Minutes

Student Learning Outcomes Committee
March 3, 2014
2:30 p.m. – Room 2411A

Present: Candace Brown, Moh Daoud, Jose Gutierrez (ASLPC), Tina Inzerilla, Marilyn Marquis, Jessica Samorano (ASLPC Rep), Paula Schoenecker, Mark Tarte, Scott Vigallon,

Guest: Cathy Gould, Leim Humyh, Jeannine Methe, Rachael Ugalle

---

I. Agenda Set

The meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m.

II. CurricUNET Demo of SLO Software

A 30 minute interactive demonstration was conducted by a representative from Governet, the vendor that offers CurricUNET, which is currently being used at LPC. CurricUNET has three built in modules which are SLO, Catalog, and Program Review. The Catalog module has been implemented, and at this meeting he went through and explained the SLO portion of the program. Present at this demonstration were members from the administration, faculty, students, and classified staff.

He began by introducing the five main points of the SLO Assessment Module -

1) Identify the Outcome – identify the assessment outcome from the learning, service area, program, Administrative, or general education areas.

2) Identify How Outcome Was assessed – determine what outcome in which area is being assessed. The term, year, course selection, and what type of materials were used.

3) Result Data – what are the results, and what does this information show.

4) The Analysis – interpretation of results.

5) The Action Plan – if improvements are needed, methods of how this is to be accomplished.

The SLO module is accessed by logging into CurricUNET and the familiar features of this program makes the selections easy to follow. It also allows the operator to pull active curriculum directly into the assessment model, which creating an assessment was shown from beginning to end.

The presentation was solely to introduce the idea of using CurricUNET as another means of inputting SLOs. This module has not been activated, and is available with no additional cost, and includes customized programming. The personalization process does not have to start from the beginning, and knowing the type of reporting information required helps with the implementation process.

III. <u>Approval of Minutes</u> – February 3, 2014

Draft minutes to be presented at the next meeting

IV. <u>Administrative Update</u>

None

V. <u>eLumen Update</u>

Scott Vigallon reported that Spring courses have not been loaded into eLumen. He added that a meeting had taken place that included Tina Inzerilla and a representative from eLumen. Discussion surrounded the new version of eLumen and it was discovered that LPC and Chabot are not tied together and can be separate. The licensing would have to be reworked since the needs at each college would not be identical. 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 new version also has a Program Review Module that could be included in the licensing.

Scott's concern with CurricUNET is that the reports he is required to generate. With eLumen he is able to extract that information without having to wait for a program to be written, which is not the case with CurricUNET. The question of who would be administering the system

was answered by explaining that no one person would be in charge and that after the "levels" of access was determined it would be "shared" by those who would have access at the various levels.

VI. Annual SLO Report

Tina Inzerilla began with the section of the ACCJC 2014 Annual Report that relates to SLOs. Members had previously been given a selected number of program reviews and asked to review the SLO section. Questions numbered 35 through 39 of the annual report were briefly discussed with the answers being derived by what was discussed.

The questions dealt with effective and innovative practices for measuring ILOs in non-instructional areas, and how this information is passed on to the campus community and the community; alignment of SLOs from institutional and course to programs level; the various communication strategies used to share SLO results; how dialog and reporting SLO results take place; and how this information is communicated at the departmental and institutional levels. The members were also asked to send information to Tina Inzerilla about SLO practices that had a positive impact on student learning, achievement, and institutional effectiveness from what they had read, that will also be included in the report.

VII. Degree/Certificate Outcome Results

Discussed at a previous SLO meeting was publicizing Degree/Certificate Outcome Results at the program level. Information with an example was sent and an opportunity for faculty to respond did not result in much feedback and there was no opposition. Scott Vigallon will add the following link http://www.laspositascollege.edu/slo/results.php to the SLO webpage, which is where results for all programs with more than zero results for the periods of 2011-12 and 2012-13 can be viewed.

VIII. Discussion of SLO Worksheets for Program Reviews

The members shared the following comments after having read the SLO sections of each program review:

- Faculty either included or excluded information, there was very little in between.

- Reading program reviews in their entirety would be very interesting. Reading one selected section was not very interesting.
- Faculty not fully aware of the type of questions that were going to be asked and some answers were not thorough and uninteresting.

- There needs to be a general understanding of what dialog means, and the type of information the questions are trying to draw out. Some answers were described as "just filling in the blanks" rather than taking the time to provide honest answers.

- Dialog documented was not complete. Dates and times may have been noted although what was conversed was omitted.

- Negativity came through in some of the answers provided.

- Funding was key in most program reviews.

- Lack of full-time faculty in some areas was mentioned.

The comment from the Committee was that finding ways of increasing the interest of writing program reviews, and having them be more meaningful continues to be a work in progress.

IX. Suggested Changes to Program Review Template

In order to clarify what information was being asked, the members reviewed and modified the questions related to SLOs located in the Program Review packet.

Question 1: Split last column in two with one indicating "number of courses assessed" the other "number of sections assessed."

Question 2: Remove "frequency" and change to "list the courses assessed."

Question 3: Delete this section in tri-annual review.

Question 4: Move "d" – "What are the general plans for assessments in the upcoming academic year?", and list under #2

Work on improving the remaining questions listed under "a", "b", and "c."

X. Software Discussion

- No cost for customizing program to fit the college's needs.
- SLOs cannot be imported from eLumen into CurricUNET
- Program can provide data on how many core competencies have been assessed and the outcome; the number of programs assessed and the result for each program.

- Reminders can be set up for scheduling updates on what has been assessed, what is due, and when it was last done.
- The elements of what should be contained in the report would be written by CurricUNET.
- The colleges would not have to be tied together instead each would have their own module.
- Some faculty find using CurricUNET difficult, and adding SLO into this program will add to what already exists.
- Some faculty find using eLumen difficult.
- This SLO module could be a way to capture documentation for accreditation. With CurricUNET also having the ability of running a Program Review module it may improve how things are currently being done.
- There would be a lot involved with customizing this program, although it does seem comparable to eLumen.
- Introducing faculty to eLumen was a painful process, and bringing in something new could result in the same experience.
- This would be a one-stop shop for faculty by including inputting SLOs at the same time they are writing or updating their curriculum. It would be better than having to keep reminding faculty.
- If there are too many steps in the process and not user friendly, that would not go over very well.
- Assessments will have to be re-entered.

XI. <u>Accreditation Sections Mapped to SLO Committee</u>

No discussion.

<u>Adjourned</u>

4:40 p.m.

C. McCauley