

**SLOAC Steering Committee/ Institutional Effectiveness Committee Minutes –**

**November 24, 2014, 2-3:30, Room 6203**

Present: Michael Bishow, Kristina Brower, Lorraine DeMello, Jan Fosberg, Nick Kapp, Lucia Lachmayr, Aaron McVean, Evan Leach, Nichole Palmer, Sarita Santos, Arthur Takayama, Dennis Wolbers, Karen Wong

Absent: Alice Erskine, Jacquie Escobar, Angelica Garcia, Alana Utsumi

Documents: [Balanced Scorecard link](#)

- I. Approval of the 10/27 Minutes – approved as is
- II. Balanced Scorecard
  - A. Questions to Consider for Your Section—please see below for each group’s analysis
    1. How well are we performing over time?
    2. Is the Goal value an appropriate value?
      - a) Should it be increased? Decreased?
    3. Is the measure a good measure for what we are wanting to assess?
      - a) Should we use a different measure?
    4. Is there an additional measure that I think would be good for this area?
    5. Are the links to college-wide initiatives up to date and comprehensive?
  - B. Proposed Changes for Each Section (e.g., revise current measures’ benchmarks, which is based on the five year average? replace current indicators with another as a measure to determine if we achieved a goal? introduce new measures to reflect current strategic priorities?)
    1. ES 1-4
      - a) ES2- Raise the benchmark from 51% to 54% since it is the five-year average.
      - b) ES4- (1) Raise the benchmark from 55% to 63% since it is the five-year average. (2) Remove Reading from the formula since Reading courses are no longer offered, and remove DSKL classes since they’re not traditional basic skills courses a la Mathematics and English. (3) Add ESOL to the “Description” since those courses are included in the formula.
    2. IS 1-3

- a) IS1— Debate about whether to broaden the measure to include all planning documents (e.g., APPs, CPRs and ALURs) vs. delete this measure since everyone is required to submit these planning documents annually.
  - b) IS2—(1) Raise the benchmark from 70% to 78% since it is the average between the two scores thus far. (2) Review the Employee Voice survey questions to ensure they are pertinent to the measure. (3) PRIE office should consider whether this survey can be administered regularly every three years.
  - c) IS3—Lower the benchmark from ten to six since it is the five-year average.
3. IG- 1 – broaden to encompass modified courses, too
4. New additions under consideration (Aaron and Karen)
- a) retention and success in distance learning courses
  - b) subsequent success from one level below transfer to transfer level courses within a three year time frame in English and Mathematics
  - c) # of degrees issues
  - d) # of certificates awarded
  - e) # of transferring students
  - f) # of international students
  - g) % of programs meeting their success and retention benchmarks (depends on what we find out at the accreditation conference)
  - h) retention, persistence and success for underrepresented groups compared to the general student population (something equity related)
  - i) replace ES5 with Student Scorecard data?

III. Please designate the following Monday (the 4<sup>th</sup> Mondays of the month, except the first meeting of each semester), 2-3:30, for SLOAC Steering/ IE Committee meeting: February 2\*, February 23, March 30\*, April 27. The two meetings with an asterisk beside them are not on the usual fourth Mondays.

<b>BALANCED SCORECARD MEASURES</b>	<b>MEMBERS</b>
------------------------------------	----------------

ES 1-4	1) Kristina Brower 2) Arthur Takayama
ES 6-10	1) Lorraine DeMello 2) Jacquie Escobar 3) Alice Erskine 4) Nichole Palmer
IS 1-3	1) Dennis Wolbers 2) Lucia Lachmayr 3) Steve Aurilio 4) Michael Bishow
FB 1-4	1) Evan Leach 2) Karen Wong 3) Jan Fosberg
IG 1-5	1) Nick Kapp 2) Sarita Santos 3) Alana Utsumi

From the webpage:

## Overview of Balanced Scorecard & Planning Process

### Skyline College Goals & Strategies

#### GOAL 1:

Develop the scope, quality, accessibility and accountability of instructional and student service offerings, programs and services.

#### Strategy 1.1

**CONTINUOUS EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT OF INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS, SERVICES & MODES OF DELIVERY:** An innovative and An evaluative consideration of programs, courses, services and modes of delivery to provide a comprehensive and **integrated** approach to meet student and community needs.

