

San Diego Mesa College  
Committee on Outcomes and Assessment

Meeting Notes

April 19, 2022

3:45p.m. – 5:00 p.m., Zoom

<b>ATTENDEES</b>	<b>School Representative</b> (Not to exceed 3 Deans*)
Bridget Herrin, Co-Chair	Monica Romero (absent)
Eliza Rabinovich, Co-Chair (excused)	Amanda Johnston
	Leslie Shimazaki
<b>Membership Areas</b>	Alison Gurganus (absent)
Ailene Crakes	Janue Johnson (excused)
Isabel O'Connor (absent)	Mark Manasse (excused)
John Crocitti (absent)	Saloua Saidane (absent)
Michael Temple	Inna Kanevsky (absent)
Anda McComb	Nathan Resch
Howard Eskew (absent)	
Sahar (Mona) King (excused)	<b>Classified Professionals</b>
	VACANT
<b>Advisory:</b>	
Pamela Luster (excused)	<b>Students:</b> Edward King (absent)
Lorenze Legaspi (excused)	
<b>Administrative Support:</b> Sahar King	<b>Guests:</b> Chris Kinney

**Agenda Item A: Call to Order: Bridget Herrin at 3:50 p.m. in Zoom**

<b>DISCUSSION:</b>
<p><b>1. Approval of April 5, 2022, minutes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The draft of the agenda and minutes were emailed to COA committee prior to the meeting for review.</li> <li>○ The minutes from April 5, 2022, M/S by Amanda Johnston and Nathan Resch and approved.</li> </ul>

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

**Agenda Item B: Continuing Business**

<b>DISCUSSION:</b>
<p><b>1. Review ILO Grad Survey Questions (Objective: Edit &amp; Approve)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Will be used in creating rubrics; will be sent out to all students who have petitioned to graduate.</li> <li>b. <a href="#">Communication Questions</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Orally/auditory comparison could be confusing to students.</li> <li>ii. Could see students rating themselves very high with these questions in particular; may result in little to no variation in this data.</li> <li>iii. Can we get qualitative data? This will be going out to 2,500 students; do we have the capacity to analyze responses?</li> <li>iv. Recommendation that we match “tactile” back to ILO language of kinesthetic.</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. <a href="#">Professional and Ethical Behavior</a></li> <li>d. Revisions will be pushed into survey.</li> <li>e. Will review results from last survey at next meeting.</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Action plan for deliverables (Objective: Update)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Timeline for new cycle (Objective: Vote) (Tabled)           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Shift to 4-year cycle to align with Program Review, integrate into PR workspace.</li> <li>ii. Goals set in Year 1 as part of comprehensive PR.</li> <li>iii. Assessing (1) CLO annually in Canvas/Nuventive               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PLOs and ILOs rolled up from CLOs annually (if software allows)</li> </ul> </li> <li>iv. Review ILO statements in Year 4</li> <li>v. Biggest concern – not having enough time to assess in a 4-year cycle; goal is to make OA part of PR reflection process, not something that must be assessed separately.</li> <li>vi. Look for formal vote next meeting.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Forward any potential folks who can fill seat vacancies</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Anyone</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ongoing</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Talk to colleagues from your schools to discuss shift to 4-year cycle in partnership with software solution with more</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Everyone</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Next meeting</b></li> </ul>

streamlined reporting of data		
-------------------------------	--	--

**Agenda Item C: New Business**

<b>DISCUSSION:</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Discussion on future of AUO's (Pros &amp; Cons)</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How AUOs are different than what we do with PR?           <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. PR doesn't have required formal assessment component</li> <li>ii. AUO is defined as concise statement on what one will receive from a service</li> <li>iii. Current PR structure will ask every single unit to look at data and identify trends, gaps, outcomes, experiences, developing goals/action plan.</li> <li>iv. How are AUO's being assessed? Largely by survey.</li> <li>v. Take to next Dean's Council for further discussion.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> <li>2. <b>Outcomes Assessment and Program Review Faculty Coordinator Proposal</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Formal proposal has been made to PRSC and PIEC to expand OA Coordinator to include PR.</li> <li>b. Increase 0.4 reassign to 0.6</li> <li>c. COA has Dean of IE and Faculty Coordinator as co-chairs, PR does not have the same model.</li> <li>d. Dina taking back to AS for discussion; PRSC Faculty Cochair also sits on Senate Exec. No members of Senate Exec are appointed, all elected.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bring discussion on future of AUO's to next Deans Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ailene, Leslie</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Before next meeting</li> </ul>

**Agenda Item D: Announcements/ Adjournment**

<b>DISCUSSION:</b>
1. Next meeting: May 3, 2022

Submitted by: Sahar King, Administrative Support

Approved on: