LAMC LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (LOAC)

December 3, 2013
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m., CC #4

AGENDA

1. Review of minutes of November 26, 2013 meeting
2. Student Survey on SLOs
3. Approval of LOAC Charter
4. Approval process for SLOs at LAMC and the process for updating and revising SLOs.
5. Questions for discussion regarding benchmarks and the process for ensuring quality assessments (see attached summary).
6. Accreditation and Measures of Quality (selected slides from a presentation to the California Association of Institutional Researchers (CAIR))
7. Discussion of sample assessments and rubrics
8. Next meeting – Date and Time: ___________________________
1. Review of minutes for November 19, 2013 meeting.

2. Discussion of draft of Student Survey on SLOs to be distributed next week.

The SLO survey will be distributed as a paper copy to instructors that want to volunteer. Members made suggestions on the wording for some of the questions. Par Mohammadian suggested that we add a question about how many units the students have taken at LAMC. Various philosophies and ideas regarding the survey were discussed in-depth. Further discussion centered on the distribution strategy and timing of the survey.

Marie Zaiens shared a handout on how she integrates the SLOs in her Developmental Communications class. Margie Long talked about how she reviewed the SLOs in her classes and how the outcome was very positive. Further discussion followed about how to educate and grow awareness and understanding of the SLOs, including how the SLOs specifically related to their classes.

3. Continuation of Review of LOAC Charter

Pat reviewed the ELAC responsibilities of the SLO facilitators at ELAC for consideration. Members made some suggestions for revising the Charter. There was discussion regarding members of the committee providing guidance to faculty in developing and analyzing assessments. Questions were posed and contemplated regarding responsibility for timeliness, feedback, and implementation of improvements as a result of assessments.

4. Sample Assessments and Rubrics for Discussion -
   (tabled until next time)

5. Next meeting – Tuesday, December 3, 3:00 – 4:30, CC#4

Pat checked with members to see if they could meet in January, once or twice. Most agreed they could.

*Mark Pursley mentioned that we should consider adding a student from ASO and/or ASO Advisor to the committee.

Adjourned: 4:00 p.m.

Deborah Paulsen, Recorder
Mission Statement:

The Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee's mission is to ensure that the college goes through an ongoing, systematic process that clarifies and improves achievement of Learning Outcomes at every level from institutional, program, and course through certificates and degrees with specific emphasis on student success. The Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee works with faculty and staff to ensure the methods of assessment of course SLOs (CSLOs), Service Area Outcomes (SAOs), Program and Division Learning Outcomes (PLOs), and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) are aligned and consistent across the College.

The Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee is sanctioned by the College Council and is a subcommittee of the Academic Senate. It works with the Student Support Services Committee and the Administrative Service Units and reports to the Academic Senate.

The Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee is charged with the following:

- Guide and support faculty and staff in facilitating outcome assessment.
- Assist in establishing a procedure for evaluating SLOs and SAOs to ensure continuous quality improvement on all levels: institutional, program, degree/certificate, and course level.
- Assist in establishing and maintaining an assessment schedule for all levels of outcome assessment: ILOs, PLOs, SLOs, and SAOs.
- Work with administration to ensure that outcome assessment assignments are completed on time.
- Provide colleagues with guidance, training, tools, rubrics, models and other resources that will assist them in SLO and SAO development and assessment.
- Assist faculty and staff in analyzing the results of assessment to implement changes that improve learning and services.
- (new) Provide qualitative feedback on the Learning Outcome process.
- Maintain open and frequent communications about SLO and SAO development and assessment with various college groups, including but not limited to the
Department chairs, Academic Division Deans, Curriculum Committee, Academic Senate, and the Office of Academic Affairs.

Committee Membership:
The committee is co-chaired by the SLO Coordinator and an administrator. Membership includes 1-2 faculty from each department, representatives from Academic Affairs, the Academic Senate, Curriculum Committee, Professional and Staff Development, Student Services, and Administrative Services, and the Associated Students Organization (ASO) Advisor and/or student representative.

Voting Rights:
Only faculty members are given voting rights. When there is more than one faculty or staff representative per department present, only one vote per department is allowed. The faculty co-chair does not have voting rights.

Reporting System:
The LOAC will report and make recommendations to the Academic Senate and work jointly with the Student Support Services Committee and the Administrative Unit areas. Outcomes Committee.

Membership Responsibility and Code of Conduct:
It will be the responsibility of every member of the Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee to attend each meeting and to adhere to the College Code of Conduct.
Approval Process for SLOs and Course Outlines of Record (CORs) at LAMC:

The SLO Coordinator reviews all Course Outlines of Record (CORs) before the COR is sent to the Technical Review Committee. The initial review involves reviewing the Course Description, Content and Objectives, and SLO section including the SLOs, Methods of Assessment, Criteria for Assessment, Benchmarks, and ILOs supported. After the Technical Review Committee's examination of the COR, it is then put on the agenda for discussion at the full Curriculum Committee meeting (twice a month). The COR is projected and all members review it again to be sure that notations made during the technical review have been appropriately responded to and all issues have been resolved. The COR is then either tabled because it needs more revision or it is approved. A list of all courses approved by the Curriculum Committee is sent for approval to the Senate and then the CORs are forwarded to the District for their final approval before going to the state.

