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

I. Call to Order  
Tricia Alexander, Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

II. Roll Call  
Sign-in sheet circulated

III. Approval of the Agenda  
Agenda approved by ASLO Committee for February 17th, 2009.

IV. Approval of the Minutes  
Minutes approved by ASLO Committee for February 3rd, 2009.

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

VI. Reports (information only)

VII. Unfinished Business

A. Ratings on GEO’s: T. Alexander expressed how pleased she was with the mapping grid having been about 95% completed to date. She noted that music courses were not rated as a 5 in Aesthetics, which goes to show that the faculty teaching GE courses have a different perspective on their course content than do outsiders.

B. Communication Skills – Are they a central focus? Should we take faculty teaching GE courses at their word when they say that communication skills are a central outcome of their courses, even if the course is in microbiology or anthropology? N. Schroeder took offense over the idea that faculty not trained in teaching communication skills claim that they are teaching this subject matter. It is important to remind faculty that if they have ranked their courses on any GE outcome as a 4 or 5, they will be asked for assessment data. The question was asked, “What is the difference between actually teaching listening, and assessing listening?” P. Creason thought that a good idea would be to ask the different departments if they are dead set on rankings as high as a 4 or 5 on communication skills. If they say yes, then we should propose they go over their course content with us so we can find out how they actually assess it. P. Creason added that the faculty members’ concept of the GE outcomes were “all over the map,” so that clearer definitions need to be provided. On the other hand, if the faculty are adamant about their courses being ranked a 5 on the GE outcomes, then we need to leave it at a 5. When rated a 4 or 5, there must be an outcome in their course outline that links to the GE outcome. Are there any course outlines that have an outcome about the communication skill of listening? N. Schroeder shared the grid on which she has mapped existing course-level outcomes on the course outlines of record onto the GE outcomes. She said that we need to be sure that faculty completely understands the line between the 3 & 4 ratings. E. Bagg reminded the committee that we need to include adjunct faculty in this process.

C. In terms of assessment criteria, faculty members within disciplines will need to set the criteria for competency. For example, the math department needs to determine what constitutes numeric literacy. Is it equivalent to competence in Math 110 course-level outcomes? C. Hendricks suggested that we ask each department which course they would like to designate as their threshold course. E. Bagg thought that we should let the departments choose the three GE outcomes they would like to assess next fall. P. Knapp said they should pick only one GE outcome to assess this fall and T. Alexander concurred that this was probably more manageable. The departments will need to be provided with a list of activities they could do for this assessment. Some type of pre-post measure is needed. Help will be needed on data analysis, as well as how to translate the data into something meaningful that can be used for improvement.
D. When providing grid ratings on Flex Day, some departments ‘averaged’ rankings under critical thinking by considering whether their courses addressed critical thinking AND science literacy AND numeric literacy, whereas we wanted them to provide us with the highest rating they would give to any of the three outcomes. Obviously more instruction on how to do the ratings is needed.

E. The committee briefly revisited the one remaining institutional-level SLO. T. Alexander thought that the ISLO is appropriate, in that it applies to any student coming through LBCC.

F. The three motions to go before the Curriculum Committee the next day were discussed briefly. The one to change the core competencies to GE Outcomes was likely to be passed. The one proposing to combine Creativity with Aesthetics was reconsidered in light of the feedback received on Flex Day that creativity to a scientist is different than creativity associated with aesthetics. Philosophers didn’t like the “bullet points” in the Appendix addressing creativity, because they didn’t cover what the philosophy courses do. The ASLO committee wanted to continue to move forward with the motion to combine creativity with aesthetics, in the service of combining the outcomes into a more manageable number.

VIII. New Business

A. Mira Costa College Reps & March Flex Day material: Representatives from Mira Costa College will arrive at 10 a.m. on our next Flex Day, Wednesday, March 25th, 2009. Do we want them to cover methods of assessment? Or do we want them to cover where to go with the data once we actually collect it? It might be a good idea to get info on ‘closing the loop’, that is, making use of the data for improvement across the institution. We would like them to start with an overview of their model. Obviously, not all aspects of assessment can be presented in the matter of a few hours.

B. T. Alexander updated the committee on the first meeting of the new ISLO Committee. She said the members were excited about our grids and although they are new to the assessment project, they wanted to get right to work trying to create a companion grid appropriate to their areas.

The thorny question as to what constitutes a program outside of the GE program was revisited. Some courses do not lead to a certificate or a degree. They are just pre-requisites that allow transfer. The question was asked, “What programs should we turn to now that the GE program assessment is underway?” C. Hendricks suggested that we should focus on the nursing program. Two other programs suggested were ESL and the engineering certificate. The committee tentatively decided to work on each of these three as our next project.

C. LBCC Warning Status: E. Bagg began emphasized the fact that we need to figure out a way to get more involvement in assessment work across the campus, as this is a huge responsibility for our group. She added that it is imperative that we seek out all possible resources to support us. The committee agreed.

IX. Next Meeting: March 3rd, 2009 in D352.

X. Adjournment: 4:05 p.m.