1. Approval of Minutes from Nov 21, 2012

2. Updates:
   a. Addressing Accreditation Standard IIIa1c: Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes
   b. Share information with CPT committee – 5 minute Student Learning Report
   c. Pilot group for CurricUNET
   d. Faculty Manual
   e. How to reach out to Departments/Programs that are not proficient? –see attached list with edits.

3. Unfinished Business:
   a. ISLO Discussion & How to Improve ISLO Discussions
   b. Use of Blackboard for document storage

4. Open forum
Nicole-Administration of Justice
Paul-Art
Rebecca-Auto Technology
Anne-Computer Networking
OPEN-Construction Technology
Rebecca-Culinary Arts
Paul-Dance
Rebecca-Engineering
Jia Yi -English as a Second Language
Anne-Electronic Systems Technology
Tammy-Geology
Tammy-Geography
Paul-Graphic and Multimedia Design
Rachael-History
Paul-Interior Design
Rebecca-Math
Paul-Media Entertainment Arts
Ann-Manufacturing Technology
Nicole-Modern Languages
Paul-Music
Paul, Nicole, Rebecca-Non-Credit
Jia Yi -Philosophy
Anne-Photography
Rebecca -Physical Science
Rebecca -Physics
Nicole-Physical Education/Kinesiology
Anne-Political Science
Anne-Psychology
Leslie-Sign Language
OPEN-Surveying
OPEN-Water
SLO Committee Minutes  
December 5, 2012  
MENH-342, 1:30-2:30 pm


1. Approval of Minutes from November 21, 2012: Rebecca Eikey will make the following changes to the electronic document:
   - Daylene Meuschke requested adding Bob Maxwell’s name to the document
   - Jia-Yi Cheng-Levine requested adding her name as confirmed for Program Review

2. Updates:
   a. Addressing Accreditation Standard IIIa1c: Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes
      - Paul Wickline stated the Accreditation Standard IIIa1c is an issue of discussion with the Academic Senate
      - The committee was reminded that, while many colleges have been addressing this, COC has not yet addressed this point.
      - Nicole Faudree added that Paul, Nicole, Vince, and Adele met regarding passing a resolution in Spring 2013.
      - Paul Wickline pointed out the SLO Guiding Principle for SLO Assessment #10, paragraph 4 (page 24 of handbook), includes a significant passage as an overriding argument against the use of SLOs as a basis for faculty evaluations.
      - The SLO Committee will propose that the Senate come to a joint resolution with COCFA to address Addressing Accreditation Standard IIIa1c.
      - Nicole Faudree added it should be clear that SLOs should not be part of faculty evaluations. SLOs should be there to evaluate faculty learning.
      - Paul Wickline suggested the committee should define what this means for faculty.
      - Jia-Yi Cheng-Levine recommended faculty consider self-evaluation as a process for determining how the SLO process guides teaching and pedagogy.
      - Paul Wickline noted “as a component” of evaluation does not specifically mean it is part of the faculty evaluation.
      - Anne raised a question and concern: Part timers are not involved in how many passed or failed—the process is different for part-timers just doing assessment. Would like to consider how “degree of involvement” is worded or phrased. Nicole thinks most faculty will take this seriously.

   b. Share information with CPT committee – 5 minute Student Learning Report
      - Paul Wickline suggested providing regular 5-minute student learning reports on results at each meeting for any level (course, program, institution) and stated it is important to emphasize and show how to effectively report results to CPT.
      - Rebecca Eikey noted a report will go out to the CPT in spring 2013 providing the reorganization of the committee. Nicole added the committee needs more people to come represent the SLO Committee to CPT. Daylene stated the meetings are held on Mondays, but the meeting times can vary.

   c. Pilot group for CurricUNET
Paul Wickline provided information about recent updates to CurricUNET for the pilot group. One question added is the following: “Please describe the specific involvement of the faculty in the planning of the assessment (full time or part time).” The committee needs to decide if names should be listed or if responses should just include a broad statement.

