Lauren Hasten, Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm., in Room 2411A.

I. Set Agenda
The agenda was set as drafted with one addition to Old Business. “SLO Student Video Contest” was added as the first item.

II. Review of Minutes
The draft minutes of October 5, 2009 were not available for review and will be reviewed at the December meeting.

III. Chair’s Update

   A. LPC Express Accreditation Article
   A grossly inaccurate October LPC Express headline (“Students Unprepared for Accreditation”) and article were discussed by Lauren. Ms. Hasten was one of the people interviewed for the story and she was misquoted and her information was used out of context to paint a very different view of LPC’s accreditation (Oct. 19-22), and WASC’s standards (“WASC has no idea…”, for example). Lauren’s point to the budding Express journalist was that SLOs are a moving target, that WASC and California community colleges see the requirements differently, and she explained these in detail to the reported, who took few notes. After the article was published Lauren wrote a letter of complaint to Melissa Korber, journalism instructor, who spoke to the Express staff. Lauren received a formal apology, however there was no correction in the Express. A committee member mentioned that the headline bore no relation to the (non-factual) article; Lauren replied that the headline is usually a group process to garner readership.

   In addition, the WASC Team asked many questions related to SLOs of many committee chairs, and none of the team members seemed to take the inaccurate Express article poorly.

   B. WASC Accreditation Site Visit
   Lauren shared about the SLO-related visits with the WASC Team during the week of Oct. 19-22. From the SLO Committee, she and Scott Vigallon, as a Instructional Technology Department and as Distance Education Coordinator were interviewed. Tom Orf and Scott Vigallon as the co-chairs of Standard Two, dealing with learning outcomes, were also interviewed.
The closing comments WASC Chair Doug Houston mentioned a recommendation that the college should continue on its’ current path to reach the “Proficiency Level” (see “Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: Student Learning Outcomes”) by 2012. He also said that considering the amount of time since WASC published this rubric, that we are right where we should be ending the Developmental Level and moving into the Proficiency Level.

Laurel Jones noted that all the rubrics and emphases from WASC now have continuous improvement components in them. All committees will need a data analysis piece. SLOs will be the primary drivers of committees’ assessments. The VP of Academic Services should be able to tie all committee work back to Program Review, and how SLO assessments have made learning more effective for our students.

IV. eLumen Update

A. “Program Level” in eLumen

Lauren said that she and Scott will have more to report on in December, as they meet with Tina Inzerilla, our former eLumen expert, on Nov. 3rd. They will discuss how best to work with eLumen’s less than satisfactory functionality program-level use.

V. College Update

None.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. SLO Student Video Contest

Lauren began this discussion by saying that despite lots of PR for this contest there was only 1 last-minute entry, which was not what the committee was expecting. The question asked last month, for discussion today, is how to proceed? Discussion included:

- How can there be a competition if only one entry/ no one to compete against; and Can there be a winner, absent any competition?
- Mike stated that similar situations have occurred for the student anthology with 1 or few entries to judge.
- We did not set any rules or qualifications they had to meet.
- Reminded committee that we were to post all entries online and let the whole campus vote.
- If we have people vote, now or later, can Scott set up a system where people will be allowed to vote only once? (Yes.)

It was decided after 2 differently phrased hand-votes, and Greg and Sharon volunteering to run the next phase, that the contest would be continued. Further parameters will be decided after hearing their proposals next month on:

- Dates: From/To
- PR types and budget they can procure
- Have the voting open from Friday before Spring Break to Friday after (2 weeks)
- PR: More posters, place on Zone student email, LPC Home Page event/banner.
B. ePortfolio Pilot Project
In Amber’s absence Lauren mentioned that last month the committee agreed to launch the ePortfolio project. She and Amber will draft some samples and release to the faculty. In addition, Amber can procure some waiver forms for the students whose work will be posted.

Reminder: The committee voted the first ePortfolio theme as the Communication Core Competency. Are all committee members comfortable with this? Response: yes.

C. SLO Steering Committee ‘Charge’ Update
Lauren re-addressed the need to update the ‘charge’ of the SLO committee, after introducing the matter last month. Any committee’s charge can be updated at any time, they reside in the Academic Senate Bylaws (for Academic Senate Committees), and also in the College Governance Handbook (for all committees). The Governance Handbook is overseen by the College Council and College President, and is available on the Grapevine, Administration and Committees tabs. Sharon mentioned that this is timely, as all committees are being asked to review their charge and committee composition this year.

Lauren distributed the current charge and a proposed new charge, based on committee input last month. She added roles for Software Liaison (currently eLumen) and Data Steward.

