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

I. Set Agenda
The agenda was set with one change: Under “Topics of the Month” to move item VI.E. to the VI. A.

II. Review of Minutes
The draft minutes of February 2, 2009 were approved as written.

III. Chair’s Update

A. Letter to Faculty

Lauren reported that she sent the letter to faculty which was approved at the last meeting, regarding assistance to meet the gaps in SLO reporting, and updating them on the simplified revised model of “Program” and “Institutional”-level SLOs.

B. Division Presentations / WASC Rubric

1) Lauren said she sent an email to each SLO Committee Division representative recently with the statistics on SLO completion, and said that she shared this with the SS&W Division giving them detailed information. Many people were shocked about the low overall completion rate of 56.24% and said they would complete more SLOs.

2) Lauren stressed the importance of taking the low status report to each Division, hit the message hard and try to get more results. The College and this Committee has been doing SLOs for 6 years, and the low rate of completion is very frustrating. Amber asked if anyone at the meeting brought this up in their Division; Tina and Catherine mentioned this in A&C and faculty there know of the poor numbers now.
C. The SLO Song Student Video Contest – AS Update

Andrej brought up several points about the contest to make sure it is well promoted. To this end, Lauren will have a catchy announcement posted on the LPC Home Page and the Zone. Everyone please be sure to promote the contest in their classes and flyers will be put on all bulletin boards, the Library and the Student Union.

IV. eLumen Update

Tina said there are no problems at this time. Catherine asked if there was a report, or could one be created, on “Closing the Loop,” in order to encourage and advise colleagues. Tina and Lauren said some information is available and will start to identify a procedure for more Closing the Loop information. People could volunteer to bring their reflections on Closing the Loop to Division and Town Meeting; and more work will be done on this later.

V. College Update

Amber asked the SLO Committee to ‘test drive’ the Program Review Task Force’s (PR TF) Narrative Template, and she passed out a memo with sample questions to start the discussion. The PR process will be presented to Academic Senate later this semester, and the TF is asking for the SLO Committees’ input on how best to incorporate the use of SLO assessment into PR. The TF would like to get some Action Plans from the input.

The point of doing all this work is to help programs plan and request resources to improve student learning. This relates to the Closing the Loop information also, and the inter-relationships of SLOs and PR are starting to become more apparent to faculty.

Several suggestions to the memo were made during discussion:

- Under a., add: # of Adjunct-only courses
- Create d. and e.: What roadblocks have you encountered in getting resources for student learning? And: How would you suggest getting additional data on student assessment, and closing the loop?

VI. “Topics of the Month”

A. SLO Town Meeting – Lauren reviewed the following points so the Committee could give input on establishing the order of the SLO presentation at Town Meeting on March 4th.

a. Lauren will present the Zoomerang website survey and the review of the new model for: Course \(\rightarrow\) Major/Certificate \(\rightarrow\) Degree. Clarify and answer questions as needed.


c. Lauren will put up the eLumen reports showing the very poor percentage of SLOs assessed. She will ask for faculty to complete their data entry from Fall 2008; and eliminate the “rows of zeroes” so our percentage completions can come up to a decent, if not very good, level. The committee felt it was acceptable to present all the low numbers, as that is the truth, and if it embarrasses anyone that is due to their own inaction on SLOs.

d. Lauren will present the course-level outcomes: current statistics and discussion of strategies for completion.
e. Lauren mentioned that she will help people clean up some zeroes in eLumen by instructing them:

1) Let people know not to do a “Prepare Assessment” if they do not plan to assess a course this term, and 2) teach people how to do “Preparation/Delete” if their have already prepared for an assessment but are not assessing this term.

There was discussion on several items:

- LaVaughn reminded everyone that the term “program based GE” is used in a different context in the Curriculum Committee discussions. Everyone noted this.
- Lauren gave a sample of points in her talk including, “We are better than 56%; we need to find a way to get to 100%”

A lengthy discussion about how to motivate faculty during Town Meeting was held. It began with the question if we should make a list and assign to committee members the responsibility to talk with and ask each person non-compliant with SLOs to write and assess. Ideas mentioned included:

- The idea was proposed to take verbiage from instructors’ course outlines, which are their goals for the students, and have a volunteer/ghost-writer put that in SLO language, get agreement from the instructor and input SLOs into eLumen for them.

