<u>Present</u>: Adrianna Simone (Social Justice Studies), **Chair;** <u>**Voting Members**</u>: Diwa Ramos (Math); Cindy McGrath (Journalism); Sara Toruno-Conley (English); Robert (Bob) Moore (Science); Ryan Tripp (Social Science); Tess Caldwell (English), <u>**Non-Voting members**</u>: Rikki Hall (Director of Admissions & Records)
<u>Absent:</u> Ryan Pedersen (Dean of Instruction: Math & Sciences; Natalie Hannum (VP of Instruction); Armon Gonzalez (LMCAS Senator)
<u>Guest</u>: Chialin Hsieh, Morgan Lynn, Marci Lapriore

Meeting called to order: 1:06 pm   **Location**: Online – Zoom Meeting

<u>CURRENT ITEMS</u>

- <u>Welcome, Public Comment and Announcements</u>
  - Members welcomed by the chair, A. Simone.
  - S. Toruno-Conley announced a Live Poetry Event on April 29 entitled "Open Mic: A Celebration of Poetry & Spoken Word"
  - Agenda was shared by A. Simone. The first order of business was to ask a volunteer to be the notetaker. D. Ramos volunteered to be the notetaker.

- <u>Approval of the Agenda</u> - **Action:** Approved (M/S: C. McGrath /B. Moore); unanimous
  - A. Simone suggested to move item #7 of the agenda, i.e., GESLO eLumen mapping, to be the first order of business

- <u>Approval of the Minutes (February 9, 2022)</u> - **Action:** Approved (M/S: S. Toruno-Conley/ D. Ramos); unanimous
  - R. Hall updated the previous minutes by adding C. Konsavage's last name (Admissions and Records).

- <u>GESLO eLumen Mapping:</u> C. Hsieh shared the ISLO statement that was approved by SGC. C. Hsieh shared that the approved ISLOs were naturally aligned with GESLO. As such, it was recommended to approve the current setup/alignment:
  - ISLO1 Communication Competency aligns with GESLO1
  - ISLO2 Critical Thinking and Information Competency aligns with GESLO2
  - ISLO3 Scientific Inquiry aligns with both GESLO5 and GESLO6
  - ISLO4 Ethical Insight and Diverse Perspective aligns with GESLO3 and GESLO4

  M. Lapriore asked the committee about revising CSLOs and how it would fit in the new model. C. Hsieh responded that there would be articulation with curriculum committee and then followed by eLumen updates. A. Simone added that GE would always provide feedback and would verify alignment.

  C. Hsieh shared the eLumen mapping source. A. Simone asked what happens if more than one GESLO aligns with a particular CSLO. C. Hsieh demonstrated on the eLumen mapping/grid that the GE committee could provide multiple alignments (check marks). For example, ENGL100's CSLO 1 could align with GESLO1 and GESLO2 on the mapping.

  Questions about departments' roles were raised. C. McGrath asked whether the GE committee would work with department chairs to complete / verify mapping. M. Lynn asked on how GE closed the loop on the course alignment. A. Simone also asked a related question of whether the departments had control of actual mapping/ alignment.

B. Moore responded to M. Lynn's question and shared that when writing GESLO criteria, the committee was only required to map course with one GESLO. A. Simone also shared that the new model was more fluid and flexible in aligning courses from the old model to the new model. Furthermore, the new model could take out non-existent ones like interdisciplinary studies.

A. Simone suggested to pull together a GESLO file that the committee worked on. From this file a spreadsheet could be created that would summarize courses and their alignment with GESLO. This would be verified by C. Hsieh. Then this process would be checked during the succeeding semester by GE Committee. C. Hsieh also shared that whoever replaces M. Lapriore as a CSLO coordinator should receive training on how to extract data from eLumen for assessment purposes.

A. Simone shared the concern that some GESLO categories had more course options in them compared to others. As such, students' opportunities to take other courses might be affected. Example of this would be ethical insight where certain options or availability might have shrunk. Because of this, A. Simone said that GE committee was encouraging faculty to map any of the courses to GESLO to help improve options for students. B. Moore agreed with this suggestion. He pointed the need to figure out ways to increase the likelihood that a student would get at least one course from each category.

M. Lynn wanted to clarify whether the GE committee had reason to worry about transfer students. A. Simone answered that the responsibility was local. M. Lynn also wanted to clarify whether the GE committee was responsible for local GE program assessment since a lot of the courses now had been expanded to be part of GE. A. Simone confirmed the assessment responsibilities. B. Moore also mentioned that GE used to be the broader SLO, but ISLO assessment would be currently even broader. C. McGrath also shared that in terms of assessing GE student learning outcomes, the CSLOs at that level would be the measuring tool since there would be more CSLOs on that level. C. Hsieh clarified that courses that were not attached to PSLOs would map their CSLO to ISLO.

A. Simone asked if the committee would need to vote for the natural alignment of GESLO with ISLO. C. Hsieh wanted to affirm this suggestion so that it would be on record. B. Moore wanted to clarify the actual motion because there were three steps included in the motion. S. Toruno-Conley clarified that the actual motion would be the automatic alignment of GESLO to ISLO. D. Ramos also affirmed this point and shared that the first four ISLOs were already directly corresponding with GESLOS.

- <u>Motion for the approval of the automatic alignment of GESLO to ISLO</u> - **Action:** Approved (M/S: B. Moore / S. Toruno-Conley); unanimous
- <u>Ethnic Studies Tech Review (Breakout Room)</u>
  A. Simone assigned Ethic Studies courses pending stage 4 for tech review and feedback.

<u>Meeting adjourned</u> at 2:28pm