



Meeting of the Assessment Chairs
Friday, August 17, 2012
Minutes

Present: Mary Carr (OH), Hope Essien (MX), Michael Heathfield (HW),
Rosie Inwang (OH), Noah Marshall (WR), David St. John (MX),
Marcia Turner (CDL)
Facilitator: Cecilia López, AVC

The meeting of the Assessment Chairs was called to order at 3:00 p.m. at MXC, room 2208.

Future Meetings: Assessment Chairs voted to meet at 2:00 p.m. on the third Friday of each month classes are in session. The next meeting of the Assessment Chairs is, therefore, scheduled for **2:00 p.m., Friday, September 21, 2012 at MXC**, room number TBA.

Human Diversity Survey:

1. **Assessment Week:** In order to assure a representative sample, HW shared that the College has scheduled the administration of its Human Diversity Survey for its Assessment Week, **November 5—10, 2012**. Faculty agreed to check with their Deans and Vice Presidents as to the viability of those dates; however, faculty voiced strong support that the Survey be administered during the same week across all five colleges that are administering the Survey.
2. **Colleges Involved in Administration of the Human Diversity Survey:** The administration and faculty from the following five colleges have agreed to administer the Survey fall 2012: HW, KK, MX, OH, and TR.
3. **Logistics:** The faculty member at HW who will provide logistical assistance to the Assessment Chairs is Jeffrey Swigart at HW. Jeff will provide a “cheat sheet” to the other Assessment Chairs since the list of actions that must be considered to administer the Survey (or any measure) is important. In addition to what Jeff will share, faculty

discussed the importance of being prepared: with paper backup of the surveys in case the internet does not cooperate; providing faculty who have volunteered a class period with sufficient notice of the timing of Assessment Week, the reason for administering the Survey, and instructions as to its administration; and PR for Assessment Week across the College and especially to students, explaining why the College is assessing Diversity SLOs and why student input is so important. Additionally, Jeff will set up a link for the distribution of all Survey materials, forms, and grids that faculty will need to facilitate the administration of the Survey. Lastly, rather than have a series of meetings on administration of the Survey, regular communication by the Assessment Chairs with Jeff will be conducted through email.

4. **Issues—Disability Access Center & Administration of the Survey:** Assessment Chairs and Deans of Instruction involved in the administration of the Survey need to contact their respective DAC's and request large print versions of the Survey and if necessary, any other resource that their DAC students may need.
5. **Representative Sample:** Faculty determined that 10% of the credit students enrolled across the grid (M+W, T+TR, Fri, and Sat) would comprise a representative sample of each College's credit students.
6. **Survey Monkey:** AVC López will contact AVC Gutierrez to determine who has authorization to use Survey Monkey during Assessment Week: District or each individual college?
7. **CDL:** Faculty wanted to know if the Survey could also be administered to CDL students. Dean Marcia Turner indicated her delight to be part of the administration of the Diversity Survey. Dean Turner will work with AVC Antonio Gutierrez's office to determine how to track students enrolled in both CDL and the courses for which faculty have volunteered to administer the Survey. Faculty suggested that they target faculty who teach face-to-face and CDL courses to volunteer for administration of the Survey.
8. **Item Analysis/Validity & Reliability:** AVC Gutierrez's office will be approached to assist Assessment Committees run item analysis and validity and reliability studies on the Survey.
9. **Human Diversity Survey Outcomes:** Faculty agreed that assessment data will be "crunched" during the summer either by College IR officers or by staff at AVC Antonio Gutierrez's office. Also, faculty agreed that during spring 2013, the office of the AVC, Accreditation & Assessment will schedule a series of meetings for interested faculty to: discuss the implications of the assessment

data/information; recommend changes if warranted by the data/information; and to consider changes to the Human Diversity SLOs and/or Survey to strengthen either or both.

Release Time: The issue of the importance of release time for Assessment Chairs was discussed. Since assessment of General Education SLOs is expected, as well as faculty work on the CCCDQP, the time to engage meaningfully in the process of assessment at each college is important and should be supported.

