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