

TEACHING & LEARNING PROJECT MINUTES

MARCH 6, 2012 OFFICE OF INSTRUCTION – CONFERENCE RM 420

Present: Cindy McGrath, Kiran Kamath, Scott Cabral, Mike Grillo, Christina Goff, Tawny Beal, Alex Sterling, Margaret Hertstein, Note-taker. Guest: Ryan Pedersen

1. Welcome, public comment and announcements.
2. The agenda was approved with change to #7 item from Survey Executive Summary to GE Seminar discussion with Alex.
3. Minutes from February 21 were approved.
4. Constituent updates.
 - Monday was Alex first GE Seminar. He did a great job!
 - The CTE committee did a survey on assessment at its meeting to see where everyone is in CSLO assessment. Mike asked folks to send the info on to Christina.
 - Kiran will be getting back to us on the Accreditation Report that is coming up. She would like to make it an agenda item for our next meeting.
5. Report from today's Department Chair Meeting.
 - 183 courses are done, about 600 due. Considering what could be assessed in Summer there are still 166 courses to be finished this SP12.
 - What are the options if these are not completed? Cindy asked around the table what we thought about the message given at the Department Chair Meeting. Response from faculty seemed to be they heard and understood that there could be consequences. The Recording Arts chair; for example said he has tried very hard to get his adjunct faculty to comply with the assessment of the RA courses. At the chair meeting he asked for a letter from management in support of asking part-timers to assess. What other options would he have to get part-timers to do the work?
 - We veered off agenda into a discussion of this problem.
 - ❖ Many part-time faculty have another job. They may not be teaching to the COOR and if this is the case intervention will occur through the evaluation process. Faculty meet with the evaluation team and are given a "needs improvement" to address this. The COOR is the contract with the student and LMC, and part of the teaching responsibilities including assessment.
 - ❖ Department Chairs do not always have a lot of contact with their adjuncts. It is an informal supervisory relationship. Even so, there are ways to address the problem for a department chair. During the scheduling process they many opt to not offer a course to a faculty who do not assess as requested, for example. But we would probably have to check with the union on this.

- ❖ What about part-time preference rights? Grades and reports not completed in a timely manner is part of faculty responsibility. However assessment is not spelled out but neither is grading, so it should be concluded it is a required “report”. Deans can ask for this to be spelled out if necessary during negotiations with the union.

Other possible steps

- ❖ If the majority of your classes are not assessed – 66% by June 1, you will not be able to offer a summer class without the promise of assessing it during summer.
- ❖ Cut from schedule based on non-assessment.
- ❖ Inactivation steps informally through curriculum process. This is tricky since some courses are part of an ongoing program and cannot be inactivated.
- ❖ Christina has already sent out emails regarding where faculty are and can she assist? She has heard back from some; 33 percent are already a year behind. She sent those a personal email with more detail and offer to help. She can request a meeting from those she hasn’t heard from. Once she gets feedback she will need dean assistance.

Program Assessment Update

Cindy handed out the list of the programs and dates of posted PSLO assessment data. Need 10 more by June 1. She had some questions regarding transfer math and the mathematics degree. She will ask Scott Johnson the department chair about this.

6. New Assessment Model.

Cindy explained she left out of the model an important process: who will selected the TLC Chair and CSLO-PSLO Assessment Coordinator. We have gotten so used to the “twisting arms and then breathing a sigh of relief when they say yes” approach that she didn’t think about it. After a brief discussion everyone agreed the people filing the jobs should be recommended by the TLC and approved by the Academic Senate. Cindy will write the language and take it to the Academic Senate as a friendly amendment to the model as they are considering it at the meeting on Monday.

7. GE Seminar discussion.

- The GE seminar was terrific; Alex enjoyed the interaction with the faculty in attendance. Unfortunately the attendance was low.
- The low attendance is cause for worry whether or not the top-down mandated assessment is affecting the faculty in a negative way.
- Alex would like to build community and get professional development going. He does not want to be an enforcer of the assessment.
- What can be done?

8. Implementing the new model in FA12.

The committee brainstormed with Ryan on what the assessment portion of Program Review software will look like. Check off boxes with links to documents on the “P” drive would be good. The less automatically populated fields the better. Other suggestions to consider when building the templates:

- Have a box that lists all the courses with an edit so courses can be put into different Course Cohorts as needed. This allows for flexibility but the courses will not fall off the radar when moved. Tracking for course outline dates and assessment dates to trigger responses.
- Start with a bare-bones model since time is critical but have a plan to expand.
- It is important to faculty to have their own style of document to attach, not prescriptive.
- Cindy and Christina will work with Ryan on the design as needed.

The current forms used for assessment reporting were discussed. The outcome was to have 3 versions. A chart version as handed out; a word document that is pared down from the one disseminated today and a make-your-own option that embodies the three required components: What We Did. – What we Learned – What we Plan to do. Christina may have a pared down version of the current word document already started. Give Cindy feedback.

Leadership transition. There are some interested faculty. How will we recruit? Let’s put our thinking caps on and continue the discussion at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned 4:05 p.m.