LAMC LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

October 28, 2013
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m., CC #4

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introduction of Members

2. Purpose of Committee
   a. Promote dialogue among all units (members are SLO ambassadors)
   b. Review Best Practices
   c. Evaluate and provide feedback about assessments already conducted
      1.) What have we learned from assessments?
      2.) Are quality assessments being done? Are they authentic assessments?
      3.) How can the assessments be improved?
      4.) Are units/departments/disciplines discussing assessment results and improvements?
      5.) Are recommended changes being implemented?
   d. Make recommendations for improvement
   e. Ensure Sustainable Quality Improvement

3. Distribution of Draft of Committee Charter for Review and Discussion at next meeting

4. Gap Analysis Report Highlights
   a. Rec. 2: Outcomes Assessment and Student Success Standards
   b. Recs 7 & 9: Student Support Services, Program Review, and Outcomes Assessment

5. Measurement Instruments – Developing Performance Standards

6. Rubrics for Assessment Self-Evaluation
   1.) Authentic assessment
   2.) Usefulness of data
   3.) Benchmarks
   4.) Department discussion

7. SLO Validation Rating Sheet and Feedback Form

8. Additional Training Needed and Best Way to Provide It?

9. Next meeting – Tuesday, November 5, 3:00 to 4:30, CC #4
Mission Statement:

The SLO and Assessment Committee's mission is to ensure that the college goes through an ongoing, systematic process that clarifies and improves achievement of SLOs at every level from institutional, program, and course through certificates and degrees with specific emphasis on student success. The SLO and Assessment Committee works with faculty to ensure the methods of assessment of course SLOs, program SLOs, and Institutional SLOs are aligned and consistent across the college.

The SLO and Assessment Committee reports to the Academic Senate and jointly works with the Student Support Services Committee and the Administrative Units.

The SLO and Assessment Committee is charged with the following:

- Guide and facilitate faculty and staff in implementing outcome and assessment processes.
- Support faculty and staff about institutional, program, degree/certificate, course level SLOs; and the processes and timing for establishing and assessing them.
- Provide colleagues with guidance, training, tools, rubrics, models and other resources that will assist them in SLO alignment, development and assessment.
- Assist faculty and staff in analyzing the results of assessment to improve learning and services.
- Maintain open and frequent communications about SLO 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.
- Monitor assessment calendar and work with administration to ensure that outcome assessments are completed on schedule.

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, Professional Development, Curriculum Committee, and ...
Voting Rights:

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

Reporting System:

The SLOAC will report and make recommendations to the Academic Senate and work jointly with the Student Support Services Committee and the Administrative Unit Outcomes Committee.

Membership Responsibility and Code of Conduct:

It will be the responsibility of every member of the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee to attend each meeting and to adhere to the College Code of Conduct. Members with three unexcused absences during any semester will be replaced from the appropriate constituency.
Learning Outcome Highlights from the Analysis of Accreditation Recommendations based on Dr. Lee’s Gap Analysis Report

Background

Dr. Matthew Lee was retained to conduct a gap analysis of the current status of LAMC to meet ACCJC recommendations and standards contained in an action letter July 3, 2013. This gap analysis is being used to develop an action plan in AY 13-14 in order to substantially meet the accreditation recommendations and establish sustainable systems that will be institutionalized at Mission.

RECOMMENDATION 2: OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT AND STUDENT SUCCESS STANDARDS

1. The College must demonstrate it has met Proficiency level
2. The “fixes” must be sustainable practice

This recommendation reflects a recent increased emphasis on overall effectiveness and not just assessment of discrete units.

