

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Solano Community College

Minutes – Wednesday February 8, 2017

2:30-4:00pm, Room 902

In Attendance: Amy Obegi, Rebecca Estes, LaNae Jaimez, Terri Pearson-Bloom, Randy Robertson, Michael Wyly

- I. Approval of Agenda, 1st L. Jaimez, 2nd R. Robertson
- II. Approval of Minutes from 1/25/17, 1st T. Pearson-Bloom, 2nd R. Estes
- III. Public Comments, None

- IV. Discussion/Information Items:
 1. Updates
 - a. A. Obegi met with Shirley Lewis on February 7, 2017 regarding the quality focus essay for accreditation. She will be providing input on the report related to improved academic assessments and our strategies/timelines for making the assessment process more transparent and inquiry-based.
 - b. 4th Annual ASCCC Symposium Highlights (Feb. 3, 2017). A. Obegi shared a report of the major learning from the SLO symposium she attended. The notes are attached below. Some of the major themes were moving from a culture of compliance to a culture of inquiry (making assessments meaningful) involving students, and mapping.
 - c. Integrated Planning Meeting with Superintendent President, AS President, Institutional Research and Planning, Assessment Coordinator scheduled for Friday, February 10, 2017. A. Obegi will provide a report after the meeting. We want to make sure SLO assessments and program review are meaningfully integrated into the integrated planning process.
 - d. Meeting with GoverNet planned for Monday, February 13, 2017. A. Obegi will share our planned revisions for the SLO module (as reported in the previous minutes).

 2. Newsletter, Volume 5 for review. The committee reviewed and approved Volume 5. R. Robertson suggested some changes to the sample to clarify the success criteria which will be integrated into the newsletter.

3. *Solano's General Education Learning Outcomes and Institutional Learning Outcomes revisited.* The committee reviewed our current GELOs and ILOs, the new Accreditation standards, Solano College Board Policy on General Education, and the results of our previous GELO and ILO assessment. We also looked at the GELOs and ILOs of San Francisco City College who just went through accreditation and received praise for their outcome assessment process. The committee noted a number of themes, such as our current GELOs and ILOs do not adequately correlate with the accreditation standards related to these assessments, and our outcome assessments showed that some of our GELOs (like reading) were not measured by many courses and are in fact typically measured in Basic Skills courses rather than those at the general education level. T. Pearson-Bloom suggested we align our GELOs with the General Education pattern (which is also what SF City and some other community colleges do). This way we have a clearer link between the approved general education courses and the outcomes we wish students will achieve. We agreed to have approximately two GELOs for each GE topic area, and additional ILOs since the four we currently have do not tap into all the learning students will undertake at the college. A. Obegi agreed to develop a draft of revised GELOs and ILOs to share at our next meeting. The committee is hoping to get them approved this semester to integrate into CurricUNET META. We want people to be mapping their SLOs to the most current version of the GELOs and ILOs.

Future Meeting dates for Spring 2017:

February 22, 2017

March 8, 2017

March 22, 2017

April 5, 2017

April 26, 2017

May 10, 2017

A. Obegi's Highlights from the ASCCC 4th Annual SLO Symposium February 3, 2017

Attended presentations by:

Natasha Jankowski, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA)

Randy Beach, ASCCC South Representative

Katryn Weise, City College of San Francisco

GOALS OF ASSESSMENT/CULTURE OF INQUIRY:

We want to create SLOs that are clear and measurable, but most importantly, do they address the learning we want students to take away from the course. Imagine you had a blank page to start from.

What are the core skills/knowledge you want to measure? Do these skills/knowledge fall in line with our program learning outcomes and our institutional learning outcomes/goals?

We want SLOs to be meaningful so we want to talk about them!

Move from a culture of compliance to a culture of inquiry. SLOs are our research data about the learning in the classroom. They can form the basis for faculty dialogue how to improve student learning and higher education in general. "The business of learning is hard work and messy and taking an inquiry approach helps us delve into how to improve learning." "Change moves at the speed of trust"

Questions: How can the campus move toward a culture of inquiry? Reflection is important as is having a shared value of student learning. Consider use of SSSP money to support retreats (or scholarships) for departments (or interdisciplinary groups) who engage in these discussions and make plans for improvement.

Important that SLOs are at the foundation of how we can structure professional development to improve instruction. What are the needs of students and faculty in the classroom? We want to make it meaningful and relevant to faculty.

It takes a community to engage in and support our learners. Campus resource allocation must also tie in the SLO assessment. Tying to resources also helps to engage faculty.

STUDENTS:

We need more transparency with students about what their SLOs are, when/how we are measuring them, and the criteria we are using to measure them (rubric). We want them to know what our learning goals are for them and give them the opportunity to perform their best. There are many ways we can do this. For example there can be a map (guide) in the syllabus, or when we go over the assignment/test/etc. we can remind them that there is an assessment embedded in the assignment and share the rubric with them. We can also write the SLO at the top of the assignment. An activity called "let's face it" can help faculty see the value in making expectations of learning clear.

A number of colleges are also engaging students in discussions about ways to measure the outcomes and what would be a meaningful learning experience for them.

Also, some faculty give out student feedback evaluations after the assessment to see what they thought their strengths were, and the areas they feel they need to work on most. At the core, assessment is about improving student learning and it can be informative to get their perspective. We want students to be able to articulate their skill set and what they have learned (metacognition). In order to do this, we need to be able to articulate ourselves the core learning we want them to obtain from the course and program, and be intentional about our teaching.

We need to have "root cause" conversations. What is at the heart of student successes and difficulties? Curriculum mapping can help peel back the layers of learning. What is working, what is getting in the way? Ex. are all our assessments at the end of the semester when students are swamped? Does it really portray their true potential or are mitigating factors getting in the way?

We can also involve students for an end of the semester evaluation. Ask them, in what assignments and in what ways did they feel they learned the outcomes?

DISAGGREGATION OF DATA:

Most colleges don't yet have systems set up to disaggregate by student (which is what they are primarily looking for), so can ascertain success trends by ethnicity, gender, etc. SF City College has their Curricunet set up so that the students are in the system, for each mark met, developing, or not met. Then data is linked through Banner in the office of ITRP to look at demographics. At SF City college, strong correlation between SLO assessments and grades. SLO data does provide more data points. But for the disaggregated SLO analysis to be instructive, the SLOs have to be written strategically ex. writing, versus knowledge, versus critical thinking, etc.

OBJECTIVES V. OUTCOMES:

According to Randy Beach, objectives are what the instructor wants to teach (teacher's responsibility), outcomes are what you want the student's to learn (student's responsibility). Another person described the objectives as the long view...what are your aspirations that the students will learn? The outcome assessment is what they did learn (in some measurable way). The objective looks forward, the outcome looks back at what they did. They are not one in the same. Using higher order Bloom's taxonomy action words can be a goal, but won't apply for all CTE SLOs.

MAPPING:

ILOs map to GELOs, map to PLOs, map to SLOs. Some argue to start from the top, others suggest starting from the bottom...

We need to look at all our SLOs for a course and see (if/how) they are mapping to the program learning outcomes. This gives us a tool to see if we are measuring what we want them to know at the end.

We should do the same thing in relation to our GELOs and our ILOs.

Mapping can be a useful tool within a degree to make sure content in courses are sequentially building. A great basis for conversations. If we say we introduce something, what does that look like? If we say we developed or mastered the skills, how is the learning and outcome assessment more robust? Have we in fact scaffolded the skill/knowledge?

We can potentially map many things: content, structure, course-taking patterns, assignment timing, co-curriculum, etc.