Richard Grow, Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m., in Room 2411A.

I. SET THE AGENDA
The agenda was approved as drafted.

II. REVIEW OF MINUTES
The minutes of September 12, 2011 were not yet ready for review.

III. CHAIR’S UPDATE – Richard noted that the SLO Committee was invited to work with the IPRC (Instructional Program Review Committee) at 3:30 today on a worksheet for the mid-term report, and on possible additions to the Common Tool to make SLO and Program Review recorded in 1 document.

A. Rich noted that the timeline for the Mid-Term ACCJC visit is:
   1. Fall 2011 - Begin organizing and collecting all SLO data now.
   2. Fall 2011 & Spring 2012- Encourage much more SLO and Program Outcome writing (see VI. A. below).
   3. Fall 2011 & Spring 2012- Hold many departmental and college-wide discussions on SLOs, and interface with Program Review and allocation planning ...
      AND RECORD ALL DISCUSSIONS in some format – even e-mails.
   4. May 2012 – All Mid-Term report writing to be complete by May 20-ish.
   5. Fall 2012 - Mid-Term Team visits LPC (date to be announced late summer 2012)

IV. eLUMEN UPDATE

A. Scott reported that there have been no new SLOs submitted since he created the Web Form on the SLO site that assists faculty in inputting their SLOs (Scott input the SLOs into eLumen based on the Web Form information). Scott showed on screen the Web Form and gave background for the new members.
   1. Each department SLO Coordinator could send their rubric to the adjuncts and point out that they do not have to use eLumen for entering SLOs.

B. However there were two new Program outcomes written.

C. Scott presented the eLumen Upgrade Management Plan between LPC and Chabot. The need arose last year for an urgent upgrade for Chabot’s purposes, therefore this plan was written by Scott to delineate procedures for eLumen changes: Minor, Major, and
Emergency. The Plan was agreed to by consensus by this committee, and Scott was thanked for writing this.

D. Rich said that it would be great to show the divisions our new Web Forms which can be used with declared scores (class aggregate scores).
   1. There is one Web Form to send the declared scores for your course level SLOs to Scott Vigallon, who will enter the data in eLumen.
      • This is especially useful for adjuncts to send in their scores and not have to enter into eLumen.
   2. There is a second Web Form to send in the Program Outcomes. There is a tutorial to see how to enter the data in eLumen (the Declared Scores and new tabs make this easier than before).

E. Please advertise the workshops which will be held to help people with the use of these forms and eLumen:
   • Sept. 15 at 1 – 2 PM in the TLC
   • Oct. 5 at 1:30 – 2:30 PM in the TLC
   • Nov. 2 at 1:30 – 2:30 PM in the TLC

V. COLLEGE UPDATE - VP Marge Maloney mentioned that the District Educational Master Plan has been e-mailed to the Deans, who will distribute to their Divisions. She asked that SLO member encourage discussion and revision of the Plan using the Update Form inside the Plan.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. Plans for First Draft (rough draft) of the Mid-Term Report – Rich asked the members to work toward writing the Mid-Term Report which should be useful and robust for faculty members, and to think about the inquiry & evaluation process:
   1. Each Division SLO Point Person discuss with their Division members the number of Course Level and Program Level SLOs assessed, and how the data was analyzed.
   2. Administration will ask the Deans to allocate additional time in Division Meetings for these discussions.
   3. The process of SLO evaluation needs to document all the good data, holes in the data, poor data, and robust discussion of all evaluations.
   4. This data can be very informative for use in “inquiry”, adaptation of course preparation, and useful for faculty analysis of teaching plans.
   5. For a robust Mid-Term Report the evaluation write-ups should state:
      • The evaluation of eLumen and other data – Close the loop on the eLumen data.
      • Discussion and Reflection on the information,
      • All factors that affect completion or holes in the data.
• What questions are raised for faculty from the SLO findings, and address these in the Program Reviews

• What changes could be made, if any, to serve current students

• What changes will be made for the next Program Review. Think ahead for next Program Review.

