

Members of the Board*:

Helen Bailey (Evaluations); 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); Sam Park (ASI representative)~~

Guests:

Andrew Morris (HIST, Co-Chair GE Task Force)

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

I. Administrative Tasks

- A. Minutes from May 2, 2019 approved unanimously as submitted.
- B. The Board asked for a reminder in terms of the GE implementation timeline – what has been passed and what still needs to be finished this year.
 1. The GE template has been approved – both the standard and the high-unit versions. The Senate also approved the definition of “high-unit program” and the writing component requirement throughout GE.
 2. Area A and Area B requirements for student learning and course design will be submitted as a resolution to the Senate, starting with the Executive Committee next week.
 - a. Once these outcomes are published, the Registrar’s Office will publish them.
 - b. Since this is the last week to submit business to the Senate for consideration, the remaining requirements will be sent to the Senate in the fall. It is still the goal for the GEGB to approve them by the end of this quarter.
 3. Gary said that he’ll be sending an email to the campus that outlines the general timeline for course renewal and course proposals.
 - a. Each course will be grandfathered in for the moment (e.g. F/B7 will be in Upper Division B) until it is their turn through the course renewal process. Not every course will survive, but hopefully many of them will.

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

II. Area B Criteria

- A. Gary shared an update from Paul Choboter (Math, GE Area B Work Group Chair). Paul's concern was in regards to the writing requirement in Area B, particularly in B4: Quantitative Reasoning. He shared this concern with Joe Borzellino, who was the Academic Programs and Planning representative on the GE Area B Work Group. They were concerned that students would be asked to write essays related to calculus or algebra.
 - 1. Gary reminded Paul that writing had always been a requirement for each GE class, including those in mathematics and science; this language was included specifically in Area B criteria for better consistency and transparency regarding the requirement.
 - 2. Gary also said that he would include language that the Senate already approved via AS-873-19 to show discipline-specific examples, such as math proofs or lab reports.
 - 3. The Board agreed that adding language to provide such examples in each subarea would be appropriate.

- B. Gary asked the Board was comfortable with language related to "computational" and "computer science" in Area B.
 - 1. The Board shared their concerns, primarily related to defining the terms better to ensure future GEGB cohorts would apply the meaning the same way.
 - 2. The Board unanimously approved the revised language, which was added to a preamble to B4: Quantitative Reasoning.

III. GE Area A and Area B Resolution

- A. Gary shared a draft of the resolution for the educational outcomes and course design requirements.
- B. The Board unanimously and provisionally accepted the wording to the resolution. They agreed that, pending how the rest of the conversation today, Gary could adjust as appropriate to include Area A, B, and/or E.

IV. Area E Education Objectives and Course Criteria

- A. The Board recommended the Area D/E work group revise the course criteria, which are student-focused at the moment, and focus them on course design elements that instructors need to include.

V. Defining "Educational Objectives" and "Course Criteria"

- A. The Board agreed to include a definition of these terms to the resolution, so that all faculty knew what was meant by these two separate sections. While the two are symbiotic, there are distinct differences in the two areas.
 - 1. The Board acknowledged the difficulty in defining these terms and the expectations the GEGB is allowed to enforce. The focus is defining the terms so that the course can be assessed when it comes time to the course renewal process. The goal is not to evaluate faculty on their ability to deliver the criteria.

2. The Board approved the definitions and agreed to add them to the guidelines preamble – along with the Area A and Area B requirements – in the resolution being sent to the Senate.

VI. Diversity Learning Objectives (DLO) Resolution

- A. José Navarro presented the revised DLO resolution and explained its connection to the USCP criteria.
 1. The Board asked for clarification on the establishment of the fifth DLO as happened in the AS-836-17 resolution.
 2. The Board also asked for consistency in the formatting of the document.
- B. The Board agreed with one objection to sponsor the resolution and send it to the Senate Executive Committee to review.

Meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Review current Area C language and be prepared to finalize at the next meeting.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE

Thursday, May 16, 2019 | 3:40 – 5:00 p.m., 10-241

GENERAL DEADLINES

1. May/June 2019 – Gary will send an email communicating the GE template implementation timeline as well as the timeline for course review, renewal, and new proposals.
2. Fall 2020 – Implementation of new GE template