LAMC LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (LOAC)

February 4, 2014
1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m., CC #4

AGENDA

1. Review of minutes of January 28, 2014 meeting

2. Final approval of LOAC Charter

3. Student Survey on SLOs
   - Revised Student Survey was distributed to all Winter Intersession faculty
     Friday, January 31
   - Due date: Monday, February 10,
   - Academic Affairs will assist with keeping track of which instructors submit the
     survey packets

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, benchmarks met or not met,
     highlights of improvements made and changes planned, and a reflection on
     what has been learned.
   - 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 proportion of students who have reached the benchmark.
   - Other suggestions for changes/additional information?

5. Highlights and discussion of Chairs’ Fall Semester Reports
   - All Chairs’ Fall SLO/PLO Assessment reports have been submitted.
   - 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.

6. Recommended trainings for the Spring 2014 semester?

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


9. Next meeting – Date and Time: ___________________________
LAMC LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (LOAC)
Minutes of Meeting January 28, 2014

12:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.

Present: Co-Chair, Pat Flood; Sarah Master, Stephen Brown, Patricia Chow, Rolando Cuevas, Louis Eguaras, Margie Long, Par Mohammadian, Darlene Montes, Riye Park, Deborah Paulsen, Mark Pursley, Dennis Schroeder, Robert Smazenka, Tara Ward, Debby Wong

1. Review of Minutes of December 3, 2013 meeting

2. Chair’s Fall Semester Reports
   a. Pat announced that all except three departments have turned in their SLO/PLO semester reports. They were of very high quality. The ACCJC has indicated that we need to speed up the process of updating, assessing and reporting learning outcomes. Good progress has been made on course SLOs, however, many PLOs still need assessments. Pat will work with Nick Minassian to produce a learning outcomes report within the next two weeks to update the college on the number of SLOs and PLOs that have had at least one outcome assessed in addition to the proportion of all SLOs and PLOs that have been assessed.
   b. Debbie Wong suggested that for reporting PLOs it would be good if there was an open dialogue box for reporting information such as assessments that may have not worked. For example, math tried an assessment for Statistics 137, but the objectives and projects did not match, so it was a problem. Pat mentioned that the Department’s Notes page can be used for this purpose.
   c. Pat and Deborah have been working with Nick on linking program assessments by mapping which specific SLOs support each PLO. This will enable chairs to do roll up assessments more easily from SLOs to PLOs. ILOs that are supported by course and program learning outcomes are already indicated on the online system.
   d. Pat and Deborah have requested Nick to not divide the Department’s notes page by semester, but rather to keep notes ordered simply by date with the most recent note at the top.

3. Approval of LOAC Charter
   a. The LOAC Charter was further discussed and revised. Pat said she would make the revisions and send the Charter to the committee members for a final check so that it can be approved at the next LOAC meeting.
   b. It was suggested that a representative from ASO and Robert Crossley be added to the committee. Pat said she would contact Robert.
4. **Student Survey on SLOs**
   Dr. Matthew Lee had worked with Sarah Master on revising the latest draft of the Student Survey and the committee reviewed it. It will be administered during the final week of classes of the Winter Intersession. The Committee went over the survey in detail and wanted to simplify some of the questions. All of the members thought that the survey would help to develop student awareness of SLOs and that it was worthwhile to do as a pilot survey. Riye Park asked if it could be translated for the ESL discipline; however, it was decided that there would not be enough time to do this for the Winter Intersession.

5. **Next Meeting: Tuesday, February 4, 1:30 – 3:00 p.m.**

   Pat requested that members bring with them their packet of materials from the January 28 meeting.

**Adjourned:** 1:37 p.m.

**Recorders:** Steve Brown and Deborah Paulsen
Mission Statement:

The mission of the Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee (LOAC) is to provide direction and resources to support an ongoing, systematic process that clarifies and improves achievement of Institutional, Program, and Course Learning Outcomes with specific emphasis on student success. The Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee works with faculty and staff to ensure the process of assessment is integrated and consistent across the College for course SLOs (CSLOs), Service Area Outcomes (SAOs), Program and division Learning Outcomes (PLOs), and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs).

The Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee is sanctioned by the College Council and is a subcommittee of the Academic Senate. The committee 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 evaluating outcomes to ensure continuous quality improvement on all levels.
- Assist in establishing and maintaining an assessment schedule for all levels of outcome assessment.
- 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 with outcome development and assessment.
- Assist faculty and staff in analyzing the results of assessment to implement changes that improve learning and services.
- Maintain open and frequent communications about outcome development and assessment with various college groups including but not limited to the Department chairs, Academic Division Deans, Curriculum Committee, Academic
Senate, and the Offices of Academic Affairs, Student Services, and Administrative Services.

- Provide qualitative feedback on the overall learning outcome process.

Committee Membership:

The committee is co-chaired by the Outcome Assessment 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, Administrative Services, and the Associated Students Organization (ASO) Advisor and/or student representative.

Voting Rights:

Only faculty and staff members are given voting rights. When there is more than one faculty or staff representative per department present, only one vote per department or area 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 areas.

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.
1. How many units have you already completed at LAMC?
☐ 1 to 15 units  ☐ 16 to 30 units  ☐ 31 to 45 units
☐ 46 to 60 units  ☐ More than 60 units

2. Please mark the choice that best describes your knowledge and understanding of the course student learning outcomes (SLOs) in this class:
☐ I know about them and understand them well.
☐ I know about them but understand them some.
☐ I know about them but understand them little or not at all.
☐ I don't know about them.

