



Assessment of Learning Committee (ALC)

Monday, May 8, 2017

COMM 109 - 2:30pm to 4:00pm

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

Recorder: Isabelle Peña

Attendees:

Compton Coordinator – Hoa Pham
Behavioral & Social Sciences – Janet Young
Business – John Mufich
Fine Arts – Vince Palacios
Fine Arts Associate Dean – Walter Cox
Health Sciences and Athletics – Russell Serr
Humanities – Kevin Degnan & Rhea Lewitzki

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

Guest: Dr. Jean Shankweiler, Vice President – Academic Affairs

MINUTES

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

I. A. Approval of Minutes

Joshua R. moved to approve the minutes for the 4/17/2017 ALC meeting; motion was seconded by Merriel W. Motion was carried.

II. Reports

A. Community and Personal Development ILO – Jenny Simon

1. At the last ALC meeting, we talked about using a three-pronged approach to assess this ILO: Utilization Data, SENSE and CCCSE Surveys, and a Short Survey.
 - a. Utilization Data is almost complete. Jenny S. still needs to contact one person to get some more data.
 - b. SENSE and CCCSE Surveys: Joshua R. is going through each individual question in the categories that were discussed in previous meetings but SENSE and CCCSE also have aggregate scores that they produced that follow alongside the categories that we are interested in, and those are national benchmarks which compare us to other similar schools across the nation.
 - c. Short Survey/Questionnaire (*See attached handout*):
 - Jenny S. stated they are still working on this. Students in 4 sections of John Mufich's course were asked to fill out the pilot survey.
 - Claudia S. asked to correct "Learning Resources Center (LRC)" to "Library Learning Resource Center (LLRC)" under the list of services/programs. Jenny S. also stated that the list of services and programs may change.

- Joshua R. stated that we got some thorough responses for the usage of programs and services. For the final questions (#6 and #7), half or more left that question blank (both the rating and the fill-in). Jenny S. suggested to replace the last two questions with “To what extent do you feel that El Camino College has helped in your *personal development*?”—remove “community” in the question, since students may not know what we mean by “community” (i.e. there are several types of communities—El Camino community, Art community, Writing community, etc.) and to also move the question to be after #3 instead of at the end of the questionnaire. ALC members agreed to make this change. May still need to change the wording of the question.
- At the last meeting, it was suggested that we list categories of the services and programs, instead of a listing the individual programs; however, this is hard to do (some programs are hard to categorize) and maybe it would be better if someone in Student Services, who has the expertise, can provide us with the categories for the survey. Merriel W. stated that students may not know what the services are if we just put categories. Claudia S. suggested separating Academic (Puente, MESA, etc.) vs. non-Academic (Veterans, Health Center, etc.); Jenny S. stated that it’s hard to separate them because some fall under both.
- Merriel W. asked to add “Women In Technology” to the list of programs; Jenny S. asked the ALC members to think about programs in their departments that are not on the list and let her know if they need to be added.
- Claudia S. suggested that the Library Learning Resource Center, Tutoring Center, and Basic Skills Study Center should be listed separately. Jenny S. asked ALC members that if they see where categories can be combined, to let her know, because that would be even better.
- Claudia S. asked why we ask for the student ID number; Jenny S. stated that we ask for this information so that it would help with disaggregation (e.g. can be linked to ethnicity, Veteran status, etc.)
- Jenny S. will finalize the survey and work with Joshua R. to get the survey out to students by the end of this semester.

B. Information Literacy ILO – Russell Serr/Jenny Simon
(See attached handouts.)

1. The 2013 Information Literacy Report was distributed at the meeting. This is the first time we have assessed this ILO. Russell S. also looked at different colleges online. Some other colleges combined this with Critical Thinking; they folded them into other ILOs; some of them have rubrics like we did with our Communication ILO.
2. We used the SAILS test before; there are some benefits to using the SAILS test again—the drawback is that it costs money, so we would have to see if we have money in budget if we were to use this test again. The last time we used this test, it cost us \$4 per test and we spent approximately \$1,400. Now it costs \$5-\$6 per test. Russell S. asked Dr. Jean Shankweiler if we have the budget to spend to administer this test. She stated that she will check and will get back to Russell S. Joshua R. stated that it is a contract with the company who administers the test. Russell S. asked the ALC members if we want to use the SAILS test alone or do we want to add something to it.
3. Claudia S. stated that when we assessed this ILO in 2013, in addition to the SAILS test, we compiled a survey to see where faculty stood on Information Literacy, how faculty implemented Information Literacy. Jenny S. stated that it would be good to get data

from the 2013 survey in addition to the results of the 2013 SAILS test. Joshua R. stated that Irene Graff worked on this the last time so he will ask her.

4. This is our ILO assessment for next year (2018) and we are currently in the planning stages—the earlier we plan, the better chance of getting useful and meaningful results from the assessment. Fall 2017 semester is when we will start planning for this assessment and give the survey/test in Spring 2018 semester.

