

COLLEGE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Meeting Summary

Tuesday, Feb 7, 2017 - 1:30-2:30

16-105

Committee Members present: Madeleine Murphy, Kevin Sinarle, Santiago Perez, Jane Jackson, Laurie Chin, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza

1. Agenda approved

2. November 2016 minutes approved (note: no meeting 12/16, so minutes were approved over email).

3. Chair updates:

- Flex activities this semester (on the new Institutional Outcome activity, and the “Water Cooler Workshops) were really poorly attended. But the people who did come had great ideas. The ILO activity will focus on climate change, and take the form of some kind of student discussion activity – stay tuned. The “water cooler workshops” session yielded some ideas, and there will be at least one experiment in student reading (Writing Center reading groups).
- Assessment 2.0: An Opening Day extravaganza?
In our continuing effort to try to make times and places for faculty to find out what people are doing, raise questions, and generally get together to find out more about teaching and learning on campus, here’s a suggestion: Perhaps launch something like the old Scholarship of Teaching and Learning center (SoTL)? Instead of having a room dedicated to it, though, we could have something like an “Institution for Teaching and Learning” academy, working with Professional Development, and organizing a routine series of activities. (Flyer attached.) This is currently purely hypothetical. – Discussion: This looks generally like a good idea – we should think more about it.

4. From GE to ILOs: Crafting a revision. We discussed possible amendments to our GE SLOs. The first thing we want to do is rename them – Institutional Learning Outcomes makes much more sense. (GE is confusing; the LOs don’t follow the GE pattern.)

The issue: Current GE SLOs don’t include language that reflects creative thinking or creativity, OR that makes room for SAOs (i.e., counseling, support services etc.)

Solutions:

- Add new language to existing five SLOs? We didn’t like that; “critical thinking” would end up tracking everything from economics, to art, to dance, to physics – not enough separation of data.
- Add two new SLOs. We preferred this: it preserves distinction, and while seven LOs is a lot for a *course,* it’s not really a problem to have seven institutional LOs (they’re assessed through single activities and mapped course outcomes, so it doesn’t increase effort to have seven).
Also: What if no one maps to a specific ILO? Or if the enrolment in those courses declines? – We could revise them, but we can also use the establishment of the ILO to lobby for more resources and attention to a particular field. ILOs are a statement of the college values: if we value creativity, we will want to promote it.

Next steps: Madeleine will circulate the draft ILOs just to our committee, and collect any more feedback.

This revised document will be brought to ASGC at their late February meeting, and will do the rounds of Curriculum Committee and various other places before they are finalized. ASGC finalizes them; it’s OK for us to send out a draft for comment – plenty of people may have comments. We hope to get the new ILOs approved this semester!

Meeting ended 2:30 p.m.

College Assessment Committee

Monday 4/18/2016 - 3:00 – 4:00 15-155

MEETING SUMMARY

Present: Madeleine Murphy, Kevin Sinarle, LK Sengupta, Jane Jackson, Tabitha Conway, Graciela Mascereno

Absent: David Locke, Lilya Vorobey, Denaya Dailey, John Stewart (PRIE), Teresa Morris (COI), Theresa Martin (PD)

Note-taker: Madeleine

Meeting began at 3:05.

1. Approval of the agenda – agenda approved. However we couldn't look at the new Tracdat pages together, because the internet was down. (Jane said she had entered some data, and that she had emailed some questions, but overall the pages were MUCH easier to navigate.)
2. Approval of minutes March 21, 2016: Minutes approved. Thanks to Kevin who took the notes.
3. Brief updates

GE SLO assessment group (Quantitative Reasoning) meets Thurs May 5. Last meeting Madeleine shared the report from the first group (on Effective Communication). (Jane expressed interest in joining the QR group, since this was the only current GE SLO that music classes might reasonably support. We noted however that there is room for a new GE-SLO: we should add one on creativity.)

Notes from ACCJC-sponsored workshop: Fundamentals of Assessment. – Madeleine reported from a day-long workshop on the previous Friday (4/15/2016). The workshop was given by Amy Driscoll, an assessment expert not affiliated with ACCJC; ACCJC was sponsoring the workshop, however, and one official was present to answer some compliance-related questions.

Much of the workshop focused on things we know (at least, we on the committee know): how to write good SLOs, what assessments work best – also there was a longish section on rubrics. There were some important take-aways for our college assessment program, however.

