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.
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-Physics
Nicole-Physical Education/Kinesiology
Anne-Political Science
Anne-Psychology – talked with Dept
Anne -Sign Language
Nicole -Surveying
Nicole -Water
CurricUNET Assessment Module Instructions
In an effort to assist faculty with the planning and collection of assessment plans and results, College of the Canyons purchased the CurricUNET Assessment Module from Governet and the college moved from the WEBCMS system to CurricUNET in 2010. This tool will replace the SLO tables within the program review beginning fall 2014. Pilot testing began in spring 2013. All faculty will have the opportunity to use this tool beginning fall 2013.

**What will the Assessment Module do?**

- Allow faculty to record both assessment plans and results at both the course and program levels.
- Use a combination of drop down selection and narrative response for faculty to record assessment plans and results.
- Provide a central database of assessment plans and results that can be easily accessed by faculty and department chairs for planning, discussion, reflection, etc.
- Provide SLO coordinators and researchers a more effective method for creating institutional assessment reports than the SLO tables currently offer.
- Simplify the data entry process for faculty by reflecting the information currently asked in the SLO tables within program review. (A few additional questions have been added to improve the assessment process and meet accreditation expectations.)
- The program level assessment process allows for either direct assessment or mapping. If mapping, the database will pull course level results that exist within the module and tally these results for faculty.

**What won’t the Assessment Module do?**

- It will not aggregate information from multiple sections of the same course. Faculty members and department chairs will still need to collect this information for input into the assessment module. For example, if a department has 10 sections of a 101 course, a faculty member still must collect and aggregate the assessment data and enter this into the assessment module. **Each 101 instructor will not enter his/her own data into the assessment module.**
- When mapping assessments at the program level, the module believes each SLO is a different student. Therefore, if you have 25 students in a course, and you have two SLOs for that course, the module believes you have 50 students rather than 25. However, the percentage is still accurate. There is currently no known solution for this, but the SLO coordinators will continue to work with GOVERNET to address this problem.
COURSE LEVEL ASSESSMENT

**Note:** This guide will only discuss “Course Level Assessment.” A guide for “Program Level Assessment” will be provided during 2013 fall semester.

The assessment module is broken into **two phases**.

The **first phase** (which is very brief) is the identification of an “**ASSESSMENT PLAN**.”

- Ideally, this phase should be completed at least one semester before and **no later than the start of the semester** in which the assessment will take place. So, if your department is assessing a course’s SLOs in the spring, complete the plan the previous fall.
- After faculty members have completed the first phase within the assessment module, they will submit this plan to their **department chair** for approval or editing.
- If the plan is approved, the faculty who submitted the plan will then be able to enter results in the second phase.
- The department chair could also send the plan back to faculty for clarification or make his/her own changes to the plan.

The **second phase** is the recording of “**ASSESSMENT RESULTS**,” the **analysis** of those results and the **action** the department will take based on the analysis of those results.

After faculty have completed the second phase, they will click the **SUBMIT** button to make the assessment “active” and complete the assessment for this course.

**So, let’s get started!**
PHASE 1 – ASSESSMENT PLAN

1. The CurricUNET login webpage is http://www.curricunet.com/Canyons/. (If you forget this link, you can also type “curriculum” in the COC home page and the first item that is shown is the COC CurricUNET page.)

2. Type your login username and password (contact Patrick Backes – patrick.backes@canyons.edu if you need this information.)
3. Click on “Create Outcomes Assessment” under BUILD in the side menu. Doing so will open this screen:

![Create Outcomes Assessment Screen]

