

# West Hills College Coalinga Institutional Learning Outcome Guide and Report

**ILOC Members:** Arkady Hanjiev, Justin Hampton, Andrea Pulido, Jill Bonds, Robert Pimentel, Sherry Barragan, Chris Chaney, Mark Matteson, Jason Smith, Francisco Banuelos

**Date of Meetings:** 4/9/18, 4/16/18, 4/23/18, 4/30/18

## Institutional Student Learning Outcomes Report

**Recommendation#1:** WHCC faculty have a college wide discussion during the next FLEX Day in regard to students failing classes due to not turning in their work. Discussion should focus on results from ILOC and corrective measures that need to be undertaken in order to resolve issues that arise in the discussion.

**Data:** From the data reviewed, it seemed to be that when a student did not complete their SLO assignment most of the time it was because they did not complete the assignment. Extrapolating, we are not sure whether this is a college wide issue in which students fail courses because they do not turn in their work. Based upon the data there is not enough information in order to resolve the issue therefore a college wide discussion might be the best way to proceed.

**Closing the loop:** This will be fulfilled based upon measurable outcomes developed during the discussion.

**Recommendation for SLOC#1:** The SLOC to provide training to faculty on the permanence of SLOs.

**Data:** Reviewing the data suggests that faculty need training on the permanence of SLOs.

**Closing the loop:** This will be fulfilled by faculty taking a survey at the end of the training in which 100% state that they understand that SLOs are a permanent piece of the course. The SLOs may change but not on a semester by semester basis.

**Recommendation for SLOC#2:** The SLOC to provide training to faculty the calculation of the Success Criteria in regard to the data faculty have from their SLO assessments.

**Data:** Reviewing the data suggests that faculty need training on how to calculate the success criteria after assessments have taken place.

**Closing the loop:** This will be fulfilled once the SLO committee can discuss and provide training. Also, need to see whether Elumen automatically determines whether assessment results fulfill the success criteria. Closing the loop will be fulfilled if this will not be an issue looking at the ILOs during the next cycle. Faculty will take a survey at the end of the training in which 100% state they understand how to correctly calculate the Success Criteria in light of the assessment results. If it occurs in the next cycle, then training for specifically for those instructors.

**Recommendation for SLOC#3:** The SLOC to develop a basic training on SLOs through a video training or screenshot document.

**Data:** Reviewing the data indicates that there needs to be basic training about SLOs for new hires as well as a refresher for veteran faculty.

**Closing the loop:** This will be fulfilled once a training site is made and training documents distributed.

**Recommendation for ILOC#1:** The ILOC to meet at least once a semester and look at data at least once every two years.

**Data:** As we looked at the data, we realized we were looking at spring 2012 to fall 2017 data. There have been processes that have changed since 2012 and 2013. We should meet once every two, or possibly three years to discuss data. In the meantime, we should look at updates on recommendations that have been forwarded.

**Closing the loop:** This will be fulfilled once a committee schedule is put together and we review this recommendation to make sure we are meeting more frequently and have an established timeframe to review data.

**Recommendation for ILOC#2:** To expand the ILOC to include at least two members from each learning area.

**Data:** In this part we were just looking at the number of people that made up this committee. There were only 10 members in this committee and we were looking at making college wide recommendations. It would be good, since we are making college wide recommendations, to have more members in this committee for the next term.

**Closing the loop:** This will be fulfilled when the committee itself, before it starts a new term, will expand the membership.

## Institutional Student Learning Outcomes

<i>The Core Competencies that are to be reviewed are given below.</i>	
I	<b>I. Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, and Creative Thinking</b> Students will collect information in response to a question or problem; analyze or draw valid conclusions from statements, images, data, and other forms of evidence; or assess the implications and consequences of conclusions.
II	<b>II. Communication</b> Students will use effective communication skills in reading, writing, listening, speaking or communicating in different formats.
III	<b>III. Quantitative Analysis and Scientific Reasoning</b> Students will analyze, estimate, use, or evaluate quantitative information using words, data, graphs, or symbols; or apply the scientific method to questions regarding observable natural, physical or social phenomena.
IV	<b>IV. Social, Cultural, Environmental and Aesthetic Perspectives</b> Students will define or analyze significant social, cultural, environmental or aesthetic perspectives.
V	<b>V. Information, Technology and Media Literacy</b> Students will be able to locate, evaluate, synthesize or use multiple forms of information, data, media, or technology.
VI	<b>VI. Personal, Academic, and Career Development</b> Students will analyze their knowledge, skills, abilities, set personal, educational, and career goals, work independently or in group settings; identify or practice lifestyle choices that promote self-reliance, physical, mental, or social health.

