Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:39 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks
   A. Minutes from January 31 approved with modification.
   B. Kaila Bussert will resume her position as the full-time PCS representative for GEB. Jesse Vestermark will return as needed for Area A work group discussions.

II. Course Proposals
   A. Gary asked the group to review PHIL 230 for next week.
   B. Since CM 333 and ARCH 120 are proposed to start Summer 2021, Gary recommended waiting until the new GE template is finalized before the GEB evaluates the proposals.
   C. The GEB reviewed the revisions to RELS 180. After an extensive discussion, the GEB did not approve the course for D1 and recommended that the course be considered for D3 or even for D5.
      1. Gary said that he would communicate the group’s decision to the proposer.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person’s name.
III. GE Report Overview and Structure
   A. The GEGB discussed AS-504-98 “Resolution on General Education 2000” as a model for the structure in their upcoming resolution to the Senate. The GEGB will finalize their commitments to the template and then discuss the course requirements, educational objectives, unit requirements, and program overlays for inclusion.
   B. The GEGB will send the report to the Senate by April 2.

IV. Writing Intensive Courses
   A. Gary asked the writing specialists to discuss their concerns, priorities, and goals for writing in the GE program.
      1. Debra Valencia-Laver shared that the current writing intensive requirement began after Cal Poly received feedback from employers and other constituencies that writing should be a more integral component in General Education. Writing needed to occur throughout the course and not just in a final paper where the student was not able to receive feedback or the chance to revise. One concern in a writing intensive course is the amount of students in the classroom. Too many students and the faculty cannot provide adequate feedback. Also, if faculty are teaching multiple sections of a writing-intensive course in one quarter, that can be a challenging workload. Writing intensive courses are not limited to General Education but also continue to the major program.
         a) The GEGB discussed how writing should be tailored to the subarea since writing is not the same in each discipline.
      2. Dawn Janke expressed her hope that, in regards to GWR, that writing proficiency is not achieved through one course along but is a sustained practice through multiple experience in lower-division and upper-division General Education courses. We want students to have multiple opportunities, too, in their major program to learn how to write within their discipline before they graduate. She also expressed the idea that certain sections in C4 might be writing intensive and some may not due to the need for larger class sizes to avoid graduation roadblocks. It would be in the GEGB’s interest to consider finding a way to label writing intensive sections so that we could evaluate degree progress and see where students received that sustained practice throughout their entire education.
      3. Dianna Winslow suggested that GE courses be as closely aligned as possible between general writing intensive sections and between GWR-designated classes. It is important that students receive feedback and that courses are at the appropriate size to offer feedback.
      4. Kathryn Rummell reminded the GEGB of WINGED, which was the “Writing in Generally Every Discipline” program. She reminded the group that there should be professional training as there are very different writing skills needed in a course on history versus a course on creative writing. There might be a different set of skills required in a writing intensive course than one for GWR.
5. Helen Bailey reminded the group of the requirement that students receive 24 units of writing intensive instruction throughout their career. In the past, all sections within an area marked as writing intensive would have to meet that requirement; thus, there was no need to track. However, since some courses within the same subarea are not writing intensive, it would might be something to reconsider tracking.

6. Bruno Giberti suggested composing language that explains the value of a writing intensive focus for students as well as for faculty. The language would be parallel but more appropriate for each audience.

7. Dustin Stegner reminded the group that any discussion of requirements or a set of required courses that students have to take within GE should be carefully considered so as to stay in compliance with EO 1100-R.

8. Mark Borges discussed the lack of feedback that frequently occurs in writing intensive courses. He also discussed that some subareas might be deemed as writing intensive but are not. For instance, his C1 class did not contain any writing component.

   a) Dawn Janke supported this notion by saying that she has studied 400 student survey results and conducted many focus groups with students around their writing experience. Overwhelmingly, these students said that they are not getting feedback, even in their Area A courses. They get a grade but do not know how to build on the feedback – if there is any.

   b) The group also discussed the administrative requirements and resources needed to support many sections of a writing-intensive course. Faculty workload is a key concern with writing intensive courses.

9. The group discussed that a 4000-word requirement does not have to be original writing. It could include proposals, drafts, revisions, or post-writing reflections.

10. Writing could be in support of the Learn By Doing philosophy as a way to connect the General Education program with the major program. It might be useful to consider writing as a value not tied just to General Education but at the university level.

   a) If writing intensive program becomes more university-level focus, then the GWR is a type of overlay to show the commitment of writing across the discipline. Perhaps students submit a portfolio of their work as a way to prepare them for the writing requirements they will face later in their careers, too.

11. The group also discussed the value of keeping the minimum 10% writing in each GE class. It might not be enforced at the moment but could be something that is discussed during course renewal and review.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
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