



Assessment of Learning Committee (ALC)

Monday, November 9, 2015

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

SLO Coordinators: Russell Serr and Jenny Simon (Interim)

Recorder: Isabelle Peña

Attendees:

Deans' Representatives – Elise Geraghty
Behavioral & Social Sciences – Janet Young
Fine Arts – Vince Palacios & Fariba Sadeghi-Tabrizi
Fine Arts Associate Dean (Interim) – Walter Cox
Health Sciences & Athletics – Corey Stanbury
Humanities – Argelia Andrade

Industry & Technology – Sue Ellen Warren
Industry & Technology Assoc. Dean (Interim) – Randal Davis
Mathematical Sciences – Susanne Bucher
Natural Sciences – T. Jim Noyes
Institutional Research & Planning (IRP) – Joshua Rosales

Guest:

Richard Mascolo – Professor, Psychology Department

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 10/12/2015 ALC meeting; motion was seconded by Janet Y. Motion was carried.

II. Reports

A. Missing Spring/Summer 2015 Assessments – Russell Serr

1. We are at 97% complete for the Torrance campus. A couple of divisions sent Russ S. e-mails of why assessments were not done and/or why they will not be done. Russ S. advised the ALC and facilitators to let him know of assessments that are not going to be completed so that they can be moved to the next semester or the next time the course is taught.

B. Finalized Communication ILO Action Plans – Russell Serr

1. Writing across the curriculum: Jason Suarez will conduct some workshops; would like to get a librarian involved with “writing across the curriculum” project—it is supposed to be an entire project (not just a few workshops) wherein faculty are recruited and must go through the whole process of applying what they learned in the workshops in their classrooms, then come back and share with each other the results.
2. Work on having a larger sample size.
3. Library resources better utilized: Research and citation help.

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

Handout: Palomar College General Education Outcomes: Critical Thinking (Learning Outcomes Council – 2013)

- A. At the beginning of last week, SLO Coordinators asked Facilitators to give them names of faculty who might be interested in helping to assess the Critical Thinking ILO. There are a few more

divisions that still need to give them names and Jenny S. has contacted those divisions with a second reminder.

- B. The assessment process that SLO Coordinators settled on is applying Palomar College's Critical Thinking Rubric which is adapted from Palomar College's Critical Thinking Group and tried by Palomar College with success. Coordinators felt this was a good starting point and will be modifying the rubric for its final use for the assessment.
- C. Josh R. prepared and shared with the ALC the starting point for an Excel template that will be sent out the participating faculty to collect data for the Critical Thinking ILO. It will be the similar format as the Communication ILO template. He will add 2 more categories to the Excel template for a total of 5 categories (Communication ILO only had 3 categories).
- D. Jenny S. asked ALC for any feedback on the rubric. Elise G. suggested simplifying the rubric, using fewer ratings (i.e. instead of rating from 1 to 5, use only 3—Achieve, Adequately Achieve, Did not Achieve). Jenny S. agrees that we should simplify the process. Fariba S. stated that part of the ILO process is the disaggregation of the data and that's where the numbers rating (0 to 4) come in. Vince P. stated that the numbers rating—also labeled "Below Benchmark" (0), "Emerging" [1], "Developing" [2], "Proficient" [3], and "Exemplary" [4]—makes sense as far as identifying the where the students fall. Vince P. stated that we need to know why we are doing this and what the outcome of this assessment is. Jenny S. stated we need to look at the end product and plan backwards from there.
- E. Fariba S. commented that the wording for the descriptions/terminology under the "Competency" column should be a lot simpler so that faculty will easily understand what they are assessing (e.g. some faculty may not understand what "Influence of context and assumptions" mean). She stated that they met before, they came up with 4 categories—To be able to: (1) Identify, (2) Analyze, (3) Assess, and (4) Compose. Jenny S. agreed that we need to make this rubric work for us (ECC) but this rubric is a good starting point. Fariba S. suggested having the 4 categories (rows) and 3 columns from 0=Inadequate to 3=Adequate. Jenny S. stated that Coordinators are open to suggestions for modifying the rubric.

