

SLOAC Steering Committee/ Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes –

April 27, 2015, 2-3:30, Room 6203

Present: Michael Bishow, Kristina Brower, Lorraine DeMello, Alice Erskine, Jan Fosberg, Liz Gaudet, Nick Kapp, Lucia Lachmayr, Evan Leach, Aaron McVean, Sarita Santos, Arthur Takayama, Alana Utsumi, Dennis Wolbers, Karen Wong

Absent: Steve Aurilio, Jacquie Escobar, Nichole Palmer

Resource: Belinda Chan

Guests: Karen Dimalanta, Nathan Jones, Nadia Tariq

Documents: Arthur's powerpoint presentation; proposal to revise the committee charge and membership

I. Approval of the 2/2, 2/23, and 3/30 Minutes – approved as is: Dennis abstained for the 3/30 minutes

II. Three presenters on assessment – Despite the three different disciplines, the common theme of failure as a means of learning emerged.

A. SS/CA—Arthur Takayama (Powerpoint)

1. Arthur presented the dilemma with which the Art faculty grappled. In creating a rubric, technical mastery is only one element of engaging with producing art; it's the other elements that can be more elusive to assess, such as expressing oneself and being able to bring an idea into fruition. Such an endeavor may result in failure, which is encouraged because it is necessary for growth. Most important is to act on that information so as to move closer to the vision, or perhaps reveal another path by at least engaging in the process. Thus the Studio Art Project rubric assesses (a) engagement (using class and lab time effectively), (b) creativity (exploring multiple ideas before selecting one/ demonstrating personal thought/ communicating the idea visually with a unique perspective), (c) elements/ principles of art (demonstrating understanding of principles), and (d) technique (demonstrating proficiency in material technique).

B. Kinesiology/ Athletics/ Dance—Jan Fosberg

1. Activity classes in KAD are assessed every semester they are taught rather than on a three year schedule

2. Fitness-based classes have a common SLO- "Improve or maintain acceptable and healthy body composition, flexibility, muscular strength,

muscular endurance and flexibility.”

a) Positives- The pre/post fitness test has been used for the past forty years, so there is forty years of data to draw from for comparisons. It continues to be administered in COMB, DANC, FITN, INDV (except Golf and Archery), and TEAM courses for course and program level assessment purposes.

b) The fitness test measures/substantiates SLO criteria of improving one or more of the following: Muscle endurance (step test/resting heart rate); Muscle strength (ab curls/body comp-muscle gained); Flexibility (sit and reach box); Health/wellness (blood pressure/resting heart rate/step test); Body composition/fat loss (body comp test)

3. Archery

a) Positives- There are many years of data on which to base shooting standards.

b) Major assignment- Scorecards reflect improvement AND student performance vs. standards

c) Issue- There are difficulties in "use of the sight" comprehension due to the large class size (lack of one-to-one time) and counter-intuitiveness on sight adjustment. Much of the discussion centered on how to reinforce this concept, for instance having each student “mess up” and then re-adjust to hit the target or conceptualizing it as a Math/ Physics problem and explaining it as such.

d) Issue (true in all leveled classes)- The sample size is small if class data is divided by level (beginning, intermediate, advanced intermediate). For this reason, among others, KAD faculty use a narrative to describe results of classes as a whole rather than the results by level.

C. SMT—Evan Leach (Mathematics)

1. Evan provided the context, that Math 120 tends to be the class with which most students struggle, and that Mathematics faculty wanted to refine their course level SLOs to be manageable for assessment purposes. The two main SLOs across all levels were (a) problem solving at the appropriate level, (b) and multiple representations (a.k.a. “The Rule of Four:” with equations, graphs, tables of values, verbally). He pointed out these are easy to assess, but the assessment lacks authenticity. So they’ve since added another SLO they see as pertinent: grit (a.k.a. perseverance, determination, growth mindset etc.) The department is still grappling with different ways to assess it.

2. To reinforce his point, he distributed two versions of the same algebra problem, one with a tip on how to solve it. The one with the tip “ruined” learning; while more students may be able to solve it as a result of the tip, more important is how students engage with challenging problem solving. How can students deal with being “stuck” in constructive ways? The challenge for faculty in continually assessing “grit” throughout the semester is to give hard enough problems that force the majority of students to draw from their inner reserves to persist; students who can easily solve those problems don’t have to draw from such reserves. His presentation circled around to Arthur’s, namely how students can learn from failure/ initial failure.

3. A question raised was whether “grit” is taught in Mathematics classes. Perhaps “grit”/ learning from failure can be CTTL workshops next year?