- ONE: It was clear that the person giving the workshop (Amy Driscoll) did not consider that "program assessment" required some separate, different process from course-level SLO assessment. In response to Madeleine's question (how do you assess students who come & go, few of whom will actually take your degree, and who mostly won't do a capstone course or assignment), Driscoll characterized program assessment as a *meeting* rather than a student task – namely, the meeting where faculty come together to look at their course-level SLOs as a whole, **and** any other relevant information, and asks, "How's my program doing?" Since most faculty report great difficulty in coming up with meaningful tasks for program assessment, this is a big relief.

- TWO: There was a strong emphasis on *qualitative* rather than *quantitative* assessment. That is, while we do need to conduct plentiful SLO assessments, the emphasis appears to be on the discussion and the collaboration between faculty. Evidence does not need to meet the standards of epidemiological research! In other words, while we try to get as much and as good evidence as possible, we should focus more on having useful conversations than on worrying about data management.
- THREE: SLOs are intended to be broken-down grades. That is how ACCJC sees them (this from the lips of the ACCJC official present, Jack Pond). They do not need to be alternative to grades – they can be assessed by embedded assignments (this is apparently the norm). Nor should only passing students be assessed; the preamble ("Successful students are able to...") isn't intended to exclude anyone – SLO assessments should be as representative as possible.

4. Tracdat: How it's shaping up: Couldn't demonstrate the new look & feel, due to internet crash! But Madeleine said that the revised Tracdat was hopefully going to be much clearer, and *minimal* – rather than load it with features that people don't understand, we're starting with the minimum of features, and we can build it out as we develop our assessment cycle.

5. Draft Assessment Report – comments and revisions:

- Program SLOs: As noted above – this needn't be a separate *assessment*, just a separate review of the results we've got – course-level SLOs, but anything else that matters too. In fact, this is really Program Review, isn't it? We should clarify the relationship between Program Review and the assessment calendar.
- Why can't we use grades to review our programs? – There have been rumblings in the world of assessment specialists that perhaps *grade would* make an acceptable alternative to SLO assessments. This would be greeted with great relief, we agreed, since most of us thought that grades were already our way of declaring what knowledge, skills or abilities students had demonstrated. But it was pointed out that grades *are* more general (what pattern of abilities does a B+ demonstrate?), and that students can fail for reasons other than good performance (ie, non attendance) so SLOs are maybe more precise.
- Recommendations got supportive response. What sort of timeline should we recommend in an assessment cycle – should we do course SLOs every semester, every year, every two years? Overall feeling was that SLO assessment works best when it's part of grading. SLO outcomes are grades broken down, so it makes sense to capture them like grades, for everyone all the time. If we assess annually, we'll only ever know how fall students do (or spring, or whatever) when we might want to contrast. Also, it's easy to forget about SLOs when we do them infrequently.
- Ideas for assessment: In sequenced courses where an exit quiz is appropriate (ie, content courses), how about using the post-test of the first level as the pre-test of the second? It would show patterns of preparedness. This is what they do in accounting. And it could be standard across disciplines. Indeed, standardized assessments should be encouraged: embedded

WebAccess or Canvas quizzes that ask some basic questions for basic scoring (associated with the G#, too, so the results can be disaggregated), and that can be administered to all students without the instructor having to reinvent the wheel. Where this doesn't work, faculty can data-tag assignments – maybe share a rubric? This would also take the burden off SLO coordinators in each department, who must now hassle part-timers for their results, sometimes to no avail; also to part-timers, who don't necessarily know what sort of quizzes to administer and are unfamiliar with assessment.

- If we're moving towards a course-based, grading-style SLO assessment, then we really SHOULD PUSH for them to be recorded, like grades, in WebSmart. It's crazy to have this separate system designed to generate reports, just for SLOs. Even data-tagging in WebAccess or Canvas won't get as much compliance, since not everyone uses those – but *everyone* uses WebSmart and everyone enters grades.

- The semesterly "assessment" flex day sounds like a good idea – though do we need a whole day?.... However, big concern: If we allocate a flex day to something called "assessment," still less "SLOs," will anyone go? SLOs are box-office poison. And many faculty don't need to attend flex days; they've already met their annual requirement for professional development by October. Suggestion: Align the date with program review, maybe? Identify a day, maybe a month before program review, for faculty to look at program & course-level SLOs. That would make it more useful for faculty, and would give them some important time to think about PR.

Meeting ended at 4:01.

