

Present: Cindy McGrath, chair; Members: Curtis Corlew (Art Faculty), Robert (Bob) Moore (Science Faculty); Diwa Ramos (Math Faculty); Adrianna Simone (Social Justice Studies); Sara Toruno-Conley (English Faculty); Ryan Tripp (Social Sciences Faculty); Ryan Pedersen (Management Representative); Shondra West (note taker)

Absent: Nikki Moultrie (Management Representative)

Guest: Joshua Bearden, Rikki Hall

Meeting called to order: 2:32 pm

Location: Zoom Online

CURRENT ITEMS

1. Announcements & Public Comment:

None

2. Approval of the Agenda

Action: Approved; unanimous

3. Approve Meeting Minutes February 10, 2021

Action: Approved; (M/S: Moore/Corlew); unanimous

4. GE Chair Announcement and Membership Update

- Cindy shared a draft of the GE Chair reassigned time announcement and explained it contains components from previous announcements plus a deliverables list provided by Natalie and Nikki related to the new reassigned time form. It has been forward to Natalie for the President's Council agenda for review and approval. When it is distributed those interested in the position will have about two weeks to apply and forward completed documents to both Cindy and Nikki. A final candidate will be selected after interviews and forwarded to the Academic Senate (AS) for approval.
- Cindy reported that (AS) approved Ryan Tripp and Adrianna Simone as official GE members.
 - Adrianna asked about a student representative. Cindy shared reps are limited due to the campus closure from COVID, but will follow-up with LMCAS.

5. New ISLO Core Group and Relationship to GE

- Cindy provided an update from the AS discussion Monday regarding the campus developing an Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) Core Group. At AS meeting, Cindy provided historical context about ISLOs and Chialin presented on the conceptualization of the core group structure. Furthermore, the AS discussed whether to endorse the core group. Some concerns:
 - The Teaching and Learning Project (now TLC) was instrumental in creating the college's first set of ISLOs. Because SLOs are both instructional and non-instructional, the TLP/TLC was assigned a dual reporting relationship to SGC and AS. The proposed ISLO Core Group was created by and will report to SGC.
 - There was a consideration in AS to endorse the core group with parameters, however, more discussion was needed, so due to limited time AS decided to continue the discussion at the next meeting.
- Adrianna Simone underscored the rushed nature of the discussion Monday at AS, but said there was a core group discussion Tuesday at TLC that aided in enhancing one's understanding about the topic.

- R. Pedersen added that the AS discussion about the TLC's reporting relationship included the suggestion that TLC become a direct report to AS. However, he said, student learning outcomes (SLOs) are not just a responsibility of instruction, but of student services as well so it would be appropriate for the core group developing ISLOs consider them.
- Some clarity is needed surrounding the development of new ISLOs by a SGC group and the TLC's relationship with senate and SGC. Also, there is confusion about whether LMC has ISLOs: in the past, the five sets of ISLOs were eliminated and replaced with GESLOs as the college's sole set of ISLOs. More clarity will be needed so that faculty do not become confused with the development of the new GESLO model and the development of new ISLOs. Cindy will continue to share updates with the GE members about what transpires with ISLO core group discussion at AS.

Cindy asked the committee about their perspective how to broaden ISLOs

- R. Pedersen said standard formats for ISLOs exist elsewhere and hopes the core group can adopt broad ISLOs and maintain a simple process. He said ISLOs should also cover institutional and student services SLOs components while maintaining GE philosophies. He added that ACCJC provides examples of ISLOs, which Cindy said were incorporated into the new GE model along with including Title V, LMC and District requirements from the GE committee's analysis last year of a requirements crosswalk.
- B. Moore expressed concern around adding another layer of assessment outside of GE and wondered about the motivation of creating ISLOs. Cindy said there may be some confusion around mapping. While there is a view that CSLOs map to PSLOs and then to ISLOs, GE courses map instead directly to the GESLOs/ISLOs. In addition, some GE courses that are part of programs may also map to PSLOs as well. When the college used the ACCJC assessment rubric in 2011 to revise the assessment model the language included assessing at the course, program and degree level, not at the institutional level. Students who earn a degree meet GE SLOs through their courses, and disciplinary PSLOs aren't required to map to GE.

