SLO Committee Minutes
September 2, 2009

Attendees: Jennifer Brezina, Jia-Yi Cheng-Levine, Fred D’Astoli, John Garcia, Audrey Green, Barry Gribbons, Rhonda Hyatt, Daylene Meuschke, Matt Teachout

1. Introductions were made

2. The ACCJC Rubric for SLOs was distributed. The group reviewed the document and discussed where COC seems to fit on the rubric. There was agreement that while different departments were at different levels with SLO writing and course assessment, most departments were still in the Awareness or Development stage of program SLOs and that Institutional level SLOs were incomplete.

   The group also agreed that issues with SLOs often come into focus as assessment plans are being made (Is the SLO too broad? Too specific? Not easily measurable?). It would be helpful for people to plan assessments as SLOs are developed rather than later. There are also many questions among faculty as to how to best plan assessment efforts and include adjuncts in the process.

3. The group discussed the following projects for 2009-2010
   a. ISLOs for non-transfer programs
   b. Assessment plan for COC
   c. Forms/Database for assessment data
   d. Update of SLO Manual

   All agreed that increased training for faculty, especially where assessment is concerned, should be a priority for this year as well.

   A suggestion was made to work on the update of the manual as a high priority, but there was also agreement that short (1-2 page) handouts for faculty trainings may be more helpful, at least initially. The handouts could then become the basis for additions to the handbook.

   The group also agreed that a template for department assessment planning would be very helpful for department chairs. Jennifer will be working on a template like this for the fall SLO workshops and will send a draft out to the committee for comments later this month.
4. SLO Assessment Planning Workshops for departments will be held on Friday mornings in October and November from 9:30-11:30 in PDR-2. Flex credit will be available for both full-time and part-time faculty. Jennifer will be contacting department chairs to encourage departments to sign up for a workshop date.

5. The next meeting will be Wednesday, October 14 from 2-3pm (room TBA).

   In the meantime, committee members are encouraged to email Jennifer with examples of successful SLO assessments (both from COC and other colleges) to include in training materials for the fall workshops and possible inclusion in the revision of the SLO manual.

   Barry will also work on a draft of a white paper/SLO Brief on assessment which will be discussed at the next meeting.
SLO Committee Minutes
October 14, 2009

Attendees: Leslie Bretall, Jennifer Brezina, Bob Brode, Barry Gribbons, Lee Hilliard Rhonda Hyatt Mike Joslin, Kevin Kistler, Melanie Lipman, Nicole Lucy, Daylene Meuschke, Matt Teachout

1. The minutes from the September meeting were approved.

2. There was discussion regarding how the SLO committee fits into the college organizational structure. Currently, the committee is an operational team in the Institutional Development and Technology area.

   Other options that were discussed include the committee becoming a collegial consultation committee or becoming a subcommittee of the Academic Senate. Faculty involvement and input was seen as a primary goal for both of these possible changes.

   As the discussion continued, there was an interest in creating a formal tie to the Senate, but perhaps not as a subcommittee, since this committee is broader than instructional SLOs and also includes AUOs. Jennifer will discuss the possibilities further with Michael Dermody and will report back the group at the next meeting.

3. Jennifer updated the group about the fall workshops and distributed handouts that are being used at the workshops. So far, there has been a lot of enthusiasm, but there were also many questions. Some common questions include: how often to assess courses, how to assess programs, how/when to assess courses not offered regularly and when to archive courses that are not being regularly offered.

   There was a suggestion to research how many courses are not regularly offered (within a 2-3 year cycle) to see how significant of a problem this is. Barry will put in a work order for a report and will share this with the group.

   Another topic of discussion was how to make minor changes to SLOs because some departments are discovering as they start to assess that the SLOs are not what they should be. It may be beneficial to link an assessment method/tool with the SLOs as courses go through the revision process. Jennifer will discuss this with Audrey and Ann.
4. The committee discussed a workplan for the group that includes timelines for various projects for the year and people who are interested in working on each project (draft attached).

5. A new meeting time for the committee will be discussed through email.
SLO Committee Minutes
November 18, 2009

Attendees: Leslie Bretall, Jennifer Brezina, Jia-Yi Cheng-Levine, John Garcia, Necia Gelker, Rhonda Hyatt, Mike Joslin, Ann Lowe, Rebecca Shepherd, Matt Teachout

1. The minutes from the October meeting were approved.

2. A summary of SLO-related FLEX activities planned for Spring 2010 was distributed (see attachment). The 2/1 FLEX session will include several department chairs and others that are involved in the SLO process for their departments. Ann and Nicole will co-present with Jennifer for the 2/2 session. Others who are interested in co-presenting at either session during FLEX week should contact Jennifer.

The focus for spring semester will be program SLOs and ISLOs. Early in the semester, perhaps at the first department chair meeting of the semester, a group of faculty from all divisions will revisit the GE and CTE ISLOs that were developed and try to draft a common set of outcomes that can be used for ISLOs that will cover all COC students, regardless of their program. Lifelong Learning and Basic Skills SLOs will also be drafted. The drafts will then be discussed by the SLO Committee, divisions, and eventually the Senate with the goal of coming to a final, approved version during the spring semester.

Jennifer will conduct trainings on writing and assessing program SLOs in March and April. Departments will be encouraged to align their program SLOs with the draft ISLOs and GE, CTE, Lifelong Learning, or Basic Skills program SLOs as they are writing or revising them.

The committee discussed that a focus for fall 2010 might center on mapping courses to program and ISLOs. This will be especially important if the college is able to purchase software to aid in the compilation of course assessment data for program SLO and ISLO assessment. Faculty-led Opening Day sessions were discussed as a possible time and method for beginning the mapping process.

3. Jennifer distributed a summary of the data Barry provided regarding course offerings (see attachment). The majority of classes are offered regularly (offered at least once between Fall 2008 and the present). Of the 1510 active courses (ISAs excluded), 1059 have been offered since Fall 2008. There were small numbers of courses (169 and 30, respectively) that have never been offered or have not been offered since Fall 2005.
Some of the courses that have not been offered yet are going through the articulation process, which is why they are not yet offered. Other classes are part of programs that are still being developed and have not yet been offered. The committee discussed looking more closely at courses not offered in the last three years and working with the Curriculum Committee to try to reduce the number of courses in the catalog that are not offered regularly. According to college policy, all courses in the catalog should be offered at least once every four years.

The process for un-archiving a course was discussed. Once a course is archived, it needs to go through the curriculum committee approval process and come back into the catalog before being offered. If it is brought back within the first year or two, revisions will likely be minimal and it probably will not need to be re-articulated. If it has been archived for three or more years, it will need a full revision (as it would have even if it had stayed in the catalog), and it will need to be re-articulated.

One concern expressed during the meeting related to more specialized courses that departments were encouraged to develop in better budget times. The courses were developed, but with current scheduling constraints, the college is asking departments to offer more introductory level classes and to reduce the number of specialized classes in the schedule, which is leading to many courses not being offered. This is a subject to continue to discuss with the Instruction Office.

Another issue discussed was the length of time needed for course revisions. Much of the Curriculum Committee’s time this semester has focused on new courses needed for grants that the college has received. Because of this, there has been little time for non-grant funded new courses or for regular course revisions to be considered. This presents a problem for departments who need to revise SLOs in order to begin assessment. The committee discussed the need for additional resources for the Curriculum Committee in order for that committee to be able to complete its part in the SLO process.

4. The Workplan for 2009-2010 that was created at the October meeting was distributed for review (see attachment). Committee members are encouraged to email Jennifer if they would like to work on any of the projects or have suggestions for changes or additions.

5. The group discussed the possibility of changing the SLO Committee meeting time if it continues to conflict with Coffee on the Side in the spring. After the meeting, it was
determined that Coffee on the Side will be moving to Tuesdays in the spring, so there is no longer a conflict. The SLO Committee will meet from 2:30-3:30 on 2/17, 3/17, 4/21, and 5/19 in LIBR-206.

6. The group was unanimous in its decision to become a subcommittee of the Academic Senate. The committee will continue to address both SLOs and AUOs and have faculty and administrative co-chairs. The committee will continue to encourage representation on the committee from each academic division as well as from students, administrators, and classified staff. The SLO Committee will have an official liaison to the Senate who will give monthly updates at Senate meetings. Major policy decisions will be endorsed by the Senate, but procedural issues will be delegated to the committee to handle.

In order to complete the process, Jennifer will prepare a draft report of the committee’s fall activities and planned activities for spring and send it out to the committee for comments/revisions. Once the committee finalizes the report, it will be forwarded to the Senate. The Senate will discuss the report at an early spring meeting and, as they accept the report, will officially “adopt” the SLO Committee.

7. The committee drafted a mission statement, using the current committee description on the college’s Intranet site as a starting point.

Current committee description on intranet: The SLO Committee provides information, guidance and support to all college faculty and staff involved in the development and assessment of student learning outcomes and administrative unit outcomes.

Revised Mission Statement: The SLO Committee, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, provides leadership, information, guidance and support to all college faculty and staff involved in the development and assessment of student learning outcomes and administrative unit outcomes. The Committee is co-chaired by the Faculty SLO Coordinator and the Vice President, Institutional Development, Technology, and Online Services, and it seeks representation from all academic divisions and other constituent groups.

Jennifer will work on gathering copies of other colleges’ Strategic Plans for SLOs for the committee to discuss in February. One goal for spring semester will be to have the Senate adopt a Strategic Plan for SLO assessment that will help the college meet the Fall 2012 accreditation timeline.
The SLO Committee, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, provides leadership, information, guidance and support to all college faculty and staff involved in the development and assessment of student learning outcomes and administrative unit outcomes. The Committee is co-chaired by the Faculty SLO Coordinator and the Vice President, Institutional Development, Technology, and Online Services, and it seeks representation from all academic divisions and other constituent groups.

In attendance: Leslie Bretall, Jennifer Brezina, Jia-Yi Cheng-Levine, Vince Devlahovich, Daylene Meuschke, Necia Gelker, Barry Gribbons, Rhonda Hyatt, Mike Joslin, Kevin Kistler, Ann Lowe, Anne Marenco, Rebecca Shepherd, and Matt Teachout

1. The minutes from the November 2009 meeting were approved.

2. Handouts were given to committee members listing dates and times for upcoming SLO-related FLEX sessions as well as the dates/times/locations of the upcoming SLO software demos. Committee members were encouraged to share this information at Division Meetings.

   It was also announced that a new field for program SLOs has been added to the forms for degrees and certificates in WebCMS. As degrees and certificates come before the Curriculum Committee, faculty will be asked to include a program SLO for approval. This will then become the official SLO for the program, just as the SLOs for courses are in course outlines. There will be FLEX sessions on writing and assessing program SLOs in March and April.

3. Since the deadline for submitting ideas for fall FLEX presentations is in late February, the committee discussed possible topics for SLO-related FLEX sessions. The group generated the following ideas:
   a. Avoiding SLO Anxiety
   b. SLOs, Objectives, and Course Content: How the Different Parts of the Course Outline Work Together
   c. Assessment Issues
   d. Tools for Managing SLO Assessment Information
   e. Closing the Loop: How to Discuss Assessment Results With Your Department and Make Meaningful Changes
   f. A Working Session on ISLOs
Jennifer will create an online survey and send the link out to the group for voting to determine which two sessions will be presented FLEX week and which will be presented later in Fall 2010.

4. Leslie and Mike presented an update on the revision of the SLO manual. They have gathered the electronic versions of the existing materials and are currently working on editing them for consistency. Once they are ready, they will send a draft to the committee for comments.

The group also discussed next steps after the manual is ready. The goal is to produce a binder for each department chair with the current materials in them and space for adding additional materials as they are produced. In addition to being distributed in binders to department chairs, the materials will be added to the SLO committee website, which is currently in need of revision. As part of that process, the committee will work to develop a common “look and feel” for all SLO materials to lend consistency and a quick recognition-factor to the materials. Support from the Graphic Design and/or IT departments may be needed as part of this process.

The committee is also interested in creating a series of SLO briefs for distribution. The first brief will focus on the changes that have taken place during the 2009-2010 year. Additional briefs can address subjects like SLO anxiety, choosing assessment tools, and other training topics. Ideally, a draft of this first brief will be ready for discussion/revision at the March committee meeting, so that it can be finalized and distributed in late March/early April, hopefully, as part of the next department chairs meeting. Daylene will send a copy of the current format for SLO briefs to the group.

5. At the November 2009 meeting, the committee voted unanimously to seek adoption as a Senate subcommittee. According Michael Dermody, the next step in that process is for the committee to present a report to the Senate of recent activities and appoint a liaison from the committee to attend Senate meetings and give ongoing updates. The Senate will accept the report and formally adopt the committee at that time. Jennifer will be the Senate liaison and will email out a draft report for feedback. The Senate report and the SLO brief will likely end up being the same document.

6. The group discussed ideas for organizing upcoming meetings of ISLO groups. Groups will likely need to meet separately this time since some faculty may need to participate in multiple groups, and committee members will help Jennifer organize and facilitate the meetings for their areas. The meetings will focus on confirming the ISLOs for each group
and the assessment method, then on creating a timeline for each group to complete an assessment cycle before 2012. Several committee members thought it would be helpful to bring examples of ISLOs from other schools to these meetings for faculty to consider.

Jennifer will email the committee with the list of GE classes and also the ISLOs written in 2008. The committee will discuss more specific plans for these meetings at the March meeting once the members have had a chance to review the current ISLOs and GE groups. Jennifer will also bring examples of other schools’ ISLOs to the meeting for discussion.

7. The committee discussed the need for a Strategic Plan to help provide guidance for the college as we work to meet the 2012 deadline for Proficiency. The document should include areas such as Philosophy, Roles, Resources, Goals, Timeline (including visual representations of the timeline) and will be presented to the Senate for approval, hopefully, by the end of Spring semester. Barry will email the group the Strategic Plan for the University Center as an example of format, and the committee will continue its discussion of adopting a Strategic Plan at the March meeting.

**Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 17 from 2:30-3:30 pm in LIBR-206**
SLO Committee Minutes
March 17, 2010

The SLO Committee, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, provides leadership, information, guidance and support to all college faculty and staff involved in the development and assessment of student learning outcomes and administrative unit outcomes. The Committee is co-chaired by the Faculty SLO Coordinator and the Vice President, Institutional Development, Technology, and Online Services, and it seeks representation from all academic divisions and other constituent groups.

In attendance: Leslie Bretall, Jennifer Brezina, Jia-Yi Cheng-Levine, Vince Devlahovich, Daylene Meuschke, Necia Gelker, Barry Gribbons, Mike Joslin, Kevin Kistler, Ann Lowe, Anne Marenco, and Jim Temple

1. The minutes from the February 2010 meeting were approved. Ann noted that although the committee has in the minutes that a proposal was submitted for a fall FLEX session on the components of the course outline (SLOs, Objectives, Course Content), that option didn’t seem to appear on the Faculty Development Committee interest survey being conducted this week.

2. Leslie and Mike provided an update of the progress on the SLO Manual revision. Leslie has completed a first pass through the instructional SLO manual, and Mike is working on the student services manual revision/update. Jennifer, Leslie, and Mike will meet next week to talk about how to handle updates to sections of the manuals that appear “dated.” A draft of the revised manual should be available or the committee to review next month.

3. The group discussed the software demonstrations that have taken place over the previous month. The group agreed that Taskstream and eLumen did not meet the college’s needs at this time. The decision at this point is between TracDat and developing a homegrown system. If TracDat includes the features we need, and if we are going to use many of the more complex features available in TracDat, TracDat would be a better choice. If we are not going to use many of the available features or if there are important features that are missing from TracDat, it would be better to create our own system. A subgroup will work on developing a list of important features that would have wide usage on campus to bring back to the next meeting. The subgroup will include: Barry, Daylene, Jennifer, Anne, and Vince. In the meantime, all committee members are asked to solicit feedback at upcoming division meetings as to what features are important to faculty and would be used.
4. Jennifer provided an update on the planning process for Institutional SLOs. After research it was determined that there is no accreditation requirement for the college to have institutional-level SLOs beyond those for the GE and CTE programs. The committee agreed that using the college’s GE categories as the basis for GE program SLOs would be better than using CSUGE/IGETC requirements, which was how the previous GE SLOs were drafted.

