1. **Approve Minutes from September 11, 2014. Approved as distributed.**

2. **Faculty Presentation: Bob Mitchell, English.**

   Assessment based on papers for his English - 101B course. Used first and third essays, on the short story and drama, respectively.

   SLO used: Write well-organized, critical essays, which include a clear thesis about a work of literature, textual evidence, correct grammar, appropriate style and word choice.

   **Results of Thesis assessment:** Second paper did not fair as well as first Paper. No rationale for why.

   **Result of Textual evidence assessment:** This is a more challenging paper and usually gives lower result rates. However again first group did better than second group.

   **Results of Grammar assessment:** First pass, was not as good as the second pass. Why low results. Maybe students are not proofreading their work., maybe assuming they know more than they do.

   **Appropriate Style and Word choice assessment:**

   **Results:** Both papers about the same.

   Organization of paper a factor and word choice depended on how and why they would have picked certain words.

   **Rachel:** Did you discover anything you did not already suspect? Anything that jumped out? No not really. Well the first thesis statement big discrepancy between the two sections. No I was not surprised. Usually my experience has been after the first paper – I tell the students to focus more on the needs of the paper and read to them a good paper from someone in the class.

   **Rachel:** Are you changing anything next semester

   **Bob:** Maybe show them a model essay.

   **Rachel:** Do you get many drops?
Bob: No not really.

Alison: Bob, Have you thought of inviting other people to do the assessment who also teach this class, to discuss what they do?
Bob: Good idea.

Rachel: And would be good to compare results with those teaching the class online.

Leta: Have you thought of introducing any other interventions?

Mini Dialog of whole group about ways to improve, including annotating a sample paper with students and comparing/contrasting samples of adequate vs. excellent papers.

3. Faculty Presentation: Mike Curran, Athletics/PE.

Assessed KIN 240.

Student Learning Outcomes

The student will:

a. Identify compartments of life experiences in which physical activity plays an important part.

b. Identify the breadth of kinesiology as a discipline and its related fields.

c. Demonstrate an understanding of the meaning of personal choice, responsibility and professional commitment in education and career preparation and how personal values relate to career choice.

SLO #2 was assessed.

Considered:

Why is this SLO important? Why is it there for the department?
It’s an intro level course. We need to evaluate Kinesiology at the macro level.
Students need to know that Kinesiology includes numerous sub-disciplines/related fields; thus we want to explore these in depth.

Wants students to know why we are doing what we are doing.

Which leads to:

1) How much are they absorbing info
2) How much are they engaged and learning
3) Tells me how well I am doing my job
4) Tells me what I need to do in regards to re-teaching/reviewing/revisiting certain topics

Students really need to know what they are getting into in the field of Kinesiology.

Considered how to get students to take this SLO seriously. If just grades them on it, they may not think that is important to them. He tries to get the students motivated.
1) Graded on it.
2) Discuss how it’s related to decisions they’ll be making in the rest of their lives.
3) This may help them make critical decisions.
4) It makes them reflect on what they are doing.

No meaning=no interest
No interest= no learning

Assessed SLO with a precise rubric.
Students graded 0-6, 6 being highest.
Two parts to grading:
1) breadth
2) at least three fields

Grading based on the point system.

Results: 40 students,

6 points 7 students
5 points 10 students
4 points 22 students
3 points 5 students
2 points 6 students
1 points 0 students
0 points -0 students

Some of the Findings:
Felt questions were too broad.
Some seemed overwhelmed.
Some listed the units in the texts as the fields.
Will try to find creative ways to engage them further

Results: Will be making changes.

In short, if there are 11 who get a 2 or a 3, will need to look at his teaching methods as his job is to get all of them on board.

Gale: Does the fact this is a GE course have any bearing on the fact some students might be taking this just to fulfill a GE requirement?

Mike/Jeff: Yes.
Discussion ensued then about types of students who enroll in this class.
Jeff: CSU –we guide them.
Alison: What was your point question?
Mike: I used the actual SLO #2
Chris Warden: Online vs. Face to face?
Mike Curran: If they are in the room, they cannot use materials that I cannot see them using if they are online.
Jeff Roberts: I looked at how they answered the questions (online).
4. **Student Success Conference: Report from attendees.**

**Mark Lieu:** SLO Review – Rio Honda (from experience on accreditation team site visit).

Their SLO committee reviews CSLOs that people write, and the Curriculum committee accepts them once they’re approved by the SLO committee. (See attached Checklist for Review of SLOs.) People also have to create a framework for assessment and benchmarks to aim for/to compare against when they create their SLOs.

Leta: to compare class achievements to institutional benchmarks college-wide (institutional standards).

This could be something we could consider since, as we’ve discussed, faculty presentations at SLOAC is like preaching to the choir. This follows our discussion begun last May on the function of the SLOA committee.

Alison: Departments could also look at SLOs and break out which students are not meeting the standards to pinpoint where they’re not being successful (part of equity plan) as areas to target. This concept would work with big programs, primarily.

**Mark:** Student Success Conference report of highlights.
Take aways:
1) Holistic--Need to link all efforts across campus.
2) We need to be more intentional, especially since funding is now available.

Attended two things that were really insightful.
1) Embedded tutoring in PSY 101 class.
   Data came from SLO review.
   Over 60% of students take this class at the college. CSLO data showed success rates not up to par. They established an embedded tutoring program in every section to bring student success rates up.

2) Program Review - CTE –Fire Science courses.
   Vocab and reading issues (low comprehension). College got together with learning center to work on these items and created contextualized fire learning units. Result was that students realized there was a learning center and discovered other support they could get there. Data on success rates show it increased 10-20%.

**Jeff:** Attended same break-outs as Mark. Noticed Mechanisms at other schools in place to identify purposeful links between Student Success initiative and equity plans and various areas. Here, we are still working on this.

He also noted how glad he is to be working at Ohlone after hearing others’ experiences at other colleges. We are nearing completion and being ready to submit our equity plan, while others were just starting.

**Rachel:** There were a lot of sessions on equity and student success.

**Jeff:** A lot of talk about regionalizing plans.

**Jeff:** Powerpoints of sessions are on RP website.
Rachel: Four workshops that stood out. (See attached document.)

1) Institutional Set Standards—Disaggregating the data/targeting small sub-groups; examples of timelines and projects/processes at College of Canyons and Contra Costa.
2) Using e-folios—students and faculty (Learning Academy, LA Valley).
3) SLO Cloud 2.1 Simplifying reporting in the cloud (home-grown).
4) Passion & Purpose class: to motivate students (Chabot).

5. Program Review and PIO process revised – Status.

Nov. 21 PIO deadline (deans to set deadlines with people in their departments). Leta and deans are working individually with faculty on program review, using the revised PR module/plan.

6. Genius Bar Schedule and response to date.

Ask people to RSVP and to give an idea of what they’ll want to work on.

7. Completing the first 4-year cycle of Course Assessment – Status.

Updated Master List: 98% of courses planned/in-progress; 71% of courses with completed assessments. (See SLOAC website for updated charts, including Courses Still to Be Assessed (only 22 not yet planned).

Fall 2014 assessment plans still needed from several divisions. Can just confirm if all courses have been completed. Individual dean charts (status of course assessments), Faculty Assessments completed/planned, and Additions/Deletions to Master List charts have all been updated and posted.

Meeting adjourned: 4:45pm