

SLOAC Steering Committee Agenda
October 29, 2007
1:45-3:45, Room 5131

Present: Steve Aurelio, Jacquie Escobar, Jan Fosberg, Cathy Hasson, Rick Hough, Nick Kapp, Melissa Komadina, Lucia Lachmayr, Jen Merrill , Vanson Nguyen, Jude Navari , Christine Roumbanis, Arthur Takayama , Linda Vogel, Dennis Wolbers , Karen Wong, Soodi Zamani

I. Accreditation Feedback

A. Vicki's "Skyline Shines" summary of the "Exit Report"

"Here is my summary of the Exit Report—it was an extremely positive one. It was clear to me that the visiting team really saw Skyline in all its glory. I was proud of the college and of our self study. What we heard yesterday was just the preliminary findings reported by the Visiting Team Chair, Robert Garber. These are my quick notes on them, not the ultimate, official wording:

1. Commendation

- (1st) The SLOAC Committee, the framework for development and implementation of SLOs, and the supportive culture at the college for that work

2. Recommendations

- College: (4th) Build upon the SLO structure and accelerate full implementation and integration, and utilize assessment findings in college decision making.
- District (these three will be the same for all three of the district's colleges): (1st) Develop and implement policies and procedures to incorporate SLOs into evaluation for those with direct responsibility for student learning."

3. Next step: In response to the district-wide recommendation, Karen and her counterparts at CSM and Canada will work with the senates and union to craft something along the lines of faculty being involved in the SLOAC process as evidence of commitment to effectiveness in supporting student learning.

4. Other points that emerged from our discussion were:

- a. the need for an academic calendar that includes a mid-semester training day to work on the initiative; the AFT Executive committee voted in support of such a day after receiving feedback from faculty that the majority favored it;
- b. the need to improve communication of timelines and resources (suggestions: printed update with the SLOAC Steering Committee members listed as resources; spring semester brown bag poster session featuring our pilot assessment plans and instruments;

orientation for new faculty that includes SLOAC; step-by-step guide to make use of our Framework and website; dissemination of our revised Framework to all faculty and staff on campus);

- c. the need to get adjunct faculty involved (suggestions: one-on-one meetings; stipends through grants to compensate them for their time and energy);
- d. the need to assess where our faculty are at in regards to the SLOAC and which resources they need to implement it; this finding emerged from a survey that the SS/CA faculty administered within their division;
- e. the insights gained by piloting on a smaller scale, and therefore encouraging others to do the same.

II. CCSEE Survey Update

- A. Purchased with BSI monies, so we may not get to have as much input into the fifteen questions pertaining to Skyline; on the other hand, many of the existing questions pertain to our institutional outcomes
- B. SLOAC Steering Committee and BSI Subcommittee to help compose “critical thinking” survey questions by December 1st: Rick Hough, Jacquie Escobar, Rachel Bell, Cathy Hasson, Christine Roumbanis, & Karen Wong

III. Institutional Outcomes

- A. “Aesthetic Judgment” bullet point—delete for the time being, but revisit once we’ve undergone a cycle of assessment at the institutional level to determine if it’s a measurable and appropriate institutional outcome (See below for the subcommittee’s recent findings and recommendations.)
- B. Proposed additions to the bullet points under “Citizenship”
 1. demonstrate scientific literacy concerning a range of global issues;
 2. demonstrate a commitment to active citizenship.
- C. Next steps:
 1. Disseminate to appropriate shared governance committees.
 2. Talk to the IPC to make sure that there is a convergence of the college’s missions and goals and the institutional outcomes.

IV. Draft Assessment Plan Presentations: Christine Roumbanis (CAOT 225: Spreadsheets I, Excel)—first example of a weighted rubric, Jacquie Escobar & Melissa Komadina (Counseling 100: Student Success)

V. October Reminders:

- A. Present the SLOAC Framework, Phase II on Assessment to your Division or Department this Fall.

- B. Please save the following Monday afternoon, 1:45-3:45, for the SLOAC Steering Committee meeting, Nov. 19.
- C. Arrange to meet with your Framework team prior to your scheduled date to present findings: (1) Part I – Oct. 8, (2) Part II—Oct. 29, (3) Part III—Nov. 19
- D. Apply for professional development to attend the Assessment Workshop led by Jerry Rudmann, Friday, Feb. 29.

10/17/07 E-mail

Hi Karen,

I've had discussions with Jude N., Bridget F., Robert M. and Donna Bestock about the Aesthetic Sensitivity SLO. Well, it became apparent that we are further from resolution than ever. The real issue was how well could the students actually fulfill the SLO. On referring to our Catalog and the AA/AS GE Humanity courses, it is possible for a student to complete the degree WITHOUT having taking any art, music, or literature course. As such, the student would not necessarily acquire the technical skills to "analyze and critically evaluate" creative works as listed in the bullets. In other words, the SLO is unrealistic vis a vis what courses students could actually take for the Humanities requirement.

