**VENTURA COLLEGE**

**Student Learning Outcomes Committee**

**Tuesday, October 14, 2014**

**3:00-4:30pm**

**MCW-312**

**Present:** William Hart (Co-chair), Michael Callahan, Ayanna Gaines, Claudia Peter, Ryan Petitfils, Tanya Shaffer, Jenchi Wu, Alma Rodriquez, Susan Bricker, Bea Herrera, Jaclyn Walker, Jason (Student)

**Recorder:** C. Peter

| **Agenda Item** | **Summary of Discussion** | **Action Due & by Whom** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Announcements/Information Items** |
| * 1. SLO division updates from committee members
 | 1. Jenchi Wu reported that Art division is discussing methods of implementing credit by examination. Discussion ensued and Susan Bricker clarified the meaning of credit by examination. Title V directs that students may only get credit for a course by taking the course here OR through credit by examination. This affords the student a method of getting credit for prior work. Many classes at Ventura College do not allow credit by exam (for example – foreign languages).
2. Patrick Jefferson (EVP) needs to define the areas that can use credit by exam first. Then the decision goes to the departmental level where tests are developed and the actual testing is done. Criteria for conducting credit by exam can be found in the college catalog in two sections: (a) appendices, and (b) its own section in the catalog.
3. On transcript the successful completion of credit by exam is indicated with a “CRE”. In the future this practice will be changed to either giving the student an actual letter grade or a pass/no pass on the transcript. Awaiting decisions from Dr. Jefferson.
 |  |
| 1. SLO items must be current in four locations
 | 1. The 4 places are college syllabi, Trac Dat, COR (course outline of record), and the department’s web page where it can be linked to a word document. Faculty will have to add SLOs any time they create a new course or update an existing course. If faculty change SLOs, there is a fast-track option in Curricunet to submit for just a change in SLOs but nothing else in the COR can change. Please remind your divisions/departments to update the SLOs on their web pagers. All of the four sites need to match.
 |  |
| 1. Evidence for accreditation should be sent to **vcaccred@vcccd.edu**
 | 1. Any changes in SLOs or discussion of SLOs in committee meetings need to be sent to this email address for accreditation purposes as data and proof of compliance. In the subject line put the standard number and put it on the document if possible. Back items that should be in the accreditation report should also be sent.
 |  |
| 1. Academic Senate approved the revised ISLO rubric #3 on Critical thinking and problem solving.
 | 1. Each criterion has grading levels except for (see below):

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
| **Use of critical thinking to make an informed decision** | ------------------------------- | Analyzes situation from relevant and/or safety considerations and selects appropriate action. | Does not analyze situation from relevant and/or safety considerations and does not select appropriate action. |

Student will either demonstrate critical thinking to make a decision OR not.(See attachment for current critical thinking rubric.) |  |
| **Discussion Items** |
| 1. ISUO/ISLO updates
 | 1. ISUO #2 – S. Bricker reported that a draft will be ready for discussion at the next SLO meeting.
2. ISLO #5 – Ty Gardner is chair of this SLO – no reports as yet. W. Hart will email Ty about subcommittee’s progress on this SLO.
 |  |
| 1. Quality Assurance Project
 | 1. QA project should begin in November. Need to develop a plan and time line for the project. Committee will discuss further at next meeting. Student Services will set up a meeting with Debbie Newcomb to discuss project.
 |  |
|  **Action Items** |
| 1. Approval of goals for FY 14-15 (see goal sheet attachment discussed at meeting)
 | 1. Goal 1a approved. Motion to approve A. Gaines and seconded C. Peter. R. Petitfils, B. Herrera and Jason (student ASVC) abstained. Remainder of committee approved.
2. Goal 2 changed to read:

“Maintain and evaluate an ongoing focus of quality control for the overall SLO process.” B. Herrera motion to approve. Seconded by S. Bricker. R. Petitfils, B. Herrera and Jason (student ASVC) abstained. Remainder of committee approved.1. Goal 3 – Committee discussed putting this under Goal 1B to read as:

“Establish a rotational plan.”C. Peter suggested that the manual address the following information:* Explanation of the SLO process
* Purpose for the SLO process
* Steps in the SLO process
* Resources / Super users on campus
* Forms
* Rotational Plan
* Closing the loop process and forms
* Trac Dat Entry and resources
* Quality Assurance (Proposed Evaluation plan of the process)
1. Goal 4 - committee proposed the following statement:

“Identify and address issues related to an incomplete closing the loop process.”1. Goals 5 – Discussion of statement:

“Facilitate collaborative participation of staff, faculty and administration in data collection, reporting of results and subsequent actions to meet SLO outcomes in our accreditation self-study report.” Committee decided to continue discussion of Goal 5 at next meeting. |  |
| 1. Approval of minutes

September 9th, 2014 | 1. Changes to minutes:
	1. D1a – Add: “The rubric was approved by the committee. It will be submitted to the academic Senate for their official approval.”
	2. E2a – change “nominated” to “elected” W. Hart is a Co-Chair of this committee.
2. Committee approved minutes with changes. R. Petitfils, B. Herrera and Jason (student ASVC) abstained.
 |  |
| 1. Comment from Michael Callahan on new accreditation standard
 | 3. Michael Callahan reported that there is a new accreditation standard that we will have to meet. It calls for all data to be disaggregated by subpopulations. |  |
| **Handouts/ Needed Information** |
| \* = Hard copy handout^ = Electronic Handout |  |  |
| SLO Committee Goals for FY 14-15 for discussion. | 1. Create a SLO manual for faculty/staff
2. Manual to address how to, why, connections between ISLO/PSLO/CSLOs and TracDAT

 2. Continued focus of quality control for entire SLO process 3. Rotational Plan4. Closing the loop5. Establish a process to facilitate collaborative participation by and through the SLO committee in the development of our accreditation self-study report and preparation for our accreditation site visit.  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Charge**: The Student Learning Outcome Community will be responsible for monitoring the progress and evaluating the quality of Student Learning Outcomes on campus. The committee will create an annual report of the SLO progress.

**ISLO-3 RUBRIC FOR CRITICAL THINKING AND PROBLEM SOLVING**

Students will recognize and identify the components of problems or issues, examine them from multiple perspectives and investigate the ways to resolve them using reasoned and supportable conclusions while differentiating between facts, influences, opinions, and assumptions.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS** | **MEETS EXPECTATIONS** | **DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS** |
| **Points** | **2** | **1** | **0** |
| **Recognition of issues** | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding. | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions. | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description. |
| **Examination of issues from multiple perspectives** | Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others’ assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position. | Identifies own and others’ assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position. | Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position. |
| **Evidence*****Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion*** | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly. | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning. | Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question. |
| **Student’s position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)** | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged.Others’ points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).  | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue.Others’ points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis). | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious. |
| **Use of critical thinking to make an informed decision** | ----------------------------------------------- | Analyzes situation from relevant and/or safety considerations and selects appropriate action.- | Does not analyze situation from relevant and/or safety considerations and does not select appropriate action. |
| **Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)** | Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student’s informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order. | Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly. | Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified. |