Present: *Scott Hubbard, Chair,* Briana McCarthy (CSLO/PSLO Coordinator), Cindy McGrath (GE Assessment Chair), Marie Magante, Nina Ghiselli, Roseann Erwin, Liz Green, Patrice Moore, Maria Perrone, Nancy Ybarra, Nikki Moultrie, Ryan Pedersen, Shondra West (Note taker)
Absent: Chialin Hsieh, Iris Archuleta, Scott Warfe, Jaylon Morton,
Guest: None
 Location: SS4-409

CURRENT ITEMS

1. **Call to Order** 2:42PM

2.   **Announcements and Public Comment**
     *   SLO Symposium scheduled for Friday, 2/7/2020 if anyone is interested in attending, contact Scott Hubbard. TLC & GP will provide funding for the conference.
     *   Scott will wait until December to share more the SOAR survey via the EMP plan
     *   Briana shared an update about the adjunct stipend COOR revision and assessment reporting process, which is posted to the TLC Website. The PRST language was removed from the document, since the program review assessment tool is no longer available.

3. **Consent Agenda**
    Action: Approved (M/S: Maxwell/Erwin); unanimous
    Change the lead to item 6 S. Hubbard; move item 7 after the position paper discussion

4. **Approve Minutes**
    Action: Approved (M/S: Ybarra/Maxwell); Abstain: Pedersen, McCarthy, and Erwin

5. **Student Services SLO Update**
    Dr. Maxwell shared an update about the student services program review to include the revised outline template. The template utilization provides support for how best to assist what happens in the student services unit when completing an assessment and program review process. Dr. Maxwell further explained the template boxes in each section. However, section one was not modified: introduction, goals, vision for success, etc. Section two of the modifications noted, such that the managers worked together to brainstorm ideas that applied to the dynamic nature of student services. Several questions tied with comprehensive program review process was kept. The section referencing student engagement (a-c) questions are new to identify accountability with engagement among students, faculty, community, and staff with regards to the comprehensive program review goals. Also, the questions help with how does it relates to seeking professional development opportunities for staff? Section D reference to an advisory board if applicable and how it relates to the comprehensive program review goals.

    Dr. Maxwell presented a chart outlining a comprehensive process that aligns with the vision for success goals indicators, whereas the indicators for the accreditation should differ. The chart shared by Dr. Maxwell demonstrates that the accreditation indicators pertain to course success which is different than the five goals tied to the vision for success indicators. Furthermore, Dr. Maxwell shared that work to complete the student services theme is

underway via meetings with staff and re-evaluating the value of student services, specifically how it influences the comprehensive program review goals and student learning outcomes. Further, looking at the assessment measurements and how will it be used with the status of the goals, whether they are in progress, completed, abandoned, or new. Reviewing the assessment process will help close the loop and document the method. Additionally, help determine to incorporate an annual assessment cycle, outside of the five-year-review; however, the comprehensive program review will remain on the same five-year goal review. A request by Dr. Maxwell, have the department look at their comprehensive goals in comparison to aligning them with student learning outcomes (SLOs). Whereas year-3, this year will become the planning year to create a matrix, based on the group discussions to implement in the upcoming years as part of the assessment and evaluation. However, if a decision to maintain the existing comprehensive goals and SLOs, they will be assessed annually and what's the plan to complete the process. As a pilot process, it will align with the existing process to complete the comprehensive program review write-up in year-6. Clarification of the vision for success references to the statewide initiative.

Dr. Maxwell continued sharing the next section referencing assessment and institutional effectiveness. Referencing the chart, the language was revised to learning support outcome (LSO) updates. Accreditation standards refer to LSOs, which will help the institution align practices to identify student LSOs in each area, furthermore, this will provide flexibility to assess student learning support, employee learning, or service area learning support. For example, new student orientation and outreach can create student learning support outcomes that measure students' capability to identify three resources on campus. The measurements determine whether student learning is occurring oppose to satisfaction. The goal of helping student services staff diversify their practices beyond satisfaction to think about the types of learning needed by the students and how to initiate the practice. Dr. Maxwell spoke about the differences between educational plans and employee learning outcomes, such that the person is learning about a particular subject matter. For example, employees learning about Guided Pathways or full-time Equivalent Student (FTES), more so this helps determine what professional development is needed. Ultimately, the staff has a role as educators that impact student learning not easily understood or seen, which learning support outcomes help with this.

