

General Education Governance Board Orientation Meeting
Thursday, September 20, 2018

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); ~~Karla Bussert (Library)~~; Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); Gary Laver – Chair (PSY); Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Jesse Vestermark (Library)

Guests:

Dustin Stegner (ENGL), Academic Senate President

Meeting Notes:

1. We determined our fall quarter schedule with meetings to be held on Thursdays 4–5 and Fridays 11–12. Thursdays will be for business regarding the reexamination of campus GE; Fridays will be for catalog review.
2. Regarding the reexamination of GE, the charges and composition of the five GE work groups were discussed (Area A, Area B, Area C, Area D/E, and Diversity & Inclusion). Calls for participation have been sent out campus wide, with the goal of having the groups begin their work in late October/early November. Each group will have a member of GEGB as a liaison. In its role as a steering committee for the work groups, during the first half of fall quarter GEGB will discuss its recommendations for guiding the groups as they work on their charges. To meet critical catalog timelines for implementing changes to Cal Poly's GE template in the next catalog, the work groups must issue reports on their recommendations to the GEGB in late January/early February for implementation in resolutions to the Academic Senate soon thereafter.
3. The review of GE curricular proposals for the next catalog will parallel the college-based sequence used by ASCC: CSM, CENG, CAED, CAFES, CLA, OCOB. As there were only six proposals involving

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

course deactivation, these will be reviewed in the coming week, along with the proposals from CSM and CENG.

Action Items for Next Week:

For Thursday, September 27

1. Read EO 1100-Revised and FAQs
2. Read the draft of the GE Task Force Report

For Friday, September 28

3. Review all courses intended for deactivation: CHEM 111; GEOG 301; HIST 214; HIST 324; PHIL 320; SS 121
 4. Review all CSM and CENG proposals
-

Upcoming Meetings:

Thursday, September 27, 2018

4:10 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. in 10-241

Friday, September 28, 2018

11:10 p.m. - 12:00 p.m. in 10-241

General Education Governance Board Meeting
Thursday, September 27, 2018

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); ~~Kaila Bussert (Library)~~; Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); ~~Jesse Vestermark (Library)~~

Guests:

Dustin Stegner (ENGL), Academic Senate President
Andrew Morris (HIST), General Education Task Force Co-Chair

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m.

Administrative Tasks and Reminders

1. The minutes for September 20, 2018 were approved as submitted.
2. Meeting invitations for the rest of the quarter will continue to appear on the GEGB's calendar as a two-hour block. This decision was made to avoid losing the room and to keep the time reserved on the GEGB's calendars in case a two-hour block is needed later in the fall.
 - a. Gary or Shannon will send weekly reminders as to the appropriate meeting start time. (Typically, Thursdays will begin at 4 p.m. and Fridays at 11 a.m.)
3. Recruitment for work group participants is good so far, but we will still be targeting more student groups. Gladys Gregory (Academic Senate coordinator) will be sending a second email to all faculty the week of October 1 of the call and deadline to apply.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

Discussion of EO 1100-Revised and FAQs

1. Gary framed the meeting's conversation around three goals: (1) summarizing Executive Order 1100-Revised (EO 1100-R) (2) identifying what Cal Poly currently has within its General Education (GE) program; (3) and considering the questions that need to be presented to the work groups to answer.
 - a. For this year, the GEGB will begin a GE program review, starting with comparing the current Cal Poly GE template with EO 1100-R and making needed alignment changes.
 - i. In subsequent years, the GEGB could continue the program review in terms of broader discussions as to what a GE program should contain. This analysis could include ways in which the program as more than a set of prescribed set of classes and instead a broad set of interrelated areas that could offer specializations, pathways, and other meaningful connections.
 - b. The GEGB and work groups will also have to consider how EO 1100-R might impact high-unit degrees and the current GE options based on college.
2. Discussion on Area A
 - a. Areas A1 and A2 are inverted compared to EO 1100-R. Historically, this inversion occurred through a consensus that learning how to compose an argument would better inform students on how to write a speech.
 - i. The current consensus is to avoid confusion in any way we can and to switch the areas to align with EO 1100-R.
 - b. Area A3 is "critical thinking." Are there new ways that we could consider this topic and the classes that might be offered within this subsection?
 - i. Arguably, everyone in the university should be teaching critical thinking; the GEGB will ask the work groups to consider how this might apply in a GE course. It could be that more philosophy classes are offered.
 - ii. The new learning objectives for A3 will lead logically to certain departments teaching the courses that are qualified to do so.
3. Discussion on Area B
 - a. Gary reminded the committee that the goal is to streamline the template to make it work within the full CSU system as well as community colleges; Area B differs more than any other area. We will have to make changes and also think about the smoothness of the transition, especially in the ways it might impact high-unit programs.
 - i. Students are currently beholden to the catalog from when they started, but they could change their catalog preference, if they would like.

- ii. As a polytechnic university, students should be taking a breadth of Area B courses and not just discipline-specific options within the area.
 - iii. The work group will have to consider how this area can continue to support the robust engineering programs on campus.
 - iv. Since we have an extra 8 units compared to semester-based campuses, there could be an opportunity to provide some options within Area B.
4. Discussion on Area C
- a. Gary reminded the group that there are very specific Cal Poly values, such as writing across the curriculum, that are not necessarily reflected in EO 1100-R.
 - i. Since there is a lower-division elective within Area C, we could consider adding a rule that courses must be selected across departments.
 - ii. As was addressed in the FAQs sent by the Chancellor's Office, it is permissible to add a separate line showing the upper division requirement. Cal Poly could add that to its template.
5. Discussion on Area D/E
- a. Gary reminded the group that our current D4 will become Area E under the new EO 1100-R template.
 - b. Additionally, if presented properly, every program could propose an orientation to the major that introduces students to higher education, prepares them for their future career, etc. to fulfill the Area E requirement.
 - c. There is language within the EO that programs in excess of 180 core units could receive special consideration.
 - d. Given the language to the American Institutions requirement, if we need a second course, we could include it here.
 - i. Since there is a separate committee reviewing Cal Poly's USCP requirement, there could also be a committee analyzing the American Institutions requirement.

Meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

For Thursday, October 4

1. Area A in-depth analysis and draft of instructional materials for the work group.

For Friday, October 5

2. Review all course proposals for CAED and CAFES (10 total)
-

FUTURE TOPICS

Thursday, October 11 – Area B in-depth analysis

Thursday, October 18 – Area C in-depth analysis

Thursday, October 25 – Area D/E in-depth analysis

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, October 4, 2018

4:10 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. in 10-241

Friday, October 5, 2018

NEW LOCATION: 11:10 p.m. - 12:00 p.m. in 38-114

GENERAL DEADLINES

Friday, October 12 – Statement of Interest for GE Work Group is due

Tuesday, October 16 – Academic Senate Executive Committee approves GE Work Group chairs

General Education Governance Board Meeting
Friday, September 28, 2018

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); ~~Kaila Bussert (Library)~~; Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); ~~Aaron Keen (CSC)~~; **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Jesse Vestermark (Library)

Guests:

Daniel Parsons (Registrar)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:10 a.m.

Administrative Tasks:

1. Daniel Parsons will join the course review meetings and act as scribe when it comes to adding the GEGB comments through Course Management to the proposers.
2. There was an observation that submitting revisions through Course Management is tricky for GE classes; often, the submitters align the objective with a department and not a GE PLO. It could be a matter for future consideration as to developing a better connection between course proposals and GE PLOs and course criteria.

Courses Proposed for Deactivation – CHEM 111, GEOG 301, HIST 214, HIST 324, PHIL 320, & SS 121

1. HIST 214, HIST 324, and CHEM 111
 - a. There were no dissenting comments in the workflow for any of these courses.
 - b. Courses were unanimously approved for deactivation as a slate.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

2. GEOG 301
 - a. The proposal for deactivation did not include a workflow reference to Earth Science, which takes the course as a D5 requirement. GEGB reached out to the Earth Science department, which confirmed that they changed to requirement for the new catalog to GEOG 308. Comment has been addressed.
 - b. Course unanimously approved for deactivation.

3. PHIL 320 & SS 121
 - a. Both Philosophy and Social Sciences have a new course pending for approval that would replace PHIL 320 and SS 121 respectively.
 - b. There was a point of order as to whether the deactivation should be approved or if GEGB should wait until the replacement courses have been approved.
 - c. Daniel Parsons said that the GEGB could approve the deactivation; since he will be attending these meetings, he'll be able to track the approval process for the replacement courses.
 - d. Courses were unanimously approved for deactivation as a slate.

Courses Proposed for Edits – BIO 227, CHEM 124, CHEM 127, & PHYS 412

1. CHEM 124 and CHEM 127
 - a. These two classes are proposing a revision to the prerequisites mostly as a response to EO 1110.
 - i. Since both classes are moving to only one class meeting the prerequisite, there was a discussion amongst the GEGB if this would create a bottleneck for students who have to fulfill the prerequisites and now only have one option.
 - ii. Any program who might be impacted by the revision was notified prior to the proposal being submitted and was given the opportunity to provide feedback. Math received notification from Chemistry, but this correspondence is missing from the workflow.
 - iii. Additionally, classes that are deactivated are still kept in the catalog for one more cycle to let students know that it is still there but ending in 2021.
 - b. Course revisions were unanimously approved as a slate.

 2. BIO 227
 - a. Revisions show the department did their due diligence.
 - b. Course revisions were unanimously approved as submitted.

 3. PHYS 412
 - a. There is no apparent change to the GE nature of the course, simply an addition of MATH 242 as a prerequisite. This change reflects that physics and engineer majors take different math courses. The math classes that physics majors take will change from MATH 244 to MATH 244.
-

- b. Course revisions were unanimously approved as submitted.

Courses Proposed for Addition – MS 111 & ME 313

- 1. MS 111
 - a. The group recommended that they revise the proposal in two areas:
 - i. Remove “mastery” from the language as that expectation does not align with a 100-level course.
 - ii. Highlight areas within the proposal where the ULO on ethics, diversity, and sustainability are apparent.
 - b. Proposal was returned to the department to consider revisions.
 - i. Proposers were given until October 4 to submit revisions.
- 2. ME 313
 - a. Since Executive Order 1100-R (EO 1100-R) does not contain an Area F, Cal Poly instituted a deadline for any Area F proposals in Spring 2018.
 - b. All GE courses will be going through a review once the new GE program learning outcomes have been finalized.
 - c. GEGB recommends that this proposal is resubmitted once the new learning outcomes are finalized; it is fine for them to resubmit off-cycle.

Meeting adjourned at 12:01 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

For Thursday, October 4

- 1. Area A in-depth analysis and draft of instructional materials for the work group.

For Friday, October 5

- 2. Review all new courses for CAED and CAFES (10 total)
-

FUTURE TOPICS

Thursday, October 11 – Area B in-depth analysis

Thursday, October 18 – Area C in-depth analysis

Thursday, October 25 – Area D/E in-depth analysis

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, October 4, 2018
4:10 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. in 10-241

Friday, October 5, 2018
NEW LOCATION: 11:10 p.m. - 12:00 p.m. in 38-114

GENERAL DEADLINES

Friday, October 12 – Statement of Interest for GE Work Group is due
Tuesday, October 16 – Academic Senate Executive Committee approves GE Work Group chairs

General Education Governance Board Meeting
Thursday, October 4, 2018

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); ~~Kaila Bussert (Library)~~; Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; ~~Neal MacDougall (AGB)~~; José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Jesse Vestermark (Library-interim)

Guests:

Dustin Stegner (ENGL), Academic Senate President
Andrew Morris (HIST), General Education Task Force Co-Chair

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m.

Administrative Tasks

1. The GEGB is reminded to review course proposals for CAED, CAFES, and the revised submission for MSCI 111 for tomorrow's meeting.

Area A Discussion

1. The GEGB discussed the current Cal Poly requirements for Area A as well as the guidelines from EO 1100-R in order to create preliminary guidelines and recommendations to share with the Area A work group.
 - a. The GEGB discussed if there was an opportunity to streamline and synthesize (where appropriate) the educational objectives and course criteria. Objectives seem to be student-focused and criteria seem to be curriculum- or faculty-focused, which leads to some confusion. This consideration could also be applied to the other GE Area work groups, too.
 - i. One concern is that, by removing the distinction between objective and criteria, certain crucial details could get lost.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

- ii. Because there will be a member of GEGB on each work group, there will be constant oversight, which should limit the risk of a relevant goal getting lost in translation.
- b. The GEGB also discussed if there is a potential expansion into the courses that could get offered under the new EO 1100-R guidelines.
 - i. The goal should be to craft the objectives that experts are teaching the content; there should not be a limitation or framing that prohibits certain disciplines from submitting course proposals. EO 1100-R seeks to remove the ownership of certain subareas to specific programs.
 - 1. For instance, if there is a specific course regarding “writing within the discipline” that meets the objectives for teaching the writing process but comes from a non-traditional department, then the GEGB would consider.
 - 2. The GEGB noted that there is a six-year sunset clause for classes that have not been taught. The hope is that the course is owned by a department and not one or two individuals.
 - 3. The course renewal process will continue to evaluate how the course is being offered and who is teaching it.
 - ii. GEGB will continue to find ways to share the course proposal process with departments to encourage creativity and an expansion of proposals across disciplines.
- c. The GEGB discussed the connection between the Area A and Diversity and Inclusion work groups. Area A could be a strong opportunity to include diversity, equity, and inclusion goals in the curriculum.
- d. The GEGB discussed the requirement that Area A has to be completed before Area C, Area D, and Area E classes can be taken. There is a requirement within EO 1110-R that there are multiple sections offered in the “Golden Four” cohort of classes to prevent barriers to graduation from occurring.
- e. The GEGB considered the Cal Poly writing intensive objective.
 - i. While inherently included in Area A, it’s not necessarily a focus during course renewal and should be.
 - ii. The GEGB encouraged a focus during course renewal to ensure appropriate course caps and writing-intensive strategies.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AREA A WORK GROUP

1. Consider endorsing swapping the labels between the current A1 and A2 classes with EO 1100-R.
 2. Retain writing intensive courses in A1 and A3.
 3. Analyze course cap suggestions for each area.
 4. Consider how educational objectives and course criteria are structured and if they are designed more for faculty than for students.
 5. Collaborate with Diversity and Inclusion work group to create certain objectives and criteria related to that topic within Area A.
-

ACTION ITEMS

1. September 27 minutes will be reviewed on October 5.
 2. Area B will be the focus on October 11.
-

FUTURE TOPICS

1. Thursday, October 18 – Area C
 2. Thursday, October 25 – Area D/E
-

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, October 11, 2018
4:10 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. in 10-241

Friday, October 12, 2018
NEW LOCATION: 11:10 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. in 38-114

GENERAL DEADLINES

Friday, October 12 – Faculty Statement of Interests for GE Work Groups are due.

Tuesday, October 17 – Academic Senate Executive Committee approves GE Work Group chairs.

Friday, October 19 – Student Statement of Interests for GE Work Groups are due.

**General Education Governance Board Meeting
Friday, October 5, 2018**

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); ~~Mark Borges (ASI representative)~~; ~~Kaila Bussert (Library)~~; Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); ~~Aaron Keen (CSC)~~; **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; ~~Neal MacDougall (AGB)~~; José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Jesse Vestermark (Library-interim)

Guests:

Daniel Parsons (Registrar)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:10 a.m.

Administrative Tasks

1. Minutes were approved as submitted for both September 27, 2018 and September 28, 2018 meetings.

Marine Science Course Proposal

1. Last week, GEGB expressed concerns regarding the new Marine Science course proposal (MSCI 111). The course was resubmitted to include appropriate revisions.
2. Course proposal and edits were unanimously approved.

Course Proposal from the College of Architecture and Environmental Design

1. GEGB considered the new course proposal – Construction Management 318: Housing and Communities.
2. The GEGB raised a number of concerns.
 - a. Daniel Parsons will talk with Susan Olivas about the best way to roll back this proposal.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

- b. Ultimately, the proposer will meet with the GEGB Chair to discuss the Board's concerns.
3. As part of the ongoing GE template revision process, GEGB will also consider prerequisites for upper division Area B, C, and D courses.
4. This particular course also includes a prerequisite for a course that hasn't been approved yet, which could be concerning..

Course Proposals from the College of Architecture and Environmental Design

1. Agricultural and Environmental Plant Sciences (AEPS) 315: Organic Crop Production
 - a. Though the course proposal says that this course is intended for Area F/B7, the edits are strictly to the name.
 - b. If the GEGB approves this course now, the course will still have to be resubmitted for approval once the new GE template (including outcomes and criteria) are established.
 - c. Revisions approved unanimously.
2. Animal Science (ASCI) 112 and BioResource & Agricultural Engineering (BRAE) 349
 - a. The GEGB focused on these two courses together as the nature of both courses is primarily if not wholly online. The GEGB discussed what a general education learning outcome entails and whether those outcomes could sufficiently be met online.
 - b. The GEGB will continue to discuss this topic next week after conducting more research on policies and any previous Senate resolution regarding online courses.

Meeting adjourned at 12:01 p.m.

General Education Governance Board Meeting
Thursday, October 11, 2018

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); ~~Kaila Bussert (Library)~~; Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); ~~Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning)~~; John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); ~~Jesse Vestermark (Library)~~

Guest:

Andrew Morris (HIST), GE Task Force Co-Chair

Gary Laver, Chair of the General Education Governance Board, called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m.

