Outcomes Assessment Work Group
September-Meeting Minutes

Friday, September 8, 2017
1:00pm – 2:30 pm
Founders Hall 111

View the agenda and attachments at:
http://outcomesassessment.sites.mjc.edu/index.php

Members Present:
Patricia Wall, Taure Shimp, Brandi Snider, Lynette Borrelli, Gerry Wray, Bobby Hutchinson, Belen Robinson, Yolande Petersen, Kathleen Ennis

- Members introduced themselves
- A short discussion on requesting FLEX for OAW participation
- SLO vs CLO terminology: Lynnette asked what was the correct terminology to state on the syllabus? “SLO” or “CLO”? The answer was: “CLO” would be more appropriate as “SLO” is a general term: http://www.mjc.edu/instruction/outcomesassessment/elumen_basics.pdf
- Amanda updated the OAW membership list on the website updated.
- Nita went through the steps needed for faculty to access the basic information: http://www.mjc.edu/instruction/outcomesassessment/instructors_and_users.php
- Discussed portions of the most recent SLO report to Senate
Discussion on how to handle schedules that are missing:

- Kathleen suggested that the remaining missing schedules could be divvied out to the group to call and make contact reminding departments of outstanding schedules. Nita will send an email list to members next week.

- If some schedules still remain even after reps contact the departments, Nita said she would send out an email to the departments mentioning a last resort because without schedules, we can’t distribute assessments in eLumen.

- Mentioning of how to get data discussions started; the importance of making it interesting--data corridors or data dinners etc. There was a mention of how cooperation was needed by all individuals and groups (YFA, Academic Senate, and individual faculty) to make SLOs meaningful.

- Nita mentioned she would train department and div coordinators in data extraction from eLumen

- The one-time $200.00 stipend offer for part-time instructors might continue for 2017-2018--confirmation needed from an administrative office

- Regarding encouraging colleagues, Belen gave an example of how she created a common assessment for COLSK and how that made data entry extremely easy; Bobby agreed that a common assessment was a great idea. Lynnette mentioned that a uniform rule on creating a common assessment might not work for all as every department had its own methodologies.
OAW members said we should invite Curtis to the next OAW meeting to address the issues and concerns of the work group.

Nita also mentioned the importance of taking the whole SLO process slow and in carefully planned steps, which, unfortunately hasn’t happened. Example: Have a four-year or five-year plan where during the first couple of years, attention is paid to getting comfortable with the software and understanding SLO-assessments. Next, understand the importance of “mapping” and the movement of data from a variety of data points to a variety of destinations; after that, become comfortable in extracting and discussing reports; lastly, apply the meaning of the data wherever needed.

There was once again a re-iteration of how the SLO work at our school was a difficult path as its functioning depended on requesting our colleagues to participate; Bobby mentioned the importance of recognizing Accreditation as one of the major reasons to create SLO data. Nita added that perhaps OAW could encourage colleagues to move away from the compulsiveness created by Accreditation standards and simply explore the possibilities of SLOs.

We ended on a positive note: In Spring 2017, 92.5% of courses scheduled for assessment had scores in them.