

Learning Assessment Task Force Meeting Notes

October 15, 2013

3:40 pm – 5:00 p.m.

Student Services Center, I4-402

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| ATTENDEES | Julie Barnes, Chair | Jennifer Cost | Pam Luster |
| | Jill Baker | Ed Helscher | Andrew MacNeill |
| | Leela Bingham | Madeleine Hinkes | Marichu Magaña |
| | Kristan Clark | Angela Liewen | Susan Topham |

AGENDA ITEM A: LATF 2013-2014 Action Plan

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| COMMENTS/ DISCUSSION | <p>LOOKING BACK:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Julie will update the 2012-2013 LATF Action Plan to reflect what was achieved. We might publish a newsletter to review what people did and learned in 2012-2013. <p>LOOKING FORWARD:</p> <p>MOST IMMEDIATE PRIORITY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACTION PLAN ITEM #6: Expand meaningful institution-level learning assessments. <p>ILOs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For next time: We will focus on our ILOs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the ILOs reflect the values that we value? Do we want to include others? How are they defined? There was a discussion of perhaps including “civility.” <p>ACCJC Rubric:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next time will also focus on the ACCJC rubric, which should be a part of our action plan. |
|---------------------------------|---|

| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON(s) RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
|---|-----------------------|----------|
| Make sure that everyone has our ILOs and their current definitions. | Julie | ASAP |
| Correct Action Plan Header that reads 2012-13 | Julie | ASAP |

AGENDA ITEM B: New ACCJC Rubric

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| DISCUSSION | <i>Will discuss next time</i> |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|

| ACTION ITEMS | RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
|--------------|-------------|----------|
| <i>None</i> | | |

AGENDA ITEM C: Roundtable

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| COMMENTS/ DISCUSSION | <p>BARNES: ILOs should be a distinct area of interest for our groups this fall. Civility, the subject of a recent Board Policy, would be interesting to assess and perhaps include as a new ILO.</p> <p>Others with ideas shared that we could work with the ASG, look at civility among employees, survey our own perceptions, etc. For our website document center and in thinking about learning assessment, let’s remember the big paradigm shift from teaching to learning, as initially discussed by Terry Banion, Robert Barr and John Tagg.</p> <p>BINGHAM: We will be using our teaching and learning money to work with adjuncts on SLOs. There will be food.</p> <p>COST: In thinking about the faculty perspective, it’s very important that assessment is meaningful. We need to discuss learning outcomes in multiple venues, at the District and on campuses, paying attention to what we already do, and we want to embrace the spirit of civility in moving forward.</p> <p>HELSCHER: The Taskstream 2.0 pilot is ready to go. A small group of folks will be testing it from DSPS, Student Affairs, COMS, SPAN. We no longer have to worry about status reports and actionable items. It will be streamlined and easier. We may have to do a little work once it goes online.</p> <p>Some thoughts -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports aren’t likely to improve any time soon and they’re often inaccurate. Ed will make sure we have accurate reports published at the beginning of each semester. • Remember: When you finish inputting and everything is complete, press the SHARE button, which means, “Ok, I finished this cycle. Others can look at it.” • Ed will wait until Thanksgiving to input program SLOs when he has a break to do this. <u>At next Dean’s Council: If anyone has SLO changes at the program level, give them to Ed asap.</u> • 2012-13 Closing the Loop: Ed will make trainings available. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLO Training Workshops in LRC432, 9:00-11:00 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuesday, October 22 • Wednesday, October 23 • Thursday, October 24 • SLO Training Workshop in LRC432, 2:00-4:00 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Friday, October 25 • Would it be possible to do a special session with Student Services folks? |
|---------------------------------|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Ed: Yes.</p> <p>HINKES: Will it be our job to work on ILOs? Yes and it'd be good to complete that before we convert to using Taskstream 2.0.</p> <p>LIEWEN: I'm on a team which will focus on study hall for athletes and am excited. Per meeting notes from the last meeting, I will work on e-portfolios.</p> <p>LUSTER: Thanks for your work on behalf of the BOT meeting. The students did such a great job demonstrating their learning. I received many mails afterward saying it was the best BOT meeting ever. Mike Gast videoed. In assessing student learning, we can load such videos into Taskstream. We have many similar opportunities to capture student learning through performances, etc.</p> <p>MACNEILL: We used our teaching and learning money to look at assessment cycles.</p> <p>MAGAÑA: We used our teaching and learning money to bring together faculty and staff from EOPS /DSPS/STAR. We talked about program changes, got to know staff, and thought about how we can work together more effectively. We'll have a follow-up session to complete this work.</p> |
|--|--|

| ACTION ITEMS | RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
|---|--------------------|-----------|
| Get any program-level SLO changes to Ed ASAP | Deans/Mgrs/Writers | ASAP ASAP |
| Get 2012-2013 Wrap-Up Session Schedule to Julie | Ed | ASAP ASAP |

