ASLO Committee 2008-09 Report
Submitted by Tricia Alexander, PhD, SLO Coordinator

Summary of Accomplishments:

1. The college’s institutional-level outcomes (ILOs) were revised.
2. The Critical Thinking ILO was assessed during Fall, 2008, (as well as Spring 2009 and Summer s009).
3. General Education Outcomes (GEOs) were developed.
4. A method for assessing communication skills (writing, speaking, reading, and listening) across disciplines was developed during Summer and Fall of 2008.
5. The Communication GEO was assessed during Spring, 2009.
6. Course-level outcomes for all courses were revised and assessment training sessions were made available through Flex Day presentations and workshops.
7. A plan was developed to address the accreditation board’s recommendations.
8. The ISLO committee was set up to oversee assessment in non-instructional areas and the meetings were co-chaired by the ASLO Coordinator.
9. An ASLO committee member responsible for coordinating with the Student Success effort was designated.

Below is a chronology of the year’s events, which details the progress on the listed accomplishments.

1. Revision and Assessment of Institutional-Level Outcomes (ILOs)

August 26, 2008 meeting
In order to complete one cycle of assessment by 2012, the ASLO committee decided to consolidate the existing 11 institutional core competencies. A proposal will be made to the curriculum committee to put “Science Literacy” under “Critical Thinking” and to put “Teamwork and Collaboration” under “Communication”. This will reduce the number of core competencies to nine.

Several additional strategies for meeting the 2012 deadline were proposed, such as (1) looking for work products already produced by students when taking classes as items that could be used for institutional assessment, (2) combining all core competencies into one comprehensive assessment instrument that would contain a small number of items measuring each core competency, and (3) getting assessment data from each program by having faculty report data directly into software (such as TracDat) when they record their grades at the end of the semester.

A spring 2007 survey of faculty put “Personal Goal Attainment” as the next most important core competency to assess, after Critical Thinking and Communication. This vote echoes the students’ ranking of the core competencies in a small, non-representative survey also conducted in 2007. Committee members made suggestions as to how data measuring Personal Goal Attainment could be captured: (a) ARC data, (b) certificates and degrees awarded, (c) goal information on LBCC admissions applications, and (d) some kind of exit polling. It might be important to interview students who drop out as well as those to attain their educational goals.
September 9, 2008 meeting
The ASLO committee briefly discussed subsuming the “Civic Engagement” core competency under “Communication.”

Committee members agreed to further explore a strategy that was raised during the previous meeting, of coming up with a small number of key items to measure each core competency and then look into whether some of the items could be combined into a comprehensive assessment instrument. The remaining core competencies were distributed among committee members who volunteered to spend time during the next two weeks considering whether data has already been gathered that could be used to assess “their” core competency. If not, the individual committee members were to consult with experts or, if they were experts themselves, to come up with a small collection of items that might be used to measure the core competency. Committee members were to be prepared to report back at the next ASLO meeting.

ASLO committee members discussed whether the Personal Goal Attainment outcome could be assessed by referring to the goal indicated on students’ admissions applications. The Final IE Report for 2008 contained data indicating that on their college application, about 40% of students gave “transfer” as their educational goal. The college could follow up and determine whether students who declared this goal upon entering the college actually achieved it. About 2.5% of students stated on their application form that attaining an AA degree only (as a terminal degree) was their goal and another 4.5% indicated that getting a certificate was their goal. This assessment approach leaves out students who don’t indicate any goal on their applications. Data may be available from the counseling office that is relevant to Personal Goal Attainment, since counselors often try to help students clarify their goals.

September 23, 2008 meeting
Tricia Alexander took the proposed changes in the institutional core competencies to the 9/17/08 curriculum committee meeting with a motion for a first reading: “Science Literacy” will be subsumed under “Critical Thinking” and “Teamwork and Collaboration” will be subsumed under “Communication.”

Two comments made by curriculum committee members were that (1) perhaps the “subsumed” core competencies should be completely blended into the major core competencies rather than merely being subsumed, and (2) that the changes in the core competencies should be done all at once rather than piecemeal. Tricia responded that (1) faculty members have expressed a desire to not have any core competencies “disappear” and that (2) practically speaking, each change in the core competencies will have to be considered on its own merits, so doing them incrementally is a pragmatic approach. Nevertheless, it has to be granted that making several changes has the potential for causing confusion, due to there being several iterations of the core competencies.

At the previous ASLO meeting, individual committee members had volunteered to spend time during the next two weeks considering how to measure several of the remaining core competencies; considering whether data has already been gathered that could be used to assess the core competency or how data could be generated to measure it. These individual committee members were to consult with experts or, if they are experts, to come up with a small collection of items that might be used to measure the core competency. Committee members reported back on their findings:

Peter (Aesthetics): (In consultation with Larry White and Cathy Crane, he developed outcomes)
   1. Students will appreciate a variety of art forms as they exist in various cultures.
   2. Students will know what the fundamentals are that make up a particular art form.
3. Students will be able to articulate aesthetic judgments (i.e., Is a work of art successful in accomplishing what its author was trying to do?)

4. Since students are only required to take one course in “the arts,” the assessment questions cannot “drill down” too deeply into the specifics of a course or discipline.

John (Wellness): (Clarified in a 9/24/08 meeting with Tricia Alexander and Natalia Schroeder)
1. Students will increase physical fitness (reserve capacity for strength, cardio-respiratory endurance, and flexibility).
2. Students will reduce health risks associated with an unhealthy lifestyle.

Sheng- Tai (Creativity): (in consultation with other English instructors)
1. English instructors believe that Creativity is manifested in the assignments listed in existing course syllabi.
2. Creativity has elements, such as originality, the ability to generate new ideas, and the ability to synthesize existing elements into new combinations.
3. Whereas creativity is extremely challenging to measure, perhaps the ability to produce some of these elements of creativity can be assessed.

Craig (Civic Engagement): (in consultation with Paul Savoie, Gene Goss, and others)
1. Paul and other Political Science/History instructors stated that a 12-16 item questionnaire would not be difficult to develop that would measure Civic Engagement and community participation.
2. CSULB makes community service a graduation requirement. LBCC could consider doing this.
3. College service hours and ASB activities could be considered measures of this core competency.

