San Diego Mesa College
Committee on Outcomes and Assessment
Meeting Notes

September 3, 2019

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., MC 211B

ATTENDEES	Bridget Herrin, Co-Chair (excused)	Mary Gwin
	Kris Clark, Co-Chair	Ed Helscher (excused)
	Tina Recalde, Acting Co-Chair	Linda Hensley
	Leela Bingham	Pam Luster (excused)
	Ailene Crakes	Mariette Rattner
	Donna Duchow (excused)	Saloua Saidane
	Claudia Estrada-Howell (excused)	Isabel O'Connor
	Michael Temple	Raquel Aparicio
	Manuel Velez	
	Anda McComb	
	Support: Sahar King	Guests:

Agenda Item A: Call to Order: By Kris Clark at 3:37p.m. in MC211B.

DISCUSSION	**Approval of May 7, 2019 Minutes** • The minutes from May 7, 2019, were emailed to COA members for review prior to the meeting. • The minutes were M/S by Leela Bingham and Mariette Rattner and approved.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• Post approved minutes to the COA website.	• Mona King	• Before the next meeting

Agenda Item B: Pathways Report – Howard and Toni

DISCUSSION	**1. Pathways Report** ➤ Toni Parsons and Howard Eskew, Co-Chairs of Pathways Committee will be invited for a future meeting. ➤ Kris Clark reported out on the Pathways relate discussions from the 2019

DOC Orientation on August 30, 2019. COA would be a part of the 4th Pilar—to ensure students are learning, and even though the Pathways works at Mesa has not yet progressed to the 4th Pilar, it is still important for COA and DOCs to be involved in the discussion early on so that when Pathways asks for our input, we are prepared.

➢ 25 DOCs from Students Services and Instruction participated in the Orientation

➢ Discussion focused on how Outcomes Assessment and Pathways might align.

➢ The main points of discussion included the need to determine a baseline for surveys, how well are students staying on their Paths, how are students using Pathways, and using Outcomes Assessment to determine student goals as a first step in helping students achieve their goals.

➢ One of the main recommendations provided by participants centered on the need to establish a baseline for surveys and how that can be accomplished.

➢ If we have just started looking at learning and not attaching it to an outcome of a particular course, how do we determine what is a student's success level?

➢ Ed Helscher, presented a survey he ran at the end of spring and is currently analyzing. To assess student and faculty perception, hearn the same survey with the students and his faculty.

➢ Feedback from a committee member: Is it possible to track students?

➢ Response: Ailene Crakes said, yes, but we are not there yet. Counseling faculty, alongside the district, has been focused on the registration piece to ensure that students are enrolled in their classes, Tracking of students is coming, but maybe down the line a bit.

➢ Is it possible to establish a cohort?

➢ Response: Ailene Crakes said, some programs already have a cohort, but most do not have that capability currently. A cohort could help programs that are struggling to develop a pathway.

➢ Tina Recalde: May benefit in faculty thinking about the skills students need by the end of the program. Then looking at what GE courses can be added to the pathway to help students achieve those skells

➢ There might be value in having students and faculty come together. Faculty need to know what skills the students need to have before they walk away from the program. By asking students currently in a program what they expect to get out of that program, we might discover information beneficial in developing the path.

➢ Is the department or program able to identify majors now more quickly than they used to be able to?

➢ Response from Ailene Crakes: this is not something that we can do currently. However, the system does allow us to establish student groups. For instance, there is a group for student-athletes and a group for Mesa Academy, but we are a bit away from being able to identify majors.

➢ Bridget Herrin presented the Student Characteristics Dashboard at

| | President's Cabinet. This dashboard shows what students declared as their major on their college application. |
| | |

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
• Invite Pathways Coordinator to COA Meeting • demonstrate the student characteristics dashboard	• Kris Clark • IE Office	• next meeting • next meeting

Agenda Item C: Continuing Business

DISCUSSION	**1. Outcomes Perception Survey results—Anda McComb** ➢ The Outcomes Perception Survey was distributed in Spring 2019 to test the climate about outcome assessment across Mesa college. ➢ The survey was sent to the entire campus. ➢ There were 124 responses to the survey. ➢ The first three questions were used to determine the respondent's role in outcomes assessments. Respondents who were COA members, DOCs, or served on the ILO Taskforce were identified as "participants" while those who had been involved at their department or program level, but not at the governance level, were defined as "non-participants." The survey results were presented in such a way as to separate the participants and non-participant responses. ➢ 81% said that it is the professional duty of faculty and classified professionals to regularly assess what students are learning. ➢ Both groups had over 70% agreement regarding Faculty/Classified Professionals/Administrators having a professional duty to regularly assess what students are learning; however, participants seem to feel more strongly about this statement, 92% agreement compared to 71% agreement for non-participants. ➢ The majority of respondents said that their department is coordinating Student Assessment annually in consultation with their departmental faculty, staff, and administrator and that assessments are administered each semester. ➢ About two-thirds of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their department administers assessments on a semester basis (66% for both groups). ➢ 75% of the respondents said outcomes assessment is best developed and administered by their respective departments. ➢ Both groups had over 50% agreement regarding Outcomes Assessment being best developed and administered by the respective departmental proctors;

however, participants seem to feel more strongly about this statement: 87% agreement compared to 62% agreement for non-participants.

