

Fall 2020 Mapping Proposal – Feedback from IEC noted in red



With the College embracing a learner-centered orientation, we faculty need to move away from students having to make connections on their own and instead help them understand how our specific courses and/or assignments fit into a larger, comprehensive learning experience. In regards to Skyline College’s Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs), it’s critical for each degree - bearing program to articulate how it is supporting students in achieving them, and to communicate to students the ways its courses support students’ development of these competencies. In addition, every degree-bearing program needs to participate in the assessment of the ISLOs to provide insight as to how well the students college-wide are mastering them, and how we can best support student learning.

Status:

- 1) Skyline College has five Institutional SLOs: Citizenship, Critical Thinking, Effective Communication, Information Literacy, and Lifelong Wellness. Because they’re based on graduation requirements for an AA/AS, **all degree bearing program should teach all five competencies. But not all do.** [Though all programs may not align, they should not be forced to. Rather, aim for authentic, not forced alignment, and by extension, authentic assessment. Though not all degree bearing programs may address all of the ISLO competencies, general education courses should be identified that address those gaps.] In addition, the assessment results aren’t representative of the College as a whole since they are dependent on which three-to-six programs participate in the ISLO assessment; thus, they’re hard to generalize from.
- 2) A deeper connection needs to be made between the ISLOs and teaching and learning, one of the major intents of assessment. Assessment results have yielded **sporadic professional development**, when what is needed is sustained professional development around these core competencies. [This PD can still take place, perhaps by continuing the plan of focusing on an ISLO each year. Presently the APP has an ISLO question, but it’s not required. In the future, ISLO assessment results should be required. Karen’s main concern is that the ISLO rubrics *not* go to the wayside, and that the relevant criteria be integrated into the assessment. Also, Karen should still provide an online entry for each program’s results, along with students’ G#s, so that the College can continue to disaggregate the data.]

- 3) The **three-year assessment cycle may not accommodate the dialogue that SLO assessment is intended to engender**. [Presently keep the three - year assessment calendar. Suggestion for a future calendar is to connect it to the comprehensive program review cycle. The challenge is that CPRs are staggered such that each program will be at a different place in the assessment calendar. Perhaps there can be a six-year calendar, with all required courses for the degree assessed at least twice within that calendar?] Such dialogue should help us to develop a shared understanding of what the outcomes mean for us, how students can demonstrate their knowledge and skills, how we can support that learning, and more broadly, how our specific courses and/or assignments fit into a larger, comprehensive whole—in this case, the ISLOs. As Natasha Jankowski and David Marshall (2017) write in *Degrees that Matter*, “Such collective reflection requires exploring not just whether a program is constructed in ways that support student attainment of learning outcomes, but *how* [my emphasis]” (86).

Proposal:

Instructional programs will transition from a three-year to a **five-year assessment calendar** beginning in fall 2021. Each year will feature one of the five ISLOs, and **all degree-bearing programs will be required to assess at least one course that aligns with the ISLO**, ideally a required course for the degree. [Rejected. Programs should not make superficial changes to align with the ISLOs, should there be gaps. But to encourage a more intentional connection to ISLOs, the mapping itself can be tied in with program review. Would IEC ensure this regular review takes place, or Curriculum Committee?] The course may be concurrently assessed, meaning assessing all of the course level SLOs and relevant criteria from the featured ISLO’s rubric. For an example of the latter, the instructors teaching that course may opt to assess only two out of the six criteria on the Critical Thinking rubric. Or the course may be assessed twice: once in regards to the featured ISLO, and separately it course level SLOs.

For each ISLO, **professional development** will be offered in two ways: (a) how to foster the featured ISLO through curriculum and assessment design, as well as pedagogy, and (b) how to assess them.

The new five-year assessment calendar is due by Monday, May 3, and will be posted on the SLOAC website. [Five years seems far too long; if a course is assessed only once within that cycle, it’s assessed every five years. That lag is far too long to respond to student needs.]

Plan:

To generate this new five-year calendar, review course SLO mapping to ISLOs. This review will help to reveal whether and which courses address the ISLOs, leading to gap analysis where particular ISLO(s) are not addressed. Ideally the review will be done in collaboration with other members of the department, as the task goes beyond simply reviewing the SLOs. It will likely involve conversations about assignments used to assess the SLOs and their suitability for ISLO purposes, as well as whether students are given sufficient opportunity to practice and apply them. [Mapping is reasonable, but this proposal as a whole is too much right now, especially with all of the COVID related work and other major initiatives on campus (e.g., shifting courses online,

distance education addendums, likely changes to comprehensive program review, guided pathways, etc.).]

