

**Learning Assessment Committee Meeting,  
Friday, April 13, 2007  
1-2:30 pm in T-750**

Present: Tracy Camp, Vina Cera, Cheli Fossum, Jackie Graves, Evelyn Lord, Ann McMurdo, David Mitchell, Mae Frances Moore, Karolyn van Putten, Louis Quindlen

1. We agreed that the draft requesting the development of an assessment plan for the Peralta Community college District Office was all inclusive of our concerns and was ready to go to the Laney Senate on April 17 for approval. From there, it will be taken to the DAS, who could possibly take it back to all the local Senates. We felt that the DAS was the appropriate body to recommend the District Offices and Board make use of the specialized training available for them from the Accreditation Agency Our representatives will make that request.
  
2. We reviewed the Timeline for Outcomes and Assessment Tasks, which will also be presented to the Senate on 4/17. Some minor revisions were made: a) a comment under Assessment of Outcomes, that for the next round of Program Review, we should include wording in the templates that would be specific to SLOs and assessment, in order to emphasize the importance of using the 2009 data elements as evidence for closing the loop/cycle; and under the Services section, parentheses were added after Administrative Offices, and these enclosed 'Dean's, President's and Business Office.' We removed 'Human Resources, Physical Resources, and Financial Resources' from the list, since they were District functions.
  
3. The remainder of the meeting was spent on preparation for the April 26 workshop, and hammering out our own definition and understanding of what we meant when we referred to Laney's 'Institutional Outcomes.'  
Last meeting we'd decided that Gen Ed outcomes, those for degrees and certificates, should be our institutional outcomes. At a Brown Bag discussion held two days earlier, there was strong concern voiced that GE outcomes didn't address a large part of the Laney student population – those who came for lifelong learning, basic skills, self development and civic responsibility, and other specific vocational concerns. After much discussion, we decided that since the Accreditation Cte. was only evaluating outcomes in the degree and certificate arena, we should spend our time on 4/26 evolving these for Laney. We were probably eventually going to end up with about four very broad institutional outcomes, from which the GE outcomes, and all other areas of student learning would flow.  
The draft form we drew up started with four very general institutional outcomes that would focus the discussion: 1) Basic Skills, 2) Knowledge/Understanding, 3) Higher Order Thinking Skills, and 4) Values Development.  
Under this would come the GE outcomes for degrees and certificates. This tier would be subdivided into two areas: 1) outcomes for AA, AS degrees and 2) outcomes for vocational certificates. Each of these would have links to the institutional outcomes. The degree level outcomes would have a course level emphasis, whereas the certificate level

outcomes would place a greater emphasis on the program level, because of the inherently focused nature of the vocational curriculum.

4. We were allotted 3 hours for the workshop – from 1 - 4pm. (We weren't sure how this would fit in with the special plans for the Chair meeting also to be held that day)

Tentatively, we planned:

- Make a brief opening presentation, outlining definitions
- Presenting a simple, easy to read timeline, delineating what needs to be done and by when
- Karolyn and Matt will briefly fit this effort into the Self Study picture/matrix
- We will then break out into two groups: one to work on GE outcomes for degrees, and the other (vocational) to work on outcomes for certificates. We'll also suggest that the groups look at specific courses in their depts. that could be mapped to these outcomes.
- We need to develop a form to make the process more apparent and reportable
- We'll conclude by coming together, reporting on each others' work, and develop a first draft of our GE outcomes for the college.

5. It was obvious that we needed more time to make the 4/26 session successful. We agreed to meet next Friday, the 20, to finalize these plans. An effort will be made to get the timeline out to mail boxes before the 26<sup>th</sup>, for staff to have a chance to give the matter some thought beforehand.

Since it was also decided in the timeline that our dept/program outlines should be posted online, we were going to request the Office of Instruction to both make the software available, and to engineer the process.