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Why ISLO Assessment?

ACCJC (Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges) expects that SLOS and authentic assessments are in place for all courses, programs, support services, certificates and degrees. COC has defined the assessment of "degrees" through ISLO's.

More importantly, the goal is to improve student learning and instructional approaches through an examination and discussion of assessments that examine broad learning outcomes shared by multiple departments and divisions.
"Student success in college cannot be documented -- as it usually is -- only in terms of enrollment, persistence, and degree attainment...(Are) students who have placed their hopes for the future in higher education actually achieving the kind of learning they need for a complex and volatile world?" (College Learning for the New Global Century, AAC&U)
"Student success in college cannot be documented -- as it usually is -- only in terms of enrollment, persistence, and degree attainment...(Are) students who have placed their hopes for the future in higher education actually achieving the kind of learning they need for a complex and volatile world?" (College Learning for the New Global Century, AAC&U)
General Discussion Summary:
1. Most ISLO groups chose to use mapping of course level SLO results rather than direct assessment to assess ISLOs. Consensus was to continue to use mapping in the future.

2. Concerns expressed that direct assessment rather than mapping might provide richer dialogue when closing the loop.
   - Humanities division HFA loop closing contradicts this assumption.
Sampling of Break-out Discussions:
1. Confusion about mapping process, direct assessment process

2. Confusion about purpose/goals of ISLO assessment and IGETC connection. "So what" needs to be answered for all concerned.

3. Where is data shared? To what end?

4. How is this connected to student learning? Retention? Success?

5. Continue with both mapping and direct assessment

6. How do we increase faculty interest in/understanding of ISLO assessment purpose and outcome of results? Flex workshop attendance?

7. Create a separate ISLO committee?

8. Make process simpler and more meaningful.

9. Are ISLOs' aligned with college mission statement?

10. ISLOs don't foster significant cross discipline conversations/collaboration as some ISLO areas are discipline specific.

11. Is dialogue truly meaningful after results received?
ACTION PLAN from ISLO Meeting Fall '12

1. SLO coordinators presented to Humanities and FAPA divisions, closing the loop. (Done)
2. ISLO summary report posted on SLO website and submitted in ACCJC SLO Proficiency Report. (Done)
3. ISLO results shared at SLO committee meetings. (Done)
4. SLO coordinators will request time on opening day for ISLO discussion. (Tabled)
5. SLO committee will explore Ad-Hoc research committee to investigate other institution’s approach to ISLO assessment. (Completed by SLO Coordinators)
6. Revise SLO manual to provide information about the purpose of ISLO assessment and an overview of process. (In progress)
Spring 2013 FLEX SESSION ON ISLO

Group in attendance examined 3 options for ISLO process:
1. IGETC /College Skills / CTE
2. Core Competencies
3. LEAP OUTCOMES

Group strongly urged consideration of LEAP OUTCOMES.
IGETC, College Skills & CTE

1. Brief History
2. Pros and Cons
3. Q&A
**PROS**

1. Faculty generally aware of ISLOs and process.

2. May be easier to continue current process with improvements rather than to start from scratch.

3. Lessons learned from first round of IGETC ISLO assessment may be lost.
CONS

1. Process not uniform with some ISLO areas using direct and other using mapping of course-level results.

2. Faculty do not see a connection between student learning and assessment results.

3. Data not meaningful to faculty.

4. Process burdensome. Example -- some courses were assessing course, program and institutional SLOs in same semester.
Core Competencies

1. 4-6 core, fundamental competencies that an institution believes are critical to the success of an institution's graduates.

2. They are defined in broad, conceptual terms.

3. Each tends to be described in more detail by a list of key indicators that help operationalize the terms.

4. These competencies transcend students' experiences across their academic, co-curricular, social and personal development.

5. They tend to be interwoven throughout an institution's mission and goals.
SAMPLE: Core Comps

- http://www.foothill.edu/schedule/institutional_learning_outcomes.php (sample Core Competencies)
- http://pro.cabrillo.edu/slos/4cores_tmp.htm
- http://slo.sbcc.edu/docs/CSLO%20to%20ISLO%20Map%202010-2011.pdf (form used to map CSLO to ISLO)

ACTION PLAN from ISLO Meeting Fall '12

- O coordinators presented to Humanities and PARA teams, closing the loop. (Done)
- O summary report posted on SLO website and included in ACCJC SLO Proficiency Report. (Done)
- O results shared at SLO committee meetings.
- O completion will be presented on opening day for new SECC.
- O core will explore Ad-Hoc research
PROS

1. Most California community colleges have core comps in place and are using them to assess degree outcomes. Many examples exist.

2. MAY be simpler for faculty/admin/staff and students to remember and internalize than the current IGETC ISLOs.

3. MAY be able to align with college's mission more clearly and distinctly and help focus institutional instructional goals.

4. Can be aligned with LEAP core 4.
CONS

1. "Back to drawing board" feeling.

2. Process of developing core comps with all faculty, staff and admin will take time.

3. Developing assessment process for core comps.
**LEAP Outcomes**

Association of American Colleges and Universities
LEAP = Liberal Education and America's Promise

1. "Essential Learning Outcomes for a contemporary liberal education"

2. "Principles of excellence" that provide a new framework to guide students' cumulative progress through college.

3. 12 Essential Learning Outcomes and Authentic Assessments
Four Areas

1. Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World

2. Intellectual and Practical Skills

3. Personal and Social Responsibility

4. Integrative and Applied Learning

ADD LINK HERE:
PROS

1. Outcomes developed by AACU

2. Wealth of material exists including rubrics.

3. Palomar could be used as an example.
"This assessment process provided forums where instructors from across disciplines shared their experiences and worked together to improve students' general education. Discussions were lively and productive—raising questions and coming up with valuable recommendations. Feedback from faculty members involved in the process was overwhelmingly positive."

(French and Nelson, "General Education/Institutional Learning Outcomes")

1. "Back to time.


3. Develop.
CONS

1. "Back to drawing board" feeling.

2. Process of refining rubrics with all faculty, staff and admin will take time.

3. Developing assessment process for LEAP outcomes.
**STEPS AHEAD?**

Sharing and discussion today

- Why we (SLO coordinators, FLEX workshop participants) like LEAP outcomes
- Examine sample outcomes/rubrics
- What LEAP Outcomes assessment might look like
- Timeline for implementation
Possible Timeline

Fall 13 --
- Orientation of COC to LEAP Outcomes
- Visit with Palomar and other institutions using LEAP outcomes

Spring 14 --
- Establish schedule for Outcomes Assessment (which Outcomes would be assessed in which semesters?)
- Determine courses mapped to specific outcomes
- Plan for assessment of selected LEAP Outcomes

Fall 14 --
- Begin Outcomes assessment