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 (English, Academic Senate Chair)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks
   A. Minutes from January 17, 2019 approved unanimously.
   B. Pathways work group will meet for the first time tomorrow from 2-3. John Jasbinsek said that he would attend that meeting on behalf of the GEGB.
   C. Gary will remind the work group chairs that their reports with template recommendations and revised objectives and criteria are due next week.
      1. Once the groups submit the report, they cannot edit them. The GEGB will make the final determination as to what to submit to the Senate and will work with the area groups if need be.

II. Course Proposals in the Curriculum Management Workflow Portal
   A. Religion 180 is being reviewed by the USCP committee as that is how the program managed the revisions. The GEGB will review the proposal when it is received.
   B. Women and Gender Studies 201 is being proposed for an online conversion. It is already approved as a regular course. In comparing the proposal to the criteria from the e-policy resolution, the GEGB was satisfied that the proposal met the criteria.
      1. Approved with two abstentions.
   C. Architecture 120 and Construction Management 333 are new to our workflow. The GEGB will review them at a future date.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person’s name.
III.  **Area B In-Depth Analysis**
   A. The GEGB did not object to renaming the lower division areas to be consistent with EO 1100-R.
   B. The GEGB considered the ramifications of one track for Upper Division B rather than separating the requirements by college.
      1. The Area B Work Group is working on objectives and criteria that can be as inclusive as possible with the various disciplines included in that area.
      2. The GEGB recognizes the EO 1100-R goal to simplify the template and eliminate multiple tracks through the program as much as possible, but if Cal Poly maintains exceptions to high-unit programs (like in CENG), then there would have to be at least two different templates.
   C. The GEGB considered keeping current exceptions for high-unit programs, which is permitted within EO 1100-R.
   D. The GEGB also considered how double counting might afford students more breadth than before in the GE program.
   E. The GEGB discussed the additional eight units Cal Poly has within the GE template.*
      1. Four units are in quantitative reasoning.
      2. The GEGB discussed making the additional units GE electives, untethered to any discipline. The group discussed merits and drawbacks to this option and realize that flexibility is something students might really enjoy. With double counting, students have much more leeway in the classes they can take and could pursue additional interests. This conversation is one the GEGB will continue.

IV.  **Writing Intensive Courses**
   A. Senate Resolution AS-504-98, “Resolution on General Education 2000,” outlines (amongst other things) the writing intensive component in GE.
   B. Rachel Fernflores (Area C Work Group Chair) commented that her group is considering a goal of 2,000 words for lower-division writing intensive courses and 3,000 words for upper division courses. Some courses reach 3,000 words during the final exam, which isn’t a meaningful writing experience as it lacks feedback and opportunities for revision.
   C. The GEGB also recognizes that ensuring classes go through a course renewal process is essential and missing from the program. It will be a priority for the group following the approval of the new template.
   D. Another priority will be reviewing faculty workload so that, as writing intensive courses become smaller and thus have more sections of them, there is proper administrative support.

---

* By way of the semester-to-quarter unit equivalency conversion, quarter-based campuses have 8 units to factor into the template in order to meet the required units for lower-division general education.
E. The GEGB also recognized that the current wording for Writing Intensive courses require all GE courses to include 10% writing. The GEGB will consider revising the language to include possible examples so that it is clearly identified in course syllabi.

F. The GEGB reaffirms the need to keep Writing Intensive courses within GE and will work on offering some clarification to the wording, perhaps by bringing in Dawn Janke or Jay Peters to an upcoming meeting in February/March.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

______________________________

ACTION ITEMS

Thursday, January 31, 2019 | In-depth analysis of Areas C and D/E

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, January 31, 2019 | 4:10 – 5 p.m., 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. Week of January 28, 2019 – GE Area Work Group Reports Due
2. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
3. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template