelines* recommend that most General Education courses be taught by full-time tenure-track or tenured faculty. In AY 2007-2008, this is true for 40.5% of all Gen Ed courses (see Tables 6a and 6b). This represents a percentage of 29.15% at the regional campuses and 45.5% at the Storrs campus. 54% of all Gen Ed courses at all campuses were offered by adjuncts and Teaching Assistants, the rest by non-tenure-track faculty and other professionals. Courses taught by adjuncts could be found significantly more often at the regional campuses (nearly 60%) than at Storrs. By comparison, significantly more courses taught by Teaching Assistants (approx. one third) were offered at Storrs. To be sure, adjuncts, TAs, and other professionals can be excellent and involved teachers. Yet, they are likely to be less integrated into the overall teaching mission of the university and less familiar with the *General Education Guidelines*, and require and deserve support and supervision to ensure the maintenance of teaching standards and fulfillment of General Education course goals.

The maintenance of the Gen Ed goals also creates a challenge whenever a course is passed on from the faculty who originally developed it and oversaw its approval to other instructors, independent of their rank. Supported by the Registrar's office, GEOC has therefore started to set up a system that will automatically contact every instructor who is scheduled to teach a General Education course in the following semester and alert her/him to the criteria of the Gen Ed Content Areas and/or Competencies.

*Table 6a. General Education **classes by instructor rank** at each campus Fall 2007 (% of total)*
(Note: Individual sections are not counted as separate classes)

Campus	Asst Prof	Assoc Prof	Prof	Instructor /Lecturer	Total full-t. faculty	Adjunct	GA	Other	Total part-t. faculty	Total Courses
Avery Point	10.9	9.4	7.8	0	28.1	54.7	9.4	7.8	71.9	64
Hartford	9.7	9.7	11.7	0	31.1	52.4	14.6	1.9	68.9	103
Stamford	4.4	19.8	9.9	0	34.1	61.5	3.3	1.1	65.9	91
Torrington	6.5	6.5	0	9.7	22.6	77.4	0	0	77.4	31
Waterbury	13.2	17.6	1.5	5.9	38.2	47.1	14.7	0	61.8	68
All regionals (avrg)	**8.9**	**12.6**	**6.2**	**3.1**	**30.8**	**58.6**	**8.4**	**2.2**	**69.2**	**71.4**
Storrs	**12.5**	**12.2**	**17.8**	**3.8**	**46.3**	**18.1**	**33.3**	**2.3**	**53.7**	**663**
All campuses	**11.3**	**12.6**	**14.2**	**3.2**	**41.3**	**31.5**	**25.0**	**2.3**	**58.7**	**1020**

*Table 6b. General Education **classes by instructor rank** at each campus Spring 2008 (% of total)*
(Note: Individual sections are not counted as separate classes)

Campus	Asst Prof	Assoc Prof	Prof	Instructor /Lecturer	Total full-t. faculty	Adjunct	GA	Other	Total part-t. faculty	Total Courses
Avery Point	11.3	7.0	9.9	0	28.2	57.7	11.3	2.8	71.8	71
Hartford	6.5	9.7	12.9	1.1	30.1	51.6	16.1	2.2	69.9	93
Stamford	5.6	28.9	8.9	0	43.3	52.2	3.3	1.1	56.7	90
Torrington	10.3	3.4	0	3.4	17.2	82.8	0	0	82.8	29
Waterbury	16.7	20.5	1.3	5.1	43.6	46.2	10.3	0	56.4	78
All regionals (avrg)	**10.1**	**13.9**	**6.6**	**1.9**	**32.5**	**58.1**	**8.2**	**1.2**	**67.5**	**72.2**

Storrs	**17.7**	**12.1**	**18.7**	**5.1**	**53.6**	**11.3**	**32.0**	**3.1**	**46.4**	**621**
All campuses	**15.4**	**13.4**	**14.1**	**3.8**	**46.7**	**27.1**	**23.7**	**2.4**	**53.3**	**982**

Since class size and credit load vary and full-time faculty tend to teach larger courses, the overall picture of instructors teaching Gen Ed courses slightly changes when looking at the credit/contact hour production by different ranks of instructors. As Tables 7a and 7b indicate, tenure-track or tenured full-time faculty produce 30.35% of Gen Ed credit hours at the regional campuses and 57% at the Storrs campus. Overall, regular full-time faculty teach considerably more than half of student contact hours in UConn's General Education program.

Table 7a. General Education ***credit hour production by instructor rank*** *at each campus Fall 2007 (% of total)*

Campus	Asst Prof	Assoc Prof	Prof	Instructor /Lecturer	Total full-t. faculty	Adjunct	GA	Other	Total part-t. fac.	Total Credit Hours
Avery Point	14.3	6.7	10.6	0	31.7	51.7	8.8	7.9	68.3	5488
Hartford	9.0	11.5	11.8	0	32.3	52.5	13.5	1.8	67.7	9655
Stamford	5.8	18.6	10.1	0	34.6	60.7	3.3	1.4	65.4	7561
Torrington	6.1	7.4	0	10.8	24.3	75.7	0	0	75.7	1904
Waterbury	17.9	24.0	0.9	4.8	47.6	41.6	10.7	0	52.4	6541
All regionals (avrg)	**10.6**	**13.6**	**6.7**	**3.1**	**34.1**	**56.4**	**7.3**	**2.2**	**65.9**	**6229.8**
Storrs	**16.0**	**14.4**	**25.0**	**6.3**	**61.6**	**15.3**	**21.7**	**1.4**	**38.4**	**104140**
All campuses	**14.8**	**14.5**	**21.1**	**5.2**	**55.6**	**24.1**	**18.7**	**1.6**	**44.4**	**135289**

Table 7b. General Education ***credit hour production by instructor rank*** *at each campus Spring 2008 (% of total)*

Campus	Asst Prof	Assoc Prof	Prof	Instructor /Lecturer	Total full-t. faculty	Adjunct	GA	Other	Total part-t. faculty	Total Credit Hours
Avery Point	5.7	6.5	10.6	0	22.7	60.9	14.3	2.1	77.3	5398
Hartford	15.6	8.8	8.2	0.2	32.7	52.6	12.6	2.0	67.3	8550
Stamford	6.0	25.6	7.9	0	39.5	55.3	4.0	1.1	60.5	6718
Torrington	6.6	4.1	0	4.1	14.8	85.2	0	0	85.2	1470
Waterbury	16.7	25.8	0.7	6.3	49.6	40.0	10.4	0	50.4	6388
All regionals (avrg)	**10.1**	**14.2**	**5.5**	**2.1**	**31.9**	**58.8**	**8.3**	**1.0**	**68.1**	**5704.8**
Storrs	**18.8**	**15.4**	**24.4**	**6.7**	**65.2**	**10.1**	**22.6**	**2.0**	**34.8**	**95829**
All campuses	**17.1**	**15.5**	**20.3**	**5.6**	**58.4**	**20.1**	**19.7**	**1.9**	**41.6**	**124353**

SUBSITUTIONS

According to the *General Education Guidelines*, schools and colleges have the explicit authority to make substitutions to the requirements for individual students. They are also required to make an annual report to the GEOC on the substitutions made, to ensure uniform interpretation of the guidelines across different academic units. The Registrar's office kindly supplies GEOC with a list of all substitutions made in a given AY. Follow-up meetings with the responsible individuals at the school/college level are scheduled as needed. A total of 418 substitutions were made in this third year of operation of the "new" General Education Requirements (Table 8); this number is drastically lower than last year's (778).

Like last year, CLAS being the largest college shows the bulk of substitutions. However, this reflects a very small percentage of CLAS graduates. As anticipated in last year's report, the substitutions made by the former College of Continuing Education (CTED) for BGS students have dropped to a more

acceptable level. The CTED numbers also include many courses pre-approved for substitution by the GEOC. Moderately high percentages of substitutions in the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (AGNR) as well as Education (EDUC) and Nursing (NURS) mostly reflect the needs of the transfer students served by these units.

