

## Spring 2020 SLOA Committee Meeting Agenda

Friday-May 1, 2020-Noon- 1:00 PM Via Zoom (<https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/262744378>)

Meeting called by George Bonnand, Chair

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

Resources: José Ramón Núñez; Joe Ramirez; Marwin Luminarias;

### Agenda Items

Approval of Meeting Minutes –  
Assignment of Meeting Minutes Scribe-  
Approval of Agenda for today’s meeting (See below)-

Topics	Supporting Document Filename (in SharePoint*)	Bring Copy
1. Review and approval of previous meeting minutes and proposed agenda for today.		No
2. Presentation by Joe Ramirez via Zoom-sharing of results from the Institutional Integrity Committee’s review of the College’s Institution-Set Standards and an analysis of the Communications ISLO.		No
3. Update on SLOs for Spring 2020.		No
4. Update from ISLO redesign members.		No
5. Other-Issues, problems, reports.		No

### Zoom Meeting Minutes for 5-1-20 SLOA Meeting

Members in attendance: Bradley Dawson; Caleb Petrie; George Bonnand; Deanna Smedley  
Jill Kageyama; Matthew Tribbe; Wendy Perez; Alix Plum; Stephen Klippenstein;  
Anna Shyrokova; Phat Truong; and Karin Pavelek

Guest speaker: Michael Manger (Joe Ramirez deferred to Michael Manger for this presentation)

-Meeting began at approximately 12:03 PM

-Proposed Meeting Agenda for 5-1-20 and Meeting minutes from 4-3-20 were approved

-Zoom Meeting was turned over to Michael Manger

Michael presented the “Fullerton College Institution-Set Standard” report and the “Fullerton College Institutional Student Learning Outcomes: Communication to SLOA committee.” which were both dated April 2020.

-Points highlighted by Michael’s presentation were as follows:

- Overall, the college is doing well against the institution set-standard.
- 10 standards were established and the baseline levels were set at the 90 percentile.
- Michael stated that there were two requests of our committee:
  - The first is a request for the committee to recommend using only a two-level metric assessment (meets or does not meet) and to no longer use “Exceeds” as a metric on SLOAs or other multi-level assessments scales or metrics. This would promote and facilitate consistency and reporting metrics.
  - The second is a request as follows: Since Department-specific ISLO analysis will now likely become part of the Annual Update form for Program Review. Can the SLOAC every fall run a report and provide it to the Program Review Committee that shows which courses constituted the aggregate ISLO data, a list, in other words, of the courses mapped to that specific ISLO?
- Michael went on to present data in the ISLO Communication report which showed some data for Communication ISLO attainment. While ISLO Communication attainment were high there were some inconsistencies with the use and distribution of students who ‘exceeded expectation’.
- Michael when on to point out that while the percentages for the “exceed expectations” category are relatively low, they are even lower for disproportionately impacted students, including African American, Native America, Hispanic/Latinx and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students.

-Michael concluded his presentation and stated he would forward a copy of the reports to George Bonnard so that he can forward to the SLOA committee.

-George Bonnard took control of the Zoom meeting and asked if there were any questions. A few clarification questions were asked and promptly answered by Michael Manger. Michael then departed the meeting.

-George Bonnard stated the request to align Program Review (PRC) and SLOA cycles was made to the Chairperson (Kelly Robertson) of the PR committee. No issues with this proposal were stated.

-Questions were asked by the committee members regarding changing the assessment scale from a 3 level assessment with the “Exceeds Expectation” to a 2 level assessment scale which has only “meets and does not meet”. Some members had concerns about it being a big undertaking. Brad stated we should have discussion with department members to be aware and make changes "as we go" to make things less daunting than doing everything at once. Convince others to discuss and think about ceasing from using "exceeds" was mentioned. It was stated by George Bonnard that if you have assessments in courses with an assessment scale other than the 2 level (Meet-Does Not Meet) then it should be changed to the 2 level.

-Brad motioned to recommend to Faculty Senate to align Curriculum Review and Program Review. Motion was approved. Vote Passed to go to four year-We are jumping in to PRC year 1 of 4. This is 3 yrs. after 2023 it will then change to 4 years.

-George Bonnard stated he will seek approval from Faculty Senate, IIC and even the President. Brad stated we only need to report to Faculty Senate not PAC or IIC or the President.

-A question was raised by a member as to whether or not we will need to evaluate ISLOs. Course level SLOs roll up to the ISLOs.

-George Bonnard asked members to go to departments in their division and make sure they know what they are doing when it comes to assessments. Encourage faculty to "close the loop" by having discussions on the findings and reflections of their SLO's.

-Last meeting of the semester. We will meet in Fall again. Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 schedule will be forth coming soon.

Other information:

Responses for requests from Michael Manger (11c)

- The first is a request for the committee to recommend using only a two-level metric assessment (meets or does not meet) and to no longer use "Exceeds" as a metric on SLOAs or other multi-level assessments scales or metrics. This would promote and facilitate consistency and reporting metrics.
  - **Response**-It is the opinion of the SLOA Chairperson and members of the SLOA committee that we support, promote, encourage and recommend all divisions/department to follow through with this request. Justification for this is as follows: Consistent assessment scales/tools in eLumen will lead to more accurate and reliable information from eLumen. A 2 level assessment scale is what most departments and divisions use currently thus the impact should be minimum to most divisions as it is implemented gradually.
- The second is a request as follows: Since Department-specific ISLO analysis will now likely become part of the Annual Update form for Program Review. Can the SLOAC every fall run a report and provide it to the Program Review Committee that shows which courses constituted the aggregate ISLO data, a list, in other words, of the courses mapped to that specific ISLO?
  - **Response**-The chairperson grants this request, since this request would need to be carried out by either a Data Steward (George Bonnard) or a member with overall rights to the reporting function (Joe Ramirez) in eLumen. Justification for this is follows: The Program Review process for Fullerton College is a requirement and thus requires assorted reports and information from our eLumen system. Reports shall be provided accordingly to support the process as well as any other required process.