6. GE Curriculum: Tech Review Process Going Forward

- Cindy provided a tech review update. A discussion is needed with Morgan to make changes with the GE tech review process and will ask to place this as an agenda item for the next curriculum meeting. More information to come at the GE March 28th meeting.

7. GE Model Implementation and Faculty Packet

- The catalog is being developed and Cindy shared the CSU/IGETC requirement list with the members. Today's discussion focusses on integrating transfer courses that meet GE into the GE model divided into the different categories. Discussion centered around how to reformat the LMC GE categories in relation to CSU/IGETC requirements areas:
 - R. Hall shared that students look for courses based on the area it fulfills for transfer. For degree audit purposes IT is making changes in the back end tailored to students' needs. However, among the three colleges there is a slight difference in how they label the degree area requirements, such that CCC and DVC requirements somewhat align to CSU/IGETC, but LMC is listed slightly different. All use different designations (letters and numbers) but start with Language. The direction of the conversation was to move LMC's Math and English to the top of the list. Cindy explained that the LMC GE area listing is based on the more consistent Title V areas and asked the committee if eliminating the area letters that correspond to Title V might be an option, and then rearranging them visually.
 - R. Hall suggestions
 - Remove the letters, e.g., Area A, Area B, Area C making it easier for students to read

- Reorder the categories so they are better aligned with the transfer requirements, even though CSU and IGETC math requirements are located in different places
- Consider reformatting: DVC uses roman numerals and CCC uses both roman numerals and letters
- C. Corlew suggestion
 - Remove all sequential letters/numbers and use the titles with abbreviations that correspond to the requirements. Rikki shared the coding is a potential concern when recategorizing the transfer requirements.
- A. Simone suggestion
 - Consistency across the campus and add category titles and codes that match

The committee discussed coding implications and making them available behind the scenes for programming purposes. Cindy suggested providing labels visible for students and adding code in parenthesis that helps both students map courses to transfer requirements. R. Hall provided a demonstration of what the area mapping and coding would like using CCC/DVC GE worksheets and degree audit programming.

- B. Moore suggestion
 - Use abbreviations, e.g., Natural Science-NS, Language and Rationality- LR, etc. Having two lettering formats is less confusing for students and the end users.

The committee liked the abbreviation suggestion provided with codes for students to match them up to university transfer requirements.

There was a recommendation made by R. Pedersen to reorder the abbreviations close to the university transfer listing requirements and closely aligned to the district. R. Pedersen suggested to reorder them to: LR, NS, AH, SBS, and EMS., in which R. Tripp suggested to add a key of definitions for the abbreviations at the beginning of the listing. As a result, the committee agreed to remove the area letters (A through E) and replace them with the abbreviations and codes in parenthesis.

The committee furthered discussed IGETC reordering and agreed to maintain simplicity since the ordering is somewhat different than CSU transfer listing.

C. Corlew expressed EMS abbreviations conflicts with an acronym that matches an existing EMS program. In conclusion, the abbreviations for the GE area requirements will be two-letter abbreviations in the following order: LR (language and rationality), NS (natural sciences), AH (arts and humanities), SB (social and behavioral sciences), and EM (ethnic and multicultural studies). Cindy said she will forward these updates for the new catalog, and added she had already catalog sent John Schall the new GE philosophy GE SLOs list for the GE page.

One concern: The final GE position paper passed includes wording that all LMC courses that transfer as GE for CSU/IGETC be folded into the LMC GE model. However, some GE transfer into requirements areas LMC does not have. Cindy asked the committee for feedback on how to handle the situation. For example, KINES, COUNS courses do not fall into LMC requirements areas since we do not have a lifelong learning category. Cindy and Rikki will review the courses to determine what areas they may fulfill and follow-up with the committee for more discussion at the next meeting.

Another consideration are courses pending GE approval not assigned to a CSU/IGETC area and whether adding them to the list with ongoing work with the department to make the revisions.

R. Hall suggested adding a statement to the list that courses approved for a certain designation CSU/IGETC GE areas not applicable to LMC AS/AA degree pattern can be used as elective credits.

The committee suggested asking departments to make minor revisions to courses such that they meet particular CSU/IGETC areas.

8. **GE Goals** Tabled

Meeting adjourned at 4:03 pm