CCCDQP: Faculty discussed the response CCC need to provide to Lumina and the CCCDQP's lead college as articulated by Dr. Jason Wood at Central Wyoming College (Please refer to Dr. Woods' attached document, which explains the topic of SLOs in the context of Lumina's DQP for the AAS and in the context of employer input). By **Thursday, August 23, 2012, COB**, faculty agreed to provide to AVC López their responses to the following:

1. What do you collectively agree/disagree with? Provide your best rationale for each.
2. Generate a list of 3-5 refined research questions to be considered in our 2-3 year project.
3. Develop a rationale, with examples of potential projects, to address the refined research questions.
4. Collaborate with faculty at your institutions to generate two or three sample assignments that could elicit active learning and the demonstration of the skills/competencies embedded in the generic SLO's for a particular DQP area.
5. Determine how important it is to make the process and results transparent and available to other colleges...how can we do this at each step?

Meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Cecilia López, Ph.D.

Minutes
Meeting of the Assessment Chairs
September 21, 2012
2:00 p.m. @ MXC – Hurst Room

Present: Jennifer Asimow (HW); Kate Connor (TR); Hope Essien (MX); Rosie Inwang (OH); Michael Heathfield (HW); Jennifer Jakob (DA); Noah Marshall (WR); Mary McLean (DA); Jane Reynolds (MX); Jeffrey Swigart (HW); Marcia Turner (CDL); Martha Vertreace-Doody (KK);

Facilitator: Cecilia López (DO)

Action Items:

1. **Community College Consortium of the Degree Qualifications Profile (CCCDQP):** Dr. López will inform the Lumina Foundation that currently, CCC does not have the institutional capacity to continue as participants with the CCCDQP.
2. **CCSSE:** HW, OH, and WR will administer the CCSSE spring 2013; DA, KK, and TR, will administer the CCSSE spring 2014. District will pay for the administration of the CCSSE for spring 2013.
3. **Assessment Schedules:** Each college will submit to Kojo, with a copy to López, an assessment schedule for 2012-2017.
4. **Support for Assessment Chairs:** Colleges that have not provided release time or stipends for their Assessment Chairs (e.g., KK, OH, and TR) will submit to Kojo, with a copy to López, its plans or needs to provide release time or a stipend for fall 2012 and spring 2013.
5. **General Education SLOs & Measures by Campus:** Each Assessment Chair will review with their VPs and/or Deans of Instruction the attached draft of the SLOs and Measures. Revisions are due to Dr. López by **COB Tuesday, October 2, 2012**

Discussion Items:

Human Diversity Survey: After introductions, López reminded the Assessment Chairs to share all assessment documents and information with members of their Assessment Committees. Additionally, López introduced Professor Jeffrey Swigart, who has volunteered to offer assistance and advice to those Assessment Chairs at KK, MX, OH, and TR who will administer the Human Diversity Survey during Assessment Week, October 5-10.

Edits to the Survey: Jeff provided an overview of changes that have been made to the Survey based on feedback and suggestions for edits from TR faculty. Professor Inwang added that OH also is interested in considering changes and will submit them to Jeff very soon. Please check with Jeff as to the deadline for suggesting further changes.

Online vs. Paper/Pencil: Although the Survey is designed for online administration, several colleges do not have access to sufficient computer lab spaces and, therefore, will administer the Survey in class, using paper/pencil. Jeff suggested that even for those colleges that offer the Survey online, since Blackboard and the Internet have been known to “crash,” having 200 paper copies of the Survey in reserve is wise.

Sample Size: Further discussion about sample size and response rates occurred. The minimum sample size, based on each college’s total credit headcount, should be 10%.

Faculty Volunteers & Representative Sample: Attaining a 10% sample size will depend entirely on working with faculty volunteers. Please contact faculty to volunteer several class periods from which one or two courses per faculty member can be drawn. A sufficient number of courses across the grid (M+W, T+TR, F, & Sat) are needed to assure a representative sample. Please refer to the “cheat sheet” of instructions that Jeff has provided and will continue to provide as issues emerge that need to be addressed.

