College of San Mateo Committee on Teaching and Learning (CTL)
Minutes
Monday, September 25, 2:30 to 4:30

Zoom: https://smccd.zoom.us/j/83208189628?pwd=Tm9IV25OQ1Y2b1lVa3pMcko0dVk1UT09&from=addon

All members of the campus community are welcome to attend CTL meetings.

Required membership:		Present:
Co-chairs	**Guillermo Cockrum**, Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Coordinator	X
	Susan Khan, Professional Development Faculty Coordinator	x
Academic Support and Learning Technology (ASLT)	**Julieth Diaz Benitez**, Instructional Designer	X
	Teresa Morris, Library	x
ASCSM	vacant	
	vacant	
Business/Technology	**Philip Tran**, Business	x
	Reginald Duhe, Management	
Classified Senate	**Alicia Frangos,** Student Success Coordinator	x
	vacant	
Counseling	Zulema Esparza, Counseling	
	vacant	
Creative Arts & Social Sciences (CASS)	**Erica Yoon**, Psychology	x
	vacant	
Kinesiology, Athletics, & Dance (KAD)	vacant	
	vacant	
Language Arts (LAD)	**Briana Avilla**, Communications	x
	Madeleine Murphy, English	
Math/Science	Kazumi Tsuchiyose, Math	X
	Yelena Feinman, Math	x
Instructional Technologist	**Erica Reynolds**, CSM Instructional Technologist	x
Planning, Research & Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE)	**Heeju Jang**, Planning and Research Analyst (PRIE)	X
	Natalie Alizaga, Research Inquiry & Institutional Effectiveness Manager (PRIE)	x
Dean of Academic Support and Learning Technology (ASLT)	Tarana Chapple, ASLT Dean	

Attendees: Susan Khan, Alicia Frangos, Kazumi Tsuchiyose, Briana Avila, Erica Reynolds
Erica Yoon, Heeju Jang, Julieth Diaz Benitez, Lena Feinman, Natalie Alizaga, Philip Tran, Teresa Morris, Guillermo Cockrum

Guests: Philip Tran from Business and Technology, Todd Windisch (Academic Senate President),

I. Order of Business, 2:30-2:35
   a. Approval of the September 25 Agenda
   b. Approval of August 28 CTL Meeting Minutes.
      i. Approved with minor edits from Erica Reynolds concerning the creation of a space where committee members could demonstrate technology, they found useful.
      ii. Julieth Diaz-Benitez moves to approve minutes of August 28 CTL Meeting
      iii. Erica Reynolds makes changes to her remarks in prior agenda.
      iv. Minutes approved with a motion to second by **Natalie Alizaga**
   c. Public Comment.
      i. Julieth Diaz-Benitez on the Antiracist Council. Asked we help share information on upcoming Black Status Speaker Series.
         1. Please share the information with students and/or department.
II. Information Items, 2:35-2:55
   a. Introductions & Welcome to new Members & Co-Chair (Susan, 10 min)
      i. Introduction to Guillermo Cockrum, Co-Chair. SLOAC
      ii. Phillip Tran from Business and Technology
   b. Update on PD (Susan, 5 min)
      i. Discussion about activities of the Professional Development Faculty Coordinator:
         1. Coordinate 4 College Flex Days
         2. Coordinate/Facilitate New Faculty Institute
         3. Coordinate/Facilitate College 1 Faculty Institute
         4. Coordinate new redesign for Equity and Accessibility Lab Faculty Fellowship Program (to be launched in Spring). Deadline is October 6.
         5. Long-range PD planning for CSM. Four Goals Identified:
            a. Improve Data Gathering about PD needs, attendance, and effectiveness
            b. Leverage PD to help create a culture of anti-racism and equity
            c. Build opportunities for Classified Professionals, Management, and Adunct Faculty opportunities. Especially around Diversity Equity and Inclusion (DEIA) and Onboarding.
            d. Improve communication about PD opportunities across campus. Ensuring a culture of continuous improvement.

