**Assessment Committee Meeting 11-4-24**

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

Welcome new committee member, Becky Ellison!

**Request from the Teaching and Learning Council**

Email from David Plotkin and Carol Burnell:

*We have a request that the Assessment Committee please answer the following three questions, in the form of a proposal for the Teaching and Learning Council to consider:*

*1. What work does the Assessment Committee do that does not need Teaching and Learning Council oversight or approval?*

*2. What work does the Assessment Committee do that requires Teaching and Learning Council oversight or approval?*

*3. What work does the Assessment Committee do that requires oversight or approval from the Shared Governance Oversight Group or the Board of Education, if any?*

*We are wanting to honor the spirit of the shared governance redesign that allows decisions to be made at appropriate levels.*

How soon do they want a response? As soon as possible, at the end of fall term at the latest. Their next meeting is Dec 6.

T&L Council webpage: <https://webappsrv.clackamas.edu/committees/TLC/>

DISCUSSION

Most of what we do is in the category of not needing oversight/decision from Council

Reframe the question: What might the T&L council do for us and the issues that come up?

We can give recommendations but we’re not empowered to fix some of the problems we identify. At the same time, we don’t want to hand it off and say “solve this” without faculty input.

Workload issue - should that go to T&L, go to deans?

There’s no lack of knowledge that there is a capacity issue, so we’re left with sense that there is not an urgency to address it

Could this group elevate the issue of capacity for assessment work?

Council might not be in a position to help with anything until later this academic year

Advocating for resource allocation perhaps - helpful for there to be release time for assessment leads that’s consistent across departments for example

In our response, let’s give a couple of examples of things we don’t need oversight about.

Report review synthesis should go to T&L Council. And maybe also to the Oversight Council. One intent of shared governance is that we don’t want things decided in a vacuum. There are things that come from our assessment work that should inform college operations and student learning, so both T&L and Oversight should be see synthesis.

T&L Council priorities not yet defined and they haven’t started functioning as they will--developing, learning. It’s easier to add and harder to take away, so we should err on the side of promising less in terms of Assessment Committee reporting and oversight to T&L, until we get a feel for how T&L Council will function.

**College requirements for number of outcomes assessed and when**

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

DISCUSSION:

Relate the timeframe to program review or other meaningful timeframe, rather than “each year” X number of outcomes…

What we never have enough time for in the one-year cycle is doing research to inform a change in curriculum or teaching.

What if the expectation is around use of assessment, or engaging in an effective inquiry cycle, rather than a specific number of outcomes or other specific product? Goal is inquiry and improvement.

Meaningful improvement takes multiple terms or years.

Years spent in meaningful learning support/improvement seems like time well spent.