DeAnza College SLO Core Team Meeting Minutes

Present: Veronica Avila, Amy Leonard, Mary Pape, Toño Ramirez,

Thursday, Nov 5, 2015, L76, 6:30 – 7:20 am

TOPIC	Purpose	LEADER	Notes
This Brainstorm IPBT linking PR to PLOAC	I/D/A	Coleen, Mary, Toño	**Minutes, 11/3 Meeting, Christina's Office** Present: Anu Khanna Randy Bryant, Anu Khanna, Coleen Lee-Wheat, Mary Pape, Toño Ramirez, and via teleconference Christina Espinosa-Pieb. I. Considering the definition of "meaningful" The meeting began with a brief discussion of the type of 'meaningful' that most immediately concerns Christina. On the one hand, we might emphasize meaningful *connections* between SLO assessment work and institutional decision making. On the other, we might emphasize the perception amongst faculty that SLO work yields meaningful benefits for pedagogy. Christina indicated that she is most concerned with the latter, as she worries that many faculty currently feel that the SLO process has become nothing more than a 'cut-and-paste job' to satisfy the ACCJC. Given that extensive negotiations with FA have recently resulted in the inclusion of SLO work in the adjunct faculty contract, she is curious about what might be done to foster authentic faculty investment in the process. The core team proposed a formal mechanism by which the newly developed SLOAC Assessment Rubric (http://www.deanza.edu/slo/pdf/SLOAC_PLOAC_Rubric.pdf) might be used to evaluate a sample of current assessments on campus. We asked for her thoughts on (1) who might be best suited to comprise a task force to carry this out, (2) how we would

best proceed in selecting SLOACs for evaluation, and (3) her views on the best way to make use of evaluation results. Both Christina and Randy expressed immediate reservations about our proposal. Christina's reservations stemmed from a reluctance to form any new task force at this time, as campus resources cannot support compensation for such an endeavor. Randy's reservations stemmed from worries about formal evaluations of SLOAC work interfering with academic freedom. Toño suggested that academic freedom protects individual faculty *practices*, and is not intended to protect anyone from *criticism*. This point did not seem to ease Randy's concern, as he believes that any formal mechanism for assessing SLOAC work, 'however well intended', would likely eventually be used to influence resource allocation in a way that is incompatible with the FA agreement.

This portion of the conversation resulted in a decision to have the SLO core team approach Academic Senate about the possibility of a Senate sub-group using the rubric to evaluate a sampling of current assessment work. The aim would in no way be punitive, but instead to identify examples of high-level assessment work that might encourage the faculty at large to consider ways to make the process meaningful for them.

A separate conversation pertained to the role of adjunct faculty in facilitating SLOACs. Mary asked whether it was appropriate to allow adjunct faculty members to take the lead on particular assessment projects, given that SLO work is now a part of their FA contract. Christina replied that the only situations in which it would be appropriate to allow adjunct faculty to take the lead in an assessment cycle are those in which (a) there are no full-time faculty who teach the course to be assessed, or (b) a department only has one full-time faculty member, and her/his responsibilities cannot accommodate the additional burden of

leading a SLOAC. In all other circumstances, assessment efforts should be led by full-time faculty.

The conversation then turned toward the role of SLO assessment work in shaping PBT decision making. Randy indicated that at present, IPBT does take note of whether departments who have requested resources have *completed* their assessment requirements, but that decisions are not at present influenced by the *quality* of assessment work. Toño then asked whether there might be any foreseeable circumstance under which an allocation decision might be influenced (either positively or negatively) by the quality of a particular SLOAC or PLOAC. Randy and Christina agreed that no such circumstances are foreseeable at this time. Randy indicated that there might, however, be some cases in which the IPBT might be influenced by the clarity of the *linkage* or *relevance* between a SLOAC/PLOAC and a particular resource request. Mary then suggested that the core team continue to think about mechanisms for encouraging faculty to make these connections clear on the program review document. Christina and Randy invited Mary and Toño to attend future IPBT meetings, and it was agreed that we would.

II. Focus on quantity of outcome assessments complete
The final portion of our meeting focused on the current percentage of courses/programs that have successfully completed an Assessment Cycle, and on those that have documented a minimum of a second cycle of assessment. Christina emphasized that she does not want ACCJC standards to be used as our primary mechanism for encouraging faculty/staff participation in the assessment process, but that we must also be realistic about our need to meet those standards. Mary reported that 'the numbers are not where they need to be', and that our current completion percentages are lower than several other California community

| | | | | colleges. The group then discussed whether this was in some part related to the fact that we have thus far emphasized the quality and authenticity of assessment work over a higher-yield 'cut and paste approach', and whether this fact might not be taken into consideration by our next visiting accrediting team. We resolved to keep with our current 'quality-precedes quantity' approach, but that Mary would provide Christina and Randy with a report on the status of assessment work for all programs by next week.

