Mission Statement
Oxnard College promotes high quality teaching and learning that meet the needs of a diverse student population. As a multicultural, comprehensive institution of higher learning, Oxnard College works to empower and inspire students to succeed in their personal and educational goals and aspirations.

Members Present: M. Dean, L. Edwards, E. Endrijonas, K. Engelsen, L. Hopper, C. Horrock, C. Inouye, L. Kama’ila, B. King-Rushing, C. Mainzer, M. Price, M. Sanchez, C. Tafoya

Members Absent: G. Casillas-Tortorelli, C. Guerrero, M. Pinto-Casillas, J. Redding, L. Ruvalcaba

Welcome/Announcements
Erika called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m.

Additions/Changes to the Agenda
None

The committee agreed to take the agenda out of order, addressing the Old Business first.

NEW BUSINESS

Creation of a LOT Handbook
There definitely is a need to develop a LOT Handbook. A subcommittee will be formed to determine how to do this. Members volunteering to work on this included Marji, Linda and Ishita.

WASC Expectations Regarding “Closing the Loop”: Program Review and LOs.
Closing the loop means some level of program review. Using the example from Pierce College Linda explained the process they used. The crucial item is to make sure that faculty get together to identify where students are the strongest and where they are the weakest. If there are no weak areas, then you do not have the right SLOs. Even a one-person department must have dialog so they would meet with their larger group, like Social Sciences.

How do you see this committee going about closing the loop? Give faculty something as a result of doing this. For example – equipment, space, supplies, and tutors, are all carrots. Information coming out of the SLO process is incorporated into the program review. This is already going on at PEPC; there is a place in the PEPC report process for this information. All this must be tied to resource allocation – evidence-based resource allocations.
Between now and the time eLumen rolls out faculty should be encouraged to use the newer forms that are on line. SLOs should then be submitted to the OCSLOGrp email address. Betty posts them online, time permitting.

Marlene advised that the forms online are pre-populated with program SLOs, so if a program changes their SLOs, the form may not have the right items on it. In this case, there is a generic form on the site that can be used.

There was discussion about using student workers to enter data from each course syllabus into eLumen. We would need to set security levels. This is a support issue that we cannot solve now.

**What to do About Courses without SLOs and How to Obtain Them Pre-eLumen**

**What to do about remaining SLOs that are due and overdue?**

- Have a system in place that is not punitive in nature. This approach doesn't work
- Linda reviewed the spreadsheet Marlene submitted last June on where we stand with our SLOs. We have at least one SLO for virtually everything, although a few are past due.
- The committee agreed that the best way to meet the 2012 SLO deadline is to have the request come through the Academic Senate.
- Deans must be engaged with faculty on this process.
- Focus on the positive – send kudos to departments that have done all of their SLOs, like Art or Alcohol and Drug Studies.
- Have a LOT Committee “Hero of the Month”
- Encourage faculty to delete or suspend courses that haven't been offered recently
- Most syllabi do not have SLOs on them.
- There has been pushback from faculty not wanting to give their deans copies of their syllabi.
- Discuss after accreditation
- As we move through the entire process of assessment, when all courses are in eLumen, they will be mapped from the course level to the program level to the institutional level.

An institution should take a student from lower level/transitional studies all the way through mastery. Mastery is defined as a demonstrable level of education appropriate for graduation with an AA. There is an expectation that a student who achieves an AA is performing at a higher level than when they entered the institution. Patterns show the baseline where students started and where they exited. Exit exams are being used at some institutions as a capstone experience. WASC is looking for capstone courses for each program.

Students are avoiding capstone courses and just taking necessary courses to obtain GE or to transfer to four year college/university. There should be some courses, like ENGL R101 and MATH R014 that have been deemed to show mastery at the community college level,
because there are concerns that capstone courses at the community college level are pushing the envelope into the upper level. Each SLO is supposed to be assessing at a different level (introductory, developmental, etc.).

**What Types of Programs WASC Expects to have Evaluated First**
The four areas WASC is interested in are Transitional Studies versus GE, Career Vocational and Student Services. Do we as a college have enough courses in these areas? We must have the data that shows how many students start out in Transitional Studies and where. The data should show the percentage of students that start out at the lowest level of Transitional Studies courses. Carolyn advised that Lisa has been working on gathering this data. We are so far low in terms of the level of basic skills our students come in; it’s a long haul to get them up to any level of mastery. WASC assumes that we are encouraging students all the way to the AA level and then transferring them to four-year colleges/universities.

**Rubrics**
We must have rubrics.
- More difficult to develop for some areas than others.
- Different for every discipline
- eLumen has a rubric library.
- Linda has many examples she can share.
- Course level rubrics are easier to do when other levels (institutional and program) have been established. In the meantime, it is important for faculty to develop one of their own.
- Marji has a set of rubrics that were developed in Arizona which she can share

**OLD BUSINESS/POTENTIAL ACTION ITEMS**

**Minutes**

| APPROVED/SECONDED | Mati/Marlene | 1 abstention |

The minutes from the September 21, 2010 meeting were approved as presented.

**Evaluation of How Well We Did with the Program Assessment Cycle Form**

Overall a broad representation of forms was received from the campus. Some points of discussion were:
- To some degree, the four letters were not understood or clear, particularly since the term assessment refers to the entire process.
- It wasn’t really clear what the term assessment meant, unless it meant using a particular test, instrument, etc. because all faculty uses some form of assessment every semester.
- It wasn’t clear what the word “evaluate” meant; does it mean that you are going to wait to look at what you did until the end of the semester? As a result some faculty put all four letters in every semester.
The one item that was not on the form was when faculty would report out the data. The response was that after the evaluation dialog took place involving a report out from the department or faculty member, a report would be created from the data in eLumen.

Until eLumen is up and running, the committee felt that the form was flexible and useful to everybody, as long as the term evaluate is understood to mean reporting and feedback is provided.

- Faculty should use the form to keep track, not for committee to grade.
- Use as a guide to help move through a process, not as an absolute form.
- Bring samples if you have any to share. Give faculty tools to help them.

Carolyn Inouye reported that IT was involved in setting eLumen up with the server over the summer. However, Carolyn, Bola and Lisa were left off the email chain in getting access to the server. Bola and Lisa are working diligently to get the data uploaded, but they are not getting cooperation from IT in getting access to the server. That is the situation right now, and they hope to have a solution in the next week or two in terms of being able to sign on and get a password. Carolyn commented that the form is walking us through the steps and will help ease us into eLumen. In eLumen we can develop a form that the faculty uses, not submitting this data to anyone.

**GE Level SLO Progress**

WASC wants to see that we really do have a GE pattern. Look for weaknesses in GE pattern (if any). We are certainly on track. Must look and measure that all GE courses have SLOs. WASC wants to see more assessment on what is called high volume classes – like English – they want to see more data on that than on that one class that only a few students take.

Chris Mainzer reported that the GE subcommittee is trying to get draft statements from each area by next Monday, so as to have something to show the Accreditation Team. She advised that Natural Science and PE are done. Linda asked if all faculty teaching Natural Science courses were involved. There is a gap for courses that are between areas. Chris indicated she would take this feedback to the GE Subcommittee to make sure there are no missing SLOs.

**ISLO Progress**

Linda advised that the 2007 Core Competencies document on the LOT website is missing areas like life-long learning, citizenship and community, collaboration and other chunks of information. Erika advised that those components do not exist in any of the core competencies. What we basically have is an outline of our major GE areas. Items like methods of delivery for students with differing work schedules would make us look much stronger as an institution. This is another topic for the Academic Senate to consider. The Mission Statement revision that the college is beginning might be a good model for how the Senate wants to engage in a campus-wide discussion about our ISLOs. It is curriculum, it is the shape of our program, but it also reflects the values of our college. We need to make sure that the dialog around the ISLOs is as inclusive as possible. When a student graduates from OC, we should be able to go back to their course schedule and map it to make sure
that every one of our ISLOs has been met. We should have ISLOs that are broad enough umbrellas where all of these needs can be met, not 50 ISLOs or it would be impossible to map out. We need to have general catch all categories that people can map to. The ACCJC doesn't specify how many ISLOs a college must have; there is no magic number.

**Current and Future Technology Needs**

Some points of discussion:
- Bola noted from previous LOT minutes that there is a need for archiving old forms. He advised that we now have a new high-speed, duplex scanner in the Faculty Resource Center.
- Many schools have invested in iPads so faculty can do their assessments on the fly. Anything more portable would be welcome.
- We must consider these technology needs for our faculty.

Carolyn advised that the eLumen trainer assigned to us is anxious to come and meet with us. She had contacted Carolyn just before school started, but Carolyn advised her that we needed to wait until the LOT Committee formed. Do we want to have an extended LOT meeting where we could show her our existing paper forms? She could walk us through and gives us guidance, not just for eLumen, but the process we are using and how we transition over.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.