Lincoln Land Community College

Academic Assessment Team Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: November 21, 2016	**Location:** Stephens Room
Meeting Time: 3:30 p.m.	**Chair:** Carmen Allen
Purpose: Monthly Meeting	

Membership in Attendance: Victor Broderick, Jason Dockter, Brian Early, Elaine Guthals, Wendy Howerter, Tricia Kujawa, David Leitner, Cynthia Maskey, Katie McAfee, Jennie O'Malley, Adrienne Range, Ryan Roberts, Colin Suchland, and Cindy Smock. Student members: Jonathan Davis/Cody Ross
Absent: Sharon Cheek, Richard Monke
Support Staff: Pam Daniel

Approve meeting agenda: Elaine Guthals moved to approve, Colin Suchland seconded. All approved.

Summary of October Indianapolis Assessment Institute brief reports (Colin, David, Jennie and Elaine)

Colin shared that he had two major takeaways… rubrics rule, and we should be doing more as an institution to encourage more rubric development and implementation. This should be done because it allows for the process of course, to program and to gen ed to be more explicit; it should be a practice and protocol – a good habit to get into. The other major takeaway was that despite the idea that technology saves us, that institutional planning and meetings are so much more important – getting people together into the same room and on the same page to discuss and progress is absolutely necessary. At the Institute, he spent time visiting with TK20 and AFIS vendors, (Nov. 30th of meeting scheduled for Colin, and if he likes it he will schedule a session for the larger group.) Meeting with TK20 was scheduled for this week but fell through due to schedule issues; the demo will be rescheduled.

David Leitner shared that his takeaway was the importance of getting students involved in assessment. For example, at the beginning of a course a teacher shares the course outcomes with students, and then asks the students how well do your personal goals match up with the course outcomes – thereby sparking internal motivation. During the course, instructors can tag each assignment to the outcome, so students can make the connection of "why are we doing this." At end of the course, students can use assessment to summarize and reinforce what they know how to do (since they don't usually seem to remember).

Carmen asked the student members if they had been made aware of outcomes in their classes. Cody Ross said that he was not made aware. Jonathan Davis said that his instructor, Mr. Leitner, had made him aware of what they would be learning in class, and the outcomes were listed in the syllabus. Jonathan shared that most students won't go back and look at the syllabus after the first day, and that they are not aware of how assignments are connected to the course outcomes. Carmen said that we as teachers need to do a much more effective job at making sure students know why they are in the course, learning what they will get out of it when they are finished.

Jennie pointed out that this also relates to the gen ed competencies linked to each course. She shared that during a student panel held at the conference, all of the students said that no critical thinking occurred in gen ed courses – that it only occurred in the upper-level, program courses. Jennie shared that she was shocked that students are not aware of what they are learning in their gen ed courses. As

a follow up, Carmen asked the student members to define what critical thinking is. Jonathan stated that it's the use of metacognition to work your way through certain problems and answer questions like this one. Carmen reaffirmed that learning is about learning, making the point that we as teachers need to build these type of bridges with our students, so that they are aware of what we are doing in the classroom and why. It was recognized that it is because of discussions like this that students should be members of teams like this one.

Colin stated that, while he hates to beat the word rubric to death, there is an overtness of process that he now appreciates. In his SOC classes, he just started implementing rubrics and feels that it helps the entire learning process. With using rubrics, he is more explicit about telling students what they need to do and they are therefore better able to meet the immediate objective… like getting a good grade. If he tags the rubric outcomes to the course outcomes, he can easily see how what is done in each class allows him to measure what is accomplished in the course. Jonathan said he has used rubrics to go over testes and see how he did on classes. Adrienne Range shared that she hasn't found where in her classes that she can apply a rubric. With this perspective, Carmen suggested that we should continue this conversation.

At the Assessment Institute, Jennie focused on groups that are implementing new things on their campus, specifically things being used in schools for communication – with all players. Planning was her other focus, and recognizing that we while we have a lot of processes planned out, we need to be documenting what is being done for the Systems Portfolio. She also looked at sustainable assessment structures, in case key people are suddenly no longer around.

Elaine's takeaway from the conference includes a quote "Faculty alone cannot do assessment, administrators alone should not do assessment." She learned that assessment has not typically been built into the curriculum. She also learned that there is a need for a two-tier rubric in programs, courses and gen ed, what are our levels for success for students. For example: Tier one – shows how this class assignment ties to the course outcome/tier two – shows the general criteria for the individual. Jennie will bring a two-tier rubric example to the next assessment meeting.