DAC: Please contact your College’s DAC to be sure large-print copies of the Survey are available for DAC students.

Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE): López suggested that Assessment Committee members review the sample copy of the SENSE to determine if usefulness for possible administration spring 2014.

Reminders:

- a. Assessment Week: November 5-10, 2012
- b. 2012 Assessment Institute at IUPUI, Oct. 28-30, 2012
- c. College Assessment Web Pages: Upload Assessment documents
- d. Next scheduled meeting of the Assessment Chairs: 10/19/12

Submitted 9/24/12
Cecilia López, AVC, Accreditation and Assessment

Meeting of the District-wide Assessment Chairs DRAFT Minutes 11/19/12

Present: Jen Asimow (HW), M. Carla Carr (OH), Kate Connor (TR), Hope Eissen (MX), Rebecca Flores (KK), Mike Heathfield (HW), Rosie Inwang (OH), Noah Marshall (WR), Jane Reynolds (MX), Marcia Turner (CDL)

Absent: Daley College

Facilitator: Cecilia López

Meeting was held at MX, Hurst room, and started at 2:00 p.m.

Agenda items were:

- Assessment Week and administration of the Human Diversity Survey;
- Revised Schedule for the CCSSE
- ICCB/CCC General Education SLOs and Measures
- 2012-2017 Assessment Timeline
- Sharing Good Practice

Assessment Week & the Human Diversity Survey: Assessment Chairs were asked to share with the Committee progress the five Colleges (HW, KK, MX, OH, and TR) that had agreed to the administration of the Human Diversity Survey during the agreed-upon Assessment Week, November 5-10, 2012, the twelve week of the semester.

(Note: This discussion did not include the two colleges (DA & WR) that had declined to participate in the administration of the Human Diversity Survey during Assessment Week. Also, KK's representative, who had been held up in traffic, did not participate in this segment of the discussions.)

1. **HW's** representatives announced that HW's Assessment Committee had made minor changes for purposes of inclusiveness to HWC's definition of Human Diversity but had not changed or modified the College's Human Diversity SLOs. The final version of HW's Human Diversity survey is available for all to copy to Survey Monkey. HW reported that 50 faculty have volunteered to administer the Survey, which will provide a duplicated HC of 2,200; however, due to a variety of reasons, the final number of respondents is expected to be 1,500 or 10% of HW's credit HC. The half of the Survey will be distributed in HW's computer room. Another half will receive the Survey by a faculty generated link. Upon completion, the student will receive a Certificate of Completion. One strategy

being used by faculty is to issue a certain number of points upon successful completion of the Survey. Because of a carefully designed grid, HW knows how many classes are participating, what dates, and during what times in the grid. HW consistently avoids bias by “cross walking” disciplines, days (Mon-Sat), and times (day/evenings) so that over sampling on any one discipline or grid position is avoided. A question arose about how faculty volunteering engendered a “random sample.” HW’s methodology is a “sample of convenience, whose power is in the number of students involved. Over a ten year period, demographic comparisons demonstrated that each sample was indeed comparative to HW’s credit population. Lastly, HW’s IR officer is responsible for data analysis.

2. **MX** will administer the Survey by paper and pencil since insufficient number of computers are available. Faculty have randomly been selected from Credit, Adult Education, and ESL. So far 1500 students will constitute the sample. Letters explaining the Survey and the assessment process have already been sent to faculty. However, Adult Ed. Directors will share this information with their AE faculty. MX’s IR officer will analyze the data for the Assessment Committee. MX was congratulated on its administration of the Survey to AE and ESL students. However, all agreed that administration of General Education measures, other than Human Diversity, would be inappropriate for AE and possibly for ESL students.
3. **TR** is on target to administer the Survey during Assessment Week. Its IR officer is responsible for data analysis.
4. **CDL**: Only students who are taking all their courses online will be administered the Survey. CDL will advise faculty by email about the Survey and explain the assessment process. CDL needs District’s assistance to identify those students.
5. **OH** announced that the college had conducted its Assessment Week in September, assessing SLOs in Critical Thinking, Human Diversity, and Quantitative Literacy because faculty had been informed that the College had to have a report on assessment submitted to HLC by October 30, 2012. A lengthy discussion followed regarding the appropriateness of assessing General Education SLOs the first weeks of September rather than after midterms but before final exams, a time that research suggests provides the best results in terms of student learning. In effect, OH had less than five weeks to: administer three measures; evaluate the results from two measures and the Diversity Survey; analyze the data; distribute the data as assessment information to the faculty; discuss the implications of the assessment data for affecting change; and

