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

| **Agenda Item** |  | **Next Steps** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| What’s Happening at LCC – Best Practice(s) Jim Allen (HHS) | Competencies & Mastery using D2L presentation  The publisher of the chosen textbook provides us with a test bank. The instructors pick questions for a test. This is not necessarily the best way to do it. Jim’s idea is to improve student learning by testing and grading by objective. The objectives are associated with exercises, worksheets, activities, quizzes, and exams. Jim went through the questions and identified which objective it tied into. He wrote his own test bank and weighted them. Students can take the exercises as many times as they want to. You can tell what objective the student is struggling with. This is where the mastery learning comes in.  Jim’s idea is to use the objectives in D2L. An instruction can go into the class list to identify progress. Students can work ahead but they can’t work behind. The next step is tracking to see how students are doing. We want to base grades on different competencies. | Grace will add the PowerPoint to SharePoint. |
| Approval of the notes on 3/2/17 | Karen will add a paragraph on the LCC Assessment Report.  All approved. |  |
| Conference Highlights – Leslie | Leslie went to Kirkwood CC in Iowa. They based general education assessment on the assumption that writing will show up in every course if the job is done right. They had an assessment day where the entire faculty did a general education assessment. It was graded and sent out on the last day of the semester. The assignments were randomly chosen within the program. The assignment had to pass a certain check to be included in that assessment. They collected artifacts in a digital drobox. Any class could submit an assessment. It was judged by the assessment committee on a 4.0 scale. They had enough for 250 faculty members to read. The classes were assessing themselves. They were looking at the ELOs throughout the college. We have core courses that aren’t on program of studies. We wouldn’t catch these. |  |
| Syllabus Team Report - Leslie | This will be on the agenda for the next meeting. Deadline for completion is fall 2018. |  |
| General Education Assessment Plan– Karen | Karen presented the report to different divisions and the Curriculum Committee. Karen reaches out 2 semesters before program review to see if they faculty need help with question #8. We will be looking to CASL next year to help people develop analyzing and tracking strategies. We could do a workshop.  Next meeting --- See below   * + Methods and Procedures   + How should we go about collecting student artifacts?     - For example, if we chose D2L, what would that process look like?     - Other?   + We will likely want to modify the VALUE rubrics, customizing them for LCC. How should we go about modifying the VALUE Rubrics?     - As examples, for our Informational Literacy rubrics, customizing them for LCC. How should be go about modifying the VALUES rubrics?     - Or, we use the VALUE rubrics as our first go-around, and modify after     - Other?   + How should be go about scoring the artifacts?     - As examples, Assessment Day? Faculty score on own, submit through D2L?     - Other?   + How many students should be sample each academic year?     - As examples, 10% (about 400) 20% (About 800)     - Other? |  |
| Adjourn | There are 2 meetings left. There will be no best practices. | **Next Meeting:**  **Thursday, April 13,**  **2:30-4:00,**  **WCP 110** |