****

**Assessment Committee October 17, 2022**

**Attended:** Kelly Mercer, Jil Freeman, Ashley Sears, Lisa Nielson, Yvonne Smith, Dave Mount, Jason Kovac, Jennifer Bown, Elizabeth Carney

**Agenda Items:**

1. Updates
2. Faculty Roles and Responsibilities document
3. Committee membership
4. Homework for next time

**Updates**

* Goal is to get you a draft of the assessment section of the accreditation report by November 7th to review for discussion at our November 14th meeting. We will also have time Nov 28th (our last meeting of the term) for that and for discussion of how to communicate with and support faculty re the accreditation visit.
* Dave is serving as a faculty fellow for CTL this term doing assessment things and also a book club

**Faculty Roles and Responsibilities document**

Discussion/feedback. Do we want to approve this doc as a committee?

The doc could help further our culture of assessment. We need to keep building our culture. There are some folks who “get it” and others who don’t.

Who is our audience?

Where might this live in the future? Could something like this become a template for what committees use (thinking of our shared governance redesign work)? Think about how we use language and names. We could use a glossary--we need to promote a common language. Our understanding of the roles and expectation of faculty around assessment can provide a reasoning for the faculty-majority requirement of the Assessment Committee and can indicate the kind of expertise and experience needed for members of the committee.

This is about a college-wide culture of assessment and evaluation and it ties to our mission - not just academic assessment but evaluation is also expected of service areas, for example. Add some language about this?

The summary paragraphs at the top work

What legs do we have to stand on? Faculty job descriptions don’t necessarily mention assessment, though some recent ones are adding it (Math for example). The FTF contract does say something but not specific to program assessment. If those things aren’t there, that leaves us with good will but no way to “enforce” (other word?)

Where does culture come from? Where does change come from?

FYFE faculty do get introduced to assessment as part of Spring term focus on course design. Do talk some about aligning course outcomes with gen ed outcomes but don’t talk much about the process of program assessment.

Make sure we preserve time for faculty to participate in assessment. Could we carve out regular opportunities for departments to talk about assessment topics - honor with the time it needs at system level?

I hear that from my dept - about the time it takes, sometimes resentment. Some depts solve the issue by making it one person’s work to organize etc. Does having one person do most of the organizing work help or hinder a culture of assessment?

The assessment team lead is a role not acknowledged or articulated in any official way. In response to the accreditation Warning, administrators designated team leads. For many the team lead work just got folded into their existing role as program lead--new and more work. There are vacant gen ed team lead spots right now - in one case, at least, it might have something to do with the fact that there is no clear program or department that “owns” that area.

*We didn’t come to a decision about whether the Committee should officially approve this document and how it would get used. We will revisit at a later meeting.*

**Committee membership**

Membership as stated in the current committee charter, with comments in italics:

**Voting Members**

* **Committee Chair (the Assessment Coordinator)** *do we keep this role associated with a position?*
* **The Assessment Coaches**
	+ *We’ve shifted from three coaches year-round to faculty fellows in CTL on a term-by-term/project-by-project basis with a focus on some aspect of assessment. If Fellows change, is it okay to have someone as a member for one term only? Does it make sense for this to be a standing membership position?*
* **Faculty representation from each academic division in the college**
	+ *IEP: Elizabeth Carney, Jil Freeman*
	+ *AFAC: Lisa Nielson, Kelly Mercer, Dave Mount*
	+ *A&S: April Chastain, Jennifer Bown, MaryJean Williams*
	+ *TAPS: Yvonne Smith*
* **Faculty representation of general education assessment**
	+ *Kelly Mercer (Math/Computation), Dave Mount (Writing/Communication), Jennifer Bown (Science)*
* *Should we add a representation category for pre-college and academic support areas (ABE/GED, Library, ESOL, FYE)? Ask Library (Jil, E, Jason), ESOL, FYE*
* *Should we add a representation category for Associate Faculty/Part-time Faculty? YES*

**Non-voting Members**

* **Deans or Associate Deans to represent each academic division in the college**
	+ I*EP: Jason Kovac, Lisa Reynolds*
	+ *AFAC: vacant*
	+ *A&S: vacant*
	+ *TAPS: vacant*

*For deans and ADs in divisions other than IEP, maybe look to a consultative role or have them as folks we keep informed rather than being full members?*

* **Chair, ~~Instructional Support & Professional Development~~** *Center for Teaching and Learning*
* **Representation from Institutional Research** *Propose to change this from a membership position to a consultative role, as needed YES*

*We will revisit this discussion and decide on any edits to the committee charter.*

**Homework for next time**

On Moodle there is currently a resource for programs that they can use to self-assess the quality of their program assessment process: [NWCCU Rubric plus CCC Resources](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1SwidNh5nFkjBvkqLTztr4KAzDf3fJgcj/view?usp=sharing). But I thought the rubric could be more useful so I reviewed rubrics from different colleges and universities and drafted this:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1gk2C7rYh9XVlNhH2XB8SkaCYYDmGvIGNyeL4ZVa_7ZM/edit?usp=sharing>

Looking for any general feedback you want to offer, and specifically:

* Does this rubric reflect what the Committee sees as valuable program assessment?
* Are the categories (i.e. Culture of Assessment, Measurable Learning Outcomes, etc.) the ones that make sense? Are there things that aren’t covered that should be?
* Is the criteria language clear? Is the tone okay?
* Are the levels appropriate in their expectations and are they effectively spaced?
* For committee members who are faculty in programs: can you imagine this rubric being useful for your program?
* Jason, I’m particularly interested in your thoughts on the rubric about program assessment and program review – at the same time, since we’re looking to redesign the CQI system, I know that our expectations might change.

Your comments and questions about any of the above would be welcome. Could you review the draft by our next meeting, Oct 31st 🎃?