

Adult Basic Education
Flex Day Activities
August 24, 2016

Twenty-five staff members attended Flex Day Activities including twelve faculty, five managers, and eight classified. The purpose was to provide guidance and information on the development of SLOs and ILOs for 2016-2017 and to provide an opportunity for staff to formulate activities/interventions to improve student communications skills, assess their skill level, and to collect supporting data.

Leslie Johnson provided an introduction by discussing updates on WASC accreditation and AEBG activities for the upcoming year. Mary Ann Gomez-Angel and Donna Necke presented information on the ILO process and participants formed into four smaller groups to identify interventions to develop and assess this year's goal of communication. The groups were identified as High School Equivalency (HSE), Adult High School Diploma (AHSD), Counseling, and Short Term Vocational (STV). Groups then shared their ideas for interventions/assessment, and target dates for compilation of data followed by a full group discussion.

Mary Ann Gomez-Angel presented information on Course Measureable Objectives (CMOs) and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and lead a discussion on the status and development for this year. Donna Necke also presented the Course Outline of Record, four-year, review process.

Susan Wright conducted a presentation on Character Strengths within the Workplace and provided a self-assessment for participants.

Pre and post tests were completed by participants to assess their knowledge of SLOs, ILOs, and CORs.

AmLa SLO Workshop Follow-Up Report

Eight adjunct faculty and three full-time American Language Department faculty members met on Thursday, September 8, 2016 from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m. to prepare adjunct faculty for conducting writing SLOs in the fall semester.

The workshop had three primary objectives, which were completed. First, the adjunct faculty were given an overview of the Department's writing SLOs. The Department has three levels of writing: basic, intermediate, and advanced. This year the Department is carrying out two SLOs for each of these three levels. The Department has not done SLOs for writing classes in four years, and several of the adjunct faculty are new, and thus have not been exposed to the concept of SLOs nor the way in which they are conducted in AmLa.

The second objective was to inform the adjunct faculty of the process for the collection of SLO data, the grading of the paragraphs, and the method of submitting their results. This was successfully done, and a handout explaining the process and time lines for completion was distributed.

The third, and most important objective, was to go through a norming process so all faculty would grade the paragraphs they would read similarly. This took the majority of the time as first a rubric was distributed along with a handout on grammar scope and sequence. After the rubric was explained, the adjunct faculty reviewed the grammar scope and sequence handout so as to know what is expected of students at each of the levels. Sample paragraphs were first reviewed before faculty actually had to read a number of paragraphs from each of the three levels. After reading the paragraphs, faculty were asked to grade the paragraphs according to the rubric. This process was completed several times to make sure all faculty agreed on the passing or failing of the paragraphs relative to the two SLOs.

The workshop was quite successful not only in achieving the objectives set out but also in providing an opportunity for faculty to get to know and work with each other.

Winter Reading Adjunct Faculty SLO Workshop Report
Learning Assistance – Reading
February 8, 2017 4:30-7:00pm Bld.6-112

Two reading adjunct attended a two hour Winter Reading Workshop along with two full time reading instructors and a Learning Assistance Resource Center (LARC) supervisor.

We began by examining the READ 90 Course Outline of Record and Measurable Objectives and sharing a variety of assessments and LARC activities in READ 90. Emphasis was placed on connecting assessments with outcomes and Measurable Objectives.

To close the loop on the Four Levels of Comprehension SLO started in Summer 2015, we reviewed conclusions from the Summer 2016 READ Workshop meeting where student results were analyzed. Findings showed that students and faculty members interpret the Four Levels of Comprehension in multiple ways.

In order to increase consistency of instruction and learning of Four Levels, An excerpt from Chapter 7 “Are There any Fallacies in the Reasoning?” from Asking the Right Questions was used as literal, inferential, evaluative, and appreciative questions were generated individually and then shared with the group. Understanding of levels were discussed and multiple perspectives were shared.

Product vs process was discussed and caution was given about a “skills” based approach to presenting these levels of thinking to students. If the purpose is to enable a deeper understanding of text, students benefit from assessments that scaffold critical thinking skills.

A suggestion was made to create a Four Levels of Comprehension LARC assignment that would be available for instructors (like a Directed Learning Assignment) to use as a guide to clarify questioning as a process to deepen comprehension which is connected to the following reading outcome:

1. Create, evaluate, and respond to questions that reflect a variety of comprehension levels using college level texts across disciplines.

It was agreed that an additional handout with a circular flow chart that includes “transference” could emphasize types of thinking, the recursive nature of levels, and depth of questioning.

The discussion also included LARC tutor and student perspectives in regards to the purpose of LARC assignments, how they connect with student learning outcomes and the LAC developmental education philosophy, and types of assignments that are highly effective.