Paul (Numeric Literacy): (in consultation with math instructors)
1. Numeric Literacy contains several areas, including consumer economics, medical area skills, logic, statistics, electrical area skills, and calculus.
2. During the discussion, the idea re-emerged that Numeric Literacy may fit under Critical Thinking. Paul offered to go over the Numeric Literacy items of the Critical Thinking Assessment Instrument with the math instructors. Hannah Alford will be asked to analyze the numeric literacy items on the CTAI when she looks at the data collected this fall.
3. During the discussion, there seemed to be consensus among the ALSO members that students’ ability to compute consumer economics problems might be a good representation of numeric literacy, whereas assessing their ability to do calculus would not be a relevant skill set to assess.

Mark (Information Technology and Computer Literacy): Mark was not able to attend the ASLO meeting, but at the beginning of the meeting he handed me a brief report of his findings, which I have included below.)
1. According to Gerry Jenkins in the CBIS department, all courses in COMIS, CBIS, and CS have SLO’s that relate to Information Technology and Computer Literacy.
2. Every SLO in each course taught in these departments (except the 600 band) has been assessed since Fall, 2006.
3. Gerry Jenkins indicated that he would be glad to make a presentation to the committee and that we should see the assessment techniques used in this department as they might be attractive to other departments.
During this discussion, the issue came up as to whether faculty members expect students to *gain knowledge or change their behavior* as a result of their education at LBCC. For example, champions of Wellness and Civic Engagement want students to exhibit specific changes in behavior. On the other hand, in the area of Aesthetics, the emphasis seems to be on supplying students with tools that they may or may not choose to use in their future lives.

**October 7, 2008 meeting**

ASLO committee member Sheng-Tai consulted with English instructors on assessment of creativity. Jeff Epley from the English department visited the ASLO committee to discuss his course on creative composition and his sabbatical leave proposal that involves developing creative nonfiction pedagogy. In his classes he attempts to foster creativity, but assesses students on skill sets he has taught them rather than creativity per se. For example, students create metaphors and similes, and they learn the elements of a lyric poem. The group discussion touched on facets of creativity, such as inventiveness, imaginativeness, mental flexibility, intuition or insight, and resourcefulness.

Committee member Paul Creason reported back on his meeting with the math department faculty. They selected items 7, 9, 11, 22, and 27 on the CTAI as appropriate Numeric Literacy items. Paul conveyed the ASLO committee’s invitation to the math instructors to supply math items for the CTAI, and they may do so in the future. They did not object to placing Numeric Literacy under the Critical Thinking outcome. The ASLO committee members unanimously agreed that a new motion should go to the curriculum committee to put Numeric Literacy under Critical Thinking.

Tricia Alexander made a proposal to group all core competencies under three “umbrella” concepts: Critical Thinking, Communication, and “Personal Development” (a new term). There was general agreement on this approach, although there was some discussion about where a few of the core competencies would best fit. No final agreement was settled upon, so the committee needs to further discuss the matter.

**November 4, 2008 meeting**

The majority of the time allotted for this meeting was devoted to discussing whether ASLO committee members were satisfied with having only one institutional-level learning outcome (ILO): “Students will achieve their personal, educational, and/or career goal,” while recommending to the curriculum committee that the rest of the core competencies become GE program outcomes. The idea behind this change is that all but this one of our current list of institutional core competencies may not be pertinent to a large population of our students, such as those intending to earn certificates to further their career goals or community members signing up for a couple of courses in order to enrich their lives. At one time, our current core competencies were called GE goals, and we are proposing to return to this idea. The consensus of our committee was to make this move, but some members were not happy with having only one institutional-level goal, as it doesn’t sufficiently capture a way in which our college is distinctive from others.

ASLO committee members did not wish to abandon the one remaining institutional-level outcome, but desired to add one or more to it. Eva Bagg mentioned that Long Beach is the most diverse city in the country, and one idea the committee came up with for a second institutional-level outcome was: “Students will engage in respectful interaction with a diverse population of fellow students.” A suggestion was made that our committee share this issue with the rest of our colleagues at the college to get input from a wider group. This was carried out by Tricia Alexander through an email message to the entire full-time faculty.
November 18, 2008 meeting

The majority of the time allotted for this meeting was devoted to discussing the newly proposed ILO: “Students will engage in respectful, cooperative interaction within a diverse community of fellow learners.” Several word changes were suggested. No decision was made on the wording of the second ILO, so it was deferred until the Dec. 2nd meeting.

December 2, 2008 meeting

The majority of the time allotted for this meeting was devoted to going over the four motions that the committee planned to introduce at the Dec. 10th curriculum committee meeting.

The ASLO committee members had already unanimously agreed to make a motion (#1) to change seven of the eight institutional core competencies Critical Thinking, Communication, Aesthetics, Civic Engagement, Creative Thinking, Information Technology and Computer Literacy, and Wellness into GE program outcomes. The remaining institutional core competency, “Goal Attainment: The ability to achieve one’s education, career, and personal goals” will be renamed as an Institutional Student Learning Outcome (ILO). In addition, this ILO needs to be reworded, because we don’t actually want to measure students’ “ability” to achieve their goals, we want to measure whether they do achieve them. So, the newly proposed wording that was decided upon at this meeting was: “Students will achieve their educational, career, and/or personal goals.”

After considerable discussion, the committee decided upon the following wording for a second ILO, which will be proposed (Motion #2) at the next curriculum committee meeting: “Students will engage in respectful interaction within a diverse college community.” Several ways to measure this ILO were discussed, including assessment at the course level by instructors’ observations, as well as looking for a decline in referrals of students to the Student Affairs Dean due to disrespectful, uncooperative behavior.

Motion #3 will be to place Information Technology and Computer Literacy under Communication. This was agreed upon at the previous meeting, and it was not discussed further.

Motion #4 was controversial and was tabled for further discussion at the next meeting. It involved removing Creative Thinking as a GEO and placing the ideas related to it under Critical thinking, and then adding a creativity component to the Aesthetics GEO. The proposed changes involved altering bullet point #2 under Aesthetics (described in the Appendix section of the official Institutional Core Competencies document) to read: “An appreciation of design principles and creativity common to and uniting all of the arts.” Bullet point #2 under Critical Thinking would also be amended to read: “Problem-solving, decision-making, constructing and deconstructing arguments, including creative thinking that would generate original ideas or solutions.”

A proposal to add the term “literature” to the third bullet point under Aesthetics was unanimously approved. It will read: “A willingness to seek out and encounter art, music, dance, literature, and/or theatrical experiences to enhance the student’s leisure pursuits.”

