

Student Support Services Outcomes Assessment

Minutes

July 17, 2013

Attendees:

Jason Chevalier, Meghan Chen, Audrey Yamagata-Noji, Eddie Lee, Jim Ocampo, Bailey Smith, Emily Woolery, Barbara McNeice-Stallard, Annel Medina, Kate Scott

Regrets:

David Charbonneau

Background

The release of the college's new Outcomes Plan sparked conversation about how it could be improved. Although two representatives from Student Services and one from the Library were members of the Outcomes Committee that created the plan, it was unclear to the Student Services Team how their area was well represented in the plan. After Jason and Barbara met with Audrey's Student Services Team Managers, it became clear that a larger student support services meeting was needed to fully address this issue; thus the current Student Support Services Outcomes Assessment meeting was called to allow larger scope of discussion on the Outcomes Plan as well as outcomes assessment in general.

Summary of Meeting Key points

- ◇ The group agrees that learning happens everywhere in the college and not merely in the classroom.
- ◇ Group understands and embraces the importance of doing student learning outcomes assessment (SLOs). It is difficult to do SLO in situations where they only see students once and don't know if the learning is short- or long-lived. The group is doing a lot of (SLO) work. The group realizes that sometimes administrative unit objectives (AUOs) and strategic actions (SAs) are needed before SLOs can be used.
- ◇ For accreditation purposes, Standard II.B states that student support services must understand students' needs, what you are doing to meet those needs, and how you are using SLOs. Accreditation is SLO focused and silent on AUOs and SAs.
- ◇ The group wondered if there is something in between SLOs and AUOs. In some areas, such as Counseling, there is a hybrid of services and teaching. For example, why are students in line now when they should have been planning weeks ago for their registration? Do they want to figure out how to do this better? What can we do together to make sure that future students don't do this late planning in the future?
- ◇ **Assessment Rotation Plan:** Too much assessment is being done each semester; like the idea in the Outcomes Plan of doing assessment over a 4-year time period. We must realize that robustness of outcomes assessment is key to accreditation. What is the "Continuum of Impact" of our outcomes assessment work?
- ◇ **Robustness:** While the groups are using many SLOs, the quality or robustness of them is sometimes great and sometimes not great. The Outcomes Committee is doing a qualitative review of courses up for 4-year review. This review will provide the first ever direct feedback to



faculty from their peers as to how well their work aligns with what the college has been saying for years should be included in a full cycle of outcomes assessment. It is anticipated that this direct feedback will help focus faculty on the fact that someone is reading their work and that someone has a clear pathway for them to follow to improve their work. The group is also trying to improve quality of their work and would like to see what that Outcomes Committee is using.

- ◇ For sustainability, it is important to look at the impact of our work, the use of it, and the why of it. It is sustainable if it is fully engrained in what we do as part of our work. It is sustainable if we have a change in leadership and they wish to fully revamp the process and employees strongly disagree.
- ◇ **GEO:** For general education outcomes (GEO), the Library is left out. If the college used broader GEO such as Learning Competency, then more student support service areas would be able to become part of the process. The group recommended that the college be holistic in its use of GEOs such that all members of the college could align with the GEO for one year (e.g., Learning Competency). The original GEO work began with the creation of GE Zones that included these broader categories. This work will be revisited by the Outcomes Committee.
- ◇ **Name** Audrey handed out the expanded PIE definitions that her team uses. The group thought that her re-working and adding to the definitions had merit. The group discussed changes to the name of SLOs, etc. What is being measured and how results are being used are important and not necessarily the name the college attaches to it. Overall, the group concluded that the college could keep the same SLO name, but provide more direction (i.e., be more inclusive) and sub-group definitions under it to allow all groups to be able to attach themselves to it and to accomplish robust outcomes assessment. Group recommends an umbrella SLO with categories under it such as course, program, GEO, student support services.
- ◇ The group is also aware that they need to determine how to gather a listing of all student support services outcomes work and to demonstrate the robustness of their work such that it is evident that learning is happening and that the changes that are being made to improve student's learning and educational experiences.
- ◇ **TracDat & PIE** How is TracDat (electronic repository for outcomes assessment) being used now for this work? What changes are needed to improve upon it for student support services? Given that the group needs to do outcomes assessment work for its program review (PIE), how can we leverage TracDat? Reports within TracDat may need to be customized per each group's needs. The date filter in TracDat reports may not be working (Bailey will give Kate examples). Important to remember the big picture of what we are trying to accomplish.
- ◇ The group does not use common assessments.