**BERKELEY CITY COLLEGE**

**Assessment Committee**

**Meeting Minutes**

**September 22, 2020 12:30 -1:30 pm**

**Present:**, Jennie Braman, Nancy Cayton, Leonard Chung, Pieter de Haan, Heather Dodge, Jenny Gough, Kuni Hay, Iva Ikeda, Fan-Ching Kuo, Charlotte Lee, Adán Olmedo, Phoumy Sayavong, Fatima Shah

**Absent:** Fabian Banga, Sepi Hosseini

Meeting took place via Zoom. Meeting ID: 629 464 98

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA ITEM** | **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION** | **FOLLOW UP ACTION** |
| I. Call to Order and Agenda Review | 12:33 p.m.  |  |
| II. Minutes from 9/1/20 | ApprovedP. Sayavong moved/A. Olmedo seconded8 yeas, 0 nays, 3 abstentions |  |
| III. ILO Assessment Status | P. de Haan briefly discussed the status of the Computational Skills/Quantitative Reasoning ILO (data needs analysis) and Self-Awareness & Interpersonal Skills/Teamwork (ILO needs revision).K. Hay emphasized the need to create a process to make changes when necessary. Process must include which groups approve the committee’s recommendations, when and how decisions are publicized, and planning the timeline so that changes can be included in the next catalog. | Assessment Committee to create a process for changes to ILOsAfter process is approved, start process to change “Self-Awareness” ILO |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA ITEM** | **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION** | **FOLLOW UP ACTION** |
| IV. Assessment Barriers Survey Results Discussion | N. Cayton created a PowerPoint file to summarize data from the survey and identify themes. P. de Haan reviewed the information in the file and solicited discussion. J. Braman noted that it seems faculty don’t feel a sense of urgency to complete assessments. She also noted that after entering a number of assessments for her area that she realized that there is no framework to share that information with the department or members of her discipline. Faculty need time to get together to discuss the data collected and how to use it to improve, but most department meetings don’t allow time for these discussions. She emphasized that the college needs to create a framework and designated time to do this.P. Sayavong also noted that it is important to explicitly address the results of the survey so that the campus community knows that their responses were read and actions are being taken to respond.K. Hay added that assessment is a critical area for our accreditation and that we are not currently meeting the expectations of the accrediting commission. We need to act on the information that we have learned from the survey and address the areas where faculty are struggling. If not, our accreditation rating could be “show cause,” the lowest rating possible, which would put our college in jeopardy. | Committee to discuss action items from survey results at next meeting. |
| **AGENDA ITEM** | **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION** | **FOLLOW UP ACTION** |
| V. Review One Drive and Documents for Liaisons | P. de Haan reminded liaisons to update the documents in their OneDrive folders and showed the Science department’s document as an example. The information will be used in a report to the faculty senate in early October. | Liaisons update the document in their folder called “Round 4 Assessment Schedule 8\_x\_20” by Sept. 30P. de Haan report to academic senate on assessment progress in early October. |
| IX. Other/Announcements | P. Sayavong showed the APU template draft. It is nearly finished. Note that there is more emphasis on assessment results than in the past. There is also a link to view the department’s assessment schedule from the template. K. Hay noted that as discussed at a previous meeting, the IPC has recommended that no resources are awarded to departments that don’t have assessment complete. J. Braman suggested strengthening this to a requirement and others agreed. |  |
| X Adjourn | 1:27 pm |  |