



Assessment of Learning Committee (ALC)

Monday, September 11, 2017

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

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

Recorder: Isabelle Peña

Attendees:

Academic Affairs – Linda Clowers

Compton Coordinator – Hoa Pham

Deans' Representative – Walter Cox

Business – Ana Milosevic & Evan Hess

Fine Arts – Vince Palacios

Health Sciences and Athletics – Russell Serr

Humanities – Kevin Degnan

Industry & Technology – Merriel Winfree & Bruce Tran

Mathematical Sciences – Susanne Bucher

Inst. Research & Planning – Joshua Rosales

Compton Division 1 – Hoa Pham

MINUTES

Call to Order: Meeting was called to order at 2:45 p.m.

I. A. Approval of Minutes

Russell S. moved to approve the minutes for the 5/08/2017 ALC meeting; motion was seconded by Kevin D. Motion was carried.

II. Reports

A. Spring/Summer 2017 Assessment Status Update – Russell Serr

1. The most current SLO and PLO Assessment Status Summaries for each division were distributed to the ALC members. Deadline for Spring/Summer 2017 assessments is this Friday, September 15, 2017. Assessment entries are getting done but there is still a lot to be entered. We have a long way to go, especially with the PLOs.
2. Isabelle P. will run another report next Monday, September 18th, so that the most current summary report can be included in the submittal to Academic Senate at their meeting scheduled on Tuesday, September 19th.
3. ALC members and facilitators were being asked to encourage faculty to get their assessments in this week. Russell S. and Jenny S. are available to help, if facilitators cannot meet with them or help them.

B. Community and Personal Development ILO – Jenny Simon

(PowerPoint presentation & handouts)

1. Jenny discussed the data that were on the handouts that were distributed at the meeting.
 - a. The first handout is a table showing utilization data obtained from the deans and directors of various programs on campus (i.e. she asked them how many students

- use their services). She also looked at the ECC annual factbook to see how many students attended ECC for each year.
- b. The second handout shows the data of the Student Survey that were given to students at the end of Spring 2016 semester. Random sections were targeted for this survey. Everyone who answered that they used the services seemed satisfied with that program/service. Students answered “Neutral” if they didn’t use the program or service. There are very few that were below “Neutral” throughout the survey.
 - There was discussion regarding how PLO assessments are aligned with ILOs; Vince stated that since we can take SLO data and use that to assess a PLO that the SLOs align with, why can’t we use the PLO assessment data to assess the ILOs rather than creating more rubrics? Jenny that this is a problem and that we are working on being able to take PLO data and it might be the “Percentage box” that we are adding in the TracDat results area that may help us to get PLOs feeding into ILOs. The problem with this ILO is that it doesn’t really align with courses; even though there are some courses that align with this ILO, it is more service-related. Vince P. stated that for those courses that align with this ILO, we can see how services affect those courses and the effectiveness of those programs and services along the context of the PLO and SLO of the course.
 - Linda C. stated that moving forward, alignment grids will make a big difference; it needs to go back to our statements so we do have better alignment from course SLO to PLO and PLO to ILO. When we revise the statements, we can better align them.
 - May have another meeting to get data in another (better) format
 - c. The third handout included data from the SENSE and CCSSE (national) student surveys. SENSE is for incoming students and CCSSE is for any community college student. 291 students were surveyed.
 - For those answers showing “Missing”, we can assume that the students did not answer if they did not use the program.
 - Linda C. stated that those who used the programs stated that they were satisfied with them. The most interesting thing is that of 25 of the 29 programs, 45% or more of the students answered that they never utilized the services. Jenny S. clarified that this does not include the specialized services like Veterans Affairs, Foster and Kinship, etc. Russell S. pointed out that as an example, the percentage of students who want to transfer to a four-year college is really high, but yet on the survey, the percentage of students using the Transfer Center is low.
 - Compared to other colleges, we offer quite a bit of programs and services. What is it that is keeping our students from utilizing these services? Is it a “student culture” thing (i.e. they don’t ask for help because it makes it look like they can’t do it themselves)? We need to look into what is the help-seeking culture around here? How do we need to advertise these programs and services?
 - Merriel W. stated that in vocational studies in the Industry and Technology area, a lot of these students use the programs on campus. Perhaps students on the academia side are not aware of the services that are available on campus? Linda C. agreed that certain student populations may be more exposed to and be more likely to avail themselves of the resources on this campus. Russell S. stated that we don’t know if the students know about these services or do they

simply just not use them? Are the programs and services being advertised enough? Are we really reaching out to that student in need?