4. “Create a New Assessment.” Complete the fields with the following:
   a. **Title** for this assessment.
      i. Include at least the Course number (TH 110). (“TH” is abbreviation for theatre)
      ii. You might also include the name of the course (Understanding Theatre)
      iii. If you have more than one SLO for the course, you should identify which SLO you are assessing (SLO1, SLO2, SLO3, etc.).
      iv. Example: **TH 110_Understanding Theatre_SLO1**
      v. You don’t need to include the date, as this will appear by default.
   b. **Assessment Term** -- In what semester/year the assessment will take place.
      i. In most instances, the assessment will take place in one term.
      ii. However, if you wish to assess for several semesters before you plan to complete phase 2 (analysis results/action plan) you may click on “**Term Range**” which will open up a beginning semester and an ending semester.
   c. **Cycle of assessment**. How many times has the department assessed this course? Most departments should have at least 1 cycle complete, others may have 6 or more.
   d. **What are you assessing?** Select either **Course SLO** or **Program SLO**. Each will open up a different menu option.
   e. Click **SAVE** (bottom right). This will open a screen allowing you to select the “**DISCIPLINE**” and “**COURSE**”
5. “Create a New Assessment” Continued.
   a. See COURSE SLO at the bottom of the screen in the blue banner.
   b. Click on green “+” to the right of “Select Discipline.” This will automatically load the discipline for which you are assigned.
   c. Click on green “+” to the right of “Select Course.” Select your course. After selecting discipline, each course within your assigned discipline will become available. Choose the course for which you are creating an assessment plan.
   d. Once you complete this process, you will see the option to SAVE, FINISH or CANCEL at the bottom of the screen. Click “FINISH” if ready to move on.
6. **Results.** You can edit or move on.
   a. You will now see a screen that would allow you to edit the fields you have completed so far. Click on a pencil to edit a field if needed.
   b. Or click “State Outcome” in the ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST to select the outcome you are going to assess in this plan.

7. Click on “State Outcome (Phase 1)” in the Assessment Checklist. This will open up an area that pulls the courses SLOs from the CurricUNET database.
   a. The course below only has ONE SLO. If the course has multiple SLOs, these would appear below.
   b. Also, if the course has both LECTURE and LAB SLOs, these would appear below.
   c. Click on the box to the left of the SLO to select it.
   d. Click on FINISH. Doing so will “lock” the information and put a check mark next to the “State Outcome” in the Assessment Checklist.
8. Click on “Means of Assessment (Phase 1).” You will see this screen below.
   a. Answer the questions below concerning the MEANS OF ASSESSMENT and CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS. See comments below.
   b. Click “FINISH” when finished.

   **Means of Assessment**
   - Select the following assessment instrument to assess the SLO
   - Essay
   - Test
   - Skill Demonstration
   - Performance
   - Objective Test
   - Survey
   - Portfolio
   - Other, Please Specify

   What method of assessment will you use to assess the students’ attainment of the course SLO? You can click more than one instrument to assess an SLO; however, if you do so, make sure to clarify the criteria for success for each in the “Criteria for Success” below.

   **Assessment Checklist**
   - Main
   - State Outcome (Phase 1)
   - Means of Assessment (Phase 1)

   Please describe the specific involvement of the faculty members (including adjunct faculty) at phase 1 (planning phase)

   Please explain how faculty were involved in the development of the assessment instrument or will be involved in the implementation of plan.

   **Criteria for Success**
   - Please state the percentage of students the department expects to pass the SLO assessment
   - %

   Identify the names of the faculty (including part-time) involved in the planning. This is important for departmental record keeping, routing of questions, etc.

   Identify the percentage of students you expect to pass the assessment.

   Please note the criteria for passing the assessment. For example, a score of 75/100 on a rubric, attaining an 80/100 on final exam, etc.
9. Once you click FINISH, you will see “locked” fields and the “Means of Assessment (Phase 1)” checked in the ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST. See below. If you wish to revise the information, click “UNLOCK” to edit.

10. You are now ready to SUBMIT PHASE 1 to the department chair.
   a. Click Submit Phase 1 in the “Assessment Checklist”
   b. If the department chair has completed this plan, he/she will submit AND approve phase 1.

Congratulations! You have completed PHASE 1 and submitted an ASSESSMENT PLAN to your department chair for review. You can track your proposal by returning to your CurricUNET home page and clicking on “My Proposals” under “Track” in the lefthand menu.

Here’s our sample assessment. Click on “Check Status” for details.
PHASE 2 – ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Once your department chair has approved the assessment plan and you are ready to submit the course assessment results, you can move on to PHASE 2 – the recording of the assessment results.

Please note, instructions for department chairs will be provided in a separate guide.

