



Minutes

Student Learning Outcomes Committee
September 8, 2014
2:30 p.m. – Room 2411A

Present: Ann Hight, Tina Inzerilla, Marilyn Marquis, Paula Schoenecker,
Mark Tarte, Scott Vigallon

Guest: Rajinder Samra

- I. **Set Agenda** – The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. Agenda Item V was moved before Item III, and discussion of Membership and Charge added.

- II. **Approval of Minutes from May 12, 2014**
MOTION made to **APPROVE** draft minutes from last meeting.
MSC: S.Vigallon / P.Schoenecker / **PASS**

- III. **Administrative Update** – None

- IV. **eLumen Update** – Scott Vigallon reported the following figures taken from his September 5, 2014 report.

Courses:

744 Total
36 NEW (Fall) – No SLO's
684 (92%) SLO's Complete
708 Revised Total Courses (Subtracted 36 NEW Courses)
378 (53%) Assessed
28 Courses w/SLO's not mapped

Programs:

97 Degree and Certificates
71 (73%) Outcomes Complete
64 (66%) Ongoing Assessments

Scott added that there are 28 courses with SLO's that are not mapped to core competencies, which may be due to the extra step required under the new system. Also, Scott said that according to VP Noble, part-time faculty working on SLO's need to write a short narrative to "close the loop." When this is done the process is considered finished, and the faculty member can then be compensated.

Scott reviewed the list of courses and found that some have not been taught or offered in a while. The rule of thumb is that if courses have not been taught for 2 or more years, and are not expected to be on the schedule for another 2 years, they should be deactivated in eLumen. These courses count against the uncompleted number of SLO's and assessments that show outstanding for the College.

The reporting of SLO's and assessments each semester are taken from 2 years back plus one semester (i.e.: Fall plus Summer), and next semester will repeat itself (Spring plus Fall). The 2 year cycle was decided by this Committee although it can be revisited and changed.

- V. Institutional Effectiveness Report Narrative** – Rajinder Samra worked with Scott Vigallon to obtain data and presented a report he generated reflecting the College's Achievement of SLO Outcomes by Core Competencies. The percentage figures shown were based on a total of 22,061 assessments. A pie chart was included for each of the five competency areas (Communications; Critical Thinking; Creativity & Aesthetics; Respect & Responsibility; Technology). Each pie showed a clearer perspective of the number of students and how they placed within the circle. The total of five categories indicated percentages from levels beginning at Mastery all the way down to No Demonstrated Achievement.

Based on the information in Rajinder's report, he asked that a narrative be written by the SLO committee to include in the IEC (Institutional Effectiveness Committee) Annual Report. After some discussion Tina Inzerilla agreed to compile everyone's thoughts and come up with an objective narrative, which she will present to the SLO Committee for the committee's review.

- VI. Program Planning Updates** – The College Day session turned out to be successful. Members of the SLO and Program Review committees partnered together and assisted faculty. Tina reviewed the SLO sections on the PPU's (Program Planning Updates) that had already been received. The questions in the SLO section of the document had been previously revised, and the information drawn from those improved questions

greatly increased the level of written information related to student success.

PPU's are currently being written and are due October 15th. Previously, SLO members reviewed the SLO portion of the PR without the discipline member present. Feedback was provided with no acknowledgement of whether the comments had been received and implemented. The idea of partnering with disciplines was mentioned once again, although this time the feedback would be sent to the PR committee who would incorporate the SLO feedback with theirs prior to meeting with the deans. This would guarantee that feedback from this Committee had been received.

The SLO committee members will review and ensure that students were addressed in the PR, and whether the pedagogy had changed based on the assessments. Suggestions from the SLO Committee to the disciplines of how to incorporate and bring this type of information out in their PR is the real purpose. A guideline with suggested comments will be provided by Tina and Marilyn to assist the committee with their reviews.

VII. Software Upgrade Update – The SLO committee has decided to delay the decision of upgrading to the latest version of eLumen until after the accreditation. The committee will revisit discussing upgrading the software sometime next year.

VIII. Generic Program Outcomes – Scott Vigallon mentioned that late last year the Committee created program outcomes for five generic programs, which helped increase our numbers. There are still a total of 26 degrees and certificates (and possibly more) that do not have outcomes, and have not had for a number of years. Attaining 100% will not happen if the initiative to write them is not taken, so Scott suggested that the SLO Committee takeover.

Discussion ensued about how faculty should be notified of the importance of completing their program outcomes, and offering suggested outcomes if they chose to use their own. The idea of a presentation at a Town Hall meeting that added humor yet brought out the seriousness of this issue was positively received.

A list of courses and programs without SLO's and ongoing assessments, is to be provided to the deans to be presented at their division meetings. This will provide faculty the opportunity to update any courses they choose to before the SLO's presentation at the Town Meeting.

IX. 100% Completion of SLO's, Assessments, and Degree/Certificate

Outcomes – Compensation for writing SLO's was discussed with the VP of Academic Services who met with the President about a proposal to compensate SLO committee members \$2,500 for each SLO, Assessment, and Degree/Certificate Outcome they complete.

The President's counter-proposal was to give someone reassign time during the Spring semester to perform the work. The Committee felt that whoever took on this project would not be motivated enough to take on this huge project, and that having one person at 100% or two at 50% each would be more motivating.

Tina Inzerilla will present this recommendation from the Committee to the President before the next Executive Staff Meeting.

X. Adjournment – 4:45 pm

C.McCauley