January 20, 2009 meeting

In its December meeting, the curriculum committee rejected the motion to add a second ILO: “Students will engage in respectful interaction within a diverse college community.” As a result (and after considerable discussion), the ASLO committee members decided to shelve the proposal for this ILO for the time being. In the December meeting, many curriculum committee members expressed enthusiasm
over the idea of an ILO pertaining to diversity, but did not like the wording proposed by the ASLO committee. Since this was the best wording the ASLO committee could come up with after devoting the better part of two meetings to the task, we decided we had enough pressing work to do without putting further effort toward creating a new ILO at this time. If we do pick this up again, we intend to look at the standards of conduct code for students to determine whether its wording is adequate, so that an ILO covering respect for diversity might be unnecessary.

March 31, 2009 meeting
Based on the new plan presented by the tribe (a task force) created by the Academic Council, the ASLO committee’s job current task is to (1) develop ILOs and (2) define what is a program and begin the process of helping programs develop program-level outcomes. The ASLO committee examined a list of potential ILOs that Tricia Alexander had synthesized from several different colleges. In making the list, she kept in mind four factors: (1) The new ILOs should align with other documents in existence (e.g., the college mission statement) that outline our college’s purpose; (2) They must be measurable; (3) The proposed ILOs should be broad enough to be relevant to students doing coursework outside of the general education program, and (4) the statements need to be written in a way that make them clearly student learning outcomes. Remember that Barbara Beno gave our college feedback regarding LBCC’s current ILO (Students will achieve their educational, career, and/or personal goals.), saying that it was not actually a learning outcome. Instead, it appears to be an achievement outcome.

April 7, 2009 meeting
The ASLO committee took a second look at the draft ILOs that will be submitted to the curriculum committee for first reading on April 22nd. At the March 31st meeting, the ASLO committee members had agreed that students would need to take more than a couple of courses at LBCC in order for the college to have any likelihood of influencing that student’s development in a significant way. For example, students taking fewer than 12 units might not be expected to show a measurable change on any of the college’s ILOs.

It was further decided by Eva Bagg with agreement from the rest of the ASLO committee that departments would not be expected to measure these institutional-level outcomes. These outcomes will be assessed through the Institutional Effectiveness office. However, across the campus, faculty may be asked to take class time to administer assessment instruments provided by the IE office. While doing program reviews, department members will be asked about the extent to which their programs address the college’s mission statement and institutional learning outcomes.

April 21, 2009 meeting
Only one faculty member responded to Tricia Alexander’s email to the full-time faculty to give feedback regarding the proposed ILOs. This person wanted to know how some of them could be measured, and didn’t like the “Wellness” outcome, as it seemed to imply that students would be weighed and their heart rates measured as they entered and exited the college. This faculty member suggested calling this “physical education.” Instead, Tricia altered the “wellness” ILO to read “wellness education,” as she did not wish to exclude mental health.

April 28, 2009 meeting
On April 22nd, the curriculum committee accepted the ASLO committee’s draft document of proposed ILOs for first reading, with only a few comments. The most substantive one was that the description of the Information Competency ILO was a bit unusual and was different from the GEO on Information Competency. In response, Tricia Alexander proposed to put the ILO on Information Competency,
“Students will learn to collect, evaluate, and use the information that is necessary to achieve their educational, career, and personal goals under the ILO, Personal Development. She drafted new wording to expand the Personal Development ILO to include the gist of the above statement, and this change was accepted by the ASLO committee without further modification.

May 12, 2009 meeting
The content of the ILO motion was modified just prior to going to the curriculum committee for second reading. The third ILO, on Thinking as Reasoning, was streamlined to align it with the GEO on Critical Thinking.

Critical Thinking Assessment Project (ILO)

August 26, 2008 meeting
An update on the Critical thinking Assessment taking place this semester was scheduled. The critical thinking summer task force revised the Critical Thinking Assessment Instrument (CTAI) and recommended that more time be given for students to complete it, as the 30 minutes allowed in the first round of assessment resulted in many students not being able to finish. The task force responded to the reading proficiency issue that was raised after the first test results were reviewed with evidence that this was not an obvious confounding variable. Faculty members have been contacted and the CTAI will be mailed next week.

September 9, 2008 meeting
One of the Summer Institute 2008 projects led to the discovery that a third of the items on LBCC’s Critical Thinking Assessment Instrument (CTAI) could be used to measure Science Literacy. The ASLO committee asked research assistant Hannah Alford to analyze 10 of the 30 items on the CTAI separately, as a measure of Science Literacy.

February 3, 2009 meeting
Tricia Alexander commenced the discussion of the Critical Thinking Assessment Instrument (CTAI) results. Forty-five minutes (instead of the 30 minutes allowed on the first assessment effort) was sufficient time for almost all students to complete the 30-item instrument. The instrument did distinguish between freshmen and sophomores on critical thinking, but only seven of the 30 items were needed to make this discrimination. Freshmen and sophomores were significantly different on Science Literacy items, but not on the Numeric Literacy items. The committee noted that when an item fails to discriminate between freshmen and sophomores, it could be a “bad” item or it could indicate that students are not learning the skill reflected by the item.

Since the items on the CTAI selected to measure Numeric Literacy did not distinguish between freshman and sophomore skill levels, the ASLO committee will ask the math dept. to look at the items. The Math faculty may wish to create new questions. Patty Bucho mentioned that they were solicited for new questions a while back and that they gave no reply. Tricia Alexander indicated that the committee would like the math faculty to define Numeric Literacy for the college.

Paul Creason was asked to share these results with the math department and discuss the Numeric Literacy items. Did the math faculty want to recommend other assessment items for us to try on the critical thinking assessment instrument? Will they define for us what numeric skills constitute Numeric
Literacy? Last semester, the ASLO committee members had agreed amongst themselves that consumer math questions would be good ones for inclusion, but the math department faculty members did not think such items represented the essence of Numeric Literacy. The ASLO committee defers to the math faculty on this.

The ASLO committee discussed concerns that some faculty have with taking up their class time to collect data. Natalia Schroeder mentioned that other programs ask students to complete assessments outside of class time. Students could go to a computer lab on their own time and take the CTAI under controlled conditions. Faculty could send students to a time and place when the CTAI would be offered and grade it as an outside-of-class participation assignment.

Next, there was a discussion of a research study Tricia Alexander had come across in the book, *Freakonomics*, which revealed that some teachers fake results on assessments, such as those used to measure “No Child Left Behind” competencies. This has sometimes taken the form of instructors changing children’s scores on their scantrons before turning them in. The ASLO committee discussed ways in which faculty members could be helped to feel less vulnerable to being singled out because of poor scores, and thus less likely to feel the urge to doctor the results. Aggregating scores within departments might be helpful, although doing so makes the data potentially less valuable as a feedback mechanism. Eva Bagg will ask the TracDat demonstrators to address ways in which their software might help with this issue.

