Attending: John Sewart, Tabitha Conway, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Teresa Morris, Kevin Sinarle, Santiago Perez

1. Approval of the agenda: Jennifer Taylor Mendoza had to leave early but had an important update, so was added to the top of the agenda. Also, because Item #5 (data management) was directly related to her update, we moved it up the agenda.

2. Approval of minutes from 10/4/2016 – to be approved subsequent to the meeting, to give participants time to review.

3. Announcement from Jennifer Taylor Mendoza re disaggregation. Jennifer went to a training for new evaluators for ACCJC, given by Richard Wenn. The training spent a lot of time focusing on IB6, which talks about the disaggregation of learning outcomes & achievement data. No one is confused about disaggregating achievement data in general, but everyone has been confused about whether or not learning outcomes should be disaggregated, and how.

Wenn says he is aware that the colleges are panicking, and there will be a communications piece sent out shortly; but first of all, stop panicking. This is not something that colleges need to implement tomorrow, but can implement over time. ACCJC do want faculty to look at where students are struggling, and identify and close achievement gaps. But accreditation visitors are not being told to put colleges on warning for not yet having collected disaggregatable student outcomes data. So long as there is a planning process intended to disaggregate SLO data, they will not ding anyone.

This is comforting news: ACCJC gets that this is something colleges need time to figure out. However, it doesn't really change the end goal. Madeleine says that we have been going around telling people that they need to move towards collecting SLO data like course grades – every time, on every student – and this message remains unchanged.

We re-read the language of IB6, which says that the college disaggregates and analyzes learning outcome achievements – institution identifies performance gaps – this guides allocation, etc. The emphasis is on making sure that the institution knows about achievement gaps, and considers them when allocating resources.

We already do this, of course, in program review. And that, apparently, is going to be OK with ACCJC for the time being.

4. Who will look after the data?

(Originally item #5 on the agenda, but the discussion flowed out of Jennifer's summary of the ACCJC workshop, so we moved it up.)

The need for disaggregatable data points to the need for the right kind of database and data management.

We discussed whether Canvas can help with keeping disaggregated data. We considered using online students as a sort of pilot group for data collection, with online instructors collecting data from their students through Canvas.

Ultimately, though, SLOs sound like grades. We need to collect them like grades. If we use samples, at-risk or small populations (the ones that ACCJC are most interested in) tend to disappear. If SLO assessment data is being considered as a metric of student success, we need to treat them like grades – we should just go there.

John Sewart brought up the need for uniformity. People can't have their own metric. We should have a scale – Madeleine suggested the 1-5, where 3 is competence – and have everyone use it. ACCJC always looks for the institution-wide metric.

We discussed the difficulties of disaggregatable data. Suppose everyone could log SLO results, like grades, on each student; and suppose we periodically asked PRIE to run us a report – say, showing the results for two different populations, or from two different SLOs in different semesters, or whatever. How much of a difficulty would this pose? John said that it is no big deal – once you've created the script, which *does* take some work, it's basically just another column added to the metrics. Not a problem.

What about GE SLOs? Shouldn't we disaggregate that data too? Answer: Yes, and we can do so with mapping (and perhaps also with qualitative GE activities, though these will always target smaller populations).

3. Chair updates

- Visit to ASGC on 10/25: Madeleine presented ASGC with a summary of the summary of the report recommendations: basically, that we need to do three things -
  1. Get everyone assessing like they grade
  2. Introduce an "assessment" flex day, a flex activity time slot set aside for interesting activities
  3. Introduce coherent, college-wide policies where needed, for example in metrics (see above) or clarifying course objectives v. SLOs.
  ASGC did not seem all that excited, but are ready to consider things, IF the college can guarantee support. The thing that always comes up is the recording of SLO data: having to fuss with a separate form, using Tracdat, inputting bitty results from different outcomes, hassling colleagues. If we can make it so that faculty simply collect SLO data as part of their grading, they will be a lot easier about things. We are arguing for a data entry position in ASLT to help with this.

By the way, prior to ASGC, Madeleine visited the Center for Academic Excellence committee to present the "assessment day" idea. They *loved* it.

- LSCs and SS interviews so far: Madeleine has talked to about ten different people/services. The overall picture is different from the instructional side; because student services and learning services don't give grades, they really do need a way of gauging how well they're doing, so SLOs serve a purpose. However, they have the same dislike of Tracdat (no one uses it to generate reports), and the same sense that the SLO mandate isn't all that helpful. They are mostly very interested in revised GE SLO language; although some of them do fit neatly into the existing institutional outcomes, many of them don't, and have alignments that don't really express their goals.

- Liaising with SLOACS / Assessment day. Madeleine has been talking with Jessica at Cañada, and Karen Wong at Skyline, the two SLOACs for their respective colleges, about a possible Assessment Day at the District level. This sounds more like a formal thing, that some colleges do, where all college employees gather to listen to a hosted presentation of the data and what it means, and generate themes and ideas for what to do about it. That's not necessarily a bad thing, but not quite what we are working on here at CSM – so for the moment we are going ahead with our "assessment day," where we set aside a flex slot to talk about student learning. (We are still talking about a larger assessment day at District level.) Also, the three SLOACs are going to explore what has happened to colleges who do not meet IB6 – as Jennifer Taylor Mendoza said, ACCJC isn't necessarily dinging people on this, but it's good to know what recommendations have been issued.

4. Revising the GE SLOs

We reviewed proposed amendments to the GE SLO language.

- The GE pattern: Teresa Morris reminded us that adding an SLO, and/or adding language to the existing SLOs, may affect the GE pattern as a whole. That doesn't mean the adds aren't good, but we need to be VERY thoughtful.
- Information competency: This seems to be much harder to find in this new language than before (though the old language hasn't been changed, mostly only added to). GE-SLOs are where we identify what it means to be a general educated student at CSM. Should we put the words "info comp" into the rubric? It's implied, but we don't want too much inferring, really.

Some tentative additions to the language for "independent learning skills":

- Articulate realistic and achievable academic and/or career goals;
- Create manageable plans for achieving academic and/or career goals;
- **Identify and access college resources [NEW WORDING].**

[We took out the "make use of learning support resources" and "student support resources" – we questioned the verb "make use of," as well as the distinction.]

Some discussion of the "creativity" language inserted into the "Critical and Creative Thinking." The feeling was, Is this too compact? Should we have three SLOs for thinking, and give each one its own space – quantitatve, creative, and critical?

We ran out of time – we will return to the discussion at our December meeting, hopefully to come up with wording we like. (Note: Revised GE SLOs will, of course, need to be passed through COI, ASGC, IPC, and other bodies too.)

Meeting ended 4:00 p.m.