Minutes of the General Education Subcommittee  
March 7, 2016  
Library Biella Room  
4:00 pm – 6:00 pm

Present: Lawrence Bliss, Luz Calvo, Eric Fricke, Julie Glass, Zach Hallab, Yi Karnes, Rita Liberti, Sarah Nielsen, Aline Soules, Nancy Thompson, Mitchell Watnik.  
Absent: none.  

The Chair (Glass) called the meeting to order at 4:05.

1. Approval of the agenda (M Soules/S Hallab/P)  
2. Listening Session on Sustainability. Garbesi wants “and” for #1 not “or”. All need to be addressed as it follows the most widely accepted definition, citing UN report. Calvo noted that the emphasis for sustainability to have environmental emphasis seems okay. She proposed the first outcome be adjusted to “identify the social and/or economic dimensions of environmental sustainability...”. Ivey noted that the economic sustainability aspect may point against ecological sustainability. Calvo argued that wasn’t the case. Lewis argued to include ecological. Garbesi alluded to an Executive Committee resolution for sustainability. LeDuc said she prefers environmental over ecological. Glass has pasted suggestions from individuals on to the proposal for clarity within the projected document. Buchholz argued for and/or (as opposed to and) since that makes it easier to be addressed. Liberti asked about examples from disciplines outside business or science or environmental sciences. Ivey indicated that there is opportunity within History. LeDuc invoked former GE Director Murphy’s vision of “wicked problems” (multiple dimensions) and that courses need to address all to really get at the issue. Kitting asked about whether a human ecology course might fit into the current proposal. Many speakers said that it seemed to them it would. In the second outcome, “the relationship” was replaced by “interactions”. There was discussion about adding “and the effect on the well-being of humans”. The consensus was not to do so. For outcome number 3, there was a suggestion to add social and economic to environmental regarding “sustainability”. The consensus was to remove environmental, leaving sustainability unmodified. The suggestions Lewis sent to the subcommittee were similar to Garbesi’s. There were additions to the “e.g.” list of topics suggestions. Glass recommended removing the list entirely. The subcommittee tended to agree with Glass. Garbesi clarified the sentence by putting “significant” to describe concerns. Calvo asked who decides “significant”. Glass suggested “substantive” in place of “significant”. Kitting objected to “concern” and recommended “crisis/es”. Garbesi
recommended “a specific problem”. Lewis felt that the course should discuss more than one problem. Calvo chimed in about “identify” as opposed to Lewis’ “discuss” in outcome 1, defending the former. Many of the guests left at this point.

1. Approval of the minutes of Feb. 22 and Feb. 29. Feb. 22: (M Hallab/S Bliss/P) Feb. 29: (M Bliss/S Fricke/P) Thompson should be listed as a member, not a guest.

2. Reports
   a. Chair. Glass said that some comments were received after listening sessions, including one about diversity that was sent during the listening session.
   b. GE Director.
   c. Semesters. There was no representative of semester conversion.

3. Business:
   a. Follow-up discussion about listening sessions. Glass read the outcomes from social justice and solicited comments. Glass read the current version of sustainability outcomes and solicited comments. Calvo asked whether the subcommittee viewed the outcome as not necessarily being environmental. Glass responded that, with the first outcome having an “and” that environmental was a necessary component. Liberti asked about the ability to discuss both global and local. Glass cited Garbesi as noting that it is all intertwined. There was discussion about the “and” versus “and/or”. Some subcommittee members suggested that global should not be a problem for any course, but it was pointed out that local might be an issue for a course focused on global warming. The subcommittee agreed to note that “and” doesn’t imply equal weight. Regarding the diversity outcome, there was a note from Jaski Kohli from accessibility services suggesting “ableism” in outcomes 2 and 4. Outcome 3 is more touchy. David Fencsik from Psychology asked about mental illness, particularly in outcome 4. He points out that outcome 3 is more restrictive than the others and wondered whether that was the intention of the subcommittee. Glass asked whether the “expansiveness” of outcome 4 is rendered irrelevant by the constriction of outcome 3. Calvo argued that race, gender, class, and sexuality are the lens. There were some changes to the outcomes to shorten the length. (M Liberti/S Soules/P) for the chair to send the current document to faculty for a last round of feedback, due by the middle of finals week.
   b. Discussion of Writing II requirement. The subcommittee did not address this issue.
   c. Code requirements. (M Calvo/S Soules/P) to send the code requirements to CIC.
   d. Cluster structure.
4. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 6:00 PM. The Chair indicated that the subcommittee will plan to meet weekly during the Spring, but will not meet during finals.

Respectfully submitted,
Mitchell Watnik, subcommittee secretary