SLO Committee Meeting

November 21, 2012

Attendees: Paul Wickline, Rebecca Eikey, Anne Marenco, Rebecca Kroll, 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.
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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