Members present: Chris Chamberlain, Tamra Donnelly, Caron Inouye, Michael Lee, Sally Murphy, Sarah Nielsen, Julia Olkin, Aline Soules, John Whitman

Members absent: Denise Fleming

Guests: Julie Marty-Pearson

Chair Lee called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm.

1. Approval of Agenda

M/S/P (Chamberlain/Soules) to approve the agenda as amended.

2. Approval of Minutes

M/S/P (Whitman, Soules) to approve the minutes of January 31, 2012

3. Committee Membership and Election of Chair

Two representatives from CBE are still needed. Marty-Pearson stated that she would be teaching for CBE next quarter, so she could be a potential member. Lee will contact Interim Dean Agrawal proposing that she be appointed for winter and spring quarters. Lee will also reach out to Theyel to find out if he is interested in serving on the committee. Chamberlain sent an email to Associate Dean Zarillo mentioning that CEAS needs another representative to the committee.

4. Revisit charge

The committee discussed the Excel sheet showing the mapping of program learning outcomes to institutional learning outcomes that was prepared by a graduate student intern working with ILO subcommittee members during the development of the ILOs. Lee added a worksheet with a different sort method to show the percentages of programs that cover the ILOs through their PLOs. Discussion of whether there should be a one to one match up led to the conclusion that more flexibility was needed. Donnelly will send the graduate learning outcomes to Lee for updating and distribution to the committee on Monday. Lee will craft an email to distribute the workbook to programs to let them know that it is intended to be a useful tool for redesigning PLOs.

5. Joint statement regarding culture of assessment at CSUEB

Chamberlain spoke to Senate Chair Watnik and the two of them plan to meet with the provost to discuss. Murphy had a chance to speak to the provost earlier in the week and she broached the subject with him. She suggested that the provost and the president need to make a statement that we are transforming CSUEB culture to become a learning centered community. In order to include the entire university it is important that a statement come from the president. Murphy mentioned that efforts were made but nothing was sustained since the last WASC Educational Effectiveness visit. Soules suggested a joint Senate/Administration announcement. Because some senators view assessment as an unfunded mandate there could be resistance to supporting this.
6. **EEC**

Inouye reported that EEC members have been reaching out to college colleagues to assist with redesign of PLOs. Faculty need to be assured that the multiple requests are asking for the same thing. Also, faculty are not being asked to assess ILOs, just to map PLOs to them.

7. **GE Program Assessment**

Murphy distributed the GE Learning Outcomes outline, a 2003 or 2004 description of the GE Learning Outcomes, and learning outcomes for the Cultural Groups/Women General GE Requirement. The CG/W document was the first learning outcome written for a CSUEB program. In December of 2012 the Senate approved a GE assessment protocol. The GE Subcommittee will be implementing the plan, beginning with critical thinking and expanding from there. Nielsen wondered if the WASC Core Competencies would be useful to help assess GE. Murphy suggested that they are very broad and would detract from analysis of the institution-specific goals of CSUEB.

GE comprises 72 units and there are also 12 units of other graduations requirements. The GE Subcommittee will be instrumental in assessing GE and demonstrating attainment of ILOs. Murphy mentioned that transfer students learning can be assessed through upper division GE requirements, which include PLOs such as critical thinking, communication, information literacy and quantitative reasoning.

Murphy will provide regular GE Subcommittee reports to the committee.

8. **Co-curricular Committee**

Whitman mentioned that the committee will meet again in early March. It would be useful to have a spreadsheet similar to what was developed for the academic programs for co-curricular programs. Murphy mentioned that the now defunct Division of Student Affairs gathered data and assessed its programs, but she is not aware that the practice has continued.

9. **Planning for Distinction**

How the Shared Strategic Commitments and the Institutional Learning Outcomes can be used for evaluation of programs is being discussed by the Instructional Program Task Group. The Mission was thought to be too broad to offer a meaningful evaluation platform. Lee asked for input on how much weight the incorporation of SSCs and ILOs should have. The consensus was that not knowing what all the criteria are makes such a judgment impossible. Also, since the SSCs and ILOs are very new, programs haven’t had time to incorporate them into planning. Chamberlain pointed out that the development of ILOs was very inclusive and was meant to be an expression of what current expectations are. The new factor is asking the programs to demonstrate their alignment, not to create the alignment, which theoretically already exists.

10. **Meeting adjourned** at 3:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tamra Donnelly, Secretary