Student Outcomes Committee - Minutes 12 November 2015

1. **Welcome**

   **Attendees:** Duane Oakes, Marjorie Leta, Megan McGuire, Tim Florschuetz, Elizabeth Allen, Angeline Surber, Brian Dille, Matt Ashcraft, Ginger Leyendecker, Layne Owens-Goodman, Lindsey Pedersen, Jen Fay, Kristine Ouzts

2. **Matt Ashcraft Update from OIE**

   Providing report on outcome data from last year to generate faculty discussion and participation.
   The previous year we were in a state of flux so no reports came out. IE is working on putting together a report with two purposes: to review the history of our new assessment process and to show what we have learned thus far from our pilot. We will be reviewed again by HLC in four years so we need to show our efforts in a well-organized manner starting now. Matt’s office will put together a tracking spreadsheet for participation (not at the level of the department) just to track progress towards increased participation. Our goal is to double the rate of participation each year from the initial pilot. Currently, we have not yet reached that goal.

3. **Permanent space for SOC Information repository Update**

   a. Institutional Advancement is working on moving all the information from the Libguides into the OIE website.
   b. Diana attended Drupal training to maintain SOC pages

   Institutional Advancement is working hand-in-hand with Diana on the general structure for an assessment website so everything is in one place

4. **Assessment Coaches – Report**

   a. Stress importance of using “Scoring Guidelines” rather than rubrics
   b. Verify faculty are uploading their scoring guidelines to their Canvas Courses
   c. Verify that those that have already assessed MCC’s 4Cs implementing old scoring guidelines reassess by using update AY15-16

   One problem was identified - one faculty uses her own rubric to grade. When she and her coach tried to add the scoring guidelines it didn’t work. Her only option was to redo her own rubric to accommodate the scoring guidelines.

   Tim offered up a potential solution – create the same assignment (ungraded) and pull in scoring guidelines and score it. She could then have two windows open (one with her rubric and one with the scoring guidelines) to score it.
Brian would like to know if it would be possible to at least know who is assessing in each of the departments. A few thought it would be even better to know which faculty are using the old scoring guidelines, which faculty have not assessed, etc.

Marjorie reiterated that all assessment coaches need to reach out to those in their departments offering assistance and reminding everyone to use the new Scoring Guidelines.

5. **Branding Efforts and “MCC’s 4Cs Mondays”**
   a. **MCC’s 4 Cs Current Offering:**
      i. 1 and 3 Mondays 12:00 – 2:00 pm
      ii. 2 and 4 Mondays 2:00 – 4:00 pm
      iii. Attendance has varied between 1 to 11 participants
   b. **Branding and promotion**
      i. There is resistance to showcase our MCC’s 4 Cs on the main page of the website
      ii. Banner or pop ups showing MCC’s 4 Cs would add value to the implementation process – feedback?

Pushback for displaying the 4C’s on MCC’s main webpage is partly because we don’t have assessment data to share. There is not much to explain. The web oversight committee considers our webpage as primarily a marketing and recruiting tool.

Lindsey made the point that the 4C’s is not just about data collection but is also about a culture change. She indicated we should consider raising the profile of the 4Cs on the webpage to work towards creating that culture.

Jen asked if we can place MCC’s 4 C’s on the About Page of our website. Matt indicated we may be able to place it on the same page as the Mission, Vision, and Values page and add the label “Student Learning Outcomes” to the link for this page. Matt thinks that would be possible. He will ask Shared Governance and the President’s cabinet.

6. **Academic Impressions Webinar:**
   a. **9 Formative Assessment Techniques:**
      i. Gain nine formative online assessment strategies to improve student learning outcomes. This example-packed training provides a guide for each assessment technique, allowing you to practically apply these techniques in your online courses to improve student feedback and more effectively address student challenges.
      ii. 1 December 1:00 – 2:30 pm EST (11:00 am to 12:30 pm)
      iii. Need a host if there is a group that is interested

Shall we ask the CTL (Laura) to host the Academic Impressions Webinar? Marjorie will ask Diana to send out an e-mail about this webinar clarifying its purpose and what being a host would entail.
7. **Today’s Main Objectives. Discussion**

   - Data Report on current status of implementation:
     - 64 instructors have at least attached the scoring guidelines to an assignment
     - 28 instructors attached the correct scoring guidelines
     - 29 instructors did not use the correct scoring guidelines
     - 7 instructors used both old and new scoring guidelines for at least one of their sections
     - 20 instructors have attached scoring guidelines since the last competency report pull on 10-1-15
     - 2 instructors that attached scoring guidelines on the report on 10-1-15 are no longer on the 11-6-15 report
     - There are a total of 121 sections

Some faculty feel uncomfortable asking other faculty to volunteer to assess. Ginger suggested that we offer more events like the paid adjunct training on Saturday with specific days and times.

