

Summaries of January 2009 Meetings

SLO Coordinators: Jim Haynes, Coleen Lee-Wheat: Anne Argyriou, Senate President, Anu Khanna, Curriculum Chair

Monday January 5: *Anne Argyriou and Coleen*

Coleen to meet with Jim Haynes at 9:00am on Monday then Anu and Anne at 10:30 for regular discussions.

Defined an objectives for the week: Become familiar with what other schools are doing, their history, how they grouped their assessment groups, their successes, their definitions—find out the similarities (30 min)

Tuesday January 6 – Coleen met with Jim Hayes. ½ hour. Shared meeting goals set by Anne and Coleen. Decided to meet again on Thursday mornings to compare our research and drafts of our “SLO” mission statement.

Anne Argyriou and Coleen m spent the evening surfing the net and comparing other schools and their progress.

Thursday—Jim and Coleen 9:30-11:30am --discovered that the SLO models from Glendale and Cabrillo Colleges are excellent. We discussed several concerns:

Where exactly are we in the process compared to other schools?

Do we have a “SLO committee”? Who will make up the institutional steering committee?

Do we need an “SLO oversight committee”—a group to review and critique the outcomes before they are officially input into a spot on a piece of curriculum?

Besides setting up vehicles for others to create SLOs what are our responsibilities?

Do we have a calendar for this process to “unfold as such” yet?

Do we have an assessment model in place yet?

Who is going to fund conferences for us?

Is there money/incentives for faculty to attend workshops?

Is there someone recording our progress? Is a DA website important? (similar to other schools)

Jim is writing up our mission statement based on the concept that it will apply to both student services and instruction. We liked the “village” concept from Cabrillo. They talked about combining GE and basic skills as a group. We would like to extend it to our definition. Brings us to a discussion point. What are the groups on campus that we will be including in our SLO's i.e. custodial to financial aid--groups that lend to facilitating the learning process. How have other colleges defined their groups.

SLO RESEARCH REVEALS

SLO process represents a “shift from teaching to student learning” . . . from presenting information and making it the students’ responsible for their learning.

Statistically student success is greater when expectations are clear.

Instructors have found that clear SLO’s lend to the creating of a more logical sequence of objectives. We already do this! But how often do assess and readjustment of assignments and tests to ensure that the student is learning the material and can show that s/he can use the material.

Instructors and their peers have found that they have had many “fruitful” interactions in the discussion and creation of SLO’s.

Assessments of SLO

- one or two questions in a test that focus on an SLO
 - questionnaires for graduating transfer students
 - portfolios with groups of instructors evaluating the file
 - creates concrete information of program review, equipment, instructor/staff training

BRAINSTORMS by Coleen and Jim

Possible activities to involve instructors

Flex days to teach the concept of SLO

Week long summer sessions to allow discussion, learning and their involvement in creating a plan for the assessments of SLO’s relating to core competencies, department SLO’s and course SLO’s

Invite faculty who are already concerned/interested to become “lead players” for their departments.

- a) need a template workshop for them
- b) need incentives/rewards

Make instructors learn a new topic (one hour lesson) in a “SLO based curriculum”.

Student involvement

Have a panel of students work with faculty to test run an SLO assessment model

Have a panel of students critique/discuss whether they believe a given SLO has value to them.

Our approach needs to be positive

--never bring up “administrators” are forcing us to do this.

--emphasize what we already do and KISS to place it into a format

--create an environment on campus that encourages the faculty to want to interact to create a “productive project”. Something that will mean something to students and instructors.

--create a workbook or website that will give clear and easy directions for the creation and implementation of an SLO

work towards an assessment model that will be simple, not overly time-consuming and something the faculty and students will find meaningful

January 12,2009

9-9:30 --Jim and Coleen met. Discussed SLO Learning Outcomes statement he compiled. Rehashed "brainstorms".

We also agreed that the "Assessment Models" could bring all of the processes of the college under one umbrella--student learning.

Reemphasized our belief that the administration needs to provide support for faculty workshops, flex days etc.

Noon--Anu, Ann, Jim and Coleen met. Anne noted that the four of us will be the SLO Committee group. Christina E. will be the Administrator we report to.

We discussed a calendar of events that Ann and Anu created based on a rubric from the Accreditation Commission.

Ann and Anu will write out the more explicit details of the "tentative proposed timeline for SLOs" for historical records. Coleen will be keeping electronic and hard copy records of our meetings.

We have determined that we are still at the "awareness" stage.

It was agreed that the SLO implementation depends upon the finalization of the Institutional Core Competencies. Ann and Anu will be working with the ICC committee. The hope is to scale down the redundancies of the draft of the ICC to 3 or 4 very broad concepts that are not linked to GE.

Task for Jim and Coleen is to bring forth several possible ways to define "programs" within an SLO model. It was suggested that we use the SLO workshop materials from the Cabrillo assessment program to start.