SLO Revision Process:

SLOs are revised as needed by department chairs in conjunction with their discipline faculty and then forwarded to the SLO Coordinator for approval before being entered in the online SLO system.
Questions discussed at the District Student Learning Outcomes Advisory Committee (SLOAC) meeting on November 25, 2013

1) How is your school setting benchmarks for your Institutional Learning Outcomes?

**LAMC:** CSLOs have a default benchmark of 70% on the online SLO system which can be adjusted up or down by the department chair. Chairs are also can add comments in a textbox. SLOAC suggested that the same could be used for the ILOs.

**Harbor:** The SLO Coordinator sets the benchmark for the ILOs.

**West:** When instructors create an SLO, they create the benchmark level for that SLO. They have an annual poster session to assess their ILOs and they use a rubric to evaluate them.

**City:** City has not set any benchmarks. They plan to work on this in the spring.

2) What is the process at your school for looking at assessment results across all CSLOs to reach conclusions about overall learning performance? (See response to Question #3 below.)

3) How are you ensuring that quality assessments are being done?

**Mission:** Department chairs review the assessments in their department along with the SLO Coordinators. Previously, when they had academic deans, the deans also helped to review assessments and gave feedback to the department chairs.

**Harbor:** The SLO Coordinator is the quality control for assessments. They also use advisory committees with representatives from the Cal State system that review the quality of the assessments for all the offerings and provide a report.

**West:** The department chairs and deans are reviewing assessment data and are looking at discrepancies between student achievement data compared to the SLO data. Faculty have concerns about being evaluated based on their SLO data.

**City:** City plans to replicate Cabrillo’s process where the SLO committee reviews assessments and gives the campus feedback in a “State of the Union” type report. Feedback will include comments on the quality of assessments for all areas of the campus.
Accreditation and Measures of Quality

A Presentation to the California Association of Institutional Researchers (CAIR)

By

Dr. Barbara Beno, President ACCJC WASC
National Demands for “Improvements”

1. Improvements in student learning, and in their accumulated and demonstrated knowledge and skills upon completion – i.e., student competencies

2. Improvements in the number of completers

3. Improvements in the completion of diverse populations

4. Improvements in affordability through efficiencies, reduction in costs.
Accreditation and Assessment of Quality

- Most of the Accreditation Standards are about good practices that lead to effective institutional performance, and they include many requirements that institutions engage in self-assessment for purposes of knowing how well the institution is achieving its own mission and goals.

- Accreditation is moving from evaluation of process alone to evaluation of outcomes.
### College Benchmarks and Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011/2012</th>
<th>2012/2013</th>
<th>Meets Standard</th>
<th>Benchmark/Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Successful course completion rate (%)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fall-to-fall persistence rate (%)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Degree completion (total #)</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Transfer (total #)</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.a. UC/CSU Transfer #</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Certificate completion (total #)</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Licensure Pass Rate: Radiological Technology—National Exam</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Job Placement</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fall-to-spring persistence rate (%)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student success rates during their first year*</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Success in GE</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Success in DE</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Success in CTE</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Success in Pre-transfer</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Success in Non-CBET ESL</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. % of students placed in pre-transfer math that take pre-transfer math</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. % of students placed in pre-transfer English that take pre-transfer English</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. % of students place in pre-transfer reading that take pre-transfer reading</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. FTES (Total #)</td>
<td>4420</td>
<td>4402</td>
<td></td>
<td>4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. LOAD (Year)</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>504</td>
<td></td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1 through 7 are required by ACCJC and US Department of Education.
- Green indicates meeting the benchmark.
- ✓ indicates meeting the benchmark.
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Student Learning Outcomes (Competencies!)

Southern New Hampshire University
University of Northern Arizona
Western Governors University
Student Achievement and Student Learning

- Student Achievement measures are one aspect of Student Success but are not alone enough to assess educational quality.

- Student Learning Outcomes address another aspect – they indicate what knowledge, skills and abilities student have gained as part of their educational programs (i.e., competencies), and that they can demonstrate to employers and in further education.
Accreditation and Student Learning Outcomes (Competencies?)

- Accreditation Standards require institutions
  - to define intended student learning outcomes for courses, programs and certificates, and degrees
  - Assess student learning that occurs
  - Use the result to make improvements
- Student knowledge, skills and abilities are of concern to the public, and to legislators
- Student competencies are being assessed as a means of awarding degrees at some institutions
Student Learning Outcomes Measures (competencies)

- Course-level SLO assessment: # and % and examples of assessment results from program review,
- Program-level SLO assessment: # and % and examples of assessment results in program review, % of students demonstrating program competencies
- Institutional SLO assessment: # and %, % of students demonstrating institutional competencies
From Assessment to Improvement

- Assessment, or measurement of student achievement and student learning helps an institution know how well it is fulfilling its mission.
- The federal and national emphasis is now on producing more college completers, so improvement of institutional outputs is needed.