



Assessment of Learning Committee (ALC)

Monday, September 22, 2014

Admin 131 - 2:30pm to 4:00pm

SLO Coordinators: Russell Serr and Karen Whitney

Recorder: Isabelle Peña

Attendees:

Academic Affairs ECC – Bob Klier
Academic Affairs CEC – Chelvi Subramaniam
Dean's Representative – Jean Shankweiler
Behavioral & Social Sciences – Janet Young
Business – Kurt Hull
Fine Arts – Vince Palacios
Fine Arts Associate Dean – Diane Hayden
Humanities – Argelia Andrade

Industry & Technology – Sue Ellen Warren
Industry & Technology Associate Dean – Daniel Shrader
Mathematical Sciences – Susanne Bucher
Natural Sciences – (Thomas) Jim Noyes
Inst. Research & Planning – Irene Graff & Joshua Rosales
Library/LRU – Claudia Striepe
Student and Community Advancement – Robin Dreizler
Compton Rep – Kendahl Radcliffe

MINUTES

I. Call to Order

Meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m.

II. Introduction of New ALC Representatives and Facilitators for Fall 2014

- A. Humanities: Argelia Andrade will be replacing Stephanie Merz.
- B. Health Sciences & Athletics: Corey Stanbury (will not be able to attend some meetings but will act as Facilitator for the division).
- C. Industry & Technology: Renee Newell will be replacing Pati Fairchild.
- D. Behavior & Social Sciences: Janet Young is back as ALC; Eduardo is still Facilitator.
- E. Institutional Research: Josh Rosales replacing Carolyn Pineda.

III. Approval of Minutes

Jean S. moved to approve the minutes for the 9/08/2014 ALC meeting and the motion was seconded by Claudia S. Motion was carried.

IV. Reports (Bob Klier)

A. Fall 2014 Alignment Grids

99% of Academic Program Alignment Grids are in. We will begin posting them on website starting tomorrow (9/23/2014).

B. Spring/Summer 2014 SLO/PLO Assessment Completion

- 1. Spring and Summer 2014 SLO/PLO Assessment Reports: As of this morning, 87% of the SLO reports and 81% of the PLO reports have been completed in TracDat. Bob K. has been communicating with division deans and facilitators regarding reports that are incomplete and any "clean-up" items on assessment inputs. We have done approximately 500 assessments in the Spring 2014 semester and 139 assessments were done in Fall 2013.
- 2. We have begun posting reports on the SLO reports on website. Coordinators want Facilitators to review reports by Friday, 9/26/2014, for any "clean-up" items that need to be done (e.g. action

items listed in “Data and Analysis” instead of the “Actions” section. There is no hard deadline to do this review; rather, it is an ongoing review of assessments entered in TracDat.

3. ACCJC visit will be on October 6 through 9, 2014. As of Friday, September 19th, the ACCJC team has been given “read-only” access to all areas of the ECC TracDat database for their review.

C. Deadlines

1. Fall 2014 Assessments are due February 9, 2015. Russell S. recommended making division due date earlier so as to give each facilitator time to review the TracDat entries.

V. Adjunct Faculty Involvement – How do divisions handle SLO training for adjunct faculty?

- A. Karen W. stated that one of the ALC’s goals for this semester is to talk about best practices with adjunct faculty. Coordinators would like to touch base with deans and associate deans to find out what sort of training materials they have used in the past and what they have done in their individual divisions. She has asked committee members that if they want to take the initiative on this, to e-mail her by Friday, October 10, 2014, what they have done in their respective divisions and provide any information regarding what they do to train their faculty on SLO assessments, so that Karen W. can put something together for discussion at the next ALC meeting.
- B. Karen W. asked the committee members what their thoughts are with regards to creating an Advisory Committee for this or if they just want to discuss this as a whole group. Coordinators want to see if there is any sort of consistency across campus. Committee members agreed this should be done as a group instead of creating a separate Advisory Committee.
 1. Kurt Hull (Business) stated that they leave it to Dean to follow up on the faculty but doesn’t necessarily have a division practice.
 2. Diane H. (Fine Arts) stated that Chris Mello helped put together some documents on “Five Easy Steps to SLOs”, which she will e-mail to Karen W.
 3. Russell thinks that most divisions do their training informally, with no set structure; he thinks we should come up with some type of structure.
 4. Chelvi S. (Compton) stated that what she does is refer faculty to the SLO website’s training materials.
 5. Argelia A. (Humanities) stated that Kevin Degnan conducted a workshop during the college our and many of their adjunct faculty attended; faculty who did not have access to TDat was still able to see what those who have access it and it made them feel included.
 6. SueEllen W. (Industry and Technology) stated that they are given 10 to 15 minutes during their Division meetings to help the other full-time faculty learn the ABCs of SLO assessments so that they can teach it to the part-time faculty they work with. They call it “SLO School” and so far, they have held one meeting and will continue to have meetings to help the various departments in the division. In the first meeting, she showed the video on the SLO website (which was well-received) covered the assessment status (they handed out a list of what still has not been turned in, had a lesson on how to build your SLO and gave the faculty the meeting dates of the upcoming training sessions. At the next meeting, they will do norming sessions similar to what the ALC has done in the past.

