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