1. **Approve Minutes from October 17, 2012.**
   Motion to approve: Jesse MacEwan; Second: Lesley Buehler.

2. **Framework document update (Jim Wright).**
   This document started out a couple of months ago with questions that came up about the cycle of our assessment and review processes. The Framework document describes these and helps show how these all relate, and will help us with writing our accreditation self-study, in particular in Area II.A. It also shows how our GE, Curriculum, and SLOA committees are all related and how the processes are interrelated. The document has been revised a couple of times now and has circulated through GE, Curriculum, and Faculty Senate, and they’ll be approving it by the end of the semester. We plan to then post it on our website(s).

   Recent updates to this document had to do with clarification of the areas relating to programs and what we mean by this (degrees/certificates of achievement, as approved by the Chancellor’s Office).

   To clarify, courses can be assessed more often than every three years, especially if this is needed to assess the program. Also, focus can shift from year to year, as to what aspect of the program is assessed, so course assessments can move around depending on changing focus or interest, and do not need to be done every year in relation to program assessment.

   As described in the 2-year action plan: assessment should be a process that is meaningful and has value, within a set of parameters, that shows we have a clear process in place.

   **Motion to endorse the Framework document: KG Greenstein; Second: Rick Arellano. Motion passed.**

3. **FAQ document (Jim Wright and Rachel Sherman).**
   This document answers nitty-gritty, more operational-level questions that have been coming up from faculty. Heather McCarty, Wayne Yuen, Jeff O’Connell, KG Greenstein, Deb Parziale, Jesse MacEwan, Rachel Sherman, Leta Stagnaro, and Dr. Wright all had input on this document. Heather recently sent it out to all faculty via email. The section on flex pay for adjuncts will be adjusted and an updated version sent out to more correctly reflect contract language in regards to assessment.
4. WASC accreditation standard II.A update (Leta Stagnaro and Rachel Sherman).
The II.A. team has been meeting regularly and is currently working on drafting various sections of this standard. We plan to complete a draft of all sections of the standard by the beginning of spring semester and will be eliciting input from team members and relevant committees (Curriculum SLOA, GE, Faculty Senate, etc.). Leta (team leader) met with expanded team members, who are reviewing the previous accreditation report and familiarizing themselves with the process. A draft of the March 15, 2013, WASC assessment report has been completed by Leta and Rachel. This will be updated and a draft sent to SLOAC members for input. This document closely relates with several areas in standard II.A.

5. Faculty Presentation: Jim Andrews, Accounting.
Jim A. provided some basic information about his course, BA 101A Financial Accounting, and described the methodology being used to assess student learning in the course. This course is required for the AA degree in Business Administration. Students are learning a new language in this class and the class is the same, no matter where students take it. Similar texts and materials are used throughout the country. It is basically language-based learning, where students are learning new terminology used in the world of financial accounting. They are mainly doing “recognition” in this class, which is a lower-level skill in Bloom’s Taxonomy, but they must learn higher level skills for use in business, in the work place. They all take the same broad, but not deep, uniform CPA exam throughout the country. They are engaged in memorizing, as well as learning how to do journal entries, the foundation of knowledge for business majors.

Roughly 400 students per year take this course. It is taught online and face-to-face (web-enhanced).

The course currently has eight SLOs. This list is similar to SLOs at other colleges and to SLOs at the college where Jim A. taught. So for now, he plans to leave the SLOs as they are (and not condense them or change them) so that content and outcomes will be consistent with other colleges across the country.

Mainly, the students are doing “applying” and “understanding” (lower level Bloom’s), primarily. They are assessed via multiple choice exams (two midterms and a final), mapped to learning outcomes. The goal is to capture achievement of each SLO, to get data on all the SLOs.

However, he also wants to capture data on student achievement for more complex multi-step calculation problems, beyond measuring the more basic skills represented in the SLOs.

The assessment grid captures data on student achievement from tests via scantrons. Results are then coded into the assessment grid and broken down by question and by student. One question could relate to more than one SLO.

- Sample question, relating to simple recognition about correct journal entries for a business. Students do well on recognition questions.

- Example of assessment on recognition and one calculation (slightly more complex).

- Example of multi-step, slightly more complex question. Success goes way down on these types.
The question Jim A. raised was, why give more complex questions if we can assess the SLOs with simpler ones? He believes it’s important to continue to do this because it’s the exact kind of problems students will be facing in an actual job situation.

Assessment methodology: There are things they can do to improve success rates and get more accurate data and things they cannot do.

- Each outcome currently is assessed with roughly 10 different questions each semester that test different dimensions. Assessment can be college-wide, across all sections.
- Adjustments can be made in instruction techniques and selections of texts.
- Currently, data cannot be disaggregated to investigate student performance by common demographics.

Overall, the better students do well with more complex questions; other students do not. It is hard to get this group to improve.

