

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

March 17, 2009

1:00 - 3:00 p.m.

V111

MINUTES

Members Present: Phyllis Arias, Eva Bagg, Cathy Crane, Rose DelGaudio, John Downey, Ann-Marie Gabel, Shauna Hagemann, Peter Knapp, David Morse, Eloy Oakley, Kevin Ryan, Sigrid Sexton, Natalia Schroeder, Christopher Villa, Joan Zuckerman

Absent: Donald Berz, Lou Anne Bynum

Note Taker: M'Shelle Reece

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The meeting minutes of February 17, 2009 were approved adding an agreed upon statement regarding the creation of the Program Review Taskforce.

3. SLO Tribe and Program Review Taskforce Report & Recommendations

Dr. Morse provided an update on the work of the Program Review Taskforce. The taskforce has met and divided up into several work groups focusing on different parts of the taskforce charge. The work groups plan to meet together with rough drafts for discussion and assessment of possible resources needed and will meet again for a full day to finalize their proposal. Their proposal will then be shared with the college at large through various venues to solicit feedback. They will meet again on April 20 to incorporate this feedback and finalize their proposal for presentation before the College Planning Committee on April 23.

President Oakley, Academic Senate President Sexton, Dr. Bagg, and CCA President Sheaffer had a conference call with ACCJC President Dr. Barbara Beno asking questions and clarification regarding our ACCJC Evaluation Report recommendations. Their discussion unveiled the following information and guidance from Dr. Beno:

- The ACCJC's Program Review recommendation is equally responsible for our warning status, and should be given equal importance and urgency, as the SLO recommendation

- Clarification on requirements for SLOs at the program, course, institutional levels
 - *courses not connected with a program need only course level outcomes*
 - *Inactive courses should be deleted from our catalog (streamlining the process for deletion and reactivation of courses was discussed)*
- The frequency of our SLOs should not be standardized but based upon reasoning which can be defended
- Recommendation to revise our Institutional Level SLO to elicit outcomes directly related to student learning. As currently created, our Institution level SLO will collect achievement data rather than direct evidence of student learning.
- Regarding the faculty evaluation portion of the recommendation, it was clarified that the SLO data collected is not intended to be used in individual faculty members' evaluations but rather the data may be used to evaluate how faculty use and apply SLO data gathered to self-evaluate and make improvements in teaching methods in the classroom

Dr. Bagg gave an update regarding the work and recommendations of the SLO Tribe and distributed three handouts. The first document, LBCC Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Blueprint, was created with the intention of capturing a comprehensive view of all of the assessment related requirements for the entire college. The blueprint identifies four major work strands. These work strands include course-level assessment, program-level assessment, institution-level assessment, and process management. Subgroups will be identified to take responsibility for each of the major areas included in blueprint. In addition, the SLO Tribe recommends that an Assessment Resource Team be established that supports all levels of assessment and all phases of the assessment cycle for instructional, student support services and administrative units of the college. This team should include experts on each of the phases of assessment who are to be deployed to provide guidance and professional development for departments throughout the college as their needs arise. The blueprint also identifies four work strand oversight groups. The fourth group, the Process Oversight Group, is a new entity that will be responsible for coordinating activities across the strands and supporting resource development and deployment, as there will be extensive support needs in terms of professional development, training, documentation materials, and personnel. A charge is to be developed for this group and brought back for review at the next Academic Council meeting.

The blueprint also sets forth a timeline indicating the level of development or completion that is recommended to satisfy the Commission's expectations for SLO assessment (Phase I) and for guiding the college toward achieving further progress with student learning outcomes assessment that will be reported in the midterm report to ACCJC in October 2011 (Phase II). Assessment targets and development milestones are also indicated through October 2012 (Phases III and IV) when proficiency in SLO assessment is expected.

The second document, ACCJC Warning Tasks - Phase I, delineates each task required to address our SLO recommendation. Associated with each task are the lead groups or

positions responsible for task completion and a list of needed resources. The SLO Tribe has captured resource needs at a high-level, but acknowledges that more specific resource requirements will be determined by the work groups as they begin to execute their respective charges.

The third document, Work Strand Template, is an incomplete draft that provides a visual sample of how the broader task list can be delineated by the designated work groups.

In addition to the submission of the blueprint, the SLO Tribe strongly recommends that an Accreditation Oversight Group be immediately established to address all of the recommendations in the ACCJC warning letter and in the Evaluation Team Report. This oversight group is to provide high-level leadership and commitment to the activities and needs of each work strand, coordinated and efficient resource appropriations, and institutional focus and mobilization.

It was recognized that college-wide education of SLOs is crucial and a challenge and we must plan to use all available opportunities for this purpose; i.e., College Day, flex days, revise contract language to include SLOs in college service hours.

President Oakley expressed concern and asked that the ASLO Committee be assured of the value and importance of their work and that their work is on going. He emphasized that their involvement and coordination in the plans set forth addressing our SLO accreditation recommendation is essential.

The next report to ACCJC needs to be drafted, vetted out the college and ready to go before the Board of Trustees in September. It was agreed that individuals responsible for drafting the first report should also be involved in drafting the follow-up report, with specific mention of Julian DeIGaudio and inclusion of classified staff.

President Oakley thanked members of the SLO tribe for this blue print, acknowledging all for the hard work and time spent creating this blueprint.

4. Development of Plan for ACCJC Response

Next steps of action in our ACCJC response will be:

- Faculty to move forward on course level outcomes
- The ASLO Committee to continue their work on program level and institutional level outcomes
- The ISLO Committee to also provide input to the development of institutional level outcomes
- Assemble the Accreditation Oversight Committee
- Assemble and create charge for the Process Oversight Group

5. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.