



MEMBERS

Helen Bailey Office of the Registrar – Evaluations; **Kaila Bussert** PCS – Library; **Rachel Fernflores** CLA – Philosophy; **Samuel Frame** CSM – Statistics; **Bruno Giberti** Academic Programs and Planning; **John Jasbinsek** CSM – Physics; **Gary Laver** GEGB Chair / CLA – Psychology and Child Development; **Bwalya Malama** CAFES – NRM&ES; **Andrew Morris** Academic Programs and Planning; **José Navarro** CLA – Ethnic Studies; **Brent Nuttall** CAED – Architectural Engineering; **Phillip Nico** CENG – Computer Science; **Sam Park** ASI

MINUTES

Gary Laver, General Education Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, called the meeting to order at 12:11 p.m.

A. Announcements

1. Minutes from March 10, 2020 were approved as submitted.
2. The GE 2020 recertification timeline for Area A and B proposals has been extended from June 1 to June 15. An email will go to departments (with current courses in those areas only), associate deans, and curriculum chairs; they are encouraged to forward this message to their faculty.
3. The Office of the Registrar fixed the workflow to delineate objectives for B1/B2 courses with the specific B3 outcomes. This fix is automatic; GEGB members are encouraged to share this update with any of their faculty who might have been confused by the way the objectives were originally displayed.

B. Curricular Proposal Review

1. NR 304: Agroecology (Upper-Division B)
 - a. The GEGB expressed the concern that there might not be enough seats available to support both ENVM majors who might want to take the course and other GE students.
 - b. Course was rolled back.
2. PHIL 336: Feminist Ethics, Gender, Sexuality and Society (Upper-Division C; eLearning addendum)
 - a. Rachel Fernflores, the course proposer, recused herself from this portion of the meeting.
 - b. eLearning addendum was approved.



3. WVIT 300: Survey of Grape Growing and Winemaking (Upper-Division B)
 - a. The GEGB thinks this course is strong and could be a signature GE course for Cal Poly.
 - b. They expressed concerns about the lack of a lab or activity associated with the course.
 - c. The GEGB also had questions about the lack of prerequisites, only recommended thematic courses.
 - d. They encouraged the proposers to integrate elements from lower-division B more explicitly within the course.
 - e. Course was rolled back.

C. GE Pathways Report

1. The GEGB continued their conversation from last month. Some comments include the following:
 - a. Gary let the Board know that he emailed the six college deans a few months ago about the prospect of a GE Pathway and their willingness to offer enough courses to support it. Three deans responded and were cautious to offer their full support without more information. However, deans might not be as focused on GE courses to be able to make offer their full support at this time.
 - b. Gary asked the Board to consider what a pilot program might look like, which would help determine whether some segment of students would be unable to participate.
 - c. Pathways would function more like a choice of electives, which would help limit the amount of substitutions available. Students would have a clearer sense of the courses available in a given pathway before enrolling, which would limit a potential workload issue with too many petitions to take a different course.
 - i. The GEGB thinks that a “Choose 3 of 4 classes” rule would provide enough options without encouraging students to request too many substitutions.
 - d. Two of the courses would come from upper-division courses and one would come from lower-division course.
 - i. The Board wants to make sure both transfers and students on the high-unit template have enough options to be able to participate in a pathway.
 - e. The Board agrees that a small capstone experience would make the pathway more than just a collection of classes but still need to review what that might look like.
 - f. The Board also expressed concerns that the pathway coordinator would not only need to track students’ progress but would also need to act as an advisor, which would be a major workload concern.

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.