Concern about faculty members fudging data tends to bolster the value of assessment tools such as the CTAI, particularly if the ASLO committee were to develop a strategy in which faculty did not turn in students’ completed forms.

The next step with the critical thinking assessment will be to compare our students’ results with those of faculty, or with more advanced students, such as those at CSULB. A pilot project at CSULB conducted with the CTAI in Fall, 2007, showed that LBCC students performed slightly better on the instrument than did CSULB students. Such comparisons should help determine the validity of the instrument. Also, the items have not yet been analyzed by skill to determine whether there is a difference in performance on the seven different types critical thinking skills assessed by the instrument.

**General Education Outcomes**

**October 21, 2008 meeting**

After attending an assessment conference in October, 2008, Tricia Alexander clarified for the committee the distinction between General Education Outcomes (GEOs) and Institutional-level Outcomes (ILOs). Many colleges reserve institutional outcomes as a designation for outcomes applicable to all students at the college, and treat general education as a program at the college. The accreditation team directed LBCC to develop GEOs, clearly indicating that they did not recognize our institutional core competencies as comparable to GEOs. Our LBCC core competencies used to be called GE goals, and they were designated on the document passed by the curriculum committee as relevant to AA degree and transfer students only. Therefore, all but one of our current core competencies might better be referred to as General Education outcomes. The core competency having to do with students meeting their personal educational goals does fit the concept of an ILO. The ASLO members concurred with this view, although the members haven’t yet decided what to do about it.
Tricia Alexander presented to the ASLO committee the Mira Costa model for institutional, program, and course-level assessment as an example of how to align institutional, program, and course level outcomes. The ASLO committee members liked this model and agreed to move in this direction.

Each assessment strategy has advantages and disadvantages. One problem with leaving various disciplines to measure critical thinking, communication skills, and so on is that the data they feed back to the ASLO committee and IE office for compilation as an institutional assessment may not be meaningfully aggregated. However, what is a distinct benefit is that the disciplines will be more likely to take ownership of their assessment results and find them meaningful in providing feedback as to how to improve instruction.

**November 4, 2008 meeting**

Tricia Alexander posed the question: “If we did make GE a ‘program,’ how could we reconcile the core competencies with the GE plan as it exists now?” Our group noted that there is a pretty good fit between the current core competencies and the “areas” in GE Plans A, B, and C. However, the core competency “Creativity” doesn’t have an area counterpart, nor does the core competency “Information Technology and Computer Literacy.” Creative thinking could be tucked under Critical Thinking and/or Aesthetics, and Information Technology could be subsumed under either Critical Thinking or the Communication outcome.

**November 18, 2008 meeting**

The committee decided to make a motion at the December 10, 2008 curriculum committee meeting that the rest of the core competencies become GE program outcomes. When the full-time faculty was asked via email about making this change, only five responded. Four were positive about the change, and the fifth person objected only until it was explained to him that the core competencies weren’t going away, but were only being relocated. Further ways to present these changes to the college community were discussed. The March 25, 2009 Flex Day would represent one opportunity. Mira Costa College representatives have already been invited to make a presentation on that day. The Board report in March might also be a good opportunity.

Next, the committee addressed further refinements in the core competencies (soon to become GEOs). All but one of the ALSO committee members favored placing Information Technology and Computer Literacy under Communication. A motion will be made to this effect at the Dec. 10th curriculum committee meeting. Creative Thinking will be split up into “bullet points” under both Critical Thinking (creative problem-solving) and Aesthetics (creativity). This change will also be in the Dec. 10th motion to the curriculum committee meeting.

The ASLO committee members were given a template for mapping courses in their discipline areas onto the proposed GEOs and ILOs, as was done in a model given to members that used psychology courses by way of example.

Paul Creason met once again with the math department, and they are on board for putting Numeric Literacy under Critical Thinking, so this should be finalized at the Nov. 19th curriculum committee meeting.

**January 20, 2009 meeting**
The ASLO committee considered dropping its efforts to get a motion passed to remove “listening” from the communication core competency, as recommended by the communication assessment task force, with concurrence from the ASLO committee. The curriculum committee rejected this motion, because the members wanted evidence that the skill of listening isn’t adequately emphasized by our GE curriculum to warrant including it in the communication outcome. Even though providing this evidence will take effort on the part of the entire faculty, the ASLO committee has devised a way to do it, and thus has decided to plunge ahead and ask the faculty to provide this information. Since one grid is already going out to departments for use on the January Flex Day, which pertains to mapping of GE courses onto all GE outcomes, the ASLO committee members hope to send out a companion grid that asks faculty members (while they’re at it) to map their courses onto the four skills (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) of the communication outcome. This is asking for additional work, and risks confusing matters, but we didn’t think it would be any less confusing to send out the communication grid at a later time. Faculty members might glance at it, and assume they had already done it on the January Flex Day.

Next, the ASLO committee took up an issue discussed last December as to whether to remove Creative Thinking as a separate GEO and partition the essence of this outcome between the Critical Thinking and the Aesthetics outcomes. One argument for doing this is that there is no comparable section under the GE plans for creativity. The result of this discussion is that the ASLO committee decided to make a motion to the curriculum committee, amending the Aesthetics outcome to read “Aesthetics and Creativity.” The bullet point that was formerly under Creative Thinking will be put under the newly combined outcome along with the three bullet points for Aesthetics. There will be some minor rewording of the second and third Aesthetics bullet points.

The grid to be sent out to departments on the January 2009 Flex Day for mapping GE courses’ outcomes onto GE program outcomes was discussed, and some minor changes were made. There was controversy over whether to share with faculty members the committee’s plan to ask them for assessment data only on GE outcomes designated as central to each course (a score of 4 or 5). Some committee members worried that faculty might be tempted to go with a score of “3” rather than “4” if it meant there potentially would be less assessment work for them to do. On the other hand, there is some incentive for faculty members to indicate their courses’ relevance to the overall GE program outcomes by using scores of 4 or 5. Furthermore, Mira Costa College’s experience was that faculty members tended to liberally employ a score of “5” when rating their courses, so that a consideration which might constrain this tendency would do no harm. Tricia Alexander cited an example from a Mira Costa presentation that their math faculty gave their courses ratings of “5” on Aesthetics, reasoning that there is nothing more beautiful or eloquent than an equation!

