REDWOODS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Meeting of the Assessment Committee

Room FM110 Eureka Campus: 7351 Tompkins Hill Road,

CCC Confer from the Del Norte Campus

# Monday, January 25, 2015

# 2:45 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.

**Summary**

1. Introductions and Updates:

Spanish Professor Kristy Carlsen was introduced as a new member of the Assessment Committee. Professor Carlsen represents the Arts and Humanities Division. Assessment Committee Co-Chair Dave Bazard provided an update of General Education (GE) mapping session during the Spring Flex session. Dave said it was well attended and faculty were able to map course outcomes to GE outcomes. There was a minor programming problem that Paul Chown later fixed. Dave indicated that he will communicate with the Associate Deans and Deans about the need for all GE courses to be mapped to GE outcomes this semester.

Dave also provided an update regarding the Faculty Assessment Coordinator. Due to lack of experienced applicants, the administration decided to postpone filling of this position until the Fall 2016 semester. The District had an interest in a coordinator who could fill this position this spring and continue into next fall. The District will make another announcement this spring to try to fill the position.

2. Status of progress for 4-year cycle:

The committee discussed that a list of courses and program requiring additional assessment to meet the 2012-2016 4-year cycle was distributed to Deans, Associate Deans, and Directors. These administrators will work with faculty to increase our completion of this cycle.

3. ILO review session for Spring 2016

Co-Chair Bazard described the calendar for ILO assessment review and indicated that a summary of the assessments for all three Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) was scheduled for the Spring 2016 semester. Angelina Hill and David Bazard will meet to determine the date for this dialogue session.

4. Assessment Pilot in Canvas

Angelina Hill provided an update regarding the use of Canvas to gather assessment data that can then be disaggregated by demographic group. Angelina is working with Reno Giovannetti on determining how to extract the data. The assessment will be administered by faculty volunteers, with a goal of capturing student achievement from larger classroom sections. Angelina will report back about progress on this initiative at the next Assessment Committee Meeting

5. Assessment reporting for courses not taught in 2015-2016?

Co-Chair Bazard updated the committee regarding courses with incomplete assessment cycles that are not being taught this academic year. His question regarded how to account for these in the cycle-end reporting. Should reports be entered to state that assessment couldn’t be completed because the course was not taught this academic year? The committee decided that entering these types of reports would be confusing and thought it better to try to identify these types of courses in the final accounting, but not within the assessment reports themselves.

6. Web Page updates

The Assessment Committee discussed the need for an update to the Assessment web page used by faculty and staff (not necessarily the committee web page). Co-Chair Hill said she would invite Brian Van Pelt to the next Assessment Committee meeting to discuss how we can update the page and possible options within Evoq.

7. Revision of Closing the Loop process.

The Assessment Committee discussed the problems with the current “loop process” and possible improvements. The problems focused around the two-step process that puts the “loop” improvement descriptions and subsequent follow-up discussion into a separate report. The Committee agreed that the change in the main reporting tool that produces a prompt when there is an open loop is an improvement to this process, but the separation between the reporting discussion and the “closing the loop” discussion still exists. The Committee discussed ways in which the previous plans for improvement could be automatically imported into the next assessment report. That way, the authors of the next assessment would be able to reflect on the results of those changes in the main body of the assessment report (rather than in a separate “loop” report). The Committee agreed to consider these possible solutions and the feasibility of making this change to the reporting tool, and discuss this topic at the next assessment meeting.