



Minutes

Student Learning Outcomes Committee

March 4, 2013

2:30 p.m. – Room 2411A

Present: Marilyn Flores, Tina Inzerilla, Marilyn Marquis, Janice Noble, Paula Schoenecker, Janice Noble, 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 February 4, 2013 - **TABLED**

III. **Administrative Update** – Dr. Janice Noble was not in attendance at this meeting and asked Tina Inzerilla to review some of the questions with the SLO committee that appeared on the ACCJCs Annual Update Report. This report is due back by March 25th, and contained questions not previously listed.

Question 29 asked for a percentage of college programs, which we classify as degrees and certificates, and ongoing assessments of learning outcomes, which we define as those having been assessed within the past two years. The number of courses with ongoing assessments has been easy to calculate, although it is the programs that have been a bit difficult. The initial step is for instructors to inform Scott Vigallon which courses and SLOs within those courses are mapped to their program outcomes. In eLumen, once courses are mapped and assessed the program is automatically assessed. The second step is when an instructor has mapped the course SLOs to the program SLOs. What was

realized later was that many instructors had not done their course SLO assessments so in actuality even though the course SLOs are mapped to the program SLOs, they were not assessed at the course level. The consensus was to continue calculating the percentage to this question as before.

Question 30a dealt with the percentage of programs with SLO assessment results available to students and **30b** ask for the URL on the college's website where the results are located. The answers to these questions were not available and will not contain information. Due to nature of these questions, it was suggested that Dr. Noble ask her other ALO constituents how many of them will actually be or did respond to 30a and 30b.

The remaining questions, **31 through 42** could be answered, although additional information will need to come from other individuals.

Tina and Scott will be meeting with Dr. Noble and Rajinder next Monday to discuss the presentation of standardizing the 0-4 level.

- IV. eLumen Update** – Scott Vigallon previewed the SLO presentation that is expected to be shown at the next Town Meeting. Informational graphs and accompanying percentages pertaining to courses and programs with and without Assessments and SLOs were broken down by division and explained. The information was reviewed in detail to make certain that all areas that needed to be shown were included, and that the information for each was clear and correct

Discussion ensued with how important it was to inform the faculty of where each division stood in terms of completeness, and how to better communicate this information in a visual form.

- V. Feedback on Program Review Instructions Draft** – Tina Inzerilla displayed a draft of the Annual Program Review Template. The changes discussed at a previous meeting were prominently displayed. The committee focused on the section dealing with SLOs, and agreed that the suggestions submitted to the Program Review committee had been incorporated accordingly. Committee members were asked to submit any additional comments or suggestions directly to Jill Carbone or Teri Henson.

- VI. SLO Dialog Faculty Forms** – The two examples of dialog forms that the Program Review committee had suggested be used were reviewed by the committee. One document pertained to Evidence of Dialog and Decision Making and the other for Learning Outcomes Assessment Dialog.

The discussion revolved around the forms and how evidence and documentation have already taken place and documented in other ways. The idea of introducing yet another method for collecting evidence seemed to be looked at as unnecessary. Some are already keeping logs, and conversations that have taken place in hallways, or in general conversation, although not necessarily written on a form. Keeping a mental note and jotting it down and saving this information on a desktop folder, then going back and completing one of these forms was another suggestion. It was also mentioned that standardizing division agendas so that just those items that evidence is required to be provided for would be discussed and captured in the minutes (SLOs, curriculum, budget, etc.).

- VII. Assessment Timeline** – After review of the timeline, Tina Inzerilla stated that as long as assessments were performed at the minimum of once every two years, the disciplines could decide how often they were to assess each course.

- VIII. Good of the Order** – Due to Spring Break there will not be an April meeting.

- VIII. Adjournment** – 4:08 p.m.