Comments from SLOAC (Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Council) regarding the SLO and Point of Improvement Sections of the 2011-2012 Full Program Reviews

ACRT:
SLO section: assessment strategies and plans for improvement looked good.

Point of Improvement section:
• Readers liked the program excellence section and assessment of previous program reviews.
• The SLO section did not mention any future goals or recommended actions and did not really address the questions. #2 asked how you can improve student performance, but the answer was a list of outcomes.
• Under moving forward objectives, you mentioned that students were completing certificates, but did not mention how many.
• Assessment of previous program reviews was excellent.

Court Reporting Notes
Overall, well-written, clearly defined SLOs. Point of Improvement provided a detailed description of outcomes and their relation to program improvement.

One comment: Future Goals: “create a program culture that supports the intensive practice necessary for success” – was thought to be too vague. Perhaps you can be more specific in subsequent program reviews in detailing how you go about creating this culture.

Early Childhood Education
SLO Section: Committee members wondered if the ECE program will use the GE/college wide rubric for written communication in the future. Under course level outcomes – it is entirely about the writer of the program review. Perhaps in future program reviews, more complete information can be provided.

Point of Improvement section: WELL DONE!

Electronics Technology:
SLO section: Question was raised as to whether there were any “program goals or outcomes” although you don’t have degrees/certificates. But under course level – the answers were well done with good examples included.

Point of Improvement Section: Overall this was fine. Again, even if you don’t have degrees or certificates, one could put together program goals/outcomes. Committee members wondered HOW you plan to attract additional students to your program. In the next full program review, remember to fill out the assessment of previous program reviews, as you will have received funding for instructional equipment in the meantime.

Machine Metals and Technology
SLO Section was only filled out for welding classes. What about the rest of the program?

Point of Improvement Section: Committee members noted that review would be stronger if specific numbers/statistics and examples were included to describe both current program and future plans. The SLO section was left blank.
Comments from SLOAC (Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Council) regarding the SLO and Point of Improvement Sections of the 2011-2012 Full Program Reviews

**Environmental Landscaping Design**

**SLO Section:** A detailed explanation of outcomes was provided. Committee members noted that one or two specific examples of assessments would help to show the link between the SLOs and the assessments. Also it would have helped to include examples of how questions/assignments have improved.

**Point of Improvement Section:**

Overall well written. In the SLO section – these comments were made:

- How do you determine Why? What methods do you use?
- It would help to have a little explanation/rationale for why and how improvements will improve the program and student learning.
- Under assessment of previous program reviews – it was stated that students were satisfied with the instruction. Committee members asked how this is ascertained? Are students surveyed?
- Under other concluding remarks – the rationale was clear regarding the need for space to teach non-organic gardening, landscaping and farming.

**Multimedia Studies**

**SLO Section** – well written, very detailed overview. However, under the course level outcomes, there were no specific examples.

**Point of Improvement section:** WELL DONE!!!