Call to Order

Tricia Alexander, Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Sign-in sheet circulated

Approval of the Agenda

Agenda approved by ASLO Committee for April 7th, 2009.

Approval of the Minutes

Minutes not yet approved by ASLO Committee for March 31st, 2009 – to be sent to committee by email.

Public/Faculty Comments (must pertain to item[s] on the agenda)

Reports (information only)

Unfinished Business

Further discussion of draft document of ILOs to recommend for adoption. The goal is to have a satisfactory draft by the end of the meeting to send to the full-time faculty, ISLO committee, and others for feedback. We’re aiming for a motion to the curriculum committee on April 22nd.

Under the Diversity ILO, the word respect is attitudinal – is “awareness of others’ opinions” also attitudinal? Would faculty be able to monitor and report on these? E. Bagg thought that surveying faculty would be an adequate way to address this. M. Matsui’s area can help with providing evidence to evaluate this ILO. P. Creason said we need to ask students, “Have you been exposed to another culture?” and “Have you actually learned something else about others?” W. Shaw added that in ALL LBCC classes, there is likely to be exposure to diversity.

Regarding the Personal Development ILO, P. Bucho asked, “How do we measure dependability?” T. Alexander asked, “Could the criteria be things such as whether students get papers in on time?” T. Alexander asked whether reliable and dependable were the same thing? The committee decided to drop “dependable” as redundant. The committee wanted to keep the terms “reliable” and “accountable.” T. Alexander asked whether accountability was a separate thing from reliability, and the committee members seemed to think so. Also, under the “c” portion, Self-Management Skills, should working independently be considered an example of being reliable? The committee decided to reword and consolidate the ideas expressed in this section. In addition, the group agreed that “personal enrichment” is a better term than “personal growth” in the general description of personal development.

The committee considered explicitly adding science literacy and numeric literacy under the critical thinking portion of the third proposed ILO, Thinking and Reasoning, but didn’t come to a decision about it.

Should we align the ILOs with the GE & program level outcomes? Is there an outcome that corresponds to the GE outcome “wellness” among the proposed ILOs? T. Alexander thought it would fit nicely under “personal development”. A vote was taken, and the majority wanted to add “wellness” under the Personal Development ILO. T. Alexander asked whether the committee was okay with her taking the description of wellness from the GEOs and putting it into the ILOs document. The committee was fine with that.

Should the committee add other outcomes found under GEOs?” T. Alexander advised the committee to align the GEOs with the ILOs in order to avoid confusion. She liked the idea of asking faculty to again rate their courses on the ILOs using the same 0-5 scale they used for the GEOs. The rest of the committee preferred to have the ILOs measured more globally, with the responsibility for this
assessment being shouldered by the Institutional Effectiveness office. Individual faculty members would not be expected to assess ILOs.

P. Knapp did not think we can do an “apples to apples” comparison between GEOs and ILOs. Some kind of ‘global instrument’ will be in place in order to assist with the evaluations. He said that it might be a good idea to also create a ‘vocational grid’ that is comparable to the GEOs, with the ILOs being above both of those. Then, the GEOs would take care of half of the house and the vocational outcomes would take care of the other half of the house.

The draft of ILOs will be sent out to the faculty via email this week and then will go to the curriculum committee as planned on April 22nd.

B. Review program definition documents and timeline for visiting departments to help with program-level SLO development. Decide whether to publicize names of committee members handling each school, to encourage department heads to contact their designated ASLO member.

It was decided that we need 100% participation on program reviews by August, 2009. Committee members have been assigned to the different schools and need to visit department heads to get two or three outcomes for each program. T. Alexander has been working on a document that should help with this process. The committee reviewed it briefly and made a couple of suggestions.

VIII. New Business

A. There are funds for Summer Institute 2009. What guidelines shall we give applicants in terms of the types of projects we want them to work on this summer: **Will be added to next meeting agenda.

IX. Next Meeting: April 21st, 2009 in C100A. (Tuesday after Spring Break)

X. Adjournment: 4:00 p.m.