

MEMBERS: Scott Hubbard (**Chair**), Briana McCarthy (CSLO/PSLO Coordinator), Cindy McGrath (GE Assessment Chair), Iris Archuleta, Roseann Erwin, Liz Green, Chialin Hsieh, Marie Magante, Scott Warfe, Tanisha Maxwell, Nikki Moultrie, Ryan Pedersen, Nancy Ybarra, and Note Taker: Shondra West

Absent: Nina Ghiselli, Patrice Moore, Maria Perrone

Guest: Beth Ann Stone and Jill Buettner

	Topic/Activity	Notes
1.	Call to Order	2:35 pm
2.	Announcements and Public Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome and introductions by committee members
3.	Approved the agenda	Approved; (M/S: N. Moultrie/R. Erwin); unanimous
4.	Approved the minutes May 14, 2019	Approved with changes (M/S: N. Moultrie/I. Archuleta); abstain Dr. Maxwell and M. Magante; motion passed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor changes to the agenda - name correction Julie to Jill and remove the word ‘all’ and replace with teaching faculty page 7.
5.	Accreditation Standard Draft Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and provide feedback on draft ISER standards related to assessment 	<p>Beth Ann shared updates regarding the accreditation standards. Beth and Chialin created a template design to assist with validating the review process by asking three questions. Scott shared, 1.B.9 is not under the purview of TLC. The committee reviewed the remaining standards as a collective.</p> <p>I.B.6 committee feedback: Evidence to support disaggregated data specifically for learning outcomes by subpopulation is unavailable; however, data is available for course and program completion rates, persistent, enrollment specifically for conducting learning achievement outcomes. Some departments review their program completion and success rates by populations to establish goals, objectives, and meet funding requirements. For example, Ryan P. shared, HSI grant disaggregates data based on degree and transfer completion of certain populations with a financial need, ethnicity, etc. The HSI program disaggregated the data using state identified subpopulation in the relationship with the student equity plan, which identifies disproportionate populations. Scott shared that the capability for TLC to disaggregate data by learning outcomes is inaccessible until the launch of eLumen, which will support the efforts of disaggregating student learning outcomes (SLO) by a subpopulation.</p> <p>Recommendation: revise the statement to read “disaggregates and analyze achievement for the subpopulation of students.” Beth shared that the entire statement will be removed, it was derived as criteria.</p>

MEMBERS: Scott Hubbard (**Chair**), Briana McCarthy (CSLO/PSLO Coordinator), Cindy McGrath (GE Assessment Chair), Iris Archuleta, Roseann Erwin, Liz Green, Chialin Hsieh, Marie Magante, Scott Warfe, Tanisha Maxwell, Nikki Moultrie, Ryan Pedersen, Nancy Ybarra, and Note Taker: Shondra West

Absent: Nina Ghiselli, Patrice Moore, Maria Perrone

Guest: Beth Ann Stone and Jill Buettner

		<p>Cindy questioned the previous role of both the TLC and Student Services assessment committee. Scott shared historically, TLC had the purview of institutional outcomes; however, Student Services have branched off to evaluate their SLOs. It's unclear with regards to the disaggregation of Student Service's SLO by subpopulation. Dr. Maxwell shared Student Services SLOs are being reviewed to determine the effectiveness of disaggregate the data by accurate written statements. Also, Dr. Maxwell explained in conjunction with the Student Services team; they are reviewing the assessment cycle to determine reasonable and intended measurements of assessing records, as well as, working in conjunction with Chilin to identify the data points that are relevant for Student Services to evaluate their data.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Evaluate documents that explain TLC and Student Services holding a partnership with the assessment process, and determine if both areas should merge again.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> access other courses, programs, and student environments based on transitions; e.g., advancement levels in course achievements. Also, consider First-5 and child study grant-funded programs as part of evaluating the transitions. For example, measuring foster youth & parent community programs, whereby the population (low-income) must achieve completion of their programmatic learning outcomes to transition to the next level. Contact Melissa Jackson and Sarah Steers to obtain the data.</p> <p>Further information is needed to determine whether the accreditation team would like the disaggregation data by subpopulation, with an understanding that devices are unavailable to retrieve the information until eLumen is in place, or future years. Chialin asked if the disaggregation of learning outcome data by day/evening or deliver mode is available, which Scott and Nancy shared data by achievement outcomes are available. However, disaggregation of data by a subset of students that can critically analyze the content (GESLO3), is not. Dependent on how departments disaggregate their CSLO/PSLO assessments, there's a likelihood to confirm the information by</p>
--	--	--

MEMBERS: Scott Hubbard (**Chair**), Briana McCarthy (CSLO/PSLO Coordinator), Cindy McGrath (GE Assessment Chair), Iris Archuleta, Roseann Erwin, Liz Green, Chialin Hsieh, Marie Magante, Scott Warfe, Tanisha Maxwell, Nikki Moultrie, Ryan Pedersen, Nancy Ybarra, and Note Taker: Shondra West

