

SLOAC Steering Committee Minutes

September 27, 2010, 2- 4, Room 6203

Present: Steve Aurilio, Michael Bishow, Luciana Castro, Greg Christensen, Kathleen Feinblum, Jan Fosberg, Rick Hough, Rob Johnstone, Nick Kapp, Melissa Komadina, Lucia Lachmayr, Vicki Morrow, Sita Motipara, Jude Navari, Arthur Takayama , Dennis Wolbers, Karen Wong

Absent: Regina Pelayo (broken foot), Christine Roumbanis (TechPrep)

- I. Approval of the 8/30/10 Notes— approved as is; however, for future practice, rename the agendas “minutes” after they’ve been approved

- II. Update on our recommendation to add a “trigger” to the annual work plan report to ensure that all departments are assessing annually.
 - A. Rob, Vicki, and Karen crafted language to add the following to the College Workplan-- Strategy 1.4, ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING: Ensure that Skyline College assesses student learning at the course, program and institutional levels, engages in shared reflection on the results of these assessments, and uses the results to sustain or improve student learning.
 1. Will need to solicit feedback from College Council, IPC, etc.
 2. Hopefully the question of whether to add this strategy will be resolved by the end of Fall, 2010.
 3. Making explicit this goal is good for accreditation purposes, but there is still the question of the union wanting to include participation in assessment as part of faculty evaluation.

- III. Adjunct Compensation for Start-Up Assessing-- Honorarium
 - A. Make explicit what is required and that SLOAC Steering Committee members are available to help: (a) create assessment plan and instruments; (b) analyze data, discuss implications, and make recommendations, if any; (c) Upload the aforementioned on Tracdat, which can be done with assistance from a TracDat administrator within or Dean of the Division, (d) coordinate assessment with others teaching the course, if need be.

B. Maximum stipend— \$550 total, with \$250 for the first course, and \$100 for up to three subsequent courses

C. Concerns

1. Quality control— ideally solicit feedback from other faculty teaching the course and/or SLOAC Steering Committee members

2. Sustainability—presently there is a limited amount of money for compensation, so the priority will be departments that are entirely adjunct taught. This question will likely need to be revisited.

IV. Recommendation for program level assessment (Below is the recommendation and feedback, and separately is Rob's data)

A. Only seven programs have 20+ degrees. If you add certificates, you get another 11, but 7 of those are in Auto Tech.

B. Major revisions are noted in red in the document below.

V. Information and Computer Literacy ISLO Update (Dennis Wolbers)

A. Question: This ISLO has 3 components (bullet points). However, the 2nd bullet point is an area not explicitly taught by librarians. It reads: "Use computer technology to organize, manage, integrate, synthesize, create, and communicate information and ideas in order to solve problems and function effectively in an information society."

Although the rubric Dennis wrote for this ISLO does have a skill category that pertains to the use of computer hardware and software, the librarian has not – and will not – teach that set of skills. So he did not assign any scores at all for that category as he applies it to ENG 100 essays.

Therefore, the question becomes: Who on this campus will be assessing computer technology skills as it is defined in our ISLO? Should there perhaps be a separate rubric for computer technology literacy written by faculty in CAOT?

1. Computer skills are demonstrated in all sorts of assignments given in courses across all disciplines. Therefore, can computer literacy skills be assessed in a variety of courses using existing assessment instruments? (The rubric would have to be revised and/or expanded to include computer literacy skill categories.)

2. In many instances, students are assumed to have these skills, or they're helped in more informal settings such as in the Learning Center or during office hours. Does it make sense for GE instructors to assess it since they're not formally teaching it?

3. CAOT teaches those skills, so should they create a separate rubric, or should the criteria be included under the existing rubric? Or is it sufficient to have their course level assessment results roll up to that ISLO?

