

ACSLO Minutes
LACCD Student Success Initiative
Advisory Council on Student Learning Outcomes
 Friday, February 21, 2008 @ 1st Floor Conference Room, 811 Wilshire Blvd.

Attendance

Barbara Anderson (PC), Daryl Kinney (LACC), Dave Humphreys (LAHC), Deborah Harrington (DO), Lloyd Thomas (WLAC), Pat Flood (LAMC), Rebecca Stein (LAVC), Lora Lane (LAHC). Guests: Arend Flick (Riverside Community College)

Start Time

10:05 AM

The minutes of January 11, 2008, were distributed.

1. **Update on District Planning Committee and SLOs: Program Review Guidelines & Report Request from Board (Members of DPC).** Deborah, Rebecca, and Pat attended this meeting and led the discussion. Minutes from this January 23rd meeting were distributed (also a draft “Reporting” grid). The grid is supposed to make it easy to report to the BOT about college progress in achieving Strategic Planning goals. There was some concern about how the grid would align with the annual ACCJC report about SLOs. Grid assumes all colleges are following basically the same format. Does it allow for college differences? Some feel the grid looks too much like a “report card” which was its original name. The grid does not establish uniform criteria; we don’t have to cover everything. We carefully studied the section on SLOs—Objective 3. There was discussion of how the following inter-relate--Core competencies, institutional outcomes, general education competencies, program outcomes, course outcomes. Members will send Rebecca Stein—who serves on the DPC—our concerns. We agreed that we will bring our SLOs –core competencies, gen. Ed, etc.—as well as plans/forms for assessment, SLO handbooks, assessment results to our next meeting.
2. **Sharing: SLOs, Online Program Review & Assessment Aggregation @LATTC (Bradley Vaden).** Unfortunately, Bradley had a family emergency and could not attend. We will move this item to our next meeting.
3. **Q & A on Assessment with Arend Flick, Associate Professor and District Assessment Coordinator for Riverside Community College District (All).** Assessment and Program review go together. Arend wants to “simplify the process” if possible. It needs to be sustainable. It can work in a local program. How do you systematically go through student E-portfolios and look at “critical thinking” across the college in a number of courses? Outcomes assessment should be collaborative [among several teachers, not just one.] (Daryl). Riverside’s Program review is rigorous in its demand for reports on assessment practices—what has worked, what has not? What has the discipline been doing in course based or program based assessment? Tie this to resource allocation. Riverside’s Strategic Planning Committee examines Program Review to determine how “robust” a discipline’s assessment work has been. This is on the Riverside College website (which can be linked from the SLO pages of the LACCD website @http://www.laccd.edu/inst_effectiveness/Student_Learning/). Start with the big enrollment courses—[like English 101, Psychology 1, and Math 115]. Assessment results can lead you to revise your SLOs to make them sharper. At Riverside, the Business division assumed responsibility for assessing its outcomes—then reported to the Assessment Committee which examined and approved its work. Accreditation Teams can put colleges on “warning” if they don’t make sufficient progress in assessing SLOs. You have to balance “carrots” and “sticks” to get faculty participation. There is a “culture of resistance” at some schools. At Valley, each semester one department presents its SLO assessment process. City has provided enhanced incentives for departments who complete their program assessment first. At City, results of

program assessment are presented at “opening day” in the Fall. Designing assessment right can actually make less work for faculty--groups of faculty evaluate each other’s students. It establishes “norms” in the discipline, teacher “coaches” students to help them pass the course/competencies. Rather than do big trainings, sometimes it’s easier to go one-on-one with individual teachers/departments/discipline-specific. Arend repeated that at Riverside, when divisions go through Program Review, they must present their SLO assessment results. Survey students on self-perceived learning gains—compare this to Gen. Ed. Assessment results. Sample 10-12 high enrollment classes—ask teachers to send paper “artifacts” to the committee which would evaluate them. Gen. Ed. Committee has to see whether GE requirements/courses actually fit with recently adopted SLOs. Maybe add “global awareness” into many courses, or create an individual course.

4. Planning: District-wide Assessment Training Series for Faculty (All & Amend Flick)

College reps briefly reported on SLO assessment progress at their campuses. Aligning individual courses with college outcomes. Difference between analytical and holistic rubrics. Holistic is overall impression. Outcomes assessment should focus on specifics—which an analytical rating scale can do. Harbor keeps is making SLOs separate from the course outline, so it is easy to change them. At Mission, 15% of faculty have done assessment and gotten together with peers in their discipline. At West, 20% of faculty have posted assignments aligned with college and/or program SLOs, with rating scales, sample papers, and self-reflection by the teacher. [Try to put yourself in the role of the student. Teacher reflection can help the teacher recognize the need for some changes, which will end up helping students] At Pierce, department chairs are doing a lot of work, they are attempting to assess all the high enrollment classes. At City, ten faculty (who may represent more than ten classes—several sections of the same course, etc.) are participating in a pilot assessment project. Comprehensive Program Review asks them to explain how they have changed their program as a result of assessment.

Deborah asked, “Does anyone have a college handbook on SLOs?” How do different colleges add or embed SLOs into course outlines? The agreement was that for the next meeting, the coordinators would share as many specific items including completed SLO-related forms, handbooks, assessment evaluations, etc., in order for the committee to begin to see where concrete gaps are in order to design an effective, hands-on, district-wide assessment training for faculty in the fall.

Next Meeting: April 3, 2008. 10AM in the 1st Floor Conference Room at 811 Wilshire.