

MINUTES:

Meeting: Student Learning Committee

Date/Time/Location: 8.31.2018/9:00 a.m./TMCC Board Room

Present: Terri Martin-Parisien, Erik Kornkven, Dr. Ann Brummel, Dr. Deb Hunter, Les Lafountain, Alixena Patnaude, Dr. Teresa Delorme, Ace Charette, Ron Parisien, Kellie Hall, Edwin Acosta, Marilyn Delorme, Marlin Allery

Absent: Sheila Trottier, Chad Davis, Wanda Laducer

Staff Present:

Guests:

Officiating Recorder: Ace Charette

| Agenda Item | Discussion – Conclusion | Recommendations or Actions |
|---|--|----------------------------|
| 1. Call to Order | 9:09 a.m. | |
| 2. Roll Call | | |
| 3. Adopt Agenda | <p>Discussion of whether to include committee composition to the agenda.</p> <p>Discussion of whether to consider future new chair for committee at the end of the meeting.</p> <p>No new items added to agenda.</p> <p>Kellie motions to approve agenda. Les seconds.</p> | Motion passes |
| <p>4. Approval and discussion of reports/forms</p> <p>a. Year-end assessment report</p> | <p>Erik asks if we had a chance to review the year-end assessment report.</p> <p>Erik reviews the matrix for the yearly assessment report.</p> <p>Erik asks for any thoughts, comments, concerns, or ideas.</p> <p>Dr. Brummel: is curriculum mapping part of this?</p> <p>Erik: curriculum mapping occurs in a separate section within the document.</p> <p>Erik: I debated a narrative at the beginning summing up the year. I still could add something like that. This will be on the website and available ultimately to the Higher Learning Commission. We want it to be accessible and usable. Students should also be able to learn about program assessment from this document also. The narrative always looks and sounds good, but it's not the most meaningful part of the document. Too much narrative is possible, so I just did an overview with narrative in little paragraphs along with overall numbers.</p> | Tabled |

Dr. Delorme: Narrative comes from other documents about the overall institution itself, so it maybe isn't necessary in this document.

Erik: Institutional assessment will also be included in this. Ace and I are working to get institutional assessment included in here. Given this, students or others should be able to find everything in just one document. I am basing this from documents we got from Standing Rock and Sitting Bull where institutional and student learning documentation was all in one place.

Erik: Should we wait to approve this until we all have a chance to review?

Dr. Deb: I would like to wait.

Erik: I will place this on the next agenda.

Les: There is a concern on p. 78-79: the pre- and post-test is not necessarily something we want to give out to everybody. Is that something we want to have in here? Should it be anywhere else? Everything else is more of a diagram that gives the overview, and here is an actual test.

Erik: Maybe we should say in the actual report we should not include it, but if you want to share it you can bring it physically to the committee meeting.

Kellie: This could invalidate the tool if students have access.

Erik: Up until now we have let people choose. Some people just include the sheet; maybe this year we can have it open to share documents like this for the committee, but not to put it in this final document.

Dr. Delorme: there are two schools of thought on whether this should be accessible.

Kellie: if you're just trying to measure growth (vs. letting students know what is on a graded exam), it may be better to keep it out of this document.

Erik: It does strengthen this document a bit to share an assessment tool; maybe we can just ask them to describe the tool rather than provide it in its entirety. I think we can be more uniform in whether we include items like this or not; it can get very long if everyone includes all of their assessment tools.

Dr. Delorme: Maybe a link where people can access sample assessments for courses would allow students or others to go in and take a quick peek; this might be good for visiting teams as well.

Erik: That would be useful too. I have been wanting to gather assessment tools, not just for reviewers, but also for us.

