

Student Learning Committee  
Minutes June 16, 2015

Meeting was called to order by Terri Martin-Parisien, Chair at 1:24PM.

Roll Call:

**Members Present:** Travis Azure, Audrey LaVallie, Dr. Teresa Delorme, Terri Martin-Parisien, Rhonda Gustafson, Sheila Trottier, Les LaFountain, Marilyn Delorme

**Members Absent:** Leslie Peltier, Kellie Hall, Peggy Johnson, Ron Parisien

3. Motion made by Les LaFountain to accept the agenda, seconded by Rhonda Gustafson. Discussion: none. All in favor, motion carried.

4. Motion made by Dr. Delorme to approve the Minutes from Jan 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting, seconded by Audrey LaVallie. Discussion: none. All in favor, motion carried. Minutes approved.

Motion made by Audrey LaVallie to approve the Minutes from Feb. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting, seconded by Sheila Trottier. Discussion: correct spelling of embedded. All if favor, motion carried with correction.

Motion made by Dr. Delorme to approve the minutes from Mar. 6<sup>th</sup> meeting, seconded by Audrey LaVallie. Discussion: none. All in favor, motion carried.

Motion made by Les LaFountain to approve minutes from May 18<sup>th</sup> meeting, seconded by Audrey LaVallie. Discussion: Concerning Dept. reports

1. How should evidence be provided to prove assessment findings?
2. Need representative evidence
3. Develop a way to measure results from provided evidence

Recommendations:

1. Must provide evidence
2. CTE students shouldn't have to take a Social Science course to be included in the Cultural Survey. However, culture/diversity is still a general education outcome that applies to all students.

All in favor, motion carried.

5. Terri presented the Assessment calendar

Discussion: Committee was in agreement to have general education and culture Assessment yearly. Sheila's view was that it was too soon to have Associate of Applied Science assessed in the 2015-2016 academic year because we do not currently have an assessment model for Associate of Applied Science. After considerable discussion it was decided to assess Associate of Science to academic year 2016, prior to CTE's next accreditation process. The third item for the 2015-2016 would be Professional Development. All other activities would remain the same.

Audrey LaVallie made a motion to accept the calendar with changes “Take out Associates of Science, replace with Professional Development. Everything else stays the same.”  
 Second by Rhonda. All in favor, motion for calendar carried.

6. Sheila and Rhonda presented views on Dept. Chairs. Sheila stated that Marilyn Delorme would continue with Allied Health, Ron Parisien with Technical, but there is possibility a third chair is needed; she will discuss this with Dr. Davis and Kelly. Rhonda believes a review of Chair duties and selection processes is needed. However, she also needs time to discuss this with her Faculty. Audrey LaVallie is agreeable to stay on for Math and Science for 2 more years. Because of concerns, this agenda item was tabled until Fall meeting.

7. Audrey presented the Math and Science department report (Student Learning Report (Assessment 2015) TMCC Science and Math Department).

She showed a power point excel report of each instructors evaluated class, their evaluation tool, results and recommendations. She also had a detailed narrative report. The following table represents a summary of the general education outcomes at a 70% mastery level:

	A.L.	C.H.	S.B.	D.H.	M.P.	L.O.	D.H.
Communication	Met	Not Met			Met		
Mathematics	Met	Not Met			Met	Not Met	Met
Science	Met	Not Met	Not Met				
Culture/Diversity	Met	Met					
Critical Thinking	Met	Not Met	Not Met		Met	Not met	Met
Technology	Met	Met			Met	Met	Met

Discussion followed concerning report:

1. Grading- Good, Fair, Poor vs. A,B,C,D Should there be an institutional definition for a grade? Meaning that an A from all faculty would be interpreted by the student the same.
2. Should students receiving a D in a prerequisite be allowed to continue on to the next level course? Students need to be made aware of the importance of the statement “must achieve a **C or better** to pass course.” When a C could be only 70% and in some Colleges this would be considered a D. Do we need to take a look at our grade percentages?
3. Is there a possibility of having two grades for a course; one for lecture and one for lab?
4. Can Introduction to Organic /Biochemistry be split into two courses?  
Audrey will provide the SLC with evidence to support the above concerns.
5. Student advising should be the responsibility of Full time Faculty in the student’s degree area; training should be provided to Faculty to accomplish this successfully.

These concerns will be reviewed at the SLC Fall meeting upon receipt of evidence. It was also noted that the current recommendations provided by the department do not follow the findings of the faculty.

