

California State University, Stanislaus

Assessment Leadership Team

December 10, 2009 1-3pm

Naraghi 104

Present: C. Castillo, H. Coughlin, S. Davis, D. Demetrulias, S. Fletcher, D. Hamlett, B. Kamp, L. Johnson, T. Held, S. Marshall, D. Moore, K. Nainby, A. Petrosky, R. Roy, J. Tiemann Gonzalez, J. Tuedio

Excused: N. Aly, C. Bengston, S. Gajea-Brujic, A. Janz, R. McNeil, G. Novak, C. Stefanco, C. Whitman, S. Young

Recording: E. Prevette Littlepage

Introduction: Diana Demetrulias welcomed Byron Kamp to the Assessment Leadership Team.

1. WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review Site Visit and Preparation for the Educational Review

The group reviewed and discussed the revised WASC Criteria for Review and rated campus progress. The Educational Effectiveness Framework and Self-Assessment will be reviewed for the April 03 meeting.

- **CFR 1.2** - Discussion occurred on the development of student learning outcomes. The group discussed benchmarking and the expectations for documenting student achievement. Most members did not think that the expectations for achievement have been established at all levels even though the goals have been established. Discussion occurred on campus progress made on establishing rubrics and benchmarks for achievement. It was noted that we have goals in place and direct assessment, but there is a need to set benchmarks for achievement. Group discussed the value of quantitative vs. qualitative data. It was noted that PAC reports list the outcomes and discuss the assessment process; the data are not published.
- **CFR 1.9** – Group agreed that we do this well.
- **CFR 2.3** – Group discussed the need to continue calibrating and recalibrating assessment and benchmarking.
- **CFR 2.7** – Discussion occurred on the need to have alignment between the Academic Program Review process and the Program Assessment Reports.
- **CFR 2.10** – Discussion occurred on how well we disaggregate data by student characteristics. It was noted that we do have disaggregated institutional data that includes demographic data. It was noted that the campus does not currently track who is or is not repeating classes but are trying to track who repeats courses both demographically and also by program. It was noted that aggregate data may camouflage in some areas and discussion occurred on how this occurs at the program and institutional levels. It was noted that programs receive disaggregated data on students through the APR process and that demographic data is available on retention, etc. Overall, the group agreed that we are doing well at the institutional level and exploration of the program level will continue.
- **CFR 2.11** – Group discussed current processes and data available on co-curricular programs. It was noted that Student Affairs has been using the CAS Standards to evaluate effectiveness. Discussion occurred on what programs would be considered co-curricular and what data are available. It was noted that there was a general feeling that the campus was well on its way in this area and would continue to work on assessing the direct impact on student learning in these areas.

- **CFR 3.2** – Discussion occurred on the engagement of part-time and adjunct faculty. The group discussed the need to have program-specific faculty development and support. It was noted that adjunct faculty are not paid to do faculty development activities, so would need to consider this.
 - **CFR 4.4** – Discussion occurred on benchmarking. It was noted that the campus does have a peer institutions methodology in place for coming up with comparable institutions. It was noted that this is something that Institutional Research is currently working on.
 - **CFR 4.5** – Discussion occurred on Institutional Research capacity. It was noted that the campus has the structures in place and the ability to generate the necessary data; the challenge is working with programs to determine how the program-level assessment could be better served by IR. It was noted that this area has improved dramatically over the last few years with new leadership.
- a. Educational Effectiveness Framework (#23)
 Discussion of the overall rating of CSU Stanislaus using the Educational Effectiveness framework. It was noted that external review by Dr. Mary Allen placed us in the “developed” category overall, with some areas in the “highly developed” and others in “emerging.” Discussion occurred on expectations for WASC Educational Effectiveness Review. It was noted that the emphasis would be placed on student learning and results of our direct assessment.
- b. CSU Stanislaus Rating on Educational Effectiveness Framework? – Deferred
- 2. Review Revised Assessment Leadership Team Responsibilities (Charge #1) - Deferred**
- a. Assessment Flowchart (#29)
- b. How well are the stated purposes of ALT being achieved?
- 3. Action Plan and Priorities (#18) - Deferred**
- a. Review and update action
- b. From among the *Assessment Action Plan* what are ALT’s priorities?
- c. In your evaluation of the university’s assessment program, what is working well? What can be improved?
- 4. Assessment Updates and Reports**
- a. Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee – Jim Tuedio, ASL subcommittee chair

J. Tuedio noted that the addition of Program Assessment Coordinators to the subcommittee this year has created more of a connection to assessment processes on campus than was previously in place. He noted that the ASL subcommittee was in the process of developing a survey to direct back to the department faculty and developing some prompts for PACs to discuss with their department colleagues.

J. Tuedio stated that the ASL subcommittee would like to put a report together by the end of the year that highlights the questions that have emerged as the result of inquiry. He noted that, included in that report or a separate letter, the ASL subcommittee plans to make a recommendation on how to align the PAC and APR processes.

J. Tuedio noted that the survey would be sent out in early Spring 2009. He noted that it is critical to see the payback and benefits of this process to make it meaningful.

b. Stockton Assessment Plan – *Angel Sanchez, Director of Institutional Research and David Hamlett, Director of Stockton Center*

A. Sanchez provided a handout to the group displaying an outline of tasks for a comprehensive assessment of the Stockton Center and students. He requested feedback from the group on the outline and proposed process.

Discussion occurred on the Stockton Assessment Plan outline, including a discussion on the data elements and assessments currently planned. The groups discussed the definition of a “Stockton student” and “Stockton faculty” and the unique needs of both. D. Hamlett noted that Stockton students and faculty feel that their population is unique and has unique needs. He noted that the support and services to meet these needs will be evaluated. The group discussed the need to consider ITV and online courses in this evaluation as well.

A. Sanchez noted that these data are currently being collected and analyzed and will have a document at the end of the year. He noted that feedback was requested during the process.

Discussion occurred on PAC involvement in looking at Stockton student data. It was noted that the Assessment Council is going to be discussing this topic. It was suggested that data currently being collected on student achievement be disaggregated.

c. Assessment Council Update – *Rosanne Roy, Faculty Coordinator of Assessment for Student Learning – Deferred*

5. Schedule for Spring ALT meeting - meeting will be scheduled for April.

Respectfully Submitted,
E. Prevette Littlepage

DD: epl 3/14/09