REDWOODS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Meeting of the
Assessment Committee

February 23, 2021
2:50-4:15 PM

https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/621307055

Notes

Members Present: Philip Mancus, Paul Chown, Amy Murphy, Chris Lancaster, Kelly Carbone, Dave Bazard, Cheryl Norton, Marla Gleave, Erik Kramer

Members Absent: Joe Hays, Angelina Hill,

Guests: Stephanie Burres

1. **Call to Order**
Chair Mancus calls the meeting to order at 2:52 pm.

   1.1 Approve notes from January 26, 2021 meeting
   Notes are approved as written.

2. **Discussion**
   2.1. **Service Area Assessment: ILO to SLO map (final review)**

   https://webapps.redwoods.edu/assessment/outcomes/iloutcomemappingedit.aspx

   Chair Mancus presents the ILO to SLO map document to the Committee and notes that there are still a few service areas pending completion. Chair Mancus opens the floor to the Committee for discussion. There is none. Chair Mancus presents the legacy site, created by James Hays, with the updated ILO assessment including the service areas. Paul Chown notes that the ILO to SLO map from the document has not been added to the system, but it can be used to add the SLO's to the ILO's. Chair Mancus proposes that the Committee can rule to accept or not accept how the SLO's are mapped to the ILO's.

   Erik Kramer asks how long ago the ILO's were mapped to courses. Chown responds that they are not yet mapped however, GE has been

mapped to ILO's. Kelly Carbone questions if there is a place to add a comments section on the legacy site so service areas can provide clarification, for example with the Athletics Department and ILO #3, as it's not necessarily clear how they map without the explanation. David Bazard agrees and adds that, other than the Multicultural Diversity Center, it's not necessarily clear how ILO #3 maps to other SLO's. Chair Mancus instructs Committee members to take notes regarding which SLO's do not appear to map with ILO's.

Kramer inquires about the consequences if a map is established for a service area. Chair Mancus responds that the service area will assess the outcome and ILO's will be assessed, in part, by reviewing outcome data. Chair Mancus responds to Carbone's inquiry by stating that the webpage may be too full after the comments are included, but that they could be included under ILO's. Chair Mancus continues by noting that, it is his understanding that, accreditors want to be assured that we have a constituent review process consisting of dialogue and documentation of the dialogue. Moreover, accreditors want to be assured that we are utilizing the assessment process for plans of improvement at all levels of the College. Chair Mancus notes that this document is a part of our record for the vetting process. Chair Mancus concludes that it may be possible to embed a link to this document so that it is also a part of the assessment process webpage.

Chown notes that, in the past, service areas defined their SLO's and would meet with the Committee to ensure they are assessable, measureable, etc. Chown questions whether the Committee could encourage service area Dean/Directors to meet with the Committee to review the SLO to ILO mapping. Chown concludes that it appears the service areas may be zealous with their mapping and sometimes less is more. Chair Mancus responds that it can be challenging to expect attendance at a meeting or to receive consultation with that many individuals. Chair Mancus adds that, to obtain the current data, it required four separate rounds of emails. Chair Mancus concludes that he was planning to present this at the next Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) meeting on April 17, but this task may be able to wait until the end of the term to complete. Chown notes that there will not be an ILO outcome assessment at the IEC meeting this year.

Bazard agrees with Chown's point regarding the zealousness of the SLO mapping to ILO's, specifically referencing ILO #3. Chair Mancus acknowledges the Committee's concerns and notes that this process appears to be more challenging than originally thought and requires more time. Chair Mancus instructs the Committee to review the information, compile their determinations regarding the SLO to ILO map, and present them at the next meeting. Chown states his favorability toward this proposal. Kramer notes that service areas that mapped their outcomes to all three ILO's will likely raise concern.

