Meeting was called to order at 1:00 pm.

1. Welcome and Regrets
   A. Regrets: Lisa Blansett, Brenda Brueggemann, Miguel Gomes

2. Past and Future
   A. Minutes of March 12, 2019 meeting (‘Minutes_3-12-19.docx’) The minutes were approved as submitted.
   B. Next Meeting: Tuesday, April 16 – 2:00pm – 3:30pm
      Monday, April 29 – 1:00pm-2:30pm

3. Chair’s Report
   A. ∆GE Working Group
      • The DeltaGE report has been submitted for discussion. See Urgent Business.
   B. Upcoming Business (see also items 10.A and 10.B)
      a. First Year Writing Assessment Report (4/16/19)
      b. Reports from 2017-18 Provost’s Competition Winners (4/29/19)
         • Members were notified about these upcoming items of business.
   C. GEOC Chair Announcement: E. Schultz has been appointed Chair for Life...(April Fools!)

4. Subcommittee Reports
   A. CA1 Report
      a. HIST/AMST 2810 Crime, Policing, and Punishment in the United States [CA1-C] (#8136) [Add CA1 and AMST cross-listing]
      b. LAND 2201 The Common (Shared) Landscape of the USA: Rights, Responsibilities & Values [CA1, E] (#9751) [Add E] – Review for continued CA1 compliance
The subcommittee recommended the approval of two courses and is awaiting updates on two others.

The report was accepted as submitted (approval of ANTH/EVST 3340 and GEOG 2200).

C. CA4 Report
   a. GEOG 2200 Introduction to Human Geography [CA2, CA4-Int] (#10094) [Add CA2 and CA4-Int]

D. Q Report
   a. Q Assessment Updates

E. W Report
   a. COMM 4035W Advanced Media Effects [W] (#9484) [Revise number and prereqs]

F. E Report (see ‘E Report_4-1-19’) [Courses in Green were approved; courses in Red were denied; all other courses are pending]
   a. ARE 3434 Environmental and Resource Policy [E] (#10938) [Add E]
   b. ARE 3437 Marine Fisheries Economics and Policy [E] (#10939) [Add E]
   c. ECON 3466 Environmental Economics [E] (#11127) [Add E]
   d. ENGL 3635 Literature and the Environment
   e. ENGL 3715 Nature Writing Workshop
   f. GEOG 1300 Weather, Climate and Environment [CA3, E] (#10034) [Add CA3 and E]
   g. GSCI 1050 Earth's Dynamic Environment [CA3-Lab, E] (#10376) [Add E]
   h. GSCI 1051 Earth's Dynamic Environment [CA3, E] (#9974) [Add E]
   i. ARE 4438 Valuing the Environment [E] (#10621) [Add E]
   j. ARE 4462 Environmental and Resource Economics [E] (#10622) [Add E]
   k. EVST 1000 Introduction to Environmental Studies [CA2, E] (#9604) [Add E]
   l. GEOG 2400 Introduction to Sustainable Cities [CA2, CA4, Int, E] (#8801) [Adding E]
   m. GSCI 1010 Dinosaurs, Extinctions, and Environmental Catastrophes [CA3, E] (#10377) [Add E]
   n. GSCI 1055 Geoscience and the American Landscape [CA3, E] (#9975) [Add E; remove “formerly offered”]
   o. GSCI/GEOG 1070 Natural Disasters and Environmental Change [CA3, E] (#10378) [Add E]
q. GSCI 2500 Earth System Science [E] (#9971) [Add E]
r. NURS 4250 Public Health Nursing [E] (#9715) [New E]
s. SPSS 2100 Environmental Sustainability of Food Production in Developed Countries [E] (#10898) [Add E]

- EVST 1000 was submitted with just a one-line justification for E, so the subcommittee requested more information from the proposers “for posterity.” This additional information will be added to the CAR.

- The report indicates the first E courses not recommended for approval. Specifically, these courses do not address human interaction with the environment. The subcommittee co-chairs had a face-to-face meeting with GSCI personnel and there has been some back-and-forth email correspondence since then that will require more response. However, the committee decided the courses were a clear no, and GSCI can resubmit if they want with revisions.

