



Assessment of Learning Committee (ALC)

Monday, November 14, 2016

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

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

Recorder: Linda Clowers

Attendees:

Academic Affairs ECC – Linda Clowers
Compton Coordinator – Hoa Pham (Interim)
Inst. Research and Planning – Joshua Rosales
Behavioral and Social Sciences – Janet Young
Business – John Mufich
Fine Arts Associate Dean – Walter Cox

Health Sciences & Athletics – Russell Serr
Humanities – Kevin Degnan
Industry & Technology – Merriel Winfree & Bruce Tran
Library/LRU – Claudia Striepe
Mathematical Sciences – Susanne Bucher
Natural Sciences – T. Jim Noyes

Guest: Dr. Jean Shankweiler, VP of Academic Affairs

MINUTES

Call to Order: Meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m.

I. Approval of Minutes

John M. moved to approve the minutes for the 10/10/2016 ALC meeting; motion was seconded by Claudia S. Motion was carried.

II. Reports

A. Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) – Linda Clowers

1. Linda C. met with Idania Reyes regarding the timeline for the WAC project. She reported that Idania R. had recommended postponing the project until results from related pilot projects (e.g., Jason Suarez' project) have been analyzed, as the methodology of the WAC project might be informed by the results.
2. Jenny S. reported that she had consulted with Debra Breckheimer and Claudia Striepe, and they agreed to set dates to meet by next semester to further discuss future recruitment efforts in the meantime. Linda C. noted that Idania R. had also suggested that participants from the Suarez study might be potential recruits for the WAC project in the future.

B. Critical Thinking ILO (#1) Results – Jenny Simon (handout)

1. Jenny S. led a discussion based on a review of the DRAFT report of the Critical Thinking ILO (#1) which had been prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning and was included in the meeting packet.

2. Jenny S. identified that one of the notable assessment results was the lower pass rate for the *Analyze* and *Conclude* components of critical thinking (as assessed using the standardized scoring rubric). She noted that in response to these results the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) project might be adapted to facilitate improvement in students' critical thinking skills.
3. Jenny S. also highlighted the results related to disproportionate student performance as a function of race/ethnicity, reporting lower pass rates for African American students across all three of the components assessed (i.e., *Identify*, *Analyze*, *Conclude*). The committee discussed how the Student Equity Program (SEP) is currently targeting this student population and how the results from ILO #1 provides rationale for continued college-wide initiatives to address the equity gap.
4. Claudia S. mentioned that it was noted in a recent accreditation team meeting that ACCJC- accredited institutions are required to analyze and report disaggregated student learning outcomes data. Discussion ensued.
 - a. In response to comment and inquiry from John M. regarding the need to modify what/how student-level data are currently collected and stored, the committee engaged in discussion about the functionality of TracDat and other data management systems for supporting disaggregated data analysis. Based on explanations/demos from Nuventive meetings and conferences, Kevin D. and Linda C. commented on how labor intensive it would likely be to fully engage the features TracDat currently offers.
 - b. Russell S. confirmed that ECC is currently in compliance with the ACCJC standard, as disaggregated data are analyzed at the ILO level and by various academic programs (e.g., Radiologic Technology) which report to additional external regulatory agencies.
 - c. The committee engaged in further discussion regarding the collection and maintenance of student learning outcomes data (e.g., SLOs, PLOs) and agreed that a modified assessment protocol may be in order. Janet Y., Kevin D., John M., and Tom N. inquired about and/or shared their experiences with different systems and platforms (e.g., Canvas, Gradebook, eTudes).
 - d. The committee also discussed the potential advantages of incorporating SLO/PLO assessment data entry into one of the existing systems that faculty use to input student data (e.g., grades, attendance). The committee recommended exploring how other colleges manage their SLO/PLO data.
5. Jenny S. noted lower pass rates by students with disabilities than by economically disadvantaged students or the general population of students, and the committee discussed the incorporation of critical thinking components in Educational Development classes.
6. Joshua R. reported that the results yielded no significant difference in pass rates as a function of number of units completed. He noted, however, that the rubric had not been normed to account for differences in interpretation (e.g., a student's performance might be considered "exemplary" for an introductory course but only "proficient" for an advanced course).
7. The committee discussed challenges, limitations, and action planning related to the assessment of ILO #1:
 - a. Reported results were not based on raw rating score (0-Missing, 1-Developing, 2-Proficient, 3-Exemplary) but rather on Pass (rating of 2 or 3)/No Pass (rating of 1). Joshua R. noted that the average rating scores may yield different results than current report of percentage passing.

