Learning Support Centers Coordination Committee (LSC^3)
Meeting Summary

Date: February 4, 2014
Time: 3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
Location: CSM Learning Center

Attendance: Ron Andrade, Steve Opson, Cheryl Gregory, Theresa Martin, Melissa Green, Jamie Marron, Yaping Li, Juanita Alunan, Monique Nakagawa (Notetaker), Lena Feinman, Russell Cunningham, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza (Facilitator).

Announcements:
1. **Learning Center Update**
   Jennifer's promotion to dean raises the question of who will co-chair LSC^3. She cited the BSI model of having one faculty and one administrator serve as co-chairs. She would like the co-chairs to be the Learning Center manager and a faculty member.

   The LC is changing the management position from director (academic supervisory) to manager (classified supervisory). This change will take effect once the dean position is made permanent. An interim LC manager will be appointed while an internal search takes place for the permanent position. The LC is also looking for short-term temporary help.

2. **Program Review reminders**
   Jennifer reminded the group that Program Review is due on March 25. Cheryl noted that the online form does not have spell-check and recommended first completing the form in Word and then cutting the pasting.

3. **SLO Assessment reminders**
   Jennifer reminded the group to input their data for fall 2013 and spring 2013. Yaping wondered whether it was truly necessary to assess every semester. Russell noted that we need the data to show outcomes. Juanita stated that the writing center conducts an SLO assessment every semester, but that they don't look at it until spring. Cheryl noted there was some confusion for those centers that have their SLO assessments embedded in the annual satisfaction surveys. She would be fine with PRIE collecting the data each term and reporting on the aggregate data at the end of the year. Theresa would like to have published on the LSC website the program review and SLO timelines. The group would like survey data collection in the fall and a report in the spring. Jennifer said she would check in with John Sewart.

Old Business:
4. **Approval of previous Meeting Summary**
   [Motion] To accept the minutes as presented (Cheryl, Russell). Motion approved.

5. **Pinnacle Update**
   Printing costs would be 12¢ for 20 or fewer copies, and 10¢ for more than 20 copies. Labs need to provide their own printers and computers, at a cost of probably $2-4K. Jennifer talked to Yusuf at ITS about how to cover the costs. Since labs are no longer allowed to

exchange cash for copies, the alternatives to Pinnacle are to give students free copies, to arrange for students to pay the Business Office for copies, or not to have copies. Lena reported that the Math Resource Center (MRC) is no longer interested as it does not make so many copies and does not have funds for equipment. The Math department has yet to decide what to do about copies, but will probably choose to stop altogether. Jennifer said she would like to find equipment money for ISC and MRC. Ron reported that students at LC seem okay with Pinnacle, and don't generally complain about the cost, except in those cases where they can get it free at another lab. Russell stated that the Business lab averages 5-7K print jobs per month, at a cost of ~3¢ per page. Students need a password for computers linked to the printer. They would like to go Pinnacle, but there is no space for a dedicated computer or card reader, and it would be a logistical nightmare when the whole class prints. So instead, his lab charges a materials fee for those classes that get passwords to print. Cheryl asked whether students can send print jobs to other printers on campus; Jennifer would follow up. Lena added that MRC would be fine with Pinnacle if there is money for a printer and computer.

New Business:
6. **Sharing Trials and Triumphs**
   Russell shared about WebAccess. Uploading files is not intuitive. Submitting all the way through to get a grade is a hassle. Teachers are not fully trained. We need better training. Support staff have not been trained.

   Steve recommended that anyone using Windows 8 use StartEx, which virtually restores the Start menu to Windows 7.

   There was a lot of discussion over the trials of providing census reports on TBA and HBA classes. Cheryl noted that SARS does not provide data on student drops. Russell and Lena noted their differing lab policies on students who don't logout, and Juanita observed there was a lack of clarity and consistency. Jennifer suggested that the college may need a funding model for LSCs that is not tied to TBAs, because of difficulties in figuring out student hours and in course repeatability. For example, Math has dropped 850 because of the repeatability problem, but as a consequence students needing specialized help are not receiving it.

   The LC is offering online tutoring in math by appointment via cccconfer. Tutoring sessions are 30 minutes long, and communication is by video/audio/chatbox.

   Steve shared that the Nursing lab is collaborating on simulation training with the respiratory therapy program at Skyline. The lab plans to collaborate in the future with Public Safety and EMT programs. The lab has a new $15K neonate robot.

7. **Data findings from other Learning Centers**
   Monique shared her findings from an online environmental scan of California community college learning centers. In general, many learning center program reviews were not much more meaningful than those at CSM. They either made fairly meaningless comparison of grades between center users and non-users or focused on the provision of tutoring services and associated learning outcomes. From the environmental scan, she drew 3

recommendations: 1) Revisit the meaning of "evidence-based," 2) Consider the Library as the original learning center, and 3) Establish standards in resources, operations, and professional development.

1) Revisit the meaning of "evidence-based." "Evidence-based" does not mean that our learning centers must constantly replicate the research findings of controlled studies; that would be impossible. Rather, we might consider "evidence-based" to mean that our practices are supported by the relevant literature and best practices.

2) Consider the Library as the original learning center. Perhaps we can model learning center assessment on Library accreditation standards?

3) Establish standards in resources, operations, and professional development. This follows up somewhat on 2). Library accreditation includes standards on the number of volumes available, the hours of operation, etc. In parallel fashion, learning centers might also establish standards on the hardware, software, and other equipment available; the hours of availability; and the professional development of staff to maintain quality services and best practices. To illustrate, Monique distributed an excerpt (pages 5-8) from the Cerro Coso Learning Assistance Center program review (http://www.cerrocoso.edu/planning/docs/LAC_ProgramReview_2009.pdf).