

## District Assessment Workgroup

October 13, 2016

### **DRAFT Meeting Notes**

Attendees: Carolyn Holcroft (phone), Allison Herman (phone), Katie Ha, Valerie Fong (phone), Paul Starer, Elaine Kuo, Lisa Ly, Kristin Skager (phone), Karen Chow (phone), Amy Leonard, Mark Fu, Mayra Cruz, Christina Espinoza-Pieb, Sheila White Daniels, Veronica Avila, Stephen Fletcher, James Mailhot, Jerry Rosenberg, Thomas Ray, Clara Lam, Patty Carabus, Anne Argyriou, Barbara Dahlke, Ram Subramaniam, James Nguyen, Mallory Newell, Andrew LaManque, Patrick Morriss (phone), Casie Wheat, Lori Silverman

The committee first reviewed the goals and objectives of the committee and noted that the committee reports to Academic and Professional Matters committee. The quad-chairs for De Anza are: Rob Mieso, Anne Argyriou, James Mailhot, and Mallory Newell. The tri-chairs for Foothill are: Andrew LaManque, Casie Wheat, Carolyn Holcroft.

The Goal is:

Make recommendations on District assessment and placement policies/procedures to support an increase in the number of students successfully completing our college-level English, Math and ESLL courses.

The Objectives are:

- Position Foothill-De Anza Colleges for anticipated system-wide implementation of CAS (Common Assessment System).
- Examine our current assessment and placement policies to ensure they are data-driven /evidence- based, and revise if necessary.
- Recommend ways to integrate equity, student success, and basic skills planning around issues pertaining to assessment and placement.
- Discuss a common approach to Multiple Measures implementation

Members from the ESL, Math, English and Reading departments at both colleges provided updates on their competency mapping process. The English departments at both colleges are already working together, a connection was made between the math departments at the meeting, and the De Anza ESL department agreed to reach out to the Foothill ESL department.

The committee then reviewed where the state is at on the common test and multiple measures. The CAI test is now on hold, it is expected to be available by fall 2017. The group then reviewed a memo that was sent out by the Chancellor's Office (September 30, 2016; Clarification on-Multiple Measures used in Student Assessment). The group discussed the main points of the memo:

1. Colleges must employ at least two evidence-based measures in assessing a student. One of these measures may be an assessment test.

2. The measures chosen must be of different formats to allow students multiple opportunities to illustrate their knowledge and readiness. If another test is selected as a multiple measure, it may not be highly correlated with the first test.
3. An English essay, whether machine or human scored, is considered an assessment test, therefore it must be approved by the Chancellor's Office in accordance with title 5, section 55522.
4. Options that constitute evidence-based multiple measures may include high school GPA; grades in high school coursework; highest level of coursework in high school; SAT, ACT or EAP scores; non-cognitive information (such as the number of hours worked or the importance of college to the student); or other methods or approaches. Please note this list is not prescriptive or definitive.
5. Colleges must use evidence to determine an appropriate method for utilizing multiple measures information, particularly regarding placement accuracy or reducing disproportionate impact. Supporting evidence may include research studies conducted at other colleges, local pilot studies of new multiple measures, analysis of historically collected measures, or other relevant information.

It was noted that it is not clear if an essay is considered a multiple measure since there is also an essay within the common test (multiple choice + essay). It was discussed in some detail and it appeared that the discussion was leaning towards an essay not being considered a multiple measure, based on items 2 and 3 above. It was also noted that asking students to write an additional essay may not be practical and create fatigue for the student.

The committee then discussed possible topics for future meetings:

- a. EAP at both colleges - proficiency levels - <https://www.calstate.edu/eap/>
- b. Multiple measures at both colleges
  - i. Using self-reported data
- c. Retake policy at both colleges
- d. Human essay scoring and portability
- e. Non cognitive variables for international students – a handout was passed out with 6 suggested non cognitive variable scales that are recommended by The RP Group which we could explore:  
<http://rpgroup.org/system/files/NCVCriteriaScales.pdf>
- f. Training counselors on diagnostic results
- g. Addressing disproportionate impact on an ongoing basis

The next meeting will be November 10, 4-5 p.m. at the Toyon Room at Foothill College.