

SLO Meeting Minutes

February 4, 2014

Attendees: Vivian Baker, Suzie Ama, Julie Cornett, Melanie Jeffrey, Jan Moline, Lisa Stephens, Sarah Witkowski

Absent: Corey Marvin

1. Vivian called the meeting to order at 9:05 am.
2. The agenda was approved.
3. The committee composition was discussed. Vivian is the new Student Learning Outcome Coordinator. The committee is comprised of 2 administrators, 1 classified staff member, and 5 faculty members. The membership includes representation for Liberal Arts, Career Technical Education, Student Services, Learning Support Services, and a remote site. The committee composition still needs Academic Senate approval. Vivian will contact Laura to put this on the next agenda.
4. The committee reviewed the Mission and Charge. A small change was recommended to encompass administrative unit outcome assessment. Suzie suggested adding “and institutional effectiveness and” following “learning.” It now reads: “To act as a standing committee to promote student learning and institutional effectiveness by providing leadership in continuous and sustainable assessment and to foster a culture of inquiry.”
5. Suzie reviewed the Fall 2013 Comprehensive Annual Assessment Report with the committee.
 - a. Cerro Coso is behind with respect to course and program assessments. There is an urgent need to delete programs that are no longer being offered. If this is cleaned up, we are at 71% completion for program assessments and 72% for course assessments. The ACCJC requires 85% as a minimum standard to demonstrate continuous, sustained, quality improvement. *The data included in the report is from August 2013 and does not include assessments that were entered by October 1, 2013.
 - b. The committee feels that programs with NO assessment data must assess this semester.
 - c. The aggregated themes from assessments reported in Fall 2013 Annual Unit Plans showed that most gaps (23 instances) were attributed to instructional practices. Most other themes in the rubric had several recorded instances. Julie suggested that our rubric be provided to Chairs prior to completion of AUPs because it may not have occurred to them to indicate others causes for gaps. She also suggested adding Adjunct to the rubric because unit plans attributed gaps to adjunct faculty, who are not as well trained in assessment. In addition, faculty may benefit from training on how to interpret results. Vivian will work with Michael Carley for guidance and possible data points, such as tutors, sites, etc.
 - d. Suzie highlighted the committee’s narrative comments, and Vivian said that IEC was also concerned about universal 100% in a certain discipline, as well as some disciplines merely indicating a plan to plan. The formal assessment approval process will catch these types of issues more effectively. Jan expressed concern that in many cases, the

loop is not being closed. What were the improvements, and will the outcomes be reassessed? Vivian added that the process should be intentional and reflective. Future discussion: how to close the loop at all levels – what to do with identified themes.

- e. Jan, Julie, and Vivian expressed concerns about the impact of C-ID-imposed learning outcomes. The trend is for C-ID courses to have a large number of outcomes, and the committee discussed the sustainability of this. The question was posed whether C-ID SLOs can be listed as Objectives in the new Meta version of CurricUNET, while retaining fewer SLOs, defined locally.
- f. There was discussion about assessment cycles. It is clear that PLOs will be assessed during the year prior to Program Review (year 4 of the PR cycle). Course SLOs should be assessed during years 1-3, ideally distributed to keep workload manageable. Some courses may need to be assessed more often due to program or college wide impact. *If a gap is identified, changes need to be made and re-assessment conducted in a timely manner and prior to Program Review.
- g. Suzie reviewed the results of the ACCJC Report on College Implementation of SLO Assessment. The score of 1 for program assessments is reflective of the inaccurate denominator—programs that are no longer being offered. In spite of the fact that we scored higher than average, we still fall below the established standard of 85%.
- h. Suzie reported that the SLO Training Course is close to being finished, and Vivian has already performed some testing on it. Three modules are complete and the fourth is in progress. When it is completely done, the committee will be invited to test it and provide input. This will be an especially good resource for adjuncts, new fulltime faculty, and new chairs. The committee recommended these be added to the Professional Development page and available for Professional Development credit.
- i. Two out of the three CurricUNET Assessment Module problems have been resolved in the past year.
 - i. Yet to be resolved is the relational SLO database field in the curriculum and assessment modules. The SLO field for assessments should be a look-up field. There were numerous meetings and conversations about this with the District CurricUNET Liaison, but no progress.
 - ii. The Assessment Module now requires the completion of the Attachment category. This task is complete.
 - iii. The approval process is set up and functioning. At the next meeting, the committee will be trained on how to review assessments. This coincides with the deadline for Faculty to input assessments from Fall 2013. It was suggested that Faculty Chairs be added to the queue. It was questioned whether Corey should also be in the queue...Vivian will ask him about his preference.
- j. The AUP offers more structure in the reporting out of assessments, but as mentioned above, we recommend also providing Chairs with our rubric to help them identify themes.
- k. Suzie reiterated that all assessments should be planned collaboratively by departments and non-objective assessments must have a rubric. Ideally, non-objective artifacts

should be assessed by multiple people. However, given that many programs only have 1 full time faculty member and adjuncts are not paid to spend a lot of time with assessment, she broached the question about the acceptability of allowing individual faculty to assess artifacts if the rubrics and assignments were developed collaboratively and if there were collaborative norming and identification of examples representing the threshold of acceptable student performance. Moodle has an Outcomes feature that would facilitate this. Vivian said that IEC discussed the possibility of paying select adjunct stipends, for programs where there is no full time faculty expert, to participate more fully in the process. A stipend amount was not identified, and it is not clear how much time would be compensated.

- I. With respect to 2014 goals, Suzie highlighted the need to codify the denominator for assessment. Some disciplines use census enrollment, others use end-of-term enrollment, and still others use a cohort that consists only of students who turned in an assignment. Jan suggested that we define the denominator as enrollment at the 60% date. If a sample is being drawn, it should come from that roster, not from submitted assignments. The committee will continue to consider this.
6. Jan expressed concerned that assessment is formal research and students are not giving consent to being used as research subjects. While some would say this is not formal research, the degree to which this process is being formalized and results reported out elevates this activity to the level of real research, and there are ethical issues with not abiding by standards dealing with human subject research.
7. Vivian asked the committee to think about data points for the evaluation of assessment committee. This will be discussed further at the next meeting.
8. Vivian also indicated that there would be Curricunet training at the next meeting.
9. The meeting adjourned at 11:00 am.