Notes

# Committee for Assessing Student Learning (CASL)

Meeting Held September 13, 2019, from 12:15pm to 1:55pm in TLC 326

## Team Members:

### Present:

Patti Ayers, Ed Bryant, Michelle Curtin, Timothy Deines, Nikki Gruesbeck, Karen Hicks, Joe Long, Zach Macomber, Rafeeq McGiveron, Rob McLoone, Lisa Nienkark, Chuck Page, and Kara Wiedman

### Absent:

Antuan Bell, Dana Cogswell, and Alejandro Gradilla

## Approval of 4/26/19 Notes

### Notes:

* Call for approval of minutes. No objections or additions.
* Minutes approved as presented.

## Change meeting start time to 12:30pm

* Call for approval of start time change to 12:30pm.
* No objections, future meetings will start at 12:30pm and end at 2pm.

## Assessment Updates – Karen

### Notes:

* Data dashboards, in the past faculty had to collate their own for program review.
  + Excel spreadsheet presented, sample of what that looks like is on SharePoint
  + Karen walked folks to where it was on SharePoint and discussed how the example was set up
  + Initial impressions from group were favorable
    - Liked the dashboard/summary of the information
  + This information is used to respond to question #8 in Program Review
    - Helps with action plans and allows allocation of meeting energy/time to discussion verses administrative work
    - Holly from CDS and 2 interns will be taking D2L and preload the information into dashboards
* Handbook and video being prepared for the Program Review.
  + This should help faculty understand expectations and why Program Review is conducted
  + Looking for faculty recommendations and participation in the video
  + Intent is to be ready for incoming AY 20-21 cohort
* HLC systems portfolio.
  + Completed last spring
  + Expect to have official feedback next month
* Item analysis.
  + This type of analysis looks at individual questions and determines their performance
    - Seems to be faculty’s favorite form of assessment, Zack agrees
    - 2 measurements
      * Difficulty - percentage of students answering the question right/wrong
      * Discrimination factor – looking at trends in who is getting questions right/wrong
        + For example is a normally good test taker getting the question wrong and a normally bad test taker getting it correct?
        + Then need to look at the question to be sure it discriminates test performance
        + This item is harder to do and currently requires manual input

Karen is looking at mechanizing it

* + Larry Simpson, Accounting Faculty, is working with Karen to create a self-service form to use for this type of assessment
    - D2L also creates item analysis but does not collate the semesters and the tool that Karen is creating will go from semester to semester so will be able to see trends over time
  + Michelle: What is stance on longstanding questions performing well but needing to switch up the test?
    - Karen: Item analysis is temporary. If you have a strong test unless you make major changes you would not need to re-analyze it.
    - Zac: To keep the test questions newer he will set up the same outcomes but change examples
      * This allows the question to be updated but the general item is the same
    - Judgement call – on when need to change questions in a test

### Next Steps:

* Karen to give update on progress of Data Dash Boards from D2L, official feedback from the submitted HLC systems portfolio, and status of the self-service item analysis tool.

## General Education Assessment Results - Karen

### Notes:

* General Education Assessment Report – for Social Science and Humanities.
* Presented here in draft form for discussion will be presenting to Social Science and Humanities next Friday.
* Went over the report in SharePoint and had some hard copies for people to review – discussion:
  + May want to give more details regarding each Essential Learning Outcome (ELO)
  + Presented the total report to CASL but each program will receive an Individualized report
  + Sent the results in advance to the programs and will be asking what they think of these items and what we should do about them
  + CASL should determine parameters around each ELO
    - For example is a 75% in an ELO good or not
    - Need to determine how meaningful the ELO connections are
      * CASL wants to help with this
      * Want true reflections of student learning
* Essential Learning Outcome (ELO) Discussion:
  + Original ELOs were set using Association of American Colleges and University (AAC&U) standards
  + Best practice is to have an ongoing process to re-examine the ELOs and make sure they are still relevant
    - Outcome statements for ELOs need to be defined
  + Rafeeq is working on General Education Core requirements (Core) for the Michigan Transfer Agreement (MTA) to streamline the transfer process
  + ELO learning outcome statements can be set up by Karen and Rafeeq then CASL can work over the rough draft and refine
  + Rob: Are there other essential learning outcomes from what we are currently using? What are our options? Should we be going shopping?
    - Karen: Yes that would be part of the review system.
    - Rob: Do you lose authority from accreditation if “mix and Match?”
      * There are universal ELOs that should work for all courses and accreditation
      * Karen will look around at other schools ELOs and bring in ideas
    - Rob: It seems that outcome statements interpret ELOs with longstanding ramifications
      * Setting goals for the entire institution with outcome wording
      * Karen: Yes, until the next review, usually every 4 years
  + It is generally recommended to review ELOs and their outcome statements every 4 years
  + Michelle: Does LCC follow a standard method of assessing ELOs?
    - Karen: We do it differently
      * Many collages all use value rubrics and the same assessment in a course
        + Often set up during their PD days
      * LCC, allows individual faculty, teaching the same course, to select aligned and commensurate methods of assessment
    - While Karen likes the uniformity of the value rubric the standardization of every rubric does not work for LCC because we are a large college
      * We use Blooms and levels, making sure the same cognitive level is demonstrated in all of the same courses verses requiring use of the same assessment instrument
        + Meaning different faculty, teaching the same course, can pick different tests/projects to be used to assess their ELO as long as the cognitive level demonstrated is the same
      * The HLC systems portfolio review went well using the LCC method
  + Michelle: How are other schools evaluating if they want to keep the current ELOs?
    - Karen: They use a survey to faculty, issued on a cyclical basis
  + Rob: What if an ELO is not selected by a course?
    - Ed: Chemistry focuses on critical thinking, knowledge of human cultures would need to be in general education courses
    - Karen: This is okay because the individual course does not have to demonstrate every ELO, it is the total curriculum that has to hit them all
    - Michelle: Is there a problem if only review same ELO in a course?
      * Karen: This may well happen and is okay, with an assessment cycle, all 4 are assessed
  + Tim: What is the relationship between ELOs and Core requirements?
    - Rafeeq: For the 2020 curricular year, Core and MTA are becoming combined
      * This will make sure a curriculum hits all four of the ELOs necessary for a degree
    - Tim: ELOs apply to both streams in same way?
      * Rafeeq: That is the intent

