OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (OAC)

Monday, August 24, 2020, @ 12:00 noon – 1:30 pm

By ConferZoom (Remote)

AGENDA

I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

III. Approval of Agenda

IV. Approval of Minutes
a. Monday, April 13, 2020

V. Opportunities to Address the Committee

VI. Action Items
a. No Action Item

VII. Discussion Items
a. Review Committee Purpose and Membership
b. Recognize Pilot Faculty
c. Review of OAC work from last Semester
d. Program Review Meeting (Collaboration)
e. Review of Midterm Report
f. E-Lumen Update

VIII. Other Discussions/Information
a. Glossary Startup / 3 M's (coming up with terms)

IX. Announcements
a.

X. Future Agenda Items

XI. Next Regular Meeting
a. Monday, September 14, 2020, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)

XII. Adjournment

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (OAC)

Monday, September 14, 2020, @ 12:00 noon – 1:30 pm

By ConferZoom (Remote)

AGENDA

I.   Call to Order

II.   Roll Call

III.   Approval of Agenda

IV.   Approval of Minutes
    a. Monday, August 24, 2020

V.   Opportunities to Address the Committee

VI.   Action Items
    a. No Action Item

VII.   Discussion Items
    a. Faculty Training
    b. Faculty Survey
    c. eLumen Assessment/Rubrics
    d. Program Review Update
    e. Peer Review/Course Review Cycle
    f. E-Lumen Update

VIII. Other Discussions/Information
    a. Glossary Startup / 3 M's (coming up with terms)

IX.   Announcements
    a.

X.   Future Agenda Items

XI.   Next Regular Meeting
    a. Monday, September 28, 2020, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)

XII.   Adjournment

AGENDA

I. **Call to Order**

II. **Roll Call**

III. **Approval of Agenda**

IV. **Approval of Minutes**
   a. 09/14/2020

V. **Opportunities to Address the Committee** *(2 minutes each)*

VI. **Reports** *(2 minutes each)*
   a. eLumen (Lisa Holmes/Keiry Borruel)
   b. Curriculum (Eduardo Vasquez)
   c. Program Review (Karen Kane)
   d. Sub-Committee
   • Glossary Update (Sub-committee members/Penny Shreve)

VII. **Action Items**
   a. No Action Item

VIII. **Discussion Items**
   a. Committee Membership (Joseph Williams)
   b. ACCJC Follow-up Report (Status Update)
   c. Faculty Training/Survey (Follow-up)
   d. eLumen/Canvas Assessment (Faculty Preparation)
   • Observe A Process with Assessing Outcomes in Canvas/eLumen
   • 2-yr Assessment Cycle Submissions (Update)

IX. **Other Discussions/Information**
   a. Glossary Update (sub-committee/Penny Shreve)
   b. BoardDocs Rollover Agenda (Jessica Tainatongo/Michelle Henderson)

X. **Announcements** *(2 minutes each)*
   a.

XI. **Future Agenda Items**

XII. **Next Regular Meeting**
   a. Monday, October 12, 2020, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)

XIII. **Adjournment**

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (OAC)

Monday, October 12, 2020, @ 12:00 noon – 1:30 pm

By ConferZoom (Remote)

AGENDA

I.   **Call to Order**

II.   **Roll Call**

III.   **Approval of Agenda**

IV.   **Approval of Minutes**
a. 09/14/2020
b. 09/28/2020

V.   **Opportunities to Address the Committee** *(2 minutes each)*

VI.   **Reports** *(2 minutes each)*
a. eLumen *(Lisa Holmes/Keiry Borruel)*
b. Curriculum *(Eduardo Vasquez)*
c. Program Review *(Nance Nunes-Gill - Academic Senate President)*
d. Sub-Committee
   • Glossary Update *(Nance Nunes-Gill/Jennafer Worland/Sumana Pasala)*

VII.   **Action Items**
a. No Action Item

VIII.   **Discussion Items**
a. Committee Membership *(Joseph Williams)*
b. Committee's Purpose Statement and Description *(Beverly Ranney & Nance Nunes-Gill)*
c. SLO Conference *(General Info)*
d. Proposed Process for 2-yr Assessment Plan *(No FT Faculty / Penny Shreve)*
e. Faculty Training/Survey *(Follow-up / Penny Shreve)*
f. OAC Committee Handbook *(Joseph Williams)*

IX.   **Other Discussions/Information**
a. Sustaining records/glossary *(Gustavo Bento)*

X.   **Announcements** *(2 minutes each)*
a.

XI.   **Future Agenda Items**

XII.   **Next Regular Meeting**
a. Monday, October 26, 2020, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)

XIII.   **Adjournment**

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (OAC)

Monday, October 26, 2020, @ 12:00 noon – 1:30 pm

By ConferZoom (Remote)

AGENDA

I. **Call to Order**

II. **Roll Call**

III. **Approval of Agenda**

IV. **Approval of Minutes**
   a. 10/12/2020

V. **Opportunities to Address the Committee** *(2 minutes each)*

VI. **Reports** *(2 minutes each)*
   a. eLumen *(Lisa Holmes/Keiry Borruel)*
   b. Curriculum *(Eduardo Vasquez)*
   c. Program Review *(Lisa Holmes)*
   d. Sub-Committee
   • Glossary Update *(Nance Nunes-Gill/Jennafer Worland/Sumana Pasala)*
   • OAC Handbook *(Joseph Williams/Penny Shreve/Nance Nunes-Gill/Jennafer Worland)*

VII. **Action Items**
   a. Adopting Committee's Revised Purpose Statement and Description
   b. Proposed Process for 2-yr Assessment Plan *(No FT Faculty / Penny Shreve)*
   c. Faculty Training/Survey *(Penny Shreve)*

VIII. **Discussion Items**
   a. SLO Symposium *(General Info)*
   b. Update submission of 2-yr Assessment Plan *(Joseph Williams/Penny Shreve/Keiry Borruel)*

IX. **Other Discussions/Information**
   a. OAC Handbook

X. **Announcements** *(2 minutes each)*
   a.

XI. **Future Agenda Items**

XII. **Next Regular Meeting**
   a. Monday, November 9, 2020, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)

XIII. **Adjournment**

AGENDA

I. **Call to Order**

II. **Roll Call**

III. **Approval of Agenda**

IV. **Approval of Minutes**
   a. 10/26/2020

V. **Opportunities to Address the Committee** *(2 minutes each)*

VI. **Reports** *(2 minutes each)*
   a. eLumen *(Lisa Holmes/Keiry Borruel)*
   b. Curriculum *(Eduardo Vasquez)*
   c. Program Review
   d. Sub-Committee
   • Glossary Update *(Nance Nunes-Gill/Jennafer Worland/Sumana Pasala)*
   • OAC Handbook *(Joseph Williams/Penny Shreve/Nance Nunes-Gill/Jennafer Worland)*

VII. **Action Items**
   a. Proposed Process for 2-yr Assessment Plan *(No FT Faculty / Penny Shreve)*
   b. Faculty Training/Survey *(Penny Shreve)*

VIII. **Discussion Items**
   a. Committee's Revised Purpose Statement and Description *(CGC Approval)*
   b. SLO Symposium *(General Info)*
   c. Update submission of 2-yr Assessment Plan *(Joseph Williams/Penny Shreve/Keiry Borruel)*

IX. **Other Discussions/Information**
   a. OAC Handbook

X. **Announcements** *(2 minutes each)*

XI. **Future Agenda Items**

XII. **Next Regular Meeting**
   a. Tentative Monday, January 25, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)

XIII. **Adjournment**

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (OAC)

Monday, February 8, 2021, @ 12:00 noon – 1:30 pm

By ConferZoom (Remote)

AGENDA

I.   **Call to Order**

II. **Roll Call**

III. **Approval of Agenda**

IV. **Approval of Minutes**
     a. 11/23/2020

V.   **Opportunities to Address the Committee** *(2 minutes each)*

VI. **Reports** *(2 minutes each)*
     a. OAC Co-Chairs – Penny Shreve and Joseph Williams
     b. eLumen - Lisa Holmes and Keiry Borruel
     c. Curriculum - Eduardo Vasquez
     d. Program Review
     e. Sub-Committee
     - Glossary Update - Nance Nunes-Gill, Jennafer Worland, Sumana Pasala
     - OAC Handbook - Joseph Williams, Penny Shreve, Nance Nunes-Gill, Jennafer Worland

VII. **Action Items**
     a. Proposed Process for 2-yr Assessment Plan (needs to include 1st or 2nd read; handout?) – Penny Shreve
     b. Faculty Training/Survey (needs to include 1st or 2nd read; handout?) – Penny Shreve

VIII. **Discussion Items**
     a. Committee's Revised Purpose Statement and Description *(CGC Approval)*
     b. 8th Annual SLO Symposium
     c. Update submission of 2-yr Assessment Plan - Joseph Williams, Penny Shreve, Keiry Borruel
     - Are all plans submitted?
     - When courses change (add or subtract a course), how is the plan updated?
     d. Mapping Updates During Curriculum Process (Changing SLOs or PLOs)
     e. Faculty Training/Professional Development (Pillar 4)

IX. **Other Discussions/Information**
     a. OAC Handbook
     b. Glossary

X.   **Announcements** *(2 minutes each)*

XI. **Future Agenda Items**

XII. **Next Regular Meeting**
     a. Monday, March 8, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)

XIII. Adjournment

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (OAC)

Monday, March 8, 2021, @ 12:00 noon – 1:30 pm

By ConferZoom (Remote)

AGENDA

I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

III. Approval of Agenda

IV. Approval of Minutes
a. 02/08/2021

V. Opportunities to Address the Committee *(2 minutes each)*

VI. Reports *(2 minutes each)*
a. Co-Chairs *(Penny Shreve & Joseph Williams)*
b. eLumen *(Lisa Holmes/Keiry Borruel)*
c. Curriculum *(Eduardo Vasquez)*
d. Program Review
e. Sub-Committee
  • OAC Handbook *(Joseph Williams/Penny Shreve/Nance Nunes-Gill/Jennafer Worland)*

VII. Action Items
a. Glossary *(Sub-committee)*
b. Committee's Revised Purpose Statement and Description *(Joseph Williams)*
c. Proposed Process for 2-yr Assessment Plan *(No FT Faculty / Penny Shreve)*
d. Faculty Training/Survey *(Penny Shreve)*

VIII. Discussion Items
a. Update submission of 2-yr Assessment Plan *(Joseph Williams/Penny Shreve/Keiry Borruel)*
  • Are all plans submitted?
b. Curriculum Process (new/changing SLOs and PLOs) *(J. Williams/P. Shreve/E. Vasquez)*
  • Mapping (SLOs to PLOs) and 2-yr Assessment Plan (new courses)
  • When will eLumen be ready? (to streamline OAC processes involved)
  • What do before eLumen is ready? (to complete the OAC processes involved)
  • Outreach to new/changed course, programs and certificates developed in the past year
c. Faculty Training/Professional Development – Pillar 4
d. Friday SLO talk

IX. Other Discussions/Information
a. OAC Handbook

X. Announcements *(2 minutes each)*
a.

XI. Future Agenda Items

XII. Next Regular Meeting
a. Monday, April 12, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)

XIII. Adjournment

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (OAC)

Monday, April 12, 2021, @ 12:00 noon – 1:30 pm

By ConferZoom (Remote)

AGENDA

I. **Call to Order**

II. **Roll Call**

III. **Approval of Agenda**

IV. **Approval of Minutes**
   a. 03/08/2021

V. **Opportunities to Address the Committee** *(2 minutes each)*

VI. **Reports** *(2 minutes each)*
   a. Co-Chairs *(Penny Shreve & Joseph Williams)*
   b. eLumen *(Lisa Holmes/Keiry Borruel)*
   c. Curriculum *(Eduardo Vasquez)*
   d. Program Review
   e. Sub-Committee
   - OAC Handbook *(Joseph Williams/Penny Shreve/Nance Nunes-Gill/Jennafer Worland)*

VII. **Action Items**
   a. Committee's Revised Purpose Statement and Description *(Nance Nunes-Gill)*
   b. Glossary *(Sub-committee)*
   c. OAC Handbook *(Sub-committee)*

VIII. **Discussion Items**
   a. Curriculum, research, and OAC connections (new/changing SLOs and PLOs) *(J. Williams/P. Shreve/E. Vasquez, Keiry Borruel)*
   b. OAC Folders for research Office – Mapping and 2-year plans *(Joseph Williams/Penny Shreve/Keiry Borruel)*
   c. Friday SLO talk
   d. Best (effective) practices for deeper faculty discussions needed for Pillar 4

IX. **Other Discussions/Information**
   a. OAC Handbook
   b. Glossary

X. **Announcements** *(2 minutes each)*
   a.

XI. **Future Agenda Items**

XII. **Next Regular Meeting (tentative as need)**
   a. Monday, April 26, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)

XIII. **Adjournment**

Agenda

I.   **Call to Order**
II. **Roll Call**
III. **Approval of Agenda**
IV. **Approval of Minutes**
V.   **Opportunities to Address the Committee** *(2 minutes each)*
VI. **Reports** *(2 minutes each)*
    a. Co-Chairs *(Penny Shreve & Joseph Williams)*
    b. eLumen *(Lisa Holmes/Keiry Borruel)*
    c. Curriculum *(Eduardo Vasquez)*
    d. Program Review *(Lisa Holmes)*
    e. Sub-Committee (as needed)
VII. **Action Items**
    a. Glossary
    b. OAC Handbook
VIII. **Discussion Items**
    a. Best (effective) practices for deeper faculty discussions needed for Pillar 4
    b. OAC role in Program Review data of outcomes
    c. End of year reflection on OAC
IX. **Other Discussions/Information**
    a. OAC Handbook
    b. Glossary
X.   **Announcements** *(2 minutes each)*
XI. **Future Agenda Items**
XII. **Next Regular Meeting (tentative as need)**
    a. Monday, May 10, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)
XIII. **Adjournment**

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (OAC)

Monday, May 10, 2021, @ 12:00 noon – 1:30 pm

By ConferZoom (Remote)

AGENDA

I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

III. Approval of Agenda

IV. Approval of Minutes
   a. 04/12/2021
   b. 04/26/2021

V. Opportunities to Address the Committee *(2 minutes each)*

VI. Reports *(2 minutes each)*
   a. Co-Chairs *(Penny Shreve & Joseph Williams)*
   b. eLumen *(Lisa Holmes/Keiry Borruel)*
   c. Curriculum *(Eduardo Vasquez)*
   d. Program Review
   e. Sub-Committee (as needed)

VII. Action Items
   a. .

VIII. Discussion Items
   a. Visual Walk-through eLumen /Canvas rubric integration
   b. Status of OAC mapping ready or in eLumen by program
   c. End of year Survey on OAC effectiveness

IX. Other Discussions/Information
   a. End of year Survey on OAC effectiveness

X. Announcements *(2 minutes each)*
   a.

XI. Future Agenda Items

XII. Next Regular Meeting (tentative as need)
   a. Fall 2021 TBA – Tentatively Monday Aug 23 or Sept 13, May 10, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)

XIII. Adjournment

I. Call to Order
a. Called to order at 12:04 p.m. by J. Williams.

II. Roll Call
a. Voting Members – Joseph Williams, Penny Shreve, Susan Nylander, Bret Sage, Emily Garrison, Jennafer Worland, Ashley Vizenor, Denise Pasley, Gustavo Bento, Ibrahim Aboud, Sumana Pasala
b. Voting Members Absent – Amy Ross, Ramon Vasconcellos
c. Non-Voting Members – Beverly Ranney, Jessica Tainatongo, Beverly Ranney, Nance Nunes-Gill, Keiry Borruel, Lisa Holmes
d. Non-Voting Members Absent – Eduardo Vasquez
e. Guests – Herbert English, Tanesha Young, Stephanie Ingalls

III. Approval of Agenda
a. 1st – G. Bento / 2nd - J. Worland (11, 0, 0)

IV. Approval of Minutes – April 13, 2020
a. 1st – S. Nylander/ 2nd – J. Worland (9, 0, 2) S. Pasala and E. Garrison abstained as they were not members last year.

