|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Members Present:** | Tue Rust, Chair; Louie Giambattista, Paula Gunder, JoAnn Hobbs, Morgan Lynn, Briana McCarthy, Cindy McGrath, Gail Newman, Nancy Ybarra, Richard Stanfield (LMCAS), and Shondra West (Note Taker) |
| **Absent:** | Courtney Diputado, Nina Ghiselli, Natalie Hannum, and A’kilah Moore |
| **Guest:** | None |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Topic** | **Meeting Minutes** |
| 1 | Call to Order | Meeting called to order 2:10pm |
| 2 | Announcements Public Comments | A team of faculty members (Briana, Cindy, Morgan, Chao, and Jill) went to the San Diego Assessment Training Conference last weekend provided by Institute Evidence Based Change and Educational Testing System (ETS). The goal was learning how to integrate cultural competency into assessments, but it wasn’t covered well. The workshops didn’t seem to align with California Accreditation, they approached SLOs from a micro-perspective with things needed in a classroom, instead of in a reporting fashion using 2-5 course levels with big outcomes in the end; the training was suited for those wanting to learn how to write outcomes for a lesson. Most attendees were SLO Coordinators or Administrators, or those report back to their college.  The conference was beneficial towards having strategy conversation about assessments and developing ideas of starting workshops at LMC. Texas/Chicago College used as an example; how they improved retention and success via student engagement strategies - getting to know students as being beneficial to building connections between the faculty and the student. This is a potential strategy towards building teamwork; communication outside of lecturing classroom to better connect with students. STEM is critical area for professors to know their students and learn how to communicate with them.  Overall the conference topics were built around assessments and less on cultural competency awareness. Briana will share the handouts collected from the SD Conference workshops. One suggestion: what verbs to use and not to use when writing assessments. There was information also shared about how to avoid setting students up for failure or stereotyping, and information was provided how to conceptualize assessment theoretically via questions, which lead people to different assessment outcomes and what is the goal. When really thinking about the question and taking people through the process, it improves teaching. What’s learned from assessments will help improve teaching and help identify what students need to learn in order to pass exams. In addition, looking at how sequencing courses to PSLOs help in an effective way.  Future agenda item, talk about next steps as committee to help others develop CSLO/PSLOs or have strong focus on equity. |
| 3 | Approval of the Agenda | Change agenda order:   * Item 4 approval of minutes - move to 9   **Action**: McGrath/McCarthy; unanimous |
| 5 | TLC Midway Report | Committee discussed and reviewed the Midway report. The report was updated to include: a coversheet, contents, budget information, addendum pages; changes to the Forward, Assessment of Assessment, Concluding Remarks, Signature sections; removed goals and clarified next steps; and updated graphs. The midway report covers a 5-year period: 2012-17.  **Committee’s Feedback:**   * Page 14 - correct typo, “faculty”   **Forward - pg.3**   * No changes   **TLC Membership - pg.3**   * No changes   **Assessment Update - pg.4**   * Hyperlinks are embedded within this section   **GE SLO update - pg.4**   * Change 3 out 5 to GE assessed 4 out of 5 that was reported to ACCJC * Define the meaning of “core component GE courses vs. SLO”: GE has 5 SLOs that were written as SLOs from 5 different criteria before creating student learning outcomes; and the talk now is possibly eliminating interdisciplinary and adding Information Literacy. The GE Committee needs to vote on substituting Information Literacy for Interdisciplinary. * Substitute vocabulary “core GE” with “core characteristic”; interdisciplinary is a core characteristic of the course   **Institution-Set Standards - section removed - pg.5**   * Define institutional set standards and add the actual numbers * Correct the statement that the Deans review the standards. Program standards are part of program review and not part of assessment. Program standards are part of the comprehensive annual program review, which TLC is not responsible TLC oversee assessing of program SLOs. The program standards is review of the program data which gets confused with CSLO assessments of student work. Originally the program review process was brought to TLC for approval when it should have been the Planning Committee responsibility. * Remove this section; it’s confusing * Institution Set Standards are important in that it provides numbers of students passing classes, which is not necessarily TLC’s purview.   **Budget Section - pg. 5**   * No changes needed   **Equity - pg. 6**   * Add information about the San Diego workshop attended - Integrating Cultural Competence put on by Institute for Evidence-Based Change. * Add the word “all” -Want to raise diversity awareness in all SLOs   **Assessment of Assessment - pg. 6**   * Clarify #5 that full-time faculty members are responsible of assessing courses. When a full-time faculty member is unavailable, funding is provided for part-time faculty to complete assessments. Some specialized programs/courses are taught by adjunct only. * Write-out “PD” - Professional Development   **Concluding Remarks - pg. 8**   * Take out interdisciplinary and replace with CLSOs not assessed e.g. speaking. Or write GE committee is preparing second round assessment on GESLOs. * Change the signature names to Tue, Cindy and Briana - this is not a policy document going to Senate and SGC for approval.   **Action: Approved** (McCarthy/McGrath); unanimous |
| 6 | TLC Chair Applicant | Scott Hubbard applied for the TLC Chair position - the committee reviewed Scott’s letter of interest and position paper. After TLC vote for approval, the next step is approval by Academic Senate, followed by the President appointing the new chair to include .25 reassigned time starting Fa’16.  **Action: Approved** (Gunder/McGrath); unanimous |
| 7 | Changing days/times of the TLC | The committee discussed changing the day and time of the meetings due to member availability. The committee agreed to 2nd Wednesday 2-4pm location to be determined; L109, L105, or L106 or possibly in the Professional Learning Center.  **Action:** Approved (Ybarra/McCarthy); unanimous  Two members are cycling off; Paula (PDAC) and JoAnn (Basic Skills). New appointments are needed for; Basic Skills, CTE, GE (Cindy agreed to continue if there’s no interest), Math/Sciences, PT at large, and PDAC. Dean’s membership as meeting quorum is questionable; currently there are 15 members and quorum is half plus one. 7.5 |
| 8 | CSLO/PSLO Discussion | Briana shared that documents were updated on TLC’s website - Document and Resources tab. Documents added to the list:   * Adjunct Stipend Information * CSLO Assessment Reporting template * How to Guide CSLO Assessment * How to Guide PSLO Assessment   **Committee Feedback:**   * Send changes or feedback to Briana * Dept. Chairs are not required to upload PSLOs assessment to PRST; they are completed by the author * CSLOs are uploaded to PRST by the originator and not Dept. Chair; adjunct faculty can request access. Dept. Chairs are responsible for overseeing assessments are being uploaded. Some Chairs may want them filtered through them as reassurance they have been completed. * Some departments have multiple programs that may require completing multiple PSLOs. It’s possible to complete one set of PSLOS by choosing to complete them all. * Refer faculty to *PSLO Assessment How to Guide* to address questions or refer them to the assessment Q/A workshop to take place on 5/11 from 3-5pm. * PSLO reporting document is available on the P-Drive. Nancyand Maria wrote the original document. In the past, not all programs were assessed, they choose 1 or 2. The expectations is that all PSLOs will be assessed. * In thinking about writing PSLO assessments and what would be a helpful document that will define benchmarks, assessment findings, and action plan is unknown. The committee discussed developing a format similar to the CSLO grid with fillable boxes, worksheet, or writing a narrative report. CLSOs were intended to be a grid form and PSLOs not, but some decided to complete CSLO report in narrative format. * The recommendation is to use both - grid and narrative for PSLOs. To avoid confusion regarding the use of CSLO grid vs. PSLO narrative format, write a note that either format is acceptable. * From a visual point the distinguish differences; CSLOS use a grid for and PSLOs narrative format. A vote is needed to determine the best format. Assessment first started with PSLOs before CSLOs were created. Developing hybrid document model; a grid in a narrative where the findings would be in narrative form. List PSLOs (vertical); identify assessment instruments used (horizontal); findings in the narrative to each. * PSLO assessments were completed in one round and everybody completed at least one. * Recommend asking people to summarize their previous PLSOs assessment and talk about it. The summary is not considered a comprehensive program review instead the PSLO report that requires departments to review their most current results; which everyone has done at least one, expect multiple programs. In the past only one report was needed for multiple programs, whereas now a report is needed for each. * Briana will work on a draft and request feedback before 5/11 workshop. * Should there be a question about teaching or directing people to talk about SLOs and not teaching? This could be implied when discussing how to improve what students can and cannot do*.