



Student Learning Outcome Committee Meeting

August 22, 2016 | 2:30 PM | 2411A

LPC Mission Statement

Las Positas College is an inclusive learning-centered institution providing educational opportunities and support for completion of students' transfer, degree, basic skills, career-technical, and retraining goals.

LPC Planning Priorities

- ❖ Establish regular and ongoing processes to implement best practices to meet ACCJC standards.
- ❖ Provide necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance.
- ❖ Develop processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessment of SLOs and integrate assessment of SLOs into college processes.
- ❖ Expand tutoring services to meet demand and support student success in Basic Skills, CTE, and Transfer courses.

Meeting Name

Members Present (voting):

Co-Chair: John Ruys

Co-Chair: Ann Hight

Administrators:

Roanna Bennie-Absent

Don Miller

Faculty Reps:

Mark Tarte

Marty Nash

Kimberly Tomlinson

Akihiko Hirose

Gina Webster- Absent

Classified:

Scott Vigallon

Members Present (non-voting):

Director of Research and Planning:

Rajinder Samra- Absent

Meeting Guests:

Karen Spirn

Minutes

1. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 2:32 PM

2. Review and Approval of Agenda

MOTION to APPROVE Agenda

MSC: Hight/Tomlinson/APPROVED

3. Review and Approval of Minutes (May 16, 2016)

MOTION to APPROVE draft minutes from May 16, 2016

MSC: Hight/Nash/2-Abstentions/APPROVED

4. Overview of the SLO Committee and Review of Charge John Ruys

John Ruys reported that the committee charge has gone through significant changes utilizing both the ACCJC requirements and the AAHC's Nine Principles of Learning Assessment. Every year the SLO Committee is required to review the committee charge and structure to determine if any changes need to be made. The question was raised whether the language of the charge should be changed from "Core Competencies" to "Institutional Student Learning Outcomes". It was explained that historically when the state created Institutional Outcomes they were referred to as "Core Competencies", but now to reflect the Statewide Senate Accreditors updated language of "Institutional Student Learning Outcomes" the same language should be consistently used across the board, including in the committee charge. All other SLO documents will need to be updated to reflect that language change.

MOTION to APPROVE committee charge with the change that Marty Nash suggested replacing "Core Competencies" with "Institutional Student Learning Outcomes"

MSC: Tarte/Tomlinson/APPROVED

The existing committee structure consists of two Faculty Representatives from three divisions, one representative from Student Services, the Vice President of Academic Services, one Division Dean, the Director of Research and Planning, one Classified Representative, and two Student Representatives. Two potential changes to the Committee Structure were suggested: 1.) Adding a second Classified Representative so Madeline Wiest, new Curriculum and SLO Specialist, could sit on the committee 2.) Updating the committee structure to include the new fourth division and whether to keep two representatives per division. In order for Madeline Wiest to join the SLO Committee, a recommendation would need to be made to the Classified Senate for approval, including the reasoning that she will be heavily involved in the new eLumen system. In terms of the number of committee members per division, several concerns were raised, including that without two members being on the committee per division there is the risk that if an absent member would leave division to be without representation during a meeting and that for smaller divisions it may be difficult to find two people to serve on the committee. The question was raised whether a second representative for Student Services might also be needed as many questions have been raised around SAO's reflecting a potential need. Kimberly Tomlinson agreed to go back to Student Services to get feedback regarding whether additional representation is needed. Next meeting the committee will vote on the committee structure and discuss recommendations to classified and academic senate (Tomlinson reported that she may need more time to report back from Student Services). Kelly Abad wants to have feedback regarding Committee Structure by the end of October, beginning of November.

5. Program Review for Fall 2016

Karin Spirn

Program Review Updates are due October 10th and are largely SLO based. The Program Review Committee is requesting feedback on what they can do to assist the SLO Committee with processing the information in the PRUs. The SLO Committee will have from October 12th to November 13th to review PRU's. The Program Review Template is similar to last year with some changes having been made based on feedback from committees and faculty. Most of the changes to the SLO related fields, however came out of recommendations from the ACCJC to document a clear timeline of assessment and to increase critical discussion of PSLO data. Last year teams from the SLO Committee read only a targeted section from the program review updates and then wrote a short paragraph regarding SLO or SAO trends in that division to be added to the Dean's Summary. It was suggested that this year it might be more holistic if partners of two from the SLO Committee write a reflection on both Sections One and Two of the Program Review Update. The Accreditation Committee is working on a status follow up report to the ACCJC, which will go to board in January.

Scott Vigallon has made all program data from Spring 2014 thru Spring 2016 available on the SLO website. The new eLumen system will organize the data in a more legible format. The point was raised that some programs may not have data because it was not mapped to PSLOs or course level data was not entered. It was suggested that the language of "every three years" for assessment be clarified to encourage faculty to enter more consistent

data into eLumen for more robust data. The college is trying to move toward ongoing assessment, with in depth discussion and analyzation taking place every three years. A clarification on this point to the PRU template was suggested. Karen Spirn will write a clarification sentence to add to the PRU Template and will check in with SLO Committee members to make sure it is agreed upon.

