Assessment of Student Learning
Outcomes Committee
Meeting Minutes
August 26th, 2008
D352
2:30 – 4:00 p.m.
Tricia Alexander, Chair

Members Present: Tricia Alexander, Chair; Patty Bucho; Sheng-Tai Chang; Brenda Harrell; Craig Hendricks; Natalia Schroeder; Wil Shaw; John Smith

I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

III. Approval of the Agenda

IV. Public/Faculty Comments (must pertain to item[s] on the agenda)

V. Reports (information only)

VI. Unfinished Business

T. Alexander introduced the topic of needing to speed up the assessment process to meet the 2012 deadline.

J. Smith agreed that we are not moving fast enough on student outcomes. He felt we should hang on to the outcomes we already have, but it’s time to do some testing.

W. Shaw and P. Bucho both agreed that full-time support is needed in order to reach the entire scope. It can be tough to work all day, then gather as a committee and reach the goals that the Accreditation Board is requiring. It is more than just clerical support that is needed – it is “a think tank”. W. Shaw added that he feels very strongly about going to accreditation and telling them that if they want this process to go faster, then fine, but we need their help.

Even though faculty answered the survey ‘not to reduce the number of core competencies,’ we could technically still go back to them and say, “Hey look – we thought this was an option, but it is NOT.” Should we eliminate? Should we combine? Which way should we go?

N. Schroeder introduced herself as the ‘ASLO Coordinator in Training’, saying that she is interested in getting the job done and getting us to where we need to be, at the time we need to be there. She added that she liked what J. Smith said in that we do tend to always want to have a perfect finished product, but we just haven’t been given enough time.

S. T. Chang said that he is for combining or ‘bundling’ two or three core competencies together, and weighting them, some being more important than others.

J. Smith still thought the answer was to SIMPLIFY – we really need to get things moving. He didn’t feel that we should weight the core competencies – he said to let things pop-up according to need. He felt it was important to pilot a test very soon. Can we get five questions for each core competency from each department, and slap together a test as a pilot?

P. Bucho said not to get rid of any core competencies. She did say, however, that there is simply NO WAY that we have time to truly test all the core competencies we have right now. She is for doing a ‘quickie type test’ so that we don’t have to eliminate any of the core competencies we already have in place.

B. Harrell brought up the fact that there is no point in doing a quick assessment is we don’t do a really good job. She felt that it might be better to take a few of the core competencies and work on them. She added that we can always add on as we go, because she really did have a problem with doing things just to do them.

N. Schroeder wanted to know – where did the 2020 timeline come from? Why did accreditation specify 2012? She added she would love an explanation via email.
T. Alexander thought it would be important to make sure the test questions will actually give us info that we can use. Would we be confident that our departments could be fairly judged by just a single question or even five of them?

J. Smith says it would be tough to rely on just five questions to make a determination.

Regarding the questions as to whether we should follow-up on the Summer Institute participants, by assessing their work products as satisfactory or not, the group thought it might be rude to “grade” our own faculty. It seems that the data compiled in course level and program level assessments during the summer sometimes just sits on someone’s desk until the following summer. In other cases, the assessment tools are actually created and used within a department. C. Hendricks felt that we should add on another $100 to have a second part to the Summer Institute to “reflect”. Participants are on the hook for Flex day during the following spring. The group agree that it would be a good idea to have participants use their summer institute products the following fall and report on their outcomes on the spring Flex Day.

Should we push LBCCD to implement a software program that we could all use to plug our data into? Then the data could be collected along with Program Planning and Program Review.