

SLOAC Steering Committee Minutes

October 25, 2010, 2-4, Room 6203

Present: Steve Aurilio, Michael Bishow, Jan Fosberg, Rob Johnstone, Nick Kapp, Melissa Komadina, Lucia Lachmayr, Sita Motipara, Jude Navari, Christine Roumbanis, Dennis Wolbers, Karen Wong

Absent: Luciana Castro, Greg Christensen, Kathleen Feinblum, Rick Hough, Vicki Morrow, Regina Pelayo (conference), Arthur Takayama (PEDAC)

I. Approval of the 9/27/10 Minutes—approved with revisions to the PSLO policy, as devised with input from the Curriculum Committee

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

A. Should Skyline have an ISLO pertaining to computer literacy, especially if it's not central to nor explicitly taught in any courses beyond CAOT? CSM and Canada do not include an explicit computer literacy ISLO. The closest was from Canada's GE ISLO list: Use communication skills and technology to interact with others and express ideas in a diverse society.

1. Recommendation: Yes, Skyline should still keep both ISLOs, but separate the Information from the Computer Literacy ISLO since they address two different skill sets, which in turn require two starkly different assessments.

2. Regarding the computer literacy ISLO, can we hold our students accountable to it if we're not explicitly teaching it (i.e, adept use of Powerpoint for class presentations)? Only CAOT explicitly teaches those skills, and yet students are supposed to master them in their time here at Skyline. So should data be generated only from CAOT?

3. Needed action: Create a rubric that measures computer literacy.

B. If we keep the computer literacy ISLO, then should we adapt the following for our own rubric:

<http://www.tusculum.edu/academics/civcarts/ComputerLiteracyRubric.doc>.

C. (These others evaluate too discrete of skills but may be of use to CAOT faculty:

1. <http://www.ncstatecollege.edu/studentsuccessplan/Computer%20Literacy%20CLO/Computer%20Literacy%20Competency%20Rubrics.doc>

2. <http://www.stapollinaris.com/Uploads/Files/2-8%20Computer%20Literacy%20Standards%20Rubric.pdf>
3. <http://www.rcampus.com/rubricshowc.cfm?code=M3428A&sp=yes>
&

D. Update on [the rubric](#)

III. Lifelong Wellness Pilot (Jan Fosberg)

A. Which classes besides those in Counseling should be surveyed? In which classes is personal development addressed or even central to class outcomes?

1. We have this ISLO, but the issue is that students aren't required to take any coursework that is specifically related to personal development, and even those on the AA/AS track can choose courses listed under "Personal Development" that don't explicitly address personal development as our ISLO defines it, so how can we expect it of them? Yet we also recognize that these qualities are central to a student's development.
2. One suggestion is for students to complete the OnCourse pre/post survey in courses listed under personal development.
 - a) Melissa provided a handout on the Skyline AA/AS Degree requirements. Some courses listed on p.2., #5, aren't even offered anymore.
3. Discussion to be continued at the next meeting...

IV. 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: November 22, January 31, February 28, March 28, April 25.

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 Characteristic	Not Attempted -0-	Beginning -1-	Proficient -2-	Advanced -3-	Score
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)	

