

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

May 3, 2010

Name	Present	Name	Present
Lauren Hasten (Chair, BCATSS)	X	Eric Harpell (MSEPS)	
Elizabeth Hopkins (PEHW)	X	Chris Lee (St. Svcs.)	
Mike Sato (A&C)	X	Scott Vigallon (Classified)	X
Greg Daubenmire (MSEPS)		Gina Webster (BCATSS)	X
Amber Machamer (Admin.)	X	Neal Ely (Admin.)	
Helen Nguyen (ASLPC)	X	Richard Grow	X
Alex Blue (ASLPC)	X	Sharon Gach (Classified)	X
Laurel Jones (Admin.)	X		

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

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

I. Set Agenda

The agenda was set with one addition: a student concern was added under the “VIII. Other” section, however was held after the review of minutes in the interest of the student’s time.

II. Review of Minutes

It was decided at the last meeting to review the minutes of Dec.7, 2009, Feb. 1, 2010, and March 1, 2010 offline and to email changes to Sharon Gach. There were no changes emailed; therefore Dec., Feb., and March minutes are approved.

The minutes of April 12, 2010 were reviewed at this meeting, with one change under VI.B. “There was a discussion of robustness of SLOs, especially to capture the collective work of the SLO committee for the Year of Reflection.” The April 12th minutes were then approved.

III. Chair’s Update

A. FIN - Lauren and incoming Chair Richard Grow attended the Faculty Inquiry Network meeting recently, and reported that connections between the FIN work and SLOs were coming to light. The presentation by Katie Hern of Chabot gave many ideas for inquiring into student learning problems and motivations for many classroom situations. Lauren and Richard mentioned many of the examples that will be used in the Pilot FIN Project in 2010-11. A FIN contact at LPC is Michelle Gonzalez.

IV. eLumen Update

Scott said that the next version of eLumen, version 3.8.4, is scheduled to be released this summer. There is no reason not to update to this, although there will be no additional tools. The only thing added to this update will be some online Help Documentation.

The committee held a brief discussion of eLumen, stating that colleges which are able to map SLOs to program outcomes and to core competencies, are happy with the software. Prior to the last upgrade, LPC was able to map to both. After that upgrade, LPC lost the ability to map to program outcomes without a major upheaval to our setup. Also, at institutions where there is a centralized (top down) approach, where faculty do not deviate from a pattern, eLumen works fine.

eLumen can provide Declared Scores, which are entered collectively by faculty instead of entering scores one student at a time. However, currently eLumen does not allow those Declared Scores to be mapped to program outcomes or core competencies.

V. College Update

Laurel discussed various projects coming into alignment at once: SLOs, Program Review and BRIC, in which next year's committees will be discussing the interrelationships in a more holistic way. There was brief discussion in general on Strategic Planning, especially regarding tight budgets and budget allocation. The alignments of several projects and strategic planning will give an opportunity to guide the college for the future. Even if a number of committees' planning diverges from each other, this is a good opportunity for reflection and discussion.

Laurel mentioned the Accreditation Follow-up Report which is due October 15th and that according to the Common Ground agreements there will be a time to assess all projects and determine which projects relate to other projects' goals, and prioritize what actions to take in what order. Dr. Jones advised, as the Accreditation Liaison Officer, when committee members hear things to try not to be defensive, to reflect, and see where common problems can be worked on with other areas.

Laurel reported that she met with John Ruys, Staff Development Chair, and discussed a Fall flex day with a morning topic (perhaps Teaching and Learning topic), and an afternoon session (SLOs). **If the SLO committee would like the afternoon session, it would be helpful to send an email to John requesting this also.**

Laurel promoted the idea that, after the Common Ground materials are published, to have several committees meet together and coordinate ideas. She could see a useful retreat day for these committees: Curriculum, Program Review, SLO, and Staff Development. There may be an idea circulating that SLOs are not as useful as it was hoped they would be – if the committees can bring all ideas into the same room for discussion many connections could be made and misinformation corrected. Amber mentioned that the institution continues to ask faculty to do more reporting and non-classroom work, that she often suggests that we have more flex days in order to accomplish the work. She believes at least 2 flex days a year with structured time to work and discuss SLOs, program review, etc.

Richard summarized by saying that the Faculty Inquiry Network tools seem useful to learn about processes, and to enhance the spirit of inquiry. In the case of SLOs we could think about writing them such that instructors receive good information from them. If we use similar terms to the FIN terms, it may be easier to relate.

VI. Old Business

A. SLO Song – Video Contest – Lauren announced that entry #5 received the most online votes to win the contest. One of the co-producers of this entry sits on this committee, and the committee congratulated Helen Nguyen, and Matthew Wells! Sharon Gach will do a check request for the prize funds from the LPC Foundation, as the President's Account funded this contest.

