|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Members Present: | Tue Rust, **Chair**; Nina Ghiselli, Louie Giambattista, Paula Gunder, JoAnn Hobbs, Natalie Hannum, Morgan Lynn, Briana McCarthy, Cindy McGrath; Gail Newman, Richard Stanfield (Student Rep); and Shondra West (Note Taker) |
| Absent: | Jeanne Bonner, Courtney Diputado, A’kilah Moore, and Nancy Ybarra, |
| Guest: | Pam Perfumo |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Current Items** | | |
| **Item Number** | **Topic** | **Notes** |
| 1 | Call to Order | Meeting called to order 2:08pm |
| 2 | Announcements  Public Comment | Committee members introduced themselves by name and department. Add Morgan Lynn as the Department Chair representative for Liberal Arts. Pam Perfumo visiting member from Child Development Department, is considering the position for CTE representative. Remove Jeanne Bonner as the Math and Sciences representative. Nina’s teaching assignment conflicts with TLC’s schedule and a substitute representative from Student Services is needed for spring (only). Richard shared he serves as the Student Life representative, but his teaching interest is the primary reason for selecting this committee.  No Public comments |
| 3 | Approval of Agenda | **Action**: Approved (M/S: Hobbs/Newman); unanimous |
| 4 | Approval of the Minutes from 12/8/15 | **Action**: Approved with changes (M/S: McGrath/McCarthy); 8 yes; 3 abstain: Lynn, Giambattista, and Hannum  Amend the meeting time from 2-4pm to 2-3pm |
| 5 | PSLO Planning | Going into the 5th year of the assessment cycle and to help departments with the process; FLEX and conference activities are available. Briana shared the plans for PSLOs assessments during year five (2016-17) via a PowerPoint presentation. Briana asked the committee to think about strategies as they go through the plan, provided that three questions will be asked regarding support for professional development needs at the end of the presentation.  The professional development for Spring’16 FLEX is based on supporting faculty and staff with assessing CSLOs and PSLOs while taking an equity approach towards assessment. During January’s FLEX workshop, it covered assessment tasks and strategies from an equity lens. Guest speaker Avei Ben-Zeev from San Francisco State presented on stereotype threat and talked about fix and growth mindset.  To follow-up with a part-two session, Brianna offered a workshop regarding best practices towards making assessment available for all learners while exploring task of lowering the learning barriers through an “gogo” assessment activity.  Biology assessment examples were used to include a diversity of tasks given to students in order to assess learning outcomes and how to contextually apply them. Also, time was given for attendees to develop ideas for new tasks to be implemented during the spring.  Looking at the qualitative feedback (comments) from the flex survey 10 people responded; 7 people found Avi’s presentation valuable, 4 shared to bring Avi back, 4 asked for in-depth more exploration into specific stereotype, 3 found the biology assessment task examples helpful, 1 requested how to score student data for CSLO/PSLO or reporting purposes, 2 requested information on concrete strategies how to address stereotype threat, and 1 person asked for more interdisciplinary assessment task examples beyond biology. The overall feedback was positive with majority 4 and 5 scores; with 5 being the highest scale. The general feedback was wanting to learn more about stereotype threat and how.  Later during the spring semester another workshop around April/May will be held to share out new assessments tools or frames that have been tried, or how to incorporate stereotype threat leading towards mapping assessment task to CSLOs/PSLOs. The remaining execution of the plan will happen during Fall’16 focusing on how to give assessments, score, and analyze the data. During spring’17 will be how close the loop by taking data collected to form CSL/PSLO to apply COOR revisions.  The PSLO ideas shared during the January workshops was for people wanting to learn more about PSLO assessments; create capstone projects, develop exit surveys, have students complete portfolios, analyze CSLO data to map to PSLOs, and analyze program data (how many students passed industry exams, obtained degrees or gained employment).  The committee worked in pairs to address the three questions:   1. What CSLO/PSLO support is needed? 2. What interest might you have in co-facilitating a support session? 3. What PSLO assessment ideas do your departments have?   *- Group Discussion -*  Committee results from question 1: **What CSLO/PSLO support is needed at this point in the assessment cycle?