

San Diego Mesa College
Committee on Outcomes and Assessment
Meeting Notes

March 20, 2018

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., MC 211B

ATTENDEES	Madeleine Hinkes, Co-Chair	Mary Gwin
	Kris Clark, Co-Chair	Ed Helscher (excused)
		Linda Hensley
	Leela Bingham	Bridget Herrin
	Ailene Crakes	Charlie Lieu
	Monica Demcho	Pam Luster
	Donna Duchow	Tim McGrath
	Claudia Estrada-Howell	Mariette Ratner
	David Fierro	Tina Recalde
	Rob Fremland	Saloua Saidane (absent)
	Sean Flores	Michael Temple
	Support: Anda McComb, Sandra Perez	Guest: Amanda Horner, Alanna Milner

Agenda Item A: Call to Order: By Kris Clark at 3:35 p.m. in MC 211B.

DISCUSSION	<p>Approval of March 6, 2018 Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The minutes from March 6th were emailed to COA prior to the meeting for review. The minutes were M/S by Rob Fremland and Leela Bingham and approved.
-------------------	--

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post approved minutes to the COA website. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mona King 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Before next meeting

Agenda Item B: DOC Reports

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> George Ye (Dramatic arts) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New instructor was recently hired to teach courses in film making. Over the last year, new curriculum has been updated, activated and added to the program. The overall assessment plan has needed to adapt to the changing schedule. Averaging assessment of about 3 courses per semester.
-------------------	--

- Courses are broken into 4 areas for assessment:
 1. Survey and Lecture Based Courses
 2. Performance based classes
 3. Other specialty classes
 4. Mesa College Theatre Company classes.
- Later on some articulated outcomes will be created for the film program.
- Outcomes are being met overall.
- The byproduct of working on outcomes has generated a great deal of constructive dialogue among faculty members about our mission statement, individual course objectives, and about how they are serving their students.
- As a result, course outcomes did not change but an assignment prompt was aligned.
- Collect data on student performance through:
 - Direct survey
 - Post-performance discussions
 - Group conversations
 - Visits from intercollegiate organizations
 - Student self-assessment with peer feedback
- End of the year one on one interview with majors in the programs.
- <https://vimeo.com/260518500?activityReferer=1>
- **Amanda Horner (Marketing program)**
 - No full time faculty for marketing
 - 4 total courses
 - With such a small data pool it can be difficult to compare semester to semester.
 - Students are exceeding expectation as far as assessments.
 - Have done a good job getting adjuncts on board to help with assessments.
 - Trying to do more in-class assessments sometimes using assignments as assessments.
 - Trying to create a rubric.
 - Developing some cross-departmental certificates in the future might be beneficial for students
 - Certificates haven't been developed yet, but they should combine the skills you have and what skills would help you market yourself.
 - For CTE data, there are more contract jobs available that students are looking into.
- **Rich Chagnon (Music department)**
 - Approximately 6-8 courses need assessing per year to complete them all in a 6-year cycle.
 - As a part of the assessment process, each semester courses to be assessed are identified, the current "Outcomes" listed in Taskstream are first reviewed and revised as necessary.
 - By the time the assessment of all classes is complete, the Outcomes for each course should be accurate.
 - This past fall, 4 contract and 3 adjuncts assessed 4 courses. An additional 6 courses will be assessed this semester, spring 2018, as well as PLOs
 - Results:
 - Sharing teaching practices
 - Adjuncts want to try different modes of teaching.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leslie Styles (AMSL) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 21 sections need assessing per year to complete them all in a six-year cycle. • Needed to improve course outcomes to develop new assessments • CLOs were interrelated with Signing Naturally curriculum series for ASL Basic Skills courses. • This current spring 2018, 3 contract, and 5-7 adjuncts are assessing ASL skill courses. They are from ASL 1 to ASL 4 plus labs. • Eventually, ITP courses will be assessed as well. • PLOs need to be assessed.
--	--