**February 3, 2009 meeting**

On Flex Day, evidence was collected for the ASLO motion to remove “listening” from the Communication core competency, by requiring departments with courses in the GE plans to use the new mapping procedure to indicate the extent to which listening skills are emphasized in each course in Plans A, B, and C of the GE program. Interestingly, of those who responded, the majority rated listening skills as a “4” or “5,” indicating that this is a central focus of their course and that they test or otherwise assess their students on this skill. However, in looking at the courses concerned, the ASLO committee members noted that the list includes courses such as astronomy, chemistry, and geography, so there is a possibility that the rating instructions were misunderstood. ASLO members will need to follow up by clarifying with these faculty members what a rating of “4” or “5” means, and then see whether they want to stick with their current course ratings or modify them.
On the January Flex Day, data was also collected regarding the extent to which each course in GE Plans A, B, and C addresses each of the GEOs. About half of the departments have reported in with their course ratings. ASLO members were asked to contact individual departments for follow up. The volunteer assignments were:

**Wil:** Business Administration, CBIS, CAOT, Distributive Ed, and Philosophy, PE

**Tricia:** History, Poli Sci, Human Services, Social Sci, except Philosophy, Life Science, Physical Science, and the Library course

**Peter:** School of Creative Arts and Applied Sciences

**Paul:** Math and Statistics

**Sheng-Tai:** Foreign Languages

**Mark:** GE Electricity course

**February 3, 2009 meeting**
The motion before the curriculum committee to combine creativity with the Aesthetics outcome was briefly revisited, after feedback was received from a couple of faculty members that Creative Thinking should perhaps be kept as a separate SLO. The ASLO committee decided to go forward with the motion to the Curriculum Committee.

**March 3, 2009 meeting**
ASLO members were asked to follow up with the few GE courses for which we do not yet have ratings on the GE outcomes.

The ASLO committee was updated on the three motions that were made at the last Curriculum Committee meeting. The institutional core competencies no longer exist, and have, with one exception, become GEOs. Two other motions were submitted for first reading. One was to combine Creative Thinking and Aesthetics to create a new GE outcome entitled Aesthetics and Creativity. The second was to subsume Information Competency (what used to be known as Information Technology and Computer Literacy) under the Communication outcome. There was no objection to either motion.

**Communication Assessment Project (GEO)**

**October 21, 2008 meeting**
Tricia Alexander reported on difficulties that the communication assessment group ran into in its attempt to create a standard rubric for assessing communication skills. The assignments that group members have brought to the group for practice using the rubrics have not had enough commonality to make for meaningful comparisons. The assignments have been idiosyncratic and not amenable to being assessed using the common rubric created by the communication group. Natalia Schroeder pointed out that faculty members who volunteered to test the rubrics by using their in-class assignments are not all part of the GE program, so students in these programs would not necessarily have taken the appropriate English classes that would enable them to perform adequately. The classes represented by the faculty members who volunteered to participate would not all be the ones we need to assess under the GE program.

**November 4, 2008 meeting**
The communication group asked Tricia Alexander to recommend to the ASLO committee that “listening” be removed from the description of the Communication core competency. After discussion of the pros and cons of this change, the communication group had a vote, and the majority was in favor of making a motion to the curriculum committee that listening be removed. Not only is listening difficult to assess, but more importantly, only one course in listening is taught at our college, and it is an elective course. Therefore, this skill is not emphasized enough in our curriculum to be considered a core competency.

**November 18, 2008 meeting**

The progress of the communication group was discussed, as well as what to do about faculty members who were paid in full last summer (due to grant constraints) and then flaked out by not attending numerous required meetings during the fall. Several sanctions were proposed, including informing these faculty members that they would be ineligible for future stipends. A method might be developed whereby errant faculty members could “earn” their way back into the committee’s good graces by “redemptive acts.” There might be a way to have stipend checks printed and signed, but held for up to three months pending completion of behaviors stipulated in the contracts.

**Program-Level Outcomes PLOs**

**February 3, 2009 meeting**

The ASLO committee discussed developing program-level outcomes for non-GE program departments. The committee members looked over a list of academic and vocational programs, looking for “natural clusters” that could meaningfully constitute a program, for the purpose of assessment. Natalia Schroeder suggested that the committee might only deal with program-level assessment for those units that have a specific outcome, such as a certificate, license, or degree. Apparently, other colleges have done this, and this interpretation of a program has satisfied our accrediting body.

February 17, 2009

ASLO members followed-up with departments teaching GE courses that had not reported ratings for those courses on the GEO matrix. We ended up with approximately 95% of the two grids completed, an excellent response. The courses still without ratings are CBIS 8B, Comp Science 11, 21; Counseling 7; Creative Arts 41; Dance 1; Fashion Des 32; Film 1; Geology 7; Interdisc Stud 10; Math 27; Public Admin 1; Theater Arts 1, 25, 30.

The committee discussed whether to simply accept faculty ratings of their courses on communication skills and other GE outcomes, or to try to clarify further what a “4” or “5” rating is intended to designate, and see whether faculty members wish to change their ratings. It was decided that further clarification would be a good thing, but after that, the ASLO committee will accept faculty ratings, and move forward to ask for assessment data on the outcomes given a “4” or “5” rating. When faculty members have to think about how to do an assessment of the outcomes, they may reconsider their ratings on their own.

The next step decided upon was that the ASLO committee will ask faculty teaching GE courses to select one of the GE SLOs on which they ranked their courses a “4” or a “5,” for an assessment of that outcome at the beginning of the fall 2009 semester. It was decided that Tricia Alexander should go to the dept. head meeting in two days to give a “heads up” on this expectation.
Faculty members’ choices for assessment tool to use in the fall are as follows: (1) If they want to assess Critical Thinking, Science Literacy, or Numeric Literacy, they may use the CTAI that was developed by the ASLO committee; (2) since faculty teaching the courses have indicated with a “4” or “5” rating that they are already assessing the GE outcome, they should be able to pull assessment data for the college out of the products required from the students taking the course; (3) If faculty members want help designing a new assessment tool, the ASLO committee can be a resource to them in doing this.

February 3, 2009 meeting
Now that an assessment plan for the GE program outcomes is in place, it was decided that the time has come to branch out to programs outside the GE program. ASLO committee members suggested we start with the ESL vocational program, the nursing program (LVN, RN, and Allied Health), and a certificate program-electricity.

March 17, 2009 meeting
Tricia is on the new Program Review and Program Planning Implementation committee. The first meeting of the group was held Friday, March 13th. That same day, Barbara Beno, speaking with President Eloy, Eva Bagg, and Sigrid Sexton, and others via a conference call, indicated that it was the program review problems at LBCC that prompted the warning status rather than our SLO status.

