



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

GUEST

Dustin Stegner Academic Senate Chair / English

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 28, 2020 were approved as submitted.
2. GEGB confirmed that they can meet during fall quarter MW 3:10-5:00 p.m.
3. Gary let the Board know that they will be reviewing the Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) at next week's meeting and asked that they review them in advance. The goal is to have the PLOs reflect the mission statement and vice versa.
4. President Armstrong signed the guidelines for GE 2020 Areas C, D, and E. Once the curriculum workflow is updated, we will let programs – especially those with lower-division C, D, and E courses – know so that they can begin the recertification process.
 - a. At the moment, the GE website focuses on the old template. Now that the template and all guidelines have been confirmed and students are aware of the new template, Gary and Shannon will update the website to focus on GE 2020.

B. GE Mission Statement

1. The Board continued to review and refine the statements within the mission. They discussed what elements might be better suited as a PLO.
2. The Board agreed to continue discussing it in conjunction with the PLOs at the next meeting.



C. GE Pathways

1. Gary reminded the Board the four key elements of the potential pilot: how much flexibility is allowed; how many units would be in the pathway; what are the course levels; and how many Areas should be incorporated.
2. The GEGB agreed that they would be the group to approve the pathway.
 - a. Proposers might have to respond to specific guiding questions within their proposal, which address the rigor of the pathway as well as how the courses are connected and cohesive.
3. The Board agreed that the ambition of the model is to connect Areas that might not seem to have an obvious connection and to highlight the comprehensive, interdisciplinary nature of a Cal Poly education. Thus, courses should most likely come from a minimum of two (2) Areas.

D. Curricular Proposal Review

1. DSCI 231: General Dairy Manufacturing (B2 and B3)
 - a. The Board discussed the “laboratory” versus “activity” designation of the B3 component. All but one B3 course is listed as a lab.
 - b. The GEGB reviewed the course’s ability to show the “larger context” of how this material relates to a GE student.
 - c. Course will be rolled back.
2. ES 145: Reasoning, Argumentation, & Writing (A3)
 - a. The GEGB acknowledged the new consultation memos received in light of the revisions made to the proposal.
 - b. Gary indicated that Denise Isom was available as a contact should the Board have questions about the proposal.
 - c. The GEGB began its discussion of the proposal and will continue next week.

Meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.