



**ASSESSMENT WORK GROUP
UNAPPROVED MINUTES
April 20, 2012**

Members Present: Gerald Wray, Teryl Ward, Beth Bailey, Jason Wohlstadter, Steve Aristotelous, Pedro Mendez, Antoinette Herrera, Lorena Dorn, James Todd, Chad Redwing, Bonnie Hunt, Charles Mullins, John Sola, Kathleen Ennis

Members Absent: Adrienne Peek, Jennifer Hamilton, David Baggett, Kamran Payvar, Kimberly Christensen

Guests Present: Dr. Mary Retterer, Interim President, Dr. James Fay, Interim Vice President of Instruction

I. Review of Minutes:

The Assessment Work Group members reviewed and approved the April 6, 2012 minutes.

II. Program Level Outcome Check-In:

Heather Townsend provided the group with an updated list of programs that had PLOs turned in for purpose of an electronic addendum to the catalog. The group analyzed and discussed the lists provided. Chad remarked that general studies PLOs are going to be completed, but they are not authentic yet. Chad stated that it is hard to track this information for assessment. Dr. Fay noted that any assistance needed from him can be provided. Pedro said that the assessment process is an evolving process. The group discussed and identified point persons for each PLO that has not been completed. Charles Mullins had asked about the upcoming budget cuts, and if we should even move forward on this. Pedro said, "Yes, if a program exits today, we should have PLOs for the program." Lorena motioned that we not establish program learning outcomes for IGETC and CSU-GE right now until we firmly establish the method to be used for GELOs. Once the method is established, the group will focus on using that method. Dr. Retterer suggested the group ask other colleges (American River or Sac City) how they assess the IGETC and CSU-GE programs. Pedro tabled the discussion on the IGETC and CSU-GE outcomes for the next Assessment Work Group meeting. Heather Townsend noted that all PLOs, in order for an appearance in the catalog addendum, must be submitted via email to Heather by 5:00 p.m. on April 23, 2012.

III. Course Level SLO 2011 Submission Check-In:

Pedro showed the work group members a form, a simplified version of the Excel spreadsheet that was sent to members last week, for the collection of assessment data. The assessment data collected by members will be incorporated into the 2012 Comprehensive Assessment Report. The data used for the report is courses assessed in 2011. Pedro stated that members can use the spreadsheet that was sent via email, or the word file format document that was distributed. Pedro explained the manual data collection process to Dr. Fay. Pedro stated that CurricUNET does not have a working useable tool to pull data out for assessment purposes yet. For now, the Assessment Work Group must manually input data for the Assessment Report. Dr. Fay asked Pedro to show the spreadsheet to Gina Rose. Dr. Fay stated that Gina may be able to populate the information for the group.

James Todd asked about inactivated courses. James asked if there was a list of all courses that have been inactivated recently. Heather said that she will ask Letitia Miller, Curriculum Specialist, about a database that may hold this information. James Todd said that there are courses on the books but they are not active. James asked if we are supposed to assess these courses. Pedro stated that if the course is not active, we do not assess it.

Chad Redwing asked when the data is due. Pedro stated that the information needs to be sent to Pedro by May 2, 2012. The report will be presented at the May 15, 2012, Assessment Workshop.

IV. Assessment Work Group Faculty Coordinator (Co-Chair) Update:

The Assessment Work Group members discussed the current state of the Assessment Work Group Faculty Coordinator position. The work group invited Dr. Retterer and Dr. Fay to join in on the discussion. Dr. Retterer commended the group for meeting from 1-3 on a Friday, and said that they were really brave to do so. Mary also stated that she was very proud, and thanked the group for taking on the assessment task. Mary pointed out that the minutes had stated that the position was offered now at 40% and not 20%. Mary stated that Jennifer is also receiving 20% for writing the Accreditation Report. Dr. Retterer said, "We are still about \$800,000 away from a balanced budget. Everything is extremely tight. We are trying to keep this flat. The same as it has been. With that said, I know that this coordinator position is a lot of work. Nobody wants to do it along with everything else that they have to do. Unfortunately Pedro has to do it, he doesn't get release time. I want to make sure that you are clear on exactly what the terms were, that were turned down. It was the 40% that was turned down, and we are just trying to see if we can keep that cost stabilized and not add another \$17, 500 to it. I don't know if anybody else has stepped up or if the Senate has reopened it, but there has to be somebody from faculty to work with Pedro whether they have been on the committee before or not."

