

Present: Cindy McGrath, chair; Curtis Corlew, Ryan Hiscocks, Nikki Moultrie, Ryan Pedersen, Nancy Ybarra, Note Taker: Shondra West

Absent: Iris Archuleta, and LMCAS: Rochelle Arnold;

Guest: Josh Bearden, Mark Lewis, and Morgan Lynn

CURRENT ITEMS

Meeting called to order 2:40 p.m. Location: L-105

1. Announcements & Public Comment:

None

2. Approval of the Agenda

Action: Approved; unanimous

3. Approval of the Minutes from Date 11/13/19

Action: tabled

4. GE Model Revision / Discussion and Information

Review of ACCJC Standards

- The committee reviewed the ACCJC Accreditation Standard II.A.11 standard and discussed how CTE courses that do not write to the GESLOs we have considered our ISLOs may put LMC out of compliance in this area. Curtis and Cindy attended a CTE meeting to ask the committee how their programs meet the six competencies listed in II.A.11: communication competency, information competency, quantitative competency, analytic inquiry skills, ethical reasoning, and diverse perspectives. Currently students completing CTE certificate programs bypass GE requirements. The question becomes should GESLOs continue to serve as the ISLOs or should we consider creating separate ones?
- A question raised about degrees and certificates meeting II.A.11, since it reference degrees. According to Chialin, CTE programs certificate and degrees are required to meet the ACCJC standards. Math/English are currently not part of the LMC GE model as approved courses, but instead are considered competencies. However, they are considered GE for transfer.

Review CA Code of Regulations Regarding GE Philosophy/Courses

- Nikki shared the California code of regulations 55061 and 55062, such that college programs could meet general education requirements instead of at the course level. Representatives from ASSC may visit LMC to offer a training for Academic Senate and Curriculum Committee members, and the GE Committee may want to join them. Currently the Curriculum Committee follows the Program Course Approval Handbook (PCAH) and CA Code 55062 items a-e.
- The committee read and discussed the CA code 55061/62 language in relation to the rationale of broadening the GE model. Currently, Guided Pathways is under development to help students navigate their pathway to success and transfer, therefore broadening the GE model is a benefit for the students to have more options. The committee shared their interpretations of the 55061/62 document; however, it was determined a legal consultation is needed. The outcome of the

discussion, members agreed to broaden the GE model and consider adding Math and English courses to the model.

Proposal by Mark Lewis

- Marked shared his proposal for revising the GE model criteria, such that more courses could become part of the GE model, e.g., Math and English. The idea that all GE courses will assess two non-discretionary criteria: reading/writing and critical thinking. The oral competency is a different skill involving different parts of the brain and not conjoined with reading/writing competency. Furthermore, GE program can pick two additional criteria from the seven following: ethical reasoning, multicultural perspective, quantitative reasoning, oral and visual communication, ecological and environmental, creative expression, information retrieval and evaluation. Ultimately, all GE courses will meet four (4) criteria. The format is setup by course, such that different courses in a department can pick different discretionary criteria. This proposal will help students enhance their GE knowledge, specifically adding quantitative reasoning. Mark added that if a model similar to his proposal adopted, it would provide more freedom for other departments to participate and assess their courses more easily.
- It was noted that Josh Bearden, Academic Senate president, shared Mark's proposal with the Senate, and it was met favorably. Mark's proposal provides more options, empowering faculty to have extended choices within the GE criteria.
- Cindy indicated Mark's proposal is an idea to broaden the GE Model, taking into consideration that the committee will need to determine whether to put forth ISLOs.
- Mark was asked about how to prevent clusters of classes selected, thus eliminating the a single SLO, such as multiculturalism. Mark said the process would include departments submitting a request to GE as the committee overseeing the program. However, Mark does not think any SLOs would fall through the cracks because there is a diversity of courses offered, and discipline faculty would likely choose different GE criteria. Another question involved how we would insure all students met all seven SLOs? The committee will need to explore this further when proposing a model revision. The challenge becomes determining the proper mechanism to track meeting GESLOs. One idea might be assessing at the programs rather than the course level. Nikki shared a methodology how a previous program synchronized their course requirements with the SLOs rather than having each course meet all of them. Josh suggested symposiums or extracurricular activities might be able to be used for meeting some SLOs. Cindy emphasized that GE is not solely about the units that transfer, but involves the integration of common SLOs to create a cohesive GE program that meets Title 5 and accreditation standards. The task of GE is to think about how students are meeting our SLOs, either at the GE or institutional level, rather than focusing on transfer unit completion. The committee discussion continued about how to better incorporate CTE programs since most courses that meet GE SLOs are for transfer. In addition, the committee will need think about the assessment process concerning program vs. course SLOs. Nancy provide a visual demonstration using English PSLOs to demonstrate how the program maps to ISLOs in comparison to GESLOs. Overall, the committee is supportive of Mark's proposal as a possible way to revise the model. It will also considering the idea of measuring SLOs and mapping to them at the institutional level, whether they remain GESLOs or transition to ISLOs.

- The committee spoke briefly about the eLumen program rolling out now as the program that will have the functionality to provide assessment data when the assessment module becomes operational in a year or so. That may require faculty to use assignment rubrics within Canvas or add the CSLO assessments directly into eLumen. Faculty would likely continue to write an assessment report, however elumen may streamline developing quantitative data.
- Mark noted for committee consideration of the GE model revision that there are some GE courses not specifically tied to programs, so they would not be able to be assessed at the discipline program level. Additionally, if we move to program assessment of GESLOs, many programs would probably need to rewrite their PSLOs to incorporate them. However, the introduction of eLumen may be a good time for departments to review them.
- Cindy reminded the committee that today's discussion is about brainstorming ideas for revision but some other data is needed before a decision is made, such as the GE survey and the Flex workshop feedback.

5. **Planning for GE flex/discussion surrounding GE Revision**

Cindy shared the GE philosophy paper from 2013, in comparison to the position paper from 1983, that the senate has asked us to review. The survey will help with the process of updating the position paper itself. A recommendation was made to include students as part of the survey. Unfortunately, the draft survey questions ask about whether faculty find it easy or difficult to integrate the student learning outcomes into their courses, which is instrumental to making the decision how to revise the GE model. Cindy shared the survey draft for feedback, which is she hopes will go out in December.

Additional revision B9: Ask about creating a separate ISLO that incorporates the basic ACCJC standards.

Suggestion: Use what we already know to propose a revised GE model as opposed to sending out a survey. Instead, have the conversation at the flex workshop. Based on previous surveys and ACCJC standards, the committee has an understanding how to move forward. The committee discussed who makes the final decision: Senate, Shared Governance or Governing Board. It was determined it is 10+1 issue, however it may go through the shared governance process as informational item, and then submitted to the Governing Board for approval. The conversation will continue at the next meeting, Dec. 11.

6. **GE Faculty Survey** - see item 5

7. **Future agenda items** - none

Meeting adjourned 4:24 p.m.