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

Lauren Hasten, Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:37 pm., in Room 2411A.

I. **Set Agenda**  
The agenda was set as drafted and it was noted a quorum was present.

II. **Review of Minutes**  
The draft minutes of February 1, 2010 will be reviewed and revised by Lauren and brought to the April 12th meeting for approval.

III. **Chair’s Update**

A. **SLO Song Student Video Contest** - Lauren said that we have continued to publicize the contest, there are no new entries yet this semester, and we still have the entry from Fall term. The contest closes April 2nd.

B. **Program Review** – Lauren said that a small group met to work on Program Review (P.R.) and that programs need a template on which to report their work and needs; especially since the Accreditation visit included P.R. needs in their Recommendation #3. The campus will also need instruction on how to use the template (the Common Tool). Elena Cole, chair of the P.R. Task Force will present their work to the faculty at Town Meeting on March 3rd, and to the Executive Board of the Academic Senate.

C. **Academic Senate Report** – Lauren reported to the Academic Senate on:

1. **SLOs and Core Competencies** – She reported that most SLOs assessed within only two Core Competencies (Critical Thinking and Communication). She showed the results of the evaluation of the Critical Thinking C.C. The Senate asked the SLO Committee to make a recommendation on how to address the problem of assessing only in the two core competencies.

2. **eLumen Data** – Lauren also let the Senate know that since we are looking at assessment data, as Accreditation Recommendation 3 demands, and working on the P.R. sub-committee work, we will now need to teach the faculty how to access and interpret their data. As the Division discussions on eLumen data use were held last month, Lauren asked the Senate to approve that the LPC Office of Institutional Research and Planning to be allowed to interpret
the eLumen data for each department, with the exception of the MSEPS division which would like to opt out of this interpretation program. The Senate approved this motion, and Dr. Machamer and Dr. Holthuis will begin to “liberate the data” from eLumen into Excel reports.

3. The 0-4 Scale in eLumen – Lauren mentioned to the Senate that those departments not using the 04 Scale will have to be separately analyzed in a very time consuming manner. She made the request of the Senate to standardize the 0-4 Scale, but this was voted down because there were many unanswered questions. However, the Senate is willing to revisit this at a later date.

IV. eLumen Update

A. Program Level SLOs in eLumen - With the eLumen upgrade this year the previous program to provide certain reports is not available. To get these reports again, the eLumen programmers inform us we will need to choose from several options which have a risk of losing some data. We could also wait until we finish the P.R. planning to determine the best reports to request. The drawback to this is that we cannot input department outcomes and correct to the course level outcomes. This will have to be discussed again at a future meeting.

V. College Update
None.

VI. Old Business

A. Division Reports and Last Month’s Talking Points – Lauren said that in last month’s Division Meetings MSEPS voted down the standardized 0-4 Scale. Discussion on how to move forward on this despite the opt-out considered that:

- Eric said that in MSEPS there was discussion and frustration about originally getting ahead of the curve, but now having to re-do the math course scales into the 0-4 scale; and possibly still evaluating data on their own.
- Lauren said that she is only interested in future sections and not re-doing past terms’ scales or evaluations. If courses in future terms can be re-tooled to the 0-4 Scale there will be lots of assistance with evaluation.
- There were questions on how to translate other scales into the 0-4 Scale (e.g., 1-8, 0-7, and how to easily put them into the correct proficiency level. A small chart was written out as a sample:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>eLumen sample assessment</th>
<th>Below 60%</th>
<th>60% or better</th>
<th>70% or better</th>
<th>80% or better</th>
<th>90% or better</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Scale A: 0-9</td>
<td>0 – 5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Scale B: 1-7</td>
<td>1 – 4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Scale C: 1-4</td>
<td>1 – 2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Lauren said the key is to show whether students are proficient in the several SLOs for each course; smaller divisions of scale are not important in SLO theory.

