



EL CAMINO COLLEGE

Vice President – Academic Affairs

NOTES – November 26, 2012 Assessment of Learning Committee (ALC)

Present: K. Laureano, C. Mello, J. Young, C. Subramaniam, K. Hull, R. Williams, J. Noyes, J. Forbes, P. Fairchild, K. Whitney, H. Storms, S. Bartiromo, R. Serr, C. Striepe, F. Arce, J. Shankweiler, C. Pineda

- 1) Community and Collaboration Survey Update (Carolyn Pineda): Surveys went out in November. Sampled 4,000 students at ECC and 1,500 students at CEC. A reminder will be sent out before finals. It was suggested to leave the survey link open 2-3 weeks after the semester.
- 2) Restructuring the ALC (Janet Young and Chris Mello): Discussion was held regarding ALC meetings. Are they efficient? How successful are the data gathering methods we are using? How well do we gather data? Is it relevant and can we do a better job? How many surveys can we do? Are we really getting the information and data to make it successful and yield change as far as results?

The next core competency due for evaluation is Information and Technology Literacy.

Core Competency Expert Group Tasks:

- Recruit groups of experts of task force to review core competency.
- Task group can decide how often to meet.
- Task group to decide most efficient way to assess tools and analyze data.
- Group leader writes final report.
- Task group committee can consist of 4-5 people in each core competency.
- The expert group leader would be the organizer/leader and report monthly to ALC on progress.

The time commitment would be two semesters. If we have the task groups, one coordinator would attend initial meeting of task force. ALC is responsible to oversee timeline. Groups would report to them. If group meets once a month, hope that during the off week, the facilitators will be able to meet. Need to depend on committee to find people to do the task and motivate.

ALC can continue as they have been. If the idea does not work, a change can be made. Run a trial expert group and see how it connects with ALC meeting. ALC is not just used for proof reading but as an advisory capacity. Need to rely on ALC to direct the right people best suited for the job.

ALC is a large group, members are not necessarily experts in all areas, and need to find the right people to provide meaningful data. Some concerns about the proposed change of redesigning

the ALC: Not all divisions are represented on all subcommittees. Are faculty too busy? Do not reinvent the wheel. Will we lose continuity? Will they have too much power? What if it doesn't work?

J. Shankweiler suggested smaller subcommittees. Rotate as we are working. Go with the next group and one coordinator and select a member from ALC group. While second group is finishing, next group starts. Always have an overlap. We do not want to reinvent the wheel. ALC serves as a body to report. Provide an input group to report to once a month. Make sure all divisions are represented.

I. Graff suggested a trial run by having two groups instead of one group. Information and Technology Literacy is not as global as others. Do not make a decision with just one. Provide monthly report to ALC. Need experts on assessing context and knowledge. Find people that know how to assess.

The goal is finding people that have ideas we have not found.

The purpose of the task force is to find better ways to make public on knowledge and how it affects teaching. Compare with other campuses. Is there anything we can compare our results with? More reason to get more people interested. Use baseline data.

Questions to ALC committee:

- (1) Do you think this is a more efficient way to gather data and doing our business? Yes
- (2) Will it yield more meaningful data? Yes
- (3) How many people interested in serving along the way? Some raised hands.

Why are we changing? Spend a lot of time accepting task. We do not have all the expertise in the committee. Streamline to get things done without putting too much pressure on everyone.

The best way to analyze core competency, is to have we have experts to assess and present. We hope expert group format would solve the problem. Need to be clear how many expert groups there are and provide clear parameters. What kind of balance of members and leaders? Groups would have access to IR if they want to go survey route. Show groups what we have done. They would be adding and not reinventing.

Best strategy for recruitment for information and technology literacy to begin (fall 2013). Accept new model for spring semester with discuss modifications.

Core competency – Institutional SLOs. Will we confuse faculty now? If we change, we need to do it soon. SLO (Student Learning Outcomes), IAO (Institutional Assessment Outcome), PLO (Program Learning Outcomes). Need to track CurricUNET to see if change can be made. Recommendations will be presented at Academic Senate for discussion and if there are any objections.

C. Stripe and I. Graff are interested on serving Information and Technology Literacy. “Students locate, critically evaluate, synthesize, and communicate information in various traditionally and

new media format. Students understand the social, legal, and ethical issues related to information and its use.” Need to find another committee member in the CIS department.

Provide names to coordinators. Gather names and leaders will do the contact. Need to start at beginning of spring 2013. Clearly state what the expectations are. Do it in spring to administer core competency in the following fall. Forward names to coordinators and should be submitted a week prior to 12/10.

A short presentation by J. Young and K. Laureano will be presented at the Council of Deans on 11/29.

Need to reach out to CEC and utilize them. It was suggested to have one CEC rep for each group. Chelvi Subramaniam will discuss with R. Murray about finding someone from Business/CSI department. Two people are needed from ECC. Suggested names are: Rica Young, Francine Vasilomanolakis, and possibly a CIS faculty member.

III. Newsletter. Include our goals and positive reinforcement that faculty are doing a good job.