

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
STEERING COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes – April 2, 2007**

Name	Present	Name	Present
Carolyn Baranouskas	X	Laurel Jones	X
David Boehm		Stuart McElderry	X
Moh Daoud	X	Amber Machamer	X
Jim Gioia		Carlos Navarro	X
Teresa Henson	X	Michael Schwarz	X
Lauren Hasten	X	Maureen O’Herin	X
Tina Inzerilla	X	Scott Vigallon	
Laurie Myers Student Rep		Sharon Gach, Admin Asst	X

I. Welcome and SLO News

Dr. McElderry opened the meeting at 2:30 pm. He said the next training for SLOs will be after the Town Hall meeting on April 4th, and trainers will work with people on rubric training.

II. eLumen Update

Ms. Inzerilla said that the eLumen programming is running well. Ms. Hasten mentioned that when working with instructors to train on writing rubrics and then entering them into eLumen, it may seem like an extra step, e.g., extra ‘bookkeeping’ at first; and trainers could encourage them to understand how this seemingly extra step helps in the classroom and how the eLumen data will give important summary information to them for improving their teaching.

Dr. Machamer mentioned that the look and feel of eLumen will affect how instructors take to it; and how they may feel about the importance of the rubrics and entering them efficiently. She asked Ms. Hasten, now that she has worked with her rubrics and eLumen for awhile, would she have chosen different rubrics with what she now knows? Ms. Hasten said she was very happy with what she originally chose; and that eLumen speaks to the need to start in a more simple manner, and can get more in-depth with later use and experience with it.

Ms. Inzerilla reported the following are some of the inputs into eLumen:

- Lauren Hasten, good success and pleased with the results
- Paul Torres, Political Science and Brian Hagopian, Auto – used default rubrics Ms. Inzerilla created
- Kristy Woods -, Math, has completed hers, and the rest of the Math department will wait until Fall 2007
- Dr. McElderry, History: to be written and input over the summer.
- Ms. O’Herin, English: to be written and input over the summer.

Ms. Inzerilla shared that Chabot College agreed to purchase eLumen and the mutual LPC / Chabot server will be put at the District office. The server will move from LPC to district during the summer. District IT staff will control it and Ms. Inzerilla will continue to control the LPC items. District will need to purchase a new server for this.

Dr. Jones asked when the Program Based Outcomes will be input; Ms. Inzerilla replied that will happen when the Student Services piece is completed. Some re-programming will need to be done for Program Based Outcomes. Dr. Machamer asked if assessment of outcomes will be done in the courses; this will be done for the sequence courses.

Dr. Jones voiced a concern that we will need data to support having an AS degree level learning outcome. Each A.S. group has developed a Program Outcome and selected an appropriate General Education (G.E.) course to support it. In eLumen there will be a difference between Course Objectives and Program Outcomes. Dr. Machamer said that the evidence lies within the core assessment.

Ms. Inzerilla said this could be programmed now, and an A.A. or A.S. degree could be chosen as an outcome. This could be made into hierarchical outcome, where courses would roll up into a degree outcome. Dr. Machamer said that with the five G.E. disciplines plus the student's major, each student's program is General Education (unless it is a certification program), e.g., A.S.-Automotive; A.A. – English). Dr. Jones mentioned that the Curriculum Committee is looking at Focused Degree patterns now, and that we could let faculty know as they are creating their SLOs to get their area's Program Outcomes approved through Curriculum Committee soon. Ms. Henson asked how we would get assessment for a five person class when someone else teaches it (satisfies 19 units of AS/GE)? The completion of the Program is the end Outcome, therefore the AA or AS is the measure of the outcomes. [Math, English, Anthropology, etc. are not "programs", they are General Education areas.]

The work toward establishing the AS degree program could proceed with a few standards each year, e.g., AS in Biology, while in other areas there would be 'core competencies'. The distinction is that there is no end-point of a General Education area. However, there are a few exceptions. For the most part the college is heading in the direction for each student to be part of the General Education Program, or have a declared major of an AA or AS in a subject area.

Further, the usefulness of eLumen collecting and providing data on SLOs **and** Program Outcomes is that data is input once only for both areas, as the SLOs and program outcomes will be written in tandem leading to the same outcome (GE student or degree student). Therefore, all courses roll up to information students are learning in G.E. area 1, GE area 2, GE area 3, etc. , and do not have to be analyzed or entered more than once for the several purposes.

Dr. Jones mentioned that under Title V for transfer to four year colleges the trend is not to have general studies or liberal studies, but for students to have a declared major. The five areas we have now would be for General Education plus a sixth area is the 'major'. We could get ahead of the curve by starting to think in this way while developing our SLOs.

There was a discussion of questions and confusion of how LPC and other colleges have spoken of SLOs in relation to general education goals, and these distinctions were verbalized and understood where the differences lie.

The summary of the above discussion was that the accreditation team will look at each college's Objectives, Outcomes, and Terminology and whether they were consistent in putting the SLO and Program Outcome programs in place.

It was asked if a course only writes one top SLO for its' objective, will the accreditation team see this as meeting the objective of the course; this would depend how the rubric is written. Different colleges have approached this in different ways.