Administrative Tasks

1. Minutes for October 4
 - a. Approved with slight modification to Summary of Recommendations for Area A.
2. Minutes for October 5 were approved as submitted.
 - a. As the GEGB considers more online courses, they will invite Catherine Hillman from the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology to the meetings to inform the GEGB about online course best practices and pedagogical considerations.
3. The GEGB was given a preliminary report of GE work group applications and data analysis.
 - a. The GEGB agreed to meet from 3:30 - 5:00 p.m. on October 18 to have extra time to form the GE Area work groups.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

Area B Discussion

1. Gary Laver began the Area B discussion by focusing the GEGB on B5 as it contains both upper division and lower division courses.
 2. Helen Bailey discussed the programmatic challenges that will occur with reordering and renaming subareas. It will add a little complexity for current and transfer students and should be factored into the implementation timeline. This is not meant to be a barrier but a thoughtful, important step within the process. In some ways, it reinforces part of the Task Force recommendations to call areas by their disciplines and not the numbering convention.
 - a. The GEGB will seek further clarification from Academic Programs and Planning as to compliance guidelines with naming and structure.
 3. With the 8 extra units Cal Poly has in its GE program (compared to semester-structured campuses), there could be an additional section that reflects the current B5; the new B7 does not fit in the pattern of an upper-division Area B course.
 - a. B5 is not a foundational course but builds on the foundation in the B1-4 lower-division courses, but it most likely cannot be an additional upper division requirement. It could be a lower-division elective.
 4. It could be that B5 and B7 are combined in some way; it would have to wait once B7 is approved and reviewed.
 5. The GEGB also considered that B5 includes a writing component. It speaks to the unique character of the Cal Poly GE program to have a writing intensive science course and would be an important aspect to try to retain. B5 upper division classes could potentially also be aligned with GWR objectives.
 - a. However, it would have to be in the Upper Division course, not in a lower-division B5 class as students have to have junior standing before they can complete the GWR.
 6. The EO also allows for additional classes in Area B in computer science and economics. It would be great to consider if we want to expand to include those options.
 7. Some current B7 classes might fold into a B5 area and could expand science writing. B5 could be a really special opportunity to cultivate Cal Poly's science offerings.
 8. The GEGB recognizes that there are a fair number of courses that will have to be edited to fulfill the new requirements.
-

9. One important consideration for the work group is how the upper division courses must be within the same disciplines as the lower-division courses. It could be that every one of the lower-division courses includes an upper division class.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AREA B WORK GROUP

1. Review the new language regarding math and quantitative reasoning as there could be a shift as to what that encompasses.
2. Discuss writing intensive areas, such as within B5.
3. Review the uniqueness of Area F/B7 and incorporate it within the new Area B structure as permissible.
4. Consider the inclusion of new course areas consistent with the broadening of Area B as allowed by EO 1100-R.
5. Try to consolidate Area B into the fewest amount of tracks as possible, keeping in mind that certain high-unit programs might receive exceptions.
6. Review language in EO 1100-R regarding classes that can be offered as the Upper Division Area B class.

Meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

For Thursday, October 18

1. Area C in-depth analysis and draft of instructional materials for the work group
2. GE work group discussion

For Friday, October 19

3. Review all CLA courses from ART-ENGL
-

FUTURE TOPICS

Thursday, October 18 – Area C in-depth analysis

Friday, October 19 – CLA proposals from ART through ENGL

Thursday, October 25 – Area D/E in-depth analysis

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, October 18, 2018

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. in 10-241

Friday, October 19, 2018

11:10 p.m. - 12:00 p.m. in 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

Friday, October 19 – Deadline for student work group applications

General Education Governance Board Meeting
Friday, October 12, 2018

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); ~~Kaila Bussert (Library)~~; Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); ~~Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning)~~; John Jasbinsek (PHYS); ~~Aaron Keen (CSC)~~; **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; ~~Neal MacDougall (AGB)~~; José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); ~~Jesse Vestermark (Library)~~

Guest:

Daniel Parsons (Registrar)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:12 a.m.

Administrative Tasks

1. Gary Laver confirmed that the prerequisites for D5 had changed from “at least two” to “one or more” lower-division D5 classes. That change was made [to the General Education website](#). If the GEGB wants to review that prerequisite, they can do so at a future date.

CAFES Courses

1. Animal Science 112: Principles of Animal Science and RPTA 201: Sociocultural Dimensions of Work and Leisure
 - a. These courses are both being offered online.
 - b. According to eLearning Academic Senate resolution [AS-750-12](#), there is a set of 10 questions faculty should consider when determining “the suitability of eLearning-based courses.”
 - i. In particular, the GEGB will use Section 4 questions 8, 9, and 10 as a standard review to proposals for wholesale change to online delivery.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person’s name.

- c. The GEGB will use these questions to frame their conversations of eLearning classes; the course proposal workflow will be updated in the future to include these questions for proposers to address.
 - i. The GEGB also recognizes that the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (ASCC) will have an eLearning addendum as a focus for their Winter 2019 meetings.
 - ii. The GEGB also recognizes that ASCC will review particulars of proposals especially in terms of contact hours, equivalencies, WTUs, and cap sizes. One concern is that faculty could record lecture videos and upload them every year.
 - 1. Gary Laver will meet with Brian Self, the current ASCC chair, to discuss this process to make sure that courses receive a thorough analysis.
 - d. ASCI 112 and RPTA 201 were sent back to the department as several questions within AS-750-12 do not seem to be addressed.
2. RPTA 257r: Leadership and Diverse Group
- a. This course was sent back to the department as the prerequisite restricts it to only being available for KINE and RPTA majors or AGED minors.
3. New Courses
- a. Soil Science 120: Introductory Soil Science
 - i. The GEGB confirmed that the high school chemistry requirement cannot be enforced.
 - ii. The GEGB recommended that the course proposers review that purpose behind that prerequisite, the material that is covered within the class, and if there are alternatives that could be considered, such as leaving high school chemistry as a recommendation.
 - b. Soil Science 130: Soils in Environmental and Agricultural Systems
 - i. Course was unanimously approved.

Meeting adjourned at 12:01 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

For Thursday, October 18

1. Area C in-depth analysis and draft of instructional materials for the work group
2. GE work group discussion

For Friday, October 19

3. Review all CLA courses from ART-ENGL
 - a. The GEGB is reminded that while there are a number of ENGL revisions, most of them are solely in terms of the name of the class.
-

FUTURE TOPICS

Thursday, October 18 – Area C in-depth analysis; work group appointments

Friday, October 19 – CLA proposals from ART through ENGL

Thursday, October 25 – Area D/E in-depth analysis

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, October 18, 2018

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. in 10-241

Friday, October 19, 2018

11:10 p.m. - 12:00 p.m. in 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

Friday, October 19 – Deadline for student applications for work groups.

General Education Governance Board Meeting
Thursday, October 18, 2018

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); ~~Kaila Bussert (Library)~~; Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); ~~Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning)~~; John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; ~~Neal MacDougall (AGB)~~; José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Jesse Vestermark (Library)

Guests:

Dustin Stegner (ENGL), Academic Senate President
Andrew Morris (HIST), GE Task Force Co-Chair

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

Administrative Tasks

1. Minutes for October 11
 - a. Approved with modification to summary of recommendations
2. Minutes for October 12
 - a. Gary Laver will speak with Susan Olivas about SS 130 if they can have an activity or if it has to be a lab.
 - b. Minutes approved unanimously.
3. The GEGB recommended that Gary send a memo to the campus letting them know that we are going to evaluate course proposals through AS-750-12, particularly the ten questions in Section 4.
 - a. Dustin Stegner recommended that the GEGB speak with Catherine Hillman from the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology to help facilitate and inform this discussion and the GEGB's evaluation process.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

Area Work Group Membership Appointment

The GEGB discussed faculty applications for the five work groups. Student applications are due by October 19 and will be discussed at the October 25 meeting.

Area A

1. Lauren Kolodziejski was appointed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee on Tuesday, October 16, 2018 as the Area A Work Group Chair.
2. The GEGB appointed the following members:
 - a. Faculty from related program: Jay Peters (ENGL)
 - b. Faculty from non-related program: Christopher Woodruff (MUSIC)
 - c. Associate Dean: Debra Valencia-Laver (CLA)
3. The GEGB will continue discussions about a final faculty representative from a related program (who will be from the GEGB).

Area B

1. Paul Choboter (MATH) was appointed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee on Tuesday, October 16, 2018 as the Area B Work Group Chair.
2. The GEGB appointed the following members:
 - a. Faculty from related program: Gita Kolluru (BIO)
 - b. GEGB Representative: Emily Fogle (CHEM)
 - c. Faculty from non-related program: Christopher Woodruff (MUSIC)
 - d. Associate Dean: Derek Gragson (CSM)

Area C

1. Rachel Fernflores (PHIL) was appointed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee on Tuesday, October 16, 2018 as the Area C Work Group Chair. Rachel will also be the GEGB representative for the group.
2. The GEGB appointed the following members:
 - a. Faculty from related program: Elizabeth Adan (ART); Karen Christian (WLC)
 - b. Faculty from a non-related program: G.W. Bates (BRAE)
 - c. Associate Dean: Debra Valencia-Laver (CLA)

Area D/E

1. Kris Jankovitz (KINE) was appointed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee on Tuesday, October 16, 2018 as the Area D/E Work Group Chair.
2. The GEGB appointed the following members:
 - a. Faculty from related program: Sara Lopus (SOC); Bethany Conway-Silva (COMS)
 - b. Associate Dean: Camille O'Bryant (CSM)
3. The GEGB will continue discussions about a final faculty representative from a non-related program (who will be from the GEGB).

The GEGB will discuss the vacancies (including the Diversity and Inclusion work group) at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

For Thursday, October 25

1. Continue work group appointment conversation
 - a. GEGB representative for Area A
 - b. GEGB representative for Area D/E
 - c. Diversity and Inclusion
 - d. Student appointments
2. In-depth analysis of Areas C, D, and E (time permitting)

For Friday, October 26

3. Review remaining CAFES course proposals
 4. Review all CLA courses from ART-ENGL
 - a. The GEGB is reminded that while there are a number of ENGL revisions, most of them are solely in terms of the name of the class.
-

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, October 25, 2018

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. in 10-241

Friday, October 19, 2018

11:10 p.m. - 12:00 p.m. in 10-241

Work Group Orientation/Training (FYI only – only GEGB work group members will need to attend)
Two 2-hour workshops will be scheduled for the week of November 5.

GENERAL DEADLINES

(none)

General Education Governance Board Meeting
Friday, October 19, 2018

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); ~~Mark Borges~~ (ASI representative); ~~Kaila Bussert~~ (Library); ~~Rachel Fernflores~~ (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); ~~Aaron Keen~~ (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; ~~Neal MacDougall~~ (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Jesse Vestermark (Library)

Guest:

Shayna Bailey (Registrar)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:11 a.m.

A. Course Re-Submissions

1. Construction Management 318: Housing and Communities
 - a. The GEGB received a new proposal that addressed their comments.
 - b. One thing that is mentioned in the proposal is that there are no other classes within Cal Poly on this topic, but the GEGB notated a few. It's not a hindrance to their proposal but certainly something for the proposer and department to keep in mind as they propose new courses.
 - c. This course is required for CM students but there are not enough seats to include GE students given the current number of seats they propose.
 - i. The GEGB acknowledges the many revisions made to this proposal. They ask that this potential roadblock be addressed. They have until October 23 to respond.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

2. Recreation, Parks, and Tourism Administration 201: Sociocultural Dimensions of Work and Leisure
 - a. John Jasbinsek asked if the university had any concerns about the security of an online course and if the current PolyLearn platform is secure enough to meet the WCET standard.
 - i. Until the university addresses the security model of an online course, he will not approve of an online course.
 - b. The GEGB appreciated the revisions made to the course but still has a lingering concern about teacher-to-student ratio and contact hours.
 - i. The GEGB asked Gary Laver to consider adding this information in his memo to all faculty about what an appropriate ratio would be and why.
 - c. The GEGB rolled back the course and gave a deadline of October 25.
3. Recreation, Park, and Tourism Administration 257r: Leadership and Diverse Group
 - a. Course was approved as resubmitted.
4. Soil Science 120: Introductory Soil Science
 - a. The Registrar's Office will add a minor edit in the course description that it fulfills Area D5.
 - b. Course was approved.

B. New Courses

1. Natural Resources 328: Environmental Leadership and Community Engagement
 - a. It was confusing as to why D1 was a specific prerequisite and not just any lower-division Area D course. The GEGB asked for clarification.
 - b. The GEGB could not determine how 50% of the grade was connected to writing (which is required for all upper-division Area D courses).
 - c. The GEGB noticed that there were no consult memos attached to show that the proposer reached out to similar classes. They encourage all proposers to review the catalog for similar courses and to send consultation memos to avoid unnecessary duplication.
 - d. Course was rolled back.

Meeting adjourned at 12:01 p.m.

CAL POLY

ACTION ITEMS

For Thursday, October 25

1. Continue work group appointment conversation
 - a. GEGB representative for Area A
 - b. GEGB representative for Area D/E
 - c. Diversity and Inclusion
 - d. Student appointments
2. In-depth analysis of Areas C, D, and E (time permitting)

For Friday, October 26

3. Review remaining CAFES course proposals
4. Review all CLA courses from ART-ENGL
 - a. The GEGB is reminded that while there are a number of ENGL revisions, most of them are solely in terms of the name of the class.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, October 25, 2018

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. in 10-241

Friday, October 19, 2018

11:10 p.m. - 12:00 p.m. in 10-241

Work Group Orientation/Training (FYI only – only GEGB work group members will need to attend)
Two 2-hour workshops will be scheduled for the week of November 5.

GENERAL DEADLINES

(none)

General Education Governance Board Meeting
Thursday, October 25, 2018

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); ~~Kaila Bussert (Library)~~; Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; ~~Neal MacDougall (AGB)~~; José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Jesse Vestermark (Library)

Guests:

Dustin Stegner (ENGL), Academic Senate President
Andrew Morris (HIST), GE Task Force Co-Chair

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:39 p.m.

Administrative Tasks

1. Minutes for October 18
 - a. Approved as submitted.

Area Work Group Discussion

1. Gary informed the GEGB that Jesse Vestermark volunteered to be the GEGB representative for the Area A work group. The GEGB confirmed that appointment.

Diversity and Inclusion Work Group

1. Gary reminded the GEGB of the membership requirements for the group: two faculty members from different colleges; one GEGB member from a third college; two students; an associate dean; an OUDI representative; and a member from Academic Programs and Planning.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

- a. José Navarro was appointed the Diversity and Inclusion Work Group Chair by the Academic Senate Executive Committee on October 9.
- b. Bruno Giberti will be the Academic Programs and Planning representative.
- c. Jennifer Teramoto Pedrotti was appointed the Associate Dean representative at the October 18 GEGB meeting.
- d. GEGB reviewed the applications and decided to expand the work group to allow for more colleges to be represented at these meetings. The following members were appointed:
 - i. Aaron Keen – Computer Science and Software Engineering
 - ii. Neal MacDougall – Agribusiness
 - iii. Marilyn Tseng – Kinesiology and Public Health
 - iv. Grace Yeh – Ethnic Studies
 - v. Aaron and Neal are both GEGB members but will be representing their colleges and not the GEGB in this work group.
- e. The GEGB recognized that broader college representation within each work group is valuable. Additionally, the GEGB recognized that ensuring certain expertise within each area – such as a representative from English or a department that teaches a 40404 class – is essential.
 - i. Greater representation and expertise in each work group can hopefully allow for a smoother integration of the final template and outcomes.
 - ii. The GEGB approved the following expansions:
 1. Area A: Two non-CLA representatives
 2. Area B: Two non-CSM representatives
 3. Area C: One English representative and one non-CLA representative
 4. Area D/E: Two representatives from programs that teach 40404 courses
 - iii. The GEGB approved the following appointments:
 1. Area A: Amanda Lathrop
 2. Area B: Michael Whitt and Amy Lammert
 3. Area C: Catherine Waitinas
 - iv. Gary Laver will reach out to OUDI (Diversity and Inclusion); Orfalea (Area A and/or Area C); History, Political Science, and Ethnic Studies (Area D/E) for nominations.

Area C

1. The current educational objectives and course criteria are a bit more conflated in this area than in the others.
 - a. The objectives are rather weak (when looked at through Bloom's taxonomy) with little measurable outcomes.
 - b. Additionally, there is a separation in terms of the expectations for student learning versus course criteria.
 - i. For instance, there is no student-based outcome related to writing.

- ii. The focus of the educational objectives should be to raise the level of expectation. The information for students and courses should complement one another, but the course criteria are held to a higher standard than the educational objectives.
 - c. The work group should consider course sizes with the writing-intensive focus of this area and how that relates to enrollment numbers and the quality of writing in classes that might be too large.
 2. One major consideration for the group will be in non-English classes and what it means to offer a knowledge-based versus skills-based.
 - a. EO 1100-R emphasizes that Area C “excludes courses that exclusively emphasize skills development” and that certain “courses in languages other than English in partial fulfillment of this requirement if the courses do not focus solely on skills acquisition but also contain a substantial cultural component” (page 8).
 3. The work group (in fact, each work group) will not have to finalize the template design – that will be the work of the GEGB to send to the Senate. The work groups are reminded that their focus will be on writing the area outcomes.
 - a. We cannot require students to take a class in one discipline; EO 1100-R seeks to prevent that type of monopoly on a requirement and to prevent campuses from created additional areas beyond what is stated in the template.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AREA C WORK GROUP

1. Discuss the measurability and level of higher-order learning for each outcome.
2. Explore higher standards in the area’s goals/objectives.
3. Emphasize writing and explore standard outcomes for writing-intensive courses.
4. Analyze course sizes in all subareas, particularly in writing-intensive courses.
5. Review language in EO 1100-R that excludes courses that only emphasize skills development, particularly with non-English-language courses.
6. Discuss the idea of limited disciplinary focus within a particular area.

Meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

CAL POLY

ACTION ITEMS

For Thursday, November 1

1. Continue work group appointment conversation
 - a. Student appointments
 - b. Faculty appointments (as needed)
2. In-depth analysis of Area D/E

For Friday, November 2

1. Review remaining CLA courses

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, November 1, 2018

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. in 10-241

Friday, November 2, 2018

11:10 p.m. - 12:00 p.m. **in 38-114**

Work Group Orientation/Training (FYI only – only GEGB work group members will need to attend)

Monday, November 5 – 2-4 p.m. (35-511)

Wednesday, November 7 – 11-1 p.m. (35-511)

GENERAL DEADLINES

(none)

General Education Governance Board Meeting
Friday, October 26, 2018

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); ~~Kaila Bussert (Library)~~; Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); ~~Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning)~~; John Jasbinsek (PHYS); ~~Aaron Keen (CSC)~~; **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; ~~Neal MacDougall (AGB)~~; ~~José Navarro (ES)~~; Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Jesse Vestermark (Library)

Guest:

Shayna Bailey (Registrar)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:11 a.m.

Administrative Tasks

1. Minutes from October 19, 2018 were approved as submitted.
2. Soil Science 130
 - a. The course was approved but there was a lingering concern about the difference between a lab and an activity. There is one other course that offers an activity – AEPS 110: People, Pests, and Plagues. An activity may count as a lab experience if it meets a certain set of criteria. They might need to provide a little clarification on the contact hours.
 - b. Daniel Parsons will send an email to the course proposer. The ASCC will also be reviewing this in a week, and Daniel will discuss this concern with them, too.
3. Given the fact that the ASCC is working on an eLearning addendum, the GEGB suspended the need for Gary to send an email to the campus explaining how the GEGB is reviewing online courses.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name

Course Re-Submission

1. Construction Management 318: Housing and Communities
 - a. They added another section to allow for more GE students to take the class.
 - b. Course approved following latest submission.

2. Animal Science 112: Principles of Animal Science
 - a. The GEGB received a revised submission that maintains a 50:1 student-to-faculty ratio. The GEGB “approved” the course so that the ASCC could review it, but Gary included a note with his “approval” that the GEGB is, in fact, neither approving nor denying this course but asking the ASCC to discuss the viability of this ratio. This concern falls outside their expertise and purview in terms of how Cal Poly will establish appropriate online cap sizes.
 - b. Daniel Parsons said that he would flag this comment for the ASCC to review since he will be at their meeting when this course is discussed.

3. Recreation, Parks, and Tourism Administration 201: Sociocultural Dimensions of Work and Leisure
 - a. They changed their student-to-faculty ratio as recommended by the GEGB.
 - b. Course approved following latest submission.

4. Natural Resources 328: Environmental Leadership and Community Engagement
 - a. They expanded in the course assignments where the writing intensive aspect would be. Two writing assignments will each be 25% of their grade.
 - b. Daniel Parsons can go into the description and make edits that the prerequisite is one course from D1-D4 with at least a C- grade. The proposers included that information in the course requisites but not in the course description.
 - c. Course approved following latest submission.

New Courses for Discussion

1. BioResource and Agricultural Engineering 349: Water for a Sustainable Society
 - a. The GEGB has a number of concerns about this proposal and determined that the best way to address them would be for Gary Laver to reach out directly to the proposer and discuss those concerns.

2. English 230, 231, 251, 252, 253, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 340, 341, 342, 343, 345, 349, 381
 - a. All of these courses are proposing nothing more than a title change to remove the antiquated term “masterworks” from the title and replace it with a more relevant title related to the timeframe.

- b. While the content of these courses remains the same, the name of the courses was a concern brought up within the larger, recent English program review.
- c. Slate of classes approved as submitted.

Meeting adjourned at 11:58.

ACTION ITEMS

For Thursday, November 1

- 1. Continue work group appointment conversation
 - a. Student appointments
 - b. Faculty appointments (as needed)
- 2. In-depth analysis of Area D/E

For Friday, November 2

- 3. Review remaining CLA courses
-

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, November 1, 2018

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. in 10-241

Friday, November 2, 2018

11:10 p.m. - 12:00 p.m. **in 38-114**

Work Group Orientation/Training (FYI only – only GEGB work group members will need to attend)

Monday, November 5 – 2-4 p.m. (35-511)

Wednesday, November 7 – 11-1 p.m. (35-511)

GENERAL DEADLINES

(none)

General Education Governance Board Meeting
Thursday, November 1, 2018

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); ~~Mark Borges (ASI representative)~~; ~~Kaila Bussert (Library)~~; Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Jesse Vestermark (Library)

Guests:

Dustin Stegner (ENGL), Academic Senate President
Andrew Morris (HIST), GE Task Force Co-Chair

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:39 p.m.

Administrative Tasks

1. Gary communicated with the chairs Ethnic Studies, History, and Political Science regarding the two seats the GEGB would like to represent American Institutions in the Area D/E work group. Each chair said that she or he would see what they could do to submit nominations. Gary also communicated with OUDI on a representative for the Diversity and Inclusion group.
2. Minutes for October 25 were approved with modification.
 - a. Summary of Recommendations item #6 for the Area C work group will now say this: “Discuss the idea of limited disciplinary focus within a particular area.”

Student Appointments to GE Work Groups

1. The GEGB discussed possibly appointed two student representatives for each committee as the work and time requirement might present a challenge for a student. The group determined that it was best to keep with the original membership design and wait to see

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person’s name.

how engaged the students are within their group to determine if a substitute or alternative is needed.

- a. Mark Borges said that he and Jasmin Fashami (ASI President) could also step in as needed, particularly if they need to remind students of their duties.
 - b. The GEGB determined that Senate rules dictate that if a faculty member does not show up for two meetings, then they are removed.
 - c. The GEGB concurred that students would have a similar rule and be informed that attendance is required or else the GEGB would consider removing them from the work group.
2. Area A Work Group
 - a. Rachel Hughes (ENGL) unanimously appointed as the student representative.
 3. Area B Work Group
 - a. Daniel Wong (CSC) unanimously appointed as the student representative.
 4. Area C Work Group
 - a. Jon Harger (AERO) unanimously appointed as the student representative.
 5. Area D/E Work Group
 - a. Tedmon Tran (EE) unanimously appointed as the student representative.
 6. Diversity and Inclusion Work Group
 - a. Gary reminded the GEGB that this group calls for two student representatives.
 - b. Melissa Quintero (AGB – ES) unanimously appointed as one of the student representatives.
 - c. Gabriela Guillen (CSM) unanimously appointed as one of the student representatives.

Area D/E Analysis and Recommendations

1. The Area D/E Work Group still needs a GEGB member included.
 2. Cal Poly's current D4 will fold into Area E, but there is an argument, too, that there could be an orientation course in Area E that pertains to a specific major but is still appropriate for any GE student.
 3. The educational objectives for Area D need to be reviewed so that there is a stronger connection with the objectives and the course criteria.
 4. D1 could be problematic because it reads as both economics and comparative social institutions, but there is no distinct section for political science in EO 1100-R. American Institutions needs to
-

be addressed directly, but Political Science needs its own place in Area D, too. American Institutions may require one or two classes since there is both a history and civics component. EO 1100-R does not reflect the information from EO 1061 (“Graduation Requirements in United States History, Constitution and American Ideals” August 23, 2011). American Institutions needs to be considered in its complexity.

5. Some campuses fulfill the American Institutions requirement outside of GE. We are the only campus that completes this requirement with 1 course. The Chancellor’s Office has no problem with the way we have structured our American Institutions requirement now.
 - a. It could be that American Institutions becomes an overlay with the new GE template, perhaps through an upper division course.
 6. The GE Task Force report included a recommendation to change the CENG exemption from D5. If an upper division class is part of the capstone experience, it seems like a loss to have students skip that. It might be a better option to have them not need to take a lower division course, especially since the new GE structure does not define subareas. Students are very much aware that certain colleges receive exceptions for needing to take GE courses, which leads to a feeling of college elitism and of some majors/colleges mattering more than others.
 7. EO 1100-R does not include any prescriptions for Area D. There seems to be an overall concern that there is no consistency in the GE program and that students can randomly choose classes that do not connect. Having Area D be open-ended does not solve anything. However, the more prescriptive, the more students you might lose. However, there could be an endorsement to provide a structure that reflects the value of this university.
 8. If Cal Poly CENG students do not have to take one of their three lower division Area D classes, then that raises two concerns. First, that would automatically create a different template. Second, that would mean that transfer CENG students, which Cal Poly is seeing more of, would have had an extra class in their transcript (since they have to complete all of the lower division classes before being able to transfer) that does not help them in their progress to degree.
 9. Structure can provide some value, but flexibility would also prevent students from seeking to fulfil the class by taking an online course through a community college. Perhaps there could be menus that correspond to different disciplines that provides both structure and options for students. Does adding labels change anything?
 - a. The GEGB recognizes that the work group is not developing the structure for Area D but perhaps they can include some recommendations as to how it would work so that it is more than just reshuffling classes into new menu categories and that is something that is implementable.
 - b. The GEGB will be charged with combining the various reports into one cohesive proposal for the Senate.
-

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AREA D/E WORK GROUP

1. Focus on learning objectives for each of the main disciplines specifically named in EO 1100-R.
2. Consider D1 being an appropriate place for the American Institutions Requirement.
3. Consider if Political Science should have its own area.
4. Consider if CENG students should not have to take one lower division D course or if that would present hurdles for CENG transfer students as well as the university in having multiple templates.
5. Consider course size in writing intensive classes.

Meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, November 15, 2018

4:10 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. in 10-241

Friday, November 2, 2018

11:10 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. in 10-241

ACADEMIC SENATE

General Education Governance Board
2018-19

General Education Governance Board Meeting Friday, November 2, 2018

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); ~~Kaila Bussert (Library)~~; Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); ~~Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning)~~; John Jasbinsek (PHYS); ~~Aaron Keen (CSC)~~; **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; ~~Neal MacDougall (AGB)~~; José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Jesse Vestermark (Library)

Guest:

Daniel Parsons (Registrar)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:11 a.m.

Administrative Tasks

1. Minutes from October 26, 2018 were approved as submitted.
2. Following the November 1 meeting, Shannon Sullivan-Danser sent email notifications to all students who were appointed to serve on a GE work group. Within minutes, Daniel Wong – who was appointed for the Area B work group – said that he did not want to participate.
3. Michael Latner would be interested in serving as one of the American Institutions experts for the Area D/E work group.
 - a. The GEGB agreed to appoint him but still have him submit a Statement of Interest.
4. Gary said that he received the GE Task Force report from Andrew Morris and Gregg Fiegel. Over the rest of the quarter, the GEGB will read it carefully and come up with an official motion to accept it or not. Now that the work groups are formed and the orientations begin next week, the GEGB will start to focus on other topics, and this report will be one of them.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name

Course Re-Submissions

1. BRAE 349: Water for a Sustainable Society
 - a. Gary spoke with the proposer about BRAE 349. He was very receptive to the comments. The proposal is still with him, but Gary has every reason to believe that the GE-relevant issues will be addressed.
 - i. UPDATE FROM NOVEMBER 6, 2018: Gary received the revised proposal. The Academic Senate Curriculum Committee will be finishing their review of CAFES proposals on November 8. Gary sent an email to all GEGB members to review the new proposal and share any concerns or approve it by emailing himself or Shannon. The course was approved and forwarded to the Senate Curriculum Committee.

2. Gary let the GEGB know that many proposals related to USCP have entered our workflow. They weren't a part of the original workflow but are there now. Those classes are ENGL 348, ES 301, 302, and 304 and RELS 380. Gary asked the GEGB to be prepared to discuss them soon.

New Courses for Discussion

1. ART 145: Ceramics I
 - a. This is a new C3 course proposal but comes from an established course (ART 245) that Art wants to have considered for C3. Any new GE course requires a new number to delineate when it can start to count towards GE, which is why it is now ART 145 instead of Art 245.
 - b. The proposers should explain the why they are moving from a 200-level course to a 100-level course.
 - c. The GEGB is confused as to why it is connected with Art 346.
 - d. The Art department takes its number very seriously to show a linear progression through the subjects.
 - e. There seems to be a disconnect between the educational objectives and the course description, which should include that the course will also include the culture and history of ceramics plus a writing component with term papers.
 - i. These are minor considerations that are implied for the faculty but might not be as obvious for students.
 - f. The GEGB also asked the Art department to define "critique" so that it is clearer what that means for a GE student taking an art class.
 - g. Course was rolled back.

2. ART 314: History of Photography
 - a. The prerequisite language says that a student must have junior standing; isn't that implied because this is a 300-level course?
 - i. Certain CLA programs (such as English, Philosophy, and Art) do not have many 200-level courses. These students need to take 300-level courses even if they do not have junior standing. Since more of these courses are in GE, we'll have

to consider the EO 1100-R language that says campuses can use their discretion when allowing student programs to receive credit that others do not.

- ii. This course does say that Area A needs to be completed, so there is still some level of accountability there.
 - b. Should there be a conversation for programs to offer more 200-level courses so that there aren't so many exceptions?
 1. Some programs are very strategic with the courses they want their faculty to teach to ensure the same level of education, study, etc. whether the student is a native or transfer student. If a student is ready to take a 300-level course at any time, then we should not try to put barriers in front of them.
 2. If a program wants their students to take more upper division classes, then that should be a major requirement; it might not work for a GE student.
 - c. The GEGB agreed that having the Golden Four and completion of C3 was a strong enough set of prerequisites for this course.
 - d. Course approved unanimously.
3. COMS 384: Media Effects
 - a. This course will replace COMS 419.
 - b. The GEGB did not have any comments that concerned them.
 - c. Course was approved as submitted.
 4. DANC 221: Dance Appreciation
 - a. This course was previously approved as an online course. The only change was in the course description.
 - b. Course was approved as submitted.
 5. ENGL 133: Writing and Rhetoric for Multilingual Students
 - a. The GEGB determined that, though there are many changes in the description, the CLOs are adequate. It seems as though they are just updating language terminology and not the content of the course.
 - b. Course approved as submitted.
 6. ENGL 134: Writing and Rhetoric
 - a. There was a minor edit. The GEGB did not have any concerns.
 - b. Course approved as submitted.

Meeting adjourned at 11:58.

CAL POLY

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, November 15, 2018

4:10 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. in 10-241

Friday, November 2, 2018

11:10 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. in 10-241

General Education Governance Board Meeting
Thursday, November 15, 2018

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); ~~Kaila Bussert (Library)~~; ~~Rachel Fernflores (PHIL)~~; Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); ~~José Navarro (ES)~~; Brent Nuttall (ARCE); ~~Jesse Vestermark (Library)~~

Guests:

Dustin Stegner (ENGL), Academic Senate President
Andrew Morris (HIST), GE Task Force Co-Chair

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m.

Administrative Tasks

1. Minutes for November 1 approved as submitted.
2. The Summary of Recommendations for the Area D/E Work Group did not include anything specific to Area E.
 - a. The GEGB recommends the work group to consider writing outcomes that would allow for an orientation class to transition to university life and that might include information about how study successfully, how to have research effectively, the value of a liberal arts education etc. Area E could also include a class that introduces students to their major.
3. The GEGB will meet Thursdays from 4:10 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. for Winter and Spring 2019.
4. Area D/E Work Group Membership
 - a. Michael Latner sent a statement of interest for the Area D/E Work Group. Since the GEGB approved his appointment pending his statement of interest submission, his appointment has been (re)confirmed.
 - b. Gary Laver said that he can be a GEGB rep for the Area D/E work group and can attend as many meetings as possible.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name

5. The GEGB received the final report from the GE Task Force. The GEGB will draft a resolution letting the Senate know that they formally received it.
 - a. Gary Laver will prepare a draft resolution and share it with the GEGB for approval in the near future.

Teleconference with the CSU Chancellor's Office regarding EO 1100-R Progress

1. Mary Pedersen, Bruno Giberti, Dustin Stegner, and Gary Laver spoke with Alison Wrynn (Interim Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs and Faculty Development) from the CSU Chancellor's Office to discuss Cal Poly's progress on implementing the EO 1100-R template revisions.
2. It was a highly clarifying conversation in that there will be little-to-no exceptions permitted in the template design.
 - a. Area D could have areas designated for American Institutions and for Upper Division. The other two lower division courses will essentially be an open-ended list of classes for students to pick from.
 - i. Engineers can still be afforded an exception in Area D. Any exception we currently have can continue in the new structure.
 - b. Area C will have C1, C2, a lower-division elective, and an upper division requirement. We will not be allowed to add or tinker to that structure.
 - c. Area B will not have separate upper division subareas. There will be one collective group of courses.
 - i. The work of the B7 Task Force will fold into the new B5 objectives.
 - d. With the exception of the 8 or 12 units Cal Poly has by virtue of the semester-to-quarter course equivalency conversion, there will be no latitude permitted.
 - i. Having those 2 or 3 extra classes does provide Cal Poly with a little bit of latitude.
 - ii. Cal Poly can have programs decide what to do with those extra units, but they must be fulfilled within General Education.
 - iii. Cal Poly can also use those 2 or 3 extra classes to bolster our students' experience in a certain way.
3. Cal Poly cannot make any changes to the Golden Four (Area A plus B4) for native or transfer students.

Work Group Next Steps

1. The GEGB will have to combine the various work group reports, smooth out any potential problems, and ultimately propose a cohesive plan.
 2. The GEGB will need to mimic some of the conversations going on in the work groups, especially in regards to template concerns, and come up with a judgment that this campus can reflect.
 3. The GEGB liaisons on each work group will be responsible for sharing progress reports with the rest of the GEGB in anticipation of the final report in January.
-

4. Cal Poly can still pursue pathways as a way to provide an integrated experience through the GE program. Any creativity beyond what we do to the structure would be find.
 - a. However, pathways cannot require any set of prerequisites as that would add extra units to a student's progress to degree.