It was discussed that in general, the SLO Committee sees SLO data as only part of the data used to drive program improvement, including resource requests and institutional planning, instead viewing SLO data as more useful in planning within programs. The Program Review Committee is developing a document, as they have in previous years, that Program Review Update reviewers can use with reviewing and processing PRUs that Karin Spirn will share with the committee.

6. Accreditation Update

John Ruys

The SLO and the Accreditation Steering Committee have been working on SLO related documents. ACCJC provided feedback to the college that while the college's use of course level assessments was acceptable, the ACCJC did not see enough evidence of discussion of program and institutional level SLO data, that Student Outcomes were not included on syllabi, an absence of a clear timeline of assessment, and also a lack of publically available evidence of how courses are mapped to program assessment. A lot of items that the SLO Committee will be working on this year are a product of that document. SLO Liaisons roles have been created, for 1 CAH of release time for individuals in academic divisions, to work with faculty on such items as program outcomes and provide guidance on course level student data. The question was raised if any ACCJC recommendations were made surrounding the documentation of conversations about SLO's outside of committees. It was discussed how much of the conversation around Student Outcomes does not get captured and whether there is a repository to collect that information other than just committee meeting minutes. It was expressed that Program Review is a way of capturing and articulating some of those conversations. The idea of a blackboard discussion boards was presented to encourage part time adjunct faculty to engage in these discussions, but that it may be easier to create those forums when Canvas is launched.

7. SLO Liaison positions

John Ruys

For fall semester only, the SLO Liaison role has been created for 1 CAH of release time to work with faculty on tasks directly related to accreditation. This includes tasks such as training faculty and adjunct faculty on the use of PSLO's, SLO's and how utilize assessments. Pending any corrections from Academic Services the SLO Liaisons will be Angelo Bummer for Arts and Humanities, Marty Nash for BHAWKS, and Akihiko Hirose for CATTs. Adeliza Flores was suggested as the SLO Liaison for MSEPS.

8. eLumen 6.5 Overview and Process

John Ruys

Scott Vigallon raised the question whether Student Services will be using the same reflection templates used for course SLOs in eLumen, which are directly linked to the questions used for program review. Kimberly Tomlinson stated that it would seem that as the reflection questions are linked directly to program review, using the same reflection templates for SAOs would help make the process easier. There will be a SAO training on Flex day, September 22nd with a separate break out for Student Services. There will also be SLO/ eLumen trainings coming up for faculty/ adjunct faculty hosted in the TLC 2410. There will be training for Discipline Coordinators on writing, editing, and entering SLO's on Flex Day, as well as some designated afternoon's in September. The question was also raised whether Student Services will map SAO's to ISLOs in the new eLumen system, though it is not required. When developing ISLOs, especially the Respect and Responsible ISLO which includes diversity, community, self-knowledge, team work, and being professional, Student Services felt that they would strongly assist students with developing these traits and lobbied to have SAOs tied to the college ISLOs. It was agreed that ISLO's should be mapped pending any changes from input from Student Services. Scott Vigallon also requested a list of Student Services Area Coordinators, so that they can be entered into eLumen. It was discussed that the SLO Committee will reevaluate the ISLO's this year, perhaps doing some re-writing/editing.

Historically, the SLO Committee has not been heavily involved in giving faculty member's feedback regarding their SLO's, but this will change with the use of workflows in the new eLumen system. When discipline coordinators enter a Program SLO, Course SLO, or SAO it will trigger a workflow similar to CurricUNET. The workflow, as it is currently being suggested, would be that once the Discipline Coordinator enters the SLO it would be reviewed by the full time faculty in their discipline (distinguished as course coordinators), then by the SLO Chairs and Data Steward and the SLO Chairs would bring it to the SLO Committee meeting for feedback. From there any changes would be sent back to the Discipline Coordinators, if not approved. Feedback regarding the SLOs will not be content related, but instead suggestions whether the SLO is written correctly and if it is all-encompassing when compared to the course outline. It was requested that the committee members take this suggested workflow back to their discipline and divisions for feedback.

Don Miller noted that the Division Admins will be reviewing all syllabi (due by this Friday) for SLOs in order to meet the accreditation standards and returning syllabi to faculty that are missing SLO's. The SLO report in eLumen was run and the newest version posted on the SLO Website. Committee members were encouraged to remind faculty in their divisions to look on the SLO website for eLumen tutorials, to go to one of the multiple trainings offered or to reach out to either of the SLO co-chairs for eLumen assistance.

9. Administrative Update

No Report

10. Adjournment- Meeting adjourned at 4:34pm

11. Next Regular Meeting (Monday, September 12th, 2016)