

## Project SLOPE Task Force Meeting November 30, 2017

Present: Tricia Johnson, Kathleen Martin, Dan Lawrence, Victor Vialpando-Nunez, Megan Hurson, Leedel Cohenour, Bani Roy, Lynette Jachowicz, Kelly O'Dell, Stephen Zeeh, Alicia Vasquez, Bobby Pace, Jo O'Brien, David Murphy, Patti Molai

Introductions and sharing background/familiarity with assessment.

Takeaways from Chicago roundtable that may be helpful for this group's work:

- Scalability – we don't have to do everything. Focus on the ONE thing that you're going to be looking at.
- Reiteration of the idea that we need to all be on the same page and using the same language across the institution.
- Not here to duplicate what other institutions are doing. Need to create a plan that is meaningful for our context and setting.
- While we are getting guidance from HLC to do this, we need to always be focused on how this helps us measure student learning.
- Think about what is feasible and build from there. We want this to be sustainable and meaningful over the long haul.
- There is a great deal of flexibility – there is not just one way to go about this – we need to determine what makes sense for us.
- HLC is not insistent in seeing that you are good at everything. They are more interested in a demonstration of trying new things, even if the experiment was a failure. The learning from this process is valuable, and seen that way by the HLC.

It may be helpful for us to determine what proportion of the feedback instruments we use are for our purposes/accreditation, and which ones are for industry/community.

What stood out to you from the two readings?

- The importance of communicating your findings to your audience.
- Don't collect data if you don't plan to do something with it.
- Starting off by asking ourselves "why?" Why are we doing this particular activity? What are we hoping to achieve from this?
- The "why" for SA and AA were remarkably similar.
- The value of including students in determining desired outcomes. Engaging students in this process rather than assuming we know what they need.
- Closing the loop is important. Feedback at mid-stage can be really helpful. This allows an instructor (or other leader) to make some changes while the project/course is underway, rather than waiting until the end when the feedback cannot have any impact on the current course/project phase.

- The way we communicate what we are working towards here is really key. Help people realize this is not about judging an individual person and how well they are doing their job, but evaluating a program as a whole and determining what we need to tweak to find improvements. There is often a lot of fear around assessment that if my results are sub-par there may be punitive action.
- We need to have conversations in each area that make people feel comfortable that it is okay to show where the holes are. We are building a culture of recognizing when things don't go as planned in order to leverage this information for strengthening our work and our outcomes.
- The "why" is really important. We rely so heavily on adjuncts and they are most vulnerable – yet, they are typically less privy to the "why." Not only does the institution need to know the why, but this needs to be shared across all levels.
- Communication is really important. Not sure how we talk about what we did, but teaching people about assessment in general. People see it as something we do because someone is making us, not as something we do because we see merit in the process.
- Building in trust that this is about improving practice and outcomes – not about finding and calling out inadequacies.
- It might be helpful to inoculate our staff from the idea that this is a thing that will be used against people or that will hem them in.
- This is not just limited to faculty and instruction. Our branding and messaging need to be really clear that this is institution-wide and all about the student's experience at CCA. This is a holistic effort and we need to be really clear in communicating this.

**Phase 1:** Through the end of this school year; focused on revitalizing our 6 institutional outcomes. Determine if we want to make any modifications to these. They are 21 years old.

**Phase 2:** All of next school year. Educating stakeholders of the revitalized outcomes and begin program outcome alignment. Designing our programmatic assessment. Build our foundation for data collection so that the data we collect is data we will use.

**Phase 3:** AY 2019-20. Start collecting data. Baseline program data and design course level outcomes.

**Phase 4:** Merge all the steps together.

#### Suggestions for Committees That Would Be Helpful

- External stakeholders: local businesses – what skills do they want graduates to have? Four year schools.

- Internal stakeholders: Focus groups led by someone from a different area/specialty than the one being discussed.
- A group to determine the repository for this data and various levels of accessibility (internal vs. external). How we collect information and pull it all together.
- Training/needs assessment.
- Communications – both internal and external (i.e. on CCA website).

#### Moving Forward:

- Aim for this group to get together once a month.
- Everyone who will be teaching in the spring was asked to send their spring schedule to Emily Silvola by December 8 so we can be sure to avoid these times for our meetings.
- Tricia or Emily will send a Doodle poll with potential meeting dates and time.