

Learning Assessment Committee

Friday, Oct. 2, 2009

1:00-2:30pm, T-750

Members Present: Vina Cera, Cheli Fossum, Evelyn Lord, Ann McMurdo, Marco Menendez, David Mitchell, Linda Sanford, Karolyn van Putten, Elnora Webb

1. Meeting/Workshop Schedule for the semester:

- Oct. 16: Workshop, 1:30-4:30pm, G203. David may come earlier to work on assessment plans & rubrics
- Oct. 20: (Flex Day) Workshop, 1-4pm, F170. Evelyn & Vina will help
- Oct. 30: Workshop, 1-4pm, F170. Offered to CTE Division
- Nov. 13, 30 (Monday, 2:30-4pm), Dec. 11 – regular meetings

Though offered to specific groups, the workshops are open to all who care to come. In order to encourage more participation, Linda will send a listserve of her division, and Cheli will seek out other cluster listserves, and send out emails. Participants will be asked to sign up.

We briefly discussed the need for program, degree, GE assessment, as well as institutional outcomes and effectiveness, and considered focusing one of the above workshops on degrees or writing programs.

2. Resolution:

Over the past 2 weeks, we've been working on drafting a resolution to go to the Senate, DAS, and ultimately to the Educational Committee at the District, strongly urging them to allocate more funds for Laney's greater share and need of resources. We ended up fine tuning the resolution and the co-chair will type it up for submission.

3. Examination/Discussion of the ACCJC Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness, SLOs:

-We looked at the "Proficiency" levels, as a guide to where we needed to be in 2012.

- The question that loomed was how to interpret the term "comprehensive." Did this mean that ALL SLOs had to have been assessed and actions taken as a result? Or, was it to be understood as it grammatically defined the assessment reports made? There were differences of opinion by members who'd been to previous WASC trainings. We are following the 5-column model in TaskStream, which we think should satisfy the 'comprehensive' requirement. Many of us felt that as long as we were following the 5-column method and preparing appropriate reports, were also assessing programs, student services and institutional outcomes as a balanced effort, and had realistic plans in place to address the remainder, we should be in compliance by 2012.

Cheli had called ACCJC and spoken with the newest member of the committee, who didn't think "comprehensive" referred to literally "all." However, since she

was new, we couldn't be sure she was aware of all the nuances. The VPI and cte. co-chair, then called ACCJC and spoke with a longstanding member, who went over the entire wording of the rubric. He will be getting back to us with an official interpretation.

- We then proceeded to discuss future approaches and needs. It was clear that we had to make a drive to develop ILOs, and press for more program, GE, and student services assessments. We hoped to apply to student services administration to give time for staff to work on these issues during their regular hours, and to schedule more workshops on their behalf. Spring Break was suggested as a good time to hold these, since there's no academic activities going on, yet classified staff are at work. Surveys were also suggested. It was suggested that we look more closely at routine activities, to discern whether or not there might already be some assessment going on that could be used as a basis of outcome assessments.