I. The meeting was called to order at 1:00 pm.

II. Items for Discussion

A. Changes to the Recertification Process

A few members of the GEB expressed their concern that changing the current recertification process will negatively impact articulation of courses with other system campuses. Katy Ho reported that she referred back to campus articulation agreements, and as long as we have a vetted process for recertification, System Academic Affairs is not concerned about the specific process. If our campus deems a course to have a certain designation by way of the process established by our own campus, that is how the receiving institution will take it. Katy stated that she will put it on the agenda and solicit feedback from other VCAAs at the next system VCAA meeting.

Katy also clarified that “ACCJC is not prescriptive in terms of what constitutes a degree requirement. ACCJC only cares that you have a curriculum process in place to review courses and ensure that the courses meet the required designations and also checks to see that there is a process in place to assess SLOs. We need to assess the process of assessment. We mainly need to show them that we did it.”

A member of the GEB expressed concern about “lowering” recertification standards. He noted that the W.I. System committee would not honor our W.I. designations if we did not immediately discontinue the practice of offering W.I. as a “dual option” course. Katy explained that changing the process does not mean lowering the standards.

Mieko, in consultation with the Diversification sub-board, introduced a checklist-method for simplifying the process of recertifying courses for Diversification designation.

The GEB decided by consensus that, for now, each sub-board has the prerogative to implement their own process of review. The Diversification will pilot the simplified checklist-method for recertifying courses.

B. Recertification and Assessment
GEB members expressed concern regarding the superfluity of assessment that is being required. Katy stated that there will be an institutional researcher whom she will work with to make sure that assessment efforts are not being duplicated unnecessarily.

The issue of how often course level assessment needs to occur was entertained. Ron noted that urging instructors to do course level assessment each semester is overkill. He believes that course level assessments are important, but there needs to be agreement or guidance on how often they need to be conducted. Katy said that she will clarify how often course level assessment needs to occur.

GEB members inquired about how the new ACCJC standards would affect the GEB and its processes. Katy informed the GEB that there will be an orientation session when the new ACCJC standards are implemented.

Eric Shaffer expressed his desire for a “live” definition of assessment.

C. Foundations Board Membership Update

Steve reported that he has appointed Mingjing Chi from the Math department as the new member replacing Judy Sokei on the Foundations Symbolic Reasoning sub-board. He stated the following reasons for his decision: (1) The only courses that need to be reviewed for recertification in the next 5 years are math courses (2) Symbolic reasoning is scheduled to be replaced by Quantitative reasoning in 2018. Ron expressed his desire to be a member of the board and noted that Phil 110 and logic have always been represented on FS. The replacement is for a 110 instructor. Others noted that the charter encourages that disciplines affected by decisions should participate in the relevant sub-boards. Steve agreed to put Ron on the Foundations sub-board e-mail list and include him in the Foundations sub-board meetings so that he can have input, but the vacancy has been filled. He would not be allowed to vote. The discussion was postponed to a future meeting when the matter could be discussed further with a change in the GEB charter to allow sub-board members to vote on important sub-board issues, such as sub-board replacements.

A member of the GEB noted that when revisions were made to the most recent version of the charter, some of the critical details from the earlier version were inadvertently left out. Specifically, she noted that the following key sections were not included, but should be put back into the current charter.

1. Members of the Gen Ed Board are appointed by the FSEC Chair in consultation with the Gen Ed Board Chair.

2. The Board Chair must be elected at the end of each year.

3. The Gen Ed Board can petition the FSEC Chair to remove any Board member who is not performing his/her function.

Discussion of updates to the current GEB charter will be continued at the next meeting of the GEB.

Blue text indicates additions by Ron Pine.