Common Assessment/Multiple Measures Steering Committee Notes

May 25, 2017 - DRAFT

Attendees: Mallory Newell, Jerry Rosenberg, Anne Argyriou, Jim Mailhot, Barb Dahlke, Kathy Flores, Casie Wheat, Pati Carobus, Thomas Ray, Maria Marin

The committee was joined by Josh Roberts, English faculty at Sacramento City College and the Competency Mapping resource for the CAI test. Josh shared a presentation and answered questions from the group. The group discussed bringing a CAI professional development event to the campus for district opening day. Mallory will follow up on this.

Josh stated that it does not matter if you map to the prerequisite or the outcomes, both will work. However, if you are trying to align across the district, both colleges should use the same method. Josh mentioned that we will get feedback from the field testing that we are currently undergoing. Casie will follow up with the committee on results from the field test. Josh also mentioned that the essay was likely a year away from being ready so colleges will continue to use their own essays. Once the CAI essay is ready, all colleges will need to use it if they choose to use an essay. However, De Anza can continue to human score their own essay. If anyone would like to be involved in the process to train the machine essay with human scored essays, please contact Maya Cruz to notify her of your interest and she will let Josh know.

There will be a different essay prompt for ESL than English and there will be multiple prompts for each level and subject. Karen Chow asked if we will have the ability to utilize numerous multiple measures within the platform and that will be available, such as SAT, EAP and GPA.

The group did not have time to discuss any other agenda items.

An analysis of self-reported high school transcript data is available to review and will be discussed in the fall: <http://www.deanza.edu/ir/deanza-research-projects/reports/Self_Reported_Transcript_Analysis.pdf>

The PDF presentation from Josh Roberts was emailed to the committee.

Amendment received via email:

In regards to the statement above: *If anyone would like to be involved in the process to train the machine essay with human scored essays, please contact Maya Cruz to notify her of your interest and she will let Josh know.*

First, I don't think there was agreement that this was a good idea.  I know that our ESL department has not discussed this issue.  It would require additional readers for each essay, and frankly I don't think our department would have enough readers.  Secondly, our department has been adamant about keeping our human readers, so I don't see the point of spending the time and money to train "the machine" if we do not want to use the machine to grade the essays.

Please include these points in your notes.

Thank you,

Kathy Flores