Present: Pat Flood, Chair, Sarah Master, Stephen Brown, Madelline Hernandez, Sheila, MacDowell, Tigran Mkrtchyan, Darlene Montes, Parvaneh Mohammadian, Monica Moreno, Deborah Paulsen, Patricia Rodriguez, Tara Ward, Marie Zaiens

1. Review of purposes of Committee
   a. Promote dialogue among all units
   Pat Flood gave an overview of the agenda and the handouts attached. She also reviewed the Western Association of Schools and College's (WASC) rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes. The criteria and requirements for achieving "highly developed" outcomes were emphasized.

   b. Review Best Practices
   Tigran Mkrtchyan talked about how the Math Department organizes SLO assessments; they developed a pool of problems and assessed each SLO every time in the last cycle. They designed benchmarks and discussed what actions would be taken if benchmarks were not met.

   Stephen Brown talked about assessment philosophy. He mentioned that he had taken part in one of the interdisciplinary “Deep Dialogue Discussions” being conducted by Academic Affairs Vice President Michael Allen and that they had been very productive.

   c. Evaluate and provide feedback about assessments already conducted
   Discussion ensued regarding: Are the assessments authentic? What have we learned? Should we be the external reviewers? How can we ensure quality control; who should be responsible for quality control; should it be up to the chairs and deans? In the past year we have lacked feedback due to vacant dean positions in Academic Affairs; however, the College is in the final process of hiring both an Academic Affairs dean and an interim dean.

   Tara Ward brought up that focus groups for evaluating the assessments might be a good idea. A few departments could compare assessments. It could be a group of peers discussing the learning process, what we have done, and how we can improve. Some learning outcomes rubrics were presented and discussed as a possible way for chairs and faculty to self-assess their work.
3. Discussion of Rubrics and Criteria for Assessment Self-Evaluation

Monica Moreno shared that Student Support Services has been working with Dr. Perez every week on Division Learning Outcomes for Service Area Outcomes (SAOs). They look at past SAOs, review, and assess how they are doing. They are working on a map for how SAOs are aligned with Division Outcomes and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). The group has also discussed the development of benchmarks for SAOs.

Tara Ward stated that last year they did not do a unit review in Administrative Services. They would like to streamline what they do in each division and how it relates to helping the campus. Human Resources wants to review and evaluate processes and administer evaluations for vendors and staff.

4. Additional Training Needed and Best Way to Provide It?

In the past we have had workshops on entering data into the system, which work best when organized by department. Pat asked the members to query their departments about what additional training is needed.

One of the things we need to focus on this semester is to review the modifications that were suggested previously to see if they have made a difference in student learning.

It was suggested that we have workshops to reemphasize the value of doing assessments and that perhaps we could have experts in the field give some presentations. The possibility of having the Professional Development Committee sponsor some speakers was raised. It was also suggested that we record training sessions and post them on the website.

Adjourned 4:30.

**Next meeting – Tuesday, November 12, 3:00 to 4:30, CC #4**