Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for February 18, 2011
Academic Senate Office, 841
12:00-12:50

Members Present: Stephanie Burns, Antonio Castro, Angie Moore, Eileene Tejada, Robyn Womall

1.0 Meeting called to order 12:10

2.0 Adoption of Agenda –msp (E. Tejada)

3.0 Minutes for Review from fall 2010 –msp (E. Tejada) approved with edit
   October 1
   October 22
   October 27
   November 5- change attendance to include E. Tejada
   December 3

4.0 Public Comment- none.

5.0 Action Items

   5.1 Elect Faculty Co-Chair
       Eileene Tejada comments that she feels comfortable with her knowledge of the committee and confident in representation throughout new challenges.
       S. Burns nominates E. Tejada
       E. Tejada elected as new Faculty Co-Chair –msp, unanimous

6.0 Discussion Items

   6.1 Future Meetings
       The committee requested that Eileene give her presentation on Data Models, Best Practices, and Potential Red Flags again. The committee also requested a follow-up report on Data Models and Best Practices at the next meeting.
       Meeting times: from 3-4p.m. in the Senate Office (841) on the following Fridays:
       March 11
       April 8
       May 6
6.2 Status Report

S. Burns is currently working on PEP, helping those starting the 11/12 cycle.

R. Wornall continues to work on PEP. The committee supported the idea of expanding assessment and developing data for service outcomes in student services and administrative areas as part of the PEP process. Assessment would examine how departments impact other departments/services throughout the organization and would clarify processes. Data measuring service outcomes for student service/administrative units would be collected at two points in between PEP cycles and then assessed during the PEP review year to ensure continuous improvement. The committee suggested modules for training (videos) on service assessment outcomes.

R. Wornall plans to meet with Oscar De Haro to discuss the Student Assessment Survey. Key points for discussion include construction of representative survey, determining the best way to assess points of access in student services, and survey deployment. SEM is trying to determine these points in an effort to create awareness.

A. Castro recommends emphasis on freshman guidance services and support/ follow-up resources for students. He notes the importance finding service points of entry and then maintaining follow-up to guide students.

7.0 Items for Next Meeting

S. Burns asks members to consider what kinds of trainings they would like to have available in the TLC and brainstorm ideas for increasing faculty involvement in trainings.

Assessing Student Learning Handbook: an electronic copy is needed to make the edits approved from last semester. Eileene will request a copy from Erik Shearer.

Baseline development: the committee will be studying baselines for success. Currently successful course completion looks at enrollment on census day and whether or not the students made it through the semester. This does not look at specific examples of course completion and you will find that baselines should be developed to better assess for authenticity. Comparable populations should be used for comparison and should identify criteria for success on SLOs. Course
completion data is often misrepresented in favor of higher rates of completion.

Considering dynamics when assessing data: because not one baseline is applicable for all courses. Baselines need to allow for flexibility and give a picture of completion rates. These should develop conversation and not rely on the same benchmarks for completion for all courses. How can we track/follow-up? How do these benchmarks align within the institution? How does our organization compare with other institutions? How are SLO driven? What determines content and how are these different from the outcomes? What is the rationale? Is there something else that we could be using that is more appropriate and how do we measure everything without collapsing our assessment?

Communicating success is important. The process needs to be relatable for professors, and create dialogue between the student and professor to assess all angles of a course. This process is not a part of accreditation and is understaffed and underfunded. What kinds of resources are available when we look at where budget money is really going? The bottom line is “Does the institution meet the standard, and if not, how far are they from it?” This is the challenge to assessment.

8.0 Meeting Adjourned 1:00 – msp (A. Castro)