

## SLOAC Minutes, September 29, 2009

### Attendees:

X Carolyn Arnold    X Fe Baran                    X Adrian Huang            X Deonee Kunkel  
X Gloria Meads        X Jan Novak                    X Rebecca Otto            X Norberto Ruiz  
X Patricia Shannon    X Michelle Sherry        X Steven Small

Chair: Carole Splendore

Note taker: Carole Splendore

The meeting began at 12:05 pm.

1. Carole showed recent additions to the website, including the pages on FIGs, FAQs, and the Archives. The group liked the new additions.
2. The group decided to be more formal in the approval of minutes.
3. Carole and Jan reported on the WASC Level 1 Workshop (Deonne arrived later in the conversation). They sketched out the plan for program-level definition and assessment. Jan referred to the college catalogue's selection of courses which represent degrees and certificates. Carole referred to her workshop notes, which many on the committee had read. Of particular note were that programs were being proposed to be defined as degrees and certificates, and possibly basic skills, but not necessarily transfer. Rebecca's plan of a year earlier, which is basically the same plan, and her Program-level learning outcomes handout was referred to. Also read aloud was the passage where the SLOAC is the college-wide body where the definition of program will be decided. Gloria mentioned that the plan had not been discussed, only presented. The group concurred that more time would be spent on this in the semester.

Carole also mentioned that the decision to have only one outcome per course was a Chabot college compromise, not the ideal of what curriculum alignment of course level slos will necessitate. 3-4 outcomes per course are better. The workshop leaders proposed scenarios where division meetings would be mostly given over to the alignment of which courses are introducing, developing, or mastering particular outcomes in a single discipline. Jan noted that when one assesses, usually they assess a course, ie. all of the outcomes. Carole mentioned that faculty will not be assessing all courses every semester; time will be built into the schedule for reflection and adaption. She proposed that the SLOAC will go into the divisions and disciplines to set schedules for assessment which may be every few years, maybe every six years for one, perhaps every two years for Nursing as it is tied to a 2-year certificate.

4. The question of whether Chabot was at the Awareness or Developmental Phase was again (as it was the meeting of Sept. 15) raised. The group again referred itself to the ACCJC/WASC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: SLOs. Again the group read through the items together, and checked off all the activities for the Awareness stage as being attended to. Then the team looked at the Development stage, and checked off all, but paused that the college had authentic assessment strategies for assessing slos as appropriate to intended program and degree learning outcomes. However it is arguable that we are now in the process of developing those strategies.

The group found it as a positive that the other goals in the Development stage had been established, including that existing organizational structures are supporting slos and assessment; ie. the Faculty Senate, the Curriculum Committee, and Program Review. It was also discussed that leadership groups had accepted responsibility of slos (Trish named T3) and appropriate resources are being allocated to support slos and assessment. Carolyn mentioned we have a 50% coordinator position, the FIGs are supporting slo work, and a new eLumen specialist is soon to be hired.

Rebecca mentioned that it might be useful to put this rubric up on the website, with links to supporting documents which provide evidence that the work has been established following the bulleted items, in red. These documents would include dates, and mention of how many faculty were involved.

5. Working through the WASC rubric and its Proficiency stage

The group began continuation (from the Sept. 15<sup>th</sup> meeting) of working through the exercise, whereby the Proficiency stage of Implementing SLO Framework at a CC, was studied. Carolyn mentioned one value of this was to become familiar with all the terms.

Carole mentioned that hearing the committee's vision of what this stage would be like at Chabot would help her in revising the College SLOAC map. This document, which it was agreed would be a draft, was to be revised for the next, Oct. 20<sup>th</sup> SLOAC meeting. It is a timeline which documents our history but which also extends our timeline out to 2012, and it covers activities in all 3 levels of outcomes assessment. The original College SLOAC document was presented. It was completed by Carolyn in May 2007. It showed one CWLG being assessed a year. Carole mentioned to Carolyn this activity was going to need to be sped up.

The group discussed the following elements of the rubric:

- SLOs and authentic assessment are in place for courses, programs, and degrees (discussed Sept. 15<sup>th</sup>).

Authentic assessment was defined as meaningful, and that actually measures their ability to do that thing. SLOs would be part of repeating and renewing structures, through student pathways as defined as courses, certificates, and degrees (GE), and Puente and Daraja.

- Results of Assessment are being used for improvement and further alignment of Institution-wide practices.

Faculty would get together in groups of those assessing the same course, or those in the same division, or those in groups across the college; to discuss and debate better learning, as evidenced by results if possible.

They would agree on what to improve, by looking at the SLOs and CWLGs and how we are teaching and assessing them, and referencing other quantitative and qualitative measures.

- There is a widespread institutional dialogue about the results.

A continual dialogue would take place across all disciplines, and it would include staff, counseling, the library, and students too. Right now it is occurring at Flex days and College day, and in co-teaching scenarios, FIGs and BSI.

We would experience it on Assessment Days, assessment Friday morning sessions, in retreats, summer intensives, in divisions and hallways.

The results would be evidenced by assessment records, data, and perceptions.

- Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward improving student learning.

The administration, the SLOAC, and other bodies would make policy revisions based on discussions on the results of assessment and improving student learning. We would be thinking strategically, as we are now, however now it is soft, and not integrated.

In an institution our size (we think of ourselves as small but really we are medium-sized) this dialogue will always look a little diffused.

We are now having (diffused) discussions on how buildings are being used. Building 100 is being discussed as to directly support student learning.

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 pm. The rubric work will continue on the other four statements.