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 GEB 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