

Reading Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, September 23, 1:00pm, H304

Present: Torrance campus: Mimi Ansite, Robin Arehart, Gene Armao, Maria Bauer, Debra Breckheimer, Rose Ann Cerofeci, Matt Cheung, Susan Corbin, Suzanne Gates, Rosemarie Kistler, Sylwia Kulczak, Tom Lew, Inna Newbury; Compton campus: Judy Crozier

Recorder: Suzanne Gates

1. Review of theoretical framework and shared pedagogy

Suzanne Gates read through the following work accomplished by reading instructors last semester:

- a. Belief statement:

We believe that students construct meaning from a text while they read; that practice with a variety of strategies can help students monitor their own comprehension of college-level texts, whether print or electronic; and that a skilled college reader reads with clear purpose and can apply comprehension of a text to discipline-specific tasks such as testtaking, essay writing, or entering academic conversations.

- b. Theoretical framework: ***Sociocognition***

- c. Shared pedagogy: ***Strategies instruction (five models)***

2. Results of last semester's English 84 SLO assessment

All three English 84 SLOs passed the Spring, 2014, assessment, as follows:

SLO 1	Demonstrate their ability to recognize context clues that assist with vocabulary acquisition necessary to comprehend and analyze non-fiction texts written at the 9-12 th grade level.	73% of students (129/177) did pass this SLO.
SLO 2	Demonstrate their ability to employ comprehension strategies necessary to comprehend non-fiction texts written at the 9-12 th grade level.	73% of students (129/177) did pass this SLO.
SLO 3	Demonstrate their ability to analyze non-fiction texts written at the 9 th -12 th grade level.	70% of students (124/177) did pass this SLO.

Suzanne distributed copies of the assessment data and analysis, and explained that her analysis draft was based on two factors: first, she found data analysis difficult because three assessment methods were used to collect data, with no indication of which assessment method produced passing and failing students; and second, the reading

program already was scheduled to review, discuss, and choose one common assessment with which to assess SLOs.

Reading instructors are asked to review the analyses and send any comments to Suzanne. She will incorporate comments/revise analyses to include perspectives of all instructors. Suzanne will email the assessment data/analyses to all reading instructors. English 80 and 82 SLOs will be assessed this semester.

Judy Crozier suggested that instructors indicate their assessment method on their assessment data sheets; Suzanne will ask Kevin Degnan to add assessment method to English 80 and 82 reading assessment data sheets sent to instructors this semester.

3. This semester’s project: Choose one common assessment...

- That reflects our shared pedagogy and theoretical framework
- To assess SLOs
- To be one measure (one of multiple measures) determining student college readiness
- For consistency across reading sections/levels (college consistency project)
- For substantive program review data

Instructors discussed the need for one common SLO assessment, and agreed that one assessment will provide rich and consistent data across sections of a course. However, we reiterated our stance that multiple measures will be used for determining whether students pass a course, and the common SLO assessment will not be an exit exam. Instructors may use other measures in determining a student’s readiness for the next course level.

4. Types of available assessments for both 82 and 84

Instructors discussed the assessment types listed below. Discussion comments are listed in red within the table.

Measure	Sociocognitive?	What it can tell us	Type of test
Degrees of Reading Power Uses Cloze method (word deletion and selection)	Yes	Degree of engagement with text; ability to comprehend text through context and word choice; vocabulary acquisition; analysis of multiple levels of comprehension; ability to self-monitor comprehension; background knowledge	Scantron or online. Multiple choice. The new online version aggregates and parses data immediately. Online may be cost-prohibitive.
<p style="color: red;">We discussed the difficulties of using Cloze procedures to assess all SLOs. Some instructors felt standardized tests may not provide breadth of students’ reading facility. Another concern: all instructors would have to teach the Cloze method if this assessment type is adopted.</p>			
Cloze method Uses instructor-chosen	Yes	Degree of engagement with text; ability to comprehend text through context and word	Scantron or hand-graded. Aggregating data with other reading

<p>text “run through” a Cloze maker, which deletes every nth word. Student then fills in word.</p>		<p>choice; vocabulary acquisition; analysis of multiple levels of comprehension; ability to self-monitor comprehension; background knowledge</p>	<p>sections will be impossible if instructors use differing texts. This assessment would work only if instructors use texts at the same level of complexity and delete the same nth word. An alternative to the DRP.</p>
<p>Although instructor-chosen texts would give instructors choice of theme, text source, and vocabulary, we felt that making our own Cloze tests would be time-consuming. We felt that grading the tests would be difficult, and assessment of data across multiple sections impossible, unless each test version used the same parts of speech, same complexity of text, same word deletions. We agreed that instructor-made Cloze assessments were not practical.</p>			
<p>Authentic assessment Uses highlighting and annotating of authentic texts (those texts not written specifically for standardized tests)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Degree of engagement with text; ability to apply strategies to text in order to advance comprehension; vocabulary acquisition; analysis of multiple levels of comprehension; ability to self-monitor comprehension; background knowledge; understanding of own reading process</p>	<p>Highlight and annotate complex text. Instructor scores according to rubric. Data across sections would have to be aggregated, parsed, and interpreted by faculty. The program Power of Process may be able to score by rubric and aggregate data <i>in the future</i>.</p>
<p>Authentic assessment is currently one of three assessment methods available to instructors for SLO assessment. We discussed the rubric created several years ago by the reading department, and Suzanne said she would send the rubric and examples to reading instructors.</p>			
<p>Student-instructor conferences</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Degree of engagement with text; analysis of multiple levels of comprehension; background knowledge; understanding of own reading process</p>	<p>Individual or small-group conferences would need to be scored by a rubric shared across all sections. Resulting data are limited in scope and would not address all SLOs. May be helpful for students who have difficulty with standardized tests.</p>
<p>We discussed the time commitment involved in student conferences, and the difficulty of recording data while conferencing with students.</p>			
<p>Socratic circles</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Degree of engagement with text; analysis of multiple levels of comprehension; background</p>	<p>Socratic sessions would need to be scored by a rubric shared across all</p>

