Spring 2021 SLOA Committee Meeting Agenda

Friday-October 1, 2021-Noon- 1:00 PM Via Zoom (https://fullcoll-edu.zoom.us/j/92758081864)

Meeting called by George Bonnand, Chair

Members: Bradley Dawson; Caleb Petrie; Toni Nielson; George Bonnand; Deanna Smedley
Matthew Tribbe; Wendy Perez; Alix Plum; Michael Mueller; Stephen Klippenstein; Anna Shyrokova; Phat Truong; Karin Pavelek; Tran Dat

Resources: José Ramón Núñez; Marwin Luminarias;

Agenda Items

Assignment of Meeting Minutes Scribe-Recorded in Zoom
Approval of Agenda for today's meeting (See below)-

Topics	Supporting Document Filename (in SharePoint*)	Bring Copy
1. Review and approval of proposed agenda for today (10-1-21).		No
2. Review and approval of previous meeting minutes on 9-3-21 (see attachment)		No
3. Introduction of new members to the committee		No
4. Rubric for PSLOs redesign-Final draft and timeline		Yes
5. Revisit plan/process (ideas and thoughts on paper if possible) for how PSLOs should be submitted to our committee for review and approval. (see attachment)		No
6. Program Review reports		Yes
7. Other-Issues, problems, reports.		Yes as necessary

Meeting Minutes

The following is a Zoom link to the recorded meeting: https://fullcoll-edu.zoom.us/rec/share/VtNWi1dHZYMc_YnCQIGPCEdGE2lyGAn072gWKkMynPHJhhBfVTuV2PmT_mcC7t6F.xnKaWL4nHjxSmceZ?startTime=1633114429000

The following is a summary of the meeting minutes:

Meeting started at approximately 12:04 PM (approx. 11:23 on the zoom counter).

Meeting minutes for the 10-1-21 were approved by the committee.

Meeting minutes from the previous meeting on 9-3-21 were approved by the committee.

Introductions to new members of the committee were made to Michael Mueller (Fine Arts) and Dat Tran (student representative).

Alix Plum started a discussion with questions regarding the PSLOs and the rubric form. Alix's questions were centered around whether or not newly revised programs/certificates that are currently in process in CNET can be used? Or are the "Active" ones to be used? George Bonnand stated in summary that newly revised PSLOs for certificates or programs will replace the ones in the "Active" file in CNET once approved through the department and committee.

Another question Alix had was regarding a question on the rubric which stated the following: "PSLO reflects professional organizations' outcome statements, if applicable". In summary the group determined that this questions was for 3rd party outcomes which the PSLO might center around. An example of this might be for outside certifications for welding, or cosmetology or automotive. Deanna pointed out that if this question does not apply to a major then NA can be put down.

An overview of the PSLO Rubric form section was covered briefly by George Bonnand.

Alix Plum had another question regarding the "suggested improvements/revisions" section. Deanna Smedley made the comment that some things have not been figured out as of yet.

Alix made the comment that it would seem to be effective if faculty could determine the method of assessment for each PSLO and then put them on the form directly next to the question in the "suggested improvements/revisions" section. Deanna pointed out that this was not a directive when this form was created and that Appendix A does state the type of assessments that can be used. Deanna when on to state in summary, that changing directions now that the form has gone out might not be a good.

Deanna then made the comment that faculty were under the false impression that all boxes in the form needed to be checked off. Deanna stated it is not necessary for each PSLO to have all boxes checked off. It is possible 2 or 3 boxes could be checked off for each PSLO and that combined with other PSLOs all boxes should be checked.

The conversation then centered around a question Brad Dawson posed regarding approving PSLOs that were are not yet approved in curriculum. George Bonnand stated that is correct however there could be issues with new PSLOs in the future if the PSLOs are not in alignment with curriculum material presented but that would be reviewed by the curriculum committee.

Deanna stated in summary that this form was not set and that changes could be made. The form was presented to many groups throughout the campus including the SLOA committee where it was presented twice with excellent feedback.

Brad Dawson made two suggestions for the form.

The first suggestion was to have a place where the old PSLO could be stated so that it would be obvious what the new PLSO is replacing. Much discussion occurred around this suggestion. The consensus of the discussion was to maintain the form tentatively as is regarding new PSLOs.

