

SLOAC Steering Committee Agenda

January 25, 2010, 1:45- 3:45, Room 6203

Present: Steve Aurilio, Michael Bishow, Luciana Castro, Kathleen Feinblum, Jan Fosberg, Tom Hewitt, Rick Hough, Rob Johnstone, Lucia Lachmayr, Jude Navari, Regina Pelayo, Arthur Takayama, Karen Wong, Soodi Zamani

Absent: Ray Hernandez (District Budget Mtg.), Nick Kapp, May Lee, Johannes Masare, Vicki Morrow (District Budget Mtg.), Sita Motipara, Vanson Nguyen, Virginia Padron, Christine Roumbanis (District Curriculum Committee Mtg.), John Ulloa

- I. Approval of the 11/23/09 Notes -- approved as is

- II. Revisited the question of program level assessment
 - A. Recommendation: To use the existing infrastructure afforded through program review, the SLOAC Steering Committee recommends that everyone scheduled for program review be asked to assess on the program level, but be provided with a “toolbox” as to what will suffice, such as course level assessments rolling up, mapping of courses to program level SLOs (*The SLOAC Framework*, p. 33), surveys, performance on licensing exams, capstone projects, focus groups consisting of majors, etc.

- III. March 10-12 Flex Workshop Ideas, Schedule, and Need for Volunteers
 - A. Low participation last Fall—assuming that the faculty and staff are saturated with information and now they simply need to carve out the time to work on it.
 - B. Rather than offer formal workshops, Karen will ask Deans to ask their departments to meet on either Wednesday afternoon, 1-4, or Thursday morning, 9-12, to work on the SLOAC, and she'll ask the Deans where these groups are meeting so that we can send out roving teams of SLOACsters who can help with any questions they have. These will be taking place simultaneously with the TracDat trainings, to which participants must be invited.

On Thursday afternoon, 1-4, we'll also offer a workshop on data analysis, some version of 3 and 10 below.
 - C. Potential workshops

1. Creating Data Spreadsheets (Christine)—better to have folks work with Christine according to their individual needs , if she’s willing
2. Managing Assessment with TracDat (one of the days)
3. Completing the Cycle: Data Analysis and Implications
4. Generating Program Level SLOs
5. Aligning Courses with Program Level SLOs (for programs that have a common set of outcomes)—Fall 2010
6. CATS: Classroom Assessment Techniques
7. Setting Benchmarks
8. Presentations by faculty who have created SLOs and assessment plans
9. Definition of Terms
10. Data Case Study

IV. Feedback on ISLO Rubrics

A. These rubrics will be downloadable from TracDat for faculty to use to evaluate their students’ work and ideally “roll up” their data for ISLO analysis and discussion.

1. Option one: Faculty who have identified the ISLO as central to their course will be asked to apply the rubric.
2. Option two: A core group of faculty across the disciplines will be asked to apply the rubric, and analyze the aggregated data together. Perhaps our Steering Committee will morph into that role?

B. Critical Thinking (Rick)

1. Though people can download the entire rubric, they should only use the categories that apply to their assignment.
 - a) Recommendation: The preface should be revised to a directive: “Select the appropriate statements that apply to your courses.”

C. Information and Computer Technology Literacy (Tom)

1. Only instructors who assign “traditional” research papers would employ this ISLO rubric. To use Arthur’s example, he would not select this rubric because topic choice/focus, search tool selection, and online search strategy do not apply to this type of assignment.
2. Librarians would assist classroom faculty who do choose this rubric, especially with the first section, including the online search log.

3. Question: Why is there the option of choosing 6 numbers instead of 3? It gives the scorer some flexibility and the data can be more nuanced than without.

4. Question: Why is the on-line search log used instead of looking at the final product, the works cited page? Librarians can get more insight about how students are conducting searches.

V. TracDat Update → <https://sanmateo.tracdat.com/tracdat/>

A. Training— Karen will pilot the training with a small group of SLOACsters to anticipate potential difficulties in the March flex training that will be led by a TracDat representative. Deans have been identifying faculty to coordinate assessment efforts in their department and identifying at least four key faculty per division to be trained in TracDat, some of whom are on this committee. Karen will contact these individuals to participate in the March flex training.

B. Piloting faculty for a TracDat training with Karen prior to March flex—Rick Hough (Math), Regina Pelayo (Cosmetology), Jan Fosberg (PE), Luciana Castro (Foreign Languages), Rachel Bell (Reading), Steve Aurilio (Administration of Justice), Jude Navari (Music)

VI. Introduction to TracDat

VII. Please designate the following Monday (4th Mondays of the month), 1:45-3:45, for SLOAC Steering Committee meetings: February 22. March 22, and April 26. Also, please review the Effective Communication rubric so that we can pilot it in the February meeting.

CRITICAL THINKING

STUDENTS WILL BE ABLE TO DEMONSTRATE CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS IN PROBLEM SOLVING ACROSS THE DISCIPLINES AND IN DAILY LIFE.

Critical thinking includes the ability to:

- raise vital questions, formulate responses (or solutions) to problems, evaluate the reasonableness of a solution and provide a justification.
- analyze and compose arguments; assess the validity or strength of an argument using appropriate deductive and inductive techniques.
- think creatively and open mindedly within alternative systems of thought; communicate, either artistically, graphically, symbolically, or verbally, a complete and clear solution to a given problem.
- make effective use of evidence in an argument; evaluate the truth or value of the premises using reliable sources of information.
- demonstrate understanding of diverse disciplinary perspectives and use appropriate inquiry, including the scientific method.
- analyze multiple representations of quantitative information, including graphical, formulaic, numerical, and verbal.

ISLO: Critical Thinking					
	Does all or almost all of the following when appropriate	Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely
Supports claims with evidence	Includes evidence that is appropriate and relevant.				
	Accurately interprets evidence such as quotes, graphics, statistics, etc.				
	Meets standards of evidence such as timeliness, accuracy, relevance and sufficiency.				
	Correctly uses and references multiple credible sources to ensure the accuracy of premises.				
	Other (please describe):				
Responsiveness to bias; Fair-mindedness	Provides unbiased selection, interpretation, and presentation of evidence.				
	Avoids unexamined use of emotionally loaded language or images.				
	Discriminates between facts versus values/opinions.				
	Justifies assumptions based on ideology (political, religious, or personal), peer pressure, or self interest.				
	Presents fair/charitable consideration of rival theories or opposing views.				
	Is open-minded regarding alternative conclusions; avoids dogmatism.				

	Other (please describe):				
Accurate and logical analysis	Does all or almost all of the following when appropriate	Consistently	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely
	Infers conclusions that are well-supported by the premises.				
	Develops arguments that are deductively valid or inductively strong; uses appropriate deductive and inductive criteria in composing or analyzing arguments.				
	Demonstrates an understanding of theory and application.				
	Considers multiple methods in solutions.				
	Makes logical connections between and among ideas.				
	Appropriately chooses and correctly uses formulas or formal techniques, (such as in algebra, logic, probability theory, chemistry, physics, statistics, etc.)				
	Examines both internal and external inconsistencies. Checks solutions for reasonableness.				
	Understands how to form and test hypotheses.				
	Other (please describe):				

INFORMATION AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY LITERACY: STUDENTS WILL BE ABLE TO DEMONSTRATE
SKILLS CENTRAL TO INFORMATION AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY LITERACY

Information and computer technology literacy includes the ability to:

- Effectively locate and access information in numerous formats using a variety of appropriate search tools.
- Use computer technology to organize, manage, integrate, synthesize, create, and communicate information and ideas in order to solve problems and function effectively in an information society.
- Evaluate the relevance, quality, and credibility of a wide variety of information sources using critical thinking and problem solving skills.

	Beginning 0-1	Proficient 2-3	Advanced 4-5	Score
Topic choice / focus	Topic is not chosen, or is vague, too broad, or too narrow.	Topic has a discernable focus but lacks precision and needs to be better articulated.	Very clear focus on a topic that is appropriately precise and well articulated.	
Search tool(s) selection (assessed via student online search log kept during research process)	Inappropriate search tool(s) chosen for the type of information source(s) needed.	Search tool(s) chosen that might provide the type of information source(s) needed, but better choices are overlooked.	The best and most appropriate search tool(s) consistently chosen for the type of information source(s) needed.	
Online search strategy (assessed via student online search log kept during research process)	Significant mistakes made carrying out basic and/or advanced search techniques, (e.g. errors choosing search terms, identifying concepts within the research topic, choosing search mode, Boolean logic, truncation, etc.) Lacks overall conceptual understanding of search strategy.	Applies basic and/or advanced search techniques with few or only minor errors. Demonstrates basic understanding of the technical and conceptual aspects of online search strategy.	Applies basic and/or advanced search techniques skillfully and demonstrates complete mastery of all technical and conceptual aspects of online search strategy.	