- ➢ Three of the questions produced responses with less than 50% agreement: 1. The effectiveness of my work improves when outcomes are regularly assessed throughout the cycle. 2. I see value in the time I spend on Outcomes Assessment. 3. Assessing outcomes has immediate relevance to my daily work. The Committee may want to spend some time reviewing potential reasons for these responses.
- ➢ Non-participants compared to participant responses differed substantially regarding the effectiveness of their department's plan for periodic outcomes review and review of the assessment tool.
- ➢ There is a noticeable gap in perception between participants and non-participants regarding the department having consensus on its approach to student learning, and the review of data gathered from assessments each semester.
  - ▪ **Questions from committee member:**
  - ▪ When we are showing the data between participants and non-participants, we are demonstrating the agreement just based on who responded. We did not measure the disagreements.
  - ▪ Is it possible to do a breakdown to know whether the respondent is faculty, classified staff, or adjunct faculty?
  - ▪ It would be nice if the report could give us three to five takeaways from each section.
  - ▪ There are probably some inherent issues with the survey itself that we can talk about down the road. We might want to rewrite it at the end of this year and run it again.
  - ▪ Our goal is that everybody on campus, regardless of what role they play, has some role in the outcomes process.
  - ▪ What is work effectiveness? What does it mean? Bigger classes? More of students passing? Are our students more successful?
- ➢ For future discussions of the survey results, change the terminology from participant and non-participant as the goal is for everyone to participate on some level. No suggestions for terminology changes were finalized. **Spring 2019 Outcomes Perception Survey**
- ➢ **Powerpoint**

2. Governance Survey Results

- ➢ The survey was distributed in Spring 2019.
- ➢ The questions focused on the following themes: How is the committee organized? Does the committee start on time? What is the quality of discussion? What is the quality of communication? Etc.
- ➢ 6 respon total. 83% were faculty, 17% were administrators
- ➢ 50% of the respondents had been on the committee for one to three years, 33% for three to five, and 17% were on the committee for more than five years.
- ➢ 100% said that they expected to continue in the next academic year.
- ➢ Respondents indicated that the goals of the committee were clear and

	aligned with and in support of the college goals.
	➢ Regarding meaningful dialogue about agenda items, 33% of respondents disagreed, but there is no response or explanation.
	➢ Respondents noted that the committee does not have an orientation for new members, and this is something that the committee should address this year.
	➢ Respondents indicated that they felteetings are scheduled for the appropriate amount of time to accomplish the goals.
	➢ Survey suggestions that are in progress: IE office updated the website and the handbook this summer. After some discussion of the floating start time based on the end time for President's Cabinet, it was decided that COA should officially begin at 3:35 PM.
	➢ **Governance Survey Results**
	      3. Review of Mission Statement
	➢ Subject tabled for discussion during the next meeting.
	➢ **Mission Statement**
	      4. DOC update form (Anda)/ Confirmation of DOC list
	➢ DOCs will be provided with a link where they can enter the new DOCs information. The new DOC will then receive an automatically generated email with resources such as the Outcomes Guide and Departmental Coordinators Job Description.
	      5. Once they receive an email from Watermark, they will then be able to access their Taskstream account and an OA YouTube training video. **Defining the role of COA in Pathways**
	➢ Standing item.
	➢ Subject tabled for discussion during the next meeting.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

Agenda Item D: New Business

DISCUSSION	**1. OA Institute Redesign** ➢ OA Institute had been run as a Summer Institute, but because of the funding, we did not run it this past summer. ➢ At a Co-Chair meeting last year they talked about the idea of turning that Institute into a series of one day workshops specific to the program and department needs. Kris brought this idea forward to the DOC Orientation and it was well received by the DOCs, so the plan moving forward is to create

a menu of items that an Instructional School or Student Services Department can select and to tailor one-day workshops to specific needs of programs and departments.

➢ Kris will present a more concrete plan later this semester.

2. COA workshop schedule

Thursday, August 15, 2019	1:00pm-3:00pm	TBD	Outcomes Across the Campus
Friday, August 30, 2019	10:00am-NOON	LRC-435	Dept. Outcomes Coordinator Orientation
Friday, September 13, 2019	10:00am-NOON	LRC-435	Integrating Global Consciousness in Your Curriculum
Friday, October 18, 2019	10:00am-NOON	LRC-435	Assignment Charrette
Friday, February 28, 2020	10:00am-NOON	LRC-435	Rubrics, Canvas, and Outcomes
Friday, April 24, 2020	10:00am-NOON	LRC-435	Integrating Critical Thinking into your Curriculum

➢ ILO workshops this year will focus on
  o Global consciousness
  o Critical thinking
➢ The second workshop in Fall will be an Assignment Charette which can be used for Outcomes or just improving an assignment. This is a cross-disciplinary activity.
➢ In the spring, we will revisit using Canvas rubrics to support the Outcomes Assessment process.

3. AUO's vs. Goals for Program Review

➢ There seems to be confusion between goals in program review and Outcomes
➢ A lot of the administrative units are pulling their goals from program review and turning them into outcomes.
➢ Goals are short term things to be achieved and outcomes are long term.
➢ The clarification exists in the handbook.

4. DOC report revisions

➢ After much discussion at COA and Co-Chairs meetings, it was suggested that the DOC reports presented in COA for the last two years take on a new video format that would allow us to create a library of best practices. Video reports would be submitted to COA throughout the year, and COA would view and respond to the reports. The reports would then be entered into a video repository for access by the DOCs. This idea was discussed and approved at the 8/30/2019 DOC Orientation after examples were presented.
➢ It was suggested that the videos be closed captioned.
➢ **Dramatic Arts Program Outcomes video presentation example**

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

OA Institute Re-design	Kris Clark	November 2019
Manager's meetings	Kris Clark, Isabel O'Connor	November 2019

Agenda Item E: Announcements/Adjournment

DISCUSSION	1. Next meeting, September 17, 2019 2. COA Meeting Schedule 2019-2020

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

Agenda Item F: Adjournment

DISCUSSION	• The meeting was adjourned by Kristan Clark at 5:10 p.m.

Submitted by: Sahar King, Senior Secretary
Approved on: