

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT COUNCIL

Minutes

October 13, 2014

Members Present: Lynn Hobson, Dan Stiffler, Jim Costello, Sheryl Lidzy, Linda Adams-Wendling, Steve Catt, Cynthia Kane, Rich Sleezer, Brian Schrader, Gary Wyatt, Michael Smith, and JoLanna Kord

Members Absent: Nate Terrell, Allan Comstock, Joe Yanik, Shawna Shane, Matt Seimears, Zeni Colorado, Patrick Martin, Ellen Hansen, Gonzalo Bruce, Larry Falcetto, Andrew Smith, Eric Yang, Mel Storm, and Julie Cayton

1. The September 15th Minutes were reviewed, Brian Schrader motioned to approve, Gary Wyatt seconded and all approved as written.
2. In two group breakout sessions, council members discussed the timeline as presented in the Student Learning Improvement Plan. There was some discussion about the actual plan itself and expectations. Also some questions about just how this will work and report out of the Campus Labs Compliance Assist module. The reporting process, who will run the reports, and some genuine concern about the overall processes and expectations were shared. There was some dialogue about where we were with the PASL and where we are going with assessment efforts. We also talked a bit about how the strategies for improvement learning fit into the goals of the new strategic plan. All good dialogue and sharing.
3. A binder of the most current Academic Program Student Learning outcomes, General Education Goals, and Student Affairs Learning Themes and Outcomes was distributed. The purpose was to have council members take the information back to their faculty and staff to review their own program specific outcomes and to observe how overall these student learning outcomes present institution-wide across all the programs. The next step in this process is to insure each program has up-to-date student learning outcomes and courses within these programs must be mapped to each specific outcome. Some standards and leaning outcomes are dictated by specialized accreditors (Nursing/School of Business) or State entities (KSDE), others are determined by professional organizations or internally by faculty experts. Regardless, each degree program should have up-to-date student learning outcomes for each of their programs.
4. We didn't have time to look at the Curriculum Mapping – Next Steps, and how this will present in the Compliance Assist program. Work will continue to be done by the Assistant Provost in utilizing the tool to provide efficiencies in the curriculum mapping component.
5. Open Discussion – The dialogue continues to be focused on the time paradigm. How do we create the ability to dedicate time to assessment practices and how to balance all of the expectations placed on faculty and their roles in this process. This dialogue also included some of the real barriers that faculty and departments face in juggling daily instruction demands. In addition, there was a note that the terminology and language affiliated with assessment is hard to get, as there seem to be many differences to how words are used to describe assessment and how this varies both internally and across accrediting agencies.
6. Meeting Adjourn at 5:05 p.m. – Next Meeting Date: November 17, 2014