



## **Minutes**

Student Learning Outcomes Committee  
December 3, 2012  
2:30 p.m. – Room 2411A

Present: Candace Brown, Tina Inzerilla, Marilyn Marquis,  
Paula Schoenecker, Priscila Chavez Velez, Scott Vigallon

---

- I. **Agenda Set** – Meeting called to order at 2:43 p.m. and agenda approved as drafted by censuses.
- II. **Approval of Minutes** – Draft minutes from November 5, 2012 will be presented at the next meeting.
- III. **Administration Update** – Dr. Marilyn Flores mentioned that Dr. Jan Noble has reminded the deans to continue to work with Scott Vigallon on SLOs and Assessments from the ongoing list that had been previously shared. Scott added that a recent news article stated that the ACCJC will be cracking down even harder on community colleges because of the pressure they are getting from the Department of Education.
- IV. **eLumen Update** – No updates to report.
- V. **Ways of Mapping Course SLOs to Core Competencies and Creating SLOs** – This agenda item was presented at the last meeting and brought back for additional discussion. Scott Vigallon's brief recap of his conversation with eLumen (the software where SLOs are entered) brought out the fact that the college has the ability to reorganize eLumen using the Matrix Model. Currently, "everyone" is using multiple Rubrics, which does not generate an accurate institutional level report. Reorganizing eLumen would provide more accurate reports by adjusting multiple-level rubrics to generic categories of Mastery, Above Average, Average, Below Average, No Demonstrated Achievement. More than one Core Competency can be mapped to an SLO. If the Core Competencies were to change, this new method would make a smooth transition. Reorganizing would entail taking all of the SLOs and putting them into a new format,

which Scott would be willing to take on as a summer project. It would change the way SLOs are mapped to Core Competencies in the future. At the moment everyone is allowed to enter SLOs and map them to one Core Competency, and reorganizing eLumen would mean that only coordinators would be allowed to do this. Entering data using the Matrix Model is much easier and having only the coordinator enter SLOs would provide standardized reports. There is also a recommendation to only allow coordinators to enter SLOs for consistency purposes. Adjuncts could still write SLOs and provide comments, although only coordinators would have the ability to change what is in eLumen.

The conversation at the last meeting also included standardizing the Rubric scale for the entire college. Other colleges in California that use eLumen do not enter data as we do and end up with great results, which is not our case. Changing to the Matrix Model would mean coordinators would have to be trained, and would also need to review the current SLOs to make certain they are correct. The idea is to have one coordinator per discipline and for those areas without full-time faculty, ideas of how to select one ensured more dialogue.

The following questions need to be answered: 1) Does the college want to reorganize eLumen? 2) Should non-coordinators be disallowed from entering SLOs? 3) Should there be a standardized Rubric scale that is used by everyone? Currently, most but not all instructors are using the scale of 0-4 with people putting in their own criteria for each level, which changes the meaning of the 0-4 scale. If we do agree to reorganize, there are settings in eLumen that could expand the 0-4 scale and allow for more choices. The system would be able to place those “additional choices” into the appropriate section of the 0-4 scale when generating reports.

The suggestion was made to tackle the first two questions and at the last SLO meeting Rajinder Samra seemed like the ideal person to present this information at a Town Hall Meeting. His interest in proper reporting, and the style he brings when conveying information campus-wide would not be taken as a directive but as a way of helping obtain the most accurate data to assist him as well as the faculty. The opportunity for discussion that would include everyone’s input at one place was seen as more beneficial than if this information were to be presented at a division meeting.

- VI. Timelines for Assessing SLOs** – The Program Review committee has been discussing having an Annual Program Review (update) during the 2013-14 academic year. The template would be made available to faculty in March 2013, and the process completed by the end of September

2013. Feedback from the deans would be provided to the disciplines in November and in a Spring Town Hall meeting (perhaps March) a summary of what was written in each of the program reviews would be presented to be used for planning by each discipline. The process would repeat itself in 2014-15 academic year, alternating which year an annual (update) or a comprehensive review would be written. Only one-third of the comprehensive reviews would be requested at a time to avoid disciplines becoming impacted at the same time.

With the Program Review committee's timeline, the SLO committee should begin to establish a timeline to tie-in with program review so that assessments could be used by disciplines in their next program review. The biggest impact would be those disciplines with a lot of courses that have a large number of SLOs within those courses.

Sometime in the Spring the Program Review committee has to go to the Planning Task Force, and take the summaries from the Vice Presidents and use that information for planning purposes. This December the 2014 Program Review committee will be discussing which questions should be included, which has already been provided by the SLO committee. The SLO committee will most likely have one or more joint meetings with the Program Review committee where the questions will be revisited. The questions have been broken up into categories that would need to be addressed in the Annual Report (update). When the faculty realize that allocations are not coming their way they may realize the importance of writing and updating their program reviews.

The importance of updating and keeping discipline plans current cannot be stressed enough. Funding is dependent upon what is written in each review, which should be reason enough to keep them updated and ties in with disciplines having to write SLOs.

- VII. Departments Requiring SLO Assistance** – A message to all disciplines with a list of their courses, degrees and certificates without SLOs and needing assessments, and a request when this will be completed will be going out to all faculty from their dean. Included will be the names of SLO committee members who will be available to assist disciplines who have questions of how to begin, or are not sure how to continue to complete the process. Ways of getting this message out to both adjunct and full-time faculty was considered an issue because not everyone attends division or Town Hall meetings, nor does everyone read or receive e-mail. One idea was to have Dr. Noble include this information in her next set of Talking Points after the first of the year.

The college has experienced changes in its administration that may have added to the lack of completion of SLOs and Assessments. Curriculum mandates from the State Chancellor's Office has placed additional demands on faculty that include creating "families" within courses, rewriting curriculum to address repeatability, and more that all leads to creating new courses, which leads to writing more SLOs. The ACCJC is now asking for a comparison of SLO data between face-to-face and DE courses. This will be an extra effort by Scott since data from eLumen is counted by course and not by section.

Discussion ensued regarding the possible ramifications that could occur if the college does not comply with completing SLOs and Assessments for all or as many courses, degrees and certificates. All changes affect eLumen and conveying this information to all faculty, and stressing its importance has been an ongoing question with no real answer in sight.

**VIII. SLO Representation at Future Program Review Committee Meeting** – Candace Brown has volunteered to attend the Program Review meeting, as a representative from the SLO committee, on the second Wednesday of the month.

**IX. Publicizing SLOs to Students** – Many students (and members of the campus community) are not aware of the definition of a SLO or why they are even written. ASLPC representative Priscila Chavez Velez came up with an excellent idea of placing an ad in The Express and including an article in the school's magazine - Naked. The article would focus on accreditation then lead into SLOs, the meaning, and importance. Tina Inzerilla will contact Dr. Jan Noble to inquire about funding support.

**X. Adjournment** – 4:25 p.m.

C.McCauley