Attendees: Kathy Scott (lead), Ty Gardener, Sandy Hajas, Gwendolyn Huddleston, Dave Oliver, Salomeh Pourmoghim, Peter Sezzi

This group of volunteers will review and revise our processes for course and service area SLOs in light of the recent recommendations made by the accrediting team.

At the beginning of the meeting, we noted that most of our courses have SLOs, methods for assessing SLOs, and rubrics. We agreed that we need to do more in the area of assessing them: collecting and analyzing data and "closing the loop": "determining ways to use the data and make applicable revisions to the curriculum, departmental processes, and the outcomes/objectives" (Mt. SAC). We also need to do a better job of documenting discussions and meetings.

Prior to this meeting, the committee members reviewed documentation on other colleges' SLOs, SLO handbooks, and SLO processes generally. The list of colleges had been narrowed down prior to the meeting by suggestions made from the commission and others, and the group primarily discussed specifically the work done at Cabrillo, Mt. SAC, and Moorpark Colleges.

The group decided that Mt. SAC and Moorpark's models looked particularly good, partly because they utilized the Nichols' 5-Column Method. Of the two colleges, we liked Moorpark's assessment form slightly better because of the landscape layout and the connection of course level SLOs to program level SLOs, Core Competencies (or Core Purposes in the case of service units), and the College Mission. We did agree, though, that the form needed some slight modification; we would prefer having a separate form for instruction and for service areas.

We had a discussion about the extent to which we could ask for consistency among departments in data collection and analysis, at least this first time. We agreed that our task would be simplified if we could get faculty to agree to use the same or similar methodologies.

The group reviewed our existing Core Competencies in comparison with some of the other colleges'. We preferred what our college had already created, and we will support the continued use of them.

We discussed the need for rubrics to be part of this process. Dave and Gwendolyn noted that rubrics are on the syllabi for many of the courses in their areas. We will need to ensure that disciplines across campus are doing the same and are using the rubrics for assessment.

If we use forms, etc. created by other colleges, we will credit those colleges on our forms/documents.

The group agreed that having one person with 60% release time would be preferable to having two or three with less release time. Our decision was based on the need for greater levels of availability for faculty assistance (number of hours) and uniformity in the process.

We also agreed that a FT classified person is needed to support the faculty member and the process of getting all documents, etc. online.

We discussed how this entire process will need to be dialog driven within each department or service unit.

The committee tentatively agreed that we would try to have one SLO for each course (especially those in the Core area) to identify, measure, and analyze one SLO during the spring semester. The committee sees a need to define "program" in relation to program-level SLOs.

We also agreed that we will collect data and analyze it for SLOs on a rotational basis. We will not analyze every SLO every semester.

We looked briefly at the form used by Cabrillo College for the documentation of meetings at which assessment results are analyzed and decisions made about changes made to improve instruction. We will discuss this meeting form in more depth at our next meeting.

Tasks Assigned:

1) **Sandy will modify the form.**

2) **Ty will work with faculty in his area to complete the form through Level 3 (measurement), using the instructional model.**

3) **Peter will complete the form using library as a service unit example.**

4) **Peter will put this assessment form on the agenda for tha next Academic Senate meeting (11/4/10) for discussion. It will go back to the Senate again in two weeks (11/18) for a vote after any necessary revisions have been made. Salomeh will present.**

5) **Provided the Senate agrees with this process and votes to move forward with it, the form will be presented at the Department Chair Meeting on November 23.**

6) **Sandy agreed to create a draft SLO Handbook for faculty and service areas to use as they go through this process. She will send it to the group prior to our next meeting (Monday, 11/8). Our group will review and offer suggestions for revision. Ultimately, this document will also go to the Senate for approval.**

7) **Ty also said that he would create some program level SLOs with faculty in his area to use as samples.**

8) **Dave will create the electronic depository (initially SharePoint).** We may later look at Lumens (used by Oxnard College) and TracDat (used by Mt. SAC).

9) **Kathy will ask for Robin's approval to concentrate the faculty release time with one person rather than several.**

NEXT MEETING: MONDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2010, 5:00, LIBRARY