

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Solano Community College

Minutes – Wednesday February 22, 2017

2:30-4:00pm, Room 902

Meeting began at 2:45. In attendance was Amy Obegi, Rebecca Estes, Ferdinanda Florence, LaNae Jaimez, Cynthia Jourgenson, Terri Pearson-Bloom

- I. Approval of Agenda, 1st F. Florence, 2nd, R. Estes. Approved unanimously
- II. Public Comments, none
- III. Discussion/Information Items:
 1. Updates
 - a. *Integrated Planning Meeting with Superintendent President, VPAA, AS President, Institutional Research and Planning, Assessment Coordinator on Friday, February 10, 2017.* A. Obegi shared that the meeting centered around making a model/schematic that articulates how an integrated planning process would be formalized on campus, with the inclusion of dates and deadlines. Relevant to the assessment committee, SLO assessment results (a report generated from CurricUNET Meta) would be given to faculty at the beginning of the fall semester to help inform/update the program review yearly goals. This helps faculty prioritize needs and share them with deans and administrators.
 - b. *Flex presentations for March 14 and 15th.* A Obegi asked for feedback about the flex presentations that were submitted for the optional flex days in March. She submitted two workshops on the CurricUNET assessment module and one on creating success criteria rubrics. The committee suggested holding back on introducing the assessment module, because as we reviewed it, it became clear that there are more changes to be made and we aren't yet ready to go live. Instead, it was suggested that we have one open workshop to work on outstanding SLO assessments, keep the success criteria session, and then have a third session on revising SLOs so they are current and ready to go when CurricUNET goes live.

2. *CurricUNET Assessment Module Feedback*. The committee reviewed the “sandbox” of the CurricUNET assessment module and suggested the following recommendations:
- 1) Check to ensure all the discipline codes are correct
 - 2) Eliminate the version of the SLO
 - 3) Add “kick backs” or “blocks” if a section isn’t complete, such as the ILO boxes aren’t checked.
 - 4) Add a box that says “no co-contributor” If there is one, then the list is generated
 - 5) On the curriculum side, it needs to say “Success Criteria” and the notes boxes need to be moved to the appropriate places. Also, the note “is this course a general education course” doesn’t show up. Is that because it knows?
 - 6) On the curriculum side, is there a way to just update SLOs (like updating the textbook) that doesn’t generate a full curriculum review?
 - 7) In the Methods section, we need a clarifying description that says attached the assignment, writing prompt, exam questions, etc. that is used to measure this SLO.
 - 8) In the Methods section, we do not want two sections. We just want it to say methods and list the various methods that could be used. It was suggested we pull from some of the prompts generated by Governet and include those in our list.

The discussion brought up a number of important questions and considerations. The first is the need for us to pilot the process ourselves to discover any “kinks” and rectify them before we go live. We saw the need for updating GELOs and ILOs so faculty can map appropriately. What about the opportunity to link SLOs to the PLOs? This isn’t currently a function. As we were doing a sample, it became clear that the SLOs may not be current in CurricUNET and they may not have been inputted properly. For the assessment module to work properly, these will have to be updated and faculty will need our support in making this happen. Perhaps departments can go into a computer lab at the same time during fall flex. It also became apparent that we need a plan for how SLO changes will be approved and then populated in the assessment module. Does anyone look them over? Can there be a quick approval rather than generating a curriculum review? How long does it take after an SLO is changed for it to be assessed? It became clear that we will need a clear plan/timeline for implementation, including time for faculty to make

changes, map their GELOs, ILOs, etc, and input their assessments. Trainings will be required. We would love a 2nd required flex day at the beginning of fall when we can get all faculty trained and inputting their assessments.

3. *Revisions of GELOs.* A. Obegi shared a draft of revised GELOs based on feedback from the previous assessment of the GELOs, and the idea of making the GELOs clearly sync with the general education course sequence. For the initial draft the GELOs of SF City College were consulted who use a similar model, and the CSU (Option C) was used as the foundation. The committee liked the initial model. A. Obegi agreed to incorporate Option A (Solano) and Option B (IGETC) into the draft. Our goal is to get the draft completed ahead of the next assessment committee meeting so they can be vetted by Senate and faculty as a whole. We want to revise the GELOs and ILOs in CurricUNET Meta as soon as possible, so people are mapping outcomes correctly when it goes live. A. Obegi also agreed to draft revised ILOs. The committee recommended using the accreditation guidelines as the basis for outcomes.
4. Quality Focus Essay for Accreditation – Tabled due to lack of time.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:12pm

Future Meeting dates for Spring 2017:

March 8, 2017

March 22, 2017

April 5, 2017

April 26, 2017

May 10, 2017