****

**General Education Assessment Subcommittee, Nov. 22, 2022**

**Attended**: John Phelps, Kelly Mercer, Derek Lougee, Martha Bailey, Chris Konieczka, Dave Mount, Lisa Reynolds, Kari Hiatt, Elizabeth Carney

**Agenda**:

1. Accreditation next steps
	1. Timeline/plans for finishing the report (due Feb. 6) and prepping for the evaluation visit (April 3-5)
	2. What sort of prep, questions, concerns come to mind regarding the visit?
2. Discuss the Year Seven accreditation report current draft, [online here](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1KQJ-y3yrPkS2aK5oJj7SMbTnWTJtkfe1csM3ChfFK9I/edit?usp=sharing). We also have a progress report on related instruction assessment, [online here](https://docs.google.com/document/d/19xQFmY-3iia9pBQQqyEMJ4KrbcNh0G4LpoEZWMOpqbk/edit?usp=sharing).

Notes about reviewing:

* For the main Year Seven report, we’ll discuss Standards 1.C.2 through 1.C.7 with particular focus on 1.C.6. which is about general education assessment (see the table of contents—you can hover and click right to that place in the document).
* Don’t worry overmuch about wordsmithing at this point. The feedback I’m looking for at this stage is more about “this concept feels underdeveloped,” and less about word choice and punctuation.
* The [rubrics from the NWCCU Accreditation Handbook](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1PqzDeiwMYAaTFc-ll5mP27bVGyW8lClu/view?usp=share_link) may be a useful reference point, in identifying what (if any) concepts need additional oomph in our draft. I’ve attached those excerpted pages from the Handbook to this email.
* Please use “Insert a Comment” to leave your feedback, or use the Google Doc “Suggesting” mode to add new language within the draft itself.

Discussion Questions:

* What seems effective?
* What could be improved?
* Questions? Points of confusion?

**Discussion Notes**

No specific questions or concerns regarding the visit at this time.

We’ve done a lot! It’s helpful to see it all written down in the report.

There is a lot of jargon though.

You get the impression that related instruction is no longer required, though we are still having to report on it.

When communicating out with the College about Year Seven, we may need to clarify that related instruction is still part of the gen ed assessment expectation for accreditation

The examples were good, but it felt like reading the same examples many times--between sections in the main report. However, this is understandable given the structure of the report (addressing Standards that overlap in separate sections means there is some repetition). The examples are clear though.

Noticed the AACU rubrics mentioned - I didn’t know about these rubrics and didn’t realize some gen ed teams use them.

1.C.5 last paragraph: I worry that it doesn’t show we are serious and have specific plan--it’s very general. What is it that makes this true for us? Seems there is more we could show.

Maybe the last paragraph could more specifically call out some of the things we’ve already mentioned in the report and connect them to the general plan/aspiration discussed there.

Maybe mention leveraging the new Courseleaf system as one specific goal related to that paragraph.

Yes, but at the same time, the current tone of the paragraph makes sense given that the report is mostly backward looking.

I personally would like to see a more central approach to assessment at the College. It feels like each group is floating in its own boat, rather than us all being a well functioning armada. We are captains of our boats but we need an admiral. I’m not sure about the right amount of centralization and admiral-type leadership though.

There’s no college-level system or expectation around using/connecting your program to larger data. It’s almost incumbent upon a program if they want to synthesize with other data--such as with EYES. Dictating top-down using data points is not necessarily the approach, however (because, among other issues, data will mean something different for different people/programs). But we do need to know from upper leadership what the expectations are.

For Associate Faculty it feels that assessment is happening around us but not with us. Some AF think assessment does not necessarily relate to what they’re teaching. We’re hanging around on the fringes. There were conversations and there was momentum building, including/among AF Faculty, before the pandemic and they stalled with the pandemic. We need to figure out how to re-engage and re-envision now.

We don’t need top-down structure, but we need top-down guidance…this would help with AF involvement among other issues.