Spring 2021 SLOA Committee Meeting Agenda

Friday-September 3, 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; Stephen Klippenstein; Anna Shyrokova; Phat Truong; Karin Pavelek; Sheree Brewster

Resources: José Ramón Núñez; Joe Ramirez; 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 (9-3-21).		No
2. Review and approval of previous meeting minutes on 5-7-21 (see attachment)		No
3. Confirmation of terms for members for the next two years (See SLOA Committee document)		No
4. Rubric for PSLOs redesign (Jeanne Costello)		Yes
5. Program Review (Josh Ashenmiller)		No
6. 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)		Yes
7. Other-Issues, problems, reports.		Yes as necessary

Meeting Minutes

Zoom link to the recorded meeting: https://fullcoll-edu.zoom.us/rec/share/dLiQ_pqR28womks0Nremzv3-HGp3Iba-k7GurUyqNgJIqcb12R5w86sqQPiJfFP3.to9TXkdyo13f9j-a?startTime=1630695279000

The following is a summary of the meeting minutes:

Meeting started at approximately 12:04 PM (10:30 on the zoom counter).

Meeting minutes for the 9-3-21 were approved by the committee.

Meeting minutes from the previous meeting on 5-7-21 were approved by the committee.

Terms dates for the members was discuss. A copy of the Student Learning Outcome Assessment Committee was redistributed to all members which states each members terms. A request to each member was given by George Bonnand to please let him know if members are going to continue with the committee. Committee members should be elected by their respective division to be the representative and then confirmed by the Senate.

The meeting was then turned over to Jeanne Costello so that she could present information on the "Rubrics for the PSLO redesign" form. This form is a combined effort between the SLOAC and a subgroup from the Guided pathways Workgroup #4. Jeanne Costello when through the revised form (dated 5-18-21) with the committee and explained the various fields to be completed. A question was presented by Jeanne as to how we wanted to collaborate with our fellow faculty or what role we wanted to play regarding this form and PSLO redesign process. A couple of methods were discuss for large and small departments. A suggested method was that the PSLOs form should come from the department chairs (in order to be prioritized) and filtered down to faculty along with a coaching session from Jeanne Costello. The form could then be completed and submitted through each SLOA division representative (once they work with each department on it) to the SLOA committee for review and approval. No objections to using the form that was presented were noted during the discussion.

A timeline for this process was shared with the SLOAC group for completing Guided Pathways mapping and the redesign of PSLOs. In addition, the following questions were asked:

Questions:
1. Does it make sense to have a scheduled deadline for SLOA Rep consultation? A program can discuss the rubric together with the rep who would sign off on the form prior to the SLOA meeting at which the revised PSLOs would get committee approval? Does the Monday deadline provide time if the rubric discussion suggests the PSLOs could benefit from one more revision before upcoming SLOA Committee meeting?

2. Will it be possible for SLOA Committee members to approve revised PSLOs outside of the regular, once per month meeting schedule? Or should the timeline assume that the approvals by this committee will only happen according to this monthly schedule?

3. Will SLOA Committee members be working individually with programs to provide guidance on revision and use of the rubric, or will this kind of discussion take place in division meetings? In other words, what is the best structure for providing support to programs as they revise?

4. How can I and workgroup #4 support the SLOA reps as they support their faculty in this PSLO Revision process? Jeanne will be providing additional coaching sessions via a Google doc sign-up like last semester. This worked well. Other suggestions?

Members of the committee asked questions regarding the mapping process and where to document the mapping. Jeanne showed a listing of programs and where they were in the mapping process. A

question came up as to whether Program mapping needed to be completed before the PSLO could be revised. The answer to this question is "No" since this should be done concurrently or it can be done before or after each process is completed.

A comment was made by one member of the committee that the timeline is very tight. The response to this from Jeanne was to prioritize the programs that were the top 50. Some concerns were made regarding this timeline. Small departments may be more affected than large departments since will take some time to accomplish. Jeanne stated that how we accomplish our PSLOs and Mapping is an emerging conversation that may happen as we work on these processes. An emphasis on the top 50 programs should be the immediate priority and then work on the others should be done.

A question about how to assess PSLOs was asked and a discussion regarding ensued with Jeanne Costello and Brad Dawson. In summary, it was determined that some certificates and programs have built in projects which are not realized or assessed that could be used for PSLO assessment.

