

SLOAC Steering Committee Minutes

August 29, 2011, 2-4, Room 6203

Present: Steve Aurilio, Michael Bishow, Luciana Castro, Jan Fosberg, Chris Gibson, Rick Hough, Nick Kapp, Melissa Komadina, Lucia Lachmayr, Jude Navari, Regina Pelayo, Paul Spakowski, David Ulate, Mike Williamson, Dennis Wolbers, Karen Wong

Absent: Rob Johnstone, Christine Roumbanis, Arthur Takayama

Attached: IAM Gap Analysis (to be completed for the September meeting)

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

- I. Welcome and Introductions
- II. Approval of the 4/25/11 Minutes—approved as is
- III. 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.
 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) TO 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.

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.

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 DO: David Ulate created templates for faculty to complete, and the Research Office can take care of that calculation.

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?)

IV. 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: August 29, September 26, October 24, November 28 (possibly the 21st so it's before Thanksgiving), 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.

5/25/11 e-mail from Political Science Professor Johannes Masare's concerns about PSLOs

"Please find attached the PSLOs for the Department of Political Science.

1. Political Science is not a "program" that awards degrees, diplomas or certificates.
2. There is not a set of courses that a student is required take in the Department of Political Science -- students take one, two or more courses depending on what they want to accomplish by taking that course. Most of the time it is for meeting certain requirement for graduation or for transfer to a four-year institution.
3. There are currently four core courses in the Department of Political Science:
 - i)- PLSC 115 – Comparative Government.
 - ii) - PLSC 130 – International Relations.
 - iii) - PLSC 150 – Introduction to Political Theory and
 - iv) - PLSC 210 – American Politics.
4. Each of these courses has its own SLOs. So, what I have done according to Professor Karen Wong's e-mail of May 20th, 2011, is to roll up "course level assessment to program level assessment." Thus, I have integrated the key SLOs in the above courses into one "program student learning outcomes."

Please note, for a department that does not award any degrees, diplomas or certificates to talk of SLOs as they relate to the whole/entire department is absolutely meaningless. SLOs of students are based on the students' learning assessment of a course or courses they have taken, how do we assess students' learning outcomes based on courses they have never taken? No student is required to take all the courses currently offered in the Department of Political Science, so how do we make such an assessment? I understand that there are college-wide SLOs. Student Learning Outcomes – "learning" what subject? What is taught to all students at Skyline College so that we can assess the respective "outcomes" of their learning?

Students at Skyline College take courses ranging from Algebra, Biology and Chemistry through Philosophy, Political Science and Psychology to Wellness and Women in Transition! So, on what discipline or subject or course are we going to assess our students' learning outcomes?

Maria, this is not the place or the time for me to express my personal views about this SLOs and PSLOs process, I just wanted you to know what I think of this process. So, I am required to come up with PSLOs and that is what I have done on the next page."