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 ☐ No ☐ Don't know

4. Were the SLOs discussed at least once at the beginning of the course?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't know

5. Were the SLOs reviewed more than once during the course?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't know

6. Were specific guidelines (a rubric) used for one or more assignments in this class?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't know

Rubric was not provided. It did not help at all. It helped a little. It helped a lot.

7. If you answered 'Yes' to question 6, how much did the rubric help you achieve at least one of the course SLOs?
☐ Not at all ☐ A little ☐ A lot

(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 never heard of it
   - I barely understand
   - I understand partially
   - I understand well
   - I understand very well

9. Program learning outcome (PLO)

10. Institutional learning outcome (ILO)

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.

Thank you for completing this survey!
SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS' ASSESSMENT REPORTS - 2013

The findings from this past year's semester reports indicate a higher degree of reflective thought about what has been learned and what changes need to be made to ensure that more students achieve the desired learning outcomes. Some of the key findings that emerged are

- Faculty are more often preparing and distributing rubrics and examples in advance of the evaluation of assignments to make expectations clearer.
- Areas of weakness are being focused on more in presentations of the course material, practice sheets are being distributed, and assignments are being revised.
- Supplemental resources have been added and faculty are more often using Etudes as an online platform to distribute information and to keep students better informed as to how they are doing in the course.
- Increased use of peer reviews for assignments before submitting them for grading and additional use discussions, video clips, and online resources have further strengthened understanding of concepts being assessed.
- Support services at the college are being used more widely, especially tutoring centers such as the Learning Resource Center, Math Center, Student Success Center, and the Child Development Resource Center.
- Courses are being modified due to changes in industry demand.
- New classes are being added and Child Development and other disciplines have begun offering hybrid classes.
- How-to-video tutorials and PowerPoint are being used more often in classroom instruction and have also been added to department websites which students may download to improve their learning; for example, the Life Science Web Department Web page.
- Student tutors have been hired to help with understanding and application of principles (Accounting, AJ, Law, CAOT, Math, and Child Development).
- Changes in course content and emphasis have resulted from the assessments; for example, in accounting, financial statements have been emphasized as a critical competency for completing the course.
- More authentic assessments have been developed to replace traditional means of assessment to obtain more meaningful results; for example, Administration of Justice developed a crime lab where they can set up mock crime scenes for students; Personal Development has developed an educational plan project.
- Additional critical thinking and ethics content has been embedded in a number of courses; for example, law, history, and philosophy.
- Assessment workshops for all full-time and adjunct faculty to discuss SLOs, align assessments, and review progress to date have been added resulting in increased faculty collaboration.
- Developmental Communications faculty are implementing strategies such as referring students to the various services that are available on campus. They have also emphasized structure and accountability as a result of their assessments.
- Staff members are collaborating with Learning Center staff to create online interactive tutorials as well as workshops targeted at specific courses.
Several disciplines have rewritten their course-level SLOs to more appropriately reflect the program and the course outlines; for example, ESL, Life Sciences, Culinary, Political Science, and Psychology.

Physical Education has altered their testing to incorporate additional cardio vascular assessments for classes that have cardio vascular endurance as an integral part of the course, such as in basketball.

Prerequisites are being added; for example, since all SLO assessments indicated that writing and researching anthropology papers need to be improved, English 28/ESL 8 is being added as a prerequisite for all anthropology courses.

Exams are being revised to include clearer formatting and more explicit instructions to minimize the chance of errors due to misinterpretation of the questions.

Lab manual exercises are being modified; for example, in biology a new laboratory exercise addressing how to read a primary research article is being added.

New texts have been selected based on assessment results.

More essay exams (rather than multiple choice/TF exams), group discussions, video presentations, and in-class group exercises are being used.

Increased emphasis is being placed on service learning for students by placing them in internships in non-profit agencies; for example, sociology and administration of justice.

The Math Department has a sequence of corrective actions in place depending on how far below the average rubric score is compared to the established course or program benchmark:

Under the 70% benchmark, the SLO must be reassessed based on the recommendation criteria below during the following semester:

1. If between 55-69% (Moderate): The SLO question will be reviewed and modified if needed. Additionally, the course coordinator may provide more homework questions and additional online resources related to the topic assessed and communicate any changes to all faculty.

2. If between 40-54% (Poor): In addition to action described in (1), the course evaluation committee will review the course outline including the topics and timeline and make appropriate changes. The textbook and courseware may also be reviewed and appropriate changes made.

3. If below 40% (Critical): In addition to actions described in (1) and (2), the department will review curriculum for the course as well as of prerequisite courses. Changes may be made in these courses to insure the continuity of the curriculum and learning expectations. Meetings with faculty may be scheduled to advise them of any changes and provide training as necessary.

In summary, faculty at LAMC have been actively involved with assessing their course SLOs; some work has been done on the Program outcome assessment level but more focus needs to be placed on these. All Program Outcomes are listed on the online SLO system along with the courses that support them. The next step is to have the department chairs’ course SLO-to-PLO alignment matrices (2.24. sample matrix) transferred to the online system so that it is clear which courses support each PLO. This is in the process of being implemented and is intended to be in place for the spring assessments. A more detailed mapping will enable faculty to use a roll-up method to assess both the Program and Institutional Learning Outcomes to augment assessments that have already been done.