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Partnership Resource Team Members:

**Primary Institutional Successes**

| **Description of Primary Institutional Successes** | **Notes and Comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Solid Infrastructure   * + The [Six- Year Assessment and Evaluation Cycle](https://www.sdmesa.edu/about-mesa/institutional-effectiveness/learning-assessment/documents/Cycle%202010-2014.pdf)   + A [Program Review Handbook](http://www.mtsac.edu/president/cabinet-notes/SD-Mesa-program-review-handbook.pdf)   + A [Taskstream User Guide](https://www.sdmesa.edu/about-mesa/institutional-effectiveness/learning-assessment-task-force/documents/StudentServicesAssessment.pdf) | * Assessment Cycle provides guidance in what will be assessed each year. (The next key step is to flesh out how PSLOs and ILOs will be assessed.) * Handbook provides clearly identifies the steps, the data that is provided to the lead writer, and how the program review will be evaluated. * Handbook also provides general descriptions of assessment processes, results and actions are integrated into program review. (In some cases, the general descriptions made it difficult to discern the assessment methodology.) * Taskstream Guide is configured specifically for Mesa College and offers step-by-step guidance. |
| Concerted effort to continually seek feedback from employees to explore the SLOA’s current status on campus via the focus group and Jill Baker’s presentation on [Assessing the Assessments](http://www.sdmesa.edu/about-mesa/institutional-effectiveness/learning-assessment/documents/Assessing%20Our%20Assessments%20REV%209-3-13.pdf) that was presented twice at the 2013 Fall Convocation |  |
| The Committee on Outcomes and Assessment’s Role and [2015-2016 Goals](http://www.sdmesa.edu/about-mesa/institutional-effectiveness/coa/purpose-membership-goals.shtml) |  |
| Assessed ILOs with a survey, a good first step, and [reflected on what more needs to be done](http://www.sdmesa.edu/about-mesa/institutional-effectiveness/learning-assessment/documents/Assessing%20Our%20Assessments%20REV%209-3-13.pdf) | (Questions-- How many students took the survey? Who are the students who took the survey? Such information should be documented.) |
| Meaningful course level SLO statements that capture the core elements of courses in objective terms that are measurable. |  |
| Some solid models of the assessment cycle | Examples include Art and Foreign Languages with discussions about student learning exhibiting a high level of engagement. |
|  |  |

