

Student Learning Outcomes Committee - Minutes

October 7, 2025

3:30 pm – 5:00 pm

Main Campus (SCI 134), Chico Center (CHC 134)

I. Call to Order: 3:36pm

Attendees: Julie Jenks (SLO Coordinator), Andrea White, Elizabeth Wannemacher, Shannamar Dewey, Ted Cluver, Lia Deromedi, Laurel Hartley, Kelly Womack, Leo Salas, John Dahlgren (visitor)

II. Introductions: We went around,

A. Welcome to our new committee members: Leo Salas (GE Student Senator) and Kelly Womack (CTE faculty)!

III. Approval of Agenda & Minutes

- Laurel Move to approve, Elizabeth 2nd: Passed unanimously
- Laurel Move to approve, Shannamar 2nd: Abstention: Leo, Kelly W. (Were not present)

IV. Public Comments

V. Update on [Charter & Bylaws](#) – review suggested changes from college council

Charter

- A. Went over the Charter: minor grammatical changes (capital vs. Lower case) and added a duty.
- Adjusted faculty representation to be broadly represented of COI's
 - 7 went to 9. Described now as 1 representative from each COI, 1 from GE and 1 from CTE
 - one student development faculty member
 - We discussed these changes and when and how they will be implemented

Bylaws

- The changes follow what we saw in the Charter

Andrea: Moves to approve the Charter and Bylaws with revisions. Ted 2nd: No discussion, Laurel and Lia abstain, all others in favor.

VI. SLO Assessment Process Revisions

A. [Background](#)

- Changes are to streamline, make it easier and more meaningful, greater clarity.
- SLO assessment process starts with individual faculty reflecting on their courses each semester (1 objective for each course). This part we aren't changing largely, perhaps just the form it comes in and the ability to track.
- The second part is the dept. level discussion: SLO reflections are distributed and those feed a discussion, can be course level, department, program, sometimes nothing is done because the process is unclear.
 - i. We need to make sure it works with accreditation.
 - ii. Want to have a rubric
 - iii. When we do course level outcomes, we are checking a box to map to the ILO.
 - iv. We want to look at our programs to see if there is a mapping approach that would work and if it would fit into the rubric

- B. [Draft ILO-based rubric](#) – discussion of how well the programs we tested mapped to these ILOs – were there elements missing that should be captured?

Clarifying, imagine that this document is part of our program discussion. We look at the PLO's and discuss how well are they meeting the ILO's.

Thoughts from our "homework":

- Critical thinking was easy (maps well)
- Work effectively wasn't showing up (not addressed in PLO's explicitly)
- But can pedagogy map to it?
- How do we work with non-explicit outcomes? (Like "develop accountability, initiative, and pursue lifelong learning").
- Laurel: is it possible to have two tools?
- Is there some easy way to do this that we are missing?
- Andrea: What about simple mapping: CSLO to PLO to ILO?
- Laurel: what about separate instrument for CTE programs with accreditation outside the college?
- More general discussion: looking at the current form, maybe it's fine, maybe this is more of a training and buy-in issue. John gives a great example of program-level thinking and how looking at the objectives for four classes and coordinating them helped look at the program outcomes and course materials.
- Currently we aren't capturing how courses from different departments contribute to a conversation on a program that includes them.

- What is the heart of this? What is the issue that we are really trying to solve? Let's all think more about this over the next month.

- Andrea: it would be good to have program-level discussions as a FLEX
- Laurel: we have been largely GE on this committee, not a lot of cross over. CTE is different and that needs to be acknowledged, it's a whole different focus. They have detailed processes related to relevancy for their fields.

C. John Dalghren – FLEX training (held for CTE faculty in ICT on Friday 9/26)

(This was give during the discussion above): When he starts looking at ILO's he thinks about his part in the institution. (Not necessarily to cover all the ILO's). Looks at how what he covers fits in. 1 level: any grouping of courses that comes together into a program. The original premise was that we are monitoring everything all the time. It's a tough thing to uphold, and the idea that we can statistically or analytically is hard, it's all going to be biased toward instruction.

VII. Informational: Accreditation Midterm Report – Section C draft in progress – summarizing SLO Committee annual reports (on [SLO Committee website](#) and [draft 24-25 annual report](#))

- Took minutes from 24-25 meeting minutes and created this annual report.
- Julie is requesting opinions from those who were there. Suzanne will look at it when she can.
- We went over it together, this information, we don't think we vote on this.

VIII. Future tasks

- A. Discuss [ILO Results](#)
- B. Once GE Taskforce has finished work - Revisit GELOs (AP 4025 and 4100)

Motion to adjourn: Ted move, Elizabeth second. All approved