

**Meeting Date:** November 15, 2021

**Assessment Committee**

Attended: Jennifer Bown, Elizabeth Carney, Jil Freeman, Shalee Hodgson, Jason Kovac, Kelly Mercer, Dave Mount, Lisa Nielson, Ashley Sears, Mary Jean Williams

Guests: James Bryant-Trerise

**Meta-rubric for assessment**

Many colleges use a “meta-rubric” to evaluate the program assessment process. We’ll look at a few examples and talk about if/how such a rubric review could benefit us.

Currently CTL provides this rubric for programs to self-evaluate their assessment plan/process:

<https://online.clackamas.edu/mod/resource/view.php?id=1558053>

We looked at the NWCCU Rubric for Student Learning - Standards 1.C.1-1.C.9

<https://nwccu.org/tools-resources/institutions/accreditation-handbook/>  - see table of contents and click on Appendix C or go to page 61

Specifically we looked at the criteria and levels for 1.C.2 and 1.C.5.. We’ll continue with 1.C.6 and 1.C.7 at our next meeting.

We discussed these questions:

1. Do the criteria descriptions make sense? Is anything unclear?
2. At what level would you rate CCC on this standard in the rubric and why?
3. What evidence could we show for this rating, if any?
4. What problems would indicate that this criterion is not well developed at CCC?
5. Other comments or questions?





Discussion of 1.C.2

* Curriculum Committee is making new efforts to make curriculum review more accountable related to this – for gen ed courses to be clearer about how course is designed to meet intended learning outcomes.
* This is not institutionalized and we have no way to capture. Not a lot of guidance. We need to think about how to make more meaningful.
* Students are taking more courses than they need to with more prereqs. We tend to air on the side of caution, so it’s not very often that students don’t take a prereq. (Math)
* How much is gen ed covered in other places, outside of gen ed courses? Are students taking stuff they don’t need to take? We need to provide structure and support for reasons why to require what they require. Accounting is an example—they ask what skills students really need and why prereqs should exist. They change prereqs as needed based on those questions.
* There can be such a domino effect of changing the pre-reqs.
* Is “performance targets” about within a course or within a sequence?
* What is the role of learning outcomes in pre req discussion and support?



Discussion of 1.C.5

* We haven’t kicked back into assessment vigor since the pandemic began.
* We’ve done a lot to assess at a program level but we’re not necessarily assessing all courses.
* This is a maturity model rubric – the last stage (level) is a meta stage about strategy optimization.
* Some departments would place in one stage and others in other stage - are you going to go with the majority because there are always stragglers?
* Even the initial level is a bit concerning to me--I don't think we can confirm all "programs" assess learning for all of the courses that meet requirements in their program.

**Gen-ed Subcommittee**

What are our needs/desires for gen-ed assessment that an Assessment sub-committee might help with?

* Connection to the state. A committee could help because it’s a lot of labor to coordinate for an individual. Having a group that is talking to the state and understanding what’s going on…state and four-year partners. Some of this might be outside of the bounds of assessment.
* As a bridge committee between assessment and curriculum.
* Communication and coordination of Transfer and CTE general education.
* There’s no instructional body currently and the venues are not adequate at this point. As a result of shared governance planning there could emerge an instructional super committee. Current committees such as Curriculum and Assessment Committee could sit under that. This committee can advocate for needs that don’t have advocacy in any other places.
* Conversations and planning around schedule and approach to gen ed outcomes assessment.
* Wisdom sharing between gen ed assessment teams—what works and what has been challenging.
* A body to help with strategy and resources for solving gen ed assessment challenges that are beyond the scope of any one gen ed assessment team.