**Menu of Options for Institutional Consideration for Its Innovation and Effectiveness Plan**

| **Area of Focus** | **Options:  Ideas, Approaches, Solutions, Best Practices** | **Notes and Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Provide Institutional Support to Convey Mesa’s Commitment to Assessment to Improve Student Learning    * + 1. Reassigned Time | * + 1. Two SLOAC Coordinators     2. SLOAC “coaches” from different disciplines | i) To facilitate the creation of an assessment infrastructure and determine how to integrate SLO assessment into existing college decision- making processes; to chair the Committee on Outcomes Assessment; to provide professional development and support to faculty/ staff and SLOAC “coaches.”   * + - 1. To provide professional development and support to faculty/ staff (e.g., creating authentic and meaningful assessments, analyzing and configuring data, shaping action plans, assessing on the program and institutional level, inputting information into Taskstream, coordinating departmental assessment, etc.) The Mesa faculty we talked to were very enthusiastic about such individuals receiving reassigned time, and were very open to being held “accountable” in terms of what their responsibilities would be. |
| 1. Provide Institutional Support to Convey Mesa’s Commitment to Assessment to Improve Student Learning 2. Stipends | * 1. Enable Adjunct Faculty to Participate in Assessment | This stipend is not for faculty who simply administer the assessment, but rather those that may have created the SLOs, and definitely created, administered, analyzed, and if need be, acted on the assessment results. Such a stipend is especially important for classes taught exclusively by adjunct faculty. |
| 1. Provide Institutional Support to Convey Mesa’s Commitment to Assessment to Improve Student Learning 2. Travel and Conference Funding | * + 1. Provide resources for SLOA leaders to attend statewide or national conferences on assessment. |  |
| 1. Provide Institutional Support to Convey Mesa’s Commitment to Assessment to Improve Student Learning 2. Assessment Philosophy | * 1. Revisit or perhaps draft an updated assessment philosophy that addresses current concerns and reinforces that results will not be used for faculty evaluation | * + 1. Example: Skyline College’s SLOAC Philosophy that was forged in 2005 is published in the [SLOAC Framework](http://skylinecollege.edu/sloac/framework.php) on pages 44- 47. Mesa wrote a similar philosophy early in the initiative.     2. Example: Given ongoing concerns about the SLOAC, the Academic Senate worked with the SLOAC Steering Committee to compose [Resolutions](http://skylinecollege.edu/academicsenate/assets/documents/312ASGC_SLO_Resolutions_v5_Approved.pdf) that were approved in March 2012 |
| 1. Build on Existing SLOs and Assessment Infrastructure 2. Enhance Faculty and Staff’s Understanding of SLOs and Assessment | a. Provide a manual/series of briefs to convey all steps of the assessment process, define assessment terminology and inform assessment practices, e.g. direct vs. indirect measures, rubric creation, mapping guidance, configuring and analyzing data. | Such a manual/ series of briefs could be created by the COA. Please see Skyline College’s SLOAC Framework.  For instance, some course level assessment results were not comparable because the assessment methods were significantly different and/or evaluation criteria weren’t consistent across sections. Faculty who teach the same course could forge a common or at least comparable assessment method (e.g., a short essay, embedded common questions on an exam) and a rubric to guide evaluation.  Also, outcomes and objectives were used interchangeably in some instances. It’s important to make a clear distinction between the two, with some examples.  There also needs to be a clear distinction between achievement data and SLO assessment data attained via a direct assessment. Models of entries could help reinforce the distinction. |
| Facilitate professional development via flex days, “The Loft,” and embedded within departmental/ division meetings. Some campus “best practices’ models could be highlighted. | Provide reassigned time or stipends for assessment coaches to provide assistance to individuals and/or departments, and assessment oriented professional development.  Set aside a day each semester for faculty and staff to engage in SLOA related work (perhaps like the Fall 2013 Convocation). The day could begin with a campus-wide workshop and/or series of workshops, with time set aside in the afternoon for faculty/ staff to work with their departmental colleagues. |
| 1. Build on Existing SLOs and Assessment Infrastructure 2. Determine how mapping course level SLOs, PSLOs and ISLOs can be leveraged to concurrently assess at multiple levels. [See Mesa’s 2013 ILO presentation](http://www.sdmesa.edu/about-mesa/institutional-effectiveness/learning-assessment/documents/Assessing%20Our%20Assessments%20REV%209-3-13.pdf) for potential strategies to directly assess, such as via course embedded assessment and e-portfolios. | Flesh out how PSLOs will be assessed. | It cannot be the exact same as course level assessment (which was the case with some program’s Taskstream reports) but can draw from course assessment results.   * + - * 1. The mapping provides a convenient means to assess PSLOs via course level assessment results “rolling” up.         2. There also can be direct measures, depending on the PSLO, such as licensure pass and job placement rates. |
|  | b. Flesh out how ISLOs will be assessed. | * + - * 1. The indirect measure (the survey) is one means. Stay the course to acquire longitudinal data.         2. A direct measure may yield more actionable information. Rubrics may need to be adopted/ created. The [American Association of Colleges and Universities has rubrics](https://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics) that the California State University Chancellor’s Office is in the process of disseminating and encouraging colleges to adopt.         3. Consider concurrently assessing ILOs and GE SLOs (assuming they’re the same. I didn’t find a separate list of GE SLOs). If using a direct measure, ensure that some key GE courses also are assessed. |
| 1. Build on Existing SLOs and Assessment Infrastructure 2. Improve Taskstream | Create Taskstream reports with consistent format and information. Provide models of what SLOA information is needed for program review. | The course level and program level assessment should be different in terms of methodology. More guidance on creating quality assessments will help to address issues such as course level and program level assessment being the exact same. |
| 1. Strengthen the Reporting Mechanism and Tool | Decide whether to continue or replace Taskstream. | If the college decides to use a different database, it may be best to stay the course until after the accreditation visit. Stop gap measures include the following, and may provide a strong foundation if Taskstream continues to be used:   * 1. Roll out workshops and/or drop in hours for faculty/ staff to enter their information in Taskstream. Ideally each department will have its own Taskstream “expert/ SLOA coordinator.” Deans can help by recruiting faculty/ staff to be those individuals and to support them in this role OR   2. Provide reassigned time for SLOAC “coaches” to enter SLOA related documentation. The drawback, however, is that faculty/ staff may not have a good sense of the assessment cycle, as well as what and how to report. |
| 1. Provide models of course level and program level assessment entries, as well as follow up action plans, e.g. Art, Foreign Languages. | These entries will clarify what type of information to include and how much. Ideally the assessment method will be clear, for instance indicating if it is a direct or indirect measure, and what type of measure it is, e.g., essay, short essay, lab report, common test questions aligned with SLOs, pre/post test, presentation, or performance.  It also may be helpful to provide options for follow-up actions: (a) Conduct further assessment, (b) Use new or revised teaching methods, (c) Develop new evaluation methods, (d) Plan purchase of new equipment or supplies, (e) Make staffing changes, (f) Engage in professional development, (g) Revise course sequence or prerequisite, (h) Revise course syllabus or outline, (i) Other. |
| 1. Explore whether configuring options are possible. | Potential options might include:   * + - 1. “Roll up” course level assessment results to PSLOs so as to make use of the mapping and thus establish one means to directly assess PSLOs.       2. Document assessment methods and instruments, e.g., common test questions, assignments used for instruction and assessment, rubrics, checklists, or surveys. Question—The Taskstream Guide has directions on entering this information, but the actual reports were hard to find. How does one run such a report? |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |