

**DE ANZA COLLEGE
SLO COORDINATOR MEETINGS MAY 2009**

Tuesday May 5, 2009—10:30am-11:30am—Anne Argryiou, Anu Khanna, Jim Haynes, Coleen Lee-Wheat, Andrew LaManque

Anne reports that Christina Espinosa-Pieb needs a budget proposal for the implementation of the electronic recording system – hardware, and development time frame. Anu reports that she has arranged a meeting with Lydia, Bradley Creamer, Bradley’s boss and herself to develop a timeline for the development of the electronic SLOP recording form. There has been an administrative commitment to this project. Bradley likes the SLOP recording form and believes that it will provide an excellent frame for the entire project. Anu has asked that the programming be completed by July and at the latest September we would like to have all three phases developed. In the meantime, collecting the data on the draft form or on hardcopy will suffice. The next meeting with senior management has been postponed to May 21. Anu, Anne and Andrew LaManque all agree that the budget will be a priority project for the VP’s until then. The group agreed that opening day must be used wisely as it is the only mandatory flex day. The Board presentation was discussed. Overall, we thought that it went very well. The Board even applauded the presenters. We felt that the presentation could have been stronger if we had emphasized that De Anza has a “faculty driven” process, and that making the college’s fiscal and staffing needs public.

May 14, 2009

Anne Argryiou, Anu Khana, Coleen Lee-Wheat, Jim Haynes
1030-11:30am Senate office

Ann noted that she is the designated Head for the accreditation report due June 1st.

Jim and Anu recap their meeting with Lydia. The discussion centered on the Staff Development position. Politically, to promote that position it must have a SLO/SAO component. SLO will not be part of the title for the person. It will be a faculty position with up to 1/3 teaching responsibility, 1/3 staff development, 1/3 SLO. In the beginning, the teaching responsibility might be only one class due to the need to support the outcomes project. The Board should support this position because of the SLO component. There may be some dissent from a “Dean” who has to absorb this faculty member without being a part of the hiring committee, but it is impossible to determine what discipline this person may come from.

Jim introduced two articles (found by Mary Kay) “Evaluating the Efficiency, Effectiveness and Sustainability of Outcomes-Based Program Review” and “9 Principles for Assessing Student Learning”. Jim would like to have the group assess the readings and then hopefully concur with him that the Senior Management should receive the document. It basically validates the concept of annual program reviews and defines the role of administrators, and decision making bodies like the IBBT, Deans and College

Council etc. and their need to support the outcomes project. Jim discussed the necessity for the management teams especially the senior management and their need to receive training that is specific to their needs (relative to the outcomes project). Jim would also like to rename the project from SLO, SAO, SLOC, SLOP to “Outcomes Based Assessment Program Review”—OBPR.

The long term calendar has been created was then discussed. Does the assessment cycle that we have in place actually match the fiscal decision making cycles that are currently in place? We started with the State Budget, the May revise; so final budget presentation to the Board takes place June meeting. Therefore, program reviews must be discussed in March and April. So, if an assessment cycle finishes in the Spring of the previous year, then data is available for discussion for the creation of program reviews in the subsequent Fall quarter. Jim pointed out that administrators could have an AUO statement –“all decision making cycles need to flow smoothly”. Coleen will revise the long term calendar to reflect this discussion and the AUO component for discussion next Tuesday. A complementing budget proposal will also be revised and presented so that we can make a presentation to the Senior staff on Thursday May 21.

Ann noted that she bumped into the Student Body President in the campus center. He queried her about her feelings about De Anza meeting the accreditation team’s deadline. She paraphrased her answers which basically reiterated the groups sentiments that: if the administration provides time and a place for the faculty and staff to interact and send the message that this is a priority; the DA student learning outcomes project will meet the criteria of showing an assessment cycle that lends significant information to the program review cycle. The reasons why De Anza is so far behind Foothill is that the VP at the time did not understand the project and the SLO coordinator wanted to work independently on the project. She suspects that her message would probably be relayed to Martha and the Board.

Opening Day—Anu’s vision was laid out and modified (separate document). We plan to embellish on the schedule this summer. For Thursday’s meeting with the senior staff, we will present a template for discussion. (Coleen will come up with a template for Tuesday’s meeting to discuss).