IV. **Data Analysis** – Richard Mascolo, Guest Speaker

- A. SLO Coordinators introduced Richard Mascolo, Psychology Professor (who also teaches Statistics), who presented his process of "data crunching" (analyzing data) when he assesses his SLOs/PLOs.
- B. Richard M. stated that in his point of view, assessing only one SLO in one semester (vs. assessing all the SLOs in one semester) makes no sense at all. He stated that if you want to make comparisons of the SLOs across the board, assessing all 3 SLOs in one semester makes more sense because you are assessing the same students; if you assess one SLO at a time, you will end up with different sets of data and you cannot compare them because the results are from a different group of students being assessed.
- C. If we look at it from a clinical point of view, some of the research methods that he reads and teaches talk about, a program needs at least 5 things:
 - 1. Need: One of the first things to assess is whether there is a need. (In terms of general student success, there is a need.)
 - 2. Theory: In Psychology, they like to have an intervention based on some theory—like it should make sense and that it works.
 - 3. Process: This is a big part of the outcome; in this case, what our students are doing—are they doing what they're supposed to be doing?
 - 4. Outcome: This is hard to assess if the process is missing; showing that something works is not enough.

5. Efficiency: This part matters; what is necessary to get the effect (outcome). What is sufficient? (When can you stop?)

- D. Richard M. does a lot of data collection and crunching for the SLOs in the Psychology courses. What he is doing right now to get his department to 100% compliance is giving the basic multiple choice quizzes across the different SLOs, scoring them, entering them, and coming up with some numbers. He also does some additional analyses. After he collects his data, he graphs it.
- E. Richard M. also teaches in his classes that just because you have fancy statistics and mathematical niceties doesn't make it meaningful. The very first measure is, "What is the criterion/criteria for success?"
- F. What is a good outcome? Regarding the measurement of the outcome, one thing Richard M. tries to do is follow-up with students who leave ECC. We have almost no feedback on how our students do. In Psychology, for instance, one can't just get a Bachelor's Degree—one has to get a Master's Degree as well—in order to get any kind of job in the field and also have to do well in school. But he is not sure our students do that and he is concerned that even though our students do well according to the numbers here at ECC and even get their Bachelor's degree, they really don't do well enough to get into the Master's program and end up getting a job that's not in the field of Psychology. He's starting to get some follow-ups from former students; started to collect some student e-mail addresses and has sent e-mails to former students to write to him (not sending them a survey) to tell him how they are doing in whatever program they transferred to, if they have a plan, and what they are going to do after graduation. For Richard M., the true outcome of the SLOs is how well the students do in their destination.
- G. Vince P. commented that Richard M. justifies the need for SLOs but feels that the way we are doing it doesn't make sense. Why doesn't the state/accrediting agency establish meaningful criteria, rubrics, and standards so that is meaningful and develop a program that is purposeful; feels that what we are doing is meaningless. Richard M. stated that in Psychology, faculty talked about standardizing these assessments; without standardization, we don't have reliability; without reliability, we don't have a valid outcome.

V. **Next meeting – November 30, 2015**
 Facilitator Meeting for November 10 is cancelled.

VI. **Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 3:50 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	TracDat 101: Learn the Software Basics Library Basement West	Upcoming Deadlines
September 14 October 12 November 9 November 30	September 15 October 13 November 10 December 1	Wednesday, October 14, 2015, 3-4pm Wednesday, October 18, 3-4pm	Fall 2015 SLO/PLO Assessments <i>February 5, 2015</i>
		<p>"Working" Workshop: Entering SLO Assessments in TracDat Library Basement West</p> <p>Wednesday, December 2, 2015, 3-4pm Tuesday, December 8, 2015, 1-2pm Wednesday, December 9, 2015, 3-4pm</p>	

Attachments:

1. Palomar College General Education Outcomes: Critical Thinking (Learning Outcomes Council – 2013)