

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES  
STEERING COMMITTEE  
Meeting Minutes – September 10, 2007**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Present</b>
Jim Gioia	X	Marge Maloney	X
Richard Grow	X	Maureen O’Herin	X
Lauren Hasten	X	Michael Schwarz	X
Tina Inzerilla	X	Scott Vigallon	
Laurel Jones		Kristy Woods	X
Amber Machamer	X	Sharon Gach, Admin Asst	X

**(Decisions in Bold, Research items in Italic)**

Ms. Hasten, 2007-08 Chair, opened the meeting at 2:30 pm., in Room 2411A.

**I. Chair’s Update**

- A. Lauren Hasten called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm. Members introduced themselves, and Lauren said she would try to keep the meetings on task for the earliest adjournments possible.
- B. The Department Lead List is sixty percent filled in, and the remaining spots are mostly in departments with sole faculty.
- C. The October 2 Board Meeting will feature a presentation of Student Learning Outcomes; Lauren and Laurel’s will coordinate with Chabot staff for the presentation.
- D. Coordination with Chabot SLO goals – Lauren recently met with the chair of the Chabot College SLO Steering Committee. LPC is ahead in planning and process.
- E. Accreditation Self-Study and Focus Groups – At the next Town Meeting the second hour will be set to work on Accreditation Focus Groups and this Task Force will participate and assist, as Lauren has previously mentioned to various members.

**II. eLumen Update – Tina Inzerilla**

Tina Inzerilla reported that the SLO entering is going well. She has met with District IT personnel and they have decided to purchase the module to allow offsite access to eLumen; the goal for having this online is the end of September.

**III. College Update – Dr. Amber Machamer**

- A. Amber reported that she recently attended the Statewide Academic Senate Curriculum Institute SLO Day. The State Academic Senate is now working on SLOs more vigorously. LPC appears to be in the forefront of colleges making progress on SLOs, many colleges have not even begun their work. She described various models and mentioned that the advantage to our model is that it captures useful data up-front to improve both teaching and learning.
- B. Amber described upcoming Focus Groups on Accreditation, which will be done for all committees of the LPC community. These will bring awareness of how SLOs function in relation to their areas of

responsibility; and how aspects of campus life interrelate and work in a cross-discipline way for student learning outcomes. Committees will also be better able to act on the SLO data they are given.

#### IV. Action Areas

After thorough discussion of each of the following action areas, and unanimous agreement by the committee, the following will be recommended by Lauren to the Academic Senate for discussion and adoption.

- College-Wide eLumen Assessment Scale Standardization – The following points were discussed and committee consensus was:

- a. What does a zero (0) mean?

**It was determined that zero will mean “No Proficiency”. (See further definitions in b. below.)**

Previously, eLumen had zero to mean “Not Assessed”; however now an “N/A” radio button has been added. In addition, there is a “NS” radio button, meaning that the student was absent from the assessment, and therefore there is “No Score”.

- b. How many points should be on the scale?

After discussion of various systems of 2 point, 5 point, 6 point, and 7 point scales, it was determined that it would be best to have **5 points on the scale: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4.**

**Definitions:**

**“N/A” – Not applicable**

**“NS” – No score (student absent)**

**0 – No Proficiency**

**1 – Below Proficiency**

**2 – Proficient**

**3 – Above Proficiency**

**4 – Mastery (could teach others)**

- c. Should default settings be made available? What about program-level defaults?
- d. Can instructors opt out of using the standard scale?

**The committee recommends that all instructors consider using the standard scale in order to get clean data. Lauren will assist any instructor in translating their scale to the standard 5-point SLO scale.**

- Adjunct Participation in SLO Creation and Assessment

- a. Must adjuncts be consulted, or are faculty free to write SLOs on their behalf?

**After discussion, the committee feels that in departments with no fulltime faculty, adjunct instructors should be consulted for writing SLOs in their departments.**

- b. Will financial compensation be made available to adjuncts for writing SLOs?

**Amber related in Laurel's absence that Laurel's would like to find the funding to pay adjuncts for their additional time to write SLOs, for those departments with no fulltime faculty.**

- c. Should there be any requirement to bring adjuncts into the SLO process?

**After discussion, the committee felt that it would be well to consult with adjuncts, however there is no recommended requirement to include every adjunct. Departments should let each adjunct know about this process, and that they will need to get up to speed to be able to assess SLOs later. It would be great to invite them to participate now, although funds are not yet procured for this; but at least keep adjuncts informed of the processes.**

- Laboratory Hours
  - a. How should the College handle the assessment of laboratory hours which are built-in components of other courses, or which are a separate CRN number? (e.g., English).

**The steering committee recommends that courses with curriculum should have SLOs written. For instance, in the Science departments, lab classes that have their own curriculum should write their own SLOs (they are actually classes held in the laboratory). However, it is acceptable to ignore the labs connected with a lecture class.**

- Assessment Rubrics

Addressed in IV. A. b., above.

- Non-Compliance; how to deal with disciplines lacking SLO leadership

**The committee recommends that departments which have not complied with the College requirement to write SLOs, be referred to the Academic Senate for action. One possible option the Senate could invoke includes asking the Dean to assign another instructor to write SLOs,**

- Default Values for Actions in eLumen

Tina said that eLumen has added some default statements/values for our use, and the committee discussed verbiage. The purpose for this is to count the number of changes faculty recommends and assess changes for the feedback loop.

**These are to be used at the end of the semester in the following way:**

- After scores are entered
- Write the report in Notes field
- Then click the appropriate default action to assist in improving scores
- Correlates to Notes typed in Notes field

***Tina will research whether multiple radio buttons can be clicked.***

Default actions/verbiage the committee recommends for radio buttons include:

- b. Action Areas –
  - **Modify Syllabus;**
  - **Purchase Equipment;**
  - **Amber will send additional items from a list she has**
  
- c. Action Status Level -
  - **No Action Intended**
  - **Action Intended**
  - **Action Underway**
  - **Action Complete**

## V. Other

- A. Maureen O’Herin asked if there should/could be multiple core competencies for a course. *Tina will research this.*

**FYI: One SLO could be applicable to several competencies.**

- B. Ms. O’Herin asked if eLumen allows a copy (clone) function from one SLO to another. *Ms. Inzerilla will research this.*
  
- C. Ms. O’Herin asked if there can be a larger space for Notes, so that they can be pasted in from Word. *Ms. Inzerilla will research this.*

**Next Meeting:** October 1, 2007.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 pm.

Sharon Gach  
Administrative Assistant