



Assessment of Learning Committee (ALC)

Monday, October 10, 2016

Library 202 - 2:30pm to 4:00pm

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

Recorder: Isabelle Pena

Attendees:

Academic Affairs ECC – Linda Clowers
Compton Coordinator – Hoa Pham (Interim)
Business – John Mufich
Fine Arts – Vince Palacios
Fine Arts Associate Dean – Walter Cox
Health Sciences & Athletics – Russell Serr

Humanities – Rhea Lewitzki
Industry & Technology – Merriel Winfree & Bruce Tran
Mathematical Sciences – Susanne Bucher
Natural Sciences – T. Jim Noyes
Library/LRU – Claudia Striepe
Student & Community Advancement – Robin Dreizler

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 09/12/2016 ALC meeting; motion was seconded by Vince P. Motion was carried with change to III.D.1. [Add Jenny Simon.]

II. Reports

A. Spring 2016 Assessments Completion – *Russell Serr*

1. Updated SLO & PLO Assessment Status sent to Coordinators. Russell will forward to facilitators. Let's try to finish everything by this week so Linda C. can take it to the October 27th Council of Deans meeting.
2. We are in pretty good shape; we are almost at 100% overall—Math and NSC are 100%.
3. Hoa P. asked what the consequences are for faculty who don't complete their assessments.
 - a. Russell S. stated it is totally up to the deans; it is part of the faculty contract to do SLO and PLO assessments and be actively engaged in the process. This is discussed in their faculty evaluations and their review with their dean.
 - b. Walter C. stated that in the Fine Arts Division, this is discussed in their faculty evaluations and there is a section in the evaluation form that asks if they have completed everything with regards to assessments.

B. TracDat Template – *Russell Serr*

1. Kevin Degnan had some questions regarding the TracDat SLO/PLO template that is posted on the ECC SLO website; since Kevin was not in attendance, this topic will be deferred to next meeting.

C. Writing Across the Curriculum Update – *Linda Clowers*

1. Linda C. met with group and talked about what ideas had already been discussed at previous meetings and started to brainstorm on how we can do this project in this upcoming year.
2. The group walked through an outline of what we could cover—very similar to faculty development—a 3-hour workshop which would equip faculty with ideas and other resources that will help them to get their students up to speed on some of the foundational concepts (some would be discipline-specific, some are more general in terms of general study strategies and skills).
3. Other piece is focused on giving students experiences with writing as well as skill development.
4. Discussed a deliverable project that the faculty would have—at the end of the workshop training experience, there will be an assignment where faculty would either develop or significantly revise a writing assignment for their course, which would include elements that would make students engage more with the material through writing, which doesn't necessarily have to be formal (e.g. a journal).
5. Discussed the assessment piece of this project (outcome was quite ambitious in the original proposal); scaled back the number of workshops—originally had 3 workshops then scaled it back to one longer workshop this semester and a follow-up possibly on Spring 2017 Flex Day.
6. At the end of the spring semester, will have to do an assessment—we can assess the students' self-efficacies, the instructors' perception of their improvement as we do pre- and post-surveys, which will also be preliminary; can also assess the faculty development experience.
7. Linda C. will be checking with Idania Reyes to see if there is any opportunity for us to shift our timeline on the implementation of this project—looking into having the workshop on Friday, December 2, 2016. Susanne B. stated that there is also a Great Teachers seminar on Friday, December 2nd (for scheduling purposes).

III. **Critical Thinking ILO (#1) Preliminary Results** – *Jenny Simon*

- A. Results are still preliminary; Jenny checked with Josh and he said final report will be ready in 2 weeks. Should have it by the next meeting.
- B. Once data has been finalized, may want to invite the participants back to share their thoughts so we can see the bigger picture.

IV. **Community and Personal Development ILO (#3)** – *Jenny Simon (Handout)*

Handout: ILO #3 – Community and Personal Development: Potential Assessment Components

- A. Still in the planning stages. Robin Dreizler's area (Student and Community Advancement) will touch on a lot of the things that the ILO statements touch on. Linda C. drafted a document that was distributed to the ALC, which will be used as a starting point for discussion.
- B. Robin D.'s comments:
 1. Have we defined the point at which they are considered "students?" They are technically considered students once they finished the application. Does a student's engagement start from the time he/she submits an application? Because there are certain responsibilities that a student takes on at that point. We can easily assess someone based on the number of core services the student has completed just after the application. This would consist of a large cohort of students we can survey.

2. There are a lot of different ways we can initially measure students' engagement—how quickly they follow up with core services, how often, how many, etc.
 3. Reading the ILO statement further, his first thought was it referred to current students and how are they engaged on campus; he identified 24 different programs that we might possibly be able to access in terms of participation rates and how engaged are they—AGS group, our Ambassadors, Athletics, CalWORKS, EOP&S, Federal Work Study students (would be a good group), as well as those who complete the core services—First Year Experience, Foster Youth, Honor Transfer Students, MESA, Project Success, Puente Project, STEM, Student Government, Tutors, Veterans Program, InterClub Council groups, etc. As an example, for our Ambassadors, we assess them and do a pre-survey as they start the program in the Fall which assesses where they think they are in terms of their confidence and knowledge of the programs and services, and the post-survey follows up with some self-efficacy and confidence questions as well. In looking at this, there is a lot that we can do and that is easily available.
 4. Some individual programs (like Admissions) have done customer satisfaction surveys. Most of the programs that do surveys are looking more at completion rates and participation.
- C. John M. asked if this includes internship. Jenny S. stated that it can (service learning). Linda C. stated that it is worth adding “number of internship opportunities” because we can then pull data that shows demand vs. supply. Another we may want to consider is to look at what our peer colleges are doing.
- D. Russell S. asked if we also get data from the Health Center. Do they track students and why they go there? They have workshops like test-taking anxiety classes and we can look at success rates and possibly obtain data regarding students' use of mental health services.
- E. Jenny S. stated that at the last meeting, Joshua R. mentioned that we have recent data on CCSSE (Community College Student Services Engagement) survey and SENSE survey. We may be able to rely on the data from these recent surveys rather than creating new ones.
- F. Jenny S. has also been looking at SLO assessments that have been done in TracDat. Human Development is the best fit for this ILO, but other programs may also have some alignment to this ILO (including Philosophy). We would want to prioritize the programs. Community Education would also be a good fit but we may not be able to assess their students as they are not considered “students” per Robin D. since they don't have to go through the application process and there are no restrictions on who can take those classes; however, Linda C. stated we may look at current ECC students who also take community ed classes.
- G. Robin D. stated that a lot of the programs he has mentioned are currently assessing their Service Area Outcomes (SAOs); now that he has a better idea of what we are looking for, he will look and see if he can pare it down to 4 or 5 programs that have outcomes that they are already assessing.
- H. Robin D. stated that we should have a control group.
- I. Where do we go from here? Need to think about the next steps.
1. Jenny S. stated that she needs to meet with Josh and see what kind of data IRP has. Jenny will meet with Josh and Robin D. to go over CCSSE and SENSE surveys and look at the questions that were asked on the surveys.
 2. Jenny S. will continue to look at TracDat and look at SLO and PLO assessments that align with this ILO.

3. There is plenty of data out there that we can gather. Next step is deciding who, on campus, to invite to participate in reflecting on the data and making sense of the data in order to make recommendations.
 4. ALC needs to prioritize the data; participation data for student services is already out there—it is just a matter of selecting a cohort; Robin D. stated that narrowing down a cohort is critical.
 5. Will there be standards required? We need to come up with standards of student and community engagement.
- J. This is a new concept for us (ALC); Russell S. stated that, unlike previous ILOs assessed, there is no template for this one—we are the ones setting the template. We might want to establish a baseline data of what our community is doing—participation data; satisfaction data; learning outcomes type of data.

VI. Next meeting – November 14, 2016

VII. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

FALL 2016 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
September 12 October 10 November 14 November 28	September 13 October 11 November 29		Fall 2016 Assessments – March 3, 2017