SLO Committee Minutes  
Oct 9, 2013  
MENH-246, 2:00-3:00 pm

In attendance: Rhonda Hyatt, Andy McCutcheon, Edel Alonso, Barry Gribbons, Diane Solomon, Nicole Faudree, Anne Marenco, Ann Lowe, Jennifer Brezina, Cindy Stephens

Action items:
- Nicole and Ann Lowe have volunteered to try Authentic Assessment Rubric for program and department assessment.

1) Minutes from Sept 11, 2013 approved.
2) Updates:
   a. Guest Speaker, Geoff Buhl (Sept 25, 2013 meeting)
      i) A robust discussion of Geoff Buhl’s presentation included the following comments, questions, and concerns:
         - Many voiced interest in the idea of using signature assignments for assessment, but some expressed concern over how assignments would be chosen and how the assessment itself would be carried out.
         - Barry suggested that the way that Channel Islands incorporates signature assignments is not that different than our use of ISLOs, but he also pointed out that it raises the same challenges with producing meaningful results from the aggregation of pass/fail numbers.
         - Others who like the idea of signature assignments also expressed concern over the amount of work involved and what that would mean for chairs and faculty.
         - The question was also raised whether the Mapping-GE and Signature Assignment-LEAP models are really as categorically opposed as our discussions seem to suggest.
         - Some suggested that signature assignments could be combined with mapping to create rubrics for assessment of the assignments themselves but also to generate more meaningful dialogue on improving student learning.
         - Edel expressed some concern that GEs often get a “bum rap” in these discussions and suggested that students are not merely “checking off” boxes when selecting courses. She believes that students are making meaningful choices whether they realize it or not.
         - It was also suggested that we need to have a broader discussion about moving forward with LEAP or keeping ISLO structure.
         - Barry suggested questions to ask here might be: What has been the purpose of ISLOs for past five years? How do we use that information to make improvements? Is CSU GE structure the most fruitful structure?
         - Some suggested that we try using signature assignments but keep our current ISLO structure for now. Others wondered if we could even link LEAP principles to GEs to better guide discussions, but keep ISLOs and mapping.
• It was also suggested that more emphasis on guiding loop closing sessions toward meaningful discussion is more crucial than which structure we use to aggregate numbers—more discussion of pedagogy instead of assessment results.

• Concern was also expressed over what qualified as a signature assignment: does it need to be a culminating assignment? How do we assess/define, for example, “critical thinking” in different disciplines?

• Some concern was expressed over the logistics of assessing signature assignments. Would there be reading sessions of the assignments with table leaders, norming, and rubrics? Who would organize and run these sessions? Who would participate? Who would assemble norming materials and write rubrics? Or, would faculty just read assignments on their own and report individual results? Would this be rigorous enough to produce meaningful results? How would either approach be received by faculty?

• Also, questions were raised concerning what technology would be available to faculty to make this process easier.

b. SLO Resolution (addressing Standard IIIa1c) was approved at Academic Senate (9/26/13)

c. Authentic Assessment (see attached rubric)
   i) The committee discussed what “authentic assessment” really means.
   • Some suggested it means “assessing the assessment tool.”
   • Others asked what the term “real world” means and how it applies to authentic assessment.
   • Nicole asked if any chairs or deans would be willing to use the Authentic Assessment Rubric for department or program assessment.
     o Nicole and Ann Lowe volunteered.
   • Some voiced concern over asking faculty to adopt another rubric.
   • Again, the question was raised: how do we make assessment more meaningful?
   • It was suggested that it is more about the dialogue than grading each other’s assessment tools.
   • The question was asked: It is better to self-assign the discussion over authentic assessment than to be asked to work on it more with accreditation.
   • It was suggested that a question be added to the CurricUNET Assessment Module regarding the authenticity of the rubric.

Meeting adjourned at 3:05 pm.