3:45pm to 4:30pm the committee attended the Academic Senate meeting. Coleen and Jim introduced themselves and briefly shared their insights for the process.

January 13, 2008--Jim and Coleen met at 9:30am

Our task is to discover several different ways to divide the institution into assessment groups. We conclude at this time that we believe our task is to create groups of faculty/staff who work together in order to create program SLO's in light of "a yet to be determined institutional SLO".

A question arose: are the Institutional Core Competencies" one in the same as the institutional SLO's.

COS used the GE model for their ICC's and SLO's for instruction. They had a completely separate process for Student Services.

We like the Cabrillo model where the SLO's for the College served as an umbrella for both instruction and Student Services. They had four SLO's and five "sectors"/groups that in turn created sector SLO's. The assessment models ranged from a survey for sectors lent indirectly to student learning to elaborate portfolios for student's graduating with an AA in Art.

So, what criteria should we use to create "groups"?

A possible model could be "groups" that already exist as found in the "phonebook/directory" of our college.

We might group instructional faculty based on similarities in how their students learn how to "critically think". For example,

- 1) physical sciences and life science groups share the fact that their students use the scientific assessment process.
- 2) English, speech and composition groups share the fact that communication is their emphasis whether written or oral.

The creation of groups could become a political mess if we do not emphasize that we are seeking similarities amongst group members (instructors or staff) who could work together to create "a better learning environment for the students." --more succinctly SLO's and assessments that they could use to a productive end.

We have decided to look for the "lists of groups" other institutions have created and how they relate to their Institutional SLO's. We will be meeting next Tuesday to share our findings.

E-mailed Ann Argiroyo and Anu
Aren't ICC's different than SLO's for the institution?

January 16, 2009--Jim and Coleen met impromptu.

Talked about an hour total today. Jerry Ruddman articles could be excellent models to follow for student services.

There is a great need for us to meet with the Ann, Anu and Christina, VP to determine what is happening with the Staff Development Coordinator position.

Our discussions brought out these observations:

- 1) there needs to be an on-going center and lead person for faculty and staff to go to.
- 2) There needs to be a overall development plan "wheel of assessment and development" set into place
- 3) There needs to be a SLO committee whose membership provides continuity for the process to occur.
- 4) Summer programs for instructors need to be set up ASAP.
- 5) We believe that our training needs to occur prior to the summer.
- 6) Maybe we can spend funds arranging more workshops by guest speakers for this Spring and Summer until a staff of trainers can be educated or we just grab templates that exist and run with those.

January 20, 2009 --Jim and Coleen met 9:30 to noon

Created an outline for meeting January 28, 2009 with Christina Espinosa Pieb, Robert Griffin and Andrew La Manque.

Key components of SLO project. How should they be coordinated?

- 1 Create a leadership committee that has revolving terms of service that overlap to ensure continuity (based on Cabrillo model)
- 2 Commit to expanding the "Faculty Staff Development Position" and office as a resource "area" for the "assessment processes".
- 3 The consequences of not creating an institutional commitment to this process.
- 4 Finalize ICC's
- 5 Create Institutional SLO's—statements can include themes for both Student Services and Instruction
- 6 Define criteria for creation of "units" (Cabrillo and Rudmann, Gabriner projects)
- 7 Create a "revolving wheel of assessment" timeline (model after Cabrillo College)
Insert a copy of page 49 from Cabrillo "Building a Framework"
- 8 Faculty awareness Phase
 - Formulate a "unit" interested faculty and Student Services personnel
 - Train them using professionals who have already taught the process?
 - Need a commitment of funds
 - Need a commitment to provide incentives for Faculty who participate
 - Need a timeline/calendar for one to two workshops to happen before

June.

Spring Flex Day to provide Faculty Awareness

Videotaped or Power Point "online" sessions that provide Faculty Awareness

Possible Fall Workshops for units

January 22, 2009 Anu Khanna, Anne Argyriou, Jim Haynes, Coleen Lee-Wheat

9:30 to 11:30am met to discuss the agenda for the January 28, 2009 meeting. We rehashed the importance of a Staff Development Position. We will ask for a budget. And most importantly ask exactly what they feel the SLO coordinator's job tasks are relative to the process.

We spent the majority of the meeting talking about what we would present to the Academic Senate on Monday.

January 26, 2009—9-9:30am Jim and Coleen reviewed the Senate presentation outline

Presentation of "SLO Mission Statement" to Faculty Senate by **Coleen Lee-Wheat and Jim Haynes 3:30-4:15pm**

Handout of the Mission Statement was passed out and described by Jim who also emphasized how we need to secure a "full time staff development person" to ensure that the SLO process would occur into the future.

(Note: Next time don't do the following!

An example of an SLO assessment was described using two teachers teaching the same class in their own way, but sharing the same "Learning Objective". An attempt to emphasize the positive interaction between colleagues was made.)

Faculty brought up fears of complete "standardization" of teaching.

Faculty brought up fears that the quantification of assessment results would lead to instructor evaluations.

