



Assessment of Learning Committee (ALC)

Monday, April 17, 2017

COMM 109 - 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
Behavioral & Social Sciences – Janet Young
Business – John Mufich
Fine Arts Associate Dean – Walter Cox
Health Sciences and Athletics – Russell Serr
Humanities – Kevin Degnan & Rhea Lewitzki

Industry & Technology – Bruce Tran
Library/LRU – Claudia Striepe
Mathematical Sciences – Susanne Bucher
Natural Sciences – T. Jim Noyes
Inst. Research & Planning – Joshua Rosales
Compton Division 1 – Hoa Pham

MINUTES

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

I. A. Approval of Minutes

John M. moved to approve the minutes for the 3/13/2017 ALC meeting; motion was seconded by Russell S. Motion was carried.

B. Facilitator Meeting

April 18th Facilitator meeting is cancelled.

II. Reports

A. FALL 2016 SLO/PLO Assessment completion – Russell Serr

1. Currently, we are at 90% overall completion for SLO assessments and 54% for PLO assessments. Russell S. will forward the updated summary reports to facilitators.
2. At the end of this week, we will switch the TracDat summary flags to reflect Spring 2017 assessments due.

B. Next 4-Year Timeline (2017-2020)

Submission for the next 4-year assessment timelines have been extended to June 1, 2017. Timeline worksheets will be sent out to the divisions in the next couple of weeks.

C. Standard Met/Not Met

1. Janet Young suggested adding another selection to this assessment category: Partially Met or Almost Met; this would cover those assessments where the results have not reached the minimum Standard and Target for Success, but have come really close to it.
2. Russell S. asked those in attendance what their thoughts were on adding.
 - Susanne B. asked if this was really necessary if they put in the report the percentage of students that met the standard; Linda C. stated that it would be helpful to have a

field that shows this information so that it is easily seen; Jenny S. stated it would help to add a field that shows the straight percentage and then average it out across courses, in addition to the "Standard Met/Not Met".

3. Russell S. suggested we table this discussion for later since Janet Y. is not present.

D. English Pilot on Data Disaggregation – Kevin Degnan

1. Russell S. stated that the ACCJC and Academic Senate have been discussing disaggregation of assessment data.
2. Humanities division is working on a pilot on disaggregation of data; they started last semester.
 - Was going to use Google Sheets but there were logistical challenges. Their solution: Their designated administrative support staff creates an individual roster sheet for each section and a master spreadsheet, using Excel. Sheets were populated with roster data (student names and ID numbers), which IRP can then populate with the disaggregated data after the results have been collected and entered.
 - Kevin D. & Rhea L. then e-mailed the individual spreadsheets to the respective faculty to fill in with their results. Each spreadsheet had the SLO statement.
 - They collected data on each assignment—both grade and SLO result. Data/results were transferred to the master spreadsheet.
 - This semester they improved on the process a bit.
3. John M. stated that it seems like a waste of data entry when the method of entry is easy with Gradebook. It seems that it would be a better solution using Gradebook, unless it is not flexible enough to accommodate additional data entry points. He stated he would like to have a discussion with Art Leible of ITS to see if we can accomplish this using Gradebook. Kevin's understanding of Gradebook on the portal is that it is an inadequate system for this type of task. Kevin D. agreed that the process for collecting SLO data should be much simpler and streamlined with the data that comes from the registration system and the grade system.
4. John M. stated that we probably have the flexibility to set up our Gradebook ourselves; each individual faculty can set up their Gradebook menu; can set up an assignment for SLO #1, #2, #3, etc.; he suggested that we pilot it and see if it works and if it gives us the percentage with numbers; he will look into this.
5. Kevin D. still thinks that there should be a central database administrator who would set it up rather than having each individual instructor setting up their own Gradebook; Jenny S. agreed and stated she can see problems arising with having individual instructors setting up their own Gradebook.

E. Alignment Grids – Janet Young

Will table it for next time since Janet Y. is not present

III. Community and Personal Development ILO – Jenny Simon

A three-pronged approach was used: Utilization Data, SENSE & CCCSE surveys, and Short survey.

- A. 1st prong - Utilization Data from 2014-15 is done: Had 100% response rate. Met with Robin Dreizler and some ALC members before this meeting.
- B. 2nd prong - SENSE & CCCSE surveys: Josh is looking at the SENSE survey (given to incoming students) from 2014 and 2016. He is about halfway through comparing the data. Still have not started going through the 2014 CCCSE survey data. They will be giving another CCCSE survey this fall but we will only be using data from 2014. There is a lot of information and covers a lot the different categories. The challenge is trying to whittle down the amount of data to something that is usable.

C. 3rd prong - Short Survey:

1. John M. piloted the short survey. Used a modified version of the handout from the last meeting. Joshua R. put it in a format which can be answered using Scantron. John M. used it in five of his classes, which consists about 70-80 students. It took an average of 10 minutes to do both sides.
2. Joshua R. stated they will be scanned this week. Waiting to see what the results are.
3. Jenny suggested putting the “Never Used” check box at the beginning/first column.
4. There are probably 30 services listed. John M. asked if we can put them in categories; Jenny S. agreed. At the meeting before this ALC meeting, they were discussing changing the question regarding Very Satisfied, Not Satisfied, etc. However, we are assessing “engagement” not satisfaction.
5. John M. suggested asking questions like: “Have you used this service?” and “How many times have you used this service?” (i.e. frequency)
6. Russell S. stated it would be a good idea to keep the survey to one page. Jenny S. stated categorizing the services, rather than listing each service/program.
7. John M. asked if we should find out how long the student has been attending this college and how many times the student has used the service/program. The question for this is, how do you answer “No. of times”? Times per semester? Per Year? Since they started attending this campus?
8. We are trying to find out how engaged do they feel as a student.
9. Let’s see what kind of results we get. Jenny S. stated we need to see where all the data falls before we do any tweaking.
10. Russell S. thinks we have a good base from all 3 prongs.

IV. **Next ILO assessment: Information Literacy**

To get ahead of the curve, we want to start planning out the next ILO assessment: Information Literacy. Russell S. will run this by this the ALC so we can start getting ideas of getting a game plan by the time Fall 2017 starts. Need to start talking about the plan for Information Literacy at the next meeting.

V. **Next meeting – May 8, 2017**

VI. **Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

SPRING 2017 ALC Meetings Mondays, 2:30 to 4:00 pm Admin 131	Facilitator Training Sessions Tuesdays 1:00 to 2:00 pm SS 119	TracDat “Working” Workshop: Entering SLO Assessments in TracDat Library Basement West	Deadlines
March 13 April 17 May 8 May 22	March 14 April 18 (Cancelled) May 9 May 23		4-Year Timeline Worksheets (2017-2020) Due June 1, 2017