

Present: Cindy McGrath, chair; Members: Iris Archuleta (PT faculty rep), Curtis Corlew (Art faculty), and Robert (Bob) Moore (Science faculty); Nidia Gonzalinajec (Math faculty); Shondra West (note taker)

Absent: Nikki Moultrie and Ryan Pedersen (Management reps)

Guest: Roseann Erwin (Librarian), Rikki Hall (Director of Admissions & Records), Natalie Hannum (VP of Instruction) and Marci Lapriore (TLC chair)

Meeting called to order: 2:31 pm

Location: Zoom Online

CURRENT ITEMS

1. Announcements & Public Comment:

None

2. Approval of the Agenda

Action: Approved; unanimous

3. Approve Meeting Minutes

- April 22, 2020 – **Action:** Approved with amendment (grandfather to legacy); unanimous
- April 24, 2020 – **Action:** Approved; unanimous
- May 13, 2020 – **Action:** Approved; unanimous
- September 9, 2020 – **Action:** Approved; unanimous

4. GE assessment and eLumen

Rikki shared her experience as an eLumen tech reviewer relating to GE. In the past, the course author would mark a GE box on a paper form signifying they are requesting GE status in a particular GE area. However, in reviewing courses via the eLumen process, some courses are not marked GE. It is unclear whether course outline authors may be confused about how to complete the eLumen GE process. Rikki is finding herself reviewing all courses submitted via eLumen to check for GE and commenting on whether courses meet the new GE model.

As GE tech reviewer, Cindy said her experience is similar to Rikki's and added that she notified Nikki about the problem of distinguishing which courses require GE review. Cindy chalked it up to the fact that the eLumen process is experiencing growing pains as everyone is adjusting to a new system. In the past, the GE committee, as a whole, evaluated the courses submitted before they went to Curriculum Committee. Now the GE chair reviews them while serving on the eLumen Tech Review Team.

Rikki shared that the Curriculum Committee has also discussed the challenges with reviewing courses via eLumen.

5. GE SLO descriptors

Cindy reviewed that at the last meeting Bob volunteered to write the scientific inquiry descriptor and Curtis the one for human communication, and that we will be reviewing those today. She also explained that Roseann agreed to attend the meeting to weigh in on information literacy, and that the Math department sent Nidia today as a temporary rep until they officially appoint someone to sit on the committee now that math has been folded into the GE program. Cindy reported she contacted the English department, and they will select a representative for the committee soon now that the writing requirement has also been folded into the GE program.

Curtis shared the draft human communication descriptor, explaining that he used the previous GE SLO 1: Reading, writing and speaking descriptor as a template. Now that speaking has been moved into its own

broader SLO statement on human communication, the descriptor includes wording that students should communicate as a speaker, visual communicator, or performer. As speaker, students can communicate individually or in groups; visual communication involves students making visual artifacts in a GE course, for example a chart or PowerPoint presentation; and performance involves students participating in in-class performances in theatrical literature or music courses, for example. The draft descriptor also includes suggested assessment criteria and illustrations of how instructors can integrate human communication assignments into their courses.

Recommendations:

- Cindy suggested adding that students will demonstrate one or more of the following proposed assessment criteria.
- Curtis mentioned that students should complete one area from A-C, whereas D is a standalone requirement.
- Item D was moved to the proposed assessment criteria statement to read:
A student who communicates effectively will demonstrate the ability to analyze, synthesize, interpret and evaluate concepts experienced in speech performance, or observed in visual artifacts. In addition, a student will demonstrate one or more of the following:
- A recommendation was made to change the wording (demonstrate/perform) for option C. At the next meeting, Cindy will bring this back to the committee as an amended statement for review.
- Curtis explained the descriptor is a starting statement for colleagues to offer their ideas and feedback.
- Cindy shared that before courses had to meet all the GE criteria; however, in the new model all courses will need to incorporate reading, writing, and critical thinking plus one of the six new GE SLOs. The purpose of the descriptors is to provide faculty with a definition of what the GE SLO statements mean as well as multiple examples on how their courses can meet the GE SLO criteria.
- Bob asked a question concerning science students meeting the requirement. Curtis explained students could meet this requirement via presentations (visual representations), e.g., PowerPoint.

