

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

Absent: LMCAS: Rochelle Arnold

Guesta: 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 and 11/27/19

- November 13, 2019 **Action:** Approved with amendments; unanimous
 - Remove Anthony Perri as a committee member
 - Change ANTHR-001 to approve; the curriculum committee addresses the PSLO alignment.
 - No action needed for ANTHR-008 — this is not a GE course
- November 27, 2019 **Action:** Tabled

4. GESLO 1

English Professor Morgan Lynn, who is incoming Curriculum Committee chair, attended the meeting to share concerns about the writing requirement across the curriculum, and wonders if students receive enough writing support. Many GE courses have an advisory of eligibility for English 100, but the English Department recently eliminated its English placement process in line with AB705. Because everyone is now eligible to enroll in English 100, the advisory is moot and most GE courses do not have an English 100 prerequisite. But in evaluating course outlines, Morgan noted that many have advanced writing assignments she believes might be difficult for students who may not have college-level writing skills prior to enrolling in the course. She asked committee members to think about this is advance of a future discussion about the issue, which centers around GESLO 1: reading, writing and speaking.

Cindy explained that in the '90s there was some discussion about whether to quantify the number of pages students should read and write in a GE course, but faculty declined to so because of the issue of academic freedom. As the committee looks to revise the GE model, Cindy suggested the committee might consider ways to more clearly define and evaluate student learning outcomes around reading, writing and speaking.

A question was raised about faculty teaching non-writing courses that require students to complete writing assignments and using a writing assessment tool as part of the grading process. Although the committee agreed the focus of the writing GESLO centers around teaching students how to write for specific disciplines — as a political scientists or economists or journalists — a concern was raised about whether strong discipline knowledge but weak writing skills might prevent students from earning an "A" in the course without extensive coaching and tutoring.

One idea floated was to help first-time students understand the legitimacy and expectations of writing a college-level paper and provide them with a graded sample essay to enhance their ability to succeed in the course. It was noted that departments set the curriculum requirements; for example, trigonometry requires students have prior math skills to be successful in the course.

Additionally, Morgan explained that AB705 changed the dynamics of college students' first-year experience. In the past, most students took English 90 during the first year, before moving into any GE classes. Now many are taking GE courses without that preparation.

Suggestions:

- Access and review data from past GESLO assessments to determine how students performed within the writing criteria.
- Add an advisory that students must have completed English 100. However, it was noted this change may affect enrollment numbers. Ryan added that some students follow advisories and others don't, and studies have shown underrepresented students take notice of them more often, so this might represent a disproportional impact.

The committee continued discussion about the implications of an advisory as either eligibility or completion of English 100. This does not limit students from taking any GE courses, since most students take them during their first year. The real concern becomes accessibility, coaching, and support needed to earn an "A" in a course that requires extensive writing. When thinking about advisory statements, developing consistency becomes essential to students, especially in the catalog.

Additional suggestions:

- Work with TLC and Curriculum Committee to develop standard language for advisories.
- Adopt a policy, like some other colleges, where no more than 60% of the student grade comes from a single assignment.
- Offer GE tiered courses during the first-year and second-year, which occurred in the past.

One of the questions we need to wrestle with is: How do we continue providing challenging courses to students that enhance their writing skills?

Nancy said Title V states that the curriculum committee establishes and has purview over prerequisites and advisories, so it would decide if a course needs a pre/co-requisite or advisory during the review and approval process.

Traditionally, GE has provided faculty professional development around the teaching of student learning outcomes by bringing in speakers and consultants. So perhaps we can establish professional development around the teach and assessing of writing in non-writing courses.

To conclude, talks about requiring prerequisites/advisories are things to think about when revising the GE model. Cindy noted that Title V curriculum regulations require all degree-applicable courses to include writing, problem solving or performance assignments as part of the grading process.

5. Planning for GE Flex

Cindy shared copies of the Spring 2020 Flex workshop proposal with the committee and asked for feedback about how to organize the workshop discussions. Cindy has talked with different committees and department groups to obtain feedback concerning talking points.