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• N/A		•

Agenda Item C: Continuing Business

DISCUSSION	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public access to assessments (standing item) 2. ILO assessment plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In process 3. Program Review 2018-19 OA questions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions have been completed and will go to PR in the next meeting. 4. Dean’s Checklist <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Checklist that deans and managers can use when they are reviewing the assessment work over the summer. • The lead writers and DOCs would benefit from this list. • Starting with model from Wisconsin • Collaborative Work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluating shared responsibility might be difficult • It depends on how the DOC reports it out • What would make the difference in how someone answers each of the questions? • One is collaborative process and the other is administering • Quality of Program and course level outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program specific. • Proposing keeping the first, second, and last questions. • This is something that can be reviewed annually. • Curriculum Mapping: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not using this section. • Measurement Tools and Procedures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kept the first one-describe tools • The third one implies that direct measure is more valuable than indirect measure. • It’s talking points, not directing points. To provide some guidance to deans
-------------------	---

	<p>in their responses for DOCs who are submitting their information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there was someone who looked at this and said “well you have no direct measures” What would be the consequence? • They could ask the DOCS about it. It would start a conversation. • How does this document relate to the guiding practices in the SLO handbook? • As long as it is in the handbook and it says that these are the kinds of things that we think are important, then there isn’t an opportunity to be heavy handed. • Does this connect or align with the questions asked in Taskstream? • It asks what your instrument is. • What if you combined those and said “Is there a mix of direct and indirect assessment?” • This is for course and program level. • Not prescriptive, just guidelines. • Evidence/Results/Conclusions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reported results were aggregated across groups of students rather than report for individual students. • Not reporting for individual students but do want to be able to disaggregate big groups into groups that are meaningful. • Evidence and conclusions were combined into results and renamed it “results” • “Is the tool working?” “Did you find out what you set to find out?” • Merged evidence/results/conclusions into one with 4 questions. • What if it was changed to say, “Was there a conversation of the meaning of the conclusions?” • Just change sufficient to meaningful in question 2. • First and second under conclusions were combined and added to evidence/result • The last question under conclusions was removed. • Changes/Improvements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will changes be implemented? • Impact of Previous Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Did the previous recommendations have the impact desired?” • Need to close the loop. • People asked for guidance so this is an optional resource • Maybe there should be some front matter that says this is a guideline. • Uses of the Information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not using this section. • Revised form will come back to COA <p>5. Sample survey for DOCs (Oklahoma Example)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long and has some irrelevant information. • If anyone would like to join to look this over let Madeleine and Kris know. • This would be survey that would be sent to the DOCs • What would the results be used for? For this committee to look at and improve the process. • People have a sense of what needs to be done mid-cycle and get some feedback.
--	--

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise checklist DOC survey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kris, Madeleine Kris, Madeleine, Donna, Leela 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two weeks

Agenda Item D: New Business

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IEPI grant augmentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When first applied, Mesa received \$150,000; however, some colleges were receiving \$200,000. With the ILO project, Mesa is able to ask for \$50,000. The green column is new. Area of focus G for reexamining the ILO assessment process. Plans for new ILO process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The hope is to have first assessment up and running fall 2018 A workshop over summer Organize a taskforce and assess one ILO per year. Measure of progress, will have student self-assessment at certain milestones instead of just at graduation. Late spring and summer meetings to develop the instrument and the rubric The budget is in place until June 30th Paying DOCs, adjuncts, NANCES, workshops The committee agrees to go for the \$50,000 Committee should encourage people to join the Taskforce Faculty would earn one ESU Most of the work will be building the assessment and scoring it. Unless you're on the committee, you don't have to score the assessment. It will be interdisciplinary. Assuming that the taskforce uses something that works out well and wants to sustain it, we will need a new funding source.
------------	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Review program review assessment questions Send letter to faculty about ILO taskforce 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All committee members Madeleine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next committee meeting

Agenda Item E: Announcements/Adjournment

DISCUSSION	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Next meeting April 3, 2018 2. Retreat April 6, 2018 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Let Beth know if you will be attending 3. OA Institute 2018, June 11-15 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four applications in so far. • A presenter is confirmed who will demonstrate Canvas. • Can Canvas do some of the things that Taskstream does in program review? So far all we have heard is for assessment not for program review. • Portfolium allows you to integrate your Blackboard or Canvas platform into it. • With VIA, you can set up your assessment and upload it into Canvas, but you cannot do it the other way around. • Someone will be coming in to do a Habits of Mind session. 4. AALHE Annual Assessment Conference, June 4-7, Salt Lake City <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you would like more information follow this link: http://www.aalhe.org/mpage/2018Conference
-------------------	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 		

Agenda Item F: Adjournment

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting was adjourned by Madeleine at 4:56 p.m.
-------------------	---

Submitted by: Sahar King, Senior Secretary

Approved on: