Assessment of Student Learning
Outcomes Committee

Meeting Minutes
November 18th, 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; 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

A message regarding the proposed changes in the core competencies, making all but one of them GE SLOs and adding a new ISLO, was sent out to the full-time faculty, and five responses were received. What little response there was was positive. E. Bagg thought that the March board meeting would be a good time to present the changes to the college community. The March Flex Day will also be an opportunity to share the changes with others at the college.

The ASLO committee discussed the wording of the proposed new institutional student learning outcome. The tentative wording is: “Students will engage in respectful, cooperative interaction within a diverse college community.” One member stated that ISLOs need to be a “know” or a “can-do” idea. The current wording for the new ISLO has the terminology “will engage,” which doesn’t say what the student will know or be able to do as a result of going to college at LBCC. J. Smith said that “will engage” is what the students will be doing while here at LBCC – it’s something they do when achieving an outcome.

N. Schroeder said she likes the phrase “students will gain an awareness of” or “students will appreciate an awareness of.” J. Smith suggested the wording, “The student will appreciate the advantages of learning/interacting in a diverse college community.” Some other terminology that would work was “effectively navigate” and “function effectively.” T. Alexander asked each person around the table, these are the responses:

- P. Knapp - to appreciate
- M. Matsui - to navigate effectively
- S. T. Chang - to function effectively
- J. Smith - to “gain” something
- P. Creason - still likes ‘engage’
- N. Schroeder - feels ‘create’ and ‘engage’ are similar – she likes them both
- B. Harrell - okay with engage
- P. Bucho - engage/navigate are fine
- E. Bagg - navigate carries a lot of potentially valuable connotations
- W. Shaw - doesn’t care how it’s worded

P. Creason said that he really wants diversity to come through strongly. He does like what P. Knapp said about using the term “appreciate”. He feels ISLO #2 really seems like two separate concepts:

1. Students will appreciate a diverse college community environment.
2. Students will engage in respectful, cooperative interaction.

-or this-

Students will appreciate a diverse college community AND they will engage in respectful, cooperative interaction.
P. Bucho says she has parents who are registering their kids for them – what she wants to see is the student doing it for themselves, learning to navigate the system. So, she really likes the verb ‘navigate.’ T. Alexander suggested ‘navigate’ could be included in a bullet point under ISLO #1.

How would this new ISLO be measured? Attendance? Appropriate participation? Having a tolerance for diversity?

T. Alexander asked if we are getting ready to talk to the curriculum committee about moving Information Technology and Creative Thinking under Communication and Critical Thinking, respectively. J. Smith says that Info Tech should be by itself. What does the committee think? All but one member wanted to move Info Tech under Communication, although E. Bagg thought it would possibly fit better under Critical Thinking.

S. T. Chang reminded everyone that there is no ‘right way’ to organize these concepts. T. Alexander agreed that we can organize the SLOs any way we see fit, yet we must be prepared to explain our rationale, and gain approval by the rest of the college community.

Do we like Creative Thinking under Critical Thinking? There was general agreement to divide up Creative Thinking and turn it into bullet points under both Critical Thinking (creative problem-solving) and Aesthetics (creativity).

A faculty member from ASLO was sought to serve on the Student Success committee. M. Matsui volunteered. T. Alexander & E. Bagg will co-chair the new ISLO committee and would like one more participant from the ASLO committee. No one volunteered, so E. Bagg suggested we should open this up to faculty members who have participated in the summer institutes.

P. Creason & T. Alexander spoke with the math department on flex day. One math instructor mentioned that not all math problems rise to the level that would classify them as ‘Critical Thinking,’ but the math department is on board with placing Numeric Literacy under Critical Thinking, and we’ll soon know if the curriculum committee will approve this change.

The assessment of communication committee met for the last time on 10/31/08. One issue that needed to be discussed by the ASLO committee was what to do about faculty who didn’t follow through with their assignments after having been paid. P. Creason talked about the need to pay grant money out of a specific year to use up funds when it is grant money. Someone said that we could possibly tell the uncooperative faculty members that they would not be able to participate in the future. Would it be possible to have all the checks sent to the SLO Coordinator to hold until all work has been submitted? Other ideas were discussed.