Committee Members - Present: Jane Jackson, Lakshmikanta Sengupta, John Sweart, Kevin Sinarle, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Lilya Vorobey, Madeleine Murphy (chair), Tabitha Conaway

Absent: Denaya Dailey, Teresa Morris, David Locke, Grecia Mascareno

Note-Taker: Kevin Sinarle

1. Agenda – approved
2. Chair Reports: Discussion
   a. Timeline
      i. Tentative timeline handout given out. Timeline is slightly off, but still on track to be completed by end of term
      ii. Fall 2015 faculty involved in that terms assessment pilot met and reviewed results of GE SLO #1
      iii. Faculty assessment evaluations will be compiled and discussed at next CAC meeting
      iv. CAC chair will be contacting faculty to be involved in the next assessment pilot for GE SLO #2
   b. GE-SLO pilot
      i. GE SLO #1: Effective Communication – selected faculty met to discuss assessment in different disciplines
         1. Handout of results was given out at meeting (see attached) and discussed
            a. Discussion items included:
               i. Issue of GE SLO assessment w/out a capstone course
               ii. There is a lot of confusion about GE SLOs amongst faculty, but clear through ACCJC that GE SLOs’ must be done
               iii. Do all courses need to be linked to a specific GE SLO? – the answer is a bit unclear at this time, and points to the need to look at the framework of our current GE SLOs in future discussions
         2. SLO #2 – Quantitative Reasoning – will be assessed next academic year – selected faculty will be invited to participate in the assessment and review of the results
   c. SLO Website update : CAC chair is continuing to work on the new CSM SLO website
      i. There will be an overview of SLOs’ and CSMs assessment approach
      ii. There will also be a toolkit for the CSM community to use as they develop and assess SLO’s
      iii. The site is expected to go live by the end of the spring 2016 term
d. Tracdat update: tracdat is currently on hold, assessment results should still be collected and saved, but not entered into tracdat until the new version of tracdat is complete, and available
   i. The CAC chair has been working with the tracdat development team on the changes to tracdat – it has been a slow process – there have been several changes to help with the tracdat interface, but still appears less than ideal for instructional faculty
   ii. Volunteers have stepped forward to enter old data into the new version of tracdat to provide additional assessment of the tool
   iii. Many faculty on campus have expressed frustration with the useability of tracdat

e. Research: College-Wide SLO status report: 26 Faculty interviewed so far
   i. In virtually all departments, one contact person organizes SLO assessment and enters data
   ii. Most faculty use embedded assignments; some use an extra quiz or pre/post quiz, and a few use self-assessment surveys
   iii. Most faculty interviewed do SLO assessment every year, or in each class. Many record the assessment each term as they enter grades for the course.
   iv. Nursing, Cosmetology, and Addiction Studies have more meaningful metrics, while most departments have yet to sort out how to assess program SLO’s in a meaningful way because of small numbers, and impossibility of tracking students.
   v. Some faculty have found real value in SLO assessment, but many faculty do not see that SLO’s contribute much to real assessment

Conclusions: need clear college-established policies that define SLOs; faculty need more support on how to write SLOS; we should disassociate assessment from SLO gathering – perhaps dedicating a flex day each term to “assessment” activities and create a clear assessment cycle that culminates in program review; Processes need to be integrated.

3. Next Meeting: scheduled for 4/18/16