**   * To create a mindset towards completing PLSO assessments: send monthly emails pertaining events or speak at department chair meetings about completing the work now to avoid the stress later. * Use exit surveys as a valuable tool and as a way to keep in touch with transfer students about their experience at LMC; for example, did students have access to prerequisite needed for transfer. This should be completed before students leave using social media platforms (LinkedIn, Facebook, etc.) * One challenge is staying in touch with students completing (CTE) programs that try to reach certain areas when the enrollment numbers dwindle and classes are cancelled impacts their ability to graduate. Once students’ move on it’s difficult to recapture them unless we start looking at those course that fall out of sequence or disciplines that have enrollment less than 20, consider letting the class run for graduation purposes while using those classes for comprehensive feedback via a capstone exam, not scored. * Create a trigger for students petitioning for graduation to complete exit survey. The issue is whether it becomes program specific or along the lines of teaching pedagogy? * Give an assessment to all students about what courses have been taken to look at the scores of those who took one or more courses to compare improvements. Or develop a comparison study regarding the number of courses that moved the PSLO barometer towards program learning outcomes. The challenge will be aggregating the data and teaching people what to do with it. Tue is willing work on this and bring people in. * Try not to complicate the process and develop five core questions that people will answer. Avoid a survey that’s too long, while understanding the possibility of a low response rate. Suggestions: create survey monkey or have classes use a computer lab. * Some programs have many different entry and exit points e.g. like business where students can take one or two classes to obtain a license/certificate. With these different entry/exit points what will be measured; did the program meet the needs and at what point? * It was questioned if an alumni office exists? The answer was no; the honors program is currently working on ways to connect with completers. Having someone oversee alumnus would be easier to track. Having access to students’ emails would be a good method to send surveys and add a gift card or drawing incentive. Suggestion: offer First Friday Free Pizza for students to complete surveys before they leave college. * Consider funding departments for adjunct to help with CSLO/PSLOs. The ESL department is fortunate to receive funding and have access to people that have CSLO/PSLO knowledge to address the current curriculum changes; however, support is needed for other departments wanting help with understanding how to map PSLOs and CSLOs to determine the needs and how to use assessment. It’s important for departments to review their PSLOs to determine if they continue to meet the needs of the department and how to use CSLO assessment to reach PSLO outcomes. It’s possible to use equity funding to encourage part-time instructors as an equity issue. * From a global view, use the opportunity to think about GE becoming the intuitional GESLOs and changing them to ISLOs as a holistic view to support other programs; CTE, basic skills, etc. * Coaching people to develop research questions to determine the success rates; who, why, and where. Instead of assuming that departments want the same outcomes, they may be different for each department. Lots of data is available to determine success rates, but doesn’t really get to the why. * There’s some confusion about the difference between program assessments vs. program student learning outcomes. So when discussing PSLO vs program assessments, they are different which resides within the program review process. As an indirect measure program assessment is the number of students exiting the program vs. direct measure PSLOs look at the work completed. * It was questioned whether the information shared earlier is invalid depending on the PSLO outcomes. Determining the number course completed in a program vs. measuring the learning is that the evaluation (assessment) is the work that that was completed, not the number of students who completed the work.   Briana thanked the committee for sharing their ideas and asked to find out what are the department’s needs. The feedback can be shared at the next meeting. The PSLO assessment is due 2016-17 (year 5) and comprehensive report due the following year (year 1). As TLC committee will continue to look at how everything map to the college outcomes and determine what are students leaving with as they exit the program. The data received empowers the college to make changes. |
