Student Development Assessment Group Notes

Tuesday, April 2, 10:00-11:00

Attended: Erik Kramer, Kathy Goodlive, Anna Duffy, Ruth Moon, Cheryl Tucker

1. Assessment Reporting Tool

Ruth brought samples from other college’s and discussed the benefits of the clean and simple nature of the instructional format and how well mapping works. Kathy - noted that anytime we combine things it is helpful; is there a way to combine “student services” further? For example, how we all support the matriculation process in terms of the new enrollment priorities. This process involves all student service areas. Erik talked about difference between outcomes and activities and the need to ensure that we are measuring what students would learn. One way to approach it may be to knock off what is simply our job, and what is more related to what the student would take away from it. Also difficult to assess without a “classroom/lab.” Indirect measure are allowable, but we need to frame it around what the student will learn or take away. Another example – the assoc degrees for science exploration – students have not been selecting the correct degree for their major. In terms of mapping, it would be helpful to have a broad and specific level.

Ruth’s notes:

ASSESSMENT REPORTING
Academic Year; Service Area; Method of Student Contact or Service (or hide this box);

List all Faculty / Staff involved; Where are artifacts housed and who is the contact person?;

Additional Information to help you track this assessment

What assessment methods or tools were used to evaluate how well the outcome was met?
1. Collect new data: tracking ongoing processes, counting data elements, making observations
2. Use existing internal or external data sources
3. Reports, meeting notes, documentation, narrative or descriptive information
4. Surveys, Interviews, focus groups, training or workshop attendee evaluations
5. Cost/benefit analysis, SWOT, or ROI analysis

What criteria was used to determine the usefulness of the assessment? [benchmark, norm, best practices, standard, expectations, hypotheses, assumptions]

To what extent did performance meet the [benchmark, norm, best practices, standard, expectations, hypotheses, assumptions]? (Erik suggested using current outcomes to test these)

Provide the number or percent:
Did not meet [benchmark - assumptions];
Met [benchmark - assumptions];
Exceeded [benchmark - assumptions];
Not measured
What do these results indicate?
Check if actions or changes are recommended by the results. (Checking here will activate the section below) If you checked above, what category best describes how the recommendations will be addressed:
Reevaluate / modify outcomes
Reevaluate / modify processes
Modify evaluation tool / methods
Change funding priorities / shift staff or resources
Implement or modify staff training
Other
SUBMIT FORM

Question: do instructors do just one? Can check more than – intended to be useful. Important to spend some time and get this right in the beginning so we can have continuity in our evaluations and assessments over time.

Closing the loop section has some issues. Suggestion to get rid of check boxes but leave big one, add elsewhere to comment on without external process. Doesn’t need to be complicated. Closing the loop is a common, simple part of all assessment.

Could we get a spreadsheet or listing of the answers we have already provided in the boxes. (we mostly used the “other” box – would be good to see what people used the most)

Can we have a “mouse-over” or “balloon” that explains/informs/instructs . . .?

2. Assessment Retreat
   o Finalize Days/Times
     - Erik suggested we allow for drop-in so faculty can participate more easily
     - Ruth – plan for fall and spring, series of mini-meetings, alternate between service and instructional programs, have one that is a joint – seeing so many shared outcomes i.e. MDC looking at outcomes that have evidence of diversity, saw many also related to the library.
   o Draft outcomes
   o Draft agendas
     - Shared outcomes theme (can we have a placeholder/checkbox on the reporting tool that indicates there is a shared course outcome); success/persisistence in English 52 labs – repeatability issues?; Library; informed educational goal/major/program selection and informed planning for scheduling;

APRIL RETREAT: PROGRAM REVIEW
1. Welcome, Overview and Outcomes
   a. Participants will . . .

2. Reporting out on assessment in Program Review: How are we doing? How can we improve? (it would be great to have some PRC members provide feedback and dialogue here!!!)
3. Action Plans
   a. How to create an action plan (backwards mapping exercise?)
   b. Alignment with institutional plans and goals

4. Resource Requests
   a. Types of resources
   b. Alignment with institutional plans and goals

5. The Integrated Planning Narrative Revisited (Staff indicated that they wanted to go through this again and continue to improve their understanding in last year's evaluations)

6. Evaluation

MAY RETREAT: ASSESSMENT
1. Welcome, Overview and Outcomes
   a. Participants will . . .

2. Assessment Reporting Tool
   a. Overview
   b. Assessment Reporting Form
   c. Assessment Plans
   d. Artifacts

3. Assessing Student Development Outcomes using data from Instructional Outcomes Assessment

4. Evaluation

3. Assessment Thursdays
   - Agree we definitely need to do this
   - Assess committee Utpal rec we dialogue on review of assessment processes – what works; show and tell ??? share results; showcase; how to assess an outcome in a class that never meets;
   - Dialogue Sessions for instruction and student development in May on a Thursday and Friday; Assessment Summit for Student Development only in May
   - Shared theme for another Thursday? (Anna & Kathy)
   - Assessment methods (Ruth and Cheryl)

4. Accreditation check-in

5. Other