Post-Meeting Addenda:

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| COMMENTS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nellie Dougherty asks to remain on the Task Force, although she may make very few meetings, if any. She's interested in the work of the committee and wants to stay in the loop. • Trina updated the notes from last time, so they reflect the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ITEM C: Changed "Professional" Development Committee to "Staff" Development Committee • ITEM C: Noted that the LRC Committee could be morphed into a learning outcomes resource committee. |
|-----------------|---|

Next Meeting: Tuesday, November 5, 2013, 3:40 pm – 5 pm, I4-402
2013-2014 Calendar: 1st/3rd Tuesdays, 3:40-5, I4-402

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Learning Assessment Task Force

CVYf 1), 2013 Agenda

Members:

Julianna Barnes, Chair

Jill Baker

Leela Bingham

Kristan Clark

Jennifer Cost

Nellie Dougherty

Ed Helscher

Madeleine Hinkes

Angela Liewen

Pam Luster

Laurie Mackenzie

Andrew MacNeill

Marichu Magaña

Michelle Parsons

Mariette Rattner

Susan Topham

- A. LATF Action Plan/Goals for 2013-2014 (Julie/All)
- B. New ACCJC Rubric (Julie)
- C. Roundtable

Next Meeting:

November 5, 2013

3:40 pm – 5 pm

SD Mesa College 2013-14 Learning Assessment Task Force Action Plan

September 17, 2013

Learning Assessment Task Force Purpose:

To facilitate meaningful dialogue and assessment practices which support the ongoing improvement of student learning and institutional effectiveness. To provide planning, support, facilitation, communication, and leadership that will enable the achievement of college goals pertaining to learning assessment.

| Goals | Objectives for 2012-13 | Status | Actions & Timeline (what & when) | Person(s) Assigned |
|---|---|--------|--|--|
| 1. Facilitate compliance with accreditation requirements. | | | On-Going | LATF |
| 2. Envision what would constitute "Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement" at Mesa College, provide guidelines/benchmarks and support for its implementation. | Review new ACCJC Rubric, and define how SCQI could best be achieved at Mesa / utilize stakeholder input | | Fall 2013 Develop a draft plan for sustainable continuous assessment, which identifies the timeline and key components of a complete cycle, encompassing the varied levels of assessment from course to institutional | LATF |
| 3. Enhance digital presence and online tools (incl. enhanced resources and user-friendliness of web page) | Develop LAFT website with enhance resources and high impact practices at the local, state, and national levels (incl. "how to" tools) Communicate evidence of learning outcomes at Mesa. | | Develop FAQs Website Development | LATF Chair/LAF/IE Office LATF/IE Office |

SD Mesa College 2013-14 Learning Assessment Task Force Action Plan

September 17, 2013

| Goals | Objectives for 2012-13 | Status | Actions & Timeline (what & when) | Person(s) Assigned |
|---|--|--------|----------------------------------|---|
| 4. Facilitate the sharing and discussion of effective assessment practices across SLOs & AUOs, for example, Community of Practice | Support the planning and implementation of campus-wide opportunities for the sharing of effective practices, discussion and analysis of findings, future institutional planning in this sphere | | | LATF Teaching & Learning monies |
| 5. Continue to evaluate Mesa College's assessment resources & systems/mechanisms/structures, and provide recommendations in support of continuous improvement | Fine tuning of TaskStream a. Develop wish list b. Support an enhanced ability to retrieve data from TaskStream in a useful format Evaluation of TaskStream | | | LATF/LAC/LAF/IE Office |
| 6. Expand meaningful institution-level learning assessments. | Run an institution level ILO assessment report from TaskStream; Evaluate results and make recommendations to PIE regarding future institution-level learning assessment Review assessment models from other colleges, devise and implement assessment of ILOs, GE, etc. | | | LATF |
| 7. Engage in robust dialogue about the results of college wide learning assessment. | | | | LATF Key planning and assessment committees (e.g. PIE) |



**ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

*Western Association
of Schools and Colleges*

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD
SUITE 204
NOVATO, CA 94949
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234
FAX: (415) 506-0238
E-MAIL: accjc@accjc.org
www.accjc.org

Chairperson
SHERRILL L. AMADOR
Public Member

Vice Chairperson
STEVEN KINSELLA
Administration

President
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD

Vice President
KRISTA JOHNS

Vice President
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President
JOHN NIXON

Associate Vice President
NORVAL WELLSFRY

August 2013

Memo to: ACCJC Member Institutions

From: Barbara Beno, President *Barbara A. Beno*

Subject: ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

Attached you will find a copy of the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness, updated by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges/WASC in June 2011. This Rubric was first published in 2007 and has undergone two previous editorial revisions. The 2011 edition reflects language added to provide some additional detail.