Chair Mancus restates the Committee's task is to review the SLO to ILO Map and vet the proposed alignments in lieu of contacting service area Dean/Directors. Chair Mancus states the justification of this approach is that the area Dean/Directors have provided their input and the Committee is considered the final review. Chair Mancus informs the Committee that he will send a follow-up email in planning for the next meeting and asks if there are any objections from Committee members. There are no objections.

2.2. **SLO Assessment Annual Calendar (draft)**

Chair Mancus presents the draft version of the SLO Assessment Annual Calendar document to the Committee members and notes that this document is the culmination of the past two years of Committee meetings, including with the Vice President of Instruction, the College's eLumen representative and the Program Review Committee. Chair Mancus introduces the guest attendee, Stephanie Burres. Chair Mancus summarizes the culmination of information contained within the document and notes that it is sectioned into instruction and service area assessments. Moreover, each section is further detailed by periods of time per academic year. Chair Mancus states his attempt at comprehensively identifying each role and responsibility within the steps specifically utilizing eLumen's terminology for the processes, for example Division Coordinators can be Deans or Associate Deans. Chair Mancus further explains that when outcome assessment is conducted it is also ensuring currency of plans and maps and the questions are designed to prompt the activity on a regular basis. Chair Mancus concludes the summary of the document and informs the Committee that its purpose is to be a guide for any individual who may be responsible for assessment in their respective area.

Chair Mancus presents the entirety of the document to the Committee and makes several notations throughout. Chair Mancus notes that the September/October timeframe is a large portion of the document as he wanted to integrate all of the Committee's recommendations to streamline the process and ensure efficiency and correspondence between program assessment and program review.

Kramer inquires if the meetings are required to be formal or if email correspondence is sufficient for single discipline faculty. Chair Mancus responds that it is the discretion of Associate Deans and adds that there will likely be several local decisions regarding parts of the process however, certain basics steps are required. Chair Mancus adds that action plans are associated to the course itself and the action plan is the documentation of the dialogue regardless of how many individuals participated.

Bazard inquires about the process with one department with regard to program review. Chair Mancus notes that an issue occurs when a PLO in a program is ready for assessments and questions how it will be assessed including how to obtain documentation and report the results and that the dialogue occurred. Chair Mancus adds that the College has been accommodating its process to align with eLumen. However for example, when a PLO for the Sociology ADT is assessed, that assessment required documentation, which is not currently supported by eLumen. Chair Mancus adds that, because program outcomes are derived from course outcome assessment, there is no data other than CLO's to draw from. Chair Mancus continues to note that reports can be drawn for review and to make informed decisions as to whether or not the outcome was met, which will be documented in the action plan. Moreover, it is possible to have a discipline and program action plan, which document discussion and can transcend into plans and program plans for program review.

Chair Mancus continues to present the document to the Committee and notes that the "Discipline Assessment Conference" title is a placeholder until a better title can be achieved. Chair Mancus points out another potential issue regarding potential required cross-

dialogue between departments for example, considering the Psychology ADT program outcome where two courses from two departments mapped the previous year unbeknownst by other faculty [correction: two other departments have courses that map to one or more of the PLOs for Psychology AA-T?]. Chair Mancus states that he is hopeful this potential issue can be resolved in real-time and adds that email correspondence or course assessment results may be sufficient for review. Chair Mancus concludes that the Division Coordinator should be able to review the action plan to utilize that data.

Chown agrees with Chair Mancus and notes that this point is very valid for cross disciplines affecting program assessment. Chown notes that as a departmental faculty member conducting course assessment for a program that they would likely prefer the individual conducting program review and program assessment to discuss with them prior to utilizing the results. Chair Mancus notes that this may introduce intrusiveness and adds that course assessment and documentation could be completed and utilized for program outcome assessment. Chair Mancus states that perhaps program assessment should be closer in time to program review so that program outcome assessment dialogue can occur during the discipline conference stage since that cross dialogue will be required.

