



Assessment of Learning Committee (ALC)

Monday, October 13, 2014

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

SLO Coordinators: Russell Serr and Karen Whitney

Recorder: Isabelle Peña

Attendees:

Academic Affairs ECC – Bob Klier
Dean's Representative – Jean Shankweiler
Behavioral & Social Sciences – Janet Young
Business – Kurt Hull
Fine Arts – Vince Palacios & Harrison Storms
Fine Arts Associate Dean – Diane Hayden
Humanities – Argelia Andrade

Industry & Technology – Sue Ellen Warren
Industry & Technology Associate Dean – Daniel Shrader
Mathematical Sciences – Susanne Bucher
Natural Sciences – (Thomas) Jim Noyes
Inst. Research & Planning – Joshua Rosales
Library/LRU – Claudia Striepe
Compton Rep – Kendahl Radcliffe

Guests: Dr. Francisco Arce, Vice President of Academic Affairs
Preston Reed, Institutional Research and Planning

MINUTES

I. Call to Order

Meeting was called to order at 2:37 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes

Bob K. moved to approve the minutes for the 9/22/2014 ALC meeting and the motion was seconded by Daniel S. Motion was carried.

III. Reports

A. Spring/Summer 2014 SLO and PLO Assessments (Bob Klier)

1. We are at 98% completion of inputting assessments into TracDat; Bob K. will collaborate with Isabelle P. to get the latest accurate list of programs that are still not entered in TracDat and he will contact the various divisions to get the status of those incomplete assessments.
2. We have done very well with entering assessments; the ACCJC visiting team was looking through TracDat and our SLO website for the reports and two of the members had positive comments about our reports.

B. Missing 3rd Week Report (Russell Serr)

Facilitators were supposed to turn in a 3-week report of classes that were cancelled for this semester; Russell S. reminded the ALC members and facilitators that if they still have not turned in the report, to do so as soon as possible to Bob K. or Isabelle P. so that those courses/SLOs that are scheduled to be assessed in Fall 2014 can be revised with a different timeline.

C. ILO Bullets - Discussion Board (Russell Serr)

Due to the hectic schedule everyone has had recently to prepare for the ACCJC visit, the coordinators and Isabelle P. have not been able to create the ILO Bullets discussion board on the MyECC portal. This will be done this week and the link will be sent to ALC reps and facilitators to post their input and suggestions for discussion at the next meeting.

D. Missing information on assessments (Russell Serr)

Russell S. noticed that, in looking at some of the PLO assessments reports entered on TracDat, some information are missing—mainly the actions and action dates are missing from the reports. He asked the ALC reps and facilitators to look at the SLO and PLO reports and fix the ones that have missing information or information entered in the wrong areas.

E. Senate Report (Karen Whitney – PowerPoint presentation)

1. Karen W. gave an update of what is happening in the Academic Senate in relationship to SLOs; one thing the Senate Executive Committee has been talking about since the contract was amended and in looking at the current contract language, there wasn't any true parallel between the language used for evaluation of the instructional faculty compared to non-instructional faculty—a change was made in the evaluation procedure of non-instructional faculty where they have to “effectively participate in Service Area Outcome process”. Several Senate members discussed the potential problems with the word “effectively”—i.e. it is very subjective and who decides what is effective and what is not; they thought it would be better if it was more specific, and at the very least, that the two evaluation processes were more parallel in the language used; they met with the ECC Federation of Teachers and proposed some language changes for the next round of contract negotiations.
2. For any concerns, input, and/or comments regarding this issue, ALC members can e-mail their thoughts, comments, recommendations, etc. to Karen W. and Claudia S.

F. ACCJC Visitation (Bob Klier)

1. Dr. Arce made a short visit to congratulate the ALC for their good work. 6 years ago, there were issues with a lot of areas that fall under Academic Affairs. This time, it's a different story; all the work that has been done in the college has paid off—everyone has worked together and there has been great collaboration between administration and faculty and the work of the ALC has gone beyond all expectations. He thanked everyone for all their hard work—all the effort and contributions of the facilitators, the coordinators, and Bob Klier for working with everyone, being focused and keeping everyone on-track. Karen W. stated that it was all a collaborative effort—a lot of work was accomplished all over the campus. Jean S. also mentioned that in addition to not getting recommendations, ALC also got commendations for the Assessment for Learning Committee and the Curriculum Committee. For the ALC, Bob K. stated that the commendation was for their strong work with Student Learning Outcomes at the Course, Program and Institutional levels. Jean S. stated that we met their standards but there were 10 things that we still needed to fix before the mid-term report.
2. ALC met with ACCJC on Tuesday; Bob K. thinks we responded very well to their questions and had good dialogue with the visiting team.
 - Bob K. stated that we assess the General Education Outcomes (GEOs) at the course level and that we are not going to add another layer of GEOs; we are going to use the ILOs to assess the General Education areas.
 - ACCJC liked the example reports the ALC showed them.
 - Bob K. thanked everyone for all their hard work.

