

Present: Cindy McGrath, chair; Curtis Corlew, Ryan Hiscocks, Nikki Moultrie, Ryan Pedersen, Nancy Ybarra, Shondra West (note taker)

Absent: Iris Archuleta

Guest: Josh Bearden, Rikki Hall, Mark Lewis, Morgan Lynn and Julie Von Bergen

CURRENT ITEMS

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

1. Announcements & Public Comment:

None

2. Approval of the Agenda

Action: Approved (M/S: C. Corlew/R. Hiscocks); unanimous

3. Approval of the Minutes: Date April 15, 2020

Action: Approved; (M/S: C. Corlew/R. Hiscocks); abstain R. Pedersen, N. Ybarra, and N. Moultrie

4. Formal presentation of GE model revision proposals

- **Proposal 1: Mark Lewis's GE revision, Fall 2019**
- **Proposal 2: Josh Bearden's GE revision, Spring 2020**
- **Proposal 2A: Mark Lewis's proposed amendment to Proposal 2**
- **Proposal 3: Cindy McGrath's GE revision, Spring 2020**

Cindy provided a brief overview and context of the bulleted items (proposal 1-3). Additionally, Mark Lewis asked to withdraw his Proposal 1 agenda item since it had been discussed in the fall.

Josh Bearden presented Proposal 2- GE revision based on using the Title V language and revising it to align with CSU/UC transfer requirements in an 18-unit package:

Area I: Language and rationality

Area 1A: English Composition

Area 2A: Communication and Analytical Thinking

Area 3A: Mathematics Comprehension

Area II: Natural Sciences

Area III: Arts and Humanities

Area IV: Social and Behavioral Sciences

Area V: Ethnic and Multicultural Studies

Discussion ensued on the remaining reforms in his proposal:

Reform 2 would allow current GE courses to maintain approval until the course is due for review when it would be required to meet the new proposed SLOs. In addition it would allow departments to submit other courses for LMC GE approval.

Reform 3: The newer process would require each department to identify which GE SLOs their courses align with.

Reform 4: Assessments of courses would occur as normal according to the current cohort cycle.

Reform 5: Changes to GE SLOs consist of splitting out oral communication from reading and writing, and removing interdisciplinary studies and replacing it with evaluating information and its sources critically.

STEM courses could consider offering SLOs and J. Bearden recommended that STEM representatives provide feedback.

Reform 6: Legacy courses eligible for CSU/UC/IGETC as meeting LMC GE requirements immediately.
 Reform 7 and 8: J. Bearden spoke about them representing the tech review process.
 Reform 9: Covers the GE philosophy and Title V language.

M. Lewis said he had made amendments and suggestions to Bearden's proposal, listed as Proposal 2A on the agenda.

His proposal would require students to meet LMC AA and transfer requirements, selecting one course from each Area: Natural sciences, social and behavioral sciences, arts and humanities, language and communication, quantitative reasoning, ethnic studies, and ethical inquiry. He indicated multicultural studies and ethical inquiry courses would double count in other boxes. His proposal also is consistent with other proposals that include eight GE SLOs, except for minor wording differences.

N. Ybarra and R. Hall both reported that double counting is not allowed. Rikki said that making the two other areas graduation requirements would thus increasing the current 18-unit graduation requirement package by six units.

C. McGrath discussed Proposal 3 and summarized what her position paper does:

- Removes barriers for transfer students
- Provides options for CTE students
- Ensures GE SLOs are distributed to eliminate or minimize gaps in student pathways
- Maintains efficiency for departments and programs in teaching to and assessing the GE SLOs

The paper includes the new GE philosophy statement, updates to new student learning outcomes, modification of the definition of what constitutes GE at LMC, flexibility of integration of GE SLOs, and defines what GE courses fall into which requirement categories, as well as minor changes of the role and membership of the GE committee. Overall, the aspects of revising the GE model include Title V and ACCJC requirements and input from Flex workshops, department meetings, and GE surveys. Additionally, reading and writing have been separated from oral communication (speaking). She said that because all degree-applicable courses must include Reading and Writing, and Critical Thinking, they should be institutional rather than GE requirements and handled by the Teaching and Learning Committee instead of GE. C. McGrath also suggested including symbolic writing to the GE definition where applicable to include math, foreign language, and music courses. Further, C. McGrath said modifications to the GE model also include:

- Wordsmithing the SLOs:
 - oral comm has been renamed human communication with the ability to communicate and collaborate effectively as a speaker, visual communicator or visual performer
 - Information literacy - no change.
 - Ethical insight was modified to address faculty questions about what's required by the student.
 - Diverse perspectives - a combination of existing and new proposal
 - Quantitative reasoning - no change
 - Wordsmithing scientific methods to scientific inquiry (students will apply scientific inquiry)
- Contextualizing student learning outcomes in a course: Beyond reading, writing, and critical thinking, one of the GE requirements must be met for each course; she suggests that the six GE SLOs are each assigned to a requirement box for equitable distribution. Assignment of GE SLOs to the requirements list, she said, would reinforce the idea that the GE program is more than a collection of units but leads students through a designed set of outcomes consistent with the intent of Title V

C. McGrath shared that her proposal generally aligns with the other recommended proposals regarding the requirements list and SLOs. And the model maintains the same amount of units for CTE programs.

M. Lewis asked M. Lynn if the information competency SLO is appropriate to assign to college composition courses, and M. Lynn said it is a debatable issue, since they are not experts in the same way librarians may be. However, English does require research assignments in which students must use credible sources. N. Ybarra shared that even though English faculty may not have an Info Comp background, this same concern is shared with any department evaluating any of the GE SLOs, including the writing criteria. She added that LMC has an interdisciplinary model in which all faculty weave into their curriculum outcomes they may not be expert in, and the committee discussed the concerns surrounding that idea. M. Lewis said some departments like science may have trouble meeting SLOs that are not specific to the course content they teach. J. Bearden said that one of the purposes of revising the GE model is to empower faculty to teach what they are best at and make their own decision about which GE SLOs are appropriate for their course.

5. Discussion and possible action on GE proposals: R. Hiscocks asked about voting on moving one of the proposals forward to Academic Senate for approval since time is of the essence. The committee discussed the differences among the differing proposals and noted there were enough similarities among them to move forward, given a bit more time.

The committee agreed that J. Bearden, and C. McGrath should work together after the meeting and on Thursday to iron the differences in their proposals and integrate it into one complete position paper. The GE Committee decided to add a special meeting Friday, April 24 to fast-track approval of a revised position paper so it could be passed on to the Academic Senate by its Friday, 2:30 p.m. agenda deadline for consideration at the Monday, April 27 meeting.

Meeting adjourned

Remaining Meeting Dates Spring 2020 – April 24, noon-1 and May 13, 2:30-4 p.m. on Zoom
