LAMC LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (LOAC)

February 19, 2014
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m., CC #4

AGENDA

1. Review and approval of minutes of February 4, 2014 meeting

2. Mission College Learning Report – Dr. Matthew Lee

3. Curriculum Addendum to the COR for updating SLOs
   Discussed at the Curriculum Committee meeting on 2-18-14

4. Assessment of the Information Competency ILO and schedule for the next assessment of the other six ILOs

5. Updates in the SLO online system
   Each PLO is now linked with the supporting SLOs.

6. Winter Intersession Student Survey on SLOs/PLOs/ILOs
   - The student survey was distributed to 40 Winter Intersession faculty Friday, January 31
   - 38 packets were returned, almost 900 students responded.
   - Analysis of data

7. Schedule of meeting times for the spring semester

8. Next meeting – Date and Time: ________________________________
Present: Co-Chair, Pat Flood, Stephen Brown, Robert Crossley, Patricia Chow, Par Mohammadian, Nina More, Monica Moreno, Riye Park, Deborah Paulsen, Jolie Scheib, Debbie Wong, Marie Zaiens, Louie Zandalasini

1. Review of minutes of January 28, 2014 meeting

2. Final approval of LOAC Charter
   Deborah Paulsen moved to approve the LOAC Charter, seconded by Stephen Brown. It was unanimously approved.

3. Student Survey on SLOs
   - The Student SLO Survey was distributed to all Winter Intersession faculty (40 sections) Friday, January 31 and is due Monday, February 10.
   - Academic Affairs will assist with keeping track of which instructors return the survey packets.
   - We will discuss the results at the next meeting.
   - It was suggested that we ask the instructors that distributed the surveys if there were any questions/confusion regarding the survey.
   - Some suggestions were made for the survey questions for the next time. All agreed that this pilot survey will help raise awareness and generate discussion.
   - The process for distribution of the spring survey was briefly discussed. It was suggested that we possibly use a random section selection for a number of paper surveys and distribute the rest online.

4. Summary of conference call discussion points with LAMC consultant Dr. Matthew Lee
   - A summary section will be added to the Spring 2014 Chairs' Summary reports about the number of SLOs/PLOs assessed, were benchmarks met or not met (If not met, is there a process in place to help students achieve them next time?), highlights of improvements made and changes planned, and a reflection on what has been learned.
   - The Accreditation Steering Committee is planning to have the LAMC follow-up report for the ACCJC completed by 2/13.
   - Sarah Master, Deborah Paulsen, Pat Flood, and Dr. Lee will meet with LAMC's web developer Nick Minassian on Thursday, February 6, about some of the additional information that would be helpful to have on the online SLO system; for example, in addition to the rubric average, it would be helpful to know the (1) proportion of students who have reached the benchmark, (2) the total number...
and percentage of assessments that have been submitted, and (3) how many courses and PLOs have had at least one SLO/PLO assessed. The same is true for the service area outcomes (SAOs). LAMC has over 1,200 course SLOs.

- Debby Wong mentioned that Math usually does an attachment as its assessments are very extensive. We need to be sure these assessments are counted. Debby said she will discuss this with Tigran in the Math Department.

5. **Highlights and discussion of Chairs' Fall Semester Reports**

- Pat stated that almost all SLO/PLO reports have been turned in; only one department has not completed the report, however, they are the largest department in the school and they have reported that they are almost done. CSIT assessment results also were not included as part of the Math/CSIT Department report.

- The Chairs’ Assessment Reports will be posted on the SLO Web page under “Assessments and Reports” and the two-page summary will be sent to all faculty and staff for further discussion at Council of Instruction and the Academic Senate.

- LOAC members reviewed a two-page bulleted summary of the Chairs’ reports. Members commented that the work done had been extensive, much value had been obtained from the assessments, and meaningful improvements have been made as a result.

- Some problems with the present online system was discussed: individual courses are mapped to PLOs, but we do not know which specific SLOs support which PLO. Another issue brought up was that when we do a roll-up assessment, we need to capture the students that are actually in the programs and find the different ways that we can identify them, such as through a capstone course. We can identify students that have taken a particular sequence of courses, such as anatomy and physiology to show that they are a biology major, but in other areas, it is more difficult to identify the majors.

