2012-13
Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Subcommittee
Summary of Work

Actions for the year
(According to the Annual ACCJC Report submitted April 1, 2013)

Courses
SLOs on Course Outlines 100% (1311 out of 1312 courses)
Course Assessment Plans 98% (1281 out of 1312 courses)
Ongoing Assessment of SLOs (course SLOs closed the loop) 39% (516 out of 1312 courses)
Courses Reporting/Due for Review this Year 67% (158 out of 235 courses)

Programs
SLOs/Mission Statement on Curriculum Guides 94% (85 out of 90 programs)
Program Assessment Plans 94% (85 out of 90 programs)
Ongoing Assessment of SLOs (program SLOs closed the loop) 36% (32 out of 90 programs)
Programs Reporting/Due for Review this Year 71% (12 out of 17 programs)

Student Support Services
Program Assessment Plan 100% (14 out of 14 programs)
Ongoing Assessment of SUOs 43% (6 out of 14 programs)

Institution
GEO Assessment Plan & Timeline 100% (479 out of 479 courses)
Ongoing Assessment of GEOs 40% (2 out of 5 GEOs)
Qualitative Summary 2012-2013

The work of the ASLO subcommittee began with three significant changes. First, the SLO Coordinator’s position release time was decreased from 60% to 40% release time. In addition, the part-time classified clerical position was eliminated. Lark Zunich was approved by the Academic Senate to be the new SLO Coordinator.

The work of the ASLO subcommittee began before the fall 2012 semester. In August of 2012 SLO Coordinator, Lark Zunich, planned and executed a three-hour training for adjunct faculty. This included discipline specific break-out sessions. Over 200 people participated in the training.

In September, Vice President of Academic Affairs, Gaither Lowenstein, sent a letter to all full-time and part-time faculty outlining expectations for SLO participation that included the mandate that every faculty member would assess one or more SLOs in each and every course he/she taught. He also name consequences for those who were not involved in the SLO process. This mandate had far reaching consequences for the ASLO subcommittee as it required many more trainings to be available. The ASLO subcommittee worked within the mandate while expressing concern that SLO assessments were never meant to be punitive. A great deal of time was spent within the ASLO subcommittee debating these mandated changes and how the work of the SLO Officers was impacted. There was concern for the quality of assessments and the gathering of meaningful data by faculty who felt under duress to perform SLO assessment tasks.

Training and Professional Development focused on empowering faculty to take control of the SLO process. This was accomplished by several workshops designed to the reframe SLO conversation away from forced compliance based on requirements of an outside agency to an opportunity to exercise academic freedom within each discipline and for faculty to exert local success criteria as well as local faculty control. Workshops included, Protecting Academic Freedom, We Have Data- Now What?, Closing the Loop, and Communication. Multiple workshops of each title were developed, planned and presented by the SLO Coordinator.

Along with reframing and continuing education about the benefits and vitality of SLOs for teaching and learning, the ASLO subcommittee continued working on methods of data collection and accurate record keeping. A ParScore work group created an instruction manual and attempted to test the existing scantron machines for the purposes of SLO assessments and data collection. A protocol was established for using TracDat. This included on-going workshops for SLO Officers, establishing deadlines, and establishing a process for the monthly transfer of SLO changes from TracDat to the Curriculum Database.

In the Area of General Education Outcomes:
In the fall semester artifacts were collected for the cultural sensitivity and diversity component of the civic engagement GEO. The communication GEO saw the completion of the writing component as well as the development of the rubric and collection or artifacts for the reading component. Finally, data were collected for the speech component of the communication GEO. In the spring semester, the rubric for the aesthetics and creativity GEO was developed, and a new group of faculty worked on applying the reading rubric to gathered artifacts. Data collection continued. By
February raw data had been collected for the reading and speech sections of the Communication GEO. The Civic Engagement GEO is languishing due to lack of engagement by faculty members and needed assistance from Institutional Effectiveness on how to properly proceed.

Knowing that the 2012 ACCJC self-assessment proficiency rubric report was coming due, Institutional Effectiveness helped set an agenda for more actively encouraging departments to “close the loop” based on collected SLO data.

There were also on-going snags for the ASLO subcommittee. First, the committee experienced many vacancies and appealed to the Academic Senate to make it a priority to find ASLO committee members. The second problem was communication with the faculty and college community. The subcommittee members did not feel the newsletter was an effective way to communicate with faculty. In lieu of a newsletter ASLO subcommittee members were charged with finding a new format for communication. Additionally, the GEO assessment lacked commitment by full-time faculty to use rubrics on collected artifacts.

Finally, Vice President Lowenstein also ended the financial backing for the SLO Officer pilot program. Without the assistance of SLO Officers working with discipline specific faculty to continue the SLO movement, the ASLO subcommittee voted to create a full-time classified position that would lend expertise and assistance to all faculty and continue the SLO work across campus. The SLO coordinator worked with the CCA negotiating team and the Vice President of Academic Affairs to create a classified position and two SLO Officers per school to assist the ASLO subcommittee in working directly with faculty. The Board of Trustees approved the classified position of Educational Assessment Research Analyst and the CCA negotiating team secured funding for 10 faculty stipends that they named Accreditation Mandate Advisors. The name change away from SLO Officers or Advisors was not done with input or consent of the of the ASLO subcommittee.