ASSessment of Student Learning Outcomes
COMMITTEE
Subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
October 6th, 2009
L-255
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.

I. Call to Order
II. Attendance Recorded
III. Agenda and Minutes
IV. Public/Faculty Comments (must pertain to item[s] on the agenda)
V. Old Business
   Re: Letter from ACCJC -States to “include the attainment of these SLOs in faculty evaluation”. It was mentioned that no one from faculty has ever asked the union to look into this.

   One of the members asked about other colleges, and Kim informed the subcommittee that she has seen other colleges ignore it, as well as to put it into their contract with a blurb stating that “faculty will participate”, and as a component of faculty self-evaluation.

   The subcommittee requested that Dwayne Shaffer, President of the CCA, be invited to the next meeting. Kim will invite him.

VI. New Business
Kim started by whole-heartedly thanking the subcommittee for showing up and apologized for “hitting them a little hard” at the last meeting.

   Kim reminded the committee to keep thinking at course level and to be very specific, but at the same time to be thinking globally. The current work of this subcommittee will require such back and forth engagement of issues.

   The members are happy about us ‘branching out’ – one member added how he left the last meeting feeling rather positive about everything.

   AD/GE Philosophy of GE (another subcommittee of the curriculum committee) handout was compiled by taking all the separate write-ups, and putting them together to come up with a “comprehensive” version. We must be reminded to edit for clarity, not content. Kim took a few minutes to go over why parts were in red, and where they originated. The subcommittee offered its suggestions, which Kim made note of, and will send it on to AD/GE for finalization. Kim added that the AD/GE Philosophy of GE piece will eventually be posted on our website, following editing and polishing.

   The next topic, Instructional Program Assessment Plans. Clarification about department plans, which are the all-encompassing business aspects of a department and program plans which are the instructional component(s) of the department. One department may have one program while another department may have several.

   Starting soon, there will be training for subcommittee members to be able to assist, guide, and support other faculty members in creating their course level assessment plans. This makes our members the reviewers.

   There are a variety of ways to come up with program level outcomes. How can you assess them? We need to look at the best way to fill out the first 3 columns in a program assessment plan.

   2012 is D-Day. We must encourage everyone to get up and get going with this now. It is now known that we must look at assessments more regularly, about once every six years. The assessments do not need to be assessed consecutively each year. Course assessment plans will follow the established routine course review cycle.

   The subcommittee has requested they receive a copy of the flowchart in full color (for the instructional side).

   Remember the three M’s: Meaningful, measurable and manageable. Is it meaningful? Can it be measured? How manageable is it? This is the protocol for course, program, and institution level outcomes assessment.

   A worksheet was presented to view the College’s mission, existing ILOs and the newly expanded Instructional Program Outcomes. Review and discussion ensued as to their alignment and redundancy. After substantial discussion it was agreed that the College should be using one or the other, but not both of them. It was decided to eliminate the ILOs and to use the General Education Outcomes (GEOs) as a measure of institutional effectiveness for instructional portion of the College at this time.

   It was asked, “Who would coordinate it?” Institutional level assessments will be done. GEOs as well as achievement data information and this will be a joint responsibility of the ASLO Subcommittee and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, with cooperation from instructional programs. ALL MUST BE DONE BY 2012!!! Now is the time to gear it up, and get it going – we can always change it and refine it at a later time. Let’s give it a try and see if it’s reflective enough of the Institution.

   Each department will be responsible for entering all pertinent data/information into TracDat.
NOVEMBER 10th, 2009 - ACCJC will be here for a return visit to assess progress in establishing an on-going and systematic process.

Resource binders were distributed to begin inservice training for subcommittee members. This will continue within the framework of the subcommittee meetings for the rest of this semester. Commitments were discussed.

The subcommittee asked me to please forward a copy of their signed stipend contract to each of them for reference.

Outcomes Assessment Standards per ACCJC

A continuing process that lets us know if we are being as effective as we need to/want to be. There are four levels:

- Awareness
- Development
- Proficiency
- Sustainability

Description of what an accredited institution must do.

We are required to provide evidence we are making progress. We must be at the proficiency level by 2012. We must show we are making an effort in getting this done. As stated by ACCJC, we need to be able to show a plan on how we will get to the proficiency level by 2012.

VII. Training and Review

Please use the concise version on how to fill out each one of the columns.

Detailed directions on how to fill out the assessment plan will be presented at our next meeting on the 20th.

Try outcomes assessment process for one cycle, and then change it if need be. Midterm corrections can be made if it is totally unmanageable, but that should be captured in the results phase of the assessment process.

VIII. Informational Items

IX. Next Meeting  Tuesday, October 20th, 2009 - 2:30-4:30 p.m., L-255

X. Adjournment