Upper Division B

1. Cal Poly has a rather customized Area B so that students can have a unique experience depending on their major. The conversation with the Chancellor's Office showed that those options are not permitted any more.
2. The GEGB should consider amending their summary of recommendations so that the work group has an updated set of expectations.
3. After the Thanksgiving holiday, the GEGB should consider how to balance the Executive Order EO 1100-R and the more student-focused structure of the current Upper Division B experience.
 - a. There could be sets of outcomes that are cohesive unto themselves. It could be that there are clusters of criteria that work best for certain disciplines. Programs would recommend a certain cluster for their students.
 - b. The concern would be if the program requires one course and a student takes a different one, then, s/he would have wasted units.
4. The GEGB recommends separating the UD-B clusters as much as possible to what is pedagogically appropriate for students based on their disciplines.

Extra Units

1. Some programs require students to take multiple courses in one subarea. If Cal Poly prescribes the extra 8-12 units and that student is in a program without enough free electives, that could be problematic.
2. There's a special opportunity at Cal Poly by virtue of being on the quarter system. Students might end up with slightly different GE patterns based on what their program determines, but it could be a good thing in the long term.
3. The GEGB needs to mitigate as much confusion as possible so that, if a program does determine a specific class for their students to take, students are informed but still given the opportunity to enjoy a robust General Education program.

Research

1. The GEGB and Academic Programs will gather as much information as possible from the Chancellor's Office and other campuses about how they are organizing their templates and the courses they are offering.

General Education Governance Board Meeting
Friday, November 16, 2018

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); ~~Mark Borges (ASI representative); Kaila Bussert (Library);~~ Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); ~~Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning);~~ John Jasbinsek (PHYS); ~~Aaron Keen (CSC);~~ **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY);** ~~Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES);~~ Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Jesse Vestermark (Library)

Guest:

Daniel Parsons (Registrar)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:10 a.m.

Course Review

1. ART 145: Ceramics I
 - a. Proposer made edits per the GEGB's recommendations.
 - b. Course approved as resubmitted.
2. Spanish
 - a. This set of classes is designed to mirror the classes would take if they studied abroad. The intent of these courses is for students to receive C1, C2, or C5 credit. The current course description only lists C5.
 - b. Previous GEGB chairs have allowed for this set of courses to count for credit in those areas.
 - i. Gary Laver will confirm with the department chair and college on their intent for this set of classes and if the description should be amended to say that it will count for C1, C2, or C5 credit.
 - ii. Rather than rollback, Gary will send an email to them about this set of six Spanish courses as well as the parallel set of six courses in Italian and Chinese.¹

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name

¹ The set of Italian and Chinese courses did not meet the deadline. The GEGB will consider approving these courses as a courtesy since the course descriptions directly parallel one another.

- iii. The GEGB will ask for a blanket statement showing the intent for this three sets of six classes.

Slate of Approvals

1. The GEGB had no marked comments about the following set of courses and were approved unanimously:
 - a. ENGL 348
 - b. ES 320, 321, 322, and 323
 - c. PHIL 301, 343, and 362
 - d. POLS 112
 - e. PSY 304
 - f. RELS 201
 - g. SOC 321
 - h. WGS 345 and 351

Continuation of CLA Course List

1. History 354
 - a. The department should be made aware that Area F will cease to exist; this course will roll into B7 for the time being but will need to be reapproved once the final GE template is approved.
 - b. The department was asked to consider getting a consultation memo from Computer Science.
2. Ethnic Studies 301, 302, and 303
 - a. The GEGB recommends the cap size switching from 32 as proposed to 24 or 25.
 - b. ES 302 will also include a specific note as it was unclear what was being assessed in the quizzes and how many there would be.
3. ENGL 373
 - a. There was a comment by the proposer about how they are intending to go beyond what is listed in course assessments, particularly in CR3. It is a comment that reflects more on the proposer than the nature of the course. It could be challenging to replicate if someone else was to teach this course.
 - b. The GEGB was confused how and where students would be shown effective models of film criticism and how it would be integrated into the topics.

Remainder of CLA Courses

1. ENGL 311
 - a. Course seems to be skills based and more appropriate for a major course. Rhetoric and writing is often separated from literature, so this course would need to offer more than skills development especially with EO 1100-R. The GEGB also wonders if a C- in Area A would be sufficient enough prerequisite.
 - b. Course was rolled back with the GEGB's comments.

2. ENGL 312
 - a. The GEGB noticed that ENGL 133 is referenced quite extensively in the outline. The GEGB would have the proposer consider adding it as a prerequisite in the course description.
 - b. There are no EOs or CRs mapped on the course learning objectives.
 - c. Course was rolled back with the GEGB's comments.

3. ES 324
 - a. Course was approved as submitted

4. HIST 311
 - a. The CLOs seem to be rather generic. Only the fifth comment is specific to the course.
 - b. Course was rolled back with the GEGB's comments.

5. HIST 313
 - a. There is not a single educational objective listed in CLO8. There is an approval from WLC but they are not referenced earlier in the proposal.
 - b. Liberal Studies would add the course to their curriculum since their concentrations are all in other departments. They do not need to necessarily submit an approval memo in response.
 - c. Course was rolled back with the GEGB's comments.

The GEGB will meet on Thursday, November 29 at 3:30 p.m. and Friday, November 30 at 11:00 a.m.

Meeting adjourned at 12:02 p.m.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, November 15, 2018
4:10 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. in 10-241

Friday, November 2, 2018
11:10 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. in 10-241

General Education Governance Board Meeting
Thursday, November 29, 2018

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); ~~Kaila Bussert (Library)~~; Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); ~~Emily Fogle (CHEM)~~; Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); ~~John Jasbinsek (PHYS)~~; Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Jesse Vestermark (Library)

Guests:

Dustin Stegner (ENGL), Academic Senate Chair
Andrew Morris (HIST), GE Task Force Co-Chair and GE Pathways Chair

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m.

ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

1. Minutes for November 15, 2018 were approved as submitted.
2. The Area A student representative resigned from the work group due to time commitment conflicts.
 - a. The GEGB unanimously appointed Chloe Fowler as the new Area A student representative.

GE PATHWAYS WORK GROUP APPOINTMENTS

1. Dustin Stegner announced that Andrew Morris had been appointed as the chair for the GE Pathways work group.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

2. The GEGB expanded the faculty membership to appoint the additional four faculty members who applied to the work group.
 - a. Josh Machamer – Theatre and Dance
 - b. Samuel Frame – Statistics
 - c. Carmen Trudell – Architecture
 - d. Gregg Fiegel – Civil and Environmental Engineering, Director of University Honors Program

3. There were thirteen student applications, so the GEGB expanded the student membership to appoint three students.
 - a. Philip Ryan Abarquez – Political Science Senior
 - b. Katherine Ettl – Political Science Senior
 - c. Vidhi Sachdeva – Civil Engineering Senior

4. There are still some *ex officio* positions that need to be filled by members of different administrative departments.

GE TASK FORCE REPORT

1. The GE Task Force report will be added on communication to the Senate. No formal resolution needed.

GE WORK GROUP DELIVERABLES

1. Gary will communicate updates with work group chairs about designing outcomes with EO 1100-R in mind.

2. Gary, Dustin, and the GE work group chairs will set up a meeting with the CSU Chancellor's Office in January to discuss a draft of the template design.

3. The GEGB will continue to discuss the nature of the revised course criteria and educational outcomes.

Meeting adjourned at 11:58.

ACTION ITEMS

For Thursday, December 6

1. Continue with GE template discussions

For Friday, December 7

1. Complete review of all remaining course proposals (the OCOB class as well as any re-submissions)
-

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, December 6, 2018

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. in 10-241

Friday, November 2, 2018

11:10 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. in 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

(none)

General Education Governance Board Meeting
Friday, November 30, 2018

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); ~~Kaila Bussert (Library); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM);~~ Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); ~~Aaron Keen (CSC);~~ **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY);** ~~Neal MacDougall (AGB);~~ José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Jesse Vestermark (Library)

Guest:

Daniel Parsons (Registrar)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:10 a.m.

ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

1. There are additional OCOB class descriptions in the OneDrive folder. Those proposals were put there erroneously.

COURSE RE-SUBMISSIONS

1. Ethnic Studies 301, 302, and 303
 - a. Per the GEGB's recommendation on November 16, the cap size was changed to 24 students for each course.
 - b. Courses approved as resubmitted.
2. History 311: Comparative World Environmental History and Sustainability since 1492
 - a. Per the GEGB's recommendations on November 16, the CLOs were revised to relate more specifically to the nature of the course.
 - b. Course approved as resubmitted.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

3. History 313: Modern Middle East
 - a. Per the GEGB's recommendation on November 16, the proposer included mapping to CLO 8.
 - b. Course approved as resubmitted.

4. ENGL 312 and 373
 - a. Proposals were revised to address the GEGB's concerns.
 - b. The Registrar's Office will update the course descriptions to include the language used in the course information sections.
 - c. Courses approved as resubmitted.

5. Spanish set of courses for study abroad
 - a. Gary Laver shared the language that he drafted in regards to these courses being eligible to fulfill C1, C2, or C5.
 - b. The GEGB is reminded that approving these sets provides more flexibility for the first-year level. Approving this exception bridges the gap of students receiving credit for these courses if they went through a CSU study abroad program. This language does not replace the existing intermediary course.
 - c. The GEGB approved of the slate of Spanish courses as well as the identical Italian and Chinese courses. The GEGB also approved of the exception courtesy language, which will be added on the note for each of the 18 courses.
 - d. The Registrar's Office will edit the course description to reflect that these courses are eligible to fulfill more than just C5 classes.

NEW SUBMISSIONS

1. Religion 180: The American Religious Experience
 - a. The GEGB agreed that this is not a lower-division course nor does it fulfill 40404. The GEGB also agreed that the content is fascinating but the scope, content, and depth are too ambitious for a 100-level course.
 - b. Course was rolled back with a deadline of December 6 to resubmit.

2. Philosophy 361: Indian Philosophy
 - a. This course would replace the deactivated course.
 - b. The assignments total 95 points, not 100, and seem to be the same set of assignments each week and do not have sufficient level of information.
 - c. The GEGB was concerned about the prerequisites. Since transfer students might not have taken Philosophy 230 or 231 in their lower-division GE curriculum at a community college, it would be challenging for them to have that specific prerequisite. Other C2 prerequisite conventions suggest that it is fine not to list.
 - d. Per EO 1100-R, philosophy students should be eligible to double count this course.

- e. Neither the midterm nor paper are included in the expanded course content.
 - f. Course was rolled back.
3. Sociology 343: Contemporary Societies of the Developing World
- a. The GEGB discussed the need for the course to be mapped onto the educational objectives or course criteria.
 - b. The GEGB also commented that the verbs should reflected higher-order thinking skills (i.e., forms of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation).
 - c. The CR4 response should also be strengthened.
 - d. Course was rolled back.

Meeting adjourned at 12:04 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

For Thursday, December 6

- 1. Continue with GE template discussions

For Friday, December 7

- 1. Complete review of all remaining course proposals (the OCOB class as well as any re-submissions)
-

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, December 6, 2018

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. in 10-241

Friday, November 2, 2018

11:10 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. in 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

(none)

General Education Governance Board Meeting
Thursday, December 6, 2018

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); ~~Kaila Bussert (Library)~~; Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Jesse Vestermark (Library)

Guests:

Dustin Stegner (ENGL), Academic Senate Chair
Andrew Morris (HIST), GE Task Force Co-Chair and GE Pathways Chair

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m.

ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

1. Minutes for November 29, 2018 were approved with modifications to attendance.
2. Chloe Fowler said that she is unable to join the Area A work group as the student representative due to time constraints in January.
 - a. The GEGB appointed Christopher Wang (Aerospace Engineering Senior) as the student representative.
3. Work group updates
 - a. Gary met with chairs for Area C and Area D/E.
 - b. Emily Fogle reported that Area B talked about Upper Division B (UD-B) requirement and how it will look to fold in B7 with the new UD-B structure. In general, the group liked the idea of one large selection of classes and different sets of learning outcomes based on programmatic preference. The group will try to finish the outcomes for B1-B4 first and spend their meetings in January to focus on UD-B.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

- c. Area A has split into subgroups to have more focused conversations and will meet once again as a group before the end of the quarter.
- d. The work groups and GEGB will discuss in January the extent to which it might possible to fold in some of the current GE structure with the rules from EO 1100-R. Cal Poly should consider a conversation with the Chancellor's Office in January to present some of the plans for their consideration, especially in regards to the "extra" units Cal Poly has by virtue of being on a quarter system.
 - i. The GEGB's goal for January should be a further analysis of the subject areas (A1, A2, A3, etc. not just "Area A" as a whole) to be better prepared for what the work groups will present.

GE Units and Template Design

- 1. The GEGB discussed the "extra" eight units Cal Poly has to consider with the GE template. By way of the semester-to-quarter unit conversion, we have the opportunity to offer breadth and consider creative ways to allocate those units.
 - a. The GEGB is reminded that the EO acknowledges that certain latitude might be extended for high-unit programs and to consider the potential impact this might have on transfer or change-of-major students
 - b. What is the best way to balance a prescriptive program with encouraging students to take classes that they would not take otherwise?

SUMMARY

- 1. At the conclusion of the conversation, the GEGB settled on these areas for further conversation.
 - a. Should the GEGB give programs the opportunity to choose what courses their students should take, or would it only encourage discipline-specific courses instead of the breadth of the GE program?
 - b. Should all eight units be open-ended GE electives?
 - i. Or, should all students continue to have an extra B1 course?
 - ii. If so, then should those extra four units be up to student or program choice?

Meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

(none)

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, January 10, 2019
4:10 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. in 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

January 28, 2019 – Work Group reports submitted
May 1, 2019 – Registrar will share new template and outcomes with faculty

General Education Governance Board Meeting
Friday, December 7, 2018

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); ~~Kaila Bussert (Library)~~; Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); ~~Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning)~~; John Jasbinsek (PHYS); ~~Aaron Keen (CSC)~~; **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; ~~Neal MacDougall (AGB)~~; José Navarro (ES); ~~Brent Nuttall (ARCE)~~; Jesse Vestermark (Library)

Guest:

Daniel Parsons (Registrar)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:10 a.m.

Administrative Tasks

1. Minutes from November 2, November 16, and November 30 were approved as a slate.

Course Re-Submissions

1. Philosophy 361: Indian Philosophy
 - a. They updated the language so that it doesn't conflict with EO 1100-R.
 - b. Assessment methods have more detail.
 - c. Course approved as resubmitted.
2. Sociology 343: Contemporary Societies of the Developing World
 - a. Verbs were strengthened, CLOs are now mapped, and final tally is to 100 points.
 - b. Course approved as resubmitted.
3. Religion 180: The American Religious Experience
 - a. Gary Laver told the GEGB that he spoke with the proposer directly. In his email memo, he maps the course to EO 1061 (American Institutions) requirements.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

- b. He is using alternative methods modeled from a previously approved 40404 class to explain the relationship between American government/institution development with religion.
 - i. The GEGB believes the goal would be to understand history and/or American government through religion, not the other way around, perhaps through an exploration of how religion was a major influencer in immigration.
- c. The proposer also views this course as a stepping stone to C4 or D5.
- d. The GEGB recommends the proposer make the connection to 40404 more explicit so that it mirrors other D1 courses or consider proposing this course for D5.
- e. The earliest this course could go in the catalog would be Winter 2020.
- f. Course was rolled back.

New Course Proposals

- 1. Business 204: Financial Literacy
 - a. This course does not map properly to the new EO 1100-R. It cannot work as a D4 or E class. It must belong in B4, which is the new section related to Quantitative Reasoning.
 - b. They can resubmit if mapped to the proper subarea or consider waiting until the new outcomes are complete and submit an off-cycle course.

Minutes from yesterday and today will be reviewed in January.

Meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

ACTION ITEMS

<<none>>

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, January 10, 2019
4:10 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. in 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

January 28, 2019 – Work Group reports submitted

May 1, 2019 – Registrar will share new template and outcomes with faculty

General Education Governance Board Meeting
Thursday, January 10, 2019

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); Kaila Bussert (Library); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Jesse Vestermark (Library)

Guest:

Andrew Morris (History, Co-Chair GETF)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. The GEGB welcomed Kaila Bussert back from maternity leave. She and Jesse Vestermark will continue to attend meetings together and collaborate on the Area A work group until the transition is complete.
- B. Minutes from December 6, 2018 were unanimously approved as submitted.
- C. Minutes from December 7, 2018 were unanimously approved with slight modification to Religion 180 summary.
 - 1. Following the GEGB's revision to its summary of concerns, Gary Laver will officially roll back the class for further revision by the proposer.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name

II. GE Pathways Work Group

- A. The GEGB reviewed and discussed the associate dean applications for the GE Pathways work group. They appointed Camille O'Bryant to the position.
- B. The GEGB will continue to discuss the open positions for representatives from GEGB and University Marketing.