Table 8. ***Substitutions*** *to the General Education Requirements* ***by School or College***

	# subs	# grads	subs/grad
ACES	-	-	-
AGNR	62	343	.18
BUSN	46	575	.08
CLAS	132	2364	.06
CTED	86	348	.25
EDUC	29	203	.14
EGBU	0	11	.00
ENGR	26	303	.09
FNAR	16	133	.012
NURS	20	141	.14
PHAR	1	102	.01
Total	**418**	4523	.09

Almost 40% of all substitutions were made to the CA4 Diversity and Multiculturalism requirement (Table 9), which corresponds to similar numbers last year. Given the relative newness of this category, this is not unexpected but will have to be addressed. This high number of substitutions partially reflects the fact that, unlike other Content Areas, no automatic substitutions are given to transfer students for Diversity and Multiculturalism courses taken at other institutions unless they transfer in as the equivalent to a specific UConn CA4 course. Substitutions for this Content Area are always considered on a case-by-case basis by the school or college, and are included in these numbers.

As last year, the fewest substitutions were made for the Q and Second Language requirements. Based on a new and Senate-approved policy to govern substitutions in these areas, the Academic Adjustments committee, of which the Chair of GEOC is a member, is meeting regularly to consider petitions from students requesting alternate ways of meeting the Second Language or Q requirements, on the basis of learning disabilities.

Table 9. ***Substitutions*** *to the* ***General Education Requirements by Category***

Category	Substitutions granted
CA1	41
CA2	29
CA3	100
CA4	157
Q	3
W	59
Second Language	29
Total	**418**

PROVOST'S GENERAL EDUCATION COURSE DEVELOPMENT GRANT COMPETITION

In Spring 2008, the Provost's General Education Course Development Grant Competition was held for the fifth time. This program has tremendously enriched UConn's General Education program and simultaneously the over all undergraduate program. It has proven to provide an additional incentive for faculty to develop innovative General Education courses that, in many cases, connect faculty's scholarly expertise in a given field with the goals of UConn's Gen Ed program. A pre-competition workshop run by the Chair of GEOC and the Director of the Institute of Teaching and Learning (ITL) familiarized faculty with the goals of UConn's Gen Ed program and the procedures of this competition. Twelve proposals were received. The review panel consisted of past competition winners, members of the ITL, GEOC members, and the Chair of GEOC. Six proposals were selected to be funded, most of them in part this year and in part next year. In all cases, the full amount (up to $10,000 including fringe benefits) of the budget proposed by the faculty has been approved for items such as supplies, travel support, course release, summer stipends, summer salaries, and guest speakers. This year's winners represent courses in programs as diverse as Economics, Linguistics, Modern and Classical Languages (Arabic, Chinese, French, Italian), Puerto Rican and Latino/a Studies, Sociology, and Women's Studies, and cover all of UConn's Gen Ed Content Areas and Competencies except for CA 3 (Science and Technology) and Q. The announcement of this year's winners was followed by a festive ceremony hosted by Provost Peter Nicholls and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Veronica Makowsky. At this event, all winners briefly presented their innovative projects.

Final reports of the winners of 2006 are due in June 2008 and will then be evaluated. All winners of the 2007 competition submitted a Year One Report and participated in a two-hour workshop moderated by the Chair of GEOC and the Director of ITL. Taking the participants' reports as a point of departure, the following items were addressed in a lively and rich discussion: innovative methodologies that actively engage students in large lectures and small seminars inside and outside the classroom (such as creative ways to implement collaborative learning, field trips, virtual discussions, simulation games, and more); student learning objectives (as outlined for the specific Gen Ed Content Areas and Competencies); ways of assessing student learning; surveys providing instructors with student feedback; interdisciplinary features; global features; connections between faculty expertise and Gen Ed course goals; procedural matters; and altogether thrills and challenges of preparing the proposed Gen Ed courses to be taught in AY 2008-09.

UConn's General Education program and thus the overall undergraduate offerings have clearly benefited from this competition. It has helped Gen Ed to move away from a "check list" of at times only moderately interesting courses to a stimulating set of offerings that makes use of faculty's scholarly expertise and passion. This involvement now enriches UConn's multifaceted Gen Ed program that is open to ongoing change as ever new topics and methodologies become relevant in today's society and research, i.e., war, interculturalism, human rights, gene technology, environmental issues, multidisciplinarity, teamwork, to name a few. The competition encourages faculty, on the content level, to teach what excites them and provide General Education at the same time and, on the level of pedagogy, to solicit the immensely valuable and forthcoming input of the Institute of Teaching and Learning for their course design and evaluation as well as for the implementation of technology.

*Table 10. Courses developed through the **support of the Provost's Competition** by Gen Ed category*

Category	Courses approved 2004-2007	2008 Proposal Winners
CA1	15	2
CA2	7	1
CA3	7	0
CA4	22	3
Q	3	0

W	16	2
Total	**43**	**6**

OVERSIGHT, INNOVATIONS, and REVISIONS

Assessment

The University of Connecticut instituted the "new" set of General Education Requirements in 2005. Over the course of this past Academic Year, GEOC has started an evaluation process to determine the extent to which the General Education program is meeting its goals. As part of these efforts, in consultation with faculty teaching the relevant courses, GEOC has translated the original criteria for inclusion of courses in each Content Area (CA) into a set of learning outcomes to be met by students. Assessment documents including student learning outcomes have been developed by the GEOC subcommittees for the Content Areas 2, 3, and 4, have been approved by GEOC, and are available on the GEOC website. The CA1 and Q subcommittees are currently working on such documents.

With respect to the actual assessment of Gen Ed Content Areas and Competencies, GEOC's Assessment subcommittee, with GEOC's approval, has elected a focused approach that concentrates on limited numbers of students in restricted areas of the curriculum. Data gathering has focused and will continue to focus on approaches sufficient in depth and complexity and on samples of students sufficient in number to allow for valid conclusions and meaningful recommendations for the improvement and strengthening of the program. Given the size and complexity of UConn's General Education program, the assessment efforts – perceived as a cycle including developing student learning goals and outcomes, data gathering, data analysis, recommendations for improvements, dissemination of the recommendations, implementation of improvements, and eventually new data gathering – will take several years.

Based on the abovementioned learning outcomes developed by GEOC subcommittees, the GEOC Assessment subcommittee, in consultation with the director of the Writing Center, Tom Deans, and Hedley Freake as a representative of the Sciences, has developed assessment plans for Writing, Information Literacy, and Content Area 3 (Sciences and Technology) in 2007 which were put into place in AY 2007-2008:

Assessment of Writing (W). Progress to date. May 1, 2008
(Coordinator: Tom Deans)

In the early summer of 2008, W assessment (as presented in the AY 2007-08 GEOC Assessment Proposal) will focus on the evaluation of final versions of the last papers seniors submitted in their Spring 2008 "W courses in the major" in Art History (ARTH), Human Development/Family Studies (HDFS), and Political Science (POLS). Originally we had secured the participation of four departments across the Content Areas 1, 2, 3 including one from the sciences, but the science department pulled out of the process too late for us to find another. We anticipate working with one science department, most likely Nursing or EEB, in Fall 2008 to round out our original plan. The assessment of Writing will be conducted under the leadership of Tom Deans, Director of the W Center, and with the help of departmental coordinators in ARTH (Duncan Givans), HDFS (Lisa Kraimer-Rickaby), and POLS (Virginia Hettenger) as well as six graduate assistants from these three departments.

While the actual reading and evaluation of students' writing samples will take place in May/June 2008 (see schedule in Appendix 1) the following has been completed during the 2007-08 Academic Year:

- The W assessment plan was drafted by Tom Deans and the GEOC Assessment Subcommittee.
- A Student Academic Writing Self-Efficacy Measure Questionnaire (see Appendix 2) has been developed by Scott Brown, Tom Deans, and graduate students of the School of Education.
- IRB approval was sought for the research plan and was granted on April 10, 2008.

