



GEOC Meeting November 6, 2017

*Members in **BOLD** were in attendance:*

Eric Schultz – Chair, (Karen Piantek – Admin), Joseph Abramo, **Lisa Blansett, Michael Bradford**, Baki Cetegen, **James Cole**, Michael Darre (Ex-Officio), Ana Maria Diaz-Marcos, **Arthur Engler**, Beth Ginsberg, **Bernard Goffinet, David Gross**, Alvaro Lozano-Robledo, **Thomas Meyer, Michael Morrell, Gustavo Nanclares**, Anji Seth, Kathleen Tonry (Ex-Officio), Eduardo Urios-Aparisi, **Manuela Wagner**, Brenda Brueggemann, **Debs Ghosh**

Regrets: Anji Seth, Brenda Brueggemann, Beth Ginsberg

Meeting was called to order at 1:32pm.

1. **Welcome**

2. **Minutes of October 25, 2017. Meeting were accepted as submitted.**

3. **Next Meeting: November 29, 2017 at 9:30am**

4. **Chair's Report**

A. **ΔGE Working Group**

- E. Schultz reported that the group reviewed options for incorporating the environmental literacy with regard to courses that would be "orphaned."
- David Ouimette and Tom Long have been added as members of the working group. The group is becoming male-heavy, though, so more female members are needed.

5. **Subcommittee Reports**

A. **No reports**

6. **Old Business**

A. **GEOC Review of Second Language Courses (likely nothing to report)**

- No discussion.

B. **Proposal to add Environmental Literacy to the General Education curriculum**

- M. Morrell reported that there are about 25 courses that would currently fulfill the environmental literacy that are already gen ed. D. Gross asked if this was hypothetical. Yes, the committee is still exploring how often these courses are actually offered. There are 62 courses that have environmental content but are not gen ed, and we don't know how many would qualify as gen ed. M. Morrell expressed concerns about the capacity to require environmental literacy for at least 5000 students to start.
- G. Nanclares asked how many courses this would add to the gen ed requirement. Only one course would be needed, but it would overlap with existing requirements.
- There was some discussion again on potentially implementing environmental literacy as a skill code.
- E. Schultz noted that there has been a suggestion to make it an optional substitution for one of the content areas. This would make things feasible and give us some flexibility.

- M. Bradford asked for clarification about why we may not have capacity yet. It was noted that if all the classes had a capacity of a few hundred it might work, but it is unlikely that they do. This is information that we still need to find.
- E. Schultz noted that he would be sending the committee a historical document from 2000 in which GEOC was first named.
- T. Meyer asked how many of the 25 courses are offered at the Regional campuses. M. Morrell noted that this is some of the info we still need to determine capacity.
- D. Ghosh expressed that she felt environmentalism and sustainability were important topics. She understood the concerns but felt that we shouldn't consider abandoning this idea.
- D. Gross suggested that college deans should start having conversations within departments and colleges about the potential impact of implementing environmental literacy.
- B. Goffinet asked about the implementation timeline. There was a desire to get something implemented by Spring. E. Schultz noted that in theory if the proposal was approved by GEOC today it could conceivably be approved in time for the next catalog year.
- E. Schultz noted that we have been asked to take an action on this proposal, so we should take some kind of action. He said that this could include anything from passing it, to sending it back to the environmental group for more information.
- M. Morrell noted that he would not be able to agree to the proposal as stated from both a logistical and philosophical standpoint at this time.
- B. Goffinet noted that GEOC is not being asked whether we should implement it; we are being tasked with finding a way to implement it.
- G. Nanclares said that this is not the kind of proposal that can just be approved and then thought about later. He felt it probably has to go to the subcommittees first.
- There was some discussion on exactly what the charge of the Senate was. M. Wagner said that she didn't think the language of the charge was strong enough to suggest that we needed to find a way to implement this no matter what; it seemed to suggest that we should explore ways to do it.
- E. Schultz noted that the proposal does not necessarily have the specificity we are used to. He suggested we need an environmental subcommittee. There was discussion of whether the subcommittee was a pre-requisite or a consequence of adding environmental literacy.
- M. Wagner noted that she does not understand the push to get this done before the full gen ed overhaul. She felt that it does not make sense to do these two things separately.
- B. Goffinet suggested that our solution to the environmental literacy implementation may inform how we proceed with the rest of the gen ed overhaul.
- D. Ghosh suggested that making something happen now is a way to keep this topic from getting lost in the grander scheme of the gen ed overhaul.
- E. Schultz agreed that GEOC cannot just say this cannot be done. We would need to have some very good reasons for not making this happen.
- D. Gross asked about getting a subcommittee together to identify criteria that would shape this proposal into something more relevant to gen ed.
- B. Goffinet noted that if he considered his own course, which is on the list, he is not necessarily sure it does fulfill the literacy as it is being envisioned. D. Gross also questioned how other types of courses would fit in, if legal policy on the environment would be considered, for example.
- E. Schultz said that he felt the committee was not ready to approve the proposal as submitted.
- D. Gross suggested a friendly amendment to the motion to remove the requirement that the course would have to be gen ed. There was no second.

- D. Gross suggested that as long as we implemented environmental literacy as a substitution, we could approve it today without problems. Few students would just take the option.
- There was discussion about what we are really accomplishing by putting the motion through, whether implementing it as an option would be “false advertising.”
- T. Meyer suggested that three credits, as proposed, do not constitute literacy.
- The general consensus was that implementing environmental literacy could be done, but that more specific and clear substantive objectives need to be established first.
- E. Schultz will provide a proposal at the next meeting that will explain the environmental component as an option within the gen ed framework as opposed to a course requirement.

Meeting adjourned at 2:59pm

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Piantek
GEOC Program Assistant