- Satisfaction surveys: Coordinators chose not to collect this data since it would add to an already heavy load of data already being collected; however, many of the programs and services do satisfaction surveys since they are part of their program review.
 - Linda C. stated that this ILO is just too broad; it tries to capture too many things that you can't really put your arms around it in a meaningful way. Based on this assessment process, it might make more sense to separate the statements out.
 - The one thing that came out of this assessment process is: What action do we want to take moving forward? There are a couple of actions that we can propose as a group: (1) Perhaps we make recommendations to programs/services based on the assessment results, and (2) assessing student help-seeking culture on campus.
2. There are these benchmarks that Jenny S. shared on Flex Day, which are compilations of questions from the national student survey called SENSE that are averaged out; not sure all these benchmarks are relevant for this ILO but we can take a look at these for our analysis. There is also a section called Social and Academic Support, which we might be able to feed into our assessment.

C. TracDat Changes – Russell Serr

1. Assessment Results section:
 - a. The 'Reviewers' Comments' box is not being used the way it was intended. We are going to remove it.
 - b. We are going to add a field called 'Percentage Met' so it will be there for the next round of assessments. This is optional, but may be useful data for gathering PLO data. ALC agreed to keep this optional for now and see how many faculty members use this. Over time, this might be useful to add in the PLO Results section but for now, this field will just be in the SLO assessment results section.
2. Linda C. informed the ALC that TracDat is changing their branding. 'TracDat' will be changing its name to 'Nuventive Improve' when they update to the next version. The appearance will have a new look but the general structure of the software will stay the same. We are not going to upgrade yet until a couple of weeks after the deadline due date for the Spring/Summer 2017 assessments.
3. Hoa P. informed the ALC that the Compton campus is looking at 4 different software companies to replace TracDat for assessments and will be testing the software they select. Irene Graff from Institutional Research suggested that a few people from ECC be involved in the pilot phase of this new software and try it for a semester or two, to see what ECC thinks about the software. Hoa will send Russell and Jenny the names of the ones that Compton is considering.

D. SLO/PLO Assessments – Russell Serr
(Handouts)

1. Before the 4-column assessment reports go into the website, Russell S. reviews the reports to make sure they are complete and he found that there are common omissions in the SLO/PLO reports.
2. Russell S. found that some of the PLO assessments are lacking in meaningful content and that faculty is just using course assessments because they don't have anything else planned or they did the PLO assessment at the last minute. He suggests starting on the PLO assessments early.

3. Actions: Russell S. suggests trying to list actions that are meaningful.
4. Follow Ups: There are a lot of Follow Ups that are not being done.
5. Isabelle P. stated that she can run an Action and Follow Up ad hoc report to keep track of which Action and Follow Up items need to be completed.
6. Russell S. suggests designating a lead person for an SLO or PLO assessment.
7. Russell S. suggests that SLO/PLO assessment reviews should be part of the agenda for Division Council meetings.
8. Linda C. recommend having a dedicated meeting to discuss these items; either specific to the course or general SLO and PLO assessment meetings.
9. Russell S. stated that another issue is when an adjunct faculty enters an assessment for a course and puts in an action item and action date but then another part-time faculty teaches that same course the next semester(s) and is not aware of the Action Item for that course.
10. Assign feature worked for a while but not sure if it is still working. Isabelle P. will test this feature to see if it still works.
11. A lot of discussion for these topics so Jenny S. suggested we will table this for now and discuss again at the next meeting.

III. Next meeting – October 9, 2017

IV. Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

FALL 2017 ALC Meetings	Facilitator Training Sessions	TracDat “Working” Workshop: Entering SLO Assessments in TracDat	Deadlines
Mondays, 2:30 - 4:00 pm COMM 109	Tuesdays 1:00 - 2:00 pm SS 119	Library Basement West	Spring/Summer 2017 Assessments Due
September 11 October 9	September 12 October 10 (Cancelled)		September 15, 2017
November 13 November 27	November 14		

Attachments:

- SLO & PLO Assessment Summaries – 9/11/2017 (4 pages)
- Community and Personal Development ILO (5 pages)
- Common Omissions in SLO and PLO assessment reports (2 pages)
- SLO PLO Infographic (2 pages)