In conclusion we should retain our focus on quality over quantity. Negative feedback from the ACCJC might be countered with the fact that our numbers are lower since we have been emphasizing meaningful assessment.

IIII. Contractual issues discussed:
• Inclusion of SLOs on syllabi mandated for both part-time and full-time faculty.
• Part-time faculty can be "invited" to conduct assessments for any courses they teach, for PLOs, and ILOs. However, they are "expected to conduct assessment of SLOs only for courses they teach where there is no full-time faculty member that teaches that course.
• It is not permissible for part-time faculty to be lead on assessments where there is full-time that is capable of doing so.

IV. Action items:
1. Investigate possibility of having SLO Sub-group in Academic Senate
2. SLO Coordinators will become more involved in IPBT by attending meetings as appropriate.
3. Collect authentic assessments as showcase
4. Keep Randy Bryant and Christina informed of quantity of assessments at course and program levels. |

Academic Senate Handbook for Department Chairs	D/A	Mary	Updated section on SLO work was submitted to Mayra Cruz for in inclusion.
Governance e-Handbook and Websites	D/A	Mary, Toño	There are no updates necessary. Mary will so inform Mallory.
2015 Convocation	I/D/A	Mary	April 15, 2016 has been set as the date. Members of Academic Senate did not feel that this being an important tax date would have any impact. The following Friday is Plenary and that would mean that persons holding Academic Senate positions would have a conflict.
Assessment of ILOs	I/D/A	Toño	Alan Sim wrote a comprehensive report comparing and contrasting the critical thinking course offered English, Philosophy, and Speech departments. We will include this as part of assessment work completed for this ICC. Since Alan completed this work as part of his PDL, we encourage other faculty to consider assessment of one of the other ICCs as the focus of one or more quarters of PDL leave work.
ACCJC /WASC	I/DA	Mary	Mary will attend the Self Evaluation of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness Workshop this Friday, November 6 at Solano College. One area for her to investigate: are other colleges placing quality over quantity?
TracDat	I/D/A	Mary	Updated to Version 5.48 For the purposes of reporting out numbers Mary will revisit the concept of adding "place holders" pointing to pdf files where much of the assessments during cycle one were collected.
Rubric Task Force	I/D/A	All	Academic Senate Sub-group will now be charged with the task of testing the rubric as an assessment to for evaluating the authenticity of assessments. The first assessments to be evaluated will be from

			courses taught by members of the SLO Core Team. This sub-group will be informed of quantities of assessments completed.
SLO Workshop	D/A	All	Upon adoption of the Program Review document by the IPBT workshops will be set up to assist department chairs. The focus will be first and foremost on the data necessary to have at hand (data collected through Institutional Research and data from SLO/PLO assessments) and secondarily on entering the Program Review information into TracDat as well as a brush-up on entering assessments into the new system. The workshop will be held on days in addition to a Friday to accommodate faculty schedules.
Newsletter	I/D/A	All	Next Newsletter: • Shout out that 50% of all outcomes at both course and program levels need to be assessed for a minimum of a second time by the end of Winter 2016 quarter. • Best Practices • Changes to TracDat (addition of instructions and custom fields)

SLO Core Team Meeting Minutes
Present: Veronica Avila, Coleen Lee-Wheat, Amy Leonard, Mary Pape, Toño Ramirez
Thursday, Nov 12, 2015, L76, 6:30 – 7:20 am

TOPIC	Purpose	LEADER	Notes
October Minutes	D/A	Mary	Minutes for October were approved and will be posted.
Partners In Learning Conference	I/D/A	Toño	Toño will draft the proposal for a workshop to be presented by the SLO Core Team. The theme will focus on Stress and Learning Outcome Achievement. It is stressful for faculty to feel that their students are not achieving the student learning outcomes. Students will feel stressed if they fall short of meeting the student learning outcomes for a course or program. Not attaining the expected skills means the student could be stressed in the next course; stressed in carrying out responsibilities associated with their job; and/or not as confident as they might be in contributing to their world.
ACCJC /WASC	I/DA	Mary	Mary attended the Self Evaluation of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness Workshop on Friday, November 6 at Solano College. This workshop was to impart the expectations of accreditation under the updated Standards and with the addition of the Quality Focus Essay. The following points were expressed: • Quality Focus Essay replaces planning agenda. • Anything you say must be backed by evidence. Must pull evidence from everyday work. • Rubric for evaluating SLO work is gone. So the word sustainability was not mentioned. • Assessment workshops planned for Mar 1 and Mar 3 with Linda Suski; Amy Driscoll on Apr 15. • Same level of Student Support Services must be offered to students enrolled in online classes as face-to-face classes. • How are the outcomes created? How are they assessed?

