

College Outcomes Committee
LOS ANGELES PIERCE COLLEGE – SSB – Large Conference Room
Minutes – October 18th, 2017, 2:30-3:30pm

Attending: Jennifer Moses, Sherri Berger, Earic Dixon-Peters, Beth Benne, Dale Fields, Mario Macias, Margarita Pillado, Thomas Vessella, Giselle Calubayan, Paul Anthony Quintero, Absent: David Gonzales, Christi Hamilton, Susan Rhi-Kleinhardt, Larry Kraus, Erin Hayes, Loralyn Frederick.

Meeting was called to order by Moses at 2:34 p.m. in SSB Large Conference Room

AGENDA: Approved as written by acclamation (Benne/Pillado - MS)

MINUTES: Approval of the minutes from 9/20/17 as written by acclamation (Benne/Pillado - MS)

PUBLIC COMMENT: No commentary

1. SSLOs and SOAs for Co-curricular areas (e.g., student services)

- a. Dean Earic Dixon-Peters provided information regarding the importance of assessing SSLOs, in addition to SAOs. Outside materials were provided outlining the research on using SSLOs to improve Student Services.
- b. The committee discussed accurately identifying and defining outcomes for these areas, including the important distinction between SSLOs – Student Service Learning Outcomes and SAOs – Service Area Outcomes.
 - i. SSLOs are those student outcomes that result from educational activities conducted by student service areas. For example, improved student knowledge/skills as a result of a workshop or outreach activity.
 - ii. SAOs are a goal of the service area, such as increasing the number of students served in an area.
- c. The committee discussed effectively identifying those students who could/should be reasonably assessed for SSLOs and offered to support to Student Services for implementing SSLOs assessment.
- d. Student Services requested returning to the COC for support at future meetings to establish timelines for SSLO and SAO implementation in eLumen.

2. GELO 2 assessment task force and re-categorization

- a. **Action:** The COC recommends to the Senate to create a task force to conduct the GELO 2 assessment. The COC discussed that the task force should have representation from across the academic areas (1-4). Moses, Pillado, and Fields volunteered to be on the task force (areas 1-3), but the COC will ask for volunteers from all faculty via the Senate, looking especially for a faculty member from Area 4 (Berger/Benne – M/S; approved unanimously).

- b. The committee discussed re-categorizing the GELOs as PLOs-GE. The current use of GELOs are confusing and redundant. The logic is that General Education Programs are programs, so their outcomes are indeed PLOs. This re-categorization would increase clarity theoretically in our outcomes structure and would allow departments and programs to more effectively map their SLOs and PLOs. We would then, as a campus, have course-level SLOs, program-level PLOs, and College-level ILOs
 - c. **Action:** The COC recommends to the Senate the GELOs be re-classified as PLOs-GE. Moses will draft a NMP for the Senate to make this change (Berger/Pillado – M/S; approved unanimously).
3. The committee voted to move Agenda item #8 (SLO/PLO/ILO Mapping) up the agenda to discuss implications of a re-categorizing GELOs on the logic of mapping (Pillado/Fields – M/S; approved unanimously).
4. **SLO/PLO/ILO Mapping**
 - a. The committee discussed SLO/ILO Mapping – All course SLOs should map to at least one ILO. Previous SLO curriculum addendum documents prompted departments to map their course to ILOs. The addendum has no such prompting. The COC should work with Curriculum on possibly adding SLO/ILO mapping to the SLO addendum form.
 - b. The committee discussed SLO/PLO mapping.
 - i. There are many different program sub-types (GEs, CTE, ADT, Inter-disciplinary, etc), all of which have PLOs that all need to be mapped to the SLOs for the courses that support that program.
 - ii. A set of guidelines does not currently exist to indicate who should do the SLO/PLO mapping. For example, many programs use the same courses in their programs (e.g., a math course that support Chemistry, Physics, and Math) and thus it seems reasonable that program should be mapping down to the SLOs that support that program. However, it is not always clear who is primarily responsible for a particular program. As such, who should do the SLO/PLO mapping for any particular program is unclear (ADT, GE, or otherwise). COC should work the APC to get input on developing a set of best practices for SLO/PLO mapping across the sub-types of programs. Moses volunteered to request presenting at APC to invite feedback.
 - iii. The committee discussed the problem of courses that are a part of a program, but whose SLOs do not seem to map to any PLOs.
 - a. The COC discussed moving from hierarchical mapping structure to a split model for mapping in eLumen. This will ensure no courses are orphaned for outcomes assessment. A hierarchical structure assumes all SLOs map to a PLOS, and thus ILOs can be assessed as a function of PLOs. This is not

consistent with the course at Pierce. Some courses do not support a program, but rather simply support the ILOs. As such, SLOs should map to PLOs and then to ILOs separately, with both ILOs and PLOs assessed with SLOs.

- b. **Action:** The COC recommends to the Senate that we move from hierarchical mapping structure to a split model for mapping in eLumen (Berger/Pillado – M/S; approved unanimously).
5. The committee discussed moving 10/18/17 agenda items that were not discussed to the November meeting.
6. It was announced that the next meeting would be November 16th, 2017 and the meeting was adjourned at 3:34 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Jennifer Moses