

Learning Council

Meeting Notes from December 3, 2004

ATTENDANCE:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BOB BARBER | <input type="checkbox"/> JUDY MCKENZIE |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> KATE BARRY | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> KEN MURDOFF |
| <input type="checkbox"/> DONNA KOECHIG | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TAMARA PINKAS |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ADAM DAVIS | <input type="checkbox"/> ALBERT POOTH |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> LIDA HERBURGER | <input type="checkbox"/> CATHERINE RESCHKE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PATRICK LANNING | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> KEN ZIMMERMAN |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SABRINA DAVIS | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SONYA CHRISTIAN |

OUTCOMES:

DISCUSSION:

Observer(s) in attendance:

1. Review of Minutes

Decision:

Minutes approved without correction

2. Friday Retreat Logistics

Decision:

Three retreats will be held on the main campus and the fourth will be held at the downtown center.

3. Electronic Discussion

Process:

4. Council Membership by Position

Mary Brau, Jenette Kane.

Discussion:

- Everyone is responsible for bringing their own copies of the documents sent out electronically.
- Jenette Kane will be attending so that she can provide back-up note-taking for Anna Kate.

Agreements:

- Good for discussion but not for decision-making
- Original message needs to be clear about what response is expected
- The subject line needs to start with "Learning Council"

Discussion:

- Following-up on the last meeting's discussion of this issue, Mary Brau was nominated as a member by position.
- Rationale for Mary's membership on the council:
 - The scope of Mary's work in her position as Coordinator of Student Outcomes, Assessment and Curriculum Development, has direct impact on the scope of work of the Learning Council; her input is critical to moving the work of the Learning Council forward.
 - Curriculum is at the core of the Strategic Learning Plan and Mary coordinates the curriculum approval and development process, the degree requirements process and the assessment process.
 - College-wide policy regarding learning is at the heart of Mary's work
 - Alignment with accreditation standards 2, 4, & 5, but especially 2, are closely tied to Mary's work with the curriculum approval and degree requirements committees.

OUTCOMES:

7. Subcommittee on Committees report:

Decision: Wait for instructions from College Council before doing further work.

8. Learning Plan Development:

Decision:
Subcommittee will continue to refine questions and reduce the number.

Future Agenda Items:

- Assessment Team status report
- Quorum Issue
- Discussion of how communication will flow between College Councils and the other Councils.

Next Meeting:

January 7, 2005. 1-3 in PE 206

DISCUSSION:

Discussion:

- College Council is working on the issue of which committees will report to each council. They will develop instructions on how to make the determination of whether a committee reports to a council.
- Assessment:
 - Accreditation—Standard 2, Policy 2.2
 - Accreditation set broad parameters for assessment.
- Process:
 - Learning Council should ensure that there is a “systemic process of program review”.
 - The Assessment Team should set standards for program review.
 - Needs to be flexible
 - Not proscriptive of how departments should do the assessment.
- Review charter of assessment team (Anna will distribute)
- Sonya to work with Mary Brau and Craig Taylor to develop some recommendations for Learning Council’s consideration.

Discussion:

- 7 Questions for the internal scan process is too many. Pare down to 2-3 questions
- Need to decide if these are specific/mandatory questions or just conversation starters.