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| **Item Number** | **Topic/Activity** | **Notes** |
| 1 | Call to Order | 2:12pm |
| 2 | Announcements & Public Comment | Briana questioned the committee: What help was needed for students to feel supported?* Have one-on-one time with the instructor. Students shared with Jessica that they would benefit from having additional time to talk with their instructor.
* Recommendation: mentor instructors on what things to talk about with their students and have multiple meetings on certain topics. It’s important to know how to have comfortable conversations that support students and bring about student empowerment.
* Recognizing equitable interventions when PSLO assessment results indicate students are having problems which may lead to them dropping.
* Determine a method to contact students that have dropped courses and figure out the reason.
* Explain to students what office hours are used for. The information can be placed on the syllabus.
* From a CSLO perspective meet with students that are experiencing challenges achieving the CSLO requirements by creating an alternate assignment/paper. Develop ways to use CLSO assessments to help students improve when there is a deficiency.
* In the Fall, offer a Professional Development PSLO workshop after Focus Flex, Wed. 3:30-5. The focus will be PSLO assessments and interpreting data. Later in the Spring, when reports are due, offer a Flex that review the results of the report. The goal is to interpret the results, develop a plan, and implement the plan.
 |
| 3 | Approve Agenda | Approved with amendment, unanimous* Move item 6 to 5
 |
| 4 | Approve Minutes | Approved with amendments: 2 abstentions * Revise the 2nd paragraph item 5 - CSLO assessments are a validation of students’ grade, but doesn’t catch why students drop. Students’ that fail a course is based on quality of work vs. quantity. There should be a relationship between the students receiving high grades vs. proficiency. It would be nice to gather data why students drop to determine what are their needs; was it the pedagogy that was challenging or was it personal circumstances.
* Program review and PSLO assessments are not the same. PSLO is assessing the program based on pedagogy whereas program review looks at the statistics through an equitable lens; graduation rates and number of people enrolling.
* The committee requested to edit the minutes and bring them back to the next meeting.
 |
| 5 | Cohorts Selection for New Courses for Next Cycle | * It was shared to create a standardize process for placing new courses as they enter curriculum into cohorts for the PRST that meets the goal of achieving at least 100% of course assessments within a 5 year cycle. Nancy shared after the committee consideration, to make the recommendation for department chairs and deans to place new courses into the proposed plan.

**Nany’s proposal**: if a course enters curriculum year 1 place it in cohort 3; enter year 2 placed in cohort 4; and enter year 3 placed in cohort 4, but if the faculty feels it’s too soon to assess the course because it the 1st year being offered, then delay assessing the course until year 5 which is the program level assessment and the catch up year. The challenge with courses in year 4, they cannot be placed in cohort 4 and 5, because year 4 would be in progress and year 5 is the program level assessment, so instead place the course year 1 of the next cycle. If tracked by OI, a rationale can be provided why courses are not assessed at 100% for the accreditation report. That 10% of the courses enter the curriculum in year 4 and therefore will need to be placed into the next cycle, year 1.**Committee Feedback:** * Over time few courses will be added to cohort 1 and 2. It might be better if courses were added to year 1 that it goes into 3; 2 into 4; 3 into 1; and 4 into 2. The downside courses in year 3 would wait 3 years to be assessed, they will be sitting in the catalog every year as not being assessed and will lower the percentage of courses not being assessed. The same rationale could be used that 30% of courses are not assess with an explanation why, so this may not be a good idea.
* It was questioned what percentage of courses are new each year? It was shared about 5%.
* This proposal is only for new courses, which maybe ½ of 5 percent of the courses might not be assessed.
* It was questioned if new courses are added during the 5th catch-up year? Yes, these courses could go into cohort 2.
* Math department requires certain courses to go into specific cohorts, by design.
* Some departments divide up their courses or to avoid bigger assessments, so course assessments are not clumped in the same cohort year.
* This brings up a point of determining when pedagogy should be assessed?
* Determine the impact, look into the number of new courses offered that need to be assessed.
* Have a conversation with department chairs to determine when they want their courses to be assessed knowing that it must happen during an off cycle.
* The method chosen must be trackable; maybe using excel to track new courses.
* The COOR form requires cohort numbers to be entered into PRST.
* A recommendation, allow department chairs to select their cohort numbers, instead of a number selection process that may not work for departments, especially if courses are only offered once a semester. If departments know courses are to be assessed during the off cycle, it might be easier to maintain.
* Curriculum relies on TLC to oversee assessments.
* New courses being assessed during year 5 would be an exception to the process, however year 5 is the off cycle those courses would be in 1. Courses in year 4 would be assessed during the current year. Year 5 is the PSLO year, with idea not to work on CSLOs.
* Speaking on the conversion cycles, this will help with the accreditation report. It’s difficult to maintain an institutional processes based on accreditation because their requirements change. The college decided to create an institutional process that offers consistency.
 |
| 6 | Membership Confirmation & Meeting Time for Next Year | * The members will remain on the committee for fall.
* The date/time was questionable; previously the meeting was scheduled for Tuesday 2-4 and moved to Wednesday. The committee discussed different times 1-3 and 3-5 for Wednesday. The committee recommended Tuesday 2-4pm; but will check with Nancy before approving it.
 |
| 7 | CSLO/PSLO Discussion | * Tabled
 |
| 8 | GE Discussion | * Tabled
 |
| 9 | PSLO Report Examples | The committee reviewed the PSLO report examples during a workgroup session. **Committee Feedback:** * Speech course: used a pre/post survey to gather their results. It’s challenging to use surveys to determine assessment findings when the submissions numbers are low, it skews the results. Once students leave it’s hard to get individual results.
* English course: students submitted a writing assignment with an attachment survey to it. Only 10% of those surveys were assessed from the entire group. The results indicated students had writing challenges, but their reading was satisfactory. The results of this assessment will help establish a rationale for accelerated learning.
* Math course mapped CSLO results to PSLOs and used the proficiency levels (low-high) for specific course assessment. The results were good towards making improvements; changing the wordiness of some PSLOs, making sure one PSLO includes effective learning; mapping PSLOs better. Not all students were at 100% proficiency, not sure were the gap resides (mapping or assessment). The method of mapping the PSLOs requires looking at the COOR at the same time is a great way of doing the assessment. The backwards design, write the PSLOs and go backwards how each course CSLO well meet the goal.

When people need guidance these courses can be used as an example. Currently speech is uploaded to the website as a reference tool.  |
| 10 | TLC Position Paper Reflection | * Tabled
 |
| 11 | Recommendations for Leadership over Summer and Next Year | Scott asked for feedback from the committee regarding new ideas/projects. * Have the committee meet with the new Dean over the summer.
* Cindy commended the committee for their contributions and leadership.
* Tue asked about having a retreat regarding assessment training, equitable assessment, creating discussion topics, looking into what’s happening at the state level, and increasing ones knowledge to determine useful resources. Resources can be posted to the website.
* PSLOs and CSLO have a session to uncover common themes to find where training is needed, e.g. instructors needing help with synthesizing information. Bring someone on for professional development training on a specific topic. For example, how to create an assessment that looks at writing assignments. This group would be responsible for looking into what’s needed for faculty. This would be possible a Monday meeting. Look into things that can be implemented Spring 2018.
 |
| 12 | Adjournment |  4:00pm |