

**Present:** *Scott Hubbard, Chair*, Briana McCarthy (CSLO/PSLO Coordinator), Cindy McGrath (GE Assessment Chair), Nina Ghiselli, Roseann Erwin, Liz Green, Tanisha Maxwell, Maria Perrone, Nancy Ybarra, Nikki Moultrie, Shondra West (Note taker)

**Absent:** Chialin Hsieh, Marie Magante, Patrice Moore, Scott Warfe, Jaylon Morton, and Ryan Pedersen

**Guest:** None

Location: SS4-409

## CURRENT ITEMS

---

### 1. Call to Order 2:38PM

### 2. Announcements and Public Comment

- January 31<sup>st</sup> is the Guide Pathways workshop - GPSEM
- The committee discussed meeting both February 11<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup>.
- February 7, 2020 Briana, Jill, Nina and Scott will attend the SLO sophisms to gain assessment insight. In addition, Briana, Jill, and Scott will present at the sophism regarding the development of LMC's PIP and the assessment process.

### 3. Agenda

**Action:** Approved (M/S: Moultrie/Erwin); unanimous

### 4. Approve Minutes; Action: Tabled

- Attendance update: Liz Green - absent, Tanisha Maxwell - present, and replace Iris Archuleta with Ryan Tripp (PT).
- A question concerning page 2 (par 2) accreditation standards referencing Learning Support Outcomes (LSO). A recommendation was made to confirm if LSOs are indeed referenced in the ACJC standard language. Dr. Maxwell found the information in II.C.2

### 5. SLO Assessment Update (Standing Item)

- The Office of PIE provides an assessment update during each meeting. For year one, the number of assessments submitted increased by 5% plus 6% in year two. The cumulative total of assessments completed increased by 50%. This number represents the 35% increase from the beginning of the semester.
- Nancy shared that the Deans are working with their departments to solidify the assessment process, which the departments expressed they will submit their assessments after Fall final exams, others have shared they will submit their assessments in Spring 2020 due to the course not being offered during Fa19, and some departments will deactivate courses not offered within the last three years. These changes impact the dominator, thus increasing the percentage of assessments completed. Nancy questioned the approach to address courses that require assessment completion? Scott shared that between Briana and him are in contact with people, have provided support via drop-ins, and continue to offer Flex workshops as a way to encourage departments to complete their assessments. Furthermore, Scott will work with the Office of Instruction to obtain a list of outstanding areas.

- With concerns about cross-listed courses; Nikki questioned who's responsible for assessing courses that are in multiple disciplines. With the developments of eLumen, it will help people access information instead of obtaining it from individual people/dept.
- **Add as an agenda item for February 2020:** Consider enforcing institutional policies and procedures with direct consequences regarding not completing assessments.
- Nikki asked in the 5th year whether the PSLO percentage numbers are low and whether year 5 completes the cycle, or does the CSLO/PSLO process start over at year 1? It was shared, year-5 has been extended in the past; however, PSLO assessments are needed as part of the program review and RAP requirements.
- Cindy shared in the past to assure assessments were completed, the COOR cover sheet, identified when the course was last assessed. As a method of closing the loop, the purpose of the COOR revision was due to the last assessment outcomes. Over the years, the two processes were split apart to house the responsibility of assessment to TLC and COOR review with curriculum. Cindy recommended bringing back the assessment quality assurance via the COOR of not offering the course until completion of the assessments. This is an institutional, operational, & Title V requirement.
- The committee discussed other ideas:
  - i. Suggested that the Office of Instruction not to place courses in the schedule if assessments are incomplete; however, the dilemma with this situation, students would not be able to take courses to meet academic requirements.
  - ii. Write a policy in the position paper; however this may pose a challenge with approval from Academic Senate vs. academic freedom.
  - iii. Implications applying for RAP and Box 2A.
- The committee will reconvene in February to discuss more ideas.
- The committee spoke about faculty evaluations and whether the assessment component is part of it. Currently, it's not written into practice; however, when the Dean certifies evaluations, comments about submitting paperwork timely (Admissions & Records rosters/grades) are added.
  - i. Tanisha agreed to develop a timeline for A&R to initiate reports to confirm the submission of required documentation: grades, rosters, etc.
- Another consideration: Deans can implement the required yearly letter sent to Department Chairs to include the responsibility of following-up with their departments regarding the assessment process.

