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 April 7, 2020 were approved as submitted.

   2. Gary let the GEGB know that many recertification proposals entered the workflow, but there were no new proposals for Areas A and B.

B. **GE Pathways**
   1. The GEGB does not necessarily need to send a resolution about a pilot pathway program to the Senate this year; it could be one goal to complete a draft of a resolution by the end of the quarter in order to have it ready to send at the beginning of September.

   2. The GEGB discussed several components of a GE pathway. Among those comments were the following:
      a. A pathway could only include courses from General Education.
      b. The Board discussed if a pathway could come from a set list of courses or could have a small amount of options. They also discussed if the courses should come from two out of the three areas and if they should only be upper-division courses.
      c. The GEGB thinks focusing on upper-division courses will provide the most flexibility for transfer students, high-unit majors, as well as students who enter Cal Poly with significant lower-division AP credit.
      d. Since students on the high-unit template tend to have their Upper-Division B course determined for them, it might be challenging to require a pathway to include upper-division courses in B.
      e. Additionally, since students tend to select courses that fit around their labs or activities, it might be necessary to include a small amount of flexibility in course

selection. Some courses also have "equivalents," so there might already be a small amount of options allowed within a pathway.

f. The GEGB acknowledged that it might be challenging to plan for a pathway with the recertification process still beginning. Some courses that could work in a pathway might not be recertified, or there could be new courses proposals coming that would change how a pathway might be constructed.

g. The Board also wondered if the structure of a pathway should be determined by a particular proposal – that it might need to be a "case-by-case" rather than "one-size-fits-all" basis; they discussed the concern with limiting the conceptual framework of a pathway if too much is predetermined. The goal would be to ensure that each pathway has integrity, is representative of the GE program, and is more than a scattering of classes, and that connects different areas together.

3. The GEGB acknowledged that pathways at other universities have encountered challenges, particularly with the culminating experience, but the faculty are still very much in support of a GE pathway, even if there are a few lingering pain points to resolve.

4. The Board discussed how a pilot program would need to have a set of boundaries – how long would it last in order to collect a sufficient amount of data? What numbers would they like to see in terms of enrollment/success? Who would be the pathway coordinator? Would it show on a transcript?

5. The Board advocated collecting some data from faculty and students in terms of interest and potential pathways proposals. They agreed to continue discussing data collection at the next meeting.

C. GE Mission Statement

1. The Board reviewed the current mission statement and discussed if they thought it represented the program.

2. There was some concern that focusing too much on courses – rather than the aspirations of the program itself – in the mission statement could be confusing.

3. The statement should emphasize how the program complements students' work within their major. GE is integrated, integral, and synergistic with the work students completes within their major.

4. GE also introduces key intellectual skills at the foundational level that are often practiced and refined within other programs.

5. GE at Cal Poly parallels the four years of a student's education; it is not confined to the first two years of their higher education, which is rather rare for a GE program.

6. One aspiration would be for students to view GE as a second major, not a set of courses to complete. It is a parallel program that supports and informs the major program.

Meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.