

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES  
STEERING COMMITTEE  
Meeting Minutes – February 4, 2008**

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

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

Lauren Hasten, Chair, opened the meeting at 2:30 pm., in Room 1603.

**I. Set Agenda**

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

**II. Review of Minutes**

**The Minutes of December 3, 2007 were reviewed and accepted by consensus, without change.**

**III. Chair’s Update**

- A. Assessment Software** – Lauren viewed an alternative software program, Waypoint, and found that it is rubric-based, but takes much more work to input data and get reports. Her conclusion is that eLumen is a good product for LPC.
- B. Publicizing SLOs / December 2007 Academic Senate Meeting** – At the Dec. 2007 Academic Senate meeting the senate was informed that the dialogue on publicizing the SLO outcomes needs to begin and that the Senate SLO Steering Committee will lead the discussion beginning in January.
- C. E-Mail Updates/Reminders to Input SLOs** – Lauren reported on the responses to her memo to begin & continue input of SLOs. Of those who had not yet input SLOs prior to February 4<sup>th</sup>, only 9 people had let her know about their progress (or lack of). After her memo February 4<sup>th</sup>, 26 people have responded on their progress. Several people have SLOs written but not yet input into eLumen. The big question is: How to motivate people to get this done. Discussion included:
  - How to make this meaningful to faculty. Kristy suggested more dialogue as to how SLOs are helpful to the instructor, the department and the school.
  - Discussion has been held last semester and for 3 years on usefulness, how SLO data leads to new equipment, new teaching effectiveness, etc.
  - Some people seem to want to discuss the pros and cons of SLOs longer; however, time is getting short, and the college needs to show a certain percentage completeness by Accreditation next year.

- SLOs do not have to be 100% complete; there needs to be demonstrable **progress** toward the goal though. We are not showing much progress after 1 year of using eLumen, as a whole campus.
- Some of the desired discussions center around other Program Review conversations, however, there is no time this year for Program Review to come first, then do SLOs. **We need progress on SLOs this term.**

❖ **Positive items to relate to faculty on SLOs:**

- **Genuine Usable Information Returns to You** - Your SLO work is indeed extra time and effort – but it is not in vain – quite a bit of information returns to you in the data feedback loop. Lauren has improved several things in her courses as a result of eLumen reports; many in the Math Department have seen the benefits already.
- **Encourage Participation** – Tell faculty we know they want to do a good job and it doesn't have to be perfect in the first round; and at some point we have to start somewhere and get some data to study.
- **Examples Available** - Let people know there are good examples available; contact a committee member.
- **Stay Focused** - Lauren encouraged everyone not to get 20 steps ahead of the process to figure out every detail before even inputting SLOs. Many of these other items can be decided in due course.
- **Invite Speakers from other SLO Colleges** – Go through our contacts at other colleges and invite speakers to department and division meetings. Kristy has a contact at Los Medanos. Lauren will be glad to schedule these speakers, just contact her.
- **Need Resources? Write SLOs!** – SLO data is a great way to grow your program. Data proves the need for funds!
- **We need to input outcomes to get the data** – The SLO focus groups understood the benefits of SLO data; now we need to get to it and **get the job done.**
- **Study Time Later** - We have built in a whole semester of reflection time.
- **Present/Talk it up at other campus meetings** – Other governing bodies on campus also need to hear again how important SLOs are for teaching, feedback into Program Review, funding, and Accreditation next year.
  - Have met with all governing bodies, and Amber and Lauren have data and information that may help them understand this importance again. **Email this out again.**
- We need some progress! We are past the point of 'low hanging fruit'.

**The committee liked the two-pronged approach:**

- ❖ **Experts from outside to speak/train; and**
- ❖ **Emails and assistance from the committee.**

- **Decided to email a follow-up** to encourage, to meet at least the minimum requirement of SLOs
- **Identify** some committee members to input for other instructors; not ideal, but will get it done.
  - **Jim, Tina, Lauren, Gina and Scott volunteered to input SLOs for others.**
  - **Gina is willing to email instructors one on one to encourage them to start.**

### Other:

- Lauren needs someone to go through the discipline list with her and see who needs further reminders.
- Laurel proposed to start doing eLumen training in the Adjunct Orientation sessions; how eLumen works; examples of SLOs; they can see actual SLOs and data reports, and see the benefits.
- Richard discussed pros and cons for publishing SLOs on the instructor's webpage. This has not been discussed/ decided in Academic Senate yet, therefore this can be decided later.
- Richard asked if students see the aggregate scores of their section or course; No, students only see their own scores. And, students cannot see any scoring now, this discussion is for later.

### IV. eLumen Update – Tina Inzerilla

Tina said that eLumen 3.0 was installed February 4<sup>th</sup>. The changes are mainly terminology differences (“My Courses”), enhancements in reporting, and program level outcomes. Irvine Valley College personnel lately reviewed eLumen at LPC and were impressed. Tina recently gave the eLumen representative feedback about their product. He would like to set up an organizational outcomes meeting, and Laurel, Amber, and Lauren will join Tina for this.