C. TracDat - Standard Met/Partially Met/Not Met – Janet Young

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. Janet Y. shared some examples from her Childhood Education program—examples showing that the final percentage came within 10% or less of the minimum Standard and Target for Success percentage. If we were to add ‘Partially Met’ selection in addition to ‘Met’ and ‘Not Met’, it would give us an indication of how many SLOs are very close to meeting the Standard and Target for Success.
3. Discussion:
 - Russell S. stated that from doing the assessment workshops, quite often, faculty have entered assessments where they almost made the Standard and Target for Success but because they fell a couple of percentages below, they have to enter ‘Standard Not Met’.
 - Some comments:
 - What difference does it make?
 - Doesn’t think ‘Partially Met’ serves a purpose; you either met your Standard of Success or you didn’t.
 - Could be a morale thing for the faculty assessing the SLOs.
 - It might send a positive message to the faculty.
 - ‘Partially Met’ could show more gradations for success.
 - This is the solution for that small group of faculty who may misinterpret what the goals are for SLOs/PLOs and are concerned about having to put ‘Not Met’ on their assessments; adding ‘Partially Met’ would make them feel better.
 - Claudia S. asked if the ACCJC looks at this data. Russell S. stated that anyone can look at our assessments since they are public information. Dr. Shankweiler stated that every ACCJC team is different; however, at the last ACCJC team she was on, they weren’t looking to see what the results were—they looked more into the fact that the SLOs are being assessed, they are getting results, that the work is being done and reports posted online. She stated that if we set a standard for the ‘Partially Met’, it would have to be within a certain percentage of the minimum Standard for Success. Jenny S. suggested 5%.
 - Janet stated that one thing that is missing in TracDat is any kind of quantitative data that we can capture; recommended adding a box to enter the overall percentage of the SLO results; Jenny S. stated that she proposed this at the last meeting so that we can enter the average of all SLO results from each section of a course.
4. Consensus of the ALC: No on the “Partially Met”; Yes on the percentage box.

D. Degree/Certificate Alignment Grids – Russell Serr

Last time we talked about the need to align courses to degrees and certificates.

1. Certificates are easy. You just take the courses that are required and put them on the grid and align them.

2. Degrees are a little bit more complicated because of General Education course requirements. Hoa P. looked at other colleges to see how they have done their alignment of courses to degrees.
3. Russell S. will play around with some certificate alignments over the summer and will put together some kind of model for aligning courses to certificates. For now, we will start with certificate alignment. Janet Y. stated that some certificate alignments (like Fine Arts) are more complicated because they have a lot of class choices in their certificates. Russell S. stated that Dipte Patel (Dean of Counseling) had talked about aligning with areas instead of the courses. He will talk to Dipte Patel again. If anyone has any ideas on how to do the Degree alignment, let Russell know.
4. Vince P. asked why we are doing this. Hoa P. stated that it was a recommendation from the ACCJC during their visit at the Compton campus. Russell stated that no one from the ACCJC has asked us to do this yet. However, we should be proactive.

E. Additional Information for Facilitators – Russell Serr

Russell S. gave out some information for the Facilitators who cannot be at the Facilitator Meeting tomorrow.

1. Russell S. will be distributing assessment status reports; for SLOs, we are close to 100% complete but for PLOs, we still have a long way to go so we need to encourage the faculty to get those assessments done because when they get uploaded to the website; you don't want your Course SLO or Program PLO to show as a blank report.
2. In a couple of the divisions, we have been asked to remove certain SLOs from the timeline because those courses have been inactivated when, in fact, they have not been "officially" inactivated—they may be courses that have not been taught in a long time or courses that are slated to be inactivated. If a course has not been taught in 3 years, it needs to be inactivated; if a course needs to be inactivated, faculty must go through the process of inactivation through their Division Curriculum Committee. Course SLOs cannot be removed from TracDat or the assessment timeline unless they have been officially inactivated by the College Curriculum Committee. He will go over the process of inactivating a course at the Facilitator Meeting.

III. Next meeting – May 22, 2017

Update: Meeting was cancelled.

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

SPRING 2017 ALC Meetings Mondays, 2:30 - 4:00 pm COMM 109	Facilitator Training Sessions Tuesdays 1:00 - 2:00 pm SS 119	TracDat "Working" Workshop: Entering SLO Assessments in TracDat Library Basement West	Deadlines
March 13 (LIB 202) April 17 May 8 May 22 (Cancelled)	March 14 April 18 (Cancelled) May 9 May 23		4-Year Timeline Worksheets (2017-2020) Due June 1, 2017

Attachments:

- Questionnaire for ILO (Community and Personal Development), DRAFT 3/15/2017 (2 pages)
- Information Literacy 2013 Assessment Report (6 pages), Rubric (1 page), and SAILS Test (1 page)