Step 1: [GE Committee conducted an analysis of ISLO mapping, and found enough mis-alignments to strongly suggest that programs should revisit their mapping especially since ISLOs were revised in 2016. This mapping can be valuable for many reasons: collegial dialogues about the courses' curriculum, pedagogy, and assignments to assess student learning, as well as intentional mapping to relevant ISLOs. This dialogue also can include identifying complementary GE courses, so as to support guided pathways work. Perhaps roll it out on a flex day since division meetings are tapped out; set aside designated time for this work, and roll out each step over time.] By the end of the fall semester, **review each course and how its SLOs are mapped to the ISLOs**, which were updated in 2016. Especially important is to review the mapping of SLOs from courses required for the degree to the ISLOs. [Fall is too soon to complete this task. Everyone is exhausted from the Distance Ed addendum work.]

The SLO coordinator should **update the mapping in Improve**, following the program's approval protocols. For more information on Improve, see p.3 on the [mapping user guide](#).

- Tools: [Curricunet](#), a matrix with the ISLOs provided by PRIE, [online ISLO rubrics](#)

Consider the following when mapping:

- Is at least one aspect of the ISLO competency (e.g., Citizenship ISLO's sub-descriptors on cultural awareness) addressed multiple times in the course?
- Do students have multiple opportunities to practice or apply the ISLO competency and receive feedback?
- Will students demonstrate this ISLO competency through completion of an assignment, presentation, and/or performance?

Step 2: Once all mapping is completed for each course, review the updated summary mapping report of ISLOs to course level SLOs. **Check that each ISLO has at least one course that can be assessed, with an assignment that is well suited to assess the ISLO.** Having more than one course to assess the ISLO is encouraged but not required. [Completing steps 1 and 2 by the end of spring 2021 is reasonable.]

- Tool: ISLO mapping reports provided by PRIE

Consider the following questions:

- 1) Are all of the ISLOs addressed by at least one course that is required for a degree in your program? If not, which ISLO(s) need to be more reinforced in the required courses?
- 2) To address this gap, which courses required for the degree may be revised to better align with the ISLOs? The answer to this question may prompt a revision to the course(s).
- 3) Is each of the ISLOs adequately practiced before students are expected to demonstrate an ISLO at the intermediate level (as opposed to the introductory level)? If not, which courses

can that ISLO competency be further reinforced and practiced? The answer to this latter question may prompt a revision to the course(s).

- 4) Another option is to identify which general education courses are well suited to introduce or further reinforce the ISLOs. The answer to this question may result in the course(s) being highly recommended to students pursuing a degree in your program.

Step 3: By Monday, May 3, **create the five-year assessment plan that aligns with the ISLO assessment calendar.** At least one course from your program should be drawn from to assess the ISLO. Submit the updated calendar to [Karen Wong](#). **[Rejected a new five-year assessment plan.]**

- Tool: Five-year assessment calendar template provided by PRIE

In addition, consider which course(s) should be assessed more frequently than the minimum one time within the five - year cycle. Such course(s) may be:

- popular general education courses,
- “gateway” courses to the degree,
- all required courses for the degree,
- and/or courses in which students typically have lower retention and success rates.

The program may opt to assess these course(s) every time they’re taught, annually, or at least twice within the five-year cycle. Results can be analyzed every time the course is assessed, or after multiple assessments.

Feedback on the proposal:

- 1) What, if anything, is unclear or confusing to you about the proposal?
- 2) What do you see as the barriers for implementing this five-year calendar of assessment?
What are potential ways to address these barriers?
- 3) Any other thoughts?

Potential ISLO Assessment/ Professional Development

ISLO assessment will be required in Annual Program Plans (APPs) or Planning Review Updates (PRUs).

Each year there can be a focus on an ISLO. (IEC can discuss in which order the ISLOs are scheduled.) Should there be a semester when a recurring workshop takes place that supports the

assessment, and one for pedagogy/ HIPs? How might we address the results in subsequent semesters?

2021 - 2022

2022 - 2023

2023 - 2024

2024 - 2025

2025 – 2026

Below is the comprehensive program review proposal that will be voted on by SPARC on October 8.

Deliverable	Current Due Date	New Due Date
Comprehensive Program Review -CPR	April	Nov* Draft/Apr Final
Program Review Update - PRU	April	November*
Annual Resource Request - ARR	April	November*
Divisional planning meetings	--	Early February
Dean ALUR submitted	June 1	March 1
Dean ALUR Report to Division	--	Early March
VP ALUR submitted	July 1	April 1
VPI & VPSS ALUR Report to SPARC	--	mid April
VPA Tentative Budget to SPARC	May	mid April
VPA Tentative Budget Report to CGC	May	mid May
President's Budget Priorities Report to CGC	--	mid May

*November due dates will be the Friday before Thanksgiving