GEOC Meeting Minutes
April 30, 2018 – 1:00pm-2:30pm in Rowe 420

Members in BOLD were in attendance:

Eric Schultz – Chair, (Karen McDermott – Admin), Joseph Abramo, Pamela Bedore (Ex-Officio), Lisa Blansett, Michael Bradford, Brenda Brueggemann, Kun Chen, James Cole, Debs Ghosh, Beth Ginsberg, Bernard Goffinet, Miguel Gomes, Mary Ellen Junda, Alvaro Lozano-Robledo, Richard Mancini, Michael Morrell, Anji Seth, Kathleen Tonry (Ex-Officio), Manuela Wagner, Chunsheng Yang

Regrets: P. Bedore, B. Brueggemann (Wednesdays), R. Mancini (semester), Kathleen Tonry

Meeting was called to order at 1:30pm.

1. Preliminaries
   A. Call-ins: Dial 1-866-857-0502, passcode 2023183#

2. Welcome and Regrets
   a. Welcome new members:
      i. Miguel Gomes (CA1)
      ii. Richard Mancini (CA3)
      iii. Mary Ellen Junda (CA4)
      iv. Kun Chen (Q)
      v. Chunsheng Yang (SL)
      vi. Lisa Blansett (W)
      vii. Pamela Bedore (Senate C&C, Ex-Officio)

3. Past and Future
   a. Minutes of April 30, 2018 meeting (Minutes_4-30-18.docx)
   The minutes were accepted as submitted.
      b. Next Meeting: Thursday, September 20, 9:30am-11:00am
      c. Fall meeting schedule is as follows:
         Wed. Sept. 5 – 1:30pm-3:00pm
         Thurs. Sept. 20 – 9:30am-11:00am
         Wed. Oct. 3 – 1:30pm-3:00pm
         Thurs. Oct. 18 – 9:30am-11:00am
         Wed. Oct. 31 – 1:30pm-3:00pm
         Thurs. Nov. 15 – 9:30am-11:00am
         Wed. Nov. 28 – 1:30pm-3:00pm
         Thurs. Dec. 13 – 9:30am-11:00am (exam week)

4. Chair’s Report
   A. ΔGE Working Group and Gen Ed Retreat
• A well-attended retreat was hosted back in June that aired a lot of perspectives.
• The DeltaGE group has not met yet, but it will meet later this month.

B. General Education Environmental Literacy Task Force (GEELTF) – April 20 Report to the Senate
• We will be seeing more on this later in the agenda. This group was formed in response to a Senate mandate to create an Environmental Literacy Competency.
• The goal is to approve documents related to Environmental Literacy (EL) today in order to meet a timeline for implementation in 2019-2020.

5. Subcommittee Reports

A. CA3 Report

a. SPSS 1060 The Great American Lawn: History, Culture and Sustainability [CA2, CA3] (#6267) [New]
   • The committee is dealing not only specifically with this course, but is concerned with a larger discussion of how much related content is necessary for a course to be a Gen Ed content area.
   • We really have no guidelines on this; however, we do have courses with multiple content areas at this time. Given this fact, one member felt it did not seem fair to pick on this one.
   • Members discussed the idea of a 50/50 split of content, but one member suggested that it is possible for content to overlap – e.g. that scientific and technological methods can be applied to and used to understand social science concepts – and that a content split of 60/60 or more is in fact possible.
   • The Chair asked the CA3 to submit a recommendation on this course for the next meeting.

B. W Report

a. MCB 3841W Research Literature in Molecular and Cell Biology [W] (#6026) [Revise pre-reqs]
   • The committee looked at multiple syllabi and found most of them lacking in some kind of W-required content.
   • The committee also expressed horror that one syllabus was typed in Comic Sans.
   • One member noted that in the past this was offered as a variable topics course with several sections, but it is now being proposed as a series of independent courses. To this end, it may not be in the subcommittee’s best interest to look at multiple syllabi.

6. Old Business

A. Information Literacy Updates (no updates)

B. Learning Outcomes for Second Language General Education courses

• We are hoping to have this project under way this year.

C. Q Assessment

• The Q subcommittee started collecting data about a year and half ago. They met in the Spring to identify some key courses and now want to assess them, but they were not sure how to do that. They have met with Eric Logan, who has expertise in program assessment.

D. Gen Ed courses that haven’t been taught in five years (no updates)
• It was noted that this item will be removed from future agendas. Programs do not want to delete these older dormant courses, but they can be removed from advising lists. There was previous discussion of removing Gen Ed content areas and making departments reapply for General Education status, but there was mixed interest in this, and such a move will not be pursued at this time.

7. Course Action Requests (Business was deferred)

8. New Business
      • K. McDermott gave the committee a brief overview of the document. Some members had questions and feedback, but E. Schultz asked that discussions be deferred until a later date.
      • K. McDermott will send subcommittee co-chairs the Alignment documents that are sent to instructors. She asked that subcommittee members recommend updates based on their past experiences with the forms.
   b. Environmental Literacy definition (see ‘Proposed definition of Environmental Literacy for General Education’) (Motion M. Morrell, D. Ghosh)
      • There was a suggestion that, jumping off of the earlier discussion, we should include specifics on the amount on content related to EL.
      • It was pointed out that other content areas and competencies are intentionally vague; only W includes any kind of quantifiable language.
      • On a related note, one member questioned the word “substantial” in the definition. The phrase “substantial focus” was deemed redundant and edits were made.
      • It was suggested that EL content needs to be present “throughout the semester.” An edit was suggested to the language: “…provided that it focuses throughout on one of more of the follow.”
      • There was a suggestion that we require courses to contain an assessment related to EL, but it was determined that we could not dictate requirements on pedagogy.
      • There was some question on the interpretation of the first sentence, so two commas were added to help clarify the intent.
      • There was extensive discussion of the last item. One member was uncertain how artistic representations could adequately enhance an understanding of the environment and its impact on humans, or vice versa. The member felt that the EL requirement was valuable as an opportunity to educate students on more scientifically observable aspects of the topic. Other members argued that art and aesthetic modes of representation were in fact powerful ways of educating students on the environment and its importance in their lives.
      • It was noted that maybe we need to trust the process and the expertise of the EL subcommittee to be able to ensure that EL courses contain sufficient EL content, regardless of subject area.
      • The definition was explicitly built to include humans in the environmental equation.
      • There was an argument that instructors do not necessarily need to be the expert on a topic so much as they need to provide students with the tools to be able to effectively explore the topic.

The motion to accept the Environmental Literacy definition was approved with one abstention.
c. Environmental Literacy implementation (see ‘Revisions to Senate Rules and Regs II.C.2 2018_amended for EL’) (Motion M. Bradford, B. Goffinet)
   - E. Schultz explained the document and the layers of revision.
   - There was some confusion over the rules for double dipping that were clarified.
   - Mention of an EL subcommittee was added to the document.

Meeting adjourned at 3:04pm

Respectfully submitted,
Karen C. P. McDermott
GEOC Program Assistant