Members of the Board*: Helen Bailey (Evaluations); Mark Borges (ASI representative); Kaila Bussert (PCS); 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)

Guests:
Andrew Morris (History, Co-Chair GETF, GE Pathways Work Group Chair)
Dustin Stegner (English, Academic Senate Chair)
Sarah Downing (Vice Chair of Board of Representatives; ASI Representative)

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:13 p.m.

I. Administrative Tasks
   A. Minutes from February 7 approved as submitted.
   B. Sarah Downing will be the representative from ASI for the next two weeks.

II. Course Proposals
   A. PHIL 230
      1. The course proposal for PHIL 230 says that it will be offered Summer 2021, but a comment by the proposer asks that it can be approved for Summer 2019.
      2. Rachel Fernflores commented that the course is already being offered electronically and that the faculty member who submitted the proposal was asked to do so to demonstrate e-learning proficiency.
         a. The GEGB is concerned that individual faculty members might think that they have to resubmit proposals that have already been approved for an online modality.
         b. The GEGB also questioned if the request to teach the course online for this summer was received too late for the Registrar’s office.
         c. The GEGB will approve the course but maintain reservations about the need for the faculty member to propose the course if it has already been approved for online instruction. Gary will speak with the Registrar’s office and the eLearning Task Force about the GEGB’s concerns.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person’s name.
III. GE Template and Report Structure

A. Gary introduced a GE template document to the group that captures the requirements from EO 1100-R and the recommendations from the GE subject area work groups.
   1. There are two parallel templates, the second of which factors in requirements for high-unit programs.

B. The GEGB recommended categorizing the upper division GE areas as follows: Upper Division B; Upper Division C; and Upper Division D. There will not be a B5, C3, or D3 numbering for these areas.
   a. The GEGB recommended this course of action to provide clarity and consistency throughout the GE program within the university and the CSU system. Additionally, it would reinforce the GE Task Force’s recommendation to focus on the discipline and not the letter and number.

C. The GEGB discussed keeping the A3 course description as “Critical Thinking” as stated in EO 1100-R. They recognized the Area A work group’s recommendation to rename the category “Critical Thinking and Communication” but determined that the addition might be too limiting for curricular development.

D. The GEGB discussed the possibility of an Area C elective for non-CLA students and the impact that might have on programs, especially high-unit programs.
   1. The GEGB decided that they would need to define “high-unit” programs and explain the programs that would be considered “high-unit,” such as ABET-accredited programs.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
ACTION ITEMS

Thursday, February 21, 2019 | PSY 340; GE Template and Resolution Structure

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, February 21, 2019 | 3:30 – 5 p.m., 10-241
Thursday, February 28, 2019 | 3:30 – 5 p.m., 10-241
Friday, March 1, 2019 (if needed) | 10:10 – 11:00 a.m., 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. April 2, 2019 – Academic Senate Executive Committee reviews GEGB resolution
2. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
3. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template