

Present: Ed Haven, *Chair*, Iris Archuleta, Curtis Corlew, Ryan Hiscocks, Nikki Moultrie, Cindy McGrath, Ryan Pedersen, Anthony Perri, David Reyes, Nancy Ybarra

Absent: Shondra West (Note taker)

Guest: Deborah Hawks, Sharon Goldfarb, Luis Zuniga, Janice Townsend, students

Meeting called to order 2:38pm Location: L-105

CURRENT ITEMS

2. Announcements & Public Comment:

- In the interest of faculty expressing concerns about the announcement made at the Monday Meeting regarding future changes to GE; eliminating GESLO 5 (Worldview - diversity) and adding information literacy GESLOs. The reason for the change is to on board other courses that do not meet the current GE requirements. It was shared that students seek cultural relevant material to include diverse perspectives in their classes. Removing the GESLO diversity component bring about concerns. **See attachment, 2.1 (page 4-6)**
- Documented materials regarding faculty feedback were provided to express their rationale to keep the diversity GESLO requirement. It was asked by the GE committee to reconsider developing a strategy (language) how to on board courses to meet diversity GESLO using a different structure.
- Professional Development is needed to enhance the teaching of GESLO 5 worldview
- Student Erika shared about her experience with diversity on campus in reference for keeping diversity GESLO. Removing diversity takes away from the diversity learning environment on campus.
- It was shared by another student, her experiences with having the diversity component and how it has helped enhance her relationships with people on campus, mainly with the professor.

3. Approval of the Agenda

Action: Approved; unanimous

4. Approval of the Minutes from Date October 24, 2018

Action: Approved with the corrections; unanimous

5. GE COOR Review

HUMAN 30 - Modernist Paris: Artists & Intellectuals

Action: Approved - unanimous

GESLO1 (reading, writing, speaking) - this COOR has writing, reading assignments, and oral presentation.

GESLO2 (interdisciplinary) - different discipline can teach this courses; the sample assignments contains interdisciplinary.

GESLO3 (critical thinking) - within CSLO 4, it details the critical thinking components. The entire COOR embeds critical thinking.

GESLO4 (ethical) - within CSLO 5 there is an opportunity for discussions on ethical implications; ethical inquiries are embed in other CSLOs/topics.

GESLO5 (worldview) - covered in CSLO5 in reference to diverse perspectives.

Notes: apply a cohort number for curriculum committee and remove Mariel Morison name

HUMAN 40 - Opera: The Human Experience in Music, voice and Drama**Action: Approved; unanimous**

GESLO1 - (reading, writing, speaking) critical thinking exams requires writing; reading conversations talk about things read; Cornell notes cover reading; final debate oral presentation.

GESLO2 - (interdisciplinary) sample assignments 1 and 2 covers politics, social ethical expression on the art. Different disciplines are covered in the topics.

GESLO3 (Critical Thinking) - compare and contrast assignments involves critical thinking.

GESLO4 (ethical) - covered in CSLO4 analyze the ethical and social implications.

GESLO5 (worldview) - present COOR CSLOs and assignments; cultural diverse bodies. Question - diversity reflected in the method of evaluation? Course content opera influence music of America. 20th century speaks to opera from a global diversity perspective; romantic, baroque which influence modern times.

RN 36**Action: tabled**

Questioned if appropriate for GE review due to the COOR is unaligned to GESLO instead to the occupational SLOs. The department spoke to meeting GE appropriateness via the assignments. The committee reviewed the course to provide feedback for meeting future GE requirements. In light of this course being occupational it was questioned if the course could be GE? Edward will look into other CTE courses and how they meet GE. There are several courses currently that do not meet GE; e.g. sciences.

GESLO1 (reading, writing, speaking) writing papers and providing presentations is noted in the COOR.

GESLO2 (interdisciplinary) - contains philosophy, religion, and social sciences, but not detailed in the CSLOs. Typically this is noted in the GESLO assignments

GESLO3 (critical thinking) - not specifically detailed in the COOR, whereas the students are required to use critical thinking skills.

GESLO4 (ethical) - the students take a plethora of nursing courses that meet all the GE courses, yet difficult for one COOR to meet the requirements.

CHDEV 50 - Teaching in a Diverse Society**Action: approved; unanimous**

GESLO1 (reading, writing, speaking) - reading, writing and oral presentation noted in the assessment/grading structure.

GESLO2 (interdisciplinary) - covered in the media report. The COOR covers the “isms”; psychological biases.

GESLO3 (critical thinking) - covered in children book review analyze one owns biases. Critical thinking required throughout the COOR. Synthesize information related to micro aggression and isms.

GESLO4 (ethical) - embedded throughout the COOR cover biases and impact on decision making.

GESLO5 (worldview) - covered throughout the COOR; diversity and worldview

Note: this course can placed in two GE boxes; ethnic studies and social sciences.

Art 32 and ART 33**Action: Approved; unanimous**

This courses is being resubmitted based on recommendations from a previous meeting to revise interdisciplinary and ethics. This course now meets GESLO4 ethics and GESLO2 interdisciplinary.

Additions added covers different society and beliefs systems, global electricity, engineering, math, science, politics, and economics.

6. Results/Action from All College Meeting -

7. **Share Point** - Edward shared about moving GE documents to SharePoint. Some committee members like printed versions to markup the documents. The Chair use hardcopies to mark the notes/changes required by the department. It was agreed to print less GE hardcopy materials.

