



## Minutes

Student Learning Outcomes Committee  
February 4, 2013  
2:30 p.m. – Room 2411A

Present: Marilyn Flores, Tina Inzerilla, Marilyn Marquis, Janice Noble,  
Paula Schoenecker, Scott Vigallon, Jeanne Virgilio

Absent: No representative assigned: BSBA and STEMPS Divisions  
Student Representative - Priscila Chavez Velez

Guest: Teri Henson

---

I. **Agenda Set** – Meeting called to order at 2:36 p.m. and agenda approved as drafted by censuses.

II. **Approval of Minutes** – Draft minutes from November 5, 2012  
**MOTION** made to **APPROVE** draft minutes  
**MSC:** S.Vigallon / P.Schoenecker / **APPROVED**

III. **Approval of Minutes** – Draft minutes from December 3, 2012  
**MOTION** made to **APPROVE** draft minutes  
**MSC:** S.Vigallon / M.Marquis / **APPROVED**

IV. **Review Program Review Update Forms** – Teri Henson shared a draft of the Annual Program Review Template and of the Program Effectiveness Plan. She explained that these forms would be used by both Academic Services and the academic and non-instructional sides of Student Services (i.e.: EOPS, DSPS, Veteran's, etc.). She added that examples would be provided for each section to provide clarification if questions arose as to what type of information was required, and to draw out the type of information the Program Review committee is seeking.

Questions and answers proceeded as each section of the draft was reviewed, beginning with Part I – the program’s Mission Statement and how the program supports the college mission. Part II – the Program Analysis covered Courses (for instructional programs only), New Initiatives, SLOs/SAOs, and Status of those SLOs/SAOs and assessments for the period of 2010-12, Student Data, Human Resources (faculty needs), Technological Resources, Facilities, Equipment, and Supplies Resources, Financial Resources, and any other pertinent information related to the program. Part III – the Summary included summarizing objectives accomplished and not accomplished during 2012, objectives for 2014-15, and identifying the needs in Section II and summarizing how those needs would affect student learning and/or achievement and how the program would be impacted.

Since Part II – Program Analysis includes SLOs and SAOs, the committee assisted with providing feedback and examples to make certain the information written in this area was what the committee was hoping to obtain.

A question regarding the timeline years mentioned in the annual template was answered by Teri. She mentioned that technically program reviews should have been completed this Spring, and would have then gone through an extension review process – PR Committee, the Deans, the VPs, and then forwarded to the Planning Committee the following Spring. Since the reviews are being written late, the Planning Committee will not receive the results until Spring 2014, which will be used to write the plan for the academic year 2014-15.

This program review will be considered an annual review and after the first year, disciplines will be phased into a 3-year cycle that will apply to only 1/3 of the disciplines the first year, 1/3 the second, and 1/3 the third year, where at anytime during the years there will be faculty writing an annual review while others will be in that 1/3 group. Rajinder Samra will be putting data packets together for each discipline with various types of information that will provide information for some of the remaining areas on the form.

- V. **Administration Update** – Dr. Jan Noble reported that feedback regarding the SLO Implementation Report and the Midterm Report submitted last October has not yet been received from the ACCJC, which is generally sent in late January or early February.

The Non-Instructional Program Review is moving along quickly and Dr. Noble is working with a group of four people. The Program Review draft discussed just before this agenda item will also be used and tweaked to meet the need of the non-instructional areas. Administrative Unit Outcomes as well as Administrative Unit or Service Area will replace those areas on the form where “program” is mentioned. The plan is to meet with the Administrative Unit on March 1<sup>st</sup> and finish by the end of July. Two different templates will be used, one for Student and Instruction and another for Non-Instruction. It’s hoped that for the next annual update it would seem feasible to merge into an institutional template.

- VI. eLumen Update** – Scott Vigallon reported that eLumen had been upgraded to version 3.99.7 over the break, and did not change anything for faculty, although there were additions to the administrative side.

Also back in November there were several items brought up for discussion. Whether to change to the Matrix Model, disallow members from creating their own SLOs, and standardizing the Rubric. Tina Inzerilla mentioned that the SLO committee had voted to have Rajinder Samra present at the February Town Meeting about standardizing the Rubric. His explanation of why and the impact it would make in his role as Researcher would likely be better received by everyone. He did not feel he had sufficient information to speak on the subject and asked for more information that included the percentage of individuals using eLumen who do not have a 5 point rubric. Tina will be working on providing him with that information, and hoped that at the next SLO meeting Rajinder will feel he has enough information to speak about standardizing the rubric at one of the Town Meetings. His presenting would have more meaning and he could better explain the impact it would have on calculating and gathering the data, being able to assess the Core Competencies through eLumen and establishing some sort of consistency. At the same time this would provide the opportunity to follow with information about SLOs, and perhaps have received a response from the ACCJC, which would fall along with the topics up for presentation.

Scott thanked Tina for her help with streamlining the gathering of DE course assessment data in eLumen. Due to accreditation, the college is supposed to compare SLO data between sections of face to face courses and DE courses. Because this is difficult to do in eLumen, Scott would have to go through all of the DE sections and physically counted each one. With Tina’s help an easier way was found that is less time consuming and will be used the next time.

Scott mentioned that a lot of emphasis was being placed on Program Review update, and asked whether the regular Program Reviews were being updated, and will they be written to be consistent with the update? The response was yes. His reason for asking was that he is in the process of writing an accreditation document for DE that now asks for evidence taken from discipline Program Reviews. DE information is not clearly stated in the reviews, which makes completing the required reports difficult. The program review document form does address DE in two of its questions, although changing it to clearly state DE, even if it's a YES or NO answer would draw out some type of information.

Tina pointed out that the program review template includes questions related to DE, and read the following: Please describe the program-wide dialogue on assessment results, including assessment of distance education courses. Where would one find evidence of this dialogue? Because examples will be provided to assist with each section of the template, including a paragraph for face to face and another for DE in this section would be helpful.

**VII. SLO Ad in Naked** – Tina Inzerilla mentioned that Marcus Thompson did a fabulous job with the SLO advertisement in the latest Naked Magazine issue. It is a student run publication for students, and written by students. Hopefully, the eye catching ad will help with getting the word out and provide more meaning to the letters SLO.

**VIII. Update on E-mails to Faculty** – Tina Inzerilla reported that e-mails to the faculty letting them know what has not been assessed, what course SLOs and program-level SLOs are missing, and outcomes for degrees and certificates. Instructions on how to create SLO assessments and outcomes were also included with the message. The members of the SLO committee were listed as contacts for assistance or questions, and responses from faculty may come through as having completed more than what was sent to them as being completed. If so, verify additional information with Scott and thank them.

If a course has not been offered for two years, and will not be offered in the next two years, it can be deactivated. The denominator in eLumen will change once the deactivation takes place, and the course will remain listed in the discipline's curriculum and can be reactivated at anytime in eLumen. The process for deactivating a course is for the faculty member or someone in the discipline to send an email request to the VP of Academic Services and the division dean with a list of the courses, and

copy Scott Vigallon. Once the request has been approved by the VP of Academic Services, Scott will deactivate the course(s) in eLumen.

- IX. Update on Administrative Unit Outcomes** – Outcomes will now be part of all reviews, and will be written in all reviews on the non-instructional side. AUOs, (Administrative Unit Outcomes) will be incorporated in this round of program reviews.
- X. Good of the Order** – Marilyn Marquis shared a chart from Palomar College that listed their ESL department SLOs. It is well structured, organized and in compliance.
- X. Adjournment** – 4:15 p.m.

C.McCauley