



Minutes

Student Learning Outcomes Committee

November 5, 2012

2:30 p.m. – Room 2411A

Present: Candace Brown, Moh Daoud, Tina Inzerilla, Marilyn Marquis,
Jan Noble, Rajinder Samra, Paula Schoenecker, Jeanne Virgilio,
Scott Vigallon

- I. **Agenda Set** – Meeting called to order at 2:35 p.m. and agenda approved as drafted.
- II. **Approval of Minutes** – Draft minutes from October 5, 2012 were presented for approval. MOTION made to APPROVE the draft minutes pending correction to Agenda Item III.
MSC: S.Vigallon / J.Virgilio / APPROVED
- III. **Administration Update** – Dr. Jan Noble reported that no news had been received regarding the SLO Implementation Report, as of yet.
- IV. **IPRC Update SLO Analysis Presentation** – At the prior meeting, Committee members were assigned discipline program reviews to analyze and report at this meeting. Below is a summary of presentations by Tina Inzerilla:

Anthropology – Briefly written, did mention assessing courses each semester, and did not have a clear description of how students were affected by SLOs.

Foreign Languages – There were some SAOs (Service Area Outcomes) written into this program that are generally associated with Student Services. This pointed to an indication that clarity in how the questions are written was important so that there would no question about how to answer the question(s) to draw out the “wanted” information.

English – The impression of this review was that emphasis was placed on the SLO process rather than how it affected the students. The report mentioned the faculty not wanting to use eLumen but an inquiry based model to document the SLO process. She did speak with Karin Spirn and mentioned that eLumen could help them get through the inquiry based model by looking at the numbers in eLumen first, and then going to the inquiry based model.

Geography – Several paragraphs were written that covered how SLOs have affected students.

History – Do not have any concerns, although no discussion of how SLOs affected their students was included in their review. The question of whether the lack of data in eLumen due to the number of courses that had been assessed lead to omitting what affects SLOs have had on students? That was possible, but it was noticed that while the faculty member was filling out the program review update their answer was not correlated to a discussion about students, so it could have gone either way.

It looked as if many faculty walk through the process of completing program review updates answering in a quick and simple way.

Below is a summary of presentations by Paula Schoenecker who mentioned that the consistent theme for not completing SLOs or assessments among all programs was not enough time, money, and only having adjuncts that are not trained.

Theater – There is no full-time faculty, and not much has been done with SLOs or assessments.

Speech – Feel that they are making great strides, and not much input from adjuncts.

Chemistry – Doing well with assessing SLOs and their goal is to have more per course. They offer an online support tool and have a thrust to towards getting students prepared for a standardized final and are having discussions with students. The results from using this online learning tool will not be known until the results from last semesters finals are reviewed. This program is clearly working on things the way it's intended.

Public Safety – This was not broken down into the public safety sections and it was clear that the review was only for Administration of Justice.

The number of courses and total SLOs are listed and the program level SLOs have not yet been assessed.

Automotive – Have completed all SLOs and some assessments.

Below is a summary of presentations by Candace Brown:

Business – The most complete and on target to the questions that were asked. 100% of their courses (29 total) have completed SLOs, and assessments. 100% of their degrees and certificates (13 total) have completed SLOs and assessments. Course SLOs were evaluated and related this information back to their certificates, written outcomes or all SLOs for all five degrees and eight certificates. Their course level SLOs have been mapped back to their certificates and are complete. The discussion as to how this related back to the students included a list of courses that were the most improved and the percentage increase was also noted. Courses needing improvement were also listed, and currently, all certificates and degrees have outcomes and course level SLOs mapped.

Health/Nutrition – The program has written five SLOs of which four have been assessed, and 1 course has not been offered in the last two years. There are no degrees or certificates.

Kinesiology/Physical Education – The program is going through many changes since it has gone from Physical Education to Kinesiology. There has been a lot of work done from renaming courses to updating curriculum, and in CurricuNET under Kinesiology and into “families.” The program has written 50 SLOs of which 38 have been assessed within the last two years. Currently, there are no degrees or certificates because all of the programs are new as of Fall 2012. As far as how the students were affected, there was no response.

Below is a summary of presentations by Marilyn Marquis:

Interior Design – This is one program that does not have a full-time faculty member. All nine of the program courses have SLOs, and assessments have begun and to be completed in the Spring. The two certificates do not have SLOs, and there was no discussion related to how students were affected by SLOs.

Mass Communications – Out of 19 courses 15 have SLOs, and the assessments are to be completed in the Spring. All three certificates now have SLOs. While working on SLOs it was realized that making changes to the rubric would lead to better student learning.

Humanities – Out of 15 courses 13 have SLOs, and all 13 have been assessed. The certificate and degree have outcomes and no assessments. SLOs are being taken seriously and faculty has made writing SLOs an ongoing process. Separate grades are given for the writing content of papers and students are more aware of their writing style and getting assistance from the Writing Center more often than before.

Library – Out of the 5 courses, 5 have SLOs, and assessments. There are no degrees or certificates for this program. The online section of Intro to Library Skills has been eliminated since students were not learning as projected as discovered while writing SLOs.