1. Coordination, Training, and Documentation (Pages 16-18)

a. Program Review Oversight Committee (PROC) with input from administration provide support and expectations for outcome leads
b. Add section to Program Review about changes made as a result of SLO assessments.
c. Implement enhanced reporting capabilities through technology by Spring 2014
d. Publish an annual Mission Learning Report on student learning and student achievement
e. Develop a Master Schedule for periodic assessment of CSLOs, SAOs, PLOs, ILOs
f. Evaluate information and training needs of the College Community
g. Conduct systematic evaluation and revision process for outcome cycle with first review completed by fall 2013 but no later than spring 2014.
h. Assess SAOs connection to ILOs and identify genuine connections

2. Progress on the Outcomes Cycle (Page 18)

a. CSLOS should have:
   1. Master schedule for outcome assessment so that every CSLO is assessed every 3 years
   2. Faculty should enter into the system’s file actual implementation of improvements and subsequent re-evaluation of student performance.
   3. CSLOS should be mapped to PLOs
   4. SLO Coordinator and administration support for the Senate to require pedagogical changes and their assessment
   5. Ambitious schedule timetable for faculty to benchmark standards
b. Program Outcomes
   1. Accelerate assessment of PLOs and SAOs
   2. Implement "roll up" method to link assessment of PLOs to the achievement of CSLOs
   3. SLO Coordinator develop methods to assess and report overall learning (page 19)
   4. Schedule training for outcome leads
   5. Administrative services develop methods for gauging their contribution to ILOs

c. ILOs
   1. Academic Senate take explicit leadership in overall student achievement
   2. SLO Coordinator should assist faculty assessment methods for ILOs
   3. SLO Coordinator looks at roll up assessment of ILOs based on achievement of CSLOs, PLOs, and SAOs etc.
   4. Incorporate results of roll up assessments in the annual Mission Learning Report

3. Integration with Planning and Resource Allocation (page 20)
   a. Program Review
      1. New section of PR to include standards for student learning (page 21)
      2. EPC add meaningful consideration of ILOs for instructional and non-instructional program reviews

   b. Other Planning Processes
      1. All master planning committees should review the annual Mission Learning Report to recommend improvements in functional areas

4. Communication and Dialogue
   a. Have a 2nd flex day
   b. Identify other ways to have meaningful dialogue
   c. Under President's leadership all committees, constituency groups, and administrative units must have a dialogue on outcome assessments results and their alignment to institutional structures.

5. Institution-Set standards for Student Achievement and Student Learning
   1. PROC in consultation with Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) Academic Senate, and other groups as appropriate and with college wide input for dialogue should:
      a. Establish five-year baselines
      b. Set standards for student achievement
      c. Develop, implement and document regularly revisiting standards, goals, and revising them as appropriate.
   2. AA maintain licensure pass rates, job placement
   3. Five year baseline for student learning
   4. Mission Learning Report should include documentation on both sets of standards (e.g. learning and achievement) and baselines.
RECOMMENDATION 7 AND 9: STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES SCOPE AND PROGRAM REVIEW AND OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

ACTIONS TO CLOSE THE GAP (page 41)

1. See page 20 regarding SAOs, ILOs and the standards for student learning in program reviews

2. Scope of Services: Student Services Master Plan
   a. Assessment and enhancement of services to meet student needs.
      - SSSC should incorporate the Student Services Master Plan a comprehensive assessment of scope of services
      - The assessment must be based on sound evidence including a comparative analysis of other LACCD and California community colleges
      - Set forth concrete recommendations for implementing enhancements for a 3 year period
      - The college should commit to a portion of the plan
      - VPSS should submit a resource request every year until the recommended service enhancements have been fully implemented
   b. Matching students in need of Services
      The Student Services Master Plan an assessment of student needs (page 31). Such methods matching student needs to services include:
      - Getting self-identified needs in the application
      - Dissemination of a more friendly director of services by needs rather than departments
   c. SSSC needs to assess a continuous improvement of services—especially counseling and coordinate with DE to assess DE students
   d. SSSC should evaluate its role in program review, annual updates needed and who bears responsibility for monitoring progress between comprehensive reviews
   e. SSSC should review the plan and recommend revisions as needed annually

