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

I. Set Agenda
The agenda was set as drafted.

II. Review of Minutes
The draft minutes of October 5, 2009 and November 2, 2009 were reviewed and approved.

III. Chair’s Update

A. Lauren mentioned that since there are no Division meetings this month she will send the talking points this month to all faculty. She will also go to Academic Senate meeting and take the Charge of the Committee as re-worked by the SLO Committee today, and present it for approval.

IV. eLumen Update

A. Software Upgrade – Amber reported that a new version of eLumen will be in effect on 1/7/10. Lauren will include this information in her talking points to faculty. Amber asked that the committee members assist by encouraging people to input their scores before 1/6/10. If faculty wait until 1/7/10 there will be new screens to learn.

V. College Update

A. CurricuNet Information – Amber and Lauren reported that they will attend a Webinar next Friday on how CurricuNet software may be able to handle program-level SLOs. This can be viewed from one’s desk or in the Innovation Center. Lauren and Scott will listen to the Webinar and bring a report back to the committee. As this committee knows, eLumen is not effective at the program level; and the main question is if CurricuNet is more effective than eLumen.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. SLO Student Video Contest – Sharon and Greg presented their plans for rolling out the SLO Song/Student Video Contest, Part II. The committee agreed with the steps and thanked them for their work thus far. It was requested to get the information on the LPC home page event banner as soon as possible.
B. SLO Steering Committee Charge Update – Lauren presented the second version of the updated SLO Committee charge with the changes suggested from last month. The Committee thanked Lauren for her work on this and felt it covered all information, was well written and thorough. They felt it needed to be as long as it is to cover the complexities in the responsibilities of the committee, especially with the committee roles of Software Liaison and Data Steward. Lauren will remove reference to the specific software (eLumen).

C. eLumen Data: Core Competencies – At a previous meeting the committee requested that Amber run a study from eLumen data to see how we are meeting the LPC Core Competencies. Amber presented a detailed analysis of how Core Competencies relate and interact with our current SLOs, and with the eLumen software. She gave a background with some draft slides of how eLumen data is funneled into Excel. The difficulties of working with eLumen to get manageable data, and understanding the limitations of the data.

Amber stated that courses not following the 0-4 Point scale were not able to be added into the Excel analysis. Lauren gave a history for new members of the 0-4 Point scale recommended to the Academic Senate 2 years ago. The Senate gave the option for faculty to use the 0-4 Point scale, but did not require it. Thus, now that we are trying to get macro-level Core Competency data, much data is lost due to variations of scales.

It was asked if we could determine a clear ‘pass’ line from other scales, and utilize that as #2 or 3 in the 0-4 Point scale (a student rating at least a 2 level in understanding the SLO). Amber said yes that is possible, but is not worth the data analysis time to transfer the information.

Amber hopes that faculty will see the benefit of having their assessments roll up into the macro-level/Core Competency data, and do this voluntarily. Two and 3 years ago the committee predicted this problem would happen, and now much data is lost and unusable at the institutional level. Amber hopes that the presentations of this information at Academic Senate and Town Meeting will show people that Non–0-4 Scale data cannot be used institutionally.

There was discussion of the pros and cons of more autonomy, versus being more proscriptive in the scale used. It is hoped that departments which do not have reliable data to roll up to Core Competencies will see the need to have useful data on the macro level.

There seems to be a need to balance autonomy against limited data and to begin the dialogue on quality of data so that we as the college can see how our SLOs are doing, as well as WASC.

Amber’s and Lauren’s presentation points were:

- The data shows very little eLumen data coming into 3 of the 5 Core Competencies. The most used are Critical Thinking and Technology.

- There are other things that can be done now to help with the 3 under-reported Core Competencies. We could also ask faculty to see if they have other SLOs to write for the low-reported Core Competencies, which would help get data for the whole college.

- Due to not being able to use the data from the ‘Non-0-4 Point Scale’ courses, very little information actually rolls up to the macro level in Core Competencies.

- The committee may need to think about recommending multiple SLOs be written for each course, to speak to more/most of the Core Competencies.
Committee discussed the idea of having several SLOs written at the time a course is created. Some colleges have this information on their course outline form for their curriculum committee – we may wish to do this in the future.

Amber said there is a lot more than just number crunching the Research and Planning Office can do. They can combine eLumen course data with other institutional reflections and planning, and model the building of a “Culture of Evidence.”

As a college we need to remain accredited; WASC is requiring a “Culture of Evidence”, therefore LPC needs to provide evidence of students meeting the learning outcomes.

We are awaiting our accreditation report from WASC, due in January or February, 2010.

Amber and Lauren are willing to co-present the eLumen/Excel/Analysis process at an Academic Senate Meeting and a Town Meeting.

After this presentation the committee may wish to request that the Academic Senate enact a policy to formalize a trustworthy scale.

The timeline given in our upcoming WASC report will determine what the Academic Senate will need to tell faculty and by what deadline.

Amber asked the committee:

Regarding pie charts fall 08 and spring 09, would it be best to show the sorting by Course, Section or Assessment?

After discussion it was agreed that showing data by Assessment would be most useful, especially at Town Meeting.

Committee discussion included:

The committee believes that faculty are now beginning to see that the eLumen reporting is not just an ‘exercise’ to get ‘some’ data; and that faculty for the most part would want their data to roll up into useful information (Core Competencies and “Culture of Evidence” / Accreditation.)

This information would not only be for their course and department, but for the Core Competencies (are we indeed teaching students what our Core Competencies say we do), and for overall Course-to-Core Competency-to-“Culture of Evidence” standards.

The discussion of the reporting scale as 0-4 has been ongoing for over 2 years, and perhaps faculty now have enough experience with eLumen to see a way they could take the other reporting scales and transfer them into the 0-4 scale, so that reliable reporting could be run from eLumen across all disciplines, and feed into analysis for Core Competencies.

Lauren could make a recommendation to Academic Senate that standardizing the reporting scale in eLumen (0-4) would create the ability to extract usable data for the “Culture of Evidence” standards.

Greg stated that there are indeed mathematical methods to transfer any reporting scale into the 0-4 scale, and that this is a do-able item. However, with the Shared Governance system the adoption of other methods does take longer; and the idea that a method ‘comes from above’ is still difficult for some faculty to adopt.

Mike proposed that if departments wish to have autonomy in their scales: Might the Academic Senate wish to give a compromise and have those departments use their scales
for their purposes, and also translate their own scales into the 0-4 Point scale for use in the macro/Core Competency analyses.

Other points pondered by the committee:

- The committee still in discussion about how much to recommend to Academic Senate due to the fact that some faculty do not wish to use the 0-4 scale
- The college knows what it’s basic 10 recommendations from the WASC visit will be, we do not yet know the severity though.
- When we know severity and time frame to correct our recommendations, this committee, as well as other committees and administrative functions will know what exactly to recommend, and in what time frame.
- As the college studies CurricuNet and the Program Review committee develops their recommendations it is hoped they will encourage faculty to incorporate SLO data into the Program Review for Spring ’10. It would be great to start basing resources partly on what SLO data shows about student learning needs.

D. ePortfolio Pilot Project – In the interest of time, this item will be discussed at a later meeting.

E. eLumen Notes and Planning - In the interest of time, this item will be discussed at a later meeting.

VII. NEW BUSINESS
None.

VIII. OTHER
None.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Gach
Classified Representative/
Administrative Assistant

Next Meeting: Monday, February 1, 2010 - 2:30 pm – Room 2411A