6. Scott noted that he has pulled data out of eLumen into a spreadsheet for “Assessment by Program”. SLO Coordinators can run this and other reports from eLumen, and he will assist them.

• Scott will send the list of SLO Point Persons to Marge, Rich and each Dean; and will point out which disciplines need a Point Person.

• Due to the way Banner is organized there are multiple disciplines in the Social Sciences and Sciences areas. This has implications for the ‘closing the loop’ process. Other disciplines only have access to that discipline’s program which makes it easier to close the loop.

• Therefore it is best for Social Sciences and Sciences to ‘close the loop’ on the Program Review Annual Update Form only. Scott will assist.

B. Reading Program Reviews -

1. Rich mentioned last month that the SLO Committee members will start reading the SLO part of the Program Reviews online so that we can collect the needed information to write our Midterm Report in Spring 2012. We need to see who may need help with their SLOs. We need to develop a form to be used to summarize our SLO data during the Spring Flex Day. This form will become part of the Annual Program Review Form.

2. Discussion of how SLOs can be analyzed more robustly in the Program Reviews from Spring 2011. The process of reading through the Program Reviews is quite time-consuming and one must ‘dig’ to get all the information. Hopefully by November members will be able to carve out time to read most of the Program Reviews.

3. Current details of Program Review reading:
   o Jason reported that he has completed 9 Sciences and AJ/FST/EMS Program Review reading, and that 3 out of 7 programs documented their SLOs adequately.
     ▪ Only 10% of these have program Level SLOs.
   o Jason’s data included columns for:
     ▪ Have Course level SLOs been written?
     ▪ Have Program level SLOs been written?
     ▪ Have Course level SLOs been assessed?
     ▪ Have Program level SLOs been assessed?
     ▪ Was the SLO Data Analyzed? (If not, why?)
o Elizabeth and Katie reviewed each others’ programs (PEHW and English) and commented on each other’s areas.

o **Student Services** is now organized to enter data into eLumen in aggregate (without student names, for confidentiality). He will soon train some Students Services staff members on this, and Paula will discuss how to help this along with VP Baker and Deans Tomlinson and Rodriguez.

o **Business**– still need to be reviewed.

C. **Further College-Wide SLO Planning**

1. Rich and Jason reported that since a very low percentage of disciplines have Program Level SLOs, **we will ask for a session at the Spring 2012 Flex Day (March 29th) to do a robust assessment of SLOs.**
   - **Goal:** To make all discussions a ‘safe space for inquiry’, such that holes in data and robustness are OK, and highlight that holes show us what could be done next to discover Student needs.

2. **Discussions will be held at each Town Meeting** to provide time for college-wide discussion forums, give real examples of Inquiry Method using SLOs, and how to find useful data in Closing the Loop.

3. The SLO Committee asks all faculty who have not entered their SLO Data from last Spring to please enter it as soon as possible.

4. **Town Meeting Presentations: October** – Rich to orient and document the number of Program Level SLOs and discuss making the process meaningful, show the rubric and the eLumen Web Form. **November** – Katie will highlight some of the good examples of “Proficiency” and discuss making Inquiry a useful part of SLO closing the loop.

D. **Planning with Academic Senate** – Rich reported to the Academic Senate in September and summarized here:

1. He asked who would be writing the Mid-Term Report, this is still to be determined.

2. Some on the Senate felt that our SLO level (on the ACCJC rubric) is only at Level 1, Awareness; Rich responded that the ACCJC advised LPC in Spring 2011 that we are in Development (Level 2); and we should have been in Proficiency (Level 3) as of Fall 2010. He told the Senate that this Committee feels we are starting the Proficiency Level, and we are working hard to be solidly in Proficiency by May 2012 when the Mid-Term Report needs to be written.

