

August 17, 2020
3:00 PM, ZOOM

1. Approve February meeting minutes

February meeting minutes approved.

2. Last semester's progress

Achievements before COVID:

- The committee approved a consecutive term limit of two 3-year terms. For this year, several committee members have rolled-over into their second term. After many years of service, Lisa Juliano elected to move on from the committee; Alan Sauter is joining as a representative of the Math component area.
- An attendance policy was created and accepted.
- A 12-year assessment schedule (starting 2020/21) was created and accepted.
- Edits to the Critical Thinking Rubric were accepted and will be used during this year's assessment.

3. Spring 2020 Assessment format and results

Because of COVID, this past summer's Assessment Days were run in a digital format through Canvas. A course shell was created and populated with artifacts by Academic Services. 85 to 90 participants had a month's time (6/18-7/17) to assess their share of artifacts (16-18 artifacts each). The digital format was user-friendly, easy to understand, worked well, and was well received by members of the committee who were able to participate. If digital assessment is used again, there was committee support for keeping the process open for a similar amount of time. There was also support for developing orientation periods, which could consist of three days in June and three days in July when people familiar with the process would be available to help faculty complete the process.

There were a few issues with the new format that can be addressed if/when we use this format again. The interrater reliability was awkward. The IRR quiz at beginning did not help raters. Participants missed being able to interact and discuss issues with other raters, something that was a benefit of the in-person format used in past years. Discussion boards were suggested as a potentially helpful tool to alleviate some of this issue. Another suggestion was to have mentors available to answer questions or provide direction for people who are new to the Assessment Days process.

With changes to how summer courses will be compensated, there is a risk that full time faculty may not be teaching as many summer courses in the future. This could impact the number of faculty who participate as a way to meet their summer service requirements.

Discussion of 2019/20 Assessment Results

Overall, interrater reliability between the elements was similar to that of past years, though there were some concerns with elements of the rater reliability.

- For Teamwork, an average of over 90% of students met or exceeded the college standard ranking of three. This is comparable to past assessments. The 12-15 credit hour students' achievement was slightly less than 30+ hour students; previous year's assessments had an opposite trend.
- For Communication, an average of 65% of students met or exceeded the college standard ranking of three. These numbers show an improvement from the previous assessment cycle, which was itself an unexpectedly low (48% average). The 12-15 credit hour students achieved slightly higher scores than the 30+ credit hour students, suggesting the differences among our student population may not be that pronounced or that some of the higher performing students transfer out before being assessed as part of the 30+ cohort. The biggest increase in achievement was a 10% jump in the ranking of 4 (exceeds expectations). Assignment alignment efforts from Academic Services and COAT may be part of the success.

New Topics:

4. 2020/2021 assessment plan

This year's Assessment Cycle includes Social Responsibility and Critical Thinking, both of which have rubrics that were edited by COAT since the last time they were assessed. In order to help faculty get ahead of the process and to help make them aware of changes in these rubrics, the committee will be running workshops for the Fall cycle Discipline Leads and select faculty representatives (Thursday August 20th, Social Responsibility 1-2 pm and Critical Thinking 3-4 pm). The goal is to help faculty begin developing a well-aligned assignment that could be used across their discipline. Several participants are already on the COAT committee and volunteers were solicited before the meeting. Any other volunteers are welcome. We are also putting together a one-page flyer that has tips and recommendations from people who are familiar with this year's core objectives. If anyone has suggestions for these "Pro-Tips," please contact the co-chairs.

5. Artifacts recommendations: artifact length, discussion boards, math courses, ...

The committee had a discussion on the types of recommendations that are made to faculty regarding the format of student artifacts.

- The current suggestion is that artifacts should not exceed two pages in length. However, some core skills cannot be properly covered in artifacts that are too short. The consensus was to continue recommending that artifacts used for assessment should be brief and considerate of assessor's time. However, there is room to recognize that some more length may occasionally be needed.
- The committee currently allows discussion board posts to be accepted as student artifacts. Without context, these can often lead to poor assessment results. While such artifacts will not be turned away, the consensus is to emphasize to faculty the need to submit more comprehensive student artifacts.
- Artifacts submitted by math classes often contain content that is difficult for non-math people to assess. There was discussion on whether the artifacts should be created for a general audience or for a specialized audience. Reasonable arguments were made in defense of both positions. This issue significantly affects more specialized disciplines like mathematics, where student artifacts may not be easy to follow unless the assessor is familiar with that branch of mathematics. Some faculty participated in Assessment Days with the hope of being able to contribute their expertise in specific topics (like math) only to find that they had a random assortment of artifacts. This is the current design of the assessment process. This issue was more pronounced during the online Assessment Days because participants did not have an easy way to see the advice of colleges from other disciplines, something that was often done during in-person assessment. The co-chairs will seek out additional information from the College on whether the committee should steer artifact toward general or specialized audiences.

6. Establish CARC timelines

The COAT Committee decided that Monday, Sept 28th at 5 p.m. is the deadline for faculty to submit assignments to the Assignment Review subcommittee.

Notices will be emailed to faculty in a week or so.

7. COAT course shells in Canvas

Course shells were created in Canvas so that the committee could develop a new method of communicating with the faculty that are up for assessment. The intent is to populate the "course" with helpful information and to provide faculty an easy way to submit digital artifacts at the end of the semester.

8. Subcommittee participation

The co-chairs will send out a list of current subcommittee membership. If you would like to join a new subcommittee, please contact the co-chairs. The Rubric Review subcommittee should plan on looking at the rubrics for 2021/22 (Empirical & Quantitative and Personal Responsibility).

9. Revisit committee membership distribution

The committee needs to pick the issue of membership back up at a future meeting. With an expansion of campuses and an increase in the number of courses that will be assessed, it may be necessary to reconsider how the committee draws its membership.

10. Next Meeting, Tuesday, September 15th, 4pm, ZOOM