LAMC LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (LOAC)

Minutes of Meeting
November 12, 2014

1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. CAI Arroyo Room

Present: Faculty Co-Chair Pat Flood, Business and Law; Co-Chair Sarah Master, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness; Darlene Montes, Interim Dean Academic Affairs; Jesse Sanchez, Professional Studies; Patricia Rodriguez, Child Development; Deborah Paulsen, Arts, Media & Humanities; Jolie R. Scheib, Foreign Languages; Emil Sargsyan, Math; Par Mohammadian, Life Sciences; Mark Pursley, Social Sciences; Andzhela Keshishyan, English; Louis Zandalasini, Professional Studies; Riye Park, ESL

1. Approval of Minutes of October 8, 2014 Meeting (Approved by Consensus)

2. Updates and Overview - Flood

Pat Flood talked about the Recommendation #2 update to the Follow-up Report and Dr. Mathew Lee’s comments about how to respond to their recommendations regarding use of achievement data. There was a concern that some assessments might be using grades for their SLO assessments as it was discovered that two assessments included both a point value and grades. This has since been corrected. Pat reminded everyone to make sure that they do not associate assessment with grades. Pat also mentioned that Dr. Mathew Lee will be a consultant for the district on this upcoming accreditation cycle.

Pat talked about how she has been impressed by the work of this year’s Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC). She feels that the organization of the committee is very good, on-task, and well supported.

3. SLO 2nd Annual Summit – October 17, 2014

Almost 100 people attended the SLO Summit, and quite a few adjuncts attended. The speaker Bob Pacheco was outstanding; his presentation received an evaluation of 3.75 out of 4 with many positive comments. He will also be working with the district on the upcoming accreditation cycle. The response to the PLO Roll-up assessment portion of the Summit was also very strong with a rating of 3.64 out of 4 and many good comments. In general, it was felt that there were good discussions among departments and efforts toward getting the PLOs assessed.
4. **Updates in SLO Online System**

Pat Flood talked about a meeting with Rod Austria, Nick Minassian, Sarah Master, Par Mohammadian, Deborah Paulsen and herself regarding the SLO online system updates. They were trying to work out a schedule for regular updates; however, the quandary is that we do not receive regular updates from either the ACCJC on new information needed or the faculty on problems they are having; thus Pat has been contacting Nick as things come up.

In preparation for the Summit, Pat e-mailed the steps to do a PLO assessment using the new assessment screens. At the IT meeting there was a discussion of having the system reflect the same method for ILO assessments as for the PLO assessments. It was also noted that it would be helpful to have a link on the SLO online system to the ILO assessments, so the committee can quickly see them. All ILO assessments have been posted on the SLO website.

Another important upcoming change is the addition of the ability to assess multiple SLOs at one time. It was also mentioned that old SLOs can now be archived by clicking on the view/edit button; the archived assessments will still be viewable. Some departments have been renamed; for example, Physical Education is now called Kinesiology and Speech is called Communications; Professional Studies is in the process of being subdivided and Food Service Management has been renamed Culinary Arts. These changes have resulted in curriculum modifications with commensurate SLO changes. Pat is working with Nick on developing a similar system for archiving old PLOs.

5. **District Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC) Meeting, October 30.**

The District Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (SLOAC) met on October 30. Both Pat and Deborah attended. It was enlightening and interesting to hear about the other colleges in the district and to discuss common problems and issues such as how to address the new accreditation requirements for disaggregating SLO data. At East they have facilitators to help get assessments done, but they are still only at 52% assessment of their course SLOs. East is using TracDat to record assessment results and LACC is using Elumen; however, both systems have required additional personnel to input the assessment data.

6. **Accreditation Standard IB6 - Disaggregation of Data**

*IB6. The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identified performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or*
reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.

Deborah and Par did some research on disaggregation of data. Pat shared a handout with more information. Patterns and trends broken down into subgroups of students will be needed. The ACCJC has not given colleges specific guidelines on disaggregating data and is not planning a training/workshop until April 2015.

LAMC could look at the assessment data in terms of gender, socio-economic status, race/ethnicity, ESL, tutoring, English, math and successful completion. The information could be compared year to year.

The group discussed how different departments and programs may already have some data and more ideas on how to go about getting the information. Achievement outcomes have been disaggregated. Specific classes or groups that use the same rubrics can be disaggregated. The largest populations, such as Child Development, can be looked at first. We will need to look at the data and identify the gaps. Perhaps Achieving the Dream has some data already that we can relate to SLOs.

The challenge will be implementing changes campus-wide to help an identified underachieving group. Tutoring at LAMC was discussed in-depth. Students that receive tutoring are logged-in and are tracked. Equity funds can help make a difference.

7. Policy for Dealing with Faculty who do not Comply with Assessment Requirements

Gary Prostak, John Morales, and Leslie Milke were put on a special task force to come up with a policy for consequences when faculty do not get their assessments done. They proposed that LOAC and the respective department chair work together with any faculty member who has not completed or has incomplete assessments. Other colleges are not offering courses that have not done assessments.

The group talked about different strategies for making sure faculty live up to their contractual obligation of participating in the assessment cycle. Some of the points that were brought up were that the AFT contract and evaluations are not always effective. Initiating out-of-cycle evaluations is too slow of a process and not happening. There should be reminders by department Chairs and warnings by Deans. If a class was not offered once, then it would send a strong message to everyone. There were concerns about hurting students’ ability to graduate. Another point brought up is that if classes have not been offered consistently then they might not be assessed. There are always new courses and courses being archived; thus it is a challenge to have the statistics reflect the on-going changes in curriculum.
8. Learning Outcome Assessment Rubrics and Quality Control Process

The Math Department has very good assessment examples. The assessment cycle is every three years for each SLO, but if improvements are made, the course should be reassessed to discover if the change was successful. Each semester there is a new group of students to assess and that presents new challenges.

The group discussed assessing larger groups of students, rather than just the minimum to increase validity and for the purpose of having a more representative sample. This will be especially helpful when we start to disaggregate the data. Pat suggested that the default number of the students being assessed be changed to the maximum rather than the minimum of students included in the assessment. Chairs have been assigned to assess Liberal Arts and General Studies degrees.

Pat shared a rubric for evaluating assessments. LOAC members were assigned a discipline/department and asked to look at three random assessments and prepare some feedback for the next LOAC meeting. There will be a Chair’s report due in January and this will give the chairs time to work with faculty to make needed improvements. The assessments should be rated using the rubric distributed; in addition, the department notes page on the online system should be checked for evidence of departmental discussion. It was suggested that it would be helpful to have the assessment rubric shared with faculty.

9. Next LOAC Meeting – December 3, 2014, 3:30 to 5:00 p.m.

Adjourned 3:25 p.m.

Recorder: Deborah Paulsen