



Outcomes Assessment Committee (OAC)

Minutes – February 14, 2022, 12:00 pm – 1:30 pm

ConferZOOM

Empowering Students to Achieve Their Personal Best Through Excellence in Education.

I. Call to Order (1 minute)

The meeting was called to order at 12:08 p.m. by chairperson P. Shreve.

II. Roll Call (1 minute)

Members Present – Penny Shreve, Susan Nylander, Gustavo Bento, Jennafer Worland, Julie Gallagher, **Peter Esperanza,** Denise Pasley (Joined at 12:31), **Eduardo Vasquez,** Rodolfo Duque,

Members Absent –Ramon Vasconcellos, Andrew Rehfeld, Ibrahim Aboud, Bret Sage,
Guests –

III. Approval of Agenda (1 minute)

A motion was made and then seconded to approve the agenda 1st – G. Bento / 2nd – J. Worland (6, 0, 1) D. Pasley not present for the vote.

IV. Approval of Minutes

A motion was made and then seconded to approve the Minutes 1st – J. Worland / 2nd – G. Bento (6, 0, 1) D. Pasley not present for the vote.

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

G. Bento – An Academic Senate issue. MOUs have changed, so we are supposed to go back to previous format. But this semester will remain online and one module to be more comparable to observing a single live meeting. We will be using the MOU format even as the MOU has expired.

S. Nylander added Home page, intro and one evaluatee selected module.

G. Bento added that evaluations will often be for classes that were scrambled to go online in 2020. For example being asked to teach a new class to develop while also moving all classes online in a week. R. Duque added he will be bring it up to the Evaluation teams and that since evaluation should be about improvement, not punitive. P. Shreve noted that evaluatee can inform the observers of the situation so they understand.

VI. Reports (2 minutes each)

a. OAC Chair – Penny Shreve

P. Shreve reported that she attended the SLO Symposium. Some items included importance of equity, which is not going away; it is a major state issue. Also how education will always be inauthentic (even with trying to make more authentic), but still should aim for more real-life situation to the best of our abilities. Also a session on ILOs. BCC will be revising ILOs in the fall 22. Many colleges are stating that because OAC only oversees instructional programs, OAC should not be the overseeing group, but OAC can help. Answered a question on ILOs as far as number, we are not too far out of the norm, but most colleges seems to have 5-8. Not sure if any colleges have only 4 (like BCC) anymore.

b. eLumen – Lisa Holmes/Keiry Borrue

L. Holmes and K. Borrue not present.

c. Curriculum – Eduardo Vasquez

E. Vasquez reported to curriculum is going through a process to ensure outcomes are viewed by OAC or members. P. Shreve stated J. Worland is on curriculum and she herself is an advisor.

d. Program Review - Jennafer Rodden

J. Rodden not present. P. Shreve reported on a meeting with PRC, and how OAC and PRC had been included in PRC review, and OAC can be the ones looking at outcomes such 3 Ms and be aware of outcome as trends. This might not be until fall 22.

e. Sub-Committee (as needed)

VII. Old Business

None.

VIII. New Business

a. eLumen training for faculty – Current Discussions and Needs

P. Shreve let the group know that out of 94 courses that needed to be assess only 2 and 2/3rds courses are left. One person did not complete all their assessment. When the data is in eLumen, OAC can see reports and look for trends. If a faculty submitted an SLO report by students, it might be possible for research office can add to allow for disaggregated data, but not sure that will happen based on precedence and time available. Faculty can still use the form with the student overall % form as it was the last officially approved form in the contract and by OAC. So if a faculty added a list of success by student, programs may better see disaggregated data for their programs.

The delay was 1) a promised hand on was cancelled 2) faculty say they never saw an email or not aware the email was for them. Still asking for PT pay for training.

We did well on Mapping, but many programs do not have a FT lead. Also GE is massive with all the courses being mapped.

D. Pasley asked about Canvas and eLumen interface and if that was in place still. P. Shreve stated that faculty need to go into eLumen and Canvas to tell eLumen which course and with assessment, but the assessment you created would already be there.

Mapping for programs with courses NOT in the main program discipline (cross-discipline). Faculty will be asked to map to programs out of their discipline that have one of their courses in that program. We have asked for training for this in February and March.

D. Pasley stated that B. Ranney had a spreadsheet that might be easier. P. Shreve grades can be exported, but it is massive, and not all faculty have one assessment but a combination. B. Ranney did provide an excel sheet OAC can add as an option for reporting.

If an OAC member is doing an observation for evaluation, we can share with the PT faculty who may not understand they need to complete the assessments and we can have a helpful conversation. G. Bento points out that eLumen is here to stay and faculty should get used to eLumen, and for him going straight to eLumen through Canvas, when we can train them to add SLOs directly to eLumen. P. Shreve agreed, but added that if the assessment was already set up, being able to assess a specific SLO inside a larger assignment with multiple areas. D. Pasley added that if there was a problem with eLumen, we should have an alternative option. OAC should help people get closer to eLumen, but respect the contract. Paid training n for PT is important, and FT faculty

should have been trained within already existing training.

P. Shreve added that BCC will be using eLumen in many other places too: curriculum, program review, and so on.

b. Spring 2022 Goals/Calendar

Revising and mapping ILOs postponed to Fall 22, but others like Cross-discipline mapping, and eLumen training still are this semester. OAC members need to be able to moderate conversations with faculty on assessment in areas like why we will be using eLumen and polite colleague conversations of where we do the training, that outcomes are measurable, and the difference from 0 and NA in student achievement. D. Pasley asked for clarification on not completing an assignment does not mean a 0 because we do not know if they achieved. Zero may be the grade, but is not the achievement. This is not accurate on status of outcome achievement and can make a program or course look less successful than it really is.

c. Program Review Coordination for PLOs

P. Shreve reported

d. GE Mapping

P. Shreve reported that BCC uses ILOs as the program outcomes for GE, but ILOs are very broad and are planned to be revised in Fall 22. Before doing GE mapping, the discussion of over stretching should be addressed. E. Vasquez asked about GE as not a program (a paper, degree). BCC has for many years a faculty assigned to GE, but it is too big. GE is student experience as well. GE is considered a program in most colleges that use GELOS (GE Learning Outcomes) to assess their GE patterns. Right now we are being asked to map to the currently ILOs, but hopefully that will change since we are changing ILOs in fall 2022.

However we do need some progress on ILOs, so a report from incoming SLO assessments will be completed outside of eLumen for Spring 22. P. Shreve will check on the GE not being a program, so why do we need to map them.

At this time, OAC members are only expected to work on OAC during OAC time and any faculty training time.

e. ILOs review planning

P. Shreve reminded the committee that ILOs will be reviewed and revised in Fall 2022

IX. Announcements (2 minutes each)

D. Pasley informed people about the Big Pitch. The flyer stated that there were prizes, but not what they are. Big Pitch is for Feb 2. R. Duque noted that Academic Senate is having a special meeting on Thursday and the invites have already been sent.

X. Future Agenda Items

XI. Next Regular Meeting

a. 02/128/2022

XII. Adjournment

A motion was made and then seconded to adjourn the meeting. 1st – D. Pasley / 2nd – G. Bento. The meeting was adjourned at 1:04 p.m. by chairperson P. Shreve.