TEACHING & LEARNING PROJECT MINUTES
FEB. 15, 2011 – 2:30-4 P.M.

Present: Tawny Beal, Mike Becker, Scott Cabral, Terence Elliott, Christina Goff, Mike Grillo, Kiran Kamath, Denise Knowles, Cindy McGrath, Gail Newman, Gil Rodriguez, Humberto Sale, Janice Townsend, Julie Von Bergen, Katalina Wethington; Margaret Hertstein, note-taker.

Guests: Ken Alexander, Richard Livingston

1. **Welcome, public comment and announcements:** none.

2. **Agenda:** approved.

3. **Minutes:** Minutes of BRIC-TLP retreat Feb. 1, 2011 approved with correction to remove paragraph on page 2 that begins with "What is a Program." Minutes from Dec. 7, 2011 approved.

4. **Constituent (ISLO) updates from members:** None for today.

5. **CSLO assessment update:** Janice will report at our next meeting.

6. **Collection, use and reporting of assessment data:** The current data can be reported three ways: CLASS, paper documents, and in Program Review. What is feasible for us economically? What do we need and want as well as what will the data be used for? If the present Word documentation in our "P" drive is working shouldn't we wait until we hear what the accreditation team is looking for before we change direction? Richard said we should not back off from our planning processes. Evidence of assessment of CSLOs and what we did with the assessment data is what is important. Main discussion points:

■ What do the committee and management think of placing assessment into the Program Review document? The faculty is familiar with the Program Review processes and documents. The language could be written to fit the assessment needs, asking the right questions.
■ Gil indicated this could work, and the current template could be developed. Departments could keep their data and do direct reporting in Program Review.
■ Faculty would like to have the process of assessment flexible, with models available and criteria of what assessment should be. Previous experience has showed there are many ways to assess. Many departments have a process in place that has worked and would like to continue on a departmental level with those practices as long as it is acceptable for reporting results and planning.
■ The idea of keeping assessment in the Program Review is a good idea. The five-year report out would work. Assessment can show we are fine based on results or if we need improvement and where. Are we missing anything? Would there be a need for future data?
■ The data would be kept in the departments, and four years of course assessment data can inform program assessment in the fifth year and be rolled into the Major Program Review report the following year.
■ IT can design Program Review electronic reports with links, categorized by years for the departmental data.

■ Departments without degrees or certificates could use the fifth year as a catch up, show trends, report on why course assessment results happened the way it did. This does not have to be quantitative.
■ CTE and part-time faculty will need a model.
■ Flexibility of method is okay but be clear with wording. This is not an optional process. Improvement is what we are looking for. Some CSLOs will need improvement over time, report why and what the improvement plan is. Professional Development training with department chairs will be necessary.
■ Train the department chairs for facilitation and reporting. They can coach their own faculty. Some departments do not meet on a regular basis. Determine a list of acceptable methods and techniques with specific examples. The department chair will keep track of their courses and be sure it is happening.
■ More CTE faculty need to be part of TLP.
■ We must assist the department chairs to make this plan work.
■ TLP will assist the program review committee in writing the questions necessary for the assessment process. A draft of assessment questions will be brought to the TLP meetings for review and revision.

Note: In consideration of the timeline, remember that COORs need to be revised every five years. If we start in FA12 we could be out of compliance if the COORs are not updated.

7. **Revisiting TLP Leadership:** We need to take another look at the revision we worked up last fall in light of probable changes to the structure and college load issues.

■ In the handout the "faculty researcher" could be eliminated. The TLP committee as a whole could facilitate the work of this position.
■ Instead of load for coaching, a stipend paid on a time card would be better, depending on how many hours of work. This could be revisited in the future. Be sure to start with what needs to be done. How many hours will it take? Then decide how to do it to determine payment.
■ The "assessment coach" eventually would be taken over by department chairs once they have learned the plan.
■ Degree and Certificate assessment, ISLOs, college-wide would occur within the "GE Chair" leadership.
■ We do not want to downsize these responsibilities and jeopardize accreditation.
■ Have a category on this responsibility form for "department chairs."

Other thoughts:

■ Coaching workshops, CTE faculty need GE training.
■ "Assessment Monday" for a college-wide training, instead of only GE seminars.
■ Reach a broader group with PDAC training.

8. **Definition of "closing the loop":** tabled. Research some ideas and bring these to the next meeting for discussion

9. **New assessment calendar:** Cindy handed out the latest draft of the timeline idea.
■ Interdisciplinary boxes – a suggestion was made to move the professional development box to bottom group.
■ Departmental level – a suggestion was made to have assessment Mondays box under TLP or professional development.
Cindy asked TLP members to mark up this draft, and send ideas and thoughts to her and/or Scott for placement on the flow chart.

10. **Assessment survey:** Cindy passed out a draft of the survey. Take a look, please provide feedback as soon as possible so she can finalize the survey and send it out for a final review.

Meeting adjourned about 4:10 p.m. Next meeting: March 1.