III. Work Group Updates

- A. Area A Work Group (Jesse Vestermark): The group is writing objectives and criteria from scratch and comparing them to the current lists. The group is also considering a subset of objectives and criteria that are focused specifically on information literacy, which would apply to all of the Area A subareas.
- B. Area B Work Group (Emily Fogle): The group met after finals week and will meet again next week. The group is focusing on completing all of the lower division B outcomes first so that the rest of their time can hone in on the upper division requirement. The group is also focusing on the structure, which in its current form is rather confusing. The outcomes will – where appropriate – be mirrored in each of the subareas.
- C. Area C Work Group (Rachel Fernflores): The group is focusing on lower division objectives and criteria. There are smaller groups working on their own sets of objectives and criteria. One small group is also looking at the C5 elective, which is focused on classes in a language other than English, and considering a proposal for it to be an elective for all colleges.
- D. Area D/E Work Group (Gary Laver): The group has submitted their recommendation for the structure of Area D in the new template. They recognize D1 for 40404 requirements. D2 would be a “grab bag” of classes for the final two lower division requirements, and D3 would be the upper division requirement. Students would have to select courses from three different prefixes in Area D. Area E is pretty straightforward, and they do not have any concerns.
- E. Diversity and Inclusion Work Group (José Navarro): The work group is looking at the Diversity Learning Objectives (DLOs) and United States Cultural Pluralism (USCP) objectives. The DLOs contain both global and U.S. foci, and the work group is trying to see how it can link with USCP. The group is also considering changing “USCP” as it is an outdated term and will wait until they create the objectives to consider what that new name might be.
- F. Pathways (Andrew Morris): Andrew will reach out to group members to schedule their first meeting.

IV. Area A Analysis

- A. The GEGB agrees to rename A1 and A2 to be in alignment with the EO 1100-R template.
- B. The GEGB discussed the need for disciplinary experts in each of the areas and what the curriculum for the subareas might look like.
- C. The GEGB also recognized how Philosophy and English approach teaching critical thinking: with a focus on logic and a focus on argumentation, respectively.
 - 1. The GEGB is concerned that, given how critical thinking is taught now, it might not be in compliance with the EO 1100-R.
 - 2. The GEGB recommends Philosophy and English faculty members to meet to discuss how critical thinking is being taught for their students, especially in light of the new guidelines from the CSU.
- D. The GEGB will continue to look at the Writing Intensive Requirements over the next month as time permits.

V. General Updates

- A. CSU Executive Vice Chancellor Loren Blanchard spoke with Provost Kathleen Enz Finken just before the end of Fall Quarter 2018. At that time, Cal Poly was informed that we had until Fall 2020 to comply with Executive Order 1100-Revised (EO 1100-R), which outlines the new General Education template.
 - 1. Gary informed the GEGB that they will be working with the Office of the Registrar on this updated timeline and to what extent (if any) the GEGB will be needed to assist.
- B. Gary will be gone next week for the General Education Advisory Council (GEAC) meeting in Long Beach. Rachel Fernflores has agreed to lead the meeting with a focus on Area C progress.
- C. Gary and Dustin Stegner (Academic Senate Chair) are meeting with all six colleges to give department heads and chairs a summary of what to expect with the new GE template. Gary will also coordinate with Mark Borges on a presentation with ASI.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

For Thursday, January 17

1. In-depth analysis of Area C led by Rachel Fernflores.
-

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, January 17, 2019

4:10 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. **in 35-511**

GENERAL DEADLINES

January 29, 2019 – Reports from Area work groups are due

May 1, 2019 – Deadline to share new template with Office of the Registrar

Fall 2020 – Implementation of new General Education template

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); Kaila Bussert (Library); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); ~~Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)~~; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Jesse Vestermark (Library)

Guests:

Dustin Stegner (English, Academic Senate Chair)
Andrew Morris (History, Co-Chair GETF, Chair GE Pathways)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, was unable to attend the meeting due to a conflict with the CSU Senate meeting.

Rachel Fernflores led the meeting and called it to order at 4:10 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Minutes from January 10, 2019 were unanimously approved as submitted.
- B. The GEGB discussed the Pathways work group and the positions still open for a GEGB and a University Marketing representative. The GEGB recommends inviting University Marketing to consider joining this group to understand the intricacies of the program to better help them brand and include GE in a future marketing campaign. However, the group understands if no representative is able participate at this time.

II. Work Group Progress Reports

- A. Group A (Jesse Vestermark)
Group A hasn't met since the last update on January 10. They continue to wordsmith the document and plan on a final meeting the week of January 22.

*Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name

B. Group B (Emily Fogle)

Group B met the day before (January 16). Objectives and criteria for B1-B4 are in good shape. The group's next meeting will start to think about the Upper Division course.

C. Group C (Rachel Fernflores)

Group C is also wordsmithing the document but are considering two proposals. The first proposal presented by Debra Valencia-Laver would have one class in C1, two classes in C2, and the upper division course. The second proposal suggested by Catherine Waitinas and Karen Christian would include an area about languages other than English.

The GEGB discussed the parameters of EO 1100-R and reiterated the fact that there cannot be a new subarea. There might be the option to expand the outcomes with a focus on languages other than English, but it cannot be its own designation.

The GEGB also discussed the fact that the additional units Cal Poly has in its GE template (by way of the semester-to-quarter unit conversion) will be allocated by the GEGB and cannot be determined by the work group.

D. Group D

No update as the GEGB representative (Gary Laver) was absent.

E. GE Diversity and Inclusion (José Navarro)

The group is discussing the USCP and DLO language. The USCP does not include objectives, just criteria. The group is working on establishing objectives, too. The group is also considering how USCP is mapped to the DLOs. They are working on a resolution for the revised DLOs and hope to add it to the February Senate meeting for approval. The group is also looking particularly at the language in EO 1100-R Article 4 "Subject Area Distribution": "Instruction approved to fulfill the following subject-area distribution requirements should recognize the contributions to knowledge and civilization that have been made by members of diverse cultural and gender groups" (EO 1100-R p. 6).

As this is a mandate included in the executive order, the group will make sure that this task is discussed at future meetings.

F. GE Pathways

Group is still waiting on a GEGB and University Marketing representative. As those two members are ex officio, the GEGB recommended having the first meeting with the rest of the active members and can fill in the additional members as they volunteer.

Rachel Fernflores said that she could be available to join the group.

III. Area C In-Depth Analysis

- A. The group discussed the new template parameters and what that would look for the current Cal Poly structure.
- B. The group discussed the balance between interdisciplinary classes and classes taught by disciplinary experts and what that might mean during course renewal.
- C. The group also discussed the options between prescribing courses for students with giving students as many options as possible. Area C (4:41)

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

Thursday, January 24

- 1. In-depth analysis of Area B.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, January 24

3:30 – 5 p.m.

10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

January 28, 2019 – GE Area Work Group Reports Due

May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty

Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); Kaila Bussert (Library); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Jesse Vestermark (Library)

Guests:

Dustin Stegner (English, Academic Senate Chair)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Minutes from January 17, 2019 approved unanimously.
- B. Pathways work group will meet for the first time tomorrow from 2-3. John Jasbinsek said that he would attend that meeting on behalf of the GEGB.
- C. Gary will remind the work group chairs that their reports with template recommendations and revised objectives and criteria are due next week.
 1. Once the groups submit the report, they cannot edit them. The GEGB will make the final determination as to what to submit to the Senate and will work with the area groups if need be.

II. Course Proposals in the Curriculum Management Workflow Portal

- A. Religion 180 is being reviewed by the USCP committee as that is how the program managed the revisions. The GEGB will review the proposal when it is received.
- B. Women and Gender Studies 201 is being proposed for an online conversion. It is already approved as a regular course. In comparing the proposal to the criteria from the e-policy resolution, the GEGB was satisfied that the proposal met the criteria.
 1. Approved with two abstentions.
- C. Architecture 120 and Construction Management 333 are new to our workflow. The GEGB will review them at a future date.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

III. Area B In-Depth Analysis

- A. The GEGB did not object to renaming the lower division areas to be consistent with EO 1100-R.
- B. The GEGB considered the ramifications of one track for Upper Division B rather than separating the requirements by college.
 - 1. The Area B Work Group is working on objectives and criteria that can be as inclusive as possible with the various disciplines included in that area.
 - 2. The GEGB recognizes the EO 1100-R goal to simplify the template and eliminate multiple tracks through the program as much as possible, but if Cal Poly maintains exceptions to high-unit programs (like in CENG), then there would have to be at least two different templates.
- C. The GEGB considered keeping current exceptions for high-unit programs, which is permitted within EO 1100-R.
- D. The GEGB also considered how double counting might afford students more breadth than before in the GE program.
- E. The GEGB discussed the additional eight units Cal Poly has within the GE template.*
 - 1. Four units are in quantitative reasoning.
 - 2. The GEGB discussed making the additional units GE electives, untethered to any discipline. The group discussed merits and drawbacks to this option and realize that flexibility is something students might really enjoy. With double counting, students have much more leeway in the classes they can take and could pursue additional interests. This conversation is one the GEGB will continue.

IV. Writing Intensive Courses

- A. Senate Resolution AS-504-98, "[Resolution on General Education 2000](#)," outlines (amongst other things) the writing intensive component in GE.
- B. Rachel Fernflores (Area C Work Group Chair) commented that her group is considering a goal of 2,000 words for lower-division writing intensive courses and 3,000 words for upper division courses. Some courses reach 3,000 words during the final exam, which isn't a meaningful writing experience as it lacks feedback and opportunities for revision.
- C. The GEGB also recognizes that ensuring classes go through a course renewal process is essential and missing from the program. It will be a priority for the group following the approval of the new template.
- D. Another priority will be reviewing faculty workload so that, as writing intensive courses become smaller and thus have more sections of them, there is proper administrative support.

* By way of the semester-to-quarter unit equivalency conversion, quarter-based campuses have 8 units to factor into the template in order to meet the required units for lower-division general education.

- E. The GEGB also recognized that the current wording for Writing Intensive courses require all GE courses to include 10% writing. The GEGB will consider revising the language to include possible examples so that it is clearly identified in course syllabi.
- F. The GEGB reaffirms the need to keep Writing Intensive courses within GE and will work on offering some clarification to the wording, perhaps by bringing in Dawn Janke or Jay Peters to an upcoming meeting in February/March.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

Thursday, January 31, 2019 | In-depth analysis of Areas C and D/E

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, January 31, 2019 | 4:10 – 5 p.m., 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. Week of January 28, 2019 – GE Area Work Group Reports Due
2. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
3. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); Kaila Bussert (Library); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); ~~Jesse Vestermark (Library)~~

Guests:

Dustin Stegner (English, Academic Senate Chair)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:13 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Minutes from January 24, 2019 approved unanimously.
- B. RELS 180 is back in the GEGB workflow. The group will review the revised proposal and discuss it at next week's meeting.
- C. The group determined that they will use AS 504-98 "Resolution on *General Education 2000*" as a framework for their eventual resolution to the Senate and will modify as needed.
- D. Gary has received three area work group reports. He will share them with the GEGB to review soon.
- E. Andrew Morris could not be at today's meeting but shared an update with Gary on the GE pathway group's first meeting. They met last Friday (January 25) and discussed action plan and potential strengths and considerations for the group to discuss.
 1. John Jasbinsek attended as the GEGB representative and said that they group is discussing what if enough classes will be offered so that students can complete a pathway and what it might mean for the Office of the Registrar and University Advising to support GE pathways. The group also discussed the possibility that a pathway might be too concentrated, whereby students might lose some breadth, which is the overall goal of the GE program.

II. Areas D and E Analysis and Exploration of GEGB Considerations

- A. Area D
 1. The GEGB confirmed their support of a subarea in D specific to the 40404 requirement, an option that is permitted within EO 1100-R.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

- a. D2 would be one large are with the rest of the lower-division Area D course offerings.
 2. The current Cal Poly GE template permits an exception to CENG on Upper Division D.
 - a. The group discussed the complication of moving that exception to only needing to take 8 units in lower division D. However, this exception would be challenging for transfer students and might hurt their progress to degree.
 3. Other CSU campuses have required a prefix variation for their Lower Division D requirement, and the Chancellor's Office has supported that decision.
- B. Area E
 1. The GEGB discussed the possibility of orientation-based classes in Area E.
 - a. These classes would focus on "student success strategies" and could be orientation to the major or to university life (EO 1100-R Article 4 "Area E).
 - b. There are similar classes already available; however, these classes tend to be 1 unit only and restricted to students within a program.
 - c. Students are block scheduled in their first quarter, which might give them the orientation they need. However, if a student is considering changing his or her major or would like to know more about an industry, he or she might be restricted from taking this class.
 - i. If the course is being proposed for General Education, it would not be a true GE course if was exclusive to students within one program.
 - d. The GEGB recognized that there could be value in a course that offers an introduction to university life, especially for students who are first-generation, under-represented students without any preparation for university life.
 2. There also is a focus in Area E on "lifelong learning." A class that is only focused on the university-experience might not capture that aspect of the goal.
 - a. Area E could also include reading a few great books, developing success strategies, and learning practical skills not normally taught in the classroom (e.g. financial literacy, stress management, information literacy, etc.).
 - b. Area E classes could focus on cultivating the intellect and an exploration of the university educates and reinforces those skills.
 - c. UNIV courses might be more true to the idea of Area E than a major-based course.
 3. Currently, general psychology might migrate to Area E. However, Area D might be a better placement for those classes in the future. The GEGB also recognizes that there might be some challenges of not having enough seats in Area E without PSY 201/202 offered.
 4. Area E may also be considered as a core GE experience.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

- Thursday, February 7, 2019 | In-depth analysis of Writing Intensive Course, RELS 180, Area C, potential response to Cuesta College GE advertisement in *Mustang News*.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, February 7, 2019 | **3:30 – 5 p.m., 10-241**

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. Week of January 28, 2019 – GE Area Work Group Reports Due
2. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
3. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); Kaila Bussert (PCS); ~~Rachel Fernflores (PHIL)~~; Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE)

Guests:

Dustin Stegner (English, Academic Senate Chair)
Andrew Morris (History, Co-Chair GETF, GE Pathways Work Group Chair)

Writing Intensive Guests (at 4:10 p.m.):

Kathryn Rummell (Interim Dean, CLA)
Debra Valencia-Laver (Associate Dean, CLA)
Dianna Winslow (Writing Specialist, CTLT)
Dawn Janke (Writing and Rhetoric Center Director)
Jay Peters (Assistant Professor, Interim Director of Writing)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:39 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Minutes from January 31 approved with modification.
- B. Kaila Bussert will resume her position as the full-time PCS representative for GEGB. Jesse Vestermark will return as needed for Area A work group discussions.

II. Course Proposals

- A. Gary asked the group to review PHIL 230 for next week.
- B. Since CM 333 and ARCH 120 are proposed to start Summer 2021, Gary recommended waiting until the new GE template is finalized before the GEGB evaluates the proposals.
- C. The GEGB reviewed the revisions to RELS 180. After an extensive discussion, the GEGB did not approve the course for D1 and recommended that the course be considered for D3 or even for D5.
 1. Gary said that he would communicate the group's decision to the proposer.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

III. GE Report Overview and Structure

- A. The GEGB discussed AS-504-98 “Resolution on General Education 2000” as a model for the structure in their upcoming resolution to the Senate. The GEGB will finalize their commitments to the template and then discuss the course requirements, educational objectives, unit requirements, and program overlays for inclusion.
- B. The GEGB will send the report to the Senate by April 2.

IV. Writing Intensive Courses

- A. Gary asked the writing specialists to discuss their concerns, priorities, and goals for writing in the GE program.
 - 1. Debra Valencia-Laver shared that the current writing intensive requirement began after Cal Poly received feedback from employers and other constituencies that writing should be a more integral component in General Education. Writing needed to occur throughout the course and not just in a final paper where the student was not able to receive feedback or the chance to revise. One concern in a writing intensive course is the amount of students in the classroom. Too many students and the faculty cannot provide adequate feedback. Also, if faculty are teaching multiple sections of a writing-intensive course in one quarter, that can be a challenging workload. Writing intensive courses are not limited to General Education but also continue to the major program.
 - a) The GEGB discussed how writing should be tailored to the subarea since writing is not the same in each discipline.
 - 2. Dawn Janke expressed her hope that, in regards to GWR, that writing proficiency is not achieved through one course along but is a sustained practice through multiple experience in lower-division and upper-division General Education courses. We want students to have multiple opportunities, too, in their major program to learn how to write within their discipline before they graduate. She also expressed the idea that certain sections in C4 might be writing intensive and some may not due to the need for larger class sizes to avoid graduation roadblocks. It would be in the GEGB’s interest to consider finding a way to label writing intensive sections so that we could evaluate degree progress and see where students received that sustained practice throughout their entire education.
 - 3. Dianna Winslow suggested that GE courses be as closely aligned as possible between general writing intensive sections and between GWR-designated classes. It is important that students receive feedback and that courses are at the appropriate size to offer feedback.
 - 4. Kathryn Rummell reminded the GEGB of WINGED, which was the “Writing in Generally Every Discipline” program. She reminded the group that there should be professional training as there are very different writing skills needed in a course on history versus a course on creative writing. There might be a different set of skills required in a writing intensive course than one for GWR.

