

SLO committee meeting Dec. 6th 2022 minutes

Attendees: Monica Brown, Suzanne Wakim, Laurel Hartley, Ted Cluver, Andrea White, Dan Barnett

Public comments:

Propose discussing removing the remote option for meetings due to difficulty in really participating from ZOOM and the hybrid modality being difficult to facilitate.

Agenda items:

1. Dialog days planning
 - a. 9:00 am session-Translation station
 - i. Summary of this session-a discussion of the ILOs and how they might be non-traditionally assessed through observation of students actions/behavior/products in class or during interactions in student services. Question prompt “how have you observed demonstration of the ILO in action in your students in the classroom or on campus?”
 - b. 10:00 am session-Measuring spoons
 - i. Summary of initial design-discussion with focus on confounding variables inherent to different types of assessments and the question “are you assessing what you think you are assessing?” What are the inherent biases in different assessments?
 - ii. Change in design suggested to focus more on actionable information. Suzanne shared worksheet that would walk session participants through backward design. Worksheet has these steps for participants
 1. start with the outcome,
 2. then list current assement being used
 3. Then self reflect on confounding variables within the assessment
 4. Identify 3 other assessment types that could be used instead of the current one
 5. Design the new assessment
 - iii. Suggested approach is to start with worksheet but most of the dialog should be focused on brainstorming the confounding variables of various assessments as a group
 - iv. Note to include link to curriculum page where individual instructors can quickly access their course outcomes.
 - v. Susanne would lead discussion initially in providing an example of confounding variables and inherent hidden biases in one type of assessment, multiple choice. Then open discussion up to participants to introduce another assessment type and brainstorm the confounding variables with in it.
 - vi. Important function of the discussion is for participants to be aware of, acknowledge, and be transparent to students about what is and what is not being assessed.
2. SLO reflections form discussion-keep form as is or does it need tweaks for Spring 2023?

- a. Does the form provide enough information to have useful departmental group discussions?
 - i. Suggestion made to send form and reminder out to faculty at the beginning of the semester to remind them and perhaps prompt them to be thinking about their assessment strategies for the semester as they are designing the class.
 - ii. Examined the results from the form input from Spring 2022 looking at question: “what type of training do you want?”
 - 1. 44% responded “none”, 46% responded “canvas outcomes tool”
 - 2. Is this providing useful information in determining what trainings to offer?
 - 3. Dan suggests reconsidering using the term “training” as it might have a negative association. Suggested “conversation session” as alternative to “training”. Perhaps monthly conversations in Zoom in work session fashion with fluid structure to discuss various topics of assessment and equity. Start with intro discussion together, then camera off to work individually on an assessment, then come back together to discuss further. A way to work independently but with support.
 - 4. Recommendation to change wording on Question 10 of form. Replace “trainings” with “Discussion” and remove all the “How to...” lead ins for each option listed and change “helpful” to “useful”.
 - a. Remove the option “No training needed” from list
 - b. New question wording for question 10: “What type of discussion would you find useful for your assessment process?”
3. GELOs discussion-#12 (GELO section of the form)
- a. May need to bring GELOs back as they are referenced by the equivalency and curriculum committees, but should the SLO committee be the entity that does this?
 - i. Suggested that SLO committee should not be involved but rather faculty from the GE areas should bring them back and revise them
 - ii. Laurel makes the motion and Dan seconds it to make this recommendation to the Academic senate -Propose the formation of a separate GE committee that will determine which courses go into which GE areas-act on this once CSU/UC GE gets universalized-
 - iii. Proposed tasks for this new committee
 - 1. Develop clear guidelines for each GE area with respect to what courses should go in it
 - 2. Should include representation from each GE area and the curriculum committee
 - 3. At least 1 outcome from a GE course should fit into 1 GELO and all the College level GELOs should be represented within all the area GELOs
 - 4. A task force or a permanent committee?
 - b. Form question on GELOs assessment not providing any real useful information but GE is a program that we are supposed to be assessing.
 - i. What do we actually want to know about the GELOs from this form?

- ii. Recommend changing from question to “Which GELO or which ILO *most closely* aligns to your cSLO, and instructors can only pick 1 rather than multiple. Laurel motioned and Dan seconded for changing this on Spring 2023 form.
- 4. Topics to pick up for next semester-GELOs at top of agenda
 - a. What do we want to do with GELOs? What do we want to know about them with respect to assessment?
 - b. Dan suggests revitalization of GE....addressing why we have GE and why is it important?
- 5. Laurel motioned to adjourn, Dan seconded