SLO Committee Minutes
November 30, 2011


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

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

3. New Business
   a. Spring FLEX week workshops for CTE and Diversity: Two more ISLO groups will close the loop during the spring FLEX week. The English department will meet in the spring to close the loop on Language & Rationality I. Thus, the remaining ISLO groups that need to complete the closing of the loop are Humanities & Fine Arts, PE, Social Science, & College Skills. Some of these groups may meet in spring, with the remaining meeting during the fall FLEX week.
   b. Proposed Process and Procedures of the SLO Committee and Steering Committee: Nicole prepared a draft proposal detailing the process and procedures of the two committees. Some points discussed:
      • Questions arose about the need for an annual SLO report to the various committees and groups on campus and what form that will take. Barry and committee believed an oral report would be a possibility. Nicole suggested a one page summary report highlighting the main points would also be helpful. Another suggestion was that the CurricUNET assessment module (which is currently not available) should provide institution with a report as well.
      • Committee decided it would be best for SLO Steering committee to meet at least twice a semester – once mid-term and once at the end of the semester.
      • Barry noted that “Student Development” needs to be changed to “Student Services” on flowchart.
      • Barry reported that he thought ISA’s were doing assessments.

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

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
Nicole-Physical Education/Kinesiology
Anne-Political Science
Anne-Psychology – talked with Dept
Anne -Sign Language
Nicole -Surveying
Nicole -Water
SLO Committee Meeting Minutes
Feb 12, 2014
MENH-246, 2:00-3:00 pm

Attendees: Edel Alonso, Barry Gribbons, Rebecca Eikey, Andy McKutcheon, Rhonda Hyatt, Denee Pescarmona, Jerry Buckley, Necia Gelker, Dilek Sanver-Wang, Audrey Green, Diane Solomon, Anne Marenco, and Daylene Meuschke

1) Approval of Minutes from Nov 27, 2013

approved

2) Updates:
   a) Digication ePortfolios presentation on Dec 11, 2013
      • Denee commented that the demo from Digication is a good first step. We should use the same vetting system as was used with Blackboard to view other products. Paul will reach out to Rick Howe regarding the SLO committee’s interest. We need a multi-functional tool and focuses on the student as the user, need a robust reporting tool
      • John Makevich and Paul Wickline went to e-portfolio session at AAC&U.
      • This committee should coordinate with Ed Tech committee since they’re also looking at a similar product.
      • The ePortfolio system needs to interface with Blackboard and needs to be easy for faculty to integrate with what they’re already doing.
      • Digication - $11000 for 1000 student licenses. Maintenance fee only required if the college discontinues ($25/year)
      • Audrey said ePortfolios are also good for assessment of prior learning. CSU will look at portfolio to verify content knowledge in lieu of GE course. Ken O’Donnell has said that if a student submits a portfolio to CSU their committee will review it to see if it satisfies. CSU Fresno is using Pathbrite. Every freshman will start in freshmen seminar and finished with a portfolio. CSU Fresno passes on the materials fee to students.
      • Barry said we need to pay attention to the CSU GE pathways.
      • Dilek asked how we will identify which students would get an account. Committee comments were that this still has to be worked out but should be aligned with the ISLOs. We would start small and grow it from there.
      • Portfolio systems can also be used for student advising. Audrey said there are some schools using it for this purpose.
      • Conversation shifted to history of our ISLO process.
      • Conversation shifted to talking about what to do when the success is high.
         o Anne assesses every 4th semester. Barry said it is important to document the dialogue.
         o At what point are we going to be asked to be more granular (e.g., by ethnicity, etc)?
         o When will MyCanyons be ready? Barry said MIS will be working on it in Fall 2014.
b) Rebecca and Paul attended the ASCC Accreditation Institute (Feb 7-8, 2014), which included a panel from Cuesta College who talked about how they moved off of “warning”. There was also a presentation about online classes where they learned more about the federal government’s concern about how authenticity of students in online classes is being verified.

c) Proposed Workplan for Spring
   i) Faculty Manual
      • Anne Marenco, Diane Solomon, Dilek can assist with editing.
      • Everyone needs to have their assignments completed by Spring break.
   ii) Newsletter – Spring newsletter: focus on Authentic Assessment & CurricUNET Assessment
   iii) Workshops:
      (1) ISLO/LEAP
         • Need to do a division road show
         • Senate update: Edel will ask senators to report back on their interactions
      (2) CurricUNET Assessment training
         • Paul conducted this training. Dilek asked that faculty are notified that all the materials be made available on the SLO website. She said they are comprehensive and self-explanatory for faculty who weren’t able to attend.
      (3) Authentic Assessment
         • Paul conducted this training. It was noted that the Flex session was poorly attended.
         • Thus more support and training needs to be done.
         • We need to consider a day of training at the end of the semester (“Day of Assessment”). We need to explore ways to engage adjunct faculty members. Perhaps do beginning and ending semester sessions to help develop our culture of evidence. We also need to celebrate the successes of what’s being done in the classroom. There was a suggestion to have opening day be a working day.
         • Edel asked how we turn division meetings into more “working” meetings so that some work can get done between the beginning and end of the semester.
         • Dilek asked if we can develop talking points so we’re also sharing the same message at division meetings.
         • Dilek talked about problem with “anonymous” section of the Biology assessment. Students passed the items where it was asked as part of the test where points contributed to toward the grade but didn’t take the “anonymous” section seriously.