- V. **New SLO Questions for Program Review** – Tina Inzerilla went through the Program Review Update Addendum and asked for feedback from the members as to how better word Section A and B, and what might be added so that specific information related to SLOs is included in the writing and/or Program Review updates. The sections currently read as follows:

Section A: *Summarize your program's work on SLOs/SAOs completed since the last program review, including any conclusions, subsequent actions taken, and obstacles encountered in the past year.*

Section B: *How did the actions described in Section A affect how your program serves students?*

Feedback:

- Section A too general.
- Define SAO.
- Use ACCJC SLO Rubric to help guide questions for clarity.
- Instead of summarize use the word quantify to draw improvements, challenges, etc., and request that answers be brief.
- Remove the word including and ask individual questions.
- Has SLO dialogue taken place between faculty in discipline areas?
- Are students aware of what SLOs are?
- Is SLO information provided to students, and in what way? (Syllabus, dialogue, class web page, or class assignment?)
- What process has your discipline gone through to evaluate SLO processes?
- Number of completed course SLOs with ongoing assessment (within the last 2 years).
- Number of completed degree or certificate with ongoing assessments (within the last 2 years).
- The result in which the assessments have affected students.

Discussion followed regarding ideas of how to involve faculty with completing and continuing to update course, degree and certificate SLOs and assessments. This item will be placed on the first meeting agenda of the new semester.

- VI. Ways of Mapping Course SLOs to Core Competencies and Creating SLOs** – Scott Vigallon began by stating that one of the challenges of assessing Core Competencies is due to the different Rubric levels, and makes it difficult to use eLumen to measure the 5 Core Competencies. This was brought to the attention of eLumen who suggested reorganizing the SLOs and use what is called, the Matrix Model. Using this method would allow better assessing of Core Competencies by being able to interpret our current Rubrics in a way that would allow for the use of different Rubric scales. The Pros and Cons were presented to see whether the committee was interested in moving in this direction.

Pros:

- Solves the multi-level Rubric problem.
- Matrix Model already used for Program Outcomes.
- Provides readable and meaningful reports.
- Tasks for instructors at the course level remain the same.
- Allows Course SLOs to be mapped to more than one Core Competency.
- This method makes the transition easier for the college if it chooses to revise its Core Competencies.

Cons:

- eLumen currently allows coordinators and members to map course level SLOs to Core Competencies. If this changes, course SLOs for Program Outcomes and Core Competencies will need to be mapped and that would only be able to be done by department coordinators and adds more responsibility for them.
- Assistance from Scott for mapping existing course SLOs and Program Outcomes Courses is available, but he will only know to map to one Core Competency that already exists in eLumen.
- Mapping courses that are subsequently added can only be done by department coordinators.

The memberships felt that implementing the change would assist Rajinder Samra and Dr. Janice Noble with tracking documentation related to accreditation; although there may be additional responsibility added to the coordinators, overall it would lead the college to a goal we have set.

- VII. Creating SLOs** – Scott Vigallon stated that eLumen has an option to disallow “members” not “coordinators” from creating SLOs. This option

is used at other colleges and results in consistent SLOs and consistent data results. When the web form was developed that bypassed eLumen and allowed all faculty (both full-time and adjuncts) to enter their course data and classified them as “members”, the purpose was to have more faculty participation, but this has caused information to become muddled. When a course SLO is written by both a faculty member and an adjunct instructor, which are similar in content but not alike, the result is generated by eLumen based on what the system believes are from two different SLOs instead of recognizing it as one of the same. Disallowing “members” from entering SLOs would solve this problem and also encourage dialogue among faculty. Participation from adjuncts is not to be discouraged and would still qualify for compensation. Those disciplines without full-time faculty would have to designate an adjunct as a “coordinator”.

The beginning of how SLOs began was shared, and discussion continued with not limiting the number of SLOs written for each course, but placing only 2-3 in eLumen. The remainder of how those not entered can still be counted towards the data reported to be included with the data collected next time accreditation comes along, was left unanswered.

Changing the Rubric scale from 0-4 for Core Competencies would be great for the institution, but how to implement this was a different question.

The decision to share and present this idea to faculty at a Town Hall or Division meeting so that faculty can have a weigh in on what is decided:

Alternative #1 – Changing rubric 0-4 implemented across the board
Alternative #2 – Reorganizing eLumen by using the Matrix Method

On the other hand, finding an easier way to help faculty write their program reviews and to give them the ability to get the data from eLumen that they wouldn't get anywhere else, might encourage them to assess more often. One struggle has been the many areas faculty have to go to gather the information needed for their program review. Gathering data by course group can be set up in eLumen, and entering the data by aggregate or by student can breakdown the results in a different manner.

In the meantime, the committee is to think about how to address the suggestion to either change the Rubric or reorganize eLumen by using the Matrix Method to the faculty. This information will need to be presented in a way that does not come across as it being dictated to them, but is meaningful and can prove to be beneficial and helpful when writing SLOs, assessments, and easier when updating Program Reviews.

- VIII. Departments Needing SLO Assistance** – A spread sheet was shared that listed each division's Program Level Outcomes, SLOs and Assessments that have not yet been completed. The spread sheet is current and clearly shows where in the process things should begin. Individuals from this committee will be assigned to assist these areas, which will be decided at the next meeting.

There are many Program Outcomes that have courses mapped to them, but with no Course Level Outcomes, which results with not having any Program Outcomes assessed. So a suggestion is to begin prioritizing courses from the spread sheet that fall under this category first, so that at least it can be reported to the ACCJC that we do have Program Level data for these courses.

If some of the courses listed on the spread sheet have not been taught for two years and will not be taught within the next two years, an email will need to be sent to Scott Vigallon with a cc to the VP of Academic Services and the dean. Upon the VP's approval the course will be deactivated in eLumen.

- IX. Departments Requiring SLO Assistance** – Tabled until next meeting.
- X. SLO Representation at Future Program Review Committee Meeting** – Tabled until next meeting.
- XI. Adjournment** – 4:33 p.m.