March 31, 2009 meeting
Based on the new plan presented by the tribe (a task force) to Academic Council, the ASLO committee’s job current task is to (1) develop ILOs and (2) define what is a program and begin the process of helping programs outside of the GE program develop program-level outcomes (and programs within the GE program, where appropriate). Committee member Wil Shaw forwarded a list of existing programs as they have been defined by the Program Review Committee, which he chairs. This list will be the committee’s starting point for determining a finite list of programs that need to be assessed. The departments will be given leeway to determine what collection of courses they consider to be a program. However, the ASLO committee will develop some guidelines to help with this process. For example, there may be a unit number guideline, so that, say, a program should consist of no less than 18 units.

At yesterday’s ASLO meeting, each member took on a new responsibility, which is to go to the several department heads within a given school to discuss what programs are in that department. Then, the ASLO members will help the department faculty members develop program-level student learning outcomes for each program that has been defined. These program-level SLOs may be unique to that particular program, but faculty may also adopt outcomes from the GE program or institutional-level outcomes (see our new draft of ILOs) that apply to their program. The self-selected assignments of schools to ASLO members were as follows:

Craig – School of Business
Tricia – School of Social Science
(open) – Public Services
Peter – School of Creative Arts and Applied Sciences
Brenda & Patty – School of Health and Science
Sheng-Tai – School of Language Arts
Mark – Learning Resources, Teaching and Technologies
Wil – School of Physical Education and Recreation
Kenneth – (Absent; School of Trade and Industrial Technologies?)
Natalia – (Absent; Work with Kenneth to tackle School of Trade and Industrial Tech?)
Paul – (Absent; School of Health and Science, too?)

April 7, 2009 meeting
At the 3/31/09 ASLO meeting, each member took on a new responsibility, which was to go to the several department heads within their school to discuss what programs are in that department. Then, the ASLO members will help the departmental faculty members develop program-level student learning outcomes for each program that has been defined. These program-level outcomes may be unique to that particular program, but faculty may also adopt outcomes from the GE program or institutional-level outcomes that apply to their program. A few adjustments in assignments were made, as follows:

Craig – School of Business; History and Political Science Dept.
Tricia – School of Social Science
Peter – School of Creative Arts and Applied Sciences
Paul, Brenda & Patty – School of Health and Science; Public Services
Sheng-Tai – School of Language Arts
Mark – Learning Resources, Teaching and Technologies
Wil – School of Physical Education and Recreation
Ken & Natalia – School of Trade and Industrial Technologies

Tricia Alexander proposed that the ASLO committee members work with the existing list of programs provided by Wil Shaw, as head of program review. When committee members visit the various departments in their “assigned” schools, they should go over the guidelines (the PLO information sheet currently being developed) for defining a program, and ask the department heads and relevant faculty members whether they want to stick with their currently listed programs. In summary, ASLO committee members will (1) help departments list all programs within the department, (2) collect the existing program-level outcomes or help the departmental faculty develop a small number of PLOs (say, from 2-5 of them), (3) send these outcomes to a newly developed email address (programleveloutcomes@lbcc.edu), and (4) report any means of assessing PLOs that are currently underway. Our goal is to do as much of this work as possible before the end of the spring 2009 semester. To assist with this process, Tricia Alexander has developed a PLO information sheet. During this meeting, the ASLO committee looked over this document and made suggestions.

Craig Hendricks had already visited three of the four departments in the school of business, and he reported on the progress in those areas.

April 21, 2009 meeting
Different documents were looked at in order to help the ASLO committee hone in on a definition of a program. Formerly, Fred Trapp was the keeper of the official list of current programs used to send out program review notices. In the past, TOP codes were used to define programs, and from there, departments were allowed to make decisions regarding what constitutes a program. Budget categories are also relevant in defining a program. At this point, the ASLO committee members agree that members assigned to various schools and departments would take the existing list of programs and various guidelines for defining a program that we have collected, and let the departments determine whether they would like to make adjustments to their programs as currently defined by the program review committee. Those assignments are:

Craig – School of Business; History and Political Science Dept.
April 21, 2009 meeting
The bulk of the meeting time was spent discussing how to complete 100% of instructional program learning outcomes by this August, which is the goal set by the “tribe” task force appointed by the Academic Council to develop a plan to satisfying ACCJC’s requirements for removing the warning status.

ASLO committee members will (1) help departments list all programs within the department, (2) collect the existing program-level outcomes or help the departmental faculty develop a small number of PLOs (say, from 2-5 of them, although program members will ultimately determine the number), (3) check the outcomes to confirm that they are measureable/observable, (4) send these outcomes to programleveloutcomes@lbcc.edu, and (5) report any means of assessing PLOs that are currently underway to the same email address. Our goal is to do as much of this work as possible before the end of the current semester.

The committee began to develop a timeline, using remaining Tuesdays in the semester, since this is the day on which the committee meets. These dates are 4/48, 5/5, 5/12, 5/19, and 5/26 (which is during finals week). ASLO committee meetings are already scheduled for 4/28 and 5/12.

Two dates on the timeline were set:

4/28 the ASLO committee members will bring examples of program and course-level SLOs from their assigned schools, and we’ll use them to train our fellow members to recognize and write measureable outcomes. Not all members felt they were proficient at these skills.

6/25 the ASLO committee will hold a “Last Gasp” Workshop for Finalizing Program-Level SLOs

April 28, 2009 meeting
Tricia Alexander shared with the ASLO committee Academic Senate President Sigrid Sexton’s concern expressed at the CPC meeting the previous week that there needed to be consistency across departments in defining programs, so that one department didn’t consider each discipline a separate program, whereas another department collected all disciplines into one program. The committee pondered whether this would indeed be a problem. Eva Bagg suggested that there should be a rationale for these different approaches, but if there were good reasons for individual differences in program definitions, this should be acceptable.

In the past, TOP codes were used to define programs, and from this beginning point, departments were allowed to make decisions regarding what constituted a program. Budget categories are also relevant in defining a program. Also, there needs to be someone in charge of the program who would be responsible for the program review and planning. Using curriculum guides to define programs, as
suggested by an email from Cathy Crane, might be useful, although this approach doesn’t make sense for the Social Science department, because that department shares a curriculum guide with the History/Political Science department, yet the Social Science department in no way coordinates its activities with the History/Political Science department.

