

SLOAC Steering Committee Minutes

September 26, 2011, 2-4, Room 6203

Present: Steve Aurilio, Luciana Castro, Jan Fosberg, Chris Gibson, Rick Hough, Nick Kapp, Melissa Komadina, Lucia Lachmayr, Jude Navari, Christine Roumbanis, Arthur Takayama, David Ulate, Dennis Wolbers, Karen Wong

Absent: Michael Bishow, Rob Johnstone, Regina Pelayo, Mike Williamson

External Links: [ACCJC Revised Rubric and Memo](#) (see the third rubric); [Effective Communication Rubric](#); [Critical Thinking Rubric](#)

Internal Links: [CTE Programs & Certificates & # of Units](#)

Attached Documents: Critical Thinking Rubric Template

- I. Approval of the 8/29/11 Minutes—approved as is
- II. The November meeting will be on the 28th.
- III. Photo of Group
- IV. Experience piloting the “Effective Communication” and “Critical Thinking” ISLOs
 - A. Questions and Insights from piloting
 1. Regina raised the question of whether the 36+ units is an absolute, which would exclude all of her Cosmetology students who leave after the second semester, when they accrue 40 units for their certification and receive instruction to prepare for their licensing exams.
 - a) TO DO: We need to look into establishing a different cut-off for our Career/ Technical Education programs, either lowering the number of units accrued or asking programs to apply the relevant rubrics to their culminating experiences (i.e, for Cosmetology, it could be their “Baby Boards.”) For these students are receiving intensive instruction and constitute a significant number of our students. (See the attached table.)
 - b) DECIDED: The CTE programs that should be included in assessing ISLOs are those that require an application and have a selective admissions process. The notion is that (1) such programs

are offer intense, comprehensive educational experiences, and (2) students tend to attain mastery as a cohort, and as such, aren't general education students who happen to be taking a class that is central to a certificate or CTE degree. The programs identified thus far are Respiratory Therapy, Surgical Technology, Automotive Technology, and Cosmetology. **Karen asked Melissa to identify any other programs that should be included.**

2. Steve and Luciana raised the question of whether the rubrics should have similar headings, or at least go in the same direction (from needs improvement to excellent/ rarely to consistently).
 - a) DID: We revised the CT rubric to go in the same direction.
3. Rick and Jude raised questions about the CT rubric.
 - a) The rubric was meant to clarify abstract concepts and provide guidance but not be exhaustive, hence the 19 criteria.
 - b) **WILL DO: There was clear consensus to delete the N/A column, but it should be clear that faculty should only apply the parts of the rubric that apply to the assignment/ project being assessed. Rick will take care of making that revision.**
 - c) The 19 criteria were somewhat overwhelming. Should we keep all 19 to delineate more specific skills within the three major categories, or collapse the rubric into three categories with the applicable criteria listed as bullet points?
 - (1) (-) Faculty may get overwhelmed with all of the options.
 - (2) (-) We're only trying to get the big picture with the three major categories, so it makes sense to simplify.
 - (3) (+) The more precise our measures, the more specific information we'll have on what is working and what isn't.
 - (4) (+) That information will be needed for faculty to calculate the averages for each of the three major categories.
 - (5) TO DO: We need to resolve this question.
 - (6) **DECIDED**: Let's keep the 19 since we'd like to delineate between the different types of critical thinking, and since the reporting template that David created is so easy to use.
 - (7) **TO DO**: Now that we have rubrics, the rubrics and the ISLO bullet points don't clearly line up. More immediately, Rick will take a look at the rubric and the ISLO bullet points

and suggest revisions at one of our upcoming meetings. Before assessing each ISLO, our committee will need to take a look at the ISLO bullet points and rubrics and strengthen the alignment.

d) Since one class' results may weigh heavier than another's if multiple criteria apply to their assignment while only one or two may apply to another's, something needs to be done to come out with an average for each student within each of the three categories.

(1) (+/-) We can ask faculty to calculate their own averages, but it's additional work. (Rick provided a model—add up the scores for all of the criteria that apply and then divide by the total number of criteria.)

