

ALL-COLLEGE MEETING

COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2012

2:15 p.m. to 3:45 p.m.

COLLEGE CENTER, ROOM 195

REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

Facilitator: David Locke, SLO Coordinator

Participants: Stephanie Alexander, Librarian; Michael Brunicardi, Faculty and Coordinator, Administration of Justice; James Carranza, English faculty and Academic Senate President; Sandra Stefani Comerford, Dean, Language Arts; Lloyd Davis, Math faculty and Member of the College Assessment Committee; Laura Demsetz, Engineering faculty and Co-chair of the 2013 Institutional Self Evaluation; Susan Estes, Vice President of Instruction and Accreditation Liaison Officer; Charlene Frontiera, Dean, Math and Science and Member of the College Assessment Committee; Steve Gonzales, Electronics faculty; Elizabeth Hoffman, Associated Students; Jane Jackson, Music faculty and Member of the College Assessment Committee; Alicia Kinert, Associated Students; Terry Kisler, Business faculty and Member of the College Assessment Committee; Paige Kupperberg, President, Associated Students; Jane McAteer, Director of Nursing; Teresa Morris, Librarian and Chair of the Committee on Instruction; James Robertson, History faculty; Adam Sakov; Associated Students; Michelle Schneider, Program Services Coordinator, Administration of Justice; Henry Villareal, Dean of Enrollment Services

David Locke called the meeting to order and welcomed all participants. He explained that the meeting will provide background information that will then lead to a discussion of whether or not CSM's institutional student learning outcomes need to be revised and whether the method of assessment needs to be revised.

David then began his PowerPoint presentation by providing a definition of student learning outcomes and explaining the purposes of SLOs. He briefly described the process used to develop the college's institutional (general education) SLOs and stated that they were adopted in May 2006 as the expected outcomes of students completing the general education requirements for an Associated Degree or transfer. CSM's five categories of institutional (GE) SLOs are

- Effective communication
- Quantitative Skills
- Critical Thinking
- Social Awareness and Diversity
- Ethical Responsibility

A handout containing a detailed listing of the institutional SLOs was distributed.

David then stated that the meeting should result in two decisions:

1. Recommendations to the College Assessment Committee about how to align course SLOs and program SLOs to the institutional SLOs, and
2. Recommendations to the College Assessment Committee concerning tools to use for authentic assessment.

David mentioned that using e-Portfolios for institutional assessment is a possibility. He also showed the results of the portion of the campus climate survey that addressed CSM's institutional SLOs.

Copies of Catalog pages containing associate degree requirements, the IGETC curriculum, and the College of San Mateo's California State University General Education requirements were distributed.

Discussion then began.

One participant mentioned that information competency became a college graduation requirement in fall 2010. Does this requirement need to be incorporated into the institutional SLOs?

Another faculty member recommended incorporating "and approaches" into the SLO under Ethical Responsibility, thus making it read: "Identify ethical issues *and approaches* and understand the conflicts inherent in them." The faculty member pointed out that "approaches" refers to schools of approaches. Another faculty member commented that this additional wording actually provides a good framework.

The question of whether there are any "big holes" in the current institutional SLOs was raised. Is there a link between the general educational requirements and the institutional SLOs? This was followed by another participant asking whether information competency is sufficiently covered in the critical thinking and/or ethical responsibility categories.

Another participant asked how lifelong learning is measured.

Another participant asked whether the institutional SLOs are remaining current with what is occurring in the “real world.” How is the market place or the state changing what students need? This led to the comment by another participant that students must be more than “present-minded.” They must be aware of the past; this concept must be kept in the social awareness and diversity category. A student reinforced the idea that students must analyze the interconnectedness and importance of the past and the present. Students must understand both global and local concerns.

Next the general discussion turned to methods of assessment.

Currently CSM is using a student survey to assess institutional SLOs. Alternative methods can be really labor intensive. The discussion turned to the possibility of using e-Portfolios. A course could have a specific requirement for an assessment using e-Portfolios. Give the students the SLOs up front so that they know what they must demonstrate at the end of the course.

Participants then discussed what individual assignments might look like and how they might “map” to general education. The group decided that program student learning outcomes relate to a discipline and institutional SLOs relate to general education. Course SLOs map to general education SLOs, and course SLOs also map to program SLOs.

As a result of the assessment, are we looking at the curriculum? When faculty write a course outline, does it fit general education SLOs? Is this a possibility?

David Locke will take the suggestions and recommendations from this meeting to the College Assessment Committee for further consideration and refinement.

Summary prepared by Susan Estes