#### Strategy 1.2

**STUDENT EQUITY IN PREPAREDNESS, SUCCESS & OUTCOMES:** ~~STUDENT ACCESS, SUCCESS & EQUITY IN OUTCOMES:~~ Assessment of student preparedness to ensure access, success and equity in outcomes; through the availability, quality and appropriateness of support services to achieve student learning outcomes for all student populations.

#### Strategy 1.3

**OUTREACH & RESPONSIVENESS TO COMMUNITY NEEDS:** Broad outreach efforts that build partnerships and respond to educational community needs.

#### Strategy 1.4

**ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING:** Ensure Skyline College assesses student learning at the course, program and institutional levels, engages in shared reflection on the results of these assessments, and uses the results to sustain or improve student learning.

#### Comments:

##### 1.1

The first strategy uses the term "Innovative", which implies that existing methods are not effective or applicable. My issue is why fix something that's not broken? Hence, the revision is a change to a strategy of evaluation to justify change; not to have change for change sake. (AT)

Further comments: With the use of the phrase "Innovative Programs, Services & Modes of Delivery", the listing of new courses approved, newly funded projects and successful grant acquisitions would be reflective of the strategy of innovation. However, there is no indication that the new courses and programs actually address the issues of student equity and successes. The correlation of new courses to increased effectiveness of the college has not been made anywhere. In fact, if the number of courses was an indicator of meeting student needs, there should be a corresponding increase in student success as the curriculum expanded. There is little

evidence that such is the case. Part of the “problem” with the data is that the “new course” definition is misleading. The increases in new courses for 2006 and 2013 are more about revisions of existing courses to incorporate SLOs and meet Accreditation standards, rather than the actual creation of new curriculum. So, in reality, we were just maintaining the same curriculum under a newly revised documentation protocol.(AT)

It seems that a more informative data point needs to be created that identifies new curriculum whose major intent is to enhance the outcomes of student performance. The mere augmentation of courses without specifying the nature of courses seems to be an empty bit of information. Somehow, the indicator for new curriculum should be correlated to the enhancement/improvement evidenced in students’ performance or success. I think this would be particularly applicable for Basic Skills curriculum.(AT)

***The introduction of Technology Mediated Instruction*** (TMI), while an important development of curriculum, its mere presence is not indicative of an advancement of student success and progress. Again, to list the number of new TMI courses introduced as a measure of Skyline performance is misleading and not terribly informative. Again, there needs to be a correlation between course offerings and any enhancement/improvement of student success. If face-to-face versions of a course have demonstrated increases in students’ performance, then of course, a TMI version of that course would be indicative of attempting to engage a larger number of students to benefit from the instruction. As with listings of new courses, the listing of TMI course should be filtered for the same correlative criteria.(AT)

***For newly granted projects***, the criteria of contribution to student performance would be more difficult to ascertain. Principally, because most grant funded projects are “one-time” projects, any long term impacts upon students would be difficult to identify. Of course, the attempt at with a new project would be indicative of Skyline’s embracing of innovation and creativity in education. (AT)

## **1.2**

The second strategy is obviously about students' performance overall. My thinking is that to understand the outcome, one should also be looking at the input, that is, the student preparedness before they undertook the courses or programs. It would be similar to the determination of course prerequisites, but instead of course prerequisites is should be about how well we have guided the students to have or acquire the appropriate skills to succeed. (AT)

I feel that since we have consistently met the goal rate for each area in the past 5 years it would be appropriate to raise the goal rate slightly in all areas by 2-4 % except for in ES4 which could be raised as much as 5-7%. (KB)

## **1.4**

I think that aside from just measuring the actual success, we should be setting up systems for the students to not only rate their professor and their class at the end of the semester, but students should be asked about the services that were provided and how easily were these services accessed. An example would be was the learning center open during times convenient for you, Was there someone you could talk to if you needed help with an assignment. (KB)

*[While student evaluations of faculty is an important aspect of pedagogic evaluation, any suggestion of linking faculty evaluations to SLOs is a problematic issue. We have always maintained that specific faculty evaluations vis a vis SLOs was NOT to be done. (AT)]*

