

Learning Assessment Committee Meeting
Friday, May 23, 2008
1-2:30 pm in T-750

Present: Vina Cera, Cheli Fossum, Evelyn Lord, David Mitchell, Adrienne Riley

1. Updates:

GE Outcomes: The last meeting of the College Council was cancelled. Yvonne Lewis said she'd contact Drs. Chong and Webb, and try get approval via email.

Applications for stipends: so far, only 12 applications. This is a lot less than hoped for. Though the numbers are small, the spread across departments is fairly good, with at least nine different depts./service groups participating. If these follow through to completion, a substantial gain could be made.

2. Summer Workshop:

The Vice Pres. of Instruction has approved \$50/hr for us to evaluate the finished work. The deadline is June 26, and the number of members needed for this will be determined by the number of submissions.

3. Strategies and priorities for increasing participation:

- Try personal outreach – one-on-one approach especially to specific departments far behind. CIS, Business and Culinary were mentioned as depts. to contact
- tie in to building excitement via CurricuNet. Formatting should be input by Fall '08. However, only the new courses will be included at first – not the archived CORs.
- The method used by BCC was briefly discussed – that of taking their allotment (larger than ours) and dividing it up among 12 groups/clusters, with a lead person. Each group would be awarded ~\$3K, with the lead getting ~\$1K – \$1.5K. This shifts the responsibility to several vs the entire load being balanced by the LAC chair. Apparently Merritt is modeling their approach from BCC's. Since Laney is far larger, much more funds (release time) would be needed to make the taking on of this responsibility load more attractive. We don't know exactly how much beyond the \$20K is available for this.
- we should actively go out to faculty, rather than having them come to us. A person to person approach would address the "holes" (those needing a harder sell) and this more assertive pursuit could possibly meet with a more positive response. We could make it very easy by bringing all the necessary materials and expertise – just requiring their presence and a little bit of time.
- where there are a large amount of courses, we could make the approach just for the core courses, and hope the positive experience will build momentum
- we need to start developing strategies for "closing the loop."
- we need to find ways to begin conversations/dialogues throughout the campus (we have had some experience with this in the "Reflective Carnegie" sessions)
- future planning of workshops, brown bags, etc., should reflect the fact that a mixture of levels will need a mixture of approaches.

- Prof. Development Days could be used more effectively for training and development, but much as these would serve our purpose, in actuality, there are too many time demands on them. We need to make sure we have some time in the Flex Day Programs.
- Institutional Outcomes were discussed, and again, since these are not specifically required in the self study, these will again be put aside for now.
- A faculty member suggested that all syllabi be generated electronically, with all outcomes and objectives included. This would be easier to do once CurricuNet is installed and working. Apparently, it has a “syllabus generator,” so syllabi could more easily be standardized.
- A grid was set up by Eleanor Liu 1-2 years ago when we were working on our dept. reviews. It could possibly be updated, along with a column for SLOs and assessments, We could then have the information on hand for all to see as we wait for CurricuNet to become activated.

Rather than dwelling on the negatives of less responses than we would wish, we should take a positive look back and see just how far we've come. It's really quite impressive, even if we do have to pat our own backs. We've actually moved an ingrown system onto an entire new path, so kudos are required here!