

**Learning Assessment Committee Meeting,  
Friday, Nov. 17, 2006  
1-3:30 pm in T-750**

Present: Vina Cera, Cheli Fossum, Evelyn Lord, Ann McMurdo, David Mitchell, Mae Frances Moore, Louis Quindlen, Linda Sanford, Karolyn Van Putten

Items Discussed:

1. Evelyn Lord shared a brochure from the Center for Urban Education, based in USC, called "Doing Research That Makes a Difference." Basically it addresses equity issues for students of color, and ways in which to improve their outcomes. The State Academic Senate last year called for a committee to draft a Student Equity Plan, in which Laney did not participate (Merritt & COA did). Since the committee's charge fits with ours on working on institutional outcomes, and our demographics fit in with their inquiries, we should make an attempt to participate if/when the committee gets refunded. Frank Harris III, one of the leaders, also would welcome us. We'll inform our President to be aware that an invitation may come, and that the committee feels that it would benefit our work with institutional outcomes.

2. We had a long and detailed discussion about our goals, strategies, how far we've come, what our resources, frustrations and obstacles are, and what was needed to move our process further.

Discussion Points:

- a) We need to come up with strategies for getting more SLOs written
- b) A new concept was that each discipline's programs and degree tracks should also have their own mission
- c) There are many different ways to develop these, but all need to be directly linked to Planning and Resource Allocation.  
And there's the rub – there is no clearly defined planning or process in place. The Board appears to act outside the confines of shared governance, their requests for plans and formats are ever changing, giving rise to frustration and low morale.
- d) What then, can we actually do under the circumstances with accreditation on its way and program review around the corner? The point was made that it would be clear to the accreditation team that a large part of the dysfunction was coming from the District, that it has been an ongoing, persistent structural problem. However, accreditation is the charge of the colleges, not the District. One thing we can focus on, despite the hurdles that exist, is the educational process.
- e) Linda suggested we look at how some local and other colleges have managed their institutional changes. She informed us of a survey she'd done:
  - COA: held a college-wide forum on staff dev't day, which led to some smaller committees developing their inst. outcomes – an administration-driven process – took approx. 1 year
  - Merritt: also begun by administration, but faculty developed outcomes took approx. 1 year

- BCC: VP of Instr. prepared a survey-type format, which was compiled, re-distributed, and tweaked – again initiated by administration, and taking approx. 6-8 months

-Santa Rosa: administration rolled out a series of shared governance committees, in a visionary process, that categorized and then tweaked the outcomes. They had a specific Coordinator and the college Researcher to do the final group coordination and word smithing – took approx. 1 year

- Foothill: had a committee made up of a Researcher, Faculty and Administration – took approx. 1 year

- The above processes were all in the instructional areas and not in student services. Because they have a different reporting structure to the state, their outcomes should also reflect this.

3. Karolyn introduced a software she found online, which prepares for accreditation (an accreditation toolkit (CCSSE).

Linda also mentioned a software called eLumen, which helped with the linking, querying and alignment processes, and also their reporting.

Question arose about financing of software – (most institutions fund these processes through the Office of Instruction, since it is responsible for reporting)

4. Even though we're stymied by the fact that our institutional outcomes need to be linked to District planning and allocations, which are either nonexistent or ever changing, we still have to find a way to go forward. If we can't get direction from above, we can still work from our local, instructional level.

Current directions:

a) Linda has been put in charge of developing a template for Program Review for the District. She's done this and is now working on a manual for completing the forms. When filled out by the disciplines these should give us a great deal of data about our programs, which committees they should inform, and when compiled, should also give us a good indication of where our institutional outcomes should reside. So far, only Laney has expressed a willingness to use them. The District Information Officer has refused to provide District-wide statistical data we requested as necessary for use. He did agree to give one copy of college data to the Pres. – we've yet to receive this. We might have to resort to polling what we can from the web site.

Later in the meeting Linda went over the draft of her template.

b) Linda feels that she's taken the committee as far as she can, but that at this point, with the dissention and slowness of participation, more authority is needed to spur efforts forward. To this effect, she has offered her resignation, and suggested that we invite Dr. Webb to co-chair the committee. Under the circumstances, we sadly agreed, and expressed our sincere wishes that she remain somehow a part of our process, because her zeal, expertise and talent were irreplaceable.

c) A letter, co-signed by Linda and Cheli, was to be drafted by Linda, Cheli and Evelyn that would relay these feelings and some requests. Linda will take the letter to Dr. Webb, in a meeting to be held this coming Tues., the 21<sup>st</sup>. Requests were for more release time for Cheli, other positions for an outcomes/resources help for the college, and someone to lead the accreditation process, possible purchase of software.

d) Comment was raised about the need to pull Student Services Dean into our process.

e) Question was raised about what was involved in the Program Review process. Evelyn replied that this was the major topic of the Senate meeting this coming Tues.

5. Cheli reported on the SLO workshops held:

ESL workshop in Oct – they're meeting regularly, had 8 done to date

Math – had drafts for 4 classes and plan to work towards completing SLOs for all their courses

English – working on outcomes for two courses

Brown Bag SLOs – only 4 showed up to each. Since there seemed to be a much greater turnout for the last, excellent workshop Karolyn held on rubrics, we decided, with her acquiescence, to have a repeat performance for the last brown bag of the semester.