LAMC LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (LOAC)

November 26, 2013
2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m., CC #4

AGENDA

1. Review of minutes of November 19, 2012 meeting
2. Discussion of draft of Student Survey on SLOs to be distributed next week
3. Continuation of Review of LOAC Charter
4. Sample Assessments and Rubrics for Discussion
5. Next meeting – Tuesday, December 3, 3:00 to 4:30, CC #4

Questions discussed at the District Student Learning Outcomes Advisory Committee (SLOAC) meeting on November 25, 2013, for discussion at next week’s LOAC meeting:

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

2) What is the process at your school for looking at assessment results across all CSLOs to reach conclusions about overall learning performance?

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

4) What is the process at your school for updating SLOs?
LAMC LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (LOAC)

November 19, 2013
2:30 – 4:30 p.m., CC #4

Meeting Minutes

Present: Pat Flood, Co-chair; Dr. Mathew Lee, Margie Long, Sheila MacDowell, Sarah Master, Leslie Milke, Tigran Mkrtchyan, Riye Park, Deborah Paulsen, Mark Pursley, Patricia Rodriguez, Jesus Sanchez, Jolie R. Scheib

Introduction: Dr. Lee introduced himself by talking about his background and experience and how he was brought in as a consultant to help us address some of the accreditation recommendations.

1. Review of minutes of November 12, 2013 meeting.

Sarah Master corrected the spelling of her name. There was discussion about the January 15 deadline for SLO assessments, with the report from the Chair due on January 22. Originally, we had talked about having these reports due earlier, but the committee decided to maintain the schedule that was used for the past two fall semesters.


Pat talked about the results of the feedback received the previous evening from the ACCJC on Mission College’s Status Report on SLO Implementation submitted last spring. LAMC received an average score of 4 out of 5 points on the ten areas of information requested; it is the highest average score in the District to date.

Pat reviewed several areas that were weakest in the report. There was continued discussion on how to help students become more aware of SLOs by integrating them into the class lesson plans. Various members talked about strategies that they use in the classroom such as giving an SLO quiz during the second week, using polling technology, and having the students deconstruct the SLOs by offering alternate definitions of the words and concepts in the SLOs. Sarah is working on a student survey which has one or two questions about SLOs. The committee decided to also do a separate survey to measure student SLO awareness. One member suggested adding a text box to the online assessment system with a question such as: “How do you educate your students about the SLOs?”

Pat will forward the Feedback on the College Status Report on SLO Implementation before the next meeting for more discussion about strategies on how we can improve.
3. Master Schedule of Assessments

Pat talked about the Master Schedule of assessments she and Nick created and distributed a sample page from it. The schedule lists all SLOs, their last assessment date, the next assessment date (three years) and the following assessment date. All SLOs not yet assessed are scheduled to be assessed in Spring 2014, if the courses are offered, or as soon as they are offered after that, with a follow-up assessment within another three years. Dr. Lee reminded us that the accreditation report stressed that we need to accelerate assessment. Faculty/departments are encouraged to assess more often than the three-year minimum and to reassess after changes are implemented. Faculty are encouraged to assess an SLO every semester. Pat distributed a table illustrating a sample assessment schedule for three SLOs over a three-year time period.

Pat mentioned a common misunderstanding about SLO assessments. At the District SLOAC and at other meetings she and Deborah had attended in the past, it was stressed that we had to have at least one SLO assessed per course by fall 2012. All SLOs/SAOs, PLOs, and ILOs are supposed to be assessed within a three-year period; however, as a result of our accreditation evaluation, we realized we need to adhere to a shorter cycle of implementation of improvements and reassess, while at the same time moving on to the assessment cycle for another SLO.

Someone asked how often SLOs should be revised. Dr. Lee responded that if the SLOs are good, and benchmarks are reasonable and being met, then it is not necessary to revise them; however, it is a good idea to go back and look at them for the purpose of reflection and then make updates as needed.

There was discussion about how we can always improve, even if we've met the benchmark. Leslie Milke talked about how working with the Library to improve writing was very beneficial to her students. It was also mentioned that if things seem like they are in a rut, an instructor can do different things to be creative with the SLO, such as trying a different assessment tool.

Riye Park mentioned the challenge inherent in assessing different groups of students every semester and that waiting to implement a change and reassess until the next semester may not work well for ESL. She also mentioned that it would be good to have more data on the students' background to help understand why there are variances with each new group from semester to semester. Riye talked about some of the challenges in ESL with the Assessment Center. Jesse Sanchez highlighted a pre-test and post-test scenario that they do in Culinary Arts for assessment.

The issue of whether all students should be assessed or only the "successful student" was discussed. The committee agreed that all students who turned in an assignment should be assessed. The SLO system has a randomizer that selects 35% of all active students to be assessed, but the group agreed that the more students that are assessed, the more valid and
meaningful the assessment is. Some faculty did not realize that they could reset the number of students to be assessed to “all.” Students that have dropped out or are missing can be skipped on the online system without having a negative influence on the average score of the rubric. If a student is skipped, a textbox appears for writing a justification as to why the student was skipped.

4. Continuation of Review of Charter

In the interest of time, it was decided to discuss the LOAC charter at the next meeting.

5. Sample Assessments and Rubrics for Discussion

Pat will send ten sample assessments and rubrics for discussion at the next meeting.

