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, Nardia, Nichole, Tim (not present Ravi, ex-officio Daryl, Nasser, Wendi, & Collin).

Welcome to new Co-chairs—

> Since the model will require deep awareness of the needs of Gen Ed and CTE faculty, we have two new co-chairs to lead alongside Nichole, both are faculty already representing these areas on the ACC: Lisa Macon, CTE & Chip Turner, Gen Ed. Both of their strong connections to assessment in their area and program level assessment at the college will be valuable.

> Thank you to John Niss for his extraordinary efforts in convening and leading the ACC this summer, and more importantly for having co-chaired the process since last spring with the development of the model design team right through to the Summit where faculty endorsed the model.

Learning Outcomes Assessment Template—review version updated by subgroup, and revise

> Designate the outcomes that need to be listed at the top, different for CTE and Gen Ed.

> The question that asks about changes made to the course or program learning outcomes needs an addition to ask for an explanation, as well as the adding the ability to say no changes were made. Kristin reminded that Faculty Fellows can assist with ensuring programs know that they do not have to make changes and can enter a "no." Cheryl, reiterated that the review of course outlines needs to happen every two years even when substantial changes are not being made to a program.

> Cheryl and committee members described this as a place to more readily locate curriculum changes, and the reasons that lead to them, especially data that was considered. If Assessment Leadership Teams (ALTs) could designate which College Curriculum Committee (CCC) mtg. the changes were made in, and store the minutes from those in their TEAMs file.

> There needs to be a link in the template to the CTE Standards and Programs of Work (the designation of where they are in the state's a 3 year review cycle).

> Do we want to document changes specific to equity-minded outcomes and curriculum? Do we just add a prompt item about equity-minded changes, or is this a separate entry on the template? Where else are we collecting this information? Discuss the purpose of the template. Concern about the template becoming a "form" that is intended to alter behaviors and actions,

rather than the narrative report where the decisions are documents. Edie mentioned that faculty fellows could be the ones who have a tracking of the changes being made? Committee discussed that based on the support structure and process, the focus on equity may just be there authentically in the way Assessment Leadership Teams (ALTs) respond in the template.

At the designation of criteria the committee discussed how we may need to come to an agreement on which words mean which things. Tim explained that when the criteria and conditions for the course learning outcome are in CIM, then we are making a step towards equity since all students have a similar experience in their courses. The more specific the criteria reduce inequities when students experience very different curriculum (e.g. some were able to do a skill in person and some had two weeks to do it). Nichole reminded that through this model we have the ability to leverage the resources to improve our consistency, but the model itself does not require the ACC to be prescriptive.

We do have the glossary of terms in the model document and need to ensure it is used in the development of Faculty Leads for ALTs, and that Faculty Fellows and FD/IDs refer to it. WE may want to select a small subset of glossary terms to include directly with the template.

We need to add in the template a discussion of any other data that was included in the analysis. Where are the students as stakeholders in the template? Students can be helpful in developing the criterion and assessment methods. In this model as we assess students across courses we may be able to triangulate with SFI data as well.

Edna asked about how a person might answer the template question about reflecting on the results and if this is intended to be a collaborative process. The committee discussed the variations on how the results could be interpreted by collegewide groups, and the history of this sometimes being one person so the intent of the question is to narrate a reflective aspect of the assessment cycle. The decision was made to add an item about if the improvement plan went as planned and including the language in the model that encourages innovative interventions (which might not be successful). The ideas is that ALTs make the plan and therefore are the ones to evaluate how well their plan worked.

Decision to include the final item about the impact of the plan as the first question on the top of the template as well. The Learning Assessment office will work on prepopulating the results of the last improvement plan from Xitrics into the new template, as possible.

Further edits were made directly in the assessment plan template, and notes added for the subgroup to use on the next revision.

Jennifer recommended taking steps for others to review and try to use the template. The committee agreed to a 4 part plan of revisions:

> Mid-August: FD/IDs will work through their suggested edits.
> Late-August: Faculty Fellows wills review and revise.
> Early-Sept: Test with a few disciplines (Speech, Interpersonal Communication, and NSE each have already updated their course outlines). Ask them to document thngs that were confusing about the template, and things that seemed missing.
> Mid-Sept: ACC subgroup will meet again to address changes needed and consider the draft evaluation tool that another subgroup is developing.

