



REDWOODS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Meeting of the
Assessment Committee

September 25, 2018
2:50-4:15, FM 110

MEETING NOTES

Members present: Philip Mancus, Michael Dennis, Erica Botkin, Paul Chown, Cheryl Norton, Rianne Connor, Courtney Loder

1. Call to Order 2:58 pm

2. Introductions and Public Comment: Members of the public are invited to make comments regarding any subject appropriate to the Assessment Committee.

None

3. Action Items

3.1. No Action Items

4. Discussion Items

4.1. New Member: Rianne Connor will be representing Adult Education/Noncredit moving forward.

4.2. Revised Outcomes – Academic Support Center

4.2.1. See Attachment

1) (rewritten) Students, faculty, and staff will report awareness and understanding of ASC instructional testing services and processes.

Justification: Assessing knowledge of students and staff about the services available at ASC. Doesn't measure learning as directly as other outcomes, but if students do not know about the services, they can't make use of them. Similar to DSPS outcome #3. Planning to survey staff and students to assess this.

Committee members were unsure about the program focus of this outcome (vs. student learning focus). Philip Mancus will research and clarify the local and ACCJC history re: the necessity for student-centered

outcomes and communicate this feedback to the ASC. It may be possible to structure the survey in such a way as to be able to disaggregate students responses from faculty and staff.

2) **As a result of participating in services provided by the Academic Support Center, students will demonstrate knowledge of study skills, learning strategies, and/or collaborative learning.**

The Committee supports this outcome as written.

4.3. Coordinating Student Services Assessment

4.3.1. See Attachment (outreach email from Philip to SS Managers)

Philip Mancus reported on the outreach email he sent to directors and managers in Student Services, which didn't receive much response.

What should the next step be for Students Services (SS) outreach?

- Committee members with relationships to SS areas can do some in-person outreach
- Paul Chown can look to see which SS areas have outcomes planned for assessment and we can invite them to a committee meeting for pre-assessment discussion?
- Rianne Connor shared that at the last Student Development Leadership Group (SDLG) meeting there was confusion about how assessment for SS fits into the model used for Instruction, particularly re: opening and closing loops. For many SS areas, contact with students is sporadic and unpredictable, and thus tricky to assess using the Instruction paradigm.
 - Most SS areas are now invested in data-driven decision making and want to have measurable success indicators. Enrollment Services and General Counseling & Advising in particular face a serious challenge when developing student-centered outcomes, as every student is "their" student. Many other areas have defined cohorts of students they work with, but these two offices provide district-wide services.
 - Many SS are also unclear about when/how/why to open a loop. Courtney Loder suggested having SS areas write report without worrying about loops. Once written, they can review the report with AC members who can help identify which parts of report are "loop-worthy." Rianne thinks something like this would be very helpful to SS report writers.
 - Philip Mancus suggested having additional conversation about challenges particular to SS Assessment with some or all

committee members outside of our regular meeting time
(either via zoom or email)

4.4. Updated Criteria for “Opening a Loop”

4.4.1. See Attachment

Philip Mancus presented a revised list of criteria for opening a loop.

- ~~1. If 50% of students or more “did not meet” the SLO.~~ **Student performance on an outcome has fallen below some pre-defined threshold.**
Commentary: *In the past, 50% or more of students failing to meet an SLO was recommended as an automatic trigger for opening a loop. However, establishing a meaningful threshold should be up to service/discipline experts. The chosen criterion should ideally reflect a consensus definition within that area. What benchmarks are there to guide us? If one were to use percentages that are traditionally correlated with letter grades, then a threshold of <70% of students meeting the outcome (equivalent to a “D” or lower) would be cause for concern.*
- ~~2. If an entire unit, major project, or exam needs to be revised.~~ **If an entire activity or process (such as a unit, major project, exam, procedure, or routine) needs to be revised.**
Commentary: *The need is decided by service/discipline experts, but the basic idea is that an assessment indicates that a change in plan would improve student success. For outcomes to be meaningful metrics of good planning, good planning needs to be geared toward achieving meaningful outcomes.*
3. The SLO needs to be changed because it no longer measures the data you need/want for your area. [Keep]
Commentary: *SLOs may need revision for various reasons. New standards require capturing different data, service delivery/course content has changed, existing outcomes reflect an outmoded understanding of service or course goals, student needs have changed, etc. (See recommendation number 2)*
- ~~4. Students need facilities or equipment to meet the SLOs that they don’t have.~~ [Strike altogether]
Commentary: *It is misleading to suggest that opening a loop is a means to initiate a resource request.*
- 4. A new course or service has been initiated and you wish to generate outcome data that will serve as the baseline for assessing the reliability of your outcomes. (optional? As needed for those who would find this helpful to track baseline data, etc.)**
Commentary: *This option may be particularly attractive for new and experimental courses and services.*

Re: the suggested change to #4, Michael Dennis observed that there is a relationship between SLOs and the budgeting process. Documenting in the budget process that the resources requested are tied to student learning does have value, so the spirit of the original language may still have some relevance.

- A hypothetical example: Enrollment Services gets new software that helps students register for classes. It could be helpful to have a place to document the success of that software. Is program review where that should happen? If so, maybe we need to consult with Program Review re: where the best place for that reflection/documentation to take place.

Philip Mancus will revisit the wording of #4.

4.5. Assessment and the Curriculum Update Process
[tabled for time]

4.6. Using Student Surveys in Assessment
[tabled for time]

4.7. eLumen Task Force

Angelina Hill is assembling membership for taskforce to assess the adoption of eLumen for Assessment, determining timeline for development/rollout, etc.

Won't be a main focus of the committee, but the committee will get regular updates and be involved when their input will be useful.

Philip asked committee members to please share questions, comments, ideas with him.

Courtney will schedule a live demo of eLumen Assessment for a future meeting.

5. Reports

5.1. No reports

6. Announcements/Open Forum

7. Adjournment - 4:19