



Outcomes Committee

Minutes for March 15, 2011

Attendees: Dan Smith, Jemma Blake-Judd, Jim Ocampo, Eddie Lee, Lisa Ledebouer, Michael Sanetrick, Emily Woolery, Kristina Allende, Jason Chevalier, Barbara McNeice-Stallard

■ **Introduction of Outcomes Coordinators & their roles for spring 2011**

- The new Outcomes Co-Coordinators, Jason Chevalier and Kristina Allende, introduced themselves. Jason will be doing research to examine how other schools are doing assessment and gaining faculty buy-in. He will also help Kristina as needed while she works on the SLOs for degrees and the GEO workgroups. There is a research component that also requires the Mt. SAC chairs to ask faculty how things are progressing.

■ **Introduction of Committee members**

- The committee members introduced themselves and discussed why they were on the committee. They liked that the committee allowed for active dialogue on issues and that there was an opportunity for reflection and honest discussion.

■ **How do you think things are going across campus with SLOs and assessment? Faculty buy-in?**

- The general consensus is that there are pockets of people who are buying into the process, but there are many more that are not using assessment for curricular and pedagogical reasons. The ACCJC Team's Evaluation Report indicated that there was a confusion regarding SLOs and measurable objectives. They didn't feel that faculty were buying into the process. The committee members shared several stories about both some great assessment work as well as some heartaches. Counselors have done one cycle of assessment and now want a more in-depth assessment process to allow for a higher-level of information and discussion to come from the assessment results. Student services work is going along very well. DSPS has a lot of buy-in. The AUOs work in Student Services are going very well and are connected to the Team's goals; the goals help drive the AUO and SLO work. The Library is doing the SLO work, but is finding it challenging for many reasons. While the Music department is meeting the percentages required of the SLO Plan and Timeline, the use of the data for growth and informative processes are still lacking to some extent. A few committee members indicated that while the work of setting the SLOs and the assessment of them was sometimes laborious and not meaningful, there are now meaningful discussions during department/division meetings that focus on the use of results. Some indicated that a lot of the department chairs have the knowledge about assessment and are positive about it and they help lead the productive conversations that lend themselves to curricular issues. The departments are starting to ask if they have learned anything or if the department has changed because of the assessment piece. Many discussed how we need to get beyond the numbers for the plan and timeline and start

really focusing on the meaningfulness factor. How will the college be able to demonstrate ACCJC proficiency by 2012 (<http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/Rubric%20for%20Evaluating%20Institutional%20Effectiveness.pdf>)? Not that it is required from ACCJC, but would getting students more involved in SLOs and their assessment help with faculty buy-in? A suggestion is that the college focus on the department chairs and give them the support and training they need in order to take it to their faculty and engage them in conversations to help faculty be more involved in assessment.

- One difficulty has been working with adjunct faculty who are not paid for extra meetings. Some departments work around the issue by asking the chairs to help with the process and putting minimal load on the part-timers. The noncredit area has only adjunct faculty so faculty buy-in is difficult as the work is mandated and paid time is not given for dialogue. The worry from some faculty is that the assessment could be used as part of their evaluation; however, the faculty contract clearly indicates that assessment is only done as part of the faculty members' supplemental hours. It is important to remember that not all areas of the college will be involved at the same level because of these and many other constraints.
- **Outcomes Committee work for spring**
 - During this semester, the committee heard that it will be asked to participate in and be a part of the following tasks (see below). For the next meeting, they will review the Standard II section of the Team's Evaluation of Mt. SAC and provide feedback as listed below in the agenda items for the next meeting.
 - Accreditation Team's Evaluation Report
 - GEO Area meetings
 - AA & AS workgroups
 - Deans/chairs/department discussions on how SLOs/assessment are progressing and how to get to using the findings for curricular and pedagogical purposes
- **Items for Next meeting on April 5, 2011 are:**
 - Accreditation Team's Evaluation Report (All)
 - What areas are they giving the college a commendation?
 - What areas are they suggesting need improvement? How may we address their recommendations for improvement?
 - What strategies could we use to improve faculty buy-in?
 - Update on program-level SLOs (Kristina)
 - Update on GEO workgroups (Kristina)
 - Update on Mt. SAC faculty buy-in (Kristina, Barbara, Jason)
 - Update on how other college's are doing assessment and buy-in (Jason)
 - ACCJC Annual Report (Barbara)