

# Committee for Assessing Student Learning (CASL) - Minutes

Meeting Held Friday, April 8, 2022, from 12:30 – 1:30pm – via Webex

**Approved 9/9/22**

## Team Members:

### Present:

Patti Ayers, Dana Cogswell, Timothy Deines, Karen Hicks, Heidi Jordan, Mark Kelland, Mark Khol, Zack Macomber, Rafeeq McGiveron, Rob McLoone, Laura Orta, Chuck Page, Danielle Savory and Kara Wiedman.

### Absent:

Melinda Hernandez and Tracy Nothnagel.

### Guest:

Cheryl Garayta, Math Faculty Guests: Kelley Sakkinen, Maria Johnson, and Jing Wang

## Action Items:

* PA Day Presentation tasks.
	+ Tim to confirm James Allen will be available for the CTE PA Days Formative Evaluation Panel
	+ Karen to get questions to panelist before presentation
	+ Request CASL members attend the presentation if able, to show support
* Invite other program faculty to speak with CASL regarding their perspective on the assessment integrity issue.

## Approval of 04/08/22 Agenda

* Call for approval of agenda.
* Hearing no objections, the agenda stands approved.

##  Approval of 2/25/22 Notes

* Call for correction/approval of minutes.
* Hearing no objections, the minutes stand approved.

## PA Day Presentation Plans

* More faculty seem to becoming aware of Formative Evaluations.
	+ Helpful tool faculty can use to assess DEI issues in the classroom
	+ Ways to communicate with students and implement course changes within a semester
* Important to define difference between formative and summative evaluations uses in the beginning of this presentation.
	+ Good if could be part of the presentation description as well
	+ Formative can be considered an optional private conversation between faculty and students, used during course to pivot pedagogy if needed
	+ Summative are required end of course student evaluations that are shared with administrators and required by HLC
* Clarify context “assessment” is being used in.
	+ Often a faculty will think of assessment as a particular test or project, but CASL sometimes uses the term “assessment survey” which is neither.
	+ Moving forward clarify that surveys are not assessments.
* Panelists Mark Kelland and Heidi Jordan ready for upcoming event.
	+ Tim to confirm James Allen will be available for the CTE PA Days Formative Evaluation Panel
	+ Karen to get questions to panelist before presentation
	+ Request CASL members attend if able to show support

## Assessment Integrity Discussion

* Math Academic Coordinator, and Math Faculty, Jing Wang with Math Faculty Kelley Sakkinen and Maria Johnson attended the CASL meeting to help bring in the Math department viewpoint on this issue.

### Purview of CASL

* Academic Senate has requested CASL recommendations on this topic.
* Student Judicial Affairs deals more with the consequences of cheating, CASL can work with the assessment design to make cheating less possible.

### More Access to Proctored Testing Requested by Math Faculty

* Math department requests more online and face to face proctoring opportunities.
	+ Concerned that the testing department is reducing its capacity
* Proctored testing allows online (ON), hybrid (HY) and face to face (F2F) students to all have a uniform test.
	+ Provides equity over all delivery formats – uniform assessment
	+ Online courses fill first, while course content delivery format is different should not mean testing expectations should also be different
		- Example a F2F student caught using their textbook during a test would be accused of cheating but no way to enforce same requirement for ON and HY students
* HLC requesting proactive student identification compliance, to start within the year.
	+ Past verification using student ID alone has been determine by HLC as no longer adequate
		- Student ID and Log In information better
	+ While not perfect, ways to work around, requiring proctored tests of a large general education course could be a way LCC demonstrates working towards meeting this HLC requirement
* Want to ensure LCC students perform at the same level in these courses as MSU, U of M, and other universities/colleges.

### Non Proctored/Alternate Assessments

* Does a test need to be proctored at all?
	+ Current cheating examples
		- Students taking pictures of math exams and posting them online
		- Students working as a group to get answers when meant to be an individual test
	+ When students cheat to pass a course it is easily seen in the next course, when the student cannot demonstrate essential skills needed to build upon
		- Not knowing simple formulas or techniques taught from previous courses make learning in the next one extremely hard
		- Students need the discipline of taking the tests correctly to learn which tools to remove from the toolbox – looking up information online only shows them the tools but doesn’t help with the methodology of using them correctly
		- Tools learned in math can be used in other domains such as physics, chemistry and business
* Secondary forms of assessment – individual demonstration of known concepts, is a possible solution.
	+ Demonstrates original thought
	+ Requires assessment redesign
* Designing something that is “not cheatable” can be done but incredible time commitment on the part of the faculty in both creation and grading
	+ Examples include: Students uploading their work, writing out their thoughts, investing in writing assessments
	+ Completely different expectations of faculty than in the past – need more resources to get there
		- Are there ways the faculty can be compensated or have help (from other people) revamping assessment tools?
* Move the emphasis away from stopping cheating and more on emphasizing integrity and focusing on the learning needs for the students that are not cheating.

### MISC

* Creating a week zero review module to help prepare students for upcoming course needs might be helpful to start all students on equal footing.
	+ Issue is the difference between refreshing a student’s memory and trying to teach them concepts they don’t have because they skipped them (cheated) in the previous course
	+ Do have that option already in place for many of the courses
* Could be other issues at play.
	+ Are we sure the reason students are not coming prepared from lower courses to higher level courses is due to cheating?
	+ Perhaps students are choosing the wrong format for their learning
		- Are they choosing online courses for the wrong reasons?
	+ These other issues are important to consider but outside the purview of CASL
* Workforce environment allows searching for answers, perhaps should be allowed in courses.
	+ Concern with this thought is that basic concepts still need to be on student/worker fingertips, time not always given to look things up and learn on the job, some competency required to even discuss issues
* What is goal? Is it to apply the information learned or be good at testing?

### Thank you to guests for coming to this discussion

* Your perspective is valued thank you for sharing it with CASL.
* Will look into inviting faculty from other departments to share their perspectives on this topic as well.

## New Business and Future Agenda Items

* Discussion how formative and summative evaluations can work together in the faculty tool box.
* Work on proposed Academic Senate Presentation, CASL recommendations regarding Assessment Integrity Issues – Fall semester 2022.
* Invite other program faculty to CASL to learn their perspectives on the assessment integrity issue.
	+ Essential to get different perspectives
* Look into inviting local employer representatives to CASL to get their perspective on their expectations of what new employees know
	+ Could contact Bo Garcia to see if he has suggested folks to contact
* Showcase examples of what LCC faculty are currently doing regarding authentic assessment.

## Meeting Adjourned at 1:57pm

* Next Meeting Friday, April 22, 2022 from 12:30pm to 2:00pm, via Webex.
* Last Meeting of AY 21-22 is Friday, May 6, 2022 from 12:30pm to 2:00pm, via Webex.

*Respectfully submitted by Terri Christian*
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