V. Opportunities to Address the Committee
a. None.

VI. Action Items
a. None.

VII. Discussion Items
a. Review Committee Purpose and Membership
  i. New voting and non-voting members were announced (attached).
  ii. The committee purpose, schedule, description, etc., were reviewed (attached).
b. Recognize Pilot Faculty
  i. P. Shreve reported out that Nance and Denise were the faculty pilot of the summer. Made eLumen ready for us. Only reason we met the ACCJC midterm report. Thank you so much!
c. Review of OAC work from last Semester
  i. J. Williams reported that he wasn't going to dwell a lot on that and thanked the faculty for all the hard work that was done last year. All of the mapping and work put into SLOs and PLOs.
d. Program Review Meeting (Collaboration)
  i. J. Williams – started doing this with Karen, Lisa, Eduardo and Penny. Working with a Program Review Specialist, Maria Narvaez. She is leading the discussion; going through our Program Review handbook to make sure we are in compliance. Started that last semester; will continue this semester and keep everyone updated.
e. Review of Midterm Report
  i. L. Holmes reported out that we are in a good spot. Thank you to Nance and Denise for all your hard work. Trying to put everything that faculty has done over the past two years in the narrative. In the follow-up report submitted last October, we submitted a timeline of activities and we are on track with those. Will have this to Joseph and Penny this afternoon (still in draft form). Any evidence that might be missing, please feel free to send my way.

f. E-Lumen Update

i. L. Holmes reported to the group that we have 409 active courses in Banner, COCI, eLumen and the catalog. They all match which is huge for us. Over the summer the Office of Institutional Research took all of the information submitted by faculty during the OAC training where faculty placed their courses on a two-year assessment cycle and put everything into an Excel spreadsheet. Of the 409 courses, 58 were not placed on an assessment cycle. Probably because we don't have full time faculty in that area so that needs to be addressed. Eighty-three courses were put on the schedule to be assessed in the fall of 2020 however, 20 of those courses are not on the fall 2020 schedule of courses and therefore cannot be assessed as scheduled; these courses will have to be placed on the assessment cycle during a future semester. Of the 63 courses that we are assessing in the fall, there are 97 sections being assessed by 53 faculty. The programs are in eLumen, they now have to be mapped. Nance and Denise's programs have already been mapped. Because of the work they did on their SLOs, their programs now have PLO data in eLumen; we have the evidence that we need for the report. Right on pace where we need to be. There will be eLumen training (faculty) from 11:00-12:00 (Tuesday, 8/25) and/or Wednesday (8/26) from 2:00-3:00. Try to get to one of those if you're assessing in the fall or if you would just like to see some of eLumen. It is being recorded if you aren't able to attend either.

VIII. Other Discussions/Information

a. **Glossary Startup / 3 M's (coming up with terms)** – J. Williams let the group know that we started this last year so that we can share this with everybody so everyone is aware of the terminology being used. Hope to get back to that very soon.

IX. Announcements

a. None.

X. Future Agenda Items

a. None.

XI. Next Regular Meeting

a. Monday, September 14, 2020, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)

XII. Adjournment

a. 1st – J. Worland / 2nd – P. Shreve
b. Meeting adjourned at 12:41 pm by J. Williams.

I.   Call to Order
a. Meeting called to order at 12:07 p.m. by J. Williams.

II.   Roll Call
a. Voting Members – Joseph Williams, Penny Shreve**,** Susan Nylander, Jennafer Worland, Ramon Vasconcellos, Gustavo Bento, Amy Ross, Emily Garrison, Bret Sage, Denise Pasley, Ashley Vizenor, Ibrahim Aboud

b. Voting Members Absent – Sumana Pasala

c. Non-Voting Members – Keiry Borruel, Jessica Tainatongo, Eduardo Vasquez, Beverly Ranney, Lisa Holmes, Stephanie Ingalls, Nance Nunes-Gill

d. Guests – Christa Banton, Jennifer Rodden, James Lee, Herbert English, Jaime Rodriguez, Eartha Johnson

III.   Approval of Agenda
a. 1st – J. Worland / 2nd – G. Bento (12, 0, 0)

b. J. Williams would like to amend the agenda on item VII (a) to add the ACCJC Follow-Up Report.

IV.   Approval of Minutes – 8/24/2020
a. 1st – S. Nylander / 2nd – D. Pasley (10, 0, 2) A. Ross and R. Vasconcellos abstained from the vote as they were not present at the 8/24/2020 meeting.

V.   Opportunities to Address the Committee
a. None

VI.   Action Items
a. No Action Item

VII.   Discussion Items
a. ACCJC Follow-Up Report (attached)
- The report was shown to the group and L. Holmes let the group know that there was only one standard that had to be addressed by the College and that was the SLOs. A timeline was created on how the College was going to tackle it. The report showed in a table on the left hand side what the plan was to address the issue and then on the right hand side it described the action taken by the College (includes the evidence). Showed all of this for spring 2019 and fall 2020. Also includes what is going to be done and when it will be done to complete everything to answer the tasks needed for this standard and when the College expects to be in full compliance. Almost completely there; just have a few small items that need to be addressed. Please contact Lisa Holmes directly with any questions or concerns.

b. Faculty Training
- P. Shreve let the group know that training has taken place every semester to go over assessment cycles and mapping. There are still a few people that need to do this due to new courses. Would like to know what training is needed now.
  - J. Worland shared that she spoke with a few different faculty members (mostly part-time) and there was some confusion regarding the concept of having an assignment assess one specific SLO. Also confusion as to what the eLumen training was for. Need a better understanding of what SLOs are and how they're assessed.

c. Faculty Survey

- P. Shreve would like to send out a survey to faculty to determine what training is needed. But they don't necessarily know what they want and the facilitators don't know what they need. Found at another school that they offered lunch time trainings and after so many, they receive a certificate. Would like to try this with part-time faculty and offer them a professional development certificate. Might work better than a bigger training; something smaller that would poll them afterwards so we would know what was missed and we could receive more accurate data.
    - J. Williams reminded P. Shreve that faculty was contacted with a survey in the spring semester but there wasn't a very good turnout. Believe that faculty don't really know what training they need.
    - G. Bento agrees with both J. Williams and P. Shreve; most people don't know what training they need. The idea of the workshops is a really good idea. Give them the big picture first before we ask them to learn all the small details.
    - D. Pasley agrees with everything but if the concern is that the part-timers aren't able to attend meetings right now, will need to offer the workshops during the part-timers schedule as they work other jobs so actual lunch time trainings might not work for them. Also, record the trainings so everyone has access to them.
    - N. Nunes-Gill agreed but would also like to try and find some money so that these faculty members can be paid for participating for these trainings that we are requiring them to attend.
    - J. Williams understands the road block that is always met when requesting money for these sorts of things but will work on this first.
    - N. Nunes-Gill will speak with some of the Deans at their next meeting.
    - B. Ranney let the group know that this will be discussed at the negotiations table.
- P. Shreve said that the survey could include what trainings they would like to offer and ask how and when it should be offered.
    - J. Worland felt that asynchronous times should be offered as well since everyone has such different schedules right now. Being able to access on their own time and something that they could go back and access at a later time would be very helpful. Also suggested an OAC Canvas shell where all of the recordings could be housed.
- P. Shreve let the group know that this won't be put out right away but will wait to see what people are asking for from the previous trainings that have been offered and until the current assessments are complete.
    - K. Borruel let P. Shreve know that the faculty members that have reached out to them aren't asking about future trainings; more in relation to the actual program (eLumen).
- P. Shreve asked the group to reach out to part-timers in their area so that the trainings can be targeted to what they need.

d. eLumen Assessment/Rubrics
- P. Shreve – eLumen can pull from Canvas but the rubrics that faculty use in Canvas, are they using this in eLumen?
    - K. Borruel reported out that the assessment is created in eLumen, then upload to Canvas, then attach it to the assignment that is supposed to be covering/assessing the SLO. Then it can be brought back into eLumen after the course is over so the results of the specific SLO can be seen.
- P. Shreve would like to add this to the mini-trainings as not everyone uses rubrics in Canvas.
    - L. Holmes reported out that this came up in one of the group eLumen meetings that faculty isn't taught how to build the rubric in Canvas and it's something that needs to be added in.
    - D. Pasley told the group that if there are no rubrics in Canvas, can the outcomes still be attached to the assignment?
    - K. Borruel responded that the rubric can be created.
    - D. Pasley said that the entire rubric doesn't have to be in there; they could just have the rubric that came from eLumen and do the assessment through that.
    - L. Holmes reported that default assessments have been created so it can be

done, but it's functional as it sits right now with the rubrics in Canvas.
- P. Shreve responded that since there is a way around, there isn't a rush to include a training for the rubrics.
  - G. Bento liked the suggestion that specific questions can be linked to answers within the recorded trainings so that the entire training doesn't have to be sat through if only one answer is needed.
  - D. Pasley requested that there be one point person for when part-timers have questions.
  - P. Shreve would like all committee members to guide all faculty members when they have questions. Or to point them in the right direction of where to look for the answer or another person that could help them.

e. Program Review Update
- J. Williams reported out that Maria Narveaz is still being worked with to complete the ACCJC Follow-Up Report to get that done prior to the November deadline.
  - N. Nunes-Gill asked that if Karen Kane and others are working with Maria, shouldn't those of us that we reworking with her previously be working with her again?
  - J. Williams responded that the report they're working on right now is what directly affects the ACCJC Report to prepare for the November deadline. Does not include discussion on the handbook or the process. Will revisit the entire group once the report is done.

f. Peer Review/Course Review Cycle
- E. Vasquez reported to the group that at the Curriculum Committee meeting it was approved to put courses on a six year review cycle. Now we just have to find peer reviewers.
  - J. Williams asked if that also pertained to CTE?
  - E. Vasquez responded that CTE has to review their prerequisites every two years but that's not really part of this cycle; this includes the entire course.
  - P. Shreve said that a lot of people have heard about all these different cycles and wanted some clarification. When is the best time to update the SLOs?
  - E. Vasquez responded that when the SLOs need to be updated, they have to request an out-of-cycle review and then it would go to the OAC for review.
  - P. Shreve asked if that would be a substantive change.
  - E. Vasquez would like to double check before providing an answer. There's going to be a lot of cycles coming through and it's going to be tricky for everyone but there is also going to be a lot of courses that don't have a lot of changes just because we went through the reset.
  - J. Rodriguez responded that this would be more of a….
  - E. Vasquez reported that there are about 60 courses during the first year but there newer courses and most likely won't have changes.
  - J. Worland reported to the group that the Communication Studies ADT went to Curriculum and was approved but then the PLOs went to the OAC and were changed so will need to change the PLOs through Curriculum. Feel like this will have happened for a lot of other people as well.
  - P. Shreve responded that this brings up the question of when OAC will be involved in the Peer Review Cycle. Or is this more of a compliance of BCC and the state.
  - E. Vasquez responded that it would go to the OAC when the SLOs are updated.
  - P. Shreve asked when OAC would respond if they saw issues?
  - E. Vasquez responded that OAC would wait until they saw the SLOs/PLOs and would make comments then. There is also the out of course cycle but they aren't supposed to review until Year 3; they can request for an update.
  - P. Shreve asked if reviewers would be trained on outcomes.
  - E. Vasquez responded that this would take place.

g. eLumen Update
- L. Holmes reported out that some of the mapping is still being completed; hoping to be done in two weeks. Will assess what is missing and let everyone know. About 90% ready and fully done; just a few odds and ends to be complete.

VIII. Other Discussions/Information
   a. Glossary Startup / 3 M's (coming up with terms)
   - J. Williams let the group know that he and P. Shreve are in the process of putting together a team to put this together. Would like two people that could work in One Drive in a shared document to work on the glossary. Would like to document new terms and find out what is missing. Want everyone to understand what's being talked about and not just nodding along.
     - N. Nunes-Gill offered to assist with this.
     - P. Shreve responded that they have a general list of terms that will be put in the One Drive folder to share with everyone. Would like at least one more person to help with this.
     - J. Worland volunteered.
     - S. Pasala was also placed on the committee.
     - Document in One Drive will be available to the committee as View only and the subcommittee will have full access.
     - P. Shreve would like to meet with the subcommittee before decisions are made.

IX. Announcements
   a. P. Shreve wanted to make sure that everyone knows of the virtual play that the college is producing.
   - A. Ross let the group know that auditions were be on Zoom at the end of the month. The Zoom link, rehearsal schedule and character breakdowns is on the event page. The play is called "The Writer's Run Around."
   b. D. Pasley wanted to announce that BCC is participating in an Entrepreneurship pitch contest. Pitching for our trade technician program that we're trying to start. Competing for $50k. There were eleven colleges chosen after the first round and BCC was chosen. Still have two more rounds.
   c. P. Shreve announced to the group that B. Ranney posted an announcement up on the Canvas page for the STEM Pathway with the schedule for the semester.
   d. P. Shreve reported out that the English department is talking about putting together small breakout sessions and hoping to start in October.

X. Future Agenda Items
   a. None

XI. Next Regular Meeting
   a. Monday, September 28, 2020, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)

XII. Adjournment
   a. 1st – J. Worland / 2nd – G. Bento
   b. Meeting adjourned at 1:21 p.m. by J. Williams.

Minutes

I. **Call to Order: 12:08**

II. **Roll Call:** J. Williams notes a couple of membership side notes (explicated below in VIII. a)

Members present: I. Aboud, G. Bento, K. Borruel (advisor), L. Holmes (advisor), N. Nunes-Gill (AS President), S. Nylander, S. Pasala, D. Pasley, B. Ranney(PR co-chair), A. Ross, B. Sage, P. Shreve, R. Vasconcellos, E. Vasquez (curriculum chair), A. Vizenor, J. Williams, J. Worland
Absent/Excused: E. Garrison, J. Tainatongo (recorder)
Guests: H. English, E. Johnson, J. Lee, C. Nascio, S. Ingalls,

III. **Approval of Agenda:** J. Williams deleted duplicate item (as struck below) Motion: J. Worland/Second: D. Pasley Agenda Approved unanimously

IV. **Approval of Minutes**
   a. 09/14/2020
   Motion: A. Ross/Second: J. Worland
   Upon review of the minutes, it was noted that a comment by J. Rodriguez was not completed, so minutes tabled until next meeting so that the recorder may complete minutes. Tabling approved with S. Pasala abstaining

V. **Opportunities to Address the Committee** *(2 minutes each)*
   G. Bento notes that a previous glossary of terms was completed but has been lost and that replicating previous work such as the glossary of terms that a sub-committee has been working on seems inefficient. P. Shreve agrees and thanks Mr. Bento for bringing this up. Ms. Shreve asked N. Nunes-Gill about a previous glossary when she was SLOAC chair, and Mr. Bento says he will ask Bryce to search the drives on campus to see if the previous glossary can be located. E. Vasquez notes that other colleges have these glossaries of terms on their websites and reminds the committee that some minutes are not on our OAC site on BCC website. J. Williams says he will reach out to Amir to correct that.