Beth Bailey stated that she could not imagine having anyone else that has not been part of the committee as Assessment Coordinator. Pedro stated that he sees both sides of

the discussion. Pedro said that it is critical to have a Faculty Assessment Coordinator that is in the trenches, but he also sees the financial challenges before us. Pedro said that the position may need to be discussed and analyzed more, when it comes to project scope (resources, scope, and time). Pedro said that he was concerned of the group losing its momentum. James Todd encouraged that a better defined role be clarified for the position. James likes the idea of trying to find a way to accommodate whoever applies. James stated that maybe this position needs to be opened up campus wide. James stated, "Maybe we need set parameters so that somebody doesn't feel that they are doing too much."

Chad Redwing stated, "I think part of the problem is that it has become personal because it is so important to us, right? We put more than, I think most committees do into this work. To think that it's underappreciated, I think personally is hateful. I bring this up because there are other groups like this. Right now I am part of a cohort where I am taking three online classes as I am trying to teach, plus committee work. The group just got clarity today that there is no money to support the group to become nationally accredited to teach online. I was pretty proud of the group because they decided that if there is no money, the third online class will just be paid for out of our own pockets. I am just saying that it was that groups' decision, with this new understanding, was willing to take that on. I am wondering if that's what we need to do in this room. Given the clarity of where we are at and what the money is what we're willing to take on and not; and leave aside the hurt feelings. I know that this is a special crew and we put in an extra amount, but if that is the reality maybe the conversation is more objective. Maybe we need to say given the resources we have, what we can do so we don't kill ourselves. Part of the extra that we take on here is partly doing our work and partly doing some of our colleagues that don't do theirs. The personal part is understandable but I think it is campus wide, and I think we should let some things go."

Pedro stated, "I have had some conversations with Jennifer, and she has been wrestling with this as well. It is not a matter necessarily of resources where she is at philosophically. It is how she can be effective." Pedro continued, "She may be thinking about a different scope all together. This is kind of that balance. Assessment can be a very, very, large initiative. How do we narrow down what is important for us for the next 12 months. I have been at this for four years. The only way that we are toggling through a four year process on courses and now introducing programs, is because of this group."

Jason Wohlstadter stated, "I think we are approaching a time where the assessment responsibility is going to become greater. You are talking about scope, and with the four year cycle coming up. People are going to have to start assessing their PLOs. There is going to be a lot more workshops on how to assess PLOs. We need a leader who is informed, has the time and commitment to really be connected on what's going on. The responsibility, the scope, has increased. We are at a point that is pretty critical, and I feel like we are starting to diminish that role. I think whatever we put in to that position; it says how much we value that position. I have seen people come and go, when it comes to Assessment Coordinator, mainly because that is a position with a lot of

responsibility and very little respect around the campus. I think whatever we give to that leadership position, says a lot about how the College values that position.”

Chad stated, “We should be doing less, but others should be doing more. This is why we need to rely on this coordinator.” Pedro asked the group to keep in mind the work of the committee to the work of the Assessment Coordinator. Jason Wohlstadter noted that if the coordinator position was an easy job, people would jump for it. Jason remarked that it helps to have the administrative support for minutes, etc. Mary stated that the administrative support piece sounds like a critical piece to the position. Mary said that she can add the administrative support aspect to the Assessment Coordinator position.

V. Homework:

The work group discussed homework. James suggested that the position be opened up again to faculty, and for Dr. Fay and Pedro to discuss and define the roles of the work group representatives and the Faculty Assessment Coordinator. It was then suggested that Pedro report back to the group the result of the discussion with Dr. Fay. The discussion is very important to the group for reason of clarification and clearly defined roles. Antoinette suggested that we also look at the work group charge at the next meeting date. Heather Townsend will provide group members a list of all course inactivation’s approved by the Curriculum Committee for 2011-2012.

VI. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 3:16 p.m.