Present: Co-Chair, Pat Flood; Sarah Master, Sheila MacDowell, Par Mohammadian, Monica Moreno, Deborah Paulsen, Riye Park, Mark Pursley, Patricia Rodriguez, Dennis Schroeder Daniel Waktola, Tara Ward

1. Review of minutes of November 26, 2013 meeting

2. Student Survey on SLOs
   A student survey has been created using Class Climate to assess students awareness of SLOs, PLOs, and ILOs. It is planned to be distributed either at the end of the fall semester or during the Winter Intersession.

3. Approval of LOAC Charter
   Additional revisions were made to the LOAC charter. Pat will revise the charter for final approval at the next meeting

4. Approval process for SLOs at LAMC and the process for updating and revising SLOs.
   a. Pat distributed a handout on the present process for approving and updating SLOs and PLOs. At present SLO/PLO updates are submitted to the SLO Coordinator for approval before they are incorporated into course syllabi. Pat works with departments on SLOs before the final approval of a COR because major issues may get the curriculum approval tabled. It is the chairs' responsibility to update the online SLO system with the revised SLOs/PLOs. These updates are then immediately available to all students through the SLO website which lists all course outcomes. Since SLOs and PLOs are part of the official Course Outline of Record (COR), if the SLOs/PLOs are changed, they should also be attached to the official COR. A separate addendum which can be attached to the COR will be developed to document changes in SLOs/PLOs so that the entire COR does not have to be reviewed again, only the revised SLOs/PLOs.

   b. Pat talked about the role of Advisories for CTE in SLOs/PLOs. It is recommended to have the advisory members be involved in approving course and program outcomes. At the CAOT/Business advisory meeting in November, for example, they distributed a list of their outcomes to the members. These will be further discussed at the follow-up spring advisory meeting.
5. **Questions for discussion regarding benchmarks and the process for ensuring quality assessments.**

a. Pat distributed a list of questions she had distributed for discussion at the last District Student Learning Outcomes Advisory Committee (SLOAC) regarding the processes at other schools for establishing benchmarks and ensuring quality. These processes vary widely from school to school. She mentioned that the District is considering inviting Marcy Allen-Craig to a District wide SLO Symposium during the spring semester to assist us with answering some of our questions and to provide a forum for discussion of some of the issues regarding ensuring quality assessment. Benchmarks for student success for course SLOs and PLOs at LAMC are set at a standard of 70% and can be adjusted as determined by the department. Committee members agreed that this was reasonable and that the same standard could be applied for the Institutional Learning Outcomes.

b. Pat reminded the committee that the fall SLO assessments are due January 15 and the fall semester departmental chairs’ summary reports are due a week later, January 21, and she asked the committee members to remind their chairs. Once the course assessments are recorded, chairs and faculty can use them to complete program and institutional assessments using the matrices that have previously been prepared by chairs which map course SLOs to Program and Institutional SLOs.

c. The committee discussed the learning outcome assessment process and cycle. How do we quantify the changes? When follow-up assessments are done, a text box automatically appears on the SLO online system requesting information about whether the previous recommended changes have been implemented and if they have made a difference in student achievement of the SLO. This past fall this information was also requested as part of the online Program Review system. It was stressed that improvement is the most important factor for the purpose of assessment.

d. To assist us with disseminating information about assessments, it was suggested that we could have a newsletter and showcase departments that are innovative.

e. The procedure for ensuring quality assessments was discussed. At present much of the responsibility for ensuring quality assessments falls on the shoulders of the chairs and the SLO Coordinators. When the two academic deans who left over a year ago are replaced, it will be easier to review what has been submitted. The committee again discussed in more detail how SLOs are approved and the need to define a process for submitting them when they are updated outside of the COR six-year cycle.
6. **Accreditation and Measures of Quality (selected slides from a presentation to the California Association of Institutional Researchers (CAIR))**

   a. Pat distributed a copy of selected slides from a PowerPoint presentation by Barbara Beno entitled Accreditation and Measures of Quality which was presented to the California Association of Institutional Researchers. It was stressed that most of the accreditation standards are about good practices that lead to effective institutional performance and they include requirements that institutions engage in self-assessment for purposes of knowing how well the institution is achieving its own mission and goals. Federal and national emphasis is now on producing more college completers, so improvement of institutional outputs is needed.

   b. Council of Instruction and the Educational Planning Committee recently looked at Institutional achievement standards and set benchmarks for achievement of them based on statistics compiled over the last five years. It was emphasized that our outcomes need to tie into the Mission Statement.

7. **Next meeting – Date and Time:** Tuesday, January, 14, 12-1:30

   Adjourned 4:30 p.m.

   Recorder: Deborah Paulsen