

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

Absent: None

Guest: Imelda Lares

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

CURRENT ITEMS

- **Welcome, Public Comment and Announcements**
 - A. Simone announced the ending of online meetings for Brown Act committees by March 1, 2023. This could be adopted immediately or the committee could start the semester virtually and switch to face-to-face in March. Voting members will need to be physically in attendance while non-voting members could avail hybrid options. Further discussion was needed to finalize the modality of GE meeting.
 - N. Hannum mentioned that we could have a new note-taker soon from the office of instruction.
- **Approval of the Agenda - Action:** Approved with edits (M/S: B. Moore/ C. McGrath); unanimous
 - Edits to the agenda: Add the following item:
 - A. Simone proposed to include in agenda GE committee’s feedback to senate regarding the distribution of English courses in the new general education pattern.
- **Approval of the Minutes (October 26th, 2022) - Action:** Approved (M/S: B. Moore / D. Ramos); unanimous
 - Edits to the agenda:
 - Add A. Simone to absentee list of previous minutes.
 - Correct N. Hannum’s last name on one of the paragraphs.
- **GE COR Review Process:** S. Toruno-Conley shared the progress of the GE review process. Progress included formalizing the steps and addressing different scenarios. Furthermore, S. Toruno-Conley reported that she had discussion with A. Simone regarding a request to add a new feature “author” in eLumen. A. Simone then shared to the committee a new button feature option in eLumen, i.e. “GE transferability.” C. McGrath asked whether this process of editing with the new feature could be done at later stages after stage 1. A. Simone answered that anyone with permission could very well perform the edits at a later stage. C. McGrath also asked the protocol if faculty never picked a box, would there be provision so the process would not revert to stage 1. A Simone shared the failsafe/check process would be the indicated GESLOs. The learning outcomes could be used as reference to pick the correct box by an authorized person.

B. Moore asked if Tech reviewers could also be assigned that option so it would not cycle back to curriculum. S. Toruno-Conley shared ENG10 as an example of such situation. C. McGrath clarified that GE could be thought of in 2 different ways: (1) Discipline (requirement fulfillment) and (2) GE model (outcome fulfillment). An example of this is Bioethics. Such class might not necessarily cover scientific inquiry but covered ethics.

Academic Senate: English Courses in GE A. Simone asked if the committee had any input regarding English classes cross-listing aspect. B. Moore asked whether the senate was requesting the committee to focus on “optics problem” or substantive problem. A. Simone shared those specific comments requested by senate were not very clear, but the main concern was mostly optics. As far as breadth, S. Toruno-Conley raised the concern that this new pattern might allow certain students to just pick classes from one department. R. Pedersen shared that based on his observation, this might not be a prevalent situation but more of an unintended consequence. Questions such as, “Is this situation really happening based on data?” and “How many students were taking advantage of this model?” might be a good question for senate as well. T. Caldwell assured the committee that even within English department, courses taught by faculty had been constantly rotated and thus allowing students to gain experience from diverse faculty. A. Simone concluded this item by saying we needed more discussion to explore the broad boxes like arts and humanities (AH).

Requested Input on New GE Pattern: S. Toruno-Conley shared that Morgan wanted the committee to discuss two items: (1) membership on taskforce to help implement changes to transfer pattern (if such a taskforce was necessary), AND (2) If we should change the local GE pattern to match the new transfer GE pattern. A. Simone added that a lot of other faculty members and management were also curious about how GE committee would handle these changes. B. Moore noted that while harmonizing these courses would be ideal, the number of courses would prove to be the main disconnect and limitation.

C. McGrath recapitulated that prior to 2012, local GE always mirrored transfer package. The logic back then was to encourage students to take other AA degrees. Currently, the logic seemed to have shifted to make access to transfer better and to offer more options for students. R. Hall shared that years ago such issue already existed and was brought to senate already. Students would often choose IGETC pattern instead of local GE pattern. R. Pedersen suggested the possibility to “nest” the pattern or make it stackable GE pattern. This could be a possible a solution to remedy the “choice” issue.

Feedback to Senate: A. Simone concluded the meeting by summarizing feedback to the senate as two-fold: (1) to wait and see the type of courses offered in spring 2023 and (2) request for data regarding students taking one set of courses. Furthermore, A. Simone was noting some other areas of research the committee would want to pursue:

1. Request for “Author” in eLumen
2. Add research component concerning what DVC and CCC were doing in terms of alignment.
3. Survey / data for students taking single set of courses (see feedback to senate) and how big of an impact would this be.
4. Explore “Nested” GE Pattern / Stackable GE pattern

- **Meeting adjourned** at 2:27pm