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Strategic Goal: Institutional Effectiveness

*Did you participate in the Institutional SLO process? If not, did you wonder what it was? It is time to look back at the results for the ISLO groups and determine what the future of ISLOs is. This session is part one of a two part program for the fall.*

*Learning Outcomes: To describe the results for the ISLO areas, and analyze the data and loop closing notes to determine effectiveness of current campus-wide assessment.*

**Overview/Rationale:**

The SLO coordinators (Rebecca Eikey, Nicole Faudree, and Paul Wickline) and Audrey Green, the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs, led discussion assessing the effectiveness of the ISLO process for each of the ten ISLO areas. The twenty participants present represented administration, faculty and staff. They discussed the process, quality of results, challenges of data collection, and possible approaches for the future. Workshop presenters used breakout groups to facilitate discussions and allow participants maximum input.

**Summary of General Discussion**

1. Most ISLO group chose to use mapping of course level SLO results rather than direct assessment to assess ISLOs. (See “ISLO Summary Report” available on the SLO website under “Reports.”) Most participants supported continued use of mapping in the future.

2. However, some expressed that direct assessment may provide a richer dialogue between faculty than mapping since faculty are directly involved in the process when using direct assessment. Attempts need to be made to increase participation in the “closing” of the assessment loop at the ISLO level if mapping is used. Recommendation made to make sure results are shared at the division meetings in the fall. Suggestion made to also post results and notes from ISLO FLEX sessions on intranet and send via email.
3. Observation made that quality of assessment results might be affected by online vs. on-ground mode of delivery.

Summary of Break-out Discussions

Group 1:

1. Confusion with mapping process for some concerned. How does mapping work? How is it used to assess PSLOs or ISLOs? This needs clarification and modeling.
2. Confusion with direct assessment process. Same as above.
3. Confusion from some concerning how or why process evolved through the IGETC requirements. Faculty probably share similar confusion.
4. Consensus was to continue with both mapping and direct assessment in the future.
5. Consensus among group that more conversation on the purpose and goal of ISLO assessment is needed with all faculty, administrators and staff.

Group 2:

1. Need to communicate how the data is collected to all concerned.
2. Need to clarify how the data is used (where is it posted, shared, etc.) and what is the outcome of the data collection?
3. How do we increase attendance at ISLO FLEX sessions?
4. Mapping seems easier, but faculty don’t know their data was mapped.
5. Suggestion made to consider a separate committee for ISLO
6. Consensus that group liked methods used but more time needed to invest in process.

Group 3:

1. Pleased with methods used but interested in using mapping next time.
2. Need to encourage more dialogue among faculty.
3. Distribute results at the Chairs retreat to share and discuss.

Group 4:

1. Make process simpler.
2. Make process more meaningful.

3. Answer “so what” more clearly for all concerned.

4. Is dialog meaningful after results received?

5. Can ARCC reporting requirement be used in some manner? How can we use existing requirements and better use of time?

6. Consider fewer ISOs and that are more overarching.

7. Make sure the college mission statement is aligned to ISLOs.

8. ISLOs don’t foster significant cross discipline conversation and collaboration as some ISLO areas are discipline specific.

9. What does all this say about student learning? Retention? Success?

**Action Plan:**

1. SLO coordinators will schedule presentations to HUMANITIES and FAPA divisions to share results and close the loop.

2. A second ISLO discussion will be held later in fall semester and/or spring flex week.

3. ISLO results for each area and summary report will be posted in the ISLO area of the SLO website by October 1, 2012. [http://www.canyons.edu/committees/SLO/Institutional/](http://www.canyons.edu/committees/SLO/Institutional/)

4. Results of ISLO discussion will be shared with SLO Committee at fall meetings.

5. SLO coordinators and committee members will request time on opening day and/or Department Chair’s retreats to hold conversation with faculty concerning ISLO process.

6. SLO committee will explore an Ad-hoc research committee to investigate other institutions’ approach to ISLO assessment.

7. Consider revising SLO Manual to provide improved information about the purpose of ISLO assessment and an overview of the process.
ISLO Summary of Results

Natural Sciences - Evaluate natural phenomena and human activities through the use of scientific inquiry.

- Assessed Spring 2011 with 76% of students passing the assessment.
- Faculty participated in a discussion of the results at a Math Science Division meeting. Adjunct faculty participated in collection of the results and course level loop closing.
- Out of the meeting in the fall of 2011, a dialog between Chemistry and Biology faculty ensued regarding prerequisites. Because of the assessment results, the faculty proposed curriculum changes.

Social Sciences - Demonstrate an understanding of the perspectives, theories, methods, or core concepts of the behavioral and social sciences.

