Student Learning Outcomes Committee Meeting

September 21, 2015 |*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
Marty Nash
Adeliza Flores
Kimberly Tomlinson - Absent
Katie Eagan

Classified:

Scott Vigallon

Members Present (non-voting):

Director of Research and Planning:

Rajinder Samra - Absent

Meeting Guests:

Karin Spirn

APPROVED Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order — **John Ruys, Chair**

Meeting called to order at 2:30 pm

2. Review and Approval of Agenda — **John Ruys**

MOTION made to reorder the agenda.
MSC: Vigallon / A.Hight / APPROVED

3. Review and Approval of Minutes August 31, 2015 — **John Ruys**

Minutes from August 31, 2015 were presented for approval.
MOTION made to accept the minutes as written.
MSC: A.Hight / R.Bennie / 1 – Abstention / APPROVED

4. Review Committee Charge — **Group**

At the previous SLO meeting the committee had begun discussing its Charge. The members were asked to review the 9 Principles of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning, and LPC's Assessment Philosophy, and decide if some of what was written in these documents should be added. Currently, the Charge of the committee is to elicit broad perspectives and advice regarding learning goals for students, faculty, administrators, and staff. Some of the wording within the Charge depicts that the SLO committee establishes policies and procedures concerning the institutionalization of SLO's and assessment at the college, and works with the Curriculum Committee, Program Review, and Staff Development in doing so.

Today's discussion centered on rewording the Charge to clarify how much involvement the Committee directly or indirectly actually has, and incorporating that language.

A draft of the Charge with the suggested changes will be sent out to all members for one more review. If no other changes are proposed, the documents will be presented to the Academic Senate for approval at their regular meeting.

5. Role of SLO Committee in Evaluating SLO's — **John Ruys**

The committee has been discussing how SLO's should be written with regard to content. Discussion began by using an example of a SLO from another college that was brought up by another committee member. It dealt with how students should handle microscopes. This particular SLO

was written in a broad manner, and did not take into consideration the fact that microscopes are rather complex and have many facets. Depending on the discipline/program, SLO's were found to be vague, or just the opposite. The committee's role with evaluating SLO's needs to be established.

John Ruys had a concern with the manner of how to give advice on how to write an SLO to faculty in other disciplines, when the members of the SLO committee only know what type of outcomes they are looking for in their own courses or programs? Faculty in their own areas know more of what needs to be assessed much more than anyone outside their discipline.

In a survey conducted last semester most of the faculty felt that a SLO and measurable objectives were considered similar. Also, faculty considered objectives to be small and discrete, and outcomes as broader basic skills. Although the two description were (objectives being broader and outcomes small and discrete) known to also switch. With changes in the focus, definition, and other areas, staying on a path that keeps the college moving would be best. It would seem logical to stay with what the State Academic Senate is proposing since the chance of constant shifting would not be as high. The committee is going to continue to work on suggestions, and what exactly those will cover.

At the Curriculum Institute held earlier this year it was mentioned that Blooms Taxonomy did not have to be used for SLO's or objectives. The SLO committee's advice should be constructive.

Guidelines will be drafted, and the faculty will be informed that they can contact any one of the members of the SLO committee, if assistance is needed.

6. Frequency of Assessment Cycle **John Ruys**

John Ruys reported that a survey conducted in Fall 2014 indicated that 86% of the faculty preferred the 3 year cycle. The SLO committee previously discussed the possibility of changing the frequency of the assessment cycle. The committee members were asked to gather feedback from their division faculty as to how often course assessments should be done. Responses varied, as indicated below:

- The Business discipline assesses each year and felt the process should be ongoing. Waiting would be less authentic. They felt strongly about moving away from continuous assessments, although they know that can still continue with yearly ongoing assessments.
- Others found it better to assess all courses in one year and not the next.
- Last year it was discussed in the division, and faculty were fine with a 3 year cycle. Not sure if there was a strong indication of whether 2 years was favored over 3.
- Some of the STEMPS division faculty suggested every 5 years because it was felt that the data was not valid or meaningful. The information received by the Institutional Research Office and used for program review was considered more accurate and provided faculty with more data.
- Faculty were not sure why the cycle needed to be tied to curriculum, and those who still do not have SLO's on course outlines on record were leaning more towards a 3 year cycle rather 2.

The timing of writing program reviews and assessing courses need to be given some consideration. Currently, program review updates written two years in a row, and a complete program review self-study

report is written every third year. It would make sense to assess SLO's when the three year report is written, or have assessed SLO's once during that time. It would also be less difficult when reading program reviews to know when the measurable outcomes were assessed, which is not the case then some courses are assessed one year and others the next – during the two years that program updates are written. Also, while reading program reviews a better sense of where the program is in the cycle, and what students are learning. Improvements to a course/program might be easier to recognize especially those that do not change much from year to year. A more complete picture is given when all assessments are done at once.

Discussion ensued with a 5 year cycle not providing meaningful data; whereas, a 3 years did. It also seemed logical to have an update two years in a row and a complete self-study program review every third year.

The recommendation was to time the SLO's assessments and gather data so that the loop is closed before the self-study program review is written. The Program Review committee is waiting until after the accreditation, and based on the recommendations, decide whether a self-study program review will be due next year (2016) or the year after (2017). Faculty will be advised of their decision by the end of this semester. Also recommended is that every course and section be assessed within 3 years, using the same SLO.

7. Flex Day: Recap/Next Steps **John Ruys**

A total of 46 faculty attended the SLO workshop on Flex Day, September 15. Some faculty came prepared to complete, update, and begin writing their SLO's. Some used the definitions from ACCJC, others from CID course outlines. In all, it turned out to be a very good and helpful workshop.

The next step will be to have a survey go out to faculty who attended the workshop asking for their feedback. The survey will be similar to the one sent in Fall 2014, and contain questions specifically related to the resent session held.

Next Flex Day in scheduled for February 16, 2016.

8. Accreditation **Roanna Bennie/John Ruys**

Information has been received from the accreditation team that includes, but not limited to the following:

- Hard copies of 25 specific syllabi;
- Requesting meetings with members of the SLO committee (Tuesday (October 6) or Wednesday (October 7);
- Hard copies of all recently completed assessments and analysis of data;
- Hard copies of previously completed program reviews, and one set prior to the current program review;
- Hard copies of the most recently completed program planning updates written by disciplines, and one set written prior to the current program planning update, plus the dean's summaries.

9. Frequency of Updating List of SLO's and Percentage Assessed **John Ruys**

Each month a report is generated using a list consisting of all courses that have been offered within the last two years. The report is ongoing and lists courses that have updated their SLO's and the percentage assessed, and also courses that still need to do both. A brief discussion ensued as to whether it was necessary to run a report each month just to present, and consider reporting only once at the end of the semester. A comment was made suggesting running a mid-semester report to make faculty aware of courses still needing to be assessed, and giving them time to complete the process before the end of the same semester.

The committee will wait until after the Senate has been presented for approval, this committee's recommendation of assessing SLO's every 3 years.

10. Plan to Review Core Competencies – Tabled until next meeting. **John Ruys**

11. Administrative Update – Agenda Item 8 (Accreditation).

12. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 4:27 pm

12. Next Regular Meeting – October 5, 2015