VI. **Reports** *(2 minutes each)*
   a. eLumen (Lisa Holmes/Keiry Borruel)
   L. Holmes says there is not a lot to report out and that work is continuing to roll out. K. Borruel reminds faculty to reach out with questions.
   b. Curriculum (Eduardo Vasquez)
   E. Vasquez says he has been discussing flow charts and timelines with J. Williams and has shared research from El Camino College's website. He discussed the 6-year cycle and will be sure that faculty knows when their program is due to be reviewed.
   c. Program Review (Karen Kane)
   K. Kane states that she, along with L. Holmes, is working with a consultant on the Program Review handbook. We are gearing up for our first formal Program Review in a few years. The formal PR will occur in academic year 2021/22. There is a 2-year cycle of review for all CTE (programs, degrees, certificates); a 3-year cycle for all NON-CTE programs; and a 3-year cycle for all non-instructional programs. To ensure that it's meaningful, it is important that we know why we are doing program review and understand the data, we will be having trainings in spring 2021. L. Holmes will have data packets for programs/disciplines. There will be training in flow and PR processes and

training in prioritizing faculty hires. K. Kane, along with Nance Nunces-Gill and Dr. Beverly Ranney have been ~~is~~ working to revise AP 7120 for this purpose. A draft of the new PR handbook will circulate to all groups and include the new form, which is in three parts and should be easier to work with. Where does OAC fit in? The reviewing of courses, working with curriculum chair (who is establishing Peer Reviewers and has sent out dates through email). Peer Reviewers must be on top of what they're doing as they will be the eyes on the CORs. E. Vasquez will assign peer reviewers to work with faculty members. OAC will then assist faculty in disciplines to ensure 3 Ms are met and that objectives satisfy results. There may not be much assessment evidence this first year and we may need to change outcomes. Peer reviewers will help with aligning CORs and offer suggestions only. Peer reviews then go to tech review because J. Rodriguez and J. Tainatongo must record changes in CORs. If Face Page or more substantial changes are in order, then it must go through tech review and curriculum process once more. A visual flow chart will be created. Program Review will not be much different except that alignment of SLOs to PLOs must be included. Again, cycles are 2-year for CTE and 3-year for NON-CTE. The draft PR will be due the spring before the formal PR is due. The draft will go to the IEC Peer Review sub-committee. This is to ensure that assessment is relevant. In late spring 2021, drafts for non-instructional PR will begin. As Karen will not be here officially in the spring, she wishes to let us know that she will be available via Zoom or other means to support the effort. She notes that Penny and Joseph are very knowledgeable, but she wants to help if need be. Quiz: What was Barstow's original name? A) Fish Pond B) Calico C) Daggett or D) Irwin. No one answered correctly. The answer is A) Fish Pond. We could've been Fish Pond Community College, so let's count ourselves lucky. LOL!!! You don't need to include this. It was just for fun!!

d. Sub-Committee
- Glossary Update (Sub-committee members/Penny Shreve)
  p. Shreve asks should OAC have a report out in PR subcommittee? K. Kane says OAC co-chairs both sit on sub-committee with one vote, both on IEC and there needs to be communication between IEC, OAC, PR committees. Again, glad that G. Bento brought up the glossary of terms and it is a reminder that we need to ensure that our work produced is sustainable. N. Nunes-Gill notes that to avoid confusion with so many Outcomes, we should use CSLO (course outcomes)→ PSLO (program outcomes)→ ISLO (institutional outcomes). Need better understanding of acronyms. J. Worland reminds us we must ensure that people understand that these are separate but also connected. P. Shreve suggests an interactive glossary of terms with a link to a college glossary of terms. E. Vasquez put the link to El Camino College's glossary in the chat.

VII. **Action Items**
   a. No Action Item

VIII. **Discussion Items**
   a. Committee Membership (Joseph Williams)
   Member R. Vasconcellos needs to be approved by CGC and will sit on committee but will not have a vote until approval.
   b. ACCJC Follow-up Report (Status Update)
   No change from last report. Waiting for a couple of pieces of evidence and fix small glitches before submitting final report
   c. Faculty Training/Survey (Follow-up)
   P. Shreve showed draft of survey and will send to members for more input on what faculty want training on
   d. eLumen/Canvas Assessment (Faculty Preparation)
   - Observe A Process with Assessing Outcomes in Canvas/eLumen
   - 2-yr Assessment Cycle Submissions (Update)
   .

IX. **Other Discussions/Information**
   a. BoardDocs Rollover Agenda (J. Williams in light of the absence of Jessica Tainatongo/Michelle Henderson)
   Transitioning all future meetings (minutes/agendas) to BoardDocs Emails may look

different so keep an eye out for them

X. **Announcements** *(2 minutes each)*
   a. S. Nylander announces a workshop in the Scholarship of Teaching hosted by the TLSC. The first workshop, hosted by S. Nylander, will be on 9/20/2020 at 12:30 and will cover microaggressions and unconscious biases. B. Asdell sent out link in an email.

XI. **Future Agenda Items**
   None

XII. **Next Regular Meeting**
   a. Monday, October 12, 2020, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)

XIII. **Adjournment**
   Motion: J. Worland/Second D. Pasley Adjourned at 1:32 PM

MINUTES

I.   **Call to Order**
    a. 1205

II.   **Roll Call**

    a. Voting Members – Joseph Williams, Penny Shreve, Jennafer Worland, Denise Pasley, Bret Sage, Ibrahim Aboud, Ramon Vasconcellos, Amy Ross, Emily Garrison, Sumana Pasala, Susan Nylander, Gustavo Bento (joined at 12:54 p.m.)
    b. Voting Members Absent – Ashley Vizenor
    c. Non-Voting Members – Lisa Holmes, Eduardo Vasquez, Crystal Nasio, Keiry Borruel
    d. Guests – Jennifer Rodden, Herbert English, Jaime Rodriguez, Nance Nunes-Gill, Stephanie Ingalls, Karen Kane

III. **Approval of Agenda**
    a. 1st – J. Worland/2nd - A. Ross (11, 0, 0)

IV.   **Approval of Minutes**
    a. 09/14/2020 1st – D. Pasley / 2nd – J. Worland (10, 0, 1) S. Pasala abstained from voting as she was not present at the 9/14/2020 meeting.
    b. 09/28/2020 1st – A. Ross / 2nd – S. Nylander (10, 0, 1) E. Garrison abstained from voting as she was not present at the 9/28/2020 meeting.

V.   **Opportunities to Address the Committee** *(2 minutes each)*
    a. None at this time.

VI.   **Reports** *(2 minutes each)*
    a. eLumen *(Lisa Holmes/Keiry Borruel)*
    • L. Holmes reported to the group that everything was received for the PLO Assessment Results Report. Keiry is still working on mapping; would like to have meeting with JW and PS to ensure all information has been received. KB – Hoping to be done with all mapping by the end of next week and will have a list of everything needed to finish the rest of the mapping.
    b. Curriculum *(Eduardo Vasquez)*
    • E. Vasquez reported that not many new courses have come through curriculum yet. Routine Peer Review training will take place today. Would like to connect with J. Williams and P. Shreve to review the flow chart and how the OAC will see/receive SLOs.
    c. Program Review *(Nance Nunes-Gill - Academic Senate President)*
    • N. Nunes-Gill shared that at the College Governance Council (CGC) meeting, the proposal came back. The membership was approved but there was concern of the description so that needs to be revisited by the OAC. N. Nunes-Gill also reported that there hasn't been a Program Review meeting since last May and would like to know when that will start again.
    • J. Williams pulled up the OAC description and Purpose Statement to show the group. The issue was with the last sentence "…action plans developed, and budget allocation proposals completed." K. Kane responded to the group that the OAC committee purpose went through several iterations as they were forming their work and transitioning from SLOAC to OAC. At one time, they thought they might take over the work of the Program Review Committee. After learning more about the work needed for course and

program outcomes, they very smartly decided to stay with outcomes work and not also take on the work of the PRC.

The current purpose was written when the OAC thought they might take on the work of the PRC. As they are NOT doing that work, the OAC needs to update the purpose to adequately reflect the work they are doing with outcomes. J. Williams spoke to the group about replacing or removing the last part of the sentence (previously mentioned); it was agreed to remove it.

- N. Nunes-Gill asked if the IEC's sub-committee, the PRC, will be meeting with Maria Narvaez. K. Kane responded that a group had been formed to create a Program Review Committee Handbook and a draft will be going out soon. N. Nunes-Gill then asked if a form had been included and gone out. K. Kane responded that it will be attached into the draft of the Handbook and will go out sometime this week.
- P. Shreve suggested taking a look at the Purpose Statement and Description since it was returned to the group for review. Would like to push the vote until the next meeting to ensure that everything is accurate as it moves forward. Will include as action item for next meeting.
- **Sub-Committee - Glossary Update** *(Nance Nunes-Gill/Jennafer Worland/Sumana Pasala)*
- P Shreve reported to the group that the subcommittee hasn't met yet. At the last meeting, G. Bento mentioned the previous glossary that had been created; hoping to find it so an entire new one isn't created. P. Shreve will reach out to G. Bento.

VII. Action Items
a. No Action Item

VIII. Discussion Items
a. Committee Membership *(Joseph Williams)*
- Previously discussed on item VI (c)

b. Committee's Purpose Statement and Description *(Beverly Ranney & Nance Nunes-Gill)*
- Previously discussed on item VI (c)

c. SLO Conference *(General Info)*
- J. Williams reported to the group that this years' SLO Symposium is free and encouraged all faculty members to attend. The information will be sent out to anyone that is interested; the symposium will be held remotely on 29 and 30 January. P. Shreve let the group know that there isn't a limit on how many members each college can send and encouraged everyone to attend.

d. Proposed Process for 2-yr Assessment Plan *(No FT Faculty / Penny Shreve)*
- P. Shreve reported to the group that there are 4 or 5 discipline's that don't have a full-time faculty member. Would like to ask that faculty members that are related to these disciplines, volunteer to help create an assessment plan for these. J. Worland and R. Vasconcellos volunteered; A. Vizenor and G. Bento were voluntold to help as well.

e. Faculty Training/Survey *(Follow-up / Penny Shreve)*
- P. Shreve created a survey in Survey Monkey (showed to the group). Used the comments previously discussed to determine what training faculty members would like to see. P. Shreve will send out the link to everyone in the group to determine if the survey is okay to send out to all faculty.

f. OAC Committee Handbook *(Joseph Williams)*
- J. Williams reviewed the SLOAC Handbook and let the group know that a lot of updates needed to be made as only a draft version was found. With the change to OAC, there are a lot of items that need to be removed (i.e. Non-Instructional items). J. Williams will continue to work on this and will bring the handbook to the next meeting so changes can be discussed and requested volunteers if anyone had some extra time to assist with this. P. Shreve volunteered and suggested reaching out to previous SLOAC Chairpersons for their expertise. N. Nunes-Gill volunteered to help as well.

IX. Other Discussions/Information
a. Sustaining records/glossary *(Gustavo Bento)*
- G. Bento joined the meeting at 12:54 p.m. Reported to the group that a hard copy was

given to him as well as many others. L. Holmes did some searches on the local drives but wasn't able to find it. G. Bento suggested moving forward and creating a new glossary. E. Vasquez suggested using the glossary from El Camino to at least have a base to start from. J. Williams has a copy and will save it on One Drive for the subcommittee.

X.   Announcements *(2 minutes each)*
    a. None at this time.

XI.   Future Agenda Items
    a. OAC Handbook – Discussion (Joseph Williams)
    b. Program Review - Discussion

XII. Next Regular Meeting
    a. Monday, October 26, 2020, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)

XIII. Adjournment
    a. 1st – J. Worland / 2nd – S. Nylander
    b. The meeting was adjourned at 12:59 p.m. by co-chair J. Williams.

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (OAC)

Monday, October 26, 2020, @ 12:00 noon – 1:30 pm

By ConferZoom (Remote)

Minutes

I.   Call to Order
OAC Co-chair J. Williams called the meeting to order at 12:06 p.m.

II.   Roll Call

a. Members Present: Ramon Vasconcellos, Ibrahim Aboud, Jennafer Worland, Denise Pasley, Susan Nylander, Amy Ross, Gustavo Bento, Sumana Pasala, Ashley Vizenor, Emily Garrison, Joseph Williams, Bret Sage
b. Members Absent: Penny Shreve
c. Guests: Keiry Borruel, Jessica Tainatongo, Herbert English, James Lee, Jaime Rodriguez, Nance Nunes-Gill, Lisa Holmes, Crystal Nasio

III.   Approval of Agenda
A motion was made and then seconded to approve the 10/26/2020 meeting agenda. 1st – G. Bento / 2nd – J. Worland (12, 0, 0)

IV.   Approval of Minutes
A motion was made and then seconded to approve the minutes from the 10/12/2020 meeting. 1st – J. Worland / 2nd – S. Nylander (11, 0, 1) A. Vizenor was absent from the 10/12/2020 meeting and abstained from voting.

V.   Opportunities to Address the Committee *(2 minutes each)*
None.

VI.   Reports *(2 minutes each)*
a. eLumen *(Lisa Holmes/Keiry Borruel)*
K. Borruel reported to the group that no movement has been made on eLumen; finishing up mapping. Assisting faculty with their assessment pieces.
b. Curriculum *(Eduardo Vasquez)*
E. Vasquez not in attendance.
c. Program Review *(Lisa Holmes)*
L. Holmes reported out that two separate trainings were held last week, one with faculty and one with managers for program review. Not a lot of turn out; it was just a high level and a deeper dive will be done in the spring. The IEC started talking about creating the program review subcommittee; would like to have two chairs. No volunteers from the faculty side just yet but reached out to Nance Nunes-Gill for assistance. N. Nunes-Gill responded that a name would be sent to L. Holmes today.
d. Sub-Committee
- **Glossary Update** *(Nance Nunes-Gill/Jennafer Worland/Sumana Pasala)*
J. Worland reported out that the group did not have a chance to meet. J. Worland will look at what El Camino College has done and will try to get together soon.
- **OAC Handbook** *(Joseph Williams/Penny Shreve/Nance Nunes-Gill/Jennafer Worland)*
J. Williams reported out that P. Shreve is going to reach out to the group to see what is needed for the handbook and have more information at the next meeting.

VII.   Action Items
a. Adopting Committee's Revised Purpose Statement and Description
1st – G. Bento / 2nd – R. Vasconcellos (12, 0, 0)

b. Proposed Process for 2-yr Assessment Plan *(No FT Faculty / Penny Shreve)*
  P. Shreve not in attendance; item tabled.
c. Faculty Training/Survey *(Penny Shreve)*
  P. Shreve not in attendance; item tabled.

VIII. Discussion Items
a. SLO Symposium *(General Info)*
P. Shreve sent out the information to the group via email last week; would like to have at least five faculty members attend. J. Williams offered to send out the information again and encouraged everyone to attend, as the event is online and free of charge. E. Garrison registered for the event but is waiting on confirmation from her dean. D. Pasley registered for the symposium and R. Vasconcellos is interested in attending as well.
b. Update submission of 2-yr Assessment Plan *(Joseph Williams/Penny Shreve/Keiry Borruel)*
K. Borruel reported to the group that Athletics, Anthropology, Astronomy, Spanish, Ethnic Studies, Geology and Physics are missing. K. Borruel asked for clarification from P. Shreve to move forward.

IX. Other Discussions/Information
a. OAC Handbook
Previously discussed.

X. Announcements *(2 minutes each)*
Amy Ross announced Quarantine Cabaret in November. D. Pasley announced that Club Rush will be held on XXXX; an updated flyer will be going out today.

XI. Future Agenda Items

XII. Next Regular Meeting
a. Monday, November 9, 2020, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZOOM (Remote)

XIII. Adjournment
A motion was made and then seconded to adjourn the meeting. 1st – R. Vasconcellos / 2nd – G. Bento. The meeting was adjourned at 12:48 p.m.