- Faculty coordinators have been recruited from POLS, ARTH, and HDFS (see above).
- Faculty coordinators secured the participation of 12 W sections (6 from POLS, 3 each from ARTH and HDFS).
- Faculty coordinators, in coordination with Tom Deans, have drafted discipline-specific rubrics to rate student samples.
- In total, 120 students consented to participate (59 in POLS, 31 in HDFS, 30 in ARTH). For those 120, self-efficacy questionnaires have been administered; all of their writing samples were collected by May 5; grades for papers were collected by May 15.
- The self-efficacy questionnaires (see Appendix 2) have been sent to the School of Education for tallying of data. The School of Education will complete the quantitative analysis in June once all data (questionnaires, student paper ratings, student paper grades) is collected.
- Training of paper raters, scoring of the student papers, tallying of data, and initial analysis of findings is scheduled for May 26-June 13 (see Appendix 1).
- Analysis of correlations among student paper ratings, student self-efficacy measures, and paper grades will take place later in June.

The Final Report should be ready by Fall. It will determine the dissemination of the results and recommendations to departmental writing programs in AY 2008-09 (see the GEOC Assessment Proposal for AY 2008-09 submitted to Vice Provost Veronica Makowsky, May 2008).

Assessment of Information Literacy (IL)

In Fall 2008, GEOC recruited, with the permission and support of Tom Recchio, the Coordinator of the Freshman English program, students of ENGL 110/111 to take the Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills (SAILS) test on-line. This test is based on the standards developed by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) and made available by Kent State University. A total of 820 (50%) of students taking ENGL 110/111 and thus approximately a quarter of all incoming students took this test in a monitored environment during the first two weeks of classes *prior* to their instruction in information literacy in ENGL 110/111 and at the Homer Babbidge Library. A subset of these students took the same test again at the end of the Fall semester *after* having received instruction in information literacy in ENGL 110/111 and at the Homer Babbidge Library. The results of both rounds of testing will be made available by the facilitators of SAILS (at Kent State University) to UConn in late June or early July 2008. The results will provide information about the levels of information literacy of incoming UConn students compared to students at other colleges and universities and about the improvement of the participating students after formal instruction in information literacy during their first semester at UConn. These results will be examined by the GEOC Assessment subcommittee in collaboration with the GEOC Information Literacy subcommittee. Then steps for further assessment of Information Literacy will be determined (see the GEOC Assessment Proposal for 2008-2009 submitted to Vice Provost Veronica Makowsky, May 2008).

Assessment of Content Area 3 (CA3 Science and Technology). Progress to date, May 16, 2008
(Coordinator: Hedley Freake)

The Science and Technology Content Area (CA3) is the first Gen Ed Content Area to be evaluated. A course level analysis of the extent to which the CA3 learning goals were being met was conducted in non-gateway Gen Ed science courses in the Spring semester of 2008. A Graduate Assistant from the Neag School of Education was hired to interview science instructors to determine how and where they addressed the eight CA 3 learning goals (see Appendix 3) in their *teaching* (see Appendix 4) and the extent to which they *assessed* whether students achieved these goals (see Appendix 5).

Ten professors from Biology, Cognitive Science, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Marine Sciences, Nutrition, Psychology, and Physics, who taught non-gateway Gen Ed science courses taken largely by non-science majors, agreed to participate in the evaluation. Individual meetings were set up

between the GA and the professors. The first meeting focused on whether and to which extent the professors addressed the CA3 learning goals through their *instruction*. Available instructional materials and course websites were shared. At the second meeting, the discussion centered on how professors *assessed*, whether students met the CA3 learning goals in their courses. Assessment materials were collected and evaluated. At these meetings, each professor was asked to rate how well they addressed each CA3 learning goal in their *instruction* (see table in Appendix 4; questionnaire is available upon request) and to which extent they *assessed* student competencies (see table in Appendix 5, questionnaire is available upon request). The GA independently rated assessment in each course, based on her reading of the materials supplied by the instructors (Appendix 5). A four point scale was used and courses were judged to be meeting a learning goal, if they scored a 3 or 4 (1=not at all; 2=barely; 3=sometimes; 4=very well covered). For the convenience of comparison, an additional table (Appendix 6) provides an overview of the combined results of these ratings with respect to both *teaching* and *assessing* the eight CA3 learning goals in each course.

CA3 Student Learning Goals 1 (content and vocabulary), 4 (science vs. pseudoscience) and 7 (scientific impact on the world) were well covered in the *instruction* of all courses. Learning Goal 8 (scientific inquiry skills) was instructed in all courses that had a lab component. Other goals such as 2 (methods and technologies), 5 (scientific experiment description), and 6 (unresolved scientific questions) were covered in 8/9 courses, with the exception of Learning Goal 3 (scientific method), which was instructed in 5/9. Since the GA did not directly observe instruction, these data represent the professors' own ratings, but overall coverage of the CA3 learning goals appears good.

Assessment within courses of whether students actually achieved these eight Learning Goals was less complete. All courses evaluated Learning Goal 1 (content and vocabulary) and all lab courses Learning Goal 8 (scientific inquiry skills). Learning Goal 2 (methods and technology), 4 (science vs. pseudoscience), and 6 (unresolved scientific questions) were assessed in 7/9 courses. Learning Goal 7 (scientific impact on the world) was assessed in 6/9 courses and 5 (scientific experiment description) in 5/9 courses. Learning Goal 3 (scientific method), was assessed in 3/9 courses. Some differences were noted between the professors' self-ratings and those of the GA, though these appeared minor.

Overall, CA3 courses are addressing almost all of the learning goals established for this Content Area. Assessment of learning goals within the courses and the determination of the extent to which students meet the CA3 learning goals is less complete. A number of exemplary practices, both with respect to instruction and assessment were identified. A meeting was held with the participating CA3 course instructors in May 2008 where the preliminary findings of the assessment were shared and they were asked to talk about the exemplary practices that had been identified. A rich and powerful conversation resulted that will be continued in Fall 2008 (see the GEOC Assessment Proposal for 2008-2009 submitted to Vice Provost Veronica Makowsky, May 2008).

Thanks to the initiative and thoughtful planning of Hedley Freake and the Neag GA Elizabeth Kloeblen, CA3 assessment in 2007-08 has developed a model that may be adjusted to similar assessment efforts in other Content Areas of UConn's General Education program.

Plans for Further Assessment, Evaluations, and Recommendations for Improvements

Plans for continued W, IL, CA3 assessment and its evaluation and dissemination as well as for the beginning of CA4 assessment have been outlined in a separate document "GEOC Assessment Proposal for AY 2008-2009" submitted to Vice Provost Veronica Makowsky in May 2008. Plans for CA2 (Social Sciences) assessment are in the pipeline and are likely to be modeled after the CA3 assessment effort; they have been postponed to AY 2009-10 in order not to overburden the system. An assessment document listing learning outcomes for CA1 is currently being developed by the GEOC CA1 subcommittee.

Recertification of General Education Courses

Part of GEOC's charge from the Senate is to develop procedures for the periodic recertification of courses for continued inclusion in the General Education curriculum. In AY 2007-08, GEOC has begun discussing the purpose of and process for course recertification. A structured plan should be in place by the end of AY 2008-2009. Overall, GEOC intends to use the recertification process to find out if those responsible for offering a given Gen Ed course still think it appropriate for the Gen Ed curriculum and if the documentation (syllabi, exams, lab reports etc.) provides evidence that the course meets the appropriate Gen Ed criteria. Simultaneously this process ought to be designed in a way that reminds instructors of the respective Gen Ed course criteria and familiarizes them with the student learning outcomes that have been developed by GEOC since most Gen Ed courses were first proposed. This way, recertification may assist faculty in making the transition from thinking exclusively about what they do as teachers to also thinking about what students learn in the classroom.