The committee would also like to see institutional-level program SLOs developed for the Basic Skills program. Jennifer will contact Audrey and Denee to see if the S4S committee would like to work on these. The committee discussed developing SLOs for a Lifelong Learning program but decided to wait to see whether or not it is still a need after the others are developed and courses are mapped to them.

Jennifer will try to convert the current CSUGE/IGETC ISLOs to COC GE SLOs and will bring a working draft to the April SLO committee meeting for discussion. The committee will develop a plan at the April meeting for bringing the GE and CTE groups back together to discuss and revise the SLOs and assessment plans.

5. A draft of SLO Brief #4, which will also become a report to the Academic Senate, was distributed (see attachment). All committee members are encouraged to send feedback to Jennifer by Wednesday, 3/24.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, April 21 from 2:30-3:30 pm in LIBR-206
SLO Committee Minutes
April 21, 2010

The SLO Committee, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, provides leadership, information, guidance and support to all college faculty and staff involved in the development and assessment of student learning outcomes and administrative unit outcomes. The Committee is co-chaired by the Faculty SLO Coordinator and the Vice President, Institutional Development, Technology, and Online Services, and it seeks representation from all academic divisions and other constituent groups.

In attendance: Jennifer Brezina, Daylene Meuschke, Rhonda Hyatt, Mike Joslin, Ann Lowe, Anne Marenco, and Rebecca Shepherd

1. The minutes from the March 2010 meeting were approved with one spelling correction.

2. Jennifer provided an update on the SLO manual revision. Jennifer, Leslie, and Mike have met twice to work on the revision and have created an outline for the new manual. Most of the manual will be the same for instructional and non-instructional programs, but the sections on creating and assessing SLOs will be different (the design/assessment material for the other kind of program will appear in the appendix). A draft of the new manual will be emailed to committee members before the next meeting with the goal of finalizing the manual at the May meeting. The new manual will be distributed to department chairs as soon as possible, hopefully before the end of the semester. If the paper copies aren’t ready in time, chairs will be sent an electronic copy and will receive the paper copy in the fall.

Jennifer also reported that a template is being created for SLO committee materials so that there will be a common look and feel to the committee’s print and online communications. Once the manual is finalized, updating the SLO website will be the next project.

3. Jennifer shared the list of desired characteristics in an SLO assessment management system with the group (see attachment). Additional suggestions were made, including the ability to track external accreditation requirements (NLNAC, ABA) and the desire not to have students interacting with the system. The list has been sent to Jim Temple to get an estimate of how long it would take to develop a homegrown system that meets the needs listed. Barry suggested a meeting with Jim and Norris to clarify and explain the list so that the estimate would be as realistic as possible. The list has also been sent to the TracDat representative to verify how many of the listed needs that TracDat meets. Jennifer also mentioned that some additional systems are possibilities to consider. The
Curriculum Committee is considering switching to CurricUNET, which has an SLO assessment module. Jennifer will send a meeting invitation to SLO committee members for the demo. Jennifer will also investigate further Weave, a system used by Antelope Valley College that appears similar in philosophy to TracDat, and will set up a demo if it seems worthwhile.

4. The final copy of SLO Brief #4 was distributed (see attachment). Committee members are encouraged to share the brief with their divisions at the next division meeting.

5. Jennifer provided the group with the current CTE and draft basic skills program SLOs as well as possible GE program SLOs (with the included courses) based on the previous ISLOs (see attachment). There were several areas missing SLOs because the AA/AS degree GE requirements are not an exact match for IGETC/CSU GE. Jennifer also distributed Title 5 language about AA/AS degree GEs and some sample GE SLOs from other colleges (see attachment).

The group agreed that a preliminary meeting with each group before the end of the semester was desirable, with follow-up planning meetings to take place in the fall (one in September and the other in late October or early November) in order for assessment to begin Spring 2011. Since it is difficult to find a time to meet this late in the semester, it was suggested that Jennifer ask the deans for 20-30 minutes of division meeting time for groups to review the SLOs for their GE areas. Because GEs are not strictly along division lines, this may mean that some faculty may need to attend another division’s meeting for the discussion. At the spring meeting, faculty could also choose representatives from their group to take the lead on completing the assessment plan in the fall before bringing it back to the GE group to finalize. It was also noted that much of this could happen over email as opposed to in-person meetings.

6. The policy for retaining SLO/AUO-related records was tabled.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, May 19 from 2:30-3:30 pm in LIBR-206
SLO Software Needs

1. Ability to aggregate section data to the course level
2. Curriculum mapping
3. Ability to aggregate course data to mapped program SLOs
4. Differing levels of access to assessment data
5. Ability to show archived SLOs and archived courses and programs (and their assessment data)
6. Ability to record analysis of results and action plans
7. Ability to see historical results and action plans by course and program
8. Ability to export information, especially SLO assessments and use of information for program review
9. Ability to receive imported information, especially SLOs from WebCMS
10. Ability to record assessment data at the student level if departments choose to
11. Ability to run reports for WASC SLO Inventory
12. Ability to track additional accreditation requirements (NLNAC, ABA)
13. No requirement for students to interact with the system
What We’ve Done and What’s Ahead

History/Background:

- In 2002, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) released accreditation standards that ask colleges to identify student learning outcomes (SLOs) for courses, certificates, and programs, and to evaluate students’ progress towards achieving those SLOs. Colleges were also asked to use the assessment results to improve the education taking place in courses, certificates, and programs across campus.
- In 2003, College of the Canyons formed a steering committee to provide leadership and training to faculty and staff regarding SLOs, and the first of many SLO-related FLEX workshops was held in 2004. SLOs have been included as part of the official course outline since 2004, and the college uses the Program Review process to document SLO assessments and action plans based on those assessments. In 2008 a 50% reassigned time position was created for a faculty SLO coordinator.
- In 2007, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) announced expectations for progress in implementing SLOs through its Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness. All colleges are expected to reach the Proficiency stage of the Student Learning Outcomes rubric no later than fall 2012. Part of being considered Proficient includes that all courses, certificates, degrees, and programs have completed at least one full cycle of SLO assessment (including dialogue and action planning based on the assessment results) and that the results of SLO assessments inform decision-making and plans for improvement.
- In 2008, the college’s accreditation was reaffirmed. The visiting team noted that while the college met the current expectations for implementing SLOs, it also recommended that a detailed plan for achieving Proficiency by fall 2012 and for involving more adjunct faculty in the SLO process would be beneficial to the college.
- Most recently, the Statewide Academic Senate has prepared a glossary of commonly-used SLO-related terms. This glossary will assist faculty when communicating with their colleagues both within campuses and across the community college system.

New developments at College of the Canyons:

- A series of workshops was held in Fall 2009 to assist departments in setting up SLO assessment plans and schedules.
  - 27 departments attended workshops throughout the fall semester, including approximately 80 full-time and 35 part-time faculty members. Five additional department chairs met one-on-one with the SLO coordinator to discuss their department plans.
  - The workshops included a shift in emphasis towards scheduled cycles of assessment in order to allow for more meaningful reflection on results and action planning.
  - Departments were encouraged to use course-embedded assessments, building on assignments that were already taking place in the courses in order to make assessment a routine part of instruction.
  - Departments were provided with inventories of their courses and scheduling worksheets to help them create plans that will enable them to have all courses and programs complete an assessment cycle prior to the fall 2012 WASC/ACCJC deadline.
  - Departments were also encouraged to consider archiving courses that are not currently being regularly offered.
- Additional opportunities for training were developed, including the ability for faculty to receive FLEX credit for one-on-one training sessions on SLO-related topics of their choice and a self-paced online SLO Tutorial.
- The Student Learning Outcomes committee has increased participation and now has representatives from most divisions. Current members include: Leslie Bretall (Learning Resources), Jennifer Brezina (Humanities), Jia-Yi Cheng-Levine (Humanities), Vincent Devlahovich (Math/Science), Necia Gelker (Fine and Performing Arts), Audrey Green (Academic Affairs), Barry Gribbons (Institutional Research), Rhonda Hyatt (Physical Education), Michael Joslin (Student Services), Kevin Kistler (Academic Affairs), Melanie Lipman (Social Science/Business), Ann Lowe (Allied Health), Daylene Meuschke (Institutional Research) Nicole Lucy (Social Science/Business and CTE), Anne Marenco (Social Science/Business), Rebecca Shepherd (Social Science/Business), Matt Teachout (Math/Science).
• The SLO Committee is now a regular subcommittee of the Academic Senate. This will ensure that the effort to institutionalize Student Learning Outcomes has a clear place in the organizational and decision-making structure of the college.
• The SLO committee has begun a revision of the existing SLO manuals. The new SLO Manual will include updated material from the previous Faculty Manual for Creating an Effective Student Learning Outcomes Loop for Courses and Programs (Davis and Templer, 2005) and Constructing and Embedding Student Learning Outcomes in Non-Instructional Student Service Units at College of the Canyons (Alonso and Maple, 2005) as well as material from trainings presented in 2009-2010.
• SLO information for courses can now be extracted directly from WebCMS, which will allow for increased ability for faculty to organize the information and analyze where revisions are needed. This will also assist the college as it moves towards a common software-based solution for organizing SLO assessment data.
• Program SLOs are now being recorded in WebCMS for degrees and certificates. As was done with course SLOs, this will be phased in – as degrees and certificates are revised, faculty will be asked to provide one or more program SLOs. These program SLOs will be approved by the curriculum committee and will be recorded in the program outline in WebCMS.

What’s ahead?:
• The SLO Committee is considering various software solutions to organizing SLO assessment data. A software system such as those being considered will make it easier for faculty to aggregate data across multiple sections and to map course level assessments to program SLOs. All of this will allow for more meaningful dialogue and action planning based on results.
• The faculty will revisit the GE and CTE Program SLOs that were drafted in 2008 and will make revisions as needed, aligning GE SLOs with our associate degree GE categories rather than CSUGE/IGETC requirements. SLOs for the Basic Skills program will also be considered. Assessment of these large, interdisciplinary program-level SLOs will begin in 2010-2011.
• The SLO Committee will be drafting a Strategic Plan for Student Learning Outcomes to help the college meet the fall 2012 WASC/ACCJC deadline for Proficiency. This Strategic Plan will be presented to the Academic Senate and other constituent groups for discussion and approval.
• In addition to the continuation of the one-on-one training by appointment and the self-paced online training, planned sessions for Fall 2010 FLEX include:
  o The Course Outline: SLOs, Objectives, and Course Content
  o SLO Assessment Issues
  o Avoiding SLO Anxiety
  o Closing the Loop
• The college’s SLO website will be redesigned in 2010 in an effort to provide faculty and staff with greater access to SLO-related resources.
• As faculty have grown more comfortable with writing SLOs and designing and scheduling assessments, the professional development emphasis in 2010-2011 will shift to facilitating dialogue and developing specific action plans.

Resources
• ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness:
• Statewide Academic Senate SLO Glossary:
• Training materials
  o Online SLO Tutorial: http://www.canyons.edu/Faculty/martinj/slo_site/tutorial_slo/welcome.htm
  o Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 Workshop Materials:
    https://intranet.canyons.edu/Directories/Committee/CommitteeDetails.asp?CID={2565E272-040B-4E2B-BCDF-AD85BC003E22}

For more detailed information on this student learning outcomes brief, stop by the Institutional Development and Technology office located in LIBR-212, or contact Daylene Meuschke, Director, Institutional Research at 661.362.5329 or Jennifer Brezina, English faculty, and Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator at 661.362.5919.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Area</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success</th>
<th>Summary of Data Collected and Number of Cycles</th>
<th>Use of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **GE/Natural Sciences**      | 1. Develop comprehension of the basic concepts of physical and biological science (generally lectures).  
2. Critique and evaluate natural phenomenon through the use of scientific inquiry methods. (Mostly labs). | Means of Assessment:  
(1) - 5-10 questions quiz  
-non graded or scantron multiple choice.  
Criteria for Success:  
(1) 70% pass  
Means of Assessment:  
(2) A scientific inquiry based project.  
Criteria for Success:  
(2) Rubric (how did they demo their understanding).  
1. Complete  
2. Very good  
3. Good  
4. Some  
5. Little |                                |                                            |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Area</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success</th>
<th>Summary of Data Collected and Number of Cycles</th>
<th>Use of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GE/Social Science</td>
<td>Students will be able to: Distinguish, analyze, and evaluate the individual or the cultural and social perspectives and contributions in contemporary, historical and/or geographical settings.</td>
<td>Means of Assessment: Short (1-2 pg) paper or essay on final exam to identify and compare and contrast major perspectives.</td>
<td>Criteria for Success: Random samplings based on rubric 1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/Area</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success</td>
<td>Summary of Data Collected and Number of Cycles</td>
<td>Use of Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE/Humanities and Fine Arts</td>
<td>1. Students will be able to analyze and appreciate works of philosophical, historical, literary, aesthetic and cultural importance, and relate the fundamental humanizing perspective that they provide for the development of the whole person.</td>
<td>Means of Assessment: Using a common rubric, representative faculty will assess the degree to which students achieve SLOs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Students will demonstrate in-depth, critical knowledge of theory, research, and collaborative practices related to a chosen professional role or area of focus in the Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>Criteria for Success: To be determined later</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/Area</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success</td>
<td>Summary of Data Collected and Number of Cycles</td>
<td>Use of Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE/Language and Rationality: English Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/Area</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success</td>
<td>Summary of Data Collected and Number of Cycles</td>
<td>Use of Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE/Language and Rationality: Communication and Analytical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/Area</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success</td>
<td>Summary of Data Collected and Number of Cycles</td>
<td>Use of Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE/American Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/Area</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success</td>
<td>Summary of Data Collected and Number of Cycles</td>
<td>Use of Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE/Physical Education and Wellness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/Area</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success</td>
<td>Summary of Data Collected and Number of Cycles</td>
<td>Use of Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE/Diversity Requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/Area</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success</td>
<td>Summary of Data Collected and Number of Cycles</td>
<td>Use of Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CTE          | 1. Achieve recognized industry skills and knowledge for their chosen fields.  
               2. Develop inter-relational skills necessary to be successful in their chosen fields. | Means of Assessment: Combination of substantive scenarios based questions assessed according to a rubric, and surveys to students regarding achievement of their educational goals. | Criteria for Success: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Area</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Means of Assessment and Criteria for Success</th>
<th>Summary of Data Collected and Number of Cycles</th>
<th>Use of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Skills</strong></td>
<td>1. Demonstrate readiness for college level degree and certificate coursework.</td>
<td>1. Course level SLO assessments for Math 060, English 081, ESL 080/083, NC.BCSK 100 and NC.ESL 4B</td>
<td>2. Success rates for students in Math 070, English 091, and ESL 100 who previously completed basic skills courses in that discipline</td>
<td>Progression analysis of students through basic skills course sequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Demonstrate timely progress through developmental non-credit and credit course sequences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) General Education Requirements.
(1) Students receiving an associate degree shall complete a minimum of 18 semester or 27 quarter units of general education coursework which includes a minimum of three semester or four quarter units in each of the areas specified in paragraphs (A), (B) and (C) and the same minimum in each part of paragraph (D). The remainder of the unit requirement is also to be selected from among these four divisions of learning or as determined by local option:

(A) **Natural Sciences.** Courses in the natural sciences are those which examine the physical universe, its life forms, and its natural phenomena. To satisfy the general education requirement in natural sciences, a course shall be designed to help the student develop an appreciation and understanding of the scientific method, and encourage an understanding of the relationships between science and other human activities. This category would include introductory or integrative courses in astronomy, biology, chemistry, general physical science, geology, meteorology, oceanography, physical geography, physical anthropology, physics and other scientific disciplines.

(B) **Social and Behavioral Sciences.** Courses in the social and behavioral sciences are those which focus on people as members of society. To satisfy the general education requirement in social and behavioral sciences, a course shall be designed to develop an awareness of the method of inquiry used by the social and behavioral sciences. It shall be designed to stimulate critical thinking about the ways people act and have acted in response to their societies and should promote appreciation of how societies and social subgroups operate. This category would include introductory or integrative survey courses in cultural anthropology, cultural geography, economics, history, political science, psychology, sociology and related disciplines.

(C) **Humanities.** Courses in the humanities are those which study the cultural activities and artistic expressions of human beings. To satisfy the general education requirement in the humanities, a course shall be designed to help the student develop an awareness of the ways in which people throughout the ages and in different cultures have responded to themselves and the world around them in artistic and cultural creation and help the student develop aesthetic understanding and an ability to make value judgments. Such courses could include introductory or integrative courses in the arts, foreign languages, literature, philosophy, and religion.

(D) **Language and Rationality.** Courses in language and rationality are those which develop for the student the principles and applications of language toward logical thought, clear and precise expression and critical evaluation of communication in whatever symbol system the student uses. Such courses include:

(i) **English Composition.** Courses fulfilling the written composition requirement shall be designed to include both expository and argumentative writing.

(ii) **Communication and Analytical Thinking.** Courses fulfilling the communication and analytical thinking requirement include oral communication, mathematics, logic, statistics, computer languages and programming, and related disciplines.
Other College's GE SLOs

Natural Sciences
- Students completing relevant Assignments in Area B courses will evaluate the impact of science on their daily lives. (Mt SAC)
- Students in Area B will be able to investigate and explain physical phenomena through the application of empirical knowledge using mathematical and scientific processes and concepts. (MiraCosta)
- Students will learn the bases of physical laws and an appreciation for the difference between physical laws and our models of them and how physical laws are reflected in natural processes. (Contra Costa)
- Students will understand the scientific processes used to gain understanding of the structure and function of the living world. (Contra Costa)

Social Sciences
- Students completing relevant assignments in Area D2 courses will analyze the relationship between social, political, and/or economic institutions and human behavior. (Mt SAC)
- Students completing Area D can identify, analyze, and communicate an understanding of self and society through systematic investigation of social behavior, institutions, and culture. (MiraCosta)
- Students will understand and apply the methodologies of the disciplines to analyze social and behavioral issues. (Contra Costa)
- Students will be able to use historical facts, themes, and ideas to analyze and evaluate past events with reference to the complex pluralistic environments in which they occurred, recognizing the diversity of views and experiences due to differences in class, race, ethnicity, religion and gender. (Contra Costa)

Humanities and Arts
- Students completing an assignment in Area C (Arts) courses will be able to analyze modes of artistic expression. (Mt SAC)
- Students completing an assignment in Humanities Area C will be able to identify the influence of culture on human expression. (Mt SAC)
- Students who complete Area C develop appreciation for, critical understanding of, and the ability to express artistic, philosophical, and cultural sensibilities in historical, and contemporary contexts. (MiraCosta)
- Students will understand the nature and value of the arts and literature. (Contra Costa)
- Students will become more self-aware and self-reflective personally and socially of the values operative in their own and others lives. (Contra Costa)

American Institutions
- Students will be able to differentiate among changes in the American constitutional government over time. (Mt SAC)
- Students will develop the knowledge and understanding necessary to be informed and engaged citizens (Contra Costa)

Diversity Requirement
- Demonstrate awareness of the various ways that culture and ethnicity shape and impact individual experience and society as a whole. (Sacramento City College)
- Students will gain the knowledge necessary to understand and appreciate the dynamics of the many contemporary cultures of the 21st century. (Contra Costa)
SLO Committee Minutes
May 19, 2010

The SLO Committee, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, provides leadership, information, guidance and support to all college faculty and staff involved in the development and assessment of student learning outcomes and administrative unit outcomes. The Committee is co-chaired by the Faculty SLO Coordinator and the Vice President, Institutional Development, Technology, and Online Services, and it seeks representation from all academic divisions and other constituent groups.

In attendance: Leslie Bretall (Learning Resources), Jennifer Brezina (Humanities), Jia-Yi Cheng-Levine (Humanities), Necia Gelker (Fine and Performing Arts), Rhonda Hyatt (Physical Education), Ann Lowe (Allied Health), Anne Marenco (Social Science and Business), and Matt Teachout (Mathematics and Science)

1. The minutes from the April 2010 meeting were approved.

2. The group discussed the draft of the new SLO handbook for instructional programs. One area that the group agreed still needs to be addressed in the handbook is institutional-level SLOs. Jennifer will work on adding a section (and probably a diagram) about the interaction between course SLOs, department-level program SLOs (degrees and certificates, student pathways), and institutional-level program SLOs (GE, CTE, basic skills). The GE areas and their respective courses will also be included as an appendix.

Another area of discussion centered around the timeline for completing cycles of SLO assessment for courses and programs (both department-level and institutional). While the manual addresses ACCJC’s deadline of 2012, there are not timelines or benchmarks for departments to achieve along the way. The committee will make developing these kinds of timelines and benchmarks a priority for next year so that there is a clear plan that will help all departments make progress and meet the 2012 deadline. It was noted that curriculum revision timelines were approved by and are enforced through the Senate, so a similar path may also be helpful here.

Jennifer, Leslie, and Mike will revise the draft and should have a final version ready before the end of the semester.

Once the manual is finalized, it will be distributed to department chairs. Updating the SLO website with the content from the manual will be the next step in this project.
3. The committee discussed the CurricUNET demo that took place on 5/13. All members who attended the demo were impressed with CurricUNET’s capabilities as a curriculum management system and found it to be far superior to our current curriculum system, WebCMS. In terms of the assessment module, it does not have the functionality to track data at the student or section level, but in other respects was comparable to TracDat.

The committee agreed that there was a strong benefit in an integrated system that could handle curriculum revisions and assessment tracking and that this benefit outweighs the reduced functionality of CurricUNET’s assessment module. At the same time, there was a concern about how much time is left to meet the ACCJC 2012 deadline for Proficiency, and there is a strong need to have some kind of system in place next year to facilitate curriculum mapping and program assessment (both department-level and institutional). Without the kind of mapping and aggregating abilities of systems such as these, program assessment becomes much more difficult.

With that in mind, the committee recommended that if the college is going to purchase CurricUNET this year for curriculum management, it should also purchase the assessment module to provide an integrated solution to SLO assessment tracking and program assessment. If the college is not able to purchase CurricUNET this year, the committee recommends that the college purchase TracDat this year in order to facilitate assessment tracking and program assessment next year.

4. At the last meeting, the committee had suggested trying to use May division meetings to try to begin discussion about GE SLOs and assessment planning. For a variety of reasons, it was not feasible to get the GE groups together during division meeting times in May.

One suggestion was to send out emails to each GE group with the current SLOs and status of assessment planning for that GE in the next week or so, but many felt that might be confusing to many who had not heard much about it previously and/or that the email could be missed given how busy the end of the year is.

Another suggestion was to see if the college would be willing to designate the program of the morning of Opening Day for training and planning regarding program SLOs (department and institutional-level). The committee agreed that this would be a good option, so Jennifer will email Mitjl and Audrey to see if this is possible.
If approved, some initial materials would be sent with the opening day letter (for possible discussion at department retreats), then the Opening Day program would include both large group training on the SLO process and how course SLO assessment relates to program SLO assessment and also time for faculty members to split up into smaller groups to review their department-level program SLOs and the institutional SLOs in their respective areas and to develop tentative assessment plans and follow-up steps for fall semester.

5. SLO Committee meetings for the 2010-2011 academic year will be held on the 4th Wednesday of each month from 2:30-3:30.

6. The policy for retaining SLO/AUO-related records was tabled.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, August 25 from 2:30-3:30 pm in LIBR-206
Date: August 25, 2010

In attendance: Paul Wickline (Theatre Chair/SLO Coordinator), Jennifer Brezina (English Chair/SLO Coordinator), Patty Robinson (Dean, Social Science and Business), Daylene Meuschke (Director, Institutional Research), Audrey Green (Associate V.P. Academic Affairs), Barry Gribbons (V.P., Institutional Development), Necia Gelker (Art Department), Anne Marenco (Chair, Sociology), Rebecca Shepherd (Psychology), Kevin Kistler (Associate Dean, Institutional Support), Rhonda Hyatt (Recreation/Leisure), Vincent Devlahovich (Chair, Geography/Geology), Corinna Jobe (Astronomy), Leslie Bretall (Learning Resources).

1. Minutes from May 2010 approved.
2. Discussed policy for retaining SLO/AUO-related records. Keeping a summary of assessment results and action planning in program review is crucial. Electronically saved information or results is fine. Barry mentioned an archive of instruments should be kept as well as a few examples of student work.
   a. Questions raised:
      i. Who will do the scanning and help with archiving of representative work?
      ii. Policy needs to address this...Who will write clearer policy?
      iii. Is policy a suggestion, recommendation or a requirement?
   b. Rebecca mentioned concerns about the workload issue with chairs/faculty. Chairs and others agreed this is an issue.
   c. SLO Coordinators will bring sample language for next meeting -- “suggested” or “recommended” as opposed to required.
3. CurricuNet -- Audrey provided information into background of selection of CurricuNet. Barry asked if CSS would be involved, Audrey discussed why Jim Temple and IT might not be involved. Barry will discuss with Jim the institution’s needs.
   a. We want to make sure chairs and others don’t have to retype information into separate databases (program review, WebCMS, CurricuNet, etc.)
   b. Goal is to have Spring flex workshops on CurricuNet
   c. Paul Wickline is SLO Coordinator for CurricuNet, Jennifer discussed the other SLO coordinator duties.
   d. Audrey will present from Chaffey an example of CurricuNet at next meeting.
   e. Concerns expressed about functionality of CurricuNet vs. TrackDat in terms of CurricUNET’s inability to collect section level scores and aggregate them to the course level. We will need to find a solution for data collection, especially for large departments and ISLO assessments.
   f. Discussion of benefits of CurricuNet – large group of colleges using software which will facilitate changes and improvements.
4. Opening Day debrief
   a. Jennifer will finish compilation of ISLO notes from groups from Opening Day.
   b. Daylene asked about sampling vs. full group of students for assessment.
   c. With assessment, more is better and statistical power is increased; more reliable stable and refined.
   d. Barry mentioned that 100 students is a good number for a sample.
   e. Jennifer shared her sampling from Spring assessment – 20% from each class used.
   f. Suggestion for NEWSLETTER – sampling information. Have Nicole look at and discuss in NEWSLETTER...
SLO Committee Meeting

5. SLO Committee Workplan 2010-2011
   a. Suggestion is to schedule Flex Workshops for this Fall 2010 for Program Review
      i. SLOs for Single Person Departments
   b. Barry suggested a meeting to discuss minimizing chair duties?

6. Jennifer suggested need to set BENCHMARKS/MILESTONES so faculty, chairs, deans, others know where they are in the assessment process and can assist with SELF-EVAL of whether department is on track.

7. Improving OUTREACH is important

8. Nicole will be working on the WEBSITE. Anne volunteered to assist.

9. Forms and Software to assist with SLO Assessment Reporting
   a. Jennifer will talk to Barry
   b. Rhonda Hyatt and Audrey Green volunteered to assist.

10. Mission Statement and Strategic Plan for SLO Committee
    a. Proposal/Targets needed for individual departments
       i. Consider PERCENTAGES... by “fall 2011, should have assessed X number of classes... by Spring 2012 need to have closed the loop...etc.”
       ii. No one volunteered (yet) to collaborate on this.
    b. Benchmarks for faculty needed. SLO coordinators will bring a draft of a work plan for 2010-2011 back to the next SLO Committee meeting.

General Discussion:

- From Rebecca Shepherd... ISLO data collection? Who will be responsible for this? Jennifer responded that team leaders and others can help with facilitation? This is an issue we need to discuss.
- CurricuNET – earliest we can begin using this and training on this is SPRING FLEX. Audrey reported that on the Chaffey website, visitors can log on as a guest to investigate. What about Moorpark?
- Concerns about how CurricuNET can work to help us. Concerns about vagueness about “mapping” and use of CurricuNET -- moving beyond abstract to concrete. Desire for operational definitions of some of the terms we are using – “mapping” “aligning” etc.
- Audrey suggests a CurricuNET WEBINAR. She will look into getting this organized. Jennifer will get leaders involved. Audrey will look into scheduling this.
- Jennifer suggested tabling discussion of AUO’s and Guidelines and Training for Assessing Program SLOs for next time.
- AUO’s – discussion of accreditation and whose responsibility this is.

Next Meeting: September 22, 2010 @ 2:30 PM in Library 206
In attendance: Leslie Bretall, Jennifer Brezina, Vincent Devlahovich, Rhonda Hyatt, Ann Lowe, Anne Marenco, Daylene Meuschke, Rebecca Shepherd, Diane Sionko, and Paul Wickline.

1. Committee members were welcomed

2. The minutes from the August 2010 meeting were approved.

3. Updates

   a. The language for policy retaining SLO/AUO related records will be created specific to CurricuNET; there was concern expressed about the workload involved with collecting, collating and reporting data. The SLO Co-Coordinators will work on identifying resources to collect data; find money for chairs; etc. and will report back in one or two months. At the Chairs retreat, they will address how to align/map course and programs SLOs. The District is expanding its license for document imaging college-wide. The SLO Committee will have access to document imaging and possibly a high-speed scanner for faculty. Document imaging makes retrieving files, etc. much easier.

   b. There is a CurricuNET webinar on the 29th of September at 2:30PM; location TBD.

   c. Jennifer is in contact with group leaders for ISOs; she will send out the ISO assessment plan to faculty. The Committee was asked to think of ways to streamline data collection, possibly web-based. The committee will identify fields for and ways to layout the web-based form. Jennifer Brezina will create a draft to present to the committee. Samples of ISO assessment methods from other colleges will be collected.

   d. Paul distributed upcoming FLEX training to be presented by Nicole Lucy.

4. Jennifer distributed SLO Committee Work plan 2010-2011 and SLO Committee Work plan 2009-2010. Daylene will send Jennifer the AUO plan. There is a need for a clearinghouse of good samples, available on the web.

5. Mijtl contacted ACCJC for direction on what to do with courses that cannot be assessed. Rationale can be placed in program review to explain why a course was not assessed. If there is no plan to offer a course in the future, consider archiving the course. SLOs in program review may not match WebCMS. Need to identify how widespread this issue is and come up with a plan. 198 Special Topics should also include an SLO. Each topic should have its own SLO, course outline, and method of assessment. Consider having the curriculum committee address the issue of 198 Special Topics.
6. Jennifer will email the guidelines/benchmarks for achieving proficiency by 2012 from Fall workshop. They will be discussed at the next SLO meeting and then forwarded to the Academic Senate.

7. Barry and Jennifer will forward the SLO language in the college mission statement to the committee. John McElwain will be sent the committee’s suggestions.

8. An SLO Research Brief or newsletter will be written in spring 2011; focus to be determined; possibly in the spring 2011.
SLO Committee Meeting Minutes

October 27, 2010

In attendance: Leslie Bretall, Jennifer Brezina, Vincent Devlahovich, Rhonda Hyatt, Michael Joslin, Nicole Lucy, Ann Lowe, Anne Marenco, Daylene Meuschke, Diane Sionko, and Paul Wickline.