   MEETING ENDED HERE _ ITEMS BELOW NOT DISCUSSED

 d) CurricUNET Assessment Module –
   i) Open for users this semester
   ii) Reach out to departments via email this term to remind them SLO help exists
e) Continue discussion on the College Status on SLO Implementation (Proficiency Report): Identify areas of improvement

3) Unfinished Business:
   a) How to reach out to Departments/Programs that are not proficient?
      i) Revise Rubric
   b) ISLO Discussion & How to Improve ISLO Discussions
      i) Orientation to LEAP method of Assessment
   c) Addressing Accreditation Standard IIIa1c
      (1) COCFA negotiations
   d) Effect of SLO Assessment on Curriculum Procedures
   e) Authentic assessment Rubric use
   f) Program level results posted to website
SLO Committee Minutes
Mar 12, 2014
MENH-246, 2:00-3:00 pm

Attendees: Edel Alonso, Barry Gribbons, Rebecca Eikey, Andy McCutcheon, Rhonda Hyatt, Diane Solomon, Anne Marenco, Ann Lowe, Paul Wickline, Daylene Meuschke, Patricia Palavecino, Alejandro Morales

1) Approval of Minutes from Feb 12, 2014
2) Updates:
   a) AAC&U General Education and Assessment Conference (Feb 27 – Mar 1, 2014)
      Paul and Rebecca
      • Continues to be significant conversation about GE’s; are they still relevant, are GE’s useful to student’s entering the workforce.
      • Emphasis on evaluating institutional strategic goals; are there seamless links from institutional strategic goals to program SLO’s.
      • LEAP- Paul noted that many institutions are using the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes for both academic student outcomes and co-curricular programs.
      • Emphasis on E-portfolios; a great deal of interest and conversation about use of e-portfolios. Paul commented that CurricUNET cannot be modified to assess ISLO’s, that alternatives for assessment must be considered.
     i) Proposal to rename committee to “Assessment and Learning Committee”
        • Discussion on the topic of changing the name of SLO Committee to a title that better represents the scope of work and tasks. Additionally, a new title may shift the negative attitudes associated with the SLO focus of the committee. The title does not represent all of the responsibilities of the committee, too narrow.
        • Recommendation for Rebecca and Paul “Assessment and Learning Committee”; May present conflicts with other committees with charges/responsibility associated with assessment or learning and committees with titles that include assessment or learning.
        • Edel made alternative recommendation: “Measuring Student Learning”; Paul recommended “Learning Outcomes and Assessment.”
        • No action, further discussion.
   b) Faculty Manual
      • Deadline to complete the revision was Spring Break; but Rebecca recommended to delay the deadline until Fall, allowing time to review updated accreditation standards.
      • Paul to grant access to the manual for editing by committee members; Anne Marenco to serve as Master Editor.
      • Additional sections to be included in the manual; Authentic Assessment, Self-Directed Learning and Multiple Methods of Assessment
      • Discussion regarding the need to further discuss and define Authentic Assessment with faculty and the questions was asked about Multiple Choice exams as authentic assessment.
• Resource for AA is “Authentic Assessment Toolbox”
• Challenge for accreditation is demonstrating the use of authentic assessment at the course and program level.
• Using one or two multiple choice questions to assess a program SLO would not be considered authentic.
• Edel noted that it is more difficult to create multiple choice questions that assess higher order processes as denoted by Bloom’s taxonomy.
• Ann Lowe noted that technology is available to help recognize useful and relevant multiple choice questions (scan-tron)

c) CurricUNET Assessment Module-Update from Paul
  • Current focus of flex workshops is CAM at the program level
  • Future workshops to include course and program assessment

d) Program level SLO results are currently being organized and updated to be posted to SLO website.

e) ACCJC; Daylene noted that the annual survey from the ACCJC is being addressed. There are some questions that the SLO committee may need to develop responses for. Daylene and Paul to follow up.

f) ISLO Discussion & How to Improve ISLO Discussions
   i) Orientation to LEAP method of Assessment
      • Paul noted that it is time to begin a second cycle or evaluating ISLO’s. The LEAP method along with “sampling” rather than mapping every course may be more effective than the current method.
      • Ann Lowe noted that it may be best to delay the roll out of informational sessions about the LEAP method of assessment until the GE Policy has final approval.

3) Unfinished Business:
   a) Effect of SLO Assessment on Curriculum Procedures
      i) Include Assessment plans or example of SLO as part of course outline of record
   b) Day of Assessment
   c) Continue discussion on the College Status on SLO Implementation (Proficiency Report): Identify areas of improvement
   d) How to reach out to Departments/Programs that are not proficient?
      i) Revise Rubric
   e) Addressing Accreditation Standard IIIa1c
      (1) COCFA negotiations
   f) Authentic Assessment
      i) Workshops
      ii) Newsletter for Spring 2014
      iii) Rubric use