Minutes

Student Learning Outcomes Committee
October 7, 2013
2:30 p.m. – Room 2411A

Present: Candace Brown, Moh Daoud, Jose Gutierrez, Tina Inzerilla, Marilyn Marquis, Paul Sapsford, Paula Schoenecker, Mark Tarte, Scott Vigallon

---

I. **Agenda Set** – The meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m.

II. **Approval of Minutes** – **MOTION** made to **APPROVE** the draft minutes from May 6, 2013 and August 26, 2013.
MSC: S.Vigallon / C.Brown / **APPROVED**

III. **Introductions** – Jose Gutierrez has joined the committee as the ASLPC representative.

IV. **Administrative Update** – None

V. **eLumen Update** – Scott Vigallon reported that the deadline set by eLumen of when to have them install the Version 5 software to our system has passed, and an extension was requested. This type of decision also requires Chabot's agreement and they currently do not have an eLumen contact person. Another consideration is that due to the delivery method of the software, District ITS will also have to be consulted.

If the college does not move to eLumen's software as a service model prior to January 1, 2014, an additional fee will be added for the data migration that will cost $140/hour, and is estimated to take 4-8 hours to complete.

A webinar was scheduled to introduce and explain the changes in eLumen, but since eLumen was not available, this session has been rescheduled for November 14th at 2:30 pm. Participation can be at your desk or in a group setting in the Teaching and Learning Center. The SLO Chair has been asked to make as many faculty aware of the webinar to offer them the opportunity to see the changes made in Version 5.

VI. **Report from ACCJS Workshop** – Marilyn Marquis reported that it was a worthwhile day. The Keynote Speaker was great, very dynamic, and motivating. He spoke about all the work that faculty do, the classroom research, and the importance that is placed to ensure that they are providing all they can to help students learn.

Everyone attending the conference was divided into groups. The consensus at the table according to Marilyn Marquis was that there was a dislike of having to create SLOs. Everyone at the table was supportive of one another because they knew they were all in the same situation. Based on conversations with other college representatives, Marilyn realized that LPC seemed to have a different interpretation of how SLOs should be assessed. LPC decided a long time ago that SLOs written under the student outcomes on course outlines were to be different than those entered in eLumen, while other colleges were not under the same impression. It was iterated throughout the conference that since the beginning, many other colleges have struggled with getting faculty interested in creating SLOs. There were also many interpretations of how to conduct assessments and colleges were sticking to how they perceived it should be.

Out of the six colleges that Marilyn spoke with only LPC used eLumen. All the others had their own in-house method that doesn't lock them into having to enter information on a computer and in eLumen. Marin College uses an Excel program that when SLOs are entered, the information automatically connects to a core competency, which immediately shows where that particular discipline course influences the entire college's results. Some colleges used Tracdat, which is a web-based software that automates the assessment process by providing a structured framework for continuous quality improvement for both instructional and non-instructional programs.

A new set of standards will be previewed in the Spring 2014 that will go into effect shortly thereafter. Colleges that have begun their self-study will be assisted by an ACCJC representative who will assist with the transition over to the new standards. It was mentioned that the ACCJC

clearly has no notion of what effect introducing new standards will have on those colleges who have begun their self study process using the old standards.

VII. **Frequency of Assessing SLOs** – Currently, SLOs are to be assessed a minimum of every 2 years. Tina Inzerilla mentioned that based on the Committee's current standstill with regard to completing assessments and SLOs, now would be a good time to propose changing the frequency of assessing SLOs from 2 to every 5 years, which would also tie-in with the accreditation cycle.

She went on to say that the Committee has taken to assigning committee members to disciplines with incomplete SLOs, assessments, and degree/certificate outcomes to help with the process. If a percentage of courses within a discipline were assessed each semester, the cycle would complete in 5 years. Larger disciplines would be impacted since the percentage they would need to complete would be less. Discussion ensured with single faculty disciplines and how to meet with all of them to introduce the process and input information into eLumen. The fact that compensation is available does not guarantee that everyone will participate.