1. Introductions and welcomes - None

2. Amended minutes were unanimously approved.

3. Updates

   a. SLOs at Chair’s Retreat - Paul Wickline reported that the Chair’s Retreat was nice. Faculty received a copy of their program review and a worksheet identifying their course and program SLOs as they appear in WebCMS. Department chairs were asked to indicate if there was a discrepancy between WebCMS and Program Review SLOs. The Chancellor would like to know how many courses do not have SLOs. That number cannot be determined until Curricunet is in place. Jennifer Brezina reported that all ISLOs have been written. SLOs on syllabi must be the same as what is listed in WebCMS. 58 courses have SLOs that may need to be corrected before they can be assessed. The number of courses without SLOs isn’t known, but it is believed that it is not many.

   b. Curricunet Implementation – Paul Wickline reported that a “dummy” site has been created. The site currently has only the course module, no work has been done on the assessment module. He will know by Monday, November 1st, if there are training materials available. Concern was expressed as to whether Curricunet will be ready to implement when expected. Curricunet has a function that can be used to determine if a course has SLOs; it will not determine if the SLOs listed are actual SLOS or objectives or if they are badly written SLOs.

   c. Upcoming training and newsletter – There was a discussion about providing FLEX training to assist departments that are behind in developing SLOs or those who want assistance with revising existing SLOs. Possible ways of disseminating the information about the training was discussed. Some options were: sending an email that is addressed to the individual; ask Deans about departments in their area that may need training; create one-on-one training opportunities; create training opportunities at multiple locations during a specific block of time. Advertise the opportunity to get help writing SLOs in Senate.

Paul Wickline will present a workshop on November 3rd titled “Creating Rubrics for SLO Assessment, from 8:00 – 9:00AM. Nicole Lucy will present a workshop on November 3rd titled “Closing the Loop” from 2:00 – 3:30PM.
There was a discussion on whether the committee wanted to call the next SLO update a brief, update to the manual or a newsletter. Nicole Lucy will be writing the update. It will be about 1 – 1.5 pages and will probably be ready by Fall 2010.

d. **Workplan for 2010-2011** – Jennifer Brezina distributed copies of the 2010-2011 workplan. *Develop Library of SLO Assessment Tools and Action Plans* was added to the plan. Daylene Meuschke will work with Mike Joslin on the AUO plan and send them to Jennifer. The plan will be posted on the Web site.

e. **SLO Resource Collection** – Paul Wickline reported that he sent an email to faculty regarding the collection of SLO resources. He has not had a good response to the email.

f. **Website** – The Website is not public yet. It is in beta testing. It will be on the internet rather than the intranet. There was a discussion about requesting a redirect to the website (*www.canyons.edu/slo*).

4. **Guidelines/Benchmarks for Achieving Proficiency by 2010** – Guidelines/Benchmarks will be created and sent to the Senate with the disclaimer that “it is under negotiation and may change.” The discussion of guidelines and benchmarks will begin at the next meeting.

5. **Student Success Conference** – Jennifer Brezina and Daylene Meuschke attended the 2010 Strengthening Student Success Conference in Costa Mesa. Jennifer reported that the sessions on SLOs filled up quickly and that other colleges are having a similar debates regarding workload, and contract vs. FLEX. Jennifer reported that Modesto Junior College spoke to how they got off probation and that other colleges are using Curricunet for program review and SLOs.

The RP Group website has a number of resources from the conference at the following web address: [http://www.rpgroup.org/events/SSS10](http://www.rpgroup.org/events/SSS10). Also, Jennifer mentioned that she has a link to the ACCJC report on *What is a Comprehensive Assessment Report*. She will send the link via email if requested.

Daylene Meuschke will provide information regarding bringing someone from Grossmont College to talk about their experience with SLOs – how they started and what they've learned.

6. **Survey topic** – Nicole Lucy asked for suggestions for the SurveyMonkey survey to determine what sort of assistance or training the SLO committee can provide. The suggestions were: rubrics, FLEX activities, assessment, validity, what methods are useful (for those without SLOs), formats (face-to-face, online), days/times, what is the one thing that will help them move forward, and to rank the order of importance of the above.
SLO Committee Meeting Minutes

December 1, 2010

2:30 PM

In attendance: Leslie Bretall, Jennifer Brezina, Barry Gribbons, Rhonda Hyatt, Michael Joslin, Kevin Kistler, Nicole Lucy, Anne Marenco, Daylene Meuschke, and Paul Wickline.

1. Amended October 27, 2010 minutes were unanimously approved.

2. Updates
   a. Department Benchmarks – Jennifer discussed Department Benchmarks document drafted by the SLO Coordinators in consultation with the SLO Committee. Discussion concerning past dates on the document took place. Decision was made to keep past dates. Anne suggested adding ISLO to benchmarks. Suggestion was made to change “proposed” semester to “target” semester. Decision was to keep document as is. Motion made and accepted to forward the document to the Academic Senate for discussion. Question was raised about archiving courses. Clarification made that courses that are archived do not need to be assessed. Note also given that courses that have not been offered in the last two years and are not going to be offered in the next two years due to budget cuts and section limitations and cannot be assessed by Fall 2012 can be noted as such in the program review. This clarification was provided from Dr. Mitjl Capet.
   b. CurriuNet implementation – Paul Wickline gave the committee an update of the progress. The implementation is going very slowly. The shell is under construction. Fields are being added from WebCMS, but we don’t have much information from Academic Affairs on how things are progressing and what updated timelines will be for full implementation.
   c. ISLO – Jennifer gave an update on the ISLOs. There will be a spring FLEX to give the faculty an opportunity to continue to work on issues related to their ISLO group.
   d. Workplan for 2010-2011 – the workplan proposed dates were debated and decided upon. The approved dates will be sent to the Academic Senate for review and approval.
   e. Assessment Plan Worksheet and Analysis Reporting Forms – Paul Wickline presented an Assessment Plan Worksheet and an Assessment Analysis Reporting Form the theatre department is using for assessment record keeping. Suggestion was made to send forms to the Academic Affairs office to create a standard form for departments to use for reporting assessment plans and reports. SLO coordinators will discuss and send forward sample documents.
f. **Staff SLO Flex Survey** – Nicole reported results of faculty survey polling faculty on interest in SLO-related Flex workshops for the spring. 21 faculty members responded to the survey. Faculty responses indicate preference for individualized assistance rather than Flex workshops. SLO coordinators will send out emails to faculty reminding them of services provided by the SLO Coordinators.

3. Meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.
SLO Committee Minutes
February 23, 2011

In Attendance: Jennifer Brezina, Rhonda Hyatt, Michael Joslin, Nicole Lucy, Anne Marenco, Daylene Meuschke, Rebecca Shepherd, and Paul Wickline

1. The Minutes from December 2010 Meeting were approved with formatting changes.

2. Updates:
   a. The SLO Committee reviewed the report (update and proposed benchmarks) that will be presented to the Senate on 2/24/11. There was a question as to whether these benchmarks apply to ISA courses. The committee agreed that these benchmarks should apply to all courses, including ISA courses. After Senate discussion/approval, the report can be used as the basis for the next SLO brief.

   Previously Barry Gribbons had offered support from his office to provide reports to each department as to what percentage of courses and programs have SLOs and ongoing assessments. Chairs would then review the report to confirm accuracy and be able to see how their departments compare to the approved benchmarks. SLO Coordinators will verify with Barry that this can still be done once deans have reviewed the program reviews. The SLO coordinators will ask to visit a dean’s meeting to talk to the deans about common difficulties with the SLO tables so that they can better assist faculty in their divisions.

   Daylene Meuschke and Michael Joslin plan to review the AUO tables in non-instructional program reviews this year.

   There was some discussion surrounding what would happen if the college did not have 100% of courses and programs though the assessment cycle by Fall 2012. It is unclear at this point what kind of reporting ACCJC will as for in 2012. The proposed benchmarks and department level reports will help the SLO coordinators to assist the departments most in need of help.

   b. The CurricUNET implementation is moving more slowly than we would like it to. The template for the course level is close to being ready, and Academic Affairs was just asked for feedback regarding program outline components. The assessment module has not yet been started. The SLO coordinators will work on forms to mimic the eventual assessment module to use in the meantime. There is not a new timetable for implementation, but we are hoping to have something to work with by Fall 2011.

   c. There was a low turnout to the ISLO FLEX during FLEX week. The ISLO groups are using one of two methods to assess: mapping course SLOs to the ISLOs or using an additional rubric and/or embedded questions in existing course assignments.
The SLO coordinators will develop forms and processes for each type of assessment to help faculty get started. Daylene Meuschke will follow up to see if her office can assist with the use of scannable forms for ISLO assessment data.

LRII collected data in Fall 2010 and will collect data again in Spring 2011. It was suggested that the LR II group could present on Opening Day to show how the process can be successfully completed.

d. The SLO Coordinators presented several FLEX Workshops during FLEX week and are holding two sessions this week to provide chairs with assistance in completing the SLO tables in program review. After this week, most additional assistance will be individual rather than group, based on the survey results from spring. The coordinators reminded the committee that FLEX credit is available for SLO-related planning held by departments since we are still in “training mode” until we reach Proficiency.

3. Meetings in Spring 2011 will be the 4th Wednesday in March, April & May

The next SLO Committee Meeting is Wednesday, March 23, 2011 in LIBR-206
SLO Committee Minutes
March 23, 2011

In attendance: Leslie Bretall, Jennifer Brezina, Necia Gelker, Barry Gribbons, Rhonda Hyatt, Mike Joslin, Nicole Lucy, Anne Marenco, Daylene Meuschke, Diane Sionko, Paul Wickline

1. The minutes from the February 2011 meeting were approved with corrections.

2. Updates:
   a. Senate report of progress and benchmarks: The Senate accepted the SLO Committee report, and will be discussing the benchmarks at tomorrow’s Senate meeting. There has been significant concern from faculty that this is a workload issue that has not yet been negotiated. The committee endorsed adding language clarifying that issue if needed. The SLO Committee report to the Senate will be posted on the Senate website as a model for other committees to use when creating reports. It will also be distributed as a SLO Brief.
   b. CurricUNET implementation: No firm date has been provided as to when it will be functional, and the implementation committee has not met again. The framework is complete for the curriculum side, but the assessment module has not yet been configured. We are thinking maybe it will be ready for fall 2011.
   c. ISLOs: The Natural Science, CTE, and Diversity groups are collecting data this semester. Language and Rationality I (English Composition) is assessing Spring 2010-Spring 2011. Language and Rationality II collected data Fall 2010. American Institutions and Humanities should be collecting data in Fall 2011. So far, other than CTE and College Skills, the other groups are falling into two categories of assessment methods—mapping and direct assessment. Jennifer will develop sample processes for both methods. Paul and Jennifer will be working with Institutional Research to develop scannable forms for ISLO data reporting. A question was raised as to whether there are minutes for ISLO group meetings. There are not currently formal minutes, but there were handwritten updates from the February meetings. It was also noted that increased clerical support is needed for the SLO program, especially if there are increased documentation needs for accreditation. Jennifer and Daylene will contact the ISLO leaders to ask them each for a brief (1-2 paragraphs) update about their group’s progress. This can be combined into an ISLO update for all faculty and become the basis for an ISLO brief.
   d. Program Review report: The SLO coordinators will receive a cleaned up version of an Excel file of the SLO table from Program Review to help gauge progress towards Proficiency. Department chairs will be sent a report of assessment in their departments and will be asked to confirm the accuracy of the information. The SLO Coordinators may need help from committee members with the program review data. Mike and Daylene will receive similar information for AUOs. A suggestion was made to include the semester of next planned
assessment in the SLO table to show that there is a plan for continuous assessment. Barry will bring this suggestion to Norris.

e. Dean’s meeting: Paul and Nicole presented information about the SLO table in program review at last week’s dean’s meeting.

f. Program Review issues with SLO – stages & cycles – Tabled

g. BOT presentation: The SLO Coordinators will be presenting an update to the Board of Trustees in May.

h. Increased participation: There is a need for increased faculty participation in SLO planning. It is recommended that the ISLO group leaders cc department chairs of affected departments when planning meetings are occurring. We also need additional members for the SLO committee. The SLO Coordinators will add ISLO coordinators to the committee meeting invites and will also contact members who have not been attending lately.

i. There was a suggestion to change the name of the committee to the Outcomes and Assessment Committee to show the broader focus of the committee. There was concern that SLOs are a well-known term and changing the name might be confusing. This item will be added to next month’s agenda.

3. Meetings in Spring 2011 – 4th Wednesday in April & May

The next SLO Committee Meeting is Wednesday, April 27, 2011 in LIBR-206
SLO Committee Minutes
April 27, 2011

In Attendance: Audrey Green, Paul Wickline, Nicole Lucy, Jennifer Brezina, Anne Marenco, Michael Joslin, Rhonda Hyatt, Daylene Meuschke, Ann Lowe, Rebecca Shepherd, Kevin Kistler, Leslie Bretall, Barry Gribbons

1. The Minutes from March 2011 Meeting were approved as presented.

2. Updates:
   a. Senate Benchmark Proposal: A sentence was added to the portion in italics of the Benchmarks document to address concerns related to collective bargaining and SLOs. The added sentence is “This document is for planning purposes only and in no way is meant to direct the work of faculty or to take the place of collective bargaining agreements related to Student Learning Outcomes.”
   b. CurricUNET: Audrey is still working with CurricUNET to get an accurate timeline for implementation. The hope is that the system will be functional in the fall.
   c. ISLOs: The CTE, Diversity, Natural Sciences, and possibly PE and Wellness groups will be collecting data this semester. American Institutions and Humanities and Fine Arts will be collecting data in the fall. Both Language and Rationalities groups are in the process of collecting data over multiple semesters and both should be ready to close the loop in fall. The SLO coordinators have been working with Institutional Research to develop forms using SurveyMonkey that should make data collection and aggregation fairly easy. The forms should be ready for testing next week and should be ready for faculty use the following week.
   d. AUOs: Daylene received the file for AUOs from Norris this week. She and Mike Joslin will probably do some training with new managers relating to how to design assessment and complete the Nicholls-5 form. MAC may be a good forum for this training over the summer.
   e. Progress of PSLOs: All programs missing SLOs have been identified, and department chairs and deans have been contacted to provide the information. The Curriculum Committee will review these PSLOs on 5/11. We may need to find a way to document PSLOs that are not part of degrees and certificates since they will not be in CurricUNET since we were considering eliminating that section of program review once CurricUNET is functional. PSLOs should also be included on the course sequencing guide that each department is completing.
   f. Program Review issues with SLOs: It would be very helpful to have the next semester of assessment planned for each course/program documented in the program review or in CurricUNET. While we had hoped to use CurricUNET to document SLOs for 2011-2012, we should also plan for using program review as a backup since the status of CurricUNET for next year is unknown. Barry will communicate the needed changes to Norris.
g. BOT presentation: The SLO co-coordinators had hoped to do a BOT presentation in May, but it will be postponed to the fall. The presentation will give a brief update of the progress the college has made with SLOs over the last few years. It will be important to keep the presentation brief (5 minutes) but also to show the magnitude of the work that has been done over the past 8 years. We can show the number of courses affected, changes in student awareness of SLOs, and other data to show how much work has been done.

h. Name of Committee/organization within college: There has been a suggestion to change the name of the committee to Outcomes and Assessment in order to better describe the scope of the committee, which includes AUOs. There would then be two subgroups within the committee: SLOs and AUOs. The committee overall could report through Barry, but the SLO section and SLO coordinators could report through instruction. Travel budgets and equipment could fall under Barry’s budget area. SLO coordinator positions and potential adjunct hourly budget could be under Instruction. Discussion ensued. Some issues discussed included: the budget cannot be split between executive cabinet members, the committee’s program review should expand to embrace AUOs as well next year, SLO coordinators need to report through instruction, Institutional Research and Academic Affairs need to communicate frequently. The challenge in making this decision is that philosophically both areas need to work together, but the reporting/budget/technical constraints are forcing a decision to report through one or the other for budgeting and planning purposes. The item was tabled for further discussion next month.

i. OneNote/Wiki for documenting college-wide discussion of SLOs: From the recent Accreditation trainings, it has been emphasized that it is important to document college-wide discussion of SLOs, but we do not currently have a way to document that on an ongoing basis. One Note and/or wikis have been suggested as helpful methods. Discussion ensued. Some concerns included: the number of people who would need to be trained, the amount of work involved, the difficulty of gathering data for the midterm report without a central place for keeping evidence, problems with standardizing the format, lack of structure in OneNote. Another suggestion could be purchase and/or creating another system to track these items. Board Docs is a program that is currently being considered to manage documents for the BOT – perhaps it might help with documenting dialogue through minutes and agendas as well (there is a feature that allows for search by key word). This item was also tabled for further discussion next month.

