



Meeting Notes – November 21, 2013 Educational Effectiveness Council

ATTENDEES	Luz Calvo, Tamra Donnelly, Jiansheng Guo, Vish Hegde, Xinjian Lu, Sarah Nielsen, Sue Opp, Aline Soules, Donna Wiley, Jim Zarrillo
ABSENT	

AGENDA ITEM	
1. Save the Date for WASC ARC-April 23-25, 2014	
DISCUSSION	Members were encouraged to attend WASC ARC in April 2014, and to be sure to complete appropriate paperwork ahead of time.
CONCLUSIONS	
2. PLO spreadsheet for Blackboard Outcomes	
DISCUSSION	The working draft spreadsheet that is being used to coordinate uploading learning outcomes into Blackboard was displayed. Members requested a copy of the document. It will be distributed with the caveat that it is a draft, not meant for wide distribution. Science expressed concern that some of the documents they provided were not posted on the Program Portfolio Website.
CONCLUSIONS	Donnelly will review Science submissions.
3a. Chancellor's Office Annual Report	
DISCUSSION	The Annual Report requested by the Chancellor's Office was discussed, to inform EEC members of what we are expected to address concerning assessment results, including listing SLOs, assessment findings, closing the loop and any other significant findings.
CONCLUSIONS	
3b. Chancellor's Office Assessment Plan Requirement	
DISCUSSION	The Chancellor's Office has developed new guidelines for new program proposals, including a very comprehensive requirement for assessment plan. Members were requested to review the guidelines and be sure that any new programs follow them.
CONCLUSIONS	
4. EEC Report for WASC Self-study	
DISCUSSION	<p>The criteria for review (CFRs) that are under the purview of EEC were discussed. Members suggested that service to assessment should be considered during RTP reviews. CEAS is currently defining categories of assessment service. It was suggested that WASC requirements could be used as a tool to demonstrate the need for assessment. Members discussed a perceived gender inequity in service to the university. It was suggested that FDEC and FAC could be involved in research in this area.</p> <p>CFR 2.4 which requires that student learning outcomes are in course syllabi was discussed. It is a Senate requirement that they are included, but this has not been enforced. Discussion ensued of the best way to encourage compliance. Leadership support (president/provost) would be welcomed. EEC recommends that an email be sent in January that requires each course being taught in Winter 2014 to submit a syllabus. Good examples of course syllabi will be sent to Opp for distribution as a potential template/example to share. APGS will organize the collection of syllabi.</p> <p>Members were also asked to gather and submit curriculum maps with indications of where concepts are Introduced, Developed, and Mastered.</p>
CONCLUSIONS	
3. College Reports	
3a. CBE	Lu reported that AACSB received their Sixth Year Report. The team complimented the college on its efforts. Lu stated that CBE must follow through with their plans.
3b. CEAS	Zarrillo reported that the CEAS accreditation task force met and spent about 30 minutes on WASC needs, and an hour on CAEP needs. They are moving from

	TaskStream to Blackboard, with a pilot in Blackboard during winter and spring. REC and HRT are both going to assess critical thinking.
3c. CLASS	The CLASS FACT will next meet in January. Each department has an assessment coordinator in place who receives a \$1,500 stipend. The college has a good assessment structure in place.
3d. COS	McCrea reiterated that the Program Portfolio Website did not seem to have all the information posted. The COS members have met with some resistance internally and would like support for developing the college assessment structure.
3e. LIBR	Soules reported that LIBR faculty are not sure that Blackboard is the most useful tool for assessment.
3f. GE	No report.