

**Learning Assessment Committee Meeting,
Friday, Dec. 15, 2006
1-3:30 pm in T-750**

Present: Tracy Camp, Vina Cera, Cheli Fossum, Jackie Graves, Ann McMurdo, David Mitchell, Mae Frances Moore, Karolyn Van Putten, Louis Quindlen, Linda Sanford, Elnora Webb
Dean Peter Crabtree was invited by Dr. Webb, as the first of a contingent of participating Deans.

1. Committee meeting dates were tentatively agreed upon. The first meeting is scheduled for Friday, Jan. 12 at 1pm in T-750. Subsequent dates on Fridays, will be 1/26, 2/9, 2/23, 3/9, 3/23, 4/13, 4/27, 5/11. Friday holidays are 2/15, 4/6, 3/18. Flex Days are 1/10, 2/28, 4/26. After the first meeting, we'll revisit the semester schedule.

2. The following list of Brown Bag dates was also tentatively agreed upon, and would be more definitively decided at our first Spring semester meeting: Wed. 1/24, Thurs. 2/8, Wed. 2/21, Thurs. 3/8, Wed. 3/21, Thurs. 3/29, Wed. 4/18, Thurs. 5/3, Wed. 5/16.

Discussion:

- Do we need so many? Perhaps less general brown bags and have more focused groups
- We should come back with ideas for topics
- Both 'rubrics' events were successful. It was suggested that we hold two levels on that topic: one for beginners and one for more advanced. Examples of rubrics in use by various depts. could be brought in as examples.
- Accreditation and its alliance with SLOs should be revisited and emphasized as one of the first topics
- The possibility was raised of holding the informal workshops at other times, e.g. in the evening.

3. We agreed to holding an intensive, self-training session on assessing outcomes, before the Spring semester begins, in order to give ourselves a better handle on the assessment process. Dr. Webb offered to obtain the venue for us on either Sat. 1/20, or Sat. 1/27, from 2:30 – 6 pm. We'll finalize the details when school gets back.

4. The rest of the lengthy meeting was devoted to the discussion of how we were to develop outcomes for the College, and what overarching framework or process we would undertake to make it happen.

Dr. Webb opened the discussion by supplying a package of documents, including a Multi-Level Integrated Planning Model for Institutional Effectiveness (developed a few years ago), an Educational Master Planning Proposal, and a Laney College Strategic Planning Framework. These were presented only as a starting point for our discussion. After many rounds, we settled on a visual model that was greatly clarified by Mae Frances Moore. (Christy Blue will draw the actual model up for the next meeting). In essence its form is circular, with the central core being the College Mission and

institutional outcomes ‘that define the specifics of the Mission’ (aptly phrased by Louis). This center informs the various branches in the institution (business services, program services, student services). Shared governance is linked to all the services, as is administration, which gathers input from the various spokes or branches and establishes priorities. All of the pathways are bi-directional, in that influence and changes can go both ways. Within this framework, each of the units develops their own outcomes and methods of assessment. Encircling this model and informing it is the greater community and its needs, which the College serves.

The above model was created in the context of a ‘learning’ institution. We next worked on a model for where to place ‘outcomes’ per se in our process. The flow chart we came up with was a series of concentric circles. Here, the center of the circle was the student and his/her class outcomes, progressing outwards to course, program/degree/certificate, to College mission.

The final model addressed was the position of services. Again, the model clarified by Karolyn, was of a concentric circle, with pie wedges representing all the various services radiating from the center to the rim. At the center of the model was the individual student and his plans for success. The next circle was that of needs assessment, and the final circle was composed of the greater Oakland community, which is where the student will succeed and informs the college of the community’s needs. The many service wedges that go all the way from the student at the center to the community at the circumference is composed of financial aid, health services, EOPS, Calworks, DSPS, transfers, assessment and job placement, Puente, childcare, tutoring, etc. Influences and changes go both ways from the center of the circle to the rim. Also, each of the service wedges will develop their own particular outcomes and assessments.

5. We agreed that one of the first things we should address when we returned in the New Year, was that of terminology surrounding ‘outcomes’ per se vs ‘learning outcomes.’

Other points brought up:

- Should Institutional outcomes be representative only of degree/certificate outcomes? (most thought no, because outcomes can also relate to personal, lifelong development)
- Having the Mission and Inst. Outcomes aligned at the center gives us a reference for evaluating all our learning and other outcomes.
- We need to focus on the term ‘outcomes’ and omit ‘learning’ from our process, until we get the terminology straight.
- There was to be a reminder about having SLOs in at least one core course for each dept. at the beginning of Spring semester.
- Cheli will pursue setting up workshops during the oncoming Prof. Devt. Days.
- Cheli has been given .5 release time.