3. Meetings in Spring 2011 – 4th Wednesday in May
SLO Committee Minutes
May 25, 2011

In Attendance: Paul Wickline, Nicole Lucy, Jennifer Brezina, Rhonda Hyatt, Daylene Meuschke, Jia-Yi Cheng-Levine, Ann Lowe, Leslie Bretall, Diane Sionko, Anne Marenco

1. The Minutes from April 2011 Meeting were approved as presented.

2. Updates:
   a. Senate Benchmark Proposal: The revised benchmark document was presented to the Senate. There was much discussion by the Senate of the concept of SLOs as well as the additional workload generated by SLO assessment. There was a concern that the work associated with SLOs had not been negotiated through COCFA. The Senate voted to table the item pending a negotiated agreement regarding SLOs between the District and COCFA. The SLO committee is free to distribute the document as a product of that committee, but it is not endorsed by the Senate at this time.
   b. CurricUNET: There seems to be some progress with CurricUNET. Hopefully we will have more information soon, particularly about the assessment module.
   c. ISLOs: Jennifer provided an update regarding the status of the ISLO groups. The Natural Science, Diversity, and CTE groups will be using SurveyMonkey to collect data this semester (the links will be going out this week). PE and Wellness and Language and Rationality groups will be collecting data without using SurveyMonkey. We should have 5-6 groups ready to close the loop in the fall. Humanities and Social Sciences will be big projects for next year. Anne Marenco volunteered to coordinate the Social Sciences ISLO next year, particularly if data collection assistance through SurveyMonkey is available. It was also suggested that it would be helpful for the Humanities group to email faculty now (or at least before the start of fall) who are teaching Humanities GE courses in the fall to remind them about the planned assessments and send them a copy of the rubric to be used.
   d. AUOs: Mike and Daylene met to review the AUOs submitted through non-instructional program review and are planning AUO training sessions for the summer. 98% of programs have AUOs and 96% have assessment of AUOs, but there is some variety in how the responses were completed. Based on the program review responses, Mike and Daylene feel that a more global training effort would be beneficial. A manager or designee from each area will be asked to attend a training session.
   e. Progress of PSLOs: Thanks to the efforts of the Curriculum Committee and department chairs, all programs (degrees and certificates) now have SLOs. 82% of the programs have responded to the SurveyMonkey survey regarding program assessment. Daylene will leave the survey open until Friday to, hopefully, get a few more responses (still waiting for 5 responses).
f. Program Review issues with SLOs: It would be helpful to include the number of cycles in the program review SLO tables and the date of next planned assessment. The current format is challenging because it allows for open-ended responses, which leads to a variety of responses that have to be analyzed line by line. It would be helpful to move to a response system that limits/guides the responses, especially where a number or yes/no answer is needed. Hopefully, the implementation of CurricUNET will address these issues. There will also need to be additional training on what is expected in each section of the table.

g. Name of Committee/organization within college: There has been a suggestion to change the name of the committee to Outcomes and Assessment in order to better describe the scope of the committee, which includes AUOs. There has also been discussion of whether or not the group should maintain its status as a Senate subcommittee. Ann Lowe presented a suggestion that we could maintain two committees – one SLO faculty committee as a subcommittee of the Senate and one AUO committee functioning as a college-wide committee. The two groups could meet jointly on a monthly basis but then also would have the option to meet separately as needed as well. There was consensus among the faculty in support of this idea, but several administrative members of the committee were not present at the meeting. This item will be brought back as an action item in the fall.

h. Assessment Tools and Results: Paul has collected some assessment samples collected on the Blade server, but we need to find a location to store them for general faculty access. There is some concern about how public the results and analysis/action plans will be or should be. A suggestion was made to create an intranet site for this kind of information. There was concern that this would be the third SLO-related site at the college, which could be confusing and difficult to maintain. Another option may be to include some of these documents within CurricUNET as training materials.

i. OneNote/Wiki for documenting college-wide discussion of SLOs: Tabled

3. New Business:
   a. ACCJC report of progress: Daylene is compiling the annual ACCJC inventory of SLOs. Nicole will bring that report to the committee in the fall.
   b. Midterm report: Jennifer, Paul, and Nicole provided a report to Dr. Capet regarding SLO-related activities since February 2009 in order to address the accreditation recommendation relating to SLOs. This information will be included in the midterm report.
   c. Meetings in Fall 2011: The meetings will still take place on the 4th Wednesday of the month. Given the new time blocks for fall, the group decided to adjust the time of the meeting to 2-3pm. Nicole will try to reserve MENH-246 and will let the group know.
   d. Open Forum
SLO Committee Minutes
September 28, 2011


1. The Minutes from May 25, 2011 meeting were approved as presented.

2. Updates:
   a. ACCJC Report of Progress: Nicole Lucy reported on some of the highlights from the ACCJC annual report. Congratulations were given regarding number sixteen and eighteen which show nearly 99% of the District’s courses and 100% of the programs have SLOs. Work is being done to get an ongoing assessment plan on courses. Student Services (non-instructional) was congratulated for having 99% student and learning activities with defined SLOs and 98% with ongoing assessment of learning outcomes. Paul Wickline presented a sample assessment table information from 2011 program review of five departments that were entered in online program review. The table presented examples of the variation of data that is reported. He found that sometimes what is entered is without a description of how the data will be used. In future the SLO Committee may be able to look at which SLOs are done well and who may need some assistance in making them clear.

   b. CurricUNET Implementation: Audrey Green reported that curriculum should be live in about two weeks. The assessment module is not close to being ready. Paul Wickline reported that he contacted a number of schools to see if they are using CurricUNET and if so, are they using the assessment module. Most are not using curricUNET’s assessment module, but are using eLumen or Trackdat, or have created a “homegrown” assessment module. Barry Gribbons reported that there was a discussion in the past about adding to the Datatel grading module the ability to check-off SLOs. This or some other simple SQL server database could be created and used in the interim, while waiting for a decision on the assessment module to be used. It was stated that having a module that collects data may also help alleviate the burden on department chairs. All present were asked to bring these issues to their departments for discussion and feedback.

   c. ISLOs: Last year three groups participated in an ISLO pilot program. The three groups are - Natural Science, CTE, and Diversity. A letter was sent from the ISLO Coordinators to faculty from the three participating groups asking them to assess the department/program/course (depending on the group they were assessing) using the survey that was distributed to them through SurveyMonkey. There was less than 50% response rate from faculty in all three areas. It was determined by the committee that “sampling” the first time around is fine. They will close out SurveyMonkey and begin a new cycle. Nicole Lucy will work with Alicia LeValley on a plan for moving forward. One
consideration is to keep SurveyMonkey open year round and pull the data at certain times. Nicole will also follow up with Floyd Moos regarding offering FLEX training on ISLOs during opening day. Jia-Yi Cheng-Levine, who participated in the pilot project, shared that the time spent filling out the ISLO survey was minimal – maybe two minutes each. Nicole will include that information in future communication.

d. AUOs: Mike Joslin reported that two AUO training workshops were provided for new managers. Roughly half of the managers (40 participants) participated in the training. The managers reported that they were grateful for the training and felt it helped to clarify what the District is looking for regarding AUOs. During the workshop the presenters defined terms and provided examples of AUOs that are believed to be sound and meet the criteria, and the managers broke into groups to work on assessing the examples and find areas to be strengthened. After the workshops managers believed they had a better understanding of how to write the AUOs and how to use the results to make revisions. They will continue the AUO cycle and assess accordingly.

e. PSLOs: An email was distributed to those present that discussed a request that was sent to department chairs in May requesting that they identify the programs in their departments that had defined SLOs and assessments. Some of the stats discussed in the email are:
- there are 147 programs to assess;
- 37 programs do not have assessment plans;
- 3 programs completed the survey but did not indicate if the program had an assessment plan;
- 4 programs have not completed the survey; and
- There are program SLOs in 20% going through one cycle.
Those present discussed distributing this info to faculty, without identifying information; the info may be helpful and also encourage others.

f. Program Review issues with SLO – Stages and Cycles: A column has been added to online program review SLO, for reporting the next assessment cycle of their SLOs. It may help by informing when the next assessment cycle can be expected and that there is a plan in place.

g. Name of Committee: There was a discussion on the name of the SLO committee, the purpose of the committee, whether or not it should be a Senate subcommittee, the benefit of having one committee versus two separate committees – one AUO, one SLO, and the regularity in which the committees will meet. Some points discussed:
There are some aspects of SLOs that might be clearly a concern of the Academic Senate and some to a lesser degree;
Learning outcomes are an institutional responsibility, which can impact accreditation;
It’s important to insure that there is representation from all constituent groups;
There are a number of community colleges in which the SLO committee functions similarly to the curriculum committee;
Outcomes and assessment are a part of Academic Senate in many colleges. It is used for peer guidance not peer pressure; and
Faculty are concerned that they do the vast majority of the work, and maybe a dialog needs to be opened regarding ongoing burden – additional requirements.

Nicole Lucy, Paul Wickline, Barry Gribbons, and Audrey Green will meet to discuss and clarify the format of the committee/s.

h. Minute software to document dialog: tabled.

3. New Business
   a. Barbara Beno Letter: Paul Wickline provided a letter from Barbara Beno regarding ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness. Included on the last page are the updated SLO bullets that define proficiency? Those bullets were included in the newsletter. It was reported that the ACCJC will check for proficiency through the data provided for the annual report and the evidence provided through the self-study. The midterm report is due September 2011.

   b. Date Change of November’s Meeting: November’s SLO meeting will take place November 30th rather than November 23rd, due to Thanksgiving holiday on the fourth Wednesday.
SLO Committee Minutes
October 26, 2011

Attendance: Nicole Lucy, Ann Lowe, Audrey Green, Leslie Bretall, Anne Marenco, Paul Wickline, Barry Gribbons, Jia-Yi Cheng-Levine, Diane Sionko, Jennifer Brezina, Rhonda Hyatt, Tammy Bathke, Hanzel Cruz and Anna Badalyan, guest

1. The Minutes from September 28, 2011 meeting were approved as presented with a correction
   2b should read Trackdat.

2. Updates:
   a. CurricUNET Implementation: CurricUNET for the Curriculum part is ready and there is
      some training you all can attend. CurricUNET for the SLO Assessment has not been
      created yet, perhaps in the Fall 2011/12. At a conference Audrey found a person at
      another college that uses the SLO CurricUNET and Paul and Nicole will contact that
      person. Nicole cleared up a misconception about CurricUNET that it will not be a place
      for data reporting at the section level, but at the course in aggregate. It is where
      aggregate SLO data is stored.

   b. ISLOs –Nicole and Paul will be going to all the divisions to close loops where possible
      and where there is no loop to close, then they will help faculty set a plan in action.
      Nicole, Ann and Patrick met and mapped the courses that students must take for Social
      Science degree as well as the courses that are in the Social Science ISLO are the same.
      Someone will need to collect course SLO data from Program Review.
      The HFA ISLO has its own challenges because HFA has four divisions are involved. We
      are going to attempt to go from one division to another and address this challenge, but
      the HFA is still a murky in terms of when it will be assessed, how it will be assessed, but
      we are working on it and doing our best.

      Ann encouraged attendance at the Academic Senate, where Program Discontinuance
      will be discussed. In the proposed Program Discontinuance, there is definition of what a
      “program” is which would be helpful for people to review as it relates to Program SLO.

   c. Program Review issues with SLO. Nicole stated that Program Review issues have been
      corrected. Paul and Barry have already done one FLEX training and it went very well.
      Paul did a presentation at the Dean’s meeting about the SLO table get some uniformity.
      He encouraged them to get in some uniformity.

   d. Steering committee and SLOAC and their organization within the college: Based upon a
      model from Cabrillo Community College, a proposal was made to change the purpose
      of the committee so that the members would review all SLO’s and their results; consequently, we could then see campus-wide what issues are re-occurring and what themes are arising. This would create more of an institutional dialogue. Paul wanted to
make sure that the Program Review committee and the SLO committee did not do the same work. Nicole and Paul will bring a more concrete suggestion for reorganization at the November 30th meeting.

3. New Business
Nicole wanted to let everyone know she attended the Student Success workshop two weeks ago. It was very helpful and beneficial. Nicole said she learned a lot about how we are doing compared to other colleges and she believes we are doing better than average. She let the committee know there are some travel funds so if anyone is interested, there is an Accreditation conference in February in Orange County. Paul plans to go and would like at least two other people to attend if possible. The conference is February 10th. Audrey who also attended the conference where it was reiterated that we need to document the dialogues. We need to let departments know to take minutes for department meetings when discussing SLO’s and closing loops. If they can send minutes to Audrey she will have her department post them and keep them in one place. Barry thought the minutes should be kept where the committees are on the website.

Meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m. The next meeting will be November 30, 2011.
SLO Committee Minutes
November 30, 2011


1. The Minutes from October 2011 meeting were approved with changes as presented.

2. Updates:
   a. CurricUNET implementation: Paul Wickline provided a report on the status of the SLO portion of the college’s transition to CurricUNET. Hopefully, there will be more to report after the break because the curriculum portion of CurricUNET was implemented recently.
   b. ISLOs: Paul Wickline and Nicole Lucy reported that they attended the Division meetings for PE, Natural Sciences, Humanities, Fine & Performing Arts, Social Science, and Language & Rationality II (group, not Division) to close the loop on the ISLO. During the spring FLEX week, Paul and Nicole will help the faculty in the Diversity and CTE group close their loop.

3. New Business
   a. Spring FLEX week workshops for CTE and Diversity: Two more ISLO groups will close the loop during the spring FLEX week. The English department will meet in the spring to close the loop on Language & Rationality I. Thus, the remaining ISLO groups that need to complete the closing of the loop are Humanities & Fine Arts, PE, Social Science, & College Skills. Some of these groups may meet in spring, with the remaining meeting during the fall FLEX week.
   b. Proposed Process and Procedures of the SLO Committee and Steering Committee: Nicole prepared a draft proposal detailing the process and procedures of the two committees. Some points discussed:

   • Questions arose about the need for an annual SLO report to the various committees and groups on campus and what form that will take. Barry and committee believed an oral report would be a possibility. Nicole suggested a one page summary report highlighting the main points would also be helpful. Another suggestion was that the CurricUNET assessment module (which is currently not available) should provide institution with a report as well.
   • Committee decided it would be best for SLO Steering committee to meet at least twice a semester – once mid-term and once at the end of the semester.
   • Barry noted that “Student Development” needs to be changed to “Student Services” on flowchart.
   • Barry reported that he thought ISA’s were doing assessments.

A motion was made to accept the proposed revision of the SLO committee structure, with the suggested changes. The motion passed unanimously. The next step is to finalize the process and procedures to be presented to the Academic Senate during the spring 2012.
c. Review of Rubric to evaluate quality and themes of SLO table review: Paul presented a proposed draft of a rubric to evaluate departments’ SLO tables. Due to lack of time, this item was tabled until the spring meeting.
SLO Committee Minutes
February 22, 2012

Attendance: Nicole Lucy, Jennifer Brezina, Barry Gribbons, Paul Wickline, Daylene Meuschke, Leslie Bretall, Jia-Yi Cheng Levine, Mike Joslin and Rebecca Eikey.

1. The minutes from November 2011 were approved with noted changes.

2. Updates:
   a. CurricuNET implementation. Paul informed the committee that the assessment tool exists, but it is not yet functional. He has questions to address with Patrick and the SLO committee, which he will bring to the next meeting. The new date for faculty to use the assessment module is Spring 2013 with a pilot group in Fall 2012. The committee discussed how information would move from the Program Review SLO table into the SLO assessment module. The suggestion was to have an adult hourly copy and paste the information. Barry offered the help of an adult hourly.
   b. ISLOs: Nicole informed the committee that during the spring FLEX week, she and Paul helped faculty close two loops for the CTE and Diversity ISLO groups.

