

Assessment Coordinating Committee – Wednesday, July 15th 12:00pm-2:00pm

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.*

In attendance: Cheryl, Chip, Craig, Darren, Donna, Dori, Edna, Edie, Jennifer, John, Keri, Kinyel, Kristin, Lisa, Marlene, Nasser, Nardia, Nichole, Ravi, Tim, Wendi & Collin (not present ex-officio Daryl).

Welcome to new member filling vacancy, Kinyel (Gen Ed, Osceola)

Finalize Variations to Standard Timeline—1, 2, 3, 4

“Intentionally timed, annual college-wide meetings within disciplines and programs occur at milestones within the assessment cycle and within contracted workdays. The ACC will provide a standard timeline of meetings from which Assessment Leadership Teams can deviate to align with accreditation or other obligations, though they will still be expected to keep pace with the assessment cycle” (p. 14).

The longer a program or discipline takes to develop learning outcomes or assessment instruments, the longer it takes for it to be implemented. Meaning it is best to implement deadlines earlier than necessary to give some breathing room to programs that look at the deadline as a ‘start time.’

For disciplines that use an extra year from interdisciplinary needs, do note that there is more than one way to establish how that year is used and why that year is necessary (though the timeline spaces out the 3rd year as the interdisciplinary touchpoint, it could be started earlier).

To be added to the standard timeline are the Program Review timing for CTE, and FIP/HIP cycles.

Limitation of the current model: possible issues involving degrees that may not plan for a 3-year cycle but may end up needing a 3-year cycle due to unforeseen circumstances from the improvement plan stages. There is a question whether the ACC should be the body approving these sorts of changes midway through the program or discipline's improvement plan.

Instead of adding in a new variation, building in opt-in points for each variant cycle that already exists. Would allow for fewer overall variations with just as many options for programs that need them.

Guidance for review of course & program learning outcomes

“Programs and General Education disciplines conduct a review of their course learning outcomes and map connection(s) to program and/or General Education outcomes at the beginning of each cycle, refining the number and scope of course learning outcomes as necessary. Faculty Development and Teaching/Learning Academy (TLA) will provide support for writing measurable outcomes” (p. 8-9).

Decision #1:

Deans and Program Chairs pull in the full (and only when necessary due to small program part) time faculty onto the ALTs before the cycles are chosen, possibly in 2,3 or 4-year terms dependent on what the program or discipline decides. Smaller programs would have an easier time with this organization, but larger programs benefit greatly from organizing this early. As the participating in the ALTs is a curriculum activity, it is within the job description of the full-time faculty to participate in curriculum activities. Kinyel and Edie advocated for deeper student involvement with outcomes assessment. Craig mentioned asking the student how they can demonstrate each learning outcome in order to create a better assessment and improvement plan.

Decision #2:

Adding in the parameter for each outcome to be appropriate for the course length and depth. Additionally, whether the outcomes can be aligned under another, as an indicator.

Decision #3:

As for disrupting inequities, outcomes must be free from bias as well as thoroughly inclusive independent of any cultural differences. It is important to convey the equity-minded messages as positioning not a dominant or submissive culture, but instead allowing all different cultures the ability to learn as best they can (with specific examples from diverse cultures as well).

Decision #4:

Remains as is.

What resources will be needed?

Framing of types of suppressive learning outcomes; implicit bias training; how to have the conversations about the dominant culture and in relation to learning, industry, etc...; ACC evaluation that gives the faculty an idea of the language and expectations of the outcome; background on why this is important; examples; useful resources, on the website.

What faculty development will be needed?

ALT training—equity-minded practices and assessments; how to have hard conversations/facilitation; decision-making.

Peer review of learning outcomes trying to identify implicit bias and ways to increase equity/decrease inequities? Faculty learning from their own examples and the review of others.

Mentoring currently within disciplines, is there an opportunity for across discipline ALTs?

Spaces for reflection on examples of modifications within the emerging equity conversation.

Faculty engaging students (transparency)

PD related to teams seeing they are part of a larger whole.

On equity-minded assessment, we will need background as to why this is important, space for reflection, and examples of how modification in outcomes and assessments can lead to different student outcomes.

Equity-minded Assessment definitions

Ongoing in partnership with Faculty Fellows who will further refine the working definition

TEAMs – A walk through, and demonstration of forms capability

Might be important to split up the questions within the assessment plan at different intervals so that the ACC get the questions at different times, as necessary.

Necessary to be able to continually edit, so the survey version that would require submission is less workable. Prefer the spreadsheet version in TEAMs.

Next Work Product – Assessment Plan Template

Subgroup asynchronously development before next meeting (Darren, Kristin, Marlene, Nichole)

Submit resources for rubric for evaluating the assessment plans.

Calendar Updates:

Thursday, July 23rd 3pm-5pm

Thursday, Sept. 24th 3pm-5pm

Thursday, Oct. 22nd 3pm-5pm

Assessment Institute, IUPUI (Oct 26 & 27, 2020)

Nov & Dec. Committee Meetings (decide during next meeting)

Reminder for each ACC mtg. We need a designee to watch the chat and another to take notes.