



**Minutes of November 1, 2022**  
**Outcomes Assessment Meeting**  
**3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.**  
**Zoom**  
**Approved: December 6, 2022**

**Attendees:** Shannon Myers, Chris Tarman, Joanne Benschop, John Thomford, Mary Beth Headlee, Janelle West, Elise Fanney, Krista Byrd, Ashely Davis, Nadia Khan

**Recording Secretary:** Aracely Ragazzo

**Meeting called to order: 3:35 p.m.**

**Meeting adjourned: 5:04 p.m.**

Agenda Item	Action <small>This column is for important information (e.g., actions/tasks to be completed or significant dates).</small>	Motions <small>This column is for motions made.</small>
<b>Approval of Minutes</b>		
		Tarman moved to approve the minutes dated October 4, 2022, West seconded; motion carried.
<b>I. Call to Order &amp; Introductions</b>		
<b>II. Changes or Additions to the Agenda</b>		
<b>III. Co-Chairs Reports/Update</b>		
	<p>Myers – gave update on Go SLO Wednesdays, offering an online hour in which she assists faculty with any outcomes-related questions. The main thing people have trouble with is going back to previous terms, when attempting to enter results in Anthology.</p> <p>Tarman gave update on the SLO assessment summary data. Clarified that the numbers being shown are what is in Anthology and not the assessment maps.</p>	

#### IV. SLO Coordinator Reports/Update

Benschop (SLO Coordinator) - talked about redundancy of the SLO process. San Bernardino uses curriQunet to map their core competencies. Benschop shared what the process looks like in curriQunet. Would like to streamline all the SLO processes. Shared a process at Long Beach. With a similar process OAC would request SLO revisions and offer suggestions.

Discussed an issue with a SLO recommendation that was made, CPC was involved. If the SLO approvals are going to be with CPC, they will need to have SLO knowledge. Would like the committee's input on whether the SLO checklist should be made more formal.

Thomford - C&P felt that SLOs were not under their purview about 7 years ago when Gail Baughman was C&P Chair. The committee asked SLOAC to review. That is why a SLO Coordinator position was set up.

Myers – A checklist is a good idea as long as it does not get too involved.

Pescarmona – during fifth Friday an issue came up where there was an error with the Bloom's Taxonomy in the outcomes area of Anthology. If the wording of a SLO does not line up with Bloom's, and error appears in Anthology. Suggested we remove Taxonomy from Anthology if it is going to give people an error.

Benchop shared that Bloom's is the best choice to be used in the development of the SLO's because it is an effective tool for

Add streamlining the SLO processes to future minutes

	<p>the entire assessment process, and faculty that are not as knowledgeable about how Bloom's can be used may not realize this.</p> <p>Thomford asked if faculty can still enter their info if an error note appears. Can we retain the taxonomy and add a notification in Anthology that using Bloom's terminology is not a requirement, but a useful tool?</p> <p>There is a way we could build the mapping into Curriqunet. Can put in a link for people to map to a core competency on that screen or a related block.</p>	
<b>V. Student Services SAO Update</b>		
	Mortaloni – absent	
<b>VI. Associated Student Government Report</b>		
	Davis – absent	
<b>VII. Action Items</b>		
A. Welcome		
<p>B. Accreditation</p> <p>Assignment: Please read Standards 1.B and 2.A.3 of the ISER Report and be FAMILIAR with it!</p> <p><a href="https://hub.miracosta.edu/accreditation/iser/">https://hub.miracosta.edu/accreditation/iser/</a></p>	<p>Myers would like the committee to become familiar with Standards 1.B and 2.A.3, and the Quality Focus Essay.</p> <p>Thomford shared some feedback for the ISER. IB2</p> <p>QFE is going to drive our future work. It is a very useful document for the committee to be familiar with.</p>	
C. Core Competency Assessment Workgroup Report	<p>Thomford shared the Goal Setting/Project Planning &amp; Completion Rubric. Would like to start assessing in the spring semester with creative thinking.</p> <p>The rubric will go to committees within the next month. Using all SMART attributes.</p>	

	Core competency assessments taking place this semester will start soon.	
D. Website Workgroup Update	<p>Myers met with the website workgroup and reviewed the website. Planning to update a bit of the mission statement. Myers shared the current OAC public website and reviewed some of the changes discussed in the workgroup meeting.</p> <p>West suggested Core Competencies, CSLOs and PSLOs all be separate pages, so that there's not so much text on that one page</p> <p>Would like to add presentations to the webpage on the Resources page.</p>	
E. Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goals</li> <li>• Quality Focus Essay</li> <li>• Spring 5th Friday</li> <li>• Assess OAC Committee</li> </ul>		Tabled
F. Switching to a 3-Year Cycle of SLO Assessment (vs. 6-year)	<p>Myers received feedback from Mary Gross regarding the concern of extra work for some departments if switching to a 3-year cycle.</p> <p>Benschop – have to do things to encourage people to assess their SLOs. Encourage procedures to make them more accountable.</p> <p>Thomford - thinks that the point of the 3-year cycle would only be applicable to PSLOs because of program review. Does not think CSLOs should be a part of that and should remain on the 6-year cycle as noted in the ISER. He</p>	

	<p>also stated that if faculty are acting responsibly, they would be assessing more frequently that once every six years, which would contribute to the Program review. Program review is mandated every three years. Can justify a 3-year PLSO cycle and take it to Academic Senate and get that moving through Faculty Assembly if it is going to require an increase in workload. Proposes that PSLOs move to a 3-year cycle.</p> <p>Tarman recognizes concern for the added workload. Feels that we need to move a 3-year cycle for CSLOs. As an institution we need to be assessing more and more frequently and more meaningfully to push our institution forward. Need to make the data collection processes more streamlined. May have to take pause on the 3-year cycle and work on the ease of collecting data first.</p> <p>Fanney agrees that it would be good to assess CSLOs every 3 years rather than 6. A lot can change in 6 years and we need to make sure students are getting what they need from our courses.</p>	
G. Redesigning the Student Experience / Guided Pathways-- how OAC can contribute to institutionalizing the RSE/GP framework through policy, procedure and practices <a href="https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/19NRVCIY9zhQ-FWjc4fDBv-vsEAJXvs4/edit#slide=id.p18">https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/19NRVCIY9zhQ-FWjc4fDBv-vsEAJXvs4/edit#slide=id.p18</a>		Tabled
<b>VIII. Discussion &amp; Information Items</b>		
A. Future Potential Topics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faculty SLO Liaisons</li> <li>OAC inclusion in First Fridays for new faculty</li> </ul>		Tabled
<b>IX. Adjournment</b>		