In GEOC, the discussion about recertification is in it's early stages. It has so far focused on the advantages and disadvantages of a relatively simple approach to recertification (concentrating on re-approval more than assessment), a more complex and time-consuming but also data-richer approach (including elements of assessment), and a two-tiered recertification process allowing for elements of both. The "simple" approach would involve a short recertification form and the request for evidence (syllabi, exams, etc.), all to be reviewed by the respective GEOC subcommittees. The more complex approach would establish a more in-depth inquiry including questions for faculty – and, in the case of Writing, programs – about Gen Ed student learning objectives, pedagogy, and assessment of student learning. A two-tiered approach would involve the "simple" approach for most courses and the more in-depth inquiry for select courses across the Gen Ed program. The latter approaches would make the recertification process more complex and may require funds to hire help for the data collection and evaluation from outside of the GEOC, but they would also provide useful contributions to the assessment of the General Education program (see GEOC Assessment Proposal submitted to Vice Provost Veronica Makowky, May 2008). Either way, a rotation cycle for recertification needs to be developed across the content areas and competencies that will allow for regular review and renewal of the curriculum, without overwhelming the GEOC subcommittees. At this point, GEOC will require more discussion before making a decision about practical recertification.

Proposed Cross-Content Area General Education Courses

In recent years, GEOC has received more and more interdisciplinary course proposals that could not easily be placed in one single CA 1, 2, or 3. Lacking a clear policy that would allow for bridges across two of the CAs 1, 2, or 3 (combinations with CA4 have been permitted all along), such course proposals would occasionally fall "in between the cracks" and be rejected. Furthermore, at colloquia about the 2008 Academic Plan, faculty repeatedly complained about the hurdles UConn's curricular approval system provides for interdisciplinary courses in general and proposals to the Gen Ed program in particular. Most importantly, today's and tomorrow's global challenges, e.g., in healthcare, the environment, trade, and politics, will have to be solved in interdisciplinary teams. Many of our students will work in such interdisciplinary teams. Therefore, they need training in problem-based multidisciplinary thinking. Some Gen Ed courses could provide models for connecting the knowledge traditionally taught in disciplinary "silos." While no student should be required to take cross-content area Gen Ed courses, it makes sense for the Gen Ed program to provide them with this option. Experiencing one or several cross-content area Gen Ed courses may inspire students to seek out further connections between their majors and other areas of knowledge and may facilitate an altogether enriched educational experience at UConn.

Currently, the *General Education Guidelines* approved by the Senate permit the approval of courses that fulfill the criteria for any of the four Content Areas in combination with a Competency such

as Q or W. A course may also fulfill the criteria for Content Area 1, 2, or 3 in combination with Content Area 4. But combinations across the Content Areas 1, 2, or 3 are currently prohibited.

This past year, GEOC had intense discussions about the advantages and disadvantages of courses connecting any two of the three Content Areas 1, 2, and 3. Such connections would affect both course approval by GEOC and the Senate and students' choice of courses that fulfill the Gen Ed requirements. Under discussion were not INTD courses which may not automatically bridge Content Areas, nor merely interdisciplinary courses which in many cases may stay within a single Content Area. Under discussion were courses that would bridge two of the Content Areas 1, 2, and 3, e.g., Social Sciences and Arts/Humanities, or Sciences and Social Sciences, or Sciences and Arst/Humanities. GEOC's explicit goal is to preserve the integrity of each Content Area (as opposed to dilution) and yet allow for connections across Content Areas. In this approach, GEOC follows the idea that the whole (of a course connecting Content Areas) is bigger than its parts (elements of two separate Content Areas). After thorough deliberation, GEOC approved a motion to add the following text about Gen Ed course approvals to the *General Education Guidelines*. This would mark a change in the University By-Laws and would thus have to be approved by the Senate C&CC and Senate:

> "In the interest of securing student learning in each of the Content Areas and simultaneously providing models for connections across Content Areas, proposals for General Education courses may include components of more than one Content Area. A course that adequately fulfills the specific individual criteria of *each* of two Content Areas may be approved as cross-content area General Education course and will be listed under each of the two Content Areas. A course may fulfill the criteria of three Content Areas and be listed as such, only if one of the three is Content Area Four**.** Commitment to each Content Area must be deep enough to satisfy the criteria of that Content Area. If, on the other hand, a course fulfills the specific criteria of only one Content Area, the course will not qualify as a cross-content area General Education course. See criteria for individual Content Areas for further clarification. Those who propose cross-content area General Education courses are encouraged to consult with the respective GEOC subcommittees. Note: For rules how students meet the General Education requirements in different Content Areas, see "Content Area Operating Principles" in PART A."

Another passage, also representing a change in the *General Education Guidelines* and thus By-Laws, lists changes in the structure according to which students could select courses with multiple designations that would fulfill the General Education requirements:

- "One and only one, Group Four course may also serve as a Group One, Group Two, or Group Three requirement.
- For all Groups, there can be multiple designations. An individual course can be approved for
  - one Group; or
  - two Groups; or
  - three Groups, if one of the three is Group Four.
- Students taking a course with multiple designations across two of Groups One, Two, or Three, must decide for which of these Groups the cross-content area course will be counted for on their plan of study.
- Only one cross-content area course may count toward the two courses required for any one Group.
- INTD courses are not necessarily cross-content area courses nor are cross-content area courses necessarily INTD courses. […]"

The Chair of the Senate C&CC agreed to invite the Chair of GEOC to a meeting of the Senate C&CC in Fall to present this proposal. If it should be approved (with or without revisions), it would then go to the Senate.

Intersession Course Action Request (CAR) and Report Forms

According to rules set by the University Senate, "GEOC approval is required before offering a General Education course for a duration of four weeks or less. Background: Approval of courses for inclusion in the University General Education system requires considerations of both content and pedagogy. The latter is likely to be altered when courses are taught in intensive sessions of less than four weeks duration" (Senate Minutes of April 4, 2005). In recent years, GEOC approved a number of courses to be offered in intersessions (see Table 2, p. 2 above). A friendly reminder of this regulation was sent out by Vice Provost Veronica Makowsky to all faculty. In order to make the approval process more transparent the necessary forms as well as a list of approved courses have been made more visibly available on the GEOC website: http://geoc.uconn.edu/Intersession_Main.html.

Second Languages and Quantitative Competencies

- In alignment with the University's goal to provide undergraduates with opportunities to become engaged global citizens, GEOC approved a motion to allow for some General Education courses to be taught in a language other than English. GEOC considers the availability of these courses an asset to the University. However, a sentence in the catalog and schedule identifying the language should assist students and advisors (e.g., "Portions of this courses are taught in XXX" or "Taught in XXX"). In March 2008, the Senate Executive Committee requested Deans, Department Heads, School/College Curricula & Courses Committees to identify and report such courses. The Senate Office will work with the Registrar's Office to update the respective catalog copies.
- In the interest of clarity, style, and updating, minor revisions (not affecting the actual requirements) in the Second Language Competency and Quantitative Competency sections of the *General Education Guidelines* have been approved by GEOC and are under discussion in the Senate C&CC.

Revision of the Senate *Course Proposal Guidelines*

In collaboration with the Senate C&CC, GEOC provided revisions (in the interest of clarity and practicality, not affecting the requirements) of the parts of the *Senate Course Proposal Guidelines* that refer to the General Education requirements. Thanks go to Marie Cantino who predominantly completed this task. Her revisions have been approved by GEOC.

ONE COURSE ACTION REQUEST (CAR) FORM

The current Course Action Request (CAR) form used by GEOC and the Senate C&CC is technically outdated and cumbersome for faculty to use, and so is the multilayered process for course approval which requires faculty to use different forms for departmental and college approval and which occasionally results in the failure of a course to move expeditiously through the system. Since all levels of course approval require some of the same information, it makes sense to develop one single form for approval of new or revision of existing courses at the university. This way, faculty would fill out a single form that would then be routed automatically through the levels of approval required for the requested action. The relevant copy would then be available to the registrar's office staff for inclusion in the catalog and course schedule.

In summer of 2007, GEOC and the Senate initially requested the BEST initiative team to take on the technical side of this project. When this did not work out, UITS developed the new form, funded by the Provost's Office. The form underwent several rounds of revisions and has now been tested by GEOC members and others. After final revisions, it will be available in Fall 2008, however initially only for Course Action Requests to the GEOC and the Senate C&CC. Discussions about its adoption by the colleges and about the revisions needed for their use will follow in AY 2008-09.