Paul noted there is no place to upload documents and there is no storage house for documents.

“Means of Assessment” box: This can have specific wording added (e.g., Portfolio).

As part of the pilot test, Paul emphasized the committee needs to put a cap on this and start on Wednesday.

“Criteria for Success”: Examples could be provided, but Paul doesn’t want it to be overwhelming.

Jia-Yi Cheng-Levine requested clarification for reporting the “percentage of students expected to pass”: Does this mean “I was hoping 90%” of students will pass? Rebecca Eikey confirmed, yes, that is correct; this is just the planning phase.

“Means of Assessment: Results” section = no changes.

“Means of Assessment: Analysis of Results” section = the text box was changed and clarified. Paul suggested there should be a text box under “Other.”

Paul noted Analysis section is not planning. Please identify involvement of the faculty.

“Trends” was removed—something needs to be written in.

“Identification of Gaps” causes some confusion—we should be able to pull this out for a report.

“Identification of Trends”: This is program level (not course level). Paul suggested putting “Trends” in program level of the assessment.

“Action Plan” – need to get away from “no changes needed / recommended.” Added statement “outline the timeline for the implementation of the Action Plan” to show there is a plan to address the SLOs.

The next step is a “Reflection on the Action Plan” addressing whether or not there were improvements made, and this will close the loop.

Nicole reminded the group to follow Barry Gribbon’s advice never to tell CurricUNET you are through with SLO process.

Rebecca Eikey suggested the committee needs to mentor the department chairs, there needs to be a department chair elect, an interim department chair, and release time for both.

Paul discussed “Create a New Assessment” at the program level. This is the same as the course level. The question was raised whether or not the phrasing in “Mapping” should be changed, but Paul recommended keeping the wording as it is written. After some discussion, it was agreed to keep the wording and see evaluate what the feedback tells us in the pilot.

Paul stated he can make changes to the “Action Plan” screens, but felt the committee should move forward on this. It was noted this can also be produced in an Excel worksheet. Jia-Yi noted this is helpful information to pass on to future department chairs.

d. Faculty Manual

- No updates or news to report. To be done in Spring 2013.
- Need to add examples (e.g., Pitfalls).

e. How to reach out to Departments/Programs that are not proficient? –see attached list with edits.

- Rebecca Eikey provided “Sustaining Proficiency—Don’t Fall into the Pit!” handout to committee members to forward to department faculty.
• Rebecca Eikey sent email to faculty letting them know the SLO committee will be reaching out to departments needing support with their course and/or program SLOs.
• Ann, Rebecca, and Paul found faculty to be receptive and that most people were not aware of the items needing clarification. Leslie waiting to hear back from faculty.
• Rebecca Eikey made the recommendation to focus on listening to faculty to identify department needs in order to facilitate in helping the faculty improve SLOs.

3. Unfinished Business:
   a. ISLO Discussion & How to Improve ISLO Discussions
   b. Use of Blackboard for document storage

4. Open forum

Meeting adjourned at 2:30p.m.
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Attendees:

Rebecca Eikey, Nicole Faudree, Barry Gribbons, Rhonda Hyatt, Ann Lowe, Jia-Yi Chang-Levine, Daylene Meuschke, Paul Wickline

Update on department chair retreat. SLO coordinators provided list of courses and programs missing assessment to chairs as well as “Don’t Fall into the Pit” handout. SLO coordinators reminded department chairs to put information in the SLO tables if they have not been able to offer the course due to new creation date or lack of sections due to budget situation, etc.

Barry raised question about merging of CurricUNET and DATATEL information. Discussion about need to do so because it is a laborious process. Daylene clarified that we did not upload courses for faculty from Datatel to SLO tables. This was an option, but faculty did not request this.

Daylene raised issues with faculty and lack of uniformity in the way courses are entered into the SLO tables. However, this shouldn’t be an issue once CurricUNET Assessment Module is online.