VI. ILO Bullets (PowerPoint presentation)

- A. Russell S. received very little feedback on bullets for the ILOs, which he requested at the last meeting, but he did get some. He looked at other colleges and noticed that the number of bullet points for each ILO varied from 2 to 4—there was no set number of bullet points. He thought having at least 2 bullet points for each ILO would help in making that ILO clear.

- B. How do we word the ILO bullets? Do we start with “Students” and then the verb or does the verbiage simply start with the verb? (See examples shown in the PowerPoint slides 2 and 3.) What does the ILO encompass? What’s not clear? How different is the bullet point from the ILO description itself?
- Karen W. suggested starting with a verb
 - Kurt H. suggested to word bullet points by using the key verbs from the main ILO statement; committee agreed this was a good idea
 - Irene G. stated that there are also standards that IR uses in their assessments and we can use those to develop bullet points since they are nationwide; Claudia S. will send these standards to coordinators.
 - Bob K. & Chelvi S. offered to take each ILO statement and taking the general statement and developing the bullet points for each.
 - Kurt H. suggested using an online forum for ALC members to input their suggestions, similar to what the committee used when developing the revised ILO statements; some committee members said this it is possible to create another discussion board for this topic; Russell S. stated that with this small group, it would be better to put something together that is semi-finished to bring back to the committee for discussion would be more effective than the online discussion board.
 - Bob K. suggested he and Chelvi S. take the initial attempt at developing the ILO bullets before starting the discussion board to give everyone in the committee a chance to weigh in and give feedback on the initial bullets; they will bring it back to the committee for discussion. Everyone thought this was a good idea.

VII. Communication ILO – Review of Past Assessment (*Irene Graff*)

Irene G. stated that it was the first assessment that Institutional Research did for this ILO.

- Two types of assessments were administered in classes towards the end of the academic year (end of Spring 2014 semester): a Student Self-Assessment and a Faculty Assessment.
- These assessments were done in courses that were mapped for Communication.
- Selected only those courses that were towards the end of the student’s career.
- Faculty were also asked to assess the students and these results were compared side-by-side to the students’ self-assessments.
- Also administered a “beginning/entering” student assessment and marked the average difference between the “beginning” students and the “ending” students.
- Assessment tool was a composite of topics from existing similar surveys and assessments that exists among other colleges and universities; they selected certain questions they wanted to use for this assessment.
- Results: they found very different assessments between how the faculty assessed the students and how students assessed themselves; students were generally more generous with themselves on all the points within the Communication ILO; and even though one of the concerns that the ALC had was how accurate is an assessment if students giving a “halo” effect over themselves, they did find a distinction between “beginning” and “ending” students and this validated this ILO in some way.
- Russell S. asked how much different was the old Communication ILO from the new Communication ILO; Irene G. stated that it didn’t change much; Karen W. stated the main changes have to do with removing the idea of “comprehension” and the difficulty with the word “diverse” in the statement.
- Karen W. went over the original Communication ILO #3 problems and possibilities for assessment of the new ILOs as well as programs that align with the Communication ILO (pages 4, 5 and 6 of PowerPoint presentation)

VIII. New Communication ILO Assessment

- Irene G. suggested that since we are going into a new cycle of assessment, maybe this semester (Fall 2014) would be the exploratory stage, i.e. explore the alignment and mapping and what output that might produce, since we don't have to do the actual assessment until Spring 2015.
- Karen W.: Would it be problematic if the second ILO assessment is vastly different from the first assessment?
- Diane H.: What kinds of actions might we come up with? If we had some idea of what we might do at an institutional level, it might give us some ideas of how we want to assess it.
- Irene G.: The take-away from the first cycle is that we need the complexity to be able to develop action plans—using a multi-level assessment that is sustainable would give us the most information to make a difference, instead of using standard assessments that are used over and over, but which the ALC recognizes that we cannot do anything with those results.
- Russell S. stated we need to look into creating groups/sub-committees to look into each ILO for possibilities of assessment—looking into some of the SLOs and PLOs that align with those ILOs.
- Bob K. likes Irene's idea of using this semester to explore; we can look at what we have right now with alignments to get a picture; Bob K. reminded the ALC that we currently only have 2 semesters' worth of data in TracDat.; we need to start creating these sub-groups for each ILO.
- Karen W.: Do we have to assess one ILO per year? Now that the pressure is off from the Accreditation Committee, some members think we should just assess one ILO per year.
- Russell S. stated that looking at the alignment grids would be a good starting place.
- Irene G. stated that some student services programs fit well with some of the ILOs and that could be a component to consider—mostly Communication and Community and Personal Development.

IX. Next meeting – October 13, 2014

- ALC Coordinators will do a PLO norming session.
- Preston Reed from Institutional Research will have a presentation on "Sample Size" to the ALC.

X. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 3:44 p.m.