At this point, the ASLO committee’s strategy is that members assigned to various schools and departments will take the existing list of programs and various guidelines for defining a program that we have collected, and let the departments determine whether they would like to make adjustments to their programs as currently defined by the program review committee. The committee assignments are:

Craig – School of Business; History and Political Science Dept.
Tricia – School of Social Science, Student Services – instructional components
Peter – School of Creative Arts and Applied Sciences
Paul, Brenda & Patty – School of Health and Science; Public Services
Sheng-Tai – School of Language Arts
Mark – Learning Resources, Teaching and Technologies
Wil – School of Physical Education and Recreation
Ken & Natalia – School of Trade and Industrial Technologies

The following timeline was proposed for completing program outcomes and assessment:

- **4/28** the ASLO committee members will bring examples of program and course-level SLOs from their assigned schools, and we’ll use them to train our fellow members to recognize and write measureable outcomes. Not all members felt they were proficient at these skills.
- **5/11** Summer Institute Applications are due. (program-related assessment projects)
- **5/12** ASLO Committee reviews Summer Institute 2009 applications
- **5/15** Feedback on Stipend Awards due back to Summer Institute applicants.

By **5/19**, ASLO committee members will help departments list all programs within the department, collect the existing program-level outcomes or help the departmental faculty develop them, check the outcomes to confirm that they are measureable/observable, (4) send these outcomes to programleveloutcomes@lbcc.edu and (5) report any means of assessing PLOs that are currently underway to the same email address. Our goal is to do as much of this work as possible before the end of the current semester.
- **6/25** the ASLO committee will hold a “Last Gasp” Workshop for Finalizing Program-Level SLOs
- **7/9** Summer Institute 2009 group meeting and mid-term reports are due.
- **8/21** Summer Institute 2009 Final Reports due

**May 12, 2009 meeting**

Tricia Alexander shared with the ASLO committee the program definition presented to her by Cathy Crane, which, on the instructional side, proposed using the curriculum guides as the main strategy for defining a program. This is the definition that the POG, created by the tribe wants to use as a definition of a program.

**May 12, 2009 meeting**

The POG decided to amend the due date for when PLOs needed to be completed on the college’s assessment plan. The original due date was August, and it was amended to extend until the end of
September. This was done because colleagues were getting confused between course-level and program-level outcomes. Tricia Alexander asked the ASLO committee members whether they were still willing to go ahead with the proposed June 25th workshop, inviting colleagues to show up for assistance in developing program-level outcomes. There was consensus that this was a good idea and general agreement that the ASLO committee members would participate.

**Course-Level Assessment**

**October 7, 2008**
Tricia Alexander conveyed to the group Gerry Jenkin’s offer to demonstrate for the ASLO committee what the CBIS department has done as a course-level assessment strategy. He suggested that this technique would be likely to be useful to other programs on campus. The committee agreed to ask him to speak at the next meeting.

**October 21, 2008 meeting**
Gerry Jenkins from the CBIS department presented the software he has developed to track course-level SLOs. There are 800 SLOs in the CBIS department, spread among more than 50 courses. About five new courses are adopted every year, so that 60-100 SLOs need to be changed annually.

The form of assessment used by CBIS is indirect, which means that students assess how well *they think* they have met each of the course’s SLOs. At first the CBIS department measured students on the first day or class as well as at the end of the semester, but department has not used the pre-test as a part of their assessment process. However, the instructors have found the pre-test data to be useful in helping them work with students during the semester. About 98% of the students complete the assessment online. For those faculty lacking the necessary software to do this type of assessment, a similar survey can be done using a scantron machine.

CBIS program-level SLOs have to do with student success in the job market, and is assessed via a survey after the students graduate. This isn’t done regularly, but was conducted through a grant put together by the CBIS department and the institutional effectiveness dean (Fred Trapp).

**Summer Institutes**

**August 26, 2008 meeting**
In the future, faculty participating in the Summer Institute will be asked to implement some aspect of their summer project in the fall semester of the same year and report on it on a spring flex day presentation in the following year. No decision was reached regarding the creation of a rubric for assessing summer institute projects as “excellent,” “satisfactory,” or “unsatisfactory” in order to give priority in future funding to those departments or individuals who have done good work in the past.

**September 9, 2008 meeting**
The ASLO committee members will have the Summer Institute 2008 final reports to review before the next meeting. There is only one report is outstanding and that is from faculty members involved in the startup of the Student Success project, so the delay is understandable.
September 23, 2008 meeting
The Summer Institute 2008 projects were reviewed. Tricia Alexander evaluated each project as “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory” depending upon whether the participating faculty had completed the project described in their applications and contracts. The ASLO committee members wanted Tricia to communicate with the faculty members whose projects were deemed to be unsatisfactory, in order to give them feedback and an opportunity to provide the missing information. The ASLO committee members decided that the summer institute application needed to become more standardized, so that evaluating the final reports would be easier. For example, sabbatical leave proposals discuss “specific deliverables,” and the ASLO committee could adopt that language. Also, the committee might ask for the summer to be a “design phase” of a project; the following fall to be an “implementation phase;” and the spring Flex Day presentation to be a “report and reflect phase.”

October 7, 2008 meeting
Since the last meeting, Tricia Alexander emailed feedback to those faculty members whose Summer Institute 2008 final reports were not satisfactory, because they did not address all of the elements of the project proposed in the application. So far, only one faculty member has responded. Committee member Natalia Schroeder offered to call each faculty member to follow up.

April 21, 2009 meeting
There is $16,500 available for Summer Institute 2009 stipends, which means we could offer 33 people $500. The committee decided to offer stipends for completing course-level or program-level assessment projects this summer. This would mean that only those who are far enough along to do this, and who are interacting with students this summer would qualify for stipends.

April 28, 2009 meeting
The applications for Summer Institute 2009 have been sent out and are due back May 11th. They will be reviewed by the ASLO committee on May 12th, and applicants will be notified on May 15th.

May 12, 2009 meeting
The bulk of the meeting time was devoted to reviewing the nine applications for Summer Institute 2009 that had been submitted by the May 11th deadline. All but one of the proposals needed follow up inquiry before the committee would agree to offer a contract and a stipend. The committee decided that its bottom-line criterion for funding was that assessment data needed to be collected and analyzed prior to Fall 2009. It looks as though nine projects will be funded.

Professional Development/Flex Day Presentations

October 7, 2008 meeting
The ASLO members approved of the 10/30/08 Flex Day presentation topic on use of rubrics. Faculty from the Communication Assessment Project task force will participate in the presentation.

