APPROVED Minutes

Student Learning Outcomes Committee
April 6, 2015
2:30 p.m. – Room 2411A

Present: Ann Hight, Tina Inzerilla, John Ruys, Paula Schoenecker, Mark Tarte, Scott Vigallon, Dr. Jim Wright (Interim VP Academic Services)

Guests: Elena Cole

I. Set Agenda – The meeting was called to order at 2:37 pm.

II. Approval of Minutes from March 2, 2015
MOTION made to APPROVE draft minutes from March meeting.
MSC: M.Tarte / A.Hight

III. Administrative Update – No report

IV. eLumen Update – Scott Vigallon
The compiled monthly update was presented. The SLO committee held an all-day Friday marathon that substantially increased the number of completed SLO's. Ninety-two percent of the programs are now assessed with courses defined as being mapped.

Candace Brown (part-time faculty) has been assisting the BSBA division with writing SLO's in the Kinesiology area. Overall, the number of courses that still lack SLO's has dropped dramatically. There are some courses such as French and Italian, which have never been assessed. It was suggested that John Ruys (SLO liaison) look into what can be done for courses that fall in this area.

Scott also shared information regarding a college that was "dinged" because instructors were not aware of their program outcomes assessment data. Last year he emailed all faculty the results to make

them aware that this information was available. These results are used to add support to discipline program reviews, and also make faculty aware of the programs' progress. How many faculty actually used the information is not known. Instead of automatically providing program outcome results to all faculty, it was suggested that a message from the SLO liaison be sent to make faculty aware this information is available, and the instructions on how to assess the results is available on eLumen.

One idea of how faculty might get into the habit of regularly assessing this information might be when writing their major program review update every three years. Including this information in their program review would get faculty to assess this information, and help with establishing a regular cycle.

V. **SLO Liaison Update** – John Ruys

Faculty have been contacted individually by email, and a standardized email is being put together regarding courses that still lack SLO data.

A meeting was held with the discussion focusing on how to move the SLO processes along. Measurable objectives for some courses were found to be similar or the same as SLO data, and understand program outcome results and how to use this information in program review planning might encourage faculty to write SLO's. Additional flex days and staff development time is being identified to assist faculty and discuss with them SLO results. A set of recommendations to assist faculty with and moving forward with developing SLO data and measurable objectives will soon be shared. One recommendation would be to suggest faculty include either SLO or measures objectives on their course syllabi, since this is an accreditation requirement.

A survey was also developed based on the discussion from the recently held all-inclusive faculty meeting. Careful thought went into the survey and the purpose is to encapsulate areas that faculty can provide answers to, which places the efforts and focuses on those areas that can help move the SLO process along.

John will also be working with the ALSS faculty with entering SLO data.

VI. **SLO Survey** – Tina Inzerilla

The SLO survey was up for discussion and review. It was important that the questions contained were inclusive and no other corrections needed

to be made before it distributing to all faculty. Corrections made or suggested included:

- Reversing the rating scale from low to high instead of high to low;
- Adding N/A as a response to questions where this would apply;
- Adding Strongly Agree to Disagree and ask to answer Why?;
- Explain Measurable Objectives (for those who may not know);
- Break up long questions;
- Remove O-5 and change scale to 1-5.

Dr. Wright wanted to share the way Ohlone College handles assessments. Their faculty use a fill in the box type of model referred to as "Course Assessment in a Box." Course assessments using a box method works for faculty there because it is a Word document, is a fillable form, and can easily be posted on the departments' website. Faculty provide answers to questions such as – What is your SLO? What assessment technique is being used? What have you found out? What changes are being proposed? The loop is then closed when the assessment is complete. Other types of assessment methods are used. For example, Basic Skills has their own system and assigns each course a course coordinator who oversees the entire process. Even though a variety of assessment methods are used, the process is documented and that information found on the departments' website. Located on the SLO website is a master list of courses that one only has to click on to get the latest assessments for any particular course.

Discussion continued with how the standard about having SLO work being part of faculty evaluation is not meant to be how well are the students meeting the SLO's, it means are faculty members looking at what students should be learning, and doing some critical thinking, and making changes based on those results. There needs to be more dialogue among the faculty because things have become so intertwined.

Faculty may feel they are being evaluated on how well they are doing their job, which may be perceived by centralized inputting of data. Although, the purpose of course assessments is not supposed to be about how well faculty are doing, but how faculty are looking at how well they are doing. The ACCJC team is not necessarily going to critique the method assessments are done, just as long as there is a way of accomplishing the task.

VII. <u>SLO Section of Accreditation Self-Study</u> – Elena Cole

A meeting was held that included representatives from the Curriculum Committee, Program Review, SLO, Integrated Planning Committee, and

CurricuNET. These individuals meet and developed recommendations that are listed below:

- SLO's can be measurable objectives;
- SLO's should be consistent with measurable objectives or mapped to core competencies;
- As curriculum is updated, the SLO committee will be automatically notified;
- SLO committee will work with faculty to provide professional development regarding SLO development, mapping, and assessment;
- Time should be made for discussing assessment results provided through flex days and other staff development opportunities;
- In order to be in compliance, SLO's and measurable objectives should appear on all course syllabi;
- Each discipline should be free to create their own assessment scale, and the SLO committee will help map that scale to the core competency in a meaningful way;
- A dedicated support person is critically needed for Curriculum, SLO, and Program Review;
- The Accreditation Taskforce and SLO committee will continue to investigate best practices and assessments, making periodic recommendation over the next year.

These recommendations are just a list and have not been vetted. Feedback is in the process of being collected and when incorporated, the draft will be written in the form of a recommendation so that can be acted upon during the next year, and included in the report.

The Self-Evaluation was distributed and reviewed. A brief discussion ensued with suggestions for changing some of the working, and adding in other areas throughout the document. It was agreed that there needed to be consistency between what is being recorded as the plan in the self-evaluation report, and what is actually being planned by the responsible committee. An additional flex day is scheduled for September 15th to devote time to the self-accreditation report.

VIII. <u>Institutional Effectiveness Committee Feedback</u> – Tina Inzerilla
The research office sent out a survey regarding prioritization of resources and asked for feedback from all committees. Much of the questions did not pertain to the SLO committee. The members reviewed the questionnaire and provided answers where applicable.

IX. <u>Next Steps for 100% SLO Completion</u> – Not discussed.

X. **Update on Degree/Certificate Outcomes** – Tina Inzerilla
There was a brief discussion regarding the definition of a program, for purposes of creating SLO's assessments. It was stated that SLO's should be attached to an approved degree or certification. Although, there are some non-degree areas that were identified as having had SLO's written. Since these non-degree areas are not the responsibility of any one faculty member, it was suggested that in order to simplify things, the definition of a program for SLO assessment purposes should be left as being tied to an approved degree or certificates.

It was suggested that the non-degree areas counted as having written SLO's be deactivated. The number of completed degree/certificate outcomes will decrease, but the ones yet to be written will bring the number back up.

XI. **Adjournment** – Meeting ended at 4:30 pm.

C.McCauley