

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
STEERING COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes – October 1, 2007**

Name	Present	Name	Present
Jim Gioia	X	Maureen O’Herin	X
Richard Grow	X	Michael Schwarz	
Lauren Hasten	X	Scott Vigallon	X
Tina Inzerilla	X	Lisa Weaver	X
Laurel Jones	X	Gina Webster	
Amber Machamer	X	Kristy Woods	X
Marge Maloney	X		
Amanda Cervantez, Student Rep.	X	Sharon Gach, Admin Asst	X

(Decision & Action items in Bold, Research items in Italic)

Ms. Hasten, 2007-08 Chair, opened the meeting at 2:30 pm., in Room 2411A.

I. Set Agenda

The Agenda was set by consensus as drafted by Lauren Hasten, and attached to these minutes.

II. Review of Minutes

The Minutes of September 10, 2007 were reviewed and several changes were made by consensus:

- o Use first names rather than formal names
- o Section II – Tina met with Steve Gunderson, rather than District IT
- o Section IV. d. – Reword decision to: **“The committee recommends that all instructors consider using the standard scale in order to get clean data. Lauren will assist any instructor in translating their scale to the standard 5-point SLO scale.”**
- o Section IV., pg. 3, under “Default Values...” – “...The purpose for this is to *follow* the number of changes...”

III. Chair’s Update

- A. October 2 Board Presentation – Lauren said that she will make a presentation on Student Learning Outcomes to the District Board on October 2nd. **Tina asked Lauren when she finds out the date Chabot will begin using eLumen to let her know.**
- B. Robert’s Rules – Lauren asked if anyone minded dispensing with Robert’s Rules; no one minded, therefore decisions will be made by consensus.
- C. WASC Training – Lauren, Scott Vigallon, Laurel Jones and others from LPC attended the WASC training on Accreditation on September 21. The report is that SLOs are in all community colleges and that eLumen provides the data required for WASC surveys. The question was again asked, “Will this data be used to evaluate instructors,” and the answer again was, “It will only be used for evaluating institutions.”

- D. Accreditation Self-Study and Focus Groups – Amber was absent from this meeting due to a commitment at an off-site meeting, therefore next month the second hour of this meeting will be on the Self-Study and Focus Groups.
- E. Presentation of Recommendations to the Academic Senate – Lauren made a presentation to the Academic Senate on September 27th which seemed to go well. See further discussion below.

IV. eLumen Update – Tina Inzerilla

- A. Off-Site Access – Steve Gunderson is working on providing off-site access for eLumen and will let her know a date when is he closer.
- B. Counseling Department – Tina met with the Counseling Department and SLOs and input are coming along well after the meeting.

V. College Update – Laurel Jones

- A. Compensation for Adjuncts – Laurel Jones reported that in May 2007 she sent a memo requesting from divisions and departments the number of adjuncts and number of hours they felt necessary to pay adjuncts to write SLOs. No responses were received therefore no money was requested in the 07-08 Budget. However she will try to find the funding. Mini-grants have all been distributed from Staff Development, however the committee may wish to plan to request a mini-grant for paying adjuncts for the 08-09 year.

Laurel requested that all compensation requests be given to her by October 15th, and she will meet with the President to try to secure funding; with priority being given to the single instructor subjects.

VI. Action Areas

- A. SLOs for Colloquia – Lauren asked if the committee felt SLOs were needed for colloquia. Previously the committee said that only areas where curriculum is written need SLOs. Some Colloquia do have curriculum, others do not. Some colloquia are analogous to labs, and some are idiosyncratic in other ways.

Jim suggested that if this question is not critical at this time that we give more thought to what colloquia are, and defer this question to a later, second tier of SLO writing; the committee agreed.

- B. Adjunct Participation in SLO Creation/Assessment – Compensation – See item V. A. above.
- C. Default Values for Action in eLumen – Tina explained the handout showing eLumen post-assessment. Actions as they currently show on-screen. A good feature is that we do not need to click on an item in every row, use only the rows/items that are needed.

Tina also asked the committee to brainstorm other possible actions that will be put into eLumen (see handout). The committee added and rearranged categories for a number of actions which Tina will have implemented.

D. Division Reports on eLumen Assessment Scale Standardization

Academic Senate Presentation - Lauren said that her report to Academic Senate on the committee recommendation for a standardized scale went well and no difficult questions were addressed there; and that since then the some Divisions have asked a number of questions of the SLO Committee. [See last page for recommendation of Sept. 10, 2007.]

A & C Division - Lauren read an email from Maureen O’Herin regarding the Arts and Communication (A&C) division discussion, since she could not be at this SLO meeting, stating that “the A&C division overwhelmingly voted in favor of the standardized scale. There was a good discussion, but no one seemed alarmed or opposed to the idea. Most wanted the assurance that this was not one step closer to 'standardized testing,' and that there would be faculty review (SLO committee and/or Senate) of any institutional/ program/ course conclusions culled from shared scale assessment data before it was widely distributed.”

SS&W and BCAT Divisions - In addition, Marge Maloney and Lisa Weaver, of the Social Sciences & Wellness (SS&W) division and the Business, Computing and Technology (BCAT) division, had some discussion in their meetings with similar concerns to the A&C division. However they ultimately agreed with the SLO Committee recommendations for the 5-step standard scale.

MSEPS Division - Kristy Woods and Richard Grow were charged with reporting to the SLO Committee, from the Math, Science, Engineering and Public Safety (MSEPS) division’s discussion and requests.

The MSEPs Division felt that:

- They did not like having already set up rubrics on many classes and now having to change them
- There were a number of different types of outcomes and they feel they are not comparable to other types
- If there are ‘low’ student outcome scores, will the instructors be judged and compared to other instructors?
- Theirs are more teacher driven processes, and they would like to continue to devise rubrics individually
- The assessment cycle should be kept to improve instruction, but should not be used for Instructional Effectiveness
- Data should be assessed, but not as Instructional Effectiveness
- They feel there is a fine line between student outcomes and Instructional Effectiveness
- No numbers should be connected with student outcomes
- If averages are used among classes, departments and divisions they will not be applicable as each class’ SLOs are so different
- Only “Yes/No” should be reported for student outcomes
- WASC does not require any standard rubrics; no other colleges are doing it this way

- Instructors are working on their SLOs and are excited to write them, however want to do them without the 5-point standard scale
- The division likes the more ‘organic’ process of the way they are currently writing SLOs
- They do not like to be asked to start writing, then be asked to change what they are asked to do
- MSEPS division would like to hear clear outcomes on the college level for all SLOs before considering the 5-point scale further.
- MSEPS instructors see no clear reasons for a standard rubric; they would like a more clear definition.

The Chairperson thanked Kristy and Richard for conveying the MSEPS opinions. The Committee understands that Kristy and Richard have been tasked with bringing these questions back and appreciates their candor.

Committee discussion included:

- The SLO Committee and most of the College would like to assure everyone that they are aware that there is less meaning the higher one takes the “statistics” of student outcomes
- The Committee and college would like to again assure that SLOs will only be used for rating the institution for accreditation purposes. This was addressed again by Chancellor Kinnamon at the Sept. 21 WASC meeting.
- Other comments included:
 - The value of SLOs is clear at the course level, but difficult to see as we move up to the program and institutional levels.
 - SLOs only have value at the course level.
 - The Chairperson urges all divisions to stay focused on the real goal: writing good course level SLOs that will be useful for student learning and show that the college is meeting its’ tasks as set forth by WASC.
 - Each course may continue to have its own assessment rubric. As discussed on Sept. 10th there need only be a scheme to translate the score instructors assign to their students using that rubric to a number that instructors report in eLumen. The Committee suggests a five-point scale only for reporting student scores in eLumen, in the belief that the data we report to WASC should be consistent.
 - No process is actually being changed, and SLO Committee members would be glad to help translate any rubric into a standard rubric.
 - The standard rubric is meant to be a recommendation on how to use the software only, not on how to write outcomes.
 - Since this is a Federal requirement through WASC they will need evidence of meeting the Accreditation standards in this area. A standard rubric is only meant to be a way to show WASC in a quantitative and comparable way across the college that Accreditation standards have been met.
 - It seems that WASC does not yet know exactly what they would like to see; however, the more evidence a college can provide of meeting Accreditation standards, the more assistance it will be to the survey team to find the college in compliance.

