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 30, 2019 were approved.

   B. Update on GEGB Resolution regarding Area A and B Guidelines.
      1. Gary informed the Board that the Area A and B requirements were approved by the Senate. We are set to share it with the campus.
      2. The DLO resolution barely passed because the Senators were discussing the ability to assess the outcomes. They were supportive of revising the DLOs but debated the verb choice and ability to evaluate the outcomes on a university-wide level.
      3. The other resolutions that rely on the passage of the new DLOs can move forward meaningfully next year.

   C. Gary thanked the members for an incredible year. They have done a tremendous amount of work, and it has been a constructive, excellent group, who grappled with many difficult discussions and ultimately made this process and this redesign of General Education very successful. He said that he knows the administration is very appreciative of their work.
      1. Next year, the GEGB will focus on the GE Program Learning Outcomes and Mission Statement. The group will also be working on the GE Pathways overlay recommendation to the Senate. Gary congratulated the group on a successful year and asked that anyone whose term expires to consider rejoining.

* Absence is indicated through the strikethrough of a person’s name.
II. Review of GE 2020 Registrar Curricular Map and Timeline

A. Brand-new Area A or B proposals will be accepted per the Registrar’s regular deadline of accepting new courses. Gary has been working with Brian Self and Susan Olivas to discuss the process for recertification.

1. Initially, Gary, Brian, and Susan thought it would be a two-year process; A and B courses would be reviewed the first year and C, D, and E courses the second. However, an evaluation of the amount of courses in C, D, and E rendered that option impossible.

B. Phase 1: There will be a May 2020 deadline for the GEGB to receive current Area A and Area B courses that need to be submitted for recertification. By Summer 2021, those courses will be implemented.

C. Phase 2: After consulting with departments that especially have many Area C and Area D courses, the group determined that Phase 2 would incorporate lower-division C and D courses as well as all Area E courses. Current courses have until May 2021 to submit their courses for review and will be implemented Summer 2022.

D. Phase 3: This phase will include upper-division courses for C and D. Courses will be due May 2022 and will be implemented Summer 2023.

E. Helen has developed a conversion document for the Registrar’s Office that shows the changes from the current template to the GE 2020 template. She asked the GEGB to review the document to confirm its accuracy. This document will be for internal purposes only and will not be published.

1. The GEGB discussed some changes related to B5 and C5 requirements.
2. Regarding current C5 classes, which are skills-based language classes, the GEGB discussed how they cannot be included in the GE 2020 C2 section because they are not (and cannot be) writing intensive. Students taking those classes are not at the level to write 2,000 words – they are still learning the fundamentals of the language.
3. The GEGB also discussed how that might impact students who receive AP credit for a language other than English. They will receive AP credit towards GE Electives through 2019-20; it will not count starting 2020-21. Helen would modify the language to add some clarification regarding the decommissioning timeline regarding AP credit for these courses.
4. The GEGB also discussed how the new template might impact study abroad classes that were recently approved for C1/C2/C5 credit and if they could count towards C2 credit in the new template. Though the study abroad courses do not have the same writing intensive component, they do provide both skills development and cultural awareness. Giving these courses C2 credit will help the International Center support students who want to study abroad. Additionally, the writing intensive component is
specific to Cal Poly – it is not a CSU/EO 1100-R requirement for C2. The GEGB agreed to discuss this again when these courses go through the renewal process.

III. Area C Requirements
   A. The Board agreed to add language to the Area C preamble that states how no class within the section can primarily emphasize skills-based development.

   B. The Board also discussed the recommendation to provide some explanation as to why C2 classes have a lower threshold for their writing intensive component than other classes. (C2 has a 2,000 word requirement while A2, A3, Upper-Division C, and Upper-Division D all require at least 3,000 words.)
   1. The Board believes it might confuse people to show that it’s 2,000 words and lead to confusion as to a heavier workload for the other designated writing intensive areas.

   C. The GEGB also discussed if C2 literature classes need to cover two centuries; that requirement would preclude some departments from showing the development of literature such as Asian American literature, which has only been developed in the U.S. starting in the 20th century or Renaissance literature, which was only 50 years long.
   1. The GEGB agreed to add “usually” in the language to provide some latitude for topics like the ones suggested.

   D. The Board discussed if the proposed CR 4 related to philosophy in C2 was too prescriptive.
   1. Motion to strike that criteria; no second.

   E. The Board discussed the study abroad criteria for C2 courses and agreed that they should be writing intensive.

   F. The GEGB unanimously approved the Area C guidelines.

IV. Conclusion

Gary once again thanked the members of the GEGB, especially those whose terms are expiring, for their work this past year. He wished them a wonderful finals break and expressed his hope to see them again in the fall.

Meeting adjourned 5:03 p.m.