GENERAL EDUCATION RELATED CROSS-CAMPUS INITIATIVES

Global Learning

The work of the Provost's Task Force on Developing Global Citizens and its Curriculum subcommittee has not per se been linked to the GEOC. Yet, the former and the current Chairs of GEOC have somewhat co-chaired the Curriculum subcommittee of the Provost's Task Force on Developing Global Citizenship. This Global Curriculum subcommittee's Progress Report has been submitted to Provost Peter Nicholls and Vice Provost Veronica Makowsky in May 2008. In some areas GEOC's responsibility and the university's agenda to enhance student preparation for global citizenship and thus offering an expanded and better organized global curriculum clearly overlap, specifically when it comes to providing students with second language competency, cross-cultural proficiency, and the areas of knowledge covered by courses in the international category of the Content Area 4 (Diversity and Multiculturalism). In addition, student learning outcomes for Gen Ed CA4 have been developed this year and CA4 assessment will begin in AY 2008-09 (see the GEOC Assessment Proposal for AY 2008-08 submitted to Vice Provost Veronica Makowsky, May 2008). Once curricular questions of global pathways, a global certificate, the inventory of courses addressing global issues, and alike have been solved (see recommendations in the Progress Report of the Provost's Developing Global Citizenship Curriculum Subcommittee, May 2008), collaboration between GEOC and the administrative body in charge of things international at UConn is likely to develop. Global learning is already a part of UConn's General Education program as all courses satisfying the international category of the CA4 requirement help develop global learning and could represent contributions to global pathways and students' global certificates. The same goes for a number of courses from the other Content Areas. Thus, a more defined global curriculum at UConn will be able to build, in part, on what's already available through the General Education program. A strong agenda to expand and clearly organize global learning and preparing for global citizenship across campus would benefit UConn's undergraduate program in general and its Gen Ed program in particular.

Second Languages and Cultures Learning Commons at Homer Babbidge Library

In alignment with the Provost Office's initiative to internationalize the campus, the development of a new Second Languages and Cultures Learning Commons has been discussed between the Homer Babbidge Library's Learning Commons Development Team and the Chair of GEOC. Currently, UConn's library provides services supporting four of the five General Education Competencies: the Q (Quantitative) Center, the W (Writing) Center, the Learning Resources Center (Computer Technology), and the Reference and Research Assistance (Information Literacy). The Second Languages and Cultures Center would be centrally located in the library like the other centers and would address the fifth Gen Ed Competency, namely to stimulate and support students' second language learning and cross-cultural proficiency. In the long run, this center may develop into a "happening" Global Center providing easy access to digital and non-digital reference materials, computer programs, and TV channels in many languages from around the world; tutoring in many languages; and a stimulating "hangout" (possibly a "global café") where students would meet, converse in foreign languages, and prepare for or report on study abroad.

To date, a meeting was organized by Kim Chambers to include several members of the Department of Modern and Classical Languages and the Chair of GEOC. Further development of the Second Languages and Cultures Commons project awaits funding.

FYE Teaching Module on General Education

The Chair of GEOC has developed the draft of a Gen Ed teaching module to be archived and used by FYE instructors. Such a module can be taught in one of the fourteen session of any one-credit

FYE course. Its purpose is to help incoming students grasp how General Education can benefit them in becoming and staying a well-rounded educated person, professional, and citizen; in getting to know disciplines which may then be chosen as majors; and, in the case of thematic pathways (e.g., focusing on global or environmental issues), in experiencing connections between different disciplines.

GENERAL EDUCATION WORKSHOPS ON CAMPUS

In order to facilitate understanding and expanding the "new" General Education requirements among students and faculty, several workshops revolving around the purpose, teaching, and learning of General Education at UConn were given on campus:

- "General Education Workshop for Freshman Orientation Leaders" (Kim Chambers and Katharina von Hammerstein, March 2008)
- "Workshop in Preparation of the Provost's General Education Course Development Grant Competition" (Katharina von Hammerstein and Keith Barker, February 2008)
- "Year One Workshop for the Provost's Gen Ed Course Grant Competition Winners of 2007" (Katharina von Hammerstein and Keith Barker, May 2008)

NATIONAL CONFERENCES

- Former and current GEOC Chairs Hedley Freake and Katharina von Hammerstein, both co-chairing the Curriculum subcommittee of the Provost's Task Force on Developing Global Citizens, attended the Conference on Fostering Global Citizenship in Brattleboro, VT, in November 2007, along with other UConn faculty and administrators involved in global education. In an informal report submitted by Katharina von Hammerstein to Vice Provost Veronica Makowksy in December 2008, this group provided the Provost's Office with recommendations concerning internationalizing the UConn campuses and enhancing student preparation for global citizenship.
- Katharina von Hammerstein, Hedley Freake, and John Bennett from GEOC attended the AAC&U *General Education and Assessment* conference in Boston, MA, February 21-23, 2008. Katharina von Hammerstein, Hedley Freake, and Lynne Goodstein ran a very well attended workshop entitled "Faculty Ownership of General Education: Teaching What Excites you!" In this workshop, they presented the models of UConn's faculty governance of Gen Ed in general and both of UConn's course development competitions in particular: the Provost Gen Ed Course Development Grant Competition and the Honors Course Development Grant Competition. The audience's response was extremely positive. Thus, this presentation may have contributed to enhancing UConn's national visibility and reputation as an institution at the forefront of curricular innovation.

  The conference was also attended by Eric Soulsby who is a member of the GEOC Assessment Subcommittee and former GEOC member Manuela Wagner. For all UConn attendees, it was a useful opportunity to examine approaches taken by other institutions to General Education, assessment, and globalization of the curriculum. As a direct result of this conference, the attending group met in May 2008 to discuss the development of university-wide Principles (modeling an approach taken by the University of Indiana-Purdue University, Indianapolis) to define either just undergraduate learning or the overall character of UConn as an institution of research and higher education. This initial brainstorming session will lead to a meeting with Vice Provost Veronica Makowsky in August 2008.
- Hedley Freake, Chair of the GEOC Assessment Subcommittee, Eric Soulsby, and possibly John Bennett furthermore attended the Summer Institute of the New England Educational Assessment Network (NEEAN) June 6-7, 2008, to connect with other institutions on issues of assessment.

STAFFING

Anabel Perez is the Administrator of and permanent staff person for GEOC. She splits her time 50:50 between GEOC and the Individualized Major/Interdisciplinary Studies program. Her performance this past year has been highly meritorious, particularly in ensuring a smooth transition from the former to the current GEOC Chair. Her constant presence while GEOC Chairs come and go ensures continuity and is essential to the successful operation of GEOC. Anabel Perez represents GEOC's memory and is a very well organized and independently thinking and working administrator. She provides very important support for GEOC's chair, GEOC's subcommittees, and all inquiries by faculty, students, and advisors.

GEOC COMMITTEE MEMBERS, 2007-2008 ACADEMIC YEAR

Katharina von Hammerstein (‘10), GEOC Chair	MCL
*John Bennett ('08)	ME
*Marie Cantino ('08)	PNB
Rosa Helena Chinchilla (‘09)	MCL
Daniel Civco (‘10)	NRME
Cora Lynn Deibler (‘10)	ART
Michael Darre (Senate Curricula & Courses Committee)	ANSC
in Spring ’08 occasionally substituted by Janice Clark	BUS
*Arnold Dashefsky ('08)	SOCI
Thomas Deans (W Center Director, on sabbatical, S’08)	ENGL
Niloy Dutta (’09)	PHYS
*Clare Eby ('08) (Hartford Campus)	ENGL
Anke Finger (’09)	MCL
*Hedley Freake ('08)	NUSC
Peter Gogarten ('10)	MCB
Jane Goldman (’09)	HDFS
*Dean Hanink ('08)	GEOG
William Lott (‘09)	ECON
Felicia Pratto (‘09)	PSYC
Thomas Roby (Q Center Director)	MATH
Xae Alicia Reyes ('09)	EDCI
Murphy Sewall (‘09)	BUSN
John Troyer (‘09)	PHIL
Robert Ganim (Undergraduate Student Rep)	

Anabel Perez (Administrator)

*: Two members have been on GEOC since its inception: Clare Eby and Hedley Freake. Many thanks to both of them as well as to John Bennett, Marie Cantino, Dean Hanink, and Manuela Wagner who all provided valuable input and are now rotating off the committee.

