Assessment Coordinating Committee – Thursday, Sept. 30th 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.*

Attendees

Andrea Rediske, Cheryl Robinson, Chip Turner (Daniel Turner), Collin Gustafson, Craig Rapp, Darren, Smith, Daryl Davis, Donna Payne, Dori Haggerty, Edie Gaythwaite, Edna Jones Miller, John Niss, Keri Siler, Krishendaye Brissett, Kristin Abel, Laura Blasi, Lisa Macon, Marlene Temes, Nardia Cumberbatch, Nichole Jackson, Noelia Maldonado Rodriguez, Ravi Varma, and Tim Grogan.

Reflect and Plan

Welcome, Focus on Equity-minded Assessment

Welcome two new members! Assessment Coordinating Committee

Campus	Gen Ed Faculty	CTE Faculty	Deans	Staff	Ex-officio AVPs
Downtown	Nick (English)	Craig (CTE)	Edna (Student Affairs)	Cheryl (C&A) Darren (IE) Donna (IR) **Nichole (LA)**	Daryl (AR) Nasser (CWE) Wendi (TL)
East	Andrea (Science)	**Lisa (CTE)** *Kristin (CTE)*	Keri (Academic Discipline)		
	Edie (Speech & CTE)				
Lake Nona					
Osceola	Tim (Science)		Marlene (Academic Affairs)		
Poinciana					
West	*Chip (NSE)*			Dori (TL)	
	Nardia (Library & CTE)				
		Ravi (CTE)			
Winter Park			John (Executive)		

ACC Co-Chairs in **Bold**, CCC Co-Chairs underlined, and *Faculty Fellow representatives italicized*

Welcome, Focus on Equity-minded Assessment

How will we know when an improvement plan has considered equity in each aspect?

- Data disaggregation (Niss)
- Choice on assignment (Edie)
- Transparency w/ students (Niss)

- Improvement / communication plan
- Authentic (Edie)
- The outcome itself would reveal equity
- Transparent assessment / Equity-minded (Nichole)
- Considering student feedback (Rapp)
- Consider prerequisite and content sequencing (Cheryl)
- Equity-minded learning outcomes
- Culturally responsive (who is our students – language choice) (Edie)
- Collaborative reflection (Nichole)
- Where are the ideas coming from (Rapp)
- Interventions (Nichole)
- Implementation of improvement plan (Nichole)
- Probably goes with Edie's but that there have been attempts to update existing outcomes to reflect equity minded language (Cheryl)
- Consider the background of students when weighing intervention approach (Niss)
- the results themselves would also show how those multiple methods benefit student learning in a variety of ways (Edie)
- The feedback loops that are in place in collaboration (Edie)

Review of Work Underway

[Collegewide Learning Assessment Symposium: Reflecting on the Assessment Model](#)

Nov. 5th 9am to noon. Filling the sessions - naming suggested [proposals](#)

Innovative Plans, Lessons Learned, Successful Interventions, Unsuccessful Interventions

New Assessment Leadership Teams, 8.2c and AA Pathways

Supporting with LOBP 4242, Symposium sessions, and what else?

Updated Tracking [Two and three-year teams and reviews](#)

LOA Template Second submissions

Faculty Fellow update – LOA Template prompts

Norming with example

What were the conversations that came up while we were reviewing it?

What were some common concerns?

Are there things that we should be aware of as we are looking at it?

Additional norming

Consider assessment of collaboration in the Model - Rows 19 & 21

Schedule another re-norming during early spring with a set of 10 completed reviews.

- (Able) Report the Results: discovered results not reported in-depth. Need for prompts to guide the ALTS to "dig deeper." Three prompting questions added to this section (see template). ACC noticed reporters not making "threshold statements." Nichole asked ACC team to review lines 18-22 to bring forward any items that are missing/startling. Need for specificity to guiding conversations. Prompts encourage deeper reflections on results, and are there to guide the conversation.
- (Upsana) Consider whether prompts lengthy. Consider what the challenges might be for the groups to address what we're asking them to do. Conversations have not been the same in smaller classrooms than larger. Consider what the challenges groups might face with these prompts when they have different size classrooms. Also consider whether the prompts are conflicting.
- (Turner) Like the reflection on how students are involved
- (Upsana) Line 21. Deans can help guide the conversation, and included a prompt question on how deans are involved to encourage that interaction.
- (Nichole) Commitment to improve the template met.
- (Ravi) Ability to "defend" feedback from the review committee
  - Reviewers to make clear that feedback is open asking/answering questions on that feedback.

Review Results Discussion

- (Edna) Threshold, benchmark, target interchangeably. Line 18, no identified threshold (what is the starting point?). Encourage to identify a threshold in second submittal.
- (Edna) List outcomes for each results to easily identify which the results tied to
- (Edna) Disaggregation of data: If there is an acknowledge pattern, what are we doing about it? Is it being addressed? Follow-up on the anecdotal assessment, but ask for data as well. Need to support w/ factual information. How will they address the discrepancy?
- (Rapp) Enhance statements from anecdotal to factual w/ data. Explain the "why."
- (Turner) Threshold – What do we mean by this?
  - (Edna) Should be addressed in Part 1 of the report. Opportunity to address in Part (round?) 2.
  - (Rapp) This example made it through without a clear threshold.
  - (Edie) Was that part of Part I of the Assessment line 10 and 11? @Craig agree - not articulated in Part I.
  - (Siler) If the thresholds have not been set in part 1, could it be that they were operating under the assumption that they are collecting baseline data in the "first" of the new assessment process.
  - (Edie) @Keri - if that's the case then in that line (18) they should articulate that they didn't set a target/threshold and that should be satisfying?
  - (Edie) How do we know that?

- o (Nichole) @Edie, hopefully by the language that says describe the connections the improvement plan has... But also will be guided by Fellows and FD/IDs, and US! When we give our feedback (clarify here)
  - o (Edie) @Nichole - so a faculty member working on a HIP for example, that aligns with the Assessment work but is not directly connected to the assessment work is still independent work and would not be listed here?
  - o (Edie) Thank you @Edna and @Craig - great explanations and appreciate the review of the review :)
- (Ravi) Course success data
  - o Nicole – Times students have taken the course.
- (Ravi) From the college point of view – How are we addressing statements/results that are "uncomfortable" to us?
- (Rapp) Collaborative process. Need for articulation in this area.
  - o (Edna) Disaggregate data opportunity in this section. This report referenced a grant.
- (Rapp) Line 21? Communicated the plan well for reviewers but not necessarily to fellow faculty.
  - o (Edna). More than one plan, more than one intervention; but how will ALL faculty in the area be engaged?
- (Edna) Line 23? Format and question interpretation. Did not understand to answer question 23 as a question. There's an opportunity for department to add explanation/answer in this area that applies to just that questions. Opportunity to explain other types of things (i.e. the grant mentioned in this report that doesn't fall within the specific parameters of the list).
- (Edna) Opportunity for the team to be more descriptive on what we'd like to see in these reports. Prompt question modifications to help address this need.
- (Niss) Off-topic: Interdisciplinary cooperation – Trigonometry - What we need and what we're teaching are not in alignment?

Looking to what's next

ACC planning to evaluate the model

Timeline

Quantitative Measures

LOA information for Deans

AA Pathways Significant and Coherent

Endorsement of the definitions

Expected timeline of how we will support the work

Annual Interdisciplinary Sharing Planning Subgroup -- Q&A

What, When, Where

Next Meeting – **August 22nd, 3pm-5pm**

Website subgroup to add ACC handbook and ACC training

Additional faculty member for ACC?

LOA information for Deans

- (Turner) What is our role when reporting faculty participation? What do we want to share w/ deans? What do we want to get in return from deans?
    - o (Edie) @Chip is this to supplement line 18?
- (Nichole) If deans could have list of faculty that are in the area that are teaching the prefix/course/CRN that are assessing the course. Need for list of faculty working on specific plans.
    - o (Edie) I think the missing piece is "what is the assessment" as in Part I we are really only asking for the plan.
- (Nardia) Deans that have multiple disciplines that are doing multiple assessment plans. How do we help the larger areas such as Humanities?
- (Dori) Do we know why they didn't participate?
    - o (Upsana) - @Dori- thank you for bringing this up. This has been an integral part of the conversation when the ALT's are looking at data. The improvement plans will be developed by making sure we address the communication plans.
- (Nichole) Do we inquire? How do we inquire about faculty participation?
    - o (Edie) In the improvement plan is there a question on how to improve faculty participation? Addition of a question: What steps will you take to help improve overall faculty participation?
    - o (Nardia) What will the group do to help people who do not want to participates but the course has been deemed to be part of the process? Who is the best person to "handle" that outlier.
    - o (Kristin) faculty lead should assist in this area.
    - o (Nichole) When we run into these collaboration "issues" be creative in supportive the work (instead of email, maybe zoom/call/other methods of engagement?). Dashboards as motivators to see data.
    - o (Ravi) Gateway courses: can increase student success rates if we focus on these types of courses. Resources focused to these gateway courses.
    - o (Upsana) – Speech faculty came together in a short period of time w/ the new process. Good news: big team was able to gather data from most faculty. Value in this team effort.
    - o (Nardia) That's a great point Upsana, and another point to sharing with other teams about how to collaborate in different disciplines/sizes
    - o (Nichole) @Edie @ Nardia we will want to discuss a little more about HIPs that touch on assessment but are not part of the collegewide assessment? The idea was to count here how the assessment results or intervention are showing up in these areas (though we can count others in other places).
- (Ravi) Gen Ed: Few faculty participated, but course was high-enrolled.
- (Niss) Separate faculty engagement into 2 pieces: development and implementation.

- (Rapp) ALT course where FT and PT faculty are engaging. Repository where everyone is building their assessments. Participative approach, but if you want to implement something new, you need support of Sr. leadership. Falls under the requirements of the job at Valencia (course assessment).

AA Pathways Significant and Coherent

(Cheryl) Common program prerequisites, best preparations for transfers. Separate program outcomes. Treated as different programs, and assessed as separate programs. Resulted in excess credits and delayed graduation. 2019 transition to degree pathways to include common program prerequisites. Remove the need for program outcomes assessments. SACSCOC issues ensued.

(Darren) Educational programs previous definition overview. Our programs offers officially a single AA degree. Didn't treat as educational programs for SACSCOC purposes. SACSCOC changed the definition of these "programs." SACSCOC doesn't gives us definition, but we must define as an institution what "significant & coherent" program would mean for us (see draft definition shared w/ the team). We have 47 degree pathways.

- (Edie) If all the "choose from courses" had a common outcome would it then be coherent?
    - (Darren) Under current definitions, then no. We will not go any further (outside of the proposed defined scope).

(Nichole) Overview of program pathways that fall within the new defined "significant & coherent." (see document).

(Cheryl) Questions on the proposed definitions?

- (Ravi) Comment on Bio.

Next Meeting Oct. 28th 3pm-5pm

Continue in Oct. Supporting LOA Template first submission reviews & Nov. Second submission reviews

Oct. Mtg. – Final preparations for Symposium

Oct. Mtg. – Next steps evaluating engagement & reflective processes

Nov. Mtg. – Next steps evaluating aligning changes to results & responding

Nov. Mtg – Collaborative data analysis preparations for supporting ALTs in spring

No Mtg. in Dec.