LAMC LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (LOAC)  
AND PROGRAM REVIEW OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (PROC)  
JOINT MEETING  

Minutes of Meeting  
April 21, 2014  

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. CAI Arroyo Room  

Present: Co-Chair Pat Flood, Steve Brown, Patricia Chow, Sarah Master,  
Tigran Mkrtchyan, Niki Milani, Nick Minassian, Monica Moreno, Riye Park,  
Deborah Paulsen, Said Pazirandeh, Monte Perez, D’Art Phares, Mark Pursley,  
Patricia Rodriguez, Steve Ruys, Jolie R. Scheib, Dennis Schroeder, Jan Silver,  
Sandy Thomsen, Louis Zandalasini, Marie Zaiens  

1. Review and approval of minutes of March 26, 2014 meeting  

2. PLO Assessment Retreat  

Pat reminded everyone of the PLO Assessment Retreat on May 2, 2014, 8:30 a.m. –  
12:00 p.m. This will be a hands-on workshop. Disciplines and departments will work  
in teams to discuss what they have learned about their programs from their SLO  
assessments using the roll-up method and will work to get PLO assessments entered  
into the online SLO system.  

3. Updates in the SLO Online System  

Nick Minassian demonstrated the latest updates to the online system. When first  
signing-in, if an SLO has been previously assessed, a follow-up textbox will appear for  
notes about the results of the implementation of changes and improvements. Also,  
when creating a new assessment, checkboxes identifying the previously selected ILOs  
will appear; if the assessment meets the ILO(s), and the appropriate box is checked,  
the assessment will count toward the assessment of the ILO. This also will enable  
Nick to generate a separate report of this information.  

Pat Flood reviewed the latest SLO statistics. 95.5% of all active courses have had a  
least one SLO assessed and 66.3% of programs have had at least one PLO  
assessed. All SLOs and PLOs need to be assessed and entered into the system and  
the focus this semester is on assessing those SLOs and PLOs that have not yet been  
assessed.  

4. SLO/SAO Summaries of Assessments and Recommendations for Integration  
of Assessment Results with Planning  

Pat mentioned that the main reason for the joint LOAC/PROC meeting is to discuss  
how to more fully integrate the results of learning outcomes assessments with  
planning and resource allocation. Two SLO/PLO questions and textboxes were added
to the online program review template last Fall: (1) Summarize the changes that have been implemented based on SLO and PLO assessments from the past year; (2) Have the outcomes been re-evaluated since the implemented changes, and if so, has there been an improvement in student learning? Are any further changes scheduled? When Pat prepared the summary of the department chairs’ SLO/PLO summaries, she found their responses to these two questions very helpful. A link to the SLO website was also added to the SLO Assessment Update Screen in program review. All resource requests made in the SLO online system also appear in the online program review system.

Someone asked what happens with the Program Review when the units complete it? It was mentioned that the Administrators in Academic Affairs need to carefully read, consider and discuss the Program Reviews so they can support the departments’ goals and needs. The Deans and Vice President will review and discuss them with department chairs, rank the requests, and forward the ranked requests to EPC for feedback before sending them to the Budget and Planning Committee for prioritization.

President Perez stated that the Service Areas will form a task force of six middle managers, coaches and mentors for all areas, including Dennis Schroeder and Monica Moreno, as peer support to review the work, support assessments, and help each unit to complete the process. The college will be hiring a new Dean of Student Success to monitor program review and oversee the student success initiative, which will include activities such as orientation, educational plans, and student learning.

Monica Moreno brought up the need for meaningfulness in assessment. She felt the recent revisions were going to be satisfying and the directors were relieved to use a structure that will work for their areas.

President Perez emphasized the importance of tracking work and evaluating implemented changes. It is important to complete the cycle. Dr. Matthew Lee will meet with the units and follow up with Mi Chong Park, Diana Bonilla, Larry Resendez, and Danny Villanueva to design a Student and Administrative Services structure that is sustainable.

Sandy Thomsen asked about how assessment results contribute to the revision of the Master Education and Facilities Plans. It was suggested that the writers and contributors of those plans (e.g., the shared governance committees responsible for the master plans) should review the program reviews (e.g., the comprehensive program review commendations and recommendations and other identified themes) to determine what should be integrated into the overall picture. Nick Minassian said he can filter out some of the more specific questions about overall planning to facilitate this process.

Sarah Master mentioned that for Recommendation 6, funding decisions being implemented need to result in better student learning, if they are based on SLO/PLO/SAO assessments. In the Follow-up Report, PROC made a suggestion to
add a check box to Program Review that an objective/funding request was based on an SLO/PLO/SAO assessment.

Sarah stated that the PROC will provide a report to College Council that emphasizes and summarizes broader themes identified by the Vice Presidents of each division (from their review of their units' program reviews). It is also important to measure if/how the cycle of Program Review resulted in improvements campus wide. Sarah talked about the student success metrics, which include graduation, retention, success, persistence and transfer. The SLOs, PLOs, ILOs, and SAOs support student achievement. Thus we can measure our performance on the student learning and achievement outcomes and compare our performance relative to the standards to measure the effectiveness of our planning and resource allocation decisions. We can look for areas of improvement and areas still needing improvement and have important discussions about continuous quality improvement.

It was mentioned that there need to be plans in place for improvement and honest efforts made towards those plans. Riye Park mentioned that there is a new crop of students every year with different backgrounds and variables. It is also important to consider the qualitative data and collect information considering their background demographics, personal information and educational goals. Sarah Master mentioned that the ACCJC wants the data disaggregated and examined, and they want to be sure we are addressing students’ different learning styles and needs.

The issue of the different types of learners from semester to semester was discussed. Faculty may need to adjust their teaching styles to match the students. Jan mentioned that some faculty gather information from their students during the first weeks of class, either informally through discussion or more formally through a class survey to consider learning styles.

The comment was made that good pedagogy means that faculty are responsive to the students in their classes and it is important to invite them to share what styles and methods work for them and what their barriers are. It helps to hear from the students what they think helps and hinders their progress. Students appreciate that faculty really care about their success. Students may have special needs and faculty can ask if they have an IEP (Individualized Educational Plan) or work with DSP&S (Disabled Student Programs and Services).

Marie Zaiens, Riye Park, Jan Silver, Monica Moreno, and Pat Flood will meet to investigate this topic more closely and suggest some questions for an in-class questionnaire and/or conversation starters that can be used to better assess student learning styles, backgrounds, obstacles, and needs at the beginning of the term.

5. Curriculum Addendum for Updating SLOs

Pat Flood presented a modified Curriculum Addendum to use in updating course SLOs for discussion. Course SLOs need to match the Course Outline of Record (COR) and benchmarks need to be included. After the department chair and Pat
approve the addendum, then it can be attached to the COR by the curriculum chair without going through the entire process of committee approval.

There was a question about how prescriptive the assessment method should be. Does it have to describe the exact assignment? Pat said “No,” just the method such as a research paper or specific questions on an exam. Instructors can use different assignments for the assessment from semester to semester, but when teaching the same course within a given semester, they should coordinate the assignment/assessment and compare the results.

Pat will send the SLO Addendum to Department Chairs for more feedback.

6. PLO, SAO, ILO Master Schedule of Assessments

Pat said she is completing a Master Schedule of Assessments for PLOs and is working with Student Services and Administrative Services to complete a Master Schedule of their areas. A schedule for ILO assessments will also be posted.

Action Items:
- Add a check box to planning objectives/resource requests to indicate which ones are related to SLO/PLO/SAO assessments (Nick Minassian)
- When updating master plans the relevant Unit Reviews (e.g., the sections related to program review recommendations and commendations and answers to SLO/SAO-related questions) should be considered.
- These recommendations will be formalized in the next LOAC/PROC joint meeting.

Adjourned: 5:07 p.m.

Next Joint meetings – Date and Time: **Mondays, May 5 and May 19 3:30 to 5:00**

Recorder: Deborah Paulsen