

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES

APRIL 8, 2020 – 2:30-4 p.m. on ZOOM

Present: Cindy McGrath, Chair; Iris Archuleta, Curtis Corlew, Ryan Hiscocks

Absent: Nikki Moultrie, Ryan Pedersen, Nancy Ybarra; LMCAS: Rochelle Arnold; Shondra West, notetaker

Guests: Josh Bearden, Mark Lewis

The meeting called to order at 2:35 p.m. on Zoom

1. Welcome, public comment and announcements: No comment or announcements.

2. Approve agenda: Approved by unanimous consent.

3. Approve minutes of Feb. 12 and Feb. 26 meetings: Both were approved by unanimous consent.

4. Review of GE Survey results: Cindy shared an analysis of GE survey Q4 in which respondents shared their thoughts about what general knowledge and skills all students should leave with when they graduate from LMC. The current GE SLOs received the most number of independent mentions in the comments, with the exception of the Interdisciplinary SLO. Others that received a good number of mentions indicating the committee might consider adding them as SLOs: Quantitative Literacy and Information Literacy. The Scientific Method was also in the double digits. All the other knowledge and skills identified in response to that survey question were mentioned by fewer than 10 respondents. Key discussion points:

The committee looked at Q4 and Q11 first. Josh said the analysis provides a clear look at the data. Ryan was disappointed that civics and how the government works was mentioned so few times. Cindy shared comment data from Q11, which asked respondents what SLOs should be added, and noted that citizenship and political competency were mentioned there, bringing the total mentions logged for Q4 and Q11 to four. She added that while she had not yet merged the data from the two related questions, the 10 substantive responses there did not add to the information from Q11 in a way that would alter the numbers significantly.

Josh noted what he found most compelling in the survey was that faculty members appear to be begging for professional development on general education. That led the committee to look at Q16, in which results show that the 128 people responding to this question said they most want to learn more about GE SLO 2: Understand connections among disciplines and apply interdisciplinary approaches to problem solving (56.25%); GE SLO 4: Consider the ethical implications inherent in knowledge, decision-making and action (50.78%); and GE SLO 5: Possess a worldview informed by diverse social, multicultural and global perspectives (49.22%). The committee also looked briefly Q17 and Q19 about

ways full-time and adjunct faculty would most want professional development around GE. Cindy noted that flex activities got the highest number of hits (61.6%).

Cindy mentioned that in a recent discussion with Josh, they had talked about streamlining the way GE evaluates course outlines to leave the GE committee with more time to focus on things like professional development. Since the Curriculum Committee is also revising its processes and position paper, perhaps the GE chair, or selected members of the GE Committee, could sit on a CC tech review team using a rubric developed by the GE Committee. She also cited a related survey question, Q20: What do you think the roles of the General Education Committee should be? There was about 69.17% support for reviewing GE COORs, 72.18% support for evaluating and assessing the GE program, and 69.92 % support for professional development about GE at LMC. Only 6.77 percent suggested disbanding the committee and distributing work to other committees.

The committee next focused on Q9 that asked survey respondents what they would change about the model. Responses show there is strong support, for keeping all our current GE SLOs. The lowest was for No. 2: Interdisciplinary, which still garnered 69.4% support and only 10.45% would eliminate it. Ryan noted that Q12 supports the idea that people want change in the model: 46.04% of respondents indicated they would like to revise the model to allow different LMC GE courses to include and assess different GE SLOs and/or ISLOs, while only 21.88% want to keep the current fully integrated LMC GE model. There was some discussion about whether the data was inconsistent. Cindy suggested both can be true — that people like all the SLOs from a college-wide perspective but want a more flexible model in which all courses don't need to teach to and assess all SLOs.

Ryan also noted that Q13 indicates faculty want to bring LMC's GE course list in line with the CSU/UC course list. Cindy said she was surprised that greater than 70% of those responding either like the idea, or would be okay with it, since it would eliminate department ability to opt out of LMC GE by requiring all courses to teach to and assess at least some of the GE SLOs. Mark expressed surprise that Q14 showed strong support for CTE certificates to integrate at least some of the GE SLOs into their courses as well.

5. Implications of results to GE SLOs and GE Philosophy Statement: Cindy suggested that the committee start first with the GE Philosophy Statement, which was analyzed and revised by the GE Committee, beginning with the GE Flex in January and then at the GE meetings in February. The GE committee decided to wait until the results of the GE Survey were complete in case any new data suggested further revision. The GE committee decided that nothing from the survey suggested additional changes. Ryan moved and Curtis seconded a motion to pass the revised GE Philosophy Statement. The motion passed unanimously (4-0).

