**Present**: Tue Rust, **Chair**; Louie Giambattista; Paula Gunder; Kiran Kamath; Cindy McGrath; A’kilah Moore; Alex Sterling; Natalie Hannum;

Shondra West (note taker)

**Absent**: Christina Goff; Anthony Hailey; Gail Newman; Sara Toruno-Conley; Nancy Ybarra

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Notes** | **Outcomes** |
| **Call to Order** | 2:36pm |  |
| **Approval of the Minutes** | A draft copy of the minutes will be Bcc’d to the committee for preliminary review and will be discussed at the next meeting. Once the committee meets; review and approve the minutes they will be posted on the TLC webpage. | Approved (M/S; Gunder/Giambattista); Unanimous |
| **Approval of the Agenda** | Approved (M/S; Gunder/Giambattista); Unanimous |
| **Public Comment** | None |
| **Focusing Activity** | 1. The committee participated with breathing and counting exercise.
 |
| **Welcome New Membership** | 1. Student Erika attended the meeting and may consider being the student representative after speaking with Demetria for approval.
2. Development Education, ESL, Student Services, Faculty Lead, and PT Faculty at Large continue to be vacant.
3. A recommendation was made to revise the membership list; Planning should be changed to Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO).
 |
| **Preparing for the Accreditation Site Visit** | 1. Kiran thanked those that attended the accreditation assembly on 9.15.14. The turnout was great and people gave positive feedback.
2. The accreditation visit is scheduled for Oct. 6-9 and the team will meet with the TLC committee; the date/time is unknown. It was requested that the committee read standard 2A, 2B, and 1; with standard 2A being the most critical. In addition, the committee was asked to think about institutional changes as a result of assessments/program review module and be prepared to discuss and provide evidence to back up the discussion.
3. As a reminder, departments should continue with uploading their assessment reports to the Program Review submission tool (PRST). The PRST is available 24 hours/7 days a week for submission. The team will be provided a password to PRST so they can start reading the reports. It will be up to this committee to share that the assessment submissions hold true.
4. The committee should be familiar with the assessment module process and changes made via assessments. The module is integrated with curriculum, assessment, professional development, reporting, and resource allocation. The process is important, but providing examples how it all works is substantial to give a broad prospective.
	1. It was commented that changes made via assessment leading to COOR revisions are not necessarily based on data, but driven from dialogue. It’s the data that sparks dialogue, therefore changing the end results what action(s) should be taken to change the COOR.
	2. Changes made based on the dialogue should be documented to illustrate what actions were taken to reach the final outcome. The documentation should be uploaded as it will become evidence to show what steps were taken to revise COORs. The data is quantitative and qualitative.
	3. There’s a pyridine shift in which the absence of quantitative data tells the story, it’s really the qualitative (dialogue) that brings about change.
5. With GE assessments the loop is not closed. The GE committee discussed implementation of procedures driven from the review of GE assessments in the Sp’14. The evidence of completion results will not be available before the accreditation visit.
	1. The committee was reminded that the accreditation visit is to validate what’s written in the report. The GE minutes will support former and current procedures and what plan was put in place as the results.
6. For accreditation to become familiar with the accreditation 10 year CSLO assessment report and become proficient in the nine categories of the rubric. The information can be located on the webpage: [<Planning>Accreditation>Accreditation Archives>,](http://www.losmedanos.edu/intra-out/accred/selfstudy.asp); located to the right select: <Accreditation Report>Status Report on SLOs (Oct. 2012)>.
 |
| **Institution Set Standards** | 1. Documents were handed out for additional reading: ***Institutional-Set Standards for Satisfactory Performance of Student Success*** and ***Institution-Set Standards for Student Achievement in the Program.***
2. The committee was asked to read, review, and approve the ***Program-Set Standards for Student Achievement***form. The purpose of the form is for departments to certify that the 2013-14 program review process leads to established student achievement standards for their programs for the 2014-15 year.

The committee recommended making changes to the document to simplify the process for faculty. * 1. The form should not create an additional process along with the PRST thus creating more work.
	2. Without the trend dynamics report, using the form to request adjustments to institutional set standards cannot be made. Instead standards can be reviewed every year, and the form should be used for departments to verify they have reviewed them; and after which describe what measures will be taken to for the following year.
	3. Basic Skills committee discussed when standards should be changed; therefore the form should be used to track the completion progress and space to write out goals for next year.
	4. This form was original created as a one-time check not to be used annually.

***Approval of the Program-Set Standards for Student Achievement form*****Motion**: to approve the original design/verbiage of the form (Tue)**Discussion**: Section 2 problematic language should be replaced with check boxes: * Were standards from last year reviewed (yes/no)
* Were goals set for this year based on last year standards (yes/no)

**Amended Motion**: section 2 - change and replace with check boxes. (Tue)**Discussion:** Revise the second paragraph in correlation with the changes made for section two. The second paragraph instructions do not coincide with the suggested changes for section 2.**Amended Motion**: change paragraph in section 1 and all but delete section 2; and replace section 2 with a tool that ask departments how are they doing in relationship with institutional set standards. (Tue)**Discussion:** Create a document with check boxes and allow for written notes. The notes should include current and future requirements leading to standard changes for the following year. **Amended Motion:** remove the language - paragraph two and section two; modify section two and replace with check-boxes; and add space for written comments describing what actions were currently taken and future actions to be considered. (Motioned/Seconded; Tue/Alex) 4 - Yes (Louie, A’kilah, Alex, and Tue); 3 - abstention (Cindy, Natalie, and Paula) |
| **CSLO Coordinator Position** | The committee was asked to share their thoughts regarding having an adjutant hold the CSLO Coordinator position which is a paid position (non-instructional rate). It was recommended to look at the charges to verify the current practice. |
| **ISLO Discussion** | Tabled |
| **Assessment** | Tabled |
| **Announcements** | None |
| **Adjournment** | 4:03pm |