		knowledge; depth of engagement with questioning strategies	sections. Resulting data are limited in scope and would not address all SLOs. May be helpful for students who have difficulty with standardized tests.
<p>We discussed the difficulty of obtaining the necessary data during socratic discussions, the difficulty of recording data during the discussion, and the nature of socratic circles, where some students may talk more than other students, but discussion participation does not mean students have facility with reading strategies.</p>			
<p>Townsend Press</p> <p>Tests student facility with strategies taught in Townsend Press texts</p>	<p>Textually no, primarily because the texts are constructed specifically for the test (inauthentic texts). However, the test gauges students' facility with a set of strategies, so if students practice these strategies as a process throughout the semester, the test is somewhat sociocognitive.</p>	<p>Locating main ideas (stated and inferred) and supporting details; hierarchy of major/minor supporting details; signal words; transitions; modes of paragraph and essay development; drawing inferences based on textual clues</p>	<p>Scantron, multiple-choice test. Data can be parsed by specific skill tested.</p>
<p>We discussed the pros and cons of the Townsend Press test. Some instructors felt that this test meets our SLO assessment needs and provides data across the reading process. Some instructors felt that the standardized nature of the test did not provide adequate data.</p>			
<p>Online programs associated with publishers' online class platforms</p> <p>(Includes MyReadingLab, Aplia, and others)</p>	<p>Sometimes Programs can be skills-centered or somewhat sociocognitive in nature.</p>	<p>Depends upon the online program. Basic skills are covered in these programs.</p>	<p>All are online tests. Some are aligned with publishers' textbooks. However, in order to use these programs, all reading faculty would need to adopt the program (often with a cost to students).</p>

We agreed that sharing an online program specifically for SLO assessment is unwieldy and costly to students.

<p>Alverno College Assessment</p> <p>Open-ended, short-answer questions based on a text</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The test requires students to engage with the following strategies: summary, paraphrase, vocabulary definition, identify relationships of comparison, contrast, and cause/effect, identify organizational pattern, and identify main idea.</p>	<p>All faculty would agree on the same questions, although the text could differ (as long as it allowed students to respond to the same questions). Assessment would need to be graded by a shared rubric, and data aggregated/interpreted by faculty.</p>
--	------------	---	--

Most instructors present at the meeting preferred the Alverno College assessment type over other types. Rose Ann Cerofeci and Debra Breckheimer currently are using this type of assessment in their classes. We discussed the flexibility of such a test—that instructors could choose their own texts, as long as that text was at an appropriate level. We agreed that a Lexile level of 1250 would reflect college-level texts (Robin Arehart said the Lexile measure lists 1250-1300 as college level); Inna Newbury suggested that instructors could run their texts through the Lexile analyzer at www.lexile.com to determine whether a text is at 1250. We also discussed the need for possible texts, even a database of texts, at 1250 Lexile that instructors could draw from. Each semester, instructors would be sent the database texts to give them the option of using a text from the database or finding their own appropriate text. Debra Breckheimer and Matt Cheung suggested that we explore the texts chosen by Steve Waterworth as part of his sabbatical project. We also discussed the importance of aligning our SLO assessment with the possibility of future reading/writing integration. Instructors agreed that the Alverno College assessment type would easily integrate with the writing process. Susan Corbin suggested that we decide whether we want a totally decontextualized test (that is, using a text with an unfamiliar topic) or if texts may discuss topics familiar to students or consistent with a class theme.

<p>Adaptive learning</p> <p>(for example, Total Reader or McGraw-Hill’s Connect)</p>	<p>Sometimes</p> <p>Programs can be skills-centered or somewhat sociocognitive in nature.</p>	<p>Students’ facility with basic skills and strategies, including main ideas, supporting details, relationships, organizational strategies, and inference</p>	<p>Adaptive learning is a formative assessment that leads students toward mastery of a subject. Students’ answer decisions are gauged by the program, which then presents a student with questions and exercises at the student’s level of expertise. The program would show us only which students have worked on the program long enough to “master” certain subjects or levels.</p>
--	---	---	--

We did not discuss this assessment type.

5. Other assessment concerns

We discussed the need to revise our SLOs so that reading levels are consistent with levels students should have mastered by the end of a semester. For example, currently the English 84 SLOs list 9th-12th grade mastery; however, this level is more appropriate for English 82.

We also discussed the possibility that if we choose an Alverno-type assessment, we should work on one course assessment at a time: this semester we could construct an English 84 assessment, to be used in Spring, 2015 English 84 SLO assessments; and next semester we could focus on constructing an English 82 assessment.

To help us determine which assessment questions we should construct, Susan Corbin suggested we look at the English 1A course outline and use it to focus our discussion.

6. Next steps

Although no firm decisions were made at today's meeting, we are interested in exploring the Alverno College assessment type. To that end, instructors agreed to take the next steps:

- Suzanne will send minutes to all reading instructors and begin an email discussion of the Alverno assessment type.
- Suzanne will send the English 1A course outline to all reading instructors to begin the discussion of what we want to measure in English 84 SLO assessments.
- Suzanne will contact Alverno College for an example of their test, and will ask their instructors about the scoring time commitment.
- Debra will send us an example of the assessment she uses in her pilot integrated reading and writing class.
- Rose Ann will send us an example of the assessment she uses in her reading classes.

7. NEXT MEETING: October 21, 1pm, H304