A point was made that we need to market the notion that this is something we have to do, but something we want to do. We need a paradigm shift – a cultural shift.

Tim brought up the point that not all faculty are utilizing Canvas, and this is may be one factor playing into the low participation?

Brian suggested that if we want to be successful that department chairs must be assessing and creating the culture of using 4C’s with their faculty. He also suggested for those who are not utilizing Canvas, they could score on a hard copy and provide that to the department secretary to input.

Matt reminded us that the 4C’s are to be incorporated into Department plans.

We need more e-mail reminders that provide a list of assessment coaches in each of the areas and that the new scoring guidelines must be used.

8. **Adjunct Training**
   a. 21 Nov 2015 – Saturday
   b. At the CTL
   c. 8:00 am – 12:00 pm
   d. Limited space to 15 adjunct faculty (13 signed up as of 11/4/15)
   e. Breakfast will be served
f. Volunteers? 1 or 2 volunteers would be appreciated
   i. Name: Kristine Ouzts (?)
   ii. Name:

   Marjorie asked for volunteers to assist Diana with the adjunct training on the 21st. One possible volunteer came forth – Kristine. She will talk to Diane.

9. AACU Research Review (Copy attached to agenda’s email):
   a. Multi-State Collaboration Produces Valuable New Evidence About Writing, Critical Thinking, and Quantitative Literacy Skills of Undergraduate Students Using Rubric-Based Assessment of Students’ Authentic Work Multi-State Collaborative to Advance Learning Outcomes Assessment Completes Pilot Study Gathering Data from 59 Institutions of Higher Education in Nine Public State Systems
   b. Key Findings:
      i. Critical Thinking appears to remain a challenge even into 3 and 4 year university students
         1. 1/3 of 3 and 4 year students earned a “3 or 4” level in CT
         2. 40% graded “0 or 1”
      ii. While the findings from the pilot study are not generalizable across the entire population of students in the participating states or nationally, the study found within the cohort of participating institutions some clear patterns in students’ achievement levels. Using a 0–4 rating scale, much higher percentages of student work products were rated at either a “3” or “4” in four-year institutions than were rated at those levels in two-year institutions in the project. Significant numbers of students nearing degree completion at two-year institutions demonstrated high or very high levels of achievement on key outcomes.
   c. Issue:
      i. Should we set assessment criteria as to the levels of achievement?
      ii. Should each achievement be measured based on “Expert level” in the field?
      iii. Feedback – discussion on the need to make any changes, create special training, etc

Discussion included:
Kristine – The course competencies are old and written using Bloom's basement. What can we do to facilitate curriculum changes.
Tim – All of the faculty were assessing works in this pilot, but never their own students’, eliminating bias. Those in the pilot are assessing in the same manner we are – broad learning outcomes across disciplines.

Marjorie – In the pilot, multiple faculty graded the works to determine inter-rater reliability. Training was extensive in this pilot. Our faculty need more training.

10. Additional Items?

Roger spoke with Jeff Anderson at the conclusion of the meeting to see if he can run stats on how many faculty are actually using Canvas. Not using Canvas was a possible reason mentioned in the meeting as to why some faculty are not assessing/resisting assessing the 4Cs in their courses. Jeff said he can run a report that shows how many Canvas courses that are created are actually published which would be a good indicator of who is actually using the platform.

Here is Jeff’s response:

The UI shows 4133 total courses so we can do the math: 4133-1555=2578. That means roughly 62% of the total courses for Fall 2015 are in the published state if this number in the UI is correct.

Meeting adjourned at 4:05pm

Note takers: Jen Fay and Marjorie Leta