Project LEARN Steering Committee Meeting Minutes, February 20, 2014

Attendance: Kris Abrahamson, Wanda Burzycki, Li Collier, Micca Gray, KC Greaney, Anne O'Donnell, Nancy Persons, Susan Quinn, Eric Thompson, John Weser, Catherine Williams. Robin Fautley

Meeting called to order at 1:05 p.m. Minutes from the Jan 17, 2014 meeting were approved.

Report from the Academic Senate: Eric reported to the Senate re: % of completed assessments and urged senators to increase their efforts to complete and post to Sharepoint. Senate responded with some shock.

Kris added that this same completion rate had been reported at DCC/IM meeting. At this meeting, there was some spirited discussion about the role of Adjunct instructors in completing course, major and certificate assessments. The current faculty contract requires that all instructors perform evaluation of student work but does not specify that any data be collected and reported as part of an assessment project. The contract does state that SLO assessments are part of regular faculty college service.
A robust discussion followed re: reasons that the college is where we are in terms of documenting ongoing assessment and what needs to be done to keep the momentum going towards completing what needs to be done for Accreditation site visit and to keep assessments ongoing after that.
Some ideas:
- Keep communication focused, short and direct – clarify misconceptions, e.g., FLEX credit
- Offer "carrot", e.g., monetary reward, to departments completing and posting SLO assessments
- Don't punish departments that are lagging; some punishments could hurt students

Communication for March: Anne will develop and send a short communication responding to questions re: assessment process and encouraging ALL faculty to complete assessments and ask for help as needed.

Report from SLO Coordinators:
Wanda: Wanda and Anne's PDA presentation re: assessing Majors and Certificates was well received. Attendees were from many different departments, both CTE and non-CTE.
- Updating of SLO website is progressing.
- Anne and Wanda met with Liko to make some adjustments to Sharepoint site.
- SLO assessment was a top topic at the DCC meeting, where there was a constructive discussion, including some Department Chairs acknowledging that they were learning quite a bit with the assessments and were changing course materials/approaches as a result.

Anne: working with Savannah, a student worker in Kris's office, who has very efficiently entered multiple assessments into Sharepoint.
- Some faculty are surprised at what they're learning that's positive as a result of SLO assessment.
- Challenge: several CTE certificates coordinated entirely by Adjunct faculty.
- PDA presentation was an opportunity to clarify questions re: assessment, e.g., it's possible (and necessary) to assess a program with few or no completers. Reminder that assessments of courses in which course SLOs match one or more major/certificate SLOs are providing legitimate assessment of outcome achievement, whether students enrolled complete and apply for the major/certificate or not.

Another robust discussion ensued re: purpose and/or wisdom of majors/certificates with no completers. Some parts of college life and programs, e.g., Theater Arts, require participation by students, who might not go on to complete an entire major/certificate. Some students enroll for career skills, but have no specific need for completing a major/certificate. Historically, college did not allow or discouraged "stand-alone" courses, which encouraged creation of major/certificate "homes" for these courses. This may be changing.

Re: engaging Adjunct Faculty in SLO assessment process, some ideas were discussed:
- Provide discipline specific sample SLO assessments
- Provide partially written assessment documentation with top part, including SLOs copied and pasted from COR and proposed method of assessment, copied and pasted from "Methods of Evaluation" of the

COR for adjunct to complete with assessment results, copied from student grading, and additional evaluative comments.

- Develop "umbrella" SLOs and SLO assessments across several courses within one department, especially those in which there is a progress of increasing skill within a discipline, e.g., languages, music, etc. Similar SLOs could be assessed at "beginning, advanced, competent" or other identifiable levels.

Additional reminder that Chairs need to "*" (star) courses that are not currently being offered when completing Section 4.1c of the PRPPs this spring. These courses will still be "active" but will be removed from total course count for the purpose of reporting our % assessments.

DQP and GE SLOs. The committee reviewed Kris's most recent document re: aligning DQP/General Education SLOs and Institutional SLOs.
Some concerns:

- ISLOs should apply to ALL students, not just degree/certificate completers
- All faculty and staff should have some part of the responsibility for helping move students in the direction of the ISLOs, including those students taking just one course.
- Can we expect students with limited college exposure to meet ISLOs?
- The last two ISLOs extend beyond or are different from the more academically oriented GE outcomes.
- It's important to document this review of GE/ISLOs for Accreditation. Kris reminded us that we need a GE assessment plan in place by April 15, 2014!

Suggestion was made to embed into the COR the GE/Institutional SLOs expected to be met by the course.
GE SLOs and ISLOs may be distinctly different:
College should re-examine the new Strategic Plan with the Mission, Vision, etc. to rewrite the ISLOs, which include ideas of creative development, improved health, etc. that are not stated GE outcomes.
Considering 4/15 deadline – GE is a responsibility of the Ac Senate; ISLOs are not.
Proposal was made to ask Senate now to endorse
    (1) GE outcomes and (2) adding identification of GE outcomes met in specific courses to the COR
Follow up later with further discussion about aligning GE and Institutional outcomes.

Specific review of DQP/GE outcomes (edited final copy version available from K Abrahamson) for Senate approval:
Approve Outcomes #1-8 for all students
Outcome #9 – for degree students only
Outcomes to be placed into the COR
Work on alignment to follow

KC Greaney reported on SRJC's participation in voting pattern survey:
2012: 49% of eligible student population voted (vs. 50% nationwide)
Lower rates among younger students
Higher rates among Social Sciences Majors
Lower rates among students in Math and "Trades" (CTE).

Project LEARN Goals. Due to lack of time, the goals will be discussed at a later meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:48 pm.

Respectfully submitted
A O'Donnell