## Institutional Learning Outcomes Level Mapping

CC	<b>Courses and Summary</b> - List courses that were assessed from the previous semester that contribute to the Core Competencies. In the summary area state any patterns, weaknesses, and strengths found in the result of the courses listed.
I	<p>Courses: AG 11, ANSI 7, ART 2, ART 5A, ART 5B, ART 13A, ART 15A, ART 15C, BIO 10, BIO 15, BIO 32, BIO 35, BIO 38, BUS 1A, BUS 1B, CD 2, CD 3, CD 5, CD 10, CD 15, CD 16, CD 21, CD 22, COM 4, CRPSCI 1, CRPSCI 7, CRPSCI 19, ENG 51A, ENG 100, ENG 110A, ENG 1A, ENG 1B, GEOG 1, GEOG 2, GEOG 3, GEOG 16, GEOG 18, GEOL 3, HE 35, IS 20, MATH 75, NUT 1, PE 28A, PE 46, POLSCI 1, POLSCI 5, POLSCI 10, SLSCI 21</p> <p>Summary: There were a few outcomes in which the instructors were planning on tweaking the assessment or the wording of an essay. Glad to see that is happening since this is part of the SLO process where instructors are realizing that the assessment is actually not testing their SLO. On the other hand, it is bothersome because that means the data is not going to be as cogent longitudinally. Another thing that was noticed as a trend were the amount of times that students failed because they just did not turn in the work. It was also noted that hands-on activities at a higher success rate than those of just pure academic exams. Test preparation was a concern for teachers but we hope that it is not going to have them teach directly to the test. There were a number of small classes which were both good and bad. It was good the fact that most of those classes had high success rates for their SLOs; bad in which the instructors stated they really could not make any conclusive decisions because of the low number of students in the class. One puzzling thing was that faculty thought they needed to change their SLOs on a very frequent basis. There were instructors that, once they had a successful SLO exam, were stating they will start writing other SLOs for the class. That is something that might need to be handled on a training session with faculty. Another thing that really presented itself was the difference in faculty. Lastly, some faculty did a great job in documenting, stating why certain students did not succeed and gave a great full picture of student effort and success. Other faculty members just put down bare minimum answers which did not lend itself to any informative data at the Institutional level.</p>
II	<p>Courses: BUS 28, ART 15A, ART 15B, ART 16A, ENG 51A, AG 11, COM 1, ART 15C, ENG 110B, ART 13B</p> <p>Summary: There were a lot of students not turning assignments. Review of the current findings indicates a need for more reflective data, including what potentially went wrong. In some cases, the Summary Data conflicted with the SLO's expectations, causing inaccurate or mismatched findings. There is a trend in students not turning in assignments, students reading below the text book level, and not being prepared with required materials for the assignments. It was noted that in one course students were allowed to grade themselves on their performance.</p>
III	<p>Courses: MATH 63, GEOG 1, GEOG 3, GEOG 16, CRPSCI 1, CRPSCI 19 ,CRPSCI 32 , BIO 10, BIO 15, BIO 32, BIO 38, AOJ 20</p>

	Summary: There is a trend in students receiving lower than average (70%) scores across the board when reviewing all data. The recommendation is to re-evaluate the SLO and the delivery of material related to the specific learning outcome.
IV	Courses: CD10, CD3, CD17B, CD 23, CD17, CD4, CD14A, CD12A, CD2, CD21, ART42, ART16B, ART 15B, ART16A, PSYCH 1, PSYCH 4, AOJ 6, AOJ 10, AOJ 16, GEO 2, GEO 1, GEO 3, GEO 18, PE 21, CRPSCI 19, BIO 38, BIO 15
	Summary: Several courses reflected a lack of student participation, students unprepared for class, not knowing the terminology and requiring study guides and guided learning. It was noted that in CD courses there was a need for testing to be right after the subject matter was presented. Some instructors may need in servicing on how to document data and how to match the results to the criteria and include detailed factual results. Instructors also summarized a need for more in depth discussion in the classroom for students to learn material. Changing the terminology on the exams seems to be a common theme.
V	Courses: GS 61, IS 1, ENG 1A, ENG 70, ENG 89, CRPSCI 7, BIO 38, ART 5B, IS 50
	Summary: Technology skills are really high in all courses. Student success rate on SLOs are high. Recommended to look at increasing the success criteria for each SLO assessed. Students that fail do not submit work.
VI	Courses: POLSCI 1, IS 2, IS 20, IS 1, PE 24, PE 25A, PE 31, PE 44, GS 1, ANSCI 05, AOJ 6, CD 10
	Summary: Everyone achieved SLOS. It was noticed cut and paste responses on two data sheets. Adjunct and full time faculty need to work more closely on SLOS together. It might be beneficial to have all courses have a standard “passing score” to analyze.