Special thanks go to Hedley Freake for his skillful chairmanship of GEOC 2004-2007 and his very generous, highly qualified, and completely unassuming support since then. He facilitated a very smooth transfer from one GEOC Chair to another.

GEOC SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS, 2007-2008 ACADEMIC YEAR

Arts and Humanities
*Cora Lynn Deibler
*John Troyer
Katherine Capshaw Smith
Gustavo Nanclares
Glenn Stanley

Computer Technology
*William Lott
*Murphy Sewall
Kim Chambers
Andrew De Palma
Stephen Park

Writing
*Thomas Deans (Fall 2007)
*Jane Goldman
Kathleen Tonry (Spring 08)
Janice Clark
Steve Zinn
Nicole Fekete (student)

Social Sciences
*Dean Hanink
*Felicia Pratto
David Atkin
Linda Lee
Jeremy Pressman
Ronald Sabatelli
Susi Wurmbrand

Information Literacy
*John Bennett
Daniel Civco (starting)
Francine DeFranco
Andrea Hubbard
David Lavoie
Carolyn Lin
Letitia Naigles

Assessment
*Hedley Freake
Katharina von Hammerstein
Scott Brown
Tom Deans
Desmond McCaffrey
Felicia Pratto
Eric Soulsby

Science and Technology
*Marie Cantino
*Niloy Dutta
John Ayers
Adam Fry
Tom Meyer

Second Language
Xae Alicia Reyes
Rosa Helena Chinchilla (S08)
Manuela Wagner (Fall 07)
Rajeev Bansal
Kenneth Fuchsman
Catherine Jarvis-Ross
Barbara Lindsey

Diversity and Multiculturalism
*Arnold Dashefsky
*Clare Eby (Fall 2007)
*Anke Finger (Spr 2008)
Alexinia Baldwin
Morty Ortega
Robert Stephens
Richa Attre (Fall 2007)

Quantitative
*Peter Gogarten
*Thomas Roby
Philip Best
James Cole
Mekonnen Gebremichael
David Gross
Lauren Schlesselman

* co-chairs

Appendices

1 – Writing Assessment: Schedule for May/June 2008

2 – Writing Assessment: Self-Efficacy Questionnaire

3 – CA3 Assessment: Learning Goals for Gen Ed CA3 (Science and Technology) courses

4 – CA3 Assessment: Alignment between Teaching and CA3 Learning Goals (self ratings by instructors)

5 – CA3 Assessment: Alignment between Assessment and CA3 Learning Goals (self ratings by instructor and ratings by GA)

6 – CA3 Assessment: Alignment between Teaching and Assessment in CA3 courses and the CA3 Leaning Goals

GEOC, Annual Report 2008, Appendix 1

DRAFT GEOC W Assessment Schedule, Summer 2008: ARTH, HDFS, POLS (Coordinator: Tom Deans)

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
May 26 Memorial Day	May 27 Orientation to project aims and timeline Discussion of WAC assessment readings Discussion of rubrics and selected student papers [everyone 9am-3pm]	28 AM: Rater orientation and calibration; practice papers PM: Start reading/scoring by rubric traits + holistic [everyone 9am-3pm]	29 Reading/scoring using rubric traits + holistic [raters 9am-3pm]	30 Reading/scoring using rubric traits + holistic [raters; 9am-1pm; AH and HDFS may not need Friday]
June 2 Reconciliation of scoring disagreements Send rubric scores to SOE for entry and analysis Qualitative discussion (in department clusters) of patterns within each batch; notes toward report [everyone 9am-3pm]	3 AM: All read papers across all three departments + discuss observations PM: Reports from each department cluster on observations, patterns, initial analysis, recommendations [everyone 9am-2pm]	4 AM: Orientation to scoring for sentence-level/editing issues only [raters together 9am-noon] PM: Start deep audit of source use for selected papers [raters solo off site]	5 AM: Scoring for sentence-level issues only [raters together 9am-noon] PM: Deep audit of selected papers [raters solo off site]	6 Deep audit of selected papers [raters solo off site] Each department rating team submits its report on deep audit findings by end of day on Friday.
June 9 Reflections and Planning: Initial analysis and interpretation. Implications? Ideal next steps? Revisions to process for next round? [everyone 2pm-5pm] - Optional (but encouraged!): Drinks and dinner at Tom's house (89 Bundy Lane)	10 No formal meeting [Faculty coordinators review findings this week and prep for drafting final report. Bring notes on Friday.]	11 No formal meeting	12 No formal meeting	13 Project final report writing session [faculty coordinators 9am-1pm] Write proposal for Quinnipiac conference? (due June 18) Complete report done by June 30.

GEOC, Annuarl Report 2008, Appendix 2

Writing Self-Efficacy Measure

The *Writing Self-Efficacy Measure* is a scale designed to assess your beliefs about your skills and abilities to write effectively. This measure will allow the UConn General Education Oversight Committee an opportunity to evaluate the impact of courses and experiences you have had at UConn on your confidence about your writing skills.

Your responses will be completely confidential and no names or individual responses will be reported. Only group responses and patterns will be shared in a report to help students and professors enhance the writing instruction provided here at UConn.

Your cooperation is critical to the successful evaluation of the writing skills of UConn students.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Name: _____ Your PeopleSoft # _____

Please respond to the following questions by **circling the number** that you think best reflects your response to the statement. Please note the following codes:

SD = Strongly Disagree
D = Disagree
N = Neutral
A = Agree
SA = Strongly Agree

1.) **In writing a paper, I feel confident that I can _____**

	SD	D	N	A	SA
a) express my thoughts clearly.	1	2	3	4	5
b) propose an argument and support it with ample and relevant evidence.	1	2	3	4	5
c) develop my own claims in ways that go beyond summarizing information delivered in class, textbooks, and sources.	1	2	3	4	5
d) revise across drafts--that is, I am inclined to write at least one draft and make major changes to it.	1	2	3	4	5
e) edit and proofread my work effectively before handing it in.	1	2	3	4	5
f) find relevant and reliable sources online.	1	2	3	4	5
g) find scholarly journal articles and books in the library.	1	2	3	4	5
h) cite my sources using an established academic citation system.	1	2	3	4	5
i) summarize sources accurately and concisely as part of	1	2	3	4	5

building an argument.					
j) find a balance between using another's ideas and my own.	1	2	3	4	5
In writing a paper, I feel confident that I can _____	**SD**	**D**	**N**	**A**	**SA**
k) properly introduce and incorporate quotations, paraphrases, and summaries from sources into my writing.	1	2	3	4	5
l) use correct grammar, punctuation, and writing mechanics.	1	2	3	4	5
m) use organizing structures *other* than the 5-paragraph theme or essay.	1	2	3	4	5
o) create a logical and stylistic flow between paragraphs.	1	2	3	4	5
p) integrate charts, graphs, tables or other quantitative data into an academic paper.	1	2	3	4	5
q) identify my own strengths and weaknesses.	1	2	3	4	5

2.) **I am confident that I can successfully communicate, in writing, what I want to say in each of the following writing tasks:**

	SD	**D**	**N**	**A**	**SA**
a) Prepare a resume and cover letter describing my employment history and skills.	1	2	3	4	5
b) Compose an effective one or two page essay in answer to a test question.	1	2	3	4	5
c) Write a paper of 5-7 pages and responds to a complex reading or set of readings.	1	2	3	4	5
d) Write an extended review of the research literature on a topic in my major.	1	2	3	4	5
e) Write a lab report.	1	2	3	4	5
f) Write a term paper of 15 to 20 pages.	1	2	3	4	5
g) Write a 10 page paper that advances an original argument and supports it with both primary and secondary sources.	1	2	3	4	5
h) Write a letter to the editor of the local newspaper.	1	2	3	4	5
i) Write a business letter complaining about a product I purchased.	1	2	3	4	5
j) Compose an essay expressing my view on a controversial topic in relation to the views of others.	1	2	3	4	5
k) Read, understand, and summarize an article in a scholarly journal.	1	2	3	4	5