College Assessment Committee (CAC)
Minutes from the Meeting of:
Tuesday, September 6, 2016 // 3:00-4:00pm
Building 18 Room 206

Chair: Madeleine Murphy
Note-taker: Laurie Chin

Members Present: Madeleine Murphy (Chair), John Sewart, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Laurie Chin (Student Representative), Tabitha Conaway, Jane Jackson, Santiago Perez Etchavarria, Theresa Martin, Denaya Dailey, and Jeff Brown.

Members Absent: Kevin Sinarle

Meeting was called to order at 3:05pm.

1. **Approval of the Agenda** - There was no official approval of the agenda.
2. **Approval of the Prior Minutes** - The minutes from the April 18th, 2016 meeting were not approved at this time. Madeleine said she would send everyone a copy of the minutes from the April 18th meeting via email because it would be difficult and time-consuming for everyone to read and approve it at that very moment.
3. **New Members/Introductions** - Everyone went around the table and introduced themselves: their names and the respective departments they were representing. New members included: Laurie Chin, ASCSM student representative, Santiago Perez Etchavarria, Biology Department, and Jeff Brown, DSPS, who may be permanently replacing Kevin Sinarle at weekly CAC meetings.
4. **Flex Day Session Report (Madeleine)** We did not get to discussing this – moved ahead with the next items.

5. Goals for 2016-2017

- Work with Professional Development, ASGC and others to create an “assessment” day – we didn’t discuss this.
- Mapping (getting all courses to map outcomes to program / GE SLOs) – this is how we are going to gather the big, disaggregatable data on program and GE SLOs. This semester we’ll need to have some sessions with divisions/departments getting people to review their mapping before it’s put into the new Tracdat. Mapping is essential – Program SLOs must align with GE SLOs.
Mapping is also essential because virtually all assessment of student work, on which SLO data is based, takes place *at the course or service level*. Program and GE SLOs will derive data from the course, LSC and SS data, based on how they are aligned. So alignment is important.
- Reviewing SLOs for LSCs/student services – having researched, last term, how instructional faculty work and think about SLOs, we need to find out what the LSCs and SSs do with SLOs. Madeleine will be meeting the key people in LSCs and SSs and reporting back.
- Promoting new assessment methods (integrating SLOs with course-level assessment) – SLO data collection should be an extension of grades, and a combination of data (grades) + anecdotal data (activities), especially at GE level. The mantra here is that SLOs are grades – or rather, SLOs break down the strengths and weaknesses behind the grades. Wherever possible (and that’s most places), SLO data should be captured in the assessments *we already do in the classroom*.
- Organizing GE-SLO assessment activities (critical thinking **and** quantitative reasoning) – We need to create and brainstorm useful, meaningful and engaging end-of-semester assessment activities. Aim to assess quantitative reasoning and critical thinking at the same time. Key questions: *How are we going to motivate students to participate? How are we going to select the students? How can this be adapted for courses with unique SLOs like music or kinesiology?*

6. Other questions / issues that arose:

- *Who is responsible for entering data into Tracdat?* Right now, each course/lab/SS has a contact person. But should everyone enter their own data? Problem: Tracdat only allows one entry per semester for a course, so four instructors couldn't enter their results for each of their sections independently; someone would have to combine them. (Jennifer & Madeleine will work on this.)

Also: Some departments may need to improve coordination and collaboration from within to effectively collect data for TracDat – create an organized, habitual system that works for each department.

- *Tracdat data entry:* Jennifer reminded us that she is getting faculty used to regular data entry deadlines, with call-outs to faculty to enter data by specific dates. A recent email reminded faculty of the need to enter data by Sept 6; she'll be following up with reminders for individual departments.

In our discussion of the ideal way to record disaggregated data (i.e., allied with the student's G#), the question arose whether we were moving towards a system where SLO data would be entered alongside the course grade, in Banner. Jennifer and Madeleine emphasized that this is NOT the case. We are using Tracdat to capture SLO data for the time being. We are certainly exploring the best way to implement meaningful assessment and painless SLO data gathering, and we can propose *ideal* solutions to work towards – whatever they are – but that is *not* where we are now.

- *Revising GE SLOs.* Jane pointed out that we need a GE SLO in creativity – music and other arts subjects don't really fit the GE SLOs as they are currently written. We will explore revising these SLOs, to make sure that they really reflect everything that everyone is doing and contributing.

Meeting ended at 4:06pm.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, October 4th, 2016 @ 3:00pm in Building 15 Room 155