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

Lauren Hasten, Chair, opened the meeting at 2:30 pm., in Room 2014.

I. Set Agenda

The Agenda was set by consensus as drafted, with the addition of “eText” discussion by Jim Gioia. The agenda is attached to these minutes.

II. Review of Minutes

The Minutes of February 4, 2008 were reviewed and accepted by consensus, with the following changes:

- III.A. – Assessment software is called “Waypoint”.
- VI. A. – “Adding ‘Wellness’ to the Core Competency Drop-Down List.” Change and simplify paragraph to read, “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.”

III. Chair’s Update

A. **Software Update** – Lauren said that Tina Inzerilla has some updates to share, and she herself has used eLumen with the new updates and finds them much more friendly and intuitive.

B. **Accreditation** – Lauren shared that the Faculty Flex Day on February 14 went very well and much accreditation standards work was done. At the debriefing session it was clear to all volunteers how interwoven SLOs are into all accreditation standards. Hopefully this new knowledge will permeate more aspects of campus life and generate more work on SLOs.

C. **Statistics from Fall 2007** – Lauren and Amber Machamer have worked on the statistics from Fall 2007. They are continually searching for friendly ways to encourage SLO writing and input, and educate faculty colleagues on this imperative task. She has sent several emails to faculty to contact her for help, information, assistance, etc. The current statistics are as follows:
Faculty & Course SLO Status – 3/3/08

Faculty
- 80 fulltime instructors total
- Prior to Lauren’s Feb. 12th email there were only 35 instructors who had reported on their status (progress & problems)
- After Feb 12th: 8 more instructors reported on their status
- Current total reporting in: 43 instructors (out of 80)

Courses
- 455 total courses for which to write SLOs
- 144 SLOs currently written (2/08), by 43 instructors
- Equals: 32% of these 43 instructors’ courses have SLOs written

IV. eLumen Update – Tina Inzerilla

A. Banner/eLumen Problem - Tina reported that a recent Banner upload caused a large data problem within eLumen. The eLumen staff worked over the Presidents’ Day weekend to clean this up, and as of today the database is basically back to where it was and instructors can be confident in entering new data now.

B. eLumen Report - There was a minor new release (3.1) recently which fixed links and made other small changes.

C. Publicizing SLOs - Tina recently presented the SLO concept to a group of Associated Student Body representatives, and gathered their feedback on several items, including how best to publicize SLOs. Tina referred to Melissa and Abbas, student representatives in attendance at this meeting. Melissa and Abbas said that students at this meeting felt that if instructors wished to publish their SLOs it was not necessary to print them on paper, but having a link from their webpage to their SLOs would save paper and also provide the information needed. There was also consensus among the students that viewing SLOs prior to course registration would not inhibit students from taking classes; classes for degrees/programs are fairly well mandated, and the students felt they would need to take classes even if they did not care for a SLO.

Lauren noted that no one can mandate an instructor to put SLOs on their syllabi, however this is just a suggestion for instructors to consider, discuss in their Divisions, etc. One of the ACCJC (WASC) accreditation standards is to publicize SLOs, and this is just one of the many ways it can be done.

Another possibility for publicizing SLOs would be to have the eLumen (future) report create a list of all SLO’s by course (data-free); and upload the list (pdf, html, or any other format) to the SLO website. This would be a very easy way to capture all SLOs without any extra typing, gathering lists, etc.

Brief discussion of:
- Some science SLOs are the actual test questions; some instructors wary of putting actual test questions up for view; they would rather students study all material, rather than specific questions.
- Laurel Jones asked students Melissa Cervantez and and Abbas Sheikh if they would assist in research on how other colleges publicize SLOs. They both agreed to do this, and will research Skyline, Cabrillo, Ohlone, and possibly others.
- Lauren said that she hoped at the end of this meeting some talking points would be gathered, and each committee member could take these points to Division meetings in March to encourage more instructors to write their SLOs.
V. College Update

Laurel mentioned that there is a question among a number of colleges on the new Title V changes regarding a 16 week calendar; whether it is 16 weeks of total instructional hours, or 16 weeks with a certain percentage of 54 hours. *She will research this with the State and report back.*

VI. Topics of the Month

A. 1. Timelines for Rotating Assessments/ Faculty Workload

Lauren brought up a topic for consideration: the possibility of changing the timeline for writing SLOs. She wondered if it would assist instructors to have some of the time pressure removed, and allow people to step back somewhat from the sense of ‘overwhelm’. She made many good points, and discussion ensued.

Lauren felt that a looser timeframe will help those feeling overwhelmed; she would like to offer a less-demanding schedule to allow people more space to open up and learn; people tend to learn better when they are more relaxed. Lauren still receives a large amount of confrontation from some instructors regarding the “Why” and “How” of SLOs.

Lauren read a draft of two paragraphs of for ACCJC regarding Accreditation Standard II which she serves on, interpreting the LPC SLO work to-date in a favorable light. She would like to see the committee consider changing the SLO-writing requirement to a certain number of courses rather than sections. She asked herself, since the statistics quoted earlier are a poor turnout; what could assist people in working on SLOs more? She felt that a longer timeframe would be of the most help.

Other points of view were discussed: On the positive side, there are 100% of faculty leads who have input all their sections’ SLOs. There is no way to predict what ACCJC (WASC) will/will not look at; we must continue our best-faith efforts to do as much as we can. Kristy Woods gave input that the committee may lose credibility if it loosens the timeframe now; everyone in MSEP has been working very hard, including adjuncts donating their time. *She would prefer to ramp up the support of instructors who need to have more education on SLOs.*

Kristy volunteered to assist Lauren with the instructors in their Divisions who are lagging behind in their timeline and encouraged other committee members to do the same. Perhaps other committee members than Lauren should become more “the face of SLOs” to show that the committee is united and that the college’s Accreditation depends on our producing SLOs.

Jim stated that it may be helpful to teach instructors to break the SLO work into manageable units, while reassuring them that they will have assistance in the process. Instructors can learn to see the process as distinct steps:

- Write SLOs;
- Input SLOs;
- Wait for student data;
- Receive data reports.
Jim felt the committee should hold the line on the timeframe. Kristy said she has helped several people understand that what they are already doing is actually an SLO. SLO writing is not an extra step, in short discussions they have found SLOs pre-written within syllabus material and course outlines! She again volunteered to assist with instructors who could be guided with this type of conversation.

Laurel mentioned that she understands that some disciplines may have a more difficult time applying SLOs to what they currently have, and this is normal in any setting to have considerable push-back to changing procedures. The push-back may also be emphasized because it is becoming more apparent who is and is not writing SLOs, and it is normal for staff to become vocal. She agrees that it is best to keep expectations high, while also supporting people to meet the plan. It would not bode well with ACCJC (WASC) to change the timeline now.

Laurel also said from a manager’s perspective there is some light at the end of the tunnel. Within the Fall 2008 semester program review will dovetail more SLOs and instructors will begin to see how SLO data will favorably impact their program funds. We are almost there; stay the course.

The committee understood how Lauren is getting impacted the most by being the public face of SLOs. They offered as much help as she needs to work with people where they are in finding, writing, and entering their SLOs.

Lauren withdrew her suggestion of changing the timeline and summarized that the committee feels it is important to keep on our current timeline; and it is very important to make a lot of progress soon.

**Flex Day for SLOs** - Lauren brought up the idea of having a faculty flex day on SLOs, similar to the great work that was done on Accreditation. The committee loved this idea, and will suggest to Academic Senate to do this during convocation week. An SLO flex day could be structured any number of ways: Large groups, small discipline groups, one on one assistance – The goal is to get as many SLOs written as possible in the current time frame. Lauren will bring this up with Divisions and the Faculty Senate.

Laurel will discuss the possibility with the Faculty Association and Ron Taylor at Chabot. If the FA would agree to close the campus for one day so that adjuncts could also attend an SLO flex day that would be a great boon.

Regarding the feedback that some instructors feel they do not need to have data on all sections of all their courses; other instructors have such different types of students that data is needed on all sections. It is possible that this could be decided at the discretion of each instructor (data for all sections, or just sampling of sections of all their courses). This will be discussed again later for decision.

B. **ACCJC (WASC) Procedural Change**

Dr. Jones pointed out that ACCJC (WASC) has recently changed their “Warning/ Watch/ Loss of Accreditation” timing. The new timing provides only two months to correct a Warning and be re-evaluated. The next step, would be a “Watch”, and if that is not corrected “Loss of Accreditation” is the final step. It is much harder to become re-accredited after Loss of Accreditation. In addition individual programs could lose accreditation, state funding, and also student financial aid. Therefore, it is incumbent on the whole campus to do a little more, go one extra mile – even a little more documented work can go a long way with ACCJC’s (WASC’s) evaluation.

The committee asked Sharon Gach to list weblinks, self-studies and resources at end of minutes.
Laurel noted that California colleges are required to review all curriculum every five years, and some of LPC’s are 12 years old. As an encouragement to review curriculum and write SLOs she will be suggesting that program funds may become contingent on program reviews and SLOs.

Amber shared that it is understandable that people would be anxious with requirement changes, and that this is normal; others who understand the need for change can continue to be patient, teach others. From a recent Campus Change Network meeting, Amber mentioned that a normal scenario for change within in a group would be “1/3 of participants eager; 1/3 of participants willing to learn to change; and 1/3 of participants desiring no change.” As we understand this dynamic we can work with people where they are and assist them to move forward from there.

B. 2.  eLumen Information

a. **Software glitches** – largely fixed, Tina working with eLumen who are working diligently to resolve the problems.

b. **SLO Tutorial** – The tutorial has not yet been updated with the newest release of eLumen. Tina will begin creating new Camtasia videos this Friday and providing Scott updates for the web page.

B. 3.  E-Mail Reminders – Rotating SLOS

E-mail Reminders – Lauren mentioned it is time for to send another email on the timing for rotating semesters’ SLOs.

C.  SLO Webpage

Scott Vigallon informed the committee that in effect the whole college Intranet is now public (via: [http://grapevine.laspositascollege.edu](http://grapevine.laspositascollege.edu). This was done by Business Services in an attempt to fix the problem of faculty lack of access to college websites from home. However, now committees will need to discuss the pros and cons of public access of internal documents on the Intranet. This could be done with a login, separate linked page, etc.

Laurel will also discuss with Mr. **Kratochvil (VP of Business Services)** if there is anything else planned for home access, or whether committees should continue to plan for creating internal passwords or archiving, for committee-only documents.

It was suggested and agreed that the SLO Committee make an informal recommendation to Mr. **Kratochvil that the SLO Committee agrees that the Intranet could be public, but to reserve the right to archive certain documents. Scott Vigallon will make this suggestion on behalf of the committee.**

D.  Publicizing SLOS

Discussed above in Section IV.C.

E.  Program-Level SLOS

Lauren said that ACCJC (WASC) will also survey our Program Level SLOs to assure that they have been written and this is a good time to begin thinking about these; as some faculty are getting to this point in the process.
The definition of a Program is attached to this agenda, and from Title 5 it reads, “(g) ‘Educational program’ is an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, or transfer to another institution of higher education.”

The Weblink for Title 5 policies is: http://weblinks.westlaw.com, click on:
- Title 5 (Education), Division 6 (California Community Colleges),
- Chapter 6 (Curriculum and Instruction),
- Subchapter 1 (Programs, courses and Classes),
- Article 1 (Program, Course and Class Classification and Standards)

**Discussion:** The college has done enough SLO writing now to begin to see how Program Level SLOs can be started, and that many course level SLOs can also be, or easily be upgraded to be, Program Level SLOs. There need be no additional assessments for Program Level SLOs. Where degree programs are in place it is easy to write program Level SLOs. Some colleagues will find it fairly straightforward to understand how the course level SLOs feed into the Program Level SLOs. This can easily start with the AA/AS/Certificate programs.

The committee feels the college should begin discussion of Program Level SLOs during the Fall or convocation Flex Day. One on one teaching will probably be most effective, so that the committee and other trainers can walk colleagues through the progression of knowledge and steps to Program Level analysis.

Laurel said the new catalog is now at the printer and she will send out the new full list of Certificates of Achievement and AA/AS degrees.