(2) Better is if we have a form that can tabulate this information. Nick thought Web Access could work, though it would require more investigation on his part. Karen talked to David about whether the Research Office can provide assistance in designing such a form. In addition to the rubric, David pointed out the form should also include the student's G#, the course, and the semester the data is included. TO DID AND WILL DO: David Ulate created templates for faculty to complete, and the Research Office can take care of that calculation. (See David's templates.) **Meanwhile, in looking at the Effective Communication rubric, the committee liked the format and made some suggestions: (a) add the name so that faculty have the option of giving the completed rubric to the student; (b) add tabs for each template in which each student's scores are recorded so that one document can hold all of the data that is submitted to the Research Office. The number of tabs will need to be determined based on an estimate of the highest number of 36+ students in a class.**

B. Schedule for assessment—It seems premature to assess the ISLOs since we need buy-in from participating faculty, and so they need adequate time to prepare—ideally the semester before, and because it's evident from the pilot that some kinks still need to be worked out. Preparation for assessing EC will begin this semester, with the notion that it will be assessed in the Spring. However, that does not preclude faculty from collecting artifacts this semester.

1. When to get the list of courses (the semester before the assessment-- draw from Degree requirements list and deans early in the semester)

2. When to send the invitations to participate (the semester before the assessment-- after deans determine who is teaching which courses)
 3. When participating faculty identify which students have 36+ units, the data that we need (the semester when faculty assess—right after census)
 4. When we need the data from participating faculty (at the end of the semester when faculty assess)
 5. When we'll analyze and discuss the data (the semester after the assessment, perhaps flex day?)
- C. Draft descriptor to send to faculty whose courses we'd like to include for the assessment of the Effective Communication ISLO :
1. need their assistance in assessing the ISLOs
 2. deadlines
 3. major assignments or projects in which students have to write responses in which students have to demonstrate effective communication—short essay responses (for instance on final exams) also suffice
 4. options to help: (a) apply the rubric(s) to the work of students with 36+ units and send us the completed rubrics, (b) apply the rubric(s) to all students' work so as to generate your own course level data and send us the completed rubrics for the work of students who have 36+ units.
 5. Rob will provide a list of the students with 36+ units for the instructors that are participating.
- D. TO DO: Where and when will there be an analysis of preliminary data? A follow-up convocation with the campus?

V. 2010/2011 Achievements

- A. TracDat-- Over 40 faculty and staff have been trained in using TracDat to manage the assessment process and determine how assessment results can inform subsequent action plans. (Thanks to Jan and Dennis for leading a TracDat, Level I workshop at this past flex!)
- B. Course level assessment—clarified that programs should assess core courses, ideally on a six year schedule
- C. PSLO Assessment
1. To prepare for the next phase of assessment on the program level, the College was provided with guidelines on how to write PSLOs and whether they need to create assessments to supplement course level assessments. Only programs that issue 20+ degrees/ certificates annually

will need to create the aforementioned; for all other programs, course level assessments will suffice for assessing on the program level.

2. Thus far, about 50% of programs submitted their PSLOs to the Office of Instruction.

3. Departments are to map their course level SLOs to PSLOs by the end of the Fall, 2011 semester.

D. ISLO (a.k.a. "General Education" SLOs) Assessment

1. Indirect measure-- Results from the CCSSE (Community College Survey of Student Engagement) were analyzed, and improvements were made to the existing instrument.

2. Direct measure—

a) Rubrics to assess the ISLOs were designed and piloted, and disseminated to the College.

b) The "Effective Communication" and "Critical Thinking" assessment processes were piloted in the Spring semester, and the process will be further discussed this Fall.

c) An ISLO will be assessed each semester, with the goal of assessing students with 36+ units completed in courses which are central to achieving said ISLOs.

E. Integration of the SLOAC into the College's existing infrastructure

1. A mechanism to track assessment progress was added to the annual division work-plan.

2. Discussion was initiated with the Curriculum Committee about the current program review processes.

3. Funds were secured through the SLOAC budget and Measure G to compensate adjunct faculty who took leadership roles in assessing within their departments.