SLO coordinators indicated that SLO tables in Program Review will no longer be used by Fall 2014. Pilot testing is occurring this semester (Fall 2013) and will continue next year with volunteer departments. By Fall 2014, SLO tables should no longer be available.

Question raised about how information will be placed into SLO tables to refer Daylene to CurricUNET Assessment Module. Statement made to include standard language to notify Daylene that information is in module. Pilot testers will be notified of this.

Paul provided brief update on CurricUNET/Governet work. Meeting held earlier on this date and regular meetings will be held every 2 weeks. Bugs encountered which Governet is working on.

Discussion held of accuracy of the list Daylene provided of courses without assessment. Ann noted that new courses that haven’t actually been made ACTIVE were picked up in Daylene’s report. Seems information is coming from either CurricUNET or MIS. Daylene will look into and report. Concerns about accuracy of the report. Issues noted with SOLAR and PLUMBING. Suggestion made that we need “last time offered” available for Daylene to note when pulling information for report. Daylene indicated we will add this.

Barry asked if every active course is currently in CurricUNET. Ann wasn’t certain, noting a Nursing course that wasn’t showing up. Need to check with Patrick on this problem to see if other issues exist. Barry suggested reconciliation of this. Need to make certain every course in Datatel is in Curricunet with the same mnemonic.

Rebecca noted that this process of looking through list has been very useful to identify and resolve issues.
Jennifer noted that some faculty are using an Administrative Program Review and aren’t certain where to indicate COURSE SLO data. Daylene suggested they place them in the AUO box and then add a NOTE indicating these are SLO results.

Barry asked if they shouldn’t be doing an ACADEMIC P.R. instead.

Rebecca asked about the lack of a program review or assessment of the Liberal Studies degree. This is an ongoing issue. She mentioned that she discussed this with Omar at the division meeting. Divisions might take ownership of these programs in their division Administrative Program Review? Jennifer noted that Humanities courses have also not been completed.

Barry noted that if there is a course it should be in the ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW. If NOT, complete an ADMINISTRATIVE program review. If there is a course, should be noted in the ACADEMIC program review due to success/retention rates, etc. It was noted that this should be a discussion at future PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE meetings. Paul will place on agenda for the March 22nd meeting.

Question raised about degrees without assessment occurring.

DSPS, GEN STU, LEARNING RESOURCES, LIBRARY, TLC are all areas with courses but might be completing the administrative program review. Need to follow up and look into this.

Rhonda noted that Health 100 is another question. Homeless. Does it live in Health Science program review of PE? Health won’t take it. Needs to live in PE/Kinesiology.

Ann raised question about new courses coming from programs that have not assessed current courses. This is a cause for concern since these programs aren’t meeting needs of current courses and programs through proper assessment of SLOs and demonstration of needs based on SLO results. Should restrictions be placed on these departments requiring them to reach proficiency before adding new courses? Curriculum committee is impacted by this. Issues should be addressed.

Question asked, does Curriculum Committee need to include this on the form for requesting new courses: Proof that current courses have been assessed? Note made to include this as a discussion item on agenda for next SLO meeting and to include it as a discussion item at future Curriculum committee meeting.

Question raised about concern of developing new programs without consideration of the consequences and impact on available resources, budget, etc.

Daylene asked about “ongoing assessment.” Paul reminded that ACCJC does not CURRENTLY indicate a requirement for how often assessment must occur. SLO coordinators recommend at least every 2 years. Curriculum would likely need to monitor this during the 5 year revision process.

Rebecca reminded the SLO committee that they should receive FLEX credit for giving SLO training.

Update on the list of departments SLO committee members are working with. Everyone has reached out to all those on the list, often through repeated contacts or individualized training.
Rebecca will be meeting with Culinary arts next week.

Recommendation made to NOT mark anyone off the list and to wait and see what the results are after Daylene pulls information.

Jennifer suggested that the SLO committee members looking at SLO results provide email feedback to deans with the guidance provided to departments.

