

Chabot College
Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee

October 5, 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:

(vacant)

Institutional Research and Grant:

Carolyn Arnold

Guest:

Alicia Fausto (Puente-Intern)
Deb Parziale (Ohlone College)

Chair: Carole Splendore

Note Taker: Harjot Sawhney

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 introduced Deb Parziale to committee members. Deb is a member of the WASC Assessment Leadership Academy along with Carole. Deb is the coordinator of SLOAC, professional development, and program review at Ohlone College.
2. Carole attended the joint meeting of the PRBC (program review and budget council). She gave an update on that meeting. That committee's goal is to review the Dean's summaries of the program reviews, and tie program review to budget and planning. At the last meeting the membership was reviewed, and it was explained the goal was to focus on college initiatives, and less so the initiatives or points of views of the committees and divisions from which the members come. Three co-chairs are in the

process of being named for that committee. That PRBC has asked the member representatives to list their committee's initiatives for the year, and to link the initiatives to the impacted area or committee. The members are also required to report out to their committees and divisions.

3. Carole wrote a one-page summary on "Qualitative Assessment" and passed on to the committee members. It was information derived from the WASC ALA material and readings. We all took our time to read it. Gloria (nursing), Kent (ESL), and Felicia (counseling) liked this idea of qualitative assessment. Trish talked about some challenges to this concept.
 - Kent gave an example where a student twice did not achieve well on the SLOs, and still the student emailed him to thank him for preparing for professional world. This is the example where quantitative assessment on CLOs did not suffice to cover all the goals of the course, and qualitative would have worked well to capture this.
 - Gloria gave similar example where the first exam was hard. Not everybody got good grades. She gave them a pep talk to prepare them for the harder course. Later, students thanked her for learning to never give up. Her short qualitative exercise she does at the end of each course, asking the students what they got out of the course, worked well to show her they achieved this course goal.
 - Trish gave similar example where her students appreciate her work in helping them become better citizens but this goal is not part of course outline explicitly. Trish referred to college wide learning goals, such as life-long learning, engaged citizens, development of the whole person in an educational institution. The challenge is that the standards and processes for qualitative assessment have not been developed yet.
 - The group acknowledged that a process that is thoughtfully developed and shared across the institution would be best.
 - Carole summarized that qualitative assessment should be done in addition to quantitative assessment. It will not replace the quantitative assessment. Second, eLumen can accept qualitative assessment as "declared assessments." Faculty can therefore enter data for %'s of students achieving at certain levels. However eLumen's founder is cautious that faculty continue to enter direct assessment scores at the student level, so that students can generate reports of their achievement of learning outcomes, a value in "the learning paradigm."
 - Deb commented that more than one type of assessment, to corroborate or triangulate, is helpful for having confidence in your data and decisions. She gave an example of qualitative assessment in nursing when the instructor or

another holds a small focus group at the end of the class. They ask students how well they think they achieved the CLOs.

- Felicia commented that if, as we are looking at it, qualitative is to be done in addition to quantitative, then this will be more work for faculty, and thus those who do it are likely to be motivated to also implement a shared process, and make use of the results.
4. Felicia (counseling) talked about qualitative assessment in her work. She passed out a handout she created on “Qualitative Assessment and Coding.” She was consultant with program evaluation of non-profit agencies before coming to Chabot College. She gave examples of assessing qualitative measures.

The overall points she made is that qualitative assessment can:

- Compliment quantitative assessment
- Capture another perspective that is not reflected in “hard #'s”
- Allow for more in-depth exploration of topics identified in quantitative assessment
- Value the affective factors in learning
- Be useful when investigating complex constructs: self-esteem, self-efficacy

Felicia provided an example for a survey of a High School parents group, where they rated a workshop on 5 different points using a 1 – 5 likert scale. Felicia explained how to “code” or analyze the data. She had started with a rubric for each of the 5 measures. For example, for a score of 5, 90%+ of the responses needed to be rated a 5. Felicia also provided two web resources.

- Due to shortage of time, Felicia will continue her discussion in the next meeting.

Next Meeting

5. The next meeting will be on Oct. 19th in room 3521.

Supplemental Handouts on Qualitative Assessment follow:

On Qualitative Assessment From Carole Splendore, 10.10

A valued practice of assessment at an institution of higher learning is to incorporate both qualitative and quantitative measures, so that they complement one another. Erickman and

Roth (2006) assert that “The qualitative-quantitative dichotomy not only distorts the concept of education research but is fallacious...instead of dichotomizing research into qualitative and quantitative, we need to integrate approaches that provide the appropriate forms of knowledge needed by decision makers...dealing with different units of analysis.” John Schuh (2009) agrees that in the future, the use of mixed methods will become increasingly common.

