



California Community Colleges

Institutional Effectiveness

Partnership Resource Teams Summary of Initial Visit Date of Visit: March 16, 2023

Name of Institution: **Mt San Antonio College (Mt. SAC)**

Partnership Resource Team Members: Sarah Harmon, Jolene Martin, Brian Miller, Joanna Oxendine, Dennee Pescarmona (Lead), Maria Spencer

Area of Focus	Institution's Point Person or Group, If Known	Heard during the Visit: Institutional Activities Underway (Positive Steps Taken or in Progress)	Heard during the Visit: Ideas Expressed by the Institution (Issues, Challenges, Desired Solutions)
A. Review and reflect on progress around course, program, and institutional level outcomes. B. Establish/re-establish an assessment cycle (regular and systematic) and timeline for course, program, and institutional outcomes. C. Identify and implement course, program, and institutional outcomes through a DEISA (diversity, equity, inclusion, social justice, and antiracism) lens.	Outcomes Coordinators and SLOAC Committee	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. There is faculty interest and motivation to do the work; SLOAC is a faculty-driven process.2. Happy with current leadership. Leadership presents a positive vision rather than punitive. How can we help vs. do your assessment now.3. SLOAC Coordinators and Outcomes Committee have revisited notification/reminder process to be more supportive and proactive using personalization of department emails; this has supported a shift in faculty viewing the Coordinators and Committee as more supportive rather than a punitive body.4. The method of disseminating information to faculty members about SLOs has been changed, resulting in increased openness and engagement among faculty. Previously, the approach was top-down, with emails from the dean that felt like a reprimand to faculty.5. PLO work has increased, and reporting has improved over the last year. This was due in part to compensation, including adjuncts.6. One department highlighted the use of course-level equity data as a way to inform reviews of their SLOs and to make them more meaningful; other faculty expressed interest in that practice.7. Recognition of faculty doing formative assessments throughout their courses8. There are departments in which rich conversations around SLOs are taking place and multiple members of the department are responsible for leading various aspects of assessment and SLO reporting.9. The work is often being done by individual faculty and departments, even if it isn't being incorporated into Nuventive.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. SLOAC is considered time-consuming, extra work that is part of the "work creep" that so many on campus are feeling. Participants commented that the campus is too big to manage and they are stretched thin as faculty and have no time to do extra work.b. There is a desire for the SLO review process to be part of the work of the faculty, rather than an extra thing to do.c. SLOs are not submitted into the COR nor are part of the direct curriculum process, which means that some faculty may not know the most up-to-date course-level SLOs. Course Design Committee focuses on CORs but not SLOAC.d. Courses still use Measurable Objectives in lieu of SLOs, which increases the number of metrics to evaluate. Need to redefine the concept of SLOs (which are not the same as objectives).e. Many processes are unclear and not transparent for faculty, especially part-time faculty. Questions about where the SLOs reside: how is the website updated? How to ensure faculty are posting accurate and current SLOs on syllabi?f. Defined need exists for evolving SLO's to meet modern-day needs of hybrid, online and in-person learners.g. The review cycles are of various years' duration, which leads to faculty forgetting to complete a cycle or doing extra work.h. There is tremendous variance in terms of how departments function, both with SLOs and in general; this was expressed as a barrier to forward movement with SLO assessment, among other issues.i. Multiple platforms that do not communicate/integrate (e.g., Canvas, Nuventive) create unnecessary barriers to meaningful SLO reflection and work.