Note made that the committee should look at PROGRAM REVIEWS after April 15th to see updates made/problems encountered, etc.

Barry would like to reopen Program Review quickly, but early May. Contingent on what Program Review Committee provides in terms of changes.

Proposal made to expand CurricUNET Assessment Module testing fall 2013.

Reminder made that we need to pursue MY CANYONS SLO collection. Reminder made to check ACADEMIC SENATE meeting minutes and Survey results to identify interest.

Review of additional items on workplan. Faculty manual needs updating. Table for next meeting. Note made that we still have 2 faculty who have not received SLO manual.

Need to add appendices to SLO MANUAL with ISLO and SLO resources. Rubric examples from COMS, THEATRE, ENGLISH, etc. should be placed in the manual. Add the PITFALLS document. Add TRAINING SESSIONS PPT’s into the document in appendices.

Suggestion made that someone might take the SLO MANUAL as an independent flex activity.

Note made that we need to identify who is and isn’t on the committee. May need outreach. Do we have reps from every division? (NOTE – we DO NOT have representation from LEARNING RESOURCES)

How do we get additional faculty involved in SLO COMMITTEE? Reaching out individually seems to be consensus.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30pm.
SLO COMMITTEE MINUTES
4-10-13

Attendees: Necia Gelker, Daylene Meuschke, Nicole Faudree, Anne Marenco, Barry Gribbons, Rhonda Hyatt, Jennifer Brezina, Rebecca Eikey, Tammy Bathke

Minutes of 3-27-13 meeting: reviewed and amended for accuracy. They were approved as amended.

Updates
1st agenda item:
   A. How to reach out to Departments/Programs that are not proficient?
      i. See attached list with edits
      ii. Time to update status of each – April 15 Program Review opens up to edits

Rebecca asked Daylene for update on report she just sent out to ACCJC. Daylene reported approximately 95% of courses have evidence of ongoing assessment. Program SLOs have shown increase as well. Significant growth over past 1-2 years in both course and program assessment. Nicole recalls it is 83%. Marked improvement indicates hard work of SLO Committee.

List update: Question raised by Anne Marenco about receiving an updated list of departments needing assistance/improvement on program review data. There is an edited list of depts. needing assistance. Daylene reported that there are programs from the Year 2 update that still need evidence of ongoing assessment. Goal to gauge which programs still need help. Two lists exist. One developed by Paul and Nicole last year indicating need for improvement on SLO tables. Other list developed by Daylene’s office. Discussion ensued about the overlap between these 2 lists and the need for updated lists.

Action: Rebecca requested that the people who have been working with their assigned departments who were deficient, per list on Agenda, could look at the departments again to see if the suggested improvements were made. If improvements made, department names could be removed from list. At next meeting individuals are to report back on their findings. Example of classes that need help: Physical Ed, LM Tech, MEA, noncredit-Diane Stewart completes this.

Discussion about “orphan” programs/courses without ongoing assessments. Decision needed about which Division these to be housed in. Concern about who will follow up on these courses. J. Brezina suggested going to Academic Senate and suggesting that eliminating the system of orphaned classes and always assigning courses /programs to a given dept.
**Action:** Rebecca to ask Edel to put Orphan Courses/Program on Senate agenda as a Discussion Item.

**Action:** List needed of “orphan” courses and programs. Daylene to obtain this list for us. Ex: plumbing, General studies currently in DSP&S, Humanities 101. Anne brought up an example of a class she will teach soon, Interdisc 1A, which is only to be taught once. Another dilemma brought up about depts. without a FT employee.

**Action:** Daylene to provide a list of depts. without a FT employee.

Question raised about stand-alone courses and interdisciplinary degrees: who does their program review? **Action:** Nicole to put this topic on the Program Review committee agenda. Ex: Patty Robinson does the one for SHARP.

