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|  | Fall 2023 SLOA Committee Meeting Agenda  Friday-October 6th, 2023-12:30 PM- 1:30 PM (Room 904) Meeting called by George Bonnand, Chair Members: Kaitlin Kroupa; Caleb Petrie; Toni Nielson; George Bonnand; Deanna Smedley  Matthew Tribbe; Wendy Perez; Alix Plum; Michael Mueller; Anna Shyrokova; Phat Truong; Karin Pavelek;  Resources: José Ramón Núñez; Daniel Berumen |
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**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 (10-6-23). (see attachment) |  | No |
| 1. Review and approval of previous meeting minutes on 9-1-23 (see attachment) |  | No |
| 1. Current status of Mapping-problem and issues |  | No |
| 1. SLOA Preferred Practices-Comments or discussion |  | Yes as necessary |
| 1. Other-Issues, problems, reports. |  | Yes as necessary |
| 1. Open training session on Elumen-After meeting. |  | Yes as necessary |

Meeting Minutes for the 10-6-23 SLOAC meeting held in room 904 in building 900.

The following is a brief summary of the minutes for the in-person SLOA meeting on 10-6-23 (meeting minutes taken and written by Kaitlin Kroupa and George Bonnand).

Meeting came to order at approximately 12:32 PM. (Please note that meeting was started late due to the Manufacturing day event that was occurring in buildings 700 and 900 that day.)

Present for meeting: Kaitlin Kroupa, Caleb Petrie, George Bonnand, Deanna Smedley, Alix Plum, Michael Mueller, Anya Shyrokova, Toni Neilson, and Phat Troung

Missing from the meeting: Matt Tribbe, Wendy Perez, and Karin Pavelek.

Meeting agenda for 10-6-23 and meeting minutes for 9-1-23 were approved by the committee. (Items 1 and 2 on agenda).

Current status of Mapping-problem and issues was the next item on the agenda. George Bonnand asked if there were any issues with mapping of CSLOs to PSLOs. No issues regarding mapping were presented by the committee members however there was some discussion surrounding PSLOs and the approval process. The PSLO approval process will be per the normal curriculum process for minor revisions. The temporary accelerated PSLO revision process that was implemented from 2021 to 2023 for accreditation purposes has been sunset effective 9-1-23.

SLOA Preferred Practices-Comments or discussion. George Bonnand asked if there were any comments or issues with the SLOA Preferred Practices Handbook redline draft that was given to the group. There were no comments or questions from the committee regarding the new draft. George Bonnand announced that he would be seeking approval from the curriculum committee for the revised SLOA Preferred Practices Handbook since the curriculum committee had approved it back in 2017.

Other-Issues, problems, reports. George Bonnand announced to the committee that around 155 out of 266 (or approximately 58%) PSLOs assigned for revision had gone through the revision process. A small discussion around PSLOs and how to revise PSLOs ensued by committee members.

Questions were also asked about how to effectively assess PSLOs. Committee members shared ideas and spirited debate among the group about how to assess PSLOs and ISLOs. (Please note that in Elumen CSLOs, PSLOs, and ISLOs can be aligned with or mapped to each other. These mappings represent relationships where in mastering an SLO of a lower scope equates to mastering an SLO of a higher scope.)

George Bonnand stated that surveys should not be used to assess SLOs (per the SLO coordinator group-California Outcomes Assessment Coordinators’ Hub). Some discussion, debate, and questions surrounded the assessment of ISLOs and PSLOs and even CSLOs among committee members. George Bonnand stated there was a guide on SLO assessment that was published by the SLO coordinator group. George Bonnand was asked to share this guide. The “Guide for Student Learning Assessment” will be provided to committee members via email with the meeting minutes for this month’s meeting.

Other questions from members were asked regarding the difference between Instructional Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes. George Bonnand stated that the SLO is what is the student going to get out of it-student focused. What can the student do? Ideally something measurable.

George Bonnand asked committee members if they would be OK with recording the meeting for reference. No members objected to this. Anya Shyrokova stated that the Institutional effectiveness department has recording devices we can use. George Bonnand stated he would follow up on that.

Deanna Smedley stated that program review was due 12/4 and inquired about reports that could be run to help with program review. George Bonnand stated that he would follow up with Daniel Berumen about these reports since there has been a data dump into Tableau for such reports. George Bonnand gave a brief summary of what needs to happen when there is a data dump from Banner to Elumen.

* As courses get added and assessments are preformed, it has to be renewed.
* Elumen speaks with banner. CurricUNET speaks with banner. CurricUNET and Elumen do not speak together.
* Elumen has to be updated manually as it gets updated in CurricUNET.
* George puts SLO’s into Elumen as new classes are approved from curriculum, but he does not put in the revised ones.
* Inactivate old SLO’s if you don’t want to see them on your assessment page anymore. They won’t be deleted because there’s data attached to them.

Phat Truong and other members asked a question regarding changing SLOs in the Curriculum process.

* Changing SLO’s is a minor revision in CurricUNET. Doesn’t require all levels of approval.
  + Adding/removing prerequisites is a major revision. Needs all levels of approval.
* Look at the program in CurricUNET – to the left you’ll see a “PO” icon.
  + That will bring up a PDF of what the program looks like along with PSLO’s to check.
  + If it’s been revised, you’ll see a “PC” icon instead which will show you the revisions in green and red.
* The curriculum committee approves SLO’s as they move through CurricUNET.

Phat Troung asked when is the end of the SLO cycle? George thinks Fall 2024

* All the CLO’s in all programs have to be assessed at least once by Fall 2024.
* Aim for at least 70-80% to be assessed.

Alix Plum from PE stated the PE technique to use SLO assessments to assess programs.

* Goal was to bring reflection template completed for assessments last semester and look at assessments to decide how to improve programs.
* Because they met on zoom, it didn’t happen.

Phat Troung asked how they assess the program if they’re only looking at CSLO’s

* Because CSLO’s are mapped to PSLO’s so the CSLO’s will work for the program as well.
  + Theoretically if the department improves at the course level, it will be improved at the program level.
  + Disagreement and conversation about this technique because it’s not how guided pathways wanted to us to assess our programs.
  + Not all courses have an assessment-based certificate that we can use to assess a program like cosmetology. We need to find a way to assess all programs.
  + Not all courses have a capstone. Exit surveys have been used in the past, but those can’t be used as an assessment.
  + Now that CSLO’s are mapped, it is more acceptable to use CSLO’s to assess programs.
  + There is room for improvement. No college has figured how to do this efficiently, we’re all working on it.
* Elumen can generate a PSLO and ISLO assessment report, but you have to create an assessment and assess student.
  + Best advice is to connect your CSLO to PSLO and then run a report on that.

Open training session on Elumen-After meeting. George Bonnand stated there would be training after the meeting for anyone who would like further training on Elumen. Kaitlin Kroupa stated she would be staying after the meeting for Elumen training which took place promptly after the meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 1:32PM