



## Outcomes Assessment Work Group

# AGENDA

**Friday, March 10, 2017**

**1:00pm – 2:30 pm**

**Founders Hall 111**

**View the agenda and attachments at:**

<http://outcomesassessment.sites.mjc.edu/index.php>

Members Present: Beth Bailey, Gagandeep Dhaliwal, Lynnette Borrelli, Gerry Wray, Barbara Salerno, Yolande Petersen, Aurelia Gonzalez, Milan Motoroni, Scott Kerlin, & Nita Gopal

1. Information about an upcoming resolution: Nita gave OAW the following information--*A few instructors are in doubt about whether “assessing a course” means all sections of a course. Hence, they would like to work with Nita on a resolution that assessing a course does mean all sections of that course.*

Nita asked the members present if they had the same doubts as mentioned by some instructors. All OAW members present mentioned that ever since they had learned about outcomes assessment, assessing all sections of a course had been their understanding; they had no doubts that assessing a course meant all sections of that course.

2. Quality of assessments: Why assessment scores are not and shouldn't be a replica of grades.

Members discussed the fine line between course grades and assessment scores and the meaning each has. An overall grade of a course evaluates student performance over a breadth of requirements, but an assessment score holds a magnifying glass over a few specific outcomes the teacher has designed.

Members mentioned that creating an assessment rubric for that specific activity used to assess an outcome or a set of outcomes might increase the quality of an assessment. At the same time, an exam score could very well be used as a guideline to figure out what outcome a student had mastered and what the student hadn't.

3. Connecting courses to programs

Nita said that before we “map,” all programs need to have courses connected to them in eLumen. For this she needed help, or programs wouldn't be able to map if the set-up wasn't ready in eLumen. Mapping, Nita mentioned, is a crucial step as data is collected, and if we want our data quality to be high and to reflect the truth about our programs, then mapping needs to be not just “completed” but done right with everyone's input. OAW members who were present spent some time connecting their courses to their programs.



## Outcomes Assessment Work Group

# AGENDA

**March 10, 2017**

**1:00pm – 2:30 pm**

**Library Basement, Room 55**

**View the agenda and attachments at:**

<http://outcomesassessment.sites.mjc.edu/index.php>

Barbara Salerno offered to provide a document with instructions for mapping. Nita provided OAW's division coordinators a screencast video to help with mapping

4. Do all division coordinators have department coordinators to help them?  
The answer was “no.” This brought us back to the fundamental problem of OAW's structure and membership.
  
5. Writing a resolution to give OAW a better structure: Should this be a committee as opposed to a workgroup? Will it work better as a committee?  
Gerry Wray mentioned that when this had been discussed many years ago, the consensus was that a workgroup is long(er) lasting—hence the decision had been taken to keep OAW as a workgroup.
  
6. Nita said that she was working on understanding the pathway from Canvas to eLumen: Assignments are created in Canvas but assessed in eLumen; the assessment has to exist in eLumen before getting to it from Canvas; the elumen section and Canvas section must exist as parallels before walking back and forth.  

Nita felt that she's not comfortable yet demonstrating this to faculty because the system needs to be foolproof for faculty to not feel anxious when working in it.
  
7. Before we end the semester, a get-together dinner? Everyone voted for April 20.