



# Student Learning Outcomes Committee Meeting

May 2, 2016 / 2:30 pm / 2411A

## LPC Mission Statement

Las Positas College is an inclusive learning-centered institution providing educational opportunities and support for completion of students' transfer, degree, basic skills, career-technical, and retraining goals.

## LPC Planning Priorities

- ❖ Establish regular and ongoing processes to implement best practices to meet ACCJC standards.
- ❖ Provide necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance.
- ❖ Develop processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessment of SLOs and integrate assessment of SLOs into college processes.
- ❖ Expand tutoring services to meet demand and support student success in Basic Skills, CTE, and Transfer courses.

## Meeting Name

### Members Present (voting):

**Chair:** John Ruys

**Administrators:** Roanna Bennie  
Don Miller – Absent

**Faculty Reps:** Ann Hight  
Gina Webster - Absent  
Marty Nash  
Adeliza Flores  
Kimberly Tomlinson  
Katie Eagan

**Classified:** Scott Vigallon

### **ASLPC Rep:**

Gergana Gospodinova – Absent

### Members Present (non-voting):

**Director of Research and Planning:**  
Rajinder Samra

**Meeting Guests:** Karin Spirn

## DRAFT Meeting Minutes

### 1. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 2:37 pm

**John Ruys, Chair**  
**Items 1 – 6**

### 2. Review and Approval of Agenda

MOTION made to reorder the agenda.

MSC: A.Hight / A.Flores / APPROVED

### 3. Review and Approval of Minutes March 21, 2016

Minutes from March 21, 2016 were presented for approval.

MSC: K.Eagan / Marty Nash / APPROVED

### 4. SLO Committee Chair 2016-2017

The SLO Committee responsibilities will be co-chaired next year between John Ruys and Ann Hight.

An Accreditation Steering Committee has formed and both Ann and John will share responsibilities as members. Their focus will be recommendations #2 and #3, which are related to Student Learning Outcomes.

### 5. SLO Committee 2016-2017 Meetings

The SLO Committee has switched meeting days with the Curriculum and will be meeting on the Second and Fourth Monday's instead of the First and Third – beginning in the Fall.

### 6. Review of ACCJC Workshop (April 15, 2016)

Marty Nash passed around a list of definitions that were shared at the ACCJC Workshop held on April 15<sup>th</sup> that could be included in the SLO Handbook. The definitions could prove to be helpful understanding some of the terminology faculty might be struggling with when writing SLO's.

He also shared information regarding a sample Course Alignment Grid that was used as an example at the workshop. He brought it to the

attention of the English department, who have since used it and found it most helpful.

The Course Alignment Grid is a method that can be used that entails going through a course semester calendar and mapping every day's assignment or assessment to a specific outcome to come up with a "snapshot" of the course. Trends or holes will appear that will show where one outcome may not be covered enough, or if an assessment does not tie back to a specific outcome, reflecting on that particular one.

Marty explained that the English department had used this grid to map the curriculum outcomes for English 104. Each weekly assignment was mapped to an SLO and make sure they are being assessed. Not just on a weekly basis but whether that SLO was being fulfilled. The intension is not to make sure that the SLO is one that should necessarily be entered into eLumen, but that the SLO is being assessed. Was it produced, was it developed, and was it mastered. It is targeted more toward course design rather than thinking how the SLO's are recorded, but the areas that should be concentrated.

This grid is something that new faculty might buy into. At first it looks a bit complicated, but when the form is explained and understood it really is a useful tool. A brief discussion followed regarding the other examples of ways of assessing SLO's that were brought out during the ACCJC Workshop.

## **7. Core Competencies: Planning and Review**

**Rajinder Samra**

Rajinder Samra began by explaining that the Integrated Planning Committee (IPC) looks at a number of items in order to help with planning purposes with one of those being the Core Competencies. The visiting team was interested in knowing how the core competencies played a part with the planning, and Rajinder admitted that it was difficult.

As a result, Recommendation #3 from the team was related to core competencies in which they asked that the college use a set standard to measure our core competencies. The team recommended: *"That the instructional administrative units engage in a systematic ongoing assessment and analysis of course programs in general education outcomes in which the results are used for improvements and effective integrated planning processes."*

The conclusion that leads to that recommendation was: *"The College needs to establish standards and satisfactory performance for student achievement of instructional/general education and learning outcomes to allow the college to determine how well it is meeting the general education learning outcomes."*

As a result of that the IPC used a definition the College had already developed, which is that the institutional set standards are meeting or exceeding 95% of a rolling 5 year average. Using that definition and applying it to the data collected related to the core competencies the results were as follows:

**Las Positas College**  
**Institution-Set Standard for Core Competency Achievement Rates**  
 Data Used to Evaluate Academic Year 2014-15