Roseanne shared that the library template use instructional versus student services uses academic support, in which the student learning support template is liked much more. The template is more comprehensive and has different results for various assignments. Additionally, the template provides flexibility to support academic managers that have courses to assess via SLOs, which they use a different template. For example, the Counseling Department is one area that is not part of the assessment cycle and offers courses that require student learning assessment and potentially can offer student learning outcomes assessment too. This is a future conversation whether to create a process for departments that require both SLOs assessment for courses and LSOs for administrative purposes (Athletics, Counseling, ACS, Leadership, LRNSK, Tutor support team, etc.). Furthermore, Nancy shared that a discussion is needed to develop a systematic approach to assess labs (computer science, math, business, etc.). MESA lab has a learning community, which they assess.

The committee discussed areas that should be added to the assessment cycle list (Athletics - KINCA, Counseling - ACS, LACI, and LRNSK), which requires frequent COOR updates; however, the departments are not prompted via the assessment cycle and are not assigned a cohort. Dr. Maxwell asked how to help, which the committee recommended complete the course assessment this year.

Dr. Maxwell concluded with explaining the remaining sections. Dr. Maxwell concluded by explaining the remaining section, which includes adding a link to the learning support outcome report in narrative form to include measures and outcomes. The section requires inputting the next steps and assignment responsibility. Finally, 5 and 6 are the impact on resource allocation and resource needs.

Recommendation to reference LSO as learning support outcomes and SLO as student learning outcomes, so that the language is not confused, opposed to using just the acronym. Additionally, LSO must have at least one SLO.

6. **Modality update on SLO assessment form**
   - Quick update from the last meeting discussion to breaking down different modality outcomes or by student groups. Unfortunately, the differentiation by student groups poses difficulties due to how assessment methods are done differently by departments by itemized or group ratio. Therefore, the final recommendation to disaggregate the information for accreditation by breaking down the information by modality, day vs. night. Currently to disaggregate the data is not part of the existing assessment form, which a workgroup consisting of Nancy, Cindy, Scott Warfe, and Chialin, worked together to discuss creating a process. Nancy shared the idea that the cyber session as a strictly online course would have been the targeted class to assess. The cyber session is not being offered and cannot be assessed at this time, so the alternative option to pick English courses that have not been assessed and teach face-to-face and online. The workgroup will meet again to discuss the next steps to attempt picking a class to assess for spring. With regards to accreditation, moving forward with a follow-up meeting to figure out the next steps with members between the workgroup, distance education, and TLC. Also, follow-up with Scott Warfe about his idea to assess English courses. The recommendation, pilot course in cohort years 3 and 4, face-to-face and online for spring 2020. Follow-up with the cyber session course in Fall 2020. Check with Grace Villegas to retrieve a report of hybrid classes.

7. **SLO Assessment Update**
   - Scott shared that Beth Ann can run the numbers of submitted and outstanding assessments. This topic will become a standing item for the committee to review. Scott shared the most recent assessment numbers submitted for year 1 and 2. Briana shared that department notifications will go out regarding outstanding SLOs assessments and that support is available to those that need assistance. The Deans are working at reviewing which assessments are actually needed, due to partial assessments or deactivated courses.

   - A recommendation was made to create a template to help explain the assessment jargon, which the information is available on the TLC webpage. A suggestion add a TLC link to

the curriculum webpage, since most people are most likely accessing that page for information.

- Briana shared a document that she sends to departments with outstanding assessments. The message to departments that assessments are required, and seeking the Deans support to encourage those to complete them. The concern, is understand who should be contacted, whereas not having the information to determined who and who has not submitted their assessments. eLumen will become the data repository to help follow-up with departments to complete assessments.

8. **Position Paper Update**
   - Homework for the committee to review the position paper as recommended by the Academic senate. When reviewing the document the senate has asked that the committee make necessary revisions, take into account the statewide and college initiatives (assessment vs. eLumen and STEM process), and provide any updates the provides efficiency of the curriculum process. Deadline Spring Break 2020, March. Scott will provide guiding questions: Find 1-3 things to keep and 1-3 things to change.

9. **Pillar 4 Discussion**

10. **CSLO/PSLO Discussion**

11. **Adjournment** 4:30pm

Next Meeting Dates: February 11, March 10, April 14, and May 12, 2020