

Chabot College
Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee

October 19, 2010
12 pm -1 pm, Room 3521

Attendees:

Applied Tech & Business:

Judy O'Toole
 Steven Small

Counseling:

Felicia Tripp

Health, PE, & Athletics:

Gloria Meads
 (vacant)

Language Arts:

Deonne Kunkel
 Kent Uchiyama

Math & Science

Bruce Mayer
 Harjot Sawhney
 Robert Yest

School of the Arts:

Adrian Huang
 Carole Splendore
 Trish Shannon

Social Science:

Susan Tong
 (vacant)

Special Services:

Ramon Parada

Administration:

George railey

Institutional Research and Grant:

Carolyn Arnold

Guest:

Barbara Daher (Interior Design – SOTA)

Chair: Carole Splendore

Note Taker: Carole Splendore

The meeting began at 12:08 pm.

Meeting Minutes will be approved through email since that saves our meeting time.

The meeting was concluded at 1 pm.

1. Carole asked for photos and quotes again.
2. Carole attended the joint meeting of the PRBC (program review and budget council) and gave an update on that meeting. That committee asked participants to share their disciplines' approach to program review. It was agreed the Program review session on Flex Day should be over the new forms and procedures, and also outline the flow chart of how requests for support and budget needs flow up from the program reviews to the deans, to the PRBC and budget, faculty prioritization, staff prioritizations, and enrollment management committees.

Members of the SLOAC committee also asked that the session outline the purpose and constituency of the PRBC itself.

3. We reviewed Carole's one-page summary on "Qualitative Assessment" and Felicia's 4 page handout on the coding of qualitative assessment, about which we began discussion last session.
 - Susan mentioned qualitative assessment was important to some disciplines, including those in the Social Sciences.
 - A discussion of the difference between qualitative assessment and the subjective nature of some learning and assessments, ensued. The group seemed to agree more or less on the following definitions:
 - Quantitative assessment is regarding what students know/can do.
 - Qualitative assessment is regarding why they feel a certain way or know something. The student work which will be assessed might take on a narrative form. It has the potential to be richer than quantitative assessment.
 - The working definition that seemed to evolve from some areas of the Chabot faculty, whether within SOTA, Social Science, or Language Arts, seemed to be different than this. In it, the student work can not be satisfactorily measured from quantitative assessment as some elements of it are not pre-conceivable, or knowable. Additionally, it is the faculty analysis of the student work that is in a narrative form, and not necessarily the work of the student. The belief is that numeric coding of student work is inappropriate, or busy work. Faculty could describe the learning, but didn't want to put it on a 1-5 scale.
 - That the faculty's grasp on what the student was learning and how well they were learning it is subjective itself was debated. The group seemed to favor faculty impartiality, as achieved through analysis.
 - Carolyn offered that the faculty member is the expert, if qualitative assessment is subjective, that is more on the part of the students. The work is about, what do they feel? It's subjective because as they know they feel a certain way, they have no other context. Felicia concurred that the subjectivity in a student essay would be on the part of the student.
 - Carole shared that the WASC ALA definition of qualitative assessment was different than the "Chabot working definition." At the WASC ALA, qualitative assessment is not so much the manner of faculty analysis, but the sort of methodology used for gathering data: surveys, focus groups, and student writing. All these could be coded (ie. put into qualitative terms).

- Felicia agree that coding of qualitative assessment is entirely possible, the point of her examples.
- Bruce and Adrian concurred that they assessed creativity on a 1-5 scale, as did Carole. All agreed they gave extra credit points for that which was not preconceived by them.
- Carole asked if the group could propose examples where qualitative assessment could not be coded. The group could not provide an example, however we acknowledged we were an analytical group, and would benefit from another point of view to propose the counter-argument!
- Felicia offered to fight the other fight. She said some faculty grade on effort. They want to see the work is turned in, and thorough. In a self-esteem class, one could of course teach/assess it on naming, describing the 8 elements of self esteem, which could be easily quantitative. But one could also teach/assess it as self-driven class, where the goal is for effort and participation. In philosophy, psychology, and other social sciences, we honor the voice within the narratives, pull themes from the narrative. Carolyn and Carole agreed they would just then count the themes!
- Bruce Mayer offered an interesting counterpoint. If the goal of assessment is for faculty self-improvement, then how is narrative analysis on the part of the faculty not sufficient?

Next Meeting

4. The next meeting will be on Nov. 2nd in room 3521. We will do discipline check-ins.