**TEACHING & LEARNING COMMITTEE MINUTES**September 04, 2012 – 2:30-4:00

Present: Tawny Beal, Scott Cabral, Paula Gunder, Laurie Huffman (Chair), Kiran Kamath, Richard Livingston, Cindy McGrath, Gail Newman, Ryan Pederson, Alex, Sterling, Patricia Tirado, Sara Torino, Katalina Wethington

1. Welcome, public comment, announcement
   * Laurie welcomed everyone to the meeting
   * The TLC recognized the hard work of Cindy McGrath, as the former TLP Chair
2. The Agenda was approved
3. Minutes were approved with the change to #4, removal of the reference to the Library
4. Memberships, cohorts, integration, synchronization, other
   * Christina Goff is now the PSLO and CSLO faculty lead
   * Cindy announced that she distributed the worksheet for the new model for faculty to put all their courses into a cohort at the department chair’s meeting. However, not a lot of faculty have returned those. She will also put it on the P drive, and Laurie will follow up. This needs to be done now, as this will be the first cohort year. This information is needed by the end of September, as it will be put on the Program Review tool, which is scheduled to be available to everyone in early October.
   * Cindy provided an update on the assessment
     + CSLOs are at 61%. The goal is 66%, however, there still may be some that have been completed, but not posted.
     + PSLOs are at 91% (31/33), however, she has heard from 2 of the 3 programs, which have already collected data, but need to write the report. Some programs have assessed more than once since 2006. The program missing is Administration of Justice.
   * PSLO assessment cycle: currently, after assessing programs, we plan for improvements, but we do not re-assess, or follow up to see if the improvement worked. It was recommended that on the Program Review tool, we ask the question as to if the improvement activities that were planned, actually worked. It was recommended to use the same questions that we use for CLSOs.
   * In addition, there needs to be documentation about the dialogue for PSLOs, not just the outcomes. It was recommended to tweak Program Review tool to get at this, similar to CSL.
   * The committee also discussed the recommendation that the COOR have a check box to indicate the date and time the SLOs were assessed. This was previously recommended, and the TLC would like to bring this forward. Laurie will bring to Curriculum Committee. The checkbox is not for Curriculum Committee to judge the assessment, but only a check to determine the timing of assessment. Some courses may have to go through Curriculum Committee more than once in the 5 year cycle in order to sync the cycles and assessment, in some cases the approval will be a rubber stamp, unless there are major changes. The TLC will need to over-communicate all of this, as it is confusing the first time around.
   * Per the new model, some members were missing, including PDAC, Student Services faculty lead. TLC indicated that the PDAC member may not need to be at every meeting. Laurie to follow up on membership.
   * The TLC noted that currently only one of the PSLOs is being assessed per program. Paula expressed concerned with doing all PSLOs at the same time, and that we are not unique in not getting them all done. There are different ways to address this, for example, some colleges had different sections do different SLOs. Other colleges do the Capstone course, or aggregate courses up. Kiran will check with Bakersfield when she does the site visit to see what other colleges are doing.
   * The TLC also noted that 3 CSLOs were selected for assessment, not all SLOs. This was agreed to when all of the courses needed to do assessment the first time. This may be an impetus to reduce the number of CSLOs.
   * The new model will have all CSLOs assessed every 5 years.
5. Christina was out. Alex reported on GE. He stated that the GE SLOs may be different with the new AST degrees, and the AA/AS degree with the fewer units (less than 18). Non-transfer and transfer may have different SLOs, based on different tracks.
   * Alex also submitted his “big idea”, which will be presented to GE committee on Thursday, 09/6. The recommendation is to move away from individual faculty doing individual assessment, and move toward more broad inter-departmental collaboration. An example is to provide exam questions to a sample of GE courses, or do E-portfolios, or capstone courses. Previously, they have done the GE Assessment Seminars, but only approximately 7 faculty have been attending (out of 70-100). Laurie recommended that members email Alex with suggestions. The concerns with the capstone is that a capstone may not be truly a capstone, as the college cannot require students to take 4-6 courses before the capstone, so they could take it out of sequence, and it would not reflect the accumulation of learning.
   * Kiran distributed the current draft of the Accreditation report, Rubric for Assessment, and the Timeline for Accreditation. LMC’s report is due October 15, 2015, and all colleges are expected to be at Proficiency. Kiran will email a report from Gavilan College, which is being used as a sample. The TLC assigned a member for each of the 7 Statements, everyone will review the Self-Assessment portion. Members were asked to review, add evidence, and email to Kiran. Evidence can be put on the P drive, under a folder marked for evidence. This will be discussed at the next meeting.
6. The committee reviewed the charges from SGC.
   * Charge 1 is partially complete, and is being implemented now
   * Charge 2 was completed
   * The last 2 charges are ongoing
   * New charges:
     + Implementation of the new model
     + Define and create the GE model
   * Ryan stated that the Planning Committee is looking at integrating all processes, which is already built into the new Assessment Model
7. The TLC needs to begin to discuss the evaluation of the model. The Academic Senate requested that the model be evaluated ½ way through, and then again at the end. Therefore, the evaluations will be in years 3 (fall 2014)and 5. The committee discussed possible evaluation tools:
   * Surveys
   * Look at objectives, outcomes
   * Quantitative