Dr. Jones summarized that in preparing for our 2009 accreditation visit, we should keep in mind:

- Defining objectives well and clearly
- Being consistent and descriptive
- Keeping our pulse on what the accreditation teams are looking for and address these items
- eLumen is now associated with one core competency,
- Keeping the competencies separated,
- Doing good data collection,
- Communicating well within large departments to sort out goals and get all faculty to a high level of detail with competencies and how they are taught in classes.

III. SLO Leadership Change and Next Year

Dr. McElderry said that he will be ending his service as Chair of the SLO Steering Committee. He will be involved in finishing up the academic year and working on the Fall semester planning. Dr. Jones and Melissa Korber, chair of Academic Senate, will put out a flyer looking for candidates to serve as chair of this committee in the 2007-08 year. The Committee thanked Dr. McElderry for his service and excellent leadership.

IV. FAQ Sheet by Ms. Hasten

The Committee reviewed the handout written by Ms. Hasten “Student Learning Outcomes – Frequently Asked Questions.” Ms. Hasten reviewed portions of this handout to illuminate the discussion above, especially in regard to “taught versus learned” information, and how SLO rubrics can assess the learned information effectively. The group felt it was a great starting point and will use the handout for SLO workshops and training.

It was asked does eLumen operate at the micro- or macro-level of assessment. Ms. Inzerilla replied that:

- eLumen compiles department information as individual points, e.g., Math will have more ‘radio’ points than English. There is no aggregate data by each ‘radio’ point.
- Each department should write its’ rubrics with the Institutional Goals in mind,.

This is in contrast to SLOs, which are:

- Global skills -- starting with the #1 thing we want to assess whether students learned is _____, the #2 thing we want to assess if learned is _____, etc.
- Skills are individual steps to the global SLO goal.
- Rubrics are steps to help learn the skills.

Therefore, ideally, faculty could pull the SLOs out of the rubrics.

V. Website Changes

The committee reviewed the SLO Website and decided:

- To remove the link to Bakersfield College’s SLO site
- It needed to pick one “What is an SLO?” Decided to add Ms. Hasten’s FAQs (item IV above).

- Put on the SLO website several sections:
 - “Writing SLOs” – and included verbiage about making an appointment with a trainer (Ms. Inzerilla has been helping faculty write SLOs, but has to take additional time to train them in what an SLO is; therefore, faculty need training appointment with a Committee member prior to meeting with Ms. Inzerilla (if meeting with Ms. Inzerilla is still needed)]
 - “Getting Started” section:
 1. Understanding SLOs
 2. Overview of SLOs with graphic – “Read This Before You Start”
 3. Graphic needed: discussed a turning wheel with spokes for the various subjects of SLOs
 4. Writing Rubrics and SLOs
 - Give examples here
 - What order in which to do SLO tasks
 - Use what you already have
 - Other things to consider
 5. Bring your practice materials and draft SLOs to training sessions
 - “Step-by-Step” to Your SLOs
 1. Decide what you already have and what you can use
 2. [other info to be determined]
 - “Helpful Links”
 1. Before You Panic
 2. What To Do If.... (show wheel going flat graphic)
- Home Page
 1. On the home webpage for SLO, remove “As part of its next accreditation...” and replace with “Las Positas College will ...”
- Change the Ten Point List (make it: “Top 10 Reasons To Write Your SLOs”) – Dr. Jones volunteered to re-write this list:
 - the #1 Reason to Write Your SLOs... To Improve Your Teaching and Student Success !
 - Use bullets instead of numbering
 - Merge #9 and #10
 - Reword numbers: 3, 4, 5, 6
 - Before #1, delete “new”
 - #2 change “assure” to “insure”
 - Rewrite whole list in our words, no need to credit previous authors as we are changing it and making it our own.

VI. “Student Learning Outcomes and Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA)”

Dr. Navarro handed out the above-titled document with information on colleges which have received awards for institutional application of SLOs. On the handout there is a link to Mesa College in Arizona, which received accolades for its cross-disciplinary approach. Key points that Dr. Navarro gleaned from the CHEA for SLO work include:

1. Articulation and Evidence of Outcomes
2. Success with Regard to Outcomes
3. Information to the Public about Outcomes
4. Using Outcomes for Improvement

VII. Other Business

Dr. Jones referred to the handout “Annual Report Update on Student Learning Outcomes 2006-2007.” These are the ACCJC requirements, we have met several of the standards already:

- Improving Institutional Effectiveness
- Student Learning Programs and Services
- And the AA/AS planning
- Dr. McElderry is working on the outstanding items to meet Pt. I, #5: “Planning and implementing changes to pedagogy, facilities, etc., to improve learning.”

Dr. Machamer reported on a Northern California SLO Coordinators meeting she attended for the Academic Senate. She offered to go to more of these meetings for the Academic Senate as she has more time to attend outside meetings than do faculty.

Ms. O’Herin shared results of various discussions she has had with other SLO sources, from which she concludes Consistency is the main tool needed across all aspects of campus life, and that there is “No One Right Way” – the important thing is to define college objectives and be consistent.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.

- Sharon Gach
Administrative Assistant