1. Click on “Modify Outcomes Assessment” (highlighted in red) under BUILD on the CurricUNET homepage. This is located under “Create Outcomes Assessment” which you accessed to create the Assessment Plan.
2. Doing so will open up all of your current outcome plans and assessments.
   a. Select the Assessment Plan for which you are recording your results.
   b. Notice you can search and sort by “Outcome Areas (Department),” Phase” (1 or 2) and “Outcome Type” (Course, Program or All)

3. To the left of the outcome, is a menu of options (edit, delete, Word doc, HTML doc, XLS spreadsheet). Click on the PENCIL icon to “EDIT” the document.
4. Clicking EDIT (pencil) will open up **PHASE 2**.
   a. Note – you can also make edits to “Title,” “What You Are Assessing,” “Assessment Term” and other fields if needed. This was provided in case faculty need to make changes to the title, etc.
   b. Notice the ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST at the right.
   c. Click on “Results (Phase 2)” to enter SLO results.
5. Enter “RESULTS (Phase 2)” (data) from assessment.
   a. # of students who participated in the assessment.
   b. # of students who passed the assessment.
   c. A percentage will be calculated automatically.
   d. If your department used sampling for that assessment, please describe process in text box.
   e. Optional – you may upload a copy of the results.
   f. CLICK “FINISH” (Note -- If you do not enter information for “Students Participated” and “Students Passed,” you will not be able to “FINISH” this step.)

You may find that the recording of results may occur BEFORE you have a chance to meet as a department to discuss these results. You can always choose to click “Finish” and close this assessment and return to it later when you have “closed the loop” with your department. **Entering the raw data and not “closing the loop” will mean the SLO analysis is incomplete.** SLO coordinators and SLO committee members will monitor these reports and remind chairs of analysis that is incomplete.
6. **Enter ANALYSIS OF RESULTS (Phase 2).** See “Assessment Checklist” at right of screen.
   a. Remember – an “assessment loop” is not “closed” until faculty have discussed the results and a plan for future assessment. This is a very important step in the assessment process. The SLO committee recommends using Department retreats in the fall and spring to discuss assessment results, develop action plans, etc.
   b. Complete sections. See notes below. When finished, click “FINISH.”

   ACCJC expects that all faculty (both full-time and part-time) participate in the assessment process. Please explain how faculty were involved in phase 2 of this assessment process.

   ACCJC refers to this as “identification of gaps” in student learning.
Here is a sample of the above:

Please indicate the semester and year the department discussed assessment results.

| Fall | Year: 2013 |

Please describe where this dialogue occurred

- Department Retreat/Meeting
- FLEX Session
- Email Conversation
- Division Meeting
- Other

Please answer the questions below concerning assessment results:

1. Did students’ level of achievement meet, exceed, or fall below Discipline’s target (see “Criteria for Success” and “Results”).
   - [ ] Below
   - [ ] Meet
   - [ ] Exceed
   
   **Comments**
   
   Estimated level of success was 75%. 85% of students passed assessment. Faculty believe the assessment is appropriate, but would like to hold norming session to explore consistency among faculty in scoring.

2. Please describe the specific involvement of the faculty members (including adjunct faculty) at phase 2 (analysis phase)*

   Both full-time and part-time faculty teaching TH 110 were involved in a discussion of results. Faculty will participate in development of an action plan.

Please answer questions below concerning analysis of assessment results:

3. Please identify specific strengths or areas where students demonstrated success in achieving course outcome(s).*

   1. Knowledge of roles of theatre practitioners in creating the theatrical event.
   2. Insightful analytical comments in many of the critiques.

4. Please identify specific weaknesses or areas where students struggled to demonstrate success in achieving course outcome(s).*

   1. Weak thesis statements.
   2. Poor organization in essays.
   3. Essays lack sufficient examples to support opinions about production quality.
Congratulations! You are ALMOST FINISHED! The last step (“Action Plan”) is very important.

7. **Complete Action Plan:**

   “Just as diagnosis without treatment is not very helpful to a sick patient, assessment without analysis and action can do little for an institution” (Braskamp, 1989)

   *Data without dialogue is useless.* Faculty (and students) benefit when faculty discuss the meaning of assessment results and create a plan of action to address findings.

   The purpose of the action plan is to...
   - Lead to continuous improvement
   - Enhance effectiveness of program
   - Provide for efficient use of resources

   **There are three steps to this process and three fields to complete:**
   
   a. What is your plan?
   b. Timeline for implementation?
   c. Next planned assessment? (This demonstrates “ongoing assessment” which ACCJC expects all colleges to show evidence of)

   The “plan” is guided by the following prompt in this assessment module:

   "As a result of the department wide dialogue concerning analysis of results, give specific examples how your department will improve student learning in the next assessment. If the department believes no improvement is necessary, indicate how the department will ensure ongoing level of success."