Additional Discussion Items:

Before a few members had to leave for another campus meeting, Pat brought up the question about whether LOAC should be under the Academic Senate or College Council, since LOAC includes members from both Student Service and Administrative Service areas in addition to academic areas. Leslie Milke stated that according to the Academic Senate Bylaws, LOAC should be under the Senate.

Margie Long suggested having brown bag lunches around SLO topics and also suggested having a list of common SLO acronyms.

Mark Pursley suggested inviting a student to be part of the LOAC.

Dr. Lee suggested that we try to send out the minutes, agenda, and other materials ahead of time for more efficiency.

6. Next meeting, Tuesday November 26th at 3:00 – 4:30pm, CC4

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Deborah Paulsen
Recorder
1. Student Learning Outcomes Survey

1.1 The student learning outcomes for my courses are clearly identified on my syllabi.
- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Don't Know

1.2 I am aware of what a student learning outcome (SLO) is at a program level.
- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Don't Know

1.3 I am aware of what a student learning outcome (SLO) is at the institutional level.
- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Don't Know

1.4 The student learning outcomes for my classes are clearly identified on my syllabi.
- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Don't Know

1.5 The student learning outcomes in my classes were verbally discussed at the beginning of my classes.
- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Don't Know

1.6 The student learning outcome for my classes were verbally reviewed on more than one occasion during the semester.
- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Don't Know

1.7 I am confident that I have achieved the course SLO(s) in my classes.
- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
LOS ANGELES MISSION COLLEGE
LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (LOAC)
Revised Draft of Committee Charter
November 26, 2013

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 assessing institutional, program, degree/certificate, and course level SLOs to ensure continuous quality improvement.
- Assist in establishing and maintaining an assessment schedule for all levels of outcome assessment: ILOs, PLOs, CSLOs, 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 alignment, development, and assessment.
- Assist faculty and staff in analyzing the results of assessment to 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.

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 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.
Responsibilities of the Department SLO Facilitator

Training Activities: $500 stipend

The purpose of this training course is to ensure the development and ongoing use of authentic assessments of student learning, to increase the dialog on student learning, and to effectively use student learning outcomes in departmental decision-making processes. In addition, the training will help to build a culture of assessment that acknowledges the benefits of learning assessment and collegial discussions on improvement fueled by the results of these assessments.

Department SLO Facilitators will be able to:

- Explain the LO process in general, as it relates to ELAC, and as it relates to the ACCJC
- Evaluate the effectiveness of LOs and assessment tools
- Help faculty to create or design assessments and assessment tools that align appropriately with outcomes
- Provide qualitative feedback on the LO process
- Plan and facilitate faculty dialog sessions to discuss assessment results with the aim of identifying gaps in student knowledge and abilities
- Facilitate the development of “use of results” plans that are viable and relevant
- Guide faculty in developing comprehensive reports at the course and program level

1. Receive required Department SLO Facilitator training by the Learning Assessment Office
   a. Attend at least 15 hours of the 18 hour training.
      i. While it is understood that scheduling conflicts and obligations may arise, it is essential that facilitators receive as much training as possible. It is strongly encouraged that all sessions be attended. This will prepare you to work within your department and allow you to complete the course work at the highest levels.
   b. Complete all assigned work. This is a required element to move on as a compensated facilitator.
   c. Participate in the rater reliability process on the Course Learning Outcome rubric. A minimum inter-rater reliability will be established, and facilitators will be required to reach a set standard of reliability.
2. Complete the ACCJC basic training & submit your certificate to OIE prior to the end of the training (will be identified in your syllabus and is dependent on scheduling).

Facilitator Activities: $750

1. Provide ongoing expertise to department members on the SLO process and the use of authentic assessments (see Course Learning Outcomes Rubric).
   a. Evidence of this interaction may include emails that provide guidance on developing authentic assessment and/or provide feedback to the department on the quality of existing assessments.
   b. Maintain minutes of department meeting SLO presentations or small group workshops.
Learning Outcomes Self Assessment Rubrics and Definitions

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. The four evaluations categories are as follows:

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></th>
<th>Assessment methods are unknown.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</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>3</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>4</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>5</td>
<td>The assessment methods for most of these courses test the application of the acquired knowledge and/or skill to &quot;real world&quot; situations. Students can use their knowledge and/or skills for problem solving and critical analysis. (Bloom's category: applying.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ACCJC encourages (requires) the use of authentic assessments for SLO analysis.

**Definition of Authentic Assessments:** Traditional assessment sometimes relies on indirect 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 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.

   ➢ This is referring to the "raw" data collected from individual students, not the summary of results reported on the SLOA forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No data or completely inappropriate data indicated.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</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>3</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>4</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>5</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>
3. **Benchmarks**

Are benchmarks identified? Are they appropriate, justifiable? Does analysis include reference to benchmarks? Is their evidence of progress related to benchmarks?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No benchmarks are used or indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</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>3</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>4</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>5</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>

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 Discussion:**

Are the SLOA results and recommendation and the assessment methods widely discussed across the department or unit?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No discussion takes place regarding any of the SLO results in these courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</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>3</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>4</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>5</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>

**Example of a Rubric Analysis of all Four Areas:** In this rubric, the average score is 3.5 or 70%. That number represents the aggregated results across all the 4 measures. Looking at the disaggregated results, this department is fairly strong on discussion (4/5 or 80%) so-so on authenticity (3.9 or 78%) but very weak on data and benchmarks (3.25 and 3.0, 63%). 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.