• **Question: what is proficiency?** The recommendation of this committee to work in eLumen is that 2 is Proficient.

• Lauren mentioned that these discussions are a natural **part of the period of reflection**, and this is the intent of WASC to allow the colleges to make their discoveries of what works for their institution.

• Some faculty members object to the fact that despite eLumen’s ability to only query individual course numbers, and not individual instructors, in courses with just one instructor someone could discover student success from that instructor. **Because of this situation a number of people have urged resistance to the 0-4 Scale, on principle.**

• When the Academic Senate did not wish to standardize the 0-4 Scale several years ago, at the request of several departments, they were **allowing the maximum amount of freedom for instructors**. What we see several years later is that this, in effect, **has created some extra work** in order to get comparable data across departments in relation to the core competencies.

• Sharon mentioned that these conversations are in the minutes of 2006 and forward, and that this problem of how to get consistent, “course to core competency data” was known several years ago.

• The resistance at Division/Department levels to providing data for institutional or program data is what seems to drive the “scale” differences. Some instructors may feel that it takes something from the program level data to use a scale that is not tailored to the program. Thus the question is asked: **“Which is most important – the program data or institutional data.”** Possibly both are equally important. Many people feel that both can be accommodated, but it was mentioned the situation has become somewhat ‘politicized’.

• Lauren mentioned that the statewide Academic Senate has had difficulty buying in to the SLO process. This also occurred with the State Curriculum Committee, in which Title V had to mandate the use of standardized definitions, scales and forms. This has now been resolved, **so perhaps with time the SLO standards will also become a balanced issue to allow colleges to move forward in assessing proficiency.**

• Every program should care deeply because SLOs are meaningful to them for their teaching.

• And similarly, the institution should care deeply so that it can also quantify student proficiency on the same scale.

• Lauren mentioned that it looks like **CurricUNet** will be adopted for curriculum documentation, which has an SLO module. **That module does not use student unit data.** These situations make it so that other entities are in control of SLO decisions.

• It appears now that the SLO committee has done all it could do to bring the issues, discussion and differences into the open, and **that this is now in the hands of others**, such as the Academic Senate and CurricUNet committee.

• **The history and purpose of SLOs statewide** has been for measuring success of the Institution. They can also be useful for course purposes, and we are still trying for a win-win for SLOs.
• Amber mentioned an example of useful institutional data: the Communication core comp score in isolation is not useful; however in combination with other core competencies it gives information about students’ learning and their needs.

• Amber closed with the thought that Las Positas College is quite a bit farther along in the SLO process and reflection year compared to other campuses.

B. eLumen SLO Data and Program Review: The March 3 Town Meeting – Lauren said that the Town Meeting March 3rd will be mainly devoted to Program Review, SLO Data use, research and working on WASC Recommendation #3. After the usual preliminary college items, the Classified Staff will meet in a separate room for discussion and faculty will remain in the Lecture Hall for training on SLO data and P.R. These activities are a part of the Closing the Loop piece of SLOs, data, and interpretation.

1. WASC Recommendation 3 Presentation – To meet this recommendation, Lauren has talked to the Program Review Task Force and SLOs are now a part of the P.R. template, called the Common Tool. Now instructors will need ability to access data and a model for interpretation of data; in a different mode than eLumen, but still accurate. During the first hour of Town Meeting Amber and Lauren will make a presentation on the Common Tool. During the second hour, Lauren requests that committee members help each area understand their particular uses and practice how to utilize data and template.

Demonstration – Lauren and Amber showed a demo of the Common Tool, how it works, the intent of each section, etc. Academic Senate has seen this information and has approved the data report (with MSEPS division opting out).

Discussion included:
• Can success and retention data from other sources be used? Yes.
• How do the Instructional Requests work with the Common Tool? That will need to be addressed by the P.R. Task Force.