- Assessed pre-summer 2012, with 80.8% of students passing the assessment.
- Faculty participated in a discussion of the results at a Social Science & Business Division meeting in fall 2012. Adjunct faculty participated in collection of results and course level loop closing.
- Faculty were pleased with the results of not only the pass rate for the students who took the assessment, but also with the way the ISLO results were reported through mapping. In an effort to assist faculty who struggle with adjunct faculty participation and assessment tools, faculty shared what was working in their departments. Some departments tasked full time faculty with the responsibility to lead loop closing for courses in their specialty. While others, included SLO work as part of department retreats so that adjuncts could be paid for participating. Finally, some departments held group norming exercises with rubrics.

Humanities and Fine Arts - #1. Analyze and appreciate works of philosophical, historical, literary, aesthetic, or cultural importance. (Lecture-based courses)

- Assessed spring 2012 with 4602/5187 (90%) students passing direct assessment using rubric.
- Faculty participated in a discussion of the results at a FLEX session in Fall 2012. Adjunct faculty participated in collection of the result and course level loop closing and are welcome at all FLEX sessions.
- Faculty were concerned that the rubric did not have depth or meaning. Mapping might be an alternative in the future. However, if direct assessment were to continue, then the rubric must be improved. Some departments were assessing course, program, and institutional at the same time last spring. Some faculty suggested mapping might be an option if the ISLO or specific course SLO was reworded. All faculty agreed that simplicity was the key. A concern was expressed over results being aggregated when the assessment tool was not standardized.
Faculty worry that if results are reported at a section level, then they could be used against faculty by the District, state, or accrediting agency.

**Humanities and Fine Arts** - #2. Demonstrate aesthetic understanding or artistic expression through disciplined-defined proficiencies in a chosen area or focus in Arts and Humanities. (Lab/Studio courses)

- Assessed spring 2012 with 516/595 (86%) students passing course level assessments. Course level assessments were aggregated; however, many performing arts courses were not represented due to lack of information in departmental program reviews and/or percentages rather than raw numbers reported.

- Faculty participated in a discussion of the results at a FLEX session in Fall 2012. Adjunct faculty participated in collection of the results and course level loop closing and are welcome at all FLEX sessions.

- Faculty discussed the drawbacks of the process of collecting assessment results. Faculty were worried adjuncts inflated results so that they would continue to receive assignments. Having adjuncts more fully invested in the process would help allay those fears. Some faculty noted there was a difference in the results from face to face sections of a course versus on-line sections. All agreed that because the ISLO is so broadly worded, it seemed easier to determine if faculty met the ISLO than a course SLO.

**Language and Rationality** - #1 (English Composition). Produce logical, analytical writing that is focused, fully developed and supported, and conforms to the conventions of standard written English.

- Assessed spring 2012 with student performance being indicated as “strong” across all courses. Data showed stronger student achievement in courses 102 and 103 as well as 204, which makes sense as these skills are developed in 101 and are refined in these courses.

- Faculty participated in a discussion of the results at an English department meeting in spring 2012. Adjunct faculty participated in collection of the results and course level loop closing, and are welcome at all department meetings.

- Faculty were pleased with the results, but still believe improvement can be made in strengthening instruction in MLA style, which was still the weakest skill across all courses.

**Language and Rationality** - #2 (Communication and Analytical Thinking). Apply systems of reasoning in solving problems or analyzing and evaluating arguments.

- Assessed Fall 2010, Spring 2011, and Fall 2011 with a percentage of passing ranging from 84% to 92%.

- Faculty participated in a discussion of the results at cross-department meetings in Fall 2010, Spring 2011, and Fall 2011. Adjunct faculty participated in collection of the results and course level loop closing.
• While the faculty were satisfied with the overall results of the ISLO results, the group was frustrated by the difficulty faced in getting adjunct faculty to participate. In addition, the group struggled to identify specific weaknesses or strengths because of the cross-disciplinary nature of ISLOs. Regardless, the group expressed satisfaction with the sharing results and discussing student learning.

American Institutions - Trace and analyze the historical development of American institutions and ideals and the operation of representative democratic government.

• Assessed pre-Fall 2012 with 77.9% of the students passing the assessment.
• Faculty participated in a discussion of the results at a Social Science & Business Division meeting in fall 2012. Adjunct faculty participated in collection of results and course level loop closing.
• Faculty were pleased with the results of not only the pass rate for the students who took the assessment, but also with the way the ISLO results were reported through mapping. As American Institutions created separate assessments (rather than mapping) to evaluate this ISLO, the faculty shared why they liked this process over mapping from a course level SLO. Faculty believed that the uniquely created assessment provided for greater alignment and academic freedom and flexibility in designing the tool.

Physical Education and Wellness - #1. Evaluate factors that affect personal health and select strategies to move towards optimal well-being.

