

Learning Assessment Committee
Friday, Sept. 24, 2010
1:00-2:30pm, T-750

Members Present: Vina Cera, Cheli Fossum, Mildred Lewis, Evelyn Lord, Ann McMurdo, David Mitchell, David Mullen, Newin Orante, Linda Sanford, Karolyn van Putten, Eileen White
(Approved minutes from 9/10/10 meeting)

1. Meeting Schedule for Fall/10 semester:

Sept. 10, 24,

Oct. 8, 29 (chair will be away for the 8th, but Cheli will chair the meeting),

Nov. 12

Dec. 10

2. Discussion of Tues., Sept. 28 Workshop:

- VPI will find funds for food snacks for the session

- We looked at the small sampling of feedback forms from the last May event and determined that they were generally positive. We will reformulate the simple questions so that they ask for a more wordy response (like "what did you learn from this, how can you use this strategy?"), as opposed to 'yes or no' questions. Many of us had attended, and attested that the room was full with lots of new faces, and that the participation was enthusiastic.

In May, we'd watched the first 7 min. of the Magna DVD, and decided that we'd continue with it for the 28th.

The agenda:

- The chair will introduce the topic & proceedings and Cheli & David will walk the workshop through the strategies

- Show the 1st segment again (strategy #1)

- ask participants to take notes on this, then summarize (strategy #2)

- show strategy #2 on DVD to enforce the modeled activity

- start the 2nd DVD showing at least 15 min. before the hour to leave time to summarize and fill out evaluations before the mass exodus at 5 min. prior to next class

At least 4 committee members will be able to attend the entire workshop

We will need: projector, flip chart & easel, markers, some extra note paper and pencils – all to be supplied through committee. Chair

will see if she can locate the May flip notes made by the participants to post on the walls.

It was suggested that we make the Magna DVD available to all programs on the campus and to look into the copyright issues involved in order to post some of the strategies and/or the DVD on our web site.

3. Expanding the resources and redistributing the work of the LAC Committee:

- We turned to Dean Sanford who was to give us some information on ILOs. The discussion quickly turned into one of how to expand the work of the committee towards meeting our assessment goals. This took up the rest of the meeting time.

The gist of message was that we should consider other schools' models in order to ease the burden on our committee and to more efficiently focus on our accreditation goals. Some schools divided their LAC into subcommittees to cover necessary topics; some worked on ILOs; some formed groups dealing with struggling faculty needs; some worked with ePortfolios; some broke the committee down into academic, support and administrative services; some groups worked on 'closing the loop;' some formed groups to deal with data. Ideas were brought up and enthusiastically discussed, combined and recombined, until it became clear that we really didn't have a focused handle on precisely "what we needed to do" and therefore, where to go from here. At this point, towards the end, VPI White suggested we make up a representative sub-committee to re-digest the discussion and come up with some strategy for organization and focus for the remainder of the year, based on our discussion [VPI White, Deans Orante and Sanford, Mildred Lewis, Karolyn van Putten and Cheli Fossum - David Mitchell as alternate].

Some of the discussed suggestions:

- generally agreed we had to widen our circle of responsibilities - to develop more ownership – no longer have a choice
- groupings should follow Ed priorities – basic skills, CTE, transfer
- pay attention to ACCJC priorities – these might be guidelines for new organization and help us to be sure to cover all bases
- perhaps we could focus on different stages of our assessment cycle
- VPI White has some examples from her consultation work that we can look at for suggestions

- Organize based on ILOs, PLOs, SLOs, GE outcomes, degrees, certificates
- Make use of existing strengths - e.g: chairs of depts. who've already succeeded in finishing a cycle attesting to its value and ease. Though this doesn't help us with strategies for programs comprised of adjuncts only or clusters where the chair has no expertise in all disciplines
- Need to formulate a recommendation for LAC chair to take to Faculty Senate for its president to set up shared governance sub committees for the transfer and CTE priorities, and to promote discussion among faculty
- Form an administrative sub group
- Group working on ILOs can also work on forwarding their assessment – it was that most institutions have five ILOs
- It was suggested that Institutional Effectiveness Committee could also take on the ILOs & their assessment
- Same for GE committee
- Question was raised that all the above suggestions created a lot of overlap, and perhaps there were too many divisions
- In response to above questions: different opinions: “more groups the better,” “more groups can cause more breakdown,” “more individuals plugging into smaller tasks gets more done,” etc.

In the intervening 2 weeks between meetings, we are expecting the sub group to work out a strategy and organizational plan for us to agree to and focus our efforts for the coming year.