

## Student Learning Institution-Set Standards (ISS) Metrics

Upon request from the AIQ Committee, the Assessment Committee was asked to determine and report out metrics to represent student learning college-wide. The Assessment Committee determined the best method is using data from pre-existing processes where faculty enter course SLO data into eLumen, SLO to ILO mappings align the SLO data to the College's four institutional learning outcomes, thus a report of ILO performance can be generated. This method is an indirect assessment of ILO performance.

With the help of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, ILO performance data for the past three academic years has been determined and reported in the table below.

	<b>AY 17-18</b>	<b>AY 18-19</b>	<b>AY 19-20</b>	<b>ISS</b>	<b>Aspirational Goal</b>
ILO #1 – Think	83.7%	87.2%	85.3%	85.4%	88.0%
ILO #2 – Communicate	82.3%	85.9%	83.0%	83.8%	88.0%
ILO #3 – Demonstrate	83.4%	85.0%	85.5%	84.7%	88.0%
ILO #4 – Engage	83.2%	86.1%	86.2%	85.2%	88.0%

Each ILO's ISS value is determined as the average over the three academic years. The Assessment Committee recommends the aspirational goal value be a couple percentage points above the highest ISS value. Additionally, the Committee recommends the aspirational goals be uniform (the same value) in that each ILO is not more important than the other.

While the Assessment Committee officially recommends to the AIQ Committee the student learning metrics in the table above be implemented into the ISS, there are additional concerns/considerations found on page 2.

The Assessment Committee voted and unanimously approved the recommendations above on March 5, 2021.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Assessment Committee,

Lora Larkin, Administrative Co-Chair

Brent Wilson, Faculty Co-Chair

The table on page 1 represents the raw (unweighted) ILO performance data from eLumen. There are advantages and disadvantages to using this specific data set. One advantage is the ability to easily generate and track each ILO over the years. One disadvantage is some courses will be over-represented, leading to some courses being “more important” than others when reporting a college-wide ILO performance.

Due to some concerns, a method to *weight* the raw data in an attempt to mitigate some issues was generated. As a result, the ILO performances were calculated using this weighted method via course enrollment. Below is the ILO performance from *weighted* data for the past three years.

	<b>AY 17-18</b>	<b>AY 18-19</b>	<b>AY 19-20</b>	<b>ISS</b>
ILO #1 – Think	84.0%	83.7%	83.2%	83.6%
ILO #2 – Communicate	82.6%	82.8%	82.5%	82.6%
ILO #3 – Demonstrate	83.3%	82.8%	82.8%	83.0%
ILO #4 – Engage	84.8%	85.3%	82.8%	84.3%

While the weighted data slightly decreased the ILO performance compared to the unweighted data, the reported numbers are still mostly in the same range of values. One advantage to this method is giving all courses an equal representation in the ILO performance reported. One disadvantage is the use of Banner to pull course enrollment data and combining it with the SLO-ILO data in eLumen, a more complex system in place that may not be sustainable.

A third method was also generated to represent the ILO performance. While the unweighted and weighted data are based on aggregating course SLO assessments, this third method uses the *percentage* of SLOs. One advantage is to avoid assessing the same students repeatedly for a course. One disadvantage is the method does not provide good course-specific contributions toward the ILO performance. Below is the ILO performance for the data over the past three years.

	<b>AY 17-18</b>	<b>AY 18-19</b>	<b>AY 19-20</b>	<b>ISS</b>
ILO #1 – Think	87.3%	86.9%	86.9%	87.0%
ILO #2 – Communicate	86.7%	86.0%	85.9%	86.2%
ILO #3 – Demonstrate	87.8%	86.5%	87.9%	87.4%
ILO #4 – Engage	88.7%	88.8%	87.9%	88.5%

This page serves as a summary of findings from OIE Director Sooyeon Kim. A thorough analysis is provided as an internal document that describes each method of calculating ILO performance, provides examples, and weighs pros and cons. While the Assessment Committee recommends the use of raw (unweighted) data to be reported into the ISS as the initial metrics to monitor student learning, the Committee further recommends that AIQ request data from OIE for the weighted data and % SLOs data and monitor these additional two methods for any variances that may not yet be seen in the data reported over the last three years. It is likely a thorough discussion and analysis of the three methods should be considered after the student learning metrics have been monitored over a longer time.

OIE also generated an [ILO Performance Tableau dashboard](#) that provides a visual representation of the data in this report as well as a comparison between the unweighted and weighted analysis models. It is also possible to disaggregate data by subject, course, and semester.

One final note is that the ILO performance reported depends on the number and quality of SLO assessments entered by faculty. It is important that faculty continue (and potentially increase) the entering of SLO assessment data into eLumen so that an accurate snapshot of the ILO performance is captured. It is also important to maintain the SLO-ILO mappings.