B. Feedback on the A.S. Request on Core Competencies - Lauren said that Sarah Thompson asked further about this committee's recommendation for a **“proportional representation in number of SLOs written”** for each Core Competency. Mike added that several areas desire

some guidance or a template, rather than the idea “do what seems right to you.” Lauren reiterated some of the information from April:

- A specific percent is not recommended at this time. For instance one SLO per course would be too low, and it is desired that SLOs be written to capture the main EOs of the course. These numbers will naturally vary by Division and Course.
- The SLO Committee recommends that there be an alignment of the number of EOs to the number of SLOs in a proportional representation; making sure that all (major) EOs are captured.
- If one SLO can speak to more than one CC it is recommended that the SLO be re-entered in eLumen and labeled to the additional CC.
- The Committee further recommends that: If there is a course with only one SLO the instructor add more SLOs speaking to the less used Core Competencies, with an eye also to addressing additional EOs.
- The SLO Committee strongly recommends that the Program Review task force weight SLOs, along with other data, in the Program Review worksheets for a department to demonstrate that resources are needed.

Discussion included the understanding that everyone is doing so many different types of tasks and suggested some helpful steps to determine if SLOs are needed and connecting them to Core Competencies:

- Print/or pull up the course outlines and current SLOs and compare them; add SLOs if there are holes in the objective areas you wish students to acquire
- Print/or pull up the Core Competencies and compare the new SLOs with the LPC Core Competencies; determine which SLOs match to which Core Competencies; and if an SLO matches to more than one, please enter it twice.
- General guidelines:
 - One SLO per course would be too low, and it is desired that SLOs be written to capture the main EOs of the course.
 - These numbers will naturally vary by Division and Course, and most of the main course outline points should be captured in the SLOs.
 - A specific percent is not recommended at this time.
 - One can ask: are my SLOs a full measure of my Expected Outcomes?

There was discussion of Division meetings allowing time to discuss and work on SLOs during those meetings. **The SLO committee proposed that Dr. Jones ask the Deans to provide time at each Division Meeting to work on time critical college items;** starting with SLOs, and progressing to some of the other college initiatives later in the year. **Lauren received the committee members’ affirmative response to assisting colleagues in writing SLOs during their Division meetings.**

Other committee thoughts:

- Would like to create a Primer, a document for training, possible a video, for all 5 divisions (incl. Student svcs), and include sample outcomes
- “Feeding the machine” of SLOs – we have until 2012 to get it fed
- EOs measure the smaller increments of objectives; SLOs measure the larger skills acquired at the end of the course

- Do the SLOs reflect the major topics being taught?
- Ideas for adding Core Comps to SLOs: Ask faculty to write in themes each semester, i.e., Fall – “Technology”; or just as “Please add 1 more SLO per course.”

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Setting Priorities for 2010-11

Opening Comments - Lauren stated that she was displeased with the chronic lateness and lack of attendance at many meetings, and offended at the no-shows for this meeting.

She further said that she took the chairmanship with one goal, to get SLOs accepted and started as a faculty mentor to do this. It quickly became that her number one job was becoming to get the college through accreditation. We were re-accredited, with several recommendations. There are times that faculty felt SLOs are meaningless, and she and committee have asked them to assess and then write more meaningful SLOs.

She feels that this committee made the WASC Rubric have meaning, however WASC offers nothing about better teaching, learning, or for the students. If we are driven by the Rubric only the discussion will be less about Learning, therefore the conflict is about Process vs. Meaning. And if we discuss only Meaning we will not progress along the needed accreditation path. She feels that we need to make Meaning of SLOs for ourselves, and therefore recommends the committee find the balance to meet WASC requirements and make this meaningful to faculty.

It was asked if SLO data will be required in the Common Tool, and this has not been published yet so is unknown. Several problems inhibit SLO writing: lack of funds for time to work on SLOs, lack of time, lack of incentives and answering ‘why’ it must be done – Lauren feels we can do this despite these obstacles.

Lauren recommended the following for completion of the WASC-related goals:

1. Be vocal about solving the problem of adjunct faculty time and funding for writing SLOs
2. Participate and lead institutional dialogue for SLOs, including working on the calendar committee to plan flex days and division activities with time for writing SLOs
3. Promote student awareness – we ran the video contest, look for other ways to promote also
4. Work for SLO completion documentation in Program Review.

And creating meaning for LPC, she offered helping faculty see the intrinsic rewards of doing their SLOs and the assessments – which is where meaning is found; and working on more robustness of the SLOs.

Lauren thanked those at the meeting for their service and asked members to consider returning to this committee next year to work with incoming chair Richard Grow.

VIII. OTHER

- ### **A. Student Concern** – ASLPC representative Alex Blue asked to address this meeting with a concern from the Student Senate on the judging criteria of the SLO Video Contest. He mentioned that one student thought the judging was unfair in that it was based on the number of votes cast for a video, rather than the quality of the videos. What occurred was people asking

many of their electronic contacts to vote, thus boosting the number of votes. The committee heard the student complaint and responded with the following thoughts:

- The purpose of the contest was to promote SLOs, which it accomplished.
- There was nothing out of order with the voting, it is the way the committee intended.
- The contest was not open to any individual's manipulation.
- The current technology does not allow for 1 vote per person at this time.
- Mr. Blue said he will discuss this occurrence with the student paper.
- Ms. Gach asked that he also consider thoughts about honesty and dishonesty in the public and student communities; this could be an opportunity to discuss ethical behavior in that forum.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:07 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Gach
Classified Representative/
Administrative Assistant

Next Meeting: Monday, September 13, 2010 - 2:30 pm – Room 2411A