

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

February 25, 2021

Meeting Minutes

Attendees: T. Crawford, Carlee Ranalli, R. Rohan, C. Hawbecker, S. Cameron, J. Luna, Bonnie Saunders, Mike Martin, Chris Baer, J. Suminski, L. Kuehnert,

- **Old Business**

- Original Outcomes Assessment Charge from 2019: “Review of current practices in academic assessment and evaluate needs to meet compliance with Middle States expectations.”

- **New Business**

- Carlee met with David Warner and Chelsea Brereton to clarify some of the procedures involved in collecting documents for SLOA. Documentation across divisions looks mostly complete aside from a few gaps that are in the process of being addressed. Chelsea and Tyler Nedimeyer know which lead faculty collect which documentation and track updates for each level of documentation.
- Carlee and Tom met with Academic Council this month, and report that a small group from AC plans to meet to develop timelines for SLOA work going forward.
 - Tom reviewed the need for General Education reporting procedures across disciplines/divisions and added that in some situations cross-division procedures are also needed in other situations, for example when collecting COG data for Math courses that are program-required courses in another division.
 - Bob commented that the “COGs” and “POGs” do not necessarily seem to coincide with current terminology used in data reporting, and that some confusion arose over the difference between Course Outcomes and Course Objectives. Reporting forms and/or terminology might need clarification or updating. He also pointed out that while Course, Program and General Education outcomes all did need to align, analysis at each level did not necessarily require connecting data for all outcomes to every level of assessment: i.e., Course level data may be used to analyze program level outcomes or Course level data may be used to analyze General Education outcomes.
 - Carlee highlighted the issues that arise when programs report data as percentages without tying results to a stated benchmark at which a standard is or is not met. One option to solve this might be to apply a basic met/not met standard to facilitate analysis, especially for ILOs.
- Carlee reported on changes to Middle States since 2015:
 - Middle States will no longer have a regional focus as of 2021 (this addresses online instruction issues, for example allowing a school in California could seek Middle States accreditation).
 - There are now seven standards rather than 14. This committee’s work falls under Standard V.
 - There will be an 8-year cycle instead of 10 years (for HCC it will still be 2025 this next time)
 - Instead of a self-study conducted at the 5 year point (in a 10 year cycle), there will be annual institutional update reports used by reviewers to conduct a Mid-point Peer Review. HCC will undergo the mid-point peer review this year (2021) based upon annual institutional updates.

- Documentation is submitted digitally.
- In Fall 2022 the co-chairs of the steering committee (one administrator and one faculty) for HCC's self-study will attend Middle States training. The accreditation visit itself will be in 2024-2025.
- **Action for Next Meeting**
 - a. Consider Middle States Process and Standards
 - b. Review [2020 SLOA Guide](#), the [May 2020 ILO's](#) and a selection of [SLOA Documents](#) from different divisions.
 - c. Review Cecil Assessment Plan and the CNU Triennial Assessment Document
 - d. Develop a list of questions/thoughts for next meeting
 - e. In the next two months if each committee member could outline what your current academic or student services assessments would look like on a 3-year schedule.

Next meeting: March 25 at 2:30 pm

Minutes submitted by L. Kuehnert – 3/30/2021