February 3, 2009 meeting
On the 3/25/09 Flex Day, two presenters from Mira Costa College will give an overview of their college’s assessment plan in a morning session, and in an afternoon session they will discuss “closing the loop” by using the data collected to improve instruction and other services.
The participants in the Summer Institute 2008 will also be presenting their projects from 8:30-10:30am on the March 25th Flex Day.

March 3, 2009 meeting
The ASLO committee was updated regarding Tricia Alexander’s visit to the February 19th department head meeting. The DHs were given a “heads up” that they were going to be asked to do assessment in GE courses at the beginning of the fall semester. The group requested a presentation on SLO assessment at their March 12th meeting. Questions to be addressed are: (1) What does ACCJC want from us?, (2) Where do departmental outcomes fit into the institutional assessment plan?, (3) Are departments being asked to discontinue the assessment they have done on their own, and (4) How does TracDat fit in?

The committee was updated on the planned Flex Day presentations by the Mira Costa College SLO coordinators. Bob Turner and Lynne Miller will be with us from 10:30-3:30. Their 10:30-12:30 presentation is entitled, “Mira Costa College SLO Coordinators Present their College’s Assessment Model: From Defining Terminology to Making Use of the Data.” Their 1:30-3:30 presentation is entitled, “Mira Costa College SLO Coordinators Discuss How They Collect Evidence and Use it to Improve Both Instruction and Other College Services.

March 17, 2009 meeting
The ASLO committee members were encouraged to advertise the planned Flex Day presentations by the Mira Costa College SLO coordinators, Bob Turner and Lynne Miller.

Bobbi Villalobos has offered the ASLO committee $33,000-$50,000 that represents the SLO portion of a Title V grant that has been in effect for three years. This money could be used to hire interns or adjunct faculty to manage data or to train department SLO specialists. Eva Bagg thought this money should be reserved for faculty professional development, because money could be obtained from other sources for hiring interns to manage data. Money for professional development has also been offered by Rose DelGaudio, as long as other colleagues besides faculty were included in the training. The fact that SLO workshops were set up for Flex Day by HR without consultation with the ASLO committee was discussed. A coordinated effort across the campus would be desirable.

March 31, 2009 meeting
A summary of the evaluations received from participants in the March 25th Flex Day presentations was shared with the ASLO committee members. They were quite positive. Almost to a person, participants requested further professional development in the area of SLOs.

The availability of funds for conferences, other types of professional development, and stipends for faculty developing outcomes was discussed. The ASLO committee members were invited by Eva Bagg to make requests.

April 28, 2009 meeting
ASLO members brought in program-level outcomes from their assigned programs, and the remainder of the time was spent discussing the wording of the outcomes as well as whether there were clear ways to measure them.
Accreditation

October 7, 2008 meeting
The accreditation team will arrive next week for a site visit. Tricia Alexander asked committee members if there was anything in particular they wanted the accreditation committee team to know about their assessment efforts. Eva Bagg indicated that the accreditation team would probably ask about dean involvement as well as what the ASLO committee is doing to involve the adjunct faculty and students in the SLO work. Committee members offered that adjuncts participate in Flex Day activities and SLOs are included in course syllabi for all sections of some courses, as a departmental policy. Two adjuncts are currently serving on the Communication core competency assessment task force. Two ALSO members indicated that they engage their students in discussions about the course-level and institutional-level SLOs. A small group of approximately 50 students were surveyed during the process of developing the institutional core competencies, and they selected critical thinking, communication, and pursuing their personal educational goals as the top three outcomes in importance.

February 3, 2009 meeting
The warning status given LBCC by ACCJC makes it imperative that the ASLO committee continue to develop a comprehensive assessment plan. Toward that effort, three handouts were given to the ASLO committee as food for thought: (1) LBCC: from Vision to Outcomes, (2) the latest versions of the ASLO Action Plan, and (3) the latest version of the ASLO Timeline.

March 3, 2009 meeting
The committee was updated on the formation of a “tribe” by the Academic Council for the purpose of formulating a plan to satisfy accreditation requirements by October 15th. This plan will be solidified over the next couple of weeks. At their first meeting today, the tribe members decided to use the Nichols model and to amend the Course Outlines of Record to separate a small number of Course Outcomes, which will be assessed on an ongoing basis from a generally larger number of Course Objectives. Peter Knapp pointed out that the method for assessing what are to become the Course Objectives is already included in the Course Outline of Record under the Evaluation section, so some mention of how the SLOs are to be assessed should perhaps be included in the COR as well.

The formation of the tribe appears to remove the formulation of a new timeline and updating of the ASLO Action Plan from the purview of the ASLO committee, so this item was removed from the agenda. At this time, it is unclear what the ASLO committee’s new role will be in moving the college forward on SLO assessment, but this ambiguity should be cleared up by the next ASLO committee meeting.

March 17, 2009 meeting
The committee was updated on the work of the “tribe” created by the Academic Council for the purpose of formulating a plan to satisfy accreditation requirements by October 15th. This plan was submitted to the Academic Council a couple of hours prior to the ASLO meeting. Eva Bagg went over the gist of the plan for the benefit of the ASLO committee.

Finally, Barbara Beno gave feedback regarding LBCC’s one ILO, saying that she did not consider it to be a learning outcome. In an effort to get the ball rolling to formulate alternative ILOs, the ALSO committee agreed to hold an extra meeting the following Tuesday. The committee members volunteered to bring in ILOs and mission statements from local community colleges. Assignments were as follows:
Committee members may, of course, bring additional samples of the mission statements and ILOs or other colleges.

**Establishment of ISLO Committee**

**August 26, 2008 meeting**
The committee members discussed whether the concept of Student Learning Outcomes was meaningful for operations at the college that do not involve direct contact with students. The members decided that since a “student learning outcome” is what a student comes out with; what a student knows or can do as a result of an experience at LBCC, then this term isn’t accurate for outcomes at the college that do not involve student contact. Service Unit Outcomes and Administrate Outcomes are terms used by other colleges.

**September 9, 2008 meeting**
Senate President Sigrid Sexton had requested feedback from the ALSO committee regarding the expected charge of the proposed ISLO committee to handle assessment activities in non-instructional areas. Several comments were made and forwarded to Sigrid.

**Coordination with Student Success Committee**

**November 18, 2008 meeting**
Mark Matsui agreed to be the ASLO representative to the Student Success committee. No one on the ASLO committee volunteered to serve on the new ISLO committee, but the group thought perhaps a faculty member from among the Summer Institute participants might be willing to do it.