



Approved Minutes

Student Learning Outcomes Committee
September 10, 2012
2:30 p.m. – Room 2411A

Present: Candace Brown, Moh Daoud, Teri Henson, Tina Inzerilla,
Marilyn Marquis, Jan Noble, Paula Schoenecker, Scott Vigllon

- I. Agenda Set - The meeting was called to order at 2:40 p.m. and the agenda was approved as drafted.
- II. Approval of Minutes – None presented.
- III. Welcome – New and returning members for 2012-13 were introduced prior to the start of the meeting. The SLO website was displayed and is ready for the next accreditation cycle.
- IV. Alliance with Instructional Program Review Committee (IPRC) – One of the goals of this year's SLO committee is to build a close alliance with the Program Review committee in order to develop a cohesive front and have better integration. Throughout the year, Teresa Henson will be in attendance at some SLO meetings and Tina Inzerilla at some Program Review meetings.
- V. Review Write-up for SLO Proficiency Report – Documents had been sent to all members of the committee that included the SLO Proficiency Report. Tina Inzerilla began the discussion for review of this report that will be submitted to the ACCJC. The report itself is a brief narrative analysis that outlines quantitative and qualitative evidence that demonstrates the status of SLO implementation at the college. The seven sections were carefully reviewed and Tina will meet with Dr. Janice Noble to share the ideas and suggestions from the group review.

- VI. Review Write-up for Recommendation 2 for Accreditation – The group followed with their review of the Write-up for Recommendation 2 for Accreditation. The members suggested word substitutions, and a section pointing to **engaging in follow up evaluations to help determine the impact of the funding on SLO** sparked a discussion related to the lack of following up. Teresa Henson stated that when the program development form for program review was developed, a section was built in where it asked how the follow up would be assessed. Evidence to be presented showing follow up evaluations is not strong. Paula Schoenecker reported that the Basic Skills committee could provide evidence because of having recently awarded a number of grants that required identifying SLOs.

A statement indicating that **the SLO committee would improve the mapping for course and program level SLOs to the Institutional Core Competencies** was the basis for a lively discussion. It was stated that last year the SLO committee was interested in measuring the level of relevancy, accuracy and currency of the core competencies. This discussion began during one of the Flex Days and thought to be finished, although it has never been. Assessment results have to be entered in eLumen, which is known to not work for every discipline. According to two faculty members, eLumen limits the number of competencies that can be selected so how can real assessments be entered.? If faculty must enter information in the same manner - it takes the away the right of disciplines finding another way to provide data. The two faculty members believe eLumen's problem is that the format is rigid and limiting. For example, English and Math have several sections of the same course that are taught by different instructors. Each instructor may have a different style of how they are assessing SLOs in their course and eLumen does not allow differences making it difficult for instructors to input information based on their own course. eLumen reports how many SLOs have been inputted and assessed in the various disciplines. According to two faculty members providing the data shows incorrect information across the instructors for a discipline because instructors use different assessments for their students.

Feedback from a survey taken by faculty a couple of years ago indicated continuing with eLumen. According to two faculty members, continuing to use eLumen interferes with the real work that is required of faculty. Placing the focus on thinking all the college requires is placing numbers in the system undermines the whole mission.

At the present time this is all that faculty have to input SLOs so until an alternative way or ways of collecting data is found, things will continue as is.

- VII. Review Write-up for Self-Study Improvement Plans for Accreditation – Not reviewed by committee.
- VIII. Administration Update – None
- IX. eLumen Update – None
- X. SLO Goals for 2012-13 – Distributed was a list with seven goals that the members were asked to prioritize and indicate in what semester the committee should place focus to work on that particular goal. At the next meeting the order in which each goal was ranked will be revealed.
- XI. Adjourned – 4:38 p.m.

C.McCauley
September 2012