	Beginning 0-1	Proficient 2-3	Advanced 4-5	Score
Information source documentation	Did not write citation(s), or citation(s) contained major errors. Student is unaware of the	Cited work, but citation(s) contained minor style errors only.	Cited work accurately with no style errors.	

	nature, purpose, and specifics of citation style.			
Information source relevance, quality, and credibility	Inappropriate and/or irrelevant source(s) chosen. Source(s) do not relate to the research topic and/or are of dubious quality and credibility. Student is unaware of and does not apply criteria used to judge information quality.	A diversity of higher quality sources is more prominent, although some sources chosen are only broadly or tangentially related to research topic or are otherwise of moderate quality. Student shows some ability to evaluate sources using criteria such as authority, relevance, purpose, currency, accuracy, scholarship, bias, intended audience, writing style, and documentation.	A variety of very high quality relevant sources and viewpoints are used exclusively. Sources selected indicate the student has carefully and thoroughly evaluated all sources according to established criteria, including looking for background information about authors, organizations, publications, and reading reviews of published works. Student is fully able to make reasoned judgments about which sources to use and which to discard.	

	Beginning	Proficient	Advanced	Score
--	-----------	------------	----------	-------

	0-1	2-3	4-5	
Organization, formatting, and presentation of final research product	Final research product is poorly presented and formatted. Haphazard, inconsistent, or disorderly presentation and arrangement of text, charts, graphs, images, web links, etc.	Final research product shows skillful application of computer hardware and software, resulting in an well-organized presentation of text, charts, graphs, images, web-links, etc.	Computer hardware and software is expertly applied, resulting in a highly organized, professional-looking presentation of text, charts, graphs, images, web-links, etc.	
			Total Score (Max = 30)	

ISLO: Effective Communication				
	Needs Work	Adequate	Good	Excellent
Comprehension	Student does not relate the message to his or her own framework/ existing knowledge, summarizes inaccurately, or fails to mention the message.	Student integrates the message into his or her own frame of reference/ existing knowledge. Student's knowledge of the subject is generally accurate, though flawed or in the words of the original source.	Student develops a framework for organizing the message and relating it to his or her own frame of reference/ existing knowledge. Student's knowledge of the subject is accurate throughout except with minor details, and is in his or her own words.	Student develops a framework for organizing the message and relating it to his or her own frame of reference/ existing knowledge or broader context/ larger world perspective. Student's knowledge of the subject is accurate throughout, and is in his or her own words.
Analysis and audience	Student generally lacks an awareness of the reader, for the discussion lacks evidence, illustrations, other definitive details and/or reasonable follow-up explanations. Analysis shows undeveloped	Student makes some attempt to provide evidence, illustrations, or other definitive details to convince the audience, but some information is either extraneous or insufficient. Analysis shows reasonable	Explanations and uses of evidence, illustrations, or other definitive details generally convince the audience. Analysis reflects good observational skills.	Explanations and sophisticated/ original uses of evidence, illustrations, or other definitive details effectively convince the audience. Analysis reflects highly developed observational skills.

	observational skills.	observational skills.		
Organization and audience	Opening comments are inappropriate, or are unlikely to engage the audience; provides little or no focus or order to the material; closes abruptly, either with no apparent concluding statement or with inappropriate remarks.	Opening comments attempt to reveal the purpose and major points and engage the audience, but the approach seems somewhat artificial, weak, or unimaginative; provides some focus or order to the material, but the structure is somewhat unclear or awkward; concluding comments relate to the purpose and major points, but they either bring in extraneous information or are unnecessarily redundant.	Opening comments attempt to reveal the purpose and major points and engage the audience; focuses and orders the materials to convey a generally unified point or effect, and provides movement within and between major points and from beginning to end; concluding comments are appropriate and relate to the purpose and major points, but they are not very strong or emphatic.	Opening comments attempt to reveal the purpose and major points and engage the audience; focuses and orders the material to convey a unified point or effect, and provides clear and consistent movement within and between major points and from beginning to end; concluding comments are strong both in reemphasizing the purpose and major points and in leaving the audience with an appropriate closing statement.