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------|
| | <p>Ace: Would this help with faculty turnover?</p> <p>Erik: That's a good point – these reports would stay, but that's a good point with the tools if faculty do turn over. Good thoughts. Feel free to contact me for any changes prior to approval at a future meeting.</p> | |
| <p>Review last year</p> | <p>Ron: I felt that when they had rubrics, that helped to give us an idea of what we were looking for.</p> <p>Edwin: I had to agree with that. With my first year, I better understood the thought process behind it.</p> <p>Erik: This refers to the practice reviews (norming) to compare our numbers and have us on the same page. This is on the timeline, not for every meeting this year, but periodically we can do this. What did you think of the celebration? I felt that it fell flat a bit; with the full campus (including cocurricular), I felt it was harder to do the celebration.</p> <p>Kellie: One thing I thought—I saw different faculty come in, it made people more comfortable when they presented to see someone else go before them. Not having closed doors was good. Maybe purposefully inviting peers to watch each other's presentations can be helpful. People got good ideas from others presenting.</p> <p>Erik: I like putting that out there. Making it a welcome environment is good.</p> <p>Kellie: It builds comradery among faculty especially.</p> <p>Dr. Delorme: Everyone so embraced the process and made a good effort to come in and present. The progress we've made in such short time is affirming.</p> <p>Erik: People could go a different way with this. We could be fighting people tooth and nail, but now there is momentum. It shows we have taken it seriously. CTE especially has taken it seriously from the very beginning.</p> <p>Les: Assessment is not a sexy topic, but we may want to send an invitation to the Boards. Being there is a challenging job on top of their day jobs, but I see a disconnect with what's going on in the institution and how they are engaging. Somehow we should improve this, and maybe this can be done through a presentation at a board meeting. This process is for us and our community. HLC is going to tell you that also. How do we get the community—via the board—to these meetings?</p> <p>Kellie: if you'd like to send me something each month to include in the board report, I can do this also. Quarterly board reports can be a bigger write-up too. Maybe we could do one presentation on that and then do a monthly update, that would be good to include in my report.</p> <p>Erik: Monthly there isn't that much going on, but maybe at the end of the year, we can get on the agenda to walk through this.</p> | <p>Discussion</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|-------------------|
| | <p>Kellie: Next month is our quarterly meeting, and maybe this would be a good time. They like having faculty there, and I think the board would appreciate that.</p> | |
| <p>Discuss goals for this year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Continued co-curricular involvement b. Delegate tasks c. Better communication | <p>Continued co-curricular involvement: Erik: We really need to follow up with co-curricular. We really need to be on the ground and help them with learning outcome tools.</p> <p>Kellie: Would the next step be for co-curriculars to present at the end of this year?</p> <p>Erik: Yes—they would present from the same form. However, in the past we have not asked them to present the first year, and this is what they did at the end of last year. They said here is what we are going to measure and how we are going to measure it. This year, they will be responsible to carry it out and present. There are still some programs that are out of the loop that have not been assessed. Some elect not to even though they have been approached. Program review ties into this, so one of the indicators comes in the program review process; if they have done no assessment, we encourage it, but we don't have the teeth to require it.</p> <p>Kellie: I think it would be good to seek ways to engage with the CTE Director and the Academic Dean to make sure all programs are assessing their programs.</p> <p>Ace: I agree; there is a lot that can happen between program reviews, and identifying assessment trends is a critical piece of identifying what is happening within a program.</p> <p>Some discussion took place on what happens if programs are not available and if these should maintain their status in the catalog.</p> <p>Delegating tasks: Erik: I think everyone in this room can have responsibility to be the outreach for assessment across campus. This includes meeting with departments; department chairs will take that responsibility for the departments under you. Being proactive will ensure people are doing what needs to be done. I would be happy to meet with everybody, but you don't need to wait for me to come if you know that a meeting needs to take place. Also, identifying leaders within the committee to be the point people within the committee to be leaders for developing assessment. Serving as a resource for areas like co-curricular assessment would help. I am a point-person for everyone, but having other point people would be helpful. We can go over this next meeting, so keep this in mind.</p> <p>Ace: I can be the contact for co-curricular.</p> <p>Erik: I think that makes sense.</p> <p>Better Communication: Erik: I put review of initial assessment plans in the timeline, as sometimes communication after these initial plans are not so great. That we can follow through for these. Every year, they complete the first three sections</p> | <p>Discussion</p> |

| | | |
|------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| | <p>of the assessment plan. We get people who are still confused about the process, but there is a breakdown of communication about how this gets back to people. This piece in the timeline will be helpful to ensure clarity.</p> <p>Kellie: this will be helpful for co-curriculars from last year?</p> <p>Erik: This is more for people who are already a bit more developed. This is a kind of check in to make sure that there are good outcomes and good methods. Those programs who have not participated yet can bet met with, but they don't follow the October 1st deadline.</p> <p>Kellie updated Dr. Martin-Parisien on the need for ensuring 100% participation for assessment (as she stepped out for this part of the conversation).</p> <p>Dr. Martin-Parisien: I wonder if we could develop a table for this so that everyone knows what is expected of them. We missed some programs last year because we overlooked it. If we had a table, we would know exactly where we are in the process.</p> <p>Dr. Deb Hunter: Would assessment be included with partnerships with outside institutions?</p> <p>Erik: A "program" is only an area where there is a certificate or a degree. (Erik covers those who were assessed and progress of those who weren't assessed in the recent past.) I'm a little hesitant to breaking out the stick, as people need to see the value of this; that's why we have seen good participation and engagement so far, and it shows pride in the work that people have done.</p> | |
| <p>Discuss Year Schedule</p> | <p>Kellie: Gen Ed HLC Conference:</p> <p>Terri: I would like to see Alixena and Dr. Deb Hunter go this year in February.</p> <p>Erik: we have that one to plan and then HLC in April; maybe we won't send anyone to that with the visit. We'll discuss later.</p> <p>Kellie: There's nothing for assessment in January?</p> <p>Erik: We typically have nothing in January specifically for assessment. For us, the winter break does not impact our timeline, as it builds momentum more toward the end of the year. Look at those in-between meetings, so sometime we will have to have the assessment kick-off meeting—the sooner the better. Maybe this meeting could go 9-11 (9-10 with everyone and 10-11 with Gen Ed faculty). For co-curricular, it would only be those who are directly responsible for assessment.</p> <p>Kellie: I think it wouldn't be bad to have everyone, as they need to know what is happening with assessment.</p> <p>Erik: For the kickoff, it needs to be more focused. It would be good knowledge for them, but they would not be direct participants; those attending need to be in charge of things.</p> | <p>Discussion</p> |

| | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Dates were considered; Erik could meet with individuals who cannot participate. September 7th was agreed upon to ensure that final assessment plans are finalized by October.</p> <p>Ace and Erik can plan for refreshments.</p> | |
| Faculty and Program Visits | <p>Erik: If you are a chair or functional unit head, please set up a time to set up assessment discussions at least once before October and another prior to the end of the year when we evaluate assessments—so twice per year.</p> | |
| Conference visits | <p>Erik: a group is going to the assessment academy results forum, so we are “graduating” from the assessment academy. It will be a time to share successes and talk about what’s happened the last 3-4 years with assessment. We will meet to put together a presentation and a poster.</p> <p>There would be time to go to the HLC annual conference, and we could have a team to present there.</p> <p>Les: I might encourage you to present at a regular session to educate other communities. It’s really hard to get people that have knowledge of tribal colleges.</p> <p>Kellie: I think the time has passed for submissions, but I can check; they may be able to squeeze us in anyways.</p> <p>Erik discussed the General Education conference, covering the basic details.</p> <p>Kellie mentioned that recommendations for attending the annual HLC conference can be submitted to Terri and Sheila. Five rooms are currently booked. Recommendations for who you would like to see go can be submitted to the President and approved soon.</p> <p>Les: Board members maybe can go to the HLC Conference as well. If there are new board members, they should be really encouraged to go. It’s important to understand this process.</p> <p>Kellie: JoAnn Decoteu has gone several times. Duane has never attended—and others have not—but there have been board members who have attended in the past. I encourage them every year, as that’s part of my report. We can try to get more rooms.</p> <p>Les: It is better to send people who do not understand accreditation.</p> <p>Erik: I think the reason that we are doing so well with assessment is that we were “met with concerns” in the past. Just think if there are other areas that are marked in this manner, we can develop these things further later on.</p> <p>Kellie: that is true, getting this designation can give us some teeth to address issues later on.</p> | |
| Accreditation visits | <p>Erik: Just keep in mind what this committee needs to do in order to support accreditation.</p> | |

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | <p>Ace: Just keeping documents organized and continuing good committee function is perfect for this process.</p> <p>Program Review:</p> <p>Ace: Describes status of the program review process, which is currently in development for implementation at TMCC. All administrators across camps are involved in discussions at this point, and we will soon be seeking feedback from at least one external contact to provide feedback on this; the next step from there would be to get faculty feedback to provide an opportunity for additional edits. We won't likely make the 30-day comment period timeline due to the fact that we need to implement this within this year, but we want to make sure that faculty are able to provide input in case there is something glaring from this document that faculty and/or program directors will want to explore further. The primary point of program review is to ensure alignment of programs to our institutional mission, ensure vital indicators of program health are realized, to improve programs that have less-than-ideal indicators of program health, and to measure community impacts to be able to eventually promote the nuanced successes of our institution to external constituents. I'll acknowledge that I have sense a kind of fear of program review in that some people associate this with program closure. Though program closure is a necessary part of the program review process, it is not the primary function of it, and it is usually only in rare circumstances that the Program Review Committee would close a program.</p> <p>Les indicated that we need to make sure that we as an institution are impacting the local community so that we understand the college's place in it.</p> <p>Ace fielded questions about the program review process to clarify understanding.</p> | |
| <p>Next meeting</p> | <p>September 7th is the kickoff.</p> <p>The end of September conflicts with a data conference in Minneapolis.</p> <p>October 12th is the next available date.</p> | <p>October 12th, 2018</p> |
| <p>Meeting Adjourns</p> | <p>Les motions to adjourn. Kellie seconds.</p> <p>Adjourned 10:58 p.m.</p> | |
| | | |