**General Education Question:** Richard Grow asked a question on General Education (GE) outcomes: for instance, for the AS in chemistry, the 1A/1B and 12A/12B tests are also the SLOs for those two sets of courses. However, he asked if we need to define an extra GE learning outcome that relates to chemistry? The committee responded that disciplines do not need to create/define a new GE based learning outcome; the student has met the GE learning outcomes by virtue of having successfully completed their GE course. All each discipline needs to do is to identify which existing GE learning outcome is also taught within their course/discipline. Therefore, there is no need to create new General Ed outcomes; just identify which are utilized within their own courses. {Suggestions: “broadens science knowledge of other disciplines,” “Gains grounding in other branches of science,” “Links content from archeology to biological science.”}

**F. “E-Test” – Online Student Portfolio**

Jim reported that he has been shopping for an inexpensive but good student portfolio software for student services. He just reviewed “E-Test” and found that it is very good and features:
- Space for all student education related letters, resumes, course work
- Ability to be designed by the student for their specific needs, leaving out areas they do not wish to be viewed by future colleges/employers
- Ability for student to restrict access to viewers based on the needed level of review
- The college does not need to maintain a server
- One time student cost of $75 for their whole college career; can continue to use beyond college for a smaller one time fee
He will propose to pilot this through DSPS for future student body use
He will apply for a Safeway grant
He will email the information and invite the committee to come to the formal presentation on campus on March 11.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Gach
Administrative Assistant

Next Meeting: April 7, 2008
2:30 pm – Room 1603

* * * * * * * * * *

Draft - Talking Points
(Gathered from February and March meetings)

“Carrots”:
- Results – We get you valuable information to use in every course!
- Information returns to you in the data feedback loop. Many instructors have already seen the benefits and improved things in their courses.
- Many SLOs are already within your course outlines and syllabi! We'll help you find them easily.
- ACCJC (WASC) says SLOs do not have to be perfect; they instead need to see Progress!

Helps:
- This is totally do-able -- 100% of faculty leads have written SLOs. Now we can help you!
- Flex Day – Fall 2008! A full day to work on your personal SLOs, with experienced help, and enthusiastic trainers.
- Outside speakers coming!
- Faculty who have completed their SLOs will help others to do the same.
- The whole SLO committee, not just the Chair, will be the “face of SLOs” and will be available to faculty for assistance, meeting, teaching, and coaching. We’ve been there – we can help!
- Our ASLPC students are also helping with SLOs! They are assisting in research on how other colleges work with their SLOs. Thank you Students!

Step by Step:
- We know everyone wants to do their best on this but … it doesn’t have to be perfect in the first time around. It can be adapted each time you teach the course!
- Break the SLO work into manageable steps, see the process as distinct steps with time in between:
  - Write SLOs
  - Input SLOs
  - Wait for data
  - Receive data reports, analyze
  - Make any needed changes in course.

- We just need to start somewhere and get the data to study. Results are good for you personally, and good for the College during Accreditation!
- The SLO Committee encourages everyone not to get 20 steps ahead of the process – we don’t need to figure out the detail of every ramification before inputting our SLOs.
- Everything will be worked out in due course. The key is “To Start”!
- It does get easier!
o **Study Time Later** - We have built in a whole semester of reflection time.

**Software:**
- The eLumen software is **getting easier to use** thanks to Tina Inzerilla’s interface with eLumen personnel. Several committee members have used eLumen with the new updates and find them more user-friendly and intuitive.
- The eLumen software is capable of creating a list of all SLOs, **you won’t have to type and re-type for the college to create reports!**
- LPC is a ground-breaking college for eLumen, **LPC provides feedback for the software.**

**It’s Normal to Not Want to Change!**
- Your SLO work is indeed extra time and effort – but it is not in vain –
  - Accreditation depends on it, and
  - You receive valuable course information back!
- It is understandable that people may be anxious with requirement changes, this is normal. **Faculty who have completed their SLOs are inspired to help you!**
- As we understand the change dynamic we will **work with people where they are and assist them to move forward smoothly.**

**Reasons for SLOs:**
- Need program funds? Write SLOs! SLO data is a great way to grow your program. **Data proves the need for funds!**
- ACCJC (WASC) requires SLOs in every section of the Accreditation standards.
- At the Accreditation flex day debriefing session (Feb. 14) it was clear to all volunteers how **interwoven SLOs are into all Accreditation standards.**
- Our college **accreditation depends** in large part on our progress with SLOs!

**“Sticks”**
- ACCJC (WASC) has recently changed their “Warning/Watch/Loss of Accreditation” timing.
- **The new timing provides only two months to correct a Warning and be re-evaluated.**
- The next step, would be a “Watch”, and if that is not corrected “Loss of Accreditation” is the final step.
- It is much harder to become re-accredited, and also a great deal of work to come off the Warning or Watch list. **No one wants that!**
- In addition **individual programs could lose accreditation, state funding, and also student financial aid.**
- Therefore, it is incumbent on the whole campus to **do a little more, go that extra mile.**
- **Even a little more documented work can go a long way** with ACCJC’s (WASC’s) evaluation!