The second suggestion was to change the "suggested improvements/revisions" section wording to "Comments" so that faculty could explain in each section what they are changing regardless if it is an improvement or revision or other. Much discussion occurred around this suggestion. The consensus of the discussion was to change this form to replace the wording as suggested.

The question was raised that if we change the form will it need to go back to senate for approval? The committee believes since these are minor changes/adjustments which do not affect the overall function or spirit of what the form is intended for then no reapproval from senate is necessary.

Karin Pavelek asked if we could ask faculty or departments to send the old PSLOs and the new PSLOs that are replacing them to the division representative? Or add it to the form? Much discussion occurred around this suggestion again.

Jeanne Costello stated in summary that she is hearing that we are asking to change the form to add a section that would show the old PSLO that is being changed and to change the wording for the "Suggested improvements/revision" section to "comments". This would be to make the form more useful by all faculty.

Phat Truong stated that he had created a Word document that showed old PSLOs and new PSLOs which would be an attachment to the form. Some discussion occurred around this idea as to whether or not it would be a smoother process since some things may be left up to the departments to do with no formal process.

Jeanne stated in summary that the reason we have one form is to make everything accessible in one place. The committee in general agreed with the idea and perhaps this does not need to be formalize on the form since the change to the form may incorporate this. Jeanne stated that changes to the form can be made readily by Jen who is the author of the form and that perhaps by Monday or next week it would be ready to go.

A question was raised by Alix Plum asking where do we put on the form how the new PSLOs are assessed. Jeanne stated in summary it is not necessary to come a definitive agreement on how each PSLO needs to be assessed at this time however it could/should be something that is looked at it and decided in the future. Jeanne when on to state, in summary, that holding up the PSLO process to determine the assessment method would not be useful at this time. Jeanne stressed in summary that we need to begin the process even if all the steps in the process are not totally defined at this time.

The discussion then turned to the timeline for this PSLO Redesign Process. Jeanne stated in summary that we must be careful about making statements like "we must do X, Y, Z……". As soon as comments are made like this, the faculty dig in their heels and seem to not do it. Jeanne stated she would rather use the language of "we strongly encourage you to do……". In summary, faculty are more likely to do the assigned tasks which are part of their faculty duties which are decided by faculty. Jeanne when on to state in summary that the consequences of not doing this PSLO redesign

and mapping in a timely matter may be that it might not be visible to students on line or on the website- "There is no pathways police………." to monitor faculty or impose consequences. Josh Ashenmiller stated that a selling point to the faculty or peers is revising our PSLOs is part of establishing a really meaningful SLO assessment process. Once this PSLO process is done it may decrease or eliminate the amount of or number of reports that is needed from Elumen since the SLO assessment process will be more robust.

Caleb Petrie asked about the timelines for top 50 programs. Note: The timeline and rubric were sent out to all members of the committee. Some discussion occurred around the timelines and missed timelines consequences. Jeanne stated in summary that we should do our best to encourage our faculty to meet these timelines as best as possible in a timely fashion as a matter of colleague respect for one another so that it is not overwhelming for everyone. More discussion occurred regarding the process of approving the new PSLOs.

Note: In general, it was agreed in previous meetings that the process for approving new PSLOs would be that the SLOA Division Representative and Department person would review these new PSLOs first using the rubric. The new PSLOs (rubric) would then be brought to the committee for review where 2 or 3 other SLOA representatives could look at them and give feedback (this could occur before the meeting). Once the feedback and adjustments are made then the SLOA committee chairperson would approve them and then forward them to the Curriculum committee for implementation.

The meeting discussion then turned to our last discussion item on the agenda "Program Review" so that Josh Ashenmiller could answer any questions posed by the SLOA committee members.

Brad Dawson stated that there might be a problem (for those that want to run data) with the Economic Disadvantaged group disaggregated data. It appears that the groups in Elumen do not match the groups that are given in the OIE report. George Bonnand asked Brad to forward the data to him and he stated to Brad that he would work on figuring out whether or not we could run a report that is similar.

Caleb Petrie asked if we are focused on running reports for "Ethnicity" or should we run reports for and include all the demographic categories for the equity analysis section in the Program Review?

Josh Ashenmiller stated in summary that the comments for other demographic categories should be included only if there is significant data that is shown for that category.

Karin Pavelek asked if we are going to get a revised rubric template to work with for our division. Jeanne stated that they will be working on that.

No other questions were posed for Josh or Jeanne.

Meeting adjourn at approximately 1:01PM.