

## **CAC Minutes, Monday, October 22, 2018**

**In Attendance:** Denaya Dailey, Rachel Cunningham, Madeleine Murphy, Robbie Baden, Andrew Young, Stephanie Roach

**Agenda approved.**

**Minutes of Monday, September 22, approved with addition of the following people to “In Attendance”:** Add Rachel Cunningham, Denaya Dailey, Lakshmikanta Sengupta (in place of LK), and Michelle Brown.

### **Review The Assessment Handbook**

Madeleine added language for Learning Communities, more language regarding the research question at the bottom of page two, and more language about “hard questions” at the bottom of page three.

- Change from “can” to “should” under “Asking a variety of questions.”
- Make clear that research questions *should* align with learning outcomes for the section “What if our research question does not align with learning outcomes?”
- In “Where to get data?,” link to PRIE’s resource request form.
- Weave in reminders or context every now and then, like distinguishing how concerns about enrollment numbers aren’t really assessment.

In regards to effective surveys, Madeleine proposed developing a module and reaching out to Erica Reynolds for help. We can also give guidance on how to use WebSmart and other resources to get feedback from former students.

- Denaya shared how, using Facebook, she was able to reach out to former students and get about 40 replies.
- Stephanie proposed changing language about specific social media sources to social media generally in “Student Outreach.”

The next step for the Assessment Handbook will be developing it into a website. Madeleine will begin the website and ask for feedback from the committee members between now and the next meeting.

### **Program Review Reading and Reflection**

Madeleine, Jeremy Wallace, Stephanie, and Jeremiah Sims have discussed putting together a group to read the Program Reviews with one eye on how they meet program reporting requirements but another eye on our needs across the College. Part of this tries to speak to previous issues with Program Review: they required a lot of work, then vanished, and nothing seemed to come of them for those who wrote the Program Reviews.

Question for discussion: Why are we reading Program Reviews and what are we getting out of them?

- We need to look at the quality of the research question. It will also be good to share out assessments and research questions that worked particularly well, no matter if the results were “good” or not.
- We need to identify training needs based on Program Reviews. At the conclusion, we should have a list of recommendations for flex day activities and workshops, as well as success stories, shared difficulties, or gaps.
- We should also review Program Reviews across different years to see if we find growth: Are we building off of PRs or not? Are we learning from the past? Is there continuity?

How do we divide up the work of reading Program Reviews?

- Let’s do roughly 10 Reviews for each person. Madeleine will develop a template for this reading before the end of the semester.
- We should also confer with Jeramy to better understand this initiative to review Program Reviews. This conversation about how this is going to work may lead to revisiting the idea of developing a larger committee for reading the Program Reviews.