**Goals for this meeting:**

Check if our method of assessing student learning is valid. Do all of these things align and make sense?

- measurable objectives
- learning activities, which act as the assessment instrument in these one-time stand alone workshops
- rubric
- recording of data -- see our sample data based on 8 sessions of the same workshop

We want to make sure we are on the right track before replicating this process/method for our other workshops. At the July 30 meeting, Annel said what we have so far all looks good. However, she suggested that we create an overarching goal for the program. I created a draft to share with her on Aug. 6.

Also said:
- taking a sample is ok. Our current sample is about 30% of the total, so we have more than enough. Less is ok.
- Creating a rotation is good so we are not evaluating everything all of the time. Ideal would be to eval 2 workshops each year. If we have six workshops, each workshop would be evaluated once every three years.
- Nice to include the student ID tied to their work.
- When assessing, two or more faculty should grade the same set, then average the student score, then record the student's average. At least, we should double-score 15% of the sample.
- Said we should have a rubric for the entire series. Not clear on why or how to do this in addition to having a rubric for assessing each workshop. Can we make rubrics for each workshop first, then base the programmatic one off of those rubrics?

**Some questions that came up:**
- How to record student comments. Comment codes ok so we can run some stats? not answered
- Are we recording the information needed to do future studies on the types of issues Meghan and Emily brought up (below)? - not answered?

**Not goals for this particular meeting (focus on top goals FIRST), but things we need to think about for the future:**

Once we assess student learning and are pretty sure our curriculum is solid, our next project ideas … for the future are:

1. find ways to correlate completion of these workshops with student success (Meghan)
2. a rotation for assessing the workshops so that not all of the workshops have to be assessed for outcomes all of the time (Meghan)
3. “get student demographics of the attendees and see if there’s any group that’s disproportionately not doing as well (the highest number of “weak” answers)”. (Meghan)
4. document library users in terms of: (Emily’s input, except the note to Annel is section b.)
   a. persistence, success, and retention
   b. student enrollment in basic skills, CTE, or transfer courses (Note to Annel - the core workshops were designed with English 1A and Speech 1A students in mind as those classes were our biggest “customers” when we did one shots.)
   c. student equity categories
   d. I’m not sure if these areas are currently important to the college, so I would welcome input from librarians are RIE on what the college wants to see. I would request that we explore all library users, if possible, rather than workshop attendees.