IV. **Assessment Sample Sizes**

Handout: Sampling for the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Preston Reed from Institution Research and Development was invited by the Coordinators to make a presentation on Sample Size and what would be some recommendations for Sample Sizes.

- Generally speaking, there are a lot of different recommendations, but what he tried to do is list some of these guidelines but does not want to make these a “one size fits all” for everyone.
- The larger the sample size is usually the better, but also consider different restraints one might have, e.g. feasibility, available time of instructor doing the assessment.

- Minimum recommendation is 10 students or 10% of the population of interest, whichever is greater. This is a recommendation, not an absolute.
- Different types of sampling, e.g. simple random sampling, stratified sampling, etc. (refer to attached handout).
- Russell S. asked what the best way is to get a random sample. Preston R. directed the committee to a website listed under “Simple Random Sampling” (refer to attached handout).
- In choosing a sample, the goal is to get as representative of the population as possible. If you’re sampling the entire population, it’s a Census, not a Sampling.
- Kurt H. asked if we are using this for our SLO assessments; Bob K. answered yes; Argelia A. shared that this is very helpful for a single faculty who teaches several sections and there is a very large number of students.
- Vince P. asked why would he select a random amount when it would be better to use all of the students’ results? Karen W. stated that it depends the type of assessment; there are certain areas where random sampling works better.
- Preston will send the Word document version of this attachment to Isabelle to upload to the SLO website as a resource.

V. Adjunct Faculty Involvement

- A. Karen W. shared documents and information that she has received from other facilitators/deans/ALC Reps regarding best practices for training adjunct faculty in general; she wanted the committee to keep in mind anything that they can use to focus on training adjunct faculty. She showed one video Tracdat training tutorial that Kevin Degnan (Humanities) sent her, which is one of a few video tutorials he created and used for training the faculty in his division. The coordinators liked these videos and Kevin D. has agreed to let us use them on the SLO website as a resource for faculty. She shared a handout that Diane H. showing a 5 easy step process which could be used by any faculty but can streamline the whole process for adjuncts (i.e. “this is what is expected of you...”).
- B. Janet Young shared the faculty census that she conducted and surveyed the entire faculty in the Behavioral and Social Sciences Division. What she found is that the two departments in her division that are struggling and don’t have their SLO assessments done in time is where the full-time faculty do not go over the SLO process with their adjunct/part-time faculty.
- C. Karen would like to have an e-mail committee to put together a packet based on what other faculty have done that could be provided to divisions as an example of ways to reach out to adjunct faculty; this committee will not meet; just exchange ideas over e-mail; Janet Y. joined the committee.

VI. Communication ILO Assessment – Advisory Committee

- A. Russell S. is still putting together information from the alignment grids to see which PLOs align with the Communication ILO; will put this off until this information is gathered.
- B. There still have been no volunteers for this Advisory Committee, but because of time constraints, they will put together an Advisory Committee at the next meeting, hopefully with a few people from the ALC and some recommendations for people outside the ALC.

VII. PLO Norming Session

Handout: Quality PLO Assessment Checklist and 4-Column Unit Assessment Report for Developmental Math PLOs

- A. A sample of the PLO Assessment 4-Column report for Developmental Math was distributed to the committee for the norming session. SLO coordinators wanted to take different reports from different divisions to give facilitators an idea of what is in TracDat to compare what is a good report vs. one that

is not. Due to time constraints, however, only PLO #3 for Developmental Math was discussed at this meeting. The members were asked to rate/vote on each of the PLO sample criteria below with (1) Outstanding, (2) Above Average, (3) Average, (4) Below Average, or (5) Poor.

