

RIVERSIDE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES

April 20, 2018

12:00-2:00 PM, DL 409

Present: Sharon Alexander, Kelly Brautigam, Debbie Cazares, Jim Elton, Rebecca Kessler, Jasminka Knecht, Denise Kruizenga-Muro, Kevin Maroufkhani, Wendy McEwen, Scott McLeod, Mike Medina, Amita Naganand, Nicolas Robinson, Rosemarie Sarkis, Rana Tayyar, Jude Whitton

Absent: Steve Brewster, Shelly Dawson, Kathy Brooks, Sofia Carreras, Scott Hernandez, Melissa Matuszak, William Phelps, Kelsie Shockley, Rhonda Taube, Jarrod Williamson

Guests: Allyson Jeffredo, Rochelle Smith

- I. Approval of the Agenda m/s/c (Elton, Sarkis)
 - Delete PAW and Assessment Summit Workgroup
 - ADD GE Outcomes
- II. Approval of the Minutes (March 9, 2018) m/s/c (Elton, Tayyar)
 - 2 Abstentions
- III. Reports
 - EPOC
 - i. Accreditation discussion – well under way for the initial information collection
 - ii. Program Review – discipline-level completion is spotty, but Deans are having meeting to discuss division-level plans
 - iii. Pathways – Advanced workshop. College is working on identifying a job description and getting a Pathways coordinator in place (probably a faculty position with 100% reassign time)
 - iv. AB705 – Summit today. Lots of changes to curriculum which will affect not only English, Math, Reading, and ESL but could also have impacts on other disciplines
 1. Pre-requisite discussions
 2. Contextualized education and cross-discipline partnerships
 - IE-LC
 - i. Met yesterday
 - ii. Responsible for Accreditation Standards I and IV (primarily I)
 1. Initial review and collection of evidence
 2. Gaps identified
 3. Possible next steps
 4. Assessment is under Standard I
 - a. PLO assessment is a gap – we are doing it but not consistently

- Program Review
 - i. Keep working on it
 - ii. Not everyone is done, but there are some good conversations about meeting needs, alignment with college goals, etc.

IV. Old Business

- Assessment Summit – update and outcomes
 - i. Keynote speaker’s PowerPoint was distributed
 - ii. Cross-discipline conversations were very good
 - iii. Keynote speaker was very good
 - iv. Service Area Outcomes presentation was good – and allowed for some good conversation and learning
 1. Would like to have more of this
 2. Also a gap for Standard I (integration of SAO with academic assessment)
 - v. How to get associate faculty more involved? Take a “road show” to DLC, Department meetings, FLEX, etc.
 - vi. Thanks to everyone who provided prizes. That was great!
- GE SLO Assessment
 - i. Nuventive (TracDat) has 4 General Education programs which house the ADT’s.
 1. Is this something that is at the District level or is it something we developed / structured in Nuventive that can probably be unmapped
 2. The latter – Wendy can fix
 - ii. Discussion about 1.0 versus 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 – thought we agreed to be just a paragraph
 1. At some point in the recent past some disciplines were concerned about mapping to the general, so RCC reintroduced the 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4
 2. Many SLO’s just map to 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0 – but allows for flexibility for those disciplines who were concerned
 3. Report pulls all critical thinking
- Wendy presented a plan and timeline for GE SLO assessment for Critical Thinking along with a report with the SLO assessment results related to Critical Thinking and a couple of draft rubrics
 - i. First step is developing rubric
 1. Jude and Denise are going to create a draft and email it to committee
 2. PLEASE LOOK AT IT AND COMMENT
 - ii. Please review the SLO assessment report. If you know of a course which includes Critical Thinking and is not listed on the report, please let Wendy know and she will map it so that it is included going forward
 - iii. At May meeting, Committee will use the rubric and the existing evidence to evaluate and identify next steps
 - iv. Timeline will allow for disciplines to collect evidence as part of end-of-year projects / assignments which can be used for the Fall FLEX assessment activity
- If a course isn’t on the list and you know it is a critical thinking course, let Wendy know and she will map it

