

## LAMC LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (LOAC)

### Minutes of Meeting

September 23, 2015

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Campus Center 1

**Present:** Deborah Paulsen, Arts/Media/Humanities; Par Mohammadian, Life Sciences; Stephen Brown, Life Sciences; Sheila MacDowell, Library; Cindy Cooper, HFAC & Kinesiology; Said Pazirandeh, Physical Sciences; Irma Luna, Research; Carolyn Daly, English; Darlene Montes, Academic Affairs; Riye Park, ESL/Developmental Communication; Emil Sargsyan, Math; Mark Pursley, Social Sciences; Yoon Yun, Math; Aleida Gomez, Counseling; Dennis Schroeder, Financial Aid

#### 1. Approval of Minutes of May 26, 2015 Meeting

Unanimously approved with corrections (Pursley/Daly).

#### 2. SLO Departmental Reports – Paulsen

Par suggested that department SLO representatives periodically present their reports to the committee. Deborah commented that all but two reports are posted online. After some discussion on the nature of the proposed presentations, Deborah suggested that department SLO reps schedule to present their department SLO reports to the LOAC committee. Deborah presented her department report as an example and pointed out that these reports can be used as evidence for accreditation. She also emphasized the importance of including:

- an indication of courses that haven't been assessed in the last 2 or 3 years
- an original summary of course assessment reports (i.e., no copy & paste)
- a summary of proposed changes, resource requests
- a list of department meetings

Deborah also answered a variety of questions pertaining to certain aspects of her report. No other departmental SLO reports were presented and it was decided that Par will come up with a schedule for two SLO department report presentations per meeting to begin at the next LOAC meeting.

#### 3. Updates to SLOs in Curriculum and Requested Modifications to SLO System – Paulsen & Brown

Deborah emphasized that in the future it is important that course level learning outcomes truly align with ILOs – specifically, if a course learning outcome is to align with a given ILO, there must be at least one component of the rubric used for the assessment that directly relates to the ILO. She also clarified that every course must align with at least one ILO.

Deborah then announced the Learning Outcomes coordinators (Paulsen, Mohammadian and Brown) met with Sarah Master, Patricia Chow and Nick Minassian to see if there would be any way to incorporate “percent above acceptable” and “normalized average rubric scores” into the system. Nick thought this was possible though it will take time to see if this can work.

There was also discussion of the possibility of flagging relevant portions of rubrics regarding specific ILOs and disaggregating student data by sub-population. Steve then presented a Powerpoint presentation he put together addressing the need to normalize rubric scores used for roll-up PLO and ILO assessments which highlighted the following:

- percent rubric scores from course level assessments are not comparable due to differences in rubric design, they need to be normalized if they are to be averaged
- a mathematical formula can be used to create “normalized rubric scores” for use in roll-up PLO or ILO assessments provided each department identifies the numerical rubric score that is equivalent to “acceptable”, something attendees at the SLO summit will be asked to do during the summit
- Nick Minassian indicated in a previous meeting this automation of all this in the online SLO system should be possible
- all that will be needed of faculty in this regard is to indicate the numerical value for “acceptable” in each rubric, something faculty will be asked to do at the SLO Summit
- a universal 70% benchmark with regard to rubric score **averages** is not appropriate due to differences in rubric design, therefore the benchmark rubric average should be defined for each rubric in relation to what the rubric defines as “acceptable”
- a benchmark of 70% of students scoring above “acceptable” however is appropriate

Said also emphasized the importance of SLO assessments actually using rubrics so that roll-up data is available. He also suggested that the online system require the value for “acceptable” be entered before the rubric can be used in an assessment.

#### **4. Information Competency ILO Update – MacDowell**

Sheila explained that a larger sample size and a broader array of courses relative to the 2014 pilot assessment made for a more comprehensive assessment in the spring of 2015.

Highlights of the assessment are as follows:

- 42 sections in 38 disciplines participated in the survey with a total of 1025 students compared to 368 students in the 2014 pilot assessment
- the current assessment is “truer” than the pilot since it was not limited to courses taught by faculty acquainted with the task force members
- the average scores and numbers of correct responses for survey portion of the assessment were lower than the pilot assessment but above the 70% benchmark
- the average score for the rubric portion of the “authentic” assessment was 77%, also above the 70% benchmark
- students performed lowest in referencing/citations

Sheila also indicated that the task force for this ILO needs to meet two more times this fall to review the data.

#### **5. Written Communication & Ethics and Values ILO Assessment – Paulsen**

Deborah reminded everyone of this upcoming assessment indicating that there should be over 500 students participating (responding to a writing prompt) in the assessment during week 7 of the current semester. This single written assignment will be used to assess two ILOs – Written Communication and Ethics & Values. Courses chosen to participate had English prerequisites and were upper level courses. Although some faculty who initially volunteered are unlikely to have their classes participate, the sample size should still be quite large. Deborah also mentioned that the student papers will be assessed at the SLO Summit on November 6<sup>th</sup> and that Gina Ladinsky will guide faculty in using a rubric for the assessment. Cindy Cooper raised the issue that some faculty, specifically non-English instructors, may not be qualified to assess the written assignments. Several committee members commented that

faculty in general should be competent to do this assessment and that those who felt they were not qualified to do so, by virtue of English not being their primary language or for other reasons, were not required to participate in the assessment. Deborah also pointed out that at least two people will assess each paper.

**6. ILO Roll-ups Final Report for Written and Oral Communication – Brown and Daly**

Due to time limits, this report was tabled until the next LOAC meeting (Cooper/Daly).

**7. Draft Agenda for SLO Summit – Brown**

A draft of the SLO summit agenda was passed out to the committee and attendees were asked to look it over and provide Deborah, Par or Steve any feedback they may have.

**8. Next LOAC Meeting – October 28, 2015**

**Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.**

**Recorder: Stephen Brown**