



Minutes of Institutional Effectiveness Committee
Held on April 23, 2018
Held in Building 6, Room 6-203

Chairperson:

Karen Wong (Recorder)

Members Present:

Steve Aurilio, Rika Fabian, Jan Fosberg, Stephen Fredericks, Zaid Ghori (subbing for Wissem Bennani), Jacqueline Honda, James Houpis, Nels Langbauer, Nicole Porter, Erinn Struss, Christina Trujillo, Alina Varona,

Members Absent:

Christina Abella/ Zaw Min Khant, Grace Beltran, Evan Leach, Kwame Thomas

Resource:

Zahra Mojtahedi

GENERAL FUNCTIONS

I. Call to Order and Introduction

Karen Wong called the regular meeting to order at 2:12 p.m.

II. Approval of Agenda

A motion was made by Jan Fosberg and seconded by Jacque Honda to approve the April 23, 2018 agenda. Motion carried unanimously.

III. Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Jacque Honda and seconded by Stephen Fredricks to approve the March 19, 2018 Minutes. Motion carried, with one abstention.

REPORT/ DISCUSSION

IV. Discuss which results may be useful for disaggregation in light of Accreditation Standard IB6.

Guest English Professor Kathleen Feinblum explained how the English department is assessing English 105 (accelerated English, equivalent to 100) and English 100 (standard transfer level English). Under advisement of the dean, they collected fifty essays from both levels and asked participating faculty to assess the essays the same day as the norming session, without revealing to faculty which course the essays were taken from. Each faculty assessed a packet of five essays, looking in particular at the thesis, organization, development, and use of the text.

She identified multiple issues with the assessment:

- (a) The essay assignments associated with the fifty submitted essays varied enormously, which can impact the outcome itself.
- (b) The norming set was problematic. Few faculty submitted packets of essays representing the range, so the norming session didn't go well. Disparate scores weren't resolved during the norming session.
- (c) The sample size was smaller than they had originally planned.

Approved Minutes

- (d) Faculty who submitted essays to be assessed were asked to submit their grades as well. Thus, they may feel personally scrutinized when the intent is to look at the results in the aggregate.
- (e) Much is vested in the assessment results, as there is pressure to show that acceleration is working, when anecdotally the opposite may be true.

As for the results, the English 105 sample on the various criteria generally were lower than English 100, at about 2 compared to 2.2, on a four-point scale.

Much of the resultant discussion dwelled on strengthening the assessment itself. Among the recommendations were the following:

- (a) The English department is resistant to assigning a common assignment, as it doesn't fit with their curriculum. One approach to address the need for equivalent type of assignments is by creating a signature assignment. In short, the essay assignments should have certain common expectations.
- (b) The norming needs to be improved, in particular the need for a strong anchor set to norm.

Math Professor David Hasson arrived too late to present, but is open to addressing the IEC next year.

V. Review the Citizenship ISLO with additional CCSSE related items

For most items, the mean scaled scores steadily increased over time. There was particular attention to stronger scores on the following two items: the College "encouraging contact among students from different economic, social and racial or ethnic backgrounds" (9c) and the College "providing the support [students] need to thrive socially" (9e). Speculation dwelled on whether those increases may be due to concerted efforts across instruction and student support services, and whether they will continue to increase due to new initiatives such as the Skyline College Promise.

Much discussion dwelled on the civic engagement items. For one item, survey respondents indicated that the College has some emphasis on students learning about "contribut[ing] to the welfare of [their] communities (12m). But as opposed to what survey respondents are exposed to at the College, what are they actually doing? Fifty-eight percent of survey respondents indicated that they spend *no* hours each week "participating in unpaid activities within any community setting...[beyond their] college" (C19). As a counterpoint, 28% spend from one-to-five hours per week, which is substantive considering that the majority of students work. Discussion dwelled on how we can facilitate growth in this area, given that it's one of the College's priorities. Among the points made were: (a) that the College needs to structure the experiences for students to have these opportunities, for instance arranging for partnerships with local agencies and organizations, (b) how to be mindful of balancing this civic experience with the majority students' need to work, (c) casting some scholarships so that students need to articulate and commit to how they will contribute some way to the larger community, (d) defining what we mean by "service learning," including granting that it can be paid, (e) exploring different approaches to measuring its presence and impact on the campus. There is much interest in empowering students to be change agents.

Discussion also dwelled on two of the items that had slight decreases. One was on how frequently survey respondents "tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)" (4h). (The IEC last year determined that this item was one way of looking at civic engagement). As opposed to respondents simply not being interested, a variety of factors may have had a role, from survey respondents not yet having the qualifications since they are early in their academic journeys or still in the process of undergoing tutor training. The second was on how often students "had serious conversations with students who differ from [them] in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values" (4t). It's helpful to keep an eye out on the types of experiences we are committed to facilitating, and to find opportunities to incorporate it into professional development.



Approved Minutes

VI. Discuss the feedback on the SLOAC from the Employee Voice Survey

Due to insufficient time, this topic was not discussed. It will be discussed next year.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Members are encouraged to continue with the IEC next year, but if not, to arrange for their replacement. The eight meetings are scheduled on the following Mondays from 2:10- 4: August 27, September 24, October 22, November 26, January 28, February 25, March 25, and April 22.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING

The next regular meeting will be held on August 27, 2018 in Room 6-203 from 2:10 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Minutes were approved by Members on August 27, 2018.