

**SLOAC Steering Committee/ Academic Senate Town Hall on the Effective
Communication ISLO and All Things SLOAC**

September 24, 2012, 2-4, Room 6203

Present: Steve Aurilio, Michael Bishow, Luciana Castro, Alice Erskine, Jan Fosberg, Katie Galvin, Chris Gibson, Rick Hough, Melissa Komadina, Lucia Lachmayr, Jude Navari, Sarah Perkins, Christine Roumbanis, Sarita Santos, Arthur Takayama, David Ulate, Dennis Wolbers, Karen Wong

Guests: Kate Browne, Zach Bruno, Don Carlson, Carlos Colombetti, Judith Crawford, Bridget Fischer, Mary Gutierrez, Katharine Harer, Ray Hernandez, Joe Morello, Cece Rebele, Leigh- Anne Shaw

Absent: Nick Kapp (teaching a lab during this time all semester), Regina Pelayo (ill)

Attachments: Skyline Faculty Voice Survey Results

I. Analysis and Discussion of the Effective Communication ISLO Assessment Results (Write a brief paragraph for Skyline Shines)

A. Students generally are faring well (89% passing overall, 88% assignment fulfillment, 92% comprehension, 88% analysis and audience, 90% organization and audience). Perhaps students are doing well because those who participated are in high level classes. For instance, students in Respiratory Therapy whose work was evaluated were in the last course of the certificate sequence. Also, hardly any work from students in the social sciences was evaluated.

B. The arguably "lowest" score was in analysis and audience at 88%, but with only 66% in the good and excellent range. The task is quite difficult since students need to provide enough evidence to persuade their audience, in addition to providing a sophisticated analysis.

C. As for tasks that students struggled with, students most struggled with writing lab reports (22% needs work) or writing essays in class (16% needs work). Lab reports are quite challenging in that students not only need a grasp of the concept, but also need to be able to analyze their data, all while abiding by lab report standards. In-class essay writing, meanwhile, is a bit of an artificial construct because most students are taught the writing process which lends itself to out-of-class writing. Most students have little practice in in-class writing (or such assignments are weighted low), and/or the prompts are unclear.

II. Feedback about the ISLO process

- A. What worked well
1. Being provided a list of which students to assess was helpful
 2. Spreadsheet was easy to use
 3. Rubric generally was clear but needs some minor revisions
 - a) Under “Assignment Fulfillment,” add “key directives” as a descriptor
 - b) Under “Comprehension,” questions were raised about a “framework”—accepted within the discipline/ conveying the message vs. simply expressing it? Leigh-Anne will look into some options.
 - (1) AACUrubrics.org is a resource
- B. What changes should be implemented the next round
1. More Business and Social Sciences courses should be assessed
 2. CTE Programs should also be invited even though the majority do not enroll students with 36+ units, but they’re in intensive certificate programs
 3. Establish a benchmark
 4. Only courses that map up should be assessed (this way they can conduct a course level and ISLO assessment at the same time)
 - a) All students in a course can be assessed so that a comparison can be made between students with 36+ units and those without.
 5. E-portfolios may be our means to assess on the ISLO level
 - a) Models to consider are St. Paul College’s Business division; the state of Minnesota is also using them
 6. Long term it may be most useful to have a pre/post measure, as students initiate their studies at Skyline vs. when they’ve fulfilled at least 36+ units
 - a) It may provide useful information as to help students make the leap from basic skills to GE/ transfer courses.
 - b) Questions to consider—who will assess at the entry point?
 7. (This item was discussed via e-mail with SLOAC Steering Committee Members) The aggregated data should be provided on the SLOAC website. The disaggregated data (divisions and participating departments) should be provided only to those groups for further discussion, including comparing their own students’ performance versus the entire group of participating students. As such, discussion of ISLO data can be extended to division/ department discussions.

III. Discussion of the Employee Voice survey about the SLOAC—focused the discussion on the low scores

A. Survey needs to be revised to distinguish between somewhat agree and disagree

B. Question #64—76% agree that Skyline has a positive approach to SLOs

C. Question #66—only 55% agree that the SLOAC is worthwhile and/or meaningful

1. The loop hasn't closed for the majority of the campus so far, so many have yet to see the implications of their assessment results. For example, for question #77, only 54% agree that they've used assessment results to inform subsequent resource requests. While the SLOAC plays an integral role in program review, only recently has it been directly integrated into planning mechanisms, which are themselves being revised to be more timely.

2. People also feel that accreditation requirements are driving the process even though the College has tried to create something that works for us. The present push to assess 100% of courses is reinforcing the perception that the ACCJC is driving the process.

3. At the Town Hall last year, no one dismissed assessment itself. People are really stretched for time to work on it. For question #67, only 52% felt that they have adequate time to work on the SLOAC, and 73% agreed that a day to work on assessment would help.

D. Questions #71, 72, and 73 about guidelines for program and institutional level assessment are 38%, 47%, and 48% because we are at the early phases of the processes for both. (ISLOs were indirectly assessed; we're presently in the midst of assessing them directly.)

E. Question #79—Only 37% of respondents agree that TracDat is helpful. Since the respondents are faculty, staff, and administrators, many may not be familiar with TracDat, and many are not even trained on it. Generally every department only has one or two faculty/ staff trained to use it.

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: 10/22, 11/26, 1/28, 2/25, 3/25, 4/ 22.