A request from Deanne Smedley to approve the Rubric for PSLO Redesign form by the committee was requested so it could be presented to the Senate for approval.

A committee vote was taken and the Rubric for PSLOs Redesign form was approved by all members.

The meeting was then turned over to Josh Ashenmiller to present information on the Program Review process.

Josh shared the Program Review Template for the Self study. There are basically 4 questions that are on the Program Review that pertain to SLOs.

Josh talked about section 4.0 in the Program Review template and the questions that are asked in regards to SLOs.

The first two have to do with PSLOs. The first question 4.1 is more of a status update of where the departments are in terms of the redesign plan for PSLOs.

The second question 4.2 is a new question which asks how the new PSLOs are to be assessed so that we have meaningful results. This question is also asking a status update of where the departments are in regards to establishing assessments.

The third question 4.3 pertains to CSLO data. This data needs to come from Elumen. Elumen can produce charts but not graphic representations of data. A question from a committee member spurred a discussion regarding how much data and type of data that is necessary for the Program Review section 4.3. George Bonnand stated the canned Elumen report entitled "Course Statistic and Evidence" does give the necessary data for section 4.3. Josh indicated that the summary sheet that is given in this report seem to be adequate. During the discussion Josh stated that the OIE discovery that approximately 56% of the courses had not been assessed in the last 3 years.

The forth question 4.4 pertains to SLO Equity Analysis data. Josh indicated that a report from Elumen that shows demographics by course which has a summary of data would work well. A discussion ensued regarding Elumen and what type of report could be used and how to create it. George Bonnand and members of the committee seem to think there was a way to create a report to do this, however this will need to be worked on to determine if it is possible. A statement was made

by a committee member that the biggest impediment to answer question 4.2 and 4.4 is that we as faculty do not know who our students are in our majors. This information seems to be critical to have to answer these questions fully. Josh indicated that assessment of students after they graduate (after the fact) with a certificate or degree seems to be how it must be completed. Some departments and divisions may not be able to track this adequately. There were a few questions regarding how to track students currently using banner or other means however at this time Josh indicated for now we need to look backwards at what has been accomplished and what the data reveals. Jeanne indicated that although assessing current students would be ideal, what we currently need is to assess past students to determine how we move forward in a better direction.

Josh indicated "the point of this whole section is it says it right there in the title equity analysis right, we want to look at "equity differences in slo performance among different demographic groups so that you can compare this to what came in the previous section, which is all the data from the office of institutional research those data packets, you know that the core success, of course, of course, completion."

Josh continued with "You know transfer rates things like that, because our theory is, and this is not just the theory we've seen we've seen evidence of this. That there are lots of students who are performing exceptionally well on as slos and yet you know 10% more of them are 20% more of them fail the class they don't finish the class they don't succeed in the class. And so what that suggest to students are actually learning something in the classes, but they're not finishing the class or not succeeding in it for other reasons, something other than their ability to learn, you know. Whatever just students support issues they're having personal life issues. You know, whatever it is they're dropping out of the class early they're not showing up for the final exam, and so we want instructors to see that difference see that gap and then think about ways that they can make small changes, you know, in their own things they have control over their own syllabus their own departmental policies. That might help keep those students in the class so they can actually finish because the CS load data from what I've seen shows that our students actually learn a lot more than we think they do if we just look at student success numbers gene do it."

Deanne Smedley asked "if he were you referring to the institutional integrity report to compare against." Josh indicated "yes that's where I where I saw that was the first time, I saw this maybe two years ago, when they were looking at the gap between slo achievement and things like student success numbers and it was really it was really big for especially certain demographic groups like."

Josh continued with "there were many more students who seem to be learning the material, and yet they just weren't completing the class or they just weren't succeeding in the class, probably for a reason there's something other than to do. With just their ability to learn it, learn the material so when departments are asking, why do we have to do this, this is a little data is meaningless --no it's not meaningless, like the stuff there is meaningful stuff in elumen we to figure out how to get it out and not just print reams and reams of it for the sake of saying here, we did it we printed reams and reams of it but um this actually makes us think now about you know what our numbers mean when we look at success and completion."

Josh thanked everyone for their time.

Deanna asked that we address any questions regarding reports via email to expedite the reports.

Brad stated that we had a report a couple of years ago that seem to address the last question in the

Program Review section 4.4. George stated he would work on it and let everyone know.

There were concluding remarks from George Bonnand.

Meeting was adjourned at 1:08 PM.