4. Another idea is to assess these skills indirectly. Someone suggested that the Technology Advisory Group could send out a survey once a year to students asking them to assess their own competence with computers. Or do any of our existing surveys, such as the CCSSE or Noel-Levitz, collect information on this ISLO?

B. Update on the rubric

VI. Photo of the SLOAC Steering Committee

VII. Please designate the following Mondays (the 4th Mondays of the month, except the first meeting of each semester), 1:45-3:45, for SLOAC Steering Committee meetings: October 25, November 22, January 31, February 28, March 28, April 25.

MAY 2010: SKYLINE COLLEGE DRAFT PROPOSAL TO ASSESS ON THE PROGRAM LEVEL

1) Who should create Program SLOs?

Any programs undergoing program review will be asked to create PSLOs because whenever possible, the SLOAC should be connected to existing infrastructures.

2) How will they create these PSLOs, and by when should they be created?

Instructional faculty in a given discipline have ultimate purview, as it's always been. Faculty have multiple means to generate these PSLOs.

The first step is to determine which ISLOs pertain to their programs, and/or ~~revise~~ **adapt** these ISLOs to explicitly connect with their discipline. Why? The ISLOs are broad enough that they encompass a variety of disciplines, so they should be applicable; the process will encourage faculty to revisit how their programs support students' fulfillment of these ISLOs. Also, course level assessment results can "roll up" to program as well as institutional level assessment, which is an efficient means to assess. On a related note, faculty can use the relevant parts of the ISLO rubrics which have already been created, so they don't need to create rubrics from scratch, and also the College will have more reliable ISLO data since the same instrument is being employed.

The second step is to supplement these PSLOs if necessary by drawing from common course level SLOs, professional organizations with which they're affiliated, etc.

3) By when should PSLOs be created and mapped to courses?

All instructional programs should have PSLOs created and mapped to courses by the end of Spring 2011.

To complete the latter, departments should complete a matrix aligning core and/or required courses with their PSLOs so as to determine which course level assessments should "roll up" to assess the PSLOs. This matrix also will enable them to determine to which extent each PSLO is being addressed throughout the required courses and where. ([The SLOAC Framework, p. 33](#)).

Student Services should already have their PSLOs, though they'll need to map them to ISLOs by the end of Spring 2011.

4) How will they assess these PSLOs?

For programs with less than 20 degrees or certificates awarded each year, course level assessments “rolling up” to program level assessment will suffice for program level assessment, though they can do more if they want.

In phase one of our program level assessment, CTE programs and the four interdisciplinary studies programs (which used to be categorized under “Liberal Arts”) with more than 20 degrees or certificates awarded each year, will be required to conduct a deeper assessment. ~~supplement course level assessments with program level assessment(s).~~ For instance, CTE programs could cite students’ performance on licensing exams; administer a survey or facilitate a focus group with graduates/certificate recipients; evaluate culminating experiences such as a capstone project, portfolio, etc. On the other hand, the four interdisciplinary programs may need to have a body representing many divisions, such as the SLOAC Steering Committee, assess those PSLOs. The question of how to assess will need to be explored. (Though presently Business Administration, Accounting, and Administration of Justice also issue 20+ degrees, we will address this question in phase two of the implementation process.)

FEEDBACK IN SPRING 2010

- Feedback from Janet Fulks, former AS Assessment and Accreditation Chair and statewide SLOAC leader:

The strategy makes perfect sense and works. The top (ISLOs) and the bottom (course) connect in the middle (PLOs). I will say that for program learning outcomes we have sometimes found that programs need to think beyond the ISLOs and the course SLOs to a larger metric when applicable. An example of this would be our pre-allied health program which has as an outcome and assessment examining evidence of success in the initial health program semester (RN XRAY, etc) and also has a focus group of students to report narrative and survey information about how relevant and comprehensive the biology outcomes were as applied to their next field of allied-health study. Our biology transfer program includes an outcome about success, assessed by feedback, in the transfer institution. In other words programs that link to specific jobs or continuing study should provide feedback externally as to the program outcomes. So these are a bit beyond our course SLOs and our ISLOs (but maybe your ISLOs cover these kinds of things)?