3. Tasks to do for Proficiency Level:
   - Program Level Assessments,
   - Authentic Assessment,
   - Align SLO results for institution-wide practices (Program Review working on this point),
   - Purposeful Direction to improve student success
4. Rich informed the committee that the Senate feels there is quite a sense of urgency for both the Program Review and SLO Committees to pull all student learning and program information into the Program Review process. The intent is to work with the budget/allocation process to match student/program needs to the college’s overall goals – in order to have one process to view needs, goals, and allocation in a more streamlined fashion.

5. Rich informed the Senate that this committee would be reviewing the SLO data from the Program Reviews, and the Senate agreed.

VII. NEW BUSINESS - Join Instructional Program Review Committee for Second Hour (Rm 2205)

A. ACCJC Rubric for Proficiency – Rich Grow and Elena Cole, Program Review Chair, reported to the committees the timeline and needs for the Mid-Term Report (see III.A.). There was good brainstorming for ways we can get to Proficiency Level:

1. Document – either in eLumen or use own method. Ask people to write down every conversation, even over lunch, of Program Review and SLO improvements, especially as they make the process more meaningful for faculty inquire and student success.

2. Get the Word Out – Division Meetings, have SLO Coordinators speak at meetings, speaker at each Town Meeting, all campus e-mails, etc.

3. Document - Sharing – Talk about experiences, positive and negative, with other departments; even the unsuccessful attempts tell us something, or where we can try other types of student success improvements.

4. Utilize other ‘best practices’ – for instance Baltimore Community College has a 1 page document for each department that links their executive summary to assessment, evaluation and final outcome.

5. Think of capturing, streamlining, and linking.

B. Capturing SLO Data on the Spring Program Review Updates – The two committees began work to create a Program Review Update Form, for use Spring 2012.

C. Elena presented a draft update form which was discussed and revised over the course of this meeting. See draft # 3, attached to these minutes.

D. Other ideas which came out of discussions included:

1. Continue to keep notes of meetings regarding group/department decisions and discussions of SLOs, Program Review and interface with allocation process. Any type of notes are valid as evidence for our mid Term Report.
   - Any discussion IS a meeting – record it in some manner.

2. November Town Meeting – try to have examples of proficiency and discuss cycle of many programs. Try to have a mini-conference for SLOs at a future Town Meeting.
3. Nov. 1 Flex Day – plan a break out session on how SLO data can be used for Student Success, program improvement, evidence of resources needed to enhance Student Success, etc.

4. The “Optional Page” of Spring 2011 Program Reviews offered an idea for expansion of further information to tie all processes together.
   - Review the Baltimore Community College links of their Executive Summary which included assessment, evaluation, final outcome on one page.
   - Add further detailed information by department in following pages
   - This process took about 3 years to complete – Therefore be patient and let the process go through its course!

5. Dr. Noble offered an idea from the Psychology and Biology student Poster Sessions: We could do a poster/video presentation on SLOs with cross-over information into Program Review.
   - Could we do this on assessment day?
   - Goal: invite a wide range of participants.
   - Also include **time for dialogue** on the presentations, and **Record the Dialogue in Notes.**
   - The Process is what is valuable, keep the process meaningful for instructors to improve their Students’ successes

6. **Add items to the Program Review ‘SLO Worksheet’:**
   - “Was the data discussed? When, & Participants. Record discussion and actions taken as a result.”

7. For one-person departments talk to a related department or the dean, Elena has a draft for one-person departments in the worksheet.