Discussion moved to revision of the GE SLOs that flow from the Philosophy Statement. Cindy asked whether, based on the data from Q11, we should consider adding Quantitative Literacy (16 mentions) and Information Literacy (14 mentions) to the list of SLOs, and whether we should eliminate the current GE SLO 2: Interdisciplinary, as we have been considering. Mark suggested that, based on the responses to Q9, faculty members appear to want to keep it. Josh said that discussion for eliminating it goes back

years, to 2014 when Alex Sterling was GE chair, and that a previous survey report when he was GE chair also showed support for eliminating it. Curtis noted that faculty find that SLO difficult to assess and said that in previous discussions we have talked about it as a course criteria rather than a student learning outcome. Mark said he thinks that particular SLO is among the most important because that is what learning is all about — making connections from a diverse set of knowledge. Iris agreed and said it is important for students to be well rounded and receive depth of knowledge in their education.

Cindy asked whether we should also consider adding as SLOs the Scientific Method (10 mentions) and Technology/Computer Literacy (9 mentions) since they got the next most individuals mentions by faculty in Q4. The committee acknowledged its importance but felt that the Scientific Method is discipline specific and that students would automatically get this in all science courses, and everyone has to take a science course for an AA degree. Curtis said he is of two minds on adding computer literacy: he said he thinks it is important, but finds most students know the very basic stuff. The rest, which is more important, is also more application specific so he would not add it as a GE SLO.

Ryan made a motion that, based on the GE crosswalk document comparing LMC's philosophy and learning outcomes with that suggested from Title 5, the district and ACCJC, that we adopt the ACCJC learning outcomes. He explained they encompass everything we currently have, except GE SLO 2: Interdisciplinary, and it incorporates both Quantitative Literacy and Information Literacy. The committee generally liked the idea, but Curtis suggested we put off voting on it until more voices are present at the next meeting, since there were several absences as a result of an emergency Curriculum Committee meeting scheduled against GE. Everyone agreed. Mark also suggested that it would be important in adding Information Literacy for us to have a definition of what it is because people may have widely different idea about what it entails.

6. Implications of results to structure of the GE model: Cindy suggested in the limited time left, 15 minutes in the scheduled meeting time, the committee should float ideas for possible revision that remove barriers for students, and then plan to flesh those out at the next meeting.

Ryan suggested we adopt the CSU/GE model as the LMC model since there is support for that. Cindy pointed out that is a course list for transfer students and that the transfer institutions aren't considering SLOs as part of that. She said she supports the idea that all courses accepted for GE at CSU and UC should be considered GE here, but that would also require all those courses to assess LMCs GE SLOs as part of our GE program. A revision to the LMC GE model structure would need to figure out how that would work here.

Josh referred to a model at Napa Valley College in which programs list as part of their degree requirements that students must also complete the general education package. There was discussion about the different structure options but how to teach to and assess the GE SLOs in those options kept coming up as a sticking point.

Cindy said a basic, non-integrated model could be built in which a specific course, or small group of courses, would be responsible for teaching to and assessing a single GE SLO. That would likely require the addition of six units to the 18-unit course requirement package because students are not currently required to take either ethics or speech, which are LMC GE SLOs.

A more flexible, partially integrated GE model could be built in which all courses teach to and assess the writing portion of GE SLO 1: Communication and GE SLO 3: Critical Thinking, and then one of the remaining GE SLOs that would be equitably distributed though the GE model. This would be somewhat in line with the “three of five” model GE has been talking about since about 2017. That would entail teaching to and assessing some, but not all SLOs.

A question was asked about why No. 1 and 3 are required. Cindy explained that Title 5 requires all degree-applicable courses, not just GE courses, to teach to and assess critical thinking, and writing unless the Curriculum Committee determines that problem solving or skills demonstration are more applicable than writing for specific courses. She cited math and CTE courses as examples. She explained that, in line with this Title 5 requirement, Dean Nikki Moultrie is already asking course outline authors to identify which assignment examples in their courses measure critical thinking and writing (or problem solving or skills demonstration) so they can be uploaded into the new eLumen curriculum module.

There was some confusion about the laws and mandates that have implications for how we go about revising the structure of the GE model. And Iris wondered how LMC GE relates to GE at the transfer institutions. Cindy clarified that it actually has little to do with what the transfer institutions will accept for transfer. Instead, it is Title 5 that requires all community colleges to have a General Education Philosophy, and it ACCJC, our accrediting agency, that requires all community colleges to have and assess student-learning outcomes that flow from that philosophy. She added that because our current GE model is a fully integrated one, assessment is integrated as well. If we make changes to the current model, we need to also revise how GE assessment will work within the new model.

Cindy said her main concern is that we do not build a new model that we know contains gaps in which students can proceed through the GE program and miss one or more of the GE SLOs along the way. Curtis said it is hard to know exactly whether teachers in the current model are teaching to the SLOs and whether students are actually getting them all now, so perhaps we need to do the best we can in constructing a new model and accept a few losses.

7. Adding GE meeting/s to make up for two cancellations: The GE Committee agreed to add another meeting, Wednesday, April 15, 1:30 p.m. to its regularly scheduled meetings: April 22 and May 13. Others may be added in the future.

Meeting officially adjourned at 4:19 p.m.