i. Perhaps, we will share more through a newsletter
c. Update on Assessment (Guillermo, 5 min)
   i. No update.
   ii. Guillermo called in from Mexico.
d. Updates from divisions and partner committees (DTL, DEAC, Library, Ed Equity, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, ASCSM, etc) (5 min)
   i. Susan Khan:
      1. Update on District Committee on Teaching and Learning (DTL).
         a. Working on mini conference on Artificial Intelligence for January Flex Day.
         b. An effort about Academic Integrity and Artificial Intelligence
      2. Academic Senate
         a. Looking for a liason for Dual Enrollment.
      3. Accreditation Institute.
         a. There are funds available on September 29th.
      4. Erica Reynolds:
         a. The Chancellor's Office is re-structuring their grant technology funds.
         b. Transition Team in Place
         c. They re-started a relationship with @ONE (Online Network for Educators) Professional Development
            i. Signed a 3-year contract for what we think might be smaller scope (TBD).
            ii. While they do have sessions, they all appear to be filled
      5. Natalie Alizaga:
         a. Would like to put a few items on a future agenda:
            i. From our PRE meeting.
            ii. Considering a Great Read
            iii. New factulty (even adjuncts) are having to do Program Review. We should brainstorm about including this material in the New Faculty Institute.
      6. Julieth Diaz Benitez
         a. On this last point about training new faculty and adjuncts.
            i. Shouldn't this fall on deans?
            ii. It's not reasonable to think that new faculty are properly trained to do Program Review
      7. Lena
         a. Agrees with Julieth but thinks we should definitely provide support for small departments.

b. All are working on Program Reviews.
c. Math and Science see more and more violations of academic integrity.
    i. Proctorio has more glitches.
    ii. How do we go to regular proctored exams
    iii. MIT does not accept our grades becaue the exams are not proctored. It appears because the student took asynchronous unproctored exams, MIT did not accept CSM grades and the students had to take the course again.
    iv. Students have good grades but are unprepared.
        1. Evidence of this can be seen on Calculus 101, where we cannot require pre-calculus.
            a. Students don't do a good job in Calculus when they took pre-Calculus asynchronously.
            b. Some asynchronous courses are now proctored.

III. Discussion/Work Items, 2:55-4:30 [w/ stretch break at 3:30!]
   a. October Flex Day
      i. Susan shared Flex Day (October 11, 2023) Schedule
         1. Administration asked for 20 minutes for announcments.
         2. People loved Alok's talk, wanted more opportunity to discuss/process
            a. Working with David Galvez to revisit the talk and main points.
            b. (1 ½ hr sesson) Bring in a consultant to see what we can do to better support LGBTQ+ students.
         3. Distance Learning proposed a session on accessibility
            a. Brought to include Canvas
         4. Off campus session led by our VPI. Connecting food justice and sustainability in our local community.
         5. Session on Assessing Institutional Learning Outcomes.
         6. Superiopr Service
            a. This is specifically for Classified Professionals to equip them to provide superior levels of service.
            b. This is being led by Andrea Viznor
         7. Mental Imagery: Envisioning the Arts and STEM within our own identities
         8. Executive Cabinet is conducting a Round table
         9. Sessions for CalSTRS for Adjuncts and CalPERS for CSEA Employees.
      ii. Guillermo question about whether there would be demand for Dual Enrollment Flex Sessions
         1. It appears that Andrea Viznor's training is addressing most of that need
         2. Perhaps it should become a more central conversation to quell many fears.

3. The pool of faculty is 9 faculty members, so perhaps the SVID workshops are the best forum
4. It could be valuable to provide a campus to a wider audience, not just those teaching. with an update to de-mystify it.

 iii. Teresa
  1. How is the balance of in person or hybrid sessions
  2. We are trying to have accessibility for document conversion.
  3. We are also trying to provide one track per session to be fully hybrid.
  4. We should provide options by modalities.
   a. 100 people in person
   b. 100 in Zoom
   c. It looks that making sessions available online doubles attendance
   d. Online attendance is particularly popular in the afternoon

 iv. Julieth likes the balance that we have. Many people are stepping up providing session proposals.
 v. Susan wishes to elicit help from members of this committee in exchange for Candy.
  1. Sign in sheets at breakfast and throughout the day
  2. Distributing feedback forms to in-person/hybrid sessions
  3. Community building activity
  4. Volunteers: Julieth, Erica Yoon, *Heeju*, Briana, Erica Reynolds, Kazumi, Guillermo, Todd
   a. 20 minute the day before to discuss

b. Continue brainstorming goals for this year (30 min)
 i. Institutional Learning Outcomes
  1. CSM changed its process and has not come together quite yet.
  2. Need to develop a process to evaluate our ILOs
  3. Todd: This is the beginning of the conversation but will be working on it on multiple levels:
   a. We need to have a session on this to inform the campus.
   b. Get consensus on a method to assess.
   c. Finally get people to work on rubrics to assess those outcomes.
   d. 2019 was the last time we assessed.
    i. We rebooted.
    ii. Seeking historical info on ILOs.
     1. Teresa: Local course level assessment and one way to look at ILOs in a rollup way.

a. If our ILOs includes ethical use of information. When rolled up the courses can map up to the ILOs. There were some areas that were not covered well.
b. We could also look at student work and see how it matched against the ILOs but it was harder to get off the ground.
c. Weakest link is that inquiry based approach has problems teasing out what the student should know after course and what the student should be able to do after leaving CSM.

