

**San Diego Mesa College
Committee on Outcomes and Assessment
Meeting Notes
October 04, 2016
3:45 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., MC 211B**

ATTENDEES	Madeleine Hinkes, Co-Chair	Charlie Lieu
	Kris Clark, Co-Chair	Pam Luster
		Tim McGrath
	Rachelle Agatha (absent)	Mariette Rattner
	Leela Bingham	Tina Recalde (absent)
	John Crocitti	Saloua Saidane
	Claudia Estrada	Michael Temple
	Donna Duchow	Susan Topham (excused)
	Rob Fremland	Ex-Officio: Yolanda Catano
	Bri Hays (excused)	
	Ed Helscher (excused)	

Agenda Item A: Call to Order: By Hinkes at 3:47 p.m. in MC 211B.

DISCUSSION	<p>Approval of September 20, 2016 Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minutes draft was emailed to COA prior to the meeting for review. • The Minutes were M/S/C by Tim McGrath and Leela Bingham.
-------------------	--

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. Post approved minutes to the COA website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. Yolanda Catano 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. Before next meeting

Agenda Item B: Continuing Business

DISCUSSION	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Membership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have two vacant positions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Classified ▪ Learning Resources and Academic Support. 2. ILO Revisions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ILOs went to Academic Senate for review. The Academic Senate voted not to approve the ILOs. There was a lot of discussion about the proposed ILOs and they had an issue with them being posted on the website without being approved, yet. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The three-year cycle and the Guide were also discussed at the
-------------------	---

Academic Senate meeting.

- Fremland proposed that an ad hoc committee be created. A committee of three to four members from the Academic Senate as well as three to four members from COA. The committee would discuss the ILOs and the issue with timing for the proposed cycle and mapping for assessment.
- Luster- In our governance processes all things are recommendations. It purports a more collegiate process. We currently have a good number of people who have already mapped to the new ILOs in courses and programs. We have a lot of people who have done a lot of work.
 - How do we move forward? Is it three years or four years?
- Bingham expressed that she was upset with the decision made by Academic Senate to vote down the proposed ILOs. COA put in a significant amount of work and the best interest of the college was always a priority.
- Clark informed COA that there was no formal discussion about changes to the the content of the ILOs with Academic Senate.
 - What content changes to the ILOs does Academic Senate propose? COA is the body responsible for this document.
 - Hinkes-We provided content changes from the ILOs last May after the Academic Senate presentation.
 - Luster- We are not talking about the wordsmithing of the Headings of the ILOs instead of the categories.
 - Fremland- People were having issues about operationalizing of the ILOs.
- Luster proposed meeting with Fremland to discuss the vetting process and improve the communication with Academic Senate. She does not intend to revert back to the old ILOs.
 - McGrath communicated he would do his part to disseminate important information to Deans.
- Luster-The President's Office will be supporting the governance process. This will give us a deadline. We want to have the changes approved by the end of Fall so we can start the full implementation in the Spring.

3. The Guide

- The Guide is currently under review.
 - Classified Staff reviewed the Guide and provided recommendations.
 - Academic Senate is next for review.
 - COA already provided some recommendations and feedback.
 - It is a guide, not a mandate.
- The timeline for outcomes assessment has been a topic of discussion for large departments such as Math because of the amount of courses they need to assess.
- Crocitti asked why his department should modify its process when it was working. Luster replied that if a department is satisfied with their current process, there is no need to change.
- Luster- From an accreditation perspective there is an assessment requirement from every course. The cycle is up to us. I personally don't have an issue with a four-year cycle. That is what we are doing for Program Review.
 - Clark- The question is the commitment on the cycle. We have the option of saying, "we want to stick with the three year cycle and see how it goes."
 - Fremland noted that Academic Senate has not formally discussed the cycle. He voiced his preference for the four-year cycle.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clark preferred the proposed three-year cycle and Estrada supported that timeline as well. Speaking from a Student Services perspective, she believes the option of a three-year cycle would work. ▪ Outcomes coordinators are available to help with the process. They will be compensated for their work with mapping. The IEPI grant passed and funding is available for this. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A motion was made to approve the three-year cycle for outcomes assessment. <p>4. Goals for 2016-2017</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A <p>5. February trainings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A <p>6. CampusLabs visit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
--	--

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. Send a reminder to Rob Fremland to get Academic Senates' recommendations and bring to COA by next meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. Yolanda Catano 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. October 18

Agenda Item C: New Business

DISCUSSION	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Workshops 2016-2017 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 2. Prepare for PRT Visit on December 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
-------------------	--

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A

Agenda Item D: Goals for 2016-2017 (Proposed)

DISCUSSION	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitor and report on the IEPI action plan and grant. 2. Deliver support for outcomes assessment across the campus. 3. Provide training on the revised Taskstream platform; assess the success of the revised design. 4. Expand the outcomes assessment page. 5. Engage the full campus in the outcomes assessment process.
-------------------	--

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A

Agenda Item E: Roundtable

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The articles that were issued for homework will be discussed at the next meeting.
-------------------	---

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Agenda Item F: Adjournment

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting was adjourned by Hinkes at 5:07 p.m.
-------------------	--

1. Next Meeting is on October 18, 2016 in MC 211B.

Submitted by: Yolanda Catano, Senior Secretary

Approved on: October 18, 2016