3. Program Review and Outcome Processes (page 42)
   a. SSSC should review the issues on page 39 and determine if they warrant changes in the non-instructional program review template
   b. A refresher for all student services staff on SLOs must be done and include:
      1. Broad participation and dialogue
      2. SAOs and SLOs should be formulated properly, measurable, and assessed to see if the services are meeting identified student needs and institutional needs
      3. Each assessment method needs to be tied to the outcome it’s supposed to measure
      4. Objectives are not resource requests but improvement steps some of which might require resources
      5. The line connecting outcome to assessment to results to analysis and reassessment must be clear
   c. SSSC in conjunction with OIE, should develop a method to gauge the contribution of student services SAOs to achievement of ILOs.
d. Every student services program must develop benchmarks for satisfactory performance on SLOs and SAOs

e. Student services must be included in the master schedule for outcomes assessment

f. VPSS and SLO Coordinator encourage unit managers and outcome leads to sign up for training on data as described on page 25

g. SSSC should evaluate and monitor status of outcome assessment and program review and implement improvements

h. SSSC should ensure that all programs go through a full cycle of program review; implementation of improvements, re-evaluation of performance ASAP

i. SSSC should require at least one program objective be tied to a strategic plan goal

j. As noted on page 26 Student Services should work with OIE to do a point of services survey

k. Student services should identify programs that have been most successful in meaningful dialogue about their effectiveness.
Performance Standards — Conditions and Criteria for Authentic Assessments, Rubrics and Scoring Guides

Performance Standards — Conditions and Criteria for performance assessment — are the basis for developing authentic assessments and their corresponding rubrics and scoring guides. When performance standards are made public to learners prior to 'just before' the assessment (Recommendation #1), students have the opportunity to be more prepared for the assessment, and will know more about what to expect, which lowers stress levels and 'exam anxiety.' Instructors who provide practice to their students in accordance with the performance standards (Recommendation #2) find that students are more prepared for both performance assessments AND written exams, because they have actually performed the steps of the skill or task correctly prior to the graded activity.

Conditions name the process or product, and describe the setting in which the performance assessment is to take place. They include:
- Environment (Examples: In a laboratory; In a simulated customer-service setting;)
- Resources Given (Ex: Given a milling machine, blueprint and materials;)
- Resources Denied (Ex: Without use of the user guide;)
- Information Given (Ex:)
- Deadlines (Ex: Within 1 hour, Be turned in no later than November 1st, 20##)

Criteria describe the process that the student is to perform, the product that the student is to create, or both the process AND product. They should be measurable and observable, and should NOT refer to 'instructors opinions' though they may refer to an outside checklist that the instructor has previously developed. In other words, they describe "what good looks like." Examples of performance criteria for processes include:
- Student followed the stated process in order
- Student selected the appropriate tools and materials to perform the task
- Student used the troubleshooting process to determine the correct problem and select the appropriate intervention

Examples of product criteria (Note how each begins with the name of the product) include:
- Product meets the measurement specifications in the blueprint
- Resume includes chronological list of work experience
- Scoring guide includes conditions, criteria and a rating scale with descriptions for each rating
- Prepared meal meets the caloric, saturated fat, sodium and cholesterol limits of the patients' dietary requirements

On page 2, you will see an example of a previously-developed scoring guide. As you examine it, think about the types of conditions and criteria that your students should know AND be able to perform, as well as a rating scale that would be most appropriate for the skill, task or product. Examples are:
- Checklists – Yes/No/NA; Go/NoGo
- Rubric Scale - 4 3 2 1; A B C D
- Likert Scale (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor)

Then think about how you could best use a well-developed rubric or scoring guide as a tool for practice (Recommendation #3: Use peer evaluations for practice) AND assessments for a grade. Then, on pages 3 and 4, develop your own scoring guide and/or rubric (Recommendation #4: Collaborate with other faculty both in- and outside of your discipline) to use for an authentic assessment in your course(s). Good Luck!
Performance Assessment Task
Communication Situation Analysis

Strategy
Drawing/Illustration

Evaluators
Instructor, Self, Peer

Target Competency
Analyze communication situations

Linked Core Abilities
Think critically and creatively
Communicate clearly

Linked Program Outcomes
Provide patient oral health instruction

Directions
Describe an actual or hypothetical communication event. You may use one of the examples you identified in Learning Plan #2, learning activity #2. Describe who communicated what to whom, how each individual felt about the event, and the resulting action or behavior. To make this assignment manageable, select a brief event. For example:

- A supervisor giving an employee feedback on the performance of a specific task.
- A software user asking for assistance from a technical support person.
- A parent/child discussion about problem behavior

CREATE a visual model of your example communication event to illustrate the elements of communication. Use the graphic features in PowerPoint or the drawing functions in your word processing software to create your visual model.