Area of Focus	Institution's Point Person or Group, If Known	Heard during the Visit: Institutional Activities Underway (Positive Steps Taken or in Progress)	Heard during the Visit: Ideas Expressed by the Institution (Issues, Challenges, Desired Solutions)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Faculty seem open to new processes; they desire openness and transparency and want to understand how processes are linked. 11. There's a strong desire to create a website / rebranding of outcomes envisioning a space for faculty. Celebrate the work of faculty and what they have been doing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> j. A need was expressed to have faculty understand the importance of SLOs, to address concerns of SLOs being used against them, fear of changing how they teach. k. Thus far, Student Services and Administrative units have not been included in broad conversations or ongoing work regarding outcomes. l. A theme of "meaninglessness" was expressed throughout the day: How do we take away the "meaningless" data and create meaningful processes and dialogue? What do the numbers even mean? How are faculty discussing results broadly to make instructional improvements? How to train all faculty on best practices for writing LOs and assessing LOs? m. Long cycles mean assessment is done on students who have long departed the college. n. Participants noted several faculty have participated in ACUE training, but that the equity work hadn't emerged as part of SLO work. Two participants noted an interest in longer ACUE work to better connect equity. o. There is a need to include more student involvement/voice-how are outcomes meaningful to them? p. Bring in more part time faculty and provide ongoing resources to help incentivize change.
D. Leverage outcome data to help inform the college's PIE processes.	PIE and SLOAC committees; PIE office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PIE process is annual, which should provide more opportunities and dialogue (though that isn't currently happening) 2. There is a strong interest in promoting use of outcomes in program review to make the reflection process more meaningful and shift away from just being resource allocation. 3. Data coaches are a great benefit. 4. Faculty expressed a desire to "break down silos" and communicate across departments/programs to improve assessment and planning. One department shared their model in the meetings of how workload is shared across the department, and others expressed a desire to emulate it. 5. There is an eagerness amongst faculty to share best practices and learn from one another. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Faculty expressed that reporting/request cycles (PIE, Curriculum, Resource Allocation, Accreditation, etc.) are too varied—one to seven years—and unaligned with/disconnected from one another. b. PIE process is an annual comprehensive process that feels like a lot of work and adds to the fatigue chairs feel. c. There is a disconnect between SLO development, the curriculum process/course of record and the PIE process. d. There is a lack of connection and collaboration between SLO work happening in instruction and AUO work in student services, and neither is well-connected to PIE. e. There is a disconnect on program review; there's a feeling that what they have been doing is wrong and no one said anything. f. Once PIE reports and resource requests leave departments and/or divisions, little to nothing is known at the departmental or faculty level as to what becomes of them. This adds to the faculty's sense that PIE and outcomes work are meaningless. There is a desire for more transparency in the processes themselves. g. Though a funding rubric exists, it has not been shared widely across campus; therefore, there is a lack of congruency between what is expected of requests and what is submitted.

Area of Focus	Institution's Point Person or Group, If Known	Heard during the Visit: Institutional Activities Underway (Positive Steps Taken or in Progress)	Heard during the Visit: Ideas Expressed by the Institution (Issues, Challenges, Desired Solutions)
			h. Faculty would like to have more support from the Deans. There is a sense that the PR funding is based on whether the Dean can effectively argue on behalf of a department.
E. Implement a Professional Development Outcomes and Assessment (data-informed) Framework to support faculty, departments, and units in assessing and analyzing outcomes.		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communities of Practice were identified as one method that has worked in other areas, and that perhaps could be employed for SLOAC. 2. One department highlighted their annual retreats in which they set annual goals that include assessment and planning, which enables them to plan accordingly. Other faculty expressed interest in doing the same as a standard practice. 3. Classified have various community-building activities throughout the year that are valued, and faculty would like to create something similar. 4. Faculty professional development opportunities are abundant and responsive to campus needs and desires. 5. Many faculty expressed praise for pre-pandemic speaker series that produced workshops, communal readings, and an opportunity to hear from a nationally recognized author/scholar. This could be applied to SLOAC work. 6. Faculty value opportunities to gather together to learn from one another or a leading expert. 7. Faculty value any opportunity they have to gather together and share with one another- to make the large campus feel smaller. 8. Faculty praised the curriculum retreat this past January which had 100 participants--all who attended did get access to necessary software. The training included a workshop on how to access WebCMS and Nuventive. 9. Trainings that have time structure, end products/work to show, and certifications are more popular and well-attended. 10. A desire to build community including more celebrations of best practices. There was a desire to have workshops to change the culture of collaboration. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Faculty expressed the need for time to do the work; there are only 2 Flex Days in the academic calendar, and those agendas are full of other events that take precedence. b. Faculty expressed that there wasn't enough time to work on these processes nor to learn from each other and inquire about best practice. c. There are competing interests for Flex activities, which might not serve the interests of SLOAC. There may be a need to have a separate set-aside LO gathering space. d. Department Chairs expressed needing help, training on SLO's. e. A lack of motivation was expressed about coming back after 3 years since the campus closed due to the pandemic. f. Faculty expressed a need for more frequent mandatory faculty training, especially for department chairs. g. There is no college hour for professional development. h. There was a desire to have all divisions to work on LOs and PIE together and get help at the same time. i. Someone brought forward the idea to run a survey after Flex Day looking at different modalities to participate. j. Bigger departments have better opportunities to get feedback. k. A request from faculty to have Instructional designers who are fluent with Canvas, WebCMS, use of CSV files & Nuventive l. A strong desire was expressed to co-create material, to have the time protected to do the work in order to prevent job burnout. m. An overall plan is needed to re-do the narrative around SLOs, what they are and their value to students, and then to create structured gathering times to do the work and create new and sustainable processes.