

**FINAL**  
Approved 4/4/11

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES COMMITTEE**

**Meeting Minutes**  
**March 7, 2011**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Present</b>
Richard Grow (Chair, MSEPS)	X	Jason Morris (MSEPS)	X
Elizabeth Hopkins (PEHW)	X	_____ (Student Svcs)	
Catherine Eagan (A&C)	X	Gina Webster (BCATSS)	X
_____ (A&C)		_____ (BCATSS)	
Amber Machamer (Admin. Rep.)	X	Pamela Luster (Admin. Rep.)	
Scott Vigallon (Classified)	X	Sharon Gach (Classified)	X
Janice Noble	X	Hannah Ackley (ASLPC)	X

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

Richard Grow, Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m., in Room 2411A.

**I. MEETING WITH INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE**

The SLO and IPR Committees met together in Room 2490 for the first hour and one-half of this meeting to present samples of what good, average and poor review of SLO data looked like within the written Program Reviews. Comments made during the joint meeting were collected and reported by Elena Cole, co-chair of the IPR Committee, and available on their website.

**II. SET THE AGENDA**

At 3:55 p.m. the SLO Committee adjourned to meeting room 2411A. The agenda was set as drafted by Richard Grow.

**III. REVIEW OF MINUTES**

The minutes of February 7, 2011 were not reviewed in the interest of time, and will be reviewed at the March 7<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**IV. CHAIR’S UPDATE**

- A. Richard distributed a draft of the SLO Reporting System white paper. The goal of the paper is to give background and decision-making information after which faculty would answer a survey of their opinions of a data management tool for SLOs. The survey was begun in December, but with only 35 out of 98 fulltime faculty responding, the committee wished to have more data on which to base any future decisions. In addition ¼ of the respondents saw discernable trends using eLumen; ¼ of the respondents were unable to see discernable trends; and ½ of the respondents were not sure and needed more data.

The purposes of the survey are to get data to be able to recommend to Academic Senate specific action(s) based on the input of a significant number of fulltime faculty, and possibly to recommend a tool for SLO data management, aggregation and reporting.

- B. White Paper suggestions and comments were discussed for the next revision. Other comments may be e-mailed. Katie volunteered to make the revisions by Wednesday, March 9<sup>th</sup>.

Discussion at the meeting included:

- The White Paper will be introduced at the March Town Meeting, and Richard would like to have committee members present it on March 16<sup>th</sup> at all Division Meetings also.
  - Reference will be to an “SLO data management, aggregation and reporting tool”, rather than eLumen specifically, as that is a distracting topic.
  - Several wording changes were made with additions and deletions
- C. Other points considered were:
- If eLumen is recommended to be reconfigured, Scott said the summer would be the perfect time to do this, and it would be good to put in an ITS request for their queue.
  - Unless we require everyone to use the same data management, aggregation and reporting tool (same system) we lose the systematic piece, and institutional data cannot be collected.
  - If we decide on declared scores, versus individual students’ scores, input by staff is possible. Scott said the upgrade for this is in our eLumen system, but we haven’t configured it for this purpose yet.
  - The SLO and IPR Committees, as well as other committees and groups, are working toward a Culture of Inquiry to improve student learning.
  - The March 31<sup>st</sup> Faculty Flex Day could be a time to continue this work, and Richard will request time for this from Dr. Ruys, Staff Development Chair, and Dr. Luster, VP Academic Services.

**V. eLUMEN UPDATE**

There was no time for this report.

**VI. COLLEGE UPDATE**

There was no time for this report.

**VII. OLD BUSINESS**

There was no time for this report.

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

There was no time for this report.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Gach  
Administrative Assistant & Classified Representative

**Next Meeting: Monday, April 4, 2011 - 2:30 pm – Room 2411A**

**ROUGH MEETING NOTES**  
**INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Notes taken by Elena Cole

**DATE: Monday, March 7, 2011**

**TIME: 2:30-4:00 p.m.**

**SLO's and Program Review:**

1. As we revise the template, incorporate SLO's under student success (Karin).
2. While departments might conduct their SLO research in a variety of ways, the "reporting out" mechanism should be consistent / standardized (Amber).
3. Concern about how we connect course-level SLO's with those at the program-level and the Core Competencies. Create a list of questions which could help us identify these connections (Marilyn).
4. SLO analysis, possibly as a part of the program review process, could be shared with colleagues (Elena). This would be supported by the staggered approach to program review and the mentoring offered as support.
5. Concern that the "reporting-out" form for SLO's will become the end-point (Teri).
6. Need to define for faculty what exactly the SLO task is (Pam).
7. Often, writers lacked what they needed to write the SLO section of program review (Pam).
8. Concern for one-person departments, especially for the isolation (Gina, Cheryl, Mark).
9. Provide a reminder system to help people remember to complete their SLO data work at the end of the semester (Nadiyah).

**Archiving:**

Pam and Martha are working on the problem of archiving final versions. Suggestions: Put them on a drive; Put them under "Academic Services," "Academic Programs"; Post all documents submitted; Put documents in PDF format to prevent them being modified.

**Themes:**

1. Equity data could be better analyzed (Nadiyah).
2. There was a wide discrepancy in how people approached the work. People will be more serious when they see they have an audience and that it matters (Marilyn).
3. Look at how many requests we got across all 38 and what types they are: faculty positions, budget, space (Cheryl).

**Ideas for Future:**

1. Cycle of 5-6 years for self-study with annual or two-year updates.

2. 12 – 14 month timeline.
3. Packet of stuff writers would receive: Benchmarks, workshops, sharing out.
4. Problem getting and analyzing data: need IR office to be able to produce data more frequently and be able to help with interpretation.