May 19, 2009—Anne Argyriou, Anu Khanna, Jim Haynes, Coleen Lee-Wheat—10:40-11:30am

A draft of a budget proposal was created for 2009-2010. Anu will come up with the document based on the template we built for January-Dec 2009. We decided to present 4 items for the May 21 meeting: the current progress of the SLO and SAO’s; the Outcomes Based Program Review; the budget, and the coordinators release time and announcement; and an opening day template for De Anza. Opening Day, hope to use the entire day efficiently. Anu came up with a tentative agenda for the day: Senior Staff opening with an endorsement of the validating the Student Learning Outcomes Project; following with

a training session; and lastly, divisions writing outcomes etc. We will come up with a possible “to do list”.

May 26, 2009—Anne Argyriou, Anu Khanna, Jim Haynes, Coleen Lee-Wheat met 10:30am-11:30am, Senate Office.

Coleen announced the results of the SLO tally sheet. So far 4% of the courses have SLO statements = 94 classes with 198 statements. We are expecting Creative Arts, Language Arts, and Physical Education to participate in their workshops by June 5. We are confident that the percentage will increase. The Accreditation annual report is due on June 30.

We reviewed the Thursday SLO Steering Committee Meeting. We came to a consensus that despite the budget crisis, this project needs more attention and support by the Senior Staff. Perhaps a meeting off-campus this summer will help everyone concentrate on the issues at hand. There are many philosophical and procedural questions that need to be discussed without outside interruptions.

Coleen will arrange a meeting with Rosemary Arca, SLO Coordinator from Foothill. We plan to discuss the District Opening Day. Anu suggested that perhaps we can offer SLO workshops that will prepare faculty and staff for their College Opening Day. The proposed College day plan is to make a large portion of the day a SLO workday i.e. write course and program SLO's and learn about assessment.

Jim expressed his relief that we will be centering our SAO efforts on the larger groups that produce program reviews. It still is a tangled mess, but he is expecting an institutional reorganization due to the budget crisis. An item for the agenda for the next steering committee meeting is that programs that are related to classroom instruction that are not required to perform program review. These groups should be folded in next. Coleen reminded the group that we tentatively have planned the course SLO's 09-10; program SLO's 10-11.

May 28, 2009—10am-11:15

Anu Khanna, Jim Haynes, Coleen Lee-Wheat, Rosemary Arca, FH SLO Coordinator

Jim and Coleen talked with Rosemary for 20 minutes

How does Foothill define programs? Foothill has not approached the “program level” by using department groupings. They recently held a brainstorming session for faculty and staff on a Wednesday morning. Over 100 people gathered to discuss possible themes/visions/ institutional outcomes statements. They envisioned three themes: “student success”, “student outreach”, “community collaboration”. (This is a group process that Katie felt will help Foothill meet AJCC requirements). The next step is to design a 3 year plan of “strategic initiatives” that will advance these areas. Rosemary described a pyramid of college value statements at the peak rests “purpose” then “vision”, next level “mission” then ILO's/ICC's, program and course SLO's. Anu noted that several years ago De Anza experienced a “strategic initiative debacle”. We probably will not be able to successfully run any thing with “strategic initiative labels on it”.

Next topic of discussion: A district opening day proposal that would mutually benefit the faculty and staff from both colleges precursor for the following day's work sessions. We discussed various themes: Teaching excellence relative to outcomes; teach and learning the value of what we do back into the limelight; sustainable teaching; AAA, Accreditation—its roots and value to us; Assessment—in the classroom, of our purpose, of our direction; Action—reflecting and then enhancement.

Free speaker—who could we find? Need a motivational speaker. Anu will tap into Marcie from Cabrillo.

Perhaps using speakers from our own ranks; instructors can share what they have done to improve/sustain their teaching. Panel? Elizabeth Barkley speaks nationally about teaching excellence. Maybe we could ask some “basic skills” people. . . . last thoughts: a panel might be more successful in a small group session.

Workshops:

What is the core of what we do?

How define it in terms of Learning Outcomes?

How do we attain funding in a zero based budget?

What are the productive things that we do?

Jim noted that if the State forces us cut programs, how will DA meet, for example, the State's (or De Anza's ?) mission statement that community colleges value and thus support lifelong learning.

New topic: Assessment workshops. Rosemary notes that at this point, Foothill faculty teaching the same class will also perform the exact same assessment tool. Katie (VP) wants the data collected to be valid by decreasing variables such as letting instructors each choose their own assessments. But, creating rubrics could still be a valid activity for all FH instructors. We can make this activity fun. Using rubrics to assess; patterns, and processes or even apply rubrics to wine taste, beer taste . . . Finally, we need to reaffirm the concept that assessment needs to be linked to the SLO statement. Thus, it might be necessary to modify existing SLO statements prior to creating an assessment tool.