

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

Absent: Ryan Pedersen (Dean of Instruction: Math & Sciences)

Guest: Michelle Mack (Counseling)

Meeting called to order: 2:33 pm **Location:** Online – Zoom Meeting

CURRENT ITEMS

- **Welcome, Public Comment and Announcements**

- Members welcomed by the chair, A. Simone
- A. Simone announced that Ethnic Studies program approved for Stage 1 by SGC
- N. Hannum announced that Dean Kristin Lima is leaving LMC to take another position
- A. Simone announced that DVC put forward a hiring call for a tenure track faculty in Ethnic Studies

- **Approval of the Agenda** - **Action:** Approved (M/S: B. Moore/C. McGrath); unanimous

- **Approve Meeting Minutes September 22, 2021** - **Action:** Approved (M/S: S. Toruno-Conley/B. Moore); unanimous

Question posed by B. Moore whether R. Pedersen, as a non-voting member, can officially make motions. N. Hannum said only voting members can make motions but suggested that since the motion in question was approving the changing a meeting time next spring, rather than a policy or something involving money, that we move past it and not revisit the motion. Point of order will be added to the September 22, 2021 minutes.

- **GE evaluation process:** Discussion of the evaluation process, working in teams, and lingering questions about evaluations.

C. McGrath clarified the unique aspects to LMC's GE education model; we had "criteria" at the program level in GE before Student Learning Outcomes were required by accreditation. Our GE model has two components: GE courses are divided into discipline boxes, and they transfer that way. Second, the GE Committee evaluates the COORs to see if they integrate the GE SLOs. Discussion continued about the previous model of GE as compared to the new GE model, in which disciplines only need to integrate 1 GE SLO. Each discipline is attached to a GE SLO, but faculty can choose to map to a different GE SLO other than the one attached to their discipline. As long as the COOR maps to one GE SLO, it can remain a GE course. Any course that transfers as a GE course needs to integrate at least one GE SLO for the local GE model. The department does not have autonomy to say they do not want to be GE.

B. Moore discussed a nutrition course. C. McGrath said that if the course does not transfer as GE, then it does not need to be a local GE at LMC. She pulled up the course catalog, pages 69-70, and discussed how it would probably be a GE elective course at LMC. If we are unsure if a course is GE, we can check the course catalog.

N. Hannum asked what is the importance of having a local GE degree? There was concern if students are confused by the local GE model. M. Mack clarified that students who are not trying to transfer and want

to earn an AA degree, the local GE model is easier, CTE, appliance tech, etc. We do have a small population that needs the local GE model. The new GE model makes it easier for students to understand what they need and required less units, 18 units, which matches the state mandate by Title V. C. McGrath clarified that we are discussing the assessment of the GE classes.

- **GE Tech Review: COOR review with GE teams:** Previous item ran long so this item was eliminated.
- **GE Spring 2022 assessment:** Discussion of the Spring 2022 assessment process and its potential overlap with the 2018 program assessment and the 30 courses that were evaluated last time.

A. Simone asked, how do we want this assessment to look if we do not want a common assignment across courses? The 2018 program assessment looked at “diverse perspectives” and “speaking.” We could look at “human communication,” which overlaps with the speaking one, and diverse perspectives. We could use the data from the old program review. C. McGrath said we could do a survey of faculty about the new model, what is working and what is not. C. McGrath asked: When is a direct or indirect assessment useful? Indirect is looking at data that we can collect indirectly, such as at the students’ grades. Discussion continued about what is considered the best form of assessment, and in previous years senate members have been disappointed with the process not being scientific enough. C. McGrath asked the question: What is the most honest way that we can do this to be compliant with accreditation without creating a lot of extra work for faculty?

B. Moore said the process from 2018 was a selection bias model. He suggested to create something that is simple and straightforward enough to get a broad response. He advocates for a simple survey for the instructors and a second layer which looks at the grades, a combination of direct and indirect. He suggested a question like, in your discipline, can you comment on the successes and difficulties/challenges to get students to understand “scientific inquiry?”

D. Ramos shared information for how the Math department conducts assessment for their courses. He thinks the indirect method will work even if the math courses are assessed a little differently from the others.

- **ISLO Update:** A. Simone briefly shared the draft and stressed that the categories are still being workshopped.

Meeting adjourned at 3:59pm