- It was mentioned that we should look at defining an assessable student for a PLO and leave it up to the department to identify students enrolled in the major. Some students do not identify their majors, yet take many units in the discipline.

- ESL doesn’t have a degree or PLOs; however, they do offer a sequence of courses. It was suggested that they consider using a capstone course to assess the sequence keeping in mind the overarching outcomes of what they want students to achieve.

- The comment was made that some students may have a different set of objectives and educational plan. The question was asked, “Can we get access to education plans from counseling?”
• Deborah Paulsen mentioned that we can send messages directly to discipline students using Blackboard Connect and that Nick Minassian can set this up for a department chair.

6. **Recommended trainings for the Spring 2014 semester?**

The question was asked, “For Spring Professional Development, what do people want help with?” The following suggestions and comments were made: training at different hours for adjuncts. Start with the philosophy; then give an overview of the system as a refresher for both day and evening instructors. Par’s PowerPoint presentation on the SLO system is very good. We need to emphasize the improvement plan. A video and PowerPoint would be good. Most adjuncts feel empowered by the assessment because it means they get a voice in decisions. Pat requested that members ask their departments and areas what their faculty/staff would like for additional training.

7. **Summary of LAMC’s First Annual SLO Summit**
   (See January 28 packet of materials)

Pat mentioned that the summary of the evaluation of LAMC’s First Annual SLO Summit was included in the January 28 packet of materials and asked members to review it.

   (Tabled due to time)

9. **Next meeting – Date and Time:** Wed. Feb. 19, 3:00-4:30 p.m.
   A survey for common meeting times for the semester will be sent by Marie Zaiens.

Adjourned 3:07 p.m.

Recorder: Deborah Paulsen
Excerpts Related to the Mission Learning Report

Page 17

d) Mission Learning Report

i) By the end of Spring 2014, in consultation with OIE, SLOAC should develop and implement a system for preparing and effectively disseminating an annual report on Mission's overall progress in improving student learning at all levels through the outcomes cycle—a Mission Learning Report. (The Report should also include sections on institutional standards for student achievement and learning; see page 21.) Using the new system reporting capabilities recommended above, the Department Chairs’ semester reports, and other sources as needed, the Report should at a minimum summarize the results of learning outcomes assessments at course, program, and institutional levels; all improvements planned on the basis of those results; resources allocated and improvements actually implemented during the following year; and subsequent reevaluations of performance. At the institutional level, it should include the contributions of Student Services and Administrative Services through progress on their SAOs. Each subsequent year, if feasible and useful, the Report might include a comparison with the previous year’s data.

ii) The College Council, EPC, Student Support Services Committee (SSSC), Technology Committee, Facilities Committee, and SLOAC at minimum should review the Mission Learning Report annually. In particular, each of the first five bodies (and any other body responsible for a major institutional plan) should incorporate substantive consideration of the Report, including both sets of standards and baselines and the most recent available assessment results, into its deliberations on updating the plan for which it is responsible. It should then ensure that at least one goal in each annual update of that plan (with accompanying measurable objectives) focuses explicitly on facilitating improvements in student achievement and learning outcomes. Each body, in consultation with OIE, should develop metrics to measure the effects on student learning (in relation to the standards) that are attributable to pursuit of that goal and objectives, rigorously assess progress every year, recommend improvements based on the results, and then, the next year, reevaluate progress.

iii) If any resources are needed to pursue that goal, requests for them should be merged with those in the annual program review and resource allocation process.

iv) The College Council should monitor overall progress in improving student achievement and learning at Mission, and help coordinate work on the major plans to ensure that activities complement rather than interfere with one another.
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c) ILOs

i) The Academic Senate should consider taking on an explicit leadership role in promoting and facilitating the long-term improvement of overall student achievement and student learning at Mission, perhaps focusing initially, though not exclusively, on the ILOs.
ii) LOAC should assist the applicable faculty and staff in refining, augmenting, and scheduling on a regular basis the standalone assessment methods and reporting already established for the ILOs.

