**Assessment Committee October 21, 2024**

Attended: Martha Bailey, Elizabeth Carney, Jil Freeman, Kelly Mercer, Lisa Reynolds, Ashley Sears, Yvonne Smith, Aundrea Snitker, Amy Warren

NOTES

**Ad Hoc Accreditation Visit (not on our original agenda)**

Any questions about Ad Hoc accreditation visit? NWCCU evaluators asked to meet with faculty from the Assessment Committee (David sent out email today)

Discussion:

What’s happened since the last accreditation visit?

* Implementation this Fall of the two-year cycle for assessment reporting (the design of which was in the works for at least a year before the Year 7 visit in April 2023)
* In past years, the Assessment Coordinator would provide for the committee a summary of themes in the reports along with a small sample of reports to illustrate the themes she had identified. Last year, each person in the committee read a sample of reports and did the work of identifying themes and, for the first time, the review process to include the VP and deans. The synthesis of this process was written up and provided to the Budget Advisory Group (BAG). [did it go anywhere else?]

Continuing work and challenges

**Report Review Process**

Context: Elizabeth and Katrina Boone will meet with deans group on Nov 5th to discuss the review process. What should Elizabeth bring as the Committee’s needs/desires for the joint review?

For Reference:

* Moodle page 2023 review:<https://online.clackamas.edu/course/view.php?id=87109>
* FInal Report 2023: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qmC374I_cKLPhx6koq7HLI-7YI4P_UlJ/view?usp=drive_link>
* Compiled Review Comments 2023: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1QzuOrmm0JPMfmds-pa2s7f8kcoDICz4YEYFOhF0sZCw/edit?usp=sharing>
* Last year’s purpose:

Our goal is to explore what we can learn from academic and service area assessment reports that could inform high-level college planning. We will look for themes and insights that we can synthesize and share with the Budget Advisory Group and other groups involved in high-level planning at the College such as strategic planning teams. The Assessment Committee will use the results of this review to inform its support of the assessment process, as it has in past years when it has done its own review of reports.

Purpose of review this year?: What do we want to know? How do we want to use the results of the review?

Discussion:

Would like to see a link back to us. After it goes to BAG or elsewhere (such as Councils), I would like to have some feedback or circle back in some way. What is happening with that information (the results of our report review--synthesis) and where is it being used? Otherwise, it’s a black hole. Great if we were not just reporting up but also getting something back.

For years (before 2016?) the question was who is looking at this assessment? We are now looking at the program level and getting feedback at the program level but there’s still the question of whether/if anything is happening with it above the program level.

Makes sense that some of this (report review results) would go to the Teaching & Learning Council.

It’s still murky about what a council will do versus what decisions the administration makes. Doesn’t sound like councils are shaping strategic planning right now. [how does program assessment work inform or connect to strategic planning? Seems most related to Excellence in Equitable Teaching and Learning strategic area]

Was assessment data used in proposing new programs? It’s not clear how assessment data is being used in that way and what impact that might have on student needs.

Also we’ve (Assessment Committee) consistently reported capacity issues. No evidence that that issue is being taken seriously or considered in decisions above us.

Looking at what BAG used to evaluate different areas (operations, students, etc)... Last year, none of the items that made it to BAG appeared to come from an academic area to support needs related to any kind of assessment. How are academic needs for things like release time or new microscopes usually handled? Is BAG where those go?

What processes do you think report review results should be embedded in that it’s not?

Release time

* What is the decision-making process for release time? Who is making the decision? So hard to know where we would provide that info? At what level is the decision made?
* Deans: what instances lead to release time and what is prioritized for release time decisions?
* Release time or dollars can be needed to help folks implement improvements that are identified through learning outcomes assessment.
* What sort of change is big enough or intensive enough to require extra time and resources?

Program development or significant program changes are big and intensive.

Potential budget cuts and redesign - all should be informed by assessment

Guided Pathways

* We’re not assessing how well guided pathways is going -- larger structural issues such as that.
* What does an EFA mean now for CCC, and what would EFA assessment look like?
* How does student learning change or benefit from an organization’s structure or a change in structure?

Larger initiatives - is assessment informing our adoption or is it something we are just jumping on the bandwagon? Anytime we are doing structural improvement work or anything that will impact instructional decisions that impact students - anytime changing department orgs etc

Challenges/needs:

* Seen data used in multiple ways and sometimes data seems to be used to fit the stories we need to tell or the decision that’s already been made.
* Skills and knowledge about how assessment results should be used effectively - best practices
* The way SA assessment has been done makes it easier to speak to in the budget. Learning assessment is a much more nuanced connection to budget - so leaders learning how to do that work is important.
* Without institutional level outcomes it makes it very difficult to look at what students are getting here on a holistic level. Can our core competencies (gen ed outcomes for transfer and CTE) be used that way effectively?

Action Item: Elizabeth will bring questions to the deans group based on this discussion, such as What sort of information would you need to inform the decisions you make?

*We didn’t get to the next part below…*

Last year’s Questions that guided the review:

* + **1. What strengths, gaps, or challenges are mentioned by more than one reporting team? What do they say about those strengths, gaps, or challenges?** Consider the *results/data* from the assessment as well as the *process* of doing assessment. Examples: more than one program’s assessment results show that students demonstrate poor teamwork skills; more than one program/unit mentions an effective strategy they’ve used to gain more faculty or staff participation in assessment work.  
    2. **What else stands out to you after reading the reports that you think could be useful for the larger group to discuss?** Consider our goal of using results to inform high-level college planning.  
    3. **What questions are left unanswered by the report templates?** What information could help the college better support assessment and student learning that doesn’t show up in the sample you read? Are there any questions that need to be added to reports?  
    4. **Do you have any other questions or comments?**

*Questions to guide the review this year?*

**Expectations about Program-level Learning Outcomes**

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/10OF9cPhg9ZmDqOrkle5XE_1t29_cOePzcyonli4XATk/edit?usp=sharing>