POST your model in your group Workspace along with a written analysis of the elements of communication illustrated in your model.

VIEW the models and analyses created by your group members. GIVE feedback to the work done by your group members.

OBTAIN feedback on your work from your group members and refine your visual model and analysis.

Scoring Standard
You must achieve a rating of at least "2" or "met" on each item to demonstrate competence.

Rating Scale
3 Exceeded criterion in terms of accuracy, completeness, thoughtfulness, or attention to detail
2 Met criterion adequately
1 Did not meet criterion

Scoring Guide
Criteria Ratings

1. you analyze a communication situation using a graphic illustration and a written analysis 3 2 1
2. analysis illustrates how the elements of the communication model apply to a communication situation 3 2 1
3. analysis identifies how participants fulfill communication responsibilities in terms of the communication model 3 2 1
4. analysis identifies elements that impact the communication situation 3 2 1
5. analysis suggests techniques to improve the communication situation 3 2 1
6. FOCUS CORE ABILITY ON ALL LEARNING PLAN ACTIVITIES; THINK CRITICALLY AND CREATIVELY AND COMMUNICATE CLEARLY
7. learner distinguishes between fact and opinion met not met
8. learner synthesizes information from a variety of sources met not met
9. COMMUNICATE CLEARLY
10. learner uses bias free language met not met
11. learner uses language that is free of obscenities met not met

Total Points ___________ Grade ___________

Learner Name ____________________________ Date ___________
Learner's Signature ________________________ Date ___________
Evaluator's Signature ______________________ Date ___________

Comments:
SLO ASSESSMENT: DEFINITIONS AND RUBRICS FOR SELF-ASSESSMENT

Accreditation Standards, as established by the ACCJC, require an on-going self-evaluation of all processes and procedures conducted by the college. This includes self-evaluation of the SLOA process.

1. The ACCJC encourages (requires) the use of authentic assessments for SLO analysis. Definition of Authentic Assessments: Traditional assessment sometimes relies on indirect or proxy items such as multiple choice questions focusing on content or facts. In contrast, authentic assessment simulates a real world experience by evaluating the student’s ability to apply critical thinking and knowledge or to perform tasks that may approximate those found in the work place or other venues outside of the classroom setting.
   --This definition is from the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges.

2. Data gathered must be useful, Informative, and actionable:
   Do the assessment results provide data that can be used to support and inform recommendations and action plans? The more broken down (disaggregated) and the more detailed the data the more informative and useful they are.

3. An important component of SLO Assessment is the establishment of Benchmarks.
   Ok. So what are benchmarks?

   A benchmark is a measure used for comparative purposes. It can be used as a goal or as a "starting point" from which to measure progress or improvement. For SLOs, a benchmark could be:

   1. the original results collected from initial assessments
   2. national or local norms or levels of achievement
   3. results from comparable institutions, or
   4. any logically established level or indicator of success, as for example the stated expected results or criteria for success.

   For accreditation purposes, ACCJC expects colleges to show CSQI--Continuous Sustainable Quality Improvement across all aspects of Integrated Planning, Program Reviews and SLOs. One way to measure CSQI is through the use of benchmarks. For example, "SLO results will improve by 2% each assessment cycle" where the "2%" reflects improvement from the original benchmark.

4. Department meetings need to include discussions about SLOA results, assessments methods, improvements, and revaluation “to close the loop.”
RUBRICS FOR SLOA SELF EVALUATION:

1. **Assessment is Authentic**
   Scores are based on Bloom’s Taxonomy (see below) of learning, a hierarchical categorization. The six categories are: remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating. Authentic assessments go beyond “remembering” and “understanding” to the “applying” category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Assessment methods are unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The assessment methods for most of the SLOs in these courses test only the recall of simple information such as names, dates, events, places. (Bloom’s category: remembering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The assessment methods for most of the SLOs in these courses test recall of subject matter, ideas or concepts by simple memory. (Bloom’s category: remembering.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The assessment methods for most of the SLOs in these courses test student understanding of the concepts by requiring student to interpret the facts and make comparisons, contrasts or predictions. (Bloom’s category: understanding.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The assessment methods for most of these courses test the application of the acquired knowledge and/or skill to “real world” situations. Students can use their knowledge and/or skills for problem solving and critical analysis. (Bloom’s category: applying.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Data is Useful and Informative, data is actionable:**
   Do the assessment results provide data that can be used to support and inform recommendations and action plans? The more broken down (disaggregated) and the more detailed the data the more informative and useful they are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>No data or completely inappropriate data indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>No detail. Only the data required on the SLOA forms were analyzed for most of the SLOs in these courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Some of the data/scores analyzed were detailed but most were not. For example, summary differences between sections were analyzed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Scores are recorded and analyzed for separate components (sub-topics or tasks) of the assessment assignment and for each section for some of the SLOs of these courses. For example, results of an essay assignment were recorded and analyzed separately for: grammar/syntax, organization and content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Scores are recorded and analyzed for separate components (sub-topics or tasks) of the assessment assignment and for each section for all the SLOs of these courses. For example, results of an essay assignment were recorded and analyzed separately for: grammar/syntax, organization and content. Results of embedded exam questions were grouped and analyzed topic by topic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An Example. In this rubric, the score is 2.03, C. That number represents the aggregated results across all the 4 measures. Looking at the disaggregated results, this department is fairly strong on discussion (2.79 or B-) so-so on authenticity (2.42 or C+) but very weak on data and benchmarks (1.37 and 1.53, D). This disaggregated approach indicates where major improvement needs to be made. If you just looked at the overall average there wouldn’t be any way of knowing where the strengths and weaknesses lie and without that information there couldn’t be any useful, relevant or appropriate analysis or recommendations.
3. Benchmarks
Are benchmarks identified? Are they appropriate, justifiable? Does analysis include reference to benchmarks? Is their evidence of progress related to benchmarks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>No benchmarks are used or indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Benchmarks are indicated for SLOs in these courses but there is no analysis of results in reference to benchmarks. There is no analysis of the appropriateness of the benchmarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Benchmarks are indicated for some SLOs in these courses with only minimal analysis of results in reference to benchmarks (no indication of any improvements). There is no analysis of the appropriateness of the benchmarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Benchmarks are indicated for most SLOs in these courses with some analysis of results in reference to benchmarks (no indication of any improvement). There is no analysis of the appropriateness of the benchmarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Benchmarks are clearly established and justifiable for all SLOs in these courses. Analysis and recommendations refer to benchmarks. Results show continuous improvement in relation to the benchmarks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Department Discussion:
Are the SLOA results and recommendation and the assessment methods widely discussed across the department or unit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>No discussion takes place regarding any of the SLO results in these courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Minimal, informal discussions occur by some of the faculty members about some of the SLOs in these courses but without any significant impact on analysis and recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Discussions occur in an informal manner on some of the SLOs in these courses and contribute to some of the analysis and recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Discussions occur in a formal manner on most of the SLOs in these courses. Results of the discussions inform the analysis and recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Substantial, rigorous, inclusive and directed discussions regarding results from all the SLOs in these courses occurs. Analysis and recommendations are based on these discussions and analyses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bloom's Taxonomy

Old Version

New Version
SLO Validation Rating Sheet & Feedback Form
To be Used with the Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Student Learning Outcome Statements, Assessment, and Analysis

This form is to be used by Validation Team Members for rating SLO statements, assessments, and analysis. It can also be used within the discipline or department to self-assess or by GELO Teams to cross-check learning outcomes within an area.

Part I: Course Information
1. Department Name:
2. Discipline:
3. Course Name & Number:
4. SLO Being Validated (copy and paste the SLO statement here):