Core Competencies	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	Institution-Set Standard	Met Standard?
<b>OVERALL</b>								
Total Assessments	18,409	17,485	30,691	21,695	22,061	25,077		
Num. Proficient	16,079	15,190	27,267	19,080	18,915	21,527		
<b>Pct. Proficient</b>	<b>87.3%</b>	<b>86.9%</b>	<b>88.8%</b>	<b>87.9%</b>	<b>85.7%</b>	<b>85.8%</b>	<b>82.8%</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Communication</b>								
Total Assessments	3,635	3,443	6,255	4,717	4,413	5,554		
Num. Proficient	3,164	2,872	5,565	4,106	3,602	4,810		
<b>Pct. Proficient</b>	<b>87.0%</b>	<b>83.4%</b>	<b>89.0%</b>	<b>87.0%</b>	<b>81.6%</b>	<b>86.6%</b>	<b>81.8%</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Critical Thinking</b>								
Total Assessments	12,406	10,534	17,426	13,743	13,148	15,515		
Num. Proficient	10,773	9,146	15,397	12,026	11,342	13,197		
<b>Pct. Proficient</b>	<b>86.8%</b>	<b>86.8%</b>	<b>88.4%</b>	<b>87.5%</b>	<b>86.3%</b>	<b>85.1%</b>	<b>82.5%</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Creativity and Aesthetics</b>								
Total Assessments	665	645	1,460	724	660	799		
Num. Proficient	625	589	1,356	687	595	766		
<b>Pct. Proficient</b>	<b>94.0%</b>	<b>91.3%</b>	<b>92.9%</b>	<b>94.9%</b>	<b>90.2%</b>	<b>95.9%</b>	<b>88.6%</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Respect and Responsibility</b>								
Total Assessments	1,269	1,862	2,328	1,191	2,172	1,501		
Num. Proficient	1,119	1,708	2,127	1,107	1,973	1,328		
<b>Pct. Proficient</b>	<b>88.2%</b>	<b>91.7%</b>	<b>91.4%</b>	<b>92.9%</b>	<b>90.8%</b>	<b>88.5%</b>	<b>86.2%</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Technology</b>								
Total Assessments	434	1,001	3,222	1,320	1,668	1,708		
Num. Proficient	398	875	2,822	1,154	1,403	1,426		
<b>Pct. Proficient</b>	<b>91.7%</b>	<b>87.4%</b>	<b>87.6%</b>	<b>87.4%</b>	<b>84.1%</b>	<b>83.5%</b>	<b>82.0%</b>	<b>Yes</b>

Notes: Proficiency includes assessment scores of "Mastery", "Above Average", and "Average".  
 The institution-set standard is meeting or exceeding 95% of a 5-year rolling average.  
 Core Competencies are also known as General Education Outcomes or Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs).

The conversation reverted to the implementation of eLumen 6.5 and how remapping will need to be done since the new eLumen will not take the former lower level mapping and subsets during the transition process. Communication has 3 subsets; Critical Thinking 5 subsets; Creativity and Aesthetics 5 subsets; Respect and Responsibility 5 subsets; and Technology 4 subsets. After review it was noted that some of the subsets listed were outdated, although engaging in a conversation at an institutional level did not seem possible at this time. A decision had to be made regarding the institutional set standards (Core Competencies) and the subsets listed beneath each before the college's transition into eLumen 6.5.

A **MOTION** to continue with the current Institutional Set Standards and each must meet or exceed 95% of a rolling 5 year average was made.

Discussion included the fact that the standards could be changed at a later date, if needed. That conversation and awareness of the subsets be conveyed institutional-wide at a Town Meeting or some other avenue to allow for more conversation.

**MSC: R.Bennie / M.Nash / APPROVED**

#### **8. SLO Workshops – May 5<sup>th</sup> (3:30 p.m.) & May 11<sup>th</sup> (2:30 p.m.)**

**John Ruys**

Two SLO Workshops were held, one on Tuesday, April 19<sup>th</sup> and the other on Monday, April 25<sup>th</sup>. The content covered questions faculty may have about program SLOs, whether faculty were revising their course SLOs, if faculty were unsure of the types of assessments to use, just wanting to vent about SLO's, or other aspects of SLO's not mentioned. The turnout was low and those who did attend were specific about the information they were seeking.

Two more workshops are scheduled to be held. One on May 5<sup>th</sup> and the other on April 25<sup>th</sup> in room 2410 (Teaching and Learning Center). Approval has also been granted for each division to have one faculty liaison who will help with accreditation and be eligible to receive 1 CAH.

#### **9. eLumen 6.5 Update**

**Scott Vigallon**

Scott Vigallon reported that spreadsheets from eLumen were to be received last Monday for us to place date information to assist with setting up the programs. As of today, none have been received.

#### **10. Accreditation Planning**

**John Ruys**

John Ruys and Ann Hight will be serving on the Accreditation Steering Committee during the Summer and Fall. The committee will be working on writing the response that will include what the college is doing, has done, and what else needs to be completed.

Elena Cole has been very vocal and worried about faculty using SLO's specifically for resource allocation that will lead to data being used as the driving force for resource allocations. Karin Sprin mentioned that same as program reviews, the request for resources can be at a pedagogical level not at an institutional level.

## 11. Spring SLO Survey

**John Ruys**

Last May, a survey was conducted to get an idea of where the college was with regard to SLO's. Approximately, 96 faculty participated in the last survey, 60 – full-time and 36 – part-time. John's idea is to send out another survey expanding the focus beyond course level assessment, which was what was concentrated on last time. This time around he suggested including program levels and opening it up to those who complete AUO's and ASO's. Based on suggestions and recommendations, there will be adjustments made to the survey that will hopefully draw out more information, and distribution will be to a larger group.

A brief discussion ensued over the implementation of the upgraded eLumen, and the fact that full and part-time faculty will now be expected to work on SLO's as per the faculty contract.

## 12. Administrative Update

**Roanna Bennie**

VP Roanna Bennie reported that meetings have taken place with the scheduler to help solve some issues related to moving data from Banner to eLumen. The transfers is not expected to be smooth, although other colleges have completed the transition, so it is doable.

## 13. Adjournment – 4:37 p.m.

## 14. Next Regular Meeting – May 16, 2016