8. Question: What does ACCJC actually want? Since not enough specifics are given by them, continue to use their guidance but **make the process meaningful for LPC Instructors.**

9. Suggestion: Reading each others’ Program Reviews challenges each other to further evaluate and come to more conclusions, expand each others’ inquiry and improvement.
   - There is that wrestling place, **a tension between the chaos and messiness of inquiry versus neat data that agencies want us to report. That is ok.**

10. Number of Program Level SLOs – Jason Morris presented the number of SLOs written - we need lots more SLOs. **We only have 12% of the Program Level SLOs completed.**
   - Program Level SLOs are needed for any area that leads to a degree or certificate. This includes transfer degrees.
   - The SLO Committee would like to encourage faculty to develop their program outcomes if they have not done so yet (a program is any program that has a degree or certificate). Each program needs to have a program outcome for each degree or certificate (they can use the same course level SLOs).
• If there are 2 degrees in a program, 2 SLOs need to be created.

• **IF the 60% of people with course SLOs written would write their Program Level SLOs, we would go from 12% to 60% of Program Level SLOs written!**

• Elena asked what the SLO Committee thinks about how to capture the updated information: incorporate into program Review forms, or record it separately? **Consensus: keep it separate.**

• Rich asked that the Point Persons in each department add the discussion of the Program Review sheets to their department discussions to inform their colleagues.

• The SLO Point Person can be a different person from the SLO Committee member, or the same person. Also there can be 2 or more Point Persons in a department. Scott Vigallon orients them on how to access data from eLumen.

E. **Looking at Core Competencies**

1. History - Rich stated that Core Competencies were written about 7 – 9 years ago, they were from the Faculty and the SLO Committee, and requested to be written by Administration based on State updates at that time.

2. The first SLOs were in 2001, mandated by WASC/ACCJC and written by the former VP of Academic Services.

3. Theoretically, course SLOs feed to Program Level SLOs which feed up to Core Competencies.

4. **Revisit Core Competencies?** There have been discussions in many committees to suggest revisiting our Core Competencies, to refine them and relate them to the new college goals, and to what the SLO outcomes show. This has not been decided on yet.

5. For current purposes it would be good to close the loop by reviewing how our course SLOs feed to Program Level SLOs which feed up to Core Competencies.

6. In the future, another way to work on the Core Competencies is to analyze the Program level SLOs, and see if statistically they **are** the core competencies utilized by Programs.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:33 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Sharon Gach, Administrative Assistant & Classified Representative

Next Meeting: Monday, **Nov. 7, 2011** - 2:30 pm – Room 2411A
DRAFT 10-10
PROGRAM REVIEW: UPDATE 2011-2012

**Discipline/Department:**
**Division:**
**Date:**
**Writer(s):**
**SLO Point-Person:**

**Audience:** Deans, IPBC, Foundation, IPRC, Vice President of Academic Services, Group(s) responsible for institutional planning and resource allocation.

**Purpose:** To capture new information about the program that is not included in the most recent program review but is relevant to program development and maintenance.

**Instructions:** Please fill in the following information as applicable. It is not necessary to complete all boxes.

---

**A.** Are there any notable changes to your program’s data since the last program review (i.e. data from the Office of Institutional Research, ARC Report data, CEMC data . . .)? If so, please describe these changes:

---

**B.** Are there other factors that have affected your program’s planning (i.e. retirements, new degree requirements, cuts in sections)? If so, please describe these factors:

---

**C.** Report the status of your program’s SLO Work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses offered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses with SLOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of SLOs per course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of degrees or certificates offered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of degrees or certificates with program outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D.** Summarize the findings in your program’s SLO work completed since the last program review:

---
E. What do these findings in your program’s SLO work suggest about student learning in your program?

F. What, if any, action(s) has your program taken as a result of these SLO findings?

G. What has been the impact(s) of any action(s) your program has taken based on your program’s SLO work?

H. How do your program’s SLO work, any changes to your program’s data, and / or changes to other factors affect your program’s needs?
I. How do your program’s SLO work, any changes to your program’s data, and / or changes to other factors affect your program’s planning?

J. What questions are raised by your program’s SLO work, any changes to your program’s data, and / or changes to other factors that affect your program’s planning?

Please attach to this update any relevant documentation (i.e. non-Elumen SLO data, reports of market trends . . .).