III. Solicit input and secure approval of our committee’s charge, membership, etc.

A. Rationale for recommending that this committee be solely the Institutional Effectiveness committee

1. No longer need a SLOAC Steering Committee since we completed our task to create an SLO infrastructure that is integrated into campus processes

2. As an IE Committee, now broadening our charge to respond to institutional effectiveness needs, with SLOAC falling under this broader umbrella

3. IE Committee would report to Strategic Planning Allocation of Resources Committee (SPARC) in an advisory capacity—our task is to “drill down” in a way that the SPARC committee typically doesn’t (e.g., ensuring metrics are adequate for evaluating how well we’re doing; analyzing results of assessments, etc.)

4. IE Committee can play a role in increasing the College’s capacity to engage in research based inquiry

B. Some members felt that it was important to consult with their divisions and that Karen consult with the Academic Senate before voting, so an e-mail vote will be conducted next Tuesday, May 5. Alana was okay with representing these proposed changes to the Classified Senate.

They also recommended that a rationale be provided for the revised membership.

C. Recommendation to the SPARC and CGC about the Name Change to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (specifying that it report to SPARC), and charge.

1. Move to approve by Alice and seconded by Arthur; to be voted on via e-mail by Tuesday, May 5

D. Recommendation to the SPARC and CGC about the change to the Compendium Membership.

1. Move to approve by Michael and seconded by Arthur; to be voted on via e-mail by Tuesday, May 5

IV. Anticipated Projects for 2015-2016

- A. Continue revising and adding to the [Balanced Scorecard](#)
- B. Set goals for the remaining fourteen [Institutional Effectiveness measures](#) to recommend to the College (CCCCO [IEPI](#))
- C. Review the [ISLOs and the sub-descriptors](#), taking into consideration feedback from assessors and other practices in the field
- D. Identify what data to disaggregate (Accreditation Standard I.B.6) so as to advise the College
- E. Review and recommend the additional questions for the [Community College Survey of Student Engagement](#), which will be administered in spring 2016
- F. Give feedback and enhance the SLOs and Assessment website for “external stakeholders”/ the public/ students.
- G. Host Town Halls for Lifelong Wellness and Effective Communication ISLOs
- H. Share best practices and/or solicit input on SLOs and assessments
- I. And respond to other projects as they come up...

V. Please designate the following Mondays (the 4th Mondays of the month), 2- 4, for IE Committee meeting: August 24, September 28, October 26, November 23, January 25, February 22, March 21, and April 25. Please find a replacement if you are not able to continue with us next year. Outlook invitations will be forthcoming.

AUTHENTIC & SUSTAINABLE SLO ASSESSMENT

Assessment Criteria	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
AUTHENTICITY			
Application to “Real-world” Situations	The assessed assignment is a simulation of “real world” tasks.	The assessed assignment has some relevance to the “real world.”	The assessed assignment has no relevance to the “real world.”
Degree of Higher-Order or “Critical Thinking” Elicited (e.g., Bloom’s Taxonomy)	Students analyze, apply, and/or synthesize information to support their purpose.	Students explain and/or summarize information but with no purpose beyond demonstrating comprehension.	Students regurgitate isolated facts with little to no personal assimilation.
Clarity of Outcomes Being Assessed and Instructions for Assessment Task	Students understand both the assignment and the outcome(s) being assessed.	Students exhibit some understanding of the assignment’s purposes.	Students fulfill the assignment without understanding why.
Quality of Assessment Results	Assessment results are well suited for analysis: assignment measures the SLO(s), evaluation criteria is consistently applied, sampling is adequate, etc.	Assessment results are sufficient for analysis but could be improved.	Assessment results are insufficient for analysis.
Dialogue Generated	Faculty/ staff almost always collaborate on creating assessments, implementing them, and/or analyzing the results.	Faculty/ staff sometimes collaborate on creating assessments, implementing them, and/or analyzing the results.	Faculty/ staff rarely collaborate on creating assessments, implementing them, and/or analyzing the results.
Completing the Cycle	Assessment results are analyzed and inform departmental priorities and action plans, when needed.	Assessment results are analyzed but don’t inform departmental priorities and action plans.	Assessment results are only recorded, not analyzed or followed up on.

SUSTAINABILITY

Mapping to Higher-Level Outcomes	The activity clearly “maps” to program and/or institutional outcomes.	Some connections between activity and other outcomes exist.	No connection between the activity and other outcomes is evident.
Ability to Keep the Assessment Cycle Going into Perpetuity	The entire assessment cycle is manageable and replicable.	Some of the assessment cycle is manageable and replicable.	The assessment cycle is overwhelming in scope.
Staffing	Enough faculty/ staff assess to shape and understand departmental evaluation criteria.	Usually enough faculty/ staff assess to shape and understand departmental evaluation criteria, but some assess more frequently than others, and/or some don't assess at all.	Even when multiple faculty/ staff teach a course and/or oversee a student service area, only one person assesses.

ACTION PLAN TO REFINE COURSE LEVEL ASSESSMENT, IF NEEDED