I would also be curious to know about the time of day that the students took these classes and how that affects retention rates. Were night students more likely to complete courses or day students? (KB)

Since ScoreCard ES4 is the student success measure that seems to be falling behind, it would be beneficial to dissect the basic skill classes and find out which classes students are having the most trouble so that we can look for solutions within that department. (KB)

*[This is the area I think research in student preparedness would be appropriate, as I don't think the courses themselves are the issue. If the students are having difficulty with the Basic Skills courses, perhaps a more in-depth assessment of the students' abilities is indicated. Recognizing that the present assessment tests are standardized, might not additional evaluations (devised by Skyline College or others) to be taken when the students' scores indicate potential problems, to identify the specific areas of difficulty? (AT)]*

### IS 1-3 (Dennis)

#### Measure IS1: Percentage of Program Reviews Completed

How well are we performing over time? **We have met the college goal of 75% every year since 2009/10.**

Is the Goal value an appropriate value? **Yes.**

Should it be increased? **I agree it should be increased to 80%**

Is the measure a good measure for what we are wanting to assess? **Yes.**

Should we use a different measure? **No.**

Is there an additional measure that I think would be good for this area? **I suggest adding an additional measure: **Percentage of Annual Program Plans Completed****

## Measure IS2: Employee Overall Satisfaction Rating

How well are we performing over time? We surpassed the college goal of 70% the last time the survey was given: 2011/12.

Is the Goal value an appropriate value? Yes.

Should it be increased? I agree it should be increased to 80%. I also agree the survey should be given every other year instead of every three years.

Is the measure a good measure for what we are wanting to assess? Yes.

Should we use a different measure? No.

Is there an additional measure that I think would be good for this area? Focus groups might be good, but difficult to arrange.

---

Measure	IS2:	SRTK	Crime	Statistics
---------	------	------	-------	------------

---

How well are we performing over time? College goal has been met.

Is the Goal value an appropriate value? Yes.

Should it be increased? No.

Is the measure a good measure for what we are wanting to assess? Yes.

Should we use a different measure? No, but additional measures might be valuable.

Is there an additional measure that I think would be good for this area? Yes. I suggest an **additional measure** that provides: 1) total number of emergency procedure classes/workshops offered to staff, and

2) some sort of assessment and evaluation of our regular emergency training drills (especially the annual earthquake drill in October).

## IG 1-5 (Alana, Nick, Sarita)

How well are we performing over time?	Is the Goal value an appropriate value? Should it be increased? Decreased?	Is the measure a good measure for what we are wanting to assess? Should we use a different measure?	Is there an additional measure that I think would be good for this area?
<b>IG 1</b>	varies	Based on <b>05/06</b> numbers, seems like it should be updated	Perhaps a comparison of the # of new courses vs. the # of existing courses, leaving a percentage. That takes into consideration banked or deleted courses, which some of the “new” courses are replacing.
<b>IG 2</b>	Out-performed goals every year	<b>05/06</b> numbers, definitely outdated, considering all of the advances that have been made. Since we have meet the goal for the past 5 years we should increase it.	Should also include the number of faculty that use web-enhanced instruction and/or course-management technology in typical on-site courses.
<b>IG 3</b>	Did not reach goals most years. Why? Lack of fundraising (IF RAISED FUNDS), or lack of knowledge, lack of applications? (IF GRANTED FUNDS)	If that is what we have available, we should strive to reach that goal. We’ve come close...	If it’s RAISED, this amount should be indexed to inflation annually. If GRANTED, why is it not reaching goal? Is the process to apply too difficult?
<p><b>SOME CONFUSION: Is the amount on the scorecard the amount GRANTED/GIVEN OUT, or the amount RAISED at the President’s Breakfast?</b></p>			



**IG 4**

We appear to have out-performed our goal every year

Looks like it's a low goal and should probably be increased (established in **05/06**)

Perhaps the goal should be a percentage; i.e. 5% of the general budget

**IG 5**

Appears to be fairly consistent (not sure what 1% is...)

Based on a percentage seems like a better idea than a set amount from 10 years ago.

Classified Staff development is not included and should be at this time.