Bob shared the scientific inquiry descriptor with the committee. He explained the critical need for all students to be aware of current events involving science-related issues and said that everyone can benefit from scientific inquiry, not just science majors. The descriptor includes a scientific rationale based on evidence, empirical experiment, observation, data, hypothesis, and an openness to testing. In addition, scientific inquiry must be open to consensus of the whole discipline to work together around high-level questions.

Questions

- Bob asked whether the information provided in the descriptor is enough. Cindy explained this will be a question for all the descriptors once the final six draft statements have been completed and the committee looks at them as a whole.
- Curtis asked if the descriptor is okay in that it is broader and includes critical thinking. Cindy said that all the descriptors should include elements of critical thinking, and Bob added that he wrote the descriptor to the scientific method with a notation about scientific evidence, hypothesis, etc.
- Iris wondered about the SLO from the perspective of teaching a course outside of the science areas in which there is a content issue around scientific debate, for example the notion of human migration and development where there may be conflicting scientific theories. Bob said he thinks Iris' concerns meets the idea behind the scientific inquiry SLO, and explained conflicting scientific theories usually involve ongoing research to gather evidence and substantiate the facts.

Roseann provided information regarding the future write-up for Information Literacy. Roseann shared a website: Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education (www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframeworkinquiry) with the committee explaining that the website is based on six concepts:

1. authority is constructed and contextual
2. Information creation as a process
3. information has value
4. research as inquiry
5. scholarship as conversation
6. searching as strategic exploration

These concepts will help Christiana and Roseann with developing the information competency requirement for LMC.

Cindy shared with the committee that CSU has come up with a new requirement around ethnic studies, which has implications for the GE. Currently, LMC has a requirement in its GE model for ethnic and multicultural studies, which has been broadly interpreted to include courses with issues around gender and sexuality, and social justice. Cindy asked the committee to think about LMC's ethnic studies requirement for future discussion. She added, for perspective that many, but not all LMC GE courses also meet CSU GE transfer requirements; some, though meet only major or elective requirements. This has been by design to offer broader options for students in LMC's standard AA degree for students not intending to transfer. Cindy asked the committee to think about the current GE for a discussion at the next meeting about LMC GE courses and CSU GE requirements.

Cindy shared a Frequently Asked Questions electronic document with the committee about the new CSU mandate adding ethnics studies to its lower-division GE breadth package. The committee will discuss this item at the next meeting.

Cindy summarized that two of the six GE SLOs descriptors are now in draft form, and the remaining descriptors are needed:

- information literacy needs to be written from scratch (Roseann and Christina)
- quantitative reasoning (Math Department)
- ethnic and multicultural studies has a descriptor that needs to be reviewed and updated
- ethical inquiry has a descriptor that needs to be reviewed and updated

Cindy asked the committee for their input on next steps: how to share completed draft descriptors for college feedback. Bob suggested sharing the draft in stages: Stage 1, ask the departments for feedback, e.g., the science department; and Stage 2 ask the broader LMC community for additional feedback.

Nidia, the temporary representative from Math, asked Cindy to clarify the process of asking the department to write the descriptors. After that clarification, Nidia said writing the descriptor will be a department effort.

6. **Tech review update**

This section was covered in item four (4)

7. **What makes a GE course at LMC?**

Cindy asked the committee to think about what makes a GE course at LMC by reviewing the new model for the next meeting. In general, the model places introductory courses into defined areas using language from earlier LMC documents and Title 5 language. She suggested the GE committee

consider making a list, almost like a cheat sheet, for faculty to determine if their course meets GE as part of a how-to packet about the new GE model.

Cindy thanked Curtis and Bob for writing the draft descriptors; Roseann and Nidia for their thinking and comments about the information literacy and quantitative reasoning GE SLOs, and everyone for their feedback.

Meeting adjourned 3:59 pm