

Meeting Minutes for Assessment Executive Committee Meeting

October 27th 2023 9:30-11

Invited: Rachelle Barrett, Cristina Crespo, Christy VanRooyen, David Hammond, Cecily Heiner, David Johnston, Gary Lomprey, Andria Fultz, Don McDonnell, Rachel Hanan, Carrie Dickson, Krista Beaty, Jennifer Wilson, Abdy Afjeh, Kevin Brown, Nupur Pande, Jessica Luebbers, Caroline Doty

Attendees: Andie, Cecily, Jennifer, Christy, Gary, Rachelle, Rachel, David J.

Resources: [2023 Convocation Assessment training \(draft\).pptx](#) [2023 Spring term assessment training.pptx](#) [Master List - Program Assessment Reports.xlsx](#) [Draft 2022-23 End of Year Academic Assessment Report and 2023-24 Academic Assessment Plan.docx](#) [CCC Year End Report Template 22-23.pdf](#)

Topics:

1. [Committee membership](#) – sent to Provost’s office for approval/documentation 10/26/23
2. AVP position update – Search ongoing. The position description was updated and approved last week. Search to happen this year. This committee will have an interview with the candidates as before. Position expectations: Collaboration between GEAC, CCT, Assessment, Accreditation. And program review process development.
 - a. Programs needing programmatic review process first are those without external accreditation. Listed in End of year Academic Assessment report.
3. Subcommittee charges.
 - a. Provost’s charges for all - 1. Liaison to OTAC “Oregon Transfer & Articulation Committee (OTAC) 2. Scheduling **monthly** [as needed] meetings. 3. Attending OTAC meetings when requested by the Associate Vice Provost of Academic Excellence or OTAC. “
 - b. Exec’s Charges for all– 1. Each committee should review the rubrics and provide updates to Rachel Hanan. 2. Work with the general education committee (GEAC) to develop a plan for how to collect data within the general education courses 3. Complete their portion of the assessment cycle.

Plan: Communication, Teamwork, and Ethical Reasoning
Assess: Inquiry and Analysis and Quantitative Literacy
Act: Diverse Perspectives.
 - c. CTER specific charges – 1. Review programmatic data for trends and gaps. Develop a plan to implement university wide actions suggested by faculty and staff. Document actions taken by programs at the university level [these were all actions from last year] 2. Review what was done before in **preparation** for a collection in 24-25 academic year. What actions need to be taken still? What will be measured university wide? What performance targets will you set? Write clear directions for faculty training to be conducted next year.
 - d. DP specific charges – 1. Work with CCT and DICE to provide guidance on curriculum and classroom design for individual programs to collect assessment data. Document participation in training on this subject. Update university definitions of ISLOs to incorporate cultural competent elements to publish to the ISLO webpage. [First sentence should have been done last year. Second sentence will be pulled from program reports turned in this term. Was third sentence done?] 2. Review what was done in 22-

23 to determine what actions need to be taken. Document any **actions** that are taken or planned in 23-24 university wide with timelines of implementation.

- e. QLIA specific charges – Aim to better represent students across all degree programs through data collection in general education curriculum. Develop a method for comparing previous data to data that will be collected during 23-24. [these were all actions from last year] 2. What was accomplished last year? What needs to be changed? 3. Develop a training for faculty for Winter term to inform them how **collection** of QLIA data will be done for 23-24.
4. ISLO Outcomes
- a. All rubrics downloadable from [Institutional Student Learning Outcomes | Oregon Tech \(oit.edu\)](https://oit.edu)
 - b. Rubrics being built in pieces so that specific performance criteria can be imported into a course assignment rubric where it is assessed.

Example: DP: apply Rating (4) = High proficiency; Rating (3) = Proficiency; Rating (2) = Some Proficiency

- c. Problem identified with performance targets of success being different for different courses. Will require rubric norming with all faculty training. Additional rating should be downloaded to the rubric for performance target.

Example: DP: Course Expectation Rating (3) = Exceeds; (2) = Met Expectations (1) Below Expectations (0) No submission

- 5. Senior Exit Survey update – none. Need to send out a reminder. This one should go to program coordinators not chairs. Also need a reminder to coordinators about how to turn in the report in course shell and if they have any questions they may be answered by the shell.
 - a. Almost all coordinators identified and uploaded to the course shell. Documented on “Master list”
- 6. General Education Reform still waiting specific charges. ISLO committees to support GEAC. ISLO committees to check Teams files of end of year report for gen ed courses identified by previous ISLO committee that support the rubric. Bring to next meeting for discussion/approval, then to GEAC, then to the faculty for collaboration on using Canvas outcomes tools. [CTER Subcommittee 22-23 QLIA Subcommittee Diverse and Global Perspectives](#)
- 7. Next meeting also plan for peer review trainings.