3. New Business
   a. Program Review SLO tables help needed. Some faculty have asked for help completing the SLO table in Program Review. In response to an e-mail, some committee members offered to help the faculty.
   b. Report from attendees at recent Accreditation Institute. Paul gave a report on the workshops he attended. He learned in one of the workshops that a rubric is coming that will explain what is needed for the midterm or Proficiency report. The format and reporting structure will be revealed on April 1, 2012.
   c. Review of Rubric to evaluate quality and themes for SLO table review. Paul distributed the rubric to the committee. The committee members suggested some modifications. Paul will revise the rubric given the suggestions and bring it back to the committee for further discussion.
   d. Loop closing remains for ISLOs: Humanities and Fine Arts, PE, American Institutions, Social Sciences and College Skills. All of these areas will either loop close this semester or assess this semester and loop close during the fall FLEX week.
   e. Open Forum: Reminder that the next meeting will be Wednesday, March 21st with the remaining spring meetings on April 18th and May 16th.

Adjourned at 3:04 p.m.
SLO Committee Minutes  
March 21, 2012

**Attendance:** Nicole Lucy, Jennifer Brezina, Paul Wickline, Leslie Bretall, Jia-Yi Cheng Levine, Rebecca Eikey, Anne Marenco, Ann Lowe, Tammy Bathke, Diane Sionko, Rhonda Hyatt, Alicia Levalley and Patrick Backus

1. The minutes from February 21, 2012 were approved.
2. Updates:
   a. CurricUNET implementation.
3. Review of rubric to evaluate quality and themes for SLO table: The Committee approved the rubric. Paul will be bringing this to the Senate on Thursday, March 22, 2012. This is a tool we will be using. This rubric is for the SLO committee as they review the SLO tables next year.
4. New Business
   a. Help needed to gather data to close loop on Social Science program SLO – some volunteers are necessary to help tally the data regarding Social Science. Committee members Anne Marenco, Jia-Yi Chen-Levine, Leslie Bretall, and Tammy Bathke volunteered to assist.
   b. Fall 2012 FLEX workshops for revision of ISLO process. Offering Fall FLEX on how to revise the ISLO process will hopefully make it a better process.
   c. CurricUNET demonstration, planning and brainstorming for SLO assessment module. The Committee had a lengthy discussion regarding options and formatting. The Committee made some suggestions regarding the module and Paul will work with Patrick make those changes. We are hopeful that a pilot group could use CurricUNET in the fall, and perhaps full implementation in spring 2013 or fall 2014.
   d. Suggestions for resolving SLO deficiencies. A discussion on whether there any penalty for not doing your SLO’s. It was suggested that the Committee look at this in the future after the committee has had a chance to look at the data. It does not appear to be a pressing matter at the moment.
   e. Open Forum: Reminder that the next meeting will be Wednesday, April 18th.

Adjourned at 3:04 p.m.
SLO Committee Minutes
April 18, 2012

Attendance: Nicole Lucy, Ann Lowe, Anne Marenco, Barry Gribbons, Tammy Bathke, Diane Sionko, Rebecca Eikey, Audrey Green, Leslie Bretall, Rhonda Hyatt, Jennifer Brezina and Paul Wickline

1. The minutes from March 21, 2012 were approved.
2. Updates:
   a. CurricUNET demonstration, planning, and brainstorming for SLO assessment module: Paul handed out a flyer of “review of SLO tables in program review” that he, Nicole, and Patrick prepared.
   a. Senate meeting April 26, 2012 to review and approve new Process and Procedures of the SLO committee and Steering Committee: Paul and Nicole will be bringing this back to the Senate in hopes for an approval. It was suggested at the last Senate meeting to merge the SLO and Program review and it was decided to keep both programs separate.
   b. Reporting of SLO data via technology options: Barry presented five options to the committee. After a lengthy discussion the committee liked both the Noris-created option and the Datatel option.
3. New Business
   b. SLO Co-Coordinator positions for the next year.
      Nicole and Paul informed the committee that they will no longer be the SLO co-coordinators. They encouraged members of the committee to strongly consider applying.
   c. Review of the SLO Tables from 2012 program review: These comments were drafted as a way to provide feedback to the chairs before the ACCJC reporting in the fall. A committee member asked about how to get more adjuncts to participate in the SLO process. The adjuncts get five hours of paid FLEX time per semester. On suggestion was to use FLEX time so that the adjunct faculty would be paid for their time participating.

Adjourned 3:10 p.m.

The next and final meeting will be May 16, 2012 in Mentry Hall 246
SLO Committee Minutes
May 16, 2012

Attendance: Nicole Lucy, Paul Wickline, Rhonda Hyatt, Leslie Bretall, Tammy Bathke, Rebecca Eikey, Jia-Yi Cheng-Levine, Mike Joslin, Barry Gribbons, Ann Lowe, Audrey Green and Daylene Meuschke

1. The minutes from April 18, 2012 were approved with changes.

2. Updates:
   a. Reporting SLO data: Web adviser as an option is not a major issue. It would require adding columns for all courses with the heading “SLO.” A committee member asked if there was a way to turn this column on or off for different courses depending upon the cycle of assessment. Barry didn’t know if this was feasible. Another collection alternative would be to have “a link” in the APR to another program, not to web advisor, but another, separate program; however, it will require considerable programming. Thus, this option may not be the most feasible either.
   b. Senate Meeting and New Procedures for the SLO Committee: Senators were concerned about the phrase: “quality of Assessment.” The claim was that having other faculty examine the quality of assessment fringes on their Academic Freedom. At this time, the faculty is not accustomed to this level of sharing. The co-coordinators will attend the last Senate meeting of the fall. The committee discussed the usefulness of the assessment rubric and the reason for it. The language will be altered based upon the suggestions of the committee members and will taken back to the next Senate meeting.
   c. CurricuUNET: The hope is to have a pilot in the fall or spring depending upon changes. Discussion regarding having Adjunct access to the module. The co-coordinators believe that it is an important element.
   d. SLO Table: the table in APR will be open on June 1, 2012, so that faculty can input any updates by September 14, 2012. We want to have the most up to date information to report to ACCJC.

3. New Business
   a. SLO Policy: Using the ACCJC SLO rubric as a place to start. The committee will reexamine this in the fall.
   b. Rebecca Eikey will chair the SLO committee in the Fall. Paul and Nicole are back to help her out.
   c. Dates for fall meetings will be forthcoming depending upon the Senate vote later this month.
   d. Several scheduled FLEX workshops Fall FLEX week August 22nd, including the future of ISLOs.
   e. Open Forum ended 3:00 p.m.
SLO Committee Minutes  
September 19, 2012

Meeting started 1:45 pm; adjournment at 2:30 pm.
Attendance: Paul Wickline, Nicole Faudree, Audrey Green, Jennifer Brezina, Anne Marenco, Rebecca Eikey, Rachel Houghton, Barry Gribbons

1. SLO committee members held an open discussion of collecting SLO results through MyCanyons and addressed concerns expressed by some members of the Academic Senate in the spring. The purpose of the MyCanyons option to submit SLO data is to help ease burden on Department Chairs, as such there is support from various Department Chairs. Committee members shared concerns that instructors should not be identifiable in the aggregate of SLO data. It was confirmed that the data could be coded and would protect student information, but faculty identifiers would still exist.
   a. Barry reported on outside agencies currently requesting data concerning student grades and suggested that this may also become an issue with SLO results in the future.
   b. Consensus reached that we need to bring concerns from the SLO committee and department chairs regarding MyCanyons collection of SLO data. It was agreed that this should be moved to an Discussion Item for Academic Senate approval.

2. Committee discussed the restructuring of SLO Committee document. Barry clarified use and structure of Outcomes and Assessment Steering Committee pointing out the distinction between these two committees.
   a. Rebecca guided discussion about SLO Committee structure. Barry clarified that Administrative Services should be eliminated and Administrative Unit be substituted in language.
   b. Discussion concerning what groups this Outcomes and Assessment Steering Committee would report to (CPT, MAC). Question were raised about necessity of reporting to Staffing and Technology committees. Concern expressed that SLO results may not be the primary determinant of hiring new faculty.
   c. Rebecca noted the need to clarify voting privileges. Everyone recommended that only one vote per division would be allowed. Need to list out all voting committee members.
   d. Clarification requested about inclusion of Professional Development committee members or Professional Development director (Leslie Carr) in the committee membership. Barry suggested potential benefits of including Leslie as a member of the committee. Decision unclear.
   e. Committee discussed functions of the committee as proposed to Academic Senate last spring.
      i. Concerns about term “quality” and “review” in previous version.
      ii. Committee decided to remove “review” and the possibility of
iii. Clarified that committee would monitor SLO and make suggestions in an advisory capacity.

iv. Rebecca offered this language: “To work with departments to insure course and program outcome and assessment are aligned with institution.”

f. Pilot testing and proposed timeline is a working draft of committee work for spring.

g. Questions were raised about whether departments would come to the SLO committee or SLO committee members would meet with departments. Desire is to lessen the feeling of an interrogation. Need to SUPPORT the efforts of the faculty and identify gaps and themes. No decision made; should continue discussion and put together a proposal.

3. Rebecca handed out list of departments to target based on last years’ SLO coordinators’ review of SLO tables.

   a. Paul made suggestion to divide up APR’s from fall 2012 (SLO tables updated) at future meetings. Committee suggested dividing these up at next meeting. Barry’s office will create PDFs and send these to members.

4. Barry suggested we have a notetaker at meetings to help with recording of evaluation and comments concerning SLO tables. Suggestion made to use rubric to evaluate.

5. Rebecca noted need to examine work plan for next meeting and discuss.

6. Need to continue to investigate who will take committee meeting minutes.

7. Rebecca asked Barry how the AUO tables were divided amongst administrators for review. No formal process noted. Barry and Daylene divided randomly.
SLO Committee Minutes
October 17, 2012

Started 1:30 pm; ended 2:30 pm
IN attendance: Rebecca Eikey, Rebecca Kroll, Rachael Houghton, Anne Marenco, Ann Lowe, Audrey Green, Paul Wickline, Nicole Faudree, Leslie Bretall, Tammy Bathke, Jennifer Brezina

1. Approval of Minutes from September 18, 2012
   a. Changes were suggested by Nicole, Rebecca made the changes to the document during the meeting.
      i. #1 last paragraph: last two sentences are confusing, reworded to be clear that student data can be anonymous, but there is no way to remove faculty identifiers.
      ii. #1B change “representation” to “concerns,” “concerning” to “regarding,” “action” to “discussion.”

2. Updates:
   a. Senate Meeting 10/11 – SLO Committee Procedures
      i. The senate requested changes to the SLO committee procedures: clarify membership and duties of members. Rebecca has clarified and will send it back to the senate.
   b. Accreditation SLO Proficiency Report
      i. They want to see dialog about gaps and interdisciplinary discussion of how to fill the gaps.
      ii. Ann suggested a programming change to CurricUNET to include a place in the rationale for how the SLO discussion influenced the curriculum revision.
      iii. Audrey suggested that the Curriculum Committee included discussion of course revisions in their meeting minutes.
      iv. Paul shared Daylene’s data results about how the college is coming along (e.g., 100% of our 1052 courses have SLOs; 76% of courses have ongoing assessment—this may not be rich discussion, but something is present in the SLO tables).
      v. Rebecca, Paul, and Nicole will attend the Academic Division Dean’s Meeting on 10/18
      vi. Rebecca, Paul, and Nicole will attend the Academic Senate meeting on 10/25
   c. CurricuNET—discussion was tabled
   d. There will be a spring FLEX ISLO workshop
   e. There will be a Panel Discussion on Best Practices with regard to SLOs on October 31st, 3-4 PM, room TBD

3. Unfinished Business-discussion tabled
   a. Reporting SLO data via technology – “My Canyons” proposal
b. How to Improve ISLO Discussions

c. **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

d. **Proposed Workplan**
   i. Faculty Manual
   ii. Newsletter

e. Share information with CPT committee – 5 minute Student Learning Report

f. Pilot group for CurricuNet

4. **New Business:**

   a. We discussed how to go about reaching out to Departments/Programs that are not proficient. The committee divvied up the departments that Paul and Nicole identified as needing assistance last semester. We will meet in the next month, before the next regular meeting, to do some norming with regard to evaluating the tables and discuss how we can best assist these departments. Everyone will look over his or her assigned programs before that meeting.

5. **Open forum-none**

Nicole-Administration of Justice
Nicole-Art
Rebecca-Auto Technology
Anne-Computer Networking
Ann-Construction Technology
Rebecca-Culinary Arts
Paul-Dance
Rebecca-Engineering
Jennifer-Rebecca -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
Jennifer-Rebecca -Philosophy
Anne-Photography
Tammy-Physical Science-Physics
Nicole-Physical Education/Kinesiology
Anne-Political Science
Anne-Psychology
Leslie-Sign Language
Ann-Surveying
Ann-Water
Rebecca-Physical Science
SLO Committee Meeting

November 21, 2012

Attendees: Paul Wickline, Rebecca Eikey, Anne Marenco, Jia-Yi Cheng-Levine, Leslie Bretall, Nicole Faudree, Tammy Bathke, and Daylene Meuschke

1. Approval of minutes: Changes to the minutes were made by Rebecca Eikey to the electronic document during the meeting.

2. a) Pilot Group for CurricUNET
   - This group will complete the Assessment module in CurricUNET during the Year 2 update for Program Review instead of completing the course and program SLO tables in the current online Program Review.
   - Confirmed department chairs in the pilot include Paul Wickline (Theatre), Anne Marenco (Sociology), Victoria Leonard (Communication Studies) Jia-Yi Cheng-Levine (English), and Rebecca Eikey (Chemistry).
   - Paul would like at least 10 department chairs to pilot the Assessment module this year.
   - The Program Review Task Force talked about extending invitations to Miriam Golbert (Biology), Dorothy Minarsch (Interior Design and Architecture), Tina Rorick (Nursing), Bob Maxwell (Business), and Connie Perez (Counseling).
   - Reviewed CurricUNET Assessment module. Discussion included not limiting the response on item #3 on phase 2 of the process only to the faculty involved in the analysis phase. Also, the attendees discussed the value of printing the CurricUNET Assessment module and sending it to the SLO committee for comment.
   - Barry suggested keeping the CurricUNET Assessment module in the “pilot/development” phase until the College is satisfied before signing off on it.
   - Other discussion included the need for department objectives to be clearly connected to the SLO data. This is currently done in the online program review process for departments completing the SLO tables in the program review process. However, departments pilot testing the CurricUNET Assessment module will need to be sure to connect related department SLO objectives to the data. The attendees discussed including it in the Action Plan in the CurricUNET Assessment module. It can be included in a text box for “new SLO objectives related to SLOs”. Then Barry can work with Noris on an upload to the online Program Reviews.

b) ISLO Discussion & How to Improve ISLO Discussions
   - There is a workshop planned but no date has been confirmed
   - Paul and Nicole met with divisions to discuss the ISLO process. Discussions largely focused on the process and not a lot on student learning. The discussions were not as meaningful as those involving course and program SLOs.
c) Proposed Workplan

- Faculty Manual – To be done in Spring 2013. Need strong examples for assessing program SLOs. It was suggested to review the “Guiding Principles for SLO Assessment” published by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (http://www.asccc.org/papers/guiding-principles-slo-assessment).
- Newsletter – Rebecca distributed to mailboxes on 11/21/12

d) Outreach for Departments/Programs Not Proficient with SLOs

- Rebecca Eikey will send email to faculty letting them know that SLO committee members will be reaching out to help departments who are not proficient with their course and/or program SLOs.

