Assessment of Learning Committee (ALC)
Monday, February 9, 2015
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
Compton Coordinator – Kendahl Radcliffe
Deans' Representative – Jean Shankweiler
Behavioral & Social Sciences – Janet Young
Business – Kurt Hull
Fine Arts – Vince Palacios
Fine Arts Associate Dean – Diane Hayden

Humanities – Kevin Degnan & Argelia Andrade Industry &
Technology – Sue Ellen Warren
Industry & Technology Associate Dean – Daniel Shrader
Mathematical Sciences – Susanne Bucher
Natural Sciences – (Thomas) Jim Noyes
Library/LRU – Claudia Striepe
Inst. Research & Planning (IRP) – Carolyn Pineda (for Joshua
Rosales)

MINUTES

I. **Call to Order**
Meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m.

II. **Approval of Minutes**
Bob K. moved to approve the minutes for the 12/08/2014 ALC meeting; motion was seconded by Diane H. Motion was carried.

III. **Reports**

A. El Camino College (Torrance campus) Report Update – *Bob Klier*
1. Fall 2014 Assessment reports due today.
2. SLOs: 521 SLO assessments are due. As of Wednesday of last week, we are at 53% complete, campus-wide, and many more assessments were submitted since then.
3. PLOs: There were 41 assessments due. As of last Wednesday, only 9 were submitted.
4. Bob K. noted that 521 is a significant increase and amount of work in assessments compared to about 60 or assessments done about 2 years ago.
5. Bob K. will run another set of reports next week and advise the divisions of outstanding assessments.

B. Compton College Report Update – *Kendahl Radcliffe*
1. SLOs:
   a. Division 1 has a 90% completion rate for assessments.
   b. Division 2 has over 80% completion rate for assessments.
   c. Division 3 has 93% completion rate for assessments.
2. PLOs: They have a 73% completion rate for PLO assessments.
3. Kendahl R. shared that the greatest challenge for them was getting faculty to enter the data in TracDat and complete their submissions; the faculty tended to input their assessment method descriptions but wait until the last minute to input the results.

C.   Deadlines: Karen W. reminded the ALC that February 17th is the deadline to report on cancelled classes; needs to include proposed timeline change. This needs to be e-mailed to the ALC coordinators or Isabelle P. so that she can revise the timelines in TracDat and so that these changes are reflected in the assessment status reports.

IV.   **ILO Rubrics/ILO Faculty Instructions for Rubrics** – *Karen Whitney*
       (Handout: Synoptic Communication Rubric – Assessment of ILO #2 - Spring 2015)

A.   Karen W. started discussion on the changes that have been made to the plan for the assessment of ILO#2 and referred to the most recently revised Communication Rubric, which was put together by Fariba Sadeghi-Tabrizi from Fine Arts. Need to finalize the rubric to make sure it is exactly how the ALC wants the document to read. Karen W. stated that this is the time to discuss any comments and clarifications anyone may have so that they can amend the rubric.

B.   Karen W. asked for feedback on the rubric (rating, the bullet points under each of the Communication Trait—Organization, Delivery, and Substantive Content).
   1.   Ratings scale:
      a.   Diane H. asked if there is a reason why there are 5 ratings; Karen W. said that it would be more widely applicable to have a 5-point scale and that it is the easiest to align with grading.
      b.   Daniel S. asked what number is "good enough". Karen W. stated that "3" is the "acceptable" rating. Daniel S. stated that it might be confusing to people because "2" is currently labeled "Fair" and most people think that "Fair" means "acceptable". Kevin D. commented that if this document will be seen campus-wide, most people may equate the numbers as letter grades (5=A, 4=B, 3=C, 2=D, and 1=F) and misinterpret "Fair" as a "C", which is a "3" on this scale; Daniel S. commented that "Fair" is better than a "D" rating ("D" usually means "poor").
      c.   Per Bob K.'s recommendation, ALC agreed to changing the rating titles to:
           1 = Poor (no change)
           2 = Below Average (instead of "Fair")
           3 = Satisfactory (instead of "Good")
           4 = Above Average (instead of "Very Good")
           5 = Excellent (no change)
   2.   Under DELIVERY:
      a.   Jim N. suggested changing one of the bullet points, "Fosters reflection in audience" to read "Shows awareness of audience".
   3.   Under SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT:
      a.   Diane H. asked if "vocabulary and fingerspelling" should be under DELIVERY since this seems more like a means of conveying the message rather than the content of the message; Bob K. stated that these are items for Sign Language; Karen W. will double-check and confirm
   4.   Under ratings description:
      a.   ~~ALC members agreed that "demonstrated" should be used instead of "executed" (i.e. to "Not demonstrated instead of "Not executed", "Somewhat demonstrated" instead of "Somewhat executed", etc.)~~
      b.   Some ALC members asked if "majorly" is a word; Kevin D. confirmed that it is a word (checked on Merriam-Webster dictionary online).

C.   Karen W. also suggested that when we share this rubric to the faculty-at-large, we should convey the standard but not the goal.

D.   Karen W. is working with Joshua R. in IRP on what is the best way that this rubric can be executed and what the "bubble sheet" might look like. Since Joshua R. is out of the office, Carolyn P. discussed the options with Mike Wilson of IRP since he is the expert on the survey software that IRP uses and they came up with the following options:
   1.   Option 1: Scannable Paper Form
        a.   IRP can upload the Student IDs into the software, but because of the software's limitations, the faculty will not get one sheet with the roster—they will get a sheet for each student (each student will be assessed separately).
   2.   Option 2: Online
        a.   IRP can upload the Student IDs for course rosters and there will be a drop-down menu/selection for each student, click "Submit", and then select the next student.
        b.   Jean S. commented that this could be cumbersome and take a long time.
        c.   Diane H. asked if it's possible to just enter the number rating for each student, like entering grades (i.e. structure it more like a grade sheet).
   3.   Option 3: Excel File
        a.   IRP will send the Excel file with the roster and faculty will enter their ranking for each student on the Excel file, save the file and send back to IRP. All students will be on the same worksheet.
        b.   Jean S. thinks this would be the easiest for the faculty.
        c.   Carolyn P. stated that this method has worked for IRP in the past and this method won't be a problem for them since it is already in Excel; just need to figure out how ALC wants the report set up. IRP can make the Excel file "read-only", so that faculty will have to make a copy of the file and enter their rankings in Excel.
        d.   Bob K. suggested that IRP include a sample of what the survey will look like when sending to the faculty; Carolyn P. stated this would be no problem.

E.   Some ALC members preferred the Online option, whereas other members preferred the Excel file. However, if 2c above is a possibility, then ALC members preferred the Online option; since some faculty might not be comfortable working with an Excel file. Carolyn will check with Mike W. if this is possible and if they can incorporate all the rosters. IRP will report back at the next ALC meeting.

F.   IRP will include an e-mail with survey (or link to survey, if online) asking for their participation in the survey. These will be sent to faculty who are already scheduled to assess SLOs that align with ILO #2 (Communication).

G.   Timeline and distribution of surveys
   1.   Karen W. asked the ALC what timeline/due date we should give faculty to submit the survey.
   2.   Daniel S. stated it may be hard to get faculty to submit after the semester is over and if it is possible to submit them before the semester is over; Jean S. stated faculty cannot submit before semester is over if their survey is part of the final exam.
   3.   Karen W. stated that the results will need to be reviewed during the summer. Karen suggested to have faculty submit results by May 22nd (when grades are due).
   4.   Karen W. suggested distributing the surveys to faculty during the 6th week of the semester.
   5.   Jim N. suggested adding an "additional comments" section in case faculty want to justify why they gave a certain number rating for a certain Communication trait.
   6.   Follow-ups can be done in small groups in the Fall Semester.

V.   SLO Assessments Follow-Up Plan – *Russell Serr*
A lot of SLO assessments have Action Plans and a lot of these action plan dates are coming up. How are faculty going to follow-up on these Action Plans?

A.   SLO facilitators are meeting tomorrow to discuss a couple of models:

1. 1st model: As somebody goes in and enters their assessment for the 2nd SLO of a course, they look at the Action Plan of the 1st SLO entered (or the SLO most previously entered) to see if the Action was implemented (e.g. was the Teaching Strategy implemented? Was it successful? Or if a multi-section course, did another faculty follow-up on the Action Plan?)
2. 2nd model: A report that is printed out which shows faculty what Action Plans are due and need to be followed-up on.

B. Jim N. stated that the issue is with informing the faculty that an Action needs to be followed-up on. The question that came up in the Natural Sciences Division SLO meeting is: Can TracDat send alerts to individual faculty when follow-ups are due? Bob K. stated that TracDat currently does not have this feature, but TracDat is releasing a new version later this semester with significant changes; however, we don't know if the new version will have this feature.

C. Kendahl R. stated that what worries her is that many of the courses in the Compton campus are taught by adjunct faculty and they rotate and she wants to know if anyone has any suggestions on how to keep track of who needs to do the follow-up? Bob K. stated that the follow-up can be done by other faculty for those Action Categories that can be researched (Curriculum Changes, Program/College Support and SLO/PLO Assessment Process). However, if the adjunct faculty who originally entered the assessment entered "Teaching Strategies" as an Action Category, this is something that cannot be researched and he doesn't see a good solution for this category.

D. Daniel S. asked who is going to be responsible for getting these Action items done. Russell S. stated the responsible party should be the faculty entering the assessment; Kevin D. stated that the faculty lead who entered assessment data may not be the same faculty lead one year from now.

E. Jean S. stated that in the Natural Sciences Division, at the beginning of each semester, they have a list of curriculum that has to be reviewed and a list of SLOs that need to be assessed; so she thinks this should just be part of the SLOs that need to be done.

F. Jim N. stated that action items should be dated within the next year.

G. Bob K. stated that the methodology for following up on Action Plans may possibly be determined by each division, i.e. what works best for each division.

VI.   Next meeting – February 23, 2015

VIII.   Adjournment
Meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

SPRING ALC Meetings	Facilitator Train-the-Trainer Sessions	"Working" Workshop: Entering SLO Assessments into TracDat	Upcoming Deadlines
Mondays, 2:30 to 4:00 pm			
Admin 131	Tuesdays 1:00 to 2:00 pm	Library Basement West	Fall 2014 Assessments -
	DE 162 or		February 9, 2015
February 9, 2015	Library West Basement, Rm. 19	Wednesday, January 28, 2015, 3-4pm	
February 23, 2015		Wednesday, February 4, 2015, 3-4pm	
March 9, 2015	February 10, 2015	Thursday, February 5, 1-2pm	
April 13, 2015	March 10, 2015		
April 27, 2015	April 14, 2015	"Working" Workshop: Learning the	
May 11, 2015	May 5, 2015	[TracDat] Software Basics	
		Library Basement West	
		Wednesday, February 25, 2015, 3-4pm	