

Present: Cindy McGrath, Chair; Iris Archuleta, Curtis Corlew, Rikki Hall, Ryan Hiscocks, Nancy Ybarra, Note Taker: Shondra West

Absent: Nikki Moultrie, Ryan Pedersen, LMCAS: Rochelle Arnold

Guest: Mark Lewis

CURRENT ITEMS

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

1. Welcome, Public Comment and Announcements:

Ryan shared that he announced the GE survey at Academic Senate

2. Approval of the Agenda

Action: Approved with changes; (M/S: Hiscocks/Archuleta); unanimous

- The minutes are unavailable
- Tabled — Analysis of GE transfer courses missing from the LMC GE curriculum

3. Approval of the Minutes from Date 2/12/2020

Action: Tabled

4. GE Survey Update

Cindy shared that she has received feedback and applied the changes to the GE survey, met with Beth Ann Robertson to upload the survey in Survey Monkey, and will compose an email message to send the survey to all LMC faculty. The deadline scheduled for two weeks to complete the survey (March 15). Cindy will encourage faculty to complete the survey by promoting the good cause of it. When sending the survey out via email, Cindy will include Mark's write-up as part of the body.

5. Information Gathering

- **On-Campus** — Cindy has met with the several departments and the TLC about modifying the GE model, along with promoting the GE survey. Cindy has plans to meet with the English department to talk about including English composition as part of the GE model or change the existing model.
- **Skyline GE Model** — Josh and Julie shared previously with Cindy a recommendation to provide the Skyline GE model as an example for the committee to review. Cindy spoke with Julie Wong, a Skyline faculty member overseeing assessment, about their process, in which the GE outcomes are used as their institutional outcomes. Cindy shared a document of Skyline's model with the committee. Cindy reported she asked Julie how they operationalized Skyline's structure and how it works. Julie shared with Cindy that they are considering establishing a GE committee structure, much like we have at LMC, to deal with GE more holistically as a program.
- Currently, Skyline's GE program consists of a list of courses, in which sections of the courses are individually mapped to GE SLOs. There is some talk about taking their GE package and thinking about it as an integrated program. Cindy also asked how Skyline ensures faculty participation in GE assessment. Because assessment is not part of their union contract like here at LMC, Skyline paid faculty volunteers to complete assessments last year, and the assessment process includes looking at each CSLO outcome mapped to the GE SLO criteria using a common rubric. With that, the integration of GE SLOs are not mapped at the program level, they are mapped directly to the GE SLOs. Cindy shared documentation of Skyline's substantive assessment rubric, in which Skyline uses TracDat to electronically map course assessment data to GE SLOs subsets. Skyline would like to

revise the format whereas they would like to use redefined format; for example thematic pathways or cluster outcomes. Rikki pointed out that Skyline offers additional options outside of the 18-unit Title 5 GE requirements package: students can take 3.0 units in area E (lifelong wellness) or an additional 3.0 units from areas A-D.

- Cindy added Skyline reported they are looking to be more intentional with their GE package rather than just offering a group of courses, and found it interesting we are looking to revise that approach.
- Cindy suggested we have several approaches to consider in our revision: 1) allow courses to meet fewer GE SLOs in an integrated model; 2) assign a particular course/s to fulfill each SLO in a non-integrated model; 3) consider adding quantitative literacy to our SLOs and add math to the GE program, and consider English courses as GE as well.
- Cindy noted that writing and critical thinking are required by Title V for all degree-applicable courses and both are current GE SLOs at LMC. Iris shared that transfer schools, both public and private, require critical thinking and writing. The only exception to a course having to include and assess writing is when skills demonstration or problem solving is determined by the Curriculum Committee to be more appropriate. Cindy shared that Nikki said she will provide a template for departments to determine which part of their COORs meet the sample assignments requirements for eLumen: writing, problem-solving and critical thinking criteria.
- An important question in revising the model is how to ensure students meet all GE SLOs no matter what GE courses they decide to take for their degree. That is the conversation about structure. In a relaxed integrated approach, should they be organized by Title V “boxes,” Guided Pathways, transfer pathways? Cindy suggested using Guided Pathways (meta-majors) to organize the model might be problematic since some pathways include many more course groupings than others and that could lead to inequitable distribution of the GE SLOs. Nancy shared that the intention of Guided Pathways is to direct students to the best GE courses that meet the pathway they are on. So Guided Pathways groupings were not designed for the GE model, but for departments and programs to organize courses in a more accessible format for students to choose course options that lead them through their education pathways more efficiently.
- Tracking back to the Title V discussion, Nancy read from the Curriculum Committee COOR instruction sheet, which includes a description of Title V degree requirements that are built into the COOR: critical thinking and writing are required as identified in the SLOs and assignments.
- Cindy noted a previous GE survey in which the college community was on board with removing interdisciplinary studies and adding information competency, and also said it is important to keep accreditation guidelines included as part of the GE revision discussion. Cindy asked the committee to consider, and provide feedback, as we work on the GE revision:
 - The broad variety of writing expectations in GE courses in the application of GESLO 1, which includes writing, specifically regarding Morgan Lynn’s concerns discussed at a previous GE meeting. Should there be a rubric for GE teachers to consider in grading the writing quality in their assignments?
 - GESLOs / ISLOs integration as universal design.
 - Option to reinsert the Title V language from the COOR instructions; the eLumen curriculum process will require it.
 - The integrated model, partially integrated model, or non-integrated model in which a specific course is required for each GESLO. Consider the advantages and disadvantages of all three.

- Ryan Hiscocks shared his thoughts to have a course selection format, and rewrite the GESLOs/ISLOs and information competency to be included at the program level as opposed to the course level. Discussion followed:
 - The concern becomes the stand-alone GE courses that are not part of a disciplinary program. General Education (GE) is a program itself and includes those stand-alone courses.
 - Some disciplinary program courses may not meet all the GE requirements within its program. For example, a foreign language does not meet the quantitative requirement. It was suggested all students who complete the program must take math to earn a degree, however. Another example: an ethics course is not required for the degree. If a program does not require ethics within its courses, how would that program meet GE? Speech is another example. While it is required for CSU transfer, it is not required for UC transfer or for the AA degree. So how would programs with courses that do not integrate speaking meet GE? If a speech course becomes a requirement, it adds units for students, if we remove it as a GESLO/ISLO, it poses difficulty for those entering the workforce without necessary speaking skills, so would it be ethical to remove it?
- Cindy asked the committee to think about the GE structure possibilities before the GE survey data is returned, considering the advantages and disadvantages of each. The goal is to build toward the advantages.
- Nancy proposed a “how” question when thinking about students who earn a degree (graduate): How does a student demonstrate they meet the five GE competency skills? How much of the competency should a student be expected to retain? How extensive should they receive the information necessary to meet the GE outcomes? How does the committee figure out to what degree the GE expectations are being met?
 - The solution may include a one-course method. The question: Why require critical thinking and writing for every course?
- For the next meeting, Cindy reminded committee members to think about a structure prior to receiving the GE survey data. Start brainstorming what might work well. The answers from the survey will tell what direction people would like to go, but not the structure itself. Think about variations on an integrated model, or the basic non-integrated model, and what those would mean for meeting GE SLOs.

6. GE Model Revision - Tabled

- Analysis of GE transfer courses missing from the LMC GE curriculum
- Additional options for CTE students
- Comparison of GE requirement boxes / Guided Pathways metamajors
- One tier or two: GE SLOs/ISLOs/both
- GE models: Basic

Meeting adjourned 3:52 pm

Upcoming Meetings:

March 11, 25; April 8, 22; May 1