At Chabot college, the Student Services Area relies on information gathered and analyzed from qualitative research such as focus groups and student surveys to guide decisions for improvement. This is not yet the case pervasively on the Academic side.

Our institutional-level student learning outcomes or College-wide Learning Goals have been assessed indirectly through our student satisfaction surveys from 2002 on. However, for our course-level student learning outcomes, we have here forth only developed measures for quantitative, direct assessment, using analytic rubrics. Our program-level student learning outcomes will be mapped from this quantitative approach, but incompletely, and there is not currently a system in place to corroborate this direct evidence or measure our proficiency on all of our program goals. Additionally, in assessment, our quantitative approach has driven us to measure and honor the cognitive and psycho-motor realms of learning, but has left the affective realm unobserved and thus the potential exists for it to be devalued.

Assessment is action research which is disciplined and systematic, but most faculty and staff lack the time and resources to conduct rigorous, replicable, empirical research studies with impartial distance. However if care is taken in designing assessments and collecting corroborating evidence (also called triangulation), assessment results may be imperfect but will nonetheless yield information faculty can use with confidence to make decisions about teaching and learning. It is for this reason Chabot would benefit greatly from a practice of qualitative measurement to triangulate with our direct measurement, and to fill in the places where direct measurement is not possible or useful.

In the affective realm, when attempting to assess attitudes, values, dispositions, and habits of mind, direct assessment is usually inappropriate, as students are more likely to give an answer they think faculty want to hear. There are in fact some values that are arguably not teachable, such as the development of curiosity. But there are some values which are difficult to assess but not impossible, and we should use qualitative measurement to do so because if we do not they are likely to drop from sight as accountability pressures force campuses on a more restricted set of learning outputs that can be more easily and inexpensively measured. Examples of this form of assessment are minute papers, journals, student self-reflection on what was their greatest achievement in the course, and student descriptions of their own behaviors which support learning.

In addition to the personally reflective, self-descriptive measurement of the affective realm, additional examples of qualitative measurement would be focus groups, interviews, or surveys of students that ask how well students understood and learned their course or program-level outcomes, or how well they achieved the goals of our programs. Program goals are a larger set of expectations for our departments not related to the evidence of student learning. For example, the goal to prepare graduates for the work place could be assessed through alumni surveys or interviews.

Qualitative Assessment and Coding – “A little bit more info!”

From Felicia Tripp, 10.10

- Qualitative assessment can..
 - Compliment quantitative assessment
 - Capture another perspective not reflected in “hard #s”
 - Allow for more in depth exploration of topics identified in quantitative assessment
 - Value the affective factors in learning
 - Useful when investigating complex constructs: Self-esteem, self-efficacy
- Opportunity – Coding qualitative assessments
 - Coding and Categorizing
 - Theoretical coding
 - Thematic coding
 - Content analysis
- Example: Surveys
 - Excel HS Parents Group Survey
 - Scoring Strategy – set rubric of % of most satisfied to likert scale standards
 - Question: I learned something I can use
 - Likert scale: 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree a little), 3 (neutral), 4 (agree), 5 (strongly agree)
 - Rubric of satisfaction: 1 (0-19% of responses), 2 (20-49% of responses), 3 (50-79% of responses), 4 (80%+ of responses), 5 (90%+ of responses)
- Example: Reaction papers
 - Context: PSCN 12 - Self Esteem for Success – 2 units
 - CLOs
 - CLO #1: Identify Origins of Self-Esteem (SE)
 - Reaction Paper Prompts:
 - Rubric:
 - 0 = work was not presented
 - 1 = Student shows very little understanding of the origins of SE
 - 2 = Student shows some understanding of the origins of SE
 - 3 = Student shows a good understanding of the origins of SE
 - 4 = Student shows a mastery understanding of the origins of SE
 - Method of assessment = Reaction paper – pre and post

Resources

- Web Center for Social Research Methods
 - <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/qualapp.php>
- Fisk Overview of Qualitative Research

- http://hcc.cc.gatech.edu/documents/156_Fisk_overview_qualitative_research.pdf

Appendix

- Example: Coding Satisfaction Survey Responses
- Case Study - Excel HS Parents Group Survey