1. Completion
2. Target
3. Data with Analysis
4. Action Plan

B. After each vote, the committee discussed why each area received certain ratings. The following are the results of the norming session ratings for Developmental Math PLO #3:

1. Completion:
Outstanding - 36%; Above Average - 21%; Average - 21%; Below Average - 21%; Poor - 21%
2. Target:
Outstanding - 14%; Above Average - 43%; Average - 36%; Below Average - 7%; Poor - 0%
3. Data with Analysis:
Outstanding - 0%; Above Average - 9%; Average - 38%; Below Average - 38%; Poor - 15%
4. Action Plan:
Outstanding - 0%; Above Average - 8%; Average - 42%; Below Average - 42%; Poor - 8%
(What is entered under "Action Plan" should be entered in the "Analysis and Data" section.)

VIII. New Discussion

Daniel S. had questions for the committee, that have come up in the Industry and Technology area, regarding the way they are coming up with the SLOs and the way they are doing the assessments. He wanted to get the committee's feedback and is looking for some kind of structure or guideline that is workable and make it sustainable, so that they can inform their faculty, especially since some of their programs have a 2-year review vs. a 4-year review.

A. *When is a good time to change an SLO statement?*

- Karen W. stated that we should wait until the end of the semester to change an SLO statement, taking into account any and all of the research so that there's enough time to make sure everyone knows, before the beginning of the next semester, that there has been a change; Jim N. stated the discussion of the data can be included in the reasoning for changing the SLO statement.
- Bob K. added that it should not be a single faculty member pushing to change a statement—there should be conversation with other faculty in that program and since we're sharing statements with Compton, it needs to be reviewed by Compton faculty as well—it shouldn't happen overnight; that is why changes to SLO statements should go through the division's facilitator(s) so they can double-check to make sure everyone is in agreement.
- Janet Y. also stated that an SLO statement should not be changed in the semester that it is being assessed; however, it is okay to change an SLO statement if that SLO is not being assessed during that semester that the change is being made.
- Kurt H. commented that this happened in the Business Division last semester where there was one instructor who was changing the SLO statements mid-semester and not telling anyone about them; it is a one-person department with a few instructors teaching within that department, and it became a huge problem when the faculty, when assessing their courses, would ask who changed the SLOs mid-stream and didn't tell them about it. So the dean took over and made it a departmental function—if an SLO needed to be changed, it should include the data from one semester and it needs to go through a formal approval (should include some communication and conversation between the departmental faculty and the dean and the facilitator about the old SLO vs. the new SLO).
- Daniel S. wanted to see if there is a process, but it seems that each division has a different process; Jean S. shared that the Natural Sciences Division has a Division SLO Committee which approves the

changes and this might be something that Industry and Technology might want to do if they want to have a formal process. Jim N. stated that departmental meetings are when SLO statement changes should be discussed. Daniel S. suggested that for a one-person department, this discussion should possibly be done with the dean.

- B. *Faculty uses data the semester before for assessment done in the current semester so that they can get their assessments done on time and not miss the deadline.*

Russell S. stated that assessments are due three weeks into the semester following the semester the assessment was done so he believes this is ample time for faculty to use data from the current semester of assessment. For example, if an SLO is scheduled for a Fall 2014 assessment, the assessment should be done in Fall 2014 and the deadline for entering the data and analysis would be 3 weeks into the Spring 2015 semester.

- C. *How do you create a base level or a baseline to establish what students know before they start the class so that when you assess them at the end of the class, you know what they have accomplished?*

Daniel S. stated that their division does not have baselines set into their formal assessment process. Should he talk to faculty about creating baseline tests to give to students at the beginning of the course to see what they know or what kind of skills they have at that point, and then giving a similar test mid-semester to see how much a student has learned? Karen W. stated that it makes a lot of sense in Industry and Technology to do this because of the skills required or being taught in their programs. However, she doesn't believe it should be mandated to be a standard for the campus as it does not work in other divisions. Jim N. agreed and stated that in some cases it makes sense to do these baseline assessments, but in other cases it does not. Preston R. suggested considering the use of idea of "Practice Effect".

