I. Call to Order - promptly @ 2:30 p.m., by Kim Anderson, Chair

II. Attendance taken

III. Agenda and Minutes - approved by the subcommittee, 11/17/09

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

V. Old Business
   A. Outreach update for ASLO process
      As requested, Kim presented a PowerPoint about the scope and intent of the ASLO process to the department heads and will be doing the same at the upcoming Curriculum Committee meeting. The PowerPoint presentation will be uploaded to the department chair website very soon. One question item asked had to do with 2012 (the magic year) – when we want to be at proficiency level. Everything doesn’t have to be assessed by 2012, but assessment plans must be in place and functioning (closing the loop). We need to be able to show that the departments are managing the plans. It is felt that some sort of goal should be in place no later than 2012. Start collecting, dialog it, and facilitate change. In order to support the outcome, evidence must be shown. Other colleges that have been looked at show the loop completed by 2012 for all courses. Note: **We need to talk about core and GE assessment loop strategy.
   B. Course SLO update
      The committee members took a few moments to update everyone on their initial contact with the departments they had been assigned. The question of whether the inactive list had seemed to get larger. The Chair briefly talked about the courses being archived at this time. The Theatre/Dance Department has already posted all course SLOs for the 3 disciplines on the department website. When SLOs are listed on the department website, syllabi must list links to the website.

VI. New Business
   A. Course to Program Curriculum Mapping (inclusion)
      The committee needs to begin talking about program level. Curriculum mapping is a standard procedure through a wide scope of community colleges. We are talking about the process of gathering this info. Only the core courses in each identified instructional program actually need to be mapped out. Core required courses must be entered as one on each row of the grid. Please note at the bottom of the page, it says you must use evidence. Several corrections were made.
   B. Course Assessment Plan Anomalies
      There are two primary anomalies that are consistently coming up while course plans are now being developed. One, the way that some outcomes are written they absolutely cannot be assessed. Two, are infrequently scheduled courses. Do assessment plans still need to be done on these? The answer is definitely yes. If we agree that certain statements can be inserted into the assessment plans, and you find you can’t come up with an outcome, use “The dept faculty has decided that it is non-assessable”, “is not feasible”, or “that it is assessed in another outcome”. You can modify the SLO, move the SLO, or delete the SLO because it is not relevant to the course at that juncture in the assessment process for that course. We recognize it needs to be refined, but it is a nice balance that still allows continued progress but flexibility for the instructional programs. The other consistent issue is the infrequently offered course. Place in column 2, under the “when” prompt. You guarantee that you will at least once offer this in the assessment cycle. If a course is not offered at least once in a six-year cycle, that can be informative. Rather than give a number of courses, keeping it general will hopefully capture appropriate information. The subcommittee approved this informational document and it will be sent out to all FT faculty. (ASLO will soon be getting an ASLO email.) We will use this as the signature, and it will also be our first real communication with the faculty.
VII. Training and Review

Blooms Digital for binder (handout) – passed out to the subcommittee to insert in appendix, behind the others. This is a new copy for digital language.

A. Rough Drafts: Learning Examples to Update - (table insufficient/sufficient handout distributed and discussed; updated and will include in informational handouts on the website)

It was decided that some support was needed, so we have created the insufficient/sufficient table. Is it significant? Helpful? There are certain standards and certain thresholds that need to be met when explaining assessment tasks. Updates and clarifications were made by the subcommittee while a discussion on the use of rubrics with certain assessment tasks clarified that documentation. These new suggestions will be inserted into the document on the website.

Members should have already critiqued the sample course assessment plans that were received in the meeting packets on their own. Members broke into groups for a brainstorm / working session on these sample course assessment plans. As a whole, the first two sample course assessment plans were discussed in workgroups and as an entire group.

The discussion covered already created SLOs, number of identified questions, test bank of questions, length of evidence collection, contradictions within assessment plans, and random sampling.

Don’t forget: pull the other two training assessment plans for homework and bring them to the next meeting.

B. Make-up training will be on Tuesday, December 8th, 2009, from 2:30 – 4:30 p.m., in L-255

VIII. Informational Items

IX. Next Meeting

Tuesday, December 1st, 2009, 2:30-4:30 p.m., L-255

X. Adjournment