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 be not 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.
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 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
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.
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  
Feb 13, 2013  
MENH-342, 2:00-3:00 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.
SLO COMMITTEE MINUTES
3-13-13

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.
SLO Committee Minutes 3/27, 2013

Attendees: Daylene Meuschke, Paul Wickline, Nicole Faudree, Anne Marenco, Rhonda Hyatt, Ann Lowe, Barry Gibbons, Rebecca Kroll, Tammy Bathke, Rebecca Eikey

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 is 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
DRAFT
COC Academic Senate Resolution on Student Learning Outcomes

WHEREAS, College of the Canyons has focused its instruction and assessment on course SLOs, course objectives and criteria for measurement of learning,
WHEREAS, our goal is to work in partnership with our students as they develop the skills necessary for success first in our courses, and then, for honing these skills as they transfer to other colleges, programs, and/or the workplace as successful lifelong learners,
WHEREAS, at College of the Canyons, assessment of SLOs shall be used to analyze, and thereby improve, student learning through informed decision making and planning,
WHEREAS, assessment results should be used for and limited to the following roles in the institution:

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

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

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

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

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

4-10-2013
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Nicole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Nicole/Ann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Tammy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Assessment Plans for Courses</td>
<td>Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Assessment Plans for Department-Level Programs</td>
<td>Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing and Assessing SLOs for Institutional-Level Programs</td>
<td>tbd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling Assessments</td>
<td>Ann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting/Analyzing Data and Fostering Dialogue</td>
<td>Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documenting Progress</td>
<td>Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary (from ASCCC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 Illa1c?**
   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
General Education Assessment

outcomes based General Education with embedded, authentic assessment
Geoffrey Buhl
Chair of the Academic Senate’s General Education Committee
Title V Project ISLAS Faculty Lead
Associate Professor of Mathematics
Presentation Structure

General Education structure and alignment

Authentic assessment of General Education
**Outcomes Based GE**

**Goal 1.** Evaluate issues and integrate ideas from multiple perspectives, including cultural, national and international, and disciplinary perspectives, and identify actions consistent with their own civic responsibility.

**Goal 2.** Identify clear, logical, and creative arguments.

**Goal 3.** Find and critically examine information.

**Goal 4.** Communicate effectively using a variety of formats.

**Goal 5.** Understand the physical universe and its life forms, scientific methodology, and mathematical concepts, and use quantitative reasoning.

**Goal 6.** Cultivate intellect, imagination, sensibility and sensitivity through the study of philosophy, literature, languages, and the arts.

**Goal 7.** Understand social, cultural, political, and economic institutions and their historical backgrounds, as well as human behavior and the principles of social interaction.
Contexts for GE

• California State System
• WASC
• Channel Islands Campus
Goal 4. Communicate effectively using a variety of formats. They are able to:

Outcome 4.1 Speak and present effectively in various contexts.
Outcome 4.2 Write effectively in various forms.
Outcome 4.3 Use relevant tools in various contexts to present and/or integrate ideas.
Size and structure of the General Education program is dictated by the system: 48 units total including 9 upper-division GE courses.
This enables us to map course coming in from local community colleges and other CSUs to our GE Learning Goals.
MEMORANDUM

TO: CSU Presidents
FROM: Charles B. Reed
Chancellor

SUBJECT: General Education Breadth Requirements—Executive Order No. 1065

Attached is a copy of Executive Order No. 1065 relating to California State University General Education Breadth (CSU GE Breadth) requirements. This executive order supersedes Executive Order 1033 and incorporates Title 5 changes adopted by the Board of Trustees at the July 12, 2011 meeting. The changes specify that students seeking a baccalaureate degree in postbaccalaureate standing shall not be required to complete additional general education courses as a requirement for graduation.

In accordance with policy of the California State University, the campus president has the responsibility for implementing executive orders where applicable and for maintaining the campus repository and index for all executive orders.

If you have questions regarding this executive order, please contact the Office of Academic Programs and Policy at (562) 951-4722.

CBR/clm

Executive Orders from the Chancellor’s Office further shaping GE goals to include the AACU’s LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes Framework.
There is not an explicit mapping of the LEAP outcomes specified by Executive Order, but there is significant overlap.
The WASC Commission has approved the first stage of the accreditation redesign process. A major component of the redesign is that institutions will be expected to demonstrate that their graduates have achieved the institution's stated level of proficiency at least in the following five areas stated in CFR 2.2a: written and oral communication, quantitative skills, critical thinking and information literacy. The Commission views this new element of the institutional review process as an essential step forward but also recognizes that it poses a challenge. Thus, WASC seeks to work with our member institutions, learn from them, and become a resource to support the region’s higher education community as we all respond to rising public and federal expectations for accountability and student achievement.
Assessment done as a part of GE program review directly serves institutional accreditation needs.
Channel Islands Mission Statement

Placing students at the center of the educational experience, California State University Channel Islands provides undergraduate and graduate education that facilitates learning within and across disciplines through integrative approaches, emphasizes experiential and service learning, and graduates students with multicultural and international perspectives.
Questions?
Assessment Philosophy

Valuable assessment:
1. Drives institutional improvement,
2. Enables faculty development, and
3. Fosters student achievement.
Assessment of student work for outcome achievement and for course grades occurs naturally and in a lightweight way.
Data Rich and Output Focused

Success of GE program is judged by the evidence of student learning as assessed through signature assignments.
General Education Goal 1. Evaluate issues and integrate ideas from multiple perspectives, including cultural, national and international, and disciplinary perspectives, and identify actions consistent with their own civic responsibility. Students will be able to:

Outcome 1.1 (c) Integrate content, ideas, and approaches from integrative perspectives across disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial 1</th>
<th>Emerging 2</th>
<th>Developing 3</th>
<th>Highly Developed 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>Presents examples, facts, or theories and asks questions deriving from more than one field of study or perspective.</td>
<td>Connects examples, facts or theories from more than one field of study or perspective, and asks questions that imply connective answers.</td>
<td>Independently connects examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective, and independently that imply connective answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Uses, in a basic way, skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation in a new situation.</td>
<td>Uses, in a basic way, skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation in a new situation, to contribute to understanding of problems or issues.</td>
<td>Adapts and applies skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations to solve problems or explore issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Identifies connections between life experiences and those academic texts and ideas perceived as similar and related to own interests.</td>
<td>Compares life experiences and academic knowledge to infer differences, as well as similarities, and acknowledges perspectives other than own.</td>
<td>Effectively selects and develops examples of life experiences, draw from a variety of contexts (family life, artistic participation, community engagement, academic field work, work experience) to illuminate concepts/theories/frameworks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meaningly synthesizes connections among experiences outside of the formal classroom (including life experiences and academic experiences such as internships and travel abroad) to deepen understanding of fields of study and to broaden own points of view.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students are exposed to rubrics that guide help them form expectations for their learning and quality of work
Working definition of authentic assessment of student learning is assessment based on student work that occurs as a natural part of coursework and that intentionally captures instructors evaluations of student work.
Assessment Paradigm

- Learning Outcomes
- Student Evidence
- Assessment Tools

The diagram illustrates the interplay between learning outcomes, student evidence, and assessment tools, highlighting the cyclical nature of assessment.
GE goals are at the programatic level. GE learning outcomes are implemented at the course level.
Major course assignments or Signature Assignments are designed so that students can demonstrate achievement towards GE learning outcomes.
Assessment tools are applied to student evidence of learning to assess student achievement of GE learning outcomes.
TK20 Campuswide

A repository for student evidence, signature assignments, assessment tools, all linked to student learning outcomes.
ATOMS OF ASSESSMENT

Apply assessment tools to groups of signature assignment generates data that can be used for program review as well as reaccreditation efforts.
Status of Transition

- Learning outcomes - progressing
- Assessment Tools - almost there
- Signature Assignments - initial
- Electronic Portfolio - almost there
- Academic Policies - progressing
- Assessment Plan - initial
Questions?
Consent Agenda Item –
Revisions to SP 06-06 General Education Learning Goals and Outcomes

Drafted by: General Education Program Review Task Force in consultation with the General Education Committee

Background: The GE Program Review Task Force took the learning outcomes listed last in the original SP 06-06 policy, and with small revisions, has listed them first in these revisions. This was done because they emphasize the University mission and should therefore be listed first.

Policy:

General Education Goals and Outcomes

General Education requirements are designed to assure that all graduates of the University, whatever their major, have acquired essential skills, experiences, and a broad range of knowledge appropriate to educated people within a society. Students who complete the General Education program examine the modern world and issues facing societies from multiple perspectives and translate knowledge into judgment and action in the form of civic engagement.

Goal 1. Evaluate issues and integrate ideas from multiple perspectives, including cultural, national and international, and disciplinary perspectives, and identify actions consistent with their own civic responsibility. They will be able to:

- Outcome 1.1 Integrate content, ideas, and approaches from (a) multicultural perspectives, (b) national and international perspectives, and (c) integrative perspectives across disciplines.
- Outcome 1.2 Take individual and collective actions which can address issues of public concern.

Goal 2. Identify clear, logical, and creative arguments. They are able to:

- Outcome 2.1 Reason inductively and deductively and from a variety of perspectives.
- Outcome 2.2 Deliberate with others and present arguments clearly, logically, and creatively.

Goal 3. Find and critically examine information. They are able to:

- Outcome 3.1 Access needed information effectively and efficiently.
- Outcome 3.2 Evaluate information and its sources critically.
- Outcome 3.3 Explain the economic, legal, social, and ethical issues surrounding the use of information.
Goal 4. Communicate effectively using a variety of formats. They are able to:

Outcome 4.1 Speak and present effectively in various contexts.
Outcome 4.2 Write effectively in various forms.
Outcome 4.3 Use relevant tools in various contexts to present and/or integrate ideas.

Goal 5. Understand the physical universe and its life forms, scientific methodology, and mathematical concepts, and use quantitative reasoning. They are able to:

Outcome 5.1 Conduct planned investigations using the scientific method to reach reasoned conclusions.
Outcome 5.2 Solve problems using mathematical methods.
Outcome 5.3 Use graphs, tables, etc. to represent and explain scientific and mathematical models.
Outcome 5.4 Make connections between important/core/key concepts (or big ideas) in the natural sciences to describe/explain natural phenomena.

Goal 6. Cultivate intellect, imagination, sensibility and sensitivity through the study of philosophy, literature, languages, and the arts. They are able to:

Outcome 6.1 Analyze creative human products and ideas.
Outcome 6.2 Articulate personal thoughts and emotions when encountering human creations and ideas.
Outcome 6.3 Create original and imaginative works in philosophy, literature, language, and/or the arts.

Goal 7. Understand social, cultural, political, and economic institutions and their historical backgrounds, as well as human behavior and the principles of social interaction. They are able to:

Outcome 7.1 Convey how issues relevant to social, cultural, political, contemporary/historical, economic, educational, or psychological realities interact with each other.
Outcome 7.2 Discuss how social sciences conceive and study human experience.
Outcome 7.3 Use social science methods to explain or predict individual and collective human behavior.
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.
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 MEETING
11-13-13

Attendees: Paul Wickline, Rebecca Eikey, Anne Marenco, Jerry Buckley, Daylene Meuschke, Dilek Sanvers-Wang, Andy McCutcheon, Denee 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) Denee 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](http://www.digication.com).

1)