3. Unfinished Business – Tabled for next meeting

4. New Business

- Use of Blackboard for document storage
  - Fresno C.C. uses the public version for program review.
  - Chad Estrella is looking into the cost of the private version as an option. Audrey Green is also investigating.
  - If a private site is obtained, the committee discussed enrolling all SLO committee members and department chairs so they can have upload privileges. Departments without department chairs but department leads would be enrolled with upload privileges on a case by case basis. All other faculty or users would have guest access without upload privileges.

Meeting adjourned at 2:44pm.
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 2:30 p.m.
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  
Oct 9, 2013  
MENH-246, 2:00-3:00 pm

In attendance: Rhonda Hyatt, Andy McCutcheon, Edel Alonso, Barry Gribbons, Diane Solomon, Nicole Faudree, Anne Marenco, Ann Lowe, Jennifer Brezina, Cindy Stephens

Action items:
- Nicole and Ann Lowe have volunteered to try Authentic Assessment Rubric for program and department assessment.

1) Minutes from Sept 11, 2013 approved.
2) Updates:
   a. Guest Speaker, Geoff Buhl (Sept 25, 2013 meeting)
      i) A robust discussion of Geoff Buhl’s presentation included the following comments, questions, and concerns:
         • Many voiced interest in the idea of using signature assignments for assessment, but some expressed concern over how assignments would be chosen and how the assessment itself would be carried out.
         • Barry suggested that the way that Channel Islands incorporates signature assignments is not that different than our use of ISLOs, but he also pointed out that it raises the same challenges with producing meaningful results from the aggregation of pass/fail numbers.
         • Others who like the idea of signature assignments also expressed concern over the amount of work involved and what that would mean for chairs and faculty.
         • The question was also raised whether the Mapping-GE and Signature Assignment-LEAP models are really as categorically opposed as our discussions seem to suggest.
         • Some suggested that signature assignments could be combined with mapping to create rubrics for assessment of the assignments themselves but also to generate more meaningful dialogue on improving student learning.
         • Edel expressed some concern that GEs often get a “bum rap” in these discussions and suggested that students are not merely “checking off” boxes when selecting courses. She believes that students are making meaningful choices whether they realize it or not.
         • It was also suggested that we need to have a broader discussion about moving forward with LEAP or keeping ISLO structure.
         • Barry suggested questions to ask here might be: What has been the purpose of ISLOs for past five years? How do we use that information to make improvements? Is CSU GE structure the most fruitful structure?
         • Some suggested that we try using signature assignments but keep our current ISLO structure for now. Others wondered if we could even link LEAP principles to GEs to better guide discussions, but keep ISLOs and mapping.
• It was also suggested that more emphasis on guiding loop closing sessions toward meaningful discussion is more crucial than which structure we use to aggregate numbers-- more discussion of pedagogy instead of assessment results.
• Concern was also expressed over what qualified as a signature assignment: does it need to be a culminating assignment? How do we assess/define, for example, “critical thinking” in different disciplines?
• Some concern was expressed over the logistics of assessing signature assignments. Would there be reading sessions of the assignments with table leaders, norming, and rubrics? Who would organize and run these sessions? Who would participate? Who would assemble norming materials and write rubrics? Or, would faculty just read assignments on their own and report individual results? Would this be rigorous enough to produce meaningful results? How would either approach be received by faculty?
• Also, questions were raised concerning what technology would be available to faculty to make this process easier.

b. SLO Resolution (addressing Standard IIIa1c) was approved at Academic Senate (9/26/13)
c. Authentic Assessment (see attached rubric)
   i) The committee discussed what “authentic assessment” really means.
   • Some suggested it means “assessing the assessment tool.”
   • Others asked what the term “real world” means and how it applies to authentic assessment.
   • Nicole asked if any chairs or deans would be willing to use the Authentic Assessment Rubric for department or program assessment.
      o Nicole and Ann Lowe volunteered.
   • Some voiced concern over asking faculty to adopt another rubric.
   • Again, the question was raised: how do we make assessment more meaningful?
   • It was suggested that it is more about the dialogue than grading each other’s assessment tools.
   • The question was asked: It is better to self-assign the discussion over authentic assessment than to be asked to work on it more with accreditation.
   • It was suggested that a question be added to the CurricUNET Assessment Module regarding the authenticity of the rubric.

Meeting adjourned at 3:05 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes from Dec 5, 2012 – the committee approved of the minutes from December 5, 2012. As the members are rotating and volunteering to take the minutes of the meeting, then as a general rule discussions should be generally stated, rather than specifically attributing comments to particular members. In addition, there was agreement that at the end of the minutes there would be a section regarding Action Items to keep the committee on track on the pending issues for the next meeting.

2. Updates:
   a. Accreditation Institute – Several members attended the Accreditation Institute offered by the Statewide Academic Senate February 7-9. One of the themes of the conference was processes and policy. These should be transparent. In addition, planning and financials are a big area. The trend is that if it is the culture of the college to be working on accreditation issues all the time seem to have no problems with accreditation. Whereas those institutions that only work on accreditation topics when a site visit is pending experience the most difficulty in the process. Traits of institutions that are consistently working include well-defined processes for accreditation issues, committees are always reviewing and revising. Furthermore, there is the idea of “critical mass” that all levels are involved in the work and there is ownership and “buy in.”

   Those faculty who attended SLO sessions shared that the SLO committee and the work being done illustrates that COC is one of the colleges working well in this accreditation area. In fact, we are one of the leaders in SLO progress. The committee was pleased to hear this good news, but believed continuing the work of the committee is paramount.

   b. Pilot group for CurricUNET – Paul provided an update on the process of working with CurricUNET and the pilot group. To illustrate, a sample assessment was created to show the technical aspects. During this process, several issues came to light including a missing “submit” button and percentage expected to pass should be a required field. These issues were flagged for discussion with CurricUNET. Additional items for discussion included approval process, review, and historical data.
3. **How to reach out to Departments/Programs that are not proficient?** – The list of departments requiring assistance was revised and updated.

4. **Remainder of Agenda** – the rest of the agenda were tabled due to insufficient time. These items included:
   a. Proposed Work Plan for the Faculty Manual and newsletter
   b. ISLO Discussion & How to Improve ISLO Discussions
   c. Share information with CPT committee – 5 minute Student Learning Report
   d. **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
Nicole - Administration of Justice
Nicole - Art
Rebecca - Auto Technology – meeting with and course assessment started
Anne - Computer Networking – talked with Dept.
Nicole - Construction Technology
Rebecca - Culinary Arts – no response via email
Paul - Dance
Rebecca - Engineering – met with and on good track
Jia Yi - English as a Second Language
Anne - Electronic Systems Technology – talked with
Tammy - Geology – Rebecca met with Vincent
Tammy - Geography – Rebecca met with Vincent
Paul - Graphic and Multimedia Design
Rachael - History
Paul - Interior Design
Rebecca - Math – met with and on good track
Paul - Media Entertainment Arts
Nicole - Manufacturing Technology
Nicole - Modern Languages
Paul - Music
Paul, Nicole, Rebecca - Non-Credit
Jia Yi - Philosophy
Anne - Photography – talked with
Rebecca – Physical Science – met with Vincent
Tammy - Physical Science - Physics
Nicole - Physical Education/Kinesiology
Anne - Political Science
Anne - Psychology – talked with Dept
Anne - Sign Language
Nicole - Surveying
Nicole - Water
SLO Minutes          February 27, 2013

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.
Attendees: Necia Gelker, Daylene Meuschke, Paul Wickline, Nicole Faudree, Anne Marenco, Jennifer Brezina, Ann Lowe, Barry Gribbons.

1. Minutes of 2-27-13 meeting: The minutes were reviewed and amended for accuracy. They were approved as amended.

2. Updates
   a. 2013 Annual Report to ACCJC on SLOs: Daylene reported that there were new areas in the report:
      • “Percent of all college programs with SLO assessment available to prospective students.” The committee discussed the source of that data and agreed the Program Review was the correct source. Since this information is available to students, the committee decided the correct response was “100%.”
      • “URL(s) from college website where prospective students can find SLO assessment results for programs.” At this time the answer to that is “0.” The committee discussed concerns about making this information available in this way. **Action:** The SLO Committee will ask the Academic Senate to discuss the best way to make program assessment information publically. Specifically, which data should be made available and the best way to display it.
   b. Outcome Indicators Meeting: This year ACCJC has asked for performance targets for outcome indicators. Reporting numerical values for target levels is new to ACCJC. The committee is working on both the indicators and the target levels.
   c. Effect on SLO Assessment on curriculum procedures: The committee discussed the fact that some departments are not currently completing their SLO assessments. Ann Lowe expressed concern about those departments creating new curriculum, when that will increase SLO assessment burden. **Action:** The SLO, Curriculum, and Program Review committees will discuss whether or not there should be limits on curriculum development when departments do not assess their SLOs. Any recommendation would be referred to the Academic Senate for discussion.
   d. ISLO discussion: **Action:** This was tabled until the next meeting.
   e. “My Canyons” option for recording SLO results for each student: The Academic Senate authorized voluntary participation by departments in this method of collecting SLO data. Barry Gribbons reported that the college was going to update the system, so this would not be a good time to begin the process. The soonest it could begin is at the end of the spring 2014 semester. **Action:** More discussion at the next meeting.
Updates:

1. Review of 3/13/2013 Minutes: No issues with minutes;
   - Discussion regarding “MyCanyons” option for reporting SLO results for each student; availability projected for spring 2014, but requires action in the form of work order request; Paul will initiate this. Additionally, Paul reconfirmed the position of the Academic Senate that the use of “MyCanyons” to report student SLO results was voluntary on the part of faculty.

2. 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. Specifically how does our district define meeting that standard and how do we demonstrate progress in meeting the standard?

   Paul Wickline presented and reviewed two drafts for discussion: Academic Senate Resolution and Board Policy Statement. These are to be discussion items at the next Academic Senate meeting. Draft is modeled after Statewide Academic Senate Resolution and Long Beach City College senate resolution. Much of the language has been adopted by other institutions.

   AS Resolution Draft discussed at length;

   - Barry Gibbons cautioned on the use of language that was against the Accreditation Standard and supported language that focused on use of SLO data to drive improvement in outcomes and student success. Recommended avoided language that might be viewed from public negatively including for example, the argument related to academic freedom.

   - Nicole Faudree shared about ongoing apprehension on the part of many faculty about the SLO process and Accreditation Standard IIIa1c. Perception that they currently have no mechanism of protection under the faculty agreement or under board policy. Questions arose about the current language in the COCFA faculty agreement and faculty evaluation, grades and outcomes.

   - Nicole Faudree recommended revising resolution to be more compressed, simplified and focus on the use of learning outcome to improve student success.

   - Discussion turned to how other institutions are meeting the standard. Discussion focused on the use of faculty “self evaluations/self reflections” as a means of meeting Accreditation Standard IIIa1c. Self-evaluation is already part of regular faculty evaluation process. Other schools are
using this as a mechanism for compliance. Example from Citrus; one element of the faculty evaluation, “Describe how you have used assessments of learning outcomes in your classroom teaching?” Ann Lowe noted that faculty evaluation is complicated in that the Academic Senate can support and make recommendations for improving the quality of the evaluation but that enforcement in under the COCFA.

- Recommendation: redraft resolution; condense the whereas components and focus on the value of SLO assessment in improving student success and outcomes and add a resolve statement similar to the one from Citrus with the emphasis on faculty “self reflections” on how the faculty member personally make use of the information from student learning outcomes in the classroom. Nicole and Paul will redraft.

3. Discussion on the Board Policy Draft: *Student Learning Outcomes and Administrative Outcomes Assessment*

- Barry Gibbons recommended that perhaps the policy be condensed that it does not need to include historical and administrative procedural content. Additionally recommended that the focus be on the value of assessment and on particular uses of assessment data rather than what data will not be used for (information on top of page 3 of draft).

- Other recommendations to include a privacy statement including faculty and students and to include a statement pertaining to faculty evaluation process including an opportunity for faculty to reflect on their use of learning outcomes.

- Paul and Nicole to redraft

4. Outcomes Indicators Committee- Update Daylene Meuschke

- ACCJC requires annual reporting of performance benchmarks. The committee set the targets for 2015-16 at 5% about the baseline. Daylene corrected some of the numbers presented: 78% for completion target and 59% for the retention target. Also noted that the committee added additional performance indicators, primarily Basic Skills, not required by ACCJC.

5. Standardization of SLO assessments: “should all sections of a course have the same assessment method? Including online and on ground and honors?”

- Paul Wickline noted that uniformity is the “Best practice” the same assessment would be used in multiple sections of the same course. But the reality is that at COC this is probably only happening in a few departments. May not be a priority at this time but would recommend updating the SLO manual to include as a recommendation.

Meeting adjourned.
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
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
Attendees: Tammy Bathke, Jennifer Brezina, Rebecca Eikey, Nicole Faudree, Barry Gribbons, Rhonda Hyatt, Rebecca Kroll, Ann Lowe, Daylene Meuschke, Paul Wickline

I. Minutes of the 4-10-13 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%.”

II. 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.
Add to the Appendix
Addendums to “Don’t Fall into the Pit” handout (Paul)

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 (Tammy)
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.
SLO Committee Minutes
May 22, 2013

Attendees: Jennifer Brezina, Rebecca Eikey, Nicole Faudree, Barry Gribbons, Rhonda Hyatt, Daylene Meuschke, Paul Wickline

I. Minutes of the May 8, 2013 meeting were reviewed and approved with one minor correction to section V. of the updates to the SLO Faculty Manual. Barry and Daylene will be sharing responsibility for Appendix F.

II. Updates

a. Proposed Work Plan

i. Faculty Manual – There is a revised version of the SLO Manual available on Dropbox. Rubrics are still needed for Appendix E. Examples from English courses 101 and 102 are available and there might be an update of English 91. Sociology, Chemistry, and Paralegal volunteered to provide rubric examples. Faculty were requested to upload changes to the manual on Dropbox.

ii. Newsletter – the articles are prepared, but it needs editing. Should be distributed by the end of the week.

b. Standard Illa1c: The resolution was discussed and was tweaked a little regarding minor grammatical issues and the section regarding SLOs and data should not be used in a punitive manner. The revised resolution was approved by the committee and forwarded to the Senate for further review and discussion.

c. Orphan courses/programs: Pending at the Academic Senate. There will be further discussion in the fall.

d. Meeting days/times for fall: the committee agreed that the second and fourth Wednesdays of the month from 2 pm to 3 pm were the best. There was a brief conversation regarding lengthening the meeting time. A proposal was floated to have the first meeting be review of SLOs from the Program Review tables or CurricUNET and the second meeting of the month be for committee business in general. The committee decided to revisit this issue in the fall.

Action Items: Sociology, Chemistry, and Paralegal volunteered to provide rubric examples. Faculty were requested to upload changes to the manual on Dropbox. Newsletter should be distributed by week’s end.
III. Unfinished Business:

a. **Reaching out to departments/programs that are not proficient?**  
   Insufficient time at the meeting to discuss this topic.

b. **How does our District define meeting the Standard IIIa1c?**  
   Brief discussion regarding the negotiations process in the fall and the need for  
   the SLO committee recommended Resolution discussed above.

c. **Effect of SLO Assessment on Curriculum Procedures** – Ann Lowe  
   was not present to discuss, so topic is tabled until the committee can get a  
   report from the Curriculum Committee about what it recommends.

d. **ISLO Discussion & How to Improve ISLO Discussions** – Insufficient  
   time at the meeting to discuss this topic.

e. **Pilot Group for CurricUNET** – The module will be open in the fall for  
   those departments who wish to use it. It will be required to be used  
   starting Fall 2014. The committee discussed how to connect Program  
   Review and CurricUNET assessment module. After the SLO Co-  
   Coordinators reviewed the SLO tables in Program Review, they made  
   sure that the course assessment module requires data in some portions  
   and exposition in others. The hope is to help faculty provide more useful  
   information and less copy and paste. A tangent issue of what is an  
   appropriate break between cycles of assessment. The consensus is that  
   what works for the department is best, but about 3 to 4 years would be a  
   maximum break. Paul showed the committee what the course  
   assessment module currently looks like. There was discussion regarding  
   report generation and creation in word or excel.

f. **Share information with CPT committee** – Insufficient time at the  
   meeting to discuss this topic.