write a report indicating the results of 400 pre-graded artifacts from 30 classes. Faculty used primarily, but not exclusively, three faculty-generated rubrics, one for each area. It is not clear why a rubric was used for the Human Diversity Survey. Some OH faculty were allowed to use the rubrics they had developed for their own courses. Also, faculty raters/evaluators of the artifacts were not trained in the use of these rubrics. Faculty “were honor bound” not to look at the grade the artifacts had previously received.

Additionally, OH used the original version of HW’s Human Diversity Survey, which had been modified as a consequence of feedback about suggested revisions from Assessment Committees from HW, KK, and TR; consequently, OH’s Diversity Survey results cannot be compared with those of HW, KK, MX, and TR. In sum, HWC faculty assessed SLOs in three areas at the same time in the first week of September in order to generate an assessment report for HLC by October 30, 2012. The consensus among some of the participants was that the process, as described, was inconsistent with common or good practice and would not yield reliable or valid data.

CCSSE, an ACTION ITEM: A decision has been made that all seven colleges will administer the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) spring 2014. This affects three colleges (HW, OH, and WR); instead of HW, OH, and WR administering the CCSSE in spring 2013 and the other four colleges in spring 2014, all seven colleges will administer the CCSSE in spring 2014. It is my understanding that District will pay for the administration of the CCSSE in spring 2014 for all seven colleges.

ICCB/CCC General Education SLOs and Measures-- an ACTION ITEM: Dr. López distributed one copy of the revised Gen. Ed. SLOs and Measures to each College’s representative. These SLOs had been submitted to Kojo and returned to the Colleges to determine their accuracy. However, several of the Colleges (e.g., TR and OH) noted that the SLOs were still not updated and KK noted that the College is working to revise its SLOs. Decision: Submit revised SLOs/Measures to Kate Connor, with a copy to Dr. López in WORD format, rather than as an Excel spreadsheet. Revisions are due **Friday, November 2, 2012**. Ms. Connor has graciously volunteered to make the corrections and distribute corrected copies to us all. We thank her for her assistance.

2012-2017 Assessment Timeline – An ACTION ITEM: Dr. López requested each College to develop its own timeline or to consider using HWC’s timeline for assessing ICCB/CCC Gen. Ed. SLOs. Faculty requested one month to submit their Colleges’

timelines. Therefore, the **due date** for submitting your College's **2012-2017 Assessment Timeline is Friday, November 16, 2012, at 2:00 p.m.**, which coincides with the next scheduled meeting of the Assessment Chairs. Each college representative is asked to bring a sufficient number of copies of its Timeline to share. We anticipate that a major part of November 16th's agenda may be focused on each college's assessment timeline.

TR raised the issue as to why the college had to assess all six ICCB/CCC General Education areas. As had been shared previously with senior administration at each of the seven colleges, there are several reasons:

1. AA/AS degree recipients must successfully complete the ICCB mandated number of credit hours in each of the five General Education areas (i.e., Communications, Mathematics, Physical/Life Sciences, Social /Behavioral Sciences, and the Humanities/Fine Arts in order to be eligible for award of the degree. The sixth General Education area, Human Diversity, has been mandated by the CCC Board of Trustees for all Associate Degrees, except for a limited number of specified AAS degree programs.
2. HLC's new Criteria for Accreditation and Core Components are specific as to HLC's expectations for assessment and for General Education. I provided senior administration a PowerPoint indicating each Core and Sub-Component that specifically deals with Assessment and General Education.
3. HLC has documented in successive Team Reports to most of the colleges continued issues with the colleges' lack of responsiveness to assessment in general and assessment of General Education in particular.
4. The Provost has requested that all the colleges submit to him measurable SLOs and copies of the measures/tools that have been (or will be used) that align with these SLOs.