Absent: Nina Ghiselli, Patrice Moore, Maria Perrone

Guest: Beth Ann Stone and Jill Buettner

		<p>modality. The eLumen software assessment module has the potential to disaggregate data by modality and by section.</p> <p>Recommendation: Investigate creating a workflow within the eLumen assessment module. Also, revise the current SLO/PSLO reporting template to capture variances in modality. Determine the different outcome factors before revising the template.</p> <p>Briana shared, currently the departments’ aggregate data to appraise the course SLO trends. Nikki shared, instead of looking at “disaggregating” the data, instead identify other characteristics that lead to the analysis of face-to-face in contrast to day/night or online trends. Briana and Scott shared in consideration of the many ways to assess information, the creation of different CSLO/PSLO template reporting forms are needed to determine modality performance.</p> <p>Recommendation: reexamine the current assessment process to help departments determine the effectiveness of class scheduling, whereby students benefit from taking classes during specific days and times. Also, examine the different ways departments may use the template.</p> <p>The committee discussion extended to realizing specific departments in which they disaggregated data for specific programs or courses, specific groups, and different pedagogical approaches. Dr. Maxwell shared an example of a college assessment strategy; where they evaluated similar courses to include multiple sections to identify student success rates via class assignments. The study revealed the trends of assignment consistency throughout the department vs. assignments derived from academic freedom that produced the greatest quality for students to reach mastery level, thereby implementing interventions for students to better retain information.</p> <p>The committee continued to review the accreditation standard responses concerning the assessment cycle process.</p>
--	--	--

MEMBERS: Scott Hubbard (**Chair**), Briana McCarthy (CSLO/PSLO Coordinator), Cindy McGrath (GE Assessment Chair), Iris Archuleta, Roseann Erwin, Liz Green, Chialin Hsieh, Marie Magante, Scott Warfe, Tanisha Maxwell, Nikki Moultrie, Ryan Pedersen, Nancy Ybarra, and Note Taker: Shondra West

Absent: Nina Ghiselli, Patrice Moore, Maria Perrone

Guest: Beth Ann Stone and Jill Buettner

		<p>Recommendation: update the completion percentage rates and change “completed” to “submit”. Departments are in the process of reviewing their CSLO assessments for submission. Scott shared, add a draft statement that TLC has adopted a process to oversee the tracking of department CSLO/PSLO completion rates.</p> <p>Briana questioned the percentage of five-year review curriculum submission, which it was unclear of the exact number. However, Nikki shared that eLumen will help resolve the problem of retrieving assessment figures by which eLumen serves as a database housing sensitive curriculum, assessment, and program review information.</p> <p>Recommendation: work with departments about updating outstanding COORs needing assessment and express the consequences of not completing them. Beth and Nancy shared that the information was announced at the last Department Chair Meeting.</p> <p>Cindy questioned the enforcement of assessment completion via faculty in comparison to managers, in which managers hold the responsibility of requiring departments to complete their assessments. As a collective TLC and Curriculum committee can assist with securing assessment requirements are being met. Cindy shared that the curriculum process entails halting any COORs with an expired assessment date from being reviewed until the assessment is completed. With the changing of the guards, the practice has been off-course.</p> <p>Recommendation: Program eLumen to complete integrity checks to decrease the number of outdated COORs needing an assessment before curriculum approval. An additional idea, develop a tech review committee to implement integrity workflows by which a TLC member participates.</p> <p>Future agenda items: 1) Review the CSLO reporting form template and consider a prompt to disaggregate data by modality 2.) Review and revise the TLC charges, and 3) continue the review of the accreditation standards - 1B2 and 1B4.</p>
--	--	--

MEMBERS: Scott Hubbard (**Chair**), Briana McCarthy (CSLO/PSLO Coordinator), Cindy McGrath (GE Assessment Chair), Iris Archuleta, Roseann Erwin, Liz Green, Chialin Hsieh, Marie Magante, Scott Warfe, Tanisha Maxwell, Nikki Moultrie, Ryan Pedersen, Nancy Ybarra, and Note Taker: Shondra West

Absent: Nina Ghiselli, Patrice Moore, Maria Perrone

Guest: Beth Ann Stone and Jill Buettner

6.	<p>Updates on TLC Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • eLumen • PIP • Focus on PD for the Year (3 E's) (TLC) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briana and Jill shared an update regarding PIP. The first session occurred at Big Break Shoreline in which the faculty participated with understanding the foundation of the program, instructor identity, reviewing the syllabi, etc. At the next meeting, faculty will learn how to use media equipment; e.g. document and video cameras. The attendees consist of both full-time and part-time faculty. Future sessions in the Fall will include learning about instructional design, motivational learning, collecting data, observation, and learning about different pedagogy methods. • eLumen update: the curriculum module developments are underway before the remaining modules are built; assessment and program review. Nikki shared that the CSLO/PSLO/ISLO will be inputted into eLumen from the COORs. A true assessment/program review timeline will be determined after the curriculum module is completed. Scott and Briana will establish professional development eLumen training before the system is introduced to everyone, and recruit beta testers before going live. • Briana asked which of the three E's faculty would find useful in association with eLumen PD training. Nikki shared information regarding her attendance at the Illumination conference, and sources from that to seek potential PD speakers to encourage the utilization of eLumen. Chialin recommended that TLC focus on methods of collecting evidence using the CSLO/PSLO templates. Briana and Scott shared they will offer more drop-ins to come.
7.	<p>Instructional Program Review Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Items related to assessment are on a form now needed by Sept 30 	Tabled
8.	<p>CSLO/PSLO Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standing item for any updates and discussion 	Tabled
9.	<p>GE Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standing item for any updates and discussion 	Tabled
10.	Adjournment	3:58