

SLOAC Steering Committee Minutes

April 22, 2013, 2-4, Room 6203

Present: Steve Aurilio, Michael Bishow, Luciana Castro, Loraine DeMello, Alice Erskine, Jacquie Escobar, Chris Gibson, Rick Hough, Jude Navari, Sarita Santos, Arthur Takayama, David Ulate, Dennis Wolbers, Karen Wong

Guests: Jim Bowsher, Joan Connors, Katie Galvan, Diane Jones, Vanson Nguyen, Kate Williams-Browne

Absent: Jan Fosberg (SMCCCD Tourney), Nick Kapp, Melissa Komadina, Regina Pelayo, Sarah Perkins

(Town Hall) Christine Roumbanis (accreditation meeting), Dennis Wolbers (accreditation meeting)

Documents: Arthur's Graphic and List' CCSSE Data for the Town Hall is at

http://skylinecollege.edu/sloac/assets/sp13ccsse_islo.pdf

- I. Approval of the 3/25 Minutes – approved as is
- II. Approved the ISLO graphic for publication—Yes



A. Karen, Michael, Luciana, Lucia, Chris, Melissa, Lorraine, Jacquie, Alice, Rick, Jude, Dennis, Arthur, David, Sarah, Christine, Regina, Sarita, Jan

B. Feedback:

1. Really like these colors. This design would work well black and white also.
2. I like the design, and I'm glad that the logo was modified at some point to look less like the Chrysler symbol. I'm wondering if it ever came up to add text along with each of the ISLO areas... For example, adding "Lifelong Wellness" etc.
3. The graphic looks GREAT!
4. Logo looks positively Vibrant! Yes!

5. Nice!
6. Likewise. I like it a lot.
7. Good job on the logo
8. I like the latest revisions, very effective.
9. Please tell Livius that he has done a wonderful job with the logo. I love that ... one of our students [created the design].

III. Framework, Part One—Arthur's revised graphic

A. Review Section One

1. Determined that the graphic is out of place since it addresses assessment as a whole. Arthur will work on revising the information so that it makes more clear how the SLOAC fits within the larger campus assessment framework.

B. **TO DO:** Need Feedback on the ALUR participants; and review the present list of participants

IV. Fall 2013 Flex Input

A. Comprehensive look at institutional effectiveness/ ISLOs (Balanced Scorecard? CCSSE? Noel-Levitz)?

B. Focused Discussion on the CCSSE?

C. Time for departments to work together?

V. TOWN HALL—CCSSE DATA – facilitated by David Ulate

A. Survey seeks to ascertain students' engagement in our classes and outside our classes (e.g., student services, service learning in the larger community, etc.). We focused in particular on those statements that relate on some level to our ISLOs. At the town hall, the intent was to analyze the data and determine how—if at all—we can act on these insights.

B. David reviewed the process and the results.

1. Process—All questions were weighted equally though some are more directly relevant than others. There were no benchmarks. The closer the mean scores were to 100, the closer the results were to the maximum output value (in this case, 4 out of the 4 answer options).

2. Overall results

a) Information and Computer Literacy (63.1), Lifelong Wellness (56.1), Critical Thinking (55.6), Effective Communication (49.9), Citizenship (44.1)

b) Overall increased on three ISLOs (Citizenship by 1.2, Info and Computer Tech by 2.4, Lifelong Wellness by 1.4) and no

change on two (Critical Thinking, Effective Communication) from the last time the CCSSE was administered, 2008.

c) In 2012, slightly fewer students scored at the lower levels in Citizenship than in 2008.

d) In 2012, fewer students scored at the lower levels in Information and Computer Literacy than in 2008, and there was a 4% increase at the highest level of “over 80.” However, few statements pertain specifically to Information Literacy as we conceive of it in our ISLOs. On the other hand, now Information Literacy skills are explicitly integrated into all English 100 courses, so more students may have the skills. Secondly, more students are computer literate than in the past, so it’s not what the campus does so much as what students already possess.

e) In 2012, fewer students scored at the lower levels in Lifelong Wellness than in 2008, and there was a 2% increase in the highest category of “over 80.”

f) Critical Thinking remained about the same, but when disaggregated, it increased by 2% at the top in the highest category of “over 80” and decreased by 3% at the second lowest category of “between 30- 39.”

g) Effective communication remained about the same.

C. Improving the process-- Implement the changes recommended from the 2008 implementation.

a) Weigh responses to questions differently dependent on how directly they relate to the ISLO. (Check the notes from when we completed this process the first time so that when the CCSSE is administered for the third time, the data will be more reflective of students’ levels of engagement.)

b) Add the questions the SLOAC Steering Committee generated after identifying the gaps in the first administration of the CCSSE.

c) Identify benchmarks for each ISLO now that we’ve administered the survey twice.

d) Implement direct measures of assessment for the ISLOs since the CCSSE is an indirect measure.

D. Suggestion to further publicize the CCSSE results→ “Data is to add context for conversation.”

1. Zero in on the results that are most pertinent to specific campus stakeholder groups

2. Identify factors that appear to impede success and initiate a discussion on what the campus can do to address them (e.g., transportation to get to and away from campus)

VI. Please designate the following Monday (the 4th Mondays of the month, except the first meeting of each semester), 2-4, for SLOAC Steering Committee meeting: August 26, September 23, October 28, November 25, January 27, February 24, March 24, April 28. I would love for people to continue with the Steering Committee next year, but in the event that you cannot, please let me know who is your replacement. Outlook invitations will be forthcoming.

PLEASE SIGN UP IN A GROUP OF TWO TO THREE TO REVIEW, REVISE, AND DRAFT TEXT FOR YOUR SECTION OF THE SLOAC FRAMEWORK. USE CCCConfer IF YOU'RE UNABLE TO MEET IN PERSON SO THAT YOUR GROUP IS PREPARED TO PRESENT YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE OCTOBER 22 MEETING. YOU ALSO MAY WANT TO CONSULT WITH THE OTHER GROUP.		
	GROUP ONE	GROUP TWO
COLLEGE IMPLEMENTATION MODEL (4-11) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add information about the integration into program review and the annual work-plan reports. • Add the AS Senate Resolutions that were adopted last year. • Integrate information from newsletters? 	1) Arthur Takayama 2) Chris Gibson 3) Sarita Santos	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXX
CREATING STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (12- 36) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Find more current examples of SLOs, perhaps from each of the divisions, or from each "type" of course: basic skills, GE, CTE, Art/Dance, PE. 	1) Melissa Komadina 2) Steve Aurilio 3) Lucia Lachmayr	1) Christine Roumbanis 2) Luciana Castro 3) Jude Navari
OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION (37- 64) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define "authentic/ meaningful assessment" • Find more current models of assessment cycles (could pull from the models that will be posted on the SLOAC website). • Templates should mimic the format of TracDat's four column report. • Include ISLO rubrics? • Karen will work on the TracDat handouts. 	1) Dennis Wolbers 2) Jan Fosberg 3) Michael Bishow 4) Regina Pelayo	1) Alice Erskine 2) Nick Kapp 3) Rick Hough