VI. Updated Accreditation Rubric—e-mail from Barstow Institutional Researcher Bob Pacheco

A. "Listserv, In 2007, the Accrediting Commission of the Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) approved and disseminated a Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness to help colleges assess their progress to meeting the standards for program review, planning and student learning outcomes assessment.

Of particular interest for many colleges is the Commission's anticipated use of the SLO component of the rubric in Fall 2012 when full-adherence to the student learning outcomes elements of the standards is expected.

Any question about whether the rubrics will be a part of the self-evaluation process has been put to rest. The rubrics are front and center in the ACCJC's new Manual for Institutional Self-Evaluation. http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/Manual-for-Institutional-Self-Evaluation_June-2011.pdf Recommendations to colleges from this past Spring's Commission actions directed colleges to use the rubric as a tool for 2012.

The rubric has four levels or stages of outcomes assessment progress: awareness, development, proficiency and sustainable continuous quality improvement (SCQI). By Fall 2012, all colleges are expected to be "proficient" at outcomes assessment, yet applying the general language of the rubric to individual colleges has been an elusive endeavor.

The Commission outreached to the field through a task force to discover the common difficulties colleges were experiencing using the instrument.

The discussions resulted in four additions to the existing language of the rubric elements; three to proficiency and one for SCQI.

Under the modified rubric, proficient colleges use college dialogue about assessment results to "identify gaps." The learning gap analysis, inferred in the rubric previously, now is now an express requirement. Moreover, discussion about results should "align institution-wide practices to support and improve student learning." Thus, institutional change is directly connected to the review of the results.

Comprehensive assessment reports, an end-product of the outcomes process, must now not only be completed, but "updated" on a regular basis, providing an historical perspective on assessment efforts.

Perhaps the most intriguing addition to the rubric was made at the sustainable continuous quality improvement level. Indeed, colleges are not expected to be at SCQI by Fall 2012, but it is a natural progression of a college proficient at outcomes assessment.

Now, colleges at the highest level on the SLO rubric must "evaluate student learning outcomes processes."

This meta-evaluative component requires colleges to periodically examine the SLO mechanism itself to identify and make needed improvements to the processes of assessing student learning.

See, http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/RevisedRubricAndCoverMemo_July-2011.pdf

VII. Initial Discussion of the Institutional Assessment Model (IAM) Gap Analysis (courtesy of Cathy Hasson)

A. Some confusion about using this instrument since some terms were unclear (“institutional assessment,” “incorporated”), so I’ll need to define those terms if we’re going to use this instrument.

B. Some folks also felt like they didn’t know enough about where institutional assessment is discussed and integrated.

C. Our big sticking point was assessment being “embraced.” We’ve created policies and procedures, and just about everyone is assessing something, but whether or not people actually see the value of assessing the SLOAC way is questionable. We’re back to the question of how we get “buy in.”

VIII. **YOUR HOMEWORK:** By the next meeting, find at least three good models within your division of course level or program level assessment in which the cycle has been completed, if possible with an action plan. Best is if the assessment cycle shows some deep reflection taking place and/or significant findings. The point is to provide models for the campus, and for us to highlight on the SLOAC website.

IX. Please designate the following Monday (the 4th Mondays of the month, except the first meeting of each semester), 2-4, for SLOAC Steering Committee meetings: October 24, November 28, January 30, February 27, March 26, and April 23—Outlook invitations forthcoming! If you cannot continue with the committee next year, please arrange for a replacement within your Division and update me.

