

**Learning Assessment Committee**  
**Friday, Nov. 13, 2009**  
**1:00-2:30pm, T-750**

Members Present: Vina Cera, Cheli Fossum, Ann McMurdo, David Mitchell, Newin Orante, Linda Sanford, Karolyn van Putten, Elnora Webb, Kathy Williamson

**1. Meeting/Workshop Schedule for the semester:**

Nov. 30 (Monday, 2:30-4pm) – left undecided until further notice or need, Dec. 11

- We have decided that having one meeting and one workshop per month seemed to be a good practice for us.
- A wrap-up session each semester is also planned, and we'll hold Fall/09's after things have settled down at the beginning of Spring semester. The Spring/10 wrap-up will be held early June.

**2. Reports:**

- The Chair reported on the workshops held in Oct. There were 3 sessions, (2 on regular meeting days, and 1 on Flex Day), and there was a good representative turn-out. Cheli was helped by various committee members and several new (to the process) departments began reporting their assessments and SLOs into TaskStream.
- The LAC resolution to the District, to rethink their funding to Laney for assessment activities was presented to the Laney Faculty Senate and was enthusiastically endorsed. It will go on to the DAS and then to the Board.
- WASC Assessment Retreat, Level II (San Jose, 10-22/24 was attended by Cheli Fossum, Karolyn van Putten, Newin Orante, and Marco Menendez. They spent a lot of time in Team Planning groups, meeting with mentors, and felt the

experience very worthwhile. We were presented with a 9-page summary of the Retreat.

- Cheli reported on two salient points:

1) We were not responsible for Institutional LOs – not in the ACCJC mandate – the ILOs were necessary for 4-year schools though. GE Outcomes were sufficient for Community Colleges.

2) Compliance in assessment was not so much a matter of following specific rules, but rather reasonable planning and reporting on activities from a position of strength and cooperative understanding.

Also, some Program Outcomes could be submitted by mapping our GE Outcomes to our Mission. Since our Mission Statement is currently under revision, Linda Sanford (leading the revision effort) asked to bring the work in progress to the LAC committee for review and comments, since the two charges are so closely related.

Though Program Outcomes are at the higher end of achievement, it's not necessary to use higher level verbs if the Outcome doesn't merit it.

At this point, a discussion ensued regarding the lack of student representation in our process. We agreed to look into this and perhaps follow up on some ideas presented about ePortfolios. There are several free platforms out there, and there's currently an experimental project going on in the District with Epsilen, headed by its Professional Development Officer.

- An approach to pushing Program Outcomes, was to pin point disciplines with the most graduates (e.g: Culinary, Cosmetology), and concentrate on helping them through the process. We talked about how to help AA degree programs (the greatest number of graduates). We explored assessing at the beginning of a course or program, and then comparing

the results with an assessment near the end. This approach would not necessarily work for all disciplines. It would be ideal if we had some sort of system degree audit in place, and were told that the District is favorably considering a new software that would make this query in Passport. It was also suggested that this software should be reviewed by the Technology Cte., which would then pass their recommendations along to the Dist.

- **Bric Project:** (Bridging Research, Information, and Cultures)

Aims to strengthen cultures of inquiry and evidence by:

1) taking 20 applications for mentoring by seasoned researchers and faculty in handling evidence by online instruction and f2f sessions. We are considering applying. The fee is around \$3.7K.

2) providing dedicated support to institutional researchers and planners.

- Newin Orante reported on plans for Student Services activities. He is going to develop a SS task force, some assessment tools to run a preliminary survey sometimes in Feb./Mar., and also to extract and examine any data that SS currently might have. Meetings are to start next week. SS is considering the pre- (perhaps during registration) and post-assessment process as a possible tool. Since they are not involved particularly in academic content, they are more interested in the qualitative experience of the student in regards to the process of learning, rather than the quantitative one.

### **3. Future Workshops/Activities:**

- Cheli will book a workshop on Flex Day, on either the 19<sup>th</sup> or 20<sup>th</sup> of Jan. She will look over her notes on participants of

the 3 workshops in Oct., and we'll try and target these folks to attend and further their efforts.

- The Chair asked for volunteer rotating consultants (perhaps for a period of 2 weeks each), from the cte., to brainstorm with her and act as a sounding board for ideas, etc. David Mitchell stepped up to the plate for first at bat.

- Karolyn was going to research her notes from the retreat and send on some tips on how to handle recalcitrant faculty, disciplines.

- Elnora suggested inviting Robert Gabriner to visit us and speak to strengthening our concepts of research at laney college

- The 2 co-chairs met to plan how to advance assessment activities at the college. They are planning a mini retreat with the Senate President and the Deans during Finals Week, and also invited members of the LAC Cte.