iii) In consultation with OIE and others as appropriate, the SLO Coordinator and LOAC should develop, document, and implement the additional annual roll-up assessment of all the ILOs based on achievement of the CSLOs and/or PLOs/SAOs.

iv) After each annual cycle of ILO assessment, LOAC should incorporate the results across all divisions (Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services) into the Mission Learning Report described above (see page 17).
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b) Other Planning Processes

i) As noted on page 17, under the leadership of the College Council, the bodies responsible for the Strategic Plan, the Educational Master Plan, and other major plans should review on an annual basis the Mission Learning Report, consider its implications carefully, and update their plans and/or recommend improvements in the functional areas covered in their plans based explicitly on learning assessment findings. Every major plan should contain documentation of this consideration of learning outcomes.
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Institution-Set Standards for Student Achievement and Student Learning

4) The Mission Learning Report (see page 17) should include documentation of both sets of standards and baselines, applicable licensure pass rates and job placement rates, and annually updated assessment results. The data sets provided by OIE for program review should also include this information on a routine basis, so that each program can consider the performance of its own students in relation to the standards.
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h) Prepare an annual summary of the proceedings and findings of the Center [for Teaching and Learning], for inclusion in the Mission Learning Report (see page 17).
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1) See “Mission Learning Report” on page 17 regarding major planning processes other than program review.
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3) Program Review and Outcomes Processes

a) SSSC, in consultation with OIE, should develop a method for gauging the contribution of Student Services SAOs to achievement of the ILOs. For example, one approach might involve a qualitative mapping narrative persuasively demonstrating links between certain SAOs and certain ILOs, followed by measuring the degree of achievement of those SAOs, and concluding with calculating the contribution to the applicable ILOs that that degree of achievement represents. (See also “Mission Learning Report” on page 17.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course:</th>
<th>Department:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Outcome** - The student will:
(Describe the major outcomes that a successful student will gain from the class for use in his/her life. Use higher order Bloom's taxonomy verbs.)

| Assessment – as measured by the following method:
- Indicate the criteria and rating scale by which the assessment will be evaluated. *(If a rubric has been developed, please attach it.)*
- Indicate the benchmark(s) for student success. |

| ILO - which Institutional Learning Outcome(s) (ILO) does this SLO support? *(See College Catalog p. 10.)* |

**Department Chair:** ____________________________  **Date** ____________________________

**SLO Coordinator:** ____________________________  **Date** ____________________________
Information competency is the ability to find, evaluate, use, and communicate information in all its various formats. It combines aspects of library literacy, research methods and technological literacy. Information competency includes consideration of ethical and legal implications of information and requires the application of both critical thinking and communication skills.

The faculty believes that Los Angeles Mission College students will be information competent and evidence the following:

1. **Recognize when information is necessary**
   - Use information to solve problems
   - Use information to expand personal knowledge

2. **Develop effective research strategies**
   - Develop a thesis statement
   - Explore general information sources
   - Identify key concepts, synonyms, and related concepts in a research question
   - Modify the information needed to achieve a manageable focus
   - Develop a search strategy
   - Select controlled vocabulary specific to the discipline
   - Determine the type of information needed to achieve a manageable focus
   - Develop a search strategy
   - Select controlled vocabulary specific to the discipline
   - Determine the type of information needed: popular/scholarly, primary/secondary, current retrospective
   - Identify the value of and difference among potential resources: magazine, journal subscription database, website, television, radio, video, or book
   - Determine the types of sources needed: books, periodicals, reference sources

3. **Locate and retrieve information in a variety of formats**
   - Use a mouse, keyboard, windows and browser
   - Investigate the scope, content, and organization of information sources
   - Select and use appropriate tools (both print and electronic)
   - Use basic Internet skills, use a mouse and browser, use a search tool, bookmark a web page, use a URL to retrieve a web page, print a web page, etc.
   - Find a book by author, title, subject, and keyword using an online library catalog
   - Locate a book in a library
   - Use print indexes and online periodical databases
   - Use and apply research limiters and expanders
   - Identify the elements of a journal or periodical citation
   - Use reference books
4. **Analyze, evaluate, organize and synthesize information**