| 6 | Midway Report | The committee agreed to review the midway report at the next meeting; March 15. The final report (separate report from midway) is due next year and it may be best to morph the midway report into the final. As a committee it was asked to either approve the midway report and send the information out in March or hold off until the final report is due.  The committee discussed changes that occurred during the last meeting as noted in the 12/8 minutes.  Additional information was discussed:   * Paragraph on population: how many students in 2014 attended LMC a year or more to be distinguished among first time students. * The graphics doesn’t disaggregate the data what position was held if they ever did assessments. * The survey respondents should show the number of FT and PT faculty that have completed assessments. * Remove information pertaining to next steps. * Pg. 8 the trends are strong on the number people responded and made changes; however its unknown the method used to make those changes.   + Not required for this report. Haven’t made it to the point of assessing the instrument results. The survey is determine if the assessment process is working according to the assessment five year module. Determining the success of those changes (good/bad) will not appear until the next assessment cycle; which is to assess if the changes made an impact as a narrative.   + The previous module was cumbersome compared to the new module developed by Cindy. Further assessment surveys will be finding out the details. The midway report is required by Senate to determine the effectiveness of the module. * Pg.10 - Leadership interest outcome was noted, but people are not applying for the position.   + A reason for this, most respondents are most likely PT. It is best to disaggregate the data to determine who answered the questions in comparison to FT vs. PT. * Equity information was added to the report. * Committee decided to wait until the final report is brought to the next meeting (March) before approving. * Question: the six goals listed at the end of the report, was the findings included in the midway report? It was shared goals 1-2 are covered by assessment; goals 3-4 requires additional information from other people/area which an addendum will be added upon the completion of the task. Goal 5 and 6 are not covered. The goal completion status will be shared in the final report. The goals are meant to be future goals; what was found. * As suggested, list the goals checkpoint status as either ongoing or completed, so at a glance people can refer to the its progress. Suggestion: at the beginning of the report add a leading paragraph e.g. executive summary of the assessment goals. * The ultimate goals of this report is reporting out the results. Change the statement to “the results of this study leads to the following goals”, or “after doing this study these are the goals”. Also, add equity goals as it doesn’t exists. Equity is a prominent theme throughout the report, but adding a 6 goal is possible to develop more meaning of equity mindset. |
|  | TLC Chair and GE Coordinator | No one has applied for the TLC Chair position. Tue’s two year term ends at the end of spring and he is not available to fill the vacancy for another year due to other Department Chair obligation. The person filling the position will gain experience with assessment, doesn’t have to be 10-year and will join a team with knowledgeable members. One challenge of filling vacancy position is that people are active on too many committees. At this time there is no shadow opportunities and this could make it difficult to fill the vacancy of the predecessor. |
| 8 | GE Discussion | Joshua Briden history faculty submitted an application for GE/SLO Coordinator. Josh is a first year history faculty member, with experience from his previous college working with assessment. Josh’s classes are all GE and he is active member on campus. The Academic Senate will review the recommendation and forward the request for President’s approval as a reassigned time position.  **Approved**: (M/S: McGrath/Gunder); unanimous |
| 9 | Announcements | * GE - working on a new assessment to follow-up on Alex Sterling’s work from year ago; evaluate worldview, creative thinking, and speaking. The idea is to have a course from each GE box in which students complete 5-6 minute mini Ted Talk, how blank discipline can save the world. The measurement will be on their speaking ability and creativity. There are 5 SLOs to evaluate and the goal is to complete the one’s not done. A survey will be sent to all faculty/Chairs who teach GE courses. * Student equity plan and professional learning working with sending a team to a conference on April 14/15: Integrating Cultural Competence into SLOs and Assessment. So far six people will be attending and open to more attendees. As a new member, Josh will be asked to go. This is an opportunity to gain knowledge, tools, strategies, and information to report out on assessment. * February 29th is a mandatory meeting 3-5pm on Spotlight on Success; speaker Dr. Veronica Neal, Social Justice Organization diversity specialist to provide a presentation. |
| 10 | Adjournment | 3:59pm |