

Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes 9/6/13

Members Present: Bonnie Suderman, Dawn Dobie, David Koeth, Pam Davis, John Carpenter, David Neville, Christian Zoller, Julie Marty-Pearson, Michelle Begendik, Denise Mitchell, Paul Beckworth, Susan McQuerry, Bryan Hirayama, and Bernadette Towns.

1. Bonnie Suderman welcomed new and returning members to the meeting, as it began at 9:00 am.
2. Bonnie demonstrated how to access the Assessment Committee page through Inside BC: Inside BC>Employees>Committees. On the committee page, members can find many resources, minutes from previous meetings, agendas, etc. They can also email committee members from this area.
3. Bonnie explained that the charge of the committee is responsible for: “[coordinating] all student learning outcomes assessment processes and reports to the Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs and Student Services.” It is separate and completely different than the assessment tests students take upon entering BC.
4. Bonnie reviewed the committee’s Philosophy statement (available in files on committee page).
5. Bonnie explained that the assessment process at BC has been developed to remain separate from personnel evaluations. For example, the scores that individual classes receive in assessments are not input into the evaluation of the faculty who teach those courses. However, ACCJC requires that assessment results will be used in evaluations. At this point, what’s being proposed for the new contract will comply with ACCJC, but not “over the red line”: during the evaluation process, faculty will be asked how assessment results changed the way they are teaching or approaching class projects. Data from assessments will not be used.
6. Bonnie gave an overview of outcomes assessment and developing Student Learning Objectives (SLOs).
 - a. The process of developing SLOs must be meaningfully carried out.
 - b. SLOs are student-centered and should involve critical thinking.
 - c. Assessment then becomes a course tool to use to see if students have grasped the outcomes. Faculty may individualize tools for assessment (all assessment instruments and methods must be valid and reliable), but all courses must have and support the same SLOs. At least one SLO must be assessed each year within each course. Many departments agree on one tool to assess the same SLO, making compilation of data much easier.
 - d. After faculty members meet and discuss results of assessment, they should ask if students are meeting course objectives and make plans for the future.
 - e. Programs must also have objectives and can use other tools, such as surveys, for assessment of what they are doing.
 - f. Assessment is ongoing. Both individual and group evaluations of results are important to plan for the future.
7. Bonnie explained that in the past “Program” was used at BC to describe a set of courses that led to a degree or fit within a GE area. ACCJC has now defined “Program” as any series of courses

that results with a degree or certificate. BC sends an annual assessment report to ACCJC ; Bonnie usually completes this.

8. Bonnie noted the different levels of assessment:
 - a. Course level: Every course has student-centered, measurable SLOs that require critical thinking. These SLOs are input to Curricunet for Curriculum Committee review. A small group of Assessment Committee members will work to evaluate the submitted SLOs during the curriculum process this school year. David Neville and John Carpenter volunteered to participate in this activity.
 - b. Program level: Program Level Outcomes (PLOs) are also measurable. Programs hand in reports in the spring, usually in April, and can use the information gathered in their Program Review report to request new equipment purchases or personnel positions.
 - c. Institutional level: This covers all students and is more difficult to assess. In the past the CCSSE instrument was used, and plans are to continue using it every 3 years. In the meantime, BC is looking for a faculty member to oversee this area, with .2 release time, and develop ways to determine if BC is meeting student needs.
9. Institutional Projects
 - a. Student Engagement: The CCSSE given a few years ago determined that student effort was a big problem at BC. Two years ago a think tank came together on campus and researched student effort and engagement. They planned and held a district-wide conference, with keynote speaker Elizabeth Barkeley, on the BC campus that offered professional development in the area of student engagement.
 - b. Improving Student Writing: Last year a think tank was created to focus on improving student writing across the disciplines. The think tank members researched and created a writing rubric that works in various subject areas and can be individualized. This school year the think tank will hold workshops with different departments whose members can bring in various samples of student writing and try out the rubric. These groups will become Faculty Learning Communities, where colleagues can discuss strategies with each other. The think tank hopes to create a repository of sample writing assignments to help faculty in the area of student writing.
 - c. General Education (GE) Assessment: we assess GE outcomes, focusing on one GE area each school year. A list of courses that covers the specific GE outcome under evaluation is sent to the Institutional Research department, who chooses random courses to assess. Department members for those courses are given a handout with an assessment tool, which they determine how to administer. At a meeting later on they share their experiences with a group of faculty from all areas of campus, explaining what assessment tools they used, what their results were, and what their plans are for addressing the results.
10. Setting goals: The committee set the following goals for the coming school year; they are aligned with the larger BC goals.
 - a) Professional Development: Provide professional development opportunities for classified, faculty, and administrators that will further the effectiveness of our existing assessment work

- Think Tank - Faculty Learning Communities on the Writing Rubric and writing and grading strategies
- Support Group - Pair with the existing Curriculum Support Group meetings to provide curricUNET training
- Department District Connections - Sponsor discussion between campuses for at least one department in order to promote inner-district work on the assessment cycle
- Work with ATD data team to strengthen the link between the assessment results/data and decisions or requests based upon those results/data

College Goal: Professional Development

- b) Move Assessment into being positively connected to student success
- Provide video clips of participants and their effective assessment processes
 - Increase the use of the Assessment BLOG
 - Develop an effective method to push out assessment information—InsideBC?
 - Evaluate use of the reception—do we do it again? make changes? do something different?

College Goal: Communication, Student Success

- c) Meet compliance requirements
- Approve SLOs within the curriculum process in a timely, effective manner
 - Maintain 100% completion of program and course assessments
 - Complete GE assessments

College Goal: Oversight and Accountability

Completed by Dawn Dobie