



Outcomes Assessment Work Group

Unapproved Minutes

March 6, 2015

1:00 - 2:30pm

Yosemite 213

View the minutes and attachments at:

http://mjc.edu/instruction/outcomesassessment/oawagendas_minutes.php

Members Present: Beth Bailey, Brian Sanders, Deborah Brayman, Eileen Kerr, Gerry Wray, James Dorn, Kathleen Ennis, Martha Robles, Nita Gopal, Paul Muncy

Members Absent: Belen Robinson, Gail Brumley, Heather Townsend, Jennifer Hamilton, Jillian Daly, Lynette Borrelli, Mark Anglin, Michael Sundquist, Milan Motroni, Patrick Bettencourt, Pedro Mendez, Sonny Gumm

Others Present: Kathy Haskin

I. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – not completed

II. **ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**1. Due Dates for Spring CLO, PLO, ILO, GELO Assessments
May 31, 2015 (with encouragement to finish by 4/20/15)**

E. Kerr spoke to J. Todd about a schedule for eLumen adoption. The contract is currently being reviewed and they would like to talk to OAW possibly at the next OAW meeting if not before. A separate meeting may have to be called and everyone invited to attend in early April.

E. Kerr suggested contacting anyone in your divisions that is assessing and encourage them to have them completed by April 20th.

2. Spring 2015 PLO/ILO/GELO Assessments - Status Reports

E. Kerr mentioned those on the list below should be able to have their portion completed by April 20, as they are not assessing the CLOs.

PLO/ILO/GELO only

Administration of Justice - PLO only

Computer Graphics - PLO only

Environmental Sciences - PLO only

Human Services - PLO only

Natural Resources - PLO only

PLO/ILO/GELO plus Program Review

Animal Science - PLO plus Program Review

Earth Science - PLO plus Program Review

Geology - PLO plus Program Review

History - PLO plus Program Review

Meteorology - PLO plus Program Review

Music - PLO plus Program Review

A discussion took place regarding courses that are not a program and do not have certain assessments; Library courses are different than other assessments and some information (Service Area Outcomes) is not able to be inserted, but should be able to be with eLumen. The difference between CurricUNET and eLumen was discussed, and what eLumen should be able to do once it is up and running. Questions were brought up about identifying students with student's W number; data can be inserted but will be behind a firewall and unable to be obtained on that student due to privacy issues.

B. Sanders mentioned going to a Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) seminar recently and asked if the person looking at that data will have a legitimate educational interest when the data is viewed. We need to be able to track our students and see what kind of flow they would have. The idea of equity and the idea of tracking performance is that it has to be done collectively to a certain extent and then broken down in demographics, which is how the big issues are reviewed. We should be able to look at students by ethnicity or other means or subgroup. It is something that we need to have input on.

Entering into eLumen should be easier as compared to CurricUNET and eLumen will generate reminders of things not done. It was mentioned that eLumen has customized everything. The question that needs to be clarified with eLumen is does the business model involve customizing to each college or is it a generic product that is customized with our data. eLumen has said it is not actually customized but there are ways to define what the institution wants to do and how they want to do it.

E. Kerr was dealing with whether to put the data into CurricUNET and Excel when we might change in the fall. Her decision was that the data still needs to be input as it is our process for now and we need to demonstrate that we are continuing that process. E. Kerr was concerned about the idea that we were going to change systems and put off the input of data. It does not convey to our faculty the idea that it just needs to be done. The data needs to be input to be transferred over.

E. Kerr will send out in the next couple of weeks to OAW representatives and deans a list of what assessments for each division that has been done or not done. Instructions will be given on how to read that document so you can go in and get rid of items that are not needed and how to clean it up a bit.

OAW needs to show that the process stays the same and that the process is not changing. A five year cycle will continue to be done and at the end of that five year cycle it will be reexamined and at that time decide what needs to be changed.

Upon the question being asked about the new system and if new CLOs would be able to be entered at all or only transferred information be worked with, E. Kerr said it needs to be made clear with eLumen, with curriculum and all of our courses, that the old information can be kept along with the old CLO and data connected with it but also be able to make changes and confirm the new CLO is where the data will come from.

B. Bailey mentioned that in fall 2015 their courses will all be renumbered. E. Kerr said she will discuss with H. Townsend and assumes that all those renumbering changes that went through Curriculum H. Townsend is aware of what needs to be changed on those and any others that will be renumbered and can be transferred over properly.

3. Independent Study Proposal Form Revisions

A conversation took place at the last meeting about the issue of what do we do with Independent Study CLOs because CLO projects are very individual but the CLOs for Independent Studies are very generic. The idea of looking at the form was discussed. Curriculum Committee said to make the changes and bring back for approval.

Discussion took place and suggestions were made for changes on the form. E. Kerr to make the revisions, will send out to OAW for review and attempt to have on the agenda for Curriculum Committee's next meeting.

Next Meeting: April 17, 2015, Yosemite Hall 213, 1:00 pm