

## Academic Assessment Committee (AAC) Meeting

February 11, 2016, 12:00-1:00pm, Cook Hall 121

*Present:* Rashid Aidun, Paul Bowdre, Renee Campbell, Jondavid DeLong, Ken Erickson, Marela Fiacco, Kirk Jones, Doug Scheidt, Jennifer Sovde, Sarah Todd, Jennifer Waite,

*Missing:* Patrick Casselman, Tatsuhito Koya, Mike Newtown, Molly Mott, Wil Rivers, Rachel Santos, Christine Thompson,

The meeting was convened at 12:00 p.m.

- I. Guiding Principles of Student Learning Outcome Assessment Draft
  - a. Sarah wrote up some guiding principles. The draft is a combination of faculty recommendations and Sarah's personal thoughts. One item was completely opposite the faculty recommendation – funding will be based on assessment outcomes.
  - b. Just GER policies have been developed in the Policies sub-committee, but nothing set in stone.
  - c. All the policies should be incorporated into one document.
  - d. On the second page, it states “Assessment results are never to be used for any personnel decisions”.
  - e. It is important to note that this is a rough draft and will require a lot of discussion and revision.
  - f. There was discussion about policies vs. guiding principles. It was decided that the two should be separate sections or even documents. To come up with the guiding principles, Middle States Standard 5 should be referred to.
  - g. This is a great first draft, thank you, Sarah!
  - h. More information needs to be included about the cycle, a lot is left out.
  - i. There was discussion about how to revise SLO's, both course and program. Course SLO's should be reviewed and changed on a three-year cycle, or through the curriculum committee. There currently is no policy for changing program SLO's.
  - j. The question was raised if students who do not submit assessment work should be counted as missing data, or not at all. It was decided that although the information might be interesting to the individual instructor, the non-submissions should not be counted, however a note should be added into the comment section indicating the number of documents missing (if noteworthy).
  - k. Sarah will work on revising the document to get the guiding principles out first, for our next meeting in two weeks, and then work on the policies.
- II. Continuation of discussion on the Fall Assessment Cycle
  - a. There was some review of the discussion from the last meeting – rubrics could be pushed out to the faculty informing them of what courses would be assessed when. A subset of SLO's would be assessed each year. No matter how it is done, faculty would not be assessing more than they currently are.
  - b. We have delved into assessing course SLO's, but the program, GER, and institutional assessments are most important – course SLO's are mostly local supervisory information. We need to work on assessing from the top down rather than bottom up.
  - c. It was suggested to begin with Critical Thinking, Communication and the **GER communication arts and English**. Each program or course linked to Critical Thinking would need to be assessed next year.
  - d. It was noted that currently there is a problem in that our institutional SLO's are incorrect, therefore everything linked to them is incorrect as well. This soon will become evident.
  - e. The cycle will be implemented in the Fall. It doesn't have to be perfect, but we have to run it. Critical Thinking and Communication are fairly safe to start with in the Fall as they likely will not change. At the same time, we need to be working on the others.
  - f. It was noted that the ISLO's and PSLO's should basically be the same and that over the course of three years all 15 GER's will be covered.
  - g. There was discussion about how Professional Competency fits into the SLO's, particularly for courses that serve a supportive role, such as history. Essentially, our definition of Professional Competency is that the student has learned the SLO's for that particular course/topic.
  - h. If a course SLO maps to an ISLO, that will determine which courses need to be assessed.
  - i. Program assessments are on the Assessment in the Major (AIM) 5-year cycle.
  - j. The question was raised of how the SLO's to be assessed for the year will be communicated. It was decided that a list will be given to the secretaries and they will separate out the SLO's to be assessed for each department.
  - k. In two weeks we will talk about training.
- III. The next meeting will be held on February 25<sup>th</sup> in Cook 121

Meeting was adjourned at 12:55pm

Recorder: Erin Voisin