5. Helen Bailey reminded the group of the requirement that students receive 24 units of writing intensive instruction throughout their career. In the past, all sections within an area marked as writing intensive would have to meet that requirement; thus, there was no need to track. However, since some courses within the same subarea are not writing intensive, it would might be something to reconsider tracking.
6. Bruno Giberti suggested composing language that explains the value of a writing intensive focus for students as well as for faculty. The language would be parallel but more appropriate for each audience.
7. Dustin Stegner reminded the group that any discussion of requirements or a set of required courses that students have to take within GE should be carefully considered so as to stay in compliance with EO 1100-R.
8. Mark Borges discussed the lack of feedback that frequently occurs in writing intensive courses. He also discussed that some subareas might be deemed as writing intensive but are not. For instance, his C1 class did not contain any writing component.
 - a) Dawn Janke supported this notion by saying that she has studied 400 student survey results and conducted many focus groups with students around their writing experience. Overwhelmingly, these students said that they are not getting feedback, even in their Area A courses. They get a grade but do not know how to build on the feedback – if there is any.
 - b) The group also discussed the administrative requirements and resources needed to support many sections of a writing-intensive course. Faculty workload is a key concern with writing intensive courses.
9. The group discussed that a 4000-word requirement does not have to be original writing. It could include proposals, drafts, revisions, or post-writing reflections.
10. Writing could be in support of the Learn By Doing philosophy as a way to connect the General Education program with the major program. It might be useful to consider writing as a value not tied just to General Education but at the university level.
 - a) If writing intensive program becomes more university-level focus, then the GWR is a type of overlay to show the commitment of writing across the discipline. Perhaps students submit a portfolio of their work as a way to prepare them for the writing requirements they will face later in their careers, too.
11. The group also discussed the value of keeping the minimum 10% writing in each GE class. It might not be enforced at the moment but could be something that is discussed during course renewal and review.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

Thursday, February 14, 2019 | PHIL 230; GE Template and Resolution Structure

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, February 14, 2019 | 4:10 – 5 p.m., 35-511

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. April 2, 2019 – Academic Senate Executive Committee reviews GEGB resolution
2. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
3. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); ~~Mark Borges~~ (ASI representative); Kaila Bussert (PCS); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE)

Guests:

Andrew Morris (History, Co-Chair GETF, GE Pathways Work Group Chair)
Dustin Stegner (English, Academic Senate Chair)
Sarah Downing (Vice Chair of Board of Representatives; ASI Representative)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:13 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Minutes from February 7 approved as submitted.
- B. Sarah Downing will be the representative from ASI for the next two weeks.

II. Course Proposals

- A. PHIL 230
 - 1. The course proposal for PHIL 230 says that it will be offered Summer 2021, but a comment by the proposer asks that it can be approved for Summer 2019.
 - 2. Rachel Fernflores commented that the course is already being offered electronically and that the faculty member who submitted the proposal was asked to do so to demonstrate e-learning proficiency.
 - a. The GEGB is concerned that individual faculty members might think that they have to resubmit proposals that have already been approved for an online modality.
 - b. The GEGB also questioned if the request to teach the course online for this summer was received too late for the Registrar's office.
 - c. The GEGB will approve the course but maintain reservations about the need for the faculty member to propose the course if it has already been approved for online instruction. Gary will speak with the Registrar's office and the eLearning Task Force about the GEGB's concerns.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

III. GE Template and Report Structure

- A. Gary introduced a GE template document to the group that captures the requirements from EO 1100-R and the recommendations from the GE subject area work groups.
 - 1. There are two parallel templates, the second of which factors in requirements for high-unit programs.

- B. The GEGB recommended categorizing the upper division GE areas as follows: Upper Division B; Upper Division C; and Upper Division D. There will not be a B5, C3, or D3 numbering for these areas.
 - a. The GEGB recommended this course of action to provide clarity and consistency throughout the GE program within the university and the CSU system. Additionally, it would reinforce the GE Task Force's recommendation to focus on the discipline and not the letter and number.

- C. The GEGB discussed keeping the A3 course description as "Critical Thinking" as stated in EO 1100-R. They recognized the Area A work group's recommendation to rename the category "Critical Thinking and Communication" but determined that the addition might be too limiting for curricular development.

- D. The GEGB discussed the possibility of an Area C elective for non-CLA students and the impact that might have on programs, especially high-unit programs.
 - 1. The GEGB decided that they would need to define "high-unit" programs and explain the programs that would be considered "high-unit," such as ABET-accredited programs.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

Thursday, February 21, 2019 | PSY 340; GE Template and Resolution Structure

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, February 21, 2019 | 3:30 – 5 p.m., 10-241

Thursday, February 28, 2019 | 3:30 – 5 p.m., 10-241

Friday, March 1, 2019 (if needed) | 10:10 – 11:00 a.m., 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. April 2, 2019 – Academic Senate Executive Committee reviews GEGB resolution
2. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
3. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); ~~Mark Borges~~ (ASI representative); Kaila Bussert (PCS); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE)

Guests:

Andrew Morris (History, Co-Chair GETF, GE Pathways Work Group Chair)
Dustin Stegner (English, Academic Senate Chair)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:39 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Minutes from February 14 approved.
- B. Gary updated the GEGB that the Registrar confirmed PHIL 231 was approved for online modality, not PHIL 230, which was approved by the GEGB last week.
- C. Gary will speak with the PSY 340 commentators directly about their concerns and approve the course after discussion with them.

II. GE Template and Resolution Structure

- A. Gary summarized the conversation from last week and the decisions the GEGB agreed to.
- B. The GEGB seemed to come to a consensus that ABET accreditation would be the distinguisher for a high-unit program; ABET-accredited programs would use a parallel but separate GE template, which is permissible in EO 1100-R.
- C. The GEGB recognized that prefix requirements need to be discussed for the areas, particularly Area C and Area D. They will continue to discuss the work group's recommendations at the next meeting.
- D. The GEGB recognized USCP as an important but separate component of GE. As a university-wide requirement, there are some USCP courses in GE but there are others that occur within the major. Any discussion of a lower-division or upper-division USCP

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

requirement would be as an overlay and cannot be directly tied to the additional 8 units Cal Poly has.

- E. The GEGB discussed the 8 units at length and what would be in the best interest of the students.
1. Prescribing units limits student choice.
 2. Designating the 8 units as electives but asking programs to avoid using the electives for throughput purposes seems to be outside of the GEGB's purview to enforce.
 3. Suggesting that CLA students take an extra quantitative reasoning course or asking non-CLA students to take an extra arts and humanities course complicates the template and presents separate tracks.
- F. EO 1100-R asks for 12 semester units (18 quarter units) for Area B, Area C, and Area D. Currently, each of those areas only has 16 units.
- G. The current focus of only using the electives only in Area B or Area C limits the breadth in Area D.
1. The GEGB is considering a template where students use the 8 units to take two extra classes in Area B, Area C, or Area D.
 - a. Students would take one of the following combinations: B and C; C and D; or B and D.
 - b. Students could take a course at either the lower or upper levels.
 2. For students on the high-unit template, they take 8 units in Quantitative Reasoning (which they already do) and then use 8 units for electives in Area B along.
 - a. Students could take D1 (40404); D2 (elective); and Upper Division D or they could take D1 and two courses in D2.
 - b. The GEGB will reach out to the Area D/E work group to learn of their recommendation for high-unit programs in Area D – whether they should be exempt from the upper division requirement or only need to take 1 course (instead of 2) in D2. S
- H. Gary will send the draft of the template to the GEGB to review.

Meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

Thursday, February 14, 2019 | GE Template; Writing Intensive Courses in GE; prefix requirements; structure of educational objectives and course requirements.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, February 28, 2019 | 3:30 – 5:00 p.m., 10-241

Friday, March 1, 2019 | 10:10 – 11:00 a.m., 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. April 2, 2019 – Academic Senate Executive Committee reviews GEGB resolution
2. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
3. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); ~~Kaila Bussert~~ (PCS); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE)

Guests:

Andrew Morris (History, Co-Chair GETF, GE Pathways Work Group Chair)
Dustin Stegner (English, Academic Senate Chair)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Minutes from February 21 approved.
- B. There will be an open forum on March 7 in the ATL during UU Hour. Dustin Stegner and Gary Laver will host the forum, which is open to faculty, staff, and students. The information was shared in the February 27 Cal Poly Report. Mark Borges said that he will see what he can do to communicate the forum to students.
 1. The GEGB will continue to refine its communication plan to faculty and students, especially as the template is finalized and approved by the Senate.

II. GE Template Structure

- A. The GEGB discussed the high-unit program GE structure, particularly in regards to Area D.
 1. Currently, students in high-unit programs receive an exemption from needing to take Upper Division D.
 2. In order to provide the most flexibility for students (including transfer students and those who might wish to consider a pathway or minor), the GEGB voted that students in high-unit programs take D1 (American Institutions), D2 (elective), and determine on their own if they wanted to take an extra lower-division class in D2 or an upper division D course.
 3. **At 4:09 p.m., the General Education Governance Board unanimously approved a new General Education template.**

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

- B. Dustin Stegner updated the GEGB on how the template would be reviewed by the Senate. He said that it would be an attachment with a support resolution. Senators can offer suggestions with the attachment but once it goes to a second reading, they cannot change anything within the attachment – they could only offer an amendment.
1. The GEGB discussed the importance of how the template is presented, especially that this template brings us as close to compliance as possible (given the fact that we are on a quarter system) with EO 1100-R.
 2. The fact that there are several members of the GEGB who are also Senators will also be a huge benefit to the passage and explanation of the template; Senators can similarly speak with their constituents about the template and allay any fears before the template reaches the Senate floor.
- C. The GEGB next discussed the prefix options in Area D and the recommendations by the work group.
1. The Area D work group asked for lower-division D classes to come from three different prefixes.
 2. The GEGB discussed the benefits and potential limitations of requiring three different prefixes in the twelve-unit Lower Division D curricula.
 3. The GEGB voted to require two different prefixes in the Lower Division D elective (D2).
- D. The GEGB also discussed the prefix options in Area C2 and the recommendations by the work group.
1. The Area C work group recommended two different prefixes in C2.
 2. The GEGB recognized that some current language courses at Cal Poly will not meet the requirements set forth in EO 1100-R. One exception might be the student who takes a language course while studying abroad as s/he will be more immersed in the culture while studying the language. That decision is between the dean's office, the department, and the study abroad program.
 3. The GEGB voted unanimously to accept their recommendation and require two different prefixes in Humanities: Literature, Philosophy, Languages Other than English.
- E. The GEGB recognizes that courses are cross listed; Helen Bailey said that she would review cross-listed classes, particularly those in Area C and Area D and report back to the group. The GEGB was concerned about the prefix requirement in C2 and D2 and how that might be impacted by cross-listed courses.
- F. Gary Laver thanked the GEGB for their contributions to the meeting and congratulated them on unanimously approving a GE template.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

Thursday, March 4, 2019 | GE Template; Writing Intensive Courses in GE; prefix requirements; structure of educational objectives and course requirements.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, March 7, 2019 | 3:30 – 5:00 p.m., 10-241

Friday, March 8, 2019 | 10:10 – 11:00 a.m., 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. April 2, 2019 – Academic Senate Executive Committee reviews GEGB resolution
2. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
3. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); ~~Mark Borges~~ (ASI representative); Kaila Bussert (PCS); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); ~~Bruno Giberti~~ (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); ~~Aaron Keen~~ (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; ~~Neal MacDougall~~ (AGB); ~~José Navarro~~ (ES); ~~Brent Nuttall~~ (ARCE)

Guests:

Andrew Morris (History, Co-Chair GETF, GE Pathways Work Group Chair)
Dustin Stegner (English, Academic Senate Chair)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:11 a.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Gary acknowledged that there was no quorum for today’s meeting. Any recommendations would be presented at the next quorum for voting approval.

II. Prefix Requirements for Students in High-Unit Programs

- A. The GEGB discussed Area D and Area C prefix requirements.
 - 1. Since C2 (Humanities: Literature, Philosophy, and Languages Other than English) follows the same structure in both templates, the GEGB recommended on voting to keep it the same for high-unit majors.
- B. Since students in high-unit programs have a different Area D option, the GEGB discussed how requiring different prefixes might be unnecessarily restrictive, particularly if they wanted to pursue a pathways option.
 - 1. The GEGB recommended against a prefix restriction in D2 for students high-unit programs.
- C. Gary said that he would bring these recommendations to the next GEGB quorum for a vote.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person’s name.

III. GE Writing through the Curriculum

- A. Gary began the discussion by reviewing the recently passed “Resolution on Course Criteria for GWR-Certified Upper-Division Courses across the Curriculum” ([AS-858-18](#)).
 - 1. The GE program encourages writing intensive courses in lower division and upper division; this resolution only addresses upper-division requirements.

- B. The Area C work group recommended writing intensive courses in Lower Division C require 2,000 words and Upper Division C require 3,000 words.

- C. The GEGB discussed the importance not only of word count but timely feedback on the writing. Instructors, particularly lecturers who might only teach writing-intensive courses, struggle with providing timely feedback.
 - 1. For example, a lecturer who teaches Written Communication and Critical Thinking courses might have 66 students a quarter (3 classes, 22 students each). If each student wrote 3,000 words, that would be 198,000 words for three sections (or 792 pages of double-spaced writing). Providing timely feedback is a real workload concern.
 - 2. The GEGB also recognized that it can only make recommendations as to course cap size and does not have the administrative purview to enforce the requirement.

- D. The GEGB recommends keeping Written Communication and Critical Thinking courses in Area A as writing intensive with 3,000 words, which is the current requirement.

- E. The GEGB reaffirmed its commitment to 10% writing in every GE course and discussed amending that language to provide appropriate examples.

Meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

ACTION ITEMS

Thursday, March 7, 2019 | GE Template; Writing Intensive Courses in GE; prefix requirements; structure of educational objectives and course requirements.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, March 7, 2019 | 3:30 – 5:00 p.m., 10-241

Friday, March 8, 2019 | 10:10 – 11:00 a.m., 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. April 2, 2019 – Academic Senate Executive Committee reviews GEGB resolution
2. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
3. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); Kaila Bussert (PCS); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE)

Guests:

Andrew Morris (History, Co-Chair GETF, GE Pathways Work Group Chair)
Dustin Stegner (English, Academic Senate Chair)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:36 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Minutes for February 28 and March 1 (with correction) approved by the GEGB.
- B. Gary summarized the response from participants who attended the GE Open Forum that morning.

II. GE Template for High-Unit Programs

- A. The GEGB reviewed prefix requirements for C2 and Area D for the high-unit programs.
 - 1. The Board voted unanimously to require two prefixes in C2 (same as the standard GE template).
 - 2. The Board determined that prefix requirements for Area D in high-unit programs was not needed.

III. Writing Requirements in GE

- A. The GEGB reviewed the writing requirements, particularly for Writing Intensive courses, within GE.
- B. The Board discussed the needs for timely feedback on writing, feedback from qualified instructors, and appropriate class sizes.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

- C. The General Education Governance Board unanimously approved the following language for Writing Intensive General Education courses:

Writing Component

All General Education courses must have an appropriate writing component. In achieving this objective, writing in most courses should be viewed primarily as a tool of learning (rather than a goal in itself as in a composition course), and faculty should determine the appropriate ways to integrate writing into coursework. The writing component may take different forms according to the subject matter and the purpose of a course. Outside of the GE areas specified below, at least 10% of the grade in all GE courses must be based on appropriate written work (e.g., lab reports, math proofs, essay questions, word problems, exam questions).

GE areas A2, A3, Upper-Division C, and Upper-Division D are designated as Writing Intensive. All courses in these areas must include a minimum of 3,000 words of writing and base 50% or more of a student's grade on written work. GE area C2 is also designated as Writing Intensive, but all courses in this area must include a minimum of 2,000 words of writing and base 50% or more of a student's grade on written work. All Writing Intensive courses must include process-oriented writing instruction in which faculty provide ongoing feedback to students to help them grasp the effectiveness of their writing in various disciplinary contexts. The kind and amount of writing must be a factor in determining class sizes.

IV. Student Educational Objectives and Course Design Requirements

- A. Rachel Fernflores volunteered to combine the objectives and requirements from the subject work groups and put it into one document with some light editing (e.g. Oxford comma used consistently). The Board will review the document and begin to craft the Area-specific outcomes next week.

Meeting adjourned at 4:51 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

Thursday, March 14, 2019 through Friday, March 15, 2019
Student Educational Objectives and Course Design Requirements

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, March 14, 2019 | **4:10 – 5:00 p.m., 35-511**
Friday, March 15, 2019 | **10:10 – 11:00 a.m., 35-511**

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. April 2, 2019 – Academic Senate Executive Committee reviews GEGB resolution
2. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
3. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); ~~Kaila Bussert~~ (PCS); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); ~~Bruno Giberti~~ (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); ~~Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)~~; Neal MacDougall (AGB); ~~José Navarro~~ (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE)

Guests:

Andrew Morris (History, Co-Chair GETF, GE Pathways Work Group Chair)
Dustin Stegner (English, Academic Senate Chair)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, was unable to attend the meeting due to his attendance at the CSU Senate meeting in Long Beach. In his absence, Rachel Fernflores led the meeting and called it to order at 4:10 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Minutes from March 7, 2019 approved unanimously as submitted.

II. GE objectives and criteria

- A. From a formatting perspective, the GEGB discussed starting each section with the title and including the course designators at the end of the title.
- B. The GEGB reviewed the introductions and preamble for the GE student educational objectives and course design requirements for Area A.
 - 1. The GEGB discussed defining information literacy and including it in other area objectives outside of Area A.
- C. The members also discussed the Area A work group’s inclusion of advocacy in some of its course requirements, especially as it is a tricky criterion to assess. Since it echoes the wording in ULO #5, the GEGB determined to keep the language for the moment.
- D. The group also discussed the importance of keeping hyperlinks (even if seemingly repetitive) throughout the document so as to reinforce and remind faculty and students of policy (e.g. writing intensive, ULOs, EO 1100-R, etc.).
 - 1. However, there are some program-wide policies that might better fit in a preamble to the GE program, such as the requirement for each class to have at

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person’s name.

least 10% of the course grade determined from a written component.

- E. The GEGB also discussed the importance of appropriately trained instructors not only designing the course but being the ones to teach it, too. The Board discussed the balance between requiring certain skills developed in the class and being overly prescriptive and infringing on academic freedom. The group said that they would continue to discuss this idea in the future.
 - 1. Rachel Fernflores said that she would bring the language the work group suggested for Area A3 to the philosophy department to get some feedback from them.

