

Chabot College
Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee

May 18, 2010
12-1 pm, Room 451 L

Attendees:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carolyn Arnold	<input type="checkbox"/> Adrian Huang	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jennifer Lange	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bruce Mayer
<input type="checkbox"/> Gloria Meads	<input type="checkbox"/> George Railey	<input type="checkbox"/> Norberto Ruiz	<input type="checkbox"/> Harjot Sawhney
<input type="checkbox"/> Patricia Shannon	<input type="checkbox"/> Michelle Sherry	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steven Small	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carole Splendore

Chair: Carole Splendore

Note Takers: Carolyn Arnold and Carole Splendore

The meeting began at 12:00 pm.

Meeting Minutes will be approved through email to maximize meeting time.

The meeting was concluded at 12:55 PM.

1. Review of CWLG FIGs to date:

A. We reviewed the measurement of the CWLG's on campus:

- 1) The (excellent!) indirect measure from the student satisfaction surveys from 2002 - 2009 is available at:
http://www.chabotcollege.edu/IR/StudentSatisfaction/StuSurvF09_CollwideLrngGoals_Trends01-09.pdf
- 2) We know how many CLOs are in each CWLG, as we configured eLumen to place the CLOs under Achievement Areas that we assigned to the five CWLGs.
 - a. This will get more accurate if/when eLumen allows more than one CWLG per CLO (we have asked David about this)
- 3) If eLumen aggregates over each CWLG, then we can get a rough measure of assessment levels of each of the CWLGs
 - a. It will be even better if we can group CLOs within the subparts of each CWLG (but how to do this?)

Therefore: we can keep doing pilots before we are ready for campus-wide assessments of CWLG's

B. Insights from the Critical Thinking FIGs and Global/Cultural Involvement FIG:

- 1) CT FIG: the same rubric can be used across disciplines and SLOs for a CWLG when the CWLG is common enough for everyone to agree on a rubric or two.
- 2) CT FIG: Both holistic and detailed rubrics should be available when conducting cross-disciplinary measurements. Carolyn explained how some faculty preferred one rubric or another, and there was change in both directions between the use of holistic and

detailed rubrics. Detailed rubrics yield more actionable data, but holistic rubrics can capture that a whole is sometimes greater than the sum of its parts.

3) The Global/Cultural Involvement CWLG had to be defined and broken into subparts, which provided a valuable glimpse into the type of G/CI that was being taught (ie awareness more than analysis).

2. Plans for the Future CWLG FIGs:

A. Pilots should continue, and each will be unique to that CWLG.

The groups would do the following:

- 1) work on defining and measuring the CWLG
- 2) figure out how to get college-wide measurement of it in the future

B. 2010-2012 possible plans

Fall 2010: Carolyn facilitates Communication FIG, focusing on Reading, which is perhaps led by the language Arts faculty
and/or:

Fall 2010: Carolyn trains Social Science faculty to run Civic Responsibility FIG

Spring 2011: A health faculty member runs the Development of the Whole person, at least some parts of it.

Fall 2011: Other subparts of the Communication and/or Whole Person CWLGs are developed

C. The Qualitative Assessment FIG was mentioned, as it is planned to launch in the Fall '10 or Spring '11 semester, and is hopefully to be led by Social Science faculty.

3. Possible Cycles for Assessment:

A. If CLOs were assessed every three years, it would match the Program Review and Curriculum cycles. The cycle could take place on a three semester basis: (1) assessment/ (2) analysis and review/ (3) implementation of improvement / followed by a 3 semester pause in assessment, in which time the change had time to be implemented and refined, preceding the next cycle of assessment.

We discussed this cycle was at this time undefined intentionally, to allow time to see how the new Program Review process will impact faculty workload. We acknowledged that the mass of data is not so important as that it is put to effective use.

B. One different CWLG could perhaps be assessed every year.

We discussed that the pilots were of volunteers, and we would need systems to move this work onto a larger campus-wide scale.

1. One idea is to map from the CLO to the CWLG to which it is linked, and view assessment data there. This would be very easy to do, the faculty would not even need to be involved in the gathering of data. However we were not convinced this would be meaningful or valuable.

2. Another idea was to take a random sample of sections, and ask faculty to develop a new assessment activity on an existing or new CLO, that speaks directly to the CWLG, and look at that data. This is the expansion of what the CWLG FIGS have been piloting. But perhaps we are asking for too much work there. Also, it would not allow for interdisciplinary communication on what it means to be teaching to this outcome, unless that discussion occurred after the fact, perhaps on a shared internal email system.

3. We discussed in the fall, we could ask faculty to think about how the CLOs map to (and speak about) the CWLGs.

4. We thought it best to keep the pilot groups, but continue to try to determine:
- a. How do we define and measure these outcomes?
 - b. What would our pilot groups' activities look like?
 - c. If we were to expand this college-wide, what would it look like?

****After the meeting, Carole and Carolyn ended up talking with Katie, and Carolyn was convinced again that the student Reading self assessment may be a good way to go in Fall 2010 with a sample of instructors, to assess reading. This is not reflected in the notes of the SLOAC conversation, but it is a strong contender for a plan in the fall, so it appears here as an addendum. Perhaps this student self-assessment on reading could be complemented by faculty direct assessment of speech.