

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

Present: Vina Cera, Peter Crabtree, Cheli Fossum, Evelyn Lord, Ann McMurdo, David Mitchell, Mae Frances Moore, Karolyn van Putten, Louis Quindlen, Ed Wright

Meeting dates for the rest of Fall 2007 were confirmed. (Sept 28, Oct 12, Oct 19, Nov 2, Nov 16, Dec 7)

The meeting concentrated on finishing up the planning for drawing up the GE outcomes and assessments for Laney.

On the basis of past meetings, retreats and college-wide sessions, it had been decided to reword Cabrillo College's outcomes to mesh with our GE requirements (numbering 8) and provide one outcome for each GE requirement, rather than several broadly applicable ones.

Some discussion around information competency and critical thinking was resolved with the agreement that both of these areas were embedded in all the GEs.

The question of using GE requirements for the Associate Degree, when this represented only a small percentage of Laney's student population, was resolved with the agreement that for accreditation purposes, this is what the accreditation committee is looking for, (a standard for AA Degrees) so we should proceed and focus on this policy.

It was unanimously decided that we should continue with one outcome and one method of assessment for each GE area.

When Laney's GE outcomes will be finalized and accepted, if desired, the committee can pursue other college-wide outcomes that will reflect more of Laney's student makeup. Also, regardless of the specific GE outcomes, all areas of the college will have met outcome and assessment requirements.

To figure out how to arrive at these outcomes, the co-chair presented a grid of possible outcomes for each GE area, along with possible methods of assessment, and a map of different departments and their applicable courses.

The co-chair will re-edit this grid and send it out to committee members for final approval,

and these possible, model outcomes/assessments will serve as the basis for discussion among key, involved faculty, who will discuss, apply, and come up with their own, tailored models. These will be used as a basis, after LAC review, for a college-wide forum for ultimate approval.

It was decided to personally identify key faculty to serve on smaller committees to work on the outcomes. They will be asked to recruit other interested faculty. These small subgroups would work on choosing one outcome that would apply to any class in that GE area. The groups would also decide on the appropriate assessment method to use. Once

the subgroups finish their work, the GE outcomes would go out via e-mail to laney-fas for another opportunity to comment and/or modify the outcomes.

Also, it was pointed out that Susan Schacher had a list of part-timers e-mail addresses that we should use.

There is a board policy regarding standards for each GE area. Adrienne Riley has access to it.

The committee thought it would be good information for our outcome proposals.

We briefly addressed forthcoming assessment and program outcomes workshops. Cheli requested helpers for each:

Assessing SLOs

9/12, Wed., 2-4pm, T-450 – Ed Wright

9/20, Thurs., 2:30-4:30pm, T-450 – Evelyn Lord

Developing Program Outcomes

9/19, Wed., 1-4pm, T-450 – Peter Crabtree

9/27, Thurs., 1-4pm, T-450 – Louis Quindlen

Karolyn van Putten mentioned that she was working on a much needed universal Calendar with the PIO.