



El Camino College Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

Notes—April 16, 2007
Assessment of Learning Committee
2:30-4:00, Library 202

Attendees: L. Kjeseth, J. Simon, H. Storms, M. Kline, K. Romero, D. Grogan, A. Spor, K. Clark, D. Maruyama

I. Presentation of Division Binders (L. Kjeseth)

L. Kjeseth introduced and distributed division binders which will contain SLO and assessment items for the division in which it is housed. At this point, these binders only contain a table of contents, which lists each course in the division by discipline and course number. The table of contents also contains information as to whether there exists an SLO assessment proposal for that course, in which case it lists the title of the SLO next to the course. Date of last curriculum review is also listed for each course.

After introducing the binders L. Kjeseth posed the question as to what else should be contained in the binders. Suggestions included: the ACCJC accreditation standards and course objectives for each course. At a later time, there will hopefully be a way to migrate this information from the course outline into the SLO Assessment reports.

D. Grogan brought up a formatting suggestion for the table of contents. She suggested that for the purpose of readability that the header for each column be put on each page.

L. Kjeseth also brought up the impetus for the creation of the binders: that the Assessment of Learning Committee division representative may be unaware of what has been turned into the SLO coordinators by faculty members in their own division.

II. Regional SLO Coordinators Meeting

L. Kjeseth discussed his experience at the regional SLO coordinators meeting on Friday, April 13. At the meeting he learned that ECC is not far behind other schools regarding SLOs and assessments; in fact, he mentioned that some schools who are on the same accreditation cycle had only recently appointed SLO coordinators. Thus, these schools had done a lot less with respect to SLOs and assessments. He reiterated the effectiveness of ECC's approach to SLOs which stresses the assessment cycle rather than the creation of SLO statements. He also said that some schools who had recently gone through the accreditation visit had been criticized for having no evidence of assessment.

III. How many SLOs?

The discussion turned to a discussion of the requirements of the SLO mandate in general. The question was posed as to how many SLOs should exist per program at this point. D. Grogan brought up the problem in her division (Business) of many faculty members being on leave or close to retirement. The programs in which these faculty are on leave/retiring may then have only one faculty member left. She asked if these programs are expected to also produce SLOs. L. Kjeseth answered that for those programs for which it is possible, one SLO is sufficient at this point. H. Storms further inquired as to how many SLOs should exist per course. The answer, from various members of the committee, was as many as is appropriate. For some courses, this may be one; for others, this may be five.

IV. Setting priorities for subcommittees

L. Kjeseth introduced the next topic of discussion: setting priorities for the various subcommittees. He mentioned that many of the subcommittees seemed overly ambitious, and that we should decide on two or three projects for the remainder of the semester. M. Kline responded that publicity was a very pressing matter in his division (Humanities). He further commented that no one knows what is going on and that many faculty are misinformed or uninformed.

L. Kjeseth brought up the idea that the bibliography committee may be considered as part of publicity, but J. Simon responded that the bibliography committee's task is to create a list of books for purchase; thus, the purpose of the sub-committee may be considered as separate. The conversation then turned to where these books might be housed. L. Kjeseth objected to the faculty bookshelves in the library basement because of the prohibition of food and drink and meeting space. The idea of contacting Ruth Banda-Ralph to inquire about space in the first-year experience office was mentioned.

L. Kjeseth suggested that the discussion about the relationship of the curriculum process and the SLO process should be tabled for now because this matter may be decided for the college by the State Academic Senate. Thus, we need to wait and see what comes of this at the next meeting of this body. L. Kjeseth said that at the Southern California SLO Coordinators meeting that the issue was brought up that the State Academic Senate may make it mandatory for college curriculum committees to put a space for SLOs on all course outlines. However, L. Kjeseth voiced several of his objections including the fact that no one in the curriculum committee wants to review SLOs. J. Simon agreed by stating that the ALC itself also doesn't/doesn't wish to review SLOs, so why should the curriculum committee? Also, she brought up the possibility of a change in focus of the SLO process at ECC if this policy passes: from the assessment cycle to churning out SLO statements. It was also mentioned that many faculty have a "compliance mentality" towards SLOs, and this mandate would only worsen that situation. K. Clark mentioned the problem of the permanency of SLOs if put on the course outline. If a faculty member writes an SLO statement without consideration of assessment, when the faculty member finally goes

to assess the SLO, and finds out the SLO isn't what he/she had intended, then the faculty member would not have the freedom to easily change the SLO statement and assessment.

V. General Education Learning Outcomes

L. Kjeseth also brought up a problem that many schools are facing in accreditation: lack of outcomes for general education. Thus, L. Kjeseth proposed that the general education subcommittee (of the ALC) draft one or two outcomes for each general education area. These outcomes would be at the same level as program-level outcomes, which each program might also have. Thus, course-level SLOs may tie either to program-level SLOs, general education SLOs, or both.

VI. Strengthening Student Success Conference

Committee members were asked whether they were interested in attending the state's Student Success Conference in San Jose from October 3-5. The focus of this conference is on student learning outcomes; ECC wants to send a team of eight to the conference. At issue are: how much funding is available and who will decide which committee members go if not enough funding is available. A. Spor mentioned that there is more funding than just through the VPAA. There is also money available through staff development, the Compton partnership, the Basic Skills initiative, and so on. All present committee members expressed interest in going; H. Storms and D. Grogan mentioned the possibility of going at a later time because the current strands at the conference may not match their particular interests.

VII. New Draft of Form for SLO Assessment Process

J. Simon introduced a new form for the SLO Assessment process. Committee members went over the draft and made suggestions. Among the suggestions were: that the title be moved from the middle of the first page to the top of the document; that the words "Student Learning Outcome" be mentioned at least once on the form rather than the abbreviation "SLO;" that instructions pertaining to submission of the form be included after each of the three sections; that the "Description of the data" section be shortened and the format changed so that not so much importance is placed on it; that option of "one-time" or "multiple-step" assessment be included in the description of the data section; that "Timeline for Reflecting on the Data" be changed to "Deadline for submission of data analysis;" that the question as to how the SLO ties to program-level SLOs and core competencies also include a third category: general education outcomes. J. Simon will do further work on the form and send out a new draft to committee members.