Late-Sept: ACC will review newest version and align draft tool for evaluating the template.

Still need to discuss how the templates are "submitted" to the ACC. There will be a subgroup developing an evaluation tool for the ACC to use in reviewing the submissions. Time mentioned that would need to include if they say they made a change, that then they did it.

Guidance for Collaborative Review of Course Outlines

We reviewed the categorized list of faculty development and resources needed to determine if these are appropriate next steps, and what is missing:

Any Faculty, on writing equity-minded learning outcomes*, we will need—
background as to why this is important,
space for reflection,
examples of modified outcomes reducing bias and focused on equity-mindedness,
how to connect workforce and industry standards to equity-minded conversation,
evidence of how changes in outcomes and assessments can lead to different student outcomes,
peer review of learning outcomes evaluating for increasing equity/decreasing inequities.

For Faculty Leads (open to all) on Assessment Leadership Teams (ALTs), we will need—
**PLOA model and process,
facilitation and decision-making skills,
how to have hard conversations,
guidance about the decisions throughout the course outline review process and documentation of those decisions,
equity-minded practices and assessments,
***how to engage the student voice (at outcomes, criteria, assessment method, and results),
seeing each ALT as part of a larger whole at the college (interdisciplinary/sequencing/AA&CTE).
_____
*Also need, encouragement around the course outline review that not all outlines will be overhauled at the same time, and for some disciplines just focusing on getting one really good one could help.

**Added the online course on an overview of the PLOA model is needed, intended for the faculty leads, open to anyone.

***Added development needed on how to get students involved.

Additional Faculty Development needed—
Implicit bias training.
Transparency in assessment.
SOTL or ASMT Assessment design, (ARP), and LOBP matching instrument to outcome.
Faculty engaging students in racially conscious discussions.
Mentoring with a focus on assessment within disciplines, and possibly across disciplines.

Resources needed— accessible outside of any faculty development course.
Matrix/glossary and framing of modifications and improvements of learning outcomes.
Examples that give the faculty an idea of the language and expectations for outcomes.

Resources, transparent on the website (which one ACC or Teaching and Learning/Fac Dev?) Which faculty would be involved in the conversation? What would be the best way to engage faculty in before they even start to write outcomes or assess? Craig mentioned these could be a faculty development certificate that people would want as they focus on their own course assessments, not just at the program level.

Recommendations were to check into the webpage where example HIPs will be shared and possibly share examples there with the ability to crosslink with that database. We also need some resources transparent on a webpage, is that the ACC page of Teaching and Learning? Chip said it makes sense on the ACC page, Marlene said we need an Academic Affairs page that Teaching and Learning could be linked to. Dareen noted that wherever we post resources, there needs to be

Faculty Fellows

Kristin is one of the incoming Faculty Fellows, we are still confirming one more.

Timelines

The timeline updates were shown, specifically the designation that a third year could be added by entering the interdisciplinary variation or the course sequencing variation when needed in order to fully implement an improvement plan. Also included are the fall designations of when CTE program reviews typically occur and the FIP/HIP cycle so that these can be connected.

Dates were standardized across the variations when possible. Edie (v1), Lisa (v1), and Tim (v4) confirmed the dates for the variations they worked on are appropriate.

A subgroup will meet starting next week to design the process for supporting deans this fall: Wendi, Dori, Edna, Jennifer, Keri, Marlene, and Nichole.

Equity-minded Assessment

Review of the equity-minded assessment map, and request for each committee member to update the map asynchronously over the next week with connections to each of our summer work products: Standard Timeline and Variations, Guidance for Collaborative Review of Course Outlines, and Learning Outcomes Assessment Template.

Next Work Product – Tool for Evaluating of Assessment Plans (Sept. ACC mtg)

Subgroup development before next meeting. Darren, Tim, Craig, Kristin, Darren, Marlene

Calendar Updates:

Thursday, Sept. 24th 3pm-5pm

Thursday, Oct. 22nd 3pm-5pm

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

Nov & Dec. Committee Meetings—to be determined