Adult Basic Education
ABE SLO/SLG Faculty Meeting
August 22, 2015
12:00 – 4:00 PM

Seventeen attended the Faculty Meeting to review ABE department instructional and student support PIE goals. One of our primary purposes of the meeting was to "Close the Loop" for the three year reporting cycle. Standards for reporting SLO Use of Results training were provided and the day closed with dialog on collaborating for student success and professional development for the 2015- 2016 school year.

Two ABE faculty, Mary Ann Gomez-Angel and Donna Necke led the group on an overview of the SLO process for new faculty members. The Student Learning Goals for the 2014-15 school year, the Follow-Up for the 2013-14 SLO Cycle, and the SLOs for 2014-15 were discussed. A reporting template for improving analysis of SLO data and writing use of results was introduced and quality examples were provided. The faculty group then split into three groups to practice and work on writing the use of results section and each group shared out their findings. Faculty and staff then exchange ideas on student success and how to collaborate and improve communication between the programs.

The meeting concluded with an evaluation of the Fall Faculty Meeting and suggestions for future professional development.

Animation Outcomes meeting

Date: Monday May 18, 2015
Time: 4PM -6PM

Sunil Thankamushy
Taber Dunipace (adjunct)
Gilbert Marquez (adjunct)

The three professors of the animation program met to work out the outcomes for the ANIM 130, and ANIM 132 classes. We discussed the goal: to have a roadmap on how the two classes inter-relate with each other, and to set expectations on what concepts, techniques and tools will be taught in each class.
Through a discussion using the whiteboard, and paperworks over two hours, we organized our material such that there is clarity on what is taught up to midterm, and what is taught after. We recognized that this would be very critical for effective co-teaching situations, should it arise.
We focused our teaching and materials to develop students' ability to think about the design of topology so that there is good execution of edgeflows, develop a good foundation in production techniques, techniques that suited for organic versus hard surface modeling.

Submitted by Sunil Thankamushy, Professor, Animation & Gaming 6/2/15

Computer Information Systems Department
Adjunct Faculty Meeting
June 13, 2016

Attendance: 16 adjunct faculty and 4 full-time faculty

The primary purpose of this meeting was to discuss student learning outcomes and meeting Title V requirements in our distance learning courses. The portion of the meeting that discussed SLOs focused on the following topics:

- **The purpose of SLOs:** Why we conduct SLOs and how the measurement and analysis of SLO data can lead to a more effective course

- **Where to find the SLOs for your course?** We want to make sure that every instructor knows how to find the SLOs for their courses. The web address location for CIS courses is **https://www.mtsac.edu/slo/index.html?unit=CIS#slo_readout**

- **How to conduct a SLO assessment:** We discussed the five column SLO matrix of naming the SLO, providing an intended outcome, determining the means of assessment and criteria for success, summarizing the data collected, and using the results

- **What to do with your SLO data?** We discussed that adjunct can either obtain a TracDat login and enter the SLO information into TracDat themselves or send the data to the department chair—who will enter the data into TracDat for them.

- **How often should SLOs be performed?** While we prefer that SLOs be performed each semester we emphasized that they should be performed at least every other year.

- **When should you modify or change your course SLO?**
    - If you feel that a SLO is no longer one of the primary subjects of the course
    - If your students are consistently meeting the SLO criteria and you want to measure a different topic within the course
    - If you feel the current SLO is no longer appropriate
    - NOTE: SLOs should align with the course measureable objectives within WebCMS

- **The course SLOs and measurable objectives must be listed on the syllabus**

PHOTOGRAPHY PROGRAM
PHOT 10 OUTCOMES AND STANDARDIZATION MEETING

Meeting Date and Time: February 1, 2016. 9:00am-noon (lunch was served from 12:00-12:30)

Meeting Location: Building 13, room 1430

In Attendance: Laurie Hartman, *Professor of Photography (Full-time), Co-Chair of Commercial & Entertainment*
Arts Dept.

Jason Perez, *Professor of Photography (Full-time)*
Dr. Sue Long, *Dean of Arts (Introduction only)*
Chris Benoe, *Adjunct Instructor and Lab Technician*
Hiroshi Clark, *Adjunct Instructor*
Dave Cook, *Adjunct Instructor*
Charles Edwards, *Adjunct Instructor*
Louis Felix, *Adjunct Instructor*
James Loy, *Adjunct Instructor*
Lynne McCready, *Adjunct Instructor*
Greg Rager, *Adjunct Instructor*
Steve Schenck, *Adjunct Instructor*
Josh Schaedel, *Adjunct Instructor*
Duncan Stewart, *Adjunct Instructor*

Guest Presenter: Emily Woolery, *Chair of the Outcomes Committee*

Meeting Details:

Both full-time and almost all adjunct instructors in the Photography Program met for the purpose of discussing Outcomes and establishing more standardized instruction across all twelve sections of our introductory course, PHOT 10 Basic Digital/Film Photography. The meeting was a mix of PowerPoint presentations and roundtable discussions. Numerous handouts were provided.

After brief introductions, Dr. Sue Long addressed the group and thanked them for their attendance, active participation in program improvement, and their desire to create the most effective classroom experiences for our students. Laurie Hartman then provided a brief overview of the curriculum approval process, webcms, and accessing the Course Outline of Record. She stressed the importance of closely following the COR.

