In attendance: Walt Birkedahl, Lesley Buehler, Gale Carli, Rich Cominos, Michael Curran, Maru Grant, Mike Holtzclaw, Robin Kurotori, Mark Lieu, Jeff Roberts, Rachel Sherman, Leta Stagnaro, Terry Taskey, Janel Tomblin-Brown, Chris Warden.

   - Minutes approved as distributed.

2. Faculty Presentation: Maru Grant, Chemistry.
   - Assessment of CHEM 101A (Spring 2012). (See document in Meeting Documents Index.)
   - Overview of CHEM 101A & CHEM 101B:
     One-year course in 2 semesters; 3-4 sections offered per semester; important course: needed for science majors, pre-med, engineering; feeder for Biology, Engineering, Organic Chemistry. Must be rigorous; attrition is high. (Problems with placement exam, which currently has pass rate set at 50%; some students pass this but are not prepared for next course in sequence.)
     - Topics covered (traditional sequence, with more facts, memorization, and frustration, vs. new “Atoms First” sequence, with more critical thinking).
     - Of the 9 SLO, SLOs 1 through 5 are assessed via clickers, quizzes & exams, Final Presentation, Lab performance, and the Final ACS exam. SLO #9 on lab safety is assessed via a video and quiz. The Final ACS exam was adopted to help with consistency; exams are proctored under ACS regulations and are not seen or graded by students’ own instructors.
     - SLOs are covered by most exam questions; some line up one to one; others are covered by multiple exam questions. One SLO was not covered in the exam.
     - Results on questions that related directly one to one with various SLOs were compared over several semesters: Spring 2008, Spring 2009 (when topics were changed from the traditional sequence to the Atoms First sequence), Fall 2010, and Spring 2012.
     - Results showed significant improvement on the most challenging SLOs/questions after the change to the Atoms First sequencing of topics.
     - Next steps: They are considering realigning SLOs to be more consistent with ACS standards and topics and are considering removing SLO#2, which is not covered in the ACS exam. They also would like to change the cut off scores for the placement exam to help with attrition rates (so that fewer students come in unprepared), but they have been told that other colleges use the 50% cut off and so far have been discouraged in their efforts to change this. However, if they can gather data that shows correlation between attrition or failure rates and low placement exam scores, then they can legitimize this change. They are also considering assessing all sections of the course in future. (The current assessment is just inclusive of Maru’s own sections.)

3. GE Assessment update. (See document in Meeting Documents Index.)
• As a reminder, the college uses GE Plan A courses and GE SLOs to assess “institutional-level” SLOs. This is done through the GE Committee, as a GE course goes through 6-year course review, when its GE status is reaffirmed (or to approve new courses in a GE area), and also when the course is assessed. The Course Assessment in a Box form currently has an area to indicate which GE area the course is aligned with, and the SLO Assessment webpage indicates the GE Area for the GE Target course assessments that are posted.

• Currently, 28 out of 31 GE target courses have been assessed in this cycle (90%). Only three courses are remaining (MUS 104, SOC 101, SPCH 103), and these are planned for Fall 2014 and Spring 2015, so we should be at 100% of GE courses assessed by the end of our first 4-year cycle, Spring 2015. 86 additional GE courses have been assessed, and 40 additional courses or course clusters are planned for assessment at this time.

4. Plans for the next assessment cycle:
• By Spring 2015, we need to have a clear idea of what we want to do Fall 2015, when our next 4-year cycle of course assessment begins and will need to communicate this to faculty in advance (through GIDD, etc.)
• We plan to provide timelines that mirror when they assessed courses in this cycle; courses should not be assessed any later than 4 years from the last assessment date (sooner is fine).

• After much discussion, it was decided not to change the process too much, as faculty are now used to the current system and are starting to become more comfortable with the process. We will encourage assessing 2 or more SLOs, instead of just one, next time (instead of insisting on all SLOs being assessed), and will review and give feedback on assessments to try to get faculty to go a little deeper in their analysis and articulate more fully plans/next steps/improvements based on results of assessments.

• It was noted that faculty are now being asked by the Curriculum Committee to align SLOs more directly with Methods of Evaluation and Assignments on their Course Outlines of Record as courses go through 6-year Review. This is helping people see the connection between SLOs and what they are already doing to assess; this is also leading to realignment and revision of SLOs where they do not line up.

• We also need to continue to work on the PSLO assessment area in the Program Review module.

5. GIDD plans for January Flex Week.
• After much discussion, we agreed that we want to “keep the momentum going” with assessment and keep the focus on assessment for GIDD. We plan to include the Accreditation Commendation about GIDD in the Flex week schedule for January (and will post it on the SLOAC website, also).

• Based on feedback from last time, we plan to allow more work time for faculty to actually get things done.

• Faculty assessment presentations (Jim Baxter, Janel Tomblin-Brown, Michael Curran) will be scheduled in the morning after Leta’s announcements, and we will plan for a shortened work day (9am-1pm), to accommodate folks who are moving and getting ready for the semester.

• Genius Bars for Course Review and Assessment will be set up concurrent with dept. work.

Meeting adjourned: 4:30 p.m.