Laurel Jones mentioned that all course outcome data has long been done at the CEMC level and all data is available and currently on the website. She encouraged MSEPs instructors to see the SLOs as just another iteration of the way we look at learning in the way that WASC requests the data. She said that instructors may be encouraged to know that there are already high outcomes in learning within the college. As a Vice President she will be happy to show WASC that the college has outcomes written and assessed, and data to support assessment. Even if all the data is not 'standardized', the faculty's work shows a strong commitment to SLOs. All the work on SLOs is highly appreciated by Laurel, the Deans and Administration.

Kristy mentioned that MSEPS would like a more clear definition of why the standard rubric is needed. Perhaps if she could show the division how other colleges assess outcomes, and how SLOs tie in to core competencies it would be helpful. **Laurel offered to provide Kristy and Richard with the WASC Standard on Institutional Effectiveness.** Laurel stated that a larger next tier discussion is how SLOs link to college competencies.

Laurel mentioned that it is not necessary to tie in to effectiveness to have standardized SLO rubrics; the important thing is to have solidarity of outcomes compared to the college competencies. Laurel feels that LPC's strong commitment to SLOs will be apparent to the WASC team.

Laurel also said that the college has been discussing SLOs for 5 years and the discussion should have been at this stage 2 years ago. There seems to be a disconnect about SLOs at many committees and we all need to work on pulling together to make a cohesive SLO/ College Competency/ CEMC flow for accreditation.

It was asked could the MSEPS division use a different method in their division for now? Then when the WASC team visits, a discussion could take place that it was unclear what WASC requires of colleges, and that this college has several opinions of what is required. This will provide opportunity for WASC to say what they expect.

There was a concurrence that this Committee only made a recommendation to Academic Senate and Divisions, and if an instructor chooses not to adopt it that is fine.

Should the 5-Point Rubric be Kept - Lauren asked if the committee still feels the 5 point rubric should be kept as a recommendation. Laurel cannot make a recommendation, but as a suggestion, **the committee could consider taking the fall semester to study and discuss the basic MSEPS question: "What is the institution going to do with the eLumen data at the Institutional Effectiveness level?"** There was general consensus on this.

Lauren suggested these actions for the Fall, and there was general consensus:

- a. Create some SLO talking points
- b. Have SLO members offer to meet with divisions
- c. Have SLO members offer to meet with Academic Senate
- d. Help the college community understand that the SLO committee forthrightly is attempting to meet WASC requirements, however the requirements are unclear
- e. **If instructors choose not to use the 5-point rubric that is OK, let the work go forward anyway.**

- f. After further discussion with the whole college community, the Academic Senate is the correct entity which will present the college SLO assessments to the WASC accreditation team.

“Grandfather” in Other Rubrics - Richard asked if it would be possible that the MSEPS instructors who want to use the 5-point scale, do so; and others who are not ready to adopt it use their own scale and be “grandfathered” in later if they so choose. The committee concurred with this idea.

Next Steps / Dialogue Questions – The committee discussed these possibilities for future college-wide and Academic Senate discussions:

- What does LPC want to show for SLOs at the Accreditation?
- What is the intent of SLOs regarding Institutional Effectiveness?
- Do instructors understand SLOs at the course level?
- Do instructors understand how SLOs relate programmatically and what the next level of work will be?
- What will core competencies and SLOs look like together? Are a certain number of SLOs needed per competency?
- The 5 point rubric is just a recommendation, continue writing SLOs.

VII. Other

None.

Next Meeting: November 5, 2007.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 pm.

Sharon Gach
Administrative Assistant

* * *

Definitions for standardized 5 point scale recommended to Academic Senate by SLO Committee (9/10/07):

- 0 – No Proficiency
- 1 – Below Proficiency
- 2 – Proficient
- 3 – Above Proficiency
- 4 – Mastery (could teach others)

“N/A” – Not applicable

“NS” – No score (student absent)