

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

Guest:

Meeting called to order: 1:04 pm **Location:** Online – Zoom Meeting

CURRENT ITEMS

- **Welcome, Public Comment and Announcements**

- Members welcomed by the chair, A. Simone.
- 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.
- A. Simone announced that the Ethnic Studies Workgroup's new charges was approved and that the meeting schedule was sent out via email. A. Simone also extended to the committee (and their department) the invitation to the workgroup meetings.

- **Approval of the Agenda - Action:** Approved (M/S: S. Toruno-Conley/D. Ramos); unanimous

- **Approval of the Minutes (February 9, 2022) - Action:** Approved (M/S: S. D. Ramos/S. Toruno-Conley); unanimous

- **GE Website Updates:** A. Simone shared several key changes to the Assessment Page and GE Surveys. The following were the summary of the key changes:

- inclusion of drop-down archived assessments
- inclusion of drop-down 2019 video tutorials
- inclusion of drop-down archived documents

S. Toruno-Conley suggested to add an image on the GE assessment page. In line with this suggestion, A. Simone also requested to add members' photo to humanize the GE membership website. She asked the members to mail photos to her ASAP.

A. Simone asked if the committee was interested in keeping the older documents on the GE website. C. McGrath suggested to keep the documents for transparency and public availability instead of archiving them in SharePoint.

- **GE Education Master Plan Report:**

A. Simone asked the committee for some feedback before she could start the e-lumen tasks related to EMP. She shared the document and informed the committee that GE was part of categories 1.3, 4.2, 4.3, and 5.2. Furthermore, she told the committee that it was also a part of the conversation to assess whether GE committee should be part (or not part) of other EMP categories.

The following summarizes the committee's input from several categories of EMP:

A. Category 1.3 (Review Policies, procedures, etc.)

S. Toruno-Conley suggested that the committee look at course outcomes and review if certain elements of it were covered this category. C. McGrath also mentioned that the GE SLO Diverse Perspectives covered this category by default. Furthermore, A. Simone said that we could state that students were taking adequate courses in line with equitable needs. T. Caldwell said that the committee even modeled diversity since membership of the committee encompass diverse groups and inclusion.

B. Category 4.2 & 4.3 (Expand articulation and pathways...; Continue to expand employer partnership...)

B. Moore said that the expanding and streamlining aspect were included in GE criterion. This also would include satisfying course requirements for CSU and other institutions. C. McGrath seconded the idea that external partnerships were already targeting CSU and UC. D. Ramos shared that this category was responsibly shared by GE along with other committees such as Curriculum, Distance Education, etc. As such, it was more of a shared systemic responsibility. R. Hall also added that partnerships would include IGETC alignment that were helpful to students.

C. Category 5.2 (Development and Implement Facilities)

A. Simone opened the 2010 document in order for the committee to review/scan the facilities plan. C. McGrath said that we have to ensure that after revising the GE model, the college would have enough online offerings / facilities for students to take GE-related classes. This would fall under "equity in facilities" and "advocacy to create facilities to meet GE needs." A good example was new facilities in Brentwood campus that would satisfy this category as well as any new facilities for any new programs in the future.

• Assessment Review (Second Draft):

A. Simone asked the committee to review the updated assessment review document. Several corrections and recommendations were offered by the committee:

- On page 3, minor correction to change the year from 2022 to 2021. There was also a clarification on the first bullet being "enrolment" as a recommendation. Verb changes were also suggested (removal of -ing in select phrases).
- On page 5, changes on phrase "question remains if the new model is working" were suggested. Several suggestions were offered such as "working well," "how effective is the new model," or "pondering the effectiveness of the new model."

B. Moore and S. Toruno-Conley suggested to invite the new TLC chair to one of the future meetings in order to engage conversations about GE SP22 assessment report.

- **Approval of SP22 GE Assessment Report (pending edits) - Action:** Approved (M/S: S. Toruno-Conley/ R. Tripp); unanimous

Meeting adjourned at 2:29pm