- Synthesize and organize information for various applications: essays, letters, reports, research papers, speeches, presentation, etc.
- Research papers, speeches, presentations, etc.
- Select and use a style format to document research and create a bibliography
- Analyze for quality, relevance, timeliness, authority
- Identify prejudice, deception, or manipulation
- Determine and explain the cultural context within which the information was created

5. **Create, present and communicate information via multiple mediums**

- Create a textual or multimedia electronic document, by cutting and pasting text, by inserting a text box, by formatting, saving and printing, etc.
- Set up an email account, send and read messages with attached files
- Present a report in front of a group

6. **Use information legally and ethically**

- Recognize what intellectual property is and how copyright protects it
- Identify and avoid plagiarism
- Obtain permission to copy, use or modify documents, images, web pages and media created by others
- Cite print, electronic, text and image sources in a document
- Question issues related to censorship and freedom of speech
Dear Chairs and Vice Chairs,

Welcome to the Spring 2014 semester! Something very exciting has just been added to the online system: The PLO/SLO relation change has been implemented. Next to each PLO you will find a "#Related SLOs" link which takes you to a page where one can simply check the SLOs that relate to the PLO and a button to save the changes (See sample below). Why is this important? Because it will enable us to do "roll-up" assessments. Also, you will no longer need to upload your SLO/PLO Matrix.

What we need you to do is to check the boxes of the SLOs that apply for each PLO. If you would prefer to have either me or Deborah do this, send us your SLO/PLO matrix and we will check the boxes for you. Whichever method you choose, it is important to get it done as soon as possible as we not only need this information for our accreditation follow-up report but also to enable us to more easily do program assessments based on supporting course assessments. Wednesday, February 19, is the deadline for accomplishing this. Please e-mail me when you have completed this task so that I can update my records.

The accreditation evaluation team last year charged us with accelerating our outcome assessments. We have done so on the course level, but we still need to focus more on the program level.

By the end of the week, we will be doing a tally of where we are in terms of the total number of assessments for our course and program outcome assessments, so if there are any more that you can enter before then, please prioritize this as it will help our numbers.

Nick Minassian, our wonderful Web Developer/Designer, also has deleted any rubrics that did not have information in them, which has helped to "clean up" our system.

Checking the related SLOs that support each PLO should only take a few minutes. Thank you for your help with getting this done.
SAMPLE:
Computer Applications & Office Technologies (AA) Learning Outcomes

Program Learning Outcome (PLO)

Assessment will include three-minute timed writings.

2. Produce properly formatted and keyed business correspondence.
3. Use good work habits as evidenced by timely submission of assignments.

CAOT 001 - Keyboarding I

Student Learning Outcome (SLO)
1. Key at a rate of 25 words per minute for three minutes with no more than 3 errors, using correct touch-typing techniques. Assessment will include three-minute timed writings.
2. Create, format, and edit business documents including letters, memos, tables, and reports using MS Word.
3. Use good work habits as evidenced by timely submission of assignments.

CAOT 002 - Keyboarding II

Student Learning Outcome (SLO)
1. Key at a rate of 36 words per minute for five minutes with no more than 5 errors using correct touch-typing techniques.
2. Produce properly formatted and keyed business correspondence.
3. Use good work habits as evidenced by timely submission of assignments.

CAOT 031 - Business English

Student Learning Outcome (SLO)
1. Demonstrate ability to use English grammar (parts of speech) and punctuation correctly.
2. Demonstrate the ability to write effective sentences and construct well-structured (logically organized, concise, and coherent) paragraphs which utilize correct grammar, punctuation, and capitalization.

CAOT 032 - Business Communications

Student Learning Outcome (SLO)
2. Construct and deliver well-structured oral presentations.

CAOT 033 - Records Management and Filing

Student Learning Outcome (SLO)
As a result of students taking CAOT 33, students will demonstrate the ability to plan, design, create, and implement an effective and efficient manual and computerized filing system.