- a. There is no way to account for differences among raters in terms of what constitutes critical thinking at different levels of coursework (e.g., remedial courses, introductory courses, advanced courses)
- b. Committee discussed perhaps using a 4-point scale in the future to increase sensitivity to differences in performance.
- c. Committee members recommended pre-/post-test methodology in the future.
- d. Committee members acknowledged that it is difficult to identify themes in terms of the specific challenges students face related to critical thinking (e.g., faulty reasoning), as various assessment instruments were used. Jenny S. recommended following up with faculty to collect information about specific items on their assessments to clarify the nature of student challenges in critical thinking.
- e. Committee members discussed methodologies for analyzing the interaction between variables such as ethnicity and gender.
- f. Committee members agreed that the data from ILO #1 represents baseline data; they also discussed the identified standard for success (e.g., 70%).

C. Community and Personal Development ILO (#3) Discussion – Jenny Simon (handout)

1. Jenny S. led a review and discussion of the Community and Personal Development ILO (#3) handout that was included in the meeting packet.
 - a. Rows represent seven (7) categories aligned with the components of ILO #3
 - b. Columns represent: 1) survey data, and 2) campus data to be collected
 - c. Survey data from previous years' administration of SENSE and CCSSE surveys
 - d. Campus data to include but not be limited to the following: utilization rates, satisfaction data, data related to "transfer behavior," Ambassador program pre/post data
2. Joshua R. reported that he is researching how to access information regarding student voter registration.
3. Janet Y. inquired about the inclusion of data regarding student conduct issues (e.g., plagiarism, class disruption)
4. Russell S. reported that there is plenty of data available for ILO #3 and that he will meet with Robin D. to determine which data are most appropriate to include in the assessment. He will subsequently share this information with the committee.
5. Committee discussed the pros and cons of administering a brief student survey to provide additional data.
6. Jenny S. set a deadline of March 1, 2017 to have collected the data for ILO #3. She recommended subsequently sharing highlights from the preliminary data analysis, as was done during the April 8th meeting regarding ILO #1.

III. **Facilitator Meetings** – Russell Serr

- A. Russell S. reported that there will not be an SLO facilitators meeting on 11/15/16. During the next scheduled meeting, the group will discuss the development of a checklist to guide the process of changing SLO statements.

IV. **Other**

- A. Jean S. reported that the midterm accreditation report is due in March 2017. She noted that there are five (5) sections of the self-evaluation report that require follow-up by the committee so that progress can be reported in the midterm report. Jean S. recommended that a small writing committee be formed (e.g., Russell S., Jenny S., Joshua R., and Linda C.) to provide updates to her by the end of Fall 2016; she will forward to Linda C. the relevant

sections requiring update. Jean S. and Jeanie Nishime will fine tune the document when all updates have been compiled.

VI. Next meeting – November 28, 2016

VIII. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned.

FALL 2016 ALC Meetings Mondays, 2:30 to 4:00 pm Admin 131 September 12 October 10 November 14 November 28	Facilitator Training Sessions Tuesdays 1:00 to 2:00 pm Library West Basement, Rm. 19 September 13 October 11 November 29	TracDat “Working” Workshop: Entering SLO Assessments in TracDat Library Basement West	Deadlines Fall 2016 Assessments – March 3, 2017
--	--	---	--

Attachments:

- Handout: Draft of Critical Thinking ILO (#1) Results
- Handout: Community and Personal Development ILO (#3)