

Library and Learning Resources

1. The purpose is to review our Student Learning Outcomes (SLO), Administrative Unit Objectives (AUO), and Strategic Actions (SA) across the **last three to five years** to answer the following questions:

- 1) How have the results been used for improvement in curriculum and pedagogy?
- 2) How have the results been used for service/process improvements?
- 3) Have have the results been connected to resource requests and allocation?
- 4) What improvements can we make *without* additional resources?

2. An evaluation of the meeting: 90% of respondents reported they found the retreat's focus on strengthening SLO and AUO useful. Although the evaluation did not seek the status of the attendees (full-time, adjunct, faculty, classified), adjuncts indicated great appreciation for knowing better the department's SLO work and for having been an integral part of the planning and assessment effort.

3. Whether or not you would like to have the option to include adjunct faculty in SLO-based meetings in the future. Yes. Learning Assistance is multi-disciplinary and the Library has different areas of emphasis (instruction, collection, reference, systems), and like many departments on campus, they rely on the contribution of adjunct faculty to assure department-wide excellence.

We thank the Outcomes Committee for its leadership and support, and especially Dr. Burley and Dr. Scroggins for providing funding.

Meghan

Meghan M. Chen
Dean, Library & Learning Resources

Earth Science/Astronomy

Hi Jason! Thanks again for all your help! Here is our report:

1. The purpose of our meeting was to discuss the course-wide SLOs/GEOs for our core courses (Astr 5, Geol 8, and Ocea 10) and plan for the fall semester - these are our highest enrollment sections and also involve the largest number of adjunct faculty.
2. The meeting overall was very successful - at first there was a general discussion about SLOs/GEOs and our department's approach to them. Faculty then divided up based on the courses that they taught, reviewed the results of the SLOs/GEOs from the previous year, and discussed the implications of these results. The faculty for each course then discussed whether to continue with the same SLO/GEO for this year. In the case of two of our core courses, new SLOs were written.
3. We would certainly welcome the opportunity to include adjunct faculty in SLO meetings in the future - perhaps because of the timing before school started back we unfortunately had low attendance from our adjunct faculty with only 1 in attendance. I believe that a meeting during the course of the year might be more successful in attracting adjunct participation.

Thanks so much again for all your help Jason!
Micol

Foreign Language

Dear Jason,

Here is my report:

On Friday, Aug. 24, 2012 we had our SLO review session between 2:30-3:30pm in two different rooms in Bldg. 66: one for Spanish and one for French. Apart from the full-time professors, we had 9 adjunct Spanish faculty join us for the review, along with 3 French adjunct faculty. We went over the results of our SLO exams from Spring 2012 and reached certain conclusions on how to proceed this semester. We went over each and every question on the SLO test and noticed what the overall % correct was for it, along with the average % score for each SLO section of the test. The reason why we did it that way was to better ascertain if the problem was with not enough reinforcement of the topic in class vs. a bad test question. We examined the SLOs results for Spanish 4, Spanish 11 and Spanish 12. We concluded that it was only in Spanish 11, in the accent mark section, that the students did so poorly as to necessitate us retesting them this semester in that class (their overall % score for that section was 64.4%). We would definitely like the option of continuing to include adjunct faculty in SLO-based meetings in the future, preferably with pay for them. Attached you will see the document for Spanish that shows the SLOs exams, how the students did and my final conclusions.

Take care,

Kurt

American Language

On Friday, Aug. 24, 2012, three full-time professors and one adjunct professor (Sharon Bjorck) met from 10-12 to discuss the outcomes of the two SLOs we administered in each of our reading classes the previous spring. We focused on identifying what each believed to be vital elements of our own reading pedagogies and assessment methodologies, as well as the outcomes of our vocabulary and reading-comprehension learning objectives.

In addition to noting the strengths and weaknesses of the SLOs themselves (both as testing instruments and whether we had written them in the most statistically-valid way), we also began brainstorming about what sort of general reading requirements we might like to require for all AmLa reading courses. These requirements would aim to ensure standard practices in all reading courses and levels so that a new professor might have some sense of the scope, sequence and best practices for the reading skills we have listed on our course objectives.

Significant progress was made in interpretation of the reading SLO results and in laying the groundwork for AmLa reading course requirements.

I would certainly like the option of including adjunct faculty in SLO meetings in the future.

Jennifer Leader
9-4-12