



Approved Minutes

Student Learning Outcomes Committee
October 1, 2012
2:30 p.m. – Room 2411A

Present: Candace Brown, Moh Daoud, Marilyn Flores, Tina Inzerilla,
Marilyn Marquis, Jan Noble, Paula Schoenecker,
Priscila Chavez Velez, Jeanne Virgilio, Scott Vigallon

- I. **Agenda Set** – Meeting called to order at 2:40 p.m. and agenda approved as drafted. Committee members were welcomed, followed by introductions for the ASLPC student representative on the committee Priscila Chavez Velez.

- II. **Approval of Minutes** – Draft minutes from March 5, 2012, April 2, 2012, and May 7, 2012 were presented for approval. The draft minutes were acknowledged by the committee.

Minutes from September 10, 2012 were presented for approval.
MOTION made to APPROVE pending corrections in Agenda Item VI.
M.Marquis/C.Brown/APPROVED

- III. **Administration Update** – Dr. Jan Noble stated that the committee's comments from the last meeting pertaining to the SLO Proficiency Report and the write-up for Recommendation 2 have been incorporated. She went on to explain the contents of the document and the pieces of evidence that will accompany the midterm report that will be sent to the accreditation agency. The document will be presented to the Board on October 16th.

The write-up for the Mid-term Report for accreditation, which is a summary document, contained items associated with SLOs. That document has also been updated, and is still in progress. The completion of this document will meet the specific timelines set in place.

The last thing left to do is to update the most recent SLO data from eLumen related to courses, programs, and degrees. This will then show matching data in both the midterm and the SLO Implementation Report.

- IV. eLumen Update** – Scott Vigallon shared the data information included in the midterm report, and explained that “ongoing assessments” is defined as having been assessed within the past two years.

Courses –

Out of 731 college courses, 668 or 91% have defined SLOs, and 354 or 48% have ongoing assessments. The college’s Banner system is such that it brings all courses into eLumen, and the eleven new courses offered in the Fall do not have SLOs. Because of this, the percentage of defined courses decreased by 1%.

Programs –

Out of 98 college programs (including certificates and degrees) 52 or 53% have defined SLOs, and 34 or 35% have ongoing assessments.

Student Learning & Support Activities (Student Services Areas) –

Out of 16 student learning support activities 14 or 88% have defined SLOs, and 10 or 63% have ongoing assessments.

Institutional Learning Outcomes (Core Competencies) –

5 institutional SLOs have been defined, and 5 have ongoing assessments.

Comments were raised regarding the percentages in each category, and how could the college not be at 100% after 10 years? Also, why would eleven courses go through Curriculum without SLOs with the faculty knowing full well that eventually they would have to be written and assessed? A recommendation to the Curriculum committee to have at least one SLO written when a new course is proposed came out of a brief discussion. Tina Inzerilla will meet with Jeremiah Bodnar, Curriculum Chair, and discuss with him the committee’s recommendation.

ASLPC representative, Priscila Chavez Velez stated that she was unaware of the definition of a SLO and not sure what it was. From the detailed explanation provided by members of the committee, the suggestion of brainstorming to discuss ways of promoting and educating students about SLOs brought forth another comment. Candace Brown, an adjunct member of the committee, shared how she also was not familiar with SLOs until she heard it mentioned. A full-time faculty member took the time to give her more information and thoroughly explain the process to

her. From that conversation she found out that adjuncts would receive training on how to write SLOs and be eligible for compensation. Candace stated that in order to reach the 100% completion level it is important to find a way to communicate this type of information to adjunct faculty as well. Many adjuncts are not involved with committees, attend division meetings, Town Meetings or have an association with full-time faculty. Tina stated that she would send out an email to all faculty explaining the process and list the things that faculty need to accomplish. She also will let adjunct faculty know to contact their discipline coordinator if they're interested and how to go about receiving compensation for their participation.

- V. SLO Priorities for 2012-13** – Distributed at the last meeting 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. The results went as follows:

1. Review Program Review Updates Fall
2. Degree and Certificate Outcomes Fall

3. Create Assessment Timeline Fall

This goal is one that most wanted to work on in the Fall. Tina Inzerilla attended the last IPRC meeting and the timeline was one item that would most likely to be set in the Spring by the committee. This SLO goal will not be tabled, although it's something that must be done in conjunction with the IPRC. Since the IPRC will be relying on the SLO committee to come up with the questions regarding SLOs for the next program review/program review update, Tina proposed having a joint SLO/IPRC meeting.

