Assessment of Student Learning
Outcomes Committee
Meeting Minutes
September 9th, 2008
D352
2:30 – 4:00 p.m.
Tricia Alexander, Chair

Members Present: Tricia Alexander, Chair; Eva Bagg; Patty Bucho; Sheng-Tai Chang; Paul Creason; Brenda Harrell; Peter Knapp; Mark Matsui; Natalia Schroeder; Wil Shaw; John Smith; Ken Tsuji.

I. Call to Order
II. Roll Call
III. Approval of the Agenda
IV. Public/Faculty Comments (must pertain to item[s] on the agenda)
V. Reports (information only)
VI. Unfinished Business

We are still in the brainstorming stage and we are trying to find a way to get to 2012. The committee decided to make have T. Alexander take a motion to the curriculum committee to make the Science Literacy core competency a sub-set of Critical Thinking and the Teamwork and Collaboration core competency a sub-set of Communication.

The committee turned its attention to course-level SLOs. J. Smith reminded us that we need to get from objectives to outcomes – N. Schroeder said the course objectives listed on the course outlines are actually outcomes, but they are called objectives. She would like a better definition of SLO – what does it really mean to us? She would like to make faculty fully versed on the exact definition. An additional issue is that the course outlines have about 20 objectives, but reducing them down to 3 or 4 outcomes would make the assessment project more manageable.

T. Alexander like an idea mentioned by J. Smith during the meeting that program level outcomes might be used as course level outcomes, so that courses within a program would have the same outcomes. B. Harrell & P. Bucho said they aren’t sure that would work for them.

Eva Bagg will be visiting El Camino College on October 2nd, 2008 to hear about their SLO program software. ASLO members are welcome to go along!!

T. Alexander brought up J. Smith’s proposal from the last meeting that one large assessment test might be feasible to measure all core competencies at once. She thought this idea was worth exploring but cautioned that you cannot assess oral communication ability using a paper and pencil test. This means that there are some things you won’t be able to assess with a written assessment tool. J. Smith says not so, you could find out some things regarding oral capabilities from the paper test. J. Smith says you just have to work harder to create an instrument that doesn’t fit perfectly. He likes the Likert Scale as a tool for assessment. The group decided to try this out.

Core Competency Assignments:
Aesthetics – P. Knapp
Civic Engagement – C. Hendricks
Creative Thinking – S-T. Chang
Information Technology & Computer Literacy – M. Matsui
Numeric Literacy – P. Creason
Wellness – J. Smith

Group members were to keep in mind that data may already exist that measure these core competencies – we may just need to work on collecting it.

T. Alexander said that S. Sexton wanted feedback from the ASLO committee on the current draft of the proposed charge for the still-to-be-formed ISLO committee. Some want to label it a “steering committee” insinuating that the new committee would be in charge of the ASLO committee. We think the ISLO should be our “companion committee.”
N. Schroeder feels we should align the committees — we want their collaboration, but we don’t want to be tied to them. She also pointed out that the word ‘institutional’ is extremely misleading. E. Bagg asked what if this committee (ASLO) sets the standard for ISLO, so that the ISLO then reports to us.

P. Creason feels we should drop the “counselors are faculty, too” thing — we (other faculty) do not need to be reminded of that.

T. Alexander then asked what she should go to Sigrid with.” Do we want to ask why student services are here? The committee does not like the word “institutional” in the title of the proposed committee. We ended today with acknowledging better clarification is definitely needed.