Dr. López reminded the Assessment Chairs that each college can continue to assess areas not mandated by ICCB/CCC, such as Critical Thinking, but that SLOs for the six ICCB/CCC General Education areas and the assessment of those SLOs are not optional.

Sharing Good Practice

1. **HWC** shared that its soon to be released report on its assessment of Writing Across the Disciplines will provide exciting data that may well have profound implications for how CCC offers writing courses and how CCC faculty teach writing.

2. **OHC** offered that its faculty had piloted a Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) rubric. In 2012, faculty identified areas of weakness in grammar and diction among OH students. Professional development was offered to faculty to improve student writing in those two areas. The WAC rubric will be administered again in spring 2013 to determine the effect of the changes made in pedagogy and course content.
3. **HW** announced that its faculty have created 21 electronic, interactive learning modules for each of the General Education targeted weaknesses from assessment data. For example, in math, a targeted area is percentages. The interactive modules were designed for faculty use in the classroom or on the web.
4. TR shared that as a consequence of assessment data from English 101 and 102, the faculty have developed “Power Shots,” tutoring sessions based on specific issues that have emerged from the capstone portfolios (e.g., misuse of commas). Tutoring targets specific areas in Math and English. Tutoring is facilitated by adjuncts and tutors; however, departmental faculty developed the Power Shots contents.

Next Scheduled Meeting: The next meeting of the District-wide Assessment Chairs is scheduled for **Friday, November 16, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. at MXC's Hurst room.**

The meeting ended at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Cecilia López, Ph.D.
Associate Vice Chancellor,
Accreditation and Assessment

Meeting of the District-wide Assessment Chairs Minutes 11/16/12

Present: Jen Asimow (HW), M. Carla Carr (OH), Kate Connor (TR), Rosie Inwang (OH), Noah Marshall (WR), Mary McLean (DA), Stephanie Owen (KK), Marcia Turner (CDL)

Absent: Malcolm X College

Facilitator: Cecilia López

Meeting was held at MX, Hurst room, and started at 2:00 The following Agenda items were discussed:

1. Results of administration of the Human Diversity Survey;
2. 2012-2017 Assessment Plans (Timelines 2012-2017)
3. Assessment Web sites and pages
4. Sharing Good Practice

Results of Administration of the Human Diversity Survey during Assessment Week:

Assessment Chairs were asked to share preliminary results of the administration of the Human Diversity Survey during Assessment Week, November 5-10, 2012. (Note: This discussion did not include the two colleges that had declined to participate in the administration of the Human Diversity Survey during Assessment Week. Olive-Harvey conducted assessment activities in early September and thus was not included in this discussion.)

Truman: Faculty volunteered 78 course sections; a total of 55 course sections participated. Preliminary results suggest that Truman's sample consisted of 20% to 25% of its credit population with a 75% response rate. Feedback from faculty was "great," with faculty excited about scheduling forums during Faculty Development Week to discuss the data from the Human Diversity Survey. Truman's student newspaper contacted the Assessment Chair since it wants to highlight an article about Assessment Week and the results of the Diversity Survey. Truman plans to start planning in spring 2013 for the administration of a measure on Civic Engagement in fall 2013. Truman is considering using Lumina's SLOs and AAC&U's VALUE rubrics to assess the Civic Engagement SLOs. Truman's VP will provide support for TR's Assessment Chair to attend AAC&U's spring 2013 Assessment Conference in Boston.

Kennedy-King: Faculty volunteered 25 sections, which resulted in 724 completed student Surveys, 257 of which were electronically completed and 467 print-based. Faculty were given the option of administering the Survey in class or in KK's lab. Although KK's goal of 800 completed surveys, or 10% of its credit population, was not achieved, KK's first attempt at an Assessment Week was considered a success. Some of the F/T faculty were very supportive of Assessment Week; many of the adjuncts were not knowledgeable about Assessment Week and were not supportive. During the break, the Assessment Committee will convert all paper surveys to electronic formats in order to facilitate data collection and interpretation. Lessons Learned: KK has decided to move Assessment Week to the week before midterms to avoid the steep drop out that occurs by the twelfth week of the semester. A more concerted effort at informing students about the purpose of Assessment Week is needed since there appeared to be considerable paranoia among some students as to why the college was collecting information about diversity.