- One member asked if the course proposers were ever invited to a subcommittee meeting to discuss the courses with the subcommittee. A joint meeting of the E subcommittee and the GSCI curriculum committee was also suggested. The E co-chairs were concerned that a meeting at this point would only escalate the issue, especially given that the subcommittee’s decision is pretty definite.

- There was a discussion of the subjective nature of the E criteria. The issue is that the E committee has made an interpretive decision about the criteria with which the GSCI department does not agree.

- The Chair made it clear to the committee that approval of the E Report would trigger a rejection of the flagged GSCI courses. The committee expressed agreement that the subcommittee was correct in rejecting the GSCI courses.

The E report was accepted as submitted (approval of ARE 4438, ARE 4462, EVST 1000, GEOG 2400, and NURS 4250; denial of GSCI 1050, GSCI 1051, GSCI 1010, GSCI 2500)

- Given that this was the last round to approve E courses for this academic year, one member was concerned that we may have capacity issues in the Fall 2019. In light of this, one CA2 co-chair suggested the approval of EVST 1000. The original concerns about the course were largely his, so he withdrew his concerns in the interest of not holding up the course and will instead communicate with the proposer for future consideration.

M. Morrell motioned to approve EVST 1000 for CA2 and advance it to the Senate C&C. J. Vokoun seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

- The CA2 subcommittee co-chairs also asked GEOC to reconsidered the current hold on GEOC 2400 for the same reasons.

D. Ghosh motion to approve GEOG 2400 for CA2 and advance it to the Senate C&C. M. Morrell seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.
5. **Alignment Reports**
   A. CA2 Alignment Report
      a. POLS 1602/W
   B. W Alignment Report
      a. POLS 1602W
   - The two subcommittees are still waiting on W syllabi from POLS. B. Ginsberg will follow up with POLS about 1602W. The CA2 subcommittee will also wait to receive the W syllabi.

6. **Urgent Business**
   A. Discussion on Final Report of the ΔGE Task Force on General Education (No formal vote required)
      a. See 'Final report of DGenEd Task Force on General Education_2.docx'
      b. See 'Staff Faculty Survey.pdf'
      c. See 'Student Survey.pdf'
   - Two committee members submitted thorough critiques of the report and the proposed Gen Ed model. Among other things, one member suggested the creation of program plans. Another member requested that the free response answers be included, so these were added as appendixes.
   - The SEC indicated that they do not require a vote on the report from GEOC. The committee can take a formal vote if they want, but it is not required. Feedback is requested, though. There is no intent to circumvent GEOC.
   - The committee wanted to know what the Senate C&C is voting on. It seems they are voting on what should happen with the implementation/framework piece.
   - One member summarized his written critique.
   - Another member felt that the DeltaGE group was faced with an almost impossible charge. To create a Gen Ed curriculum from the LEAP guidelines would require a huge number of courses. He concurred with the opinion of others that the categories of the new model are not analogous, and he also felt that the proposed system sacrifices breadth.
   - “The size, and color, and number of the buckets” was not a concern for another member; he felt that it does not need to be a perfect set. However, he was disappointed because he felt the ‘three-deep in an area’ idea did not fulfill its potential. He imagined it to be different when leaks were first coming out of the committee.
   - Regarding the idea of “buckets,” one member felt that most new majors at the university are very interdisciplinary, so the indistinctness of the buckets works well with the overall interdisciplinarity of majors now. Ultimately, advisors should be having a conversation with students to craft their Gen Ed experience.
   - One member expressed concern about the use of the term “social justice” in one heading and noted that some members of his department agreed. Members of the department felt that the term was politically charged and wondered if Gen Ed would also include a conservative-leaning curriculum as well.
   - Another member disagreed with the aversion to the term “social justice” and felt proud that it was included. It was noted that social justice is a scholarly-accepted term, so if people are going to take umbrage with it there is little we can do.
   - One member was looking for more evidence of why this version was better than what we currently have, and he felt that we do not get that in the report. In particular, he was not sure the proposal amplified student engagement.
It was suggested that we need a one-page handout in a problem/response format that explains how the newly proposed model addresses identified issues.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30pm

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