

Assessment Coordinating Committee – Thursday, Feb. 24th 3:00pm-5:00pm

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. Sure, makes, here's a guide.

Attendees

Andrea Rediske, Cheryl Robinson, Chip Turner, Collin Gustafson, Darren Smith, Dori Haggerty, Edie Gaythwaite, John Niss, Keri Siler, Kristin Abel, Lisa Macon, Marlene Temes, Nardia Cumberbatch, Nicholas Bekas, Nichole Jackson, Ravi Rajaravivarma, and Tim Grogan.

Reflect and Plan (30min)

Welcome, Focus on Equity-minded Assessment

Review of [what we aligned to our LOA model from the Equity FIT](#) discussion in Nov.

Our next steps were ([slide 11](#)) to read the full FIT and come back to the ACC with what is aligned. How about we use the alignment we already have in the document above and punctuate our conversations with references to those alignments first, before digging deeper for more strategies and recommendations.

Introduction to LOA (PD) course for those new to the model

Inventory of what needs to be included—

examples and more information on the front end of the LOA cycle

Understand the Faculty Fellow / FD/ID roles and the Faculty Lead roles (shared understanding and then a separate advanced development).

Include conflict resolution (reminders of how to approach those). 1) Within the discipline, 2) Between Faculty Fellows and Leads.

Set expectations on communication even when there is not conflict.

How to introduce the equity-minded and updated methods. Strategies for showing the value of those new approaches.

How vast would the audience be? Everyone who would be involved in the LOA Cycle (faculty, advisors, deans, provosts?). All faculty would attend.

Documents and resources can be made to everybody. There may be some content that stays unique to the Fellows.

Before anyone comes to the course, they need to read the NILOA equity-minded practices document (might this be an invitation to the reading circle we have built related to this?)

Focus on the multiple methods approach in the new model. That may be where some of the biggest conflict, and the biggest change, emerges.

There is a desire to be extremely scientifically valid—but what can this course do to show that even as the assessments are not perfect, they are contributing value and gathering information that give a strong starting point we can develop an improvement plan from.

Expose the opportunity to work interdisciplinarily with other areas of the college.

Create the more compact version of the model—the overview and scope and explain it.

Possible orientation to the specific disciplines—introduce the faculty fellows, so that we are all in this committed to this together. So that everyone sees their responsibility to engage in the assessment. (Could this be a live session and recorded to keep in the Canvas space until that shifts).

Resources ahead of time with the cycle, the overview, the examples you need (of how someone planned those out).

Can this do all these things? We need learning outcomes (e.g. is this about equity, differentiating from the prior model, orienting to the phases?).

Include the overview of the template and a conversation about "disaggregated data" and equity-minded learning outcomes (and direct to the Fac Dev courses available).

Offer in Fall 2022, August/September by what modality and timing and pacing?

In Canvas ongoing, get in and engage as a just-in-time format, but with options for a live Zoom at some point. Might there need to be a completion before they go to that face-to-face component?

The Canvas space gives those who are in the course some time to absorb what they need to in the time they need it.

For disciplines with the same Learning outcomes leaders, will they need to repeat the course? How often?

Review of Work Underway (75 min)

AA Pathways update

AA Pathways STEM ALT – interest survey

https://valenciacc.ut1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_6L6gMK8p0mqQh4G

Any specific guidance from the ACC for the AA Pathways to follow within the LOA model?

Encourage the AA Pathways STEM ALT to focus on the assessment data that exists and align it to the pathways outcomes for the pathways conversation (so coordinate with the math and science ALTs).

Also follow the timing and process.

We hope that the team that emerges will be successful in finding an easy solution.

ACC Guidance for changes to Cycle

Do we have a default maximum time, and is that different if they are new to LOA (e.g. new program)?

Proposal to offer up to a 5 year cycle. Concern about reviewing learning outcomes needing to happen every 2 years. There will be a SACS report on the cycle for review. *Is there a way to build in this room for only those where there is no one else to step in (e.g. very small areas)?

Perhaps we don't try to address this, but what do we do with situations where the work is not completed. Is it case-by-case, special case so to have no automatic default.

What do we do with the team that is just not keeping up?

The ACC is set up for those to get support to meet the criteria.

The next cycle still needs to begin, and there can be added support for the overlap.

We don't necessarily want a guidance that advertises a protocol or option.

Next steps a subgroup to draft guidance and review with Fellows and FD/IDs: Edie (along with some of the co-chairs)

Evaluation of the LOA model

Subgroup meeting after spring break, Wed. March 23rd

ACC reviews

Norming of the [second submission](#) – Review the [Questions and Prompts](#)

Add parameters to the [ACC Instructions for Reviewing Assessment Templates](#)

Recommit to what constitutes a “hold” or “clarify”

Row 18. Must have numerical results, by LO as listed in their first submission (and how many of the students met the expectation and what met the threshold). Everything in the plan that they were going to measure needs to be in the plan. Use the prompts in this row more prescriptively, and in the following rows as subjective to the individual program.

If there are no disaggregated results add a clarify and comment: "The expectation is that you'll use disaggregated data to help assess equity."

How to designate hold for a portion of the ACC response

Recommendation from Fellows for an additional (optional) prompt for the third submission

What do we want to repeat, not repeat, or learn from for the next cycle?

Looking to what's next (15 min)

Next Meeting March 24th 3pm-5pm

Evaluation of the LOA model

Collaborative Data Analysis Examples