Glossary of Terms
Associated with SLO Assessment

Broad Terminology

Student Learning Outcome (SLO)	What students are expected to produce by the end of a course, program, college experience, degree or certificate program, or set of interactions with student services. SLOs involve higher order thinking skills and are measurable. A robust SLO includes the following three elements: • Context or conditions under which performance will be assessed (e.g. test, essay, demonstration, class discussion, etc.) • Behavioral objective • Criteria, performance standards or primary traits for assessing performance Thus, an SLO suggests an appropriate assessment and rubric for measuring the outcome.
Core Competency	A broadly-defined knowledge base and/or set of skills. Core competencies can be expressed as institution-level outcome (ILO) statements which describes what students are able to do at the end of their experience at the college. They serve as "folders" or "categories" under which course- and program-level learning outcomes are organized and aligned. They may be assessed indirectly via measures of course- and program-level student learning accordingly.
Course-Level SLO	What the student will be able to produce at the end of a course. This is the lowest level at which SLOs are usually assessed. Writing a course-level SLO involves considering the overarching goals of the respective course, matching these goals with a particular assessment method, and articulating these overarching goals in an SLO statement. Courses may have multiple SLOs.
Course Objective	A statement of what the students are expected to know or learn by the end of a course. These differ from SLOs in many ways: • they often focus on what the instructor does rather than what the student will be able to do (i.e. input rather than output); • they are often content-based and not necessarily competency-based • they are often not measurable or assessable
Institution-level SLO	What students are able to do at the end of their experience at the college.

ILOs serve as "folders" or "categories" under which course- and program-level learning outcomes are organized and aligned. They may be assessed indirectly via measures of course- and program-level student learning accordingly.

Program	A set of courses which culminates in a degree, certificate, or preparation for degree or certificate

Program-Level SLO
What the student will be able to produce at the end of a program. This is the middle level at which SLOs are usually assessed. Writing a program-level SLO involves considering the overarching missions of the respective program, matching these missions to courses in the program, and coming up with a cumulative assessment which may or may not be the same as a course-level assessment. Program-level SLOs, like core competencies, may also serve as "folders" or "categories" under which course-level SLOs are assessed; thus, program-level SLOs may or may not be directly assessed. For student services, which has many modes of learning which cannot necessarily be readily divided into discreet units like courses can, this is the most common level at which SLOs are written and assessed.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Cycle
The process by which SLOs are identified, measured and analyzed, and the results used to improve student learning.
The three steps in the cycle are:

- *Identify*: Faculty meet and work together in identifying what the students should produce at the end of a set of learning experiences (be it at the course or program level). An SLO is then drafted, and an assessment plan written, which states what the assessment will be (i.e. how the SLO will be measured), and what the rubric will be (i.e. which standards will be used to determine attainment of the outcome.)
- *Assess*: The semester following the identification of the SLO(s) and drafting of the assessment plan, the proposed assessment is then run and the data collected.
- *Reflect*: In the third semester of the cycle, the data is compiled and the faculty come together again to discuss the results. This dialogue should include a discussion about the meaning of the results and how they can be used to improve student learning.

Processes Involved in SLO Development and Assessment:

Assessment	In simplest terms, assessment is the systematic collection and analysis of information to improve student learning. However, "assessment is not an end in itself but a vehicle for educational improvement" (AAHE, 1992). The purpose of assessment is not merely to gather information; the purpose of assessment is to foster improvement.
	Assessment is an ongoing process aimed at understanding and improving student learning. It involves making our expectations explicit and public; setting appropriate criteria and high standards for learning quality; systematically gathering, analyzing, and interpreting evidence to determine how well performance matches those expectations and standards; and using the resulting information to document, explain, and improve performance. When it is embedded effectively within larger institutional systems, assessment can help us focus our collective attention, examine our assumptions, and create a shared academic culture dedicated to assuring and improving the quality of higher education (Angelo, AAHE Bulletin, November 1995, p. 7).
Assessment Instrument	The evidence of learning that the student will produce (e.g. test, essay, portfolio, demonstration) and which will be evaluated by faculty associated with a particular program with respect to a rubric.
Assessment Plan	A plan written in the first step of the cycle (*identify*) in which faculty draft an SLO for a course or program, outline how it will be assessed, and state how the resulting data will be used to improve student learning.
Dialogue	A group discussion among colleagues, often facilitated, which is designed to explore complex issues, greater group intelligence and facilitate group learning (ACCJC Standards Glossary). Dialogue is an essential process in SLO development.
Norming	A process in which faculty come to an agreement about how the rubric will be used and standards applied to evaluate assessments. The purpose is to avoid inter-rater error (i.e. large differences from evaluator to evaluator in how assessments are scored).
Pilot	A small-scale trial of an assessment instrument to test its validity and usability before the full-scale assessment is run.
Program Review	An analysis of a program's performance with respect to particular indicators, including student learning outcomes. SLOs are a natural fit in program reviews because for both, the goal

is improvement (of student learning).

Rubric	A set of primary traits and guidelines for scoring and evaluating each assessment as agreed upon by a particular faculty group. A rubric makes explicit and specific statements about the expected qualities of performance at each point in the scale and for each primary trait or standard being evaluated. Rubrics help ensure consistency among raters (Oxnard College SLO Handbook, 2006).

Types of Assessment

Classroom Assessment	Simple, non-graded, anonymous, in-class activities that help instructors gather feedback from students on the teaching-learning process and determine how well their students are learning what they are being taught. The purpose of classroom assessment is to provide faculty and students with information and insights needed to improve teaching effectiveness and learning quality. College instructors use feedback gleaned through Classroom Assessment to inform adjustments in their teaching. Faculty also share feedback with students, using it to help them improve their learning strategies and study habits in order to become more independent, successful learners (Angelo, T.A., 1991; see also Classroom Assessment Techniques (2nd ed.) by Angelo and Cross, 1993). Classroom assessment is a type of formative evaluation (see below).
Embedded Assessment	Collecting assessment data information within the classroom because of the opportunity it provides to use already in-place assignments and coursework for assessment purposes. This involves taking a second look at materials generated in the classroom so that, in addition to providing a basis for grading students, these materials allow faculty to evaluate their approaches to instruction and course design. These assessments can be a part of the student's grade, but do not have to be (Oxnard College SLO Handbook, 2006).
Pre-Test/Post-Test	An assessment technique in which students are given an assessment at the beginning of the semester on material to be covered in the course to provide a baseline (pre-test). Then, students are given the same or a similar assessment at the end of the semester (post-test). This is a particularly valid way to show learning in a course because prior knowledge is established through the pre-test; then it's possible

to show learning that took place in the course itself (rather than some other course or prior knowledge) through comparing the pre- and post-test results.

Portfolio	A collection of student work to show not only learning outcomes but also the progress or process of learning.
	Portfolios may be used not only as a course-level assessment but also at the program-level to show learning progress throughout a whole program.

Types of Evidence:

Direct Evidence	Evidence that shows directly that a student has learned.
	Examples of direct evidence include essays, tests, portfolios, or demonstrations. Simply stated, direct evidence is produced by students.
Indirect Evidence	Evidence that shows student learning indirectly, through which student learning can be inferred rather than directly demonstrated.
	Examples of indirect evidence are course grades, transfer and retention data, surveys, exit interviews, etc.
Formative Evaluation	Evaluation for the purpose of *improvement*.
	Formative evaluation usually takes place *continually* throughout a lesson module, course, or program.
Summative Evaluation	Evaluation that is used to show *learner achievement*.
	Summative evaluation usually takes place at the *end* of a lesson module, course, or program. Formative and summative evaluation should be used to complement each other.
Qualitative Evidence/Data	Data/evidence that is narrative or descriptive in form.
	Qualitative evidence usually involves fewer cases than quantitative data, but shows much more specific information and tends to be very subjective.
Quantitative Evidence/Data	Data/evidence that is numerical in form.
	Quantitative evidence usually involves a great number of cases and is used to show general patterns and trends rather than specifics. It tends to be much more objective.

Goal is to establish a policy and practice that can be applied to areas with no FT faculty and no consisted PT to get input from.

How can OAC have a clear **policy** to help get these courses/faculty on the assessment schedule and as needed reach out to faculty before they are notified that they will be submitting assessments into E-Lumen.

Most of these areas tend to be only 1 or 2 courses.
Also, they usually teach a course twice in two years (or less)

Steps/Policy DRAFT

1. Find existing 2-yr schedule as best as possible (See below)
2. Make only 1 assessment for each course in the discipline each semester when possible.
3. Place courses a year ahead of the semester the assessment is planned if possible.
4. Suggest a faculty ambassador as a contact and research office information **before** the assessment semester.
5. Somehow help Faculty make changes if needed from the first planned schedule.
6. *Assign(?) a full-time faculty to coordinate with the adjunct on a rotational basis if more than one faculty is in a related area and/or on OAC or with outcome submission knowledge/experience.
7. Share suggested assessment plan with the **Dean of area for final approval.**

Four areas that have new or changing PT faculty with little or no connection to the college:

Discipline	Abbreviated	Course(S) in catalog	When offered? (based on 2020 Spring and fall
Anthropology	ANTH	ANTH 1	Fall 2020
Ethnic Studies	ETHN	ETHN 1	Fall 2020
Physics	PHYS	PHYS 2A & 2B	PHYS 2A = Fall (all) PHYS 2B = Spr (all)
Spanish	SPAN	SPAN 1A & 1B	SPAN 1A = Fall (all) SPAN 1B = Spr (all)

Assessment Schedule Grid - Based on Assumed schedule:

FALL EVEN (2020, 2022…)			SPRING ODD (2021, 2023…)		
Live	**Online**	**Assess**	**Live**	**Online**	**Assess**
	ANTH 1				
	ETHN 1				
Physics 2A	Physics 2A		Physics 2B	Physics 2B	
SPAN 1A	SPAN 1A		SPAN 1B	SPAN 1B	
FALL ODD (2021, 2023…)			**SPRING EVEN (2022, 2024…)**		
Live	**Online**	**Assess**	**Live**	**Online**	**Assess**
	ANTH 1	x			
	ETHN 1	x			
Physics 2A	Physics 2A	x	Physics 2B	Physics 2B	x
SPAN 1A	SPAN 1A	x	SPAN 1B	SPAN 1B	x

SLOAC Handbook

Introductory Materials

Outcomes Assessment Cycle

COURSE LEVEL

1. Develop/Review Outcomes

2. Assess Outcomes

3. Analyze & Reflect

4. Report Assessment Results

5. Use Results to Improve Student Success

PROGRAM LEVEL

1. Develop/Review Outcomes

2. Assess Outcomes

3. Analyze & Reflect

4. Report Assessment Results

5. Use Results to Improve Student Success

NON-INSTRUCTIONAL

1. Develop/Review Outcomes

2. Assess Outcomes

3. Analyze & Reflect

4. Report Assessment Results

5. Use Results to Improve Student Success

Resources and Background Information

PART I: COURSE-LEVEL LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT

1. Develop/Review Outcomes

A. Determine what students should accomplish by the end of the course.
B. Write outcomes with *assessment* in mind.
C. At Barstow Community College, majority of courses have identified three Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). The curriculum committee has established a minimum of two SLOs and a maximum of four.
D. Use higher order thinking outcomes when possible. See Bloom's Taxonomy *(Appendix A).*
E. During program review, examine existing Course-Level SLOs for relevance, measurability, and continued appropriateness to course goals.
F. Ensure SLOs are Measurable, Manageable, and Meaningful to the course and overarching goals for the program. For specific Course-Level SLO Samples see *Appendix B*.

Measurable:	Manageable:	Meaningful:
‣ *Use verbs that specify definite, observable student performance, actions, or behaviors.* ‣ *Directly measurable.* ‣ *Describe student rather than instructor behaviors.* ‣ *Describe student outcomes rather than processes.*	‣ *Realistic and attainable.* ‣ *Indicate behaviors that are direct results of your program.* ‣ *Use simple language, clearly understood by people outside the program.* ‣ *Validated by colleagues*	‣ *Tie directly to course content* ‣ *Applicability to course material* ‣ *Relevant to life experiences and/or allow for a bridge to existing student knowledge*

2. Assess Outcomes

A. How to Assess?
    Some common practices ideas include the following:
    ‣   Use a pre-test/post-test
    ‣   Create one assignment that incorporates multiple SLOs
    ‣   Selecting a single question in an objective test like Math
B. Create a Rubric. Why?
    ‣   Eliminates confusion or subjectivity
    ‣   Helps students understand outcome goals
    ‣   Aids departments and instructors to align better in determining goals
C. Possible challenges during the process:
    ‣   How to measure non-traditional assessments such as product, performances, or speaking
    ‣   Sample Rubrics for Speaking, Hands on, or Demonstration SLO assessments in Speech, ESL, Cosmetology, and Automotive (*See Appendix C)*
D. Timing: Assessments can be given any given time that makes sense, it doesn't have to be the final.

E. Identifying Student Success Data
  ‣ Use quantitative Data to determine if "Target" is met (needed for TracDat)
  ‣ Standard BCC Target goal - 70% of assessed students receive 70% or higher on assessment
  ‣ Helpful Math formula to identify target Met:
    - # Students Passed Assessment / # Students Assessed = % of Student Success
    - SAMPLE: 30 students completed assessment, 25 students passed the assessment with a "C" or higher (70%)
    - Math Formula: 25/30 = 83% student success on SLO assessment.
F. Remember, if there is other anecdotal information regarding student success and/or failure there is an area to include this on the Course Level SLO Report. Consider including information such as students not taking the assessment or dropping the course

3. Analyze and Reflect on Assessment Results

A. The purpose of analysis and reflection is to be honest in order to improve with student acquisition of the knowledge or skills.
  ‣ **Analysis:** Examine and evaluate relevant information that may account for differences.
  ‣ **Reflection**: Consider assessment data to determine what can be improved, keep doing what is successful, and continue to build upon your teaching based on this new data. Of course, there is an element of adaptability that we need to have in as such each class as our students will be different.
B. Based on the assessment results and your knowledge of the class anecdotally what changes would improve students' success on the assessment in future classes?
C. Reflect on the results. Consider items below or your classes may have other considerations:
  ‣ Instructor approach or scaffolding
  ‣ Outcome or assessment used
  ‣ Assignments or preparation
  ‣ Textbook
  ‣ Understanding of student learning modalities

4. Report Assessment Results

A. **Submission:** Submit Course Level SLO assessments to the SLOAC Committee (sloac@barstow.edu)
B. **Deadline:** As per Academic Senate, SLO assessment reports are due within 14 calendar days after a class ends.
C. **Course-Level SLO Form:** Use the most current form. Fill it out completely.
D. **TracDat:** Course Level SLO assessments will be added in TracDat, which will aggregate the college data. The SLO form is aligned with TracDat. Eventually, the form will be eliminated and direct submission into TracDat will begin.
E. **Program Review and Institutional Outcomes:** Course Level SLOs are also part of the Program Review, as well as program and institutional reports and outcomes analysis.
F. **Consequences of Non-Submission of Course-Level SLO assessment reports**:
  ‣ All faculty are required to participate in the outcomes assessment process.
  ‣ Not participating can reflect on evaluations and, in some cases, course offerings.
  ‣ Data in SLO reports is not part of any evaluation process, only participation in the process.

5. Use Results to Improve Student Success

A. Review assessment results from previous semester(s) and compare and contrast student success.
B. Implementation steps and as appropriate, change in assessment results in following reports
C. Continuous review of potential adjustments/ outcomes/ measurements.
   o Integrate learning into approach for new cycle
   o Adjust instructional methodology and materials as needed
   o Consider potential revisions to SLO's / curriculum as needed.
D. There is no end goal. This is an opportunity to reflect and improve the program
E. Remember when implementing, establish priorities – can't fix everything at once.
F. Use the Program Review Cycle as a chance to review SLOs and SLO assessment data

Start a New Cycle

Resources

Appendix A: Bloom's Taxonomy

General examples of SLO's that assess higher order thinking (Analysis, Synthesis, and/or Evaluation)… (Adapted from Bloom's Taxonomy).

    i. **Examine** the relationship between _____ concept and _____ concept.

   ii. **Relate** _____'s theory to your understanding of the "real life" situation provided (or experienced by student).

  iii. Using information from the text and from class, **invent** a possible model (could be physical or theoretical model, depending on course focus). **Explain** how the information you learned would support your invented model's potential success.

  iv. **Critique** _____' theory in view of the situation we experience in today's world. What elements are valid? What elements no longer apply (or never completely did), in your opinion? Use information from text/class/research to support your position.

   v. **Distinguish** between _____ and _____ as they apply to _____.

  vi. **Prioritize** the steps necessary to complete the _____ process. **Differentiate** between crucial and cosmetic/non-crucial steps.

