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

I. Set Agenda

The Agenda was set by consensus and is attached to these minutes.

II. Review of Minutes

The Minutes of November 5, 2007 were reviewed and accepted by consensus, without change.

III. Chair’s Update

A. Board Presentation – Lauren said that she, Amber and Laurel presented “What are SLOs” to the District Board recently and the presentation was well-received.

B. Student Services Department Training – Lauren said that she and Tina presented the eLumen training to Student Services staff and they are beginning to enter their SLOs.

C. Ongoing Faculty Mentoring – Lauren has recently received some requests to mentor faculty members on eLumen and entering SLOs. She has developed a 20 minute presentation and presented it to about 2 dozen faculty this semester. This has worked well and she has received uniformly positive feedback. The Standardized Five Point Scale (0,1,2,3,4), approved and recommended for use by Academic Senate (if departments so wish) has had good buy-in also.

D. Reminder to Faculty about SLO Due Dates – Lauren reported that she sent the “polite” reminder of the SLOs due by the end of Fall 2007 semester to all fulltime faculty. (Copy with these minutes.)
E. WASC Standard Two: Student Learning Programs and Services – It has been brought to Lauren’s
attention that within Standard Two, Item A. 6., the language reads “learning objectives”. There was a
discussion about the words “objective” vs. “outcome”, and how WASC recommends that colleges meet
this standard with unclear language. Amber said that other colleges have also had problems with
these two disparate words, and that perhaps by the time we are assessed WASC will provide more
information via other colleges’ reviews that clarifies what they intend.

IV. eLumen Update
A. Offsite Access – Tina reported that there is a technology difficulty with the server, and there is no time
frame yet from IT as to when offsite access can be initiated. Laurel asked Tina to send out an email
on this to faculty, and to keep them posted on any subsequent updates.

B. Question – Archives/Updates – Laurel asked if there is a place on the SLO website for announcements
and updates and archives. Scott will be glad to create this section, and include letters, memos (like
the above offsite access info), and other documents.

C. Math Department Input – Kristy reported that there is a problem with Banner being unable to update
new instructors in the system within the first week of a term. Therefore when instructors trade classes
Banner shows that 2 instructors have the same students, and also see each other’s students and SLO
assessments. Tina is aware of this and is working with eLumen to fix this problem.

V. College Update
Laurel mentioned that she recently went to an Administrative Learning Officers (ALO) training and brought
back a chart tool to show where the college should be in its’ planning and SLO input for the Accreditation
survey in 2009. The basic information from this training is that there is no “one target” for each standard,
and it changes over time. Therefore the committee will need to stay on top of what WASC is looking
for each term and update the college’s procedures and information as they deem appropriate.

VI. “Topics of the Month”
A. Deadline Issue – Lauren reviewed a draft of a letter to Faculty Leads for SLO input, and this was
discussed. Some wording changes were suggested, and also to remove section 2. There will be a need
for 10 courses’ SLOs in each department, to be written by the end of Spring 2008 semester.

After discussion it was agreed that this letter will not be sent until Spring 2008. The committee
decided that the letter will go to adjunct instructors also as it will affect them. The letter will request
that Leads assure that every section of every course has some SLOs, such that:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th># of courses to Assess</th>
<th>PLUS</th>
<th>New courses to assess</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester 1</td>
<td>Assess SLOs for 2 courses</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2 courses with SLOs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 2</td>
<td>Assess Semester 1 SLOs</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Assess 2 new courses’ SLOs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 3</td>
<td>Assess Semester 2 New SLOs</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Assess 2 new courses’ SLOs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsequent Semesters</td>
<td>Assess last semester’s New SLOs; and so on…</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Assess 2 new courses’ SLOs {When done with all courses, start review at the 1st course again}</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: At any one time, there will only be a total of 4 courses for which you are assessing SLOs.

Kristy asked Amber to remind all instructors to make appointments to meet with Amber to go over the timeline to plan in which semester their courses will be assessed, and in what order. Kristy will work with Amber on the Math Department courses.

VII. Publicizing SLOs – How and Where?

Lauren reported that there is a WASC requirement to publicize SLOs and the committee discussed the possibilities for best doing this. The “outcomes vs. objectives” wording was again discussed, and this problem is out of LPC’s hands at this time, we will just have to keep in touch with WASC reviews of other colleges and adjust as necessary to our process.

Items discussed were:
- There is no process at this time to document syllabi and review them.
- Many/Some LPC instructors do not like their outcomes/objectives within the syllabi (various reasons; it may taint the students’ learning process or intimidate students.)
- As an institution LPC decided SLOs would not be in course outlines.
- When SLOs were started in other colleges some early adopters did put them in their course outlines.
- Other late colleges put SLOs in their curriculum documents as a separate “Outcomes” page
- Kristy mentioned that Ohlone and others publishes their SLOs on each department’s website by course name. Admin Support staff have access to update department websites.
- These could also be posted on the SLO website; or on the department or the SLO websites by LaPTECHs.
- Basically we need to make sure students are informed of where to find the SLOs.

Lisa suggested we table this for discussion and consideration of how to best meet the objectives of WASC. Amber mentioned this may be a lengthy study and fits in with studying and publicizing “who we are”. Laurel said that WASC will also look at how we document our process of coming to a decision on this, and how the college discusses and decides this.
It was decided to table the decision of how and where to publicize SLOs for now, and send this to Divisions for review and discussion and request input from them for SLO committee. Laurel would also like to bring this up in writing at a Faculty Senate meeting for more longterm discussion and goals.

Sean asked why the objectives would not be good to publish on the syllabi. Lisa answered with information about the right of academic freedom and creativity; to set a list of rules and standards would be contrary to that principle and seen as inappropriate to faculty. The syllabi are the jurisdiction of the faculty and they do share ideas and best practices. Sean thanked Lisa for this answer.

VIII. Other
No other business was discussed.


Sharon Gach
Administrative Assistant