On a scale of 1 to 5 please evaluate the following statements,

Please Note: 1 means Strongly Disagree, 5 means Strongly Agree,

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
1. Overall, the person leading the workshops was effective. (Loma K. Flowers, MD)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall, the activity was valuable to you.	1	2	3	4	5
The workshop was interesting.	1	2	3	4	5
I learned something I can use.	1	2	3	4	5
This program should be repeated.	1	2	3	4	5

Excel HS Workshop – Report Summary

Workshop Trends and Impact

- Trend: The workshops excelled in facilitation and participant engagement.
 - Facilitation: 94% strongly agreed that the facilitation was effective.
 - Level of engagement in workshops: 91% strongly agreed that the workshops were interesting.
- Trend: Participants believe the emotional competence skills they learned through the workshop will help them meet their responsibilities.
 - 98% agreed that what they learned in the workshops will help them meet their responsibilities.
- Trend: Participants believe the workshops will be needed in the future.
 - Desire to see program offered in the future: 91% strongly agreed that the workshops should be repeated.
- *Trend: Participants found the workshops to be valuable and relevant, but expressed less satisfaction in these areas when compared to the effectiveness of the facilitation and participant engagement.*
 - *Overall value of workshops: 82% strongly agreed that the workshops were valuable.*
 - *Relevance and applicability of emotional competence concepts: 80% strongly agreed that they could use what they learned in the workshops.*

Appendix

- Example: Triangulation
- Case Study – YFYI – Grant Makers

A. Outcome Evaluation

The Outcome Evaluation will examine YFYI's impact on its participants' youth leadership skills, civic activism and other related youth development assets as well as measure how effectively it delivered youth-led services throughout the city. The evaluation will measure different outcomes for YFYI's three groups of participants: grant makers (board members), grantees and beneficiaries. The outcomes to be examined have the following themes:

1. Youth leadership skills and values:

- Skills as defined by YLI¹: lead activities, communication skills, decision-making, public speaking, plan activities[3]
- Skills as defined by DCYF²: problem solving, manage conflict, working in a group[8]
- Values as defined by the Search-Institute³: positive self-image, integrity, personal responsibility[4]

2. Other benefits (related youth development assets)⁴:

External Assets

- Support: positive family connection
- Empowerment: feelings of safety in schools and communities
- Boundaries and expectations: positive peer connections

Internal Assets

- Commitment to learning: attachment to school, academic accomplishment, homework completion, school engagement
- Positive sense of self and healthy behaviors: personal care/health, restraint in use of drugs, alcohol and sexual activity, positive view of personal future[4]

3. Participation of high risk and disengaged youth as defined by DCYF and YFYI. (This definition will be determined at a later point in time.)

4. Civic Activism as defined by:

- Attachment to community
- Involvement in community service
- Involvement in decision-making at sponsoring organizations

5. Effective service delivery

(See Appendix for a detailed list of outcomes/group: YFYI Outcome Measure Tool Table)

¹ Leadership skills as defined by the Youth Leadership Institute's survey to youth philanthropy programs.

² Leadership skills as defined by DCYF's 2003 Outcomes on youth leadership.

³ www.search-institute.org/assets; The 40 Developmental Assets Approach describes positive values and positive identity assets that define the values we assign to youth leadership.

⁴ www.search-institute.org/assets; The 40 Developmental Assets Approach organizes assets in to 2 major categories external and internal. Furthermore, each of these categories are organized by asset type. External assets includes the asset types of support, empowerment and boundaries and expectations. Internal assets includes the asset types of commitment to learning, positive values and positive identity.

Group 1: Grant Makers (Youth Board Members) will receive the most intense level of evaluation on outcomes related to youth leadership, civic activism and other benefits.

Evaluation Approach: The YFYI youth board will determine its own process, procedures and funding decisions. Consequently, the units of analysis will include each individual board member's development in leadership and related assets as well as the entire board's development as a group. With this approach, the evaluation will describe and measure individual and group growth through multiple perspectives, triangulating its data to provide an accurate and holistic picture of the changes measured.

Data Collection includes:

1. Board Member Self Assessment – A pre/post questionnaire for an individual board member to rate his own performance as a board member and the performance of the board as a whole will be administered in January and April 2004.
2. Youth Board Focus Group – these pre/post focus groups with board members will allow the board to describe its activities related to outcomes, respond to their rating of their performance as a group and discuss their impact upon sponsoring organizations. The focus groups will occur in February and April 2004.
3. Board Member Parent/Caregiver Interview Questionnaire – this pre/post questionnaire for the parents'/caregivers' of board members will provide an assessment on board members' youth leadership skills and other related youth development assets. This will be administered in time with the Board Member Self Assessment in January and April 2004.