

Assessment Committee Meeting Notes  
September 24, 2019

Kelly Carbone presented newly written DN Trio outcomes for review. Outcomes captured three main functions: enhanced advising and support for student education planning, development of individualized academic strategies, and advising on career/transfer pathways. The outcomes included quantitative performance standards as indicators of success, reflecting the language of those outcomes currently used by EKA's Trio program. After some discussion, it was agreed that Kelly will move forward immediately with implementation of these outcomes in order to assess and develop evidence for the ACCJC. The committee discussed and agreed that future collaboration between TRIO DN and EKA to achieve outcome alignment would be beneficial to both areas.

Joe Hash presented recommendations from an outside consultant on ways to improve Student Development outcomes. Discussion ensued on the distinction made by the consultant between student learning and service area outcomes (SLO and SAOs). A general recommendation of the report was to include at least one SAO for each area. Committee members responded that CR development areas already use PLOs within in a similar manner to SAOs. Discussion ensued on how the frequency of student interactions and the substance of what is being assessed in service areas, compared with instructional areas, affects what kind of outcome is appropriate. In some situations, assessment of student capacities/competencies is required. In other areas, it is the overall performance of a service. It was agreed that CR's current practices are generally in accord with ACCJC standards, but that further refinement of development outcomes in light of the report's recommendations may be warranted. The idea of a shared outcome across service areas was also raised. The committee agreed that members will re-read the report, consult with their constituents, and revisit these issues at the next meeting.

Philip Mancus reported on progress toward the eLumen assessment pilot, sharing with the committee key interests of the deans and associate deans. Two of the most pertinent of these were the use of aggregate assessment scores in reporting and the assignment of all faculty to the course coordinator role. It was agreed that these interests can be addressed on a trial basis during the pilot phase. VP Hill and the AC chair will continue to explore the issue of program to course mapping within the eLumen system. Discussion regarding how to manage action planning will be taken up at the next meeting. Philip also shared a list of faculty recruits for the pilot phase. All three instructional divisions, including associate deans from each, are represented. Adult Ed will not take part because they lack full time faculty and, consequently, assessment planning will be managed by the director for the entire department rather than individual faculty over individual courses.

Adjourned approximately 4:05 pm