



Assessment of Learning Committee (ALC)

Monday, April 25, 2016

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

ALC Co-Chairs/SLO Coordinators: Russell Serr and Jenny Simon

Recorder: Isabelle Peña

Attendees:

Academic Affairs ECC – Linda Clowers
Compton Coordinator – Kendahl Radcliffe
Deans' Representatives – Elise Geraghty
Behavioral & Social Sciences – Janet Young
Business – John Mufich
Fine Arts Associate Dean – Walter Cox
Health Sciences & Athletics – Russell Serr

Humanities – Kevin Degnan & Rhea Lewitzki
Industry & Technology – Bruce Tran
Mathematical Sciences – Susanne Bucher
Natural Sciences – T. Jim Noyes
Library/LRU – Claudia Striepe
Institutional Research & Planning – Joshua Rosales

Guest:

Dr. Jean Shankweiler, VP Academic Affairs

MINUTES

Call to Order: Meeting was called to order at 2:40 p.m.

I. **Approval of Minutes**

Russell S. moved to approve the minutes for the 04/11/2016 ALC meeting; motion was seconded by Janet Young. Motion was carried with correction to add "Spring 2016 assessments – September 16, 2016" at end of minutes, under "Deadlines".

II. **Reports**

A. Spring 2016 Assessments – Russell Serr

1. Spring assessments are due on September 16, 2016 (3rd Friday of the Fall semester).
2. Some timelines were updated and sent out so all the divisions should now have the current timelines. If a Facilitator(s) did not receive an updated timeline for his/her division, they are good to go. Everyone really needs to follow protocol and send the SLO Coordinators and the SLO Admin any changes to the timelines by the end of the third week of the semester.

B. Workshops – Russell Serr

"Working" Workshops ("Entering SLO Assessments in TracDat"):

1. Dates for the remainder of the semester are listed at the end of the 04/11/2016 minutes as well as on the SLO website.
2. Any faculty who wants to earn an hour of flex credit for entering their reports can sign up for the workshop through Professional Development.

C. TracDat Update – Jenny Simon

1. Linda C., Jenny S., Kevin D. and Isabelle P. had a conference call with Paul DeSante of Nuventive last week. Kevin's initial question to Nuventive was: Is there a way to directly

enter individual student data into TracDat, i.e. to have student names and IDs populated in TracDat so that faculty can go in and enter each student's individual data so that the information is in one central place and whomever is writing the reports can simply go into TracDat and get a summary of the data? Currently, faculty gather and log the individual data outside of TracDat and only enter the summary data in the Results/Assessment Data & Analysis section of TracDat. The advantage of entering individual student data in TracDat is having one central place to enter and retrieve all the data and the ultimate goal is to eventually comply with the gathering of student sub-population data for ACCJC.

2. According to Nuventive, this is possible, but it is labor-intensive and may not really work. TracDat does not interface with ECC's registration system—there is no way to match the student registration information with the courses in TracDat; the only way this can be done is to manually assign groups to a faculty member, create an Excel spreadsheet with the student information then enter this information in TracDat. Paul DeSante stated in the conference call that entering student data like age, gender, returning students, veterans, etc. would be laborious because you have to enter the same information for each student every time, for each course. Institutional Research & Planning (IRP) would have to give us a spreadsheet with the student information, which will in turn, need to be imported/uploaded in TracDat.
3. We need to determine what systems can interface with each other—e.g. if Colleague (Datatel) or CANVAS (replacement for Etudes) can interface with TracDat. Jenny S. recommended that we do a pilot using this feature, only in Facilitators' classes; Kevin D. suggested possibly running the pilot program in the Fall for a couple of sections from Facilitators who are interested in looking into this. Linda C. thinks it might be worth looking into to see if this is something we can use campus-wide in the future. She informed the ALC that this phone call was just an inquiry in terms of what TracDat can do—not so much about what direction we want to go but rather what TracDat can do for those who want to be able to get information at that level (sub-population). If we are able to do this, it would definitely change our process, which includes more of IRP's involvement in the SLO/PLO assessment process. Linda also reminded everyone that at this time, we are just taking a look at what is possible in TracDat; then we can start thinking about whether we can or how we might move in this direction. However, with so many things going on (like switching over to CANVAS, etc.), we all know that this is something that we will not be “pulling the trigger on” anytime soon. For now, faculty members should just do assessments the same way it's been done.

III. Community and Personal Development ILO (#3) – Russell Serr
(See attached PowerPoint presentation.)

- A. The next Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO) to be assessed in 2016 is ILO #3: Community and Personal Development. When the ILOs were redefined in Spring 2014, ALC combined 2 ILOs (Community & Collaboration and Professional & Personal Growth) into one. (See attached PowerPoint presentation which shows definitions of old ILOs vs. the new ILO and the methodology of assessing the old ILO.) The previous 2 ILOs were assessed with surveys through IRP.
- B. The problem is that this is not really a primary goal in most courses; it is a secondary goal. It involves Student Services.
- C. If students are doing something for the community, but not doing it for a class, do we look at that? Jenny S. stated we can talk to Student Services, especially the clubs and activities

