



Minutes

Student Learning Outcomes Committee
April 7, 2014
2:30 p.m. – Room 2411A

Present: Candace Brown, Moh Daoud, Jose Gutierrez (ASLPC Rep),
Tina Inzerilla, Marilyn Marquis, Paula Schoenecker, Scott Vigallon,
Sher Zarrinfar (ASLPC Rep)

Guest: Justin Garoupa, Interim Dean

I. Agenda Set

The meeting was called to order at 2:32 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes from February 3, 2014 and March 3, 2014

MOTION made to **APPROVE** the draft minutes from February 3, 2014 and March 3, 2014.

MSC: M.Daoud/ C.Brown /APPROVED

III. Program Level Outcomes – At this meeting Justin Garoupa was in attendance to share some information regarding the status of program level outcomes across all disciplines, which was brought up at a recent dean's meeting. At that meeting there was discussion of what role the SLO committee might play to assist with fostering the continued development of program level outcomes.

He began by saying that from a numbers perspective, the program level SLO process and total output is not overly strong, and may have an impact on the College's accreditation. Part of how some program levels SLOs are developed is by identifying a course and then "lifting" that course level outcome to be identified as one of the program level outcomes. One challenge in doing it this way is that the data does not

disaggregate which students might be completing the program, and which are taking it as a GE course. For example in English, if a literature course is identified and accesses an outcome related to literature for students completing the associate degree for transferring for English, that course may have been built to attract GE students as well as those who are transferring. So the question of whether the program is meeting the outcome for those students who are actually completing the program is somewhat limited. There are a variety of strategies that can be used to produce the data for those who are working towards a degree and those who are not. One way would be to have students self identify or to use the course enrollment sheet which already identifies for many their declared major, and separate the data for students that are program majors versus non-program majors. It is possible that the course level outcomes could result as being the same or maybe not, but this would lead to different conversations within a department of how effective program levels are being met within an area.

Another way would be for faculty to only input course-level assessment scores into eLumen only for those students working toward a degree.

There is a good faith effort to choose course outcomes for program SLOs that are not GE, although there are still courses offered that serve both degree and none degree students. It is believed that there are not very many programs that have courses that are exclusive for a specific major.

As a requirement of ACCJC, the question of how to retrieve data from program level outcomes still remains. Having conversations with other departments to learn if they have found ways to desegregate the data or strategies of how to, would be one way to begin discussions. Depending on the size of the program, accessing data may not be such of an issue for smaller programs versus accessing the data for larger ones.

The administration is interested in complying with the accreditation, as is everyone, and finding ways to bring everyone together to initiate the conversation of how to increase the number of program level outcomes written. The administration would like to be part of any conversations, play a productive role, and be supportive in this process. How to begin this task is not the role of the administration, as this is mainly the purview of faculty.

IV. Administrative Update

No report

V. eLumen Update

The eLumen report is listed under Agenda Item VII. Tina Inzerilla did want to share that the President had been approached by some faculty who asked if it was required that SLO data be entered into eLumen. His response was that it was not necessary. Tina and Scott Vigallon will meet with Dr. Russell to clarify this information.

VI. Changes to Program Review Template

The abbreviated version of the program review template will be used this time around. On the agenda was suggested changes to the SLO section in order to draw out more information since the template will not be as lengthy and detailed.

This year the SLO/SAO section will be broken up into two parts: 1) Number of courses anticipated to be offered; and 2) A series of questions – describe assessment plans for the coming year; and describe plans for completing the SLOs/SAOs assessment cycle for student learning. For budgetary planning purposes - ask how many part-time faculty the discipline is anticipating will participate.

Time was devoted to discussing and revising the questions in the SLO/SAO section of the form to draw out a bit more detail in the responses, and wording the questions to be more specific. Those disciplines completing a program review this year will find the changes incorporated in the updated template.

VII. Software Discussion

After the two SLO online demonstrations from eLumen and CurricUNET, Scott Vigallon and Tina Inzerilla did an evaluation that included looking at the Student Services module, since is similar to the SLO. Taking into consideration the comments from the committee members after the two demonstrations and their evaluation, the recommendation was to move forward with eLumen.

A **MOTION** was made to proceed with the new version of eLumen.

MSC: M.Marquis / C.Brown

Discussion: Administrative Unit Outcomes can also be completed **in the new version**, and the accreditation also now requires comparing DE outcome data with face-to-face, which is something the current version is unable to do. Also, the rubric would change from the current 0-4 to 1-5, and eLumen would take care of the conversion for those assessments

already in the system. The program will aggregate the data which will be helpful when completing the program review template.

VOTE: UNANIMOSLY APPROVED

Jeannine Methe will be advised of the decision and asked to speak with the eLumen representative to get things started, although it is not clear who has the ultimate authority to initiate moving forward with the implementation of the new software.

VIII. Pre-Accreditation Assessment Reports

The group went over the Pre-Accreditation Assessment Reports that had been reviewed previously by Tina Inzerilla.

Standard II A 1c – *The institution identifies student learning outcomes for course programs, certificates, and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.*

Self evaluation showed that the College does not meet the standard since only 60% of the degree/certificate outcomes have been created, and 56% of the courses have been assessed as of March 2, 2014. Program reviews indicated that only some disciplines use the assessment results to improve their courses.

Standard III A 1c – *The institution demonstrates a conscious effort to produce and support student learning, measures that learning, assesses how well learning is occurring, and makes changes to improve student support learning. The institution also organizes its key processes and allocates its resources to effectively support student learning. The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by providing 1) evidence of the achievement of student learning outcomes and 2) evidence of institution and program performance. The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.*

Self evaluation showed that the College does not meet the standard for the identical reason as in Standard II A 1c, although through program reviews the institution does show it organizes key processes and allocates resources to effectively support student learning.

In both standards, the following Action/Improvement Plan was suggested:

All courses need to have SLO and assessments by faculty. Program level SLOs must be created for all Degree/Certificate Outcomes, and all

disciplines need to use the assessment results to make improvements to their courses. In order to accomplish this both full and part-time faculty must be required to complete SLOs, assessments, and degree/certificate outcomes.

This improvement plan was identified during the last accreditation and it is scheduled to be executed by Spring 2015.

A brief discussion of how to generate more interest amongst faculty and encourage them to complete their SLOs and assessments followed.

IX. Accreditation Improvement Plans

Tina Inzerilla went over each of the 9 Improvement Plans assigned to the SLO committee, which are tied to standards associated with SLOs. She had previously reviewed them all, and shared her recommendations for each. During discussion there was added feedback from the committee members, which will be incorporated. Noted below is the response to the self-evaluation.

Standard II A 1c [i]: Improvement Plan – Identify certificate and major SLOs. (Standard not met)

Standard II A 1c [ii]: Improvement Plan – Access the alignment of major and certificate SLOs with core competencies. (Standard has been met)

Standard II A 1c [iii]: Improvement Plan – Articulate the role of SLOs in college policies, processes, and resource allocation. (Standard has been met)

Standard II A 2e: Improvement Plan – Develop student learning outcomes for all majors and certificates. (Standard not met)

Standard II A 2f [i]: Improvement Plan – Complete SLO development for courses, certificates, and majors. (Standard not met)

Standard II A 2f [ii]: Improvement Plan – Develop for evaluating SLO assessment data for currency and achievement. (Standard has been met)

Standard II A 2g: Improvement Plan – Investigate the correlation between outcome achievement and the awarding of credit as LPC data becomes available. (Eliminate improvement plan, not applicable – or change to: *After better understanding the requirement for ACCJC the improvement plan is being changed to focus on student learning.*)

Standard II A 2i: Improvement Plan – Develop major and certificate SLOs
(Standard not met)

Standard II A 3a: Improvement Plan – Assess the alignment of GE course SLOs with core competencies, and establish a cyclical process whereby the alignment of GE course SLOs with core competencies is regularly reviewed. (Standard has been met)

X. Annual Report ACCJC
Not discussed

XI. May Meeting Rescheduled
The next SLO meeting is scheduled for May 12, 2014

Adjourned
4:40 p.m.

C. McCauley