

Present: Marci Lapriore (Chair), Briana McCarthy (CSLO/PSLO Assessment Coordinator), Cindy McGrath (GE Assessment Chair), Cameron Bluford (Librarian Representative); Chialin Hsieh (Sr. Dean of Planning); Morgan Lynn (Curriculum Chair); Marie Magante (Math & Basic Skills Rep), Tanisha Maxwell (Vice President of Student Services), Patrice Moore (CTE Rep); Nikki Moultrie (Dean of Career Education & Social Sciences); Ryan Tripp (PT at Large), Ryan Pedersen (Dean of Math and Sciences); Shondra West (Note-taker);

Absent: Nicholas Sessions (LMC Associated Students)

Guest: Adrianna Simone (Social Justice & Ethnic Studies); Catt Woods (Classified Professional, Library Services)

CURRENT ITEMS

1. Meeting called to order 2:33 pm Location: Online Zoom Meeting

2. **Announcements & Public Comment:**

- Pedagogy conference available March 19 for everyone attend and those involved in assessment.
- Ethnic studies event offered by LMC scheduled for March 18.

3. **Approval of the Agenda**

Action: Approved; (M/S: C. McGrath/R. Tripp); unanimous

4. **Approval of the Minutes: Feb 9, 2021**

Action: Tabled

5. **Institutional Student Learning Outcomes Development (non-GE SLO's)**

Marci gave an update about the Institution Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) core group discussed at SGC. The topic focused on developing ISLOs as an assessment process that encompasses all classes offered by the institution. Chialin will facilitate the ISLO core group. Inasmuch, there were some concerns expressed during the SGC meeting about the existence of ISLOs:

- TLC's position paper indicates that ISLOs are assessed by TLC. Developing an ISLO core group conflicts with TCL's responsibility overseeing the assessment CSLO, PSLO, and ISLOs process.
- Lack of faculty representation on the ISLO core group was a concern.

Marci mentioned if ISLOs become part of the course outline of record (COOR), faculty would need to ensure mapping of CSLOs. Nikki shared that all the LOs (CSLO, PSLO, ISLO) were once mapped to the COOR, yet with eLumen, they will become part of the assessment module. Also, the LOs don't require state approval as being part of the COOR, such that ISLO should not be considered a 10+1 issue. Considering the approval of programs is an operational process that involves collaboration; whereas, developing ISLOs will help determine if programs meet institutional outcomes, not just classes, more so CTE programs. The committee discussed the following:

- TLC is responsible for assessing ISLOs instead of development; therefore, developing a core group outside of TLC purview doesn't conflict with TLC charges.
- When was the last TLC position paper approved by AS and does it continue to have language about ISLOS being assessed by TLC?
- Address TLC's structure being a subcommittee of AS and SGC as a potential conflict of interest

Briana and Cindy shared the historical perspective about GESLOs once being the ISLOs. When asked by accreditation, the GESLOs are presented as the ISLOs. As of May 2020, the GESLOs was revised from having six to eight to include universal learning outcomes. The development of ISLOs are to serve a different purpose than the GESLOs. The committee spoke about:

- Clarity is needed from AS regarding the development of ISLOs

- Question developing an institutional assessment model and what it would encompass. The model should look at both curricular and co-curricular and house the development of the ISLOs.
- Clarity is needed between the two entities (GE and TLC) about developing assessments and managing the process.
- Consider the TLC committee to make recommendations in determining a model and prioritizing the assessment process that doesn't take away from faculty influence, impact and representation of being a part of the core group. At the same time, the group includes stakeholders that help determine an institutional assessment structure, which SGC is attempting to do.
- The challenge is to consider where to house the institutional assessment model, with TLC, what is the model, who determines the model, how is it connected to ILOs, ISLOs, and other institutional components; programs and services. Additionally, thinking about how should the college assess the process, especially connecting students and the community to it for accountability.
- The GE model covers both local and transfer requirements, except certificate programs (CTE). However, all courses (programs) will meet the universal SLOs (reading, writing, and critical thinking) requirements.
- ACCJC II.A.11 defines the ISLOs – the objective becomes how do departments meet the requirements
- Examine how other colleges are meeting the ISLO requirements in consideration of a process for LMC
- Shared with the group was Nikki's straw proposal that was presented to SGC – *What are ISLOs*
- Question in thinking about developing ISLOs that GESLO outcomes encompass II.A.11 structure, so the question becomes either develop a set of ISLOs that institution meets or develop learning support outcomes to include student services/instructional and separate set for ISLOs
- When broadening the assessment process, consider the ISLOs don't overlap with the GESLO process.
- Avoid duplication of efforts when developing the ISLOs. Whereas, the core group consists of a variety of members responsible for different aspects of building ISLOs.
- Assessments often do not provide a holistic aspect of student needs. The ISLO core group is an opportunity to discuss coming up with ways to build upon providing a sound structure in support of student success.
- The college will need to determine the mapping of ISLOS; CSLOS/PSLOs to ISLOS or PSLOs to ISLOS or CSLOS to ISLOS.

Marci asked the members about becoming the representative on the core group as co-facilitator.

- Representation from TLC exists may be redundant
- Recommendation having a voice as a participant sharing experience with eLumen and assessment
- As a shared responsibility between AS and SGC; having a co-chair is a good direction depending on the workgroup product, such as having TLC revise the position paper.
- TLC does not report solely to the academic senate because of assessments and being that assessment is not a faculty matter. TLC should have a role of being its own compacity specifically with the eLumen implementation, which is needed as a reporting system.
- Student services will use eLumen as a reporting system too.
- Recommendation develop a statement for AS support in developing TLC's membership, position paper, and etc.

6. eLumen work time: Pilot Group SP21 Timeline for implementation:

- Several members are piloting eLumen assessment module.
 - Making the assessment private stays in this mode; avoid this function

- Nikki shared the *eLumen Pilot of Awesomeness* document with the committee. Departments piloting assessment are adding their feedback to the document. Any technical difficulties Nikki resolves with the eLumen designers.
- Marci shared the next steps in importing the assessments into Canvas.
- More information is needed about quizzes in Canvas importing with eLumen assessment.
- The committee reviewed Adrianna's pilot eLumen assessment module. Further, discussing how eLumen pulls data from Canvas regarding students' assessment results. For cross-listed courses the information is imported separately into eLumen. The question about how eLumen imports will impact assessment data.
- Question about what portion of the assessment is appropriate for completion and submission.

Adjourned: 4:04

The committee members stayed to test eLumen features with importing assessment data, and to determine if there is a way to remove the private feature by copying a module into a new one.

Next Meeting Date Spring 2021 from 2:30-3:55 pm

- April 13
- May 11