Harold Washington: HW reported that 84 F/T and 30 P/T faculty volunteered a total of 114 sections for the administration of the Human Diversity Survey, indicating a substantial involvement of HW's faculty in Assessment Week. The 114 sections yielded approximately 1500 completed surveys, which translates to a sample of 16% of HW's total credit population, well above the 10% needed.

HW's Assessment Committee determined that each day, approximately 10% of the participants started the electronic version of the Survey but did not finish. The dropout rate resulted in 48% completion rate for in-class surveys and 52% out-of-class surveys completed; 1,522 students logged into the survey, but 1,203 completed the survey. Faculty volunteers had been given the option to administer the Survey in class or out-of-class in a designated lab. Of the 1203 completed surveys, 422 students provided written statements, which will yield a substantial number of useable qualitative data. A surprising number of students did not know what the word *heterosexual* meant.

Malcolm X. The following report was submitted regarding Assessment Week Activities – MXC's Assessment Committee decided to enhance the collection of the Diversity Survey data with activities centered on our SLO about diversity/global citizenship. The activities held were advertised through email throughout the week, and are listed below.

- a. Monday – *"Expressions of Diversity" Contest* – Students were asked to submit artistic works to communicate their ideas of diversity. Follett bookstore and Julie Nycamp from our cafeteria donated prizes to be awarded. The entries were evaluated by a panel of faculty and staff judges, and prizes were awarded.
- b. Tuesday – *"Diversity Free-Write"* – Banners were posted on the Jackson and Van Buren hallways (our main entrances) where students were prompted to express their idea of diversity.

- c. Wednesday – *Presentation of “Babies”* – The movie “Babies” was presented on campus. This movie tracks the path of four babies of four different cultures without narrative. The movie was shown, on a loop, for the entire day.
- d. Thursday – *Diversity/Assessment Roundtable* – The Office of Instruction hosted a roundtable discussion with a panel of students to hear their experiences with assessment at the college. Over a pizza lunch, students shared their perceptions, ideas, and recommendations. This discussion was captured on film.

Diversity Survey – In collaboration with the Offices of Institutional Research, Instruction, Career Programs, Continuing Education, and Adult Education, MX class sections were identified for participation in the survey. Prior to selection, this project was presented to the College through Assessment Committee General Body Meetings, College-Wide Meetings, and e-mail. After the selection, instructors were notified electronically to expect delivery of the surveys to their mailboxes and given instructions on the administration of the survey. They were asked to return all surveys to the library, where they would then be forwarded to the Office of Institutional Research for compilation and analysis. Currently, we are in the process of gathering the surveys.

Website – MX’s Assessment Committee Co-Chair will be preparing the documents to be uploaded to the Assessment web page. Some of the documents we are gathering to be uploaded include: HLC Academy Graduation Project (paper and poster), a list of Department Assessment Plans/Projects, meeting schedules, our timeline, etc. The Co-Chair will be looking at our Sister Colleges’ websites for ideas on other documents that should/could be included.

Timeline – MX’s Assessment Schedule for the next seven years has been established and presented to the District-wide committee for review under separate cover, as of November 15, 2011.

CDL: Only students who are taking all their courses online were administered the Survey. Despite repeated reminders to CDL faculty and students about the Survey and the assessment process, only 69 of 962 potential students had completed the survey as of Friday, November 16, 2012. CDL reported that a substantial number of students who were enrolled in F2F classes as well as online classes and who had not been given a chance to complete the survey, wanted to do so. Dr. López encouraged CDL to expand the administration of the survey to any CCC student who was enrolled in F2F and online courses and who had not previously completed the Survey. CDL reported as of 11/19/12 that 104 surveys were completed by online students, and a total of 269 surveys were completed.

