**Present:** *Tue Rust*, **Chair**; John Alper, Courtney Diputado, Paula Gunder, Kiran Kamath, Cindy McGrath, Gail Newman, Sophia Ramirez, Sara Toruno-Conley, Nancy Ybarra, Shondra West (note taker)

**Absent**: Francesca Briggs, Louie Giambattista, Natalie Hannum, and A’kilah Moore

**Guest**: Derrick, POLSC Student

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item number** | **Topic** | **Notes** |
| 1 | The Beginning - Call to Order | Meeting called to order 2:11 pm |
| 2 | The People - Public Comment | None |
| 3 | Honoring the Past - Approval of the Minutes | **Action**: Approved - Gunder/Newman; one abstention Kamath |
| 4 | Honoring the Process - Approval of the Agenda | **Action:** Approved with addition - Ramirez/Gunder; unanimous  Add membership discussion item 10.5 |
| 5 | Looking Out: SLO Assessment Dashboard | Next year the committee will decide how to develop an assessment dashboard. An example of Foothill college’s SLO Assessment dashboard was shared with the committee illustrating how they use assessment completion results for it. The idea for LMC is to use a similar format via an annual newsletter showing assessment completion with quantitative and qualitative data summaries; starting Fa’15. It was shared Foothill college’s SLO website is a great resource tool to access. They have designed their website to include different SLOs categories and information explaining the process from both an administrator vs. student’s prospective.  For LMC a lot of assessment summary work has been completed by Cindy accessible via the Office of Instruction (OI). If a dashboard is planned for LMC, a more recent deadline date needs to be determined besides February when assessment results are to be submitted. With the current February deadline the data is not officially available until the following year for assessments conducted during summer or fall. Creating the assessment report is the part that takes time to discuss outcomes. Therefore, assessments completed in the summer, the written report would be available fall; and fall report available in the spring based on the assessment cycle. The purpose of having a February due date is so people can remember the date along with other items due; program review close mid-February and open around FLEX and RAP closes end of February. It was suggested for the committee to look all the dates and sync them together.  It was shared quantitative data is labor intensive which is useful for the dashboard; overall qualitative data is needed to write how assessments have improved student learning. The GE Chair will write a qualitative report with the help from Cindy and Briana to provide the CSLOs/PSLOs aspect. The assessment summary report is a nice project for Briana. Hopefully retrieving the information in PRST will make this project easier to complete. Cindy noted the final information is available on the “P-Drive” in a Excel spreadsheet that have courses listed by cohort numbers and when they are to be assessed.  Moving forward with the use of CurricuNET, it might be possible for CurricuNET to house CSLOs and PSLOs. It was recommended to add the assessment piece when CurricuNET becomes available to the college.  Tue requested for the committee to provide feedback about creating a LMC dashboard and how should the format be. |
| 6 | Looking Out: Standard II A | Institutional standards document (pg. 1-7) was reviewed by the committee in correlation with assessment. SLOs are mentioned in different parts of each standards. When thinking about the assessment cycle, it begins with creating a course, forming a loop with assessments, and closing the loop with assessment outcomes. After assessments are completed the next steps include dialogue about the assessment results, making improvements, reviewing and revising the course outline record, integrating SLOs objectives to the program review process, and posting to PRST. Closing the loop requires checking if improvements have been made.  It was shared when looking over the standards, the accreditation steering committee would like to place ownership of each standard to the different areas;   * Standard I to Planning Committee * Standard II to Office of Instruction, TLC, and Curriculum * Standard IIB to Kevin, Gail and Student Services * Standard IIC to library * Standard III to Business Office, Ronke * Standard IV President’s Office, Bob and SGC.   TLC will offer support to areas that have student learning outcomes in their standards.  The standard document should be added to the TLC resource binder for future reference. Five new binders are needed for new members.  Kiran will be attending a workshop hosted by ACCJC to learn more about new standards being adopted or minor changes to existing standards and will follow-up with the committee. |
| 7 | Looking Around: GE Coordinator, TLC Chair | The leadership positions (GE and TLC Chair) are two years. Ideally three years would be better; year one to figure things out, year two can be spent on doing the work, and year three training the new person. Also, having a three year term would reduce frequent recruiting efforts. The GE Chair position is vacant, Alex was filling the position temporary. Recently the recruitment of GE Chair position was sent; no replies. It was recommended for the committee to share names of possible candidates from GE areas (except Nursing).  There is one possible candidate that has good leadership qualities and can move things forward; Tue will be meeting with the person. Other possible candidates are people who have been on the committee and not Chaired:   * FT: Dave Zimny, Shalini Lugani, Liana Padilla-Wilson, and Sharon Wellbrook * Adjunct: Shiela Rdolfo, Francesca Briggs, and Rebecca Payne   It was suggested to create a rotation list based on longevity and use the list to determine who has served as GE Chair in order to recruit the next person. The rotation list would be GE instructors only. TLC Chair should be a past or current committee member. The Chair would be responsible for developing projects related to assessments. The chair position requires helping people understand what’s happening outside the classroom.  It was suggested to request recommendations from former GE Chairs as someone who knows what’s required. It would be beneficial for Nancy to recruit someone as well; as a former instructor, influential TCL member, and now TLC manger representative.  Creating a list may pose as a union issue when assigning people as chair without their official acceptance. There are others ways to persuade people to take on the position, but not via a list. The person willing to become chair must be committed and willing to serve. As an institution, recruiting participants to serve on various committees is a campus problem, and it may be helpful to request that the union support committees on this.  It was recommended to look at recruiting before summer and it should be the responsibility of the collective group; committee members and GE Chair should help find someone. One possibility is creating two seats so people can feel comfortable and not alone. The person would receive reassigned time. Another possibility is developing a shadow program for someone who’s interested in the future.  As a long-term solution, it was shared during NEXUS, new FT faculty are informed about their contributions to serve on committees and ask who they would like to mentor. Mentors can help encourage new faculty to broaden their committee awareness by participating. It was recommended that new hires should be allowed a semester off before sitting on committees. |
| 8 | Looking Around: Assessment Survey | 43 people responded to the survey; 11 adjunct, 21 full-time, 9 classified and 2 managers. Reminder emails were sent to Department Chairs, Academic Senate, and the President Bob for managers. It was requested of the members to remind at least 20 people. It was recommended to send a reminder email every week, send snail mail memo with candy treats, and communicate with people in various areas and departments.  So far the responses received are diverse, but more responses are needed to help determine if the assessment process require changes. It was suggested to make an announcement at the Department Chair meeting. The deadline to submit is May 20th.  Students are not required to take the survey, the questions are geared towards teaching improvements. In order to survey students, a newer version is required to include questions related how assessments affect students and their familiarity with SLOs and learning outcomes. It was shared measuring students’ knowledge around student outcomes is required by accreditation and it was recommended to embed SLOs questions into the student satisfaction survey. |
| 9 | Looking In: CSLO and PSLO Templates | This item is meant to motivate closing the loop and professional development. A RAP proposal was submitted to apply for funding for professional development opportunities; e.g. conferences, speakers, etc.  For the following academic year (16-17) PSLOs will be assessed, so the discussion about the process should start early. The committee was asked to share ideas about the existing CSLOs assessment form. The form is not mandatory, but departments find it useful. The form requires assessing three CSLO, conduct follow-up meetings, determine proficiency ratings (high/meets/below), and establish improvements. Classes that have been assessed the data is available via PRST – [www.losmedanos.edu](http://www.losmedanos.edu) by clicking on:   * faculty /staff tab * program review * open the program review submission tool * enter username and password   The committee was asked when looking at the provided CLSO documents what are the improvement trends. It was shared the trends are thoughtful, insightful, good observation, and have great outcomes. The question is how will TLC help those struggling with developing good improvement outcomes like the ones submitted?  The suggestions is develop funding strategies for departments to improve their course. Looking at DVC websites, they have developed professional development (PD) techniques e.g.; brown bag lunches which is low cost approach for others to share. Moving forward, look at written assessments reports submitted via PRST to develop common themes for PD needs. It was shared typically people do not write their PD needs in the report; the reports are used to start a dialogue regarding compliance or developing the next step. It was recommended to add an objectives area to PRST for people to identify what are their PD needs, instead of using the report to determine it, because two different people completes the report: faculty create the report and Department Chairs upload it to PRST. It was suggested to add the PD identifiers to the report.  It was suggested to change the proficiency area as met vs. not meeting proficiency; it was agreed to keep the existing format which aligns to the COOR A/C level format. It was suggested to inform people that different assessment formats are allowed other than the existing template for those that would like to provide extensive narrative summary in linear format. It was noted in agreement to develop a different format due to important questions being overlooked e.g. “what did we learn from the assessment?” in the learning column. It was suggested not to include more than one question in a column or add wording to answer both questions in bold. It was shared that different versions will be developed for CSLOs and PSLOs.  The committee discussed “What is a Program?” defined by Title 5 which as an organized sequence of courses in conjunction with PSLOs requirements. Some courses do not require PSLOs e.g.; basic skills, developmental courses, certain Math/English that are strictly transfer courses, and ACS courses.  PSLOs assessments are required for GE English/Math that are not sequence courses for a program, but leads toward an objective. In regards to requiring PSLOs for English 100 which does not fit into a major and is not a developmental education course, however it is a transfer level course there’s a question about what to do. It was suggested to change the name from “Developmental English” to “Composition in Reading Sequence” which will become part of program sequence requiring PSLOs.  It was questioned are learning communities like UMOJA required to complete assessments? Umoja has PLSOs for meeting other requirements as a unit, e.g. unit program review. For program review purposes the learning communities developed assessments, even though they do not have their own courses, the courses being used will be assessed within the departments being housed, e.g. English. It was questioned should both areas English and learning communities assess the course? It was shared it’s not part of the current practice and could be incorporated in the future. Currently learning communities are not required to assess courses due to ownership of courses being used are not unique to them.  It was recommended if areas (Student Services) are required to complete program reviews, they should complete assessments. The existing model is inclusive of programs that are required by accreditation to have assessments; learning communities and Student Services are not inclusive, but they can if it helps the unit. It was determined if a unit completes a program review, they should be required to complete assessments to determine program effectiveness for funding resources.  It was shared effectiveness evaluation is a process outside of assessments and not part of TLC charges. It was recommended to distinguish whether evaluating a program vs. requiring PSLOs for program units are the same or different? It was determined they are different. The distinction with evaluating program via the program review process is different when programs have PSLOs and do not offer classes e.g. Student Services, Library Services, learning communities; such that the program effectiveness is not being evaluated, instead what students are learning upon completing the student service process. To contend, learning communities offer things students learn that are not driven at the course level and are not program effectiveness, but things you want students to achieve from learning communities as an outcome. If learning communities are not required by accreditation to be assessed they should be given a choice to create PSLOs and assessments, unless it’s an institutional process.  It was shared a determination is needed about learning communities being a part of the assessment process; whereas at other colleges learning communities are embedded in the evaluation process to receive college resources. Tue will research and follow-up with committee at a later time.  The TLC Project Assessment Report form created by Nancy and Myra was shared and discussed. Tue shared, starting next year he would like the committee to think about developing a process for PSLOs. As a suggestion he would like if the committee could look over the CLOs objectives over the past four years. When assessing PSLOs, the data is reviewed for multiple courses. When developing PSLO research, questions and answers are directed towards CSLOs. |
| 10 | Developing: Closing the Loop Retreat |  |
| 10.5 | Membership | The number of mandatory members are 19. The premise is to represent a diverse group; departments, Deans, Distance Ed, FT faculty, adjunct, Planning Committee, and students. As one suggestion, reduce the Dean membership under five. It was shared in order to change the membership it requires changing the position paper.  It was recommendation to look at the current institution structural changes over the years, because at the time when the membership was created it was important to include different people in the assessment process and it may not be needed. It was shared Deans are important members, they offer department chair support towards the buy-in on the assessment process and implementing TLC initiatives. |
| 11 | Sharing: GE, CC, Other | No announcements |
| 12 | Celebrating: Activity |  |
| 13 | Closing |  |
|  | Meeting Adjourned | 5:01 pm |