I think the critical mass of 20 students receiving the degree or award is very practical.

- Feedback from Marcy Alan Craig, statewide SLOAC leader and former SLOAC Coordinator for Cabrillo College

Looks good to me. Since I don't know your system, I don't know how course assessments will "roll up" to program assessments. Are you using the same

assessment instrument to tell you about both? If so, how does it really give you data that shows both? That's my only concern.

- Feedback from Rick

I'm not sure exactly how to do it, but the part that is still unclear to me is the referred to "roll-up" process. Is it simply that you create a program SLO and assessment plans with criteria that literally can take data straight from course level data? For example, in math we have several SLOs that assess students' ability to model data, manipulate the model algebraically, and interpret results. I can imagine a program SLO that has to do with this, but am really unclear on how the roll-up process would work since the data is coming from different levels.

Karen's response: Good point-- I'll try to clarify that step in my directions. Essentially what you'll do is continue assessing on the course level, and that same data can be used for assessing the program level SLO. How? When you enter your PSLOs, you'll identify which courses are central to students achieving that PSLO (much like you'll eventually do with the ISLOs as well). This way the course level data will automatically roll up to the PSLO, with no additional assessment required unless your program has 20+ majors. I'm going to provide TracDat training in the Fall on how to "map."

Rick's response: Am I making this harder than it is? Is it simply the course SLOs have results that are simply referred to by the program SLO? Say, in my case for example, that I have 3 courses. Lower level course modeling SLO has it's criteria and results, mid level course has modeling SLO and results, high level course has modeling SLO and results.

Program SLO: Students can model, manipulate, and interpret. Assessment plan: roll up from low/mid/high level modeling SLOs. Results: See results from course SLOs.

That is, you don't really put anything in for program SLOs except a reference?

- Feedback from Arthur

I have a question about the phrase in section 2, second paragraph, "and/or revise these ISLOs to explicitly connect with their discipline." Does this mean that the ISLO's will to be revised after a program review to accommodate the program SLO's? Or, was the intended directive to indicate that an interpretation of the ISLO's should be developed that connects with the program SLO's?

Karen's response: In preparing for the Fall semester, I'm reviewing e-mails, and I'm not sure if I ever got back to you about your question below, but we may end up addressing it at the first meeting anyway. ISLOs are pretty set, and as such, if they apply to a specific program, they can be used as is or revised to adapt to a specific program. The

notion is that each program can work from existing resources to generate their PSLOs, and become more conscious of how their program supports students' acquisitions of said ISLOs. For instance, everyone likely employs some aspect of critical thinking, but it may be very discipline specific. (That said, if in the future we find that specific ISLOs are outdated or no longer pertinent, then of course we should revise and/or delete them.)

Arthur's response: You actually did reply to the email and acknowledged that the wording should have addressed the interpretation of the ISLO to fit a program's SLO; rather than revision of the ISLO directly. So, it was just a suggestion to add a few words to the phrase under consideration to make it clearer.

- Feedback from Jan

Karen's initial inquiry to Jan: I'm still stewing on this program level assessment, and an idea just occurred to me. Though PE doesn't have a unified set of program outcomes, minimally the first Personal Wellness ISLO applies. What about using that personal wellness ISLO as your program outcome since the data will be primarily collected through PE classes anyway? That way we "kill two birds with one stone." (The same applies to Information Literacy with the Library Program, and even the scientific method bullet point under Critical Thinking for all science programs.)

Jan's response: That would work for some of our classes (probably a majority) but not all. The other option, or additional assessment commonality, is our fitness testing program but again that would not work for all classes. Can we leave those classes that are more stand-alone or more geared toward a specific audience out of the "program"? I'm thinking about our ADAP, golf and archery, and some of our dance performance classes in particular.

