## Agenda

### This year’s work:
#### Annual Report

- I
- Pape/Ramirez
- **Purpose**: The 2015 Annual Report will be submitted by the end of this week, and is a collaborative effort from the Core Team.

### This year’s work:
#### ICC assessment

- I/D
- Ramirez
- **Purpose**: This year saw the introduction of a new method of documenting ICC assessment. In addition to TracDat data (which include ‘mapping’ from SLOs and PLOs to ICCs, along with reports on our Critical Thinking rubric), we will present the ACCJC with five distinct websites for each of the ICCs. These will contain narrative descriptions of all relevant assessment activities, and will provide links to evidence where applicable. An early draft, providing access to two of these websites, can be seen at [https://www.deanza.edu/slo/icc_assessment/](https://www.deanza.edu/slo/icc_assessment/).
  - The ‘Wellness’ page will be created in the wake of our upcoming convocation activities.

### This year’s work:
#### Assessment Plan

- I
- Pape
- **Purpose**: All department chairs have been provided with a template for creating a plan to assess all course-level SLOs at least once during the next 5-year cycle.
  - Plans are due on April 20.

### 2015 Convocation Schedule

- I/D
- All
- **Purpose**: April 17, 2015. Room Conference room A & B
  - Workshop format will be maintained.
  - The morning open session will begin with a summary of assessment of service programs:
    - Health Services
    - Nutrition
    - Psych Services
  - We will then focus on ‘Personal Responsibility’ via a Student Panel conversation. Panelists will comprise students from the LEAD, FYE, LINC and Impact programs. This panel discussion will serve as a real-time focus group assessment of each program, modeling similar assessment ideas for other programs in attendance. Questions will be developed by Jeff, Toño, and Veronica. Mary will request video footage for our website.
  - Breakout Sessions to include:
    - Personal Responsibility Across Boundaries – Veronica Neal
    - Part-time faculty and the SLO process – Amy Leonard
    - Everything you wanted to know about TracDat – Mary Pape
    - Support our Students who are Veterans – ?
    - Harm Reduction – Michelle Lebleu Burns
    - Cup Half Empty – Toño Ramirez
  - Lunch (partially sponsored by AS)
    - Massage and Companion pets available
  - Department/Division Meetings
Looking Ahead: Adjunct Faculty and SLOs

- In order to maintain an effective strategy for developing the Outcomes Assessment process, the SLO Committee would benefit relevant information about the future role of SLO work in the FA contract. Recent FA publications indicate deep reservations about this role, particularly as it applies to adjunct faculty.
- Where appropriate, the SLO committee requests to be ‘kept in the loop’ regarding policy decisions with an immediate impact on the SLO process.
- For example: A recent FA publication suggests that it is inappropriate for SLO coordinators to invite adjunct faculty to participate in assessment work, as this might result in faculty feeling pressured/threatened into participation. This is certainly an interesting suggestion, but it invites a few questions:
  - Would it be possible for FA/district to discuss these sorts of objections with the SLO committee prior to publishing them? If the SLO committee is conferring threats/unwarranted pressures on any member of the campus community, we would certainly like to know about/address as soon as possible. These articles might be interpreted as suggesting that we are not sympathetic, and this is counterproductive.
  - Is FA’s position that any attempt to invite adjunct participation is tantamount to coercion? If not, we invite suggestions for mechanisms by which we can invite the campus community at large to participate that are not coercive.

Looking Ahead: The PBTs, Outcomes Data, and Documenting Decision-Making

- We anticipate that the ACCJC will demand to see clear evidence of outcomes work/data informing college decision-making during the upcoming accreditation visit.
- At present, the best we can show is that outcomes data are available to the PBTs via the program review document.
- This does very little, however, to demonstrate how these data are used (assuming that they are used) in generating decisions.
- What might we do to more clearly and consistently document this?
  - For IPBT, Randy suggests re-wording SLO-related questions in the program review document. These might more explicitly tie SLOs to PLOs.
  - We might also consider an IPBT rubric for resource allocation, emphasizing a requirement for PLO assessment.
  - To this end, Rowena requests a report identifying programs that are delinquent in PLO assessment.
  - These suggests may not be as easily applied to the SSPBT.
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