

**Present:** Cindy McGrath, **Chair;** Members: Iris Archuleta (PT Faculty Rep), Curtis Corlew (Art Faculty), and Robert (Bob) Moore (Science Faculty); Diwa Ramos (Math Faculty); Sara Toruno-Conley (English Faculty); Ryan Pedersen (Management Representative); Shondra West (note taker)

**Absent:** None

**Guest:** Rikki Hall (Director of Admissions & Records)

Meeting called to order: 2:35 pm / Location: Zoom Online

## **CURRENT ITEMS**

---

### **1. Announcements & Public Comment:**

None

### **2. Approval of the Agenda**

**Action:** Approved; unanimous

### **3. Approve Meeting Minutes October 14, 2020**

**Action:** Approved with a correction: spring 2020 (M/S: Curtis/Goff); unanimous

### **4. Membership/Academic Senate Update**

- Academic Senate (AS) approved Diwa and Sara as TLC members. Cindy will continue to recruit for the following vacancies: ethics and multicultural faculty, LMC Associate Student, and management representative. Cindy provided a GE update at the AS meeting.

### **5. eLumen Tech Review Update**

- Rikki and Cindy shared concerns about the GE course review and approval process when using eLumen. After Cindy reviews a course for GE it's forwarded to the next level in the eLumen workflow by clicking the approval button, which misleads curriculum tech reviewers and authors of the course that it's GE approved. Cindy has developed a workaround by comparing courses submitted via eLumen to a GE to list provided by Eileen that identifies all LMC course requirements for IGETC/CSU and GE at LMC. In addition, Cindy checks tab two in eLumen to determine if a course is GE by confirming if GE SLOs data was added. Afterward, Cindy leaves a comment on the course file's first page before selecting the only option available in eLumen, the approval button.
- Cindy and Ryan recommended debriefing with Nikki to address the technical flaw, whereby to create a different process that allows the option to approve or deny a course as meeting GE.
- Cindy suggested a GE request form similar to a process used back in 2005, whereas the author would request GE approval by identifying how a course meets GE SLOs criteria. This process will help reduce the amount of time to review courses by all tech reviewers. Additionally, having a form will prevent duplication of work of reviewing courses for meeting specific requirements: GE, DE, and library tech review, or overlooking critical areas of a COOR due to an assumption that someone completed the review. Cindy shared that developing a process outside of eLumen supports the evaluation of courses by GE members. Such that having GE members evaluate courses can streamline the process and lessen the responsibility to review a large volume of GE courses by the GE Chair. Recommendations to address the eLumen GE process is set for Spring 2021.

### **6. GE SLO descriptors**

- Christina gave an update about the development of Information Literacy. Christina and Roseann have been working together on writing the descriptor in relation to knowledge practices. Christina explained GE's definition of information literacy that students will be able to evaluate information and its sources critically. In developing the revise GE descriptor, Christina and Roseann's process includes researching ACRL website standards that uses six concepts. Furthermore, using the concepts as a framework to create the language to meet LMC GE info lit requirements. Christina will ask

Roseann and Sarah to look into infusing information from different sources and reviewing existing COORs (BIOSC, CHEM, etc.) that have information literacy content that evaluate and synthesize information.

