|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENDA & NOTES** | | |
| *Name of Committee or Team:* Committee for Assessing Student Learning (CASL) | | |
| *Team Members Present: Dana Cogswell, Peggy Dutcher, Leslie Johnson, Kara Christensen, Joe Long, Cesar Potes, Ed Bryant, Suzanne Bernsten, Reid Felsing, Rafeeq McGiveron*  *Team Members Absent: Ryan Skiera, Karen Hicks, Barb Clauer, Lisa Nienkark, Gretchen Arthur, Zachary Macomber, Luanne Bibbee*  *Guests: Judy Allen, Tim Kelley* | | |
| Date: February 2, 2017 | Time: 2:30pm – 4:00pm | Room: TLC 326 |

| **Agenda Item** |  | **Next Steps** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| What’s happening at LCC– Best Practice(s) | Tim passed out the WRIT121 Assessment Plan Synopsis, the Analysis Summary Report (Fall 2016), and the Random Sampling Assessment Rubric. The plan called for a random selection of student artifacts from each section of WRIT121 and a rubric template for faculty assessment. An assessment team worked through the summer to modify the rubric and prepare the plan for fall implementation. Here is a synopsis of the plan:   * CDS randomly selects three students from each section of WRIT121. * Instructors submit one essay assignment (their prompt) and essays written for that assignment by each of the randomly selected students for assessment. * Submissions are assessed by WRIT121 faculty using a rubric created from WRIT121 learning outcomes. Each submission is read and assessed by two instructors and assessment results are entered in surveys created from the rubric in the D2L assessment site. * CDS processes the data from the surveys (yes/no answers regarding achievement of each learning outcome and brief comments on reasons for each answer) and provides a report. * The assessment team analyzes the report, and in a mandatory meeting the following semester, all WRIT121 faculty engage in collaborative discussion about how to use the results to improve student learning outcomes and plan for improvements. * Results of the collaboration and plans for improvement are reported to CDS.   Karen created the WRIT121 Analysis Summary Report – Fall 2016. The report provides a summary of student learning assessment of the Fall 2016 student cohort. The report provides results and findings of peer/faculty assessment of student work and of faculty assignments. Student work was assessed to determine if a student met specific writing and critical thinking student learning outcomes and faculty assignments were assessed to determine if the assignment fostered specific writing and critical thinking student learning outcomes. Page 3 of the report is a sampling. Qualitative data will be an issue to address. There will eventually be thousands of responses. Out of the potential 456 student work reviews, 282 reviews (62%) were conducted. Some sections that submitted bundles did not have work reviewed. WRIT121 had 76 sections and 36 instructors in the fall. Half of the faculty received 4 bundles and the other half received 5 bundles to assess. They will move the collection of assignments to the end of the semester. WRIT 121 will be doing a workshop in March. It will focus on in class assignments and activities aimed at learning outcomes.  Judy Allen passed out a document in regards to WRIT 122/132 Course Assessment. The objective is for WRIT 122/132 instructors to have a common evaluation tool between all sections and offer continuous improvement of instruction and program assessment. A holistic graded portfolio of a 2.0 or higher demonstrates that a student has met the course learning objectives. Students must receive at least a 2.0 on the portfolio to pass the class. The content of the portfolios will consist of an 1100 – 1300 word academic/argumentative essay, one or two pieces of writing, and an impromptu in-class piece.  Method:   * The classroom instructor will read his/her students’ portfolios and assign a grade. * Instructors come together in groups of 3-4. Each portfolio will be read by one of the group members who assign a grade. * The two readers must come to a half-grade consensus or additional faculty will be brought in.   Everything was collected electronically, read independently, and brought together for 2 hours for disagreements this semester. They tried to put faculty in groups based on how many sections they are currently teaching.  Students used to write 4 essays in a semester. It was externally graded. Faculty didn’t know who the students were or if they were in their section. | Grace will add the guest documents to SharePoint. |
| Approval of the notes on 1/19/2017 | Fix the typo in the second sentence of General Education Assessment and LCC Assessment Results, Fall 2016.  All approved. |  |
| Program Review Brief Update - Dana | Academic Year 16-17 Program Review documents were due on February 8 to SharePoint. Some programs have asked for an extension. The exit meetings have been scheduled for March and April. We would like for a CASL representative to attend the exit meetings. This will give program areas a resource in assessment that can help answer questions between the program review cycles. Dana has attempted to match CASL representatives with a program area. Some divisions only have one representative on CASL, so the load is a little uneven. Dana will send an email with the CASL representative assigned to each exit meeting. If you are able to attend, we will send you a meeting notice and a link of the materials to read prior to the meeting. There is no follow-up work from CASL. The meetings are typically 1 hour. After the exit meeting there is an optional follow-up meeting with Karen/Dana to help areas build measurements around their Annual Improvement Plan. We brainstorm short term, mid-range, and long term goals.  The questions that Dr. Prystowsky focuses on are:   * What is your program and why does LCC have it? * How is your program doing and how do you know? What data are you using? * What concrete measureable steps need to be taken to improve your program? |  |
| General Education Core Course Review Update - Peggy | The previous feedback CASL gave was great. Formally, CASL will not be involved. We will not do a rubric at this time. We still aren’t sure how many courses will be submitted. It is not true if someone says they have a current Core course and the Curriculum Committee is going to look at their course again. This Core course review is for courses that want to be considered to be Core. Jeff and Ed agreed that once we have the teams established they will look at criteria and outcomes. If they see something that is outdated they will update it in the next phase so the outcomes are current. |  |
| Adjourn |  | **Next Meeting:**  **Thursday, February 16,**  **2:30-4:00,**  **TLC 326** |