- F. Shannon Sullivan-Danser reminded the group that there is a meeting scheduled for next week on Thursday and Friday as that is the final time the GEGB can meet before the resolution goes to the Senate Executive Committee on April 2.

Meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

Thursday, March 21 – Friday, March 22, 2019 | GE Template Resolution

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, March 21, 2019 | 3:30 – 5:00 p.m., 10-241

Friday, March 22, 2019 | 10:10 – 11:00 a.m., 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

- 1. April 2, 2019 – Academic Senate Executive Committee reviews GEGB resolution
- 2. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
- 3. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); Kaila Bussert (PCS); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); Gary Laver – Chair (PSY); Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE)

Guests:

Andrew Morris (History, Co-Chair GETF, GE Pathways Work Group Chair)
Dustin Stegner (English, Academic Senate Chair)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:39 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Gary let the group know that Rachel Fernflores gave him her open proxy for today's meeting. Rachel also let Gary know that she would be sharing the revised objective and course design requirements with the group before the first meeting in spring.

II. GE Template Update

- A. Gary let the group know that the CSU Chancellor's Office did not approve of our initial template. In particular, Cal Poly could not mandate two classes in C2. We had to have a lower-division elective in which students would select another class from either C1 or C2. However, it was acceptable to require three prefixes in the lower-division Area C classes.
- B. Helen Bailey raised her concerns about progress-to-degree. Data shows that students would wait to take another C1 class or go to a community college for the elective. Many students would avoid a second class in the humanities if at all possible. Because of the new articulation/transfer rules between the CSU and community colleges, that possibility is outside Cal Poly's control.
- C. Andrew Morris shared that the prefix restriction in lower-division C should not impact any pathways consideration. At this point, a pathway might lean more heavily on upper division.

* Attendance is confirmed through the highlight of a person's name.

D. The GEGB voted to approve the adjusted template.

III. GE Resolution Format

A. Gary reminded the GEGB that the previous GE template was approved before the GE resolution with course outcomes and design requirements. With that in mind, there are a few components of [AS-504-98](#) that the group could include with the new template resolution.

B. The GEGB determined that the following sections did not need to be included:

1. Program Design
2. Interdisciplinary and Linked Courses (will be addressed by GE Pathways Work Group)
3. Cal Poly's Commitment to Gender and Diversity (will be addressed by GE Diversity and Inclusion Work Group)
4. U.S. Cultural Pluralism Requirement (will be addressed by GE Diversity and Inclusion Work Group)
5. Service Learning
6. Double Counting (policy is explicitly stated in [EO 1100-R](#), Section 2.2.6)
7. Staffing of GE Courses

C. The GEGB talked about reviewing the following sections to include in the longer resolution, which will include the course outcomes and design requirements:

1. Mission Statement
2. Information Competency/Information Literacy

D. The GEGB approved to include the two additional sections in this resolution: one that defines high-unit programs and one that provides a revised outline for the writing intensive component in GE.

E. The GEGB approved the name of the resolution to be "General Education 2020."

IV. Academic Senate Executive Committee Presentation

A. Gary shared the presentation he plans on giving to the Senate Executive Committee on April 2.

B. The GEGB advised Gary to anticipate questions about Area F now being folded into a larger section of Upper-Division B. Area F was Cal Poly's unique contribution to a general education program, and a lot of people are going to be upset (even though the resolution passed last year) about the potential future of those classes.

C. The GEGB also advised Gary to anticipate questions about how this would impact students, particularly in terms of transitioning them from one template to the next.

V. Meeting Schedule

- A. Gary cancelled the meeting for tomorrow and wished the GEGB a happy spring break.

Meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

Thursday, February 14, 2019 | GE Template; Writing Intensive Courses in GE; prefix requirements; structure of educational objectives and course requirements.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, April 4, 2019 | 3:30 – 5:00 p.m., 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. April 2, 2019 – Academic Senate Executive Committee reviews GEGB resolution
2. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
3. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); ~~Mark Borges~~ (ASI representative); Kaila Bussert (PCS); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); ~~José Navarro~~ (ES); ~~Brent Nuttall~~ (ARCE)

Guests:

Andrew Morris (History, Co-Chair GETF, GE Pathways Work Group Chair)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. The GEGB approved the March 14 and March 21 minutes.

II. GE Resolution Update

- A. On April 2, Gary presented the GE resolution to the Academic Senate Executive Committee. The resolution included the GE template for standard and high-unit programs, a definition as to what “high-unit programs” means, and a statement on writing (10% requirement) and writing intensive courses in GE.
 1. There were a few questions from the Executive Committee, but overall they seemed to understand the changes made to the template.
- B. Gary alerted the GEGB that the presentation at the full Senate might produce more lively conversations. While there are limitations as to what Cal Poly can do, the template reflects as much customizations as is possible under EO 1100-R.
 1. The GEGB is welcome to attend the meeting and is encouraged to share the template with constituents within their department.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person’s name.

III. Revising the GE Educational Objectives and Course Criteria

- A. Gary discussed the timeline for the quarter, including Senate deadlines and GEGB priorities to complete.
1. He was informed that the last day to put new business in the pipeline is April 18. He is going to confirm that date and report back to the group.
 2. Even though all of the outcomes and course requirements will not be finalized this year, it might be better to wait and submit them in the Fall. It will give campus constituents enough time to look at each section as it is finalized and give those groups the ability to stagger the changes more gradually.
 3. The Board agreed to try and finalize Area A and B at the next meeting. They will also review Area C in case there's enough time next week to begin that discussion.
- B. To remind the Board of where they are in the revision process, Rachel Fernflores said that the approved minutes from March 14 capture a lot of the progress that was made. She made edits to the document based on that conversation and shared an updated version for the GGEB to consider.
1. Rachel let the group know of her department's response regarding a criterion related to an active-learning environment. They said that they were fine with removing that language or modifying it to strengthen the intent of the statement.
 2. Bruno Giberti said that the comment about "an active-learning environment" seemed to be the group's way to link the class to Learn By Doing and Cal Poly's distinctive pedagogical philosophy.
 3. The group agreed to consider moving that statement to the GE introduction rather than try to make a prescriptive statement within the course design requirements.
- C. One new element is the preamble to Area B. In order to parallel the structure in the other areas, Emily Fogle added a preamble and course design requirements for Area B and its subareas respectively.
1. As opposed to other subareas, the subareas in B share common themes not content. For instance, physical science could include geology, biology, or chemistry. Each topic is its own unique discipline and does not share a common curriculum. While the same course content might be explored by English, History, and Philosophy departments, science departments do not necessarily share the same content. Because of this distinction, there are fewer course criteria and more focus on themes rather than specific topics of discussion.
- D. The Board discussed how to acknowledge the core value of diversity, equity, and inclusion within GE knowing that the working group has yet to finalize its report. The Board agreed that it might be important to include some statement about the topic within the introduction knowing that more details would come at a future date.

1. The Board also cautioned against making it seem that every area needed to include a specific class related to diversity, equity, and inclusion as some disciplines might not have an explicit way to include that within the curriculum. The goal could be to infuse those values rather than require classes to explicitly address them.
 2. They agreed to wait and see what the final report from the working group says but expressed concern about, if a statement is included in the introduction to the whole program, then it might seem like a mandatory overlay or even an empty-handed statement that is not woven throughout the program.
 3. The Board also agreed that, when the report is submitted and the GEGB makes its recommendation to the Senate, they review the language and ensure that the intent of a (possible) overlay is clear so that each subsequent GEGB cohort can follow the same standards when it comes to reviewing courses.
- E. The Board discussed their concerns about Area F being folded into a larger Upper-Division B area and not having its own subarea anymore.
1. Current Area F classes might fall short of meeting the Upper-Division B requirements. The language should be broad enough to include as many disciplines as possible while avoiding being too general and allowing for classes to be approved that truly should not be included. It might be that current Area F classes might not be approved within the new GE template **or might end up in an Area D class**, and the Board should be prepared for those conversations and reactions.
 2. The Board agreed to consider what the language would be and to present options at next week's meeting.
- F. Gary asked the group to consider the terms that are being used for these sections.
1. Currently, we say "educational objectives" and "course criteria." Until recently, the distinction between those two terms was rather unclear, even for members within GEGB.
 2. The group will consider either keeping those terms and defining them better or changing the terms to mirror the language throughout other programs (such as to "learning outcomes" and "course design requirements" or the like).

Meeting adjourned at 4:53 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

Review current Area A and Area B language and be prepared to finalize at the next meeting.
Review current Area C language and be prepared to finalize at the next meeting if time permits.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, April 11, 2019 | 3:30 – 5:00 p.m., 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. April 9, 2019 – Presentation of *General Education 2020* template to Academic Senate
2. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
3. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); ~~Kaila Bussert~~ (PCS); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); ~~Bruno Giberti~~ (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; ~~Neal MacDougall~~* (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Sam Park (ASI representative)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Minutes from April 4 approved.
 - 1. In response to the conversations last week on diversity and inclusion, Jose Navarro said that he could share some of the working documents with the GEGB for their consideration.
- B. Gary was informed that the Senate deadline to submit materials for AY 2018-19 consideration is not April 17 but rather will be sometime in May.
- C. Gary announced that there are five vacancies for the 2019-20 GEGB. He expressed his gratitude for this group and all that they accomplished this year. He hoped that they will be interested in another term or suggest a colleague who might be interested in joining next year.
 - 1. José said that he will be on sabbatical Fall 2019 but still plans on attending the GEGB meetings.

II. Update on GE Resolution Presentation to the Academic Senate

- A. Gary announced that the presentation to the Senate went fairly well; they are on the verge of a second reading and could possibly even vote on it at the next meeting April 16. Before the second reading occurs, he did want to discuss a few things that came up during that meeting and via email.
 - 1. Grace Yeh (Ethnic Studies) sent Gary an email wondering about using the term “prefixes” instead of “discipline” when talking about student choice in lower-division C and D2 classes. Her concern is that students might choose a class with a similar discipline and thus not have as much breadth.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person’s name.

* Neal MacDougall gave his open proxy to José Navarro. (Neal sent an email to Gary, José, and Shannon on April 10 with this permission.)

- a. The GEGB acknowledged her concern and the fact that they had discussed it at previous meetings. Aside from the fact that it would be rather challenging to define and track a disciplinary distinction for the Registrar’s Office, students could, in theory, still take 12 out of 16 units with the same prefix in Area D. (For instance, history in D1, D2, upper division, and then one of the GE electives in the standard template.) While the Board appreciates the concern, they decided to keep “prefix” in the template.
 2. Brian Self (ASCC Chair, ME) also shared a concern about having fewer Area B classes in the standard template. He is concerned that fewer classes in this area distances GE from contributing to a polytechnic university. He wondered if, in looking at the 8 units of GE electives, 4 of the units designated as needing to come from Area B (upper- or lower-division) and the remaining 4 open to either Area C or Area D.
 - a. Gary shared that he is sympathetic to that concern and asked the GEGB if it would be a reasonable (and approved-by-the-CSU) adjustment.
 - b. The GEGB debated the point and determined that it should be kept as it is, which would allow more flexibility (if not breadth) for students and programs.
 - B. Helen spoke with Gary about adding a line to the resolution stating that this new template will be implemented for the 2020-21 catalog.
 1. The GEGB approved added that clause in the resolution.
 - C. Helen also asked for clarity in the D elective for high-unit programs. The wording now suggests that students could take a second D1 class through their Area D elective. However, since all of those courses have to teach the same content, it would be repetitious and not supportive of breadth.
 1. The GEGB agreed to change the wording so that students can choose either another class in D2 or in upper-division D.
- III. Revising the GE Educational Outcomes and Course Design Requirements (continued)**
- A. The GEGB continued with Area A language. If a requirement is stated in the preamble, it should be echoed in the course criteria so that it is addressed explicitly during the course proposal process.
 - B. The GEGB also sought clarification as to how classes could reasonable address sustainability within the course. The University Sustainability Learning Outcomes aren’t curricular in design and could lead to confusion not only for faculty but for future GEGB members evaluating courses. The Board agreed to review the language to make sure it is as clear as possible.

- C. The members also debated whether putting course size requirements in the resolution was pedagogically important or just a political maneuver.
 - 1. The group agreed to include it for now and see how the Senate responds and are prepared to remove it so that the entire resolution doesn't get rejected.

- D. The GEGB discussed the wording in the Area A preamble that speaks to "particular attention to issues related to diversity, inclusion, and sustainability."
 - 1. The members agreed that it is important to include those ideas in the classroom, but the phrase "particular attention" – without a clear definition included – might convey the wrong impression for instructors as well as future GEGB members to evaluate.

Meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

Review current Area A and Area B language and be prepared to finalize at the next meeting.
Review current Area C language and be prepared to finalize at the next meeting if time permits.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, April 18, 2019 | 3:40 – 5:00 p.m., 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

- 1. April 16, 2019 – Academic Senate reviews *General Education 2020* (3:10 p.m. – UU 220)
- 2. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
- 3. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Kaila Bussert (PCS); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Sam Park (ASI representative)

Guests:

Brenda Helmbrecht (ENGL, former GEGB chair, first-year writing director)
Andrew Morris (HIST, Co-Chair GE Task Force)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Minutes from April 11, 2019 were approved as submitted.
- B. Brenda Helmbrecht was invited to the meeting to share her comments on the A2: Written Communication outcomes.

II. Update on GE Resolution Presentation to the Academic Senate

- A. The GE template was approved by the Academic Senate on April 16, 2019.
 - 1. Prior to approving the template, there was some discussion about including language with the resolution related to overlays, but that idea did not receive much traction.

III. New courses submitted to the GEGB CourseLeaf Workflow

- A. CM 318: Housing and Communities was approved by the GEGB Fall 2018. This proposal is for an online version of the course.
 - 1. The Board rolled the course back for clarification on contact hours, office hours, final assessment, and published syllabus for CM 318, which contains prerequisites the GEGB did not approve.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

I. Revising the GE Educational Outcomes and Course Design Requirements

- A. Brenda told the group that she is here to discuss A2: Written Communication, particularly through the lens of ENGL 134.
 - 1. The class has a standardized curriculum, with some instructor freedom, which ensures consistency throughout the nearly 100 sections offered each year.
 - 2. While ENGL 134 is “writing intensive” in the sense that there is a certain expectation with words and discussion of the writing process, this content for this course is writing. Students are writing about what they care about through a variety of modes or genres. We are not giving them a topic but showing them how genre influences writing. ENGL 134 is structured to include language from the Four Cs, which provides an evidenced-based way to approach writing.
 - 3. Because there is only 10 weeks of instruction (compared with 15 in semester-based campuses), the focus is more abbreviated.
 - 4. The primary goal for this class is rhetorical inquiry – not grammar or the exploration of a topic through writing. In other words, it is not a class on arts and humanities where the focus is on a topic (e.g. Shakespeare) and the study of writing is on the margins of course content.
 - 5. The GEGB agreed that changing the wording in the A2 preamble is not over prescribing. While the approved resolution says that the class will have a minimum of 3,000 words. The Writing Director can make a more specific recommendation, but an instructor would not be liable if their section includes 3,000 words and another section includes 4,000.

- B. The GEGB discussed the remaining outcomes and requirements and modified as appropriate, particularly in the areas related to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

- C. The Board reviewed the parallel considerations in Oral Communication and Critical Thinking subareas.
 - 6. The GEGB removed the requirement in Critical Thinking that there was at least one out-of-class written assignment. Since many philosophy instructors only allow for in-class writing, they would find that requirement too prescriptive. The GEGB agreed to change the language to make it more open-ended.

- D. The Board voted to approve the educational objectives and course criteria with the provision that Gary share the document with the Area A work group chair (Lauren Kolodziejski, COMS) as a courtesy.

Meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Review current Area B language and be prepared to finalize at the next meeting.
2. Review current Area C language and be prepared to finalize at the next meeting if time permits.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, April 25, 2019 | 3:40 – 5:00 p.m., 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
2. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); ~~Kaila Bussert (PCS)~~; Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; ~~Neal MacDougall (AGB)~~; José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Sam Park (ASI representative)

Guests:

Dustin Stegner (ENGL, Academic Senate Chair)
Andrew Morris (HIST, Co-Chair GE Task Force)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Minutes from April 18, 2019 were approved with modification.
- B. Gary Laver said that he would invite John Thompson (World Languages and Cultures) to the GEGB meeting when Area C objectives related to writing intensive courses in languages other than English are discussed.

II. New courses submitted to the GEGB CourseLeaf Workflow

- A. Gary gave the GEGB an update on CM 318 and asked for additional comments from the GEGB related to contact, prerequisites, and final assessment. He will forward their concerns to the proposer.
 1. Course rolled back.
- B. The Board discussed ARCH 120; they asked for clarification on assessment methods, particularly related to writing and how it is graded. There is nothing that reflects EOs 1, 4, or 7 in the course content. Gary will forward their concerns to the proposer.
 1. Course rolled back.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

III. Proposed Resolution on Diversity Learning Objectives

- A. The GEGB reviewed the proposed resolution on updated Diversity Learning Objectives.
1. The Board
 - a. asked for a preamble introducing the DLOs, providing historical context of current resolutions and proposed revisions, and explaining the relationship between DLOs to general curriculum and USCP courses in particular;
 - b. expressed concern that the new list was longer and included terminology that seemed to add more complexity rather than a clearer set of outcomes;
 - c. felt that the objectives could be more concise and highlight higher-order thinking skills; and
 - d. asked that resolutions be cited directly and used more clearly.
 2. The GEGB expressed a desire that if the outcomes are updated that there is more training that shows how classes across the curriculum could and should address this topic.