FALL 2014 ALC Meetings Mondays, 2:30 to 4:00 pm Admin 131	Facilitator Train-the-Trainer Sessions Tuesdays 1:00 to 2:00 pm DE 162 or Library West Basement, Rm. 19	TracDat 101 Training Library Basement West	Upcoming Deadlines
September 8, 2014 September 22, 2014 October 13, 2014 October 27, 2014 November 24, 2014 December 8, 2014	October 14, 2014 November 25, 2014 December 2, 2014	Thursday, September 25, 2014, 1-2pm Wednesday, October 22, 2014, 3-4pm Friday, November 14, 2014, 1-2pm "Working" Workshop: Entering SLO Assessments into TracDat Library Basement West Friday, December 5, 2014, 1-2pm Wednesday, December 10, 2014, 3-4pm Thursday, December 11, 2014, 1-2pm	Fall 2014 Assessments - February 9, 2015

New ILOs

Critical Thinking: Students apply critical, creative and analytical skills to identify and solve problems, analyze information, synthesize and evaluate ideas, and transform existing ideas into new forms.

Communication: Students effectively communicate with and respond to varied audiences in written, spoken or signed, and artistic forms.

Community and Personal Development: Students are productive and engaged members of society, demonstrating personal responsibility, and community and social awareness through their engagement in campus programs and services.

Information Literacy: Students determine an information need and use various media and formats to develop a research strategy and locate, evaluate, document, and use information to accomplish a specific purpose. Students demonstrate an understanding of the legal, social, and ethical aspects related to information use.

Adding Bullet Points for ILO Clarity

Critical Thinking:

- Students develop new ideas, perspectives, and skills to develop an understanding of the complex world in which they live.
- Identify vital questions, problems, or issues and evaluate the plausibility of a solution.
- Analyze, compose, and assess the validity of an argument.
- Compute and analyze multiple representations of quantitative information, including graphical, formulaic, numerical, verbal, and visual.
- Compare, contrast and analyze scientific CONCEPTS and scientific observation.
- Select, analyze and evaluate the accuracy, credibility, relevance and reasonableness of information and its sources.

Communication:

- Comprehend, analyze, and respond appropriately to oral, written, and visual information.
- Effectively communicate/express information through speaking, writing, visual, and other appropriate modes of communication/expression

Adding Bullet Points for ILO Clarity

Community and Personal Development:

- Students access important information, assistance, or resources to reach their goals.
- Students seek *feedback regarding their conduct* and their progress.
- Students perform actions that make a positive impact on their community, such as work and/or volunteer service.
- Students organize their course assignments and course selection around a clear Educational Plan.
- Develop, implement, and evaluate progress towards achieving personal goals, academic goals, career goals, and career resilience.
- Understand and participate in activities that promote physical and mental wellness.

Information Literacy:

- Students evaluate and choose credible sources for information
- Students understand when and how to give citations in the format appropriate for their field of study.

Original Communication ILO Problems

ILO #3: Communication and Comprehension

Students effectively communicate in written, spoken or signed, and artistic forms to diverse audiences. Students comprehend and respectfully respond to the ideas of others.

- “It would be useful for faculty from a variety of disciplines to come together to discuss common standards to judge student work.”
- Do if grades really reflect just that competency?

Assessment Method Assessment Instruments / Data

- ☐ Short survey designed by Assessment of Learning Committee (ALC) asking students to rate their own competence in six communication-related skills
- ☐ Holistic faculty rating of the same students in their communication skills
- ☐ GPA of same students in communication-related courses

Sample

- ☐ Sections of courses where the "Communication and Comprehension" competency rated a "4=very important."
- ☐ Random sample (8 sections—1=CEC; 7=ECC) & "volunteers" (8 sections—3=CEC; 5=ECC).
- ☐ Random sections got both student and faculty survey; volunteer sections got student survey only; for both samples, student grades were pulled.
- ☐ A follow up survey of students at the beginning of their education at ECC (or at least in lower level courses) was administered in Fall 2010. The main survey took place in Spring 2010.

Data Reflection

- ☐ Took place at two "summits," scheduled on Oct. 14 & 15, 2010.
- ☐ Torrance and Compton faculty participation
- ☐ 60+ participants
- ☐ Included presentations of program-level and course-level assessments

Possibilities for Assessment:

- Subcommittee
- Advisory committee for each type of communication:
 - Writing (english, soc.sci., nat.sci.)
 - Arts
 - Sign
 - Speaking (comms, soc sci, etc...)
- Create area specific rubric and report to subcommittee
- Use new ILO alignment to target reports
- Pull data from SLO/PLO

More Ideas:

Programs that Align with Communication

- Spoken
 - Communication Studies
 - Child development, human development
 - Art history/theatre
 - Office admin
- Artistic
 - Art, music, dance, film, theatre, photo, journalism, architecture, environmental tech
- Signed
 - ASL
- Written
 - Art History, political science, philosophy, psychology, sociology
 - English, journalism
 - Biology, Chemistry
 - Academic strategies
 - ECHT
 - Business mngt/marketing, office admin

Each advisory group decides on important traits or competencies

- http://www.natcom.org/uploadedFiles/Teaching_and_Learning/Assessment_Resources/PDF-Speaking_and_Listening_Competencies_for_College_Students.pdf
 - Topic, purpose (inform, persuade), audience.