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.
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