

**California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo  
Academic Affairs**

**General Education Governance Board Meeting  
Tuesday March 9, 2018**

**Location: Room 01-301**

**Minutes**

Attendees: Brenda Helmbrecht (Chair), Josh Machamer, Aaron Keen, Emily Fogle, John Jasbinsek, Jose Navarro, Dustin Stegner (Academic Senate Chair), Haley Warner, Neil MacDougall, Helen Bailey

**Items of Business:**

New GEGB Chair—Process Update: Dustin confirmed that Executive Committee will follow Senate protocol and send Provost one name as “recommendation” unless they have 2 equally good candidates. If so, they will suspend bylaws. The Provost is free to interview candidates if she chooses.

Memo went out from Brenda March 8, 2018, notifying campus of the suspension of all Area F proposals for 2019-21 catalog, due to the transition to Area B7.

Brenda will form a B7 subcommittee next quarter to draft B7 learning objectives, with the goal of presenting to the GEGB and the Senate (possibly at the fall retreat).

**Review of course proposals:**

Committee comments:

- Discussion regarding synchronous and asynchronous contact hours for online courses.
  - If a course is totally asynchronous, an instructor is never online at same time as students. In asynchronous courses, contact seems to be mostly student-to-student, not student-to-faculty. Student-to-student, unmediated, interactions are different from faculty-mediated discussions. Need to better understand the role of asynchronous courses.
  - What is role of an instructor in an asynchronous courses? If only a grader, or they post content and record videos, are they really teaching the course?
- GEGB members expressed concerns about caps growing for online courses. Brenda will add a note to all e-learning addenda regarding the importance of holding to the stated cap.
- Need refresh on how the e-learning addendum questions are formulated: i.e. e-learning addendum is confusing in terms of contact with students.
- What is ultimate goal for online courses at Cal Poly? (i.e. students are already “taking it somewhere else”; “save \$” etc. Are we racing downwards to meet the competition (Foothill)?)
- Upper-division GE: is these appropriate course to be taught online? Depth of discussion seems to come from instructor being there. If s/he chimes in to online discussion forums 1-2 days later, will students go back to it? Will they learn as much? Is there a campus need to have online UD

courses? Online courses may help non-traditional students. Is this the argument for the courses moving online?

- The senate has stated that e-learning should enhance student experience; this criteria is part of the approval process. Yet, this criteria is seldom articulated on the form. Is it necessary to enhance content? Or can an online course offer an equivalent experience?

Overall consensus: we all need clarity on and update to e-learning standards. Brenda will reach out to CTLT for clarification. She will also draft a request for clarification for the Academic Senate Executive Committee.