The group closely examined the COR for PHOT 10: Lecture Topics, Lab Topics, Assignments, and Measurable Objectives. After some discussion, the group agreed on more specific language for Lecture Topics and Lab Topics, as well as eight standardized assignments and a final project to be given in all sections of the course. Numerous examples of the assignments and final projects were shown. We then discussed a matrix which mapped the assignment skills to the COR Lecture and Lab Topics, to ensure that all topics are covered. The group agreed that standardization of instruction across all sections of PHOT 10 would lead to greater student success in our advanced courses as well as create opportunities for more efficient use of resources. The group agreed to modify the COR for PHOT 10 to reflect these changes and implement the changes by Fall 2016.

Emily Woolery gave an informative PowerPoint presentation providing an overview of the Outcomes process and faculty's role in the process. Laurie Hartman then lead the group in a discussion of course Student Learning Outcomes, faculty's role in collecting and analyzing data, and use of results. Faculty were urged make assessment a recurring part of their instruction so they have time to identify areas of improvement in instruction early enough in the semester to make changes. We then discussed a matrix which mapped the assignment skills to the COR Measurable Objectives and discussed methods to evaluate all M.O.'s. We agreed that all MO's could be assessed in the eight assignments and final project. In addition, our most crucial M.O. (exposure, aperture and shutter) will also be assessed in our four-question SLO's quiz, with the goal that 75% of PHOT 10 students will score 75% or higher on the four-questions quiz by the end of the semester.

After our discussions about PHOT 10 and Outcomes, the full-time faculty led a discussion about Photography Program Policies and Procedures, including printing and lab procedures. The meeting ended with a short "Photo Program Trivia" quiz. At the end, several of the adjunct instructors thanked the full-time faculty for organizing the meeting, which they found useful in giving them clear direction for their course instruction. They also appreciated the opportunity to socialize with their colleagues after the meeting during lunch.

Learning Assistance Department

Summer READ Workshop

July 14, 2015

4:00-6:00pm

Eight out of twelve adjuncts and six out of six full-time reading faculty attend the Summer READ Workshop on July 14, 2015 from 4:00-6:00pm. During our workshop, we examined changes in current CORs and discussed and took a side-by-side look at READ 90s current COR and the previous one.

Next, our full and part-time reading faculty collaborated on planning a new "Four Levels of Comprehension" SLO for READ 70, 80, and 90. The new SLO will examine the "Four Levels of Comprehension" reading strategy to evaluate how it is currently being taught, how is being assessed, and whether or not students are reaching a desired level of proficiency with this strategy.

Each full-time faculty member joined a small group of two to three adjunct to brainstorm what is known about "Four Levels" and questions related to this strategy. Because this is a complex strategy to teach well in multiple levels of reading courses, there were many questions and variations among faculty members which stimulated a robust and lengthy discussion of techniques, assessments, and outcomes.

Ideas and questions were captured on chart paper and saved to guide the direction of the new SLO. Based on the small group and whole group discussions, it was clear that part-time instructors felt comfortable sharing ideas, techniques, and insights to better inform the success of the new SLO. The collaborative Summer READ Workshop was a successful way to encourage engagement by all reading faculty members, build working relationships with colleagues, and ultimately improve effectiveness of the reading program.

The next steps will involve collecting "Four Levels of Comprehension" student samples, designing rubrics to assess proficiency at each level, and examining student learning outcomes and methods of instruction.

Library Department
SLO Discussion: LIBR 1 / 1A Courses
August 19, 2015 – 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Attendees: Jared Burton, Deb Distante, LeAnn Garrett, Hong Guo, Paul Kittle, Sandra Krause, Nora Shea, Emily Woolery

Review

Past and current assessment results were reviewed:

1. Citation SLO: Students will be able to prepare accurate citations for various sources.
    a. Last assessed 2010
    b. Criterion met

2. Evaluation SLO: Students will be able to evaluate the reliability of information sources.
    a. Last assessed 2014-2015
    b. Criterion for Success: Upon completion of Library 1 or 1A, at least 75% of students will evaluate the reliability of information sources based upon at least two given criteria.
    c. Summary of Data: 151 out of 187 students (81%) met criterion
    d. Notes:
        i. 9 sections assessed
        ii. 5 of 9 courses met criterion
        iii. Required: relevance
        iv. Other: accuracy, authority, currency, purpose
    e. Criterion Met

Decisions

1. Current SLOs were reviewed and the following decisions were made:

SLO	Decision
Citation SLO: Students will be able to prepare accurate citations for various sources.	Keep as is
Evaluation SLO: Students will be able to evaluate the reliability of information sources.	Revise – see below

2. The "Evaluation SLO" was revised:

    Evaluation SLO: Students will be able to evaluate information sources based on a set of criteria.

3. In Fall 2015, librarians teaching LIBR 1 or LIBR 1A will assess the revised "Evaluation SLO" with the following assessment method:

Fall 2015 Assessment of Evaluation SLO

Assessment Method – Formative:
One annotated source will be collected and assessed at the midpoint of the session. Librarians may choose the assessment tool, i.e., assignment, exam, etc.

Criteria for Success:
80% of students who complete the assessment tool (i.e., assignment, exam, etc.) will successfully evaluate an information source. With a successful evaluation, students will choose a source as it relates to their research question or statement based on:
- relevance (required), and
- at least one other criteria from this list: accuracy, authority, currency, purpose.

Assessment Method – Summative:
Librarians will consider a summative assessment tool in the future.