Meeting adjourned

Meeting Dates: Fall 2018 - December 12

Spring 2019 - February 13, 27; March 13, 27; April 10, 24, and May 8

Location and Time: L105; Wednesday 2:30-3:55pm

Attachment, 2.1 Janice Townsend's statement

General Education Committee Public Comment November 14, 2018

I want to thank each of you for taking the time to be on this important committee. I know each of you are here because you want to support each student's success at the college.

I also want you to know that I am concerned about changes the GE committee are considering. After the Monday meeting on October 29th, I left with the impression that the GE committee was thinking about removing GE SLO 5 (the diversity SLO) from the GE SLOs. What was stated in the meeting was that critical thinking would remain and a new one information literacy would be added. Also there was support at the meeting for the ethical inquiry GE SLO from Edward Haven, the chair of the GE committee however there was no mention of support for the diversity GE SLO.

In addition there seems to be an idea of no longer having each course teach each GE SLO but to decentralize GE. It was stated in the meeting on October 29th that the reason for this was it might bring in more courses to GE.

I would like to address these two issues with 6 points:

Point 1: Students are asking for us to have our courses be more culturally relevant

When we solicit students input about what they would like to see in their courses at LMC, the feedback we receive is that courses should be more culturally relevant and include more diverse perspectives. A student quote in the GE Program Assessment stated that curriculum "Should acknowledge all student backgrounds because incorporating student perspectives will diversity the discussion and perspectives student come away with". In the Student Equity Plan assessment, students voice the same request.

In the GE Monday Meeting, faculty mentioned that we were here for the students and that we wanted them to have a fulfilled life. One way to accomplish that is for students to hear and see their identities within the curriculum and simultaneously learn about each other's identities.

Removing the GE SLO from the GE program, implies that we do not value diversity, and I don't think that is what faculty believe around this table or at the college in general.

Point 2: Most of the eligible courses for GE are GE courses already (see handout)

I realize that our GE program is different than what articulates with CSU General Education Breadth Requirements, however using that as a guide makes sense to see what might be eligible for the LMC GE program. Surprisingly the overlap is almost complete. And as a matter of fact there are 9 additional courses that are not on CSU General Education Breadth Requirements that are on our GE requirements.

What is missing is World Language courses. Laurie Huffman has come before the GE committee in the past and the GE committee has had a challenge in seeing how learning a new language is using critical and creative thinking and reading and writing at a level required of GE coursework. I think that rationale is open to interpretation.

I hope the GE committee can spend time thinking about how our world language courses do require critical and creative thinking as well as reading and writing. In doing so, almost all of the CSU General Education Area C and D courses would be part of our local GE program.

Attachment, 2.1 Janice Townsend's statement

In also looking at courses outside of GE, there is English 100, however almost all the other English courses are GE courses. After that it really is just Math and Chemistry that don't have any GE courses.

So decentralizing GE to get more participation seems misguided. What seems the best solution would be for the GE committee to think about how World Languages could meet the GE SLOs.

Point 3: Faculty are asking for professional development to teach GE SLO 5 better (see handout)

When faculty were asked, "In what ways could LMC as a whole improve our teaching of diversity and multicultural perspectives?" 13 of the 17 responses, specifically named the need for more professional development. In the entire GE faculty survey, not one respondent mentioned eliminating GE SLO 5.

It seems to me if the GE committee is responding to faculty responses that they would be working with TLC and the professional development office to build robust professional development for GE SLO 5.

Point 4: There is no evidence from the GE Program Assessment to recommend the decentralization of teaching of the GE SLOs (see handout)

When faculty were asked, "If you could revise the GE SLOs, what changes would you make?" the following breakdown of the 21 responses were yielded:

6 faculty requested no change or not applicable

7 faculty requested to make the SLOs clearer

4 faculty requested a reduction in SLOs

1 faculty requested adding information literacy

1 faculty requested a cafeteria style model

2 faculty requested that we have no SLOs

By looking at these responses, what seems to be the strongest recommendation, is that the GE committee clarify the GE SLOs and provide a clear explanations for each, with the understanding that some courses are going to emphasize one or two GE SLOs over others.

Point 5: Not one faculty person requested eliminating GE SLO 5. It did seem from the question regarding CSLO 2 that faculty felt it would be a good idea to eliminate that as it seems more of a characteristic of a course not a student learning outcome. One person requested removing the oral component of CSLO 1 and one person requested removing GE SLO ethical inquiry

Also when I attended a previous meeting that Josh lead, just within Behavioral Sciences we could not come up with an SLO that would tie us together.

Given that we have nearly every eligible GE course within the GE program, that only one faculty out of 21 came up with a cafeteria model and the largest request from faculty was making the GE SLOs that we have clearer, it seems

Attachment, 2.1 Janice Townsend's statement

misguided recommendation to create a "wholesale change to the GE model" as referred to in the General Education Program Assessment.

Point 6: Information Literacy seems like a Critical Thinking Component rather than a standalone GE SLO:

Working with this definition of Information Literacy:

*Information Literacy Defined. Information literacy is a **set** of abilities requiring individuals to "recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information."*

It seems that these skills are subsets of both GE SLO 1 and 3 specifically reading effectively and critical thinking.

Without double counting, we have 110 courses written to the 5 GE SLOs. Removing GE SLO 2 will require work for faculty as they untether that SLO from that COOR. Imagine if you have 110 courses have to say how they are going to teach and assess information literacy. It doesn't make sense to ask faculty to do that given the survey responses.

However what does make sense, is within the clarifying of each GE SLO, that information literacy is woven into CSLO 1 and 3.

Given that I teach a course called Teaching in A Diverse Society, which teaches that every teacher should be a diversity educator, it makes sense that some of my students would like to speak to this topic. I would like to introduce you to.