Appendix B: SLO Examples

1. SLO's should address the 3 M's and have assessment methods in place to evaluate student success. The following are examples from various departments across the curriculum.

2. Identify, explore, and justify selections of potential career pathways that match student needs, abilities, and interests. 12

3. Decide what the important factors were that enabled the American colonies to defeat the British Empire during the Revolutionary War.

4. Describe the cultural characteristics of Mesoamerica as well as the historical processes by which the characteristics were created and transformed through time.

5. Discuss the role of gender on identity and behavioral roles.

6. Identify and analyze a particular environmental problem or situation, describe its physical, biological and/or sociological ramifications, and draw conclusions as to what can be done about the situation.

7. Examine limits of functions, asymptotic behavior of functions, and continuity.

8. Create a model for environmental law and community planning.

9. Explain the inherent meaning of the word primitive and discuss why oral religions should no longer be called *primitive* religions.

10. Identify the structure and composition of skin, and explain the function of skin.

11. Demonstrate the ability to provide skincare services in a safe environment and take measures to use Universal Precautions to prevent the spread of diseases.

12. Differentiate between public relations and community relations.

13. Identify and explain the various components of supply chain management.

14. Design pricing schedules and advertisement campaigns utilized in sales promotions.

15. Understand the relationship between voltage, current, resistance and power and be able to calculate each type in a circuit.

16. Perform basic arithmetic calculations as applied to business situations.

17. Recognize key regulatory agencies and labor relation organizations, and their responsibilities in the labor management relationship.

18. Identify Tools and their Functions.

19. Compare, contrast, and analyze major developmental milestones for children from conception through adolescence in the areas of physical, psychosocial, cognitive, and language development using standards research methodologies.

Appendix C: Speech Critique Sheet

Points   Type of Speech: _____

Print Name: _____ Topic: _____

                          Date: _____ Meeting Day(s)/Time(s): _____

"Like Bests" (LB):

"Next Times" (NT):

I. Content:	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor

  A. Organization
      1. Hook/Introduction: <u>Before the Topic & 1, 2, 3</u>
      2. Preview/Forecast: 1, 2, 3
      3. Body: 1, 2, 3 (Supporting Materials/Sources)
      4. Conclusion/Summary: 1, 2, 3
  B. Analysis/Reasoning
  C. Persuasive – # of Quotations and Source Citations – Properly Attributed
  D. Persuasive – Follows "Monroe's Motivated Sequence"
      · Attention; Need (Problem); Satisfaction (Solution); Visualization; and Action

II. Performance:	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor

  A. Verbal
      1. Volume
      2. Rate
      3. Fluency
      4. Non-words (um, you know…)
      5. Pitch
      6. Proper English/Double Negatives/Too Informal
      7. Vulgar Slang: "Slang Alert"
  B. Non-verbal
      1. Confidence/Poise
      2. Eye Contact
      3. Gestures (Card Control)
      4. Posture/Twisting/Magic "X"/Extraneous Movement

III. Other:
  A. Outline
      1. Accurate with Sources
      2. Complete/Comprehensive (Full Sentences)
      3. Proper Format (Typed/Numbering/Indenting)
  B. Artistic Proofs
      1. Ethos
      2. Pathos
      3. Logos
  C. Visual Aid(s) (when required) (Sources)
      1. Size
      2. Color
      3. Neat Printing/Correct Spelling
      4. Revealed Correctly
      5. Revealed At Proper Time

Time: Short   OK   Overtime   2015 © D. Conrad

Appendix D: ESL Writing Rubric

ESL 104/114 Rubric for Paragraphs

Fall 2013

	5	4	3	2	1
Conceptual Understanding	Demonstrates very clear and sophisticated understanding of assignment; ideas are clear, assertive, and insightful. Message is logical and unifying	Demonstrates clear understanding of assignment; ideas are clear and assertive; some ideas insightful; message is generally logical and unifying	Understanding of assignment is acceptable/average, though sometimes too broad. Ideas may be simplistic or predictable. No deep insights.	Understanding of assignment is basic; ideas are not really clear, assertive, or just factual; meaning may require significant inference by the reader. No real insights present.	Understanding of assignment very limited or non-existent. Ideas unclear or disjointed, perhaps only list of facts; individual's logic very hard to follow.
Organization	Very logical organization. Develops ideas fully and provides controlling main ideas, logical support and examples in very clear order. No repetition (each part of the assignment does its own job).	Logical organization. Develops ideas but may have 1-2 points not as tightly connected. Provides controlling main idea, support, and examples in generally logical order. Good use of transitions. Limited repetition.	Acceptable/average organization. Has a main idea but may occasionally go off track in supporting it. Overall, ideas in logical order, but may be missing logical examples/support. May be occasionally unclear.	Limited organization. Main idea hard to locate or too broad/factual. Support often unclear or disconnected from main idea or other support points.	Main idea not present or confused by or disconnected from organization of ideas. Reasoning difficult to follow because of order of sentences (or insertion of sentences not relevant to the point).
Communication	Great sense of voice/individuality. Ideas flow easily/naturally and message is engaging or challenging in relation to topic, purpose and audience.	Good sense of writer's voice; language (vocab) choices effective and appropriate to topic, purpose, and audience.	Writer's voice not very clear; message more mechanical. Vocab sometimes incorrect for topic. Limited awareness of purpose/audience.	Writer's voice gets lost. Message does not flow...choppy. Vocab monotonous (boring) or repetitive. Needs of audience and purpose of assignment not readily apparent.	No sense of writer's voice here. Communication very difficult to follow. Language choices misused or inappropriate to purpose and audience.
Accuracy	Grammar and mechanics of American English very strong. Few to no errors and any there do not affect meaning of text.	Above average control of grammar/mechanics. Few errors which rarely affect meaning of text.	Average control of grammar/mechanics. Some errors... occasionally affect meaning.	Little control of grammar/mechanics. Errors more common and significantly affect meaning.	Very little control of grammar/mechanics. Errors so prevalent that meaning is virtually lost.

Appendix E: ESL Presentation Rubric

Presentation Feedback

Presenter: _____ **Subject:** _____

Claim: _____

	Not at all	A little	some	a lot	Very much
Presenter was well-prepared (Prezi)	1	2	3	4	5
Presentation focused on analysis/argument about selected topic	1	2	3	4	5
Presentation was logical and organized	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter used good examples	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter appears to ENJOY the presentation	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter spoke loudly enough	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter spoke with good speed and clear pronunciation	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter seemed relaxed/confident	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter had good eye contact	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter prepared for questions	1	2	3	4	5
Prezi creative, thorough, and organized	1	2	3	4	5
Research is supportive, not the focus	1	2	3	4	5
Research is cited correctly	1	2	3	4	5

On a scale of 1 to 10, I'd give this presentation a....

Needs   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10   **Effective, Excellent**
improvement

Sounds I recommend you practice: _____

Notes:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix F: Nail Project Rubric

INTERMEDIATE COSMETOLOGY 51A
NAIL PROJECT RUBRIC

Possible 100 points

Gone are the days of the classic French manicure—today it's all about nail art. Nail art projects can range in fabulous looks: leopard print, plaid, stripes, stained glass, lace, glitter, and more. This super-fun project presents professional nail-art in 3D, **using only forms** and not tip overlays.   This project will be your individual creativity. You will design your project on a manikin hand in 3-dimensional art. Now let your creativity flow.

Criteria	0-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17-20
Proper application and understanding of nail project	The student does not reach a standard described by the project of achieving nail art.	The student shows **limited** knowledge and understanding of nails. The student has demonstrated **limited** knowledge and understanding of the elements of 3D nail art.	The student is able to demonstrate **satisfactory** knowledge and understanding of nail art. The student is able to demonstrate **satisfactory** knowledge and understanding of the elements of nail art.	The student is able to demonstrate **good** knowledge and understanding of the nail art. The student is able to demonstrate **good** knowledge and understanding of the elements of nail art.	The student is able to demonstrate **excellent** knowledge and understanding of nail art. The student is able to demonstrate **excellent** knowledge and understanding of the elements of nail art.
Quality of work	Nail application is not correct for the chosen style: 3D Nail art	Nail application is vaguely correct for the chosen style: 3 D Nail art	Nail application is satisfactory for the chosen style: 3 D Nail art	Nail application is good for the chosen style: 3 D Nail art	Nail application is correct for the chosen style: 3 D Nail art
Creativity-	Did not stay with the theme, unable to see the connection with the photograph. Application was not clean and sharp	Vaguely stayed with the theme, but was not successful. Application was not always clean and sharp.	Attempted to stay with the theme, but was not successful. Application was not always clean and sharp	Stayed somewhat with the theme - clean, sharp and effective. Followed the photograph	Stayed with the theme - clean, sharp and effective. Followed photograph
3 Dimensional and theme	The student does not reach a standard described by the project of achieving 3D art	The student vaguely achieves 3D art application	The student attempts to 3 D Nail art application	The student somewhat achieves 3 D Nail art task	The student successfully achieves 3 D Nail art task
Overall Project Results	Poor project submission	Didn't use time effectively in the nail application process to finish project appropriately	Could have use time more effectively throughout the process to finish project	Uses time good throughout the process to finish with a good project	Uses time well throughout the process to finish with an excellent project

Appendix G: Sculptured Nails Assessments

STATE BOARD MOCK ASSESSMENT
INTERMEDIATE COSMETOLOGY 51A
SCULPTURED NAIL ASSESSENT

SCULPTURED NAILS 20 minutes	Y	N	COMMENTS
Preparation			
Disinfects work area or uses protective covering			
Sets up work area with supplies labeled in English			
Sanitizes hands			
Sets up implements that are visibly clean and sanitary			
Sanitizes finger			
Removes shine from nail plate safely			
Cleanses nail plate and cuticle of dust			
Application of Sculptured Nail Product			
Applies nail form to fit snugly under free edge			
Applies primer safely			
Applies sculptured product to extend free edge			
Applies sculptured product to cover nail plate			
Demonstration of Filing			
Shapes free edge safely			
Shapes free edge safely			
Buffs sculptured nail safely			
Final Appearance of Nail			
Finished sculptured nail is smooth, even, and beveled/tapered			
Contour of sculptured nail is balanced			
Nail plate is covered by sculptured nail product			
Cuticle and surrounding skin remains free of sculptured nail product			
Safety and Infection Control			
Disposes of soiled materials using infection control procedures			
Disposes of items to be disinfected in properly labeled receptacle			
Practices infection control procedures safely throughout service			
Maintains work area in a safe manner throughout service			

Appendix H: Automotive Hands-On Presentation

Automotive Grading Rubric

Criteria	F(0)	D(1)	C(2)	B(3)	A(4)
Automotive NATEF Task Presentation Exam	Student is unable to identify components, does not show knowledge of assembly and reassembly procedures, and does not understand safety procedures and tool use. Student was unable to complete the task.	Student is able to identify the majority of the major components, must consult references during assembly and reassembly procedures, and only demonstrates essential safety procedures and basic tool use. Student requires check point inspections during completion of task.	Student is able to identify major components, shows a basic knowledge of assembly and reassembly procedures, and shows a basic understanding of safety procedures and tool use.	Student is able to identify most components, shows knowledge of assembly and reassembly procedures, and understands safety procedures and tool use. Student has some questions but is usually able to complete task in the standard allotted time.	Student is able to identify all components, shows knowledge of assembly and reassembly procedures, and understands safety procedures and tool use. Student has mastery of subject matter and could complete the task independently in a work environment in the allotted time.

Instructor Feedback:

PART II: PROGRAM-LEVEL LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENTS

1. Develop/Review Program Outcomes

A. Review College Mission (see Website)
B. Review current Program Mission Statement from most recent Program Review or create a Program Mission Statement.
C. Dialogue with department on what you do and how you know you are successful at it.
D. Identify four to six possible outcomes you want students to achieve by the end of the program.
E. Apply the three essential criteria: measureable – manageable – meaningful.

Measurable:	Manageable:	Meaningful:
‣ *Use verbs that specify definite, observable student performance, actions, or behaviors.* ‣ *Directly measurable.* ‣ *Describe student rather than instructor behaviors.* ‣ *Describe student outcomes rather than processes.*	‣ *Realistic and attainable.* ‣ *Indicate behaviors that are direct results of your program.* ‣ *Use simple language, clearly understood by people outside the program.* ‣ *Validated by colleagues*	‣ *Tie directly to course content* ‣ *Applicability to course material* ‣ *Relevant to life experiences and/or allow for a bridge to existing student knowledge*

F. As a department, narrow the number of outcomes to three preferably, but a maximum of four. Remember every outcome MUST be assessed so be realistic.
G. Write the three PLO's in active, higher level taxonomy language. (See Appendix)
H. Submit to and receive approval through the Curriculum Committee process. See Curriculum Chair or Curriculum manual for assistance.

2. Develop Assessments for Program Outcomes

A. As a department, make a determination of how to measure achievement of outcomes in a manageable way.
B. Create a plan to measure/assess outcomes collaboratively
C. Some assessments may require collaboration with other departments on campus and/or transfer institutions.
D. Create a rubric or explicit written expectations. Why?
   ‣ Eliminates confusion or subjectivity
   ‣ Aids departments and instructors to align better in determining goals
E. Identifying Student Success Data (Program data will be entered into TracDat in the future)
   ‣ Use quantitative Data to determine if "Target" is met (needed for TracDat)
   ‣ Standard BCC Target goal - 70% of assessed students receive 70% or higher on assessment
   ‣ Helpful Math formula to identify target Met:
      - # Students Passed Assessment / # Students Assessed = % of Student Success
      - SAMPLE: 300 students completed assessment, 250 students passed the assessment with a "C" or higher (70%)
      - Math Formula: 250/300 = 83% student success on SLO assessment.
F. Remember, if there is other anecdotal information regarding student success and/or failure there is an area to include this on the Course Level SLO Assessment Report. Consider including information such as students not taking the assessment or dropping the course

3. Analyze & Reflect

A. Assess and gather /Submit outcomes according to the established plan.
B. As a department, analyze outcome results to determine whether data is meaningful or whether assessment/measure needs to be rewritten.
C. As a department, analyze meaningful results and determine whether results support your program as a whole.

   ‣ **Analysis:** Examine and evaluate relevant information that may account for differences.
   ‣ **Reflection**: Consider assessment data to determine what can be improved, keep doing what is successful, and continue to build upon.
D. CHANGE: If the outcome assessment indicates the need for course, program or other adjustments to fully meet program mission, and then determine with the department appropriate steps.

4. Report Assessment Results

A. Report assessment results in the Program Review and/or TracDat.
B. PLO information (assessment and results) may be posted to department's webpage
C. Outcomes reporting at the Program Level:
   ‣ Every program develops its own outcomes assessment and plan.
   ‣ Faculty members in that program are expected to participate in the Outcomes and Assessment process as according to the plan.
   ‣ Not participating can reflect on evaluations and in some cases course offerings
   ‣ Data in SLO reports is not part of any evaluation process, only participation in the process.
   ‣ Participation in the process as dictated by the program plan is mandatory and can be evaluated as professional responsibility.