IV. Open Forum

a. **Calculation of percentage of courses with SLO assessment** – Daylene  
   explained how she excluded courses. For example if the course has not  
   been offered due to budget constraints, then that course was not included  
   in the denominator for determining the percentage. Another example  
   would be a course that was cancelled due to low enrollment and because  
   it hasn’t been offered with sufficient time to assess, it was also excluded  
   from the denominator.
SLO Committee Minutes  
Sept 11, 2013  
MENH-246, 2:00-3:00 pm

In attendance: Rhonda Hyatt, Andy McCutcheon, Edel Alonso, Audrey Green, Barry Gribbons, Diane Solomon, Paul Wickline, Nicole Faudree, Rebecca Eikey, Anne Marenco, Denee Pescarmona, Ann Lowe, Jerry Buckley

Action items:
- Barry will put in a work order for Noris to add the collection of SLO data to MyCanyons.
- Everyone to read the Palomar College GE SLO Report before the next meeting (it is on the SLO committee website).

1) Approval of Minutes from May 22, 2013  
2) Updates:  
   a) Share information with CPT committee – 9/9/13 meeting  
      i) Paul put together a sheet highlighting the CPT meeting.  
      ii) Paul provided the committee with the SLO newsletter  
      iii) Discussion clarifying the Student Services SLOs. They call them SLOs but Barry suggested they should be called AUOs. Concern had been expressed about when the SLO tables are removed from the program reviews and moved to CurricUNET, where would the Student Services SLO data be housed. If they are called AUOs, this remedies the issue.  
   b) Orphan Courses/Programs  
      i) Solutions as to who is responsible for these courses and programs were presented to the Senate last semester.  
      ii) Audrey, Ann, Jerry, and Edel met to find faculty to adopt them.  
      iii) Jerry will provide a stipend for faculty adopting orphans.  
      iv) CWE is the only program still needing adoptive parents. Perhaps CWE can be housed in each discipline. For example, the Paralegal CWE component would be added to the Paralegal Program Review. Sign Language would be housed in the Sign Language Program Review. This makes sense because the faculty in each department would be best suited to supervising and evaluating CWE students.  
      v) The list of orphans is on the Senate website.  
   c) Proposed Workplan  
      i) Faculty Manual – deadline to complete will be end of Fall semester  
         (1) We are still working on this.  
      ii) Newsletter – Fall newsletter: focus on Authentic Assessment & CurricUNET Assessment Module  
      iii) Workshops this term:  
         (1) ISLO/LEAP  
         (2) CurricUNET
d) ISLO Discussion & How to Improve ISLO Discussions

   i) Orientation to LEAP method of Assessment
      (1) Three FLEX sessions have been held on this process
      (2) Barry voiced concerns about changing to a system that would be laborious and not fruitful.
      (3) The LEAP system is used by the entire CSU system.
      (4) It assures employers that when students graduate they have the LEAP skills
      (5) E-portfolios may be a good way to document these skills across courses.
      (6) Jerry Buhl from CSUCI will be our guest at our next meeting.
      (7) Palomar is using the LEAP Outcomes and Paul is in contact with them.
      (8) Concerns about faculty evaluations being linked to SLOs were raised. Jerry assured the committee that they should not be used for faculty evaluation.

   e) CurricUNET Assessment Module
      i) Pilot group for CurricUNET
      ii) Open for users this semester
          (1) In the FLEX workshops, people were concerned with accessing historical data. Paul assured them it will still be there in Program Review.
          (2) The CurricUNET assessment module still needs some refining.
          (3) Paul has created a manual, posted on the committee website.
          (4) What is in CurricUNET is an extension of what is in the Program Review SLO tables. It is designed to elicit more thoughtful responses than have been entered into the Program Review.
          (5) On the SLO website under Resources are documents to help with completing the SLO assessment module.
          (6) PSLOs can be mapped from the course SLOs in CurricUNET.
          (7) Barry will put in a work order for Noris to add the collection of SLO data to MyCanyons.

3) Unfinished Business:
   a) How to reach out to Departments/Programs that are not proficient?
   b) Addressing Accreditation Standard IIIa1c
      (1) COCFA negotiations
      (2) Resolution was presented at Academic Senate for discussion
   c) Effect on SLO Assessment on Curriculum Procedures

4) New Business
   a) Authentic Assessment
SLO Committee Minutes
Oct 23, 2013
MENH-246, 2:00-3:00 pm

In attendance: Rebecca Eikey, Daylene Meuschke, Paul Wickline, Rhonda Hyatt, Andy McCutcheon, Edel Alonso, Diane Solomon, Anne Marenco, Jennifer Brezina, Audrey Green

1) Minutes from Oct 9th, 2013 Approved

2) Updates:
   a) Strengthening Student Success Conference Update - Rebecca Eikey
      • Palomar College adopted the LEAP model for ISLO’s and has institutional support for faculty to meet and develop rubrics.
      • This raised a concern regarding a database to serve as a repository for rubric and student portfolio.
        o Recommendation to consider in Program Review that the SLO Committee request a budget augmentation to support a data base
      • ISLO Assessment Discussion: Using the IGETC versus LEAP model; mapping rather than a “signature assignment”. LEAP is recognized and has been adopted by CSU. Current process of assessing IGETC ISLO ineffectual.
        o Question do we still need to assess GE courses for Accreditation???
   b) What type of ISLO or PSLO information are other colleges posting on websites?
      • Palomar College has a link on SLO site to Degree Qualifications and Gainful Employment disclosures.
      • SBCC has a repository of ISLO data
      • Los Medanos has program assessment results
   c) Program level results posted to website
      • CurricUNET does not have the ability to aggregate data to Report ISLO and PSLO
      • ACCJC will expect to see program level assessment results on website, currently program level results are only in Program Review.
      • Discussion regarding how this expectation could best be met and where the information should be housed; Planning and Institutional Research or SLO website.
      • Deadline for making the information available; before Fall 2014
      • Recommendation: take issue to the Senate; Need feedback on how much information is to be put forward on a public link; suggested PSLO results and use of the results. Additionally want feedback from the Senate as to where to house the information for access.
• Information from Program Review may need to be edited for consistency; there are varying degrees of detail and results in the various Program Reviews.
  o Daylene to provide committee chairs with Year 2 PSLO information.
• Audrey reported that there may be a resource allocation that can support this process.

d) How to reach out to Departments/Programs that are not proficient?
  • Using the report from Year 2 of Program Review, committee members will revisit the programs that they were assigned to contact and follow up with regarding SLO and PSLO proficiency.
  • Flex credit may be an option for those who meet with individual with faculty and chairs, Rebecca to follow up with Professional Development.

e) Faculty Manual Update: individual members to review their assigned task for update the manual. Goal is to have manual update by Spring Break 2014.

f) Program Goals: Stated goals of degree programs are to be visible to students on the program or department website. Currently the campus in the process of changing and updating department and program webpages.

g) Unfinished Business
  i) Newsletter – Fall newsletter: focus on Authentic Assessment & CurricUNET Assessment Module – Paul sent out email and on SLO website
  ii) Workshops this term:
    (1) ISLO/LEAP
    (2) CurricUNET
    (3) Authentic Assessment
SLO Committee MINUTES
November 7, 2012
MENH-342, 1:30-2:30 pm

Attendance: Daylene Meuschke, Barry Gribbons, Rebecca Kroll, Leslie Bretall, Nicole Faudree, Paul Wickline, Rebecca Eikey, Anne Marenco

1. Minutes from October 17, 2012 were approved with minor revisions to list of programs to review.

2. Updates were given from the Senate Meeting 10/25
   - SLO Committee Procedures were Approved.
   - The “My Canyons” proposal for reporting on SLO data—was not met with majority approval at Senate meeting. Some faculty were in support, others were not. Committee agreed that they would recommend the use “My Canyons” for SLO reporting should be decided on a Department by Department basis.
     a. Panel Discussion – Best Practices was held October 31. Attendance was low.
     b. Academic Program Review Workshops are coming Nov 30 & Dec 7 & Jan 29. Nicole will draft an email announcement for Joe Gerda to send. Dates for additional offering of this workshop series will be set for Spring FLEX. Daylene has FLEX workshop description.

3. New Business:
   a. The question the committee faces is “How to reach out to Departments/Programs that are not proficient?”
   b. Norming Session using a Physical Sciences as an example was done. The committee agreed improvements could be made to the Program SLO data table, where the first column should specify that this program doesn’t have a degree or certificate. Suggestions were made to rewrite the Program SLOs so that they use higher critical thinking verbs from Bloom’s Taxonomy or to reduce to one Program SLO or the faculty could leave this blank, as it is repetitive from the course SLOs. The course SLOs should include number of students who took the assessment and number who passed. The Criteria for Success should include expectation for passing and criteria for passing. The Use of Results should include more dialog. What is the plan for improvement? Perhaps, author could list the actions that will be performed. Deeper reflection as to how instructors will reinforce SLOs throughout course is needed.

   Committee members agreed that it would be useful to meet with the faculty whose Program Reviews they evaluated and starting helping the faculty with the SLO data tables.
Nicole-Administration of Justice
Nicole-Art
Rebecca-Auto Technology
Anne-Computer Networking
Ann-Construction Technology
Rebecca-Culinary Arts
Paul-Dance
Rebecca-Engineering
Jennifer Jia Yi & Rebecca K. -English as a Second Language
Anne-Electronic Systems Technology
Tammy-Geology
Tammy-Geography
Paul-Graphic and Multimedia Design
Rachael-History
Rebecca-Math
Paul-Media Entertainment Arts
Ann-Manufacturing Technology
Nicole-Modern Languages
Paul-Music
Paul, Nicole, Rebecca-Non-Credit
Jennifer Jia Yi & Rebecca K. -Philosophy
Anne-Photography
Tammy-Physical Science Physics
Nicole-Physical Education/Kinesiology
Anne-Political Science
Anne-Psychology
Leslie-Sign Language
Ann-Surveying
Ann-Water
Rebecca – Physical Sciences
Attendees: Paul Wickline, Rebecca Eikey, Anne Marenco, Jerry Buckley, Daylene Meuschke, Dilek Sanvers-Wang, Andy McCutcheon, Denée Pescarmona, Rhonda Hyatt, Jennifer Brezina, Edel Alonso, Audrey Green, Peter Hepburn, Ann Lowe

The committee discussed the feedback from ACCJC regarding the College Status Report. The report used the following rubric to evaluate the college’s progress implementing effective practices in student learning objectives:

5 – exceeds expectations
4 – meets expectations
3 – barely meets expectations
2 – doesn’t fully meet expectations
1 – doesn’t meet expectations

Overall analysis:
- Course level SLOs = 4
- Program level SLOs = 3
- Student learning and support activities = 5
- Institutional Learning Outcomes = 5

Specific areas:
- 1.5 – SLOs and authentic assessments. This is a new area for the college and will require work towards incorporating authentic assessments into the SLO process. Currently do not have a process established related to authentic assessment, but doing so is within the scope of the committee.

Action items for spring semester:
- FLEX presentations related to authentic assessment
- Division presentations
- SLO committee member training – handbook
- Presentation at chair retreat

- 2 – Widespread dialogue about SLO results and identification of gaps. The committee agreed this was an area needing improvement. In particular a definition of “gaps” needs to be developed to aid discussion.

Suggestions:
- Campus wide meetings twice a year – Daylene will bring examples
- Retreats of college leadership to discuss global themes
- Help departments develop a consistent process of recording SLO discussions and planning
- Division meetings devoted to SLO results
- FLEX days designated for SLO discussions
• 3 – Decision making includes dialogue on SLO results. The committee agreed that was also an area needing improvement.

**Discussion items:**
- Develop a method to examine which budget requests directly benefit student learning
- Coordinated programs that are integrated into the institutional student learning outcomes would help clarify needs.

Items for continued discussion:
- Finish examining the status report results
- Continue ISLO discussions
- Investigate an appropriate place to store program level results
SLO COMMITTEE MEETING  
11-27-13

Attendees:  Paul Wickline, Rebecca Eikey, Anne Marenco, Daylene Meuschke, Dilek Sanver-Wang, Denee Pescarmona, Rhonda Hyatt, Edel Alonso and Barry Gribbons.

1) Minutes from Nov 13, 2013 approved.

2) Discussion of Program Review
   a) Paul Wickline sent out SLO Assessment reminder to encourage faculty to use the CurricUNET assessment module.
   b) Program Review deadline is Feb. 24th.
   c) The CurricUNET assessment module is back online.

3) Orphan Courses/Programs
   a) Edel Alonso presented a list of Orphan Courses/Programs in need of a faculty member to adopt for the purpose of:
      i) Scheduling the course and assigning faculty to teach the course
      ii) Hiring and evaluating adjunct faculty
      iii) Writing and revising curriculum
      iv) Writing and assessing SLOs
      v) Including the course as part of a Program Review
   b) Edel has contacted various faculty members to adopt the courses/programs. Some courses are scheduled to be adopted; others have been deleted. If an orphan course is attached to a degree, the appropriate dept. could adopt the course.
   c) CTE program is being reorganized (SOLAR 050, 052, 101)
   d) GERO 101-104 and HUMAN 100,101,150 are all part of the SHARP program and need to be renamed.
   e) NANO 010 – Edel will check with Omar regarding the status of the grant.
   f) Denee indicated that BCSK 050 and 100 belong together for the GED certificate. She also suggested that all noncredit courses be split up and adopted into the appropriate departments.
   g) Denee will check the Basic Skills classes for Math and English that are run through Upward Bound.
   h) Diane Stewart will do the GED program review for the time being. All academic program reviews need to be done by faculty in the future.
   i) All faculty who are adopting courses/programs are in negotiations for release time and/or stipend.
4) Continued discussion on the College Status on SLO Implementation
   (Proficiency Report)
   a) Denée and Paul presented the report to the Deans.
   b) Course-level SLOs: student survey results indicate that 87% of students
      are aware of course-level SLOs. Emphasis on making program level
      SLOs available to students to increase awareness.
   c) Some faculty are resistant to posting SLOs on syllabi. It’s an accreditation
      issue and the information needs to be in there.
   d) Proficiency Rubric Statement 3 - Discussion items:
      i) SLOs need to be tied to budget. Need to make the connection with
         CPT.
      ii) Allocation of resources – Pac-B connection
      iii) In Program Review, strategic goals are tied in with budget requests,
         but these goals are not tied to SLO assessment data. Currently, only
         the objectives are listed in Program Review, not the SLOs. It was
         suggested that the courses that the objectives are linked to should be
         added in as well.
      iv) There is currently no evidence of dialogue regarding SLO assessment
         results, which would lead to decision-making. This is easier to institute
         at the institutional level. We need to change the campus culture and
         have meaningful dialogue among faculty across disciplines as well as
         within disciplines (at Division and Dept. meetings, FLEX workshops,
         Dept. retreats and at the Dept. Chair retreat).

5) Items for continued discussion next time:
   - Finish examining the status report results
   - Continue ISLO discussions
SLO Committee summary  
Dec 11, 2013

No special minutes were taken.
Special meeting held in conjunction with the following presentation:

A representative from Digication gave a demonstration of their e-Portfolio product. The demonstration in Hasley Hall 235 at 2:00 pm – 3:00 pm.

Digication e-Portfolios Overview

Digication e-Portfolios provides teachers and students with the tools needed to collect, document, and publish work online. The process of creating e-Portfolios facilitates teaching and learning while giving schools valuable content to support class, department and institutional goals. E-Portfolios can be used to document and assess student work, present collaborative projects, create interactive resumes, and build communities.

More information on Digication e-Portfolios can be found on their website at: www.digication.com.

1)