### Next Steps:

* Karen to bring in some examples of what other schools use for ELOs for the next meeting.

## Review Proposed Goals and Objectives for 2019-20 - Michelle and Karen

### Notes:

* Review handout of assessment goals and prioritize.
  + Went over list and discussed what each item
* Definition of co-curricular:
  + Co-curricular refers to activities and events that enhance and complement the educational experience at LCC, relate to the essential learning outcomes, and connects students to the college and community
  + Criteria (not yet final):
    - Must be aligned to one or more ELOs
    - May be on or off campus
    - May or may not be led by LCC
    - Learning experience is not mandatory to student
    - May not be explicitly tied to a program of study or course
    - Augments the college learning experience
    - Direct evidence of student learning
  + Areas Identified as Co-Curricular (not yet final):
    - Service Learning (Patti – student life)
    - Library
    - Learning Commons
    - Leadership Academy
    - CEWD
    - Career Services
    - TRIO
    - LUCERO (includes Men About Progress)
    - Advising
  + Areas that do not meet the definition of Co-Curricular (not yet final):
    - Student Government
    - Athletics
    - Student Compliance
  + Areas still under consideration regarding Co-Curricular designation:
    - Student Organizations, Clubs, Activities (requires more discussion, it varies)
    - CTE
    - Counseling Access Services
    - Student Advisory Group
    - Skills USA
* Discussion of co-curricular:
  + Michelle: A co-curricular activity adds to the students learning experience but is not for credit
    - Library and student life are examples
    - Co-curricular vs. extra curricular
  + A co-curricular activity has a purposeful learning component to it that is connected to one of the ELOs
  + Lisa: Where does the office of Diversity and Inclusion fit in?
    - Karen: That is not currently on the list and should be examined
  + The library has done strong assessment evaluations and is a great co-curricular example
  + Chuck: A few examples of library activities/resources
    - Student contact numbers
    - Teamed with English courses
    - They don’t have a protocol for what they are doing, but a plethora of items for faculty to use
  + Karen: Goal would be for CASL to have a solid co-curricular assessment plan created by the end of this academic year to implement next year.
  + Ed: Is the HLC interested in co-curricular assessment?
    - Karen: Very
  + Ed: Is there concern regarding pushback from faculty feeling that the assessment is intruding upon academic freedom or adding to faculty work burden?
    - Tim: If we are transparent about why we are doing this it seems we should not see people pushing back
      * Need clarity of how assessment fits together and what is faculty’s role in it
    - Michelle: Communication is best, pushback is most often due to lack of communication
      * Faculty pushback should be minimal if they know why
    - Karen: Assessment is personal, showing the meaning behind it is very important
    - Lisa: Karen, did you get pushback when working on the General Ed assessment?
      * Karen: Made sure to present the assessment scenario to the Social Science and Humanities Departments in the beginning
        + Not much pushback because the design is flexible and they could see that we are working with them.

## Prioritize Proposed Goals and Objectives for 2019-20 - Michelle

### Notes:

* After discussion determined the following CASL primary objectives for this academic year, listed in non-ranked order:
  + Assessment of co-curricular programs
  + Review process, targets, and action plans for institutional-level student learning outcomes (ILOs)
  + Update curriculum map design
  + Continue peer program review support

## Adjourn

* Zach motioned to adjourn
* Motion was without objections
* Meeting adjourned at 2pm
* Next meeting Friday September 27, 2019 from 12:30pm to 2pm, TLC 326.

*Respectfully submitted by Terri Christian*