VIII. Next meeting – October 27, 2014

IX. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

FALL 2014 ALC Meetings Mondays, 2:30 to 4:00 pm Admin 131	Facilitator Train-the-Trainer Sessions Tuesdays 1:00 to 2:00 pm DE 162 or Library West Basement, Rm. 19	TracDat 101 Training Library Basement West	Upcoming Deadlines
September 8, 2014 September 22, 2014 October 13, 2014 October 27, 2014 November 24, 2014 December 8, 2014	October 14, 2014 November 25, 2014 December 2, 2014	Thursday, September 25, 2014, 1-2pm Wednesday, October 22, 2014, 3-4pm Friday, November 14, 2014, 1-2pm "Working" Workshop: Entering SLO Assessments into TracDat Library Basement West Friday, December 5, 2014, 1-2pm Wednesday, December 10, 2014, 3-4pm Thursday, December 11, 2014, 1-2pm	Fall 2014 Assessments - February 9, 2015



Sampling for the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Below is an overview of key sampling concepts along with several recommendations for those seeking to assess Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs). It is unlikely that there is one right answer to the sample size or technique that should be used, but we hope that these recommendations and notes for consideration will guide you as you conduct your assessments.

Census vs. Sampling

Assessing the entire population is called a **census**, whereas assessing a smaller subset of the population is called a **sample**.

Key considerations

When deciding whether to conduct a census or collect a sample, or when deciding how large your sample should be, there are several key items to consider.

1. **Class or program sizes** – If the program or course has a small number of students, it may be best to conduct a census. However, if there are a large number of students in the target population, a sample may be best.
2. **Length and complexity of artifacts** – If the artifact assessed is relatively short or easy to score, then it may be feasible for a larger number of students to be assessed. However, assessing some artifacts may be more time consuming due to length, necessity to norm grading scales, other factors, or some combination thereof.
3. **Size of the faculty panel reviewing artifacts** – The number of faculty members reviewing artifacts can have a large impact on the number of students that can feasibly be assessed. If the artifact is short and easy to assess, then fewer faculty members would be needed to assess a large number of students.

Sample size recommendations

In general, when attempting to obtain an accurate estimate of a population, the larger the sample, the better the estimate. However, the factors noted above can impact the feasibility of obtaining a large sample of students. Our recommendation is to aim for as large of a sample as is reasonable.

Recommended minimum sample sizes

Despite the desire to recruit and assess the entire student body within the program, this may not be feasible. Therefore, we are providing general guidelines for the minimum number of students that should be sampled. **At minimum, we recommend that a sample consist of 10 students, or 10% of the population of interest, whichever is greater.**

Sample selection techniques

Below are some brief descriptions of some common sampling techniques as well as some things to consider when choosing a sample selection technique (more info here:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Sampling_techniques).

Simple random sampling – Sampling is done by randomly selecting a certain number of students or artifacts. Each student or artifact has an equal chance of being selected. With a large enough sample size, this technique may give the greatest confidence in generalizing to the population. Here is a useful tool for selecting students at random: <http://www.random.org/lists/>. You can paste in a list of student names, click “randomize,” then select the top 10 (or 15, or 20, etc.) students.

Stratified sampling – Students or artifacts are sorted into specific subgroups (e.g., by gender, ethnicity, major, day vs. evening, etc.), then a random sample is selected from each group. This may be a useful tool for when you want to ensure that certain groups are represented in your sample.

Systematic sampling – You select students based on a pre-determined order. For example, select every n^{th} (e.g., 3rd, 5th, 10th) student or artifact from a list. This approach may be more feasible than simple random sampling. However, it is important to consider how the order of students or artifacts may impact your findings.

Cluster sampling – Groups or clusters (typically classes or sections), and then all students within that cluster are evaluated. This approach may be useful when the assessment is best administered to an entire section rather than random students. However, it is important to consider the variation that can happen between different sections and instructors.

A note on convenience sampling – Convenience sampling is when a sample of students or artifacts is based on those who may volunteer or respond to a survey. Sometimes, this is the only way we can obtain responses. However, it is always important to consider that there may be important differences between those who agree to participate and those who don't. This should be considered when asking students to complete surveys or assessments, or if only a few faculty volunteer to have SLO assessments incorporated into their course curriculum. These differences may impact your ability to generalize your findings to the population of interest.

Considerations

When choosing a sampling strategy, it is always important to consider what implications the strategy may have on your ability to generalize your findings to the rest of the population. This should also be balanced with issues of feasibility. For example, whereas a simple random sampling of students may give us the best chance of generating a representative sample, there may be issues of access or sample size.

Whenever possible, we recommend comparing key demographics of the students sampled to the population of interest (at the course, program, or other level) to get an estimate of how representative the sample population may be.