

SAAC

Student Achievement Assessment Committee

Meeting Minutes February 20, 2009

In attendance:

David Moon, Committee Chair & AVCAA
Lynne Calhoun, Assessment Office
Sue Byerley, Library
Robert King, Student Success
Don Gardner, Business
Ted Lamb, Institutional Research
Aditi Mitra, WEST and Sociology
Catherine Kaukinen, Criminal Justice
Jeff Broker, Biology

ABSENT:

Fernando Feliu-Moggi
Kathryn Andrus, Teaching and Learning Center
Marcia Hacker, Nursing
Joe Wehrman, Counseling & Human Services
Ed Chow, EAS & Computer Science

Item/Activity Covered	Who will Follow-up	When
-----------------------	--------------------	------

Note – there was no December or January meeting.

Update on departmental progress reports: 53% (31) complete. 24% (14) In progress, 2 have year off, 10% (5) we are not sure what they are doing. 14% (7) won't be done this year.

Update on testing for GE/VSA: We have to complete the CLA testing by April 16th, 2009. Katie K. mentioned we can use her intro class in the fall testing cycle. Lynne will review spring catalog for potential courses for CLA testing and send information to Associate Dean's/David.

Discussion of spending priorities: \$3,000 is to be cut from the Assessment base budget going into the upcoming fiscal year – probably for at least two fiscal years – possibly forever? At this point DPAR will only fund testing. So we should get CLA and MAPP funds. David will ask, but it isn't positive yet. The plant fund currently has \$35,000 in it. David would like to plan for the use of the plant fund for the next two years, although leave open the option to revise/revisit next year. **First item** is related to Faculty level consultation (related to departmental assessment/progress reports). There are three options at this point. **1.** continue utilizing consultant (out of plan fund). **2.** Faculty associate – possibly \$10,000 for one academic year with two offsets. **3.** Kathryn. Lynne & Kathryn will team up to handle different aspects of the faculty level consultation. Potentially looking like Kathy with SLO's and measures and Lynne with the 'data' support. In exchange for Kathy's additional responsibilities the funding for the faculty associate would shift to cover an increase in assistance to assist with her workload in the TLC. The funding would provide for student hourly as opposed to work study. Kathy is not eligible to receive stipend. **The second item** is mini-grants. Potential 4 @ \$2,500 each to total \$10,000. Review the current RFP and change criteria. Help faculty write mini-grants associate with assessment process and departmental progress reports.

In depth - related to departmental progress reports: Ted suggested Lynne provide the struggling departments with a "Cadillac" version of a completed departmental progress report. Don suggested that we provide examples of what a clear objective is versus a not so good objective. David stated "Okay, how can you get there because some just don't understand. People still believe they need to make themselves look good. So they pick measures to do that, so you can model that, but it doesn't convince them if the measures come out lower than they want. So how did we get them to set and achieve their slo's versus looking good. Katie mention's that it would be helpful to meet with us (departments) and review goals and outcomes early in the year, rather than have the year already started." *Definitely good idea.*

S A A C

Student Achievement Assessment Committee

In depth – related to mini-grants: This spring in planning for next academic year (2009-2010. We can direct where the funds go. Contingency: has to report back to us and share the results with the rest of the department. Even if individual gets off-load, stipulate that whole department has to be involved (*on what level*). Another option is to send someone to a discipline related assessment conference. (*look for conferences related to their discipline*). Ted: Perhaps we could consider two kinds of proposals. One broad and innovative *along current lines of rfp* and another one specific to departmental progress reports and their assessment process – conference attendance. With both proposals tied back to assessment in the unit. Sue suggests that we target specific departments rather than all – perhaps rather than a call for proposals, select the departments we will consider proposals from. Not an open call, an invitation.

Next meeting will be Friday, March 20, 2009 in the EPC.
