

Learning Assessment Committee Meeting
Friday, Dec. 7, 2007
1-2:30 pm in T-750

Present: Vina Cera, Cheli Fossum, Evelyn Lord, Ann McMurdo, David Mitchell, Mae Frances Moore, Karolyn van Putten, Louis Quindlen, Elnora Webb

Meeting dates for next semester were confirmed. They are Jan. 18, Feb. 1 and 22, Mar. 7 and 21, Apr. 11 and 25, May 9 and 23. Classes begin on Jan. 17. Flex Day is Mar. 6, a Thursday, and Spring Break runs from Mar. 24-29.

Christie will be asked to place the dates on the Master Calendar.

Our plans for Flex Day workshops had to be changed because of the implementation of mandated, college-wide Educational Master Plan meetings on Wed., Jan. 16. Under the circumstances, Louis and Peter Crabtree will conduct the Program Outcomes Workshop (originally scheduled on Wed. morning), on Tues., Jan. 15, from 1-4 pm, and so we will not staff a table in the Best Practices area. The rest of the schedule for the Flex Days will remain the same with “How to Assess Your SLOs” on Wed., Jan. 16, 2-4pm in A239, and “SLOs for Beginners” on Wed., Jan. 16, 6-7:30pm – especially timed for P/Ters who teach evenings.

There was an update on submission of assessment plans. To date, 16 out of ~44 departments have submitted their plans. Several departments are close to being finished. It was recommended that outcomes and assessment methods for all new programs, as well as CORs, be required for Curriculum Committee Approval.

We now have completed Outcomes for all the GE areas. The chair printed them out in two formats: one with the outcomes and assessment methods for each area, and the other in a grid that mapped all the appropriate GE courses to their specific area. It was suggested that departments who gave courses in the 4d area of Oral, Written Communication or Literature, check out the courses listed for accuracy, since this is the one area that lists 3 outcomes (oral, written and literature).

We should keep in mind that all new courses that fall within the GE category, align with the newly drawn up outcomes, to make sure that their individual outcomes fall within the scope of those of the college. Having a tool like CurricuNet, a relational database, would greatly help in keeping track of alignment.

We discussed the resolution brought to the last Academic Senate meeting stating we needed further allocated resources to keep us on track for the Self Study. The Senate agreed and opted to bring the matter to the DAS so that we could bring a stronger, united request to the District.

Apparently some colleges, specifically BCC, may have questions around release time vs stipends, and Pter issues. Evelyn will email the responses to Louis & Cheli for further consideration. We thought that especially since we did not have any hard figures regarding time or dollar amounts, we could be more general in wording our request.

Since we are having a Listening session with the Chancellor this coming Monday on the 10th, we want to make sure he hears and has some understanding of our position. We think the best approach would be for Cheli to initiate the discussion with how much the committee has been doing and has accomplished over the last 1-2 years (e.g: how many COR and Program SLOs/assessments, we've adopted, how many workshops we've held, etc.) , and then for Louis to jump in with why we critically need more resources: (e.g: the lack of F/T hires leaves us with the unbalanced ratio of F/T to P/T and necessitates incentives for P/T participation; larger depts.. need release time for coordination of all the efforts and data; we don't have the wherewithal to develop databases of our findings, much less, interpret them; after having gone through this process for almost 2 yrs [the easy part], we're now in a better position to see just how much more effort and consultation we're going to need to meet the accreditation standards). Here again we could mention how quick adoption of CurricuNet would ease our tasks considerably. We hope that Gary Yee will also be at the session, but if not, we will make an effort to engage him.

Our final GE task was to adopt an outcome and assessment method which revolved around ethical standards and civic responsibilities. The Commission charges us with basing this "on a carefully considered philosophy clearly stated in the catalogue." Though our catalogue does not state a 'philosophy' per se, upon studying and reflecting on the Mission, vision, values, and GE statements in the Instructional Program, we were able to posit the District's philosophical approach. We tentatively decided to adopt a suggestion by Mae Frances Moore for our final GE requirement: "demonstrate increased awareness of ethical behavior, civic and social responsibilities locally, nationally, and globally." Assessment methods would be surveys in a sampling of classes. Committee was asked to send ideas for questions to Elnora.

The GE outcomes will be sent out for feedback.

We thought that a large poster of the college outcomes should be displayed in the faculty lounge, and possibly in the Tower Lobby. Future new courses that aspire to GE status, are submitted once annually to the college articulation officer, who brings them to a special CIPD sub-committee for approval.

Finally, we discussed what our expectations of all departments should be for the next semester. Ideally, all SLOs should be in the syllabi, and these should be checked that they're actually the approved, adopted ones. The first line of checking should be with the Chairs who will know what these are and both they and the Deans will have copies of the syllabi.

A report due the end of Feb., of the assessment results of the two SLOs in the assessment report and plan should possibly be moved up earlier.

The first dept. chair meeting will address these issues. Chairs will also be asked to inform us of what additional resources they might need to meet the plans.

It was suggested that the timeline, deadlines, and forms be displayed in T450.