As a Strategic Action, Larry Silva created a document to clarify the purpose of teaching questioning and how instructors can use Bloom’s Taxonomy prior to teaching Four Levels of Questioning. An explanation of Appreciative Questioning was included to encourage and increase consistency among faculty and between course levels.

Nutrition and Foods (NF) Program Adjunct Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) meeting

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the current Nutrition and Foods course-wide SLOs and provide suggestions on how to revise and strengthen the existing SLOs to better meet the needs of our students, facilitate their success, and ensure that our SLOs aligned with the Mt. SAC NF Course Measurable Objectives (CMOs), Administrative Unit Objectives (AUOs), Program Level Outcome (PLOs), and **Institutional Level Outcomes (ILOs)**.

On Friday, February 10, 2017, from 9 am – 11 am, four full-time NF faculty and three adjunct faculty members (Alexandra Alvarado, Julianne Fantazia, and Joy Hass) met to review all of the existing NF course-wide SLOs. The collaborative process focused on the following areas:

- An assessment of current SLOs for all NF courses, evaluating their strengths and weaknesses and how well they reflect the course measurable objectives.
- Identifying any SLOs that were in need of revision and providing suggestions on how to strengthen them through group consensus. In some cases, SLOs are to be reworded to reflect CMOs. In the case of NF 10, a new SLO was suggested to replace an existing SLO that did not have an identifiable CMO. Faculty suggested ways the new SLO could be assessed. Finally, faculty determined that reporting should include all students, not just students who completed assignments. SLO wording was updated to clarify this decision.
- Some discussion ensued about structuring assignments to reflect the SLOs. The Nutrition and Foods program allows faculty some measure of academic freedom in designing assignments. However, assignments must support the SLOs they are assessing. The department chair will follow up with faculty to ensure that CMOs are being met.
- The NF program plans to collect SLO data for all NF courses during Spring semester. Attending faculty all agreed to participate in data collection. Courses that cannot be collected were canceled prior to the start of the semester and include NF 25H, NF 30, NF 81, and NF 82. All other courses: NF 1, NF 10, NF 12, NF 20, NF 25, and NF 28, will have data collected. Use of results will be discussed at the last CSDT department meeting of the school year.

Attendees remarked that the meeting was valuable in determining NF SLOs, identifying the best methods of data collection, providing helpful tips on how to analyze the collected data, and useful questions to keep in mind when evaluating the use of results. (The next page includes the SLOs handout provided for all attendees).

Besides helping to clarify SLOs, this meeting was helpful in improving program cohesion. So many adjuncts rarely see each other or us (the full time faculty), and we like to thank them in person and hear about their experiences.

We would like to thank the Outcomes Committee for its support and funding.

Sincerely,

Carol Impara
Department Chair, CSDT



Sociology Department
ADJUNCT DEPARTMENT MEETING: SLO

Optional Adjunct Department Meeting (2 hours)
2nd Floor Conference Room in 26A
1PM-3PM

The general theme of the meeting is outcomes and how it relates to the items below.

This year there were about 10 adjuncts and one full-time professor that attended the meeting. We opened the meeting with a discussion of SLO progress for the academic year as well as how the college intends to use the outcomes data. We also discussed the purpose of the outcomes.

I updated the faculty on the SLO progress which included: the posting of all department SLOs on our department websites, our development of our Program Level Outcomes for each discipline, our college ILOs. I also discussed the goal of mapping all SLOs to PLOs to ILOs. We discussed the importance of having the SLOs on the syllabus as well as how the outcomes can be presented in a more meaningful manner to the students if the different assignments were linked to the appropriate outcome. I instructed the faculty to embed the SLOs on their course syllabi effective this fall term. I also asked them to consider linking or mapping an outcome to each of their major assignments in the class and to have these indicated on the syllabus and/or assignment instructions.

The majority of the meeting was spent analyzing and discussing the outcomes data. There were many courses that met the criteria, but a couple that did not. We looked at the wording of these outcomes and revised it to be more specific to reduce the likelihood that instructors misinterpreted the outcome intention and collected data on other aspects of the course. We also discussed how the data collection process could have contributed to some data collection error. So, the forms were revised to include a line to report the number of students who did not complete or attempt the assessment tool. It was assumed that some instructors included these students in the number of those that did not meet the expectations. The forms were also revised to include a line that asked instructors to describe their assessment method, i.e. exam, in class activity, project, essay prompt, etc. This information may be useful in identifying patterns in the outcomes data. For instance, if the data may reveal that outcomes assessed with exams yield lower success. In this case, we would be able to eliminate this option as an assessment measure as it might not be a reflection of the student's understanding of the content material, but rather their level of test taking ability.

We ended the meeting with a discussion on the goals for the 2017-2018 year which included workshops scheduled to focus on outcomes as well as teaching effectiveness.