

College Assessment Committee

April 23, 2018

2:00 - 3:00, 18-206

Draft Minutes

Attending: Monique Nakagawa, Madeleine Murphy, Stephanie Roach, Gabriele Topete Eng Goon

NOTE: Prior to the meeting, which was postponed to permit people to arrive, we discussed an item not on the agenda - the possibility of administering Likert-style surveys as a means of collecting course level SLO data. Some issues:

- Response rate: Would students respond? Email surveys often lie undisturbed in inboxes. Paper surveys might be better - or maybe embed surveys in Canvas?
- Pre/Post. How about embedding a pre-post in Canvas? That might be more meaningful.
- Logistics for PRIE. Widespread surveys with analytics should go through PRIE. It would be a task, but depending on how it was framed, not impossible.
- Validity of data: Indirect methods are not sufficient - but they can start a conversation or highlight an issue. In context, they can be meaningful.
- Next steps: Madeleine will continue to investigate possible methods of administering surveys in a way that isn't too troublesome, and provides us with course-level SLO data. Nothing will be launched until we've had a chance to discuss at the committee level.

1. **Agenda approval.** We made the following amendments:

- because only a handful of people were present, we will approve minutes from April 2 meeting over email
- We will discuss the Guided Pathways questions as a priority, since the assessment review questions are really part of another discussion that will take place at ASGC on 4/24 and 5/8.

2. **Approval of minutes 4/2.** To be done over email.

3. **Guided pathways questions.** A professional group is going to interview students who've been here a while to see how we can improve their "pathways." So this is an opportunity to ask questions about institutional outcomes / core competencies: How well do students feel they've developed them, and what can we do to improve?

A brainstorm of possible questions was circulated. Some points:

- What do we want to know? Do we want general impressions? Or do we want students to give us specifics of courses or classes that have developed their core competencies? Probably not just the latter - it's a focus group, not a big sample. But we do want them to think of specifics. Our research interest: Finding out whether our courses do seem to amount to something, and if not, what might help students get more out of them (in

terms of core competencies).

- How to frame the questions? The idea is to start a conversation. Make sure to ask questions that are answerable. “What did you get out of your education?” is way too meta and most students won’t know what to say in response. We don’t want to catch them unawares, and leave them drawing a blank. Ask something manageable. Also, make sure the questions are framed plainly and in clear language. Don’t put off students with obscure terms and flowery words!
- What sort of questions? Some thoughts:
 - “What did you get from your GE education?”
 - “Do you feel like your GE requirements related to your life? And if not, what can we do to improve this?”
 - “Did you feel like GE was just box-checking, and if so, how can we help?”
 - “There are the outcomes. Do you think your GE education helped you with any of these? Think of a specific assignment that speaks to one of these.”
 - “Do you feel like some of these just never came up?”
 - Or maybe we should ask about connections - that’s the focus of ILO assessment.
 - Instead of "Have any of your classes touched on this? ask, "Does your coursework as a whole accomplish this?" It's OK to say, "I don't know."
 - Maybe first ask a general question (what about GE?) and then bring out the ILOs, and say, do any of these ring a bell?
- Clarity about outcomes: Are we talking about ILOs or GE area? Both. The ILOs stand for the college’s goals; the GE-SLOs (ILOs 2-6) are for the GE pattern. Should we distinguish between any of these?

It would help to know what the Guided Pathways people were planning to ask, and then we’d know what sort of group we would talk to, and what we could ask.

Next steps: Madeleine will whittle out one or two central questions and some sub-prompts that might be included in the GP focus group. They want this by May, so Madeleine will circulate a draft for comment before submitting to Anniqua.

Adjourned the meeting at 3:06.