Fall 2010: Revised Draft Rubric for the *Information and Computer Technology Literacy* ISLO

INFORMATION AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY LITERACY: STUDENTS WILL BE ABLE TO DEMONSTRATE SKILLS CENTRAL TO INFORMATION AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY LITERACY

Information and computer technology literacy includes the ability to:

- Effectively locate and access information in numerous formats using a variety of appropriate search tools.
- Use computer technology to organize, manage, integrate, synthesize, create, and communicate information and ideas in order to solve problems and function effectively in an information society.
- Evaluate the relevance, quality, and credibility of a wide variety of information sources using critical thinking and problem solving skills.

Primary Characteristic	Not Attempted -0-	Novice -1-	Proficient -2-	Advanced -3-	Score
Topic choice / focus (SLO 1)	No response to topic prompt.	Topic is overly vague, too broad or too narrow in scope.	Topic has a discernable focus but lacks precision and needs to be better articulated.	Very clear focus on a topic that is appropriately precise and well articulated.	
Search tool(s) selection (SLO 2) (assessed via a brief online post-test completed by students after info lit workshop)	Search tool(s) not chosen.	Inappropriate search tool(s) chosen for the type of information source(s) needed.	Search tool(s) chosen that might provide the type of information source(s) needed, but better choices are overlooked.	The best and most appropriate search tool(s) consistently chosen for the type of information source(s) needed.	
Online search strategy (SLO 3) (assessed via a brief online post-test completed by students after info lit workshop)	Search not carried out.	Significant mistakes made carrying out basic and/or advanced search techniques (e.g. errors choosing search terms, identifying concepts, choosing search mode, Boolean logic, truncation, etc.) Lacks overall conceptual understanding of search strategy.	Applies basic and/or advanced search techniques with few or only minor errors. Demonstrates basic understanding of the technical and conceptual aspects of online search strategy.	Applies basic and/or advanced search techniques skillfully and demonstrates complete mastery of all technical and conceptual aspects of online search strategy.	

Primary	Not	Beginning	Proficient	Advanced	Score
---------	-----	-----------	------------	----------	-------

Characteristic	Attempted -0-	-1-	-2-	-3-	
Information source relevance, quality, and credibility (SLO 4)	No information source(s) chosen. Student is unaware of and does not apply criteria used to judge information quality.	Inappropriate and/or irrelevant source(s) chosen. Source(s) do not relate to the research topic and/or are of dubious quality and credibility.	A diversity of higher quality sources is more prominent, although some sources chosen are only broadly or tangentially related to research topic or are otherwise of moderate quality. Student shows some ability to evaluate sources using criteria such as authority, relevance, purpose, currency, accuracy, scholarship, bias, intended audience, writing style, and documentation.	A variety of very high quality relevant sources and viewpoints are used exclusively. Sources selected indicate the student has carefully and thoroughly evaluated all sources according to established criteria, including looking for background information about authors, organizations, publications, and reading reviews of published works. Student is fully able to make reasoned judgments about which sources to use and which to discard.	
Information source documentation (SLO 5)	Did not provide citation(s).	Citation(s) contained major errors. Student is largely unaware of the nature, purpose, and specifics of citation style.	Cited work, but citation(s) contained minor style errors only.	Cited work accurately with no style errors	

Primary Characteristic	Not Attempted -0-	Beginning -1-	Proficient -2-	Advanced -3-	Score
Organization, formatting, and presentation of final research product	No final research project presented.	Final research product is poorly presented and formatted. Haphazard, inconsistent, or disorderly presentation and arrangement of text, charts, graphs, images, web links, etc.	Final research product shows skillful application of computer hardware and software, resulting in an well-organized presentation of text, charts, graphs, images, web-links, etc.	Computer hardware and software is expertly applied, resulting in a highly organized, professional-looking presentation of text, charts, graphs, images, web-links, etc.	
				Total Score (Max = 18)	