

April 10 draft

MEMBERS PRESENT

David Locke, chair
Lloyd Davis, note-taker

Rich Castillo
Jane Jackson

Stephanie Chiou
Terry Kistler

Denaya Dailey

REVIEW OF GE SLO STUDENT SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

David distributed results of the CSM student survey discussed at our March meeting, but now with percentages computed with and without the neutral/ does not apply options. Points in discussion:

What about students who didn't take the survey because they had already dropped?

The survey data is too much information. Decision makers like to see the big picture, through graphics. Are students assessing themselves, or the program?

In March we agreed it would be useful to have data for several years in a row, using the same survey. The plan is to use 'agree' rather than 'satisfied', and omit 'neutral'.

We could break the 'and ' GE questions into separate questions and select a few of those, perhaps randomly, for students to answer. We cannot force students to take the survey because that would be adding a degree requirement. Currently, students are sent to a survey about degree SLOs when they apply for a degree. We could add some GE SLO questions to that survey. GE SLOs and degree SLOs sometimes overlap.

SLO assessment is in faculty purview, so we can change the survey questions. If we include a paraphrase of the questions to clarify them for students, that will result in a different survey experience. Revisions to the survey should go through all divisions and ASCSM. SLOs should be reviewed, but not necessarily changed, when course outlines are revised.

Changes to SLOs must go through COI, since SLOs are now on the course outline of record. If an SLO is inactivated without going through COI, TracDat will show it as still in place but not being evaluated.

The Committee agreed by consensus to continue to use the survey as it is now, but to review and revise it next semester.

Points in discussion: We could find, say, five questions that could be asked of any student who has completed a GE sequence. These could address whether students can express themselves orally and in writing, and understand information through reading and listening. The more generic the questions, the better. We could also ask students what they think the questions mean.

ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTIONS related to SLOs from Canada, then Skyline, came after an article in the February 2012 *Advocate* addressing faculty obligations related to curriculum. David said it is important CSM have a similar resolution. A district level resolution, which could be based on support from only two of the three colleges, is weaker than resolutions from the faculties of each college. Also, the colleges are accredited separately. The resolutions will be discussed at ASGC tomorrow, then sent to the divisions for input. Points in discussion of the resolutions:

1st resolution – Faculty role and responsibility in developing SLOs. Classes are transferable within the district, yet SLOs are different from campus to campus for the same course. A physics major needs 250, 260 and 270 and a certain number of units at their degree-granting college, but could take one physics

course at each college, or get a CSM physics degree without taking any physics at CSM. This has implications for interpreting the assessment of degree SLOs.

2nd resolution – support publishing student and program SLOs. Degree level SLOs will be on our website. Accreditation standard II.A.6 requires every course syllabus to have SLOs as stated in the course outline of record. The March 2012 *Advocate* has a letter from some members of Skyline’s Academic Senate asserting that having to publish SLOs in one’s syllabus violates academic freedom. But in fact faculty members are required to follow the course outline, which includes SLOs. Transparency is an issue here.

3rd resolution – opposition to the use of SLO attainment in faculty evaluation. David sees this as unnecessary but OK. Stress ‘attainment.’ Participation in the SLO process is a legitimate requirement, and faculty should look at how a course or program can be changed if its SLOs are not being met.

4th resolution – Support PERC (Peer Evaluation Review Committee) addressing ACCJC requirements on SLOs and faculty evaluation. Lake Tahoe CC met them by asking faculty, in their self-evaluations, to address and reflect on changes they made to their teaching based on assessment results.

Faculty evaluation procedures are in the contract, and SLO attainment is not part of them. The resolutions are from faculty, who are responsible for curriculum matters. David prepared the draft for the CSM resolutions. It will probably be revised, as it is reviewed by ASGC on April 10, by divisions for faculty input after that, and again before ASGC gives its final approval.

UPDATE ON CERTIFICATE OF ACHIEVEMENT SLOs COI chair Teresa Morris confirmed to David that a program which offers both a degree and a certificate could use a memo to ask COI to approve the same SLOs for the certificate that are already approved for the degree. Only three of CSM’s 30 certificates of achievement do not have SLOs. Most certificate of achievement are in programs that have a related degree. Typically, degree and certificate requirements in the major are similar, but only the degree requires GE courses. Certificates of specialization do not need SLOs, and may require only two or three courses, e.g. in tax preparation or solar installation.

ANNOUNCEMENTS LAC member Terry Kistler announced an Open House at the Library, April 26, 2:15-4:15. On April 12th, Tim Maxwell will host a session in 10-468 on human rights education.

MAY AGENDA includes revisions to program review involving SLOs, and to CSM’s assessment philosophy. Email agenda suggestions to David.