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 fine.
   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.