2nd agenda item:

B. Addressing Accreditation Standard IIIa1c: Faculty and others directly responsible for student progress toward achieving stated student learning outcomes have, as a component of their evaluation, effectiveness in producing those learning outcomes

i) Resolution to be presented at Academic Senate for discussion – reference to attached updated draft

Discussion about rewording the resolution. Concern about use of SLOs as part of faculty evaluation. This committee prefers to use it as a self-reflective process and not to be used in a punitive manner, more as a positive.

**Action:** Edits made and noted, attached at end of minutes.

3rd agenda item:

C. New Business

i. Options to assess Program level SLOs besides mapping and capstone methods. What other way is there to do assessment?

How can we help faculty on the problem list to do program level assessment? We have offered 2 methods: mapping and capstone. What other ways are there to do program level assessment?

Nicole stated she would have to double check but believes History does direct assessments. They identify certain questions in certain courses that map only to their program and they assess these. Barry stated there are no mechanisms we are using now but went on to describe some things other depts. do. Ex: powerful data provided by some
programs such as Nursing using NCLEX as capstone and surveys from employers rating graduates skills. Employment and wage data is also useful outcome data for occupational areas, which we don’t use very much now but plan to do more soon.

Problem is that some students who qualify for a degree or certificate are not applying for it. Barry stated we will begin notifying them to apply for this more systematically.

Jennifer Brezina stated what the English department has done in the past is to ask A&R for a list of students who are graduating in the upcoming semester and this list would go to the literature courses with those students in their classes. A list of 100’s of students gets boiled down to about 20 students and SLOs assessed on these students. Ex: Math and English do not have a capstone. Difficulty: how is program SLO measured?

Anne Marenco described their method of getting 2 lists from MIS. One lists everyone who has declared sociology as a major. Then instructors are asked if these students can pass the given SLOs, second list is the graduating students and then the faculty are asked if these students can meet a given SLO.

Transfer success: CSU has resistance to this process, Cal pass Plus. Hope to reopen this.

Problem: many students take a few classes and never graduate.

ii. Do students have to file for their certificates? Yes
COC Academic Senate Resolution on Student Learning Outcomes

WHEREAS, College of the Canyons has focused its instruction and assessment on course SLOs, course objectives and criteria for measurement of learning,

WHEREAS, our goal is to work in partnership with our students as they develop the skills necessary for success first in our courses, and then, for honing these skills as they transfer to other colleges, programs, and/or the workplace as successful lifelong learners,

WHEREAS, at College of the Canyons, assessment of SLOs shall be used to analyze, and thereby improve, student learning through informed decision making and planning,

WHEREAS, assessment results should be used for and limited to the following roles in the institution:

1. To improve services, feedback, guidance, and mentoring to students in order to help them better plan and execute their educational programs

2. To help design and improve programs and courses to better promote student learning and success

3. To identify shared definitions and measurable benchmarks for evaluating student abilities to more coherently and effectively promote student learning.

RESOLVED, that the College of the Canyons Academic Senate and COCFA assert that student learning outcomes and data related thereto should be used in a non-punitive manner in individual faculty evaluations to ensure the integrity of the SLO process;

RESOLVED, that the College of the Canyons Academic Senate and COCFA discourage the use of student learning outcomes in any manner that would undermine either local bargaining authority or the academic freedom or privacy of students or individual faculty members.

4-10-2013
Minutes of the May 8, 2013 SLO Committee meeting reviewed, amended, and approved for accuracy. One correction made to first paragraph: “Significant growth over past 1-2 years in both course and program assessment is **83%**.”

Updates and reports of findings for each committee member’s assigned departments:

A. Anne Marenco forwarded message that her departments made improvements and are able to be removed from the list.

B. Rebecca Eikey reported Culinary Arts and Auto Tech are good. Geology, Math, and Engineering are in process.

C. Nicole Faudree reported all of her departments can be removed from the list except Administration of Justice and P.E. Nicole will also reach out to Administration of Justice and make suggestions for making data visible.