## 6. Position Paper Update

- Academic Senate asked TLC to review and update their position paper by Spring break 2020. Scott has received feedback from TLC members via email; however, there is an opportunity for more to comment and ask departments for feedback.
- Cindy shared a historical perspective about how GE, TLC, and curriculum became interconnected, such that revising the assessment model helped to eliminate the flux of COORs being submitted at one time to curriculum. The model included arranging courses into cohort years 1 - 4, and the 5th year represents the completion of the cycle. The completion of course level cohort assessments guides the need for course revisions spread-out over five years. Also, the assessment results are useful that they help drive decisions. The college decided to tie the results to the college RAP process, funding and staffing request, and to help with program review.

- Nikki shared a concern regarding CTE courses, in which they must review and update their COORs every two years. CTE courses do not align with the four-year assessment model, causing an issue for the department. They tend to wait until their cohort scheduled dates to update their COORs. Cindy shared that CTE courses can update their COORs, PSLOs, and assessments every two years, or even sooner. The committee strategized about possibly assigning CTE cohorts to years one (1) and three (3) or two (2) and four (4). With the CTE courses updating their COORs/assessments more frequently, it may cause the assessment chart to become off who's outstanding. Furthermore, departments can use the assessment results throughout the four years to complete their program assessment report. Cindy shared the assessment model resembles Title V five year review, in which all courses should be assessed and revised by the fifth year. Additionally, Nikki shared that the prerequisite process is updated every five years.
- When thinking about revising the TLC position paper in tandem with GE, additional time is needed by the GE committee to sort out their process, which may impact TLC's deadline.
- Cindy recommended reviewing the TLC membership list in retrospect to the administration position changes, such that it reads the President appoints four managers, Department Chairs appoint five faculty, and LMCAS appoint two students without specific titles. Not having titles supports the changes happening on campus, specifically with committee chairs term dates. Furthermore, Scott shared that he would like to keep the model in which each constituency group has a vote.

### **Committee Feedback**

- Roseann recommended updating the Library's title from Library and Learning Services to Library.
- Tanisha shared that the position paper was shared with the entire student services group to review and provide feedback before spring break. Also, Tanisha questioned if the focus of TLC is instructional or institutional? If institutional, a broader membership is needed to ensure conversations are happening across the college. Moreover, Tanisha recommended having other departments complete the assessments to help with learning how to incorporate practices into one's daily work environment. Scott shared having diverse discussions supports accreditation, such that student learning outcomes, administrators' outcomes, and learning support outcomes demonstrate the effectiveness of the college.
- Tanisha recommended updating the position paper regarding TLC engagement to maintain assessments, as the ones housing the records and uploading the information to websites outside of the planning committee record-keeping process.
- Nikki recommended capturing Cindy's historical perspective in the position paper.
- Marie shared the question remains to update the paper with the existing model or redesign the paper altogether?
- Moving forward the committee can work on updating the membership list and postpone the GE/Curriculum components.
- Cindy shared that a decision is needed to keep the appendices for historical value in which the document increases from 12 to 30 pages. Additionally, any new changes made, such that additional pages to the appendices are needed to explain the thoughts that guided the decisions.

- Rosanne shared that the appendices via the P drive are unavailable, it's best to archive the information.
- Briana shared take into account new faculty that may not read the entire document. The committee agreed to delineate the document by creating a comprehensive revision and create an executive summary.
- The committee agreed to enhance the assessment model information sheet to include graphics and make it easily accessible via the executive summary. Briana agreed to work with John Schall about graphic ideas. Scott passed out the position paper to review and update over the winter break.
- Nancy shared the big five as institutional level outcomes consisting of five areas; developmental, general, and occupation education, student services, and library and learning; whereas, the model was condensed to GE. The committee needs to grapple with the idea about ILOs vs. a different approach. Additionally, determine if TLC oversees the purview of SLOs and ALOs.
- At the February 28th retreat, a discussion on how TLC, GE, Curriculum, and Academic Senate together support student success becomes a goal. This conversation will help approach the concerns of updating the position papers for each committee.
- Scott will speak with Chialin to ask about actual language concerning institutional-level student learning outcomes since accreditation speaks to program and course level outcomes, and if this is an accreditation standard or institutional requirement.
  - Briana found that accreditation standard I.B.I(i) and II.A.II(iii) contains some information; however, Nancy pointed out that institutional standards (ILOs) are different than ISLOs. The committee shared the need for clarity regarding student learning outcomes vs. institutional effective measures.

#### **7. CSLO/PSLO Discussion - Tabled**

#### **8. Pillar 4 Discussion - Tabled**

#### **9. Adjournment 3:59 pm**

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