Similar apprehension was expressed as has occurred in all colleges researched: preserving academic freedom and apprehension that some essential aspect of the learning process might be difficult to assess through a SLO. . .how can one measure "caring or an inspiration."

Standardization of testing in math was also suggested an assessment tool.

Acknowledging these reactions occurred –then time ran out. So, next time in retrospect, the example of an SLO should start at the ICC level—a topic less personal to the faculty

Next week, Coleen and Jim will return to the Senate to report the results of the first meeting of the "lead group's" meeting on Wednesday January 28. Christina Espinosa-Pieb, Robert Griffin, Andrew, Anu, Anne Argiorou, Coleen and Jim.

January 27, 2009 Anu Khanna, Anne Argyriou, Jim and Coleen met 9:30 to 11:30am

We reviewed what happened at the Senate meeting and decided to come up with a more formal Format for the second presentation on Monday Feb 2, 2009

Page 18 Coversheet from the Cabrillo packet
Present a draft for the SLO mission statement
Bounce off the Outline from "January 22, 2009 meeting"

Research discussed: use a TEMPLATE FOR AN ASSESSMENT MODEL Process—Cabrillo College

Cabrillo History

1. Senate divided all courses into two groups
 - 1) transfer and basic skills that lead to transfer
 - 2) occupational
2. 3 summers they held 2 week long faculty "learning" sessions that gave faculty members the chance to learn about the SLO model and to discuss how it might be applied to the college. Trained 60 instructors
First summer developed a "Learner Outcomes Handbook"
Second summer developed a "Learner Outcomes Toolkit"

The Assessment model at this stage was—based on the informal assessment that most faculty undertook of their own courses and their research and practical experience of the "learning sessions".

This period provided opportunities for faculty to dialog about the results

3. Faculty Senate and the Committee for Instructional Planning (What is this group? Does DA have one of these?) created a new assessment process. They phased it in gradually and tied it to the instructional planning schedule (program review calendar and budgetary requests) 6 year process
Group 1 assessed one core competency
Group 2 assessed two core competencies and revised all departmental course outlines to include SLO's
Group 3 assessed three core competencies and revised all departmental course outlines to include SLO's
Group 4 assessed four core competencies and revised all departmental course outlines to include SLO's
Group 5 and 6 assessed all core competencies and added SLO's to all curriculum
4. Once a department completes the first phase it embarks on a 5 year assessment process titled the "Revolving Wheel of Assessment"
 - i. 2 years they assess SLO's
 - ii. subsequent 2 years they each of the Core Competencies are assessed
 - iii. 5th year is spent writing a new instructional plan using the assessment results to justify budget requests and any changes to improve student learning.
5. Cabrillo' Occupational Programs were considered unique. They have State mandated "SLO's" at the course and program levels. Occupational programs at Cabrillo, however did create written SLOs for all certificates, and degrees and have designed plans to assess them. They still follow the same RWA

Cabrillo's Accrediting Planning Committee also divided the college into five sectors to prepare for Accreditation:

Transfer and Basic Skills Programs

Occupational Programs

Student Services

Library

Administrative services (Business Services, the President's component and administrative areas of Instruction)

These groups also utilize the same calendar (RWA), but their assessment tools are different.

Present "Map of Cabrillo's Assessment Structure"

Who should mold these tools for De Anza? Senate? Faculty who have been trained and have used the process? All interested faculty who are given several assessment models and are willing to compile a model specifically for De Anza?

1/27/09--Jim and Coleen met for 2 hours 9:30-11:30am

Concluded that we need more direction in what our purpose is. We came up with a set of questions for Ann and Anu in regards to what is on the agenda for the meeting with Christina, Robert, Andrew.

Jim spent the rest of the day creating a justification document for the Office of Staff and Organizational Development position and how it is crucial to the ongoing processes of assessment.

Jim met with Mary Kay Englund from the Staff Development office and found several leads in regards to faculty and staff who are working on assessments in the classroom and in their programs.

Coleen formulated a set of questions for Ann and Anu to peruse and possibly take to the meeting for discussion

1/28 to 1/30 Jim and Coleen meet for approximately 4 hours at various times during this time period.

Discussions centered around: assessment sources, redefining the importance and possible job description for the Staff Development office coordinator position, the importance of a group of persons who will follow this program through at least one assessment cycle.

Also discussed the possible futures of each of the members on our committee. It will be critical for the college to recognize that Anu Khanna might be the only faculty member who will be in the leadership role on this project after opening day next Fall.

Jim met with Robert (impromptu) about the program review process and adding a question regarding SLO related assessments. Coleen arranged meetings with Rosemary Arca, FH SLO coordinator, Barbara Illowsky, Basic Skills SLO coordinator Statewide leader, Diane Stacio, Speech Department, SLO's for the first two weeks of February.

Note: Jim and Coleen have spent six hours each a week performing research in addition to the meeting preparation, attendance and impromptu discussions.