ISLO CALENDAR OF ASSESSMENT v. 3

SPRING 2011	FALL 2011	SPRING 2012	FALL 2012
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pilot the assessment of effective communication and critical thinking with artifacts from students with at least 36 units that are enrolled in steering committee members' classes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss experiences with piloting and revise the plan. Create a rubric to assess computer literacy. Identify courses that are central to EC and get feedback and lists of faculty from the Deans. Contact the faculty teaching those courses so they can anticipate assessing EC next semester. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collect artifacts to assess effective communication. Assess effective communication. Identify courses that are central to CT and get feedback and lists of faculty from the Deans. Contact the faculty teaching those courses so they can anticipate assessing CT next semester. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report findings on effective communication. Collect artifacts to assess critical thinking. Assess critical thinking. Identify courses that are central to CL and get feedback and lists of faculty from the Deans. Contact the faculty teaching those courses so they can anticipate assessing CL next semester.
SPRING 2013	FALL 2013	SPRING 2014	FALL 2014 etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report findings on critical thinking. Collect artifacts to assess information literacy. Assess computer literacy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report findings on computer literacy. Collect artifacts to assess computer literacy. Assess information literacy. (Library staff will oversee this assessment, drawing from English 100 and other classes that require research for projects.) Identify courses that are central to C and get feedback and lists of faculty from the Deans. Contact the faculty teaching those courses so they can anticipate assessing C next semester. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report findings on information literacy. Collect artifacts to assess citizenship. Assess citizenship. Identify courses that are central to LW and get feedback and lists of faculty from the Deans. Contact the faculty teaching those courses so they can anticipate assessing LW next semester. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report findings on citizenship. Collect artifacts to assess lifelong wellness. Assess lifelong wellness. Identify courses that are central to EC and get feedback and lists of faculty from the Deans. Contact the faculty teaching those courses so they can anticipate assessing EC next semester.
SPRING 2015 etc			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report findings on lifelong wellness. 			

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Collect artifacts to assess effective communication.• Assess effective communication.			
---	--	--	--

Certificate Programs at Skyline College (2010- 2011 Catalogue)

PROGRAM	UNITS FOR A CERTIFICATE	DEGREE
Accounting	22- 22.5	AS
Accounting Computer Specialist	10- 10.5	
Administration of Justice	27	AA
(Allied Health Science) Pharmacy Technician	12.5	
Asian Studies	27	AA
Chinese Studies	18	
Automotive Technology	Most are 19	AS
(Biotechnology) Biotechnology Technician	18	
(Biotechnology) Manufacturing	11	
(Business) Administrative Assistant	24	AS
(Business) Business Administration	29-32	AS
(Business) Business Information Systems	28	AS
(Business) Computer Information Specialist	18	AS
(Business) General Supervision	22.5-24	
(International Logistics) Customs Broker	9	
(International Logistics) Ocean Freight Forwarding	12	
(International Logistics) Air Freight Forwarding	12	
International Trade	18	AS
(International Trade) Asian Business Practices	12	
(International Trade) International Business	12	
(International Trade) Import and Export	12	
(International Trade) Legal Aspects of International Business	12	
Legal Administrative Assistant	26	AS
Medical Transcriptionist	24	AS
(Medical Transcriptionist) Medical Billing & Coding	17	
(Medical Transcriptionist) Medical Office Assistant	13	
Multimedia Technology	18	AS
Office Assistant	18	AS
Office Information System	34	AS
Retail Management	27-29	AS
Cosmetology	40	AS
(Cosmetology) Esthetician	18	
(Cosmetology) Manicuring	10	
Early Childhood Education	24	AS
(Early Childhood Education) Special Education	24	
Emergency Medical Technology	7	
Family & Consumer Sciences	27	AS
Fashion Merchandising	30	AS
(Fashion Merchandising) General Merchandising	28	AS

(Fashion Merchandising) Image Consulting	30	AS
Journalism	24	AA
Paralegal/ Legal Assistant	27	AA
Solar Energy Technology	15.5- 16.5	
(Solar Energy Technology) Solar Installation	7.5	
Surgical Technology	30	AS
(Surgical Technology) Central Service Technology/ Sterile Processing	8	
TCOM & Wireless Technology	31-33	AS
(TCOM) Linux/ Unix	7.5	
(TCOM) Network Engineering	36	AS
(TCOM) Basic Networking	15	
(TCOM) PC Configuration & Repair	10-12	
(TCOM) Wiring & Installation	10- 12	