Since 1994, the Commission's Accreditation Standards have required institutions to engage in a systematic and regular review of program quality as well as in short-and long-term planning, and an allocation of resources to assure that institutions achieve their stated mission and assess and improve institutional effectiveness. The 2002 Accreditation Standards added requirements that institutions become more intentionally supportive of student learning by defining intended student learning outcomes, assessing learning, and incorporating the results of assessment into decisions about institutional priorities and improvement plans.

The Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness was developed to assist colleges as they conduct self evaluation, and to assist external review teams as they examine institutional quality during accreditation reviews. The Rubric gives institutional members, evaluators, and the Commission a common language to use in describing the institution's practices in three key areas of the continuous quality improvement process – Program Review, Integrated Planning, and Student Learning Outcomes.

It is important to note that the sample behaviors described in each text box of the Rubric are not new criteria or standards for evaluation of an institution's quality, but rather are examples of behavior that, if characteristic of an institution, would indicate the institution's stage in the implementation of the Accreditation Standards, particularly Standard IB and important sections of Standard II and Standard III. The Rubric should be used in conjunction with the Accreditation Standards and the *Guide to Evaluating Institutions*, and *Guide to Evaluating Distance Education and Correspondence Education*.

The Commission has previously announced its expectations for institutional performance with regard to the practices described in the Rubric, as follows:

- The Commission expects all accredited institutions to be at the Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement level in Program Review (Part I of the Rubric) and Planning (Part II of the Rubric).
- The Commission expects all accredited institutions to be at least at the Proficiency Level or above in Student Learning Outcomes (Part III of the Rubric).

Institutions in the ACCJC membership widely share a commitment to the purposes of assessment – to improve student outcomes. The Commission hopes that institutional leaders will continue to find the 2011 Rubric helpful as they assess their own institution’s quality and work to achieve greater student success.

The Commission welcomes any ideas for improving the Rubric and for improving institutional practices in continuous quality improvement.¹ Please direct comments to accjc@accjc.org.

BAB/mg

Attachment

¹ The ACCJC’s Task Force on Student Learning Outcomes met in spring 2011 to provide the updates contained in the 2011 Rubric.

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part I: Program Review
 (See cover letter for how to use this rubric.)

| Levels of Implementation | Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Program Review <i>(Sample institutional behaviors)</i> |
|---|---|
| Awareness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review. • There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research. • There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals. • The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units. |
| Development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness. • Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness. • Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin., etc.) • Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality. • Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement. • Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation. |
| Proficiency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly. • Results of all program reviews are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making. • The program review framework is established and implemented. • Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness. • Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples. • The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes. |
| Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement. • The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness. • The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning. |

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part II: Planning

(See cover letter for how to use this rubric.)

| Levels of Implementation | Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Planning <i>(Sample institutional behaviors)</i> |
|---|---|
| Awareness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The college has preliminary investigative dialogue about planning processes. • There is recognition of case need for quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in planning. • The college has initiated pilot projects and efforts in developing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning and implementation (e.g., in human or physical resources). • Planning found in only some areas of college operations. • There is exploration of models and definitions and issues related to planning. • There is minimal linkage between plans and a resource allocation process, perhaps planning for use of "new money". • The college may have a consultant-supported plan for facilities, or a strategic plan. |
| Development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Institution has defined a planning process and assigned responsibility for implementing it. • The Institution has identified quantitative and qualitative data and is using it. • Planning efforts are specifically linked to institutional mission and goals. • The Institution uses applicable quantitative data to improve institutional effectiveness in some areas of operation. • Governance and decision-making processes incorporate review of institutional effectiveness in mission and plans for improvement. • Planning processes reflect the participation of a broad constituent base. |
| Proficiency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The college has a well documented, ongoing process for evaluating itself in all areas of operation, analyzing and publishing the results and planning and implementing improvements. • The institution's component plans are integrated into a comprehensive plan to achieve broad educational purposes and improve institutional effectiveness. • The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes. • The college has documented assessment results and communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies (documents data and analysis of achievement of its educational mission). • The institution assesses progress toward achieving its education goals over time (uses longitudinal data and analyses). • The institution plans and effectively incorporates results of program review in all areas of educational services: instruction, support services, library and learning resources. |
| Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning. • There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution. • There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes. • There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes. |

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: Student Learning Outcomes

(See cover letter for how to use this rubric.)

| Levels of Implementation | Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Student Learning Outcomes <i>(Sample institutional behaviors)</i> |
|---|---|
| Awareness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes. • There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how they relate to student learning outcomes. • There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a few people. • Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress. • The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the level of some courses or programs or degrees; where to begin. |
| Development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline. • College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes. • Existing organizational structures (e.g., Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment. • Leadership groups (e.g., Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation. • Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment. • Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development. |
| Proficiency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student learning outcomes and authentic assessments are in place for courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees. • There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results of assessment and identification of gaps. • Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward aligning institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning. • Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned. • Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed and updated on a regular basis. • Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes. • Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled. |
| Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement. • Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust. • There is evaluation of student learning outcomes processes. • Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing. • Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college. • Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews. |