Bazard notes that it can be complicated to require. Chair Mancus seeks clarification and asks if Bazard is suggesting that it should be an as-needed basis. For example, if within Psychology it is not understood how data from program outcomes from one or two courses can generate dialogue with the Math Department. Chair Mancus notes that there is an issue with cross discipline communication with regard to outcomes such that, when Psychology assesses program outcomes, the department will utilize Math Department data, which is independent of Psychology for a PLO. Kramer adds that when Math Department faculty decide which course would map to a program level outcome, a problem could arise in a situation where there exists a prerequisite course in the program map and a different course may better align. Chair Mancus notes that Kramer's comment sounds similar to Bazard's in that certain

requirements may have a process but they are not currently built into our assessment.

Bazard notes that it may be best to start with a more simplified process and add complexity later on. Bazard continues that, at one point, it was understood that all departments had to discuss with all of the other departments during the assessment conference, which resulted in overwhelming feelings and friction among some individuals. Burres suggests adding a few sentences to the effect of "Describe the cross discipline dialogue that has occurred," which could be added into the report. Chair Mancus agrees and states that Burres provides an excellent solution. Chair Mancus states that it would have to be added to the Division Coordinator role in eLumen.

Chair Mancus resumes presenting the document to the Committee and notes that the Assessment Committee does not typically govern the ILO and GE processes however; perhaps this task can be completed during the annual Institutional Effectiveness Conference. Currently, the plan for GE is on the four-year basis to determine when to conduct GE outcome assessment. Chair Mancus notes that this process is behind schedule and he has communicated the necessity to complete this process. Chair Mancus opens the floor to Committee members.

Chown notes that the College would complete the ILO process at Convocation or the Institutional Effectiveness Summit and inquires when this process would typically occur for GE. Bazard answers that, when he served as the Assessment Coordinator, he would confer with faculty to map GE to ILO's. Chair Mancus states that he has been communicating the need to map GE outcomes as they are due for assessment and has offered consultation. He adds that perhaps the divisions are waiting for a conference to be convened by the Assessment Committee and states that he will initiate this conference this year. Chair Mancus asks if this process can be conducted at the Institutional Effectiveness Summit as a means of simplifying the process and ensuring efficiency. Bazard adds that the GE areas are highly specified, for example A1 would be relevant for the Science

Department. Bazard expresses concern for completing this process at the Institutional Effectiveness Summit because it may result in a lot of extraneous input.

Chair Mancus continues to present the document to the Committee and removes the section "Conduct GE Assessment for the Year." Kramer wonders if we should keep that language within the document for reference. Chair Mancus answers that this process should be documented but that it is best suited to be added to the Assessment Coordinator's role. Bazard notes that not all schools conduct GE and ILO outcome assessment. Chair Mancus states that he believes we should continue to complete this process. Moreover, in terms of simplification, the Committee should ensure that this process is formalized in the calendar for draft review, which Chair Mancus will present to the Committee at the next meeting. Kramer notes that individuals may procrastinate reporting Fall data, attempt to complete it in the summer, and forget what the data means. Chair Mancus adds "Deadline for CSLO reporting: December 30" to the document and begins to present the Services Assessment section of the document.

Chair Mancus informs the Committee that it is necessary to make reports and recommendations to the Service Area Assessment as soon as possible. Chair Mancus informs the Committee that it is necessary to finalize the service area assessment process and the ILO to SLO map at the next meeting. Chair Mancus informs the Committee that he will email the documents to everyone to review over the next month and send a follow-up email as a reminder about one week prior to the next meeting. Bazard notes that the published Assessment Handbook is from 2017 and likely needs to be updated and/or removed from the website. Chair Mancus states that his goal is to update all of the documents and publish a 2021 Assessment Handbook.

3. **Reports**
   N/A

4. **Announcements**
   Next meeting: March 23, 2:50 PM via ConferZoom

5. Adjournment
Chair Mancus adjourns the meeting at 4:19 pm.