CONTINUE TO NEXT PAGE

3.) **Concerning my editing skills, I am confident that I can _____.**

	SD	D	N	A	SA
a) correctly punctuate a one-page passage	1	2	3	4	5
b) edit for correct academic grammar and syntax	1	2	3	4	5
c) edit for style (concision, clarity, sentence variety, flow, transitions, active/passive voice, precision, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5

4.) For your final paper for this course, did you, **OR** do you plan to…

	Did		Plan to do	
a) write more than a single draft?	yes	no	yes	no
b) revise significantly between drafts?	yes	no	yes	no
c) see your instructor during office hours?	yes	no	yes	no
d) talk to friends or classmates about your paper?	yes	no	yes	no
e) share a draft with a friend or classmate?	yes	no	yes	no
f) go to the Writing Center?	yes	no	yes	no
g) consult a librarian to find sources?	yes	no	yes	no
h) use online resources?	yes	no	yes	no
i) use the spell-checker in your word processor?	yes	no	yes	no
j) use the grammar-checker in your word processor?	yes	no	yes	no
k) make use of other research, writing or editing resources? And if yes, which ones?	yes	no	yes	no

_____

_____

_____

5.) My top three writing strengths are:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

6.) The top three areas in which I need to improve my writing are:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

CONTINUE TO NEXT PAGE

Demographic Information

7.) Sex:
___ Male ___Female

8.) Year in School:
___ Freshman
___ Sophomore
___ Junior
___ Senior
___ Other: (specify) _____

9.) Your major (or anticipated major): _____

10.) Ethnicity/Race:
___ White
___ African American
___ American Indian or Alaskan Native
___ Asian
___ Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander
___ Latina/o or Hispanic
___ Other

11.) Are you an international student?
__ Yes ___No

12a.) Is English your primary language?
__ Yes ___No

12b.) If no, what is your primary language? _____

13.) Did you take Freshman English (ENGL 110 or 111) at UConn?
__ Yes ___No

14.) Have you taken any UConn W (writing-intensive) courses before this one?
__ Yes ___No

Thank you for your cooperation.

GEOC, Annual Report 2008, Appendix 3

Learning Goals for General Education Science and Technology Courses, CA3

Definition and Criteria of CA3 (from GEOC guidelines):

These courses acquaint students with scientific thought, observation, experimentation, and formal hypothesis testing, and enable students to consider the impact that developments in science and technology have on the nature and quality of life. Knowledge of the basic vocabulary of science and technology is a prerequisite for informed assessments of the physical universe and of technological developments.

Courses appropriate to this category should:
1. Explore an area of science or technology by introducing students to a broad, coherent body of knowledge and contemporary scientific or technical methods;

2. Promote an understanding of the nature of modern scientific inquiry, the process of investigation, and the interplay of data, hypotheses, and principles in the development and application of scientific knowledge;

3. Introduce students to unresolved questions in some area of science or technology and discuss how progress might be made in answering these questions; and

4. Promote interest, competence, and commitment to continued learning about contemporary science and technology and their impact upon the world and human society.

Laboratory courses in this category must teach fundamental principles of the biological and/or physical sciences through hands-on participation.

Mission:

To acquaint students with scientific thought, observation, experimentation and formal hypothesis testing

To introduce students to the basic vocabulary of science and technology and the process of scientific inquiry so they can make informed assessments of the physical universe and of technological developments.

To enable students to consider the impact that developments in science and technology have on the world, its processes, and the quality of life

Learning Goals:

Students should:
1. know the basic concepts and vocabulary of two areas of science or technology and the importance of these areas to modern society

2. be familiar with at least two contemporary scientific or technical methods and understand how they are applied to gain scientific or technical knowledge

3. be able to explain the conceptual basis of the Scientific Method , including its definition, motivation, steps of application, hypothesis testing, and misapplications

4. be able to distinguish between science and pseudoscience

5. be able to describe a scientific experiment that he or she is familiar with and explain how it applies the steps of the scientific method

6. be familiar with some unresolved scientific questions

7. be able to analyze debates about the roles science and technology play in shaping the world and human society

8. acquire skills associated with scientific inquiry

Learning Objectives

Students must be able to:
1a. describe the underlying principles of two areas of science or technology.

1b. explain why these areas of science and technology are important to modern society

2. describe at least two contemporary scientific or technical methods and how these methods are used to advance knowledge

3. explain the conceptual basis of the Scientific Method , including its definition, motivation, steps of application, hypothesis testing, and misapplications

4. analyze hypothetical or real scenarios to discern integrity of scientific claims

5. describe a scientific experiment or test and explain how it applies the steps of the scientific method

6. give examples of experiments that address unresolved scientific questions using established techniques, methods, or instruments

7. discuss at least two current issues related to how science and technology impact the world, including human society.

For laboratory courses, students should be able to

8a. Appropriately handle and utilize instruments, glassware or other laboratory tools

8b. identify experimental variables, record data and describe observed phenomena using scientific terminology

8c. state how changes in the variables impact results and identify trends and sources of error

8d. logically derive and state valid conclusions from analyzed experimental data

GEOC Annual Report 2008, Appendix 4: Alignment between *Teaching* and *CA3 Goals* (self ratings by instructors)

Learning Goal	BIOL 102	BIOL 103	COGS 201	EEB 202	MARN 170	NUSC 165	PHYS 103/104L	PHYS 155L	PSYC 132
1. Basic Concepts and Vocabulary	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3
2. Methods and Technologies	4	4	4	3	4	2	3	4	3
3. Scientific Method	2	3	4	3	3	2	2	3	2
4. Science vs. Pseudoscience	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	4
5. Scientific Experiment Description	4	3	3	4	3	3	1/3	3	3
6. Unresolved Scientific Questions	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	2
7. Scientific Impact on the World	3	4	3	3	4	3	3	3/4	3
FOR LAB COURSES									
8. Scientific Inquiry Skills	4	4	n/a	n/a	4	n/a	3	4	4

Key:
1=Not at all; 2=Barely; 3=Sometimes; 4=Very well covered
***To be considered as successfully meeting Learning Goals, courses must have a score of 3 or 4.**

GEOC Annual Report 2008, Appendix 5: Alignment between *Assessment* and *CA3 Goals* (ratings by instructor and GA)

Learning Goal:	BIOL 102	BIOL 103	COGS 201	EEB 202	MARN 170	NUSC 165	PHYS 103/104L	PHYS 155L	PSYC 132
1. Basic Concepts and Vocabulary	4	4	4	4	4	4	3 4	3 4	4
2. Methods and Technologies	4	4	4	3	4	2 3	2 3	4	3
3. Scientific Method	4 2	3 2	3	4 3	1	2 1	4 2/3	3 1	3 4
4. Science vs. Pseudoscience	3	3	3	4 3	2	3	4 3	4 3	4 2/3
5. Scientific Experiment Description	4 3	3 2/3	3	3	1 2	2	1/4(L) 2/3(L)	4 3	3 3/4
6. Unresolved Scientific Questions	4 3	4 3	4	3	3	3	3	3/4 2/3	3 1/2
7. Scientific Impact on the World	4	4	2	3 4	4	2	3 4	3 3/4	2 2/3
FOR LAB COURSES									
8. Scientific Inquiry Skills	4	4	n/a	n/a	4	n/a	4	4	3 4

Key: 1=Not at all; 2=Barely; 3=Sometimes; 4=Very well covered
L=lab. Within a cell, upper number is self-rated score (instructor), lower number is GA score based on written materials.
Blue indicates: GA rates assessment more highly,
Red: GA rates assessment less highly than instructor.
To be considered as successfully assessing CA3 Learning Goals, courses must have a score of 3 or 4.

