

**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)

---

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

**I. Administrative Tasks**

- A. The GEGB approved the March 14 and March 21 minutes.

**II. GE Resolution Update**

- A. On April 2, Gary presented the GE resolution to the Academic Senate Executive Committee. The resolution included the GE template for standard and high-unit programs, a definition as to what “high-unit programs” means, and a statement on writing (10% requirement) and writing intensive courses in GE.
  1. There were a few questions from the Executive Committee, but overall they seemed to understand the changes made to the template.
- B. Gary alerted the GEGB that the presentation at the full Senate might produce more lively conversations. While there are limitations as to what Cal Poly can do, the template reflects as much customizations as is possible under EO 1100-R.
  1. The GEGB is welcome to attend the meeting and is encouraged to share the template with constituents within their department.

---

\* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person’s name.

---

**III. Revising the GE Educational Objectives and Course Criteria**

- A. Gary discussed the timeline for the quarter, including Senate deadlines and GEGB priorities to complete.
1. He was informed that the last day to put new business in the pipeline is April 18. He is going to confirm that date and report back to the group.
  2. Even though all of the outcomes and course requirements will not be finalized this year, it might be better to wait and submit them in the Fall. It will give campus constituents enough time to look at each section as it is finalized and give those groups the ability to stagger the changes more gradually.
  3. The Board agreed to try and finalize Area A and B at the next meeting. They will also review Area C in case there's enough time next week to begin that discussion.
- B. To remind the Board of where they are in the revision process, Rachel Fernflores said that the approved minutes from March 14 capture a lot of the progress that was made. She made edits to the document based on that conversation and shared an updated version for the GGEB to consider.
1. Rachel let the group know of her department's response regarding a criterion related to an active-learning environment. They said that they were fine with removing that language or modifying it to strengthen the intent of the statement.
  2. Bruno Giberti said that the comment about "an active-learning environment" seemed to be the group's way to link the class to Learn By Doing and Cal Poly's distinctive pedagogical philosophy.
  3. The group agreed to consider moving that statement to the GE introduction rather than try to make a prescriptive statement within the course design requirements.
- C. One new element is the preamble to Area B. In order to parallel the structure in the other areas, Emily Fogle added a preamble and course design requirements for Area B and its subareas respectively.
1. As opposed to other subareas, the subareas in B share common themes not content. For instance, physical science could include geology, biology, or chemistry. Each topic is its own unique discipline and does not share a common curriculum. While the same course content might be explored by English, History, and Philosophy departments, science departments do not necessarily share the same content. Because of this distinction, there are fewer course criteria and more focus on themes rather than specific topics of discussion.
- D. The Board discussed how to acknowledge the core value of diversity, equity, and inclusion within GE knowing that the working group has yet to finalize its report. The Board agreed that it might be important to include some statement about the topic within the introduction knowing that more details would come at a future date.

1. The Board also cautioned against making it seem that every area needed to include a specific class related to diversity, equity, and inclusion as some disciplines might not have an explicit way to include that within the curriculum. The goal could be to infuse those values rather than require classes to explicitly address them.
  2. They agreed to wait and see what the final report from the working group says but expressed concern about, if a statement is included in the introduction to the whole program, then it might seem like a mandatory overlay or even an empty-handed statement that is not woven throughout the program.
  3. The Board also agreed that, when the report is submitted and the GEGB makes its recommendation to the Senate, they review the language and ensure that the intent of a (possible) overlay is clear so that each subsequent GEGB cohort can follow the same standards when it comes to reviewing courses.
- E. The Board discussed their concerns about Area F being folded into a larger Upper-Division B area and not having its own subarea anymore.
1. Current Area F classes might fall short of meeting the Upper-Division B requirements. The language should be broad enough to include as many disciplines as possible while avoiding being too general and allowing for classes to be approved that truly should not be included. It might be that current Area F classes might not be approved within the new GE template **or might end up in an Area D class**, and the Board should be prepared for those conversations and reactions.
  2. The Board agreed to consider what the language would be and to present options at next week's meeting.
- F. Gary asked the group to consider the terms that are being used for these sections.
1. Currently, we say "educational objectives" and "course criteria." Until recently, the distinction between those two terms was rather unclear, even for members within GEGB.
  2. The group will consider either keeping those terms and defining them better or changing the terms to mirror the language throughout other programs (such as to "learning outcomes" and "course design requirements" or the like).

Meeting adjourned at 4:53 p.m.

---

**ACTION ITEMS**

Review current Area A and Area B language and be prepared to finalize at the next meeting.  
Review current Area C language and be prepared to finalize at the next meeting if time permits.

**UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE**

Thursday, April 11, 2019 | 3:30 – 5:00 p.m., 10-241

**GENERAL DEADLINES**

1. April 9, 2019 – Presentation of *General Education 2020* template to Academic Senate
2. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
3. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template