IV. Area A Educational Outcomes and Course Requirements

- A. The GEGB reviewed the response from Lauren Kolodziejcki, Area A Work Group Chair. The Board incorporated her comments as appropriate and voted to approve Area A outcomes and requirements.

Meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Review current Area B language and be prepared to finalize at the next meeting.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, May 2, 2019 | 3:40 – 5:00 p.m., 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
 2. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template
-

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Kaila Bussert (PCS); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Sam Park (ASI representative)

Guests:

Andrew Morris (HIST, Co-Chair GE Task Force)
Dustin Stegner (ENGL, Academic Senate Chair)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Gary informed the Board of a GE communications meeting that just occurred. It included members from the Office of the Registrar, Academic Senate, and Academic Programs and Planning. The group is focusing on a timeline for GE course review and new proposals. The goal is to send a campus-wide email by the end of the quarter.
 - 1. Because this will be a multi-year process, some courses might be grandparented into a section that is inappropriate. If a student takes a compliant course that becomes uncompliant later, s/he will not be penalized for that. S/He will still receive certification for completing that subarea.
 - 2. It may not be perfect, but the goal is to keep it as clean as possible without disadvantaging students in the process.
- B. Minutes from April 25 were approved as submitted.

II. Courses in the GEGB CourseLeaf Workflow

- A. CM 318: Housing and Communities approved unanimously as resubmitted.
- B. ARCH 120: Architecture Design Studio for Non-Majors approved unanimously as resubmitted.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

III. Area B Criteria

- A. The Board discussed the preamble that suggests Area B courses are not interdisciplinary by nature. There is concern that this language might preclude courses in STS or ISLA from being proposed.
 - 1. The Board recognized that this language is aimed at lower-division courses, which rely more heavily on disciplinary expertise; this consideration is not included in upper-division courses where interdisciplinary synthesis might be more appropriate.
 - 2. The Board also recognized that this language is consistent with other preambles in GE Areas and is not unique to Area B.
 - 3. The Board agreed that if a teacher is qualified to teach the material, then it should not matter from what department s/he comes.

- B. The Board agreed to add language in LDB related to computer science, as outlined in EO 1100-R.
 - 1. The Board also expressed concern as to “computer science” as it relates to quantitative reasoning. The challenge is that, while students might learn computer programming languages, the focus should be on how those languages can help solve quantitative reasoning problems. The goal would be for students to learn how to compute various mathematical equations.
 - 2. The Board asked that their comments be returned to the Area B Work Group to add clarification on this area.

- C. The Board discussed the language related to UDB courses from Area F/B7. Those courses require two LDB courses, but not all UDB courses have that need. While that could be included in the course description, the Board amended the language to encourage professors to list additional prerequisites as course content dictates.

- D. The Board provisionally accepted the Area B criteria pending a response from the Area B work group.

IV. Other Business (as needed)

- A. Gary asked José to respond to the GEGB’s comments related to the DLOs.
 - 1. Because the timeline to submit anything to the Senate is so short, José asked if he could take the comments back to the group to modify.
 - 2. The Board agreed to discuss revisions online in order to help expedite the process.
 - 3. Gary said that he would send the revisions electronically to the Board when it becomes available.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Review current Area E language and be prepared to finalize at the next meeting.
2. Review current Area C language and be prepared to finalize at the next meeting if time permits.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, May 9, 2019 | 3:40 – 5:00 p.m., **35-511**

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
2. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Kaila Bussert (PCS); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); ~~Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Sam Park (ASI representative)~~

Guests:

Andrew Morris (HIST, Co-Chair GE Task Force)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Minutes from May 2, 2019 approved unanimously as submitted.
- B. The Board asked for a reminder in terms of the GE implementation timeline – what has been passed and what still needs to be finished this year.
 1. The GE template has been approved – both the standard and the high-unit versions. The Senate also approved the definition of “high-unit program” and the writing component requirement throughout GE.
 2. Area A and Area B requirements for student learning and course design will be submitted as a resolution to the Senate, starting with the Executive Committee next week.
 - a. Once these outcomes are published, the Registrar’s Office will publish them.
 - b. Since this is the last week to submit business to the Senate for consideration, the remaining requirements will be sent to the Senate in the fall. It is still the goal for the GEGB to approve them by the end of this quarter.
 3. Gary said that he’ll be sending an email to the campus that outlines the general timeline for course renewal and course proposals.
 - a. Each course will be grandfathered in for the moment (e.g. F/B7 will be in Upper Division B) until it is their turn through the course renewal process. Not every course will survive, but hopefully many of them will.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person’s name.

II. Area B Criteria

- A. Gary shared an update from Paul Choboter (Math, GE Area B Work Group Chair). Paul's concern was in regards to the writing requirement in Area B, particularly in B4: Quantitative Reasoning. He shared this concern with Joe Borzellino, who was the Academic Programs and Planning representative on the GE Area B Work Group. They were concerned that students would be asked to write essays related to calculus or algebra.
 - 1. Gary reminded Paul that writing had always been a requirement for each GE class, including those in mathematics and science; this language was included specifically in Area B criteria for better consistency and transparency regarding the requirement.
 - 2. Gary also said that he would include language that the Senate already approved via AS-873-19 to show discipline-specific examples, such as math proofs or lab reports.
 - 3. The Board agreed that adding language to provide such examples in each subarea would be appropriate.

- B. Gary asked the Board was comfortable with language related to "computational" and "computer science" in Area B.
 - 1. The Board shared their concerns, primarily related to defining the terms better to ensure future GEGB cohorts would apply the meaning the same way.
 - 2. The Board unanimously approved the revised language, which was added to a preamble to B4: Quantitative Reasoning.

III. GE Area A and Area B Resolution

- A. Gary shared a draft of the resolution for the educational outcomes and course design requirements.
- B. The Board unanimously and provisionally accepted the wording to the resolution. They agreed that, pending how the rest of the conversation today, Gary could adjust as appropriate to include Area A, B, and/or E.

IV. Area E Education Objectives and Course Criteria

- A. The Board recommended the Area D/E work group revise the course criteria, which are student-focused at the moment, and focus them on course design elements that instructors need to include.

V. Defining "Educational Objectives" and "Course Criteria"

- A. The Board agreed to include a definition of these terms to the resolution, so that all faculty knew what was meant by these two separate sections. While the two are symbiotic, there are distinct differences in the two areas.
 - 1. The Board acknowledged the difficulty in defining these terms and the expectations the GEGB is allowed to enforce. The focus is defining the terms so that the course can be assessed when it comes time to the course renewal process. The goal is not to evaluate faculty on their ability to deliver the criteria.

2. The Board approved the definitions and agreed to add them to the guidelines preamble – along with the Area A and Area B requirements – in the resolution being sent to the Senate.

VI. Diversity Learning Objectives (DLO) Resolution

- A. José Navarro presented the revised DLO resolution and explained its connection to the USCP criteria.
 1. The Board asked for clarification on the establishment of the fifth DLO as happened in the AS-836-17 resolution.
 2. The Board also asked for consistency in the formatting of the document.
- B. The Board agreed with one objection to sponsor the resolution and send it to the Senate Executive Committee to review.

Meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Review current Area C language and be prepared to finalize at the next meeting.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, May 16, 2019 | 3:40 – 5:00 p.m., 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. May/June 2019 – Gary will send an email communicating the GE template implementation timeline as well as the timeline for course review, renewal, and new proposals.
2. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Kaila Bussert (PCS); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); ~~Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning); John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); Gary Laver – Chair (PSY); Neal MacDougall (AGB);~~ José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Sam Park (ASI representative)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, was unable to attend the meeting due to a statewide CSU Senate conference. Rachel Fernflores led the meeting and called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Minutes from May 9, 2019 approved with slight modification.
- B. In Gary’s absence, Shannon Sullivan-Danser shared an update on *Resolution on Subject Area Guidelines (I) for General Education 2020*, which was discussed at the Senate Executive Committee two days ago. One of the concerns was in B3: Laboratory Experience. In EO 8, the language read as follows: “Work collaboratively in groups with people who have ideas, beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors that are different from their own.”
 - 1. The Executive Committee approved to have the resolution added on the agenda for the May 21 Senate meeting but asked that the GEGB consider rephrasing that requirement as the language was too prescriptive.
 - 2. The GEGB unanimously approved to change the verb from “who have” to “who may have.”
- C. Diversity Learning Objectives (DLO) Resolution
 - 1. José Navarro provided an update on the DLO resolution. It, too, was approved to go on the agenda for the Senate meeting on May 21.
 - 2. There was some concern about the verbs being not strong enough, but Jose mentioned that too strong might be unrealistic to achieve.
 - 3. Overall, it was a productive conversation.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person’s name.

II. Area C Requirements

- A. The GEGB approved the preamble to the Area C outcome requirements.
- B. The Board reviewed the C1: Arts educational objectives and course requirements and refined the objectives to make them more consistent with the other previously-approved areas.
- C. The Board will ask the Area C work group for clarification in regards to C2: Literature, Philosophy, and Languages other than English on the types of criticism that should be included.
- D. The Board also discussed if they should include the specific writing component policy related to C2 in the criteria section.
- E. The Board also discussed if there was a need to specifically identify the different C2 criteria for writing-intensive courses in English and in languages other than English.
 1. They did not think that they should list the specific courses, as those numbers might change.
 2. They also discussed the wording for the preamble to the section; they want to acknowledge the C5 courses that are not going to be included in this section while being as equitable as possible.

Meeting adjourned 5:12 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Review Area C, D, and E language

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, May 23, 2019 | 3:40 – 5:00 p.m., 10-241 (*canceled*)

Thursday, May 30, 2019 | 3:40 – 5:00 p.m., 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. May/June 2019 – communication of GE timeline implementation to campus.
2. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template.

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Kaila Bussert (PCS); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); ~~Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning)~~; John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); ~~Sam Park (ASI representative)~~

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Minutes from May 16, 2019 approved.
- B. Gary let the group know that the goal for the group would be to complete Area C and Area E by the end of the year. The group might not have time to complete Area D before the end of the quarter.
- C. Course Proposal – ARCH 120
 1. Gary let the group know that Architecture wants to reclassify ARCH 120, which was recently approved, to a 200-level course. The Registrar’s Office confirmed that nothing in the course changed except for the number. Once it arrives in the GEGB workflow, Gary will review to ensure no other changes were made.
 2. The GEGB agreed to let Gary approve the course if no changes were made beyond course number.
- D. Update on GEGB Resolution regarding Area A and B guidelines
 1. One of the comments on the floor of the Senate was to change “underrepresented minorities” to “historically marginalized.”
 - a. The GEGB decided to add a footnote defining “underrepresented minorities” to include groups that are historically or currently marginalized.
 2. A Senator asked Gary directly about modifying A3 CR2 to expand the writing project requirement from one to two.
 - b. The GEGB discussed the fact that some programs would be challenged to have at least two projects given the structure of their courses. The GEGB recommended the faculty member discuss it with her department to make it a requirement for that course rather than a campus-wide requirement.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person’s name.

3. The GEGB agreed to grammar changes proposed for B4. The Board also agreed to modify “understand” to “describe” throughout the guidelines as recommended by the ASCC.
4. The Board also discussed adding “personal finance” specifically in B4. EO 1100-R says that campuses may offer a personal finance course in the subarea, and there was a concern about including it in the preamble and/or the criteria as a permissible subject. Since a personal finance class is a specific application of mathematics and quantitative reasoning and not a separate form of mathematical logic (like statistics), it did not need to be included.
 - i. The Board voted on including “personal finance” to B4; the motion did not pass.

II. Area C Requirements

- A. Gary informed the group that he will invite John Thompson to next week’s meeting to discuss the criteria for a writing-intensive course in a language other than English. Given the requirements in EO 1100-R, Gary will make clear that the Board cannot include Cal Poly’s current C5 language courses in the new template.
- B. The Board agreed to make the language regarding “sustainability” consistent throughout the Areas.
- C. The Board approved the preamble to Upper-Division C.
- D. The Board modified the language to show that students must complete the Golden Four courses plus either C1 or C2 before taking any Upper-Division C course.
- E. The Board asked the Area C work group to discuss the language about it being a 300-level course; most CLA departments reserve 400-level courses for majors only but it might preclude a 400-level course consideration.

Meeting adjourned 5:03 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Review Area C, D, and E guidelines

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

~~Thursday, May 23, 2019 | 3:40 – 5:00 p.m., 10-241 (canceled)~~
Thursday, June 6, 2019 | 3:40 – 5:00 p.m., 10-241
Thursday, June 13, 2019 | 3:40 – 5:00 p.m., 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. May/June 2019 – communication of GE timeline implementation to campus.
2. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template.

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Kaila Bussert (PCS); Rachel Fernflores (PHIL); Emily Fogle (CHEM); ~~Bruno Giberti (Academic Programs & Planning)~~; John Jasbinsek (PHYS); Aaron Keen (CSC); **Gary Laver – Chair (PSY)**; Neal MacDougall (AGB); José Navarro (ES); Brent Nuttall (ARCE); Sam Park (ASI representative)

Guests:

Andrew Morris (HIST, GE Task Force Co-Chair)
Dustin Stegner (ENGL, Academic Senate Chair)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Minutes from May 30, 2019 were approved.
- B. Update on GEGB Resolution regarding Area A and B Guidelines.
 1. Gary informed the Board that the Area A and B requirements were approved by the Senate. We are set to share it with the campus.
 2. The DLO resolution barely passed because the Senators were discussing the ability to assess the outcomes. They were supportive of revising the DLOs but debated the verb choice and ability to evaluate the outcomes on a university-wide level.
 3. The other resolutions that rely on the passage of the new DLOs can move forward meaningfully next year.
- C. Gary thanked the members for an incredible year. They have done a tremendous amount of work, and it has been a constructive, excellent group, who grappled with many difficult discussions and ultimately made this process and this redesign of General Education very successful. He said that he knows the administration is very appreciative of their work.
 1. Next year, the GEGB will focus on the GE Program Learning Outcomes and Mission Statement. The group will also be working on the GE Pathways overlay recommendation to the Senate. Gary congratulated the group on a successful year and asked that anyone whose term expires to consider rejoining.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person's name.

II. Review of GE 2020 Registrar Curricular Map and Timeline

- A. Brand-new Area A or B proposals will be accepted per the Registrar's regular deadline of accepting new courses. Gary has been working with Brian Self and Susan Olivas to discuss the process for recertification.
 - 1. Initially, Gary, Brian, and Susan thought it would be a two-year process; A and B courses would be reviewed the first year and C, D, and E courses the second. However, an evaluation of the amount of courses in C, D, and E rendered that option impossible.

- B. Phase 1: There will be a May 2020 deadline for the GEGB to receive current Area A and Area B courses that need to be submitted for recertification. By Summer 2021, those courses will be implemented.

- C. Phase 2: After consulting with departments that especially have many Area C and Area D courses, the group determined that Phase 2 would incorporate lower-division C and D courses as well as all Area E courses. Current courses have until May 2021 to submit their courses for review and will be implemented Summer 2022.

- D. Phase 3: This phase will include upper-division courses for C and D. Courses will be due May 2022 and will be implemented Summer 2023.

- E. Helen has developed a conversion document for the Registrar's Office that shows the changes from the current template to the GE 2020 template. She asked the GEGB to review the document to confirm its accuracy. This document will be for internal purposes only and will not be published.
 - 1. The GEGB discussed some changes related to B5 and C5 requirements.
 - 2. Regarding current C5 classes, which are skills-based language classes, the GEGB discussed how they cannot be included in the GE 2020 C2 section because they are not (and cannot be) writing intensive. Students taking those classes are not at the level to write 2,000 words – they are still learning the fundamentals of the language.
 - 3. The GEGB also discussed how that might impact students who receive AP credit for a language other than English. They will receive AP credit towards GE Electives through 2019-20; it will not count starting 2020-21. Helen would modify the language to add some clarification regarding the decommissioning timeline regarding AP credit for these courses.
 - 4. The GEGB also discussed how the new template might impact study abroad classes that were recently approved for C1/C2/C5 credit and if they could count towards C2 credit in the new template. Though the study abroad courses do not have the same writing intensive component, they do provide both skills development and cultural awareness. Giving these courses C2 credit will help the International Center support students who want to study abroad. Additionally, the writing intensive component is

specific to Cal Poly – it is not a CSU/EO 1100-R requirement for C2. The GEGB agreed to discuss this again when these courses go through the renewal process.

III. Area C Requirements

- A. The Board agreed to add language to the Area C preamble that states how no class within the section can primarily emphasize skills-based development.
- B. The Board also discussed the recommendation to provide some explanation as to why C2 classes have a lower threshold for their writing intensive component than other classes. (C2 has a 2,000 word requirement while A2, A3, Upper-Division C, and Upper-Division D all require at least 3,000 words.)
 - 1. The Board believes it might confuse people to show that it's 2,000 words and lead to confusion as to a heavier workload for the other designated writing intensive areas.
- C. The GEGB also discussed if C2 literature classes need to cover two centuries; that requirement would preclude some departments from showing the development of literature such as Asian American literature, which has only been developed in the U.S. starting in the 20th century or Renaissance literature, which was only 50 years long.
 - 1. The GEGB agreed to add “usually” in the language to provide some latitude for topics like the ones suggested.
- D. The Board discussed if the proposed CR 4 related to philosophy in C2 was too prescriptive.
 - 1. Motion to strike that criteria; no second.
- E. The Board discussed the study abroad criteria for C2 courses and agreed that they should be writing intensive.
- F. The GEGB unanimously approved the Area C guidelines.

IV. Conclusion

Gary once again thanked the members of the GEGB, especially those whose terms are expiring, for their work this past year. He wished them a wonderful finals break and expressed his hope to see them again in the fall.

Meeting adjourned 5:03 p.m.