D. Jennifer Brezina reported Claudia fixed tables, Philosophy is making progress, and none are copying and pasting anymore. Jennifer deferred to the committee to decide if her departments should be removed from the list.

E. Paul Wickline suggested keeping the following departments on the list: Dance, Art, and M.E.A. Paul reported the following departments can be removed from the list: Graphic & Multimedia, Music, and Interior Design.

F. Tammy Bathke reported Physics can be removed from the list.

**Action:** Rebecca Eikey recommended postponing Non-Credit for discussion at a later date.

Discussion: During the review of the department list, Nicole Faudree raised the question regarding how much help the SLO committee should offer to a department when it is functioning and it will move onto CurricUNET (completed cycle). We can give recommendations, but how much should we give?

**III. Orphan Lists:** Rebecca Eikey reported going to the Senate tomorrow and needs to see if a procedure can be put into place to categorize orphan courses. Jennifer Brezina stated we do have a program discontinuance process put in place by Academic Senate. The committee brought up several issues needing clarification:

A. Is there a misclassification of classifying Landscape as Horticulture? (Ann Lowe, Nicole)

B. Are there adequate labor market data to see if there a need for the Horticulture program? (Barry)

C. Who should perform review? Faculty, Dean? (Barry, Jennifer, Ann Lowe)

D. Can you assess SLO content without being a subject matter expert and are we including part-time faculty? How do we address content expertise and management analysis? (Ann Lowe, Jennifer)

E. Should we consider a policy when a program is under 18 units? (Ann Lowe)
F. If a course or program hasn’t been assessed and revised in a number of years, and the loop closed, should we implement a policy that the course or program will be archived? (Barry, Ann Lowe)

Action: Rebecca Eikey stated this will be an ongoing discussion. Ann Lowe stated she will move this forward and will talk about procedures at the upcoming retreat.

IV: SLO Newsletter needs updates. Action: Suggestions for updates include the following:

A. Data and statistics updates (e.g., ACCJC report from March and CurricUNET assessment module update) (Daylene)
B. Best Practices statement (Paul)
C. Proficiency Rubric – SQCI (Paul)

V. Updates needed for SLO Faculty Manual.
Action: Paul suggested pulling pieces together for next meeting of what we can offer to each section of the manual. Faculty signed up for the following sections:

Introduction ........................................................... (Nicole)
Developing Student Learning Outcomes ........................................2 (Nicole/Ann)
Assessing Student Learning Outcomes ........................................3 (Tammam)
Developing Assessment Plans for Courses ..................................4 (Barry)
Developing Assessment Plans for Department-Level Programs ....6 (Barry)
Developing and Assessing SLOs for Institutional-Level Programs.....8 (tbd)
Scheduling Assessments .....................................................9 (Ann)
Collecting/Analyzing Data and Fostering Dialogue......................10 (Paul)
Documenting Progress ......................................................12 (Barry)
Glossary (from ASCCC) .....................................................13

Appendices:
Appendix A: Map: Interactions of Courses and Programs................19 (no updates)
Appendix B: SLO Rubric from ACCJC.....................................21 (Nicole)
Appendix C: Choosing an Assessment Tool ...............................22 (Barry)
Appendix D: Assessment Plan form.......................................23 (Paul/Rebecca)
Sample Assessment Plan ...................................................23 (Paul/Rebecca)

Appendix E: Developing a Rubric ...........................................24 (Paul/Nicole)
Appendix F: Non-instructional Program Assessment ......................26 (Barry/Daylene)
Appendix G: Bloom’s Taxonomy/Critical Thinking Verbs ..............35 (Barry)
Appendix H: Program Assessment ..........................................37 (Rebecca)
Appendix I: Associate Degree Requirements (2009-2010) ............40 (Rhonda)
Appendix J: Assessment Schedule Form ..................................42 (Paul)
Sample Assessment Schedule ..............................................43

Action: For Appendix E, if anyone has sample rubrics, Paul requested sending samples electronically.