4. Assess 5 Core Competencies Fall/Spring

Tina, Scott Vigallon and Rajinder Samra met to review one of the eLumen reports that assessed across all discipline assessments. At the moment there are multiple rubrics, which make the reports meaningless. Conversations with eLumen are underway to come up with a way to extract "meaningful information" from the current reports.

5. Complete Course Assessments Fall
6. Complete Course SLOs Fall/Spring

Tina encouraged everyone to mention completing their course assessments and SLOs at their division meetings. Even though the deans may have already reminded faculty, it was considered a good idea to have the SLO committee members make mention of this as well.

Brought up once again were the percentages of courses without SLOs or assessments, and the question of why that figure had not increased when it seems as if faculty are continuously working on SLOs. It was explained that Banner has a tendency to count labs as courses, which increases the number of courses without SLOs. Submitting a request to the dean to have the lab portion of a course deactivated in eLumen would help with reducing this number. Another reason for not having a higher completion percentage figure might be perhaps some faculty are not familiar or understand the SLO process, or just do not want to write them.

7. Administrative Outcomes Spring

VI. Reviewing IPRC Updates – The IPRC met last week and discussed the program review updates reviewed by the committee's teams. A complete list from the IPRC showed the number of updates completed by each division: Arts, Letter & Social Sciences (14); Science, Technology, Engineering, Math & Public Safety (9); Behavioral Sciences, Business and Athletics (6); and Student Services (0). The list also indicated programs that had not submitted updates: Art, Astronomy, Physics, Computer Science, Dance, Photography, Visual Communications Sociology, and Welding.

With the information having been received from the IPRC committee, the SLO committee can begin their review of the SLO content in each of the updates. The updates were divided among the committee members who were handed a list of questions, which will assist them with focusing on the SLO content written in each review. While going over the current updates committee members were asked to keep in mind the following question - "What changes should be made to program review SLO questions to capture the assessment discussions?"

There was a brief discussion regarding Student Services because program review updates from their area had not been submitted. Brought up was the fact that last year there was some confusion regarding program review and Student Services. The IPRC at that time were not sure if Student Services was even a part of the IPRC. There was no one in "charge" and the committee felt that they were not in a position to tell Student Services what they should do. The IPRC was considered an academic services committee so it was steered in that direction. This year Student Services will be integrating with IPRC and Angela Ven John is their appointed representative.

Tina has asked that SLO findings from each update assigned to the committee members be e-mailed to her by November 1st, for presentation at the next SLO meeting.

- VII. Degree and Course Outcomes** – A list of all degrees and certificates showing whether a program level SLO had been written or assessed was distributed. It was suggested that when contacting faculty regarding uncompleted program degrees and certificates SLOs and assessments that a reminder for course level outcomes be added. Follow up will be made with adjunct faculty working on a program degrees or certificates, and for programs not having full-time faculty. Meeting with faculty can count towards the 12 required Flex Hours set for this year.

Since “on-going assessments” is defined as the past 2 years establishing an assessment cycle is very important. Not only to keep up with the definition of “on-going” but also to keep from having the percentages of courses and programs from plummeting. Even though faculty are encouraged to assess each time a course is taught, there are some courses that are taught every other spring and others every semester. The cycle would need to be based on the frequency of the course and documented. ACCJC does not necessarily want 100% completion, but a plan that shows that at one given point there is 100% ongoing within the cycle. Discussion surrounding ideas of how often assessments should occur and if the timeline should be part of program review grew with interest.

The question of whether a SLO is written for each course by each instructor or is one SLO written that covers all courses with the same course title was raised. The answer was that within a discipline there can be a variation, and in smaller disciplines the faculty may choose to write their own. In larger disciplines such as English or Math, faculty might meet as a group to develop standardized SLOs. Also, SLOs for courses that are sequential are extremely important and faculty would likely work together to develop those type.

On next month’s agenda there’s to be further discussion on setting up an assessment timeline.

- VIII. Adjourn** – 4:20 p.m.