- arm of Student Services, even Special Resource Center and look at Human Development courses, which focus on this.
- D. Russell S. stated that he doesn't think we'll see a lot of courses that align with this ILO and he asked Joshua R. if IRP has the survey questions for when the two ILOs were last assessed. If IRP has the questions, ALC can use that as a starting point and see where they lead. Russell thinks that conducting surveys is the way to assess this ILO.
- E. Russell went over the assessment methodology of the last assessment. (See attached.)
- How do we measure self-esteem? Russell stated that from the last results, they were self-reported; but is that enough? Need to decide if we are measuring self-esteem for this ILO.
 - Survey should probably focus on participation in key areas/campus programs—SRC, writing center, reading center, clubs, Counseling, tutoring, Library, number of students who voted in the last student government elections and the number of seats that were filled; Jenny stated that we could measure engagement—we could ask the various areas on what data they think they can provide in terms of participation and then we can work on a survey based on the information provided to us.
 - Joshua R. stated that the last survey given to students was in Spring 2014; one survey was given to all students and another survey was given to new students—so we can do a comparison of students who are new vs. students who have been attending ECC longer. This was quite a lengthy survey. 2014 survey results is on the web page. Jenny suggested having ALC members bring some questions we can use either at the first or second ALC meeting in Fall 2016.
 - John M. asked what the response rate is for these student surveys? Joshua stated that it depends on how the survey is done—if done by mail, maybe 1-30%.
 - When we develop the survey, we might want to think about what we are trying to accomplish.
 - Jenny S. suggested having the surveys given by the programs or randomly select certain courses.
- F. How can we measure “Community”? Does “community” mean campus community or the students’ overall community (beyond the campus)? If survey questions are regarding student service programs, then “community” should mean the campus community.
- G. Jenny S. stated Robin Dreizler should be involved in this ILO assessment since he is our liaison to Student Services and Student Services is a big part of this ILO. Russell and Jenny will talk to Robin.
- H. Claudia S. suggested using some of the transfer data as a method of assessment for personal development (i.e. students who have transferred or have gotten jobs) or obtain some of the program review data from CTE. Russell agreed; however, getting data from outside sources can be tough; but we can definitely use CTE data. Janet Y. suggested we can also use existing SAO data.
- I. Linda C. summarized that there are a few areas we can consider as far as getting data to assess this ILO:
- Counts: Usage rates of different services on campus; counts of student activity
 - Looking at existing data (SAOs that relate to community engagement and leadership, Human Development courses where the outcomes do relate to personal development)
 - Surveys
- J. Josh will locate some of those surveys before the September 12th ALC meeting.
- K. Isabelle P. will run a report showing courses or services that align with this ILO.

IV. Critical Thinking ILO (#1) Update – Jenny Simon

- A. Jenny S. will follow-up with an e-mail to those who participated reminding them to send IRP their final data, whether the final data was the one they brought to the meeting or the one they had by the end of the semester.
- B. Jenny will then put in a proposal for a workshop for Fall 2016 Professional Development Day to go over some of the data received by IRP so we can look at the data and get some more ideas about follow up.

V. New Discussion

- A. New 4-year timeline
Susanne B. asked if the campus is going to do a new 4-year timeline beyond 2018. Isabelle will be working on new blank Timeline worksheets to be distributed to divisions in the Fall semester. New Timeline worksheets will include 2017 to 2020.
- B. “Met vs. Not Met” Criteria
Janet Y. asked if we can consider expanding the “Met vs. Not Met” criteria to: “Met”, “Partially Met”, and “Fully Met”. This is something that they have discussed in their department, and feel that by doing this, the data would be more meaningful than just being “black and white”, especially if the result was very close to meeting the criteria (e.g. within 1% of meeting the standard). It was agreed that if we were to add “Partially Met”, they would have to be clear in the description of the “Partially Met” criteria.
- C. Action
 - 1. Elise G. asked why we have to have an Action if the SLO met the standard. If the assessment met the standard, the action is that they are doing well and their focus will be on those courses that need improvement. Having to put an Action even if the assessment met the standard gets to be a lot of work (e.g. English 1A has 76 sections). Jenny S. stated that we can revisit this; there needs to be a sense of prioritization. Linda C. stated this is worth looking into. Janet Y. stated that if we stop putting Action Plans during every assessment, we would be losing this idea of “continually evolving/improving”.
 - 2. Jenny S. stated there is room for revisiting the system as it stands.
 - 3. Jenny S. stated proposing Action Plans possibly every 4 years. Elise G. stated that putting an Action Plan on a different cycle than assessments would be good because it would be a good opportunity to look at trends; can even align Action Plans with Program Review. Longer intervals for entering Actions make sense.

VI. Next meeting – September 12, 2016

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

Spring 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 “Working” Workshop: Entering SLO Assessments in TracDat Library Basement West	Deadlines
February 8 March 7 April 11 April 25	February 9 March 8 April 12	Wednesday, April 27, 2016, 2-3 pm Thursday, April 28, 2016, 9-10 am Wednesday, May 4, 2016, 3-4 pm Thursday, May 5, 2016, 1-2 pm	Fall 2015 Assessments – February 8, 2016 Spring 2016 Assessments – September 16, 2016