



Minutes

Approved during the 5/1/26 Meeting.

Name of Committee or Team: Committee for Assessing Student Learning (CASL)

Support Documents Link: [CASL Senate website](#); [CASL SharePoint](#); CASL Space on Webex

Recording link: N/A

- **Committee Members Present via WebEx:** Anna Mitterling, April Dreeke, Homa Ghaussi Mujtaba, Jesse Mills, Kara Wiedman, Mark Kelland, Melinda Hernandez, Rafeeq McGivern, and Zack Macomber.
- **Guest(s):** Cheryl Garayta, Lisa Nienkark, Szymon Machajewski, and Wyatt Schwanbeck.
- **Scribe:** Terri Christian.

Date: 4/17/26

Time: 12:30 – 1:57 PM

Room: Via Webex

Agenda Item	Discussion	Next Steps
Approval of the 4/17/26 Agenda	Approved Without objection.	N/A
Approval of the 4/03/26 Minutes	Approved Without objection.	N/A
Chair's Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Senate Update: A routine update regarding committee activities was provided to the Academic Senate. • Professional Development: The Chair attended a presentation by the Association for Assessing Learning in Higher Education (AALHE) titled "Humor in Assessment." Four CASL members are scheduled to attend the virtual AALHE conference in June. <p>Credit Hour and Modality Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Carnegie Unit: It was noted that federal law defines one credit as one hour of direct instruction and two hours of outside work. • Online vs. Face-to-Face: The committee discussed whether online and in-person courses should be housed in separate units or if their requirements should differ. It was clarified that while instructional delivery varies, the learning outcomes are expected to remain identical regardless of modality to meet Higher Learning Commission (HLC) standards. It was noted that some 	N/A