- Comments in favor of writing and entering for other instructors included: The information has meaning as it’s directly from the course outline; this is just a mechanical process of taking wording from one place and inputting it into eLumen; Chabot College has one FT instructor (release time) to do just this; this is just a clerical process.

- Objections included: What does it accomplish to have someone else pull out verbiage and write another’s SLO; would writing for others be “cooking the books?” ; does it lack integrity if someone else does the verbiage and input? We should ask the Deans to put the non-SLO faculty on the hot-seat – the BCAT Division presented the numbers last month and a lot of SLOs were written after the Division meeting.

- If we do not write SLOs, we are not doing what we ask students to do (complete their work).

- John Williams mentioned that in colleges where SLOs work well there is integration of SLOs, with Program Review, with Budget Review, and up to Strategic Planning. This is the only way that any of these activities work, in relation to each other as a whole system.

- The worst-case scenario from not having enough SLOs written would be a Warning status involving only 2 months to correct the deficiency. Therefore, the choices are write SLOs in 2 months now and avoid a Warning; or write them after accreditation visit in 2 months, and receive a Warning that is published state-wide.

- Catherine stated that both the College and WASC may learn some information from the process and data at LPC.

- Sharon said that the minutes from two years ago stated that the committee felt it would come to this point right before Accreditation also; this situation was almost predicted.
In summary there was agreement to take the middle ground:

- Inquire with the Academic Senate to consider how they would feel if the SLO Committee volunteered to offer to overdue SLO writers to take course outlines and using the same wording create SLOs for courses. For example: “In respect to your academic freedom, and knowing that the College needs to meet the WASC requirement of SLO writing to continue its’ accreditation, we have ghost-writers who are willing to take from your course outline your wording for class goals and create SLOs for you.”

- Rajeev volunteered to input anyone’s SLOs upon request.

- There are a range of reasons why instructors do not write SLOs, including: Just not knowing where to start [a target group for this volunteer effort to write SLOs for/with them], to not having enough time [another target group for this help], to people who actually object to having to write them.

- On a practical basis there are 312 courses to do; if ten people volunteered to do them 31 courses each is still quite a lot.

- The College as a whole is responsible for maintaining accreditation and good standing, and many people, especially on this Committee, have worked very hard to maintain accreditation to write SLOs, and many people will continue to work very hard to prevent a Warning from WASC.

- The committee feels that WASC would view as legitimate, SLOs created for others by pulling already stated student goals out of course outlines.

- The committee is also aware that there is a lack of robustness to a process where SLOs are not directly written by each instructor,

- This assistance in writing SLOs is a multi-pronged approach to reach a range of types of instructors who have not written them. Approaches could include: A Division rep from SLO committee sit and help; a ghost-writer pull out verbiage from the course outline and write SLOs for the instructor’s review; instructor or ghost-writer write and ghost-writer input SLOs into eLumen; FT instructors mentor PT instructors; volunteers pick up the speed and approach people personally, invite them to receive help.

- **SUMMARY**: Lauren will create a slide for Town Meeting offering the assistance of ghost-writers, and input volunteers, and that Division coordinators will contact Faculty to see which level of assistance is needed.

**B. Self Study Question and Clarification**

Lauren asked the committee’s feeling on whether to send the full spreadsheet to every Division/faculty member, or edit it just for the Division. **The committee agrees to send the whole spreadsheet to everyone.**

**C. Course-Level SLOs** – This item was put aside for the next meeting in the interest of time.
D. Major/Certificate-Level SLOs - This item was put aside for the next meeting in the interest of time.

E. Fall 2008 Assessment Data - This item was put aside for the next meeting in the interest of time.

VII. Other

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Gach
Administrative Assistant

Next Meeting: Monday, April 13, 2009- 2:30 pm – Room 2411A