- To get eyes on it from various disciplines, modify initial language as a first start and distribute to the committee
- PLO Assessment
 - i. Assessment Committee has established the standard that every program be assessed at least once (and preferably twice) within each Program Review and Plan cycle. Current cycle is through 2019-2020 and most of our ADT's have not yet been assessed. So...we only have 2 more years to assess them.
 - ii. Office of Institutional Effectiveness has proposed an ADT Assessment Schedule for the next 2 years and will create an email to communicate this to the disciplines:
 1. 2018-2019
 - a. BUS
 - b. CSC
 - c. EAR
 - d. POL
 - e. PSY
 - f. SPA
 - g. THE
 2. 2019-2020
 - a. HIS
 - b. PHI
 - c. PHY
 - d. SOC
 - e. ANTH
 - f. ART HISTORY
 - g. GEO
 - iii. Can use the work of PAW as well as the GE SLO assessment as a model
 - iv. FIRST STEP – check to see that the Curriculum Map in the ADT in Nuventive Improve (TracDat) has been completed – mapping courses to the PLO for Introduce / Develop / Master
 - v. Once that is complete, Wendy can create a report which provides SLO assessment results as related to the PLO's as a first step for assessment
 - vi. Disciplines can then develop a rubric, evaluate the SLO assessment, and collect artifacts for additional PLO assessment
 - vii. At what level should we be assessing PLO's? Mastery only (or primarily) or at all levels
 1. Group agreed that at the Program Level ADT, mastery is probably a really good start because it is degree-level assessment
 2. Looking at where the skill is introduced probably doesn't help as much as looking at the mastery
 3. If the assessment isn't at the masterly level, then the faculty can backtrack to identify where the gaps might be occurring
 4. Also allows for conversations about the role of each course in the program
 - viii. How do we determine the difference between introduced, developed, and mastered?
 1. Faculty who taught the course are the experts and can provide the input of introduced / developed / mastered

- ix. For program-level assessment, if you have a capstone, the assessment can be much more focused.
- x. Wendy will create an email to distribute with steps and use the Computer Sciences report as an example – they’ve mapped the curriculum

V. New Business

- GE Assessment – discussion and plan moving forward
- GE Outcome Change
 - i. Information Competency and Technology Literacy (current) and proposed change is Information and Technology Literacy
 1. Was initially proposed last year but stalled
 - ii. For a process, needs to go 1st to RCC Curriculum Committee and then District Curriculum Committee
 1. From Hayley Ashby:
 2. The “Technology Literacy” component of the GELO is aligned with outcomes for the Business Admin/Info Sys Tech department, so I would not suggest changing “Technology Literacy” to “Technology Competency” without first having a discussion with their assessment rep (Scott McLeod), who could take it to their department. Like the library, the “Technology Literacy” component is aligned with discipline/industry standards.
 3. Possibly suggest changing the GELO to “Information and Technology Literacy.”
 - iii. This is actually part of a bigger discussion: Who owns general education curriculum? A Senate workgroup was created at one point, but...? What is the status?
 - iv. Because the RAC doesn’t own the curriculum, the Committee can support or not support the name change, but the proposal has to go back to library and they have to take it to the curriculum
 - v. Please review the change (Information Competency and Technology Literacy (current) to Information and Technology Literacy (proposed) and come prepared to vote next month
 - vi. One concern is that the actual assessment processes won’t change, but the name change might create confusion
- Deadline for Fall SLO data entry? April 15th? It helps to have a deadline. September 15th is the deadline for Spring assessment.

VI. Other

Riverside Assessment Committee GE Critical Thinking process

April 2018:

- Review SLO assessment results related to Critical Thinking
- Review examples of Critical Thinking rubrics
- Select team to draft rubric (Jude and Denise are going to create 1st draft)

May 2018

- Approve rubric
- Use rubric to evaluate what we have and what gaps exist GE assessment using course level data
- Develop plan to collect student artifacts as part of end-of-year preparation
- Identify team of evaluators who will participate in assessment in August 2018

June 2018

- Collect student artifacts
- Provide to Assessment Coordinators for summer evaluation and coordination

August 2018

- Evaluators meet and evaluate student artifacts
- Create report for September 2018 Assessment Committee meeting

September 2018

- Review and approve report