* It’s important to say that if any changes are needed what the plans are to improve student learning. There needs to be language how to incorporate plan if improvements are needed; in the past people felt that an improvement plan was required whether results were good or not. * In regards to PSLO assessments what advice will be given regarding what population students to be assessed? For example English major has a short existence in which 5 people are within their last semester; how is this defined as a percentage of students that have completed a certain number of courses? It depends on the program and what they are interested in learning. A conversation about assessing students at different levels of the program; who will be assessed is important and needs to be in the template. In the how to guide it’s stated that choosing the population of students to assess and what the objectives are. * Recommend providing direction to programs that have no graduates. Assuming that assessments are in place, previous results can be used; aggregated results and looking at student data in new way, then map CSLOs to PSLOs. Or use capstone course CSLO data and write a different report. It’s not required to assess every student, just a meaningful subsample. * In the past, determining what’s meaningful was the focus, now people are focused on getting it done for compliance vs. meaningful. In the future, we will move towards a newer module that encourages meaningful assessments. |
| 9 | Approval of the minutes 2/16/2016 | **Action:** None taken (tabled) |
| 10 | GE Discussion | The GE Committee is working on a new assessment. There are three pieces of GESLOs embedded into regular discipline classes that haven’t been adequately addressed; 1. Speaking, 2. creative thinking, and 3. social diversity global perspective; all though an assessment was completed during 2011-12 cycle, it was crammed into one year, check box style. The committee would like to look at this more and in a robust way.  The committee was ask to design an embed assessment that requires a box for social sciences, natural sciences, arts & humanities, and ethics studies. Within these subjects, sections will be randomly selected and the selected faculty will be notified. They will be ask to embed an assessment into their courses; a five-minute speech. Students will have to record their speech either as a talking head in front of a camera or speaking before an audience that’s taped. The college will need to provide support and a dedicated room with assistance.  A couple students that attend previous GE meetings last fall and spring are confident they can make a video that can be assessed. The idea for the speech it is applicable for all disciplines “how blank can change the world” in biology, art, and sociology. Within the instructions, it will have how to look at creative problem solving, attention to social diversity and global perspective. An early draft of the prompt and rubric is being brainstormed and edited. At the next GE meeting Greg Stoup will talk about it so that the committee can begin to make decisions.  A FLEX workshop will be provided before or after lunch to introduce the new chair Josh Bearden and begin talking about the new direction of assessment and pilot sections selected so that faculty are given time to put the information into their syllabi for next spring to have this completed by fall 17.  Over the summer a pilot performance will be conducted with intent to show students what’s we need in their 5 minute speech; having samples are more helpful. Janice T. came to a previous GE meeting and spoke on cultural competency and equity. The thoughts were create cultural audience that relevant to the speech and the speaker is able to feed off the audience; this can bring about equity into assessment. Rebecca Pain is the one who brought the mini ted talk idea that is applicable to all disciplines and develop a universal make prompt; how blank will change the world. |
| 11 | Announcements | May 3 the committee will host a celebratory meeting for Scott Hubbard as the new TLC Chair and an introduction of the members. |
| 12 | Adjournment | 3:57pm |
|  |  |  |