Members Present: Tricia Alexander, Chair; Eva Bagg; Patty Bucho; Sheng-Tai Chang; Paul Creason; Brenda Harrell; Peter Knapp; Mark Matsui; Natalia Schroeder; Wil Shaw, Ken Tsuji.

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

Minutes

Old Business:

T. Alexander read an email she wrote to the Anthropology instructors about their ratings of their anthropology courses as 5s to all four Communication skills (reading/writing/speaking/listening). In a follow-up contact, A. Novotny decided that a rating of 3 was probably more appropriate. The ASLO committee concurred that when a 4 or 5 is given to a program level outcome, then a commitment is made to teach and assess that outcome. The committee agreed that we need to educate the college across all disciplines about this level of commitment and responsibility for GE Program Level Outcomes based on 4s and 5s on the grid.

T. Alexander reported that response to the matrix was actually good. She asked that the committee help follow up with some departments/areas that did not reply with ratings for their courses in the GE Program Level Outcomes grid or Communication Skills grid. Areas were given to ASLO committee members as follows:

Natalia - Speech
Sheng-Tai – Foreign Languages
Peter - Art/Creative Arts
Paul - Math/Biology
Wil - Philosophy
Tricia – Library, Life Sciences & Social Sciences, except philosophy

Regarding ratings on both grids, N. Schroeder suggested that the disciplines in question should look at the Course Outline of Record to see if there are written Course Level Outcomes that support or uphold a 4 or 5 for a particular GE Program Level Outcome. If not, the faculty would need to add them to their Course Outline of Record to reflect that they teach and assess that GE Program Level Outcome. The committee concurred that this was a good strategy. P. Knapp said that we should ask these faculty "Do you teach it?" and "Do you assess it?" If yes, we'll come to you for assessment materials and data to show assessment of this program level outcome.

T. Alexander indicated that ratings on the grid, such as a 1.7 or a 3.4 instead of a whole number, will be rounded up, unless doing so would put the department on the hook for assessment. For example, a 3.7 rating will need to be followed up on with a request for the department to make it either a 3 or a 4.

New Business:

T. Alexander asked whether WASC looks at the validity of our assessment data. E. Bagg replied that she thought they left it up to the colleges to determine how valid their data are. T. Alexander stated that our Critical Thinking Assessment instrument appears to be a good tool, but the reliability and validity of each assessment instrument we use should be checked. When data doesn't reveal that students are learning we need to ask these questions: "Are the courses teaching what their instructors said they teach?" and "Is the tool flawed so that it’s not measuring what it is supposed to measure?"
N. Schroeder suggested that in ten years from now, WASC and the other authorities would likely be using SLO data to evaluate instructors. W. Shaw said that he understood that four-year universities advised that we should not want this. T. Alexander added that as soon as data is attached to your name, or class, you have a reason to fudge the data, so the process becomes meaningless. W. Shaw added that SLOs help us learn more about what we need to do in our courses. P. Knapp suggested that if the reports on courses could remain anonymous, as opposed to comparing one instructor to another, then the data might be less threatening.

N. Schroeder reminded the committee that the College Planning Committee (CPC) would meet on Feb. 5, 2009 at 12:30 in room D135 for a demo from TracDat. She encouraged all to attend as the CPC was seriously considering buying TracDat for the college, and TracDat is a major SLO storage tool with many possibilities. It is imperative that the ASLO committee be very familiar with TracDat.

T. Alexander commenced the discussion of the Critical Thinking Assessment Tool. She suggested that we have more faculty take the test so we can find the tool’s strengths and weaknesses. The committee discussed concerns some faculty may be having with taking up their class time to collect data. N. Schroeder cited the success of her Lassi Pilot, which offered the Lassi outside of class time. Students could go to a computer lab on their own time and take the Lassi under controlled conditions. N. Schroeder suggested that the Critical Thinking tool could be proctored the same way -- faculty could send students to a time and place when the CT tool would be offered and grade it as an outside-of-class participation assignment.

T. Alexander noted that the numeric literacy questions on the CT assessment instrument do not distinguish between fresh/soph skills levels, so we should ask the math dept. to look at the items. The Math faculty may wish to create new questions. P. Bucho mentioned that they were solicited for new questions a while back and that they gave no reply. T. Alexander indicated that we need the Math faculty to define numeric literacy for the college.

--Meeting adjourned--