Marilyn Marquis mentioned that student outcomes are already stated in our course outlines, and decided a long time ago was that SLOs entered into eLumen were to be different. If the student outcomes on the course outlines were to be considered SLOs, we in fact are assessing courses each semester. By changing that perspective slightly, the next question would be keeping that notion of writing SLOs, assessing, analyzing the results, and make adjustments in the classroom that are necessary to improve how the class is taught. Then, periodically choose a different outcome for the course that faculty may want to take a closer look at, and look at it as a "mini" classroom research project. Instead of assuming that students are grasping the material by teaching it one way, assess whether or not it has been learned. If not, look at how the presentation of that material can be changed to reach that result, which is really the cycle. If this method was used then perhaps the process would not look so daunting and confusing. Measuring by tests and quizzes would mean breaking down which group of questions would relate to what SLO.
Mark Tarte stated that he participated with the California Association of Administration of Justice Educators to help create a manual of SLOs for all Criminal Justice and Administrative of Justice instructors around the State. Marilyn Marquis commented that too general of a SLO would not provide the data needed and the result will not facilitate any change in

how the course is taught to provide the result needed. If the focus was placed on a small number of SLOs, evaluating student outcomes would be easier and adjustments made to that particular teaching method.

Mark went on to say that the process for developing SLOs at the College seemed more complicated than it actually should be, and to find ways of making the process simple and not so overwhelming. When SLOs were introduced it was not presented in an interesting manner. He mentioned being aware that this is used to assess and improve an instructors' methodology and delivery of instruction, and improve the students' understanding of the subject. His view of this is to check a box and move it off his desk, and continue with the other things that are important to his program.

Marilyn Marquis responded with having an opposite view of the process. The approach she took when faculty were first informed that SLOs would become a requirement was to immediately learn about them, why they are beneficial, how can they be used, and who was asking that this be done. She discovered that academic institutions all around the world were using SLOs because most faculty members in higher education had not taken courses on how to become instructors. So, the concept of what instructors were saying they would be teaching meant developing some type of assessment tool and looking at those results. This is something that elementary and high school teachers learn as part of their academic training, and is not for higher institution instructors. Many faculty find creating SLOs helpful, and although she may sound as if she is complaining when SLOs are mentioned, now understands the importance and sees it as an integral part of teaching. Faculty have ideas of what they want their students to learn, and attention has to be placed as to whether or not students are learning - that is what SLOs are all about. ACCJC requires documentation of SLOs and the tool used at LPC is eLumen. Thinking of SLOs as part of teaching takes lots of hours for faculty to establish an outcome for an assignment. Entering that information is simple and once that has been established, eLumen can track to measure whether throughout that course faculty have been successful with getting the information they had intended to students.

Not everyone may like using eLumen but it shouldn't be the guiding force, it just happens to be what is used at LPC.
It was suggested to have this Committee come up with a way to present a process for SLOs to be seen as easy to enter in eLumen, and for faculty to not feel as if the task is so daunting by taking away the misinformation, and streamlining the process.

What was decided was that SLO assessments would be done every 2 and not every 5 years, as proposed earlier in this discussion.

VIII. **SLO Assessment Process and Checklist** – Tina Inzerilla and Marilyn Marquis both collaborated on a draft guideline for a SLO Assessment Process. The form listed **General LPC Guidelines** that mentioned what percentage of courses faculty should assess over a 2 year period, encourage collaboration within disciplines when developing SLOs and assessments, encourage sharing the results, analysis and keeping a log, and finally adapting the assessments and using them for program review updates.

The second half of the form covered what would be **Ideal**, such as having the discipline faculty meet to identify which outcome they would like to create a SLO for, write that SLO, discuss ways to assess that particular SLO, and have it entered in eLumen. An assessment would then be created for that SLO and the expected results identified. The assessment results would be then analyzed to discuss any changes, if any, to the SLO, assessment or teaching methods used. The results and analysis would then be entered into eLumen.

An **SLO Checklist** that covers SLO and Curriculum Mapping, Assessment Methods, Results from SLO Activities, Using Results to Improve Student Learning, and Completing Annual Planning and Evaluation Report is included as part of the guideline process. This is to provide additional assistance to Committee members who will be meeting with discipline coordinators to ensure that all areas (creating SLOs, assessments, etc) are covered.

IV. **SLO Committee Members Discipline Assignments** – A list showing the discipline areas and the coordinator that still need SLOs, assessments, degree, and certificate outcomes was distributed. Committee members were asked to assign themselves to the various disciplines, and will be contacting the discipline coordinators to inquire about their progress, and offer any assistance with helping complete sections that are still incomplete. Mark and Moh volunteered to take care of the STEMPs courses. Candace and Paul volunteered for the BSBA courses. Marilyn and Tina volunteered for the ALSS courses. Paula volunteered for the Student Services courses.

X. **SLO Committee Accreditation Standard Sections** – Not discussed.

XI. **Adjourned** – 4:35pm

C.McCauley