CAOT 034 - Business Terminology

Student Learning Outcome (SLO)
1. Differentiate between similar words and choose the appropriate words to complete the meaning of a sentence.
Please mark the choice that best describes your understanding of what a learning outcome is at each level: (1=I understand very well, 2=I partially understand, 3=I barely understand, 4=I don’t understand, 5=I never heard of it)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units already completed at LAMC</th>
<th>Course student learning outcome (SLO)</th>
<th>Program learning outcome (PLO)</th>
<th>Institutional learning outcome (ILO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-15 units</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30 units</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45 units</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-60 units</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+ units</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Survey Results

**Legend**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question text</th>
<th>Left pole</th>
<th>Right pole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relative Frequencies of answers</strong></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Std. Dev.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantile</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**n=No. of responses**

**av=Mean**

**md=Median**

**dev.=Std. Dev.**

**ab.=Abstention**

---

### 1. How many units have you already completed at LAMC?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units Completed</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 15 units</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 30 units</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 45 units</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 60 units</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 60 units</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 2. Please mark the choice that best describes your knowledge and understanding of the course student learning outcomes (SLOs) *in this class*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know about them and understand them well.</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know about them and understand them some.</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know about them but understand them little or not at all.</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know about them.</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Please think about the use of course student learning outcomes (SLOs) *in this class*, and mark your answer to the following questions:

### 3. Are the SLOs clearly identified in the syllabus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Were the SLOs discussed at least once at the beginning of the course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Were the SLOs reviewed more than once during the course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Were specific guidelines (a rubric) used for one or more assignments in this class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**02/12/2014**

Class Climate evaluation
7. If you answered 'Yes' to question 6, how much did the rubric help you achieve at least one of the course SLOs?

It helped a lot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rubric was not provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Survey continues on the back of this page)

Please mark the choice that best describes your understanding of what a learning outcome is at each level:

8. Course student learning outcome (SLO)

I understand very well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I never heard of it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Program learning outcome (PLO)

I understand very well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I never heard of it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Institutional learning outcome (ILO)

I understand very well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I never heard of it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please mark your level of agreement with the following statement:

11. I am confident that I have achieved the student learning outcome(s) for this course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for completing this survey!
3. Are the SLOs clearly identified in the syllabus?

4. Were the SLOs discussed at least once at the beginning of the course?

5. Were the SLOs reviewed more than once during the course?

6. Were specific guidelines (a rubric) used for one or more assignments in this class?

7. If you answered 'Yes' to question 5, how much did the rubric help you achieve at least one of the course

8. Course student learning outcome (SLO)

9. Program learning outcome (PLO)

10. Institutional learning outcome (ILO)

11. I am confident that I have achieved the student learning outcome(s) for this course.
### Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subunit:</th>
<th>Title V HSI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of the instructor:</td>
<td>Susan Rhi-Kleinert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the course:</td>
<td>Workshop Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please think about the use of course student learning outcomes (SLOs) *in this class*, and mark your answer to the following questions:

- **3. Are the SLOs clearly identified in the syllabus?**
  - Yes
  - Don't know

- **4. Were the SLOs discussed at least once at the beginning of the course?**
  - Yes
  - Don't know

- **5. Were the SLOs reviewed more than once during the course?**
  - Yes
  - Don't know

- **6. Were specific guidelines (a rubric) used for one or more assignments in this class?**
  - Yes
  - Don't know

- **7. If you answered 'Yes' to question 6, how much did the rubric help you achieve at least one of the course SLOs?**
  - It helped a lot
  - Rubric was not provided

Please mark the choice that best describes your understanding of what a learning outcome is at each level:

- **8. Course student learning outcome (SLO)**
  - I understand very well
  - I never heard of it

- **9. Program learning outcome (PLO)**
  - I understand very well
  - I never heard of it

- **10. Institutional learning outcome (ILO)**
  - I understand very well
  - I never heard of it

Please mark your level of agreement with the following statement:

- **11. I am confident that I have achieved the student learning outcome(s) for this course.**
  - Strongly Agree
  - Strongly Disagree

---
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