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Course Review: In Winter 2015, I finished approving GE course proposals, most of which had been revised by the proposers. To reiterate the information I shared in my fall 2014 report, the GEGB reviewed a total of 80 course proposals (39 edited/deleted courses and 41 new courses) for this catalog cycle. Revisions were requested on 34 proposals. The GEGB voted not to approve eight new course proposals for the GE program.

Appeals: Two GEGB decisions were appealed in winter quarter—an ARCH course sequence that had been proposed for both D4 and C4 status, and NR 264, which had been proposed as a GE D2 course. The GEGB’s comments regarding those courses can be found attached to the proposals themselves in the course inventory management. The GEGB discussed these appeals on multiple occasions; as chair, I worked to represent the committee’s position while speaking to the Academic Senate during my four minutes of allotted time. I am pleased to report that the appeals committee upheld the GEGB’s decision regarding the ARCH courses. I have not yet heard the final decision on the NR course.

Program Review: After the appeal hearings, the GEGB began to shift its attention to the GE program review. After some discussion, we decided not to create a new survey to send out to the university community. I simply do not think we have time to write the survey, test it, administer it, and aggregate the data. Instead, I am asking the committee to work through the survey data generated by the WASC faculty survey. This survey garnered a response rate of 27.3%, and offers data that will be helpful in considering faculty impressions of General Education. This data, combined with the data collected from the student survey the GEGB administered in the previous AY, should give us plenty to work with in our self-study.

Conference: Josh Machamer and I were sent to the “New Paradigms and Pathways in General Education” conference, held on the CSU Sacramento campus. We found the conference somewhat less than helpful, and perhaps even a little unfocused, though certainly well-intentioned. In the future, I would like to secure funding to attend the AAC&U Conference, which is held in February. I was not sent to the conference this year, though the focus was, “From Mission to Action to Evidence: Empowering Inclusive General Education Programs.” It’s my understanding that in the past, the GEGB chair regularly attended this conference. Notably, the entire GEGB was sent to the conference in Portland last spring. The February 2016 AAC&U conference will focus on General Education and Assessment.