5. Use Results to Improve Student Success

A. Implement steps identified in Step 14.
B. Include implementation steps and as appropriate, change in assessment results in following reports
C. Continuous review of potential adjustments/ outcomes/ measurements.
   o Integrate learning into approach for new cycle
   o Adjust instructional methodology and materials as needed
   o Consider potential revisions to SLOs / curriculum as needed
D. There is no end goal. This is an opportunity to reflect and improve the program
E. Remember when implementing, establish priorities – can't fix everything at once.
F. Use the Program Review Cycle as a chance to review Course Outlines including SLOs and Course SLO data

Start a New Cycle

PART III: NON-INSTRUCTIONAL OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

Introduction

PURPOSES OF ASSESSMENT

CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE ASSESSMENT

DEVELOPING THE UNIT ASSESSMENT PLAN

1. Develop/Review Outcomes

DEFINITION OF OUTCOMES

WRITING OUTCOMES

TIPS FOR WRITING OUTCOMES

STRUCTURE OF AN OUTCOME STATEMENT

GENERAL FORMAT FOR WRITING OUTCOME STATEMENTS

RESOURCES: ACTION VERBS FOR OUTCOMES

2. Assess Outcomes

DEFINING HOW YOU WILL ASSESS PROGRESS TOWARDS OUTCOMES (METHODS AND MEASURES)

DIRECT MEASUREMENT APPROACHES

INDIRECT MEASUREMENT APPROACHES

ASSESSMENT METHODS BASED ON TYPE OF EXPECTED OUTCOME

ASSESSMENT TRAPS TO AVOID

3. Analyze & Reflect

4. Report Assessment Results

TRACDAT!

5. Use Results to Improve Student Success

Introduction

> **Service Area:**
> A department providing student support services outside the classroom that are not linked to courses in the catalog or schedule.
>
> **Administrative Unit:**
> A department providing operational services and organizational support.
>
> Information to support Outcomes Assessment for both types of areas is included in this section of the handbook. The material can be applied to all College non-instructional units, although the terminology may be abbreviated, according to the flow of the narrative.

PURPOSES OF ASSESSMENT

The four main purposes of assessment should be:

- **To improve:** The assessment process should provide feedback to determine how the administrative unit can be improved.
- **To inform:** The assessment process should inform department heads and other decision-makers of the contributions and impact of the administrative unit to the development and growth of students.
- **To prove:** The assessment process should encapsulate and demonstrate what the administrative unit is accomplishing to students, faculty, staff and outsiders.
- **To support:** The assessment process should provide support for campus decision-making activities such as unit review and strategic planning, as well as external accountability activities such as accreditation.

CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE ASSESSMENT

Effective administrative unit assessment should answer these questions:

- What are you trying to do?
- How well are you doing it?
- Using the answers to the first two questions, how can you improve what you are doing?
- What and how does the unit contribute to the development and growth of students?
- How can the student learning experience be improved?

DEVELOPING THE UNIT ASSESSMENT PLAN

> It is important to note that staff participation and ownership is essential for the success of Service Area and Administrative Unit assessment.

Organize for assessment

Before assessment begins, the key players, committees and structures should be identified. One or more persons may lead the unit assessment process, but it is important for all staff to assume the responsibility for designing, implementing, and carrying out the assessment process.

Define the Outcomes of the administrative unit

Outcomes are specific statements that reflect the broader goals of the unit. The Outcomes of an Administrative Unit or Service Area usually focus more on process and student development and will primarily describe what the department is going to do and what its impact will be on students and other key stakeholders.

Identify performance criteria for each outcome

Determine what standards are expected from services provided by your unit. For some outcomes, you may want to achieve a satisfaction level of "excellent" from the students who utilize the services. However, for other outcomes, this expectation may be unrealistic because other factors may affect student perception (e.g., students' satisfaction rating of the financial assistance office).

Inventory existing and needed assessment methods

Identify, list and describe all available approaches that can be used to conduct assessment. Referring back to the needs of the unit, identify what additional methods need to be used to provide you with the necessary information needed for assessing what is going on within your unit.

Determine how assessment results will be used for improvement

No matter how well assessment activities are planned and conducted, they are not worthwhile to the unit unless the plan incorporates a timely feedback mechanism. The results and information gained should be distributed to the appropriate parties to achieve continuous improvement.

1. Develop/Review Outcomes

DEFINITION OF OUTCOMES

> An Administrative Unit or Service Area Outcome (AUO/SAO) is a statement about what a client will experience, receive, or understand as a result of a given service.

Outcomes can also be defined as statements that describe the desired quality (timeliness, accuracy, responsiveness, etc.) of key functions and services within the administrative unit.

Operational outcomes define exactly what the services should promote (understanding, knowledge, awareness, appreciation, etc.).

Outcomes state expected accomplishments or improvements that the unit has identified, after careful consideration of the critical processes and functions. They can relate to the operations and processes of the unit, and may include a consideration of demand, quality, and efficiency and effectiveness.

Outcomes may also relate to intended behaviors that a student having used services provided by the unit should demonstrate. Outcome statements can also focus on the intended abilities, knowledge, values and attitudes a student should demonstrate after having used certain services or having participated in an activity. It is helpful to think about expected outcomes in three categories:

‣ *Unit Processes and Functions* – expected outcomes about quality, efficiency and effectiveness by evaluating organizational processes, functions, and services

‣ *Satisfaction* – expected outcomes about constituents' or stakeholders' satisfaction with a unit's processes, functions, and services

‣ *Learning* – expected outcomes about whether or not students/faculty/staff are learning the desired knowledge, skills, or attitudes intended by the unit

WRITING OUTCOMES

Use the acronym SMART when developing the outcome statements for your unit:

Specific

The outcome is associated with key processes and services provided to students and other stakeholders. The outcome should be distinctive to the unit that is conducting assessment.

Measurable

The intended outcome should be one for which it is feasible to collect accurate and reliable data. Refer to section 2 for more discussion on direct and indirect assessment measures.

Aggressive but Attainable

The following is a collection of questions that might help you to formulate and define aggressive but attainable outcomes for your unit:

‣ What types of things are you striving for?

‣ What types of directions do you want to move in?

‣ What would you like to accomplish over the next year(s) and why?

‣ In terms of outcomes, what would the "perfect" Administrative Unit or Service Area look like?

Results-oriented

The outcome should aid in identifying where the unit improvements are needed.

Describe where you would like to be within a specified time period. For example: 10% increase in funding within one year; 90% satisfaction rating for next year; 10% student performance within two years. If you have previously measured an outcome, it is helpful to use this as the baseline for setting your target for next year.

Time Bound

The outcome should indicate the timeframe for assessment; for example: every spring term.

Possible outcomes to measure:

- *efficiency*
- *accuracy*
- *effectiveness*
- *client satisfaction (improve, increase)*
- *quality*
- *comprehensiveness (understand)*
- *compliance with standards*

TIPS FOR WRITING OUTCOMES

First develop a master list of "what do we do" and then identify key services or functions.

Begin the outcome statement with the beneficiary as the subject:

- *Customers have . . .*
- *Administrators are able to . . .*
- *Clients understand . . .*
- *The College enjoys . . .*
- *Customers employ . . .*
- *Students are aware of . . .*
- *The institution gains . . .*

STRUCTURE OF AN OUTCOME STATEMENT

Outcome statements will have two mandatory elements:

‣ the intended **beneficiary** (customers, students, institution, community) and
‣ the **gain or benefit** they receive from what you do (impact/end result).

GENERAL FORMAT FOR WRITING OUTCOME STATEMENTS

[Intended audience] **who** [action verb 1] [program/service] **will be able to** [action verb 2] [intended outcome].

Intended audience: students, faculty, staff, users, employees within division, employees within department, alumni, customers, administrators, clients, the university, etc…

Action verb 1: complete, engage in, participate in

Program/service: respond to maintenance requests, process payments in the drop box, prepare revenue forecast report, etc…

Action verb 2: demonstrate, describe, discuss, explain, identify, list, summarize, prepare, rate, utilize, use, select, plan

Or

[Intended audience or the department] **will be able to** [action verb to describe what it will do, achieve or accomplish]

Examples

Facilities staff in the plumbing shop will be able to respond to maintenance requests within 24 hours of notification.

Students who use the online payment process will be able to make timely payments and not lose their scheduled courses.

College administrators have the financial information they need to make decisions effectively.

Administrators who request information from the facilities inventory will receive accurate, timely, useful information.

RESOURCES: Action Verbs for Outcomes

Avoid Weasel Words:

be aware of	have a (firm) grasp of
have an awareness of	have a (an in-depth) knowledge of
be conversant with	be prepared for a variety of
be familiar with	have a (good) sense of
display a broad and full grasp of	understand
develop awareness (understanding)	have an (a broad) understanding of

Use Action Verbs:

Add	Design	List	Restate
Advance	Determine	Locate	Reveal
Alter	Differentiate	Make	Revise
Analyze	Discriminate	Manipulate	Section
Annotate	Dissect	Match	Select
Apply	Distinguish	Mobilize	Separate
Appraise	Divide	Modify	Show
Arrange	Draw	Multiply	Sift
Assign	Earn	Name	Sketch
Assay	Employ	Negotiate	Solve
Assess	Estimate	Offer	Sort
Calculate	Evaluate	Omit	Speak
Canvass	Exercise	Operate	Specify
Change	Exert	Perform	Spell
Check	Expand	Pick	State
Choose	Extrapolate	Plan	Strike
Classify	Find	Point	Subtract
Collect	Form	Predict	Summarize
Combine	Generate	Produce	Support
Compare	Give	Project	Synthesize
Compose	Hold	Propose	Take care, teach
Contrast	Identify	Quality	Tell
Convert	Illustrate	Quantity	Test
Create	Include	Quote	Touch
Criticize	Integrate	Rate	Transfer
Dance	Interpolate	Read	Transform
Deduce	Interpret	Recite	Translate
Define	Judge	Referee	Use
Demonstrate	Justify	Repeat	Weigh
Derive	Label	Reproduce	Write

2. Assess Outcomes

DEFINING HOW YOU WILL ASSESS PROGRESS TOWARDS OUTCOMES
(Methods and Measures)

Start by taking an inventory of the kinds of tools your department/unit is already using.

- What information are you already collecting?

- What kinds of assessments are you already using or are already familiar with?

Other departments on campus may be collecting data that you can incorporate into your methods/measures. The data collected should be representative of the whole year. You may want to collect data continuously or you may want to take "snapshots" at regular intervals. You may want to sample systematically, rather than collect data on every event/person/day.

For each expected outcome, describe methods (e.g., survey) you are using or plan to use and the measurement (e.g., satisfaction) to measure how well your department/unit is actually performing in relation to the outcome.

Assessment measures can be:

- **direct** (any process employed to gather data which requires subjects to *display* their knowledge, behavior, or thought processes) *or*

- **indirect** (any process employed to gather data which asks subjects to *reflect upon* their knowledge, behaviors, or thought processes),

Multiple measures should be used for each outcome. An assessment method and measure can be used to assess progress towards more than one outcome.

Assessment methods and measures must align with the outcome:

Outcome:
> *Hypothetical Administrative Unit* will demonstrate increased timeliness in terms of processing student requests.

Assessment:
> Number of students served by *Hypothetical Administrative Unit* will be tracked for three semesters.

*This is an example of assessment that **will not** provide useful, useable information.*

Assessment:
> A computerized log will track the date and time of each student request and the date and time that it is resolved. The time between request and resolution will be compared for two semesters.

*This is an example of assessment that **will** provide useful, useable information.*

Note: The first example assessment shows that data are being collected, but not ***useful*** data. The second example assessment provides information that can be used to determine if the administrative unit is increasing its timeliness.

Methods of Assessing Administrative Unit and Service Area Outcomes

The following are examples of the methods that can be used to assess the expected outcomes of administrative programs.

1. Tracking the use of a service (e.g. hits on a website, use of computer technology)
2. Satisfaction surveys
3. Graduation rates
4. Retention rates
5. Establishing timelines and budgets
6. Recruiting results
7. Tracking program participation
8. Tracking complaints and how they are resolved

Develop targets or benchmarks for each measure

Targets are specific values that you are expecting to reach (e.g., %). For example,

▸ *80% of users reported satisfaction with the service in the Customer Satisfaction Survey*

▸ *100% of monthly reports (note – it would be better to identify the reports by name) are submitted by the third business day of the month*

▸ *100% of ad hoc reports (note – it would be better to identify the reports by name) are submitted by the promised deadline*

▸ *90% of the faculty and staff responding to the annual spring Customer Satisfaction Survey will report they feel safe on campus*

Tips for developing methods and measures and for collecting data:

▸ Methods and measures must be set before you begin to collect data.

▸ If you easily meet your success target, you will want to raise the bar or modify the method, measure and/or the target in order to further improve your outcome.

▸ Using the completion of a project as an assessment method is not recommended because simply completing the project does not provide any information on how to improve.

Data collection needs to become a regular activity for the department. The more you can automate or make routine, the easier it will be to incorporate into your activities. Remember, if the responsibility for data collection is purposefully assigned to a person or position, it increases the likelihood that it will occur.

Examples of assessment measures for administrative units and service areas include:

▸ satisfaction surveys	▸ average service time	▸ opinion surveys
▸ number of complaints	▸ staff training hours	▸ external review
▸ count of participants,	▸ number of applications	▸ number of staff trained
▸ growth in participation	▸ processing time	▸ attendance at events
▸ average wait time	▸ number of users	▸ website hits
▸ statistical reports	▸ focus groups	▸ year-to-year comparisons
		▸ etc…

DIRECT MEASUREMENT APPROACHES

Locally Developed tests

Example: **Pre/Post Test.** Administered before and after a specified learning experience to measure participants' level of knowledge, skills, behaviors and attitudes. (The learning experience can be a program that meets several times or one event.) Post-test scores are compared to pretest scores to determine if the students have learned specific information or concepts.

Embedded questions

Specific questions designed to see if students or clients learned something you expected them to learn.

Rubrics designed to address specific skills or behaviors

A product or performance of some kind is completed by participants and the criteria for evaluating the product have been determined ahead of time and listed with guidelines for evaluating the quality of each aspect listed.

Behavioral observations

- An expert observer (often a supervisor) observes a practical application of a student learning outcome and rates student performance.
- An observer counts specific occurrences of a behavior that is one of the targets for a group involved in a particular experience.

INDIRECT MEASUREMENT APPROACHES

Case Study

Cases studies are focused, systematic examination of one instance of a phenomenon such as an event, program, process or person. Typically, they involve collection of qualitative and quantitative data such as observations, surveys, and interviews for an in depth study of the phenomenon. A report on the case study can help integrate the evidence into one response.

Focus Group

Individuals who are users of the support service or whom benefit from the academic preparation made possible as a result of completing the program (e.g., employers, alumni, faculty, parents, etc.) can provide important qualitative data that can be used to identify strengths and weaknesses within the program.

Interview

One-on-one structured interviews with students, faculty, employers and alumni conducted by a trained interviewer can provide useful information, which can be used to identify strengths and weaknesses within the program.

Assessment Methods Based on Type of Expected Outcome	
What is Being Measured?	**Assessment Method**
Unit Processes or Functions	‣ Error rate ‣ Cost effectiveness analysis ‣ Activity logs ‣ Wait or processing time ‣ Benchmark ‣ External or internal audit ‣ Checklist/Inventory ‣ Track services provided to constituents
Satisfaction	‣ Constituent surveys ‣ Employer questionnaire ‣ Focus groups ‣ Interviews
Learning	‣ Pre and post survey/tests ‣ Checklists ‣ Documented observations ‣ Case Studies ‣ Tracking behaviors or performance ‣ Skills inventory ‣ Rubric

It is important to note that satisfaction surveys are commonly used assessment methods. However, they do not provide direct evidence of achieving expected outcomes, ***unless it is a satisfaction outcome***. For processes/functions outcomes and learning outcomes, it is acceptable to use satisfaction surveys as supporting evidence to supplement results of direct assessment methods, but they cannot be the only method used.

