

# Outcomes Committee Minutes

Monday, March 12, 2018  
BE 314  
3:00 – 4:30pm

**Type of Meeting:** *Regular*

**Note Taker:** *Mary Rose Toll*

**Please Review/Bring:** Review the past minutes for accuracy.

**Sub Committee Members:**

Glenn Haller, Chair

**Meeta Goel, Cochair**

Svetlana Deplazes, Research Analyst

**LaDonna Trimble , Student Services Dean**

Stacey Adams, Faculty Division Rep

Tiesha Klundt, Faculty Area Rep

**Gary Heaton-Smith, Faculty Division Rep**

Cindy Hendrix, Faculty Division Rep

Cynthia Lehman, Faculty Division Rep

Scott Lee, Faculty Area Rep

Tim Lynskey, Faculty Division Rep

Karen Heinzman, Faculty Division Rep

Candace Martin, Faculty Division Rep

Tom O’Neil, Academic Dean

Mary Rose Toll, Faculty Division Rep

Joe Owens, Faculty Division Rep

**Wendy Stout, Faculty Division Rep**

**Eugenie Trow, Faculty Division Rep**

Stephen Langjahr, Faculty Division Rep

Nathan Dillon, Adjunct Rep

Items	Person	Action
I. Approval of Agenda		<p><b><u>Action Taken:</u> Moved and Approved</b></p> <p><b><u>Items added:</u></b></p>
II. Opening Comments from the Chairs  a	<i>Glenn</i>	<p>Glenn will continue as the chair for the next three years (upon approval). The eLumen implementation committee met with the focus of the meeting on The Quality Focus Essay (QFE) and program review. The purpose of this meeting was to communicate the status of the implementation to President Knudson. The date for implementation is April 1,2018, but it is delayed. Most of the discussion in the meeting was about curriculum. Outcomes has been provided with a list of</p>

		outstanding decisions that are to be made regarding the eLumen implementation. This list will be discussed, and the committee will make decisions on the various settings and then take this information to the implementation committee.
III. Approval of Minutes	Glenn	<p><b>Action Taken:</b> Minor corrections will be made for 11/27/2017 and 2/26/2018 minutes. It was moved to approve both, and both were approved.</p> <p><b>Follow Up Items:</b> Mary Rose Toll will make corrections and forward to Glenn.</p>
IV. Informational Item – Outcomes Committee Schedule 3/26/2018, 4/9/2018, 4/23/2018	Glenn	<p><b>Issues Discussed:</b></p> <p><b>Action Taken:</b></p> <p><b>Follow Up Items:</b></p>
V. Discussion/Action Item – eLumen implementation	Glenn	<p><b>Issues Discussed:</b> The committee reviewed the items listed on the “Outstanding Decisions to be Made” document:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Notifications and Alerts: The committee moved and approved that Notifications and Alerts should remain. These notifications and alerts will be sent to the deans and chairs so that they will be aware that data has been submitted by the lead faculty who will be inputting the data.</li> <li>2. Mastery Levels and Assessment Scales: There was some discussion on whether the levels should remain as is (met, not met, partially met) or be changed to several levels that may include Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, and Does Not Meet Expectations. There could be more than one level included within each of these categories. There may be some benefits in adding levels. For example, it may be beneficial to faculty to know how many students exceed the expectations, or to be able to identify data that include students who are close or far below the expectations. This would allow faculty to look closely at the data and adapt or change curriculum delivery. This gives us the opportunity to look at what we have now and make</li> </ol>

		<p>changes. The challenge will be getting faculty to buy into these changes. Much more discussion is needed on this topic before the committee makes a decision.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Assessment Scales: It is difficult to discuss Assessment Scales because there are varied mastery levels. It will need to be determined whether these scales will apply to individual departments or school-wide. Mastery levels will need to be discussed and reviewed.</li> <li>4. Faculty Scoring Options: There are three general models of assessments including, Required Assessments, Recommended Assessments and Faculty-Generated Assessments. After some discussion, it was decided that Faculty-Generated Assessments is not what will work for our campus. From what is understood, this would mean that faculty may create their own assessments to determine SLO data. The goal is more consistency. The committee is leaning toward Required Assessments created by faculty and input by the lead faculty and department chairs. This will be discussed further. No decision was made.</li> <li>5. SLO Approval and Revision Workflows: The chair will ask Dr. Ed Beyer to create a flowchart for SLO approval and revision.</li> <li>6. Non-Academic Org Types &amp; Custom Labels: Needs further discussion. Svetlana will discuss ideas with Meeta.</li> <li>7. General Education ISLOs: Needs further discussion: Svetlana will discuss with Meeta.</li> </ol> <p><b>Follow Up Items:</b> All of the above with the exception of, 1. Notifications and alerts, will be discussed further until decisions are made.</p> <p>One issue that was brought to the implementation committee was that it is clear that individual input of SLOs by faculty through Canvas and/or Banner is highly desired.</p>
<p><b>NEXT MEETING DATE:</b> 3/26/2018</p>		<p>BE-314</p>