Discussion centered around whether to make the charge more specific, as in Lauren’s example, or more broad. Discussion included:

- We are changing the name from the SLO Taskforce to the SLO Committee.
- The current charge notes core competencies, which were unique to the work when written in 2005.
- Is the charge the right place for language about specific members’ responsibilities?
- The nature of the committee work will be changing due to movement through the WASC Developmental Level to Proficiency Level.
- The next committee chair and members could find this document useful if it were more specific.
- Perhaps more specific items could be placed in a separate document (beginning of a ‘handbook’ on the SLO website)
- Committee no longer needs to “Elicit broad perspectives and advise…”, or “…gathers feedback from the college… toward achieving consensus.”
- In the third paragraph of new draft add the “Institutional Effectiveness Committee” as a new college committee which SLO Committee will work with.
- Chris Lee has wording suggestions she will email to Lauren for paragraph one regarding “sustaining and maintaining SLOs”.
- Lauren will email to Scott the current Chair’s job description for posting on the SLO site.

It was agreed to add to the list of the Committee Roles the functions for Data Steward, Chair, and Software Liaison, and to make the second paragraph more general. Laurel mentioned that this committee could tell the College Council that it is using the Shared Governance Template, and would like to have space for additional details for each committee, such as delineated in this discussion.
Lauren mentioned that the SLO Chair job announcement went to the Academic Senate President for recruitment recently as Lauren will not be continuing for the 2010-11 year.

It was also agreed that the charge of the committee will be revisited on a regular basis, as needed, but at a minimum of every two years.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. eLumen Update
Scott asked on behalf of the Chabot SLO coordinator about making an earlier upgrade to eLumen than previously planned. She asked about upgrading to 3.7 before the end of Fall term. Both colleges use the same eLumen license, and the current version is 3.6. For users, there are 10 steps to creating an SLO. Version 3.7 will provide a Smart Home page and a wizard for steps 5-10; the version after that is 3.8.2 which will have a wizard for steps 1-10. The Chabot faculty are not yet trained on eLumen at all, so the 3.7 smart home page and wizard for steps 5-10 will help them. Version 3.8.2 has already been planned and agreed by both colleges to roll out about January 6th.

The down-side for LPC faculty to upgrading to 3.7 now is that there are some minor changes, which require just a little orientation, but it is usually best to train people before rolling out a new version. In addition, about 60% of faculty do their eLumen assessments after the semester is over, 40% during the semester. Therefore, some of the 60% could have questions during the winter break, with answers not available. Scott said it will be acceptable with the Chabot staff if we wait until 3.8.2 is released about January 6th. The Committee felt this was more fair for the LPC faculty, especially since they have been utilizing it for more than a year and very conversant with eLumen as it currently is.

Scott will let Chabot know that LPC prefers to wait until the planned eLumen upgrade to 3.8.2 about January 6th.

In addition, Lauren will notify LPC faculty that if they would like to do their assessments using the current SLO screens, they should do so before January 6th, and that training on the 3.8.2 version (with wizard for steps 1-10) will be done after January 19th, during Spring Term.

B. eLumen Notes and Follow-Through
Lauren mentioned that WASC is going toward the continuous quality improvement system in all aspects of college life. Therefore, they will want to see teaching improvements based on SLO assessments; this means that after course assessments, entering evaluations or tasks into the Notes Section will be important. Even if the course assessment is fine, this needs to be written in the Notes Section.

This can be demonstrated at Division meetings soon. Lauren encourages each division rep to get comfortable with the assessment and Notes screens, and demonstrate this at their December Division meetings, in time for then end of term assessment cycle.

In addition, Lauren encourages faculty to consider mid-semester assessments. By assessing mid-semester it gives current students the opportunity to take advantage of any differences in teaching the instructor may wish to make, based on mid-term assessments. The
Notes Section can also be helpful with this in that if actions are planned, or not planned, it is easy to recall this information the next time the course is taught.

C. Data Assessment
Lauren said now that we have data in our software, it is time to start thinking about what reports we would like to review. Some reports are available from eLumen, and some would have to be created using eLumen data downloaded and compared in another software program. The Office of Institutional Research would do these reports as the “Data Steward”. Scott will provide a list of reports that eLumen does run. Please brainstorm ideas, inquire of our colleagues and in Division meetings, and bring some ideas back on December 7th.

VIII. OTHER
None.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Gach
Classified Representative/
Administrative Assistant

Next Meeting: Monday, December 7, 2009- 2:30 pm – Room 2411A