Agenda Item	Discussion	Next Steps
	<p>colleges do have outcomes that vary between modalities and that those courses require further investigation during a HLC site visit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workload Expectations: Members discussed the challenge of measuring the "two hours of outside work" in asynchronous environments. There is a concern that if students can succeed without completing the expected reading or attendance, the rigor or the syllabus may need to be reevaluated. • Future Implications: The committee considered if assessment strategies might be leveraged to measure student effort and rigor. 	
<p>Course Mapping & Data Application, standing agenda item</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data Request Update: A report comparing assessment scores between online and face-to-face modalities is in progress. This data will be packaged for discussion at the next meeting to evaluate how legacy assignments perform in modern digital environments. <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AI and Assessment Integrity: The committee discussed the impact of generative AI on skill-based assessments. There is a concern that existing assignments may no longer effectively measure student engagement or learning if they can be easily completed by AI. • Stress-Testing Assignments: Wyatt Schwanbeck made an offer to faculty to "stress-test" specific assignments using prompt engineering. This process involves generating AI responses with minimal input to see if they can pass standard grading rubrics. Contact Wyatt Schwanbeck if interested. • Faculty Support and Incentives: A discussion ensued regarding how to support and incentivize faculty—particularly adjuncts—as they redesign courses to address AI. • Resource Constraints: While technical support is available through Karen Hicks, Wyatt Schwanbeck, and various Assessment Coordinators, members noted that even full-time faculty lack the compensated time required to implement significant pedagogical changes. • Philosophical Shifts: Members reflected on how AI changes the nature of learning itself. There is a need to move beyond technical "fixes" toward a broader strategic plan for maintaining rigor and deep contemplation in a digital age. 	<p>Contact Wyatt Schwanbeck if interested in working with him to AI stress test an assignment.</p> <p>Committee members welcome to contact Szymon Machajewski for follow up questions on pedagogical innovation information shared during this meeting.</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI): It was noted that the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) embraces CQI. Identifying areas for improvement regarding AI is a proactive measure and part of the college's commitment to quality, rather than a point of concern. ● Pedagogical Innovation: A suggestion was made to integrate AI into assessments in a way that actually increases the cognitive load, forcing students to "build the muscle" of critical thinking through more difficult, AI-enhanced tasks. No "Zombie Submissions" from students! <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Resource Shared: Szymon Machajewski shared a resource titled The Learn-It-All Educator – A Guidebook for Training Brains, Not Replacing Them with AI. ○ Application: It was noted that Chapters 2 and 3 help instructors learn to treat AI as a training partner that makes cognitive struggle unavoidable rather than a shortcut that eliminates it. ○ Follow-up: Members may contact Szymon Machajewski for more information on the resource or to discuss the strategies mentioned. 	
<p>Breakout Into Discussion Teams 30-minute sessions</p> <p>Link to SharePoint AY 25-26 Subcommittee folders.</p>	<p>Breakout Discussion Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teams spent 30 minutes reviewing their worksheets. ● Session Adjustment: Due to attendance levels, the Socially Conscious/Student-Centered group was merged with the Authentic/Collaborative Assessment group to maximize discussion. <p>Brief Summaries Upon Reconvening</p> <p><i>Authentic Assessment Group:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Resource Development: The group identified a need to collect and share existing examples of authentic assessment. Support from Karen Hicks, Wyatt Schwanbeck, and Assessment Coordinators will be central to this effort. ● Existing Users: It was noted that Technical Careers and Health and Human Services (HHS) are currently the primary areas utilizing authentic assessment methods. 	<p>Continue developing group action plans during next meeting.</p> <p>Note: Based on committee feedback, future sessions may include a reconvene period after the initial 30-minute summaries to allow groups to continue their work as needed.</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Communication Channels: The committee discussed utilizing the CASL website to host the "why" (theory and value) of authentic assessment, while collaborating with eLearning on the "how" (technical implementation). ● Strategic Focus: The group decided to prioritize Authentic Assessment in the immediate term, deferring Collaborative Assessment to the next academic year to ensure a more focused rollout. ● Future Outreach: Plans were discussed for upcoming Professional Activity (PA) Day workshops, panels, and sessions. <p><i>General Assessment Fundamentals Group:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Standardization of Terminology: Discussion centered on the distinction between Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs). The committee noted a need to standardize these terms, likely moving toward "CLOs" in the future. ● Rubric Development: The group identified a need for training on different rubric types and how they can be leveraged effectively. ● Faculty Support: Members cautioned that faculty not currently using rubrics may require a tiered introduction to avoid being overwhelmed by new assessment requirements. ● Resources: The group discussed needing more practical resources for faculty. The following examples were shared in the meeting chat as starting points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ AAC&U Value Rubrics: These were recommended as a good source for rubric examples across many different fields of study. ○ MSU Math Assessment Paper: A paper on Quantitative Literacy from Michigan State was shared. While it is an older resource, it contains examples of how Math courses handle authentic assessment. 	
Future Agenda Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Standardization of Learning Outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discussion on encouraging the collegewide use of "CLOs" (Course Learning Outcomes) and potential for standardized outcome formatting within syllabi (e.g., numbering vs. lettering). 	Members are reminded to send any future agenda items to Mark, Karen, or Wyatt for inclusion.

Meeting Adjournment:

- **Motion to Adjourn:** The Chair entertained a motion to adjourn.
- **Action:** The motion was made by Zack and seconded by Rafeeq.
- **Discussion:** During the discussion, Rafeeq expressed his sincere appreciation to Zack for making the motion to adjourn.

- **Result:** The meeting was adjourned at 1:57 PM without objection.

Next Meeting

- **Date & Time:** Friday, May 1, 2026, from 12:30 PM – 2:00 PM
- **Location:** Via Webex.
- **Note:** This will be the final meeting of the 2025–2026 academic year.

WebEx Chat Information: Sent separately by Webex to all participants.

Attachments: None

LCC provides equal opportunity for all persons and prohibits discriminatory practices based on race, color, sex, age, religion, national origin, creed, ancestry, height, weight, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, disability, familial status, marital status, pregnancy, pregnancy-related conditions, military status, veteran’s status, or other status as protected by law, or genetic information that is unrelated to the person’s ability to perform the duties of a particular job or position or participate in educational programs, courses, services or activities offered by the College.