Part II: Rating of SLO Statement, Assessment, and Analysis
Directions: Using the completed assessment results form (i.e. Red Book forms 3, 6, 9, or 12) for the above-mentioned SLO, rate each of the 6 criterion. Use the attached “Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Student Learning Outcome Statements, Assessment, and Analysis” to guide you. Complete one SLO Validation Rating Sheet and Feedback Form per course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO STATEMENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the learning outcome statement comprehensive to the point that it is “SMART” (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and to a particular standard)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed: Student learning outcome (SLO) statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALIGNMENT WITH COURSE OUTLINE OF RECORD AND/OR CURRICULUM MAP</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is each outcome explicitly and intentionally aligned with the curriculum, and do they demonstrate increasing levels of proficiency?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed: Course outline, syllabus or curricular map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALIGNMENT WITH ASSESSMENT TOOL</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the assessment tool appropriately evaluate the student learning outcome?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed: Copy of test, question(s), or assignment description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALIGNMENT WITH CRITERIA/RUBRIC</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the criteria/rubric provide sufficient detail or information to evaluate the assessment results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed: Rubric or description of the criterion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOMES ANALYSIS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on the assessment results (from Form 3, 6, 9 or 12), was the analysis of the findings clearly stated and/or provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed: Assessment results analysis from Red Book form 3, 6, 9, or 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES &amp; RESOURCES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were appropriate changes and resources recommended to address these findings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed: Assessment results analysis from Red Book form 3, 6, 9, or 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part III: Feedback from Validation Team

Directions: Based on the ratings above, share your commendations and recommendations for the SLO statement, assessment, and analysis.

1. Commendations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. SLO Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Alignment with Course Outline of Record and/or Curriculum Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Alignment with Assessment Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Alignment with Criteria/Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Outcomes Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Recommendations for Changes and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional SLO Commendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Recommendations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. SLO Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Alignment with Course Outline of Record and/or Curriculum Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Alignment with Assessment Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Alignment with Criteria/Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Outcomes Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Recommendations for Changes and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional SLO Recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part IV: Final Recommendation

- [ ] No Major Changes Recommended: There are no major changes that need to be made at this time.
- [ ] Changes Recommended: Complete the Implementation Plan form to make the recommended changes above.

Part V: Validator's Information

Name: Date:
Discipline: Department:
Additional Comments:

SLO Rating Sheet & Validation Form
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome Checklist</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do the SLOs include active verbs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the SLOs suggest or identify an assessment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the SLOs address the expected level of learning for the course using Bloom’s Taxonomy as a guideline?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the SLOs address more than one domain (cognitive, psychomotor, and affective)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the SLOs written as outcomes rather than as objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Language indicates an important overarching concept versus small lesson or chapter objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outcomes address what a student will be able to do at the completion of the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SLOs address student competency rather than content coverage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the SLOs appropriate for the course?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consistent with the curriculum document of record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Represents a fundamental result of the course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aligns with other courses in a sequence, if applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Represents collegiate level work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will students understand the SLOs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments or suggestions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you talk to others about SLOs keep these things in mind:

- Each course and classroom has unique factors.
- Disciplines have unique language and culture.
- Cross disciplinary conversations are invaluable.
- Ultimately discipline-specific conversations best define competencies for students.
- Everyone is a learner when it comes to assessment.
- As professionals, we are guided by the principles of academic freedom.
SLO Development Best Practices

1. Identify 3-5 course SLOs that align with course objectives.
2. Develop course SLOs that
   - Describe the broadest goals for the activity, ones that require higher-level thinking abilities.
   - Require students to synthesize many discreet skills or areas of content.
   - Ask students to then produce something—papers, projects, portfolios, demonstrations, performances, art works, exams, educational plan etc.—that applies what they have learned.
3. Include the specific assessment method(s) that will be used to evaluate or assess the product to measure a student’s achievement or mastery of the outcomes.
4. Specify a criterion level that reflects, in the faculty’s judgment, satisfactory performance on the SLO.
5. Ensure a broad range of faculty teaching the course participate in the development of course SLOs.

SLO Assessment Best Practices

1. Be sure to have the same course SLO for each section of the same course. This SLO should be documented on your syllabus.
2. If you are using a qualitative assessment method to assess your course SLO, use a rubric to score it.
3. In assessing multiple sections of the same course, use a common rubric to score the same assessment method.
4. Faculty dialogue is a key part of the SLO cycle and a valuable opportunity for sharing best practices. Consult with each other regarding pedagogy, assessment methods, rubrics, assessment results, and changes based on assessment.
5. To obtain more comparative data, assess as many sections of the same course as is feasible. Consult your department chair for more information.