****

**Assessment Committee**, October 2, 2023

**Attended**: Martha Bailey, Jennifer Bown, Elizabeth Carney, Jil Freeman, Erin Gravelle, Jason Kovac, Kelly Mercer, Dave Mount, Lisa Nielson, Lisa Reynolds, Yvonne Smith, Aundrea Snitker

Agenda/Notes

1. **Info/Updates**:

Welcome new committee member: Aundrea Snitker

[Accreditation evaluators’ report](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1n2veaUCuU0eSsK0snIVNUXHxBcbRbA0a/view?usp=sharing)

1. **Discussion: By the end of this term, we should inform faculty what reporting will look like next Fall. We’ve been talking about making some adjustments to reporting now that we’re through Year Seven accreditation. Should changes be made now?**

* Discontinue the Alternate/Supplemental Report for 2024?
* Add anything new/restructure report, or wait until 2025?
* Pilot something with a handful of programs?

Larger goals that could factor into decisions about reporting:

1. Equity-centered assessment
2. Improvement of student learning
3. More consistent involvement of more faculty, both FTF and AF
4. Better use of student learning results to inform enterprise level planning/decisions

Jason/Elizabeth: A little background on our accreditation history…The 2016 Warning seemed to be based on the lack of a sufficient system, culture, and supports for program assessment.

Dave: Our assessment system back in the day was about fulfilling the letter but not the spirit of the requirement to assess (if you were teaching gen ed you would receive a prompt to enter in the number of students in your course who fulfilled the gen ed outcomes, with no shared understanding of what that meant, and the results went into a “black hole”).

Elizabeth: I’m excited to make changes now that we’re through accreditation, but I’m not going to be here Wi/Sp terms to help support faculty with any substantive changes to the assessment process and report/plan forms. We will have more limited support available. We (this committee) have talked about having a 2-year cycle that would more intentionally support planning and implementation of interventions to try to improve student learning. Our structure right now doesn’t provide enough support and space for that. Also the Continuous Quality Improvement team (Jason, Ashley Sears, Katrina Boone, Jeff Shaffer, Elizabeth) proposed an integrated two year cycle for all CQI elements (assessment, unit plans, budget) and the exec team is supportive. CQI team is working out the details about what it could look like. No exact timeline yet. In the meantime, for the assessment reports, perhaps a few programs could try an improvement plan/report as a pilot this year?

Martha: I like the idea of testing with a couple new programs.

Jennifer: Needs to be scaffolded. There’s too much room for ambiguity otherwise.

Jil: Yes to the idea of a longer cycle and to an intentional focus on improvement. As it is now folks are left to do changes individually. Would be interesting to do it in teams. Relates to accreditation Rec about higher level use of results. Work and build: capacity building. Multiply impact.

Eliz: Yes, and gen ed teams have been working in larger groups--multi dept etc--but could use more college-level structure and support to leverage..

Martha: with two years, time to assess, work out change, convey it, implement, and measure, and report on entire process

Lisa R: Are there some programs that have found an effective way to work on a one-year cycle? Force them to do two-year? Maybe some programs need time to plan for a two year before they start?

Jason: Some benefits to having cycle/reporting in lockstep across programs, such as our ability to support programs.

Elizabeth: Could be that programs get a choice of whether to report assessment results or report on an improvement plan and improvement results. Don’t know if it would make sense to get that choice every year or once every so many years. I’ve been wondering if we can think of Program Review as the frame. Maybe they can do an improvement project (and submit a plan and report on it) once per PR cycle. Say a program goes up for PR every 6 years. We can support them in assessment throughout as we do now, but be more purposeful in providing a midpoint checkpoint and a more substantive review at year six that could include a touchpoint with the Assessment Committee.

Yvonne: Doing program assessment in one-person programs can be a workload challenge.

Martha: Assessment should be part of the faculty job description, we should be held accountable. Figure out a way to normalize it and make it part of the job.

Yvonne: I agree that it’s a workload issue- and the load is different depending if you’re in math or the only gerontology instructor.

Kelly: We did propose a course release this year that was approved.

Dave: I have something like a release for Writing assessment.

Jason: Kelly, Dave, and Elizabeth should meet to discuss.

Jason, Aundrea: [re: getting course-release for large assessment workload] Need to support the work equitably.

Elizabeth: We need to figure out what goes into the assessment workload- is it how many students in the program, how many degrees you have, certs and/or degrees, etc.

Jil: In the last FTF Senate meeting, there was a discussion about inequities around how committees count toward the FTF committee work requirement. So there is a larger conversation brewing about equity and workload.

Eliz: The shadow of accreditation drove what we were doing since 2016, now we can claim some space to do some thinking about what might work. Discussion to be continued!

1. Discussion: In the last few years, the A&L assessment team has struggled to find leadership and the CL team, while it has a lead currently, hasn’t been able to find enough team members. Do the characteristics of these gen ed areas (involving multiple departments, for example) raise particular challenges and are there different ways to think about supporting/organizing that leadership and work?