#58F The Future of Institutional Level SLOs
10:00 - 11:20am
HSLH 204
Flex Credit: 1.5 hours
Presenters: Nicole Lucy, Paul Wickline and Audrey Green
Strategic Goal: Institutional Effectiveness

Did you participate in the Institutional SLO process? If not, did you wonder what it was? It is time to look back at the results for the ISLO groups and determine what the future of ISLOs is. This session is part one of a two part program for the fall.

Learning Outcomes: To describe the results for the ISLO areas, and analyze the data and loop closing notes to determine effectiveness of current campus-wide assessment.

Participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tammy Bathke (FTF)</th>
<th>Dave Brill (FTF)</th>
<th>Peggy Rodner (ADJ)</th>
<th>Tina Rorick (FTF)</th>
<th>Sydney Shanks (FTF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary Sornberger (FTF)</td>
<td>Connie Tripp (FTF)</td>
<td>David Stevenson (FTF)</td>
<td>Rebecca Elkey (FTF)</td>
<td>Monette Bartel (ADJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Faudree (FTF)</td>
<td>Paul Wickline (FTF)</td>
<td>Daylene Meuschke (ADMIN)</td>
<td>Barry Gribbons (ADMIN)</td>
<td>Patti Haley (FTF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Anthony (FTF)</td>
<td>Saburo Matsumoto (FTF)</td>
<td>Jennifer Brezina (ADMIN)</td>
<td>Denee Pescarmona (ADMIN)</td>
<td>Audrey Green (ADMIN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview/Rationale:
The SLO coordinators (Rebecca Elkey, Nicole Faudree, and Paul Wickline) and Audrey Green, the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs, led discussion assessing the effectiveness of the ISLO process for each of the ten ISLO areas. The twenty participants present represented administration, faculty and staff. They discussed the process, quality of results, challenges of data collection, and possible approaches for the future. Workshop presenters used breakout groups to facilitate discussions and allow participants maximum input.
Summary of General Discussion

1. Most ISLO group chose to use mapping of course level SLO results rather than direct assessment to assess ISLOs. (See “ISLO Summary Report” available on the SLO website under “Reports.”) Most participants supported continued use of mapping in the future.

2. However, some expressed that direct assessment may provide a richer dialogue between faculty than mapping since faculty are directly involved in the process when using direct assessment. Attempts need to be made to increase participation in the “closing” of the assessment loop at the ISLO level if mapping is used. Recommendation made to make sure results are shared at the division meetings in the fall. Suggestion made to also post results and notes from ISLO FLEX sessions on intranet and send via email.

3. Observation made that quality of assessment results might be affected by online vs. on-ground mode of delivery.

Summary of Break-out Discussions

Group 1:

1. Confusion with mapping process for some concerned. How does mapping work? How is it used to assess PSLOs or ISLOs? This needs clarification and modeling.

2. Confusion with direct assessment process. Same as above.

3. Confusion from some concerning how or why process evolved through the IGETC requirements. Faculty probably share similar confusion.

4. Consensus was to continue with both mapping and direct assessment in the future.

5. Consensus among group that more conversation on the purpose and goal of ISLO assessment is needed with all faculty, administrators and staff.

Group 2:

1. Need to communicate how the data is collected to all concerned.

2. Need to clarify how the data is used (where is it posted, shared, etc.) and what is the outcome of the data collection?

3. How do we increase attendance at ISLO FLEX sessions?

4. Mapping seems easier, but faculty don’t know their data was mapped.
5. Suggestion made to consider a separate committee for ISLO

6. Consensus that group liked methods used but more time needed to invest in process.

Group 3:

1. Pleased with methods used but interested in using mapping next time.

2. Need to encourage more dialogue among faculty.

3. Distribute results at the Chairs retreat to share and discuss.

Group 4:

1. Make process simpler.

2. Make process more meaningful.

3. Answer “so what” more clearly for all concerned.

4. Is dialog meaningful after results received?

5. Can ARCC reporting requirement be used in some manner? How can we use existing requirements and better use of time?

6. Consider fewer ISOs and that are more overarching.

7. Make sure the college mission statement is aligned to ISLOs.

8. ISLOs don’t foster significant cross discipline conversation and collaboration as some ISLO areas are discipline specific.

9. What does all this say about student learning? Retention? Success?

Action Plan:

1. SLO coordinators will schedule presentations to HUMANITIES and FAPA divisions to share results and close the loop.

2. A second ISLO discussion will be held later in fall semester and/or spring flex week.

3. ISLO results for each area and summary report will be posted in the ISLO area of the SLO website by October 1, 2012. http://www.canyons.edu/committees/SLO/institutional/
4. Results of ISLO discussion will be shared with SLO Committee at fall meetings.

5. SLO coordinators and committee members will request time on opening day and/or Department Chair’s retreats to hold conversation with faculty concerning ISLO process.

6. SLO committee will explore an Ad-hoc research committee to investigate other institutions’ approach to ISLO assessment.

7. Consider revising SLO Manual to provide improved information about the purpose of ISLO assessment and an overview of the process.