



**ASSESSMENT WORK GROUP
APPROVED MINUTES
May 14, 2012**

Members Present: Beth Bailey, Teryl Ward, Steve Aristotelous, Pedro Mendez, Lorena Dorn, Bonnie Hunt, and Gerald Wray

Members Absent: David Baggett, Kamran Payvar, Kimberly Christensen, Gerald Wray, Kathleen Ennis, John Sola, Antoinette Herrera, Chad Redwing, Charles Mullins, James Todd

Guests: John Zamora, Academic Senate President, Dr. James Fay, Vice President of Instruction, Heather Townsend, Recorder

I. REVIEW OF MINUTES:

Assessment Work Group members reviewed and approved the April 27, 2012 meeting minutes.

M/S/U (Beth Bailey, Steve Aristotelous) to approve the April 27, 2012 Assessment Work Group Minutes.

II. UPDATE:

Pedro announced that Adrienne, Jennifer and Jason, Lit and Lang representatives on the Assessment Work Group, will not be returning as work group members. Pedro stated that we need to look for representatives from that division to fill the spots as an Assessment Work Group member.

III. WORK PLAN FOR FY 2012-13 ASSESSMENT WORK GROUP:

The work group discussed the work plan for 2012-13. Pedro distributed a document displaying the charge for the work group, and a table outlining the scope of work for both the Assessment Work Group and Assessment Coordinator position. Pedro's outline is as follows:

Job Description	FY 2012-13 Plan	Assessment Work Group Charge	Accreditation Recommendation 2 (Standards I.B.1, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6; II.A.2.i, II.B.4; ER10)
T6: Facilitate the provision of training for staff on assessment techniques and measurable learning outcome development.	Cultivation of an Assessment Culture Campus Wide <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information by AWG Members @ Division Meetings • Dialog at Curriculum Meetings • Flex Event 	1,6	Faculty members differentiate between course learning outcomes and course objectives
T2: Recommend policies and procedures to C Committee for the development, assessment and improvement of course, program and general education level objectives and measurable outcomes. T8: Coordinate the preparation of MJC's annual comprehensive assessment report and assist in the preparation of various other reports for accreditation purposes. T9: Present MJC's annual comprehensive assessment report to the Board of Trustees.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2011 Comprehensive Report 2. Document Process for Updating PLO's in Catalog 3. Document Process for listing SLO's in CURRICUNET 4. Communicate and Ensure Course Level SLO's assessment information is being entered into PRNET and a follow up process if action plans are attached 5. 2012 Comprehensive Report 	2,3, & 4	Clear standards for assessing course level outcomes that will inform course-level curricular and pedagogical improvement.

Job Description	FY 2012-13 Plan	Assessment Work Group Charge	Accreditation Recommendation 2 (Standards I.B.1, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6; II.A.2.i, II.B.4; ER10)
<p>JD3: Work with the VPI, VPA and VPS or their designees, on the development & implementation of SLO processes at the course, program and general education levels throughout the college.</p> <p>T3: Collaborate with the Office of Instruction, the IAC and the Curriculum Committee to integrate the development, assessment and improvement of measurable program-level Learning Outcomes with the program review process.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New Assessment Schedule Plan 2013-16 for SLO, AUO, PLO, GELOs, Program Mapping 2. Review, evaluate and make recommendations on the centralization of information to the AIE Committee 	2	College must complete its development of outcomes at the “program” and “institutional” levels.
<p>T3: Collaborate with the Office of Instruction, IAC, and the Committee to integrate the development, assessment and improvement of measureable program level Learning Outcomes and the program review process.</p>	<p>Assessment Work Group Evaluation and Feedback to AIE on assessment outcomes use in college decision making and improving institutional effectiveness</p> <p>Review and recommendations of Integration of Assessment in Program Review and Resources Allocation Process [PRNET Connection]</p>		College must demonstrate that it assesses outcomes and uses them in college decision making processes to improve institutional effectiveness.
<p>JD1: Chair AWG</p> <p>JD2: Member of AIE</p> <p>T4: Present information at meetings including A. Senate, C. Committee, IAC and other appropriate venues.</p>	<p>Cultivation of an Assessment Culture Campus Wide</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) AWG Meetings 2) AIE Meeting Updates 3) IAC Updates 4) Academic Senate Updates 5) Communication Plan 6) Annual Planning Event 7) Recognition of Annual Campus Best Practices 		The college must create venues to maintain an ongoing, collegial, self-reflective dialogue about the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional processes.
	Student Services		Student Services must develop and implement

Job Description	FY 2012-13 Plan	Assessment Work Group Charge	Accreditation Recommendation 2 (Standards I.B.1, I.B.3, I.B.4, I.B.5, I.B.6; II.A.2.i, II.B.4; ER10)
			student learning outcomes, establish systems of assessment to make improvements in the delivery of its programs and services and community to students these learning outcomes.

IV. EXAMINE WORK PLAN LINKS TO 6 ITEMS UNDER ACCJC RECOMMENDATION 2:

The work group examined how the work plan links to the six items listed under the ACCJC Recommendation 2. Work group members analyzed, discussed and gave input on the crosswalk listed above. Beth and Pedro agreed, that after analyzing the processes, we need to make the data links stronger. Beth stated that it does seem clear that there is value in doing your own Student Learning Outcomes, but how does that feed into the Institutional Student Learning Outcomes. Teryl said that by evaluating own Student Learning Outcomes, it helps to create faculty buy-in. Beth answered, “It only creates faculty buy-in when people can see its affects.”

Dr. James Fay, Vice President of Instruction, noted that Brian Sanders has recently finished a Program Review Flowchart. Brian has also worked with PRNET to build out the software to complete the loop. The flow chart helps create a visualization of this process. Pedro said that he and Lorena can work to get details of the data links, and will bring back that information for group approval.

Pedro stated that part of the assessment process, is this group should be telling the story and then sending that information on to the Accreditation/Institutional Effectiveness Committee. John Zamora agreed, and said that it is all about trying to close the loop. Ongoing dialogue has to occur to close the loop.

Lorena stated that the communication on the outcomes to students should also be in the coordinator’s job description. Lorena pointed out that the information is listed in the ACCJC Rubric.

John Zamora asked the work group, "How does this crosswalk sound to you?" John stated that the Academic Senate would like for the Assessment Coordinator position to be announced soon. Beth said that she questioned the work group's existence. Beth asked, "Was our existence the result of the Accreditation Committee. Are there things in our purview that was not a Recommendation?" Pedro said that the professional development portion is outside of the work group's scope. Pedro said we want to make sure we manage scope and direction. Beth suggested that we look at colleges that have accomplished professional development. Pedro's opinion is that the Assessment Coordinator needs to keep moving this group along. Teryl's opinion is to see some connecting among all the pieces. Teryl said that we need a culture of assessment and a coordinator to keep the College on the ultimate goal, which is student success.

V. ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR 40% REASSIGNMENT TIME:

Steve asked about the percentage of people who will apply for the Assessment Coordinator position. Pedro said that it is important that the position be a faculty member. Dr. Fay said that it is not rocket science. Anyone can get up to speed in a matter of weeks. Beth Bailey disagreed.

Pedro discussed with the group the 40% reassigned time for the coordinator position. Pedro said, "If you were reading this, how does this grasp you?" Teryl said that it just depends on the department from which the coordinator is applying. It is hard to say how it would affect people College wide. Pedro asked if the position should be reassigned or overload. Majority agreed that it should be reassigned and not overload. Teryl suggested that it be someone who takes this on as primary work. Dr. Fay suggested that verbiage be used to emphasize that this position would be a career building opportunity.

VI. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.