



## Assessment of Learning Committee (ALC)

Monday, October 12, 2015

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

**SLO Coordinators:** Russell Serr and Jenny Simon (Interim)

**Recorder:** Isabelle Peña

### Attendees:

Academic Affairs ECC (Interim) – Karen Whitney  
Deans' Representatives – Elise Geraghty  
Behavioral & Social Sciences – Janet Young  
Business - Ana Milosevich  
Fine Arts Associate Dean (Interim) – Walter Cox  
Humanities – Argelia Andrade

Industry & Technology Assoc. Dean (Interim) – Randal Davis  
Mathematical Sciences – Susanne Bucher  
Natural Sciences - T. Jim Noyes  
Compton, Div. 3 (English) - Amber Gillis  
Institutional Research & Planning (IRP) – Joshua Rosales

### Guest:

VP of Academic Affairs - Jean Shankweiler

## MINUTES

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

### I. **Approval of Minutes**

Russell S. moved to approve the minutes for the 9/14/2015 ALC meeting; motion was seconded by Amber G. Motion was carried.

II. Russell S. introduced Jenny Simon again (since she was not present at the last ALC meeting) who is the SLO co-coordinator for the year. She has been in this position in the past so she is familiar with the tasks of the coordinator. Those in attendance introduced themselves to Jenny S.

### III. **Reports**

#### A. Spring/Summer 2015 SLO/PLO Completion – *Russell Serr*

1. Numbers are up; completions are really good. Overall, we are above 90% complete. Math was at 100% before the deadline. He stressed to the ALC and facilitators that if there are still some SLO assessments in their divisions that have not been entered, to please have them done as soon as possible.

#### B. TracDat Trainings/Updates – *Russell Serr*

1. There's one this Wednesday (October 14<sup>th</sup>) and one in November on “the new version of TracDat”; in December, there are three workshops on “entering assessments in TracDat”. Russ S. highly recommends attending the workshop on “entering assessments”.

#### C. Follow Ups – *Russell Serr*

1. None of the Follow-Ups are being done. Russell S. is still not sure what the best way is to do follow-ups. Initially, the suggestion was for the faculty to do the follow-up entry when they enter their assessments, but even though assessments are being completed and entered in TracDat, the Follow-Ups are not being done. Jim N. suggested setting a date for doing the

follow-ups. Russell S. doesn't know how each division wants to do it but they will discuss it at the next Facilitator Meeting. Regardless, faculty need to go back into TracDat and add some follow-ups. When doing the follow-ups, the faculty do not have to re-assess it; they just need to look at the Action Plan and see if it has been implemented and if so, was it successful; follow-ups just require one or two lines of entry.

2. Jenny S. stated that so far, we don't keep track of the Action Items and Follow-Ups and that is why it is hard to keep track of how many Actions an assessment has and if there have been any follow-ups made of those Action Items. Coordinators suggested adding a column or two to the Timeline Report to include an "Action Item" column and a "Follow-Up" column.
  - a. Isabelle will put together the spreadsheet when compiling the Fall 2015 Timeline Report to be distributed to the facilitators and hopefully give them some structure in keeping track of Action Items and Follow-Ups. HSA and Behavioral Sciences already use something similar. Susanne B. of Mathematical Sciences checks directly in TracDat.
  - b. Every facilitator can check Follow-Ups any way they like. The new Timeline Report format is not going to be mandatory to use, but would give facilitators who want to use it a tool to keep track of Action Items and Follow-Ups.

#### IV. **Communication ILO [#2] Actions** – *Karen Whitney (PowerPoint)*

Karen W. stated that we need to wrap up two things in relation to this ILO: (1) GE (General Education) Area Outcomes and (2) Action Plans.

- A. About two years ago, we looked into the possibility of doing General Education Outcomes (GEOs)—separate statements for each of the GE areas based on what is already on the catalog. Decided that instead of doing completely different assessments for each of these areas (6 main GE areas: Natural Science, Behavioral and Social Science, Health and P.E., Humanities, Language and Rationality, and Mathematics), we would just extract information/data from the ILO #2 assessment.
  1. Look at past SLO/PLO reports in communication areas for other data trends (i.e. similar action plans).
  2. Disaggregate all info into GE areas to fulfill assessment requirements.
  3. ALC members separated into different groups to go over the various course SLO assessment reports that are aligned with this ILO and extract commonalities to any of the GE areas based on outcomes and/or actions. Groups were split based on the GE areas and looked at the various SLO results and determine if there are any common gaps/common themes, strengths, action plans that they see among the different reports.
  4. Conclusions by each group:
    - a. Group 1 (Janet Y. & Josh R.)
      - Some of them are knowledge-based and some have multiple assessments.
      - One of the common gaps is the knowledge, not the communication; some are writing assignments and some are multiple choice.
      - Common strengths: some of them have multiple assessments that apply; a lot of writing assignments (Political Science and Sociology); saw well-developed rubrics that will be helpful
      - Students were performing well; they almost met the standard or did meet the standard
      - Action Plans: talked about needing more in-class activities, more real-world examples to connect students with theories, in-class writing, and in-class critical thinking
    - b. Group 2 (Amber G., Walter C., Randal D., and Jean S.)
      - Common gaps: failure of SLOs and a lot of the English classes to ask students to demonstrate comprehension through writing assignments and compositions
      - Common strengths:

- Some assessments don't list how many students were being assessed or not clear on the sampling
  - Action Plans: Many of them wanted to change curriculum and SLOs and not so much on teaching strategies
  - c. Group 3 (Russell S. & Jim N.)
    - Common gaps: written communication (had to do with citing sources and following a grading rubric), oral communication (e.g. verbal communication with patients of other languages in Nursing); in Biology & Chemistry some of the gaps are in drawing and trying to use different shapes to communicate with their instructor (e.g. in Chemistry, students have to figure out how different atoms are bonded together to form molecules and often they are thought of in terms of pictures); compare performance of students earlier in a sequence to later in a sequence of a course
    - Common strengths: lower level skills were above average; do a great job of faculty collaboration.
    - Action Plans: Biology—identifying and articulating alternative hypotheses; Nursing—to close some of the gaps, they should have more AP workshops and do more role-playing with people with whom English is not their first language (Nursing)
  - d. Group 4 (Jenny S., Elise G., and Argelia A.)
    - Common gaps: MLA documentation (students were not able to cite sources correctly); integration of sources; thesis statements—trying to state their beliefs in a clear sentence or very short text (one or two sentences).
    - Common strengths: organization of essay
    - Common action plans: Re-writing SLO statements or re-writing curriculum; workshops—how to teach integrating sources
  - e. Group 5 (Susanne B. and Ana M.):
    - Common gap: critical thinking
    - Common strength: symbolic nature of communication and the influence of communication was a strength in Communication Studies PLO, but were not in common with Math.
    - Action plans: most of them were teaching strategies.
- B. Proposed Action Plans from September 14<sup>th</sup> meeting:
1. Need to narrow down the list from the Sept. 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.
  2. Karen W. met with Idania Reyes and Jason Suarez; strategic (course completion is one of the main goals of SEP)
  3. SLO Process: larger samples would be good.
  4. Increased teacher preparation and modelling (Jason S. is happy to lead training workshop) -- might be better to hand-pick/recruit certain interested faculty instead of making it open to all faculty (possibly 2 people per division)
  5. WAC/SEP Proposal:
    - a. Focus on specific courses consistently taken by African American students.
    - b. Spring semester (8-10 hours per instructor)
      - 2-3 hour training (research, reading, writing), leave w/ ideas to create an action
    - c. Fall semester
      - Two 1-hour sessions
      - Share and fine-tune plan at beginning of the semester; pre-assignment assessment to establish a baseline
      - Share results at end of the semester
    - d. SEP focuses on 5 success indicators: (1) Access, (2) Course completion, (3) ESL/Basic skills completion, (4) Degree/Certificate completion, and (5) Transfer.

e. Research question: Do enhanced WAC assignments improve course completion for African American students?

C. **Revised** Proposed Action Plan (by Karen W.):

1. College Support
  - Increased understanding and utilization of support services offered on campus. Maybe create incentives for their use.
2. SLO Process (ALC all in agreement on this plan)
  - Larger Sample
3. Teaching Strategies (ALC all in agreement on this plan)
  - Jason Suarez-led WAC Cohort training with SEP focus.
  - Library resources better utilized - research and citation help
4. Curriculum Changes:
  - Examine pre-requisites to ensure basic skills are met. Would have to identify which courses. Strategic focus on English 1A.

D. Elise G. stated she thinks that the minimum time for a lead faculty should be 15 hours because it is a huge job.

V. **Critical Thinking ILO [#1] Assessment Plan (Rubrics, Faculty) – Jenny Simon**

- A. Wanted to take a different approach; Russell S. found a generalized rubric that can be applied to many different assessments across divisions that assess Critical Thinking; we can assess this rubric and make changes; can select 2 or 3 faculty members from each division who can participate in an assessment of Critical Thinking next semester using CCC Confer.
- B. Next semester, on April 8, faculty members will go over assessments and apply the rubric at the meeting. They will talk more about it (specific deadline dates, etc.) at the facilitator meeting tomorrow.
- C. Russell S. stated that hopefully, there will be a larger sample size for this one.

VI. **Next meeting – November 9, 2015**

VII. **Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

FALL ALC Meetings Mondays, 2:30 to 4:00 pm Admin 131	Facilitator Training Sessions Tuesdays 1:00 to 2:00 pm Library West Basement, Rm. 19	"Working" Workshop: Entering SLO Assessments in TracDat Library Basement West	Upcoming Deadlines
September 14 October 12 November 9 November 30	September 15 October 13 November 10 December 1	Wednesday, December 2, 2015, 3-4pm Tuesday, December 8, 2015, 1-2pm Wednesday, December 9, 2015, 3-4pm  <b>TracDat 101: Learn the Software Basics</b> Library Basement West  Wednesday, October 14, 2015, 3-4pm Wednesday, October 18, 3-4pm	Spring/Summer 2015 Assessments – September 11, 2015