

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Solano Community College

Minutes – May 2, 2018

3:30-5:00pm, Room **902**

In Attendance: Amy Obegi, Cynthia Jourgensen, Terri Pearson-Bloom, Randy Robertson, and David Schrumpf

- I. Approval of Agenda, 1st R. Robertson, 2nd C. Jourgensen, approved unanimously
- II. Approval of Minutes from 04-18-18, tabled
- III. Public Comments - None
- IV. Discussion/Information Items:
 1. *Academic Senate Approvals – status of SLO/PLO only and deans as approvers.* A. Obegi went back to Academic Senate requesting the PLO only modification proposal option be removed from CurricUNET META, based on the concerns brought forth by Lisa Abbot (too easy for faculty to make programmatic changes without curriculum committee oversight). The action was approved by AS, so there will only be an SLO only change button. PLO mapping will need to be done through program modifications. The Assessment handbook and training materials will need to be updated. The committee appreciates the responsiveness of the Academic Senate as we transition to META and need to make adjustments to our processes.
 2. *Professional Development Requests –* Three PD requests were submitted for Fall flex: 1) Inputting SLO Assessments into META, 2) PLO Mapping, and 3) Assessing Ethics – a roundtable discussion on the ethics ILO. A. Obegi will request Governet create a report that shows which SLOs are linked to the ethnics ILO and see if some of the faculty members teaching the course are willing to be part of the roundtable discussion.
 3. *Portfolium presentation discussion –* The committee believed Portfolium could be an effective tool for faculty who wish to learn the program. The creation of portfolios can be a useful tool for PLO data collection and in capstone courses. R. Smith talked about the benefits of such a tool for students in CTE programs who want to link their work with potential employers. The committee thought it would be beneficial if the Distance Education committee held student and faculty success workshops that taught individuals how to use the program. There were concerns about how long it would be available, if adjunct faculty would have opportunities for training, and the dangers of plagiarism that come with posting

work online. With the transition to CurricUNET META and the training that goes into learning a new program, the assessment committee didn't believe it is something we should require of all faculty, nor something that the assessment committee would have chief oversight over. We do think it could be a useful tool however.

4. *PLO pilot in CurricUNET META Sandbox and other Governet items.* A. Obegi shared her recent learning in a meeting with Natalie and Steve (a developer) at Governet that our PLO module was designed pulling from departmental SLO proposals (we did not request this). This step means that prior to a PLO assessment, department faculty would need to gather to create department SLO assessments for every SLO that is mapped to a PLO. Each proposal requires a report of findings related to the strengths and weaknesses of student performance on each SLO. Those department reports would then pull into the PLO assessment. The committee talked about the pros and cons of this system. The pros is it forces more discussion among faculty about student success on SLOs. This could benefit students and is a clear goal of ACCJC. The cons are the tremendous amount of extra time and training that would need to go into doing a proposal for every single SLO that is mapped to a PLO. Another concern is that if there is an SLO mapped to a PLO that comes from another discipline (for example a biological course in a chemistry program), one program would be dependent on the work of another program to get their PLOs assessed. It was also mentioned that as we planned the PLO assessment process originally, it included faculty discussion about SLOs, so those would not be absent without the departmental analysis. Because using this method would be a substantial change to the already published process and a large workload increase, it was suggested by T. Pearson-Bloom that we bring Academic Senate leadership into the discussion, and possibly F. Florence from program review too. A. Obegi said she would step up a meeting, get feedback, and bring it back to the Assessment Committee. The committee decided if we were required to use the departmental assessments, we would want to find ways to make the process leaner to help offset the increased workload.
5. *Canvas – Inclusion of outcomes in course shells.* Tabled. Carol Zadnik will be invited for a presentation next week.
6. *Assessment newsletter update.* The assessment newsletter was sent out today (May 2nd). The SLO only button was updated by Governet on the 1st of May, so the newsletter was sent this afternoon.
7. Next Meeting – Assessment Committee year end goals form

Future Meeting dates for Spring 2018:

May 16th