- Cindy expressed having examples beyond critical thinking, speaking, and writing, such that departments can infuse more than one descriptor to meet GE granted that they only need to assess one area.
- Diwa shared statics as a course that meets information literacy too.
- Quantitative reasoning – Diwa shared the math department has ongoing discussions to develop the descriptor. More information to share later.
- Ethical - The committee worked together to review, discuss, and update the ethical descriptor. Cindy shared a document with the committee. The document contains the existing ethics statement and an updated statement approved by the committee, Spring 2020.
- The updated statement address specific ability to assess ethics, in which students analyze and address ethical problems with a clear understanding of personal, social, civic responsibilities. Cindy asked the committee for their feedback about making adjustments to the wording and their perspective about ethical decision making. Keeping in mind that the ethical statement was passed in May, whereby the committee feedback is needed to address the language that describes the statement:
  - Bob shared an ethical example used in science, in which Cindy confirmed that it meets the ethical assessment criteria (2) statement in reference to analyze and articulate moral value.
  - Bob shared feedback about the wording of ethical problems and addressing the situation with providing ethical solutions. Considering that an ethical question is different than making an ethical decision compared to addressing ethical problems.
    - Cindy shared that with ethical problems, there is more than one-way to address it when thinking ethically.
  - Ryan shared the current discussion relates to ethical distinctions of ethical situations vs. ethical dilemmas. Ryan furthered explained the definition of the two:
    - Ethical situation – looking at an issue and use ethics to fix the situation.
    - Ethical dilemma – two different ethical frameworks lead to contradictory actions or solutions.
- Curtis' feedback – recognizing ethical considerations is the first step for students is to consider ethical problems and situations
  - A recommendation to add the language: recognize ethical consideration in evaluation of the situation.
- Iris shared that the adjustment support that it applies there are ethical considerations, realizing that not everything has an ethical implication. The first step is to recognize an ethical implication before identifying one.
- Bob shared becoming aware of ethics – knowing what an ethical question is and looking at it from the discipline perspective, in which to apply it to the subject. Moreover, reflecting does an ethical implication exists as the starting point to critique a discipline.
- Cindy asked the committee about developing a statement with how a student would analyze and address ethical problems with a clear understanding to assess it. Also, think about developing specific examples.
  - Iris shared to determine the context that an ethical implication exists depending on the discipline and developing something broader across disciplines.
- Cindy asked if the first step should focus on recognizing the ethical issues within a particular discipline.
  - Bob express support of the recommendation, which Cindy updated the language
- Bob recommended build on (a) as identifying the ethical implications of a specific issue.

- Recommendation to the statement (a) use the word alternative replacing action: explain moral and ethical implications with various alternatives in response to the ethical issue.
- Recommendation (b) articulate and analyze conflicting values of ethical implications with respect to the issue
  - Bob shared thoughts about assessing (b) looking at the conflicting viewpoints vs (a) asking students to address it from their perspective.
- Cindy asked about social, and civic responsibility:
  - Bob shared thoughts about addressing a conclusion, e.g., these are the ethical implications.
- Sarah shared thoughts about including how students demonstrate the personal, social, and civic requirements, which Cindy added as a separate addition to the list.
- Cindy asked the question about creating an assessment to determine how one would understand personal, social, and civic.
  - Bob shared an example of a student assignment that addresses what's being asked.
  - Sara asked about students being able to describe the impact of their ethical decision based on their personal, social, and civic responsibility after they have identified, analyzed, and demonstrated the ethical implications.
    - Responsibility in relation to explaining is different, such that the response is to describe the personal, social, civic impact of an ethical decision.
- Cindy updated the language based on the feedback provided by the committee members.

In conclusion, Cindy shared what's next to occur at future meetings.

- Diverse perspectives – pending a future meeting decision.
- Develop ethical insight description and assessment criteria – the committee can send Cindy feedback and suggestions.
- Information Literacy – review and discuss at the next meeting.
- Quantitative Reasoning (QR) - Diwa shared a pending draft to include students' ability to communicate perspective; problem-solving strategies and develop a plan; interpret the results in the real-world scenario; and use mathematical model skills. Cindy recommended adding an explanation to the language and examples that support QR.

7. Professional development around GE – Tabled next meeting

- a. Informational packet
- b. flex

8. Looking forward to spring 2021 – Tabled next meeting

- a. Meeting times
- b. Ge chair
- c.

Cindy shared an appreciation of the committee; thanking them for their support of GE. Cindy also expressed to members about becoming GE Chair and offering her support to the new person as Cindy term is ending. **Meeting adjourned** at 4:01 pm