ASSESSMENT TRAPS TO AVOID

Some common assessment traps are described here. These are common challenges faced by units starting to incorporate assessment into their organization. As units infuse assessment as part of their daily activities these assessment traps become easier to avoid.

Great method, wrong expected outcome

In order for assessment results to be informative, it is critical that the assessment methodology matches what the unit is trying to measure. For example, conducting focus groups with faculty to determine if students are satisfied with walk-in hours at the Advising Center is a mismatch of assessment method to outcome.

No target, no idea

It's very important that, along with selecting matching assessment methods, units define the target or criteria for determining success. Without a defined target, a unit does not have a guide to what they are striving for in their performance.

Beware of the labor intensive and time draining

If a unit has all the resources at its disposal and no pending deadline, then this common trap does not apply. However, for the majority of units, time and resources are always limited. Without the proper resources, selecting a labor-intensive and time-consuming assessment method have significant disadvantages. It increases the probability that data will not be collected reliably and consistently. Also, faculty or staff involved will not have a positive experience and may decline to participate in future assessments.

Data, data everywhere

A caution about collecting an overabundance of data: sometimes more data are just more data. For example, it is not necessary to survey every customer that uses the cafeteria for feedback about quality service. However, it is important to make sure that customers who are surveyed represent the diversity of the customer population. Some strategies include surveying customers at different points in the day; and, selecting a representative sample of customers.

The one assessment method to assess them all

It is a fallacy that one assessment method can completely capture it all. All assessment methods have their benefits and shortcomings. While expected outcomes should be assessed by at least one direct assessment method, using more than one assessment method offers multiple perspectives and addresses gaps in each methodology. As a best practice, units should strive to create a comprehensive body of evidence by selecting more than one direct assessment method and utilizing indirect assessment methods to supplement the results of direct assessment methods.

Statistically significant syndrome

Assessment is not research. All too often assessment results are dismissed because research standards are imposed on methodology. While it is important that an assessment tool is reliable, to apply the same standards as research conducted for peer review does not necessarily enhance the information collected. An appropriate assessment method should be a helpful resource for making informed decisions and improving organizational practice, it does not have to be precise, but it does need to be useful to the unit.

3. Analyze & Reflect

A. **Gather:** As a service area or administrative unit assess and gather outcomes according to the established plan.

B. **Analyze:** As a service area or administrative unit, analyze outcome results to determine whether data is meaningful or whether assessment/measure needs to be rewritten.

    a. As a service area or administrative unit, analyze meaningful results and determine whether results support your service area or administrative unit as a whole.

    b. Examine and evaluate relevant information that may account for differences.

C. **Reflection:** Consider assessment data to determine what can be improved, keep doing what is successful, and continue to build upon.

D. **Adjust:** If the outcome assessment indicates the need for adjustments to fully meet administrative unit outcome or service area outcome (AUO/SAO) determine with the department the appropriate steps.

4. Report Assessment Results

A. Report the Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) or Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUOs) for your unit assessment results in the Program Review and TracDat.

    a. Summarize the progress your unit has made on SAO/AUO measures since the last program review.

B. Service Area Outcomes information (assessment and results) may be posted to department's webpage.

C. Describe any improvements made by the service area or administrative unit as a result of the outcomes assessment process.

> - Every service area and administrative unit reports its own outcomes assessment and plan.
> - Service area and administrative units are expected to participate in the outcomes and assessment process in the program review.

5. Use Results to Improve Student Success/Client Engagement

A. Review Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) or Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUOs) assessment results for successful student and/or client engagement.

B. After analysis of SAO's or AUO's implement changes as appropriate.

C. Continuous review and/or potential adjustments to outcomes or measurements as required.

    - Integrate changes as necessary for a new cycle.
    - Adjust measurements as needed.
    - Consider potential revisions to Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) or Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUOs) as needed.

D. There is no end goal. This is an opportunity to reflect and improve.

E. Remember when establishing and implementing priorities, reaffirm what's working and make changes as needed.

F. Use the Program Review Cycle as a chance to review Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) or Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUOs) data.

Start a New Cycle

Acknowledgements

This portion of the handbook has been adapted in large part from other Colleges and Universities. It contains material from several documents on administrative unit assessment and borrows liberally from other texts.

We are especially appreciative to the University of Central Florida for their very thorough "Administrative Unit Assessment Handbook."

Various sources have been noted below:

http://www.lanecollege.edu/text/StepsinDevelopingAssessmentPlan.pdf

http://www.nvcc.edu/about-Nova/directories--offices/administrative-offices/college-planning/planning/hbannplanningevalcampusesadminunits.pdf

https://oeas.ucf.edu/doc/adm_assess_handbook.pdf

http://www.uta.edu/ier/Resources/ABCD_Outcome_Writing_Model.pdf

https://wccc.edu/media/15342/adminunithandbook.pdf

http://www.marymount.edu/marymount.edu/media/Home/Faculty-and-staff/AdminAssessHandbook.pdf

Minutes

I. **Call to Order**
The meeting was called to order at 12:04 p.m. by OAC Co-Chairperson J. Williams.

II. **Roll Call**
Members Present – Joseph Williams, Penny Shreve, Bret Sage, Susan Nylander, Ibrahim Aboud, Denise Pasley, Ashley Vizenor, Amy Ross, Jennafer Worland, Sumana Pasala
Members Absent – Ramon Vasconcellos, Gustavo Bento, Emily Garrison
Guests – Jessica Tainatongo, Stephanie Ingalls, Lisa Holmes, Beverly Ranney, Herbert English, Eduardo Vasquez, Nance Nunes-Gill

III. **Approval of Agenda**
A motion was made and then seconded to approve the agenda for the 11/23/2020 OAC meeting. 1st – J. Worland / 2nd – A. Ross (10, 0, 0)

IV. **Approval of Minutes**
A motion was made and then seconded to approve the minutes from the 10/26/2020 OAC meeting. 1st – J. Worland/ 2nd – S. Nylander (9, 0, 1) P. Shreve abstained from the vote as she was absent from the 10/26/2020 meeting. Item X updated with date of Club Rush – 10/30/2020.

V. **Opportunities to Address the Committee** *(2 minutes each)*
B. Ranney reported to the group that the two year assessment plan for ASTR and PHYS can be taken care of quite quickly; available to help if needed. P. Shreve responded that S. Bulkley got it done; cleaning up list today but feel that only two areas are left to be completed.

VI. **Reports** *(2 minutes each)*
a. eLumen *(Lisa Holmes/Keiry Borruel)*
S. Ingalls reported out that no updates to report. Working with Heather Hurley, eLumen rep, to ensure access is available for all reports in eLumen and that the data is accurate.
b. Curriculum *(Eduardo Vasquez)*
E. Vasquez thanked J. Williams for his assistance on the IMMT courses. Nothing else to report.
c. Program Review
Nothing to report at this time.
d. Sub-Committee
- Glossary Update *(Nance Nunes-Gill/Jennafer Worland/Sumana Pasala)*
  - The sub-committee did not meet but J. Worland reported that she will be sending the glossary of terms from El Camino College to the other members of the committee and will plan a meeting soon.
- OAC Handbook *(Joseph Williams/Penny Shreve/Nance Nunes-Gill/Jennafer Worland)*
  - J. Williams showed the group the current version of the Handbook and went over some of the changes that will be made as it is currently in a rough draft but it's coming along.

VII. **Action Items**
a. Proposed Process for 2-yr Assessment Plan *(No FT Faculty / Penny Shreve)*
Item tabled; will bring back in future meeting. P. Shreve reported that the assessments

are almost complete; the process will be in place for departments where a full-time faculty member does not exist. This policy will allow for OAC to assess in place of faculty; would like this approved by all faculty, not just the department. Added a final step for the Dean of the area to look over for final approval. ==HANDOUT==

b. Faculty Training/Survey *(Penny Shreve)*
Item tabled; will bring back at future meeting. P. Shreve reported to the group that the survey was sent out to faculty but didn't receive any feedback; can send out again if necessary. Do we send it at the end of the semester to get feedback for the following semester or send out at the beginning of the semester? J. Williams suggested sharing the survey at a Best Practice meeting in order to reach more faculty members. P. Shreve will try and get on the first faculty meeting of the semester to discuss this. Will confer with Lisa Holmes, Dr. Nasio and Dr. Rodden to ensure everything was captured. If significant changes, will bring back to the committee before giving out to faculty. S. Nylander suggested adding this item to the December Best Practice meeting.

VIII. Discussion Items
a. Committee's Revised Purpose Statement and Description *(CGC Approval)* ==HANDOUT==
J. Williams reported to the group that the revised Committee Purpose Statement and description that was worked on as a group; is on the agenda for the 11/25 College Governance Committee (CGC).

b. SLO Symposium *(General Info)*
P. Shreve updated the group that there are currently five members registered for this event with one more interested. This is the minimum amount of people that can be sent to the event so there is still room for others to attend. P. Shreve let the group know that it's a two-day event and it is fully online.

c. Update submission of 2-yr Assessment Plan *(Joseph Williams/Penny Shreve/Keiry Borruel)*
P. Shreve asked the group what the process should be if a faculty member changes their two-year assessment plan. L. Holmes responded that meetings are taking place with the discipline each semester for scheduling for the next semester changes can be reported to the Curriculum and Scheduling Specialist and then it can be reported to OAC. The current assessment schedule is in eLumen and the next two years will be put in shortly so anyone will be able to look it up to see when their course is scheduled to be assessed. P. Shreve asked that if changes are submitted, the OAC be notified. At the beginning of the semester, the 2-year plan can be sent to OAC so it can be reviewed and make any necessary changes. L. Holmes then reported that a change in eLumen will archive previous SLOs when new SLOs are entered into the system so OAC would need to be a part of the approval process.

IX. Other Discussions/Information
a. OAC Handbook – Previously covered

X. Announcements *(2 minutes each)*
J. Williams reported that this meeting will be the last of the semester.

XI. Future Agenda Items
a. Faculty Training/Survey *(Penny Shreve)*
b. Proposed Process for 2-yr Assessment Plan *(No FT Faculty / Penny Shreve)*

XII. Next Regular Meeting
a. Tentative Monday, January 25, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)

XIII. Adjournment
A motion was made and then seconded to adjourn the meeting. 1st – J. Worland / 2nd – A. Vizenor. The meeting was adjourned at 1:33 p.m. by J. Williams.

MINUTES

I.   **Call to Order**
    The meeting was called to order at 12:05 p.m. by OAC Co-Chair J. Williams.

II. **Roll Call**

    Members Present – Amy Ross, Ashley Vizenor, Emily Garrison, Susan Nylander, Joseph Williams, Bret Sage, Ibrahim Aboud, Penny Shreve, Jennafer Worland, Scott Bulkely, Denise Pasley
    Members Absent – Ramon Vasconcellos, Gustavo Bento
    Guests – Jessica Tainatongo, Jennifer Rodden, Eduardo Vasquez, Tim Botengan, Herbert English, Jaime Rodriguez, Nance Nunes-Gill, Beverly Ranney

III. **Approval of Agenda**
    A motion was made and then seconded to approve the 2/8/2021 agenda. 1st – J. Worland / 2nd – A. Vizenor (8, 0, 2) A. Vizenor and P. Shreve not present for the vote.

IV. **Approval of Minutes**
    A motion was made and then seconded to approve the minutes from the 11/23/2020 meeting. 1st – S. Nylander / 2nd – E. Garrison (9, 0, 1) S. Bulkley abstained.

V.   **Opportunities to Address the Committee** *(2 minutes each)*
    None.

VI. **Reports** *(2 minutes each)*
    a. OAC Co-Chairs – Penny Shreve and Joseph Williams
    J. Williams sent an email out to faculty in regards to assessment in eLumen; reminded the group that alerts might show up when assessments are due this semester; the email explains everything.

    b. eLumen - Lisa Holmes and Keiry Borruel
    Absent.

    c. Curriculum - Eduardo Vasquez
    E. Vasquez has been in talks with J. Williams to improve processes between curriculum and the OAC.

    d. Program Review
    No formal report.

    e. Sub-Committee
    • **Glossary Update - Nance Nunes-Gill, Jennafer Worland, Sumana Pasala**
    J. Worland reported to the group that the group worked on the glossary prior to the winter break and will send out to the group for review.

- **OAC Handbook - Joseph Williams, Penny Shreve, Nance Nunes-Gill, Jennafer Worland**
  J. Williams is still working on the handbook and shared with the group what has been done this far (HANDOUT) Removed information that was no longer relevant and updated relevant items.

VII. **SLO Symposium Debrief**
   P. Shreve shared a PowerPoint with the group detailing the symposium (HANDOUT)

VIII. **Action Items**
   a. **Proposed Process for 2-yr Assessment Plan if no FT Faculty in Place – Penny Shreve**
   P. Shreve reported to the group that a form was created and sent out to Deans for feedback. Waiting on feedback before action can take place. Tabled.

   b. **Faculty Training/Survey – Penny Shreve**
   P. Shreve reported that administration is to provide feedback for this. Waiting on feedback before action can take place. Tabled.

IX. **Discussion Items**
   a. **Committee's Revised Purpose Statement and Description** *(CGC Approval)*
   J. Williams reported to the group that the CGC didn't approve the committee's purpose statement; will meet with VP Botengan to work on this.

   b. **8th Annual SLO Symposium**
   Report out will be given at Cabinet on 2/9/2021. P. Shreve will send out PowerPoint to the group for any updates prior to the meeting.

   c. **Update submission of 2-yr Assessment Plan - Joseph Williams, Penny Shreve, Keiry Borruel**
   - **Are all plans submitted?**
     J. Williams wanted to check with faculty to ensure that all faculty had assessments turned in; believes that almost everything is turned in. P. Shreve responded that only missing one plan from an area that has a FT faculty member; looking for what was sent in. Currently only five areas that don't have an official assessment plan

   - **When courses change (add or subtract a course), how is the plan updated?**
     J. Williams reported to the group that an alert from eLumen will let faculty members know when an assessment is due (will receive at the beginning and end of the semester). P. Shreve added to this that if a course is created, there isn't a plan in place on how to get a new course into the assessment plan.

   d. **Mapping Updates During Curriculum Process (Changing SLOs or PLOs)**
   J. Williams working with E. Vasquez (Curriculum Chairperson) on this. When new ADTs were created, faculty didn't always update the mapping the SLOs to the PLOs. Want to bring this to faculty's attention and make a process so that when faculty are creating their program (new) one of the forms submitted to curriculum will include a checkbox that indicates that the mapping has taken place.

   e. **Faculty Training/Professional Development (Pillar 4)**
   P. Shreve will include this in the revised survey that is going out to faculty. OAC needs to push that the college set aside professional development time that will allow for these Pillar 4 things to happen. There is a lot that faculty need to know; but what they want to know is usually related to teaching students.

X. **Other Discussions/Information**

a. OAC Handbook
Previously discussed.

b. Glossary
Previously discussed.

XI. Announcements *(2 minutes each)*
S. Nylander let the group know that Herb English is planning a Black History presentation during the college hour on February 17th.

XII. Future Agenda Items

XIII. Next Regular Meeting
a. Monday, March 8, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)

XIV. Adjournment
A motion was made and then seconded to adjourn the meeting. 1st – J. Worland / 2nd – E. Garrison. The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m. by J. Williams.