It was asked how surveyors/committee see who actually has entered data, and if it can be reviewed for an individual section. Currently eLumen only provides for a total; Tina has asked eLumen to add tracking for individual sections and who has/has not entered data.

It was asked if WASC cares about section which are not entered; Laurel said that currently WASC is not drilling down to each section. They want to look at courses, assessments, new outcomes, and reassessments – in other words, making progress in the basic systems. It doesn't have to be perfect.

### V. College Update

Laurel commented on the “rumor mill” regarding concerns, rumors, and problems among faculty in getting used to having to do SLOs. She reminded the committee that it is their responsibility to concentrate on the college as a learning institution, and that SLOs are part of the new learning paradigm. She encouraged the committee to say to their colleagues that we will get through this process, we will do it well but not perfectly, and move beyond it. Laurel said she agrees with the committee's points above, but that it is incumbent on us now to put in the ‘great amount of work’ this year to get the results in Accreditation next year.

**She attended an ALO workshop in Sacramento and found that the current WASC recommendations give only two months to rectify any problems after their accreditation; rather than 3 years at the Mid-Term Report.** However, we are not in terrible shape compared to other colleges, this is the hard-knuckle work and what we need next is the effectiveness list.

Regardless of how we ‘feel’ about SLOs, we will not get far in Accreditation without more progress on SLOs. Good faith efforts and work will count with WASC (it doesn't have to be perfect, but we have to try it). WASC will not care about our dialogue of the pro's and cons of SLO's, they will want to know:

- ❖ Where are we in the “process”?
- ❖ What work did we do?
- ❖ What did we turn in?

Laurel agrees with using the expertise of others, asking speakers to talk to us. She also recommended CCC Conferences, televised conferences for disciplines to focus on the how-tos.

She is thrilled to hear that we are doing so much work, encourages the committee to keep trying. Regardless of what WASC or the State Academic Senate is telling people, the LPC faculty senate has accepted the SLO initiative and has indicated they will do it. WASC will judge us on this. She encourages the committee to use the Senate, ask the Senators how to get SLOs done, and utilize the campus processes.

## VI. Topics of the Month

**A. Adding ‘Wellness’ to the Core Competency Drop-Down List** – A possible addition to the core competencies list for Wellness was discussed; it was discovered that the Wellness competency is already contained within the Respect & Responsibility Competency.

**B. Timelines for Rotating Assessments** – We need to get a status on the rotating assessments, and **Lauren and Amber will meet, put together a status, and send an email to the committee.**

**C. New SLO Webpage – What to Post?** – Discussion/Suggestions:

- ❖ Will this be an internal webpage only? Need to find out.
- ❖ Look at colleges that have done well on their WASC survey, and see what they have posted.
- ❖ Send good link suggestions to Scott or Lauren for the “Reference” section.
- ❖ Referral to Bill Scroggins, SLO expert, now president at College of the Siskiyous.
- ❖ Usefulness of this webpage will be to reinforce verbal teaching on SLOs (not the best place for people to begin; but good for follow-up and support).
- ❖ The link will be from Academic Senate Intranet.

## D. Publicizing SLO Outcomes: How to Proceed?

Since the WASC language is vague and inconsistent we need to try to determine how to publicize SLO outcomes. **Recommend taking the discussion to division meetings in February and get their thoughts.**

Possible places for Academic Senate to publicize SLO outcomes:

- ❖ Curriculum area
- ❖ Catalog
- ❖ Class-Web
- ❖ Departmental Websites
- ❖ Schedule of Classes
- ❖ Program Brochures
- ❖ Syllabi

NOTE: Students only see the outcome, not the rubrics.

Scott recommends that we discuss linkage with Elizabeth Noyes to see how we want various areas on the public and intranet webpages to point to the SLO site.

Melissa and Abbas, our student reps, were asked how they thought students would use the outcome publication online; they believe that the information will be used to find out what exactly the instructor wants the student to know, rather than decide which courses to take (or screen out courses for which they don't like SLOs). Currently students can already compare courses with the online schedule.

#### **E. Course Level SLOs:**

- ❖ Should the Committee make a recommendation regarding the number of:
  - i. SLOs per course?
  - ii. Number of SLOs to assess each term (per course)?
  
- ❖ Do we need a mechanism to check for SLO robustness?
  - i. If so, what?

These are good questions; however, we have quite a lot to handle at this time with getting instructors to write some for each course. **This would be good to revisit later under a “Best Practices” type of review.**

#### **F. Program Level SLOs**

Lauren brought up how the committee wishes to define the term ‘program’, do we need a list of programs now, and how to proceed? Is a program a degree, or a certificate, or other?

**Laurel said the new Title 5, Chapter 6 changes address this specifically and she will bring this to a future meeting for discussion. Discussion tabled.**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sharon Gach  
Admin. Assistant.

**Next Meeting:** March 3, 2008  
2:30 p.m. – Room 2014, Library