Jim A. is explained that he is interested in seeing beyond what the SLOs currently directly relate to, to consider rote learning vs. relevance to real world situations in the work place. Discussion about what to do when SLOs don’t necessarily link up with this goal. Suggestion to alter verbs in SLOs to reflect this skill. Discussion about the need to begin critical thinking at the basic classes, rather than waiting for the higher-level courses. By the end of the semester, if they’re doing application, not just memorization, they are on the way to this. Discussion about the need to consider the trajectory of the courses, and where they are headed. They are already doing this, and making the material relevant through application and complexity, and this prepares them for where they are going next. The question is, how to make SLOs match this practice, keep the more complex questions, and not change the standards for the course at Ohlone compared to the standards elsewhere. We have to consider what the course expectations should be.

Jim A. has been in contact with people from other colleges to see what they do, i.e. Las Positas, and to discuss the possibilities of assessing learning across institutions. He also would like to do longitudinal and demographic studies, to investigate student persistence levels, success once they leave Ohlone. Discussion about whether we do this kind of research at Ohlone, how to get this data, etc. Dr. Wright notes that there is CalPass, which allows for data sharing between the Cal State colleges and community colleges. Jim notes that he would like to be able to make a difference in success/retention rates for those middle-ground students, who are not necessarily coming in already as high achievers and critical thinkers, but who have the potential to develop their critical thinking and problem solving abilities, to go beyond basic memorization of data and learn to apply course content to real-world, real-work situations, to better prepare them for careers in accounting.

6. Faculty Presentation: Debi Lemon, Spanish 101A.
The project is an “adventure in social media” and involves the use of webcams and Facebook in an online section of Spanish 101A. Debi assessed this project over several semesters and compared results that occurred as the project was refined.

The key SLO that is being assessed: Improve fluency through oral presentations, activities and projects. (The goal is to help students improve their speaking, as well as listening, reading & writing skills.)

The challenge that led to this project: How to demonstrate a physical skill (speaking) online?
Debi wanted students to engage in actual communication in the online environment, as students do in the face-to-face environment, to show fluency, not just reading something aloud.

She chose to use Facebook because students are already going there. There are six million Facebook views in one minute. Lost of potential there—no need to come up with a new technology to replace it. Facebook allows for private groups, it’s a mobile forum, it allows for unbroken communication, has a built in webcam, and can be used by students on tablets or phones, and allows for easy upload of video via any device. It allows for good instructor-student and student-student interaction/contact, important in online courses.

First semester:
- Open-ended subject, personalized model, generalized rubric.
- Result: Open-ended webcams, personalized, often with translators & dictionaries, often unintelligible.
- Hard to grade the wide variety.

Changes to the activity in second semester to get better results:
- Added webcam time limit.
- Adjusted the rubric; narrowed the subject.

Third semester:
- Included examples (of mistakes, also) in rubric.
- Narrowed the subject, had set questions, included optional questions.

Results with webcam assignments:
- Allows for more creativity and engagement.
- Examples of student videos. Lots of engagement, personal, use of props. They watch each other’s videos, and are more interested.

Examples of how Debi changed the assignment questions and made them more precise, from first to second to third semester doing this project. By the third semester, she had four sets of questions they had to answer, which were more specific; she gave them models and got much better results.

Debi showed the updated rubric she now uses, with very specific descriptions of the criteria for each grade for the assignment, which helps the students see expectations very clearly, as well as reasons for the grade (grading criteria). The rubric also includes suggestions for how students can improve their scores in each grade level. She breaks it at 7 out of 10. Below that is a 0, not functional with speaking the language. The rubric gives specific descriptions of what constitutes not passing and what they need to do to change, to pass, to be better prepared. She plans to assess again at the end of Fall 2012 semester to see how well this version of the rubric works.

- Student Voice Thread Example. (They can do this on their phones, no matter where they are.) Shows interaction between students, with instructor interaction, as well.

- Examples of instructor webcams, showing improvement, refinement over time, explaining instructions more clearly, with pictures, which led to student improvement.
• Examples of student webcams, showing them using Spanish in their lives (at a Food bank), which they get credit for.

Results:
• Fall 2011: 63% average grade on the webcam assignments.
• Spring 2012: 75%
• Fall 2012: 77%

Improvements have occurred with adjustments of instructions and rubric. Additional benefits to Facebook: Archiving is available; this provides portfolios for students.

Future plans:
• Continue to explore ways to integrate small group interaction, to bring natural interaction from face-to-face classes into the online environment.
• Add in Voice Thread.
• Work on designing webcams to be manageable for watching and grading.

Discussion about benefits of using Facebook as a classroom platform (including how the program provides data on who has seen/read posts and when).

It was noted that this assessment works for both course and program assessment and that in-person versus online results can be compared. Debi also noted that she had some visiting online students come to her in-person class to experience face-to-face interaction. She adds that webcams have been helping with success rates overall with online students.

7. Next SLOAC meeting: Thursday, December 6, 3:00 – 4:30 p.m., 7101.

Meeting adjourned: 3:00 p.m.