Present: Eva Bagg, Sigrid Sexton, Don Berz, Phyllis Arias, Byron Brelan, Lou Anne Bynum, Hurtie Chukwudire, Cathy Crane, Rose DeGaudio, John Downey, Ann-Marie Gabel, Shauna Hagemann, Peter Knapp, Lynn Misajon, David Morse, Maria Narvaez, Kevin Ryan, Lynn Shaw, DeWayne Sheaffer, Janice Tomson, Joan Zuckerman

Absent/Excused: Robin DeVitt, Bobbi Villalobos

Guest: Kim Anderson

1. The CPC co-chairs welcomed everyone back and attendees introduced themselves.

2. Update from Program Plan/ Program Review Implementation Team

   D. Morse and E. Bagg, co-chairs of the Program Plan/ Program Review Implementation Team, reported that departments have begun entering their information into TracDat. The next step is to form the Inter-level workgroups. An email has already been sent out to Department Heads & Deans to get members on these workgroups. On Sept. 17, the Program Review Subcommittee will have a training session on the validation process and how to review the program plans. The membership of the Program Review Subcommittee will go back to its original composition (as stated in its charge), which is considerably larger than it has been in the last few years.

   The oversight of the program plan/ program review process for the first year is included in the charge of the Implementation Team, but ultimately, CPC will oversee the process.

   A question was raised about adjunct faculty working on program plans and compensation for them. More discussion is needed on this topic and it has not yet been resolved.

   M. Narvaez gave an update on TracDat training. To date, there are 63 department plans expected. 23 training sessions (from Aug. 20 – Sept. 18) have been scheduled. So far, 25 departments have already completed training and 38 people have attended the sessions. M. Narvaez will continue to remind those departments who have not signed up for a training session to do so.

   At the end of the last semester, the CPC approved the charge and composition of the inter-level groups. However, the composition of the PCC Inter-level group had not yet been determined. The PCC inter-level group will review any goals that are specifically for PCC (this info can be captured in TracDat). The co-chairs met w/ the AVP of PCC over the summer to draft the composition, and they now asked CPC to approve the composition. Additional members were added to the group bringing the total number of representatives to 13.
3. Accreditation Report

On Aug. 25th, E. Bagg gave a presentation to the Board of Trustees to update them on the accreditation follow-up report that is due to ACCJ on Oct. 15. She presented highlights of the report to CPC to solicit feedback from them.

The follow-up report addresses the recommendations that LBCC received from ACCJC. The format of the report is somewhat prescribed, and an Academic Council tribe (workgroup) and the Process Oversight Group (POG) decided on the format after they had looked at different samples.

One of the report requirements is a description of the process the college took to review and approve the report. The draft will go to the Board of Trustees on Sept. 16 to be approved at the Sept. 22nd meeting. The report has already been sent to D. Morse, K. Anderson (SLO Coordinator) and S. Sexton since they have been the most involved in the process. It will also be sent to the Academic Senate, Academic Council, President’s Leadership Council and the CPC before the 16th.

Two of the four recommendations that the college must address by Oct. 15th have already been resolved (adding a statement of academic freedom and clarifying the acceptance of transfer credit in the catalog; developing a college-wide code of ethics).

Regarding the recommendation on SLOs, there has been a tremendous increase in communication and support for SLOs for faculty. To date, about 60% of all courses have SLOs. Over the summer, the Academic Council approved the definition of a program, and using the Curriculum Guide, the number of programs requiring SLO assessments have gone from 250 to 130. Approximately 5% have program-level outcomes. Some work had been done at the program-level before and programs are encouraged to build on any of their previous work.

A subgroup of the ADGE (Associate Degree/ General Education) sub-committee will work on outcomes at the degree-level. The ASLO Committee has done work on translating some of the Core Competencies into GE outcomes. The ASLO Committee will consolidate and align these GE outcomes with those that ADGE develops. There are currently three Institutional Learning Outcomes: Diversity, Personal Development, and Critical Thinking.

Nearly 100 courses have assessment plans. There needs to be additional support provided. A change to increase the ASLO membership is pending in the Curriculum Committee. In the meantime, a task force has been formed by the ASLO to address this issue.

SUOs and SLOs for Student Services & Administrative Units are considered program-level outcomes. By October 1st, all Student Services and Administrative Units will have outcomes and assessment plans developed.

E. Bagg will also include the critical thinking assessment tool developed last year and the rubric for assessing interpersonal skills as part of the evidence for the report.

There was a long discussion regarding including SLOs on the course syllabi. Faculty are encouraged to put their SLOs on their syllabi, but the CCA contract does not specifically state this as a requirement. The contract states: “The syllabus must align to the content of the course that is in the course outline and contain grading standards for the class, a description of the means by which the course is to be taught (lecture, laboratory, outside assignments, etc.), attendance requirements, and office location and office hours.” It was suggested that perhaps an explicit statement is needed and D. Sheaffer, CCA president, was asked if he could send out an email to faculty reminding them of this language. D. Sheaffer will take these suggestions back to the CCA Executive Board for discussion.

The Academic Senate has sent a letter supporting adding SLOs on the course syllabi and has sent this letter to the Curriculum Committee. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) might be developed.
Some members were wondering if the administration is willing to negotiate this point. R. DelGaudio responded that there is interest on both sides to discuss this matter and there is similar movement on the administration side.

The recommendation regarding using SLOs in faculty evaluations also generated a lengthy discussion. Student evaluations of faculty and courses are already taking place. The concern is that any assessment will be used for merit pay or used against faculty. SLOs can be a valuable self-evaluation tool, but how will assessment results be perceived? There are statewide concerns about using SLOs in evaluation. The CCA statewide sentiment is "don’t change the contract" to include SLOs in evaluation.

K. Anderson stated that achievement data (which is feared to be used against faculty members) is different from assessment that is embedded course work. Faculty are encouraged to use direct assessment measures when assessing SLOS and to develop the process as they want it to be.

It was suggested that we also see what other colleges are doing to address this accreditation standard.

While there is a mutual concern to resolve the issues regarding SLOs in the syllabi and in evaluations, it was discovered that these concerns have not yet been brought up in negotiations.

4. Enrollment Management

D. Berz reported on the Enrollment Management plan that was developed a few years ago. Enrollment Management oversight is under the purview of the CPC, and it was decided that each of the people responsible for the seven components under the plan should come to CPC to give a status report. The CPC Steering Committee will discuss the logistics.

5. S. Sexton requested that the composition of the standing committees and task forces be reviewed at the next meeting.