



Outcomes Assessment Committee

Minutes

February 6, 2018

EW 207 video w/KRV 5 and CCCConfer

9:00-11:00 a.m.

Start Time: 9:07

Adjourn: 10:52

Topic	Facilitator	Action	Minutes
1. Call to order	Vivian Baker		Present: Christine Small, Vivian Baker, Jan Moline Dawn Ward, Corey Marvin, Suzie Ama, Heather Bopp Absent: Melanie Jeffrey, Suzie Ama, Yihfen Chen
2. Approval of Minutes & Action Items From: 11/7/17		Approved	
3. Approval of Agenda		Approved	
4. Review Goals	Vivian Baker	Review	<p>*See attached document – these were the brief updates discussed:</p> <p>Current SLO Assessment #'s Courses: (fa 17) 90.09%, Programs: (fa 17) 100% , Student & Learning Support Programs: (16-17) : 90.91 %</p> <p>#1 Student Learning Outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic, and used for continuous quality improvement. IEC rating, spring 2017 = 3.67</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Elumen is live for courses, programs coming soon. Assessment is not quite ready. We will be able to enter past assessments that were not entered in Moodle, and once ready then can enter student by student going forward. <p>#2 Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive,</p>

Topic	Facilitator	Action	Minutes
			<p>and robust. IEC rating, spring 2017 = 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ AUP additional fields to include identifying all courses assessed – this field is present, but did not get rolled to the public view. <p>#3 There is evaluation of student learning outcomes processes. IEC rating, spring 2017 = 4.67</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PR are reviewed by Outcomes Committee <p>#4 Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing. IEC rating, spring 2017 = 4.67</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Program Review – 5 year assessment plan included in document. ○ Need to include training for new Chairs <p>#5 Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college. IEC rating, spring 2017 = 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PLOs available on website. Outcomes website will be updated to include a link to view: PLO, ILO, and AUO. <p>*Additional Work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Other? AUO approval process and audit of existing outcomes <p>The committee strongly recommends a new course is assessed the first time it is run- this allows the instructor and department to evaluate the assessment tools, instruction methods, etc. Then re-assess the course after it has run a few times.</p>
<p>5. Committee make-up</p>	<p>Vivian Baker</p>	<p>Review</p>	<p>We decided it would be appropriate to add another Classified member to the committee, and specifically, the Research Analyst once that position is filled.</p>

Topic	Facilitator	Action	Minutes
6. AUP Themes Review	Vivian Baker	Update	<p>*See attached</p> <p>The number of outcomes assessed was included in the AUP this year, but the field was not rolled into the report. Vivian will get this information from Sylvia so we have it to compare going forward. The report was reviewed, and the committee continues to find it a valuable process. Noted increase in “need to improve operational processes, which is indicative of AUOs now being assessed and analyzed. This is a good!</p>
7. Program Reviews	Vivian Baker	Update	<p>Library PR was reviewed today, other feedback will be sent to Vivian to compile and include in the minutes.</p> <p>Welding Technology Program Review</p> <p>Page 29 “We believe that the current learning outcomes are satisfactory and should require major...” should not? DRFT C108 shows assessment in Fall 2017, however met/not met is not indicated. DRFT C108 and INDE C60: Department identified that “more time” be devoted to spend on teaching these concepts (Gaps in SLOs). Was time the only consideration? Was pedagogy discussed? Summary of PLO assessment: last sentence need to add NOT (“we believe...are satisfactory, and should NOT be changed).</p> <p>Kiinesiology</p> <p>it does not look like all of the courses are mapped to the PLO’s. At least they are not showing in the copied excel sheet. What are the PLOs? (No documentation). Difficult to determine if the courses being used to assess PLOs are suitable. This is addressed in the narrative, but I’ll add here: Might consider reducing the # of CSLOs required to assess each PLO. Identify the one or 2 most suitable courses based on content, sequence through the program, etc. Discuss how the department collects SLO data for courses outside of the discipline. Is discussion with those departments taking place re: SLO assessment since they are being used to assess the KIN PLOs?</p> <p>Library</p> <p>Page 29 – Consider working IR in the future on a standardized</p>

Topic	Facilitator	Action	Minutes
			<p>random survey. Page 32- PLOs should be listed in chart, like the AUOs. Page 33- If possible add information in the narrative such as how many offerings, locations, etc. were included in each assessment. Page 33-Related to KRV campus and identified gap. Was pedagogy evaluated (both representative of course offering, and also if it could be adjusted to better connect with the identified population)? If only a few students were in the course, could that have been a factor (for how the course was taught, in considering results, etc)? What attempts were made, or could be made in the future to make the curriculum more inclusive (representative of the group served)? If a faculty training on how to work with different populations, including targeted teaching strategies might help, identify it (this can help with resource allocation)?</p> <p>Child Development</p> <p>Consider the targets for SLOs / PLOs – is 70% appropriate for all, or should some be higher? Department should at least discuss increasing the PLO target if they were all met. Tables look great – makes the data easy to read! CHDV 105 and 106— narrative mentions that the courses were update for CAP alignment and that they have completely different (new) SLOs and that SLO tools still being developed...yet, according to the matrix, some of the SLOs were met. A bit confused: were all the SLOs assessed? Or only certain ones? Were the ones that were not met due to the fact they weren't assessed? Or due to the fact that mastery was not achieved? Discussion of the courses that double as GE courses should be addressed.</p>
8. elumen Update	Vivian Baker	Review	<p>Courses are in and CIC is using elumen. Programs will be in shortly. The focus has been on getting curriculum ready and running. Vivian is now adding meetings with Robyn to work on the assessment piece. She'll be able to input assessments gathered since we stopped using Moodle, and hopefully by fall it will be ready for faculty to input assessment data by student. She's working with Robyn, as well as Rebecca and Justin on</p>

Topic	Facilitator	Action	Minutes
			Canvas integration –which is not as seamless (there are steps that might have to be taken each semester), however, it will still cut down on time.
9. Assessment Update	Vivian Baker	Discussion	Vivian will send out an email to Chairs for them to send any assessment data to her, while we are waiting on elumen. This is especially important for those courses that have NO assessment.
10. Future Agenda Items – eLumen process, Accreditation, Review CCCC SLO Handbook, Audit AUOs and provide suggestions (many AUOs are first generation and have not been seen by anyone on this committee) – CSLOs and PLOs are reviewed and approved. We should have a similar process for AUOs.			*Dawn, Jan, and Vivian will be attending the 5 th Annual SLO Symposium on 2/9 and will share insights at the next meeting.
11. Future Meeting Dates March 6 April 3 May 1			
12. Adjourn: 10:52 a.m.			

Meeting Chair: Vivian Baker

Recorder: Vivian Baker