

COLLEGE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Meeting Summary

Tuesday, Feb 7, 2017 - 1:30-2:30

16-105

Committee Members present: Madeleine Murphy, Kevin Sinarle, Santiago Perez, Jane Jackson, Laurie Chin, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza

1. Agenda approved

2. November 2016 minutes approved (note: no meeting 12/16, so minutes were approved over email).

3. Chair updates:

- Flex activities this semester (on the new Institutional Outcome activity, and the “Water Cooler Workshops) were really poorly attended. But the people who did come had great ideas. The ILO activity will focus on climate change, and take the form of some kind of student discussion activity – stay tuned. The “water cooler workshops” session yielded some ideas, and there will be at least one experiment in student reading (Writing Center reading groups).
- Assessment 2.0: An Opening Day extravaganza?
In our continuing effort to try to make times and places for faculty to find out what people are doing, raise questions, and generally get together to find out more about teaching and learning on campus, here’s a suggestion: Perhaps launch something like the old Scholarship of Teaching and Learning center (SoTL)? Instead of having a room dedicated to it, though, we could have something like an “Institution for Teaching and Learning” academy, working with Professional Development, and organizing a routine series of activities. (Flyer attached.) This is currently purely hypothetical. – Discussion: This looks generally like a good idea – we should think more about it.

4. From GE to ILOs: Crafting a revision. We discussed possible amendments to our GE SLOs. The first thing we want to do is rename them – Institutional Learning Outcomes makes much more sense. (GE is confusing; the LOs don’t follow the GE pattern.)

The issue: Current GE SLOs don’t include language that reflects creative thinking or creativity, OR that makes room for SAOs (i.e., counseling, support services etc.)

Solutions:

- Add new language to existing five SLOs? We didn’t like that; “critical thinking” would end up tracking everything from economics, to art, to dance, to physics – not enough separation of data.
- Add two new SLOs. We preferred this: it preserves distinction, and while seven LOs is a lot for a *course,* it’s not really a problem to have seven institutional LOs (they’re assessed through single activities and mapped course outcomes, so it doesn’t increase effort to have seven).
Also: What if no one maps to a specific ILO? Or if the enrolment in those courses declines? – We could revise them, but we can also use the establishment of the ILO to lobby for more resources and attention to a particular field. ILOs are a statement of the college values: if we value creativity, we will want to promote it.

Next steps: Madeleine will circulate the draft ILOs just to our committee, and collect any more feedback.

This revised document will be brought to ASGC at their late February meeting, and will do the rounds of Curriculum Committee and various other places before they are finalized. ASGC finalizes them; it’s OK for us to send out a draft for comment – plenty of people may have comments. We hope to get the new ILOs approved this semester!

Meeting ended 2:30 p.m.