

SLOAC Steering Committee/ Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes

November 25, 2013, 2-4, Room 6203

Present: Linda Aldridge, Tammy Calderon, Alice Erskine, Jacquie Escobar, Jan Fosberg, Rick Hough, Nick Kapp, Jude Navari, Jesse Raskin, Pricilla Sanchez, Sarita Santos, Arthur Takayama, David Ulate, Dennis Wolbers, Karen Wong

Absent: Steve Aurilio, Michael Bishow, Nohel Corral, Lorraine DeMello, Lucia Lachmayr, Regina Pelayo, Sarah Perkins, Christine Roumbanis, Allison Winston

Guest: Kent Gomez

Documents: [2012/13 Balanced Scorecard](#) links: the one-page summary scorecard, the Dashboard, and the Data Dictionary

I. Approval of the 10/28 Minutes – approved as is

II. Input on why people are leaving early (except those with childcare responsibilities) and what we as a committee can do to ensure we have adequate time to meet → Next semester we will aim for 1.5 hour meetings, beginning sharply at 2, with the understanding that folks will review documents in advance and also participate in online forums prior to meetings when prompted. At the end of the semester, we'll reflect on whether this new format works.

III. Approval of the [SLOAC Implementation Schedule](#)—approved with minor changes

A. All of these steps were rolled out over the last six years, so Karen created this document to knit everything together including what is due and when.

B. **(TO DO)** Recommended:

1. to create two separate documents, one for the TracDat coordinators and one for faculty and staff in general;
2. to list steps under the time period when they are to be worked on;
3. if possible, to create some sort of calendar graphic to supplement the document to reinforce due dates;
4. to communicate to our campus leadership that we need a one-step document or web page that identifies what is due and when (e.g., APP,

CPR, new courses, professional development grants, etc.); people want reminders.

5. to make it easier to run reports, for example by having project directors (or Karen as a last resort) run reports for departments so they can spend time discussing the information.

IV. Brief updates of the Information Literacy and Citizenship ISLO Assessments

A. Information Literacy ISLO assessment underway (Dennis Wolbers)

1. Unlike the other ISLO assessments, this ISLO is being assessed via English 100 since information literacy is embedded in it, and English 100 is required for graduation. This semester thirty sections are being taught. Two class meetings are set aside for librarians to lead workshops on evaluating sources and finding relevant information.

2. Three assessments: activity-based assessment right after the workshop, evaluation of research papers using the rubric, and a survey conducted with clicker technology that Dennis brings to each class. Essays will be evaluated by librarians for a program and institutional level assessment in the spring semester, and scores will be entered on an online form that PRIE will provide.

B. Revised Citizenship Rubric (that consolidates all of them) in preparation for the Spring 2014 Assessment

1. 23 participants accepted invitations—2 Business; 1 Kinesiology; 9 Language Arts; 6 SMT; 5 SS/CA

2. Two meetings and the assessment itself in response to feedback we received from assessing Effective Communication and Critical Thinking: (a) January 9 flex, 9- noon (or alternative January 17, 1-4) for an interdisciplinary conversation about how the ISLO manifests itself in their discipline and which project they plan to assess, (b) March 5 flex, 9- noon, for a norming session, (c) PRIE will provide an online entry form in which G#s will already be uploaded

3. **(TO DO)** The rubrics need to be enhanced with items that speak to the third bullet.

- V. Analysis and Discussion of the Balanced Scorecard
- A. Questions to consider for your item or two:
1. How well are we performing over time?
 2. What are the implications to your area? If not your area, then whose?
 3. Is the Outcome Measure Goal value appropriate?
 - a) Should it be increased? decreased?
 4. Is the measure appropriate for what we are wanting to assess?
 - a) If not, what is a better measure?
- B. ES 7- Student to Counselor ratio has gotten worse
1. What may have caused it to get worse?
 - a) Counseling is being integrated into classroom initiatives, so counselors' time is taken away from counseling itself (e.g., coordination).
 - b) Categoricals in EOPS and Disabled Students programs were slammed during the statewide budget crisis.
 2. Impact on students and the quality of counseling?
 - a) Students are frustrated—some wait up to a month for an appointment
 - b) No attention is given to prioritizing who can access counseling, such as FT Skyline students.
 - c) Most students appreciate being able to meet with the same counselor each time so that counselors are familiar with them, especially with special programs. But they're unable to with the current system.
 - (1) A recent positive change is that counselors are now employing a mechanized system to keep a record of students' prior meetings and progress.
 - d) Students who come from multiple college experiences and are looking for equivalencies need more than a thirty minute session.
 3. Questions that were raised
 - a) Where did the 900:1 ratio come from? The Data Dictionary indicates it comes from five year averages of student to counselor ratios, but what determines "optimum serve"?
 - b) How do we calculate the actual ratio? If conceptualizing counseling in a different way, do we need to adjust how we're collecting our information? Are the numbers "clean"? (how we're calculating counselors)
 - c) How can we further examine the impact on students? Via surveys?
 - d) Should there be designated counselors for certain CTE programs? What about counselors specializing in certain kinds of fields?

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: January 27, February 24, March 24, April 28. Outlook invitations will be forthcoming.