

**SLOAC Steering Committee Agenda
April 17, 2006, 1:45-3:45, Room 5131**

Present: AJ Bates, Alma Cervantes, Carlos Colombetti, Jon Freedman, Cathy Hasson, Ray Rick Hough, Betty Lindgren-Young, Jen Merrill, Jude Navari, Christine Roumbanis, Phyllis Taylor, Dennis Wolbers , Karen Wong, Soodi Zamani

I. SPRING 2006 PRESENTATIONS ON THE SLOAC FRAMEWORK

- A. How have the presentations gone so far?
- B. Is the following accurate? If you have yet to do so, please send a copy of your division/ departmental agenda and a brief report to Karen at wongk@smccd.net. If you don't have an official agenda, just a report will do, but please include in your report (a) the date, (b) time, (c) persons present for your presentation, (d) any requests for follow-up training, and (e) any other comments/ insights. And if you adapted the Powerpoint presentation for your department/division, please send it to me as an attachment.
 1. March 13, 2006: Virginia Padron presented to the Counselors
 2. March 13, 2006: Karen Wong presented to the English/Reading faculty → Because both English and Reading have been working on SLOs since Spring 2005, Karen primarily focused on the first part of the presentation, particularly on the SLOAC flowchart and the Philosophy. Karen also encouraged her colleagues to peruse the resources for assessment in the third part of the Framework. Generally faculty recognize that the SLOAC is necessary for accreditation and most full-time faculty have been intimately involved in subcommittees to draft SLOs.
 3. March 29, 2006: Dennis Wolbers presented to the Librarians → Generally the presentation went well though there was some confusion about assessment. How does the assessment of SLOs apply to library or SS units when there is no sustained interaction with students nor any formal follow-up with students that used these services? One suggestion was to survey students who attend library orientations as a whole class upon completion of the research unit. Another request was for a condensed version of the Framework because it's bulk is somewhat intimidating.
 4. March 31, 2006: Chris Case presented to the Biology faculty
 5. April 5, 2006: Phyllis Taylor presented to remainder of the LA Division—the Speech Communications, ESOL, and Foreign Languages faculty

6. April 7, 2006: Carlos Colombetti, Jen Merrill & Jude Navari presented to the Social Sciences/Creative Arts Division → In this 1.5 hour presentation, generally faculty expressed a lot of concerns, such as what's the political force behind this initiative? Who will control the processes? In your assessment, how do you factor in unmotivated or poor performing students? In addition, how do you factor in the long term performance of students whose gains aren't immediately evident? The presenters responded that the SLOAC committee is aware of and even discussed some of these concerns, and that we will continue to consider them as we shape the process. On another note, using "clicker" technology, 95% of the faculty demonstrated that they understood the distinction between objectives and SLOs.

II. How to collect \$ from Karen's Trustees'/PFE Grant

"The successful outcome of implementing this grant will be:"

- A. Faculty across the disciplines beginning training in articulating student learning outcomes →
 - participate in SLOAC committee meetings and workshops
- B. Student learning outcomes articulated at the program and college levels →
 - send Karen draft SLOs for at least one course (since as a committee we decided to focus on the course level first, not the program or college level)
- C. A successful campus-wide dialogue on student learning outcomes taking place at the program level and eventually involving faculty across the disciplines meeting as a representative body →
 - participate in creating the Skyline SLOAC Framework;
 - initiate the process of writing SLOs with your respective department;
 - present at least twice on the Framework, and/or lead workshops on how to write SLOs and/or create an assessment plan (once this semester and once next semester, particularly for the Fall Flex workshops)
- D. Discussion of the appropriate means to assess student learning outcomes such as standard rubrics, demonstrations, culminating projects, tests, etc. →
 - participate in SLOAC committee meetings and workshops.

III. Discussion of the proposed timeline for rolling out the SLOAC

- A. Regina, Cathy, Christine, and Karen met on March 30th and came up with the following draft. The CC will align expectations with the existing program review schedule. Amongst the expectations are that:
 - 1. Faculty revise all course outlines with SLOs;

- a. Is this reasonable? If not, what should be the minimum? Will special consideration be given to departments that have few full time faculty or none at all?
 - b. How frequently should workshops be held? In what form? By whom?
2. In the program review instrument, faculty will have to complete a schedule which will include the following:

SLO | Assessment Plan | Implementation

3. At minimum, faculty will have to complete assessment plans and implementation for core courses at the end of the six year cycle of Program Review.
 - a. Or should faculty be required to conduct assessments for all courses or only core courses? Is assessing only core courses reasonable?
 - b. How do we define “core courses”? (i.e, for English/Reading, core courses may be courses that have the highest enrollment due to them being prerequisites or requirements for programs or degrees)
 4. Also under consideration is that program review will also require a three-year midterm update for programs, which will include requests for resources to complete the assessment.
 - a. What should be required in this update?
 - b. Who should provide these resources?
 5. Presently no discussion has taken place about whether and/or how to conduct a formal assessment on the program level.
 - a. Can faculty reasonably tackle both course and program level assessment?
 - b. If not both, what should faculty be required to report in program review?
- B. Canada’s and CSM’s approaches**
1. Canada’s Program Review is a comprehensive review every six years, with biannual reports. They are piloting on the course level this year.
 - a. Presently they don’t require SLOs on course outlines, but rather in program review.
 - b. Faculty are being asked to submit an assessment plan for one SLO on the course or program level and an assessment, though presently no one has gone through the cycle yet.
 2. I think that CSM’s Program Review is annual.
 - a. They will require SLOs on course outlines.
 - b. Departments were given the option of generating SLOs on the course or program level.