Colin points out that the challenge is tagging these together. The assessment tool should be built into the course. Gen Ed rubric –> Program rubric –> Course rubric –> Assignment rubric

Assessment Team Workgroups

Technology Package (Colin)
The assessment tools we are investigating have a "data-handshake" with Blackboard. AFIS (The **A**ssessment, **E**valuation, **F**eedback & **I**ntervention **S**ystem) claims that their assessment tools can be imbedded into Blackboard, so that it is native in the assignment creation process. The caveat is then every instructor would then need to use Blackboard.

Institutional Improvement Day (Jennie)
The survey closed for IID, the data now needs to be analyzed.
Starting in January, instead of having three workgroups, we will move to having one training workgroup to ensure consistency.

Assessment Orientation (Carmen)
The online assessment training course has become our orientation piece. Carmen recently presented the online training to the faculty senate, to get the word out about the Blackboard course. Not everyone currently has access to it, but if they are interested, they should let Carmen or Jennie know via email.

Assessment Philosophy (David)
The team met and did some brainstorming. They will be looking at the charter from shared governance and will report back.

Steering Workgroup Report (Jennie)
The steering Workgroup is working on GEAR. GEAR emails for Information Fluency and Quantitative/Scientific Reasoning were sent out last week to faculty asking them to participate. Faculty will have until next Monday to reply as to their interested in participating. It was Jennie's intention to send a video of one of the sessions delivered at Professional Development day, but YouTube proved to be a problematic. The video would show what the process is all about and how to apply the rubric to assignments. Some people are already agreeing to participate in GEAR, and Jennie will let the Assessment Team know in January how many people say yes. Communication and Technology will be the GEAR outcomes assessed next year.

The Pilot group is helping us determine how we can give faculty feedback on the program or course assessment that they have submitted. The AQIP team created a matrix to provide feedback for program assessment materials; a similar one was developed for course materials. The program process will work with DACs and Deans reviewing the assessment information, then the Dean will return the feedback to faculty.

For course feedback, we will try something similar to GEAR - the DACs as a group will be doing a blind review of CASRs, individual faculty will get group feedback on a course matrix form. Carmen hopes there will be less pushback, as fellow faculty will be doing the review. A few faculty requested Dean feedback, so deans will be invited to their review.

Office of Academic Effectiveness Report (Jennie and Elaine)
The Office of Academic Effectiveness (OAE) recently held a retreat where we worked on our plan for next year. Identifying roles of key players, including the Assessment Team and DACs, is in process. Elaine found that the OAE needs to get the foundation in place before we can start planning for five years from now.

Elaine added that OAE is doing a college-wide outcome update, as course and program outcomes will be included in Blackboard. The OAE will be sending out an Excel spreadsheet to faculty in the spring, to ask if the course outcomes in CurricUNET are correct; It is essentially an outcomes audit. Blackboard has a way to tag outcomes to assignments in Blackboard.

PDD Report (Jennie)
Jennie reports that the assessment sessions she attended or facilitated went well. She will be reviewing the feedback to determine takeaways for the PPD group.

Jennie shared that the Pilot is going well but is concerned how we can roll this out to the entire campus. The Pilot participants are working on their first course assessment and will replicate the process for a second course in the Spring. There is a plan to invite more faculty into the Pilot for the new course assessment process next year.

Carmen shared that there was a discussion at Faculty senate about assessment, during which several members stated that they were not sure that assessment should be part of PDD. Overall, however, the senate was pleased in the offerings at PDD. Ryan shared that he knows that many faculty do not include assessment in their teaching, and thus do not see the value of including it in PDD offerings.

Jennie shared that institutions that have successfully moved forward in assessment have incorporated it into professional development. Ryan shared that it needs to become part of the culture shift at the college. He went on to say that development and assessment are part of the teaching process. Victor asserted that if faculty is interested in discussing and asking for assessment, it should be included.

Cody asked, "who is the group that do not want assessment to be part of PPD, and why are they saying that it should not be included?" The explanation surprised him greatly, not understanding how it could be considered something that is undesirable. Colin asserted that the perception is that it is a measure of how good a teacher is, instead of much a student is learning. It is a matter of academic freedom, and a pushback for autonomy/ creativity of the classroom. The assumption is that this is coming from above, and Colin pointed out that it is partially an accreditation agency requirements – there are things that we, as an institution, need to report. But on the other hand, faculty who want to be better teachers see that assessment can help us do that. It is a buy-in problem, and the Assessment Team wants to make assessment a more meaningful process.

Assessment Proficiency Program (Jennie)
Participants are also working on course assessment. Elaine and Jennie met with the new faculty and realized that the APP was built for existing faculty, not for new faculty. The curriculum did not match with what new faculty needed to learn, causing them to be really overwhelmed. This means some major timeline adjustments and possibly some of the tasks that participants are asked to do (to balance out what is done in both fall and spring semesters).

Meeting adjourned at 4:30

Future Meeting Dates:
January 23, 2017
February 20
March 20
April 17
May 8