Recommendations:

- Focus on the broader conversations by limiting the number of responses to answer questions that are similar, which will help move the conversation forward, address the problem, and present the intended options.
- The workshop should focus on addressing Title V language and the GE Philosophy paper. To start, look at whether a problem exists with GE Philosophy and SLOs structure and if there are things the committee should follow or not.

The committee reviewed the philosophy paper and pointed out the following

- Natural world as a requirement does not reflect in the existing five GESLOs.
- Revise the statement, "generally educated people have well-developed reading, writing skills."
 - Restate as "the design of general education helps students develop reading and writing skills," or "general education broadened students reading and writing skills that will help them after leaving LMC."
 - Clarify the term "well developed," which the committee felt the statement was vague.
- Look at sophomore-level course language required by CSUs and align the statements to meet those standards.
- In consideration of CTE, look at other acceptable writing requirements for English 100 that would help all students meet the minimum requirement.
- Consider broadening GE course work such that CTE students earning an associate degree can pick from bigger selection, rather than having a limited number of courses that may or may not assist them with their careers.
 - The notion of GE will help students broaden their perspective, make them better world citizens, enhance their curiosity to develop a love for learning; whereas CTE focuses on gainful employment.
 - Consider offering GE flexibility to a vast student population taking classes at the community college to encompass life-long learners, transfers, incoming workers, skill builders, personal interests, etc., in which there are many possibilities for both CTE and non-CTE students.
 - Consider that community college students' complete the first two years of a four-year transfer program.
 - Look at the GE model and set up a system that represents GE as defined by Title V, transfer, and LMC GE as a whole.
- Iris shared her viewpoint concerning the GE philosophy paper statements and specific terminology that may have different meanings depending on the individual reading it. The committee spoke about the variations and will consider the following:

- Define generally educated statement
- Clarify “express the love for learning”
- Look at each GE course to determine if the philosophy represents all
- Remove the word “moral”
- Change the statement “working with others on public projects” to “work with others
- Reword the philosophy paper all together that avoids a strict or particular way of envisioning the intent of GE.
- Nikki read the General Education Title V, section 55061 code paragraph two.
 - The committee discussed adopting GE Title V language, such that it does not duplicate the transfer CSU/IGETC GE requirements. The committee discussed the variations in comparison to DVC GE.
 - Cindy asked the committee to share ideas what additions to the statement would make it unique to LMC.
 - Address Iris's point, change “generally educated people” to “a person who graduates with an associate degree from LMC” to reduce subjectivity.
 - An additional change, work with others in communities.
 - The committee wondered what methodology should be used to update the GE Philosophy paper. By reexamining the law, the program course approval handbook, and Title V philosophy, and determine what represents LMC.
 - Look at the barriers students encounter when taking GE courses that are ineligible for transfer.
 - Expand GE courses more broadly across the curriculum without mimicking transfer requirements. The committee spoke about the Venn diagram written on the whiteboard, in which the two outer circles represent local (right) and CSU/IGETC GE (left), whereas the interconnected circles represent both. The committee shared the difficulties of departments meeting GE for associate degrees (nursing, for example) that do not fit in the current model and restructuring it, so it does.
 - The GE requirements pertain to degrees and not certificates confirmed by ACCJC via Chialin.
 - Keep the last statement in the GE Philosophy paper.

The committee will continue the conversation at the Flex workshop, Wednesday, Jan. 22, 9 a.m.- noon. There will also be a Curriculum Summit Feb. 28, 11 a.m.-3 pm., where related discussions take place.

6. Revising the GE Model - Tabled

Next Spring Meetings

Upcoming meetings: Second and fourth Wednesdays of the month from 2:30-3:55 p.m. in Library Conference Room L-105. Spring 2020 meetings: Feb. 12, 26; March 11, 25; April 8, 22; May 1

Meeting adjourned 4:14 p.m.