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

I. Administrative Tasks
   A. Minutes from April 4 approved.
      1. In response to the conversations last week on diversity and inclusion, Jose Navarro said that he could share some of the working documents with the GEB for their consideration.

   B. Gary was informed that the Senate deadline to submit materials for AY 2018-19 consideration is not April 17 but rather will be sometime in May.

   C. Gary announced that there are five vacancies for the 2019-20 GEB. He expressed his gratitude for this group and all that they accomplished this year. He hoped that they will be interested in another term or suggest a colleague who might be interested in joining next year.
      1. Jose said that he will be on sabbatical Fall 2019 but still plans on attending the GEB meetings.

II. Update on GE Resolution Presentation to the Academic Senate
   A. Gary announced that the presentation to the Senate went fairly well; they are on the verge of a second reading and could possibly even vote on it at the next meeting April 16. Before the second reading occurs, he did want to discuss a few things that came up during that meeting and via email.
      1. Grace Yeh (Ethnic Studies) sent Gary an email wondering about using the term “prefixes” instead of “discipline” when talking about student choice in lower-division C and D2 classes. Her concern is that students might choose a class with a similar discipline and thus not have as much breadth.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person’s name.
* Neal MacDougall gave his open proxy to Jose Navarro. (Neal sent an email to Gary, Jose, and Shannon on April 10 with this permission.)
a. The GEGB acknowledged her concern and the fact that they had discussed it at previous meetings. Aside from the fact that it would be rather challenging to define and track a disciplinary distinction for the Registrar’s Office, students could, in theory, still take 12 out of 16 units with the same prefix in Area D. (For instance, history in D1, D2, upper division, and then one of the GE electives in the standard template.) While the Board appreciates the concern, they decided to keep “prefix” in the template.

2. Brian Self (ASCC Chair, ME) also shared a concern about having fewer Area B classes in the standard template. He is concerned that fewer classes in this area distances GE from contributing to a polytechnic university. He wondered if, in looking at the 8 units of GE electives, 4 of the units designated as needing to come from Area B (upper- or lower-division) and the remaining 4 open to either Area C or Area D.
   a. Gary shared that he is sympathetic to that concern and asked the GEGB if it would be a reasonable (and approved-by-the-CSU) adjustment.
   b. The GEGB debated the point and determined that it should be kept as it is, which would allow more flexibility (if not breadth) for students and programs.

B. Helen spoke with Gary about adding a line to the resolution stating that this new template will be implemented for the 2020-21 catalog.
   1. The GEGB approved added that clause in the resolution.

C. Helen also asked for clarity in the D elective for high-unit programs. The wording now suggests that students could take a second D1 class through their Area D elective. However, since all of those courses have to teach the same content, it would be repetitious and not supportive of breadth.
   1. The GEGB agreed to change the wording so that students can choose either another class in D2 or in upper-division D.

III. Revising the GE Educational Outcomes and Course Design Requirements (continued)
    A. The GEGB continued with Area A language. If a requirement is stated in the preamble, it should be echoed in the course criteria so that it is addressed explicitly during the course proposal process.

    B. The GEGB also sought clarification as to how classes could reasonable address sustainability within the course. The University Sustainability Learning Outcomes aren’t curricular in design and could lead to confusion not only for faculty but for future GEGB members evaluating courses. The Board agreed to review the language to make sure it is as clear as possible.
C. The members also debated whether putting course size requirements in the resolution was pedagogically important or just a political maneuver.
   1. The group agreed to include it for now and see how the Senate responds and are prepared to remove it so that the entire resolution doesn’t get rejected.

D. The GEGB discussed the wording in the Area A preamble that speaks to “particular attention to issues related to diversity, inclusion, and sustainability.”
   1. The members agreed that it is important to include those ideas in the classroom, but the phrase “particular attention” – without a clear definition included – might convey the wrong impression for instructors as well as future GEGB members to evaluate.

Meeting adjourned at 5:06 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 18, 2019 | 3:40 – 5:00 p.m., 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. April 16, 2019 – Academic Senate reviews General Education 2020 (3:10 p.m. – UU 220)
2. May 1, 2019 – Registrar shares new template with Cal Poly Faculty
3. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template