**Assessment Committee Minutes**

Date: 11.3.17| Begin: 1:30 p.m. End: 3:00 p.m. | Location: M226

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Desired Meeting Outcome** | **Minutes** |
| **The Mission Fulfillment Committee has requested that we recommend Mission Fulfillment Indicator Targets for assessment – begin addressing this request** | **Review CCC’s Mission Fulfillment Indicators and discuss potential criteria and evidence for assessment system quality –** At the last meeting the committee spent time looking at the charter, their roles, and what they value. They discussed looking at the bigger picture, making recommendations around policies and defining assessment for the college. We want to encourage a culture of engagement around teaching, assessment, and learning while maintaining the ownership of faculty-led assessment.  Our first task in terms of looking at that big pictures and making recommendations will start today. We have been asked by the Mission Fulfillment Committee to do some thinking about what evidence tells us that we have an effective assessment system. We will look at the core themes and the mission as we talk about our indicators for assessment. We are not going to defining targets and pick language at this point.  Our core themes are meant to essentially serve our mission. Our task around our students focus on the Academic Transfer and Career & Technical Education (CTE) areas which has the most assessment underneath them. Elizabeth distributed a document that included the Academic Transfer and CTE core themes and the indicators. She pointed out that both indicators, 1.1 and 1.2 have similar language and speak to assessment.  What you have seen so far that we have done with program assessment that has been worthwhile, useful or valuable? (below notes from the discussion)  Norming conversations were very useful; Conversation/Collaboration was structured with rubric – common structure and values; Structured; Define common structure value; Talking about Curriculum; Wisdom Sharing; Alignment, outcomes; Common goals how we get there; What we teach and why; Connections between departments; Backward design or alignment; Interdisciplinary – valuable; Faculty learning from other faculty; Bigger picture of college level; Fresh perspective --- feedback from outside departments; New interest in course design; Increased focus and motivation around improvement effort  Don’t want you our faculty to comply - our job is to keep that in mind. Assessment, if we only see it as measuring achievement in the narrowest sense, then we are not situating it within this larger system of teaching and learning. Compliance based is damaging to organization in terms of continuous improvement. When you set a compliance level, people just reach want to know what is expected.  We are the language builders.  National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA)  NILOA Perspectives  Elizabeth presented an article, “Assessment in a Learning Systems Paradigm,” which summarized the framing value around learning and how assessment fit within that. The student experience is disconnected many ways, and this resonates with us this year in terms of our guide pathways initiative. The article states, “We have hear problems with transfer, the fragmented experience in General Education, disconnects with cocurricular and the curricular, and lack of integration or connection between academic courses taken from semester to semester or term to term.” What would a system look like where we are able to integrate the different aspects of student’s experiences? What would we need to understand? There are lots of national initiatives that are recognizing the same things such as assessment, guided pathways, and college readiness. Identify these four elements that they think are part of paradigm: Consensus-based, Alignment, Learner-centeredness, Communication  People assembled into groups, were assigned a section to read, and were asked later to share answers to the following questions:   1. Does the element resonate? 2. Is an assessment system reflected the element what would the system look like?   Summary: What did you take from this? What is this element of this paradigm about and then how do you see this connection to assessment systems? (below notes from the discussion)  *Consensus-based:* Critical thinking examples - We agree that it’s valued; Opportunities for getting shared understanding; Faculty led; Diverse representation; Institutional outcomes with shared process to develop; Shared understanding of academic freedom and responsibility  *Alignment*: Learning isn’t a linear process; Show students have learned in many different ways; Institutional outcomes; Shared definition of alignment; Other dimensions; Course mapping - outcomes mapping - curriculum  *Learner-centeredness*: Assessment with students not to them - such as focus groups; Web is curricular and co-curricular; Equity; Portfolios – reflection opportunities which is connected with *Alignment* (in order to be successful); Flexibility – ways to demonstrate outcomes  *Communication*: Web – Multiple directions, interactions; Value proposition - guided pathways; Relationship between service and academic assessment work. |
| **Identify how other Oregon colleges are approaching assessment; challenges and lessons learned** | **Share-out from Oregon Assessment Institute, October 27, 2017 –** Lisa Reynolds, Mary Jean Williams and David Mount attended the first organized collection from Oregon community colleges around assessment. David’s notes and the PowerPoints from the conferences are on the shared drive. Lori Sours presentation, “From Mapping to Assessment,” was impressive. She shared her process for assessing an entire program from beginning to end. It was detailed, comprehensive, organized and insightful. The process put the faculty in the driver’s seat to determine that the streamlining of the curriculum wasn’t coming from outside, it was coming from the faculty who owned the programs to make a more coherent program. When the college is ready to take it to that level, we will want to pull up her presentation and look again. Her link is included on the shared drive, and Elizabeth will follow up to make sure that we are able to access her PowerPoint from the presentation. We seem to be in line with other colleges who are talking about course level assessment and the difficulties with assessing the AAOT distribution areas. Quite a discussion about the difference between institutional outcomes and program outcomes. Yes, program outcomes and GenEd outcomes sometimes end up sometimes looking identical, but there should be a difference between program and GenEd outcomes. Discussion also on legislation was about common course outcomes rather than common course numbering. |
| **Present** | Elizabeth Carney (chair), Beth Hodgkinson (recorder), Dustin Bates, Jil Freeman, Darlene Geiger, Donna Larson, Kelly Mercer, Dave Mount, Lisa Nielson, Lisa Reynolds, Lisa Anh Wang, Mary Jean Williams |