Data Analysis: Although some of the colleges have IR officers who know how to crunch the assessment data from the surveys, Assessment Chairs explored the possibility of Dr. Gutierrez's Office of Research assisting in analyzing the data from CDL, HW, TR, KK, MX, and, if possible, OH's administration of the Human Diversity Survey. Dr. López will ask the Office of Research to assist CDL and the colleges in the analysis of the assessment survey data.

2012-2017 Assessment Plans (Timelines 2012-2017).

All seven colleges have now submitted Assessment Plans, indicating a timeline from 2012 to 2017. Consistent with good practice, HW, OH, MX, and TR have adopted an Assessment Process that reflects the CCC Conceptual Framework for Assessment. KK's and WR's Assessment Plans did not indicate an Assessment Process, and DA developed their own.

DA's, TR's and WR's Administration supported their Assessment Chairs and some Assessment Committee members to attend IUPUI's Assessment Institute; the Institute is held each fall in Indianapolis. WR's Assessment Chair felt he had learned valuable information about curriculum mapping. He demonstrated what he had learned at the IUPUI Institute by submitting copies to all of WR's previous SLOs cross-referenced with the five ICCB/CCC Gen. Ed. areas and Gen. Ed. areas mapped to eight SLOs for Biology and seven SLOs for BIO 121. Dr. López recommended that WR work on its Gen. Ed. SLOs to align with the areas required by ICCB and CCC and to rethink Biology SLOs, which as stated, are not observable or measurable.

DA reported that it had piloted the same measure they had previously piloted in 2011 in 2012 for 160 potential students who had submitted applications for graduation. Of the 160, 37 or 24% completed the assessment measure. Students viewed a video regarding a teacher who was fired from a Christian college for being pregnant. Students were asked to evaluate both sides of the argument. Student responses were graded on use of standardized English and grammar, using a rubric. The human diversity rubric to evaluate responses to the arguments has not been developed. No data were made available. Lessons Learned. (1) Last spring, the college did not prepare graduating students for taking the "human diversity" tool, and the results were not positive. Unlike last year, this semester faculty were asked to allow graduating students to miss a class period, and voted on one of six potential videos that could be used for the assessment measure. (2) Students with visual disabilities could only listen but not view the video. Overall support this semester by faculty is strong. Faculty were very supportive of the new process of taking students out of class. The data from DA's Assessment Week will be made available spring 2013 after faculty have reviewed students' work.

Assessment Web Sites and Web Pages.

Dr. López reminded Assessment Chairs that most of the colleges had still not uploaded their assessment documents to their assessment web pages. Three Assessment Chairs requested training as to how to upload assessment documents and authority to access their colleges' assessment web pages. Dr. López has requested Mr. Vinh Nguyen of Academic Affairs to assist in scheduling OIT to train those Assessment Chairs who indicate their willingness to upload assessment materials/documents.

Sharing Good Practice:

HW provided copies of two different *Assessment Times*, a six-page document specifically developed for faculty and a one-pager specifically designed for students. Both are exemplary examples of “closing the feedback loop” and communicating with internal constituents about assessment results. In addition to a unique assessment cartoon, called “Data Trouble,” HW’s *Assessment Times* for faculty contained articles, which included data results from the assessment of SLOs for Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC), and preliminary results from HW’s Social Science assessment measure.

Dr. López asked each Assessment Chairs to verify membership of the Assessment Chairs at their colleges.

Dr. López again reminded the Assessment Chairs that each college can continue to assess areas not mandated by ICCB/CCC, such as Critical Thinking, but that SLOs for the six ICCB/CCC General Education areas and the assessment of those SLOs are not optional.

Scheduled Meetings: The spring 2013 meeting of the District-wide Assessment Chairs is scheduled for 2:00 to 5:00 p.m. at MXC's Hurst room:

Friday	January 18, 2013
Friday	February 15, 2013
Friday	March 16, 2013
Friday	April 19, 2013.

The meeting ended at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Cecilia López, Ph.D.
Associate Vice Chancellor,
Accreditation and Assessment