Present: Martina Bremer (COS), Stephen Branz (EXO), Robin Love (CoEd), David Parent (COE), Peggy Plato (CASA), Revathi Krishnaswamy (HA), Simon Rodan (COB), Matthew Spangler (COSS)
Absent: None
Guest: Melinda Jackson (EXO),

Start: 2:05 pm

1. Approval of Minutes from September 10th, 2015
   a. Adjustment: 3.b.i COMM courses should be moved under the previous course discussions.

**Action- Approve Meeting Minutes from September 10, 2015 with adjustment: 7-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

2. Intensive Music Proposal
   a. They have historically received C1 and C2 in the past and they exemption for that has been removed from their exceptions. They believe they should still receive it and this is package is their solution to still retain these GE modifications.
   b. MUSC 4 A/B will meet the C1 component along with MUSC 12 meeting C2. The issue with full approval last year was that the MUSC 12 course did not contain enough writing to meet the C2 outcomes.
   c. MUSC 12 syllabus update appears to have adjusted it superficially in order to meet the request of BOGS. It only appears that they are attempting to include the additional readings based on request, and the papers do not list word counts and the additional exams does not contain enough writing. The feedback and revisions aspect of C2 is not apparent in the update.
   d. They could move the Concert report earlier so that they could do revision and feedback. They could also put a higher percentage on this assignment.
e. The exam could have contained more writing questions based on the interesting topics they are including on the exam. Or make one of the essay question off the exam to a paper.

f. If they are going to get a C2, they need to put in the official word count and feedback and revision process. Writing 15-20 words in an exam is not an adequate way to meet the 1500 word count.

g. Give them specifics on what exactly needs to be fixed.

h. Include more about coherence in writing so that they understand how important the writing concepts are.

**Action- Conditional Approval for Intensive Music Package upon re-submission of syllabi: 7-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

3. New Course Proposals
   a. PERS 1A/B-
      i. The courses have been running as experimental, form is for a minor course change not a new course proposal.
      ii. The course seems to cover the outcomes in C2 area.
      iii. Not impressed with greensheet. **Would like more detail on how they are addressing the GELO’s in the assignments.**
      iv. Duplicated GELO statements.
   b. GERM 1A/B-
      i. The course seems to cover the outcomes in C2 area.
      ii. Concerns over whether or not a student would comprehend the literature if they have a basic level of language skill.
      iii. Not impressed with greensheet. **Would like more detail on how they are addressing the GELO’s in the assignments.**
      iv. If they are interpreting texts, the only textbook is the language text no additional writings have been included.
      v. An example of the essay question

4. **So2-7** Administrative Structure for BOGS
   a. This policy mandates that course coordinators for GE proposals be invited to all BOGS meetings that will look at discussing their proposal.
   b. The policy should be adjusted to invite course coordinators at a second reading if applicable.
   c. Not including the coordinators may be seen as not being transparent.
d. Seems like a waste of time to invite them to every meeting instead of making it worth their time by inviting them to a specific meeting.

e. Just because the meeting is open to the general public does not mean they have a right to speak in the meeting.

f. We could invite them when course is on agenda, but request them to notify us if they are so we can place them at a time certain.

g. We could have a preliminary review and vote without coordinator, and then ask them to the next meeting in which you hold an official vote.

h. New verbiage on course coordinator inclusion will be created and bring to the next meeting for review before sending on to O&G.

5. GE Program Review- Self Study

a. Not much about BOGS was brought up in the report from WASC. It was noted that a review has not been done on BOGS in many years.

b. It must have come out in the interview with WASC members that we did not know when the last review had been conducted.

c. Simon, Melinda and Brandon White (PPC Chair) met over summer to review current program plan template and what parts could be addressed by BOGS.

i. How good is our GE program and by what standards (LEAP)

   1. is it how it’s offered, who offers it?
   2. how well are the learning outcomes being met?
   3. The variation in how involved the course coordinators are with the courses in their programs
   4. They are more than likely taught by an adjunct.
   5. The uncontrollable variables in course offerings and how they are taken.

ii. What does our policy and process look like, is the structure a good fit.

iii. What is the process for quality control.

d. An external reviewer, PPC letter to the Provost and Action Plan to wrap up the cycle.

e. This is a good opportunity for us to look at process and improve on it, from guidelines to including the GE Pathways as a radical change (of course requiring senate approval).

f. Good time to ask for necessary resources, committee membership, etc.

g. Currently no mechanism to manage quality control.
6. PPC GE Reviews
   a. MUSC 010A
   b. MUSC 010B
   c. MUSC/ASIA 019
   d. MUSC 120
   e. DANC 010
   f. DANC 102

Adjourn: 4:00pm