Minutes

I.   **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 12:04 p.m. by OAC Co-Chair J. Williams.

II.   **Roll Call:**
Members Present: Amy Ross, Ashley Vizenor, Susan Nylander, Joseph Williams, Bret Sage, Penny Shreve, Jennafer Worland, Scott Bulkley, Denise Pasley, Ramon Vasconcellos, Gustavo Bento
Members Absent: Abe Aboud. Emily Garrison (excused)
Guests: Jennifer Rodden, Eduardo Vasquez, Lisa Holmes, Keiry Borruel, Herbert English, Jaime Rodriguez, Nance Nunes-Gill

III. **Approval of Agenda:** A motion was made and then seconded to approve the 3/8/2021 agenda. 1st – J. Worland / 2nd – G. Bento Approved

IV.   **Approval of Minutes:** A motion was made and then seconded to approve the minutes from the 2/8/2021 meeting. 1st – J. Worland / 2nd – R.Vasconcellos Approved with 2 abstained (Bento and Vasconcellos).

V.   **Opportunities to Address the Committee** *(2 minutes each)*
None

VI.   **Reports** *(2 minutes each)*
a. Co-Chairs (Penny Shreve & Joseph Williams) P. Shreve: SLO Symposium attendees, please go back over what best ideas were so they can be used in Pillar IV, especially if one speaker stood out for potential guest to be invited to college for PD.

b. eLumen (Lisa Holmes/Keiry Borruel):L. Holmes: all courses due for assessment are in eLumen at this time. PT and FT are welcome to participate. K. Borruel: SLO default assessments are in. Mapping is on the way There are a few missing degrees that need to be clarified because there are too many copies--some of the proper files are hard to find. Once done with list, will reach out to J. Williams and P. Shreve to figure out which ones are correct. H. Robbins is now in the meetings to offer Canvas help. G. Bento mentions that he had to manually enter info because eLumen was not speaking to Canvas. K. Borruel says that getting the information in before Canvas shell is closed—information lost. D. Pasley asks when does course close? P. Shreve: once grading is complete, it gets locked. G. Bento: does the OAC committee want to have a set date for inputting SLOs? J. Williams: Bring in Heather Minehart to the conversation because it will involve scheduling. P. Shreve will write to online office to secure dates for Canvas course closure.

c. Curriculum *(Eduardo Vasquez):* Happy International Women's Day. Discussed Aps. Information sent to OAC co-chairs.

d. Program Review: L. Holmes: Coming back into full swing because it is necessary for accreditation. Handbook and Forms are in. PR begins in fall, and cycles are set. Those due for a full review are invited to work on a draft this semester as a practice run. Training on

3/10 & 4/7 from 2-4 pm with Maria Narvaez. All are welcome to training whether full review is due or not. Dean English: Will training be available to answer the equity question. L. Holmes: yes.

e. Sub-Committee
- **OAC Handbook** *(Joseph Williams/Penny Shreve/Nance Nunes-Gill/Jennafer Worland)* Update of the handbook: Non-Instructional struck out because it does not fall under OAC's purview. Run down on changes made to hand book in this iteration. Will send out to membership as a super draft to review and will be a discussion item next meeting. P. Shreve: may need to update to show how members are chosen and length of service on committee. N. Nunes-Gill: three-year term for chairs(s)—anyone can put in for it but must go to admin for application review. AS president assigns members. There must be members rotated so that we do not have an all-new committee members.

VII. Action Items

a. Glossary *(Sub-committee)*
J. Worland: Used El Camino as a basis for our glossary with adding our own information. It's a starting point. J. Williams: do we adopt this as a starting or is it something we can use for now? J. Worland: Should it go through a couple readings before being voted on? J. Williams will send out to all members to go through and add input before it is voted on. Could put it into a shared document to bring in other members' input. Sub-committee will still be in charge of changing information so remains a consistent voice.

b. Committee's Revised Purpose Statement and Description *(Joseph Williams)*
CGC sent back for committee to revise to include that assessment is ongoing and systemic and facilitates campus dialogue. P. Shreve offers suggestion for revision: J. Williams making revision into document with input from committee. The purpose statement is approved and will bring back to senate for acknowledgment of changes to send on to the CGC.

c. Proposed Process for 2-yr Assessment Plan *(No FT Faculty / Penny Shreve)*
This will only be used when there is no FT faculty to do the work. Process adopted. Penny will get this to research office.

d. Faculty Training/Survey *(Penny Shreve)*
Will be pushing not for a survey but for opportunities for faculty to discuss big items including at Inservice. All voted to remove this from Action Items.

VIII. Discussion Items

a. Update submission of 2-yr Assessment Plan *(Joseph Williams/Penny Shreve/Keiry Borruel)*
- Are all plans submitted? Only one department has their plan outstanding. K. Borruel has nothing to add at this time.

b. Curriculum Process (new/changing SLOs and PLOs) *(J. Williams/P. Shreve/E. Vasquez)*
- **Mapping** (SLOs to PLOs) and 2-yr Assessment Plan (new courses) List of programs that still need to be mapped: When programs, certificates, are degrees are created, mapping needs to be part of the initial process. Same with non-credit. Reach out to faculty to map, send forms to curriculum, and Keiry is inputting into eLumen so please keep her in the loop. E. Vasquez suggests reaching out after first read of program, course, certificate, or degree.
- **When will eLumen be ready?** (to streamline OAC processes involved) Tabled
- **What do before eLumen is ready?** (to complete the OAC processes involved) Tabled
- **Outreach to new/changed course, programs and certificates developed in the**

past year Tabled

*c. Faculty Training/Professional Development – Pillar 4*Tabled

d. Friday SLO talk Tabled

IX. Other Discussions/Information

    a. OAC Handbook Tabled

X. Announcements *(2 minutes each)*

    a.

XI. Future Agenda Items

XII. Next Regular Meeting

    a. Monday, April 12, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)

XIII. Adjournment: 1:35

AGENDA

I. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order by co-chairperson Penny Shreve at 12:01 p.m.

II. Roll Call
Members Present – Penny Shreve, Bret Sage, Ramon Vasconcellos, Amy Ross, Jennafer Worland, Scott Bulkley, Emily Garrison, Ashley Vizenor, Denise Pasley, Gustavo Bento, Ibrahim Aboud

Members Absent – Beverly Ranney, Susan Nylander, Joseph Williams

Guests – Jessica Tainatongo, Jennifer Rodden, Stephanie Ingalls, Lisa Holmes, Eduardo Vasquez, Nance Nunes-Gill

III. Approval of Agenda
A motion was made and then seconded to approve the agenda. 1st – J. Worland / 2nd – G. Bento (10, 0, 0)

IV. Approval of Minutes
A motion was made and then seconded to approve the minutes from the 03/08/2021 meeting. 1st – J. Worland / 2nd – E. Garrison (10, 0, 0)

V. Opportunities to Address the Committee *(2 minutes each)*
G. Bento asked about COR revisions; when those will occur so that we don't have to go through another Curriculum reset. E. Vasquez responded that all courses are in a 6-year Peer Review cycle.

VI. Reports *(2 minutes each)*
a. Co-Chairs *(Penny Shreve & Joseph Williams)*
P. Shreve reported to the group that the OAC Handbook has not been updated so it is not ready to share with the group; hopes to meet with the group later this month to finish those changes.

b. eLumen *(Lisa Holmes/Keiry Borruel)*
L. Holmes reported to the group that the second 9-week data load has been done so courses can be accessed; eLumen meeting this afternoon to discuss how to make this easier for the faculty. H. Robbins has been added to the meeting so that the Canvas side can be addressed.

c. Curriculum *(Eduardo Vasquez)*
E. Vasquez reported to the group that two non-credit certificates and the local Kinesiology degree were approved and were sent forward to P. Shreve and J. Williams to get mapped.

d. Program Review
L. Holmes reported to the group that the training has been completed and continuing the

work; drafts due at the end of April and final reviews will be due in the fall.

e. Sub-Committee
- **OAC Handbook** *(Joseph Williams/Penny Shreve/Nance Nunes-Gill/Jennafer Worland)*
  P. Shreve reiterated that the Handbook has not been formally updated but this will be looked at during the next meeting.

VII. Action Items
a. Committee's Revised Purpose Statement and Description *(Nance Nunes-Gill)*
N. Nunes-Gill reported to the group that this was approved by the OAC at the March meeting. No action required.

b. Glossary *(Sub-committee)* A motion was made to table this item until the next meeting.
1st – G. Bento / 2nd – A. Ross (10, 0, 0) Tabled.
P. Shreve shared a revision of the glossary; will send out to the group for input. G. Bento suggested links from the table of contents to the items within the document.

c. OAC Handbook *(Sub-committee)* A motion was made to table this item until the next meeting. 1st – G. Bento / 2nd – J. Worland (10, 0, 0) Tabled.
P. Shreve reiterated that the handbook is not ready for review.

VIII. Discussion Items
a. Curriculum, research, and OAC connections (new/changing SLOs and PLOs) *(J. Williams/P. Shreve/E. Vasquez, Keiry Borruel)*
P. Shreve acknowledged that this item has been on the agenda for a while not; met with L. Holmes and K. Borruel recently to discuss what will happen in eLumen. L. Holmes reported to the group that the changes made on paper are manually put into eLumen. To ensure that the correct version is updated the move would be to start using eLumen because we don't want to go back to where we were previously.

b. OAC Folders for research Office – Mapping and 2-year plans *(Joseph Williams/Penny Shreve/Keiry Borruel)*
P. Shreve reported to the group that the Research Office isn't notified when something is updated and which version they need to be looking at. Folders were created within the Research Office to help with the organization of this. Asked the committee review the folders once everything is moved over to ensure that the most recent version is what is within the folders. S. Ingalls reported out that K. Borruel requested that only one folder/excel sheet per program be used and that she is coming across a lot of program mapping that isn't matching the catalog. Asked that the program matches the catalog; if the program doesn't match the catalog then it can't be mapped. J. Worland reported out that hers may not match as OAC reviewed hers and changes were made and she is not sure where they are in the process. P. Shreve reminded the group that we will most likely be using paper for the next year and asked that everyone remind their peers to double check that the mapping was sent forward as well when PLOs are updated.

c. Friday SLO talk
P. Shreve let the group know that herself and J. Williams receives an invitation to attend a Friday SLO talk and would like to add a few more members to the listserv so that others can receive the invitation. If interested, please email the co-chairs.

d. Best (effective) practices for deeper faculty discussions needed for Pillar 4
P. Shreve reported that this is discussed in all of the meetings; faculty needs more time to

think more about this. Those that went to the SLO Symposium knows that this requires a lot of deep thinking. Need to talk to other people to see the other opportunities to discover new ideas. Would like to figure out a way to demand time for faculty to talk. J. Worland suggested that this be brain-stormed on; adding another item without removing another item will be difficult as everyone is already spread so thin. P. Shreve let the group know that they asked for this to be done at Best Practice and that it be kept in the existing requirements. A. Ross agreed that this be included at Best Practice. P. Shreve said that she will push for this in the new year.

IX. Other Discussions/Information
a. OAC Handbook

b. Glossary

X. Announcements *(2 minutes each)*
Amy Ross announced the next trivia night on 5/1; Spring Production will be up for streaming on 5/14. P. Shreve announced that English will be having their last two workshops on 4/20 and 4/27. D. Pasley promoted the quick pitch competition on 5/5; students will be pitching their business ideas (flyer coming out tomorrow). Click on the link just to watch.

XI. Future Agenda Items
None at this time.

XII. Next Regular Meeting (tentative as need)
a. Monday, April 26, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (as needed)

XIII. Adjournment
A motion was made and then seconded to adjourn the meeting. 1st – A. Ross / 2nd – D. Pasley. The meeting was adjourned at 1:20 p.m. by P. Shreve.

Minutes

I.   Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 12:06 p.m. by committee co-chairperson P. Shreve.

II.   Roll Call
Members Present – Penny Shreve, Scott Bulkley, Jennafer Worland, Bret Sage, Ashley Vizenor, Ramon Vasconcellos, Gustavo Bento, Amy Ross, Denise Pasley (joined at 1:07 p.m.)
Members Absent – Joseph Williams, Susan Nylander, Emily Garrison, Ibrahim Aboud
Guests – Jessica Tainatongo, Jennifer Rodden

III.   Approval of Agenda
A motion was made and then seconded to approve the Agenda. 1st – J. Worland / 1nd – G. Bento (7, 0, 0)

IV.   Approval of Minutes
A motion was made and then seconded to approve the minutes from the 04/12/2021 meeting. 1st – J. Worland / 2nd – A. Ross. Item tabled (minutes not sent out prior to the meeting). 1st – A. Vizenor / 2nd – R. Vasconcellos (7, 0, 0)

V.   Opportunities to Address the Committee *(2 minutes each)*
G. Bento thanked Eduardo Vasquez and the Curriculum Committee for all of their help with the Curriculum and to avoiding another Curriculum Reset.

VI.   Reports *(2 minutes each)*
a. Co-Chairs *(Penny Shreve & Joseph Williams)*
P. Shreve reported out that she has met with Keiry and Lisa in regards to assessment of courses; looked at overall process and ways to improve it (will be discussed later in the meting). Being very helpful getting us what we need and helping faculty one-on-one. Hoping to soon have a more consistent process. Have created a draft for both the glossary and Handbook. Don't believe that Academic Senate will be able to get through both reads before the end of spring term but going to request a draft approval can be put out for the summer.

b. eLumen *(Lisa Holmes/Keiry Borruel)*
Absent.

c. Curriculum *(Eduardo Vasquez)*
J. Tainatongo reported out that the final Tech Review of the year will be held this Friday, April 30th with the final Curriculum Committee meeting being held next Friday, May 7th. The Curriculum Committee will work during the summer to get eLumen up and running to help with the curriculum process.

d. Program Review *(Lisa Holmes)*
Absent.

e. **Sub-Committee (as needed)**
   Not needed.

VII. **Action Items**
   a. **Glossary** A motion was made and then seconded to approve the Glossary. 1st – G. Bento – / 2nd – J. Worland (7, 0, 0) **Passed. Move to Academic Senate.**
   b. **OAC Handbook** A motion was made and then seconded to approve the OAC Handbook. 1st - S. Bulkley / 2nd – A. Vizenor (6, 0, 1) B. Sage was not present for the vote. **Passed. Move to Academic Senate.** Will add the committee make-up to clarify roles on the OAC. Would also like to add an image of the rubric from Canvas in two different places (if can be done prior to submission for Academic Senate submission).

VIII. **Discussion Items**
   a. **Best (effective) practices for deeper faculty discussions needed for Pillar 4**
      P. Shreve reported to the group that this was discussed in a meeting last week with the Research Office and they are preparing videos and presentations for In-service in August but not sure if they will be given the time for it. If the faculty could reach consensus on the same *assessment type* for each course taught (no matter the instructor teaching it) would help with the input in eLumen. G. Bento responded that this raises some serious concerns with having someone other than faculty inputting so much information; also reminded the group of Academic Freedom. P. Shreve reminded the group that the courses can be taught the same way; just want the assignment that is used for the assessment to be the same for all instructors teaching *that* course. G. Bento asked that this be made clear to all divisions involved. P. Shreve will reach out to Keiry Borruel to come talk to the group and clarify some of this.

   b. **OAC role in Program Review data of outcomes**
      P. Shreve reported to the group that OAC would be involved during one section of the Program Review process; might be asked to form a response but not certain as to what our role looks like at this time.

   c. **End of year reflection on OAC**
      P. Shreve let the group know that Joseph Williams and herself will be getting this out by the end of the semester so please keep an eye out for this.

IX. **Other Discussions/Information**
   a. **OAC Handbook**
      Discussed previously.

   b. **Glossary**
      Discussed previously.

X. **Announcements** *(2 minutes each)*
   A. Ross announced to the group that next month there will be a Seussified Pride and Prejudice that will be streamed online.

XI. **Future Agenda Items**
   None at this time.

XII. **Next Regular Meeting (tentative as need)**
   a. Monday, May 10, @ 12noon – 1:30pm, Via ConferZoom (Remote)

XIII. Adjournment

A motion was made and then seconded to adjourn the meeting. 1st – J. Worland / 2nd – G. Bento. The meeting was adjourned at 1:24 p.m. by co-chairperson P. Shreve.