**Present**: Sara Toruno-Conley (English Faculty), Interim Chair; **Voting Members**: Tess Caldwell (English) notetaker for the day; Cindy McGrath (Journalism); Robert (Bob) Moore (Science Faculty); Diwa Ramos (Math Faculty); Ryan Tripp (Social Sciences Faculty); **Non-Voting Members:** Rikki Hall (Director of Admissions & Records); Natalie Hannum (VP of Instruction)

**Absent:** Jeffery Bui (LMC Associated Student); Ryan Pedersen (Dean of Instruction: Math & Sciences); Adrianna Simone (GE Chair)

**Meeting called to order**: 1:10pm Location: Online – Zoom Meeting

**CURRENT ITEMS**

1. **Welcome, Public Comment and Announcements:**

* The chair announced that Dr. Simone will return sometime in Nov and as a sidebar, Adrianna and new baby Luca are doing fine, but Luca was sick with a high fever recently.
* Cindy McGrath announced that the LMC Journalism team won several awards at the Journalism Association of Community Colleges Conference. Much congrats to the journalism team.
* Natalie Hannum made a general announcement pertaining to the recent social media post floating around campus, and she wanted everyone to know that she was available to discuss the post. The president will make an official statement early next week.

1. **Approval of the Agenda — Action:** Approved with edits (M/S: C. McGrath/T. Caldwell); unanimous
2. **Approve Meeting Minutes Oct. 12, 2022** **— Action:** Approved with minor edit to item 4, first bullet point (M/S: C. McGrath/D. Ramos); unanimous

Bob had a follow-up question pertaining to item 5, last bullet-point: “Academic Senate would like to discuss with GE folks the fact that a student could conceivably complete the local LMC GE model with one science course and the rest English courses because some English courses have been approved for several different requirements boxes.” Did Academic Senate discuss this?

* C. McGrath: There was a discussion item, but no action taken
* R. Hall was surprised that was a concern because we don’t offer any local degrees for English.
* N. Hall clarifies the concern is about the amount of English under that one area and lack of breadth of other GE courses

1. **Incoming GE CORs: ENGIN 10** **— Discussion:**

A discussion ensued pertaining to the Engineering 10 Course and what category the course should fit under. General comments were discussed pertaining to the course as well as other hypothetical examples. The final decision: although Engineering 10 does not “officially” meet the Natural Sciences GE SLO, it does meet another SLO, so based on the new model, as long as it meets another SLO, it is acceptable in the NS area.

* C. McGrath adds that just because a course meets a GE SLO doesn’t mean it can automatically be added to a GE box. The GE Committee doesn’t decide that.
* Some discussion followed about whether to give feedback to COR authors regarding similar issues: a course not naturally aligning to its assigned GE SLO. C. McGrath clarified that the GE SLOs that are assigned to a box don’t define the box.

1. **Fine-Tuning Our GE COR Review Process: Flow Chart/Decision Tree— Discussion:**

Sara Toruno-Conley reviewed the rough draft of steps for the Flow Chart in terms of how to review new courses as well as any course that needs to be reviewed. Cindy McGrath provided some background on how traditionally the GE courses have been reviewed, and she also provided some background on the new system.

Natalie Hannum is working with e-lumen and the curriculum committee to flush out ideas in terms of how to make the process more streamlined. Thus, in the future more support and perhaps training from eLumen is needed.

There was more discussion again about possible hypothetical situations and how the committee would deal with upcoming issues.  One issue that was discussed is how do we communicate with the author of a course, specifically when we have questions pertaining to the course.  Do we contact each author individually?  Do we invite the author to a meeting so that we can clear up any misunderstandings? The committee members wholeheartedly agreed that historically that when authors have attended the curriculum committee, it has not been a “pleasant” experience.  And as a committee, we are attempting to stream-line the process and make it more supportive. The bottom line is that revising courses and getting new courses through should be a positive experience, both for the author and the committee.  How we create this “positive experience” is still up for discussion.

Some members of committee felt that one person from the committee could possible reach out to the author of a new course individually, thus making it a more personal and productive experience.  Another suggestion would be to partner up with members of the committee before the writing process so that a new author could discuss the course as they are revising it.

1. **Quality Check: Review of GE CORs—Discussion**

The committee felt that the “Quality Check” item should be pushed forward to the spring and/or when Adrianna is able to take over.

1. **Closing Comments**

Finally, the chairwoman says she will “tweak” the Flow Chart so that it is clear and concise, especially for faculty who are designing new courses; other members are welcome to chime in as well.

Meeting adjourned at 2:28 p.m.