			Evidence advisory board input.
			• Student learning outcomes and assessments are needed for short courses. Michael Hegglund heads this program at De Anza College. *Standard II.A.16 - The institution regularly evaluates and improves the quality and currency of all instructional programs offered in the name of the institution, including collegiate, pre-collegiate, career-technical, and **continuing and community education courses and programs** regardless of delivery mode or location. The institution systematically strives to improve programs and courses to enhance learning outcomes and achievement of students.* The Team feels that one to two generic outcomes would serve this program best. The outcome(s) can be assessed with a concise exit survey. Amy suggested that we use a survey similar to the one used by Staff Development for their workshops. Unfortunately the agenda did not permit intercollegiate dialog to discuss such issues as authentic assessments.
TracDat	I/D/A	Mary	There is new summary report developed by Nuventive and available in TracDat 5. One can conclude that this is the tool that colleges will use in reporting SLOAC and PLOAC completion numbers to the ACCJC. The report can be generated for a particular year or multiple years and counts the number of courses with new assessments as being actively assessed. Currently this report shows 87% of our courses with "Active" SLOs have been assessed. Looking at the data currently in TracDat and counting the percentage of 'Active' student outcome statements with SLOs our numbers for the first assessment are at approximately 61 %. The worry is to have at least 50% of SLOs assessed for the second time by the end of Fall 2016. For the recent AUO workshop and at prior Convocation break-out sessions, encouraging attendees to bring their gradebooks and provide time and assistance with the entry of

			assessments into TracDat as an integral part of the seminar proved extremely beneficial. Effort will be made to have multiple rooms with computers available for this on the afternoon session of the Convocation.
AS SLO Sub-group	I/D/A	All	Mary will email Mayra Cruz concerning the establishment of SLO sub-group within the Academic Senate. The group would be charged with the task of keeping the process of SLO work cyclic, meaningful, and providing feedback on the authenticity of assessments..
SLO Core Team Meetings	D/A	All	Winter 2016 SLO Core Team Meetings will be held on Thursdays from 7:30 – 8:20 am.

SLO Core Team Meeting Minutes

Present: Veronica Avila, Coleen Lee-Wheat, Amy Leonard, Mary Pape, Toño Ramirez,

Thursday, Nov 19, 2015, L76, 6:30 – 7:20 am

TOPIC	Purpose	LEADER	Notes
Program Review Document	I/D/A	All	Wording was finalized on questions related to the SLO/PLO process. In regards to justification of resource requests, while SLO/PLO assessment data is desired, in some cases other data is more appropriate. During workshop presentations examples need to be offered of what this "other data" might be. Mary and Coleen will send the updated version to IPBT for their approval.
Partners In Learning Conference	I	Toño	Toño is finalizing the proposal.
Assessment of Short Courses	I/D	Mary	Mary and Mallory will meet today (11/19) with Michael Hegglun and Marisa Spatafore. The purpose will be to create a generic outcome for short courses such as: "Students will exhibit skills as outlined in the course description." The assessment should be one or two questions.
TracDat	I/D/A	Mary	New boxes have been added. These are currently available for vetting purposes only to the departments represented in the SLO Core Team. Mary asked that the core team see if the changes are appropriate for all.
AS SLO Sub-group	I/D/A	All	Academic Officers are discussing our request for a SLO Sub-group to oversee keeping the process of SLO work cyclic, meaningful, and providing feedback on the authenticity of assessments..
Newsletter	I/D/A	All	Next Newsletter planned for distribution on December 4th: • Shout out that 50% of all outcomes at both course and program levels need to be assessed for a minimum of a second time by the end of Winter 2016 quarter. • Best Practices • Changes to TracDat (addition of instructions and custom

			fields)
League for Innovation call for Best Practices	I/D/A	Toño	Toño will respond with two of the SLO Process best practices: • The SLO Liaison program • Assessment of ICCs on annual Convocation Day
Steering Committee Meeting	D/A	All	The two-hour meeting with Christina held on November 3, 2015 serves well as the Steering Committee meeting for Fall 2015. All of the SLO Core Team's doubts were answered. Tono will publish the minutes for this meeting.