

MEETING NOTES
Academic Assessment Council 2016-17
February 17, 2016
9:10 am to 10:00 am (Bldg. 10-241)

Membership

Richard Cavaletto (CAFES), Michael Lucas (CAED), Fred DePiero (CENG), Debra Valencia-Laver (CLA), Kellie Green Hall (CSM), Patrick O'Sullivan (CTLT), open (ITS), Mauricio Saavedra (IR), Mary Pedersen, Bruno Giberti, Jack Phelan (Academic Programs and Planning), Brenda Helmbrecht (GE), Connor Rudolph (ASI), Jason Hailer (CAED), Solina Lindahl, Beena Khurana (OCOB), Linda Vanasupa (CENG), Matthew Moore (CLA), Beth Chance (CSM), PCS/Career Services (open), Katherine O'Clair (Library), Dawn Janke (Writing Center), Kevin Taylor (SOE).

~~~~~

**ACTION ITEMS**

| Agenda Item                                                          | Action Items & Context                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Responsible Parties            | Due Date |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|
| Discussion: Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(Debra V.) A few faculty complained about the survey, that it cannot be saved. There should be an instruction saying that they should go through the original email that contains the survey link that was sent out initially, and should complete and submit the survey before exiting.</li></ul> | Academic Programs and Planning |          |

**MEETING NOTES**

1. Review Meeting Notes from [January 27, 2016](#)

- a. (Jack P.) The QR Task Force response was sent out prior to the Feb 6 deadline. If you have notes or additions to the prior discussion please forward those to me. Debra Valencia-Laver sent some additional responses from the meeting that made it into the submitted response. Jack P. requests the committee to send emails to him if they have additional comments.
- b. (Mary P.) Chancellor's office is working on responding to the task force. They are trying to consolidate the responses.

2. Announcements & Updates

- a. (Jack P.) Oral Communication Assessment: norming session begins at 10 am February 17.

3. Discussion: Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) – 15 min.

- a. (Beth C.) In the survey, all of the questions are not available for certain sections. (Mary P.) Some of the questions only apply to graduate programs. They should not be linked with undergraduate questions.
- b. (Mary P.) For WASC Review Report original responses will be looked at. Something should be written up to guide the faculty on how to respond. This is introduction what is being sent, if it can be looked at, these responses carry lots of value.
- c. (Beth C.) Statistics Department have looked at the course learning outcomes. They are not as defined by the new requirements for course learning outcomes.
- d. (Debra V.) All of the learning outcomes should be included. And comments should be made available.
- e. Mary P. requests to provide comments as appropriate. Every question requires an open box. Jack P. says, it will be valuable for Academic Programs and Planning getting the commentaries.
- f. (Beth C.) The information that will be collected might tallied up, the comments might be overlooked. Question really is, can the definition of course learning outcomes be extended. If they are, how far. Mary P. responses, that the definition of course learning outcomes can be extended. Beth Chance raises concern on the instruments being used to attain descriptive statistics, but without modelling. Mary P. responses that the data will be collected and summarized.

- g. (Linda V.) One of the transition on educational research introduced are new methods of understanding complex dynamics of statistics. Debra V. says, Mauricio Savedra, director of Institutional Research will be the key person to discuss. Linda V. suggests, it can be a scholarly approach in Assessment process and a departure from traditional way of data analysis.
- h. (Jack P.) Mauricio Savedra was in a presentation where predictive approaches in data analysis were discussed. Jack P. asks if there are any other feedbacks on inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators.
- i. (Kellie G.) Mathematics department have already submitted the survey. Is there any way someone can see some of the surveys that are submitted?
- j. (Mary P.) 30 some responses have already come back. Some were changed and re-submitted, that requires checking and cleaning up to see how many exactly have been received. Some of the departments have gone through redone the whole survey.
- k. (Richard C.) Will there be a reminder coming out? A spike is expected after the reminder.
- l. (Mary P.) There was heated discussion on the senate, about the need to publish the course learning objectives somewhere. The catalog has the new course learning objectives, that are coming in. Some faculty critiqued on learning system that are not outcome oriented.
