



Assessment of Learning Committee (ALC)
Monday, November 30, 2015
Admin 131 - 2:30pm to 4:00pm

SLO Coordinators: Russell Serr and Jenny Simon (Interim)

Recorder: Isabelle Peña

Attendees:

Deans' Representatives – Elise Geraghty	Industry & Technology – Sue Ellen Warren
Behavioral & Social Sciences – Janet Young	Industry & Technology Assoc. Dean (Interim) – Randal Davis
Fine Arts – Vince Palacios & Fariba Sadeghi-Tabrizi	Mathematical Sciences – Susanne Bucher
Fine Arts Associate Dean (Interim) – Walter Cox	Natural Sciences – T. Jim Noyes
Health Sciences & Athletics – Corey Stanbury	Institutional Research & Planning (IRP) – Joshua Rosales
Humanities – Argelia Andrade	

Guests:

See attached sign-in sheet.

MINUTES

Call to Order: Meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m.

I. **Approval of Minutes**

Russell S. moved to approve the minutes for the 11/09/2015 ALC meeting; motion was seconded by Janet Young. Motion was carried.

II. Russell S. thanked Karen Whitney (who was not present) for taking on the Interim Associate Dean of Academic Affairs position during the Fall 2015 semester, and for her leadership and support of the ALC Committee. He also thanked the ALC members for their participation and input throughout this last year.

III. **Reports – Russell Serr**

A. 'Semester of Current Assessment' drop-down menu

1. Isabelle P. has brought to the Coordinators' attention that when faculty members enter the results for an assessment on TracDat, if the wrong semester/year is selected from the drop-down menu for 'Semester of Current Assessment', that assessment will be indicated in the status reports as "incomplete".
2. Russell S. asked the ALC reps and facilitators that as they help other faculty with entering their assessments, or as they enter their own assessments, to make sure that the correct semester/year is selected from the drop down menu so that we can get accurate completion rates when status reports are run.

B. Fall 2015 Assessments - Due February 15, 2016. Russell S. asked the ALC reps and facilitators to encourage faculty to complete their assessment inputs before they leave for the holiday break.

C. Workshops - Upcoming SLO workshops are listed on the agenda and SLO website.

D. Communication ILO Assessment Action Plan

Last year, we assessed the Communication ILO. One of the Action Plans we came up with was to increase Writing Across the Curriculum, so we requested for some SEP (Student Equity Program)

funding and we received about \$8,500 to help us with some programs (workshops, etc.) to implement "Writing Across the Curriculum".

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

PowerPoint presentation & Handout: Critical Thinking Rubric

A. Introductions

ALC members as well as guests—faculty from different divisions (ECC and Compton) who will be involved with the Critical Thinking ILO assessment—introduced themselves to the group.

B. Overview and History of Assessments

1. Jenny Simon first gave an overview and history of assessment on this campus and the diagram presented showed where the SLO assessment process fits into other processes on the campus. (See attached PowerPoint presentation.) The cycle that includes Program Review, Annual Plan, assessments of SLOs, PLOs, and ILOs, as well as curriculum review are all part of the planning process; and everything then feeds into Master Plan, Strategic Initiatives, and Mission.
2. There are 3 levels of assessments: Course level SLOs (Student Learning Outcomes), Program Level PLOs (Program Learning Outcomes) and ILOs (Institutional Learning Outcomes—previously called "Core Competencies", of which there were 6 at the time).
3. The first cycle of assessments for the Core Competencies were started in 2006; the first one assessed was called "Communication and Comprehension" (now called "Communication") and the last one, assessed in Spring 2014, was "Content Knowledge" (which now doesn't exist).
4. After assessing all 6, the ILOs were narrowed down to 4 ILOs: Critical Thinking (being assessed this academic year), Communication (assessed last year), Community and Personal Development, and Information Literacy)
5. From the 6 previous Core Competencies, the previous ILO #3, which was called "Critical, Creative, and Analytical Thinking" was assessed in Spring 2011. The assessment involved asking faculty to rate their students overall in 6 areas: (1) Draw a conclusion based on evidence or information, (2) Evaluate the quality and credibility of a source or evidence, (3) Create a work that meets defined standards, (4) Use standards to make judgment, (5) Apply theory to analyze data or solve problem, and (6) Create solution or approach to a problem.
6. Small faculty involvement—faculty from only 13 sections who returned student surveys; only 8 faculty actually completed an assessment on their students' critical thinking skills but a total of 313 students submitted self-assessments. (Results showed that students rated themselves higher than the faculty's rating of the students.)
7. After going through the first assessment cycle of all 6 ILOs (Core Competencies), the ALC concluded that the current method of assessment was not the most effective method for gathering authentic data that relates to student learning and how faculty can improve it.

C. Critical Thinking Definition

1. After the "Communication" ILO assessment last year, one of the Action Plans was to increase the sample size for ILO assessments. By inviting faculty to attend this meeting and involving faculty early on in the ILO assessment planning stage, it looks like we will have a much larger sample size already for this Critical Thinking ILO assessment than the last time it was assessed.
2. Before talking about methodology for assessing the ILO, Jenny S. shared the definitions of "Critical Thinking" from various sources obtained from Google search.
3. ECC Critical Thinking ILO definition: 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.
 - Identify vital questions, problems, or issues and evaluate solutions.
 - Analyze, compose, and assess the validity of an argument.
 - Compute and analyze multiple representations of quantitative information, including graphical, formulaic, numerical, verbal, and visual.
4. When Janet Y. was Curriculum Chair, all 1,200 courses had to be revised to include a Critical Thinking sample assignment; Jenny S. stated that probably close to 90% of ECC courses aligns with the Critical Thinking ILO.

5. Jenny S. asked some of the faculty to share their ideas of what they think Critical Thinking is. Various faculty shared:
 - Childhood Education: students present lessons in classrooms and then they have to evaluate themselves based on standards—they have to write a critical analysis of what they did and measure their own performance against the standards.
 - Sociology: ability to analyze data and use it to understand what you're thinking.
 - Dance: more of a reflection on the faculty end; for the student it's subjectivity.
 - Welding: students identify the problem and have to tell instructor what it is so they can correct it themselves.
 - Accounting: students have to analyze what the equations mean, why they even bother to calculate it, and how it helps us make decisions.
 - History: make students think like a teachers; students write the multiple choice exam—they do a better job of studying the material when they ask the question rather than seeking the answer.
 - Political Science: teach students "doubt"; what is the truth or misleading about the statement.
 - Communications/Public Speaking: students have to come up with a persuasive speech so they have to identify a problem, come up with a solution, and propose an action for it. So they have to through the process and have credible sources to back it up, and they have to overcome other people's objections to what they are proposing as Action; students also do peer evaluations.
 - Nutrition: students make decisions by applying principles of basic nutrition vs. the latest "hype".
 - Astronomy: students are taught the conceptual aspects and have them apply them to other solar systems

D. The Plan/Dates

1. All faculty who are involved will pull student assessments involving Critical Thinking from ONE of their sections (the whole class) around 10th week of Spring 2016 (post mid-term; this is not the final assessment)—this is an actual assignment, test, quiz, paper, something that is already in place in your class; faculty will have to indicate which class section they are using for the assessment so that Institutional Research (IR) can generate the rosters for faculty to enter the data (need the student ID numbers to match with the data). Faculty will grade and rate the assessments using the ECC rubric, which is currently being created.
2. IR can generate the rosters around the 7th week (faculty will receive a roster/electronic Excel spreadsheet from IR).
3. Faculty to bring results (and student work) to Assessment Lunch on Friday April 8th.
4. Advantages from previous assessment:
 - a. This one will be more authentic—faculty will rate an actual assessment rather than the overall student performance; this will probably give us better results.
 - b. Participating faculty are involved earlier in the process (starting the semester before the assessment is going to take place rather than selecting random faculty getting an e-mail right before assessment is to be done).
 - c. Involves the use of a rubric rather than a simple rating scale. What coordinators hope is that they can use this rubric can be used again in future assessments.
 - d. Involves dialogue as part of the process rather than after the fact.
3. Participating faculty will get FLEX credit for being involved in this ILO assessment. Jenny S. stated that faculty will get FLEX credit for attending this Orientation meeting and for attending the Assessment Lunch (4-5 hours). Faculty will still need to sign in with Professional Development to receive the FLEX credit. Russell S. also stated that if participating faculty need to do additional "brown bag" or conference call meetings or anything that involves group discussion, they will get FLEX credit.

E. Rubric

1. This rubric is still a DRAFT. It is based on the rubric from Palomar College. Jenny S. asked those in attendance for feedback on the Rubric. It is NOT the final version.
2. Individual student—we are collecting data based on gender, race, age. Veterans group is also one of the requirements as part of the Student Equity Plan (along with race, gender, etc.) The rubric is not going to affect their grade. Rubric can be shared with the students if the faculty wants to. IR doesn't get individual information so we're not violating any FERPA.
3. Comments/suggestions/feedback:
 - Jenny S. simplified rubric down to 3 Categories/Traits (Identify, Analyze, and Conclude) and 3 Ratings (1-Developing, 2-Proficient, and 3-Exemplary).
 - Remove the word “some” under “Identify – 1 Developing” to read: “Demonstrates minimal or simplistic understanding of the problem”.
 - If student does not meet minimum or is missing the standard, it should be marked with a zero. Per Joshua R., if this is the case, then zero (0) should be included in the Rubric as a column/category (as in 0, 1, 2 and 3), in order for it to be counted. Plagiarism falls under the Zero category.
 - One faculty suggested adding something that talks about “Support”—needs to be called out explicitly in the terminology; right now, the rubric does not include anything about supporting data, facts, thoughts; Jenny S. stated the idea of “support” is part of many different categories. For example, the first bullet point under “Conclude—1 Developing” can be changed to “Does not consistently *support* conclusions with the information presented”.
 - Under “Analyze—3 Exemplary”, delete “using sophisticated thinking” under second bullet point so that it reads “Formulates a creative, original, and/or well-stated solution”.
 - Under “Analyze—2 Proficient”, second bullet point has the phrase “using creative thinking”, which does not relate to science—would rather see “effective” or “thorough” instead of “creative”; Fariba S. suggested just having terminology/verbs/key words for the bullet points instead of describing in complete sentences and then faculty can just choose the key words that relate to their discipline; Jenny S. stated that if there are two or more bullet points in a category, then faculty can use one or more bullet points that relates to their discipline to rate the student; they do not have to meet all the bullet points.
4. Russell S. suggested drafting a couple of models of the rubric based on these comments and suggestions and distribute it for some input (all participating faculty will be given an opportunity to give their input); coordinators will then draft a rubric based on everyone’s input.

V. **Next meeting – February 8, 2016**

VI. **Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 3:55 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 “Working” Workshop: Entering SLO Assessments in TracDat Library Basement West Wednesday, December 2, 2015, 3-4pm Tuesday, December 8, 2015, 1-2pm Wednesday, December 9, 2015, 3-4pm	Fall 2015 Assessments – February 8, 2016

Attachments:

1. Orientation for Critical Thinking ILO Assessment (PowerPoint presentation)
2. Palomar College General Education Outcomes: Critical Thinking (Learning Outcomes Council – 2013)
3. Draft of El Camino College Critical Thinking Rubric.