Laurel Jones mentioned that these tools will be included in our Self Study document, the Focused Report, due to WASC by October 17, 2010. Laurel mentioned that WASC recommends that we also have adjuncts participate in the SLO process, and the District and Faculty union and faculty association will be working on this over time.

Sharon asked what she could report to the Classified Senate to explain in the short version to help faculty if possible, what faculty are going through creating the Common Tool, and will need to do to complete the P.R. Lauren said the basics are: It’s a messy process, and the amount of discussion going on is normal in an open campus climate. If there is a top-down campus the process would be simple, as in “Now all faculty will do X, Y and Z” with no discussion.

2. Research Corner – Amber presented slides on the proper reading and use of data. This will be presented this at Town Meeting before the “Recommendation 3” presentation.
Laurel brought up discussion of the flow for the Town Meeting. After discussion it was decided that if the conversation in the large group (Research Corner, and “Rec. 3” Presentation) was going long, to let it flow and progress so that all could have their questions answered before progressing to the next task. Therefore the group may or may not go to the TLC to begin working with the Common Tool, depending on the feeling of accomplishment of the first section.

VII. NEW BUSINESS
None.

VIII. OTHER
None.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:37 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Gach
Classified Representative/
Administrative Assistant

Next Meeting: Monday, April 12, 2010 - 2:30 pm – Room 2411A
SLO Steering Committee
Talking Points for Division Meetings, 2/17/09

1. The SLO Student Video Contest is up and running again this semester due to a lack of entries last year. The prize is $350 cash. Please promote this to your students; a link to instructions can be found on the LPC home page.

2. eLumen has updated its software with a new look to its front page. You should be able to proceed as usual by using the blue menu items on the left side of the page. Scott Vigallon has posted an updated tutorial at: http://www.laspositascollege.edu/slo/tutorial.php

3. Scott Vigallon has begun inputting Program-level outcomes into the eLumen software. The Committee has recommended that these outcomes be drawn directly from course-level outcomes and that all assessments are conducted at the course level. If your program leads to a major or certificate of completion, the Committee further recommends that you send your Program-level outcome(s) to Scott Vigallon for entry into eLumen. Please specify the course SLOs that map to each Program level SLO.

4. Last month, the Chair reported to the Academic Senate that eLumen data which does not conform to the 0-4 reporting scale cannot be folded into institutional-level statistical queries; the Academic Senate requested additional information. The Chair then provided the Executive Board of the A.S. with a complete list of courses whose data could not be included in the stats run on Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 – clustered in a total of 12 different disciplines. As a result, the Academic Senate is now considering passing a resolution to standardize the 0-4 eLumen reporting scale.

5. In light of data which reveals an emphasis, College-wide, on the assessment of critical thinking SLOs, the Academic Senate asked the Chair to solicit from the SLO Steering Committee a recommendation as to how to proceed. At its last meeting, the Committee recommended that instructors consider writing additional SLOs for their courses which speak to the different Core Competencies, perhaps by addressing significant outcomes listed in Course Outlines. The Committee will continue this discussion next month; please forward your comments through your division representatives.

6. According to Recommendation 3 of the WASC report, LPC must deliver a follow-up report to WASC on October 15, 2010, which "demonstrate[s] resolution" of the recommendation that the College "fully integrate its processes for the assessment of student learning outcomes with its processes for program review and planning." Whether we consider our deadline to be 2010 or 2012, this would appear to indicate that the Program Review document on which we are currently working on must incorporate an evaluation of SLO assessment data.

In order to facilitate this, all full-time faculty have been given access to the "Assessments by Program" report in eLumen. Since this report is delivered in a nearly useless format (one must pull out the data and plug it into a spreadsheet manually), the Chair asked the Academic Senate to approve a process whereby the Institutional Researcher can begin providing Program-level eLumen data (in usable and interpretable form) to faculty by request. The request met with general approval. The Chair will present a framework for instructors to start addressing this data during the March 3rd Town Meeting.

Lauren Hasten

3/1/2010