   However, it may also be helpful to consider the following “What If’s:"

   - What if our learning outcomes are not as clear as we would like them to be?
   - What if our methods of assessment are not as clear as we would like them to be?
   - What if we failed to collect the appropriate data?
   - What if our methods of assessment do not really work?
   - What if our results do not really tell us anything?
Please identify the NEXT time the course SLOS will be assessed. The SLO committee recommends assessment at least every 2-3 years.
8. Once you have completed the **ACTION PLAN**, click “SAVE” or “FINISH.”
   a. “SAVE” will allow you to return to PHASE 2 if needed to make revisions before submitting to department chair.
   b. “FINISH” will allow you to “SUBMIT PHASE 2.” If you choose “FINISH” a button will appear in the ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST area at the top right.
CurricUNET Assessment Module Instructions – Recording Outcome Assessment at the Course Level

Once you complete an assessment, you can then run WORD, EXCEL and HTML reports. A sample WORD report is included below:

### Outcome Assessment Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> TH 110_Understanding Theatre_FALL FLEX_DELETE - Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status:</strong> Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type:</strong> Course Student Learning Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Created On:</strong> 08/16/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course:</strong> THEATR 110 - Understanding Theatre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide the complete statement of the outcome being assessed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraise and evaluate a theatrical or dramatic presentation through an examination of production elements such as the script, direction, acting, costumes, scenery, properties, music, choreography, lighting, and sound.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Instrument(s):</strong> Essay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please describe the specific involvement of the faculty members (including adjunct faculty) at phase 1 (planning phase).

Faculty teaching TH 110 met with department chair to compare critique assignments used for assessment and to develop rubric to assess assignment.

Please identify the faculty involved in planning this assessment.

Paul Wickline, David Stears, Madeline Lindenheim, Leigh Kennicott, Theresa Layne,
Results

Please indicate in the box below the number of students who took the assessment.

70 Students Participated

Please indicate in the box below the number of students who passed the assessment.

60 Students Passed

Below is the percentage of students who passed the assessment.

85.7 %

If your department used sampling, please describe the process utilized below.

Analysis of Assessment Results

Please indicate the semester and year the department discussed assessment results.

Fall 2013

Please describe where this dialogue occurred.

Department Retreat/Meeting

1. Did students' level of achievement meet, exceed, or fall below Discipline's target (see "Criteria for Success" and "Results").

Exceeds

Comments:

Estimated level of success was 75%. 85% of students passed assessment. Faculty believe the assessment is appropriate, but would like to hold norming session to explore consistency among faculty in scoring.

2. Please describe the specific involvement of the faculty members (including adjunct faculty) at phase 2 (analysis phase).
Both full-time and part-time faculty teaching TH 110 were involved in a discussion of results. Faculty will participate in development of an action plan.

3. Please identify specific strengths or areas where students demonstrated success in achieving course outcome(s).

1. Knowledge of roles of theatre practitioners in creating the theatrical event. 2. Insightful analytical comments in many of the critiques.

4. Please identify specific weaknesses or areas where students struggled to demonstrate success in achieving course outcome(s).

1. Weak thesis statements. 2. Poor organization in essays. 3. Essays lack sufficient examples to support opinions about production quality.

**Action Plan**

As a result of the department wide dialogue concerning analysis of results, give specific examples how your department will improve student learning in the next assessment. If the department believes no improvement is necessary, indicate how the department will ensure an ongoing level of success.

The faculty is scheduled to revise this curriculum before the next scheduled assessment. To address concerns, the faculty will hold a series of meetings to discuss the assessment tool as well as evaluate and model classroom assessment techniques and student engagement techniques faculty are currently using or would be interested in exploring. The faculty discussed requiring students to attend Supplemental Instruction through the TLC to address writing concerns (thesis, organization, mechanics). They have decided to require it of all TH 110 students before the midterm when the first critique is due.

Outline the timeline for implementation of the Action Plan (by the end of the next course, academic year, program, etc).

Faculty will meet at least twice during the fall 2013 semester and twice during the spring 2014 semester. Meetings in the fall will address curriculum revisions. Meetings in the spring will address teaching techniques. The course will be revised for 14-15, The course SLO will be evaluated again in fall 2014.

**Next Planned Assessment Cycle:**

| Fall 2014 |   |