

**Assessment for Student Learning Subcommittee  
Meeting Minutes  
February 16, 2006**

Present: Roy, Johnson, Royer, Novak

Absent: Hodge, Jensen

Meeting called to order: 8:40 a.m.

Approval of February 16, 2006 Agenda and Minutes from 12/8/05: Approved as distributed.

1) Allotment of Assessment funds

Novak asked that the Committee consider establishing criteria for and involvement in awarding funds to departments for assessment projects. He noted that in addition to the money for the two-year support of Program Assessment Coordinators (PACs) Diana Demetrulias' AQA office has monies to support specific projects. Right now the process goes through AQA with consultation by the FCASL. A set of basic criteria have been used, and application developed, and funding has been on a first come-first served basis. There seemed to be interest by the Committee in pursuing this and we will ask Lori Phillips in AQA to send the current criteria so that we can review it and decide on our level of involvement.

Further discussion on this included issues such as whether non-academic program units would be funded, the motivation for this (WASC?), whether this would be consistent with the UEPC charge for the ASL committee (the consensus was that it is), and timing of requests for proposals (once or twice a year). We agreed to discuss this further when we had more details on the existing criteria.

2) Department Assessment Reports

Roy provided the committee with two sample assessment reports used by departments at other universities. Comparisons were made with the format for assessment reports included in the recently develop Stanislaus Assessment Handbook. Novak outlined the Handbook reporting requirements which involve:

1. Mission and goals. 2. What are the student learning goals? 3. What data were collected and how? 4. What did you talk about? 5. What did you with the results to improve the program or student learning?

Roy pointed out that one of the forms had many specifics. Johnson thought having something too specific is less useful and likely to lower standards. Roy didn't think that the alternative forms would be helpful to PACs, but might confuse them.

4) Will be discussed at next meeting.

Novak suggested that the topic of how to involve faculty in participating in national and regional assessment conferences be taken up at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned: 9:40 a.m.