- m. (Debra V.) The entire survey only takes 10 minutes. Some faculty complained about the survey that it does not save. There should be an instruction saying that they should go through the original email that contains the survey link that was sent out initially, and should complete and submit the survey before exiting.

### 3. Discussion: University/GE Writing Assessment Report– 30 min

- a. (Debra V.) Random sampling does not appear to have properly executed in the Writing Assessment based on the report draft submitted by Dawn Janke. It appears that every third artifacts were selected. For other core competency scoring sessions, random number generators were used. (Dawn J.) the word 'random' should be redacted.
- b. (Jack P.) Dawn Janke expressed that this report is preliminary.
- c. Mary Pedersen thanks Dawn Janke for the report.
- d. (Dawn J.) Beth Chance was amazing in working on data. The disaggregation of the report is still in progress. What is expected from the council is to let know, what information will be helpful. How everyone can use the information? Is there something missing? So that it can be made useful for everybody.
- e. (Patrick O.) When this kind of task is done, there is a learning process. How to get results from the process? Clear understanding is required on the process-work. Some comments should be made in the end, that may be helpful for instructors, how to instruct, how to improve assessment cycles? These kinds of data have more value.
- f. (Dawn J.) Recommendations part is still blank. Some questions need answering like: how can we (instructors) grow from each cycle? How do we improve from each cycle? We might consider incorporating some discipline specific results/models to it. A number of departments were involved in this assessment process. Enough resources were not available to support and to help everyone who wanted support. Some of these individualized results will be shared, their clos, how they arrived/determined the plos. How the assignments can be designed more effectively? That was part some of the conversation that occurred.
- g. (Mary P.) To answer the question of, what can be done with this data. One of the goals that Academic Programs and Planning is trying to build more sustainable assessment planning. A model where assessment processes are to be created by the departments.
- h. (Dawn J.) Academic Programs and Planning can start with incremental changes. That will reflect in the cultural shift. The department of Journalism wanted to start an entry 200 level course. They did that with the entire department being involved. Entry level at major specific program with a number of faculty being engaged. This year the rubric has been redesigned, and will be assessed. It is sort of

tangential to the assessment process. But worthy of sharing being an example of a cultural shift. This example should be included in the report. It is very powerful. Not only is the department learning, but they can build from this initiative. That is cultural learning, when models from other departments are collected, look at what they did and learning from that model.

- i. (Mary P.) For Oral Communication this strategy is paving the way. In the upper division, artifacts are going to be collected from departments who are interested in being involved. They are discipline specific. COMS faculty are reaching out as consultants to help develop the rubric, taking ownership of the assessment with the department, with the discipline specific nuances. Academic assessment is here to help and to provide a template of the model, a touching point for the disciplines.
- j. (Linda V.) The point of intervention are the faculty. Traditional way is fixing the students, but the faculty who are here and students keep changing. The matter of temptation for the administration is to quantify development process with numbers that does not do anything. It's a logical response to attain the numbers without making progressive development. That is a risk for the departments. It is not something about the process.
- k. (Mary P.) One of the reasons to quantify the information is to understand certain scenarios. For example, the issue of students deciding to leave. Why are students leaving? Not so much about numbers. Why 12 percent of students are leaving? If the numbers are aggregated for annual rates, if an analysis of the flow is done, that helps to point to a direction to understand where the problem is. That's a cultural engineering. That's a cultural shift.

## 5. Future Topics

- Senior Project Summary Analysis
- CLA+ Results (2016-17)
- Oral Communication: Lower Division Assessment Results
- Assessment of Learn by Doing

~~~~~

Winter 2017 Schedule

~~Friday 01/27; 9:10 to 10:00am Bldg. 10-241~~

~~Friday 02/17; 9:10 to 10:00am Bldg. 10-241~~

Friday 03/10; 9:10 to 10:00am Bldg. 10-241