

From: Martin Nash MNash@laspositascollege.edu
Subject: Re: SLO Language
Date: August 24, 2016 at 2:03 PM
To: Karin Spirn KSpirn@laspositascollege.edu, John Ruys JRuys@laspositascollege.edu
Cc: Ann Hight AHight@laspositascollege.edu



These changes look good. A few thoughts on the Part Two:

-I wonder if "All courses' SLO data needs to be analyzed every three years" might still be a little unclear (e.g., Do we have to do them all together at once at some point in those three years?). How about "Each (or Every) course's SLO data needs to be analyzed once every three years." And really, this might be a good time to start the push towards clarifying data analysis is only a tool in the larger conversation, if that's where we think we're heading. That could be done by adding "...as part of a larger discussion about that course." This might also help with the "useless data" concerns, especially since there won't be any context for new data since the old data is gone or potentially invalid.

-In Table 3 (in the actual table) change "Courses to be assessed next year" to "Courses' SLO data to be analyzed next year" (to match Table 2's language)

-Same in Table 4: Change "List any courses that will *not* be assessed or analyzed during this three-year cycle (Summer 2015-Spring 2018)" to "List any courses whose SLO data will *not* be analyzed during this three-year cycle (Summer 2015-Spring 2018)."

And, in Table 4 (in the actual table) change "Courses that will not be assessed in this cycle" to "Courses whose SLO data will not be analyzed during this three-year cycle."

This would eliminate all "courses to be assessed" language.

From: Karin Spirn
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 11:21 AM
To: John Ruys
Cc: Ann Hight; Martin Nash
Subject: Re: SLO Language

Great, thanks!

From: John Ruys
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 9:20 AM
To: Karin Spirn
Cc: Ann Hight; Martin Nash
Subject: Re: SLO Language

I will stop by the meeting today.

John Ruys

Table 2: List the courses' SLO data that will be analyzed this year (Summer 2016- Spring 2017).

Courses' SLO data to be analyzed this year
<i>press "tab" to add rows</i>

Table 3: List the courses' SLO data that will be analyzed next year (Summer 2017-Spring 2018).

Courses to be assessed next year
<i>press "tab" to add rows</i>

Table 4: List any courses that will *not* be assessed or analyzed during this three-year cycle (Summer 2015-Spring 2018).

Courses that will not be assessed in this cycle	Reason this course will not be assessed
	<i>press "tab" to add rows</i>

On Aug 23, 2016, at 4:43 PM, Ann Hight <AHight@laspositascollege.edu> wrote:

Hi All,

Since there appears to be wide spread misunderstanding of the SLO process especially in how it relates to the 3-year cycle, Marty's language would provide much needed clarification to start moving the process of SLO assessments forward. While it might be too late to re-vamp the current PRU, I personally believe clarification from the SLO Committee would be extremely useful as the process has been filling out the PRU. One of the major complaints about the PRU is that

programs begin piling out the PRUs. One of the more prevalent dissatisfactions with SLOs is that the "data is meaningless", which it is mostly due to the misunderstanding of how SLO assessments relate to the 3-year cycle.

Further since we presented a chance to clean up the SLO process by not moving over the old data from the previous eLumen, clarifying the process at this point would engender more trust. Conversely, waiting to clarify what is meant by "assessment" has the potential to be interpreted as if the SLO Committee is changing their minds again.

Thus I propose that the statement proposed by Karin or John be inserted in the current PRU. Further, that the SLO Committee send out a clarification (Marty's words) to help Programs with their PRUs. PRU workshops can further clarify the purpose of the 3-year old SLO cycle.

While there may be some push back, it appears that no matter what is required in terms of SLOs, there is always going to be push back.

Ann

From: John Ruys

Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2016 4:27 PM

To: Karin Spirn <KSpirn@laspositascollege.edu>

Cc: Martin Nash <MNash@laspositascollege.edu>; Ann Hight <AHight@laspositascollege.edu>

Subject: Re: SLO Language

Hi all,

I appreciate both of you working on the language. I like Marty's wording. It puts the emphasis on analysis and discussion which is critical for us.

I am not sure we can push faculty to enter data into Elumen every semester. I think the smaller programs may push back. We seem to be moving in that direction but I would like to avoid putting that in the PRU.

We can start incorporating that language into trainings and the SLO handbook too.

"Each course's SLO data needs to be analyzed every three years as part of a larger discussion about that course."

John Ruys

On Aug 23, 2016, at 3:13 PM, Karin Spirn <KSpirn@laspositascollege.edu> wrote:

Hi Marty,

This is the language I was thinking of adding to the PRU.

(Please note: SLO scores should be measured and entered into eLumen each semester whenever possible. "Assessment" on this chart refers to program discussion, reflection and planning based on the eLumen scores. This larger reflection should be done at least once every three years for each course).

As you know, I think it might confuse people if we change it too much, but your changes below don't seem too disruptive of what's there already. What do you think, Ann and John?

Karin

From: Martin Nash
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2016 2:38 PM
To: Karin Spirn; John Ruys; Ann Hight
Subject: SLO Language

Hi, folks. I'm thinking about our discussion yesterday and the language we might use when talking about or sending out email reminders about SLO work and Program Review work (and perhaps eventually include on the PRU form?). There seems to be confusion about the three-year cycle and what needs to be done every three years, and I think the language we use could help clarify that. The current language we're using as a campus (e.g., I've seen it in reminder emails from administrators) isn't accurate. We're saying "Don't forget to assess your courses" and "Which courses are you assessing?" but technically, we don't assess courses themselves, so I think what we mean might not be clear to others. In our reminders, documents, and discussions, rather than say something like "What courses will you assess this year?" maybe we can say "Which courses' SLO data will you analyze (or discuss) this year?" And rather than "All courses need to be assessed every three years," we can say "Each course's SLO data needs to be analyzed (or discussed) every three years" In turn, this might then help us in clarifying that course SLO assessment is what happens every semester with our assignments and the like (and ideally, those assessment results would be entered in eLumen every semester). We could even take it further and say something like "Each course's SLO data needs to be analyzed every three years **as part of a larger discussion about that course**" if we want to emphasize that SLO data is just part of the planning discussion? Maybe that's doing too much at this stage, though :)

Marty