***

The ACCJC website is:  [http://www.accjc.org/](http://www.accjc.org/)

The Self-Studies are available at:
[www.laspositascollege](http://www.laspositascollege) / Faculty & Staff / Accreditation Wiki Login / Document Repository / [click the link: http://acclpc.laspositascollege.edu/lpcaccred.html](http://acclpc.laspositascollege.edu/lpcaccred.html) /
upper left corner, Search: “Self-Study”.

Here is the total link:
[http://acclpc.laspositascollege.edu/lpcaccred.html#][Accreditation%20Reference%20Handbook](http://acclpc.laspositascollege.edu/lpcaccred.html#)
What is WASC?

The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) is the corporate entity that consists of three separately organized commissions within the western region. WASC separates the two kinds of higher education institutions (two-year and four-year) into separate commissions. The three commissions that make up WASC are:

1. The Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities (ACSCU) which accredits public and private senior colleges and universities. [510.748.9001] (www.wascsenior.org)

2. The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) which evaluates and accredits public and private postsecondary institutions that offer two-year education programs and award the associate degree. [415.506.0234] http://www.accjc.org/

3. The Accrediting Commission for Schools (ACS) has the responsibility for the accreditation of all schools below the college level. Included are elementary, junior high, middle, high, and adult schools, whether public, private, or church-related. [650.696.1060] (www.acswasc.org)

The WASC web site can be found at www.wascweb.org. Please refer to Bylaws/Constitution and The Commission in the menu bar above.

What are the purposes of ACCJC?

The purposes of ACCJC are to evaluate member institutions to assure the educational community, the general public, and other organizations and agencies that an institution has clearly defined objectives appropriate to higher education; has established conditions under which their achievement can reasonably be expected; appears in fact to be accomplishing them substantially; is so organized, staffed, and supported that it can be expected to continue to do so; and demonstrates that it meets Commission standards. The Commission encourages and supports institutional development and improvement through self study and periodic evaluation by qualified peer professionals. Please refer to ACCJC Standards and Policies and ACCJC Publications in the menu bar above.

What are the different kinds of accreditation?

There are three types of accrediting agencies or commissions used in the United States.

Regional Accreditation. The most highly regarded form of institutional accreditation, and that sought by most academic institutions with comprehensive missions, is conducted by accrediting agencies that have chosen to organize themselves into six broad geographic regions of the country. These are referred to as the regional accrediting commissions and operate in the New England states, the mid-Atlantic states, the southern states, the middle or north central states, the northwestern states, and the western states and U.S. territories of the Pacific. The commissions in these six regions, which have standards that cover the entire institution, require that a component of general education be included in all degree programs. These commissions issue a periodic report on the quality of the entire institution according to processes and procedures established by each commission. The regional accrediting commissions set a very high standard for the performance of the entire institution. Not all higher education institutions can meet these standards.

Programmatic Accreditation. Programmatic accrediting agencies provide quality assurance for individual degree programs that may be offered within accredited institutions but that require special review because their graduates become licensed practitioners (for example, nursing, medical, or culinary programs, or law schools). The programmatic accrediting agencies assure that the quality of
the educational program meets the national and state standards and that graduates are prepared to pass licensure examinations.

**National Accreditation.** National accrediting agencies accredit institutions with specialized missions (for example, businesses colleges or colleges of art and design). These are referred to as the *specialized* or *national* accrediting commissions.

**Other Helpful Links:**
American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) [http://www.aacrao.org](http://www.aacrao.org)
California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) [http://www.cccco.edu/](http://www.cccco.edu/)
California Community Colleges Chief Instructional Officers (CCCCIO) [http://www.ccccio.org/](http://www.ccccio.org/)
Community College Leadership Development Initiatives (CCLDI) [http://www.sandiego.edu/cldi/](http://www.sandiego.edu/cldi/)
Community College League of California (CCLC) [http://www.ccleague.org/](http://www.ccleague.org/)
The Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges (RP Group) [http://rpgroup.org/](http://rpgroup.org/)
American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) [http://www.aacc.nche.edu](http://www.aacc.nche.edu)
American Council of Education [http://www.acenet.edu](http://www.acenet.edu)
Association of American Colleges and Universities [http://www.aacu.org](http://www.aacu.org)