2. Lena added:
   a. Used to have to do course SLO for each student.
   b. How do we pass this from the course level to the ILOs for accreditation
   c. Right now, we don't have an understanding of mapping the SLO to ILOs.
      i. Do we need to do one at a time?

3. Natalie
   a. How are we going to assess?
      i. Smaller rubric?
      ii. Assignment
   b. We've had focus group with student concerning ILOs. The ILOs did not resonate with the students.
   c. Should we re-evaluate our ILOs to make them more relatable for the students?
   d. Should we ask students what they should be?
   e. Our ILOs could be up for editing given that they were last drafted in 2017
   f. Susan: Do we really have time to re-write or first assess?
   g. Teresa: The approval takes a long time (two Senate cycles). ILOs are not just Senate. It's beyond the academic standards. It could involve IPC (as it happened last time).
   h. Natalie: We could present what other institutions are doing. Palo Alto College does what Madeline had suggested (an assignment). A random sample of students and measure the assignment against a particular rubric.
      i. Problem is the diversity of programs
      ii. It could, however, be helpful on "critical thinking."
      iii. Isolate a specific ILO and develop a shared rubric assessing 3 ILOs and talking across disciplines

        iv. One credit course (Capstone?)

        v. Ideal (Madeline) recommends a small assignment (even a quiz) that could be given to students over pizza

        vi. Continuous Assessemnt.

4. We have an archive of videos 2013, 2018, and 2019. Bring assignments and grade them.

    a. Madeline made a 10-minute video.

        i. Each team would take one ILO and developed a rubric. Perhaps a small rubric to be used on work that already exists to get an expression of the ILO within a certain timeline.

        ii. Must be small and specific exclude assignment creation

        iii. What might the assessment and rubric look like?

        iv. How to make people think about ILOs

        v. Julieth: Don't start something you can't close within the time allotted. Could cause more harm

        vi. Todd: Julieth's point about continuity and compartmentalization is important.

        vii. If we need to look at the process for ILO assessment.

        viii. We can provide historical feedback in Fall

        ix. In Spring we can develop a rubric and assess a prior assignment and have them find holes in the rubric

        x. Lena: what is the goal? Then we should start thinking about what we want and then ask faculty what they want.

        xi. Take one ILO and assess

        xii. We never approved a rubric. And the process was never formally implemented.

c. Define manageable list of goals and next steps/assignment (35 min)

    i. ILOs

        1. Re-write ILOs?

        a. Re-write rubrics for ILOs?

        b. Map out full transparency of requirements to figure out what the process looks like.

        c. Timing is important.

        d. Gathering feedback is also important.

  e. We will look at Skyline for different rubrics. Cañada College assesss ILOs via student survey
 2. Making the decision by Spring and define rubrics in Flex or even CTL
ii. Goals:
 1. Conduct a survey and focus groups of Professional Development needs
  a. Improve use of VRC (Veteran's Resource Center?) for registration/attendance tracking/reporting
 2. Develop meaningful ways to gauge/measure our ILOs
 3. Re-examining our ILOs. Erica Reynolds: Put together a backward mapped series
 4. Identify high impact/persistence practices and ways to promote them across campus.
 5. Reexamine ILOs (see above).
 6. Goals from last year
  a. Streamline the Great Read
  b. Glean the PD implications from the Great Read process
 7. More guidance to support SLO Assessment continuously
 8. Should CTL be a central hub for AI and its interactions with Academic Integrity
  a. Should this reside in this committee.
  b. What to do with Canvas and AI
  c. Once Academic Senate has their AI plans, we could assess how this committee could help.
 9. Get a way to report out the Great Read
  a. Checks and feedback for Program Review SLO process
  b. Formalize reporting on Great Read
  c. Identify trends and tools that could use development (however defined)
 10. Create a series of PD opportunities that include Classified Professionals
  a. We should be more inclusive
  b. We should gather data from our Classified Professionals, preferably through focus groups instead of surveys.

Next meeting: Oct 23, 2023 (2:30-4:30) on Zoom

2023-2024 Goals:

Brainstorm list:

-Survey/focus groups of PD needs

-improving use of Vision Resource Center (VRC) for registration/attendance tracking/reporting

-developing meaningful ways to gauge/measure our Institutional Learning Outcomes

 -re-examining our ILOs: put together a backwards mapped series

-identifying high impact/persistence practices and ways to promote them across campus: starting with Collee 1 and/or REAL

-streamline the Great Read, glean the PD implications from that process.

-checks/feedback for SLO proces

-report out on Great Read

-Use Great Read to identify trends and future goals for PD and for this cttee

-Should CTL be central hub for furthering Academic Senate goals on AI?

Goal	Priority Level	Discussion/Suggestions	Next Steps/Assignments	End-of-year Status