Assessment Retreat Notes

Famous Dave’s Conference Center

Monday, June 14, 2010

**Introductions and Awards** – Barb and Diane presented the Assessment “Academy Awards”. New members Cate Edlebeck and Steve Miller were welcomed. (Brian Jerry is also a new member who will attend tomorrow.)

**Vision and Direction for the Coming Year** – Diane gave an overview of Vision and Direction for the coming year – indicated the 3 tiered plan and thoughts about how she would like to see assessment move forward.

**Roles and Responsibilities for Team, Deans, Barb and faculty:** recent changes include Barb’s increase in time devoted to assessment, Wendy’s step back from co-chair (see roles and responsibilities discussion below)

**Accomplishments this year:** The team broke into smaller groups and reviewed a compilation of plans developed last year (communication plan, outcome plan, and assessment work plan). Each group determined if work had 1) begun, 2) was continuing, or 3) was complete. Discussion and consensus was held about each item that will help toward development of the new 3-5 year plan.

**CWO Process and initial results:**

- Ted reviewed initial Math pilot results (see attached). After discussion and recommendations from the math group, it was decided that Math would do another pilot in the coming year. The math subcommittee will meet later this summer to review the pilot recommendations and come up with plans for the next pilot. Collected data was shared with team.
- Data from the oral and written communication assessment was shared. Discussion about how the written assessment went – 8 faculty and staff reviewed artifacts – broke into teams of 2 - reviewed 77 written artifacts – the large group first read anchor papers, discussed scoring and came to a consensus before the other artifacts were scored. This system seemed to work well. The oral rubrics were collected from faculty who had either gone through training on the rubric and scored themselves or had a third party come in and score. **Recommendation for next year:** would like 3rd parties to assess the oral. Will consider bringing in/training others to help out with assessments (advisory team members?) Two communications instructors are currently developing a training video related to using the oral rubrics – should be completed by the end of summer and ready to use by next fall (Barb will verify this). Discussion about how the results should be shared (will share with faculty at the Aug. 18th in-service). Will also further develop and update the assessment website and post results on the site.
- Also discussion that only programs of “significant length” will be included in CWO assessment process in the future. **The team decided on those programs of 30 credits or more.** This will
include both Associate and Technical Degree programs. Discussion about expectations of Associate Degree students to be a minimum of 3 on the rubric and Technical Diploma students to be a minimum of a 2.

- Next outcomes to be assessed: Critical Thinking this coming year, followed by Interact Socially, Use Science Technology and Enhance Local/Global Perspectives. A plan was developed mapping out each pilot and 3 year assessment process for the next several years.
- Subcommittee members for Math and Critical Thinking were identified:

**Math CWO team members:**

- Jodie Karr
- Barb Landstrom
- Ted May
- Andrea Schullo
- Cate Edlebeck
- Brian Jerry
- Ingrid Evavold – faculty (math) - Superior
- Todd Hoff – faculty (math) – Rice Lake

**Critical Thinking team members**

- Nancy Cerritos
- Steve Miller
- Barb Landstrom
- Alex Birkholz?

  Additionally: will look for other faculty members – possibly nursing and IT instructors

**Student Learning Assessment Plan:** The 3-tiered plan was reviewed and Barb showed a draft graphic of the 3 tiers and how they intersect with program review – also team responsibilities related to each tier. The graph will be further developed and sent to the team for input/comment. How might it be used? How will it work with previous plan graphics (the circle)? More discussion to come.

**Systems Portfolio:** Diane gave an overview of the upcoming Systems Portfolio work. An initial meeting of the Systems Portfolio team to be held on June 16th. She reviewed the main components of the portfolio and responsible people for each area. A timeline was also shared. More to come on how the team will work with the process.
Tuesday, June 15th

Development of 3-5 year plan: Sue facilitated the process by which the team identified work to be completed in several areas (CWOs, Communication, Professional Development, etc.) Sue completed and shared an initial draft of plan which she will take and format and send back. The team will need to review, prioritize, and complete components including:

- Indicators
- Outcomes
- Responsible parties
- Completion date

Additional Discussion was held related to Team Responsibilities (added to last year’s committee expectations):

- Faculty team members will post their schedules on their Outlook Calendars to help with scheduling of meetings.
- When attending IP, in-person, or other forms of meetings (Adobe Breeze), members will be present and engaged (please refrain from other work while meeting is in progress.)
- Meetings will be scheduled on alternate days of the week and times of the day in order to accommodate optimal participation by faculty – activity hours may be utilized also.
- Minutes will be sent by email to members of the team and will also be posted on the Connection and website.
- Staff development will be made available to team members.
- The team will schedule time during upcoming meetings to discuss a chapter or topic from the new book “Assessment Clear and Simple” by Barbara E. Walvoord. Reading assignments will be sent out before meeting.
- Need to further consider term limits. This team started with a 4 year commitment (related to the Assessment Academy). Recommendation is to stagger term limits and look at possible renewals. Also need to determine optimal size of group.
- Will solidify the group’s role in relation to Program Review and other Collegewide assessment processes with VP and Office of Institutional Effectiveness.
- Will continue to offer Dean’s School, in addition, want to do some training with PC.
- Bring Val Smith into the loop as a professional development plan is developed.

Additional notes:
August 18th Draft Agenda (need to verify amount of time we will have)

- Introduction of new team members
- Share results of Communication Outcome Assessment
- Give update on the Math pilot and Critical Thinking pilot
- Let them know of opportunities to be part of a working subcommittee

Other recommendations:

- Make sure oral communication videos are on track to be developed and in line with CWO assessment needs
- Acknowledge assessment successes (possible newsletter – or include a segment on this in the AQIP newsletter?) Also include best practices
- Investigate SPOL (Strategic Planning On-Line)
- Development of a Glossary of Terms