

Assessment Coordinating Committee – Thursday, January 28th 3:00pm-5pm

This committee will oversee assessment plans for AS/BS/BAS/AA degrees and general education, steward a process that promotes college-wide and interdisciplinary collaboration, and coordinate each two-year cycle of learning outcomes creation and review, program learning outcomes assessment, and implementation of improvement strategies are achieved at the college. They will be responsible to Learning Council for ongoing, holistic assessment of the college's assessment process related to the two identified outcomes:

- I. Stakeholders are engaged in a reflective process related to professional practice and student learning outcomes.*
- II. Pedagogical, curricular, and co-curricular changes are made in response to and alignment with assessment results.*

Attendees: Edie, Marlene, Kristin, Darren, Craig, Ravi, Donna, Tim, Dori, Wendi, Cheryl, Lisa, John, Collin, Kinyel, Nichole

Reflect and Plan

Welcome, Focus on Equity-minded Assessment –

PRFC 1151 Equity-minded Assessment: Introduction to “A New Decade” Reading Circle is open as a [self-enroll course](#) with 1 hour Zoom sessions ongoing throughout spring. Highlights from our recent sessions include conversations about:

Including student perception of the course learning outcomes in the assessment plans
Writing learning outcomes for student discipline actions in student affairs
How to engage students in addressing the limitations of language like Standard English
Gathering data about students at the start of a course, from them and college systems.

Edie and Marlene reported on the progress of the reading circles. Additional sessions of PRFC 1151 are being planned for the coming weeks.

Review of Work Underway

Feedback on Assessment Template Reviews (60min)

How are the ALTs receiving their reviews? Faculty Fellow feedback

Alt members are surprised by the amount of detail that is being requested in the Assessment Template. The review process requires ALTs to provide more information so that reviewers from out of discipline are clear on the intended assessment. Suggested that review teams meet with ALTs as a method for formative feedback although some groups have already included that step particularly in situations where there was ‘Hold’ feedback.

There has been lots of discussions amongst the faculty fellows and with their groups about the reviews. The sense is the ALT are a little surprised by the level of detail they’re being asked for. The fellows have tried to stress the template is not the work itself, but it’s just used to record what they’re doing. Still the amount of detail was surprising. There seems to be a need to reassure teams it’s not that their work is bad. It’s that the reviewers don’t really understand what the team is doing. The suggestion is to pretend they’re describing it to someone else outside of the discipline.

The difference between Xitracs and this template is that no one else had to interpret what was in Xitracs. Now there’s a larger group of people looking so the teams may have to provide more

details. If someone is looking from a different discipline, then more information is required because of their unfamiliarity.

How are the ACC review teams experiencing the reviews? All reviewers conversation

The process has been collegial and productive with invested participants. The process is not as intricate as feared.

Norming would be helpful as there is a difference of thought as far as the level of detail asked of the ALTs. This is particularly true of the equity portion of the template. Is it appropriate to go back to ALTs with questions to satisfy curiosity of the reviewers or should we be satisfied if the template includes an adequate answer to the stated question?

There was a spirited discussion about the level of detail the reviewers as a group should be requesting and that it's not appropriate to ask for things just out of individual curiosity. On the other hand, yellow doesn't mean the group cannot proceed. It simply means we'd like more clarity. Darren concurred that we need some more norming exercises because different people on the review team seemed to have different perspectives on what they were looking for. We should continue to work on this so there's consistency.

Some training in Valencia vocabulary may be helpful for ALTs in order to create template content that is more in alignment with expectations from reviewers and the broader ACC.

Matching CTE reviewers to CTE ALTs could be helpful. Alternately, increasing non-CTE reviewer experience of CTE workings could help understanding. Lisa expressed the need to have at least one CTE faculty on each team to provide the necessary background to folks in Gen Ed.

There was not always a clear understanding of how or whether interdisciplinary connections should be documented. The example was a capstone project that included student presentations but there was not an indication of how that skill would be supported for students.

What response time commitments do we want to make as the ACC? What response time requirements, if any, do we want to make for ALTs?

Suggested that ACC reviewers try to get these done as soon as possible with a soft two-week maximum. However, this would not be officially documented. Suggested that we have solid due dates for Spring submissions since they are more time critical. Suggested that each round (review and revision) be a 2-3 week process for a total of 6 weeks.

Do we want to stick with the same review team after the revision for red?

As often as possible.

Do we want to continue working in the same teams for future template reviews?

Let's try to stay with the same teams at least until March for efficiency. It may be helpful long term to mix teams for norming purposes.

Guidance on multiple method(s) for single criteria –

Can the ACC create a decision-making guide similar to the [Guidance for Collaborative Review of Course Outlines - Decision-making?](#)

This is probably useful if only as a tool for communicating the flexibility of the model. Suggestions include a flowchart, a decision tree or a list of questions to prompt conversation.

The consensus is we need something. We decided on a subgroup to work on this to present a draft to the team for feedback. Kristen, Edie, Tim, Marlene & Nichole will meet to discuss.

Internal and External Stakeholders –

How do we as the ACC support ALTs in connecting to relevant consultants?

Looking to what's next

Librarians can help with Information literacy as well as compiling resources for research. Learning support has also come up as possible resource particularly for improvement plans.

Assessment Cycle and Equity-minded Practice Courses Graphic –

Equity-minded Assessment: Transparency in Assessment course for spring – In design

Creating Equity-minded Curricula – In partnership with the College Curriculum Committee

Shift in ACC Membership

Jennifer Robertson had to resign from the ACC. John Niss is replacing her.

Next Meeting -- February 25th, **3pm-5pm**