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

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

P. Knapp started off by saying he really likes the general flow of things, consolidating the SLOs. P. Creason talked again about how most colleges have only four or five core competencies and also stated that he believes there is still some confusion on what this process will be. T. Alexander talked about wanting to come up with a coherent plan this year to send out to our colleagues.

T. Alexander wanted to know what the group thought of the one institutional SLO that we would have left if we moved the rest of the core competencies to make them GE SLOs. W. Shaw said that we should have a couple of institutional level goals; that the one we have isn’t enough. M. Matsui liked the one ISLO about students achieving the personal, educational, and career goals, because it is broad enough to cover the entire student body.

J. Smith stated everything can fit under it, but he does think there may need to be more. He also believes that 80% of our students do not have a goal for their college experience. They have no clue. E. Bagg thought we should keep what we have and work on refining it a bit. There may be another one or two SLOs we could add. We could say something about engaging in the diversity. N. Schroeder suggested we take a look at the mission statement, and have an SLO about transfer readiness, community outreach, etc.

P. Bucho says that what happened was that the core competencies came first, and the mission statement was rewritten to match the core competencies. Maybe we should have an ISLO about civic engagement. She thought that we should have at least one institutional level outcome outside of the AA/AS degree level. The one we have is good, but we shouldn’t shut down other parts of the college that may contribute positively.

T. Alexander says she doesn’t want to add anything else without first really looking at it, as we have been trying to consolidate the core competencies to make our assessment task more manageable. N. Schroeder added that we should find some evidence first, and approach it that way. T. Alexander reminded the group that students and faculty selected “attainment of personal, educational, and career goals” as one of the top 3 SLOs that the college should concentrate on, so there is some evidence supporting this ISLO.

P. Creason likes the simplification of it all. He says what we have now is way too many, and just too detailed. It really should be cut back to four or five SLOs at the most. Paul has suggested the following core competencies: Communication, Critical Thinking, Economic & Civic Development, Culture (including aesthetics, arts – they ‘expose’ you), and Health & Wellness.

S-T. Chang suggested that, in the future, possibly having just one class that talks about educational goals might be useful. Some students are too narrowly focused, others have basically no focus.

T. Alexander wanted to know whether the group thought Informational Literacy could be put under Critical Thinking. P. Creason recommended putting it under communication. Informational Literacy has in its definition “…able to convey communication.”
T. Alexander suggested that the group should slip Creative Thinking under Critical Thinking and “forget about” it. N. Schroeder asked, “Couldn’t Creative Thinking work under any program, anywhere?” Paul made the comment that in reality, there are two different aspects of creative thinking.

Finally, T. Alexander asked the ASLO members whether they wanted to make a motion to the curriculum committee that “listening” be removed from the Communication core competency, as recommended by the Communication group. M. Matsui shared that the definition of reading, writing, speaking is somewhat troubling to him – he has 30 deaf students, 25 of whom do not speak – but he has chosen to bite his tongue whenever the communication core competency was discussed. He said he has to wonder what his students must think of that SLO. There was controversy over the issue of removing listening, so the group voted: FOR (removing listening) = 6; OPPOSED = 3