

Notes
CCSF Bipartite Committee Meeting
Wednesday, October 17, 2012
Art 218

Bipartite Committee Members Present:

Executive Council: Anna Asebedo, Thomas Blair, Monica Bosson, Venette Cook, Anthony Costa, Erin Cunningham, Beth Ericson, Stephan Johnson, Pamela Kamatani, Benedict Lim, Enrique Mireles, Kitty Moriwaki, Madeline Mueller, Francine Podenski, Suzanne Pugh, Carol Reitan, Lisa Romano, Karen Saginor, Louis Schubert, Maria del Rosario Villasana

Administrators: Deanna Abma, Joanne Low, Fred Chavaria

The Bipartite Committee did not achieve quorum until very late in the meeting.

Discussion began at 3:08 p.m. Karen Saginor facilitated.

I. Review of General Education Outcomes: The CCSF Bipartite process and procedure was reviewed.
Recommendations and Plans

- 1) Delete GEO C 4) *Evaluate how measurement errors impact the application of scientific models*. This GEO does not reflect Title 5 language, and most Area C courses do not align well with it.
- 2) Before February 2013 meeting, workgroups for each area will review GEO's in conjunction with Title 5 language and suggest revisions for consideration at the February meeting to be effective with the 2013/14 College Catalog.

II. Review of Course to GEO Mapping Data and Statistics: Committee members discussed the mapping process. Committee members discussed whether courses in an area should be required to align with at least one GEO for that area or all GEOs. It surfaced that some departments mapped only courses currently taught, and some submitted revised maps that did not register on the SLO website. Committee members identified specific errors in mapping data for particular courses.

Recommendations and Plans

- 1) Place on the agenda for the February 2013 Bipartite Committee the question of the degree to which courses in each GE area need to align with outcomes for that area (perfectly, mostly or somewhat aligned).
- 2) Clarify for departments that all GE courses need to be mapped, not just those currently taught. Warn departments that only the first submission of their mapping information was recorded. If subsequent revisions were desired, they need to contact Dean Boegel to have the earlier version(s) deleted.
- 3) Warn departments that any courses that do not have mapping data identified by January 24, 2013 will be slated for removal from the relevant General Education area. Removal will be approved at the February 2013 Bipartite Committee, and will be effective with the 2013/14 College Catalog.
- 4) For courses which departments identified as "not aligned" with the GEOs for the area, ask departments to review and determine whether they will withdraw or revise the course. If no action is indicated, the course will be withdrawn at the February 2013 Bipartite meeting. Departments that opt to revise the course must complete the revision in accordance with GEOs and submit updated alignment information by the October 2013 Bipartite Committee meeting. [NOTE – some of the GEOs will be revised at the February meeting – this may affect mapping congruity, also the February meeting will decide the degree to which GEOs need to be met in every area.]
- 5) Departments submitting courses for approval by the Bipartite Committee will need to complete mapping information.

- 6) As courses applicable to General Education are revised and the Curriculum Committee approves the revisions, mapping data on alignment to the General Education Outcomes will need to be resubmitted if the revision includes an update of the course learning outcomes.
- 7) Revised General Ed Area Course Submission forms showing GEOs/mapping information will be prepared for the approval of February 2013 Bipartite Committee meeting.

III. GEO assessment for 2013: The Committee discussed that assessment of GEOs and the assessment of course SLOs that map to GEOs. It was pointed out that assessment driven changes made to improve student learning for General Education must be made within the context of particular courses.

Recommendations and Plans

- 1) The assessment of course SLOs that map to a GEO may be used as the assessment of the corresponding GEO. Faculty will not be required to do an additional type of assessment for the GEO.
- 2) An example rubric for GE assessment will be shared with faculty as a model of GE considerations that should inform SLO assessment for GE courses.
- 3) The best practices and tools used by other community colleges for GEO assessments will be researched.

IV. Mapping of GEOs to draft ILOs: Draft Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) are under development for approval by the Board of Trustees before the end of the Fall 2012 semester. Since some CCSF programs in Career and Technical Education and Non Credit do not focus on General Education or transfer criteria, some ILOs will be assessed through capstone courses or Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs).

Recommendations and Plans

- 1) The following mapping of GE areas to Draft ILOs were approved by the Committee as a preliminary step.

GE Area	DRAFT ILO
Area A-Communication and Analytical Thinking	I, II
Area B-Written Composition	I, II
Area C-Natural Sciences	II, III
Area D-Social and Behavioral Sciences	II, III
Area E-Humanities	II, III
Area F-US History	II, III
Area G1-Health Knowledge	II, IV
Area G2-Physical Skills	IV
Area H-Ethnic, Women’s and LGBT Studies	II, III

- 2) The best practices and tools used by other community colleges for ILO assessments will be researched.
- 3) Some departments may choose to pioneer ILO assessments.
- 4) Place on the agenda for the February 2013 Bipartite Committee a discussion of ILO assessment methods for City College.

The meeting ended at 5:00 p.m.
 Notes respectfully submitted by,
 Venette Cook, Karen Saginor, Deanna Abma