As Jude mentioned, why stay with adopt an SLO and go through the assessment process cycle to find it's not realistic when we can see it's already unrealistic? While we all think the present SLO is a noble ambition and goal worth working for, an assessment based upon the present bullets would only apply to those students who took art, music or literature. The SLO would certainly apply to our transfer students but not our AA/AS students. That is because the IGETC/CSU accepted Humanities courses specify art and music courses. However, AA/AS students can take history and language classes to fulfill the Humanities requirements, where they would not necessarily encounter situations where the skills to analyze and critically evaluate creative efforts would be developed.

Two suggestions were entertained that addressed this realization about our AA/AS goals:

1. Drop the SLO all together. The first bullet of our Citizenship SLO could be interpreted as inclusive of the Aesthetic Sensitivity: "articulate similarities and contrasts among cultures, demonstrating knowledge of and sensitivity to various cultural values and issues."

2. Or, have an SLO which is much more basic, such as "Demonstrate recognition that creative efforts are a sharing of ideas, concepts, and/or perceptions between the work's creator and its audience."

I know you wanted to stay with the approved SLO, but the Art/Music people are having doubts as to whether it is a realistic SLO.

So, what ya think?

Arthur.

CITIZENSHIP

STUDENTS WILL BE ABLE TO USE KNOWLEDGE ACQUIRED FROM COURSEWORK AND CAMPUS RESOURCES TO BE ETHICALLY RESPONSIBLE, CULTURALLY PROFICIENT CITIZENS, INFORMED AND INVOLVED IN CIVIC AFFAIRS LOCALLY, NATIONALLY, AND GLOBALLY.

Citizenship includes the ability to:

- articulate similarities and contrasts among cultures, demonstrating knowledge of and sensitivity to various cultural values and issues.
- develop attitudes central to lifelong learning: openness, flexibility, intellectual curiosity, and a broad perspective that values diversity of thought.
- demonstrate appropriate social skills in group settings, listening and being receptive to others' ideas and feelings, effectively contributing ideas, and demonstrating leadership by motivating others.

Approved additions to the present bullet points:

- demonstrate scientific literacy concerning a range of global issues;
- demonstrate commitment to active citizenship.

SLO Assessment Plan Checklist

Assessment is an ongoing process aimed at understanding and improving student learning. It involves making our expectations explicit and public; setting appropriate criteria and high standards for learning quality; systematically gathering, analyzing, and interpreting evidence to determine how well performance matches those expectations and standards; and using the resulting information to document, explain and improve performance. (T. Angelo, 1995).

	Yes	No
1. Contains a balance of direct and indirect assessment methods overall.		
2. Contains a mix of quantitative and qualitative measures overall.		
3. Contains mostly formative assessments for mid-course corrective action.		
4. Contains links between major assignments/activities and assessments.		
5. Contains three different ways to assess each SLO.		
6. Contains criteria that are based on realistic and meaningful benchmarks.		
7. Contains a variety of assessment methods both tried and true and new.		
8. Contains suggested approaches for sampling or systematically evaluating the student learning outcome.		
RECOMMENTATIONS, IF ANY:		

**SIGN UP TO LEAD A WORKSHOP ON CREATING
ASSESSMENT PLANS**

YOUR NAME(S)	DEPT/ DIVISION WORKSHOP?	WHEN? (Specify if you will be presenting at the Fall Division meeting, Tuesday's Open Flex afternoon, or later in the semester.)
Dennis Wolbers	Dept. Workshop (Library Sciences)	Sp. 07 (Library Assessment Plan)
Virginia Padron & Jacquie Escobar	Dept. Workshop (Counseling)	Fall 07 (October? Perhaps the 29th)
Christine Roumbanis	Dept. Workshop (CAOT)	End of November
Jan Fosberg	Division Workshop about SLOs (PE)	Sp. 08 (May)
Jon Freedman, Rick Hough, & Soodi Zamani	Dept. Workshop (Math)	Fall 07 (November)
Lucia Lachmayr, Phyllis Taylor, & Ariel Vigo	Division Workshop (Language Arts)	Fall 07 (End of October)
Steve Aurilio, Arthur Takayama, Carlos Colombetti, Jude Navari, Jennifer Merrill	Departmental Workshops on whatever the department needs	Fall 07

Regina Pelayo	Dept. Workshop (Cosmetology)	Fall 07
Karen Wong & Cathy Hasson	Campus Flex Workshop	Fall 07
Ray Hernandez? Nick Kapp?		