GEOC Annual Report 2008, Appendix 6:

Learning Goal:	BIOL102		BIOL103		COGS201		EEB202		MARN170		NUSC165		PHYS 103l/104L		PHYS 155L		PSYC 132	
	T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A
1. Basic Concepts and Vocabulary	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3 4	4	3 4	3	4
2. Methods and Technologies	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	2	2 3	3	2 3	4	4	3	3
3. Scientific Method	2	4 2	3	3 2	4	3	3	4 3	3	1	2	2 1	2	4 2/3	3	3 1	2	3 4
4. Science vs. Pseudoscience	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4 3	3	2	4	3	3	4 3	3	4 3	4	4 2/3
5. Scientific Experiment Description	4	4 3	3	3 2/3	3	3	4	3	3	1 2	3	2	1(l)/ 3(L)	1(l)/ 4(L) 2(l)/ 3(L)	3	4 3	3	3 3/4
6. Unresolved Scientific Questions	3	4 3	4	4 3	4	4 3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3/4 2/3	2	3 1/2
7. Scientific Impact on the World	3	4	4	4	3	2	3	3 4	4	4	3	2	3	3 4	3/4	3 3/4	3	2 2/3
FOR LAB COURSES																		
8. Scientific Inquiry Skills	4	4	4	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4	4	n/a	n/a	3	4	4	4	4	3 4

Alignment between *Teaching* and *Assessment* in Gen Ed Science Courses and the *CA3 Learning Goals*

Key:
T= Taught in Course
A= Assessed in Course
l=lecture
L=lab

1=Not at all
2=Barely
3=Sometimes
4=Very well covered

To be considered as successfully meeting CA3 Learning Goals, courses must have a score of 3 or 4.

Discrepancy
Self-Rated Score (instr)
Evidence Score (GA)

+ Discrepancy
- Discrepancy

University Senate Curricula and Courses Committee
Report to the Senate
September 8, 2008

I. **The Curricula and Courses Committee recommends approval of the following courses for inclusion in the "W" Writing competency*:***

A. ENGL 3117W Romantic British Literature.

B. ENGL 3118W Victorian British Literature.

II. **The Curricula and Courses Committee recommends approval of the following course for inclusion in Content Area 4, International, Diversity and Multiculturalism**

A. PSYC 3402W Child Development in Sociopolitical Context Content

III. **The Curricula and Courses Committee recommends approval of the following course changes for courses included in the "Q" Quantitative Reasoning competency:**

A. LING 3310Q Phonology. Change of prerequisites from LING 202 to LING 2010Q.

B. LING 3510Q Syntax and Semantics. Change the prerequisites from LING 101 or 202 to LING 2010Q.

IV. **The Curricula and Courses Committee recommends approval of dropping the following course from the "W" Writing competency*:***

A. ENGL 223W Romantic and Victorian English Literature

V. **The Curricula and Courses Committee recommends the approval of the revised University Policy on Academic Adjustments for General Education Competencies: Quantitative reasoning and/or second language.**

A. Strike the language in the document referring to: University Program for College Students with Learning Disabilities (UPLD) (See attached)

Report Submitted by: Michael Darre, Chair, Keith Barker, Laurie Best, Janice Clark, Andrew DePlama, Robert Jeffers, Kazem Kazerounian, Kathleen Labadorf, Susan Lyons, Jose Machado, Maria Ana O'Donoghue, Christopher Purzycki, Eric Schultz, Nancy Shoemaker and Robert Stephens.

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
POLICY ON ACADEMIC ADJUSTMENTS FOR GENERAL EDUCATION COMPETENCIES: QUANTITATIVE REASONING And/Or SECOND LANGUAGE
December 11, 2006

Introduction

The University Senate enacted General Education requirements to ensure that all University of Connecticut undergraduate students become articulate and acquire intellectual breadth and versatility, critical judgment, moral sensitivity, awareness of their era and society, consciousness of the diversity of human culture and experience, and a working understanding of the processes by which they can continue to acquire and use knowledge. A critical element of General Education is demonstrated competency in five fundamental areas - computer technology, information literacy, **quantitative skills**, **second language proficiency,** and writing. The development of these competencies involves two thresholds: establishing entry-level expectations and meeting graduation expectations. In limited cases involving a significant disability, the graduation expectations for the **quantitative skills** and/or **second language proficiency** has been a barrier to degree completion. In an effort to respond to the extraordinary circumstances of students while maintaining the academic integrity of General Education and program requirements, the University has established a policy and procedures for considering **academic adjustments** to General Education requirements that would remove this barrier. It should be noted that the University provides a range of academic support for *all* students and provides appropriate support and reasonable accommodations for students with documented disabilities as defined by state and federal statute. Academic adjustments are only considered after a student has demonstrated that he or she is unable to complete the competency at the University. In these cases, this situation will involve a student with a significant disability whose documentation and educational history provide compelling evidence that an academic adjustment is reasonable.

Policy

Academic adjustments are granted only when it is clear that the completion of the requirement is impossible due to a disability. Waivers of General Education Competencies are never granted. Academic adjustments, which may include course substitutions, are granted on a case-by-case basis. The following rules will apply:

- If quantitative or second language competency is deemed as an essential element of a program or course of study, then a substitution is not permitted. The question of “essential element” will be decided by the Dean of each school or college or head of program, or enrollment unit.
- Academic adjustments will not reduce the number of courses/credits normally required to complete General Education requirements.
- If the student changes his or her school or college of enrollment, academic adjustments will be reviewed by the appropriate Dean’s office in the new school or college of enrollment.
- Academic adjustments will be subject to the 8-year rule.

All decisions involving academic adjustments will be determined by a University committee and submitted to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction for final approval. The committee will include the individuals listed below.

1. Designee from the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction (Chair)
2. ~~University Program for College Students with Learning Disabilities Director or Designee~~
3. Center for Students with Disabilities Director or Designee
4. Designees from the Dean's office in the petitioning student's school or college or Academic Center for Exploratory Students (ACES) as appropriate
5. Designee from the Department of Mathematics or Department of Modern and Classical Languages
6. Designee from the General Education Oversight Committee

Procedures

Consideration for an academic adjustment is done on a case-by-case basis. Students are encouraged to initiate the process through the Dean's office of the school, college, or head of program or enrollment unit (ACES) in which they are enrolled. Students should initiate the process as soon as it is apparent that an academic adjustment should be considered and after a plan of study has been selected.

The academic adjustment request is initiated when the student, in conjunction with his or her school/college of enrollment, submits the following to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction:

- An Academic Adjustment Petition, which will include a personal statement outlining the reasons for the request, an explanation of the difficulties experienced in quantitative and/or language courses, and a complete listing of the quantitative and/or language courses attempted to date. This petition will be signed by the student's academic advisor to indicate his/her awareness of its submission.
- Unofficial transcripts from all colleges and high schools attended.
- Evidence that the student has actively pursued academic support which may include letters of support from professors, high school teachers, tutors, and/or academic advisors.
- If appropriate, student release of information forms provided by the ~~University Program for College Students with Learning Disabilities (UPLD) or~~ Center for Students with Disabilities (CSD).
- A letter from the ~~University Program for College Students with Learning Disabilities (UPLD) or~~ Center for Students with Disabilities (CSD) documenting the student's need for an academic adjustment.

Students should submit all materials to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction prior to the end of the 3rd week of the semester. Committee decisions will be made before the 5th week of the semester and communicated in writing to the

student and his or her school/college of enrollment. In some cases students may be invited to speak with a member of the committee to provide more information. Requests are reviewed once per semester.

Guidelines for Academic Adjustments

The vast majority of students who experience difficulty in fulfilling the Quantitative Reasoning and/or Second Language Competency will experience success by employing any number of academic support and/or advising strategies. Academic adjustments may include an exception to an academic rule, such as allowing a student to complete a required course(s) on a pass/fail basis or substituting an alternative course(s) for a required course. Each academic adjustment should be based on the individual case and should not compromise the academic integrity of the requirements for a specific major or degree.