The TMCC General Education Assessment sheet was provided to all SLC members to summarize each General Education outcome. Each outcome was discussed in detail with the following results:

1. Communication- Each department assessed and provided evidence for the outcome of communication. The SLC discussed this and it was determined that the evidence provided was not sufficient to determine whether the outcome was met as it was sporadic with multiple meanings. Based on this evidence, the recommendation is to revisit this outcome and write a clear and measureable outcome for communication.
2. Mathematics- The Math and Science (M&S) department was the only department to assess mathematics and their goal was for students to achieve a 70% mastery. The M&S did not reach a consensus on whether the outcome was achieved as some class averages did not reach the 70% mastery. The SLC discussed this and it was determined that the outcome was not met. The recommendation was to write a clear and measureable outcome for mathematics.
3. Science- The Math and Science (M&S) department was the only department to assess science and the goal was for students to achieve a 70% mastery. The M&S did not reach a consensus on whether the outcome was achieved as some class averages did not reach the 70% mastery. The SLC discussed this and it was determined that the outcome results were inconclusive. The recommendation was to write a clear and measureable outcome for mathematics and to revisit the M&S department recommendations in the fall 2016 upon receipt of evidence.
4. Humanities and Social Science- The Social Science department was the only department to assess for this outcome and of the six faculty listed, only one faculty attempted to measure it. However, the evidence provided by the one faculty member was not specific to the Humanities and Social Science outcome. The SLC discussed this and it was determined that the outcome was not met as the outcome of Humanities and Social Science is not clearly written or measureable. The recommendation was to write a clear and measureable outcome for Humanities and Social Science.
5. Culture/Diversity- Each department planned to assess for culture. With regard to the evidence presented however, only a handful of faculty assessed culture and the results were sporadic. The SLC discussed this and it was determined that the outcome was not met as the evidence was patchy. The recommendation was to write a clear and measureable outcome for Culture/Diversity.
6. Critical Thinking- The outcome of critical thinking was assessed by all departments. Most faculty attempted to assess for this outcomes; the results provided show that there is not uniformity throughout the faculty perceptions of critical thinking. As a result, while each department provided evidence, the evidence was not defined. The SLC discussed this and it was determined that while evidence was provided, the evidence couldn't be pieced together. The outcome was not met. The recommendation was to write a clear and measureable outcome for critical thinking.
7. Technology- Each department planned to assess technology; the reports show that two out of three departments provided findings. Of the findings presented, the M&S department reported meeting the outcome of technology as it was defined throughout their department, to include the use of lab equipment. The department of A&H

reported two out of three faculty assessing technology. One faculty member provided definitions of what was assessed. The SLC discussed this and it was determined that it was inconclusive as to whether the outcome was met. The recommendation was to write a clear and measureable outcome for technology.

Discussion held at the conclusion of the summary-

1. Does there need to be a consensus on whether each department met their outcomes? For example, the M&S department was conflicted with this determination as some faculty reported meeting the outcome and some faculty reported not meeting the outcome. This will need to be discussed in the fall.
2. The recommendation provided per each department has to follow the findings presented in each report. This will be addressed in professional development sessions in the fall.

Recommendation- Based on the evidence provided, uniformity is absent throughout the departments when assessing for general education. While each department is reporting findings, each department is also providing definitions and findings that differ, making it nearly impossible to determine whether the general education outcomes are met. As such, the recommendation of the SLC is to remedy this problem by dedicating the next academic year to reviewing each general education outcome and writing clear and measureable general education outcomes as needed.

8. Debriefing on the assessment process- Comments from committee members lead to discussion concerning how many objectives an instructor should have for a course? What about course or program goals? This continued on into looking at the Institutional Goals and the General Education Student Learning Outcomes and how Seven Teachings are incorporated into curriculum. It was the consensus of the committee to review these areas in early Fall:

1. Do we need 9 Institutional goals?
2. How do we make them all map together and include the Seven Teachings?

This will begin to be addressed in the fall with the implementation of professional development.

The recommendation for the assessment process is to have set dates and procedures for the departments to turn in department goals/plans, reports, etc. This will be developed in the fall.

9. The next SLC meeting will be scheduled the third week in August 2015, on a Friday.

10. Motion to adjourn made by Sheila Trottier, seconded by Dr. Delorme. All in favor, motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 4:37 PM

Respectfully Submitted;

Marilyn Delorme