• Assessed pre-Spring 2012 with 94% of the students passing the assessment.
• Faculty participated in a discussion of the results at a Physical Education Department retreat in fall 2011 (11/18/11). Adjunct faculty participated in collection of results and course level loop closing.
• The faculty expressed satisfaction the SLO/ISLO process which they thought was simple and efficient. Faculty agreed that activity courses have high success rates for a variety of factors including elective nature of course; high student engagement, camaraderie and positive peer pressure/support provided to encourage student attendance; participation and success; consistent teacher-student contact an a nearly daily basis, and the ability for faculty to immediately check for understanding during formative assessments which occur daily in activity courses.

Physical Education and Wellness - #2. Demonstrate appropriate skills for participation in a selected physical activity.

• Assessed pre-Spring 2012 with 77% of the students passing the assessment.
Faculty participated in a discussion of the results at a Physical Education Department retreat in fall 2011 (11/18/11). Adjunct faculty participated in collection of results and course level loop closing.

For the general education Health/Science education classes, the professors struggled with student apathy and misunderstanding by students of the actual requirements of the course ("easy A syndrome"). Concerns expressed about student’s lack of communication skills and ability of students to synthesize concepts and express these in writing. SLO coordinators discussed alternative assessment methods that might be closer aligned with ISLO and not focused on writing skills. Faculty shared common assignments used in their health classes and discussed benefits/weaknesses of these assignments.

Diversity - Identify how culture and identity impact individual and group experience in society.

- Assessed pre-Spring 2012 with 86% of the students passing the assessment.
- Faculty participated in a discussion of the results at a Spring 2012 FLEX session. Adjunct faculty participated in the collection of the results and course level loop closing and are welcome at all FLEX sessions.
- As a result of the results, the faculty recommended that the ISLO should be changed to “Analyze diversity (within context of this course . . . .”). There was concern regarding the rubric because the faculty believed that the rubric did not express what was passing. For those courses and faculty using independent assessment, the group agreed that the rubric should be revised before the next assessment cycle. Many of those who did an independent assessment believed that mapping a course ISLO would be preferable as long as the course SLO relates to diversity.

Career Technical Education - Achieve recognized skills and knowledge necessary to be successful in a chosen career.

- Assessed pre-Spring 2012 with 94.6% of the students passing the assessment.
- Faculty participated in a discussion of the results at a Spring 2012 FLEX session. Adjunct faculty participated in the collection of the results and course level loop closing and are welcome at all FLEX sessions.
- Overall, the faculty was pleased with mapping results from the course level. The group believed the results were high because career technical courses have students who are typically higher functioning, goal-oriented. On the other hand, faculty expressed concerns with validity of mapping when “basic” students are lumped in with “degree seeking” students in results.

Welding department shared success stories using online “my welding lab” and other strategies to engage students and assist them with process of navigating course and program requirements. Concerns about retention and success rates spurred this department to explore such changes. Computer department expressed concerns about students’ belief that they “know
Suggestions made to try to make the courses as “real world” as possible to emphasize professionalism, certification requirements, problem-solving, procedures, accountability, litigation issues, etc. Concerns expressed about need for students to receive supplemental instruction, career/support services, college acclimation, etc. because they are so itinerant.

College Skills - #1. Demonstrate foundational skills in reading, writing, mathematics, English as a Second Language, and learning and study skills.

- Assessed before spring 2012.
  - English 081 – 89% pass rate.
- Faculty participated in a discussion of the results at Skills 4 Success meetings over the course of several semesters. Adjunct faculty participated in collection of the results and course level loop closing, and are welcome at all Skills 4 Success meetings.

College Skills - #2. Demonstrate progress through appropriate Basic Skills Course sequences.

- Assessed over the course of many semesters beginning in 2008 and continuing to present.
- Faculty participated in a discussion of the results at Skills 4 Success meetings and department meetings over the course of several semesters spanning several years. Adjunct faculty participated in collection of the results and course level loop closing, and are welcome at all Skills 4 Success and department meetings.
- As a result of the progression analyses conducted in both math and English, both departments have added “accelerated” courses to help move students through key momentum points in the developmental course sequence. Math offered its accelerated course in spring 2012 and English will offer its course in spring 2012.

College Skills - #3. Demonstrate mastery of self-regulatory skills necessary to obtain academic success.

- Assessed fall 2011 with
  - 90% pass rate for the assessment tool requiring students to identify an education goal and formulate rational for the goal, and develop an educational plan to reach that goal.
  - 76% pass rate for the assessment tool requiring students to identify and evaluate resources and support services available on campus.
- Faculty participated in a discussion of the results at Skills 4 Success meetings over the course of several semesters. Adjunct faculty participated in collection of the results and course level loop closing, and are welcome at all Skills 4 Success meetings.
• Faculty believe that in measuring the traits and skills needed for goal setting and obtaining assistance in college, data from Counseling 111 was determined to be the best measure. Based upon the assessment results, the faculty would like to see the skills taught in Counseling 111 expanded to increased numbers of basic skills students. For the assessment tools above, faculty saw 53% improvement in the results for the first assessment tool and a 29% improvement in the second tool’s results since fall 2008.