- c. Faculty will have the option of assessing on the course or program level, but presently there is no formal requirement in program review. She anticipates that several departments will assess.

C. In the subsequent discussion at the SLOAC meeting, these points were made:

1. Instead of aligning expectations with program review, which puts the pressure especially on the programs that are up for review in the next two to three years, establish common yearly objective(s) for every program. For instance, work backward from the some of the aforementioned proposals such as revising all course outlines with SLOs in the next three years, begin to draft program SLOs in the next three years, assess a certain number of SLOs in the next six years, and so on.
2. Another proposal is that assuming WASC expects us to have a process in place by 2012, work backwards to establish yearly objectives.
3. There appeared to be a general consensus that A1 was a reasonable objective.
4. A question raised is who will “critique” SLOs in official course outlines since the new course outline template requires that there be a clear integration between SLOs, objectives, and course content. The point was made that criteria for well written SLOs is in our Framework, and another point was made that faculty as discipline experts should have final say.
5. Another question raised is what is meant by “core courses,” if faculty are only required to assess “core courses” for their program review. Definitions ranged from “gateway courses” to courses that show a vertical integration to basic skills to transfer courses. Because some of those definitions would require an assessment of every course in a program, which is quite overwhelming, committee members felt more comfortable deferring to faculty to determine which of their program’s courses are core courses.

IV. Photo by Alma Cervantes of the SLOAC Steering Committee for the new and improved SLOAC website

V. Presentation by Regina Pelayo of her Cosmetology Assessment Plan (postponed until the next meeting)

VI. Reminders:

- A. Save Monday afternoons next semester for SLOAC Steering Committee meetings or find someone to replace you
- B. Give me supporting documentation to collect dollars for Trustees’/ PFE and Pilots.

- C. If you have yet to do so and are piloting, please specify what you plan to pilot.
- D. Consider attending this conference next semester and applying for professional development: “Strengthening Student Success: What Counts? Competence, Confidence, Community for All of Our Students” on October 4-6, San Diego

<http://rpggroup.org/10-06StudentSuccessConf-MainPage.htm>

What? Learn cutting-edge assessment techniques that improve both teaching and learning at the ***Strengthening Student Success Conference*** being held **October 4-6, 2006** in San Diego, California. This “can't miss” conference is being sponsored by the California Partnership for Achieving Student Success (Cal-PASS), the California Assessment Institute (CAI) and the Research & Planning Group of California (RP Group), in collaboration with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning. Expert faculty and staff who have successfully met the challenge of assessing and using student learning outcomes will plan and lead the summit.

Attend numerous presentations on effective assessment practices, network with other educators and learn hands-on techniques that you can begin implementing in your classrooms immediately.

Who Should Attend? This conference is aimed at community college faculty and staff – student services, instruction, and planning, research and assessment – and their partners (K-12, university). The conference brings discipline leaders and colleagues from across the state to share new ideas and current assessment practices around the theme of strengthening student success through building their competence, confidence, and community for all through equity.

**SIGN UP TO PRESENT AT
FLEX DAY NEXT SEMESTER**

TUESDAY,
AUGUST 15, 12:30- 2:30

**Workshop Two for the Initiated:
Writing SLOs**

(ideally would like one person from
each division)

Betty Lindgren-Young
Rick Hough
Carlos Colombetti

**Workshop One for Beginners:
Understanding Skyline's SLOAC
Framework**

Soodi Zamani
Karen Wong

**Workshop Three for the Advanced:
Creating an Assessment Plan**

(ideally would like people who are
piloting and/or created an assessment
plan)

Susan Andrien
Cathy Hasson
Possibly Phyllis Taylor

SIGN UP TO PRESENT THE FRAMEWORK THIS SEMESTER

Your Name	Division/ Department You'd Like to Present To
Jan Fosberg	PE
Dennis Wolbers	Library
Chris Case & AJ Bates	SMT-- Science
Phyllis Taylor & Karen Wong	Language Arts
Ray Hernandez	RT, EMT, Surg. Tech.
Regina Pelayo, Christine Roumbanis, & Alma Cervantes	Business
Sherri Hancock & Virginia Padron	Student Services
Jennifer Merrill, Jude Navari, & Arthur Takayama	SS/CA
Soodi Zamani, Jon Freedman & Rick Hough	SMT-- Math

SIGN UP TO PRESENT WITH KAREN ABOUT WRITING/ REVISING SLOs

Your Name	Division/ Department You'd Like to Present To
Susan Andrien & Betty Lindgren-Young	Language Arts
Carlos Colombetti	Social Sciences (several one or two person departments)
Jacquie Escobar	Counseling

CREATING A TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE SLOAC

Karen Wong Susan Andrien Christine Roumbanis Cathy Hasson	<u>Need to sign up to present:</u> Val Goines
--	--

SIGN UP IF YOU WANT TO DESIGN, IMPLEMENT, AND PRESENT A COURSE OR SERVICES LEVEL ASSESSMENT PLAN AND REPORT

PROGRAM	LEAD PERSON
1) Speech Communications	Phyllis Taylor
2) Biology	Chris Case
3) Philosophy	Carlos Colombetti
4) Physical Education	Jan Fosberg
5) CAOT	Christine Roumbanis
6) Cosmetology	Regina Pelayo
7) English (836)	Tom Sullivan
8) Counseling	Virginia Padron
9) Art	Arthur Takayama
10) Music	Jude Navari
11) Math (805)	Soodi Zamani
12) Math (130)	Rick Hough
13) Math (110)	Jonathan Freedman
14) Counseling (Orientation)	Jacque Escobar
15) Chemistry	AJ Bates
16)	
17)	
18)	
19)	
20)	

Reminder: print Regina's assessment plan and the CC program review schedule