**A-team Notes for Th, May 21**

**Present:** Sue Goff, Dave Mount, Jackie Flowers, Stephen Brouwers, Eden Francis, Steffen Moller, Jim Martineau, Yvonne Smith

**Updates:**

-- College Council Recharge Committee

Houston, we have liftoff: we have been approved as a committee and will have a committee site

--Course Analysis Pilot project

teams from Eng, Comm, Hist, Soc are having great discussions

CLC event about info literacy grew out of a discussion in both Eng and Comm

**Presentations:**

Suzanne Munro, ESL, shared the way the department gathers resources for each multi-section course to share with all instructors of that course. They have a folder on the I-drive which is accessible off and on campus. Within each, there is a folder for each class. In the class folder, they have a file labeled “Guidelines,” which includes sections for before, during and end of course, for the syllabus, and for activities that have been particularly successful in the class. All instructors are encouraged to add to this file, and to include great assignments in the folder. Because ESL is offered on two campuses using many part-time instructors, they find this method of sharing resources really helpful. Dave suggested that they could do the same thing on Google. He also suggested the use of Facebook, which the English Department uses to share folders and files and to discuss classroom issues. The ESL department uses FB for professional development purposes.

Yvonne Smith, HS chair, described the process she used to engage her advisory group in program review. She asked them what PLO the department should focus on this year, and they chose interviewing skills. Together the faculty and the advisory group developed a rubric to assess that PLO. She handed out the rubric to her students when the quarter began. She and Jean Devenney recorded all the mock interviews at the end of the course and scored them. They shared the results with the students and the advisory group. From this experience they will change a few things: the students were exceptionally nervous when two faculty were in the interviews (which surprised the two faculty); therefore, if they record the interviews next year, the two faculty will not be in the room. In addition, they found that the content in the class was too much, and they will offer a separate 3-credit class on interviewing next year. Someone suggested that students were included in a peer review/rubric.

**Discussion:**

--software subcommittee (Eden, Sue, Steffen, Kate, Kelly Mercer, Bob Delgatto, BJ, Stephen)

--\*\*selected SPOL

--how to communicate the decision and what the software will offer us

--for entire SPOL presentation, click [HERE](https://www.dropbox.com/s/acd7huleqymoevt/2015-03-17_SPOL_Clackamas_Community_College.wmv?dl=0)

--Kate showed highlights (8:22-12; 15:56-19)

Dave suggested that we start with the end result, emphasize what discussions the software will allow us to have. Yvonne said that we need to communicate soon because the word is already out, and there has already been dissatisfaction with SPOL in the innovation grant applications. We will need to overcome that first impression.

Jim Martineau suggested that departments who are ready should go ahead and start using SPOL for program review.

\*\*The A-team recommends that those who are ready and willing to go ahead once SPOL is set up.

\*\*The A-team also recommends that the course analysis pilot folks start using it. (Dave said he could use it when he teaches a course this summer.)

Eventually, the blueprints will be done on SPOL. Can SPOL replace the current Gen Ed system this spring? Jackie suggested that we use an academic year’s worth of data.

--Program review form:

\*\*The A-team approved the new form approved for program review. (“Draft” can be removed.)

--Assessment Coaches

--3 nominations came in

--steering committee met and discussed

--more discussion ahead with the nominees’ department chairs and deans

--Web resources: Moodle Assessment Resources site & Clackamas.edu site & A-team committee site

--peer review role for A-team

The A-team was very clear in NOT wanting to have a role in evaluating program or course analysis. The reasons for the A-team to review course and program analysis would be to:

--discover trends in student learning

--look for areas in which professional development would be useful

--assess our assessment methods and communication

--look holistically at programs, services, teaching and learning