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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item Number** | **Topic** | **Notes** |
| 1 | Call to Order | Meeting called to order 2:10pm |
| 2 | Public Comment | None |
| 3 | Approval of Agenda | Action: Approved (M/S: McGrath/Hobbs) unanimous |
| 4 | Approval of the Minutes | **10/20 minutes**   * Natalie Hannum and Francesca Briggs were absent * Revise the public comment statement regarding the new CSU/UC math prerequisite policy   **Action**: Approved with changes (M/S: McGrath/Newman ) 8 approve/1 abstentions  **11/17 minutes**   * Grammar correction * Name correction: Milton Clarke, Francesca Briggs, and Courtney * Item 7 change wording from survey to Midway Report   **Action**: Approved with changes (M/S: Gunder/McGrath ) 6 approve/3 abstentions |
| 5 | Midway Report | The committee reviewed and discussed the midway report:   * Page 1-2 no changes required * Page 3 - it was suggested to revise the ISLO vs GESLO statement pertaining to the state is discussing; instead accreditation requires learning outcomes at the institutional level, which has been defined as GE at LMC. It was shared discussions are being made to mandate having ISLOs outside of GE. It was recommended to research the information regarding who and what the discussions are about, before documenting it in the report. * The remaining pages contain assessment survey results with a description how to address the next steps. * Page 4 - the analysis information was discussed that many students took GE courses, but a few instructors assess them and write GESLOs which is a general statement and a difficult conclusion to draw from. The analysis needs to be more specific. The idea came from the conclusion drawn from the data results, but it is unknown how many of those faculty teach GE courses. It was recommended to rewrite or remove the statement; the committee agreed to remove the statement. * Page 5 - a recommendation was made to include information that more faculty has participated in course level assessment than program level. Also, as we move into year 5 of program level assessments, it can be shared that the survey results have concluded that more professional development is needed to train people. * Without disaggregating the report, there’s not much more to extract without looking at who is actually completing the survey in order to gain more in-depth insight. * It was suggested to add a statement “one of the limitations of this survey is that it does not identify the types of courses faculty respondents taught, therefore we cannot comment on the outcomes”. * It was questioned about SLOs vs CSLOs and did classified respond to the survey. It was shared classified complete PSLOs; there a few student services departments e.g. counseling that have CSLOs.   The committee agreed to wait and reconvene Spring’16 before sending the report. |
| 6 | Announcements |  |
| 7 | Adjournment | 3:10pm |