

Learning Assessment Committee Meeting
Friday, April 25, 2008
1-2:30 pm in T-750

Present: Vina Cera, Cheli Fossum, Evelyn Lord, David Mitchell, Mae Frances Moore,
Louis Quindlen, Karolyn van Putten, Elnora Webb, Wandra Williams,
Kathy Williamson

1. Updates:

Student Services: To date, there have been SLOs and assessment plans for 12 programs.

Departments: The ACCJC report had results for 33% of courses, though there have been several deactivations, which may up the percentage. Responses are still slow in coming in.

Approximately 24-25% have defined assessment methods, but very few have 'closed the loop.'

GE Outcomes: When Cheli went back to the next College Council meeting since her first appearance was nullified due to a lack of quorum, she was told that she had to also get approval from the Classified Senate, the ASLC, and Student Services. Had she known this, she could have made better use of the intervening time to obtain such. There was discussion questioning why this would be necessary, since the issues are not in their purview, however Cheli will comply and return to the next Council meeting with some form of memorandum indicating approval. Also, the Vice President will work with the President to establish Council protocol to facilitate future approval procedures.

2. Assessment timeline for Departments:

Cheli drew up a timeline for departments which included columns for specific tasks, the original recommended deadlines, many which had already passed, and a blank area for the departments' own deadline estimation, on one side. The other side asked for the same information, but had fields for a more narrative approach. Modifications were discussed and approved. One completed side of the forms will need to be turned in by May 15, along with signatures from a dept. representative and their Dean. Chairs will be asked to turn in both an electronic version to Cheli, plus a print-out with the required signatures. Since chair elections will be held shortly, Cheli will be given a list to notify both old and new dept. chairs.

3. Stipends for assessment tasks:

The President has agreed to a sum of \$20,000 to aid us in our task of assessment compliance. Though BCC has allocated twice as much, we agreed to work with this figure, and then ask for more should we need it.

The rest of the meeting time was spent in working out the details of awarding the stipends.

- There's to be a Laney Retreat on 6/2,3, just after school is out. Cheli was thinking of taking the remaining part of the week for a series of workshops. We could also possibly piggyback onto the Laney Retreat. The Vice President said this could be considered, since one of the four essential topics for the retreat was the integration of SLOs and their assessments into the larger Laney planning strategy.
- Besides the goal of completing college-wide assessment plans and tools, we would be considering how to integrate these plans into our routine academic activities, how to keep these in focus with more time allotted during Prof. Dev. Days, how to maintain a trail of evidence, and how to stimulate college-wide dialogues.
- Should only instructors develop assessment tools for their own classes? Though we wish to encourage people with expertise to participate, this should as much as possible be a collaborative activity, so that the results will have greater validity.
- Since many part-timers have other commitments, there should be some evenings scheduled.
- Emphasis will be on creating assessment tools. So that even if a dept. has already finished their SLOs and assessment plans, there's still a need for creating rubrics, program SLOs & assessments, and 'closing the loop.'
- Since writing SLOs is relatively simple, greater stipends should be given for the above more difficult tasks.
- The question was raised as to how instructors would be paid. Two possibilities were discussed: one by using their vendor numbers and issuing requisitions, or more easily, using the regular payroll system.

Discussion of how much to pay:

- The first stipulation is that no awards will be issued without actual production – just showing up will not earn \$.
- There are large depts. like Business and CIS, that are very far behind. Should these depts. be approached to make some form of agreement for progress? We need to figure out a way to target them.
- Possibly have a large award for the dept. with the most progress - \$1-2,000.?
- Several different levels of awards
 - \$50. per set of SLOs
 - \$50 - \$100 for a simple to a complicated assessment tools
 - \$200. for Program outcomes and assessment plans, with a minimum of 2 participants. The first one developed would be awarded full price, while additional ones would be lower.
 - \$200 for college- wide, shared, interdisciplinary assessment tools (as in Basic Skills reading and math)
 - \$25 per assessment tool with a maximum of \$100 per course? There should be evidence of coordination with dept. chair, and a list of faculty participating
- There will have to be a team to help Cheli evaluate all the results, and compensation will have to be discussed for this task.
- There should also be some training in developing assessment tools and rubrics. Karolyn informed us she'd found a very good site for rubrics: rcampus.com

- The issue of giving part-timers evaluation credit for participation, was brought up, but though the accreditation standards require all faculty to participate, such participation is not part of their employment contract, and we cannot interfere in union territory.
- If we gave more per course, we'd get more courses completed. We'd actually be happy to use up the \$20K and have to ask for more, which we're told could be a good prospect. Before we solidify the actual amounts of the stipends, we'll have to do an accounting, taking into consideration the number of active courses and the total amount currently available. Cheli and the Vice President will undertake this task.
- We considered giving a token bonus for plans already completed. We didn't come up with an actual figure, but felt that the depts. could decide themselves how to make the distributions.

Actions to be taken:

- meet with Deans and depts. to have them come up with their own realistic goals for a percentage or number of SLOs/assessments to be completed
- Recommend to Senate that all syllabi must now include SLOs/assessments. If none exist, then they be directed to the 'special' opportunities offered at various times (especially the Boot Camp and special Flex Day, if we can get those going) by